

INTELEKTUALCI V DIASPORI



INTELLECTUALS IN DIASPORA

ZALŽBA
ZAC

Intelektualci v diaspori

Intellectuals in Diaspora

Zbornik referatov simpozija »100. obletnica rojstva Louisa Adamiča –

Intelektualci v diaspori«, Portorož, Slovenija, 1.–5. septembra 1998

Proceedings of the Symposium »100th Birth Anniversary of Louis Adamic –

Intellectuals in diaspora«, Portorož, Slovenia, 1–5 September, 1998

Uredila • Edited by

Irena Gantar Godina

Prevodi • Translated by

AMIDAS, Cvetka Puncer, Nives Sulič

Oblikovanje • Design and Graphic Art by

Milojka Žalik Huzjan

Izdal in založil • Published by

ZRC SAZU, Inštitut za slovensko izseljenstvo •

Institute for Slovene Emigration Studies,

Založba ZRC • ZRC Publishing

Zanj • Represented by

Oto Luthar

Fotografija na ovitku • Photo by

Marko Zaplatil

Tisk • Printed by

Littera picta, d.o.o., Ljubljana, Slovenija

Izdajo je finančno podprlo

Ministrstvo za znanost in tehnologijo Republike Slovenije

The publication was financially supported by

The Ministry of Science and Technology of the Republic of Slovenia

CIP - Kataložni zapis o publikaciji

Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, Ljubljana

316.344.32:314.7

SIMPOZIJ 100. obletnica rojstva Louisa Adamiča - Intelektualci v diaspori (1998 ; Portorož)

Intelektualci v diaspori : zbornik referatov simpozija 100. obletnica rojstva Louisa Adamiča - Intelektualci v diaspori, Portorož, Slovenija, 1.-5. septembra 1998 = Intellectuals in Diaspora : proceedings of the Symposium 100th Birth Anniversary of Louis Adamic - Intellectuals in diaspora, Portorož, Slovenia, 1-5 September, 1998 / uredila, edited by Irena Gantar Godina : [prevodi, translated by AMIDAS, Cvetka Puncer, Nives Sulič]. - Ljubljana : Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU, Inštitut za slovensko izseljenstvo 1999

ISBN 961-6182-73-0

1. Gl. stv. nasl. 2. Vzp. stv. nasl. 3. Stota obletnica rojstva Louisa Adamiča - Intelektualci v diaspori 4. One hundredth birth anniversary of Luis Adamic - Intellectuals in diaspora 5. Gantar-Godina, Irena - I. Godina, Irena Gantar-glej Gantar-Godina Irena. II. Symposium 100th Birth Anniversary of Louis Adamic - Intellectuals in Diaspora (1998 ; Portorož) glej Simpozija 100. obletnica rojstva Louisa Adamiča - Intelektualci v diaspori (1998 ; Portorož)

Digitalna različica (pdf) je pod pogoji licence CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 prosto dostopna / Digital version (pdf) is freely available according to the CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 licence:

<https://doi.org/10.3986/9616182730>

INTELEKTUALCI V DIASPORI

INTELLECTUALS IN DIASPORA

Uredila/Edited by
Irena Gantar Godina

Zbornik referatov simpozija »100. obletnica rojstva Louisa Adamiča –
Intelektualci v diaspori«, Portorož, Slovenija, 1.–5. septembra 1998

Proceedings of the Symposium »100th Birth Anniversary of
Louis Adamic – Intellectuals in Diaspora«,
Portorož, Slovenia, 1–5 September, 1998

Ljubljana 1999

IRENA GANTAR GODINA	
PREDGOVOR	9
<i>FOREWORD</i>	11
MIRKO JURAK	
LOUIS ADAMIC AND VATRO GRILL: A PARTNERSHIP OF EQUALS?	13
<i>LOUIS ADAMIČ IN VATROSLAV GRILL: ENAKOPRAVNO SODELOVANJE?</i>	20
MIHAEL KUZMIČ	
AMERIŠKI ROJAK JOŽE MIHELIČ (1902–1989) – TEOLOG, ZGODOVINAR IN PRIJATELJ LOUISA ADAMIČA	21
<i>THE AMERICAN SLOVENE JOŽE L. MIHELIČ (1902–1989) – THEOLOGIAN, HISTORIAN AND FRIEND OF LOUIS ADAMIC</i>	32
IMRE SZILÁGYI	
CONCERN FOR ONCE’S NATION FAR AWAY FROM HOMELAND TWO EXAMPLES: LOUIS ADAMIC AND OSZKÁR JÁSZI	33
<i>SKRB ZA NAROD DALEČ OD DOMOVINE DVA PRIMERA: LOUIS ADAMIČ IN OSZKÁR JÁSZI</i>	41
MATJAŽ KLEMENČIČ	
SLOVENIA AS PART OF A UNITED EUROPE IN THE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF SLOVENE EMIGRANTS FROM LOUIS ADAMIC TO MIHA KREK	43
<i>SLOVENIJA KOT DEL ZDRUŽENE EVROPE V POLITIČNEM RAZMIŠLJANJU SLOVENSКИH PRISELJENCEV V OBDOBJU OD LOUISA ADAMIČA DO DR. MIHE KREKA</i>	58
MARINA LUKŠIČ-HACIN	
DIFFERENT UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE NOTION INTELLECTUAL	59
<i>RAZLIČNA RAZUMEVANJA POJMA INTELEKTUALEC</i>	68
MARJAN DRNOVŠEK	
SOME ASPECTS OF THE ATTITUDE OF SLOVENE INTELLECTUALS TOWARDS EMIGRATION UP TO 1941	69

<i>NEKATERI POGLEDI SLOVENSКИH INTELKTUALCEV DO IZSELJENSTVA DO LETA 1941</i>	75
IRENE MISLEJ	
VLOGA INTELKTUALCEV V JUŽNOAMERIŠKI SLOVENSKI SKUPNOSTI	77
<i>THE ROLE OF INTELLECTUALS IN THE SOUTH AMERICAN SLOVENIAN COMMUNITY</i>	85
LEV DETELA	
PROBLEM DIASPORE V RAZMIŠLJANJИH SLOVENSКИH ZDOMSKИH INTELKTUALCEV PO LETU 1945	87
<i>REFLECTIONS OF SLOVENE INTELLECTUALS ABROAD CONCERNING THE PROBLEM OF THE DIASPORA AFTER 1945</i>	92
ZVONE ŽIGON	
JANEZ BENIGAR – ARAUCANIAN SLOVENE	93
<i>JANEZ BENIGAR – ARAVKANSKI SLOVENEK</i>	101
GORDON SKILLING	
CZECHS AND SLOVAKS EXILE AND HOMELAND 1948–1989	103
<i>ČEHI IN SLOVAKI – IZGNANSTVO IN DOMOVINA 1948–1989</i>	113
HALINA FLORKOWSKA-FRANČIĆ	
ZYGMUNT MIŁKOWSKI AND AMERICAN POLONIA	115
<i>ZYGMUNT MIŁKOWSKI IN AMERIŠKA POLONIA</i>	122
JAN LENCZNAROWICZ	
POLISH REFUGEE INTELLECTUALS IN AUSTRALIA AFTER WORLD WAR II	123
<i>POLJSKI INTELKTUALCI – UBEŽNIKI V AVSTRALIJO PO DRUGI SVETOVNI VOJNI</i>	132
ISKRA ČURKINA	
DAVORIN HOSTNIK'S JOURNALISTIC ACTIVITY	133
<i>DAVORIN HOSTNIK – PUBLICIST IN ZNANSTVENIK</i>	142

JEVGENIJ FIRSOV

- FILOZOF IVAN ILJIN – INTELEKTUALEC, BOREC, ČLOVEK
(PO NEOBJAVLJENIH PISMIH MECENOMA KRAMÁŘ
V PRAGO IZ NEMČIJE, ŠVICE IN AVSTRIJE) 143
*PHILOSOPHER IVAN ILYIN – INTELLECTUAL, FIGHTER, MAN (ON THE
UNKNOWN LETTER TO MAECENASES KRAMÁŘ TO PRAGUE FROM AUSTRIA,
SWITZERLAND AND GERMANY)* 154

EDWARD MOZEJKO

- EXILE AND THE POLITICS OF MULTICULTURALISM: POLISH WRITERS
AND INTELLECTUALS IN CANADA 155
*IZGNANSTVO IN POLITIKA MULTIKULTURALIZMA: POLJSKI
INTELEKTUALCI IN PISATELJI V KANADI* 164

ANDREA PANACCIONE

- LA CULTURE POLITIQUE DE L'ÉMIGRATION MENCHEVIQUE ENTRE
LES DEUX GUERRES MONDIALES 165
*POLITIČNA KULTURA MENJŠEVIŠKE EMIGRACIJE MED OBEMA
VOJNAMA* 170

MIRJANA PAVLOVIĆ

- MIHAJLO PUPIN'S CHARACTER IN EMIGRATION AND DOMESTIC PRESS . 171
OSEBNOST MIHAJLA PUPINA V IZSELJENSKEM IN DOMAČEM TISKU 178

IGOR MAVER

- SLOVENE POETRY IN THE U.S.A.: THE CASE OF IVAN ZORMAN 179
SLOVENSKA POEZIJA V ZDA: IVAN ZORMAN 186

TIMOTHY POGAČAR

- POETRY AND PROSE IN THE AMERIŠKI DRUŽINSKI KOLEDAR 187
PESNIŠTVO IN PROZA V AMERIŠKEM DRUŽINSKEM KOLEDARJU 197

BREDA ČEBULJ SAJKO

- »IN MY LIFE I HAD ONLY TWO WISHES: TO BECOME AN IMMIGRANT
TEACHER, OR A COOK«. The Work of Jože Čuješ among Australian Slovenes 199

»IMEL SEM SAMO DVE ŽELJI V SVOJEM ŽIVLJENJU: DA BI BIL IZSELJENSKI UČITELJ ALI PA KUCHAR«. Delo Jožeta Čuješa med avstralskimi Slovenci	204
NIVES SULIČ	
NANČKA FROM AMERICA: MYTH AND REALITY – THE FULL CIRCLE	205
NANČKA IZ AMERIKE – PISMA S TERENA	210
DUŠAN DRJJAČA	
ZNAMENITI SRBSKI INTELEKTUALCI V SOSEDNIH DEŽELAH	211
EMINENT SERBIAN INTELLECTUALS IN NEIGHBOURING COUNTRIES	216
IFIGENIJA SIMONVIČ	
KO NIČ POMENI VEČ	217
WHEN NOTHING MEANS MORE	224
METKA ZUPANČIČ	
PROSTOR POD SONCEM, V TUJINI... ..	225
A PLACE TO LIVE, ABROAD... ..	232
VASILIJ MELIK	
HERMANN IN KOZLER	233
HERMANN AND KOZLER	236
IRENA GANTAR GODINA	
JAN LEGO – VERKÜNDER DER SLAWISCHEN GEGENSEITIGKEIT	237
JAN LEGO – GLASNIK SLOVENSKO-ČEŠKE VZAJEMNOSTI	242
AVTORJI/CONTRIBUTORS	243

Pričujoči prispevki so rezultat doslej najširše zastavljenega mednarodnega znanstvenega sestanka s področja migracijskih študij, ki ga je v Portorožu (1.- 5. 9. 1998) organiziral Inštitut za slovensko izseljenstvo ZRC SAZU. Organizator je na srečanje povabil strokovnjake, ki se ukvarjajo s problematiko s področja migracijskih študij, osrednja tema pa je bilo pomembno vprašanje, vprašanje intelektualca izseljenca.

Zbornik vsebuje izbrane prispevke udeležencev iz Slovenije in devetih drugih držav: Kanade, ZDA, Velike Britanije, Italije, Avstrije, Madžarske, Poljske, Rusije in Zvezne republike Jugoslavije. Prispevki štirih referentov (Janje Žitnik, Rozine Švent, Nika Kurenta in Franceta Adamiča) so bili predhodno objavljeni v reviji *Dve domovini/Two Homelands*, zato jih v zborniku nismo ponatisnili.

Osrednja osebnost in izhodišče srečanja je bil slovenski pisatelj in publicist Louis Adamič oz. obeležitev 100. obletnice njegovega rojstva. Louis Adamič je nedvomno še vedno izziv za mnoge raziskovalce tako z literarnega, političnega kot splošno znanstvenokulturnega stališča. Zato so razprave posvečene različnim obravnavam njegovega dela, delovanja in njegovim stikom z drugimi izobraženci in kulturniki, ki so jih prispevali ugledni strokovnjaki (*Mirko Jurak, Mihael Kuzmič, Imre Szilagy, Matjaž Klemenčič*), razkrile vso široko paleto njegovih dejavnosti in interesov.

»Primer« Adamič pa je tudi primerno izhodišče za širšo analizo intelektualca izseljenca, saj je vsekakor mogoče trditi, da njegov primer in s tem slovenskega intelektualca izseljenca ni samo specifičen slovenski problem. Zato je drugi del zbornika pravzaprav logično nadaljevanje prvega dela, saj so se razpravljalci v njem dotaknili tudi širših in splošnejših vprašanj intelektualca izseljenca.

S svojimi prispevki so pokazali, kako v različnih kulturah, okoljih, socialnih razmerah ipd., deluje izseljeni izobraženec. Želja je bila, da bi analiza pokazala tudi, kakšne so razlike in podobnosti ali celo istovetnosti oz. stične točke problemov, ki so nedvomno relevantni tudi danes. Zdi se, da lahko šele skozi ta spoznanja zares razumemo intelektualca izseljenca.

Večji del zbornika je torej posvečen delu in usodi posameznikov različnih nacionalnosti, ki so izhajali ali izhajajo iz različnih držav, različnih poklicev, različnih ideoloških ali političnih opredelitev. Za nekatere je bila izselitev dokončna, za druge samo začasna, nekateri so domovino zapustili prostovoljno, drugi ne, vsak pa je imel svoje razloge.

Intelektualci izseljenci so obravnavani z vidika več strok: sociološke (*Marina Lukšič-Hacin*), zgodovinske (*Gordon Skilling, Marjan Drnovšek, Halina Florkowska-Frančič, Jan Lencznarowicz, Iskra Čurkina, Jevgenij Firsov, Andrea Panachione, Irene Mislej, Mirjana Pavlovič*), literarno-teoretične (*Lev Detela, Edward Možejko, Igor Maver, Timothy Pogačar*), etnološke (*Breda Čebulj-Sajko, Nives Sulič, Dušan Drljača*), antropološke (*Zvone Žigon*).

Posebej pomembno je, da sta o svoji usodi in problemih, ki jih intelektualec izseljenec doživlja na tujem, spregovorili tudi intelektualki, ki že leta živita na tujem (*Ifigenija Simonović, Metka Zupančič*).

Obravnnavani pa so bili tudi intelektualci, ki niso bili »pravi« izseljenci; tisti namreč, ki so sicer živeli v matični, mnogonacionalni državi (Avstro-Ogrski), delovali pa so na Slovenskem, zunaj svoje ožje domovine (*Vasilij Melik, Irena Gantar Godina*).

Organizacija simpozija in natis zbornika v tako kratkem času ne bi bila mogoča brez pomoči Špele Marinšek in mag. Zvoneta Žigona, strokovne delavke in mladega raziskovalca na Inštitutu za slovensko izseljenstvo ZRC SAZU.

Simpozij so finančno podprli Ministrstvo za kulturo RS, Raziskovalni sklad ZRC SAZU, Ministrstvo za znanost in tehnologijo RS, Hoteli Bernardin Portorož in Casino Portorož, natis zbornika pa Ministrstvo za znanost in tehnologijo. Vsem iskrena hvala, hvala pa tudi Založbi ZRC, ki je izdajo zbornika uvrstila v svoj program.

The collected papers are the result of what was to date the widest-reaching international scientific meeting related to migration studies, organised by the Institute of Slovenian Emigration at the Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts (ZRC SAZU). The Institute invited experts dealing chiefly with issues concerning migration studies, and the central topic was the important question of the intellectual-emigrant.

The collected papers contain selected reports by participants from Slovenia and nine other countries:

Canada, USA, United Kingdom, Italy, Austria, Hungary, Poland, Russia and the Republic of Yugoslavia. Four articles (Janja Žitnik, Rozina Švent, Tine Kurent and France Adamič) have been already published in *Dve domovini/Two homelands*, No. 9, 1998.

The central figure (theme) of the gathering was the Slovenian writer and essayist Louis Adamič, or rather the marking of 100 years since his birth.

Louis Adamič of course still presents a challenge for many researchers – from the literary, political or general scientific and cultural point of view. There are therefore discussions by eminent experts (*Mirko Jurak, Mihael Kuzmič, Irene Mislej, Imre Szilagy, Matjaž Klemenčič*) devoted to the various debates about Adamič's work, activities and contacts with other intellectuals that revealed the whole range of his activities and interests. On the other hand the 'Adamič case' has also been a starting point for broader analysis of the intellectual-emigrant, since it has been entirely possible to claim that his case as well as the case of other Slovenian intellectual-emigrants has not been a specifically Slovenian problem only. For this reason the second part of the collection has been a logical continuation of the first part, since experts had touched on wider themes and questions generally regarding the intellectual-emigrant.

The papers expose the way that the emigrant intellectual acts and feels in various cultures, environments and social conditions. The aim was for the analysis to present the differences, similarities or even points of identification, or all the differences and meeting points of problems that are undoubtedly also relevant today. It seems the intellectual-emigrant can be really understood only through this awareness.

Most of the collection of papers has been dedicated to the work and fates of individuals of various nationalities coming from various countries, of various professions and ideological or political persuasion. For some emigration has been definite, for some temporary, some abandoned the country voluntarily, some did not but each of them had his own reason for the emigrating.

Intellectual-emigrants are discussed by various professions and their points of view, sociology (*Marina Lukšič-Hacin*), covering history (*Gordon Skilling, Marjan Drnovšek, Halina Florkowska-Frančič, Iskra Čurkina, Jevgenij Firsov, Andrea Panachione, Jan Lencz-*

narowicz, Mirjana Pavlović), literary theory (*Lev Detela, Igor Maver, Timothy Pogačar, Edward Možejko*), ethnology (*Breda Čebulj-Sajko, Nives Sulič, Dušan Drljača*), and anthropology (*Zvone Žigon*). Of special importance is that two women intellectuals, living abroad for many years, spoke of their lives and the problems intellectuals faced abroad (*Simonović, Zupančič*). The collection also features intellectuals who were not real emigrants since they have been living in multinational countries outside the domestic environment or narrower homeland (*Vasilij Melik, Irena Gantar Godina*).

It would have been impossible to hold the symposium or produce the collected papers in such a short time without the commitment of Špela Marinšek, secretary of the Institute of Slovenian Emigration ZRC SAZU and without Zvone Žigon, a junior researcher at the same institute.

The symposium was financially supported by the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Slovenia, the Office of the Republic of Slovenia for Slovenians Abroad, ZRC SAZU, the Ministry of Science and Technology of the Republic of Slovenia, the Bernardin and Portorož hotels and the Casino Portorož, and the printing of the collected papers has been financially supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology: I am sincerely grateful to all of them, as well as to the Publishing Centre of ZRC SAZU, which incorporated the printing of the collected papers into its programme.

LOUIS ADAMIC AND VATRO GRILL: A PARTNERSHIP OF EQUALS?

In 1956 Anton Melik, Professor of Geography at the University of Ljubljana, published a travelogue *Amerika in ameriška Slovenija* (America and American Slovenia). The author points out in his »notes« the pride of American people regarding their achievements, social and racial antagonisms which exist in the United States, and the fate of Slovene immigrants, who must have found it difficult »to establish for themselves an equal position with other immigrants and old settlers due to their insufficient education and lack of knowledge of English«.¹ A large part of Melik's book is devoted to his encounters with American Slovenes and among them he also mentions his conversations with Vatro Grill, who knew Louis Adamic well and was a close friend of his.² Melik says that Adamic and Grill were members of the same generation, they even attended the same secondary school in Ljubljana and they left for America in the same year, in 1913. When they met they discovered that they had the same or very similar views upon problems Slovene immigrants had in America. Melik also suggests that when a book is going to be written about Louis Adamic, Grill is the right person to contribute to it.

These suggestions and particularly the admiration expressed by Vatro Grill in his autobiography *Med dvema svetovoma* (Between Two Worlds, 1979)³ for Louis Adamic to whom he dedicated his book, arouse in me questions about the nature of this relationship, more precisely, whether this relationship was mainly a one-sided one or whether Adamic found in Grill not only an ardent supporter but also an equal intellectual partner, a man whose opinion he took into consideration or which even influenced his life and his work. In order to solve this puzzle I have not just read very closely Grill's autobiography but I have also researched Adamic's correspondence with Vatro Grill and other material on Grill kept by the Manuscript Department of the Slovene National and University Library (NUK) in Ljubljana.⁴ By now a number of books and many articles have been written on Louis Adamic and therefore it is not necessary for me to repeat the story of his life or present an analysis of his literary achievements. However, Vatro Grill is much less known not only in Slovenia but also in America and some facts from his life and work may help us to illuminate his personality more clearly.

Vatro (Vatroslav) Grill was born as Ignacij Gril on February 1, 1899, in the village Soteska near Moravče, Slovenia. He attended the elementary school at Moravče and then

¹ Anton Melik, *Amerika in ameriška Slovenija*. (America and American Slovenia.) Ljubljana: DZS, 1956.

² See n. 11, 233-234.

³ Vatroslav Grill, *Med dvema svetovoma*. (Between Two Worlds.) Ljubljana: MK, 1979. The abbreviation *MDS* is used from now on.

⁴ I wish to thank Mr. Mihael Glavan and Ms. Rozina Švent from the National and University Library in Ljubljana for their help.

finished three years of the secondary school in Ljubljana. In August 1913 he left with his mother and sister for Cleveland, where his father had been since March of the same year. The family went to America because they were afraid of the approaching First World War, and of poverty, which had already begun to affect life at home. At first Grill was not sure what he wished to do and what he could actually become in the States, so he learnt typesetting and got a job with one of the Slovene newspapers published in Cleveland. In 1918 he got a regular job with a Slovene newspaper *Enakopravnost* (Slovenian Equality Daily), but already at the end of 1919 he became a journalist and the sole editor of *Enakopravnost*, which he edited between 1919-1936, 1943-1948 and finally from 1950 until April 6, 1957, when *Enakopravnost* merged with another Slovene newspaper, *Prosveta* (The Enlightenment). This newspaper has been published since 1917 by one of the two largest Slovene societies in the United States, by the Slovenska narodna in podporna jednota (The Slovene National Benefit Society). This society still exists and it still publishes *Prosveta*, but it is mainly in English now.

Grill soon realized that his achievements in life would be higher, if he finished the secondary school and obtained the university education. He went to night classes at Cleveland Preparatory School and he simultaneously attended the Cleveland Law School. He got his Bachelor of Law degree in May 1925 and a month later he also passed his Bar exams in Columbus, Ohio. During the following decades he held various public posts. Among others, he became Assistant Public Prosecutor in Cleveland in 1942, and in 1959 he became Assistant Attorney General for the State of Ohio. Grill retired from this position in 1963. After the Second World War he visited Slovenia several times and he gathered here the material for his autobiography and wrote the first draft of his *Med dvema svetovoma*. He died on March 21, 1976 in Santa Clara, California, three years before the publication of his bulky manuscript, which was prepared for publication by Professor Jerneja Petrič.

Although Grill's professional position was relatively high in the ranks of Ohio administration, he often mentions in his autobiography that he always freely expressed his views on political and social issues. But he really became known among members of the Slovene emigrant community by his journalistic and cultural activities. He was an actor in the »Ivan Cankar« theatre society and he even directed some plays performed by this group. He was also a member of the »Zarja« singing society, and a member of various benefit societies, the Director of the Slovenski narodni dom (Slovene National Home) in Cleveland, the President of the Slovenska svobodomiselna podporna zveza (Slovenian Freethinking Benefit Society, 1928-1936). In the 1930s and 1940s Grill also translated a number of Adamic's articles, which had been previously published in various reviews (e.g. in *The New Republic*, *The Nation*, *Harper's*, *Time and Tide* etc.), from English into Slovene. Although he also tried his hand at translating literature (Dickens, Kipling) and also wrote some poems for *Prosveta* and *Rodna gruda*, as late as in the 1960s, he must have realized quite early in his life that his real forte was journalism and not creative writing.

On Dec. 24, 1921, Ivan Cankar's short story »Simple Martin«⁵ appeared in the American weekly *The Living Age*, published in Boston. Vatro Grill noticed the appearance of this and several other short stories, which were translated from Slovene literature, and he began to wonder who the translator might be, because his name did not appear together

⁵ Ivan Cankar's story is included in his *Izbrana dela* (Selected Works), published by CZ in Ljubljana in 1955 as »Bebec Martin«, one of the stories in I. Cankar's collection *Podobe iz sanj* (Images from Dreams).

with the translation. He reported about this in *Enakopravnost*, but the question remained unanswered for several years.⁶ Then, in July 1928, Louis Adamic published in the avant-garde monthly, *The American Mercury*, his essay »The Bohunks«. It was written in a slightly satirical tone and Adamic dealt in it mainly with weaknesses - but also with some positive sides - of the Slovenes, both at home and in America. One of the main faults that he mentions is the servility of the Slovenes towards people who have an authority, be it secular or religious, and their tendency to accept the worst side of American materialism, their becoming insensitive for moral values, which they »brought with them« to America. But on the other hand Adamic stresses that without their contribution America would not be what it is. Adamic also attacks in this essay the yellow press, including the immigrant papers.⁷ The response among Slovene reviewers was mainly negative (as e.g. in the Catholic oriented *Ameriska domovina* - American home), or the newspapers only mentioned the essay without giving any opinion or even kept quiet about it (e.g. *Prosveta* and *Proletarec* - The Proletarian in Chicago, *Glas naroda* - Voice of the People in New York, respectively).⁸ Vatro Grill praised the article in his editorial in *Enakopravnost* (August 15, 1928) and he expressed in it his firm belief that this was not the last what one could hear about Adamic. He also believed that the Slovenes in America did not pay enough attention to their intellectual and cultural needs and that Adamic's points were true and relevant.

History has proved Grill was right, for Adamic published in the 1930s a number of books which placed him among the best, most eloquent and also most critical American writers of the period. Several of his most important works were actually published in this decade: *Dinamite: the Story of Class Violence* (1931), *Laughing in the Jungle* (1932), *The Native's Return* (1934), *Grandsons* (1935), *Cradle of Life* (1936), *The House in Antigua* (1936), and *My America* (1938). This was, no doubt, Adamic's most prolific period, and it was also the time when he and Vatroslav Grill had very frequent personal contacts.

Louis Adamic and Vatro Grill met in Cleveland at the end of December 1933, when Adamic and his wife Stella stayed there for a few days. Grill introduced Adamic to a number of people, who were active in social, political and cultural life of the Slovene community in Cleveland, among others to Anton Terbovec, the editor of *Nova doba* - New Era, to the editor of *Cleveland Press* Frederick Sterbentz, to Frank J. Lausche, who soon became the mayor of Cleveland and who was later on five times the governor of the state of Ohio and for twelve years a member of the senate, and to many others. The visit was preceded by a brief correspondence between Adamic and Grill, which is rather important as regards their relationship. In December 1933 Adamic sent Grill a set of galley-proofs of his new book *The Native's Return* asking him to read the book and tell him what he thinks of it.⁹ Let me say right away that Adamic continued with this practice during the following years too. Adamic let Grill know about his literary creativity, his plans for future work and responses he got from various other people. Thus, e.g., Adamic very enthusiastically wrote to Grill about the progress he made with his novel *Grandsons*¹⁰ and a year later with the *Cradle of Life*.¹¹ Adamic must have been happy when Grill wrote with such high praise about his

⁶ *MDS*, 178-180.

⁷ *MDS*, 546-560 (translation by V.Grill).

⁸ *MDS*, 179.

⁹ L. Adamic to V. Grill, Dec. 11, 1933.

¹⁰ L. Adamic to V. Grill, Oct. 29, 1934.

¹¹ L. Adamic to V. Grill, July 2, 1936.

novels in *Enakopravnost*, as was the case with *The Native's Return*, which helped increase Adamic's popularity among the Slovene emigrants.¹² There can be no doubt that Adamič found in Grill a judicious, competent reviewer, whom he trusted, and who was very well acquainted with the general opinion of Slovene emigrants about contemporary issues not only in Cleveland, but also elsewhere in America.

Adamic believed that *The Native's Return* would be »of considerable importance to the Yugoslavs in this country and to Yugoslavia.«¹³ It seems that Adamic was himself surprised how positive the response was. He wrote to Grill that the book was »a big hit .. it became a best-seller in New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Boston in less than a week after publication, which seldom happens unless one is a big shot like Sinclair Lewis.«¹⁴ The book even became a part of the regular university syllabus at some well-known schools, as e.g. at Columbia University, Cornell University, Smith College etc. However, the politicians in Belgrade must have been furious about Adamic's picture of political and social situation in Yugoslavia. Adamic learnt about some of these views and so he turned to Grill for help. He writes to him:

»Dear Vatro:

When you have a chance, I suggest that you write something to this effect- that you understand that the Yugoslav consul-general in New York, Mr. Jankovich, stated in a private conversation that »The Native's Return« was a fine book, just what we needed in this country; only he was sorry I dealt with politics in Yugoslavia. Mind you, he did not say I did not tell the truth. He said he wished he had a chance to talk to me before I published the book so that he could have advised me. Don't say where you received this report from. Jankovich said the above to Ivan Mladineo, but don't use Mladineo's name either.«¹⁵

Adamic complains in the same letter that the »klerikalci«, i.e. people holding the extreme right-wing, clerical political views, wished to make Adamic even a supporter of Mussolini, what enraged him a lot.

Due to Adamic's frankness in expressing his political ideas and due to his independence from political parties, he was not liked either by the political right or the political left. The right would accuse him to have revolutionary political ideas, and the left would complain when he criticised their co-operation with the tyrannical government in Belgrade. In one of his letters to Grill Adamic mentions how it came to a crisis between him and Frank Zaitz, the editor of the newspaper *Proletarec* (The Proletarian), when at a meeting in Milwaukee Adamic expressed his opinion that many social-democrats in Yugoslavia

»had jobs with the dictatorial government and were thus co-operating with the dictatorship. Even Molek took me to task for this, later« .. and he adds further on, »in Yugoslavia, there is only one opposition group worth anything: and that's the underground Communist Party«.¹⁶

Although Grill never expressed any admiration for Communism, he probably accepted such views as topics about which he and Adamic had somewhat different positions.

¹²V. Grill, »Ameriška kritika pozdravlja The Native's Return.«, *Enakopravnost*, Feb. 5, 1934.

¹³L. Adamic to V. Grill, Dec. 11, 1933.

¹⁴L. Adamic to V. Grill, April 19, n.y. (1934).

¹⁵L. Adamic to V. Grill, May 5, 1934.

¹⁶L. Adamic to V. Grill, Nov. 20, 1934.

How keen Adamic was to inform Grill about his political experiences - at least in the 1930s - can be seen from another letter he sent to Grill on the very same day, i.e. on April 15, 1939, when he met in Chicago Dr. Edvard Benes. He was a former Czechoslovak Minister for Foreign Affairs (1918-1935), President of the Czechoslovak Republic (1935-1938) and during 1938-1945 the Prime Minister of the Czechoslovak Republic in exile, in London.

Louis Adamic was very much impressed by what Dr. Benes had told him in confidence during their meeting in Chicago. Adamic specifically points out in his letter to Grill Benes's persuasion that

».. we must work for a free Europe, for the small countries cannot exist in a dictatorial Europe. He foresees a federated Europe, or a United States of Europe. But Europe must go through another war. That's the hell of it. The economic system in this future federated Europe, he said, will be state capitalism.«

And further on, Adamic reports, that Benes would like these views to be spread, but without mentioning the source, that is his name. Another important point Benes made, was *».. to organize. Form communities. Yugoslavs, he said, are in the same boat as the Czechs etc.«*¹⁷ Adamic also asked Grill to inform people like Terbovec, Molek, Sabec *»to start gradual propaganda for this idea.«*¹⁸

The tone and the style of Adamic's writing make it clear that he expected Grill's support and also indicate that he completely trusted Grill. The latter was in a good position as an editor who knew people in Slovene emigrants' journalism, and could also predict their reactions. Besides, Grill was known among leaders of various political parties and societies and therefore his help for Adamic was definitely not negligible. They both agreed on many important points, as e.g. in their belief that in the United States religion was a personal matter and that the clergy should not be involved in politics; they both believed that free thinking was the essence of democracy; they both disapproved of crude, materialistic, extreme liberal capitalism, however, they did not think that what was then known as its counterpart, either socialism or communism, could be accepted as a solution of class antagonisms in America. Further on, they had very similar views on the importance of the emigrant's awareness of his roots, even more, they believed that emigrants should acknowledge their roots and make the best out of them. They were both unhappy because the Slovenes in America did not create a compact ethnic body, not by force, but by their own free will, and they disapproved of their division into the Catholics and the liberals and socialists. Even though this cleft seemed to have diminished when the Second World War started, it appeared again already during the last years of the War and the Slovene emigrant population in America has been divided again as regards politics after the War, too. Maybe they were both too optimistic in their views upon ethnic questions, politics and religion, because the solution - at least among the Slovenes - has not been found yet.

Let me return briefly to one of Grill's most known articles in which he expressed some of the views briefly indicated above. Already in 1936 he published an editorial entitled *»Ali je slovenstvo v Ameriki borbe vredno?«* (Is Slovenhood in America worth fighting for?)¹⁹ Grill's starting point is that it is natural for an emigrant to be torn between two countries. However, he suggests, one should first of all accept one's natural ethnicity and

¹⁷L. Adamic to V. Grill, April 15, 1939.

¹⁸*Ibid.*

¹⁹V. Grill, *»Ali je slovenstvo v Ameriki borbe vredno?«, Enakopravnost*, April 9, 1936.

only then can one contribute to the adopted land and its values. People who do not see anything good in their origin, are only likely to become servile ministers in their new homeland. Grill attacks in this article »false prophets«, among them also emigrant political leaders-without naming them individually-and indirectly also each emigrant, who has forgotten the value of Primož Trubar, France Prešeren and Ivan Cankar and their contribution to Slovene ethnic heritage. From among Slovene artists in America Grill mentions only two: Louis Adamic and a painter Gregorij Perušek. His final question is: what are we, each one of us, and the Slovene emigrant community as a whole, going to be like in twenty, thirty years time? How do we bring up our children, looking only after their personal good, or as self-aware people who are proud of their ancestors?

Gril was, as he himself admits, pleased when Adamic praised the article and suggested to Grill that the article »*should be sent to the old community - to Juš Kozak, to Oton Zupančič, and people like that.*«²⁰ In his autobiography Grill says that he did not send the article to anybody so that people might not think that he was being conceited.²¹ It is interesting to note that more than thirty years later he found an abridged version of his article published by father Kazimir Zakrajšek in his publication of Raphael's Society, but without acknowledging Grill's authorship.

Louis Adamic and Vatro Grill corresponded regularly in the 1930s, and Adamic frankly expressed in his letters to Grill views he held on various Slovene Americans, as e.g. Frank Lausche, Ivan Zorman, Janko N. Rogelj, Vincent Cankar and many others, who played an important role in the Slovene political and cultural life. Grill states though that in the 1940s their contacts were »generally more indirect than direct.«²² They met at various conferences of organizations supporting the struggle of Slovene and Yugoslav peoples (SANS, ZOJSA) for liberation in Yugoslavia. Adamic was very much involved in these efforts, he became definitely more interested in what he was saying and less in how he was saying it, although he undoubtedly also tried to keep the literary standards he had achieved in his earlier works. When Adamic's last work *The Eagle and the Roots* posthumously appeared in 1952, Grill expressed in his review his belief that in this work one can find

»all well known virtues of a psychologically acute observer, who looks at his surroundings primarily spiritually, and only then with his eyes, the virtues of a born narrator; whose joy and satisfaction is in his use of the word as a vessel of beauty and truth. As a literary work The Eagle and the Roots stands side by side his other best works.«²³

Twenty-two years later, in 1974, when Vatro Grill was interviewed on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday, he said, among others: »*It is obvious that for us, American Slovenes, Adamic was not so much important as a writer, but as a phenomenon.*«²⁴ Grill did not explain what he meant with his use of the term »phenomenon«, although one may conclude that he wished briefly to define with this concept Adamic's achievements in cultural and political sphere; however, this statement also indirectly recognizes the fact that Adamic has become less interested in pure fiction and that he was by now a »*social revolutionary*«, »*sceptical about defined philosophies, social and others*«, »*occasionally totally overwhelmed by an idea, which could be called fantastic*«, as V. Grill characterized him in

²⁰L. Adamic to V. Grill, Oct. 31, 1936.

²¹MDS, 203.

²²Ibid., 206.

²³Ibid., 222. (*Enakopravnost*, June 27, 1952.)

²⁴Bogdan Pogačnik, »75 let Vatra Grilla«, *Delo*, Feb. 11, 1974.

his autobiography, in the 1970s.²⁵ Even Rev. Jurij M. Trunk (1870-1973, a journalist and the author of one of the earliest books written by a Slovene on America (*Amerika in Amerikanci*, /America and the Americans/, Celovec, 1912) expressed in his letter to L.Adamic in 1943 his belief that Adamic's views upon the situation in Yugoslavia seemed to him »true, right and correct« and that Adamic played with his »extremely brilliant gift to write, to observe, to express, to characterize and to put before the broader public an extraordinary role«. ²⁶ This opinion may help us to understand the popularity Adamic had in America, even though some of his opponents denied him every merit. Although Vatroslav Grill can be counted among those intellectuals who admired Adamic, but he definitely was not such a charismatic personality; however, I hope that I have shown that Adamic found in Grill a trustworthy, intelligent and reliable friend, who, as we have seen, helped Adamic in many ways. Grill summarizes their relationship in the following statement:

»As an American I also wished that we, the Slovenes, would join America in a creative and meaningful way, but on the other hand, I wished, as a Slovene, for the Slovenes to preserve our identity, to remain true to ourselves until the very end.«²⁷

Although - as has been shown above - they had a lot in common the above mentioned view might be the platform of their mutual understanding and co-operation. Therefore, I believe, the central question which I raised at the beginning of this paper can easily be answered, namely, that their relationship was, generally speaking, a partnership of equals.

²⁵MDS, 215.

²⁶Geo. M. Trunk (- Jurij M. Trunk) to L.Adamic, April 11, 1943.

²⁷MDS, 223.

POVZETEK LOUIS ADAMIČ IN VATROSLAV GRILL:
ENAKOPRAVNO SODELOVANJE?

Leta 1979 je pri založbi Mladinska knjiga v Ljubljani izšla avtobiografija ameriškega Slovence Vatroslava Grilla, *Med dvema svetovoma*. Grill je gradivo za knjigo zbiral zadnja leta pred smrtjo in za objavo ga je uredila prof. dr. Jerneja Petrič. Avtor je svoje obširno delo posvetil spominu Louisa Adamiča in v njem tudi podrobno prikazal svoj odnos do Adamiča. Kako visoko je Grill Adamiča cenil vidimo – med drugim – tudi iz besed, ki jih je izrekel ob otvoritvi nove osnovne šole v Grosuplju, poimenovane po Adamiču, dne 3. Septembra 1971, namreč, da je bil izid Adamičeve knjige *The Native's Return* (Vrnitev v rodni kraj, 1934) »najpomembnejši dogodek v zgodovini ameriških Slovencev«. Grill je Adamiča osebno spoznal decembra 1933 in odtlej dalje sta bila v prijateljskih stikih vse do Adamičeve smrti.

Vatro Grill je o Adamiču in njegovem delu napisal več kot tristo prispevkov in že ta podatek nedvomno kaže, kako visoko ga je cenil. Vatro Grill ni bil neznana osebnost med slovenskimi izseljenci v ZDA, saj se je povzpел od črkostavca do pravnika in nazadnje celo do prvega pomočnika javnega tožilca v državi Ohio. Toda za njegov odnos do Adamiča je bilo bolj pomembno njegovo kulturno delovanje, še posebej dejstvo, da je od 1. Avgusta 1919 pa do 6. Aprila 1957 več desetletij urejal slovenski časopis *Enakopravnost*, ki je izhajal v Clevelandu, dokler se ni leta 1958 združil s chicaško *Prosveto*.

Louis Adamič je bil ob koncu dvajsetih in zlasti od tridesetih let dalje v ZDA splošno priznan kot pisatelj in javni delavec, zato se nam zastavlja vprašanje ali ni bilo sodelovanje med Adamičem in Grillom le »enosmerna pot« oziroma ali so bili njuni medsebojni odnosi le enostranski ali pa so bili uravnoteženi. To je osrednje vprašanje na katerega skušam v referatu odgovoriti večinoma na podlagi še neraziskane rokopisne zapuščine Vatroslava Grilla, ki jo hrani NUK. Moj odgovor je, da ta odnos vendarle ni bil tako enostranski, kot bi se na prvi pogled lahko zdelo. Tudi Adamič je v V. Grillu našel prijatelja in sogovornika, s katerim je bilo tudi zanj sodelovanje prijetno in koristno.

AMERIŠKI ROJAK JOŽE MIHELICH (1902-1989) - TEOLOG, ZGODOVINAR IN PRIJATELJ LOUISA ADAMIČA

Uvod

Med pomembne slovenske intelektualce v diaspori, ki so v tujini dosegli na svojih strokovnih področjih zavidljive uspehe, moramo šteti tudi ameriškega univerzitetnega profesorja dr. Jožeta L. Miheliča, teologa in zgodovinarja. Stike s Slovenijo je ohranjal in negoval predvsem z dopisovanjem in obiski ožjih sorodnikov v domači Ribnici na Dolenjskem in v Ljubljani, na strokovnih področjih pa s sodelovanjem z literarnimi zgodovinarji (Mirko Rupel, Anton Slodnjak, Alfonz Gspan idr.), ki so raziskovali slovenski protestantizem in protestantskimi duhovniki (Ludvik Jošar, Vladimir Miselj, Ludvik Novak, Mihael Kuzmič idr.). V slovenski strokovni in kulturni javnosti je bil predstavljen prvič (in potem še nekajkrat) kot naš znameniti ameriški rojak šele ob svoji 85. letnici rojstva,¹ malo zatem pa je bilo prevedenih v slovenščino in objavljenih tudi nekaj njegovih del.² Njegova strokovna zapuščina resda ni ogromna, je pa po svoji tematski raznolikosti, poglobljenosti in aktualnosti tudi v našem času in prostoru vredna nadaljnjega raziskovanja in približevanja slovenski teološki, zgodovinski in socialni znanstveni misli, ki jo bo v nekaterih segmentih lahko občutno obogatila.

¹ Mihael Kuzmič, Ob petinosemdesetletnici profesorja dr. Jožeta L. Miheliča (14. 3. 1902), *Evngeličanski koledar* (Murska Sobota) 1987, 65-72. Isti, Ob 85-letnici prof. dr. Jožeta L. Miheliča, *Rodna gruda* (Ljubljana) 6/1987, 34-35. Isti, Američan - Slovence iz Dubuqua (Ob 85-letnici prod. dr. Jožeta L. Miheliča), *Obzornik* (Ljubljana) 3/1987, 212-214. Isti, Teološka podoba ameriškega rokaja prof. dr. Jožeta L. Miheliča, *Znamenje XVII* (Celje) 2/1987, 185-187. Isti, Vpliv protestantske etike na znanstveno delo ameriškega rokaja prof. dr. Jožeta Miheliča (I), *Znamenje XIX* (Celje) 3/1989, 243-252. (Referat z multidisciplinarnega simpozija Posvetna eshatologija in komercialna etika pri malih narodih, ki ga je v veliki dvorani SAZU Ljubljana, Novi trg 3 v času od 5. do 7. decembra 1988 pripravilo Slovensko orientalistično društvo v Ljubljani - sekcija za indologijo). Isti, Vpliv protestantske etike ... (II), *Znamenje XIX* (Celje) 4/1989, 375-378. Isti, Mihelič, Joseph, *Enciklopedija Slovenije* 7, (Ljubljana) 1993, 129. Isti, Jože Mihelič (14. marce 1902 - 7. maj 1989), *Dve domovini - Two Homelands* 8 (Ljubljana) 1997, 187-192.

² Mihelič, L. Jože, Božje povabilo. *Evngeličanski koledar* 36 (Murska Sobota) 1987, 49-53. Jurij Dalmatin in njegov prevod Biblije. *Obzornik* (Ljubljana) 4/1987, 284-289. Primož Trubar, pozabljeni reformator I, II. *Obzornik* (Ljubljana) 2/1987, 112-117; 3/1987, 196-204. »Slavite Gospoda!« *Evngeličanski list* (Bodonci) 6/1987, 4. Pojem Boga v knjigi preroka Nahuma. *Evngeličanski koledar* 37 (Murska Sobota) 1988, 56-61. Socialni nauki prerokov. *Znamenje* 19 (Maribor) 2/1989, 155-171. Povabilo na duhovni banket. *Blagovestnik* (Novo mesto) 1/1994, 7-8. Vse prevedel M. Kuzmič. Pred tem je Jože Krašovec prevedel Delovanje Gospodovega duha v Stari zavezi, *Bogoslovni vestnik* 37 (1977) 449-455.

I. Življenje in delo

Jože Mihelič se je rodil 14. marca 1902 v mestu Ely, MN, kot sedmi otrok slovenskima izseljencema iz Dolenjske iz okolice Ribnice. Oče je bil zelo iznajdljiv in gospodaren človek, z izrazito pustolovsko žilico. Mati je bila skrbna gospodinja številni družini. Zaradi očetove nesreče pri delu se je družina leta 1904 vrnila v Ribnico, kjer so odprli gostilno.

Jože je začel svoje šolanje v Ribnici, nadaljeval pa v Ljubljani na drugi državni gimnaziji. Zaradi nekega političnega komentarja³ so ga vrgli iz šole in je šel na Dunaj, kjer se je izučil za poklic pletilca žičnatih ograj. Štiri leta na Dunaju je dobro izkoristil tudi za učenje nemščine in branje časopisov in knjig.⁴

Leta 1920 se je vrnil skupaj s starejšo sestro Karolino v Ameriko v Lorain, Ohio in začel svojo življenjsko pot kot večina rojakov na najnižjem klinu, v težakem fizičnem delu. Najprej v špecerijski trgovini, nato v železarni. Želja za izobraževanjem in s tem povezanim boljšim kosom kruha ga je vodila v odločitve, da se je ob delu leta 1924 vpisal v akademijo, ki je pripravljala študente za sprejem na Kolidž liberalnih umetnosti, na katerem je pozneje končal kemijo in matematiko. Zaposlil se je kot kemijski tehnik raziskovalec in hkrati začel študirati na Graduate School of Theology v Oberlinu, Ohio. Vprašanja in dileme o »lutrskih ljudeh«, ki jih je nosil v sebi iz otroštva v Ribnici⁵ je poskušal razrešiti s študijem teologije. Samo »materialistično« delo ga ni duhovno zadovoljevalo. Tako se je bolj posvetil teološkemu izobraževanju in raziskovanju in našel svoje mesto v Prezbiterijanski cerkvi, ki ima svoje duhovne korenine v švicarski reformaciji 16. st., ki sta jo začela reformatorja Ulrich Zwingli in Jean Calvin.⁶

Jeseni leta 1938 se je vpisal na Univerzo v Chicagu in študiral zgodovino Starega Bližnjega vzhoda z jeziki in literaturo. Leta 1941 je bil promoviran v doktorja teoloških znanosti in s tem je zaokrožil svoje študijsko obdobje. Doktorat mu je predal dr. Maynard Hutchins, tedanji rektor University of Chicago 14. maja 1941, »ravno na Jožetov rojstni dan in okrog dvajset let po tistem, ko se je vrnil v Ameriko kot osemnajstletni fant brez beliča v žepu«.⁷

Leta 1941 je prevzel pastorsko službo v Prezbiterijanski cerkvi v Coal City-ju, IL. Toda leta druge svetovne vojne so imela posebne zahteve, zato se je jeseni 1943 odzval povabilu University of Dubuque za predavanje oficirjem mornarice. 1. julija 1944 se je preselil v Dubuque in prevzel profesuro starozaveznih jezikov in literature na Teološki

³ V svojem biografskem pregledu »Professor - Emeritus Joseph L. Mihelic, Ph. D.«, 11 tipkanih strani, ki mi ga je poslal spomladi 1989, piše: »I attended for a while Gymnasium in Ljubljana, but being too free with my criticism of Austrians attacking little Serbia, and not very friendly in my expressions about »Nemčurjih« who were mostly my teachers. The result was that I was sent home after the first semester.«, str. 8.

⁴ Ravno tam.

⁵ V svojih spominih piše, da si je brat Ludvik sposodil v liberalni knjižnici v Ribnici Ljubljanski zvon, v katerem je tudi Jože prebral zgodbo »Lutrski ljudje« Janka Kersnika. Ko je pozneje vprašal domačega kaplana, kdo so bili lutrski ljudje, je bil za vprašanje kaznovan, slišati pa je morala svoje tudi mama. V fantu je vprašanje še dolgo časa ostalo odprto. N. d., str. 9.

⁶ Jože Mihelič se šteje v verskem pogledu »običajnega kalvinista« (a common-sense Calvinist), osebno pismo z dne 25. marca 1987.

⁷ »... and nearly twenty years after his return to America as a young, penniless boy of 18«, gl. Prof. - Emeritus ..., str. 2.

fakulteti. V času svoje profesure je študijsko obiskal Bližnji vzhod in raziskoval ugaritsko zgodovino s posebnim poudarkom na jeziku opečnatih tablic. Dvakrat je študijsko obiskal tudi Evropo in raziskoval protestantizem v srednjeevropskih državah. Upokojil se je leta 1971, predaval pa vse do leta 1984; »profesor emeritus« je ostal vse do smrti.

Jože Mihelič se je leta 1935 poročil z Lydijo V. Plucker iz Lennox, SD. Rodila sta se jima dva otroka. Hči Lydia M. Pulsipher, dr. kulturne antropologije, predava na univerzi v Knoxvilleu, TN, sin John Mihelič pa je producent izobraževalnih filmov za komercialne ustanove in živi v Mineapolisu, MN. Oba sta po zgledu staršev s pridnostjo in učenjem vsak na svojem delovnem področju dosegla svoje življenjske cilje.

Miheličeva znanstvena pot in delo se je raztegovalo na več področij; vseeno je kot duhovnik protestantske cerkve (za duhovnika je bil ordiniran v črnski prezbiterijanski cerkvi) ohranjal vse življenje stik s preprostimi ljudmi in njihovimi duhovnimi in socialnimi potrebami.

II. Teolog

Iskrica zanimanja za teologijo se je v Jožetu Miheliču vnela že v otroštvu v Ribnici na Dolenjskem, ko ga je otroška radovednost ob branju Kersnikove zgodbe »Lutrski ljudje« spodbudila na vprašanje, kdo so bili ti ljudje. Kaplanova zavrnitev njegove radovednosti ni potešila, ampak jo je shranila globoko v dušo, kjer je našla odgovor čez nekaj desetletij.

Jože je v Ameriki prišel v versko zelo pluralno okolje, kjer je bila ponudba duhovnih vrednot in spoznanj zelo pestra. Že zelo zgodaj se je opredelil za protestantizem Kalvine reformacijske smeri, ki je bil njegovi praktični naravi in socialnemu čutu za pravičnost najbližje.⁸ Tu je tudi iskati razlog, da se je po študiju na kolidžu njegovo študijsko in znanstveno zanimanje preusmerilo z naravoslovnega na teološko področje.

Šele v času raziskovanja protestantizma na Slovenskem in v osrednji Evropi, ki ga je opravil na svojem potovanju leta 1958-59, je prišel do dokončnega odgovora, kdo so bili »lutrski ljudje«, za kaj so se zavzemali in kakšno je bilo njihovo duhovno in praktično krščansko življenje. O tem odkrivanju je sam zapisal:

»Moj starejši brat Ludvik, ki je padel v prvi svetovni vojni, si je sposojal knjige iz liberalne knjižnice in mi jih dal za brati. Nekega dne je prinesel domov Ljubljanski zvon in v njem sem našel Kersnikovo zgodbo »Lutrski ljudje«. Prevzela me je. Bilo mi je 9 ali 10 let. Beseda lutrski me je prevzela in ko sem šel naslednjic v klerikalno knjižnico, sem vprašal kaplana, kdo so bili lutrski ljudje. Navdušeno me je vprašal, kje sem zvedel zanje. Vedel je, da v njegovi knjižnici tega dela ni bilo; potem me je mami zatožil, da obiskujem »liberalno« knjižnico in da me bo pohujšala, če jo bom še obiskoval. To je sprožilo veliko težav. Njegovo pojasnilo samo z nekaj besedami bi me zadovoljilo. Toda njegovo težačenje je vzbudilo radovednost, ki se je z leti vse bolj poglobljala. Začel sem dalje poizvedovati in sem odkril, da je bila v 16. st. reformacija in da je bil nedaleč od Ribnice rojen slovenski reformator Primož Tru-

⁸ »I made the change in America when I attended college here. For in the meantime I have become thoroughly convinced, largely through reading, that a Protestant Church, preferably a Presbyterian Calvinistic, was the best for me. This took place in January 5, 1925, when I became a member of the Westminster Presbyterian Church of Dubuque, Iowa.« Pismo g. V. Mislju dne 26. februarja 1979.

bar. To je bil začetek mojega duhovnega pozvedovanja, ki se ni končalo do mojih oberlinskih dni (1935-38), kot sem že prej omenil. Prelomnica je sicer bila že nekaj let prej, leta 1925, ko sem začel obiskovati bogoslužja različnih protestantskih cerkva v Dubuque, Iowa in opazil razliko med mašo in protestantskimi bogoslužji. Vse to me je razsvetljevalo, toda ni mi potešilo radovednosti, zakaj je prišlo do reformacije. Zakaj je bilo Slovencem in v tem oziru drugim solidnim katoliškim deželam zamolčano to veliko versko dogajanje, ki je dalo večini ljudstva priliko za izobraževanje in ustvarjanje svoje lastne literature? Zakaj je protireformacija, kjerkoli je uspela, uničila to literaturo in vrgla ljudi nazaj v neznanje in praznoverje? Čeprav sem dobil določen vpogled v Dubuque-u, Oberlinu in na Čikaški univerzi, pa sem šele v lastnem raziskovanju reformacije v Nemčiji in avstrijskih deželah leta 1958-59 našel odgovor na vprašanje, ki se je rodilo med branjem Kersnikove zgodbe *Lutski ljudje*.⁹

Mihelič je bil strokovnjak za Sveto pismo Stare zaveze, zato mu je bila v ospredju tudi zmeraj teologija Stare zaveze s spoznanjem Boga, njegovih lastnosti in odnosa do človeštva, kakor ga odstira ta prvi del Svetega pisma. Vsekakor tu ne moremo in ne smemo trditi, da se je prvenstveno omejil samo na biblicistiko in na posamezne dele sistematične teologije, čeprav se je kot predavatelj največ ukvarjal z uvodom v Sveto pismo in Staro zavezo. Ne - Stara zaveza mu je bila izhodišče za nadaljnje iskanje Boga v Novi zavezi in nadalje v zgodovini, kakor v predbiblični, ravno tako v sodobni. Bila mu je tudi prostrano raziskovalno področje, na katerem se je v podobi tipov, simbolov, osebnosti in dogajanj odlikovala resničnost Nove zaveze in iz nje izhajajočih teoloških spoznanj.

Kot pragmatik z zelo širokim duhovnim obzorjem je Mihelič iskal in našel v Stari zavezi ne samo teoretične in abstraktne teološke prvine, ampak tudi v življenju preizkušene in preverjene zakonitosti Božjega delovanja v posameznih osebnostih predkristusovega časa. Zato se je z njimi posebno ukvarjal in jih poleg drugih gesel pripravil za objavo v številnih znanstvenih in strokovnih publikacijah, med katerimi so posebno pomembne *The Interpreter's Bible Dictionary*, *Journal of Bible and Religion*, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, *Interpretation*, *Theology Today* in predvsem jubilejna izdaja *Encyclopaedia Britannica* ob njeni dvestoletnici.

Posebno skrb je Mihelič posvečal v predavanjih Stare zaveze Deuteronomiju, Psalmom in Malim prerokom, kjer ga je posebno privlačevala problematika Božje pravičnosti v socialnem nauku Malih prerokov, ki so bili v času od 9. do 6. stoletja žgoča vest družbe in raznovrstnih izkoriščevalskih slojev. Zanj Stara zaveza ni bila samo zgodovina in odslíkava tedanjega duhovnega in narodnjega življenja Izraelecev in okoliških narodov. Privlačeval ga ni samo teološko-zgodovinski vidik in stanje posameznih slojev ali naroda kot celote, temveč je v njihovem položaju našel tudi odgovore na dileme in tegobe sodobnega človeka. Svoja znanstvena raziskovanja je rad kombiniral z znanimi osebnostmi starega Izraela (Abraham, Mojzes, Samuel, David, itd.). Svoja teološka spoznanja iz tisočletja pred našim štetjem je prenašal in presajal v svoj čas in ugotovil, da se moralno stanje človeštva in socialna problematika v nekaj zadnjih tisoč letih ni skorajda nič spremenila. Zaradi tega so bili pozivi na socialno pravičnost, enakomerno porazdelitev dobrin, humanitarno pomoč ljudem v stiski, itd., aktualni ne samo v starem Izraelu, ampak tudi v Ameriki v sredini tega stoletja in so tudi v našem prostoru na izteku tisočletja. V tem kontekstu lahko štejemo

⁹ Prof. - Emeritus, n. d., str.9-10.

profesorja Miheliča med duhovne začetnike in pristaše teologije socializma in socialne pravičnosti, ki se je v začetku druge polovice našega stoletja pojavila v Južni Ameriki predvsem kot teologija osvoboditve.¹⁰ O tem je pisal v več razpravah, med katerimi naj posebej omenim razpravo Socialni nauki prerokov.¹¹ V njej po temeljiti analizi ekonomskega, političnega in socialnega stanja v času, v katerem so preroki živeli, potegne vzporednico s časom in okoljem, v katerem je sam živel:

»Iz teh primerov lahko vidimo, da ni bilo nobene teoretičnosti pri prerokih in njihovi preroški službi. Soočali so se s problemi svojega časa in jih odkrivali s polno odgovornostjo. Pokazali so na krivce in se pri tem niso ozirali na njihovo socialne, gospodarske ali verske položaje; kakor so stvari videli, tako so jih povedali. Korupcija in propad starodavne družbe sta bila v osnovi ista kot sta danes. Požrešni trgovci, izžemajoči posojilodajalci, napadalni prodajalci, lopovski odvetniki, lakomni zdravniki, prodajalci mamil, lastniki geto stanovanjskih blokov, svetohlinski pogrebniiki in 'od papeža bolj papeški pridigarji, ki rohnijo zoper 'preklete radikalce', so tudi v naši družbi. Niso pripravljene pomagati črncem in priseljencem, da bi si izboljšali delovne in bivanjske pogoje in bili bolj pravično plačani za svoje delo. Ti moderni nasilniki in izžemalci ubogih in nemočnih niso v bistvu nič drugačni od nekdanjih v času Amosa, Ozeja, Miheja in drugih preroških osebnosti, ki so nam pustile sporočila o svojem delu.« (str. 21).

V teh razpravah se kaže Mihelič tudi teologa ekologije, saj v nepravični in brezbožni družbi vidi usmeritev, ki zlahka pripelje narode in tudi človeštvo kot celoto v samouničenje:

»Poglejmo težko in tragično zgodovino človeštva. Razvoj človeštva z njegove izhodiščne točke je bil počasen in utrudljiv, povezan z mnogimi življenjskimi preizkušnjami. Trpljenje so povzročale tudi naravne nesreče: potresi, viharji, povodnji, lakote zaradi suše ali uničenega pridelka s točo, ipd. Te nesreče so človeštvo fizično utrdile in ga pripravile, da je lahko prestalo naravne katastrofe. Toda težave, ki so jih človeštvo povzročile naravne nesreče, se nikakor ne morejo primerjati s tragedijo človekove nečlovečnosti do sočloveka. Primerjava nam pokaže, da je človek povzročil več bede svojemu bližnjemu človeku, kakor so jih naravne nesreče. Čeprav naravne katastrofe človeku otežajo in zagrenijo življenje, po drugi strani človeštvo utrdijo, da lahko preživi v sicer pustem okolju. V tem oziru so bile eventuelno tudi koristne. Ne moremo pa trditi za človekovo nehumanost, da je koristna. V nasilnih dejanjih zoper človeštvo in živalski svet ne moremo najti niti trohice koristi; nasprotno, ustvarja samo vzdušje mržnje, strahu in grabežljivosti. Vse to pa povzroča in ustvarja, če tako pustimo, samo še več bede, vse dokler se celotno človeštvo na koncu ne uniči v kozmičnem samouničenju. V dolgi zgodovini vzpenjanja je človek

¹⁰ Oris in pomen teologije najdemo v besedilu Vekoslava Grmiča *Za uvod* (str. 7-18) v knjigi Leonardo Boff, *Cerkev: karizma in moč*, Maribor (Založba Obzorja), 1986. »Središčni pojem teologije osvoboditve je tedaj osvobajanje, ki pa je kar najtesneje povezano s središčnim pojmom krščanstva, namreč z odrešenjem. Osvobajanje, kakor ga razumejo teologi osvoboditve, včlenjuje rešitev iz položaja nepravičnosti in izkoriščanja, odstranitve vsega, kar človeka ovira, da bi mogel doseči popoln razvoj, in osvoboditev od greha, rešitev iz skaljencga razmerja, ki ga prinaša greh v odnose med ljudmi in odnose ljudi do Boga« (str. 10).

¹¹ »Social Teachings of the Prophets«, *Essays in Honor of Markus Barth*, 1981, 181-204. Slovenski prevod v *Znamenju* 19 (Maribor) 2/1989, 155-171.

že lahko dosege konec svoje eksistence. Na vrhuncu svojih dosežkov in tehnološkega znanja, 'know how', ko osvaja vesolje, lahko človek uniči samega sebe in spremeni zeleno zemljo v golo kozmično telo, podobno mesečevi površini.« (str. 23).

Svoja teološka spoznanja in dognanja je zapisoval v razpravah, ki jih je za dolgoletno predavateljsko delo na Univerzi res skromno število. Zanje trdi, da jih je pisal samo takrat, ko je imel poseben navdih; od pisanja mu je bilo bolj važno osebno delo s študenti.¹² Med teološkimi razpravami velja posebej omeniti *The Concept of God in the Book of Nahum*, *The Concept of God in Deutero-Isaiah*, *Social Teachings of the Prophets*, in druge.¹³

Ob pogledu na Miheliča kot teologa je potrebno omeniti še njegove pridige, ki so tudi imele največkrat osnovo v starozaveznih tekstih. Zmeraj so bile natančno homiletično izdelane, z jasnimi ilustracijami in napisane v živem, preprostem jeziku. Praviloma so bile bolj poučne (didaktične) kot razlagalne (ekspozitorne). Vzorčni primer takšne pridige je *Božje povabilo na duhovni banket* na osnovi Iz 55,1-3:

»O vsi, ki ste žejni, pridite k vodi, in vi, ki nimate denarja, pridite, kupite in jejte! Pridite, kupite brez denarja, brez plačila vino in mleko! Zakaj trošite denar za to, kar ni kruh, in svoj zaslužek za to, kar ne nasiti? Poslušajte, poslušajte me in jejte dobro, naj uživa v sočni jedi vaša duša. Nagnite svoje uho in pridite k meni, poslušajte in bo živela vaša duša.«

Poslušalcu (in bralcu) najprej približa zgodovinski oris, nato ga pouči o tem, da materialne stvari človekove notranjosti v popolnosti ne zadovoljijo, in ga povabi »v sočno jed duše«. Vernika nagovori z besedami iz davnine, toda te pridejo v življenjsko situacijo kot sedanji glas dobrega prijatelja.

III. Zgodovinar

Kakor na znanstveno in strokovno teološkem, tako se je tudi na zgodovinskem področju Miheličevo znanstveno zanimanje razvijalo v več smeri, ki so bile pogojene s predmetom njegovih študijskih okvirov (zgodovina starega Bližnjega vzhoda) in z osebno raziskovalno dejavnostjo, ki je izvirala iz zgodnjih ribniških let (Sveto pismo in slovenski protestantizem). V istem zaporedju jih okvirno preglejmo.

Zgodovina starega Bližnjega vzhoda

V času svojega študija na Univerzi v Chicagu, ki ga je začel jeseni 1938, se je poglobljal v jezike Stare zaveze, starozavezno literaturo in zgodovino starega Bližnjega vzhoda. V tem času je prejemal štipendijo za raziskovanje ugaritskega jezika, ki so ga izvirno pisali na glinaste ploščice v klinopisni pisavi. Tablice z ugaritsko klinasto pisavo so odkrili v arheoloških izkopavanjih v Ras Šamri na sirijski obali leta 1927.

Kot predavatelj je pozneje izpopolnjeval in poglobljal svoje znanje s študijskimi

¹² »Thank you very much for your effort to bring my name and according to my personal assesment a rather meager literary production. There should have been more, but I was primarily a teacher and preacher. I felt that my students needed personal attention rather than my articles and my books. I wrote only when I had a real urge and inspiration for a particular subjects« (Osebno pismo avtorju dne 25. marca 1987).

¹³ Podroben seznam razprav in drugih spisov J. Miheliča sem navedel v: Vpliv protestantske etike na znanstveno delo ameriškega rojaka prof. dr. Jožeta Miheliča (*I*), *Znamenje XIX* (Maribor) 3/1989, 243-252; 4/1989, 375-378.

potovanji na Bližnji vzhod. Leta 1959 je obiskal Grčijo, Libanon, Sirijo, Jordanijo in Izrael. Obiskoval je arheološko zanimive kraje, arabska begunska taborišča in vzgojne institucije v Izraelu. Leta 1962 je bil profesor Mihelič izbran v skupino 15 ameriških in kanadskih znanstvenikov, ki so šli v Izrael na šest tedensko znanstveno-študijsko potovanje. Vodil jih je dr. Abraham Katsh, predstojnik katedre za hebrejsko kulturo na New York University. Potovanje sta organizirala ameriška vlada in omenjena univerza.

S tega področja je napisal več del, med katerimi je potrebno omeniti predvsem še neobjavljene *Archeology and the Old Testament*, *Old Testament Synopsis*; *The Assyrian and Syro-Palestinian Interrelations* in objavljeno *The Prophetes and Their Times*.¹⁴

Zgodovina Svetega pisma

Miheliča je zanimalo Sveto pismo v najširšem okvirju, vse od prvih zapisov naprej, vključno z okoljem in časom, v katerem je nastajalo. Ravno tako se je ukvarjal z zgodovino prevajanja in določenimi temami, ki so se dotikale Svetega pisma v določenih zgodovinskih dogajanjih.

Sveto pismo je bilo predmet obravnave tudi v njegovi doktorski disertaciji »Literary Structure of King James Version of the Bible«, kjer je znanstveno obdelal literarne strukture tega stoletja najbolj znanega angleškega prevoda.

Med pomembnejše razprave s tega področja štejemo *The Bible That Jesus Knew*, *The Supreme Court of Religion*, *How the Bible Came to Be*.

Glede na dejstvo, da je Sveto pismo Stare zaveze že samo po sebi predvsem zgodovinsko-poetično-modrostni tekst, lahko štejemo v to kategorijo tudi priročnike, ki jih je za študente napisal v obliki skript: *A Syllabus of the Old Testament* v treh delih: (a) *A Study Guide to Genesis to II Kings*; (b) *A Study Guide to the Books of Prophets*; (c) *A Study Guide to the Poetic and Wisdom Literature*. Posebno delo je *The Songs of Faith (A Guide to the Study of the Book of Psalms)*.

Zgodovina slovenskega protestantizma

Kakor velika večina slovenskih izseljencev, je tudi Jože Mihelič nosil v sebi globoko ljubezen do svoje Dolenjske in včasih skoraj neidentificirano domotožje po krajih in ljudeh, s katerimi je preživel svoje otroštvo v Sloveniji. Tako ni nič čudnega, da si je že kot profesor poiskal v okolici mesta za življenje hribovit predel, ki ga je močno spominjal na ribniško okolico, in si tam zgradil hišo.

Kot teolog in zgodovinar pa se ni zaustavil samo na zemljepisni sličnosti, ampak je šel globlje v raziskovanje duše in preteklosti svojega slovenskega ljudstva, katerega del se je zmeraj čutil, čeprav včasih z grenkobo in razočaranjem.¹⁵

Čeprav ga je zanimala zgodovina Evrope, ga je njen ožji, srednjeevropski del še posebej privlačil. Še iz otroštva mu je ostalo vprašanje, kaj se je dogajalo v srednjem in novem veku v krajih, kjer je preživel osemnajst let.

Za leti 1958 in 1959 je dobil namensko Sealantic štipendijo Ameriške zveze teološ-

¹⁴ *Discovery for Parents and Teachers of Juniors*, Vol. 17, No. 2, January - March 1965, str. 11-18.

¹⁵ »In a way, my life has been different from the average European immigrant. I have been very fortunate in my pursuit of education, and there were always people who encouraged me to go as far as I could in my educational preparation. I am only sorry to say that my own people, the Slovenians tried to discourage me, and saw no or very little value in education for their children. The reason for this was mostly ignorance...«. Pismo z dne 19. maja 1986.

kih šol za raziskovanje reformacije in protestantizma v avstrijskih deželah. Raziskovalno delo ga je vodilo do knjižnic in arhivov v Nemčiji, Švici, Italiji, Avstriji in Jugoslaviji. Zbral je veliko materialov, ravno tako dragoceno pa je bilo srečanje z nekaterimi pomembnimi raziskovalci in poznavalci zgodovine slovenskega protestantizma. Med njimi je bil Oskar Sakrausky, tedanji škof evangeličanske cerkve in pastor v Bleifeldu v Avstriji, ki ga je povezal s prekmurskimi evangeličanskimi duhovniki Ludvikom Novakom, Ludvikom Jošarjem, Gustavom Škaličem in Aleksandrom Kerčmarjem. Žal se z njimi osebno ni mogel srečati, ker v Prekmurje ni potoval. Med literarnimi zgodovinarji in drugimi poznavalci tega zgodovinskega področja si je našel prijatelje, s katerimi si je pozneje dopisoval in izmenjeval strokovno literaturo: Mirko Rupel, Milko Kos, Anton Slodnjak, Alfonz Gspan, Jože Žužek, idr.

Svoje raziskovalno delo s tega področja je nadaljeval v naslednjem obisku leta 1970, ko se je v Ljubljani srečal s pastorjem Vladimirjem Misljem.

Mihelič je svoje raziskovalno delo opravljal z veliko vnemo in iskreno predanostjo, ki ni temeljila na službeni dolžnosti, ampak na notranji nuji, da razčisti svoja osebna vprašanja, kar mu je tudi popolnoma uspelo. V njegovih razpravah o slovenskem protestantizmu je za čas njihovega nastanka veliko novih odkritij in poudarkov, ki so bili sveža novost. Raziskovanje protestantizma v Sloveniji je dobilo velike spodbude in podporo ob velikih obletnicah Lutra, Dalmatina in Trubarja v sredini osemdesetih let, kar je rodilo nova odkritja, obravnave in knjižne izdaje od zbornikov, monografij dalje.

Iz zbranega gradiva s prvega študijskega potovanja je Jože Mihelič napisal dve izčrpni znanstveni razpravi, *Primus Trubar, the Forgotten Reformer* in *Juri Dalmatin and his Slovene Bible*.¹⁶ Obe imata zelo bogat spremni znanstveni aparat z vso relevantno literaturo s slovenskega in nemškega govornega področja. Skoraj nerazumljiva je Miheličeva preskromna angažiranost v iskanju primerne publikacije, ki bi deli objavila. Tako sta bili v slovenskem prevodu prej objavljeni kot v angleškem.

V dveh delih se je Jože Mihelič lotil širše zgodovinske tematike, a sta ostali obe samo v izčrpnem osnutku. To sta Highlights of Reformation Period in An Outline of the Reformation in Austrian Lands. Prva obravnava Lutrovo obdobje v Nemčiji z raznih vidikov in dogajanja; v četrtem delu se ukvarja z reformacijo v avstrijskih deželah, ki jo razdeli v tri dele: kratek zgodovinski pregled; stanje cerkve, duhovništva in ljudstva; verska gibanja med slovenskimi kmeti in meščani. Druga se ukvarja s približno enakim gradivom, le da se omejuje samo na avstrijske dežele in gre bolj v podrobnosti.

Mihelič je nameraval raziskovanje protestantizma na Slovenskem nadaljevati tudi po 16. stoletju. Za začetek protestanske cerkve v Ljubljani v sredini 19. stoletja je začel zbirati gradivo, a ga ni obdelal. Po letu 1977, ko je v Murski Soboti izšla knjiga Franca Šebjaniča *Protestantsko gibanje panonskih Slovencev*, mu je Ludvik Jošar poslal en izvod, s katerim mu je spodbudil zanimanje tudi za današnji slovenski protestantizem. Napisal je pregledni strokovni članek *The Slovene Protestants of Pannonia*, ni pa razvidno, če ga je kje objavil.

Najboljšo, morda ne ravno znanstveno, a prav gotovo človeško oceno o Jožetu Miheliču kot zgodovinarju je dala po njegovi smrti njegova vdova:

¹⁶ Za slovenski prevod gl. op. 2. V osebnem pismu z dne 18. julija 1986 mi je Mihelič zapisal: »As for the Trubar and Dalmatin's articles, I have not yet attempted to send them to any publisher here. Since I have additional copies of them I may do so sometimes in the future...« Nikoli ni sporočil, če sta bili kje objavljeni.

»Kaj najbolj pogrešam v zvezi z njim? Seveda pogrešam vsakdanjost najinega življenja, nakupovanje po trgovinah, vrtnarjenje, gledanje oddaje MacNeil-Lehrer. Toda verjetno najbolj pogrešam to, kar je bilo za njegove študente tako posebno: njegov razum, njegov presenetljivo dober spomin, njegovo sposobnost, da je živo naslikal vse, kar je videl ali prebral. Pogrešam njegov glas, njegova doživetja in dogodke - iz njegove lastne preteklosti, iz evropske zgodovine, iz Stare zaveze - dogodke, ki so nam postali po njegovem pripovedovanju tako živi in pomembni za naš čas.«¹⁷

IV. Prijatelj Louisa Adamiča

Za prijateljstvo in dopisovanje med Jožetom Miheličem in Louisom Adamičem sem zvedel čisto slučajno, ko sem pregledoval njegovo zapuščino in našel nekaj pisem, ki sta si jih napisala v letu 1934.¹⁸ Iz pisem je razvidno, da sta se osebno srečala in poznala. Vsebina pisem kaže, da je bilo njuno sodelovanje večplastno, žal pa vsa pisma njunega dopisovanja niso ohranjena. V tej najdbi so tri pisma, ki jih je Mihelič napisal Adamiču (z dne 23. januarja 1934, nedatirano, 7. februarja 1934) in šest pisem, ki jih je Adamič napisal Miheliču (nedatirano, z dne 23. januarja, 10. februarja, 29. marca, 10. aprila in 5. junija 1934). Pisma sem prevedel v slovenščino in jih objavil v *Slovenskem koledarju*.¹⁹

Vsebina pisem se nanaša na njuno prijateljsko sodelovanje v prvi polovici leta 1934, ki ga lahko vsebinsko razdelimo na tri področja:

1. Jože Mihelič prosi Louisa Adamiča za mentorsko podporo na začetku svojega publicističnega delovanja. Njegova prošnja je obotavljajoča, oprezna, a vseeno prijateljsko direktna:

»Pred nekaj časa sem Vas hotel zaprositi za uslugo, toda bal sem se Vas nadlegovati, ker vem, kako zelo ste zaposleni. Usluga, za katero bi Vas rad zaprosil, je ocena mojih poskusov pisanja. Ko sem bil še na kolidžu, sem porabil večino svojega prostega časa za izpopolnjevanje angleščine. Velik del tega se je izražal v pisanju skečev, kratkih zgodb in prevajanja iz različnih jezikov v angleščino. Človek seveda ni nikoli pravičen ocenjevalec svojega lastnega dela. Zatorej bi Vas rad zaprosil, če bi hoteli od časa do časa pregledati moje poskuse pisanja in mi potem pošteno povedati svoje mnenje o njem...« (23. januarja 1934).

Ko je leta 1932 končal kolidž, se je Jože Mihelič zaposlil in do leta 1935, ko se je poročil in začel študij teologije, poleg dela pisal in prevajal. Čeprav v pismu omenja, da se je predvsem izpopolnjeval v angleščini, je pisal tudi v slovenščini in dopisoval v tednik *Nova doba* (New Era), ki je izhajal od leta 1925 dalje v New Yorku, N. Y. in v Clevelandu, Ohio.²⁰ V njem je v letih 1933-34 tudi objavil angleški prevod prvega slovenskega romana, Jurčičevega *Desetega brata*.

¹⁷ Novoletno pismo, 1990.

¹⁸ To je bilo 25. februarja 1991, ko sem pregledoval njegovo zapuščino v University of Dubuque, Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa, ZDA. Pisma sem našel med teološkimi in bibliističnimi deli, ki so bila shranjena v 34 kartonskih škatlah, še neurejena. Tam sem našel tudi spise, ki jih omenjam v tem delu in še niso bili objavljeni.

¹⁹ Mihael Kuzmič, Nekaj korespondence med Louisom Adamičem in Jožetom Miheličem. *Slovenski koledar* 39, Ljubljana (Slovenska izseljenska matica) 1992, 196-200. Kopijc pisem v angleščini hranita avtor in Inštitut za slovensko izseljenstvo pri ZRC SAZU v Ljubljani.

²⁰ Jožec Bajec, *Slovensko izseljensko časopisje 1891-1945*. Ljubljana (Slovenska izseljenska matica) 1980, 75.

Iz razpoložljive korespondence ni razvidno, ali je Adamič pregledal Miheličeve spise ali ne. Kakorkoli, po končanih teoloških študijih in v času svoje profesure se je Mihelič ukvarjal predvsem z znanstvenim in strokovnim pisanjem, s publicistiko pa ne več.

2. Jože Mihelič pomaga Louisu Adamiču pri njegovih predavanjih spomladi leta 1934.

Louis Adamič je imel v marcu in aprilu 1934 med Slovenci v Ohio predavanja, v katerih je govoril o svojem potovanju v Jugoslavijo in tudi o političnem položaju med priseljenci v Ameriko. V Clevelandu, Ohio je bilo takšno predavanje 3. aprila, že pred tem pa v Lorainu, Ohio. Jožetu Miheliču je v pismu 29. marca sporočil, da bo imel v obeh mestih isti govor. Govoril bo v angleščini, razen kratkega uvoda na začetku v slovenščini. Obljublja mu, da se bo z nastopom potrudil in ne bo razočaral organizatorja. Za predavanje pričakuje primeren honorar, s katerim bo delno pokril stroške potovanja in bivanja v mestu, delno bo pa prispeval v fond za pripravo predavateljev za Informacijsko službo tujejezičnih Američanov, ki bo pozneje lahko pošiljala na teren predavatelje. Izraža tudi prepričanje, da se ne bi mogli odzvati na vse prošnje za nastope na zborovanjih, ko bi ne računali honorarjev.

10. aprila 1934 Adamič v novem pismu izraža zadovoljstvo, da se je ponovno srečal z Miheličem in upa, da s svojim govorom v Lorainu ni razočaral poslušalstva. Zanima ga odziv ljudi in vljudno prosi za izrezek iz časopisa *Lorain Journal*, kjer je objavljeno poročilo o njegovem nastopu.

Skromna korespondenca med Jožetom Miheličem in Louisom Adamičem, ki jo imamo v rokah, daje žal samo kratek izsek iz njunega sodelovanja v delu med slovenskimi izseljenci v Ameriki. Vseeno kaže na akcijsko sodelovanje in prikazuje profesorja Miheliča kot zagnanega mladeniča, ki je svojo domoljubnost uravnoteženo razdelil med delo z zapisano besedo s peresom in govorjeno besedo na javnih zborovanjih. V obeh primerih mu je Adamič služil za privlačen zgled, in hkrati mu je bil prijateljsko zanesljivi pomočnik.

3. Jože Mihelič z navdušenjem sprejme knjigo *Vrnitev v rodni kraj* in jo z veseljem priporoča sonarodnjakom. Zavzemal se je, da bi čimveč rojakov dobilo v roke knjige Louisa Adamiča; v pismih so omenjene *Vrnitev v rodni kraj*, *Dinamit* in *Smeh v džungli*. Sam jih je tudi naročal za svoje prijatelje v manjšem ali večjem številu izvodov. Denar je vnaprej nakazoval naravnost Adamiču, ki mu je knjige sam poslal ali pa naročil založniku, da mu jih čimprej pošlje. V enem primeru je prosil avtorja, naj podpiše naročene izvode, ki so bili namenjeni samemu naročniku Miheliču in njegovim prijateljem Johnu Kumšetu, Johnu Kotniku in dr. F. L. Mramorju; en podpisan izvod je naročil kot rezervo.

Jože Mihelič se je zavzemal, naj ljudje preberejo knjigo *Vrnitev v rodni kraj*, ker je bil sam nad njo silno navdušen. Svoje občutke ob branju in misli, ki so se mu ob njej porajale, je opisal v pismu 7. februarja 1934 s takšno doživetostjo, ki jo redko najdemo tudi pri najboljših pisateljih. Zato tudi pismo citiram v daljšem navedku:

»Povsem naravno je, da sem knjigo pričakoval z neke vrste nemiro. Po prejemu sem začel dobredno požirati vsebino knjige *Vrnitev v rodni kraj*.

Mr. Adamič, moja duša je napolnjena do roba z mešanimi občutki. Nimam besed, s katerimi bi lahko izrazil občutke, ki so me navdajali ob branju te monumentalne zgodbe o moji deželi in mojem ljudstvu, o njihovem trpljenju in potrpljenju, ki je skorajda podobno nemim živalim.

Ko sem bral o njihovih obveznostih in mukah, ki jih povzroča skorumpirani in sadi-

stični diktatorski režim, sem se včasih počutil kot zaprta žival, ki je pripravljena skočiti v svoje mučitelje, jim raztrgati drobovje in zmlati kosti v prah. Po tistem sem ponovno ječal zaradi ostrižene možnosti pomagati zatiranim jugoslovanskim množicam. Morda me slišite kot sentimentalnega norčeka - toda Slovan s svojo »srčno kulturo« v meni je bil premočan, da bi lahko bil miren, ko sem bral o svoji deželi in njenem ljudstvu in o vsem tistem, kar bi lahko bilo, pa ni, zaradi nekaj lakomnih in sebičnih posameznikov, kateri vladajo deželi.

Ljubim Jugoslavijo, njeno ljudstvo, njene hribe in doline, posejane z zaspanimi vasmami, s tako ljubeznijo, ki bi jo lahko primerjal zgolj s strastno ljubeznijo mladeniča do krasne ženske. Toda usoda me je pognala v neprostovoljno izgnanstvo. Od štirinajstega leta dalje živim v tujih deželah, med tujimi ljudstvi – ves ta čas hrepenim in vzdihujem po z gozdovi pokritih hribih, katerih vrhovi so kronani s cerkvicami in razvalinami gradov; po zelenih dolinah, ki jih namakajo srebrni potoki, ob katerih sem se kot otrok igral.

Vaša knjiga je odpihnila meglo, ki me je z leti ovila in zatemnila vizije moje mladosti. Povzročila je domotožje za Jugoslavijo, kakršnega do zdaj še nikoli nisem imel. Toda povzročila je še več od tega. V meni je dvignila ponos na moje ljudstvo, na njegov nepremagljiv duh, katerega ni moglo uničiti 500 let tuje nadvlade. Ni se mi več treba sramovati svojih prednikov – dejansko se jih nikoli tudi nisem – toda iz nekega nepojasnljivega vzroka sem pogrešal agresivnost, kakor jo pogreša tisoče drugih jugoslovanskih izseljencev, s katero bi zahtevali pravice, katere nam pripadajo kot članom človeške družbe ...

S pohvalami knjige bi lahko nadaljeval v nedogled. Zavedam se, da bo tisoče podobnih pisem in morda nekaj različnih v kratkem času pritekalo do Vas, zato končujem z: »Iz dna srca ti hvala za tvoje delo, brat Slovenec.«

S spoštovanjem, Vaš hvaležni prijatelj, Jože Mihelič.«

Sklep

Jože Mihelič je med slovenskimi izobraženci, ki so živeli v tujini, izstopajoča osebnost. S svojim življenjem in delom je pokazal toliko izvirnosti, iznajdljivosti in ustvarjalnosti, da jo je težko doumeti in pravično ovrednotiti.

Na teološkem področju je poleg rednega predavateljskega in znanstveno raziskovalnega dela ubiral prve pionirske korake v teologiji socialne pravičnosti in ekologije, ki se šele v našem času razvija v mednarodno priznana in aktualna teološka disciplino. Poleg škofa Vekoslava Grmiča je skoraj edini slovenski teolog, ki je poglobljeno obravnaval to teološko področje.

Na zgodovinskem področju se je ukvarjal s tematiko biblične prazgodovine in slovenskega protestantizma, s katerima so se tudi v Sloveniji ukvarjali zgolj posamezniki in je še danes po svoji znanstveni obdelanosti deficitarno področje. Žal so njegova dela bila napisana v angleščini in večinoma ob svojem nastanku slovenski strokovni javnosti niso bila poznana.

Razpoložljiva korespondenca med Jožetom Miheličem in Louisom Adamičem nam predstavlja samo njuno polletno sodelovanje v prvi polovici leta 1934. To pa je po svoji intenzivnosti, aktivnosti na več področjih in pristnem prijateljstvu rodilo nove ustvarjalne spodbude v Miheličevem nadaljnjem življenju, hkrati pa širilo med slovenskimi in drugimi jugoslovanskimi izseljenci tridesetih let Adamičevo misel in akcijo kakor s pisano, ravno tako z govorjeno besedo.

SUMMARY THE AMERICAN SLOVENE JOŽE L. MIHELİČ (1902-1989) – THEOLOGIAN, HISTORIAN AND FRIEND OF LOUIS ADAMIČ

Jože Mihelič was born to Slovene parents in Ely, Minnesota but from his second to his eighteenth year lived with his parents at Ribnica in Dolenjska, Slovenia. After the First World War he returned to America and began at the bottom of the social scale, as an unskilled factory worker. In the 1920s he completed his studies, for which he had had to earn the money himself, and became a doctor of Bible science. He taught at the Theological Seminary of the University of Dubuque in Iowa from 1944 until his retirement in 1971.

Mihelič's academic interests and work stretched over several fields. As a priest of the Protestant Presbyterian Church he retained all his life contacts with simple people and their spiritual and social needs.

As a theologian Jože Mihelič specialised in the Old Testament, continuing to lecture on it until 1984, even after his retirement. For him the Old Testament was not merely a history and account of the life of the Israelites and the other peoples who surrounded them. Academically he was most attracted by the social teachings of the prophets, who in their day were the burning conscience of society and the various exploitative classes. He transferred and transplanted his findings to his own time and found that the moral state of humankind and social problems have hardly changed at all in the last few thousand years.

As a historian he was a recognised expert in the history and languages of the Old Middle East. His students at the university were not the only people to benefit from his learning, he also passed it on to others via his cooperation on encyclopaedias, handbooks and popular/technical publications intended for a wider reading public. Patriotic and religious motives also led him to research Slovene Protestantism in the libraries and archives of Germany, Austria, Italy and Yugoslavia. He maintained fruitful contacts with other Slovene researchers from this field (including Mirko Rupel, Anton Slodnjak and Alfonz Gspan). He wrote cogent studies on Trubar, Dalmatin and the Protestants of Prekmurje. He also collected archive material on the awakening of Protestantism in Slovenia in the 19th century, particularly in Ljubljana, although did not have time to give it further academic treatment.

Jože Mihelič maintained friendly connections with several Slovene intellectuals in America, including the likes of Edi Gobec, Frank Gorenšek, and, above all, Luis Adamič. Sections of their correspondence which are preserved and were uncovered in the archives of the University of Dubuque show that:

- Louis Adamič's literary work, especially writing and translations into English (he translated the first Slovene novel, *Deseti brat* (The Tenth Brother) by Josip Jurčič) had a strong influence on Mihelič;

- in the 1933-34 period, when Adamič was lecturing in various Ohio cities, they met on several occasions; Mihelič helped to organise these meetings and to promote Adamič's books among the Yugoslav immigrants;

- they shared a deep love for the Slovene homeland and nation.

Jože Mihelič's scientific work in the USA significantly enriched the Protestant theological and historical fields. Through translation into and publication in Slovene his works are now enriching Slovene theological ideas and ecumenical symbiosis.

CONCERN FOR ONCE'S NATION FAR AWAY FROM HOMELAND

TWO EXAMPLES: LOUIS ADAMIC AND
OSZKÁR JÁSZI

This paper aims to compare the lifeworks of the two sociopolitical authors in the following three fields:

- Their lifelong careers;
- Coexistence of nations;
- Their views on social problems, on their countries' politics and relations with the Soviet Union.

1. Bioi parallelloi

Up to 1925, there is not, and if circumstances are taken into consideration there cannot be, any parallelism in the two biographies. Oszkár Jászi, who was born 2 March 1875 in a converted Calvinist Jewish family, studied politics and law at the University of Sciences in Budapest and, in 1898, the year Adamic was born in, received a post at the Department of Economy of the Agricultural Ministry, where he worked until 1906. In 1899, he became intensively involved in sociopolitical journalism as well. He, together with others, founded and published the periodical *Huszadik Század* (Twentieth Century), and he led the Social Sciences Association, which was the main forum of Hungarian sociology in those years, and became a leader of the radical bourgeois democrats. In 1905, his activity resulted in cooperation between the Bourgeois Radicals and the Socialists, and from that year onwards he also dealt, more and more intensively, with the problems of the nationalities, leading to the 1912 publication of his book, *The Evolution of National States and the Nationality Issue*. In October 1918, he published a scheme he had made in spring: *The Future of the Monarchy and the United States of Danubia*. In the same autumn, he became Minister of Nationality Affairs in Károlyi's government and the leader of its foreign policy. Although Hungary's nationalities did not approve of Jászi's ideas, he was much more honest and radical in his intentions to solve the problems between the nations than all other Hungarian politicians. On 1 May 1919, he left Hungary for Vienna, where he lived until 1925. Here he stood out against the so-called counterrevolutionary Horthy system and urged its overthrow, for which in Hungary he was declared to have committed treason.¹ The year of 1925 was a real milestone in Oszkár Jászi's life. He sailed to America to start

¹ Litván György–Varga F. János (ed.): *Jászi Oszkár publicisztikája*. Válogatás. Budapest, Magvető, 1982. 9–12.; Hanák Péter: *JÁSZI OSZKÁR dunai patriotizmusa*. Budapest, Magvető 1985. 181.; Litván György–Szarka László (ed.): *Duna-völgyi barátságok és viták. Jászi Oszkár közép-európai dossziéja*. Budapest, Gondolat, 1991. 7–21.

a new life, which he did so successfully as to always write his diary in English from the very day of the embarking. He became Doctor of Political Sciences at Oberlin College, Cleveland. As Péter Hanák put it: »*For Jászi, in the earlier stage of his life, science was a means of politics, but now politics became a subject of science.*«²

From this time on, more and more similarities can be seen in Jászi's and Adamic's lives, although the differences are also substantial. 1925 was a turning point in the life of Louis Adamic too. Then did he begin his literary activity by writing newspaper articles and making translations. In 1932 and 33, Adamic spent ten months in Yugoslavia, which he left as if fleeing. Jászi, who was a dedicated opponent of the interwar Hungarian political system and strongly criticised the lack of democracy and civil rights, could not return to Hungary, but visited some place in Danubia almost each year until 1934, when he travelled throughout all Central Europe.³ Adamic was a founder, and from 1942 honorary chairman, of the Slovenskoameriski narodni svet (Slovene-American National Council). He fought fascism not only by writing the book *My Native Land*, but also through his connections with the liberty movements of the oppressed nations.⁴ During the same years, Jászi was chairman of the Democratic Association of American Hungarians and was busy organising their antifascist movement.⁵ In 1947 Jászi, in 1949 Adamic visited their respective countries, but the ways they were greeted as well as what they experienced greatly differed, and so did their reactions. The rest of the paper aims to explain that the similarities and differences in Jászi's and Adamic's thoughts and principles originate partly from the Hungarian and Slovene nations' histories and partly from their views on society.

2. *The situation of the Hungarian and the Slovene nations*

The twentieth century brought major changes in both nations' lives. Hungary, which had been one of the main profiteers in the Dualist system and had had under her rule a number of other nations, whom she had tried to assimilate into her, lost the first world war and, as a consequence of it, about two thirds of her former territory. The Hungarians in the new countries coming into existence around Hungary became ethnic minorities there. The solution the rightist Hungarian government imagined was a revision of the new borders, which caused Hungary to participate in the second world war as a satellite to Hitler's Germany. This meant fighting on the loser's side again, leading to Soviet occupation after the war and losing independence for 45 years. Hungary had to endure Soviet troops on her territory, and her actions against Yugoslavia in 1948 and against Czechoslovakia in 1968 proved she had become the Soviet Union's satellite.

For the Slovenians, who had lived under Austrian, Italian and Hungarian control and earlier vainly applied for their national rights to be acknowledged, the end of the first world war brought the opportunity to establish the Slovene, or more exactly, the Slovene-Croat-Serb State. This historic step, which all Slovene historians considered to be desirable, was followed by, due to the Italian and Austrian attack, a move questioned by many people: the creation of the Serb-Croat-Slovene Kingdom. Although the Slovenians esca-

² Jászi Oszkár: *A Habsburg Monarchia felbomlása*. Budapest, Gondolat, 1982. 7.

³ Hanák Péter: *Jászi Oszkár dunai patriotizmusa* 137.

⁴ Mira Mihelič: *Louis Adamic in: Orel in korenine*, Ljubljana, 1970. 153.

⁵ Litván György–Varga F. János (ed.): *Jászi Oszkár publicisztikája*. 12.

ped the nightmare of germanisation, the republic was replaced with a centralist and unitarist realm. To make things worse, substantial Slovene-populated areas were placed under Italian control, while most of the rest remained under Austria's or Hungary's authority; i.e. the dream of unifying the Slovene nation had not become a reality. In spite of diverse processes, the situations the Hungarians and Slovenians were in between the two world wars, as well as the dividedness of their nations and the lack of democracy in both countries showed striking similarity.

Adamic and Jászi evaluated their 1933/34 visits to their homelands very similarly. According to Adamic, »the Belgrade government is part of the postwar political gangsterism in Europe«. ⁶ And »the capitalism in Yugoslavia is the worst kind of capitalism«. He felt he was so much in danger in Yugoslavia that practically fled the country, where his book entitled »The Native's Return«, in which he wrote about his experiences there, was immediately banned after its publication. ⁷ Jászi's account on his 1934 journey includes the following:

»I was deeply depressed when coming back from Europe. I felt a suffocating atmosphere throughout Central Europe and the Balkan. Personal freedom could not have been at a lower level even in the darkest centuries of absolutism than now... People are deprived of their political rights, freedom of speech and the freedom of the press disdained, cooperations developed along centuries disrupted, even the freedom of religion questioned, no more chance to criticise or dispute, in some places even between close friends... Almost every place I went to had an aura of uncertainty or terror.«⁸ He describes what he experienced in Yugoslavia as follows: »Yugoslavia is firmly founded as far as her land or population is concerned, but her constitutionality appears very rickety. The dictatorship is completely broke, yet may survive for a long time still. The conflict between Byzantium and Rome is deep and tragic. The nationality problem is treated even more dishonestly than in Romania, which, compared to the Serb dictatorship, is an island of freedom. I cannot see any solution, since the idea of a Danubian or Balkanic alliance is impracticable. So a new war will come, 'which nobody wants'.«⁹

They shared the concept of the way out, suggesting a confederacy of all the peoples of the region. The idea first appeared in Jászi's above mentioned book in 1918, and, as he wrote in 1947, he remained faithful to it all along his life. He set up three basic principles:

»It must be ensured that-

- 1. viable national states can be formed,*
- 2. efficient defence is provided for the ethnic minorities within the national states,*
- 3. the new states cooperate organically, thus ceasing the chance of conflicts between them or between their nationalities.«*

His concept suggested the cooperation of five states within the Monarchy: Hungary, Austria, Bohemia, Poland and Illyria, the state to embrace the South Slavs. ¹⁰ In 1921, he

⁶ Louis Adamic: *The Natives Return*, Harper&Brothers, New York and London, 1934. 360.

⁷ Boris Paternu: *Nastajanje Adamičevega sestava vrednot ob Ameriki in Jugoslaviji* in: *Louis Adamič. Simpozij*. Ljubljana, 1981. 97.

⁸ Jászi Oszkár: *A kommunizmus kilátástalansága és a szocializmus reformációja*. Budapest, Héttorony. 1989. 232-233

⁹ Litván György–Varga F. János (ed.): *Jászi Oszkár válogatott levelei*. 353.

¹⁰ Jászi Oszkár: *A Monarchia jövője. A dualizmus bukása és a Dunai Egyesült Államok*. Budapest, Új Magyarország Részvénytársaság, 1918. 37-39.

judged the setting up of separate national states as a progressive move, but objected that the new states were not democratic and that it created a number of economic systems which hermetically isolated themselves from one another.¹¹ In order to solve the above problems together with those caused by the fact that about three million Hungarians got into minority position, he urged preparations for an alliance of the peoples of Danubia.¹²

Sensing the growing tensions in the region, in his book *The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy* (published in 1929) Jászi condemned the preparations for the war and those Hungarian politicians who wanted to recover all of the territories formerly belonging under the Hungarian Holy Crown. However, he suggested that a revision of the borders was necessary and saw the solution of the problem as it follows:

»The roads towards real peace and consolidation can be only the following: First, revision of the frontiers in all cases where homogenous national minorities can be attached without difficulty to their connationals. Second, organization of all the national minorities in public bodies entitled to carry on their own cultural and educational system, limited only by their loyalty to the state. Third, decentralization of the overcentralized and bureaucratic states in the spirit of free local government. Fourth, elimination of trade hindrances and augmentation of the possibilities for economic and cultural co-operation. Fifth, eradication of that type of intellectualism and civic which is represented in the above-quoted utterances.«¹³

In the next years, realising that any change of the borders could be achieved only in a war, which he was firmly opposed to, he rather emphasised the importance of the transformation of all Danubian countries into democracy with economical and political cooperation among them, and proposed the setting up of the Danubia Confederacy. In his 1934 essay entitled »Germs of War in the Danube Valley« he assessed the state of affairs as follows:

»Free from any national prejudice and with equal sympathy for every people involved in this Danubian drama, I must say that all nations in the Danube valley must very soon carry out basic reforms or else a new war will come. And after the war, there comes the revolution to solve the agrarian issue not by cooperatives but by the kolkhoz, the nationality issue not by local governments but by the nationalities' soviets, and institutional issues not by the liberty of federalism but by dictatorship of the proletariat. Not Europe but Asia will rule this part of the world, and the Hungarian and Romanian islands may disappear in the Slavs' ocean.«¹⁴

Adamic, who drew attention to the situation of the Slovenians under Italian and German control in 1943 and kept dealing with the Trieste issue even after the second world war,¹⁵ drew partly different conclusion from the same phenomena. On the one hand, he also believed that a federation of Balkanic and Eastern European peoples could be formed. He wrote, for example, that the Macedonian problem is soluble only if »some sort of Bal-

¹¹ Litván György–Szarka László (ed.): Duna-völgyi barátságok és viták. *Jászi Oszkár közép-európai dossziéja*. 139.

¹² *ibid.* 141.

¹³ Jászi Oszkár: *The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy*, Chicago, Illinois, USA, The University of Chicago, 1929. 457..

¹⁴ Litván György–Szarka László (ed.): Duna-völgyi barátságok és viták. *Jászi Oszkár közép-európai dossziéja*. 226-230.

¹⁵ Louis Adamic: *My Native Land*, New York and London, Harper, 1943. 93-100.; Janez Tomšič: Louis Adamic in slovensko Primorje in *Louis Adamic Simpozij*, Ljubljana, 1981. 361-368.; Janja Žitnik: Louis Adamic's Periodicals in *Dve domovini*. 2-3. 1992. 259.

kan federation is formed, and Macedonia, now split among Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Greece, becomes an autonomous state within the Union.« This resembles the way Jászi would have liked to solve the Hungarian issue. On the other hand, however, Adamic differently judged the relations both within the federation and with Russia.

»I see now that the salvation of the Yugoslav people and other small backward nations in that part of the world lies, clearly and inescapably, in the direction of Russia. They will have to overthrow their present racketeer rulers, form a Balkan or Eastern European federation of collectivist republics and, in some mutually satisfactory way, attach themselves to the U.S.S.R.«¹⁶

He had a different view on the possibility of a war as well:

»A new European war appears certain; if not this spring then in 1934, or 35, or 36. The contradictions of the system under which the world functions make that inevitable. Millions of people might die in it, but, as things are today, millions of starving, frustrated and unfunctioning men, women and children die a low death in Europe anyhow. If such a war finally leads to general upheaval of masses everywhere, it is highly desirable. Even chaos, which might follow such a war and such upheavals before the forces true social propers could be organised, would be preferable to the present condition of 'peace', with its gangster diplomacy and racketeer methods of government.«¹⁷

The great difference between the two authors' opinions, which the above quotations clearly demonstrate, can be traced back to their diverse views on the workers movements.

3. Adamic's and Jászi's views on capitalism and socialism

Jászi, the well-read scholar, who associated with the elite of Hungary's bourgeois intellectuals, had been sharply criticising feudalistic backwardness since the turn of the century. Seeing the urgent need of changes in society, he wrote the following in 1930: »... I think the state of affairs in today's capitalism is untenable. We have to make changes or else our European culture will collapse and we will sink down into bloody chaos.«¹⁸ He opposed, however, that changes should be achieved through proletarian dictatorship. Since 1903, he had been struggling against the Marxist vision of socialism. His detailed critique of Marx's ideas was published in late 1919 and, all along his life, refused any realised form of communism on the basis of what he had experienced in Russia and Hungary. He emphasised he refused any kind of dictatorship on principle.¹⁹ He wrote that

»total bolshevisation of Eastern and Central Europe would bring about such bloodshed, anarchy and economic crisis where only adventurers, the illiterate, the bloodthirsty disequilibrators or rabid rabbi candidates could be leaders... Theoretically: Russian bolshevism is madness, politically: it is brainlessness, and morally: crime.«

Until 1918, Jászi considered himself to be a bourgeois radical, and from 1919 onwards, on the grounds of Franz Oppenheimer's ideas, he used the name »liberal socialism« referring to the model which he thought could solve the problem of social injustice while efficiently operating the economy as well.

¹⁶ *The Native's Return* 361.

¹⁷ *ibid.* 363.

¹⁸ Jászi Oszkár: *A kommunizmus kilátástalansága és a szocializmus reformációja*. 166.

¹⁹ *ibid.* 9. 54.

Adamic, who made his living as a labourer in the first period of his career and knew how hard life was for immigrants in America, also dealt, even if not as a scholar, with philosophical and economical problems of communism, and often expressed views which were very close to Jászi's. In 1925, he wrote in a letter the following: »*Naturally, I think that there is a need for social reforms, and this is the extent to which I am a Socialist myself.*«²⁰

Although he described the nature of capitalism and the struggle of the workers in his books entitled *Dynamite* and *Laughing in the Jungle*, but these did not express Marxist or radical views. He regarded communism as something bad that had to be avoided and mocked at the intellectuals who were looking forward to revolution.²¹ Before 1932, his attitude could be regarded as leftist liberal, and the change in his views took place accurately when he was on his visit to his homeland, Yugoslavia. What he experienced and what the Slovene communists told him must have caused this change together.²² From that time on, he several times expressed he was in favour of the communist way of solution,²³ and in 1934, he even stated: »*Now I consider myself a communist.*«²⁴ He saw it clearly, however, that no turn towards communism could take place in America. In the mid 30s, he was more and more critical about such events in the Soviet Union which »*he considered its illiberal internal setup manifested in, among other things, the purges.*«²⁵ First, on antifascist grounds, he supported Draga Mihailovic's resistance movement. In the year of 1942, however, he learned of the communist-led resistance aiming to transform Yugoslavia into a federal system, which caused him to start to popularise Tito's partisans in America. One of the results of this activity was his book, »*My Native Land*«. In this, referring to Josip Vidmar, he emphasises the rightfulness of the Slovene national goals opposed to the aims of the pan-Serb movement, and tries to clarify his inconsistent views on communism and the Soviet Union.

»*But what about communism? What went by that name in Russia certainly wasn't communism as yet, but might be working in that direction. And what about the lack of individual liberty? Within the multinational frame of the Soviet there was certainly far more hope of its evolution than in the Europe that was and that seemed unlikely to change except for the worse... And what about the Moscow trials back in '37? They were disturbing then. Now, however, they weren't as important as that the Soviet's multinational arrangement seemed to work.*«²⁶

Adamic's hope that the Soviet Union could develop in the right direction only held out until 1948, the year when hostility broke out between the Information Office and Yugoslavia. Between 1945 and 1948, Oszkár Jászi was also in doubts. The fact that parliamen-

²⁰ Matjaž Klemenčič: *Politično delo Louisa Adamiča, Teorija in praksa*, 1981. 1054.

²¹ Rudolph J. Vecoli: »*Dynamite: Adamic and Working Class America*, *Louis Adamič. Simpozij*, Ljubljana, 1981. 158-163.

²² Henry A. Christian: *Adamic's Struggle: the I International History of a »Radical« pamphlet*, *Louis Adamič. Simpozij*, Ljubljana, 1981. 323.

²³ Drago Druškovič: *Lovro Kuhar - Prežihov Voranc in Louis Adamič*, *Louis Adamič. Simpozij*, Ljubljana, 1981. 309.

²⁴ Bogdan C. Novak: *Why Adamic shifted his Support from Mihailović to Tito*, *Slovene Studies*, 1989/1-2. 186.

²⁵ Malcolm Sylvers: *The America of Louis Adamic: Democratic Ideals, Immigration and the Working Class Movement*, *Louis Adamič. Simpozij*, Ljubljana, 1981. 191.

²⁶ Louis Adamic: *My Native Land*, 1943. 140-143.

tary democracy had been formed in Hungary filled him with hope, but as soon as in June 1946 he thought that »*history dashed the hope that the Soviets would want democracy in Central Europe.*« In 1947 summer, he wrote: »*The sovietisation of Hungary ruined all of my lifework.*« Because of these things he rejected the Order of the Republic, which he was awarded by the Hungarian government. In October and November 1947, however, he paid a visit to Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

»*Never before could there have been a government in Hungary with so much power concentrated in its hands and which suppressed every dissent so authoritatively as today's communist dictatorship. Theirs are all military forces, police, intelligence, etc. Theirs is the monopoly over the whole economy of the country. Theirs is the monopoly of radio, press and propaganda. And everybody knows, in case of difficulty they can one hundred percent depend on the world's strongest armed force, the Russian army.*«²⁷

His despair was increased by the enforced slovakisation of the Slovakian Hungarians.²⁸ What he experienced in these countries just confirmed him in his persuasion that this region had not got closer to freedom or to its nations' reconciliation. He was unhappy to see that the Danubian peoples, »*whom tradition and experience turn against one another and no common ethos links up*«, do not form a federation on a voluntary basis. So, in 1955, he was of the opinion that the United States would have to interfere using financial means and benevolent »*tame violence*« to carry out the Danubian integration.²⁹

Adamic had different experiences at the time. The new Yugoslavia, which Tito and his group had created, functioned the way that Adamic thought desirable, i.e. on federal basis, and Yugoslav politicians were working on the formation of a wider Balkan federation. Though not to the desired extent, the integration of the Slovene ethnic areas became a reality, at a level higher than ever before. Adamic himself had largely contributed to this success by his intensive propaganda.³⁰ All these things were of huge importance and faded away the problems. So, when it turned out that the Soviet Union's own ideas on the »*linkage to the Soviet Union*« were far away from what Adamic imagined »*in some mutually satisfactory way*«, Yugoslavia, who had the advantage over Hungary that she had come out of the war on the winners' side and had a strong and independent army in the background, could say a decisive no to the Soviet Union, which Hungary's political elite could not do. Adamic totally agreed with the Yugoslav leadership on the split between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union and considered it to be final.³¹ Although accepting the Fraternity And Unity medal in 1944 and membership of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts in 1949, and travelling home to meet with Yugoslav leaders, he expressed his reservations concerning the negative proceedings in Yugoslavia. He, however, did not openly object to a number of things over which there are fierce debates among Slovene politicians even in 1998. He sharply criticised Tito's deification, expressed his objection to the privileges of the communist leaders, demanding internal democratisation. He also objected to the lack

²⁷ Jászi Oszkár »Az Ember« kitiltásához, *Az Ember*, 1948. május 1.

²⁸ Litván György: *FATE CALLS ME...Jászi Oszkár 1947 végi Duna-völgyi búcsúlátogatása*, Beszélő, 1997. december

²⁹ Hanák Péter: *JÁSZI OSZKÁR Dunai patriotizmusa*. Budapest, Magvető, 1985. 155

³⁰ Matjaž Klemenčič: *Politično delo Louisa Adamiča, Teorija in praksa*, 1981. 1064-1065.

³¹ Joža Vilfan: *Louis Adamič in povojna Jugoslavija - spomini. Louis Adamič. Simpozij*, Ljubljana, 1981. 348.

³² Janja Žitnik: *Zamuda slovenske objave Orla in korenin. Dve domovini*, 1. 1990. 257.

of publicity concerning certain issues, especially the conflicts with the Soviets, with whom the Yugoslav leaders, unlike Adamic, was ready to compromise. Instead, he would have liked them to be more open towards the United States.³²

Adamic's views on the relations between the U.S. and Yugoslavia show a kind of parallelism with how Jászi imagined the possible relations between America and Eastern Europe. According to him, it is in the Americans' interest that the western democracies join in a new type of federation which will not be against the Russians, whom and whose allies the U.S. will even offer the possibility to join as equal ranking partners in this democratic federation as soon as *»they have understood its mutual advantages and honestly intend to achieve peace worldwide.«*³³

Once Jászi happened to summarise his lifework as follows:

*»I went along the same roads towards the same goals as Masaryk. The ways we looked at the world and its problems are similar too. And the results? On one side: the founding of a state and a splendidly lived life. On the other: a country in pieces and a broken life.«*³⁴

He wasn't ready to accept the Russian kind of socialism formed by Russian pressur, although official Hungarian politics tried to win his favour.³⁵ Consequently his life and activity was a taboo-theme in the socialist Hungary until 1980, no doubt from that time on, there have been more and more follower if his ideas and conceptions.

Mutatis mutandis, what Alexander H. Uhl wrote about Adamic's book entitled *The Eagle and the Roots* seems relevant to Jászi's case as well. Janja Žitnik summarised it in the following way:

*»This is a book of disillusionment and despair...Those who think Adamic was a communist or – as Tito's friend – an enemy of the Soviet Union are wrong. Adamic, rather, balances a belief in the good of collective action by societies and a belief in the fierce individualism of the Western democratic world. Adamic's picture is one of a man deeply concerned with human values, deeply moved by the struggle of people everywhere to achieve political, social and economic freedom, and is by no means a doctrinaire picture based on political theory.«*³⁶

³³ Jászi Oszkár: Márciusi üzenet a magyar néphez. *Az Ember*, 1948. március 20.

³⁴ Jászi Oszkár: *A kommunizmus kilátástalansága és a szocializmus reformációja*. Budapest, Héttorony, 1989. 334.

³⁵ Litván György: *FATE CALLS ME...*

³⁶ Janja Žitnik: The American reception of Louis Adamic's last book on Yugoslavia. *Slovene Studies*, 1992/2. 153.

*POVZETEK SKRB ZA NAROD DALEČ OD DOMOVINE – DVA
PRIMERA: LOUIS ADAMIČ IN OSZKÁR JÁSZI*

Podobnosti in razlike v biografijah in načelih Adamiča in Jászija dajejo odlično možnost za primerjalno obravnavo. Jászi, ki se je rodil leta 1875 in je do leta 1918 igral pomembno vlogo v kulturnem in političnem življenju Madžarske, je, tako kot Adamič, ki je s petnajstimi leti zapustil domovino, našel svoj drugi dom v ZDA. Podobno kot v delih pisatelja in politika Louisa Adamiča ima tudi v dejavnosti zgodovinarja, znanstvenika politologa in publicista Jászija ideja o socializmu in (kon)federaciji osrednji pomen. Medtem ko je Adamič razmišljal o možnosti za federalizacijo jugoslovanske države, je Jászi, ki ga je zanimal položaj Madžarov, videl rešitev v taki obliki konfederacije samostojnih narodov, kjer bi se zaščita manjšin zagotavljala po načelu vzajemnosti. Jászi je bil nasprotnik konzervativne oblike nacionalizma, ki goji sovraštvo do drugih narodov, kakor tudi internacionalizma, ki ne upošteva narodnih vidikov. Oba sta posebej ostro kritizirala diktators-tvo, ki se je pojavilo v njihovih domovinah, njuna izhodiščna točka pa je bila zamisel o določeni obliki liberalnega socializma.

Adamič, ki je odločno nastopil proti fašizmu in upal, da se bo uresničila federativna država in socialistična ideja, je sprejel in podpiral jugoslovansko obliko socializma, ki ga je simboliziralo Titovo ime in ki se je uprl Stalinu.

Tako je bil ob vrnitvi v domovino leta 1949 deležen uradnega izraza naklonjenosti ter je imel kot mislec splošen ugled v Sloveniji. Jászi, ki je ostro nasprotoval fašizmu, zaradi idejnega nestrinjanja in izkušenj med bivanjem na Madžarskem leta 1947 pa tudi komunizmu, se ni želel sprijazniti s socializmom, ki je posnemal ruskega in se oblikoval pod pritiskom Rusije, čeprav so se uradni madžarski politiki trudili pridobiti njegovo podporo. Posledica tega je bila, da se v socialistični Madžarski njegovega življenja in dejavnosti ni smelo omenjati do leta 1980. Nedvomno pa je po tem letu vse bolj naraščalo število pripadnikov njegovih idej.

SLOVENIA AS PART OF A UNITED EUROPE IN THE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF SLOVENE EMIGRANTS FROM LOUIS ADAMIC TO MIHA KREK

This paper deals with the political thought of emigrants of various political views on the future of Slovenia in a United Europe from mid 1910 until the end of 1950's. It is well known that the idea of a federated Yugoslav Republic was born in the United States. One can read about this idea in the pages of the Chicago-based weekly of the Yugoslav Socialist Federation *Proletarec* as early as 1915.¹ The Chicago Declaration of 1917 continued the expectations of Slovene Socialists and Liberals in the United States that a federated Yugoslav Republic would be the best solution for the Slovene national question.²

Louis Adamic did not question the existence of Yugoslavia in any of his three books on the subject that he wrote before,³ during,⁴ and after World War II.⁵ In a resolution on the future of Yugoslavia written for the Slovene National Congress meeting in Cleveland in December of 1942, he wrote about the future of a »democratic« Slovenia in a federated Yugoslavia in a federated Europe. In this document, he also wrote about a United Slovenia that would bring together all Slovene ethnic territories including southern Carinthia and the coastal regions.⁶

There were basically two groups of political thought regarding the future of Slovenia within the Slovene political émigré community after World War II. The larger of these groups gathered around Slovenski narodni odbor, which united representatives of the group of pre-World War II Slovene political parties under the leadership of the president of the Slovene People's Party, Miha Krek, who settled in Cleveland after the war.⁷ He was also vice-president of a group of political leaders of post-World War II émigré communities having a Christian Democratic orientation from Eastern and Central Europe that united in the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe. Leaders of Christian Democratic parties from captive nations (that is, pre-World War II countries of Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Latvia) participated in all the world congresses held by Christian

¹ Matjaž Klemenčič: *Ameriški Slovenci in NOB v Jugoslaviji: Naseljevanje, zemljepisna razprostranjenost in odnos ameriških Slovencev do stare domovine od sredine 19. stoletja do konca druge svetovne vojne* (Maribor: Založba Obzorja, 1987), pp. 108–109.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 113–114.

³ Louis Adamic: *The Native's Return. An American Immigrant visits Yugoslavia and Discovers His Old Country*. (New York & London: Harper & Brothers, 1934).

⁴ Louis Adamic: *My Native Land*. (New York & London: Harper & Brothers, 1943).

⁵ Louis Adamic: *The Eagle and the Roots*. (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc.).

⁶ Dve veliki zborovanji ameriških Slovencev (Cleveland: Slovenski ameriški narodni svet).

⁷ Bogdan Novak, »Geneza slovenske državne ideje med emigracijo.« *Slovenci in država—Zbornik prispevkov z znanstvenega posveta na SAZU, (November 9–11, 1994)*. (Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti, 1995), pp. 295–305.

Democratic parties. At these congresses, they helped formulate the idea of a United Europe as it is seen emerging today.⁸

The second group was the Action Committee for a United and Sovereign Slovene State, a group that had established itself in Rome in the years immediately following World War II. This group was led by Cyril Žebot and favoured an independent Slovenia. This group worked primarily through propaganda activities, publishing the paper *Slovenska država* (Slovene State) which advocated the idea of a free, independent, and united Slovenia.⁹

In this paper, I will deal with the views of emigrants of various political persuasions on the future of the Slovenia and the Yugoslavia of their times. Although their political and ideological views differed in basic ideologies, each of them thought very deeply on the post World War II future of Slovenia and the Slovene people.

As an historian of emigration, I must also say a few words on the question of sources for future research on the topic of this paper. Louis Adamic and his political thinking is well researched and well known on the both sides of the Atlantic. There is an abundance of primary source material available for research even in published form;¹⁰ there are hundreds of books and articles written on both his literary and political work by my late friend Henry Christian,¹¹ Jerneja Petrič,¹² Janja Žitnik,¹³ and others; and Adamic wrote on his political philosophy in his own works.¹⁴

This does not apply, however, for Miha Krek, Cyril Žebot, and many others. There are Žebot's books¹⁵ as well as the numerous political statements by Krek and other leaders of Slovene émigré communities available for research primarily in the *Koledar Svobodna Slovenija* (Almanac of Free Slovenia) and *Svobodna Slovenija* newspapers, but we do not know what happened to Krek's personal archives, for example, or to Žebot's.¹⁶

On the following pages I will present some excerpts from Louis Adamic's Dinner at the White House that pertain to his political philosophy on the future organization of Europe as he saw it in 1946.

In April 1942, the French political leader Pierre Cot said before the American Association for Social Security:

»The Soviet Union, China, the colonial peoples have the same right as America to

⁸ *Freedom, Prerequisite to Lasting Peace* (New York: Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe, 1957).

⁹ Novak, *Geneza slovenske državne ideje med emigracijo . . .*, pp. 295–305.

¹⁰ Henry Christian (Ed.): *Izbrana pisma Louisa Adamiča*. (Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1981).

¹¹ Henry Christian: *Louis Adamic, A Checklist*. (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1973).

¹² Jerneja Petrič: *Svetovi Louisa Adamiča*. (Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1981).

¹³ Janja Žitnik: *Louis Adamič in sodobniki. 1948-1951*. (Ljubljana: SAZU, Razred za filološke in literarne vede, 1992); Janja Žitnik: *Pero in politika. Zadnja leta Louisa Adamiča*. (Ljubljana: Slovenska Matica, 1993); Janja Žitnik: *Orel in korenine med »brušenjem« in cenzuro*. (Ljubljana: Znanstvenoraziskovalni center SAZU, 1995).

¹⁴ Louis Adamic: *Dinner at the White House*. (New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1946).

¹⁵ Cyril Žebot: *Slovenija včeraj, danes in jutri I. in II. del*. (Klagenfurt (Celovec): Mohorjeva družba, 1967 in 1969); Cyril Žebot: *Neminljiva Slovenija—spomini in spoznanja iz razdobja 70-ih let od Majniške deklaracije*. (Klagenfurt (Celovec): Mohorjeva družba, 1988).

¹⁶ During the discussions at the 1998 Louis Adamic Symposium in Portoroz, Prof. Joze Velikonja confirmed that archival materials on the post-World War II activities of Slovene émigré communities exist but are unavailable for research.

contribute to the organization of a new Europe. This new organization will be the result of a compromise between the different conceptions of the world which exist today—with the exception of the Fascist conception.»¹⁷

Also in April 1942, the Soviet Ambassador to the United States Maxim Litvinoff stated:

»Russian Communism will be modified, American democracy will be modified, British capitalism will be modified, as a result of the war. The things that have stood between them will be broken down. The changes in them will bring them closer together. Life is a series of changes. It is a series of throwing away things that are no longer needed or useful.«¹⁸

In January 1942, Louis Adamic wrote to Eleanor Roosevelt:

»In 1917, as part of its war effort, the United States Government—acting through its propaganda office, »the Creel Committee«—officially helped Thomas Masaryk, who already had strong moral and financial support from Czech and Slovak immigrants in this country, to organize here the government of Czechoslovakia. That state thus came into existence in Pittsburgh while its territory was still in Austria-Hungary, with which we were at war. This became a factor in Austria's collapse, in speeding the war's end, in the Allied-American victory. And I think it furthered the development of Czechoslovakia into one of the most democratic countries in Europe. Her system of government was patterned closely after ours; American influence there was always strong. Masaryk lived here for some years; his wife was an American; in the 1920's several Americanized Czechs and Slovaks returned to their native land to help its progress.

Now I propose that while Hitler still holds Europe – as soon as we can free ourselves of our »defense« mood and appeasement apparatus, and overcome our military inferiority; as soon as we are clearly on top of the heap – the United States Government, as part of our effort in this war, give purposeful, well-conceived official leadership to our immigrant groups, including refugees, in organizing here a continental European federation of national states . . . Europe is a chief focus of the world problem . . .

As a government, we are already planning to feed Europe after the war. And all sorts of schemes by private organizations to aid the Old World in other respects (health, education, economic reconstruction) are under way. All this will need to be coordinated; and I hope that this time, unlike in 1918-1920, we will have the sense to use food and other services not only to relieve immediate distress but also for immediate and long-range progressive political purposes – to enhance the influence and power of the genuine democratic leaders who will appear, and to thwart their opponents. After the last war, in many countries the Hoover relief organization helped the wrong people to entrench themselves in positions of authority.

I suggest that, carefully utilizing the human resources within our immigrant groups, we organize here American provisional or transitional governments or advisory groups or commissions which at the war's end would be prepared to take over, or

¹⁷ Louis Adamic, *Dinner at the White House . . .*, p. 225

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

assist in, the temporary direction of the European countries to be included in the Continental Federation, with one currency, an economic order that will work toward general welfare, one postal system, one trade and traffic control.

These governments or commissions or advisory groups (what we call them will not be the most important thing about them) would be sent to Europe at the conclusion of hostilities, or before, and would stay there as long as needed. In taking temporary control, the scope of which would vary in different countries, they would have the support of special United States military units, and staffs of food distributors, doctors and nurses, engineers, teachers, educators and other experts – many of them immigrants and refugees from the countries to which they will return as Americans in the service of the United States; carefully selected volunteers, carefully trained for their functions and deeply impressed with the significance of their mission.

I propose that we take to Europe – in person – the American Revolution, the American Experience . . .

. . . My proposal is that we take Europe into a kind of receivership for a time; into escrow. If we don't make too many mistakes, if our whole approach is honest, we will be trusted – not by the few in high places, to be sure, but certainly by the plain people of Europe – if our advance propaganda is well handled. Since 1918 our old integrations have split. Since 1930 they have been tentatively re-formed and re-expressed, but in this war we will articulate techniques and relationships in terms of all our environments for all types of individuals. We cannot depend on unconscious integration. We must figure out many reciprocal relationships, try them out, and discard those that don't work.

Politically, we oppose the totalitarian belief that all the world must conform to one pattern, with the need and the ability to establish techniques of coordinating conflicting ways of living, each of which is good within the limits of its own geography and history. Democracy is one of these techniques. We need to learn others. We will teach totalitarian people that other nations and races are also good by working with them on tangible aims. We must display our strengths (and have strengths to display) in unmistakable forms – by our versatility, our physical and mental resiliency, our spiritual adequacy, our psychical vigour, and above all by our gaiety. We will teach them that the independent abilities of each group are necessary to each of the others for their stimulation and their enjoyment.

Economically, we are abandoning the myth that any one economic technique should or does in fact exclude others. We must learn and we must teach that reciprocity in trade and investment is superior in benefits to the geographic units involved than a position of either creditor or debtor nation. We must develop new techniques of exchange and distribution, separately and together.

Philosophically, we realize that most dilemmas are self imposed. The totalitarian states operating on the belief that what is not identical with them is therefore hostile to them will be taught the concept of multiple values – that ours is a universe of many entities, purposes, processes, and materials, any one of which may or may not be relevant to the welfare of each of the others. This is not a world of black and white, but one of many lovely shades and colours – and sounds, odors, and other pleasant things. We know that no relationship can be good nor permanent unless it works both ways. He who gives must receive, and he who receives must give – but

not on his own terms nor at his own convenience. Nor can any abstraction be of value unless it is translated into specific actions in specific circumstances.

Socially, we recognize the validity of other customs for other people. We presume that the individuals we meet are our equals and may quite possibly show themselves to be our superiors in ways that we value. We know that we must give each person we meet our individual attention, our respect for his integrity, and our expressed appreciation of his merits, be he Jew, or German, or Jap. If we do not give these things, we have no claim to his tolerance or his consideration.»¹⁹

As we can read from the above lines, during World War II Louis Adamic was already dreaming of a United Europe that would include European countries in the Continental Federation, with one currency, an economic order that would work toward general welfare, one postal system, one trade and traffic control. A careful reader must note, however, that such a Europe would not include the British Isles but it would include also the countries of eastern and southeastern Europe that later fell behind the Iron Curtain.

Soon after the occupation and the division of Slovene territory among the Hungarians, Italians, and Germans in 1941, Lambert Ehrlich, a Slovene Catholic priest and one of the leaders of anti-Communist Slovenes during World War II, wrote *Slovenski program* (The Slovene Program), in which he demanded an independent Slovene state that would unite Slovene ethnic territory. Based on this work, Cyril Žebot wrote an essay entitled *Narod sredi Evrope* (A Nation in the Middle of Europe) in which he justified the right of the Slovene nation to have an independent state. This essay served as the fundamental document for the later activities of this part of the Slovene political émigré community following World War II.²⁰

Two hundred representatives of the old political parties signed the »Narodna izjava« (»National Declaration«) that constituted the political platform of the leadership of these parties which they carried with them into exile:

1. *On the basis of the ethnic self-existence of the Slovene nation and on the basis of ethnic (national) principles, we demand the unification into one state in the legal sense of this word of all Slovene ethnic territories into a United Slovenia that must be in the geographic, economic, traffic, and strategic sense such a unit that the Slovene nation could develop undisturbed economically and politically.*
2. *A federated Kingdom of Yugoslavia under the House of Karadjordjević developed on the basis of democracy and social justice, part of which would be the national state of United Slovenia.*
3. *A federated state so organized that federal authority would be limited by a federal constitution, and all such laws not constitutionally declared as in the hands of the federal authorities would be in the domain of the constituting states. The federal constitution of the Yugoslav state shall be approved by a constitutional assembly comprising a qualified majority of legal representatives from each national state.*
4. *Basic social and economic changes that shall destroy the mastery of capital over*

¹⁹ Louis Adamic to Elcanor Roosevelt, January 25, 1942, as quoted in Adamic, *Dinner at the White House*, pp. 245–247.

²⁰ Novak, *Geneza slovenske državne ideje med emigracijo . . .*, p. 300.

work and give all the strata of society and families and individuals their socio-economic functions and give them the right to a live worthy of human beings.

*The National Committee for Slovenia established to achieve these national goals shall be supreme national authority and shall work as such temporarily until conditions in Slovenia become settled. On the day of the national holiday, October 29, 1944.*²¹

Žebot moved from Slovenia to Rome after the Italians capitulated in 1943. After the liberation of Rome in 1944, Miha Krek, vice president of the Yugoslav government in exile, also went to Rome. From that time on, Žebot and Krek sent numerous memoranda to the Western Allies proposing their occupation of the entire territory of Slovenia to thus enable the establishment of Slovenia as a democratic country and rescue it from the dangers of Communism.

As early as the end of 1945, the Slovene political émigré community began to differ over questions concerning the demands for the future of the Slovene nation. In October 1945, Miha Krek was elected president of the National Committee for Slovenia which supported the establishment of a federal democratic Kingdom of Yugoslavia, while Žebot established the Action Committee for a United and Sovereign Slovene State (hereafter: Action Committee). In 1946 and 1947, Žebot sent several memoranda to the Western Allies demanding the establishment of a Slovene state that would encompass all Slovene ethnic territory. Besides memoranda, the Action Committee began to publish *Znamenja ob poti* (Signs along the Path), and at the beginning of May 1946, *Slovenska država* (The Slovene State) that was intended as the gazette of the Action Committee.

In December 1949, the first issue of *Slovenska pravica* (Slovene Justice) appeared in Barberton, Ohio. It was in favour of Slovenia as an independent state and was published by the parish priest Anton Merkun and edited by Mirko Geratič. Father Kazimir Zakrajšek organized the publication of the first issue of *Slovenska država* in Chicago, which appeared on July 25, 1950. In 1954, the paper moved to Toronto, Canada, where it was edited by Rudolf Čuješ until 1961, Vladimir Mauko between 1961 and 1987, and Luka Jamnik after 1987.

About this time, Cyril Žebot as well as Štefan Faleš, Dušan Humer, Ludvik Leskovar, and Slavko Novak moved to the United States. Faleš, Humer, and Father Kalist Langerholz, who had been the chaplain when Zakrajšek was a parish priest in Ljubljana in the late 1920's, prepared the »Slovenska izjava« (»Slovene Statement«), pledging support for an independent Slovene state and expressing a wish for its realization with the help of the National Committee for a Free Europe in the United States. More than 300 signatures had been collected for this statement by 1953.²²

Within the framework of activities of the Slovene political émigré communities, the publication of *Slovenska država* and the signing of the »Slovenska izjava« provoked harsh criticism from the leading members of the Slovene People's Party and from Miha Krek in particular. In September 1950, Krek criticized the »Slovenska izjava«, saying that it meant the destruction of the unity of the Slovene political émigré communities. Krek wrote that it was important to destroy Communism in the old homeland first, and then »the nation itself

²¹ See Prunk file.

²² Novak, *Geneza slovenske državne ideje med emigracijo . . .*, pp. 295–305.

would decide on its fate in freedom...»²³ Krek also published his criticism of this movement in *Klic Triglava* (The Cry of Triglav), an organ of the young liberals in London.²⁴

From 1951 to 1953, the Slovene National Union was established in Chicago. It was planned as a mass organization that would support the Action Committee, especially among Slovene emigrants in the United States. In the 1950's, the Slovene National Union and the Action Committee prepared numerous memoranda in connection with the »Trieste question«.

In 1965, Slovenes in Argentina who supported the idea of an independent Slovene state began to publish the newspaper *Smer v slovensko državo* (Direction to a Slovene State), which after 1985 was united with the *Slovenska država* in Toronto. Let us also mention that part of the Slovene émigré community who supported Slovenska država (i.e., Ruda Jurčec and Jože Kessler) disagreed with Žebot, who thought that Slovenia should be part of a European federation of states. Ruda Jurčec began to publish the literary paper *Novi časi* in Buenos Aires and in 1962 the newspaper *Sij slovenske svobode* (Splendor of Slovene Freedom), which promoted the program for an Slovene independent state. Among the contributors to this paper were Marko Javornik from the United States and France Dolinar from Rome.²⁵ After the final division of the Free Territory of Trieste in 1954, a movement for the establishment of Slovenia as an independent country was begun in place of the Action Committee. It was led by Mate Roesemann, and its main aim was to spread ideas about the Slovene state. In this connection, Žebot's work should be emphasized above all.²⁶

Among the many proposals for the new frontier between Yugoslavia and Italy was one made by the Action Committee for a United and Sovereign Slovene State, a Slovene anti-Communist group in Rome. In the summer of 1946, this Action Committee submitted its »Memorandum on the Problem of Trieste and the Northern Adriatic to the Allied Governments Concerned« to the ambassadors of the Great Powers in Rome, proposing the creation of a northern Adriatic state as the immediate economic hinterland of Trieste. The new state would include all of the Republic of Slovenia (part of Yugoslavia), all of the Julian Region, Austrian Carinthia, and the part of Udine Province (Friuli) that contained the rail and road connections between Trieste and Villach. The state would be organized on the model of Switzerland's cantons to ensure complete equality for the five ethnic groups involved (Austrian Germans, Croats, Friulians, Italians, and Slovenes). The new territory was estimated to contain about 40,000 square kilometers and a population around 2,600,000 (1,600,000 Slovenes, 300,000 Italians, 200,000 Friulians, and 800,000 Austrian Germans).²⁷

In 1954, after examining all its local groups in exile, the leadership of the Slovene People's Party proclaimed a new program for the party based on the most modern and up-to-date principles of Christian Democracy. The program was designed to lead the Slovene nation after liberation toward a new life in freedom and democracy.

The Slovene political émigré communities were divided over the possibilities for establishing an independent Slovene state. In 1954, the Slovene People's Party published

²³ Miha Krek, »Izjava in prošnja Slovencev.« *Ameriška domovina*, 52 (188), September 26, 1950, p. 1.

²⁴ Novak, *Geneza slovenske državne ideje med emigracijo . . .*, p. 301.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 302.

²⁶ Žebot, *Slovenija včeraj, danes in jutri . . .*; Žebot, *Neminljiva Slovenija . . .*

²⁷ Bogdan C. Novak: *Trieste, 1941-1954. The Ethnic, Political, and Ideological Struggle*. (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press), p. 248

its manifesto. Article 1 (entitled »Slovenski narod in slovenska država« (»The Slovene Nation and the Slovene State«)), Article 7, and Article 8 are particularly important.

Article 1:

»... by natural law the Slovene nation has the right to its own state, to organize its life in its own way, to enter state associations, and to cooperate in the family of free nations. The Slovene People's Party will strive to help the Slovene nation realize this right and unite in a Slovene state ...«

Article 7:

»The Slovenes made a free decision to enter a state union with the Croats, Serbs, and other Southern Slav nations (May Declaration). Geographical, geopolitical, and economic circumstances; related blood and language; and the need to defend the territory demonstrate and substantiate the vital connections of the Slovene nation with other Southern Slav nations. The precondition for their future happiness, however, is liberty.«

Article 8:

»State connections and European conditions demand a closer connection among the nations and states for the mutual defense of peace, for the stimulation of cultural growth, and for the development of the economy. The Slovene People's Party believes that a free union among the nations of the Slavic south is the most natural and best solution, and the nation itself should decide on the question whether Slovenia should enter any association of countries by means of a universal, equal, and secret ballot. The Party welcomes and supports the establishment and organization of a United States of Europe.«²⁸

In his commentary on this manifesto, Miha Krek observed that party manifestos usually did not mention the actual form of the state

»... but due to our transitional circumstances it was necessary to state the party's principle about a nation state as the most complete expression of the nation's individuality and in this connection the standpoint of the Slovenes concerning Yugoslavia. The above-mentioned expression arises from the belief that finally wisdom and understanding will win a victory in time throughout our south, since according to what we see and what we can foresee, they dictate that all nations in this part of Europe work in their own as well as in the mutual interest toward a fair brotherly agreement, for freedom, and the peaceful union of national forces and means, which should be joined to retain the independence of all the people and of everyone...«²⁹

During World War II, representatives of the Slovene People's Party were among the leading members of the Christian Democratic parties who were members of governments-in-exile from the countries of Eastern and Central Europe in London. There they continued to work together toward their common goal, that is, to reestablish democratic governments in their respective countries.

After the war at a congress held in the autumn of 1946 in Montreux, Switzerland, the Christian Democratic International, known as the Nouvelles Equipes Internationales (NEI), was established. The first regular international conference of this organization was

²⁸ »Program Slovenske ljudske stranke.« *Slovenija*, 5 (8)—priloga *Ameriške domovine*, 54 (179), (September 20, 1954), pp. 1–3.

²⁹ Miha Krek, »Slovenski programi,« *Slovenija* 5 (8)—priloga *Ameriške domovine*, 54 (179), (September 20, 1954), p. 1.

held in June 1947 at Chaudefontaine near Liege in Belgium. Two Central European parties were represented at this conference. The Czechoslovak Christian Democratic People's Party, acting at that time more or less freely in its own country, was represented by Ivo Duchacek, the Vice-President of NEI. The Polish Christian Labor Party, organized in exile, was represented by Konrad Sieniewicz.

Due to the very different situations in these two countries at the time, it was difficult to achieve completely satisfactory cooperation between the two parties. However, in April 1948, when the leaders of the Czechoslovak Christian Democratic People's party went into exile following the Communist coup d'état in Czechoslovakia, discussions were started in Paris and London between Karol Popiel and Mr. Duchacek.³⁰

In April 1948, a written exchange of viewpoints aimed at solving the problems of cooperation took place between Mr. Popiel, then in Paris, and Miha Krek, then in Cleveland, Ohio.

It was obviously impossible to establish any basis for close and permanent cooperation while the leaders of the Central European Christian Democratic parties were so widely scattered geographically. However, during the international conference of NEI held in Scheveningen near The Hague in September 1948, the first cooperative moves were made by representatives of the Czechoslovak Christian Democratic People's Party (Mr. Duchacek), the Hungarian Christian Democratic People's Movement (Mr. Skultety), and the Polish Christian Labor Party (Mr. Sieniewicz). The goal was to present a consolidated front aiming at the active participation of representatives from the countries behind the Iron Curtain within the European Assembly. This organization was on the agenda of discussions of the NEI Congress.

Discussions with the ultimate goal of achieving closer cooperation among the Central European Christian Democratic parties began in Washington in April 1950. In the first stages, there were talks between Mr. Adolf Prochazka and Mr. Karol Popiel and subsequently between representatives of all five parties from behind the Iron Curtain, that is, the parties in exile from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Latvia. After detailed negotiations, the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe (CDUCE) was established in the Slovene Hall in New York on July 26, 1950.

The goal of the CDUCE was the realization of all the previously outlined principles of the Christian Democratic Parties in general, but it considered its most important and urgent task the liberation of the nations behind the Iron Curtain. The first duty of émigrés engaged in political activities was to conduct them so as to reach this objective as soon as possible.

The political platform of Christian Democrats at the time was that since the fate of entire nations and not just of certain population segments of Central Europe was involved, the work toward their liberation should be shared by all the democratic forces of the region. The four principal democratic political parties of Central Europe were international in character: Christian Democratic, Peasant, Socialist, and Liberal. The Christian Democratic Union regarded as its principal aim the achievement of a lasting collaboration between these movements and believed that the accomplishment of this most important work would pave the way for the liberation of Central Europe.³¹

³⁰ *Freedom, Prerequisite to Lasting Peace* (New York: Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe, 1957), p. 14.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

As far as Yugoslavia was concerned, the view of the political leaders in exile was as follows: In 1939, the Yugoslav government and the Croatian leaders concluded an Agreement (»Sporazum«) outlining the establishment of an autonomous Croatian unit as a guide for further development and for the gradual change of the centralized state into a free union of federal states. This salutary process was abruptly terminated by the German and Italian invasion of Yugoslavia on April 6, 1941. Slovene territory was carved into three portions. One was allotted to Italy, another to Germany, and a small portion to Hungary. After Italy's surrender in the autumn of 1943, Hitler extended the Nazi occupation to the shores of the Adriatic.

Unable to work in the open, the party went underground and, in accordance with the resolution of the party and the agreement of the Yugoslav government, established permanent contact with its head, Miha Krek, who had previously escaped.

At the beginning of 1950, the Slovene Christian Democrats had organized exile groups in Western Europe and in both Americas. They published one weekly newspaper, six monthly journals, and one yearly almanac in the Slovene language. In addition, the Slovene national minorities in Italy and Austria had two Christian Democratic weeklies and two publishing houses.

The leadership of the Slovene People's Party was settled on a provisional basis. In 1942, former party leaders, former members of parliament, the mayors of towns and country districts, prominent men in liberal professions, and other representatives from German- and Italian-occupied Slovenia signed a document in which they unanimously asked Miha Krek, then Secretary General of the party and a member of the Yugoslav government in exile in London, to accept the leadership of the party until the liberation of the country.³²

The Slovene People's Party wrote the following into its political manifesto as presented in *Freedom, Prerequisite to Lasting Peace*:

»The Slovene people should be united as a national unit, and all natural rights as an independent nation should be made secure for the future. The Slovene People's Party sincerely believes that the national rights of the Slovene people are best preserved in a free union of the peoples of Yugoslavia. United with them in what is but the most natural regional union of peoples, the Slovenes wish to collaborate fully to achieve a far greater union comprising all the peoples of the European continent in a United States of Europe.

In a free democracy which guarantees the freedom of man, the Slovene People's Party must continue its work toward the full achievement of the civil and social order outlined by Christian Democratic principles.«³³

The Slovene People's Party, as the strongest Slovene democratic political group, was represented and active in the National Committee for Slovenia, in the Union of National European Commissions in London-Paris-Strasbourg, and in other international bodies. As the only political party from Yugoslavia with a Christian Democratic program, the Slovene People's Party was also a member of the Nouvelles Equipes Internationales in Paris.

Émigré politicians who had been leaders of Christian Democratic parties in Eastern Europe countries before World War II met at CDUCE international congresses.

Under the slogan *»With Christian Democracy Toward Liberation and Justice for*

³² Ibid., p. 41.

³³ Ibid., p. 41–42.

Men and Nations», the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe began its first international congress at the Beekman Tower Hotel in New York on Friday, March 13, 1953. The congress, which lasted for three days, provided an excellent review of the activities and achievements of the CDUCE and of the interest that Christian Democratic political organizations in exile from Central Europe enjoyed with the American and European public. According to »*Freedom, Prerequisite to Lasting Peace*«, the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe proved to be a true and efficient spokesman on behalf of the enslaved peoples in countries behind the Iron Curtain and a very constructive element in the promotion of Central Europe's future as a part of a united Europe.

On Friday morning, March 13, 1953, the first day of the Congress, the platform decorated by the American flag and the flags of the nations represented in the CDUCE was mounted by the Chairman of the Executive Committee Msgr. Joseph Kozi Horvath and Vice Chairmen Miha Krek, Karol Popiel, Adolf Prochazka, and Kazys Pakstas. Msgr. Horvath opened the session with an address in which he praised the generous and truly Christian spirit expressed in the American attitude toward political refugees which had enabled the Christian Democratic parties organized in the CDUCE to find a temporary home on the soil of the United States. He then outlined the substance of the Communist political philosophy and its practical application. At the conclusion of his opening address, Msgr. Horvat placed special emphasis on three factors:

1. *The impossibility of the peaceful coexistence of Christianity and Communism when it is plain that the Kremlin regards Christian doctrine, the Christian church, and Christian believers as its prime enemies.*
2. *The desire to preserve the peace – not the peace of Moscow and its fellow which would transform Central and Eastern Europe into a cemetery – but a life-giving peace of liberty, justice, and progress respecting the dignity of the individual, defending the family, and assuring the victory of democracy on all fronts.*

A plan projecting a realistic and attractive future for Central European peoples liberated from Soviet domination, a plan assuring self-determination to great and small nations, a plan enabling them to form closer or looser regional ties through which they may enter the prospective United States of Europe.³⁴

It is interesting to note that the congress was also addressed by the Basque delegate in the United States, Sr. Jesus de Galindez, who stated:

»On behalf of the Basque people, who have been Christian and Democrat for centuries, I am pleased to extend to you once again our greetings and common hopes. The fight for Freedom has no geographic boundaries or doctrinaire apologies. We oppose Communism today for the same reasons that we opposed Fascism yesterday: because our struggle is for justice with liberty, which is precisely what all these ideologies lack. Brothers of Central Europe, take heart! We – you and ourselves – face a long road ahead, a road through darkness and many discouragements, a road marked with the gravestones of those who fell and the humiliations of those who failed. But it is also the road of hope, the road with a goal ahead.

Your goal may be Poland, or Czechoslovakia, or Latvia; our goal is Euzkadi. And together, our common goal is freedom for the peoples of the world, dreaming and

³⁴Ibid., pp. 42–45.

*struggling for a new day. Sooner or later the night will pass; we are already awaiting the dawn of tomorrow, a tomorrow we must not miss ...*³⁵

Also among those who addressed the Congress was Mr. Jose (Jože) Melaher in his position as Chairman of the Central European Federation of Christian Trade Unions.³⁶

Miha Krek, former Vice-Premier in the government of Yugoslavia and the leader of the Slovene Christian Democratic People's Party, referred to the question of the collaboration of Protestants and Catholics within the Christian Democratic parties. He pointed out that although the Slovene people were overwhelmingly Catholic, several Protestants worked within the Slovene People's Party in harmony with Catholics and excellent results were thus achieved. Krek stressed that strong Christian Democratic parties had been formed to do battle with Marxism for the soul of the working class. To fulfil their task successfully, these parties had to preserve their political integrity as parties of social democracy. These parties were not formed for the sole purpose of presenting a united Christian front against the evil forces that threatened ruin to our civilization but had been called together by groups of Christians who believed in the philosophy of democracy in social, economic, and political life in accordance with the words of Maritain that *»this form and this ideal of common life which we call Democracy springs in its essentials from the inspiration of the Gospel and cannot subsist without it.«* He further stated that they believed that Democracy could not stand unless it was built on Christian foundations and infused with the Christian spirit. They were convinced that it is impossible to build up a truly Christian society save on the basis of social and political democracy.³⁷

The opening address at the dinner was given by Msgr. Joseph Kozi Horvath, who welcomed the guests in the name of the CDUCE. The first speaker was Senator Theodore F. Green (Dem., Rhode Island) who praised the resolutions adopted by the congress, observing that the delegates had adopted high principles. Senator Green also endorsed the CDUCE's work in planning and preparing for the future unification of the nations of Central and Eastern Europe in some form of federated union. In our times, he said, no nation can stand well alone, either politically or economically. The struggle against Soviet imperialism necessitated the mobilization of all into one great union of free political exiles.

Western Europe was making steady progress toward a united Europe and in the foreground of the champions of that idea were the prominent statesmen of the Christian Democratic philosophy, he continued. In the kind of United Europe that these men envisaged, the Central European countries would be members, and all hoped and prayed that day might soon come, Senator Green declared.

He further asserted that the American people who knew and cherished freedom and liberty would never acknowledge the subjugation of other nations, whether by military force or by trickery. Ever since the United States had become a world power it had stood for the right of every nation to self-determination and to a government of its free choice. Both of America's great political parties, Democratic and Republican alike, had repeatedly stressed their adherence to the policy of liberation of those countries then enslaved by Communism, by all the peaceful means at their disposal. The principal goal of American foreign policy was to insure peace in the world, a real peace. America was striving to stop

³⁵ Ibid., p. 47.

³⁶ Ibid., pp. 48–49.

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 37–58.

aggression, Communist or otherwise, and to free the world from all totalitarianism by demonstrating a workable alternative.³⁸

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles also sent words of appreciation and encouragement to the exiled Christian Democratic leaders and their colleagues:

»... You are united with all other free peoples in opposition to Communist imperialism and to the extension of its ruthless authority over the lives of those who are its captives. I can assure you that you have the sympathy of the people of the United States.«

Vice President Richard Nixon believed that just as surely as freedom is a prerequisite for lasting peace, freedom would come again to the people behind the Iron Curtain: *»Governments of force, fear, and fraud cannot long prevail. The 'Red Tide' will pass and recede.«*³⁹

The Second International Congress of CDUCE convened in New York on April 15, 1955 and marked the fifth anniversary of the founding of the organization. It served to further strengthen the work of the CDUCE and its final aim: the liberation of the peoples of Central Europe from the yoke of Communist tyranny. The newly elected officers of the CDUCE were Msgr. Joseph Kozi Horvath (Hungary), President of the Council; Adolf Prochazka (Czechoslovakia), Chairman of the Executive Committee; and Mr. Konrad Sieniewicz (Poland), Secretary General. From the other leading figures in the CDUCE, the following were selected as Vice-Chairmen: Miha Krek (Yugoslavia), Kazys Pakstas (Lithuania), and Msgr. Edward Stukels (Latvia).⁴⁰

Prochazka's report to the meeting pointed out that the CDUCE in general and its Executive Committee in particular had been entrusted with the following five essential goals:

- a) *to contribute to the liberation of Central Europe from Communist oppression;*
- b) *to help, after liberation, in the reconstruction of the member states in Central Europe on the basis of Christian Democratic principles;*
- c) *to assist in the integration of Central European states into a democratic, united Europe and through it into a strong world organization;*
- d) *to insure permanent cooperation among the Christian Democratic parties of East Central Europe after the liberation of these countries; and*
- e) *to further the development, implementation, and general acceptance of Christian Democratic ideas in public life.*⁴¹

According to the report, one of the most important tasks of the CDUCE in the effort to achieve these goals had been to establish contact with influential circles in the United Nations, and especially with Christian Democrats who were the official delegates of their countries. Many formal meetings, conferences, and lectures by these delegates had been organized by the CDUCE's Discussion Club. The effort to strengthen the idea of liberation had been fostered by lectures delivered at the CDUCE's Discussion Club. Thus, for example, the French statesman Robert Schuman had given a lecture at the Club in June 1954 entitled *»The Road to Peace and Unity,«* affirming that the true unity of Europe was *»impossible and unthinkable«* without the liberation of the captive nations. With the help of the

³⁸ Ibid., pp. 43–64.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 72.

⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 71–73.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 74.

Nouvelles Equipes Internationales, the CDUCE thus succeeded in bringing the whole problem of captive nations to the doorstep of United Nations delegations from Western Europe and South America.

Prochaska's report further stressed the fruitful cooperation between the CDUCE and the Assembly of Captive European Nations. Officers of the CDUCE had taken part in most of the discussions organized by the Assembly and its staff members had participated in the work of the Secretariat of the Assembly. In Europe, the CDUCE had also been in contact with cultural and social organizations with Christian Democratic leanings. CDUCE branches in Europe had participated in the congresses and meetings of Pax Romana, Semaines Sociales, Katholiken Tage, the International Committee for the Defense of Christian Culture, the Union of Malines, Sword of the Spirit, etc.

On the third objective of the CDUCE's activities, the integration of Central European states in a united Europe, the report stated that

«... the ambitious idea of a European Federation and eventually of a United Europe has its protagonists in a number of outstanding statesmen and personalities belonging to the Christian Democratic movement. It is the task of the Union to influence public opinion in Europe in this direction, to educate younger generations, including young people in exile, in the federalist spirit and to promote the idea of federalism at universities, among others at the University of Europe.»

The Ninth International Congress of Nouvelles Equipes Internationales (International Union of Christian Democrats) met in the Imperial Hall of the Residential Palace in Salzburg, Austria, September 16-19, 1955, to discuss the most vital problems confronting the European community. One hundred and fifty delegates from seventeen European countries participated. Among them were a large number of exiled Central European leaders. Held in free and independent Austria, this Ninth Congress was devoted to the problems of European integration. Leading European Christian Democratic politicians and economists discussed ways and means for the realization of this dream of all European democrats. It was pointed out that while it might appear that the always difficult process of integration was no longer needed since the economic situation of the Western European nations was more favourable than ever, this assumption would be a fatal error.⁴²

Nouvelles Equipes Internationales was the international organization in which exiled representatives shared equal status with representatives of Western European Christian Democratic parties. The Christian Democratic parties of Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia active in exile participated in all of the NEI congresses and were also represented on its executive body. At the Ninth Congress, the representation of exiled parties was most impressive. Twenty-five of the 150 delegates attending represented five countries then under Communist rule. The Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe, called the «exiled NEI» by Western Christian Democrats, was invited independently as a sister organization and was represented by Msgr. Joseph Kozi Horvath, President of the CDUCE, and by Konrad Sieniewicz, its Secretary General.

Speaking on the problem of European integration at the Congress, Mr. Sieniewicz stated:

»A united Europe can only be created by and of free peoples. Thus, the restoration of respect for human dignity and the right to express one's opinion freely and inde-

⁴²Ibid., p. 99.

pendently, to elect the representatives of one's choice, to determine one's national fate . . . are not just chapters in the exiles' dreams but are indispensable preconditions upon which the future of Europe unquestionably depends. Therefore, this goal should be part of the political aims of all realistic Europeans, conscious of their duty toward the continent.

Europe cannot survive politically without the friendship of America. The continental economy is in peril because of the difficulties it confronts in Eurasia. The dawn of the Atomic Age has imposed upon Europe the necessity of making gigantic efforts to protect itself from being pushed from its position as an area of enlightenment to that of a second class territory.

But a United Europe, a balanced continent, wholeheartedly devoted to the preservation of peace and the broadening of cultural horizons, will be a decisive element in maintaining a balance in the atomic race with which the world is faced today. This is Europe's Twentieth Century mission. That mission is perilously close to failure if Europe is not restored to its entirety.»⁴³

After 1954, direct political activities for the establishment of an independent Slovene state were replaced by the efforts of Slovene intellectuals in the United States to acquaint foreign countries with Slovene history and Slovene problems. They also strove to establish links with Slovene emigrants of the second and third generations whose ancestors had come to the United States before World War I. The work of Ludvik Leskovar and Slavko Novak is important, as both acquainted Slovenes in the Chicago area with the problems of Slovenia on the radio. Leskovar and his wife Corinne established a radio club that organized various annual events and dances. We should also mention numerous initiatives and activities for acquainting the English-speaking academic audience with Slovene problems⁴⁴ and the construction of the Slovene Chapel in Washington initiated by Cyril Žebot.⁴⁵

In the 1960's, the group around the Slovenski narodni odbor and around the Action Committee began to draw closer together in their activities to inform the world about Slovene problems.

No one, however, thought seriously that the dream of Slovenia as a democratic and sovereign independent State could become so relatively soon a reality when Miha Krek died in 1969.⁴⁶

⁴³ Ibid., pp. 100–102.

⁴⁴ Several organizations published scientific articles on Slovenia and the Slovenes. The Society for Slovene Studies, *Studia Slovenica*, and the Slovenian Research Center of America are worth mentioning. From the very beginning, the Society for Slovenian Studies in particular encouraged cooperation with scientists from Slovenia, and in 1991 it established a special organization called American Scholars for Independent Slovenia that acquainted the American and world scientific audience with the problems of Slovenia in 1991 and 1992. I described this in »Reactions of Slovenian and Croatian Immigrants: the American Press and Scientists about the Events in Slovenia and Croatia prior to their Recognition.« *Kleine Nationen und ethnische Minderheiten im Umbruch Europas*, edited by Silvo Devetak, Sergej Flere, Gerhard Seewann. (München: Slavica Verlag, 1993), pp. 333–338.

⁴⁵ Letter from Leopoldina Plut Pregel to Matjaž Klemenčič, July 16, 1997, in author's private archive

⁴⁶ Dr. Miha Krek umrl 20. novembra 1969, *Svobodna Slovenija* 22 (48) : 1, Buenos Aires, November 27, 1969, p. 1.

POVZETEK *SLOVENIJA KOT DEL ZDRUŽENE EVROPE V
POLITIČNEM RAZMIŠLJANJU SLOVENSКИH
PRISELJENCEV V OBDOBJU OD
LOUISA ADAMIČA DO DR. MIHE KREKA*

Referat obravnava politično misel priseljencev različnih političnih nazorov o prihodnosti Slovenije v Združeni Evropi v času od sredine 1930 do konca 50. let. Znano je, da se je zamisel o federativnih jugoslovanskih republikah rodila v ZDA. O tem se je že leta 1915 pisalo v *Proletarcu*, listu organizacije Jugoslovanska socialistična federacija, ki je imela sedež v Chicagu. Chicaška deklaracija iz leta 1917 je pomenila nadaljevanje pričakovanih slovenskih socialistov in liberalcev v Združenih državah, ki so menili, da bi se z zvezo jugoslovanskih republik najbolje rešilo slovensko narodnostno vprašanje. Louis Adamič ni v nobeni od svojih treh knjig s to tematiko, ki jih je napisal pred drugo svetovno vojno, med njo in po njej, nikoli podvomil v obstoj Jugoslavije. V resoluciji o prihodnosti Jugoslavije, ki jo je napisal za zasedanje Slovenskega narodnega kongresa v Clevelandu decembra leta 1942, je predstavil prihodnost »demokratske« Slovenije v zvezni Jugoslaviji in zvezni Evropi. V tem dokumentu je prav tako pisal o Združeni Sloveniji, ki bi povežala vsa slovenska etnična ozemlja, vključno južno Koroško in obalne regije.

Po drugi svetovni vojni sta bili v okviru skupnosti slovenske politične emigracije dve glavni skupini, ki sta nastopali s politično mislijo o prihodnosti Slovenije. Največja skupina se je zbirala v krogu Slovenskega narodnega odbora, kjer so se združevali predstavniki iz skupine slovenskih političnih strank iz časa pred drugo svetovno vojno, pod vodstvom predsednika Slovenske ljudske stranke dr. Mihe Kreka, ki se je po drugi vojni nastanil v Clevelandu. Bil je tudi podpredsednik skupine vodilnih političnih predstavnikov povojnih emigrantskih skupnosti, ki jih je kot vejo krščanskih demokratov srednje in vzhodne Evrope vključevala Srednjeevropska zveza krščanskih demokratov. Vodje krščansko demokratskih strank ubežniških narodnih manjšin so se udeleževali vseh svetovnih kongresov krščansko demokratskih strank. Na teh kongresih se je z njihovo pomočjo oblikovala zamisel o Združeni Evropi, kakršna nastaja danes.

Druga skupina je bila Odbor za narodno akcijo, ki je bil ustanovljen takoj po drugi svetovni vojni v Rimu. Skupino je vodil profesor Ciril Žebot, zavzemala pa se je za samostojno Slovenijo. Največ aktivnosti so posvetili propagandi. Njeni člani so izdajali časopis *Slovenska država* (Slovene State), v katerem so zagovarjali idejo o svobodni, neodvisni in združeni Sloveniji.

DIFFERENT UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE NOTION INTELLECTUAL

The main purpose of the present reflection is to expose the fact that notions have a history, dynamics and are by meaning caught in the societies/cultures where they appear. The meanings of notions are thus relative regarding synchrony and diachronic perspective. This is valid for the notion intellectual as well. What is the meaning of the notion intellectual or better say, who can be an intellectual, depends on the period and on the social/cultural circumstances we are dealing with.¹

From the epistemological point of view the notion intellectual is based on the word intellect. There are quite a few derivations from this word: intellectual, an intellectual, intelligent, intelligence. The notion itself originates from the Latin word *intellectus* (comprehension, conception). Along this notion the word *intellegens* (mind, reason) appears. Both words are derived from the verb *intellegre* (to perceive, to observe, to understand, to think, to make out) which is composed of two parts: *inter* (amid, between) and *legre* (to read, to choose, to gather). Thus intellect initially means an »ability to make things out« (Snoj, 1997:186). In *The Dictionary of Foreign Words* we find a different explanation. Intellect (Latin) is mind, reason, a mental force, and an ability of cognition, mental ability, power of rational perception. An intellectual is a mind worker, a logician (Bunc, 1981). Similarly we find in *The Vocabulary of Foreign Words* by Verbinc that intellect (reason, intelligence) is a cognitive ability of intellect. Thus the notion intellectual means a human being who does brain, mind work, for example a scientist. As a possible synonym the expression »educated person« is given. (Verbinc, 1987) The definitions of an intellectual as a rationalist on the one hand or an educated person on the other are diverging, what will be seen through the whole discourse. Is an intellectual a logician (men of reason, reasoner, open minded person) or an educated person? The definition of an educated person is much more a narrow and formal one than the one of a logician, and not necessarily every educated person is as well a rationalist. Why would it then be necessary that every rationalist should be educated in the formal meaning of the word?

¹ In the past years there has been in Slovenia a lot of debating and writing about intellectuals and their »mission«. If we paw through the data of the Reciprocal book catalogue we can see that the interest grew towards the end of the eighties and at the beginning of the nineties. From 1980 to 1987 we find under the notion Intellectuals only three units, while in 1988 there are six and in connection with treatises on tolerance and the right for self-determination. In the next years an overflow of dissertations on the meaning of the notion and above all on the »mission« of intellectuals in the relation towards the authorities and culture followed. From 1989 to 1997 123 dissertations (articles and monographs) are registered. We must understand the mentioned dynamic in the light of intensive political activities and politization of social/cultural life as well, which at that time impregnated the Slovene space.

Contemplations on the intellectual as a reasoner or an educated person bring up a question on the relation between the notions intellectual and educated person. That relation is not absolute, universal. It is linked to a certain time and surrounding. The answer to such a formulated question will be a basic criteria for classifying various definitions into three basic groups, which we can establish considering the relation between an educated person and an intellectual.

The notion intellectual has been until the end of the 19th century used in different languages mainly as a synonym for an educated person (Vodopivec, 1998:124). Many philosophers were dealing with the significance of intellectuals, above all with their role in the society. All along, from Plato's *State* in which the philosopher² presents the ideal ruler, to Zola's public appearance in connection with the Dreyfuss process, intellectuals were in some manner put in connection with an ideal of a ruler. They were to rule or to help rule. From the end of the 19th century on the notion had a special meaning, at first in France and later it spread over Europe. P. Vodopivec (1998:124) explains the notion

»was in 1890 used to mark the educated élite, even – as some writers name it with superiority and pathetically – as the »aristocracy of mind« who with their knowledge and intellectual capability differ from the common people«.

A strong breakage of the meaning of the notion presents the famous article by E. Zola *J'accuse* (I accuse), which was the next day followed by just as important *Manifest of Intellectuals*.³ Zola's performance caused in France a redefinition of the notion intellectual. From that time on the notion marked an unconformist intellectual who in the name of truth and justice contradicts the authorities. Such an intellectual is the conscience of the society⁴ (Ahačič, 1989:15). P. Vodopivec offers a similar description saying that the notion was given special meaning with a new more democratic content. Intellectuals are

»spiritually and politically 'independent' writers and philosophers who feel a special responsibility in the relation towards the community in which they live, an become with their public engagement the announcers of 'truth'. In such a meaning – of an educated fighter for truth and justice – the notion spread at the beginning of the 20th century from France to elsewhere in Europe.« (Vodopivec, 1998:124).

Opposite to this standpoint we can offer another possible understanding of the situation, that at that time an alternative understanding of the notion intellectual emerged, which to a great extent but not entirely superseded the old comprehension. Since then we meet with two definitions, still used today, as we will later see. In the last few decades a third variant of understanding the notion intellectual joined the previous two.

Considering understanding of the relation between an intellectual and education we may thus conditionally divide the definitions into three groups:

² As everything else the meaning of the notions philosopher or philosophy changed through history. We must pay special attention to distinguishing between individual sociological and humanistic sciences from under the wings of philosophy, which emerged in the last two centuries, and their constitution to independent sciences. The notion philosophy in that time covers an area, which is nowadays expressively differentiated and heterogeneous.

³ With it the most prominent literary writers and younger educated people (non-literates) supported the demand of E. Zola for a renewal of trial against Dreyfuss (Vodopivec, 1998:124).

⁴ We find similar comprehension with philosophers: Jean Cassou, Ernst Fischer, Erich Fromm, Maurice Nadeau, Umberto Eco. The mentioned authors are resumed after D. Ahačič (Ahačič, 1989:16).

1. The notion intellectual is narrower than the notion educated person or intelligentsia.

In this case the intellectuals are educated people with some additional »quality« which distinguishes them from the rest of the educated. In dissertations the non-educated are not at all being mentioned. I. Bernik (1998:53) says that a broad consensus on the sociological contents of the two notions exists. Intellectuals are persons who are by profession dealing with creating, developing and spreading theoretical knowledge, ideas and symbols. This definition does not include intellectuals whose activities are limited only to spreading the knowledge or its practical use. The notion intelligence is wider defined and comprises all people with university education and/or people whom high education qualifies for scientific, academic, expert, management and technological professions.

By these definitions intellectuals are part of the intelligence. They are distinguished by creating new knowledge and symbols. Education is of secondary meaning, but important when differentiating the educated from the non educated. With this conception the definition by which »intellectuals are only those educated people who criticise the existing world« corresponds (Benedix v Bernik, 1997:53)

Bernik says (1997:54) the definitions correspond where claiming that creativity demands a critical relation towards the established knowledge, ideologies and institutions. By this conception a permanent tension and direct conflicts exist between the intellectuals and the defenders of the established social order. Knowledge itself does not define intellectuals but mainly does their attitude towards the »existing world«. Thus their social status and role may in various societies differ fairly.

The educated or the intellectuals are a very heterogeneous stratum. It can be divided into at least four different fields: scientific-research, technological, administrative and cultural. It also differs considering various organisational locations: economic, social complexes (for example hospitals) and the army. The fields of activities and organisational locations intersect and interlace. As a consequence the differentiation and stratification of the carriers of knowledge in reality increases. The potentials of various groups for realising their privileged social status strongly differ too. Thus we may presume their interests differ as well; they may in some situations be in total contradiction. Additionally divided can be the intellectuals who – as says Bernik (1997:51) are not »a strongly integrated community«, as Gouldner claims. In continuation he divides them (after Schlesinger) on those who satisfy their need for power of technocrats frustrated because of restrictions of the party bureaucracy and on marginal intellectuals who in contradiction to the technocratic group do not have possibilities to upgrade to the authority. That is why the latter are capable of a critical distance towards the society reality. For marginal intellectuals mentality is of importance (Bernik 1997:57), which links with their capability to create an own ideology and culture (subculture), which oppose the ruling ideology and culture. Another important characteristic of marginal intellectuals is non-conformism.

Similar are conclusions of D. Ahačić (1989:14, 15). She claims there are differences between the educated and the intelligent. The educated are a very heterogeneous stratum: technical intelligence (dealing with substantial technological and technical scientific questions; the results are material and objective), humanistic intelligence (works in a non-defined, abstract mental world). We can also divide them onto capable, average and ones with capabilities under average. For the latter conformism is the best means for asserting and professional promotion.

»In systems where the political – that is interests in ruling – prevail over other interests, conformism is the quickest and most effective way to success (...), professionalism and quality are of secondary or even lesser meaning.« (Ahačič, 1989:15).

The educated form the majority of the mind workers. Their life aim is not in contradiction with conformism. With intellectuals the situation is entirely different. But there are specific situations (political) which can compel them into conformism, which leads to ineffectiveness. The conformism of intellectuals can become dangerous (Ahačič, 1989:10).

*»An intellectual is thus a pronounced critic of the society, one who's duty is to compare and analyse and in doing so helps defeating obstacles, which obstruct the human kind on their way to a better more human and rational order.«*⁵ (Ahačič, 1989:16).

An intellectual needs thorough expert knowledge, versatility in general culture, and the ability of critical and ethical judgement, inner freedom, and above all, responsibility before oneself. One must be capable of resisting material goods to the benefit of abstract ones and that *»for principal reasons one is ready to risk one's existence. An intellectual acts in concordance with one's philosophical, professional, scientific or artistic truth, which one by oneself attains by the principle: doubt about everything.«*⁶ (Ahačič, 1989:17)

We can find a similar description of an intellectual in Slovene literary heritage. M. S. Snoj explains that in Slovene dramatics an intellectual in connection with professional determination prevails. Such are teachers and pupils, professors and students, scientists from various fields and artists (literary, plastic, and musical). It is typical they are the carriers of new ideas and critical thought. Their essential quality is a free, independent and critical mentality.⁷

»One of the essential qualities of intellectuals ever is their free, independent, critical mind, which is capable to keep certain distance, scepticism and doubt towards all things and events and at the same time to surpass the stereotyped mode of thinking, which enables them fertile thinking and activity in a non-conformist sense. In theoretical disputes on intellectuals we frequently come across a thought about eternal opposition to the existing state of matters, of eternally discontent critics and of eternal trouble the existing prevailing social structures have with them. On the other hand conflicts and their results prove among intellectuals and potentates a specific power of intellectualism.« (Schmidt-Snoj, 1993:6-7).

Their basic activity is theoretical reflection or artistic production. After the War in the function of an intellectual frequently artists, literary as well, appear in Slovene dramatics. From that fact comes the conviction and self-evident opinion that intellectuals are, if

⁵ With this definition of an intellectual a question arises on the way of human kind to a better, more humane and rational social order. The standpoint evokes an association to the ideology of linear development of societies from non-developed to developed, which necessarily takes one same course. On their highest »steps« are Europe-centric cultures/societies that are the most humane, rational and developed.

⁶ The principle »doubt about everything« is a basic principle of sociological and humanistic sciences. But from the standpoint when we justify the absoluteness of this principle we find ourselves in a position when we can doubt in humanism, goodness and criticism of critic itself. The position of absolute doubt, when one doubts in the very hypothesis, or doubt itself, which becomes its own means and aim, in the end abolishes the meaning of itself as a principle of thinking.

⁷ When we speak of criticism, we must ask ourselves what is critical. There is no criticalness itself. A critique is always written from a certain standpoint. There is always someone who determines what is critical and what not. Thus it is more important who defines the criteria for critical than the critique itself. The need and significance of critique are thus not denied; exposed is the fact that absolutely independent critique does not exist.

not exclusively then predominantly writers. This equalising with cultural workers, particularly writers frequently led to disputes on the relation between culture and politics (Schmidt-Snoj, 1993:7,10,11).

Speculations about the notion intellectual bring the mentioned author to a conclusion that an intellectual as an individual - who is to some extent, determined by one's status in the society (meaning that one does or does not belong to a certain class or stratum or group but is in essence always their non-typical »representative«) – has the typicality and characteristics of a reasonable person who is in spiritual field rationally and/or intuitively creative. One's formal education is not most important and deciding, by profession one can be anything in the range from the so-called humanistic to technical fields. Important is that one transcends the concrete profession with universality of problems one is dealing with and of which one thinks are one's concern. To act so certain self-confidence and conscience of one's position in the society and in the world is necessary. An intellectual is capable of individual and independent thinking in relation towards the prevailing or ruling mode of thinking and mentality. New questions, doubts spring up constantly, an intellectual is sceptic and takes distance. Criticalness is an intellectual's distinction; it performs as well in art as in science and by itself presents certain engagement. That in the final consequence per definitionem means the end of an intellectual having in mind the critic of the existing, bringing to self-awareness, mediation of knowledge (illuminating), when an intellectual escapes from ideologies and dogmas and he is the carrier of the spirit of freedom. The author speaks of a function of permanent distance (Schmidt-Snoj, 1993:17-18).

An intellectual is in this – first – group a mind worker with formal education and a critical relation towards one's surroundings. One's principle is scepticism, which breaks »the old truths« and leads to new ideas. In the relation towards the authorities autonomy and non-conformism are one's distinctions. Conformism causes a downfall of an intellectual. For an intellectual permanent distance to the existing is necessary. This definition of an intellectual is today in a certain way connected to the profession. That very fact brings up the question and scepticism on whether a financially dependant individual, employed in a state institution⁸ or in a private company, which follows the logic of profit, actually is capable of an autonomous pose, or to what extent does the professional activity itself and obligations block the individual. Is it not the fact of financial dependency that in certain situations frustrates and limits the autonomy of an individual even in the so-called democratic societies as well?

2. The notions intellectual and intelligence, educated person are being used as synonyms

We can find such an attitude with Gouldner and Bell⁹ when they deal with the post-industrial society, that is, an intellectual society of services, communication and informa-

⁸ In Slovenia such are all institutions financed from the budget (from the university, which is formally autonomous, to public institutions).

⁹ The question of intellectuals and intellectual work is the central theme of sociology of science. Famous representatives are: Mannheim, Shils, Daniel Bell, Alvin Gouldner. Their contributions put intellectuals in the centre of social happening in a society, which transformed from industrial to post-industrial. In such a society factors that employ intellectuals become central: education, information, communication, recreate industry, culture and art (Rupel, 1989:210).

tion. The first author claims that a new intelligence or intellectuals are coming to the stage of history although he makes a very loose definition of differences between them.¹⁰ The interests of the intelligence are to his opinion »technical« while intellectuals are critically and independently oriented – to him intellectuals are a homogenous group (Bernik, 1997:53; Rupel, 1989:19). Very distinct is the equalising of notions with Konrad and Szeleny. For them the notions are synonyms which mark a stratum of monopolist owners of knowledge. But this stratum cannot be defined on the basis of formal education only. It is necessary to take into consideration the social function of knowledge, which they avail with. The socially conditioned status of knowledge causes that we cannot speak of a general theory on intellectuals. In an analysis it is necessary to derive from the actual social and cultural conditions since only such approach enables understanding of the function of knowledge and with it the status of its owner, the educated person or intellectual (Bernik, 1997: 53).

We would probably find in Slovene space quite a few similar examples of equalising the notions intellectual and educated persons or intelligence. Let us quote D. Rupel. In his dissertation *Slovene Intellectuals* he uses the notions as synonyms and does not stop at their differences. More than in those he is interested in heterogeneity of intellectuals – educated people, when speaking of organic and autonomous intellectuals. He refers to Gramsci's definition of an intellectual.¹¹ The reference frame of an intellectual may be a movement or an organisation to which one belongs, or it can be the world of ideas (profession or culture) which sets different conditions. In the first case one is included into a strict, tightly connected system, in the second case not, as »culture is loose, diffused, indistinct and surprising«. (Rupel, 1989) Here an intellectual is on one's own with one's inventiveness. From various reasons individuals may move from individuality into a group. Various authors marked this moment of re-orientation as opposition between critical and conformist, primary and secondary, original and reproductive intellectual. In continuation the author distances from equalising both notions. He claims that the word intellectus itself or intelle-

¹⁰ Rupel states that Gouldner's central notion is »the culture of a critical discourse«. Typical for it is the oration is situational relatively independent from context and field. This discourse variant thus values with the law-determined meanings and underestimates the silent meanings, which are limited by context. Its ideal is one word, one meaning for everyone and forever. The culture of critical oration demands argumentation of validity of statements regardless the speaker's social status or authority. A good speech is one that is able to develop its principles and is focused into concordance with them, and not one, which stresses sensitiveness for context and variability considering the context. A good speech consequently includes the theoretical (Rupel, 1989:21-22). Following this assertion theoretical is thus situational independent. Is it? How we comprehend theoretical is linked with understanding the relation between theory and practice. Many authors warn about the danger before speculative theory and tendency for theoretic transposition, when theory begins to exist because of itself. Also questionable is the demand for the individual's values neutrality, objectiveness. The demand is by itself ideological, as it sells ideology that neutral is possible. It claims that an individual can rise over one's own socialness and position in the society. Thus one detaches from the own unconscious, which is socially constituted and bonds one.

¹¹ It is a Gramsci's notion from his »Thoughts on Intellectuals and Organisation of Culture« (...), which starts with the following words: »Are intellectuals an autonomous and independent social group or does every social group have its own special class of intellectuals?« Gramsci speaks of organic intellectuals that »every new class creates them simultaneously with itself and forms them during own gradual development«, and of »traditional intellectuals«, from older cultures originating specialists who themselves proclaim as independent and autonomous and allege to »class solidarity«. Typical for an organic intellectual is that one »actively co-operates in practical life as a constructor, organiser ...« (Rupel, 1989:19).

go points to the function of an intellectual as the one who is prepared to leave the world of habits and routine to achieve something; who denies prejudice, established convictions etc. Typical for an intellectual in the moment one is focused on a certain intellectual problem is one's political independence. It is to us not clear whether the critical stand-points and independence, which are most important, by the author's opinion are something only the educated are capable of or other »mortals« as well, and which people today (in the time of obligatory elementary education and raising of educational level of population) belong to the (formally) educated.

*3. An intellectual can be educated but not necessarily,
and at the same time not every educated person is an intellectual*

N. Chomsky says:

»One must be careful and not create an impression which is anyhow false, that only intellectuals equipped with special education are capable of analytical work. That is the very thing the intelligence would like others to think of them: they pretend they are engaged in esoteric matters, which are not accessible to common people. But that is rubbish. Social sciences in general and above all analyses of the actual policy are available to every one who is interested. The supposed complexity, depth and obscurity of questions connected with this, are parts of an illusion propagated by the system of ideological control. Its aim is to digress these question from the population and to convince the population that without mentor agents they are not capable of organising their own matter. Neither they are able to understand the world they live in«. (Chomsky and Jeffs:354).

This is »intellectual« mystification. »Intellectuals« (we could say educated people who appropriate the status of an intellectual) tend to elitism and elitist positions. They stress a need of surveillance of those who have knowledge and understanding needed for leading a society and supervising social change (p. 358). Thus they of course protect their interests, position and prestige.

N. Chomsky sets a concept of a responsible intellectual. Responsibility of the writer as a moral agent is his attempt to convey the truth about matters that are humanly important to the audience, which can alter these matters. In doing so the audience converts from the object to the subject of social transformation. One demands responsibility of the audience that receives the conveyed information (in Jeffs, 1997:356). The main task of an intellectual in modern society is contemplation and speculation on the state of this world and at the same time on the subject of contemplation itself. Three possibilities are in such a situation before an intellectual (p. 357): 1. Reflection and speculation can be turned into autoreferential mystification that qualifies the subject of thought into a carrier of absolute knowledge on the state of the world. 2. An intellectual can extend the knowledge into practice. 3. An intellectual is aware of the conditions of social partition of work, which establishes an intellectual's inclusion into the sphere of reflection and speculation on excluding the others, and attempts to surpass that exclusion. Thus one becomes a responsible intellectual (man or woman) and no more is the reproduction of one's placing in the society a priority. This is as well the moment of self-abolition of intellectualism. A responsible intellectual must be aware that perfect intellectual work can be realised only when it becomes a common matter and ceases to be a narrow feud of specialised classes or interests. To this con-

cept Gramsci's remark may link – that we are all intellectuals, says N. Chomsky. G. Nenning shares such understanding of the notion intellectual when saying:

»An intellectual's delusion is in the fact that one thinks an intellectual – and not only a pedantic – can be one who is separated and disunited from the people and nation (...). If you divide people/nation onto clever and stupid, the result is always the same: intellectuals, who are among themselves mentally conformistic, are the cleverest and the decedent peoples are the stupidest.« (Nenning, 1993:XIV).

We have seen that the notion intellectual appears in various contexts, above all in treatises on politics and culture and their reciprocal relations. The authors seek for differences between technical and humanistic intellectuals, between the notion intellectuals and intelligence and on the other hand between intellectuals and educated persons. It is spoken of left and right intellectuals, critical and conformist, autonomous and organic. After reading all those treatises we may ask ourselves not only what the notion intellectual means at all, but above all, what are the criteria that define the criticalness, autonomy, progressiveness and least but not last conformity. We discover that it is more important, who the one to determine criteria of meaning is, than the meaning of the notion itself and further, that the notion intellectual is caught into the net of ideology. Thus we again meet with politics, power and authority and their curious mechanisms for creating public and »expert« opinion.

Today, when we are witnessing a rapid technological development and emerging of the so called informational society, the basic »diada« of the notion intellectual onto which the definition of the notion intellectual links, becomes questionable, namely the division to physical and mental work. Machines replace the classical physical worker. Fewer and fewer people are employed in the primary sector. With this fact the classic binary, black and white and Europocentric division into mental and physical work, which can be connected with the partition between the idea and matter or spirit and body, disappears. The latter are more and more intermixed. We may even say that in the above mentioned informational societies the classical physical work is disappearing. There are more and more professions and people we can place among the »classic intelligence«. Where then is today the border between the intelligence and others, between the educated and non-educated (elementary, grammar, high school, university), between the intellectuals and non-intellectuals? What is for an intellectual more important: formal education or common knowledge? What is the relation between formal education, common knowledge, criticism and non-conformism?

We find no unique answer to these questions, no final Truth. There are more truths. There always have been and always will be. All possible definitions and criteria are relative and in some manner ideological. Beside that the »classic binary system«, which divides work into physical and mental, is out of time. A thorough redefinition of the mentioned notions is needed to enable to think the notions simultaneously, through their intermixing and co-dependence.

Let us at the end mention – as an expression of a humorous distance towards the theme – a new alternative, which we can (if we want to) understand from the title of an article: I act as a Stupid Intellectual.

LITERATURE

- Ahačič, D. (1989): *Polemike*. Cankarjeva založba, Ljubljana.
- Bernik, I. (1997): *Dvojno odčaranje politike*. Znanstvena knjižnica FDV, Ljubljana.
- Bunc, S. (1981): *Slovar tujk*. Obzorja, Maribor.
- Chomsky, N. (1997): *Somrak demokracije*. Studia humanitatis, Ljubljana.
- Inteligencija i moderno društvo* (1986). Sociološko društvo Hrvatske, Zagreb.
- Jeffs, N. (1997): »Intelektualci, novi razredi, anarhizmi«. V: Noam Chomsky. *Somrak demokracije*. Studia humanitatis, Ljubljana, str. 351.
- Kreft, L. (1998): *Zjeban od absolutnega*. Znanstveno in publicistično središče, Ljubljana.
- Močnik, R. (1990): »Delujem kot butast intelektualec«. *Večer*, 15.5. 1990, str.4.
- Nenning, G. (1993): »Intelektualci so idioti«. V: *Nova revija*, št. 136/137, str. XIV, Ljubljana.
- Rupel, D. (1989): *Slovenski intelektualci*. Mladinska knjiga, Ljubljana.
- Schmidt-Snoj, M. (1993): *Intelektualec na preizkušnji*. Mihelač, Ljubljana.
- Snoj, M. (1997): *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. Mladinska knjiga, Ljubljana.
- Verbinc, F. (1987): *Slovar tujk*. Cankarjeva založba, Ljubljana.
- Vodopivec, P. (1998): »Vloga slovenskih intelektualcev pri emancipaciji Slovencev«. V: *Slovenija 1848-1998: iskanje lastne poti*. Zveza zgodovinskih društev, Maribor.

Pojem intelektualca izhaja iz korena intelekt. Iz njega je kar nekaj izpeljank: intelektualen, intelektualca, inteligenten, inteligentca... Pojem izvira iz latinske besede *intellectus* (razumevanje, pojmovanje). Poleg njega se pojavlja tudi beseda *intellegens* (razum). Obe sta izpeljanki iz glagola *intellegre* (zaznavati, opazati, razumeti, meniti, razbrati), ki je sestavljen iz dveh delov: inter (med, vmes) in legre (brati, izbirati, nabirati). Intelekt tako izhodiščno pomeni neko 'sposobnost razbiranja' (Snoj, 1997:186). Podobno v Verbinčevem slovarju tujk najdemo, da je intelekt (raz)um, spoznavna sila ali možnost razuma. Iz tega izpeljan pojem intelektualca je človek, ki umsko, duševno dela, npr. znanstvenik. Kot možen sinonim pa je ponujen izraz izobraženec.

V preteklih letih se je v slovenskem prostoru veliko govorilo in pisalo o intelektualcih in njihovem 'poslanstvu'. Če pobrsamo po podatkih Vzajemnega knjižnega kataloga lahko vidimo, da je zanimanje zanj poraslo koncem osemdesetih in v prvih letih devetdesetih let. Od leta 1980 do 1987 so pod pojmom intelektualci vpisane le tri enote, medtem ko jih le v letu 1988 najdemo šest in to v povezavi z razpravami o strpnosti in pravici do samoodločbe. Poplava razprav o pomenu pojma, predvsem pa o 'poslanstvu' intelektualcev v odnosu do oblasti in kulture, pa sledi v naslednjih letih. Tako je od 1989 do 1997 zabeleženih 123 razprav (člankov in monografij).

Pojem intelektualca se pojavlja v različnih kontekstih, predvsem pa v razpravah o politiki in kulturi in njihovih medsebojnih relacijah. Avtorji iščejo razlike med tehničnimi in humanističnimi intelektualci in med pojmi intelektualci in inteligentca ali po drugi strani med intelektualci in izobraženci. Govori se o levih in desnih intelektualcih, kritičnih in konformnih, avtonomnih in organskih. Pri prebiranju vseh teh razprav se na koncu vprašamo ne le kaj pojem intelektualca sploh pomeni, ampak predvsem, kakšni so kriteriji, ki opredeljujejo kritičnost, avtonomnost, naprednost in ne nazadnje tudi konformnost. Odkrijemo, da je bolj pomembno, kdo je tisti, ki določa kriterije pomena, kot pa pomen pojma sam ter dejstvo, da je pojem intelektualca ujet v mrežo ideologije. Tako se ponovno srečamo s politiko, močjo in oblastjo in njihovimi prefinjenimi mehanizmi ustvarjanja javnega in 'strokovnega' mnenja.

Danes, ko smo priča hitremu tehnološkemu razvoju in porajanju t. i. informacijske družbe, postane vprašljiva tudi osnovna diada, na katero se veže opredelitev pojma intelektualca, to je delitev na fizično in umsko delo. Klasičnega fizičnega delavca v tovarnah nadomeščajo stroji. Vse manj je ljudi, ki so zaposleni v primarnem sektorju. S tem izginja tudi klasična binarna, črno-bela in evropocentrična delitev med umskim in fizičnim delom, ki jo lahko povezujemo z delitvijo med idejo in materijo ali duhom in telesom. Slednja se vse bolj prepletata ali pa morda lahko rečemo, da v prej omenjenih informacijskih družbah klasično fizično delo izginja. Vse več je poklicev in ljudi, ki jih lahko uvrstimo med 'klasično inteligentco'. Kje je torej meja med inteligentco in ostalimi, med izobraženci in neizobraženci (osnovna, srednja, višja, visoka... šola), med intelektualci in ne-intelektualci? Na zastavljeno vprašanje ne najdemo odgovora. Vse ponujene opredelitve in kriteriji so tako ali drugače relativni in na nek način ideološki. Poleg tega pa je 'klasični binarni sistem', ki deli delo na fizično in umsko, povozil čas in potrebna bi bila temeljita redefinicija omenjenih pojmov, ki bi omogočila, da bi jih lahko mislili sočasno, skozi njihovo prepletanje in soodvisnost.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE ATTITUDE OF SLOVENE INTELLECTUALS TOWARDS EMIGRATION UP TO 1941¹

When we think about the attitude of Slovene intellectuals towards emigration, we must place special emphasis on the role of intellectuals who have been highly educated, something which did not always guarantee an objective attitude towards the issue of emigration. Many thinking laymen without formal education have, in newspaper articles, letters and through other media, expressed their own viewpoints on the emigration of Slovenes, which were more understandable, more objective, and neither as ideologically nor emotionally loaded as the viewpoints of many educated people who were as a rule the shapers of public opinion.²

The viewpoints of the representatives of countries, the Catholic Church, various associations, political parties and other public and private organizations on the emigration of Slovenes, their lives abroad and the preservation of contacts with them were expressed publicly.³ Throughout this process, thinking individuals from various social strata, among them numerous educated people, took out advertisements in newspapers. Here we are speaking of the so-called critical public, who came especially from the ranks of the Catholics. If we leaf through the Slovene newspapers in the period up to 1941, we get the impression that the most attention to Slovene emigration was paid by Catholic newspapers, less by liberal and the least by socialist or communist newspapers.

Doctor of medicine and editor of the first Slovene lay-professional newspaper *Novice*, Janez Bleiweis⁴, had already raised his voice against the emigration of Slovenes during the times when only the occasional peddlers from Bela krajina left for America. In 1846 he warned Slovenes that in America the times when »fried chickens jumped into your mouth by themselves« were already over.⁵ Thus we first encounter the opinion which prevailed among the thinking population throughout the period of emigration and which can be seen clearly in the often expressed sentiment: »Not to America!«⁶ A negative attitude towards

¹ A brief version of this paper was published in *Razgledi* (Ljubljana), No. 17/1120, 16. 9. 1998.

² Drnovšek, Marjan: *Usodna privlačnost Amerike (The Fatal Attraction of America)*, Nova revija, Ljubljana 1998.

³ Drnovšek, Marjan: »The Attitude of the Slovene Catholic Church to Emigration to the United States of America before 1914«, *Slovene Studies* 14/2, 1992, pp. 169-184. See also: *Historical Dictionary of Slovenia* (Leopoldina Plut-Pregelj and Carole Rogel). European Historical Dictionaries, No. 13. The Scarecrow Press, Inc. Lanham, Md., and London 1996.

⁴ Bleiweis, Janez (1808-1881). He was a journalist, politician, and veterinarian. As the first political leader of Slovene peasants and craftsmen was also the publisher of the journal *Kmetijske in rokodelske novice/Novice*. The first number of this journal was published in 1843.

⁵ Čudna novica (»A strange news«). *Novice* (Ljubljana), 1846, No. 30, p. 120.

⁶ The Catholic Church was among the greatest adversaries of emigration and warned against the danger

emigration, cautioning about the dark sides of foreign countries, fear of the withering and loss of their (Catholic) faith, moral decline and estrangement in a foreign country were present in great numbers of thinking people in Slovenia. Only slowly during the times of mass emigration did the thought penetrate their consciousness that emigration couldn't be restricted through prohibition and by painting foreign countries in the darkest of colours.⁷ Thus a well-known expert on emigration, Janez Evangelist Krek⁸, during the time of mass emigration at the turn of the 20th century, accused foreign countries of sapping the »*bodily strength*« of emigrants, who all too quickly squandered their hard-earned cash in bars, at gaming and on »*the good life*«. Foreign countries destroyed their health, lives, »*moral*« and nationality. And what's more, it also took away their »*most valuable property, i.e. their faith*«. He was aware that it was impossible to stem the flow of emigration.⁹ As an advocate of a co-operative society he even stated that emigration also had positive consequences in that emigrants would send their savings from America which would be invested in agriculture through farmers' savings banks, all in the spirit of the idea »*Farming people above all for farmers!*«. He even considered the possibility of founding a provincial emigrants' agency in Carniola, whose role in Styria and Istria would be taken by co-operative societies. The agencies would help emigrants from the very beginning to avoid the usurious agents of various steamship companies.¹⁰ I would like to mention some other thinkers about the emigration problem up to 1914: Ivan Mulaček¹¹, Anton Korošec¹², Jurij M. Trunk¹³

of moral and religious decay abroad. *Not to America!* is also the title of the novel, written by Jakob Alešovec (1883, 1912).

⁷ Drnovšek, Marjan: »Mass Emigration and Slovenes«, *Dve domovini/Two Homelands*, No. 5, 1994, pp. 19-36.

⁸ Krek, Janez Evangelist (1865-1917). A politician, sociologist, writer, theologian, and journalist. He had been much influenced by Christian social movement. In the spirit of the social encyclical issued by Pope Leon XIII, entitled *Rerum Novarum* (1891), he demanded the Church be active in the solving of the social problem. He was also the president of the Slovene branch of the (Austrian) St. Raphael Society in Ljubljana.

⁹ J. E. Krek: *Varstvo izseljencev* (»A Protection of the Emigrants«), Ljubljana, 11 November 1907. *Slovenec*, No. 265, Ljubljana, 16. 11. 1907.

¹⁰ J. E. Krek: *Izseljevanje in zadružništvo* (»The Emigration and cooperative Movement«). *Narodni gospodar*. Glasilo Zadrúžne zveze v Ljubljani, No. 22, 25. 11. 1913, pp. 351-353.

¹¹ Mulaček, Ivan, born 1874. In 1903 left for the USA. After his return home began to study the English language in 1908 at the universities in Vienna, Prague, Graz and London. From London he sent his article *Naše izseljevanje v številkah* (»Our Emigration in Numbers«) to the Slovene Catholic scientific journal *Čas* (Volume 4, 1913, pp. 256-266).

¹² Korošec, Anton (1872-1940). A theologian and politician. He was influenced in his politics and the social ideas by Janez E. Krek. At the 3rd Catholic Meeting in Ljubljana (1906) he said: »*Our Slovene emigrants, who are leaving for larger cities, either in Germany or in America, are not pale, drained, hungry and desperate but are strong, blooming, young men who are full of life and strength, and the most vigorous women...They are aware of their spiritual and physical strength and they could prosper with it. At home they see with sadness that all their intelligence and diligence are in vain, that it is impossible to develop one's powers as they should be developed and therefore they hurry abroad, where they intend to attain be developed and wealth more easily.*« (*III. Slovenski katoliški shod v Ljubljani, dne 26., 27. in 28. avgusta 1906*. Edited by Evgen Lampe, Ljubljana 1907, p. 20.)

¹³ Trunk, M. Jurij (1870-1973). A priest, writer, historian of emigration and journalist. In 1909-11 he went to America four times. Among other things he travelled to America to collect material for the book entitled *Amerika in Amerikanci* (America and the Americans, Klagenfurt 1912). This is the basic work on American Slovenes, which was created at the time of their maximum mass emigration to North America. The work was written on the basis of literature (among others, he used the book by Balch,

and Juro Adlešič.¹⁴ We can state for a number of writings on emigration from that time that they wavered between emphasizing the positive and negative aspects of the emigration of Slovenes to America; on one hand we always find sharp criticism of this process and on the other a more understanding approach towards Slovene emigration.

Catholic thinker Edvard Kocbek¹⁵ took these thoughts a step further when in 1938 he wrote of the alienation of emigrants from their homeland, which caused inner corruption, spiritual impoverishment and the loss of a happy life.

(»No one among them can completely find themselves [abroad - author's note], almost all are crushed inside, alone, disconnected, suffering, going astray, sinking into anonymity and a life of absurdity.«¹⁶)

The culprits for emigration were found in economic and political liberalism, in the attractive romantic features of emigration and in the weak economic, cultural and political consciousness of the Slovenes. At the same time, Kocbek stated that there was no proper »counterforce« among the Slovenes to halt this disastrous process. During all times of emigration only rarely intellectuals were aware of the gravity of the emigration process among Slovenes. In addition to apathy, Kocbek laid the blame on the insufficient research of economic, cultural and political processes among Slovenes and the ignorance of the causes and structures of Slovene emigration, not to mention the psychological portrait of Slovene emigration. Research into all these segments of Slovene emigration would, according to Kocbek, also assist in obtaining a better appreciation of what it meant to be Slovene.

(»Rescuing the emigrants must not be only a matter of political technique, party symmetry and social organization, but a means of national enlightenment, such that with a proper and total process we shall rescue not only the emigrants, but the entire nation.«¹⁷)

The results of the Austrian censuses from 1900 and especially 1910 showed a depressing demographic situation for the Slovenes. The low number of Slovenes was exacerbated among other things by emigration, which at the beginning of this century had reached mass proportions. Two essays were published at that time in which the authors used a scientific approach, although with their work they only wanted to warn about the numerical results of emigration. We are speaking of the essays by civil engineer Janko Mačkovšek¹⁸ and publicist and translator Ivan Mulaček.¹⁹ Mačkovšek analysed the Austrian statistical data for Styria and Carniola from 1869 to 1910, while Mulaček focused solely on Carniola and included in his research a statistical report on emigration to America, which came from individual district-boards in Carniola after 1893. What did he hope to achieve?

Emily Green: *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens*, New York 1910), oral and written reports. In 1921 he emigrated to the USA for good.

¹⁴ Adlešič, Juro (1884-1968). A lawyer. Sec: J. Adlešič: Organizacija slovenskega izseljenstva (»The Organization of the Emigration Flux«). *Čas* (Ljubljana), Volume 4 and 5, 1909, pp. 170-189.

¹⁵ Kocbek, Edvard (1904-1981). A writer, poet, editor, translator, and politician.

¹⁶ Kocbek, Edvard: Slovensko izseljenstvo (»The Slovene Emigrants«). *Dejanje* (Ljubljana), Year I, March 1938, pp. 87-90.

¹⁷ Ibidem.

¹⁸ Mačkovšek, Janko: Statistika Slovencev (»Statistics on Slovenes«). *Slovanski svet. Zemljepisna in statistična slika današnjega Slovanstva*. Znanstvena knjižnica Omladine (Ljubljana), Book 3, Year 1911, pp. 245-260, 275-282.

¹⁹ Mulaček, Ivan: Naše izseljevanje v številkah (»Our Emigration in Numbers«). *Čas* (Ljubljana), Volume 4, 1913, pp. 156-266.

»Since demonstration and research have not fulfilled their purpose, numbers sometimes help,« he wrote, and expressed the hope that with the figures on Slovene emigration an interest in the process would be awakened among the Slovenes. His treatise was ranked by M. R. (Miroslav Ravbar?²⁰) as late as 1940 as being among the first scientific treatments of the issue of emigration among the Slovenes.²¹

In the last years before the outbreak of the Second World War we can see an increase of interest in the issue of emigration on the scientific level as well. In 1937 Dr Ivan Tomšič,²² professor of international law and the history of diplomacy at the Faculty of Law in Ljubljana, founded the Institute for International Public Law (1937), under the auspices of which operated departments for minorities and emigrants. He linked the problems of research of emigration with the current interests of the state, although he rejected politically tendentious research. Using the existing scientific methods and experience, historians would be able to study the emigration of Yugoslavs as a whole and their immigration, the legal arrangement of the status of immigrants in the countries to which they had emigrated, the effect of development and international economic and political crises on emigration etc. He was a realist, and he linked his own plans to the condition that their realization would guarantee funding. He also wrote a treatise on the international legal aspects of emigration and immigration.²³ Critics of his work already at that time stated that his perspective was »new feature in the paltry Slovene literature on emigration«, while at the same time a departure from the up-to-that-time overly emotional treatment of the issue of Slovene emigration. The first dissertation on the topic of emigration was defended at the University of Ljubljana by Josip Premrov in 1945.²⁴

Also of interest with respect to our topic is the issue of the relations and links between the educated people and the economic emigrants in the new environment. I am more familiar with the relations in Western Europe in the period between the two world wars. At that time there were two worlds, and the links between them were very weak. The only educated people who worked among the emigrants and tried to understand and solve their problems were the rare emigrant priests and teachers. The lack of Slovene priests was solved by a few foreign priests who learned the Slovene language, e.g. August Hegenkötter²⁵ and Božidar Tensundern²⁶ from Germany, Father Teotim van Velzen²⁷ from the Netherlands and others. During the Great Depression they helped them form demands and wishes

²⁰ Ravbar, Miroslav, born, 1911. A pedagogue and translator. He was coeditor of the journal *Mladi Prekmurec* (1939-40).

²¹ M. R.: Dr. Ivan Tomšič. Nekaj misli glede znanstvenega dela o zamejnih Jugoslovanih (»Some Thoughts on the scientific Work about Yugoslave Emigrants«). *Izseljenski vestnik* (Ljubljana), X/3, 1940, p. 33.

²² Tomšič, Ivan (1902-1976).

²³ Tomšič, Ivan: Izseljevanje in vseljevanje z vidika mednarodnega javnega prava (»Emigration and Immigration from the Perspective of International Public Law«). The separate from *Zbornik znanstvenih razprav pravne fakultete v Ljubljani*, XVI, 1940, pp. 287-314.

²⁴ Premrov, Josip: *O izseljenski duši. O izseljencu in izseljenstvu s psihološkega vidika* (On the Emigrant Soul. On the Emigrant and Emigration from the Psychological Perspective). He also published *Izseljenska čitanka* (The Emigration Reading.book), Ljubljana 1941.

²⁵ Hegenkötter, August. See his book: *Moje delo med Slovenci* (My Work Among Slovenes), Ljubljana 1970.

²⁶ Tensundern, Božidar. See his book: *Vestfalski Slovenci. Spomini dušnega pastirja za Slovence* (The Slovenes in Westphalia. Memories of the Priest), Celovec 1973.

²⁷ Teotim van Velzen (born 1885). The priest from Heerlen (the Netherlands). He was the founder of the Slovene Society St. Barbara at Brunssum in the Netherlands (1926).

for a solution to their unenviable situation. We learn about this from numerous memoranda, open letters and oral reports, e.g. from both congresses on emigration in Ljubljana (1935²⁸, 1937).²⁹ The majority of these expectations were addressed to the state and the Catholic church in Yugoslavia. One of the bright sides of this relationship was Slovenski klub in Paris (est. 1928), which brought educated persons together with economic immigrants. These included Alojz Kuhar (who had completed diplomacy school and the Faculty of Law in Paris, was social representative for these emigrants at the Yugoslav embassy in Paris and a correspondent for)³⁰, painter Veno Pilon (who came to Paris occasionally after 1926 and moved there permanently in 1930), Dore Ogrizek (later a Slovene publisher in Paris), student and well-known communist Aleš Bebler (after 1930 the editor of the gazettes and in Paris, member and secretary of the Yugoslav sub-commission for foreign workers at the Central Committee of the French Communist Party), Ivan Tomšič (1928-31 with a scholarship from the French Ministry of Culture in Paris furthered his studies in international law and the history of diplomacy at the Sorbonne, the Institut des Hautes Études Internationales and at the Dotation Carnegie pour la Paix Internationale), Boris Kermavner (the brother of Dušan Kermavner), Ruda Jurčec (student at the post-secondary school of political science in Paris etc.) as well as Klopčič the watchmaker and the Slovene boys (butchers) and girls who were employed as immigrant workers in the Vilette quarter of Paris.³¹

And what was the response to the mass emigration of Slovenes before the First World War and before 1940 in letters and arts? In the area of the written word, poetry, prose and plays were produced. Many works were written for lay folk with the clear message »*Not to America*«, which was also the title of a book (with the subtitle: A Lesson for Slovenes) by Jakob Alešovec (1883, 1912). During the time of mass emigration to the USA the topic of emigration was present in the works of the more visible Slovene writers, e.g. Ivan Tavčar, Ivan Cankar, Oton Župančič, Zofka Kvedrova, Anton Aškerc and others.³² The majority of the above-mentioned authors emphasized in their works the tragedy of emigration, the rift between the homeland and foreign lands, the devastating homesickness etc., often with an instructional and cautionary purpose. There were almost no reflections of mass emigration in music or the fine arts. Thus the illustrations by Ivan Vavpotič in the book *Amerika in Amerikanci* (America and Americans, 1912), written by Jurij Trunk, represent some of the few images we have with the theme of emigration.³³ There are other portrayals by folk painters in small chapels and in farm houses. In other words, the Slovenes did not receive great works of art on the theme of emigration, as did several of the emigrant nations of Europe.

With respect to the importance of the issue of emigration for Slovenes as a small nation, the response from the Slovene intellectual circles in the last two centuries has been

²⁸ *Prvi slovenski izseljenski kongres v Ljubljani*, 1. julija 1935 (The first Emigration Meeting in Ljubljana, July 1, 1935). Izseljenska knjižnica, Number 7, 1936, 148 pp.

²⁹ See also: *Izseljenski vestnik* (Emigration Journal), Ljubljana, 1932-40.

³⁰ Kuhar, Alojzij (1895-1958).

³¹ Jurčec, Ruda: *Skozi luči in sence. Volume I.* (1914-1929), Ljubljana 1991, pp. 447-451.

³² Hladnik, Miran: »Slovene Popular Novels about Emigration in the Nineteenth Century«, *Slovene Studies*, 7/1-2, 1985, pp. 57-62.

³³ Drnovšek, Marjan: Podoba Amerike na ilustracijah Ivana Vavpotiča (»The Image of America in the Illustrations of Ivan Vavpotič«). *Kronika* (Ljubljana), 46, No. 1-2, 1998, pp. 83-110.

weak. Thoughts on the emigration process and the fate of Slovenes around the world were more frequently expressed during times of threat to the Slovenes as a nation, i.e. in the years before the outbreak of the first and second world wars and during the time of secession from Yugoslavia and the establishment of Slovenia as an independent country.³⁴ In parallel, during times of crisis the interest of thinking emigrants in the fate of the home country also rose; this would be during the first and second world wars and during the time of Slovenia's attainment of independence. And today? The impression is - from the perspective of the mother country - that interest in it has been greater during times when emigration is occurring, after which it is always to a smaller extent and latterly aimed only at Slovenes around the world who did and still do consider themselves to be Slovenes. Thus Slovene emigrants and especially their descendants are more and more becoming a subject for scientific research rather than for the wider interested public and a state with a clearly formed emigration program.

³⁴ E.g.: *Slovenska trideseta leta*, Slovenska matica, Ljubljana 1997.

*POVZETEK NEKATERI POGLEDI SLOVENSКИH INTELEKTUALCEV
DO IZSELJENSTVA DO LETA 1941*

Maloštevilnost Slovencev, njihovo življenje v različnih in hkrati večnacionalnih državah (Avstro-Ogrski, Jugoslaviji) in ne nazadnje množičnost njihovega izseljevanja na prelomu v 20. stoletje v Združene države Amerike, je okrepilo zanimanje javnosti za usodo vseh, ki so našli novo domovino v tujini. To zanimanje se je okrepilo zlasti v letih pred izbruhom prve in druge svetovne vojne in v času nastajanja samostojne države Slovenije. Gre za čas, ko je bila ogroženost Slovencev zelo izrazita in so se na splošno okrepila razmišljanja o njihovi usodi in bodočnosti.

Do vprašanj izseljevanja Slovencev, njihovega življenja na tujem in ohranjanja stikov z njimi, so javno izražali svoje poglede predstavniki države, katoliške Cerkve, raznih društev, političnih strank in drugih javnih in zasebnih organizacij. Te poglede pa so oblikovali razmišljujoči posamezniki in med njimi številni intelektualci. V prispevku me zanimajo mnenja tistih intelektualcev, ki so izražali svoje poglede na neliterarni oz. neumetniški način, čeprav so mogoče pripadali njihovim krogom. Javnosti so jih posredovali v govorih, publicističnih člankih, knjigah, znanstvenih člankih ali v raznih objavljenih načrtih oz. predlogih za rešitev t. i. izseljenskega vprašanja pri Slovencih. Odnos javnosti do slovenskega izseljenstva so sooblikovali vidni Slovenci, med katerimi so prevladovali ljudje iz vrst katoliške Cerkve (npr. Janez Evangelist Krek, pater Kazimir Zakrajšek, Anton Merkun) ali vernikov (npr. Edvard Kocbek). Slovenska izseljenska problematika je bila bolj prisotna v vrstah Cerkve, manj pa v liberalno in socialistično usmerjenih krogih na Slovenskem. To velja tudi za intelektualce iz omenjenih nazorskih oz. političnih krogov. V času po 1945 je odnos do ekonomskega in zlasti političnega izseljenstva oblikovala komunistična Partija in v njo verujoči in vdani intelektualci.

Sklep: Z ozirom na pomen izseljenskega vprašanja pri Slovencih kot maloštevilnega naroda, je bila odzivnost slovenskih intelektualnih krogov na to problematiko šibka, razen v že omenjenih kriznih obdobjih. Vtis je – gledano z vidika matične domovine –, da je bil interes zanje večji v času poteka izseljevanja in nato vedno manjši oz. osredotočen samo na Slovence po svetu, ki so se in se še vedno štejejo za Slovence. Tako slovenski izseljenci in zlasti njihovi potomci postajajo predmet samo znanstvenih raziskav, manj pa odnosa države na podlagi jasno oblikovanega (izseljeniškega) programa. Tako slovenski izseljenci postajajo vedno bolj del zavesti redkih razmišljujočih intelektualcev in vedno manj širše javnosti.

VLOGA INTELEKTUALCEV V JUŽNOAMERIŠKI SLOVENSKI SKUPNOSTI

Slovenski skupnosti v severnem in južnem delu ameriške celine sta nastali in se razvijali vsaka po svoji poti. Malo uradnih stikov je bilo med obema, le nekaj vidnih kulturnih delavcev, predvsem urednikov so vzdrževali pismene odnose in se med seboj citirali oz. sodelovali. Leta med 2.s.v. so bila - paradoksalno - čas za pogoste omembe severnoameriških slovenskih ustanov in osebnosti v buenosaireškem tisku. Sicer že sredi 30. let je dokaj žalostno končala pobuda, da bi ustanovili organizacijo, ki je imela za vzor SNPJ.¹ V Buenos Airesu so od časa do časa objavljali kakšne novice, predvsem kulturne, o Slovencih v ZDA. Adamičevi literarni uspehi so redno omenjali, a je bilo njegovo politično delovanje med vojno tisto, ki je naletelo na najpogostejše - in odobravoče - odmeve v buenosaireškem tisku. Tako so januarja 1943 v reviji *Njiva* povzeli Adamičev članek »Partizani in Mihajlovič«² po *Cankarjevem Glasniku*, ki ga je redno dobival urednik Franc Birska. Sledili so še drugi komentarji, kmalu za tem pa so objavili resolucijo SANS o Zedinjeni Sloveniji³. Urednik Albert Drašček pa se je odzval novici o ukinitvi *Cankarjevega Glasnika* v prizadetem članku:

»Mi smo mislili – ker so nas o tem skoraj prepričali –, da je slovenski kulturni življenj v tujini odvisen v prvi vrsti od gmotnega stališča slovenskih izseljeniških organizacij. Dopovedovali so nam, da če bomo Slovenci v tujini gospodarsko močni, bomo tudi imeli zagotovljen obstoj slovenskih publikacij in kulturnih društev, ter nam ne bo treba beračiti po nasebini in trkati na slovenska kulturna srca. Dobre misli in lepe sanje! ... Premoženje slovenskih organizacij v severni Ameriki, kolikor nam je znano, se šteje na milijone dolarjev in razne izjave se danes publicirajo v imenu četrtilijona Slovencev! In vendar, z vsem tem ogromnim kapitalom in pri vsej tej masi rojakov, ni bilo mogoče podaljšati življenja, danes edini slovenski leposlovnih reviji, niti za toliko časa, ko bo v domovini zasijala svoboda.«⁴

O Slovencih na severu je še govora v naslednji številki *Njive* in sicer o razliki med informacijami, ki jih navaja izseljenjski duhovnik J. Hladnik (vir KSKJ) in tistimi, ki jih sami povzemajo iz *Proletarca*.⁵ V septembru istega leta je izšla zadnja številka *Njive*, po

¹ Slovenski tednik je 14.7.1934 (št.261) začel z objavo pravil SNPJ. V naslednji št. je Andrej Škrbec objavil odbor za ustanovitev »podporne jednote«, a brez vidnega uspeha. Pozneje je bilo nekaj drugih združevalnih predlogov, celo skupne izjave sredinske Prosvete in levičarskega Ljudskega odra o »enotnosti slovenskega delavstva v Južni Ameriki«. Leta 1938 je za kratek čas zaživela Zveza slovenskih društev v J.A.

² *Njiva VI*, 8 jan. 1943

³ *Njiva VI*, 9-10, feb.-marec 1943

⁴ Albert Drašček, Slovenci in slovenstvo. *Njiva VI*, 11 april 1943

⁵ Albert Drašček, Slava partizanom! *Njiva VI*, 12 maj 1943

junijskem vojaškem udaru je Argentina doživljala preludij k dolgi Peronovi vladavini, v njej ni bilo prostora ne razumevanja za protifašistično usmerjeno slovensko skupnost.

I.

Čeprav veliko mlajša in manj številčnejša slovenska skupnost od tiste v severnem delu ameriške celine, se je v dvajsetih letih izoblikovala množična prisotnost Slovencev tako v Argentini kot tudi v Braziliji in Urugvaju. Podobnost v razvoju je izpričana v strokovnem tisku, nastanek društvenih oblik (največkrat s ciljem medsebojne pomoči), cerkvenih in laičnih ustanov, politično usmerjenih organizacij, kulturnih skupin (od najpogostejših: pevskih zborov do dramskih skupin), ustanovitev glasil, publicistična in literarna dejavnost, rast slovenskih naselbin, množitev samostojnih obrtnikov in drugih samostojnih poklicev. Po prvem – in praviloma bolečem – obdobju prilagajanja k novemu okolju, utrditev in navezava stikov tako s »staro« domovino kot z razvitejšimi centri v izseljenstvu. V letu 1940 je tržaški Slovenec, novinar in diplomiranec na Trgovski akademiji, Viktor Kjuder napisal daljše poročilo o argentinsko-slovenski skupnosti, najverjetneje za potrebe jugoslovanskega poslaništva v Buenos Airesu, kjer je bil tudi sam zaposlen kot tajnik dr. Izidorja Cankarja.⁶ Skupnost naj bi štela 26.000 Slovencev, od teh 80% Primorcev. V Buenos Airesu je živela največja skupina, 10.000 priseljencev. Zapis je izredno zanimiv predvsem zaradi številčne ocene Slovencev naseljenih po posameznih krajih v notranjosti Argentine.

»Tisto najtršo dobo, ko priseljenec ne pozna ne razmer ne jezika in je primoran poprijeti se dela za vsak denar in pod vsakršnimi pogoji, so že zadnjaj preboleli. Njihov gospodarski položaj je razmeroma dober. Brezposelnih je med Slovenci prav malo. Prav mnogo jih je, ki so si toliko opomogli, da imajo že svoje hišice, svoje obrtniške delavnice, trgovine, gostilne in celo industrijska podjetja. Udelejujejo se v vseh panogah. Največ jih je zaposlenih v stavbinstvu, mnogo je mizarjev, krojačev, kovačev, mehanikov, čevljarjev, šoferjev itda. Na splošno lahko trdimo, da so radi svojih sposobnosti in marljivosti na delu vsepovsod čislani in pridno plačani.«

Večina članov skupnosti je bila kmečkega izvora, saj je šlo za zadnji val množičnega odhajanja pod pritiskom italijanskih (fašističnih) oblasti. Med njimi je bilo prav malo izobražencev:

»Kar je slovenskih izobražencev v Argentini, a jih je prav malo, živijo s par izjemami vsi v Buenos Airesu in njegovih predmestjih. Za slovenskega človeka s srednjo ali višjo izobrazbo v Argentini tla niso ugodna. V njej slovenskih in sploh jugoslovanskih podjetij, kjer bi mogel najti primerno službo, ni, tuja podjetja favorizirajo svoje ljudi, država pa domačine. Slovenski zdravnik ali advokat, ki bi prišel semkaj z namenom, da bo v Argentini izvrševal svoj poklic, bi se brž vrnil domov, ker mu tukaj niti srednje šole ne priznajo.«

V zadnjih letih smo v strokovni literaturi lahko spoznali posameznike, ki so imeli pomembno vlogo tako pri utrjevanju prisotnosti slovenske kulture v Južni Ameriki kot pri vzdrževanju stikov z domovino: naj omenim samo najvidnejše: inž. Cirila Jekovca, publicista in urednika; izvrstnega kronista v skupnosti Franja Kraševca, pisatelja Gvidona Juga,

⁶ Viktor Kjuder, *Slovenci v Argentini*, tipkopis (10 str., manjkata 6. in 7. stran), mapa dr. Viktor Kjuder, Slovenska izseljenska matica, arhiv. (1940)

antropologa Janeza Benigarja. Kjuder pa se ne ustavi pri teh osebnostih, prej ga zanima označevanje celostne skupnosti:

»Pretežna večina tukajšnjih slovenskih izseljencev je doma s Primorskega; prišli so sem z namenom, da se umaknejo političnim pritiskom doma in z upanjem, da se bodo mogli čez par let vrniti v domače kraje«, po padcu totalitarnega fašizma, seveda. Natančen pregled kulturnega in političnega delovanja nam to sicer heterogeno skupnost prikazuje kot izrazito nacionalno zavedno in v političnem smislu jasno antifašistično. Kjuder sam je bil med ustanovitelji slovenskega Sokola v Buenos Airesu, liberalnega prepričanja, a dokaj strpno razpoložen. Rojen 1. 1904 pri sv. Jakobu⁷ je sodeloval v številnih časopisih, sourednikoval mesečnika *Naš glas* redno pisal v dnevniku *Edinost* in predvsem v njenem tedniku *Novice*. Po razpustu *Edinosti* 1927 je bil Kjuder večkrat zaprt in je končno moral oditi, aprila 1. 1930 je prispel v Buenos Aires. Najprej v društvu Tabor, pozneje v Sokolu in Prosveti je razvil bogato kulturno dejavnost, predvsem ga je veselilo delo pri ljubiteljskem odru, režiral je igre tako za odrasle⁸ kot za otroke⁹ slovenske šole, veliko je predaval, vodil je jugoslovansko radijsko uro, prevajal iz slovenščine in sodeloval pri organizaciji jezikovnih tečajev. Toda bil je predvsem novinar, pisec ostrih in direktnih komentarjev o najpomembnejši temi: usodi svojih bratov »v suženjstvu«. Kot večino svojih sonarodnjakov je gojil močno upanje o rešitvi nacionalnega vprašanja, garancija za to je bil obstoj »močne in demokratične« Jugoslavije. Potrebna se mu je zdela predvsem solidarnost med jugoslovanskimi narodi, da bi se skupaj lahko zoperstavili nevarni sosedji,

»ki vedno govori, kako je njegovemu 43 milijonskemu prebivalstvu pretesno na polotoku. V bližini zemlje lačnega sosedja, ki nam je že odtrgal del slovenskega ozemlja, a gleda tudi preko Nanosa, in ki o Dalmaciji razlaga da je to njegova zemlja, za katero so ga druge države opeharile. In ta sosed je doslej tudi že bridko dokazal na koži naših bratov v Julijski krajini kakšno je njegovo razpoloženje napram Slovincem in Hrvatom.«¹⁰

Skupaj s prijatelji¹¹ je Kjuder v letu 1933 ustanovil tednik *Novi list* in ga osnoval kot moderno glasilo, ki je pokrivalo vse informacijske potrebe sonarodnjakov: ažuren pregled zunanjepolitične situacije, najrelevantnejše novice s Primorske in tudi iz Jugoslavije, aktivnosti v skupnosti in tudi argentinske novice. Tednik je bil tudi sodobno oblikovan in bogato ilustriran.¹² Kjuder je ves čas obstoja pisal uredniške komentarje, največkrat o primorskem vprašanju. Loteval pa se je tudi take tematike kot npr. refleksija o slovenskem značaju, nihajočem »iz hlapčestva v prevzetnost«.¹³ Pogosto je polemiziral z italijanskimi časopisi, ki so izhajali v Argentini, npr. o informaciji, da je Italija pošiljala Slovence v prve bojne črte v Afriko.¹⁴

⁷ *PSBL 8. snopič*. Gorica 1982

⁸ npr. Pohujšanje v dolini šentflorjanski, Deseti brat Sluga dveh gospodov.

⁹ Postržek

¹⁰ *Novi list I*, 11, 2.dec.1933

¹¹ Predsednik konsorcija je bil arhitekt Viktor Sulčič, podpredsednik dr. Kosta Veljanović, sicer izseljenški komisar, poročen s Slovenko iz znane goriške družine Čeboklijev.

¹² O Novem listu glej geslo v Enciklopediji Slovenije in tudi članek v Zgodovinskem časopisu:

¹³ Slovenska prevzetnost. *Novi list I*, 42, 21.jul. 1934

¹⁴ V klavnico. *Novi list II*, 77, 13.apr.1935. Kjuder navede novice iz antifašističnih listov, ki izhajajo v Parizu o tem, da je 50% vseh vojakov, ki gredo v Afriko Jugoslovancev. Na to se je oglasil Il Mattino d'Italia z ostrimi besedami. Kjuder pa je v Novem listu II, 79 27.apr.1935 odgovoril z člankom »Mattino je hud« kjer našteva slovenske zahteve: »Prenehati mora agitacija za odrešitev Dalmacije in vse kar je z njo v zvezi; Slovincem in Hrvatom vključenim v italijanske meje, mora rimska vlada zagotoviti nemoteno uživanje pravic, ki jim gredo po zahodnih najbolj elementarnih pravičnosti.«

Kjudra je zanimalo tudi odnos izseljencev do domovine oz. dolžnosti matičnih ustanov do svojih rojakov po svetu. Tako ob sklicu prvega izseljenskega kongresa v Ljubljani je napisal, da

»so danes vezi med domovino in nami močno zrahljane. In prav radi tega mislimo, da toliko domovina kolikor izseljenci nujno potrebujejo danes predvsem eno: da se vspostavijo medsebojne vezi. Ta potreba je nujna, je temeljna ter ima pred vsemi drugimi to prednost, da ji je mogoče zadostiti brez posebno hudih naporov, sredstev in žrtev.

Koliko je ljudi danes v Jugoslaviji in tudi med izobraženci, ki vedo o izseljencih nekaj več nego to, da jih je nekdo nazval deseto banovino? Brez posebnega pretiravanja bi lahko trdili, da je naša domovinska javnost o vsaki filmski zvezdi boljše poučena nego o Jugoslovanih, ki žive izven mej domovine, dasi je teh 2.800.000.../

Dokler se domovinska javnost ne bo zanimala za izseljence bodo vse lepe misli in vsi lepi predlogi glede izseljenstva le bob v steno, zakaj človek je najbolj gluhi tedaj, kadar mu govoriš o stvareh, ki ga ne zanimajo.«¹⁵

Na prej omenjeni kongres je društvo Tabor poslal posebno spomenico, kjer so našli vse tisto, kar bi lahko domovina priskrbela izseljenim, predvsem pomoč za slovenske šole. Hkrati so poudarjali pozitivno vlogo duhovnikov (želeli so si pa Primorce!) in domače javnosti, tako kot tudi prisotnost slovenskih diplomatov povsod tam, kjer so živeli Slovenci. Ob tem pa so opozarjali, da

»prenašanja domačih sporov v izseljenstvo /je/ škodljivo, vsak ki se s tem ukvarja seje sovražstvo med izseljenci, na razvoj notranjih prilik v domovini pa s takšnim delom vplivati ne more.«¹⁶ Kjudrovo intenzivno sodelovanje v ambicioznem načrtu dr. Izidorja Cankarja za razvoj slovenske šole je temeljil na njegovim prepričanju, da »če se hočemo ohraniti kot skupnost ter s tem ohraniti tudi svoje kulturne in gospodarske ustanove, je nujno potrebno, da preprečimo popolno odtujitev našega izseljenskega naraščaja z otvarjanjem tečajev za poučevanje materinščine.«¹⁷

Novi list je redno informiral o emigrantskih organizacijah v domovini in tudi o delovanju Manjšinskega kongresa, ki je deloval pod okriljem Društva narodov (predsednik je bil dr. Josip Vilfan, tajnik pa dr. Engelbert Besednjak). Tako je povzel I. 1935 koncept, ki je bil za takratne evropske razmere izrazito prezgoden, »naddržavne narodne skupnosti« (v nam bližnjem besednjaku »skupni slovenski kulturni prostor«).¹⁸ Kjuder je, kljub spoštovanju do jugoslovanske državne skupnosti, bil izrazito zaveden Slovenec. Zaradi tega je razumljivo, da se je večkrat jasno izrazil proti internacionalistični levici, ki je bila v slovenski skupnost organizacijsko zelo prisotna.«

Nekateri, ki mislijo, da je za dosego socialnih ciljev neobhodno potrebno, da v vsakem človeku najprej ubijejo narodno čustvovanje, stopajo po zgrešeni poti, ki so jo že hodili razni delavski voditelji na Primorskem, posebno v Trstu, ki so povzročili, da je na tisoče naših delavcev utonilo v valovih italijanskega potujčevanja ter so s tem pripravljali tla za poznejše podjarmljenje. Kdo je imel od tega koristi, slovenski delavci prav gotovo ne!«¹⁹ Kljub ostrini, ki je sicer vseskozi prisotna v njegovem besednjaku, je imel za najvišjo vrlino strpnost ob jasni opredelitvi vrednot:

¹⁵ Mi in domovina. *Novi list II*, 84, 8.jun.1935

¹⁶ Spomenica izseljenskega društva Tabor. *Novi list II*, 86, 22.jun.1935

¹⁷ Družba sv. Cirila in Metoda, 50. letnica. *Novi list III*, 101, 12. okt. 1935

¹⁸ *Novi list III*, 103, 26.okt.1935. *Manjšinski kongres*, 2-4.sept. v Ženevi

¹⁹ Izgubljeni sinovi. *Novi list III*, 105, 16.nov.1935

»Živimo v dobi, ko se je nestrpnost med posamezniki ter med malimi in velikimi občestvi mogočno razpasla. Prav gotovo pa je narodna nestrpnost, ki je izmed vseh najhujša, ker povzroča največ žrtev, dosegla najvišje meje pretiranosti baš na Primorskem, kjer žive ljudje naše krvi in našega jezika. Na stotine žrtev fašistične narodne nestrpnosti je po italijanskih ječah in v konfinacijskih taboriščih in na stotine je družin, ki radi tega života-rijo v največji bedi in pomanjkanju.«²⁰

Ko je po prihodu l. 1936 dr. Izidorja Cankarja zaključil urednikovo delovanje v *Novem listu* (novi poslanik je botroval združitvi prej med seboj sprtih tednikov - *Slovenski tednik* in *Novi list* - v *Slovenski list*) je lahko in s ponosom zatrjeval, da »v boju za teptane pravice našega naroda na Primorskem smo vselej dvigali svoj glas, imeli smo zadoščenje, da je ta naš glas nekajkrat odmeval tudi izven mej naše naselbine.«²¹ V letih službovanja v poslaništvu se je Kjuder vzdržal publicistične dejavnosti in se povsem posvetil svojim uradnim dolžnostim ter kulturnemu delu v skupnosti. Čeprav se ni nikoli loteval teme o vlogi izobražencev v skupnosti, je s svojim javnim delovanjem več kot zgovorno predstavil lik angažiranega intelektualca, ki se ne boji spopadov a postavlja na prvo mesto skupno narodno čustvo. V tem primeru je bila najvišja vrednota primorskih izseljencev rešitev nacionalnega vprašanja, kar je pomenilo združitev z matično Slovenijo. Po odhodu dr. Cankarja v Ottawa l. 1942 je Kjuder ostal kot diplomat v poslaništvu, ob koncu vojne je bil sam na svojem mestu. Konec l. 1944 ga je vlada Šubašič-Tito imenovala za vršilca dolžnosti odpravnika poslov. V tem svojstvu je pričakal prihod polnomočnega odposlanca general Ilca, ki je v l. 1946 obnovil diplomatske stike z južnoameriškimi državami v imenu FLRJ. Kmalu za tem, 13. oktobra, je Viktor Kjuder komaj 42-leten podlegel srčnemu infarktu.

II.

Po končani vojni je general Peron odprl vrata Argentine drugi slovenski skupini. Prej omenjenemu izseljenskem duhovniku Janezu Hladniku gre zasluga, da je sicer v težkih gmotnih razmerah postavil na noge organizacijo (Slovenska pisarna), ki je olajšala prihod beguncev v Argentino. Povojna skupnost (ali politična emigracija) je bila po družbeni sestavi precej različna od predvojne, primorske. Politično homogena (sicer z različnimi otenki glede nekaterih vprašanj) in v povprečju bolj izobražena. Med njimi je bila skupina duhovnikov in bogoslovcev (ok. 60), ki je imela v kraju Adregue skozi več let svojo posebno teološko visoko ustanovo. Med njimi je bilo tudi nekaj vidnih kulturnih delavcev, pisateljev, univerzitetnih profesorjev ipd. Opredeliti vlogo intelektualcev v tej skupnosti je torej kompleksnejša naloga, ki bi zahtevala natančne raziskave. V zadnjih letih je bilo objavljeno gradivo o številu univerzitetno izobraženih članih 1. in 2. generacije, a ni moj namen niti hipotetično tvegati splošnih zaključkov o tem vprašanju. Rada bi izpostavila dve osebnosti, prva, ki se po poklicu približuje Kjudrovi figuri in druga, ki se je zavestno spustila v analizo lastne odgovornosti do slovenskega občestva.

Med skupino novinarjev in urednikov (kar nekaj se jih je znašlo v Argentini: Miloš Stare, dr. Ivan Ahčin, Rudolf Smersu ipd) izstopa novinar in urednik Slovenca Ruda Jurčec tako po številu kontinuiranih publicističnih naporov kot po strastnem in briljantnem slogu

²⁰ Izseljenci za primorske brate. *Novi list III*, 142, 22.avg.1936

²¹ V četrto leto. *Novi list IV*, 147, 26.sept.1936

njegovega pisanja. Ob 90. letnici rojstva je v rodnem Ormožu izšla knjiga z izbranimi zapisi, Blaženost in bridkost zapisanih besed. Uredil jo je njegov sodelavec Alojzij Geržinič, ki je tudi napisal izčrpano uvodno študijo. Jurčec je sodeloval najprej pri *Vrednotah* (izdajatelj je bil Delovno občestvo za Slovenski katoliški inštitut), takoj po ustanovitvi Slovenske kulturne akcije l. 1954 je prevzel uredništvo *Meddobja*. V svojem prvem prispevku se je spraševal o naravi lastne skupnosti:

»Ne bi si upal trditi, da smo samo še emigracija. Grozeči potek dogodkov, ki smo jim priča, nas vedno bolj spravlja v tesnobno razmerje z narodom, ki živi na domači grudi. Blagrujemo ga, obenem pa se tresemo za njegovo usodo, saj je po pesnikovih besedah postavljen v osrčje Evrope./.../ Vedno bolj se nam bo treba vprašati, ali nismo mogoče že diaspora. Izraelu je diaspora skozi stoletja reševala vero v narodno in duhovno rešitev. Ta diaspora pa je mogla svojo nalogo opraviti samo zaradi tega, ker se je trdno postavila na temelje verskih in kulturnih tradicij.«²²

Prav ta posebna dolžnost bo rdeča nit Jurčevega opusa, dozorela bo po sporu in oddaljtvu od SKA²³ v novem glasilu *Sij slovenske svobode*²⁴, ko se bo ves posvetil osrednji misli in prizadevanju za samostojno slovensko državo: »že v naslovu je povedano, čemu hoče služiti in pomagati do prodora in zmage«. Po njegovi smrti 4. novembra 1975 je izšla 9. številka. Geržinič v prej omenjenem uvodu navaja statistiko avtorjevih prispevkov: »Hkrati je bil Jurčec najplodovitejši pisec. Poleg kratkih informativnih novic ima v Glasu 96, v Meddobju 41, v Siju 121 člankov in esejev, dva v Novih časih, po enega v Koledarju-zborniku Svobodne Slovenije in Vrednotah.«²⁵

Jurčec je strastno sledil dogajanju v Sloveniji, po raznih kanalih, največkrat preko Trsta in Celovca se nit z domovino nikoli ni pretrgala. Tako je lahko komentiral politične in kulturne dogodke ter hkrati polemiziral s starimi nasprotniki in prijatelji, a žal, brez možnosti pravega dialoga, saj je socialistična Slovenija tesno zaprla prihod nezaželenih idej in besed iz emigracije. Kruta kazen za rojenega polemičarja! V l. 1966 je v Glasu SKA v svoji rubriki Sveta ideje in dejanja komentiral esej p. Truhlarja Skupne globine, ki je izšel v tržaški *Mladiki* v duhu takratnega post-koncilskega vabila k dialogu. Spotakne se ob uvrstitvi Josipa Vidmarja med »iskalce globin« in se spušča najprej v hudo kritiko Vidmarjeve ocene Svetega Urha (avtorice Štefanije Podbevškove) in potem v spomin neuspelega sodelovanja skupine katoliških Krogovcev (mdr. Božo Vodušek, Tone in France Vodnik, Rajko Ložar) pri *Sodobnosti*. Živahni ritem in ostrina misli bi zaslužili odgovor, ki bi sodeč po odliki Vidmarjevega sloga bil na isti ravni, Jučecev sklep je jasen: »o prihodnjih globinah na najvišji ravni pa bo pokazala bodočnost, ker svet svojih resničnih globin ne bo izdal, ko ostro loči med konstruktivnim in destruktivnim.«²⁶

V isti številki *Glasa* je sedmo nadaljevanje po tonu povsem drugačnih komentarjev. V rubriki Spotoma je filozof in pedagog dr. Vinko Brumen ogovarjal bralce:

»tudi med nami le preradi sprašujemo, na koga meri to ali ono«. In nadaljuje: »Vse /besede/ in vsaka izmed njih so nastale ali so bile navdihnjene po berivu ali po kakem

²² *Meddobje* št. 1-2, 1954

²³ Glej geslo SKA v Enciklopediji Slovenije. Na občnem zboru 22. marca 1969 je prišlo do neresljivega sporazuma glede osnovne opredelitve. Skupina Jurčec, Fink, Geržinič je osnovala Sij slovenske svobode. Med najpomembnejši sodelavci sta bila France Dolinar iz Rima in Mirko Javornik iz Washingtona.

²⁴ Prva št. je izšla 21. aprila 1969

²⁵ A. Geržinič, *Obraz in obzorja Ruda Jurčeca, Blaženost in bridkost zapisanih besed*, Ormož 1995, str. 12

²⁶ Na dnu Vidmarjevih globin. *Glas SKA XII*, 14 15.8.1966

dogodku, zadnjem največ v slovenski skupnosti«. Prav to je izstopajoča Brumnova lastnost: opazuje, asociira, razmišlja in potem spregovori v umirjenem tonu, išče stik s sogovornikom kot v prijateljskem dialogu. Brumen je takoj po prihodu v Argentino objavil nenavadno svetel zapis, ki ga je naslovil z vzklikom čistega veselja: kvišku srca!²⁷ Tok njegovih misli in sporočilo sorojakom sta razvidna iz same navedbe podnaslovov: V novi svet smo prišli/Mnogotere so bile težave/Ali nam je obupati?/Naprej glejmo, ne nazaj!/Vživeti se je treba/In stara domovina, ljubezen do lastnega naroda?

Dr. Vinko Brumen se je rodil v Šalovcih pri Središču ob Dravi l. 1909. Absolviral je filozofijo pri Francetu Vebru in pedagogiko pri Karlu Ozvaldu. Doktoriral je l. 1936 in se pozneje izpopolnjeval v Nemčiji in Angliji. Februarja 1945 je odšel v Gorico, kjer je bil oktobra imenovan za ravnatelja učiteljsišča, potem ko so se italijanske oblasti l. 1947 vrnile, je odšel z ženo v Argentino. Službo je dobil pri argentinski založbi, kjer je najprej deloval potem pa vodil oddelek za humanistiko.²⁸ V slovenski skupnosti je bil vseskozi aktiven kot predavatelj in pisec. L. 1967 je izšla njegova knjiga *Iskanja*. V uvodni besedi pojasnjuje:

»Misli, ki jih razodevam in razkladam v tej zbirki, so se mi budile, so zorele in so bile napisane zlasti ob opazovanju in študiju naše zdomske skupnosti, posebej še te v Argentini. Tudi tedaj, kadar se navidez povsem oddaljijo od predmeta. Oddaljujejo se, ker sem tipal za koreninami pojavov, ki so mi razmišljanje budili. In prav te misli bi mnogo lažje napisal, ko bi jih razvijal po že končanem koncilu in po objavi koncilskih tekstov.«²⁹

Brumen je dober del svojega časa posvetil koncilskemu nauku o potrebnem dialogu, ki ga je razumel izredno široko a se je hkrati tudi zavedal vseh razsežnosti in posledic sredi skupnosti, kjer

»se radi pritožujemo zaradi različnosti mnenj in mnogoterosti cepljenj, Ni namreč v njih naša največja nesreča in najhujša slabost; ta je v naši ne-moči in ne-volji, da bi neogibnost in celo pomen razlik doumeli ter skupnost kljub njim in celo na njih gradili. Naš vzor je le preveč enolična ljudska gmota, ki bi vedno isto mislila, enako čutila in v en korak stopala.«

Leta pozneje je svoje slovensko občestvo še bolj nedvoumno označil:

»Zdi se, da se imamo za nekako izvoljeno ljudstvo, ki ima v svetu neko posebno in izredno poslanstvo, zato da je menda obdarjeno z milostjo ali karizmo mezmotljivosti in negrešljivosti, zato da ima v vsem prav, ravna vedno prav, ne potrebuje in ne prenese nasvetov.«³⁰

Ljubeče a ne popustljiv, Brumen je analiziral pojave, ki jih je imel za škodljive za slovenskega človeka v svetu, predvsem je izpostavil zaprtost, nepripravljenost na dialog, nagnjenje k ideologiji, k napuhu.

»Proti ideologiji ne zmore uspeha diskusija, še manj debata. V tej lahko pred neko skupino ljudi ali v neki pravdi zmagamo, a nasprotnika s tem ne premagamo, še manj pridobimo za svojo stvar. Glavni spoznavni znak ideologij je v njihovi togosti in dogmatičnosti nekih mnenj in zato tudi v enako togem in neproženem odklanjanju drugih mnenj.

²⁷ Vinko Brumen, V novem svetu - kvišku srca! *Koledar Svob. Slovenije za leto 1949*, str. 38-42

²⁸ L. 1992 je pri Slovenski matici izšel izbor Brumnovih razprav, Argentinski spisi. France Jerman je uredil filozofske eseje, Irene Mislej za tiste iz zdomske problematike. Glej tudi I.M., Razmišljanje o zdomstvu Vinka Brumna str. 7-14

²⁹ Vinko Brumen, Uvodna beseda. *Iskanja*, SKA Buenos Aires 1967

³⁰ Vinko Brumen, Naši naglavni grehi. *Meddobje XX št. 1-2*, 1984. Tudi v *Argentinski spisi*, Slovenska Matica Ljubljana 1992

*Vsaka ideologija se brani zlasti s tem, da se še bolj zapira vase, da še odločneje odbija vsak resničen ali le navidezen napad od zunaj; še raje pa se varuje s svojim napadanjem drugačnih mnenj in prepričanj.*³¹

Toda za Brumna je duhovno bitje, svobodno. Prav v tem je dostojanstvo, pa tudi hkrati odgovornost človeka. Brumnova drža, ko postavi pred skupnost in posameznik zrcalo, in hkrati z znanstveno metodo analizira pojave, je edinstvena v emigraciji. V zadnjih letih življenja se je resno a brez »uporabne« patetike dotaknil vprašanje sprave. Spravo je razumel v najglobljem smislu in nikakor ne v strankarsko obarvanih dimenzijah, pot do sprave z drugim, s tistim, s katerim ne soglašam, celo z nekdanjim nasprotnikom je ena sama: dialog. V dialogu je pomembneje poslušati kot govoriti, prepričevati. Poskus, da bi si postavili na položaj drugega pomaga pri upoštevanju vseh razsežnosti človekove drža. Ne gre za odpuščanje, Brumen je globoko veren in prepušča sojenje Bogu. Gre za strpnost, za dopuščanje, da imajo drugi svoj pogled na Resnico.

Med temami, ki se jih je loteval Brumen je tudi občutljivo vprašanje narodnostnega »prehajanja«. Sredi 60. let, ko je že doraščala prva generacija otrok rojenih v zdomstvu je bila živa polemika o mejah slovenstva v tujem svetu. Teolog Ignacij Lenček npr. ni dopuščal o tem nobenega dvoma: *»je treba iz etičnih razlogov asimilacijo preprečevati, dokler je to moralno mogoče.*« Ta proces ni bil za Lenčka nikoli naraven. Brumen je pa zatrjeval:

»Narodnost vsekakor ni neka stalnica niti v smislu, da se ne bi mogla bitno ali doživljajljsko spreminjati v okviru iste narodnosti, niti da se ne bi mogla spremeniti, preiti iz ene narodnosti v drugo. Kdaj morda niti ni jasno in gotovo, kak je bitna narodnost, tedaj bo pač odločilen doživljajljski element, to je narodna zavest.«³²

V nadaljevanju Brumen analizira vse atribute narodnosti, to je kri, zemlja, jezik ter jih relativizira. Tako tudi pride do »prenarajanje« ali transkulturacija, proces, ki ga najde predvsem v ameriški družbi. Opredeljuje akulturacija kot proces, *»v katerem se kultura nekega človeka ali neke skupnosti spreminja v stiku z drugo kulturo, torej zlasti proces, ko neka tuja kultura človeka ali skupnost oplaja, prerada tudi osvaja.*«³³ Temu zoperstavlja kulturno integracijo, to je sožitje dveh kultur, dva izročila, ki skupaj obogatita človeka. Omenja tudi nekaj zgodovinskih primerov nasilne dekulturnacije oz. raznarodovanje in se veseli, da je v sodobnem svetu vendarle opazna tendenca k kulturnemu pluralizmu, ki ga nekatere države celo postavijo za svoje družbeno merilo. V sredini 60. let je bila ideja o kulturnem pluralizmu znotraj ene države, novost in je izzvenela nekoliko idealistično, v smislu pričakovanja in ne še realnost. Na tem Brumen gradi svojo antropologijo, na spoštovanju drugega in drugih kultur. Predvsem pa spoštuje kulturo iz neposrednega življenjskega okolja, se od nje uči in oplaja. Hkrati pa s polno odgovornostjo ohranja materin jezik in izvorno izročilo.

³¹ Vinko Brumen, Po dialogu k spravi in enotnosti. *Meddobje XXIV*, 1989, št. 1-2

³² Vinko Brumen, *Iskanja*, SKA Buenos Aires, 1967, str. 183

³³ op.cit., str. 201

*SUMMARY THE ROLE OF INTELLECTUALS IN THE SOUTH
AMERICAN SLOVENIAN COMMUNITY*

The public activity of Louis Adamič, as well as his literary work acquired a lot of interest in the South American Slovenian press. We can find a lot of new and commentaries during the second world war about the activity of SANS in the left oriented papers, as well as in the cultural magazine *Duhovno življenje*. There is no writer we can compare with Adamič among the intellectuals active in the pre-war Slovenian community. Gvidon Jug, from Gorica, undoubtedly a good narrator, was writing only in Slovene, also the most important editor and publicist, Viktor Kjuder, did not enter into the Spanish speaking cultural world. Despite this, we can compare the work of Kjuder as a journalist and editor with the one of Adamič for the freshness, the penetrating style and the actuality. Viktor Kjuder, Slovenian from Trieste, was there journalist of the newspaper *Edinost* until his forced leaving for Argentina. In 1933 he founded an independent weekly paper in Buenos Aires, *Novi list*.

After the arrival in 1936 of Dr. Izidor Cankar, the new Ambassador of Yugoslavia, Kjuder became his personal secretary and at the end of the war Charge d'Affairs in the same embassy. He was at charge until the recognition of the new Yugoslavia from Argentina and he also hand it over to the first diplomatic representative of the new authorities. In this paper we find the analysis of Kjuder's publicistic opus, which is divided in two parts: before the 2. world war and during the war years, till the restitution of Primorska to Slovenia and Yugoslavia.

Within the Slovenian community which was formed with the arrival of anti-Communist refugees after 1948, it is possible underline the role of two intellectuals: Ruda Jurčec and Dr. Vinko Brumen. Jurčec is a distinctive political publicist who was concerned about the events in Slovenia. On the other hand, Brumen made a philosophical interpretations and analyzed the essence of the emigrant life. He dedicated a special concern to the deep dilemmas of his own community. Despite their particular points of view, both remained inside the Slovenian community and published only in Slovenian.

PROBLEM DIASPORE V RAZMIŠLJANJIH SLOVENSkih ZDOMSKIH INTELEKTUALCEV PO LETU 1945

Slovenski protikomunistični begunci po letu 1945 v svet niso šli prostovoljno. V tujini so se znašli po sili razmer, mnogi so bežali tudi zato, da bi si rešili golo življenje. Morda so šele tedaj v novem prostoru dodobra doumeli totalno naravo revolucije, oziroma protirevolucije. To domneva v svoji obsežni rekonstrukciji in (ali) interpretaciji slovenske dramatične Sveta vojna – Dramatika slovenske politične emigracije 1 – na str. 5 dr. Taras Kermauner (Slovenski gledališki muzej, Ljubljana 1997). Že so bili v vojnih razmejevanjih morda še lokalno omejeni na domače kraje in ljudi, na simpatije ali antipatije v krajevni skupnosti, v verskem občestvu, na delovnem mestu, se je pri določenem številu razumnikov zlasti v zdomstvu onstran Oceanov začel oglašati razmislek o ideološkem pomenu političnega pa tudi kulturnopolitičnega akcionizma. Predvsem soustanovitelj in urednik vodilne zdomske revije *Meddobje* Ruda Jurčec je skušal slovensko emigracijo preplesti z globalnimi obeležji. Čutil je, da se slovenski politični begunci ločijo od prejšnjih, predvsem ekonomskih valov in v redkih primerih pustolovskih poti slovenskega izseljevanja. Slovenski politični begunec je nenadoma dobil nove, skorajda religiozne in metafizične razsežnosti. Postal je pripadnik prave vere, ki ga je težka usoda prestavila v odločilne preizkušnje. Te bodo lahko pomembne za nadaljnji razvoj celotnega naroda. V tem smislu je že leta 1954 definiral usodo po svetu razkropljenih begunskih političnih razumnikov na ta presežni način: Ne bi si upal trditi, da smo samo še emigracija. Grozeči potek dogodkov, ki smo jim priča, nas vedno bolj spravlja v tesnobno razmerje z narodom, ki živi na domači grudi. Blagrujemo ga, obenem pa se tresemo za njegovo usodo, saj je po pesnikovih besedah postavljen v osrčje Evrope, saj je »prstan Evropini«. Toda nevarni razvoj dogodkov grozi zlomiti ta rahli prstan, večji narodi, kot je naš, imajo razlogov dovolj, da se plaše pred katastrofo.

Vedno bolj se nam bo treba spraševati, ali nismo mogoče že diaspora. Izraelu je diaspora skozi stoletja reševala vero v narodno in duhovno rešitev. Ta diaspora pa je mogla svojo nalogo opravljati samo zaradi tega, ker se je trdno postavila na temelje verskih in kulturnih tradicij. Pogosto se je zdelo, da je bil Izrael zapisan smrti - njegovo poslanstvo so reševali glasniki njegovih duhovnih dobrin, ki se niso odrekli svojemu poslanstvu, dasi so živeli raztreseni v vseh delih sveta.« (*Meddobje*, leto I., št. 1, SKA, Buenos Aires 1954, str. 1).

Jurčec je protislovnost osebna, ki radikalizira problem slovenstva. Vendar ga postavlja v poseben okvir iz vrednot in kvalitete. Za to je odgovoren kulturni delavec, ki mora svoj ustvarjalni delež tudi zdaj iz diaspore prinašati celotnemu slovenskemu narodu. Ko se Jurčec ob znanem sporu pri Slovenski kulturni akciji odtrga od *Meddobja*, začne pri svojem novem časopisu *Sij slovenske svobode* v svoji zadnji delovni fazi s političnim slovenstvom. Vendar se še vedno giblje na duhovni podlagi, ko skuša svoj nacionalizem povezati z oblikovanjem temeljnih načel slovenske državnosti, katere nujna posledica je ločitev Slovencev od Jugoslavije. Pri tem se zavzema za internacionalne kriterije tako v političnem

kot tudi duhovnem smislu. Čeprav se kot literat bori proti kozmopolitizmu, se istočasno zavzema za veliko svetovno republiko svobodnih duhov, ki je ne bo mogla omejevati nobena zavesa ali pregraja.

Na poseben način pristopa k problematiki slovenske politične emigracije tudi jezuitski duhovnik, pesnik Vladimir Kos, ki živi na Japonskem. V eseju »Tetralogija Slovenije« (Meddobje, l. XXIV, št. 3-4, Buenos Aires 1989, str. 282) loči ekonomsko izseljensko od ideološkega, saj med drugim zapiše:

»Ideološki izseljenec...je...kot množičen pojav po Drugi svetovni vojni... nekaj novega v zgodovini Slovencev. Za takšen pojav je izraz 'ideološki izseljenec' površen; izseliti se pomeni več ali manj nenasilen izhod iz domovine; možno je, da se kdo izseli iz Slovenije, ker se ne strinja s politično linijo vladajoče KP, a kljub temu ostane prepričan komunist...(Pojem) ideološkega izseljenca bi bolje označili z izrazom 'politični izgnanec' odnosno 'politična izgnanka': zmaga komunistične revolucije leta 1945 v Sloveniji je tisočerm Slovencem vsilila beg v tujino, da se izognejo skoraj gotovi nasilni smrti, kot je doletela z zvijačo vrnjene in brez pravega sodnega postopka nasilno usmrčene tisočere domobrance...«

Ob koncu pa še pristavi: *»Slovinci vseh štirih Slovenij (namreč osrednje Slovenije, zamejstva, izseljenstva in političnega izgnanstva, op. L.D.) smo povezani med seboj, v kolikor smo zmožni, da se priznavamo k živi zgodovini naroda, ki so ga ozemlje, govorica, demokratični čut in katoliško krščanstvo uvrstili med značilne in enakovredne narode sveta, in ki z vso svojo narodno zmogljivostjo teži po naravni dovršenosti, ki mu jo nudi le neodvisna slovenska država.«* (Meddobje, l. XXIV, št.1-2, str. 295).

Eden vodilnih zdomskih pesnikov, politični emigrant France Papež, razmeji eksistencialno in ustvarjalno ploskev zdomstva od domovine na poseben način. V esejistični knjigi *Zapisi iz zdomstva* (SKA, Buenos Aires 1978, ponatis je izšel leta 1992 v Ljubljani) zapiše, da je *»zdomstvo..., če ga definiramo s heideggerjevskim opisom - oditi z-doma, ne biti doma, izseliti se med vojnami in revolucijami, v povojnem odisejskem vračanju. Je biti mrtev za svoj prvi svet in začeti eksistirati v drugem.«* (str. 44).

Toda kaj je ta Papežev prvi in drugi svet? Prvi svet imenuje pesnik tudi *»zgornji svet«*, medtem ko je drugi *»spodnji svet«*. Prvi svet je svet Slovenije, pesnikova ožja domovina. S tem svetom je prepleten literarni svet slovenskega ekspresionizma, moderne, revolucije...Tu se nahaja tudi notranji svet duha, vere, spominov. Spodnji svet pa je svet zdomstva. Definira ga na svojski poetično-ontološki način:

»Svet zdomstva pa je postavljen v ameriški prostor in predvsem v arhaični indijanski svet, ki vsebuje vrednote, kjer se zgodba emigracije najlaže znajde. A tu je tudi mesto, Buenos Aires s svojo okolico, druga mesta zdomstva, skupni domovi...Vendar je vse nekoliko mitizirano in metafizično predahnjeno. Bralec bo spoznal to krhkost in polivalentnost svetov, ko se bo zavedel, da bere našo - Komedijo.« (citirano iz knjige: Andrej Rot, *Republika duhov*, DZS, Ljubljana 1994)

Papeževa razpetost med dva svetova se značilno zrcali iz njegove sicer lapidarno kratke, a bistvene ugotovitve: *»Sem na poti - bi dejal z Levstikom - od Litije do... konca sveta. In prav ta pot me intenzivno vrača v domače.«* (*Zapisi iz zdomstva*, SKA, Buenos Aires 1977, str. 58).

Očitno pa je, da je domotožje zaradi izgubljene domovine spodbuda za kreativno soočanje s spremenjeno bivanjsko eksistenco, kar pogodi nove možnosti literarnega izraza in ustvari ob stiku z južnoameriškimi danostmi in kulturami drugačno strukturo duhovnega in literarnega sporočila.

Jasno je, da se Papeževo stališče bistveno loči od Jurčevega začetnega izhodišča o slovenski diaspori v prvi številki *Meddobja*. Približuje se tistemu nepolitičnemu konceptu, ki ga je v nasprotju z Jurčevimi izvajanji že leta 1955 v tretji knjigi buenosaireškega zbornika *Vrednote* definiral pedagog, sociolog in filozof Vinko Brumen na konkreten in pragmatičen način. V sestavku *Nekatera vprašanja naše kulturne rasti* je menil, da je po slovenski begunski preselitvi v tujino, ki je pomenila prehod iz domačega kulturnega okolja v tuje, z vsemi to dogajanje spremljajočimi travmatičnimi problemi nastale desadaptacije, potrebna nova prilagoditev, oziroma adaptacija v okolju s tujim jezikom in tujo kulturo.

V eseju »Temelji medsebojne strpnosti« (*Vrednote II*, Buenos Aires 1954, str. 53-67) razčlenjuje tudi vprašanje narodnosti in možne zamenjave le-te, razmišlja o dolžnosti do rodne domovine in o slovenstvu zdomske mladine. Kot piše Andrej Rot v svoji knjigi *Republika duhov* na strani 90, ugotavlja Brumen, da je pojem narodnosti analogen, hkrati pa dinamičen in spremenljiv. Pri vprašanju transkulturalizacije (menjave narodnosti) poskuša odgovoriti na več vprašanj. Trdi, da je menjava narodnosti lahko etično neoporečna in v nekaterih okoliščinah »celo nekaj pozitivnega, ne samo dovoljenega, celo zaslužnega« (v svoji knjigi *Iskanja*, SKA, Buenos Aires 1967, str. 221). Sprašuje se tudi, ali ima naseljenc sploh še kakšne dolžnosti do svoje rodne domovine. Ugotavlja, da odnos z domovino ureja krepost pietete, ki se izraža predvsem v spoštovanju, ljubezni in pokorščini do nje. Ni pa več mogoče odgovoriti na vprašanje, kako daleč segajo in kako naj se izražajo te kreposti pri tistih, ki živijo izven rodne domovine v tujih deželah.

Že v prvi publikaciji slovenskih političnih beguncev v Argentini, *Koledarju svobodne Slovenije* za leto 1949, je Brumen v sestavku »V Novem svetu - Kvišku srca« nedvoumno in optimistično usmeril pogled k dejanski stvarnosti, v kateri se je znašel slovenski zdomec na tujih tleh. Med drugim je opozoril na nove razglede, ki jih v novem svetu lahko pridobi slovenski izseljenec. Zapisal je bodrilne besede:

»Naprej glejmo, ne nazaj! - Vživeti se je treba«. (str. 40). Istočasno pa je tudi poudaril, »da nam nihče ne more in ne sme vzeti naše ljubezni do stare domovine in do slovenskega naroda... Svojo ljubezen do domovine bomo najlepše pokazali, če se bomo tukaj izkazali. Ljudje bodo po nas sodili naš narod... Najbolje bomo storili, če bomo znali združevati ljubezen do stare domovine z resnim delom za novo; tudi sami bomo imeli od tega največ koristi« (str. 41-42).

Podoba je, da v primeri z Jurčevevo tezo o slovenski diaspori kažejo Brumnova izvajanja popolnoma drugačno usmeritev. Medtem ko Jurčec išče novo nalogo zdomskega intelektualnega slovenstva v idealni Utopiji z odločilnimi pozitivnimi posledicami za vso Slovenijo, se Brumen osredotoča na celotno slovensko izseljenstvo v konkretnem zdaj in tukaj. Jurčeva usmerjenost je elitna, namenjena razsvetljenim višjim izbrancem s posebnimi daljnosežnimi nalogami, Brumnova izvajanja pa temelje na kmečki treznosti, meniški kreposti in realni psihologiji o problemih prilagajanja oziroma adaptacije v novem okolju. Pri tem ne začudi, da je Brumen pri ortodoksnih političnih emigraciji večkrat naletel na nerazumevanje. Tako mu Jurčec v pismu z dne 13. septembra 1966 v zvezi s sodelovanjem v Glasu SKA in *Meddobju* kot urednik očita, da je »Tvoja zadnja glosa trpela na nekaj hi-bah... Vem pa, da bi bil avtor eseja o Vebri sposoben zgraditi drugače in bolj učinkovito«. (Glej tudi *Meddobje*, l. XXXII, št. 1-2, Buenos Aires 1998, str. 170)

Brumen je bil, če pomislimo na njegove sposobnosti in marljiva vsestranska prizadevanja, pri glavnih oblikovalcih kulturne politike v argentinskem slovenskem zdomstvu

preveč odrinjen na sekundarno ploskev. Njegova filozofska in sociološka razmišljanja so v ospredju zdomskega kulturnega dogajanja predolgo veljala za nekaj marginalnega, ne preveč pomembnega in zavezujočega.

Dejstvo je, da so se Brumnove teze o prilagajanju novemu okolju zazdele tudi marsikomu v zamejstvu več ali manj vprašljive. Zlasti mnogi zdovski razumniki, ki so ostali v zamejstvu v Trstu, Gorici ali na Koroškem, so želeli še naprej ohranjati zvestobo tako slovenski kulturni dediščini kot tudi preveč ideološko razumljeni katoliški tradiciji.

Med temi je morda posebno značilna pozicija pristašev predvojnega stražarskega gibanja, še posebej pesnika Vinka Beličiča iz Trsta, ki je svoje literarno poslanstvo doumel tudi kot varovanje duhovnih vrednot, (samo)založbo Tabor, pri kateri je objavil nekaj knjig, pa je v tem smislu jasno označil kot simbolično založbo, ki pomeni »*utrdbo, branik, skoraj bi rekel falango*« (glej: Marij Maver, »Vinka Beličiča pogled nazaj«, *Mladika*, Trst 1983, str. 63). Toda taka pozicija bi, v nasprotju z Brumnovo, mogla hitro pripeljati do popolne getoizacije slovenskega zdomskega udejstvovanja.

Tematiko diaspore je na zelo svoboden način začrtal že v prvem *Koledarju svobodne Slovenije* za leto 1949 dr. Tine Debeljak - (ps. Jeremija Kalin). V pesnitvi *Slovenska izseljenska kolednica* za leto 1949 je objavil tudi te karakteristične verze:

V IMENU DUHA

*piš jader pregnal nam je leta suha,
zdaj smo ogledniki
v deželi Kanaan: so krave egipčanske debele,
v žito se vgrezamo kot v glen...Smo čebele:
iz žuljev krvavih se nam med pocedi,
v satjih nam raste sladkost napuha,
zlat prah se nabira krog nog - in krog duha...
Zapojmo slovenski koledniki:
BOG-DUH, razvej z naših src plevi!*

Bolj kot načrtovalec novih vizij, je Debeljak kronist trpke emigrantske usode, splošno razgedani vzpodbujevalec kulturnih aktivnosti, ki naj ob več ali manj problematični slovenski književnosti v komunistični domovini ustvarijo drugo, paralelno književnost slovenske krščansko-humanistične emigracije. Podoba je, da se mu je tak projekt vsaj na začetku več ali manj posrečil. Na vprašanje, ali je pozneje postajal zgolj mit, bodo morali odgovoriti literarni zgodovinarji.

Vsekakor se je ob usihanju literarnih moči kljub dotoku mlajših peres iz druge vrste že v tujini rojenih ali vsaj izšolanih ustvarjalcev začel krhati prvotni elan vital. Pomembni zdovski filozof Milan Komar ni zaman v knjigi *Pot iz mrtvila* (SKA, Buenos Aires 1965) svaril pred psihološko in družabno smrtjo v slovenskih skupnostih. Menil je, da je »*pot iz mrtvila le ena, zanesljiva in trdna: pot duhovnega razmaha, pot resnično človeka vredne rasti*« (str. 67).

Brumen je večkrat svaril pred negativnimi posledicami »*vase zaprte slovenske kulture*« s temu načinu nasprotno nevarnostjo utopitve in asimilacije v tujem okolju. Dejstva govorijo, da je slovenska politična emigracija v petdesetletni zgodovini šla skozi več različnih faz. Po eni strani se je uresničevala Jurčeveva želja po visoki poklicanosti poslanstva

v diaspori, po drugi strani pa je realni razvoj vodil od »žlahntnih« idealov tudi k mlačnosti, nenačelnosti in oportunitizmu, kot nam v literarnem delu *Argentina* (založba Modrijan, Ljubljana 1997) sporoča pisatelj Tone Brulc.

To posthumno objavljeno Brulčevo delo ni le proti uradnemu zgodovinoписju in zamolčavanju stvarnih dejstev zapisani moralistični opomin, temveč z mnogimi stvarnimi detajli dokumentirani pregled slovenske argentinske stvarnosti iz posebnega, alternativnega, oziroma za »uradne politike« najrazličnejših barv in veroizpovedi skorajda subverzivnega zornega kota. Slovensko življenje v zdomstvu opazuje brez plašnic čez oči, analizira ga zelo natančno in pozorno ter tako, da bralec istočasno med vrsticami začuti nevarni utrip 20. stoletja. Poleg ponovnega ovrednotenja argentinskih slovenskih začetkov v idealistični vzajemnosti zaradi izgubljene domovine povezane slovenske zdomske skupnosti ne skopari s kritiko na račun poznejšega oportunitizma in privatnega koristoljubja. Brulc poroča v stilu prizadetega kronista najprej o prvih slovenskih letih v Argentini, ki so bila, kot zapiše, »za veliko večino trda in okrutna«. V posameznih včasih dokaj različnih poglavjih z raznovrstnimi epizodami nam avtor predstavi različne usode slovenskih emigrantov. Opisuje postopne diferenciacije v zdomstvu, razkol med bazo iz preprostih kmečko-delavskih slojev in politiki iz nekdanjih »boljših« slovenskih krogov tam zgoraj, ki hočejo tudi v novih emigrantskih razmerah voditi, ukazovati in manipulirati z ljudmi. Zato ne preseneti, da je za Brulčevo *Argentino* značilen poseben pogled na spreminjajočo se strukturo slovenske emigracije z vedno bolj opazno razpoko med bazo in njenim domnevnim elitarnim vodstvom. Tega Brulc vedno znova ostro kritizira in ironizira. Na koncu poskrbi še za presenetljivo, čeprav ne povsem prepričljivo izpeljano zgodbo. Na primeru sinov dveh slovenskih domobrancev, ki se priključita argentinski levičarski gverili za »*revolucionarno osvoboditev izkoriščanih ljudi*«, skuša predstaviti vedno znova v različnih oblikah se ponavljajoče upe in privide po boljšem in čistejšem življenju, ki se končajo v primežih nasilja in smrti. Pika na i pa je na koncu kravja kupčija slovenskih levičarjev in desničarjev, ki bi se radi dogovorili o nekakšni spravi, čeprav niso nikoli spremenili svojega enodimenzionalnega in polaščevalnega mišljenja. In ni v tej kritiki zajet očitek o pomanjkanju tolerance in upoštevanja drugega, o čemer je veliko pisal zlasti Vinko Brumen? Morda je zaradi takih negativnih vedenjskih načinov več ali manj usihala tudi Jurčeveva vizija »*diaspore, ki je stoletja reševala vero v narodno in duhovno rešitev*«. Ob demokratizaciji v Sloveniji je tej viziji zmanjkal osrednji steber: ideološki nasprotnik. Toda Jurčeveva zamisel nacionalnega ustvarjanja na temeljih verskih in kulturnih tradicij v svetu svobodnih duhov ob soočanjih z mednarodnimi razsežnostmi je še vedno lahko tvorna in vzpodbudna tako za ustvarjalca z osrednji domovini kot tudi za vztrajajoče pisce v izvrženosti velikega sveta.

*SUMMARY REFLECTIONS OF SLOVENE INTELLECTUALS ABROAD
CONCERNING THE PROBLEM
OF THE DIASPORA AFTER 1945*

The co-founder and editor of the Slovene emigrant journal *Meddobje* (Interval) Ruda Jurčec as early as 1954 defined the fate of the Slovene emigrant intelligentsia scattered throughout the world after 1945 in a superlative manner: »I would not venture to assert that what we are doing is still only emigration... It is increasingly necessary to ask ourselves whether we are already perhaps a diaspora. For Israel the diaspora throughout the centuries restored faith in national and spiritual salvation...« (*Meddobje*, no. 1, Vol. I, Buenos Aires, 1954, p. 1).

Where Jurčec attempted to rely on the strength and mission of a meritorious national culture in a global »republic of free spirits«, Vinko Brumen analysed various principal problems of the emigrant circumstance in a paper entitled »Some questions of our cultural growth« (in the journal *Vrednote* (Values), book 3, Buenos Aires, 1955) in a concrete and pragmatic fashion. He believed that after the settling of Slovene refugees abroad, which represented a transition from the domestic cultural environment to a foreign one, with all of the accompanying traumatic problems, a »misadaptation« occurred which would require new adjustment or adaptation to an environment with a foreign language and a foreign culture.

Has the Slovene »diaspora« succeeded in this adaptation in the manner recommended by Brumen in his articles, when he warned against the negative consequences of »your closed Slovene culture«, this manner being opposed to the concurrent danger of sinking into and assimilation into the foreign environment? The facts indicate that Slovene emigration has gone through a number of different phases in its fifty-year history. On one hand there is the realization of Jurčec's wish for a higher calling of the mission in the diaspora, and on the other the actual development of being led from noble ideals to apathy, lack of principle and opportunism, as reported by writer Tone Brulc in his literary work *Argentina* (Ljubljana 1997).

JANEZ BENIGAR – ARAUCANIAN SLOVENE

Janez, Ivan or Juan Benigar – for the sake of truth – is neither in Slovenia nor in the rest of the world among known names, not as an emigrant or scientist, although among the Argentinean anthropologists he is highly respected. Some newspaper articles even consider him the greatest anthropologist in Argentina. He is well known and appreciated in places where he lived since his arrival in Argentina in 1908 and until his death in 1950, not only as an anthropologist but as well as successful engineer (although without a degree), producer of watering systems, a fighter for the rights of the native Indian people Araucanians.

Most merit for the fact that we in Slovenia and elsewhere know at all about this hidden great mind, go to the architect Viktor Sulčič and Dr. Irene Mislej. Dr. Mislej presented Benigar's life and work to the Slovene public¹. The endeavours of the anthropologist Dr. Zmago Šmitek and journalist Svetozar Guček are also to be considered. Although the mentioned authors have published two books about Benigar I believe my paper will be welcome for two reasons:

– It will help to preserve and revive the memory of this great but unfortunately too modest a man, »intellectual« in a special kind of »diaspora«, and give at least slight knowledge and information to the unacquainted,

– I hope the paper, written from my point of view, will bring some new knowledge or conclusions and that my report on visiting the places where Benigar lived, might suggest new ideas how to bring the »white chief« (»el casique blanco«) nearer to our and wider public comprehending.

The paper is composed of the introduction, a short biography of Benigar, and a treatise on Benigar as an anthropologist and personality, and of my experience when visiting »his« places.

*Biography*²

Ivan Benigar was born in 1883 to Slovene parents in Zagreb. The father was from

¹ Viktor Sulčič wrote a book about Benigar: *Juan Benigar – El sabio que murio sentado* (Buenos Aires 1970), while Irene Mislej published in Slovenia selected translations and comments of his work and life in a book *Janez Benigar – Izbrano gradivo (Selected Materials)* (Znanstveni inštitut FF, Ljubljana 1988).

² Benigar's biography is resumed from:

Mislej, 1988:99-112

Guček, 1980:30

Biografía de Juan Benigar, Biblioteca Municipal »Juan Benigar«, Plaza Hiuncul (no date), other articles

Trnovo near Ilirska Bistrica, the mother from Dobrava near Radeče.³ In 1902 he graduated in Zagreb and went to Graz and Prague to study building. Beside that he studied medicine, philosophy and philology. At the age of 21 he mastered Slovene, Croatian, German, Czech, Slovakian, Greek, Latin, Bulgarian, Russian, English, French and Italian languages and Sanskrit. In 1903 he went by foot to Bulgaria, to Varna. On his way he made a living by teaching. He also noted linguistic and ethnologic particulars. In 1904 he wrote and published a Bulgarian Grammar. In 1907 he went from Graz to Prague to study, but after a year, just before the diploma, left for Argentina. He stopped in Buenos Aires but soon went on, to less inhabited places. Thus he arrived among the Indians on the Southwest border of Pampa. In 1910 he married a grand daughter of the last chief of the Indian dynasty Catriel, Euphemia Sheypukin Barraza. They lived in Cipolleti and had 12 children whom he gave Western and Indian names. He became known as a planner of watering systems, organiser of works and an untiring worker as he with his hands dug kilometres of canals. By day he was an Indian and chief of the family and a (miserably paid) worker, by night he converted into a thinker, we may say scientist. He wrote numerous dissertations from the fields of anthropology, archaeology, numismatics, history, politics and philology, mainly considering Indian culture. He left behind at least 375 booklets of notes (Mañana del Sur, 15th October 1995:31). On contents of his work more in continuation.

In 1932 his wife died in Kellen-ko. He moved from the estate where he worked back to the Indians, got married for the second time and had five more children. He lived in the valley of Ruca Choroi (Home of the Parrots) near a small predominantly Indian mountain settlement Alumine. With his family he ran a weaving factory and the products were known far around. Benigar died in 1950, a day after he wrote his will.

It should be emphasised that he all along lived in great poverty. He had to keep a numerous family, the owners of the land and watering systems took advantage of his honesty and he did not care too much about contracts as he strictly promoted the principle of »word of honour«. Benigar did not like civilisation. In all his years in Argentina he was in Buenos Aires once – for one day, and in the regional centre Neuquen twice. He never flew by plane (until 1929 when he stated that, he had not even seen one), only once he drove in a car....

This short and simplified biography is a necessary basis for the continuation of the treatise about Juan Benigar as an European intellectual among South American Indians who practised to extreme, to ideal the anthropological approach »observation with participation«.

Why at all did Benigar leave Europe, why so far, into an entirely different culture?

Already as a student he read a lot and had enormous knowledge. He was enthusiastic about the ethnic naturalism of J. J. Rousseau. He determined the deficiencies brought with the fast development of civilisation, the egoism of modern society. In European culture he felt limited, it seemed to him he had no opportunities to develop his personality. Distant spaces of the world attracted him. He dreamt of them as a child from the moment on he read a small book about Araucanians. The growing corruption and artificialness of

kept in the Archives of the Library Juan Benigar in Cutral Co, and the Memorial Centre »Juan Benigar« in Alumine.

³ In his sole autobiographic letter to Dr. Anton Debeljak in 1938 he wrote: »By my parents I am Slovene, by place of birth and education Croatian«.

life in the then European towns – he himself was always a follower of total truth – and the growing threatening feeling of the urge of fight for survival in the industrial society, worse and worse apathy of people... stimulated his decision. He left for a world where he expected a simple, honourable, uncomplicated life. (Sulčič, 1970:14)

Benigar told Viktor Sulčič about his decision and the reason for it: »*What you call civilisation I came familiar with as a young man and if I renounced it I had certain reasons. Among the strongest was my conviction that was not civilisation. That is why I prefer to be here, where I am, far away from large towns, living as I wish and feeling completely happy. For nothing and for nobody in this world I would not change my way of life for any other way...*« (Sulčič, 1970:252).

As we will see Benigar's wish did not mean he decided to give up intellectual life, on the contrary, among the Indians on the border of Pampa he, despite economic difficulties and everyday hard physical work, achieved what he was seeking: freedom for development of his great mind.

Among Benigar's famous works is the ethnologic and archaeological dissertation *El problema del hombre Americano*, in which he for example seeks philological similarities between the languages of the Aborigines from New Zealand and Indians in Peru, compares the symbolic in ancient drawings from Peru and Polynesia. He also writes about the pre Columbian Indian religions (In: Mislej, 1988:52-53). Most significant is a row of dissertation *La Patagonia piensa*, which he wrote in 1936 and published from 1945 to 1947 as a feuilleton in a weekly Neuquen (in 1978 a book with the same title was published). In it Benigar defends with no compromise the rights of the Indians and criticises the Argentinian centralist policy and the exaggerated nationalism, he stands for regionalisation which would ease solving the problems of the Indians. He also writes about social themes.

In his dissertation »*Crecencias Araucanas*« – »*Araucanian Beliefs*«, published in the book *El Tronco de Oro* (1968), he describes the beliefs of the Araucanians, explains the role of the numbers, good and evil gods, witchcraft, occultism, stresses the respect of ancestors and »mother earth« with Araucanians etc. It is interesting he opposed to Darwin and wrote about the realisation of evolution through reincarnations. He believed in the supernatural being, the »creative spirit« (»*espíritu creador*«), in the universal spirit.

Prominent Works

Bulgarian Grammar (1904)

El Concepto del Tiempo entre los Araucanos – The Question of Time with Araucanians

El Concepto del Espacio entre los Araucanos – The Question of Space with Araucanians

El Concepto de la Casualidad entre los Araucanos – The Question of Causality with Araucanians (Academia Argentina de la Historia, 1925-1927)

»*Tomas Falkner*« – *Descripcion de la Patagonia – Tomas Falkner – Description of Patagonia*

»*El Calvario de una tribu (Estudio social)*« – »*The Calvary of a Tribe (A Social Study)*«.

In: *Biblos*, 11. 3. 1926. Azul

»*Los Chinos y los Japoneses en America*« – »*Chinese and Japanese in America*«. In: *La Voz del Territorio*, Zapala.

El problema del Hombre Americano – Questions on American Man (Bahia Blanca, 1928)

La Patagonia piensa – Patagonia Contemplates (feuilleton, a reprint published in a book, Buenos Aires, 1978)

El Diccionario Araucano – Araucanian Dictionary (not published)

»Creanicas Araucanas« – »Araucanian Beliefs«, in: Gregorio Alvarez: *El Tronco del oro*. Buenos Aires 1968.

Newspaper articles in Argentinean papers mark Benigar as an »*European thinker*« (»*el sabio europeo*«), »*white chief*« (»*el casique blanco*«) and similar. Some even consider him the greatest philosopher in Patagonia in the 20th century or the greatest anthropologist in South America (Guček, 1982).

Benigar – Anthropologist and Indian

We could write a number of treatises on the work of Benigar. In this contribution I will focus on Janez Benigar the anthropologist or more precisely on his research position which because of its specificity hardly serves as an example. It is more an ideal, extremity, and a complete realisation of the anthropological research approach »*fieldwork*« or »*observation with participation*«.

Let me in the preface resume the basic principles of the mentioned technique.⁴ »*Observation with participation*« enables approach to the objective on the human level as conversation is informal and improvised, although based on a determined goal. This method is reliable with subtle themes when the participants define and express their feelings with difficulty. Thus their behaviour is not unnatural. »*Observation with participation*« which belongs in the frame of the methodology of »*fieldwork*« is based above all on empathy, accustoming to the life of the target group, understanding a certain culture on the basis of observation of their everyday life. In such a manner the researcher earns confidence and achieves the people around him behave as if he were one of them. Such must be his personal experience, he must »*get under the skin*« of the natives (Barfield, 1997:191). The followers of this classical anthropological approach swear to the significance of the researcher's personal experience. Such research should last (Russel) approximately one year with an obligatory pause. When we think we have discovered it all and when we are maybe too much accustomed to the new culture, we form intimate relations, become bias, then it is better we leave for a while.

The majority of the work documentation should be based on daily notes and informal interviews. Russel enumerates the important moments and characteristics an anthropologist should master in »*observation with participation*«: he must overcome the initial cultural shock, adapt to the conditions, achieve that the locals do not consider him a stranger or at least that they behave as if he were not there, thus natural. The researcher must master the language of the locals. Only by knowing their language he can communicate on a natural human level. The moment of leaving the researched community is important as well, when the researcher returns back to his culture, leaving behind the »*live laboratory*«.

At this point I am going back to Juan Benigar again who never returned »*home*«.

⁴ The principles »*observation with participation*« are summed from the instructions by Bernard Russel in the book *Research Methods in Cultural Anthropology* (pp. 148-224) and *The Dictionary of Anthropology* (pp. 188-190 and 348). Many anthropologists practised observation with participation, among them Edmund Leach (in Sri Lanka), Thomas H. Ericson (in Seychelles), Bronislaw Malinowsky etc.

Entirely different, phenomenal are as well other facts about his »researcher« life. It is to stress that he did not arrive among the Araucanians with an explicit intention to research them. Already this fact mists the image of a standard researcher. Benigar above all came to live in a different culture. Thus we are at the next point – Benigar's acculturation (more on that in continuation). He was more than maximally emphatic as he decided for a complete adoption of the Indian culture, married a native woman and raised children in Indian (not European) culture. For him there was actually no »cultural shock«. He overcame it before living in the community, as a physical worker. He partly knew Spanish that the majority of Araucanians speak, before his arrival to South America. As a talented linguist he soon learned the Araucanian language.

Of the mentioned »rules« for research work he of course lacks the »pause« and the »return« into his original culture, that is – distance from the researched group – one of the scruples about the method »observation with participation« is non-objectiveness of such research. As already mentioned Benigar came among the Araucanians above all to live and not to do research. The latter proceeded along, »from inside«, when he was already part of the community. His phenomena is in the fact that he was able – despite his emotional attachment and complete adoption of a new culture, in the evening after a whole-day physical work – to enter into the world of science in which he meditated in a manner of an European intellectual with a special privilege. As a scientist he was not aggravated with the surroundings, with in Europe valid social rules. Although he was in permanent contact with Slovenes in Argentina as well as with colleagues in Europe and although he was all the time currently acquainted with expert literature, he was yet outside that world and his time, thus in an opposite position from other researchers...

Benigar and Acculturation

The word »acculturation« means above all a contact of two cultures – on the individual level it proceeds to the notion of »socialisation« and other notions connected with adjusting of an individual or a minority to a majority or to the culture of the majority. Acculturation comprises not only adopting cultural characteristics of the dominant community but as well the mutual influence – demographic, economic, language and ideological changes.⁵ (A typical aggressive colonisation or contact was that of the European and the Indian cultures – the latter in that case being inferior and the new culture overruled it.)

An individual (or group) as a rule goes through long-lasting phases of the process of cultural assimilation or changing: the first contact between different cultures respectively their representatives, communication, evaluation of values, estimation, complete or partial acceptance of conceptions of life or selection, integration and co-ordination of initial dispositions, assimilation as the ultimate phase of the acculturation process, the point where there are no more cultural antagonisms. The latter is possible only after a few generations (Južnič, 1978:525) when some of the cultural patterns are so deeply implanted in an individual or a group that they cannot be »forgotten« on the perceptive level. The speed of acculturation process depends on the distinction of the dominant culture – the more it is different the later assimilation will complete.

⁵ Južnič 1978:514, *Leksikon CZ*, 1986:12, *The Dictionary*, 1997:1.

And Juan Benigar? Again we can speak of a phenomena. With his entrance into Indian culture he adopted without selection all its elements, completely adjusted to it, consciously resocialized himself, adopted even the Indian religion (of help was his theosophical universalistic belief). He persistently taught his own children the disappearing Araucanian language etc. At the same time he was far from rejecting his original culture from which he came. He preserved respect towards it although he strongly despised European civilisation. He had permanent contacts with fellow-countrymen and with interest followed the events on the territory of Yugoslavia,⁶ participated in academic discussions and criticised some famous Argentinean scientists. He wrote dictionaries, translated. In a textile workshop with which he wanted to help to preserve economic independence of the Indians, he introduced western technological results. Maybe the most important is the fact that he was in 1924 appointed corresponding fellow to the Argentinean Academy for History (Academia Nacional de la Historia). In short, maybe it was for the expressive diversity of the culture in which he grew up and the culture for which he consciously decided for, that he managed to preserve his European, conditionally we may even say »Croatian-Slovene« ethnic identity. We must also take into consideration that he was not a »classical« emigrant, as he did not emigrate for economic or political but exclusively personal reasons. He did not move to a place where he could settle and earn his living with ease, but went into a completely new, different world. His acculturation did not follow the standard pattern: partly unconscious acceptance of a new culture. He was conscious about it and at the same time he did not »forget« the positive of what he »brought« with him from Europe (technical, philosophical... knowledge). In his cultural position of a European intellectual amidst a »primitive« culture we may even compare him with missionaries – although we know Benigar himself was not announcing a new religion. He adapted to the ancient Indian beliefs.

My meeting with »Benigar«

I came to Alumine, still predominantly an Indian settlement, where Benigar lived the rest of his life, with the help of a Slovene couple Mari and Milan Keržič from Buenos Aires. From the near San Martin (approximately 120 kilometres) we drove on the 21st of April 1997 to Alumine where we looked for one of Benigar's sons, Alejandro Manque Benigar (manque in Araucanian language means condor). He was born in 1920. From Benigar's notes and especially from his will it is seen he trusted Alejandro the most. Today he lives in a modest cottage and is taking care of his half-sister, probably the last of Benigar's 17 children, born when Benigar was over 60 years old. Alejandro had typical Benigar's physiognomy while his half-sister was at first sight a real Indian. From what I was told I resumed some of Benigar's children were mentally handicapped. It is similar with Alejandro's son whom we met at the occasion of our visit. Alejandro remembered his father was learning Japanese before he died. He also talked about numerous visits, »where French, English, German, Slovene language too were spoken«. He loved to sing and play the guitar. Alejandro guided us to his father's grave not far away from the village. Benigar was on his

⁶ In 1920 he even became a member of the Slovene section of JNO (Jugoslovenska narodna odbrana – Yugoslav National Defence). By mail he was receiving all newspapers that were published in Slovene language in Buenos Aires (Mislej, 1988:120-121).

wish buried together with his two wives. Beside a cross there is a »Jewish« star encircled with a snake eating its own tail on their grave. Alejandro remembered they have seen their father pray and that he would not allow the children to »lighten candles« before the saints. There are quite a few riddles about his religious beliefs. In one of his records we find a note on »our gods – Indian gods«. The Slovene missionary Ludvik Pernišek baptised during one of his visits Benigar's children into Christian, catholic religion, but Benigar himself in his will denies to have been a Christian and wants on his grave a theosophical symbol.

We also visited Benigar's eldest son Juan-Llanca (Necklace of pearls). He lives in a small village nearby his father's former place of residence named Manzanal de Poy Pucon (Orchard of apples by the high water). Juan-Llanca was born in 1915 and lived his whole life in that village and is still making a living with sheep-farming and manufacturing straps, whips, string and similar products, from buckskin. As the majority of Benigar's children he is non-educated and poor.

I also visited a small recently opened documentation centre »Juan Benigar« in Alumine in which his personal belongings and dictionaries he used can be seen. It is my conclusion that he mastered more than 14 languages as understood from some notes. There were books in Norwegian, Danish, Basque, Albanian and Quechuan (Indian) languages on the shelves. It is known that during a flood his written comparative dictionary of 26 Indian dialects was destroyed.

Juan Benigar was an extremely modest person and rigorous towards himself, he did not like to appear in public.⁷ What we can reproach him for is that he was not able in due time to realise the publishing of his works or at least to see to better preservation of his numerous records. Thus after him and about him relatively few publications remained, definitely much less than he would deserve. Although I perceived among the people in Alumine respect towards the name Benigar and although the memorial centre is fairly new the remembrance of him is slowly but persistently losing. One of his numerous descendants Carlos Ortiz is supposed to see to preserving as many of his works as possible. For unknown reasons he has not yet answered my letter. Rodolfo Casamiquela, who is supposed to study Benigar's unpublished works, has been meeting, according to an article from 1989, with great trouble as the majority of works are written in his personal codes and in unreadable handwriting (El Diario del Neuquen, 20.9. 1988).

I myself found in the mentioned Argentinean libraries twelve extensive newspaper articles on Benigar. Dedicated to Benigar are the memorial centre in Alumine, the library »Juan Benigar« in Cutral Co near Alumine, a street in Alumine is named after him. The majority of his work, mostly unpublished, is kept in the museum »Daniel A. Gatica« in Neuquen. (The newspaper Mañana del sur writes on 15th of October 1995 of 375 booklets of notes which are threatened by destruction.)

I strongly hope this report – its intention is to give a short presentation of the pheno-

⁷ »It is not the man, one's work is what counts. My works have been until now so poor that my name to me is not worth the letters except when honesty demands from me responsibility considering my writings. A more suitable time for publishing one's work is after death when eventual praise can no more evoke low desires, of which slightest occurrence I always tried to nip in the bud. I am only a poor human being who falls and rises as anyone else and struggles for the unreachable perfection.« (A letter to Dr. Anton Debeljak, *Meddobje III*, 1956, No. 1, pg. 11-12. To the wish of the author published after his death).

mena of Benigar – will help to stimulate the continuation of attempts to preserve Benigar's intellectual heritage, that research which Dr. Irene Mislej started in Slovenia, will continue.

LITERATURE

- Barfield, Thomas (1997): *The Dictionary of Anthropology*. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.
- Benigar, defensor ardiente de los derechos de los mapuches. Biblioteca Juan Benigar, Municipalidad de Plaza Hiuncul.
- Benigar, Juan (1978): *La Patagonia piensa*. Siringa Libros, Bahía Blanca. *Biografía de Juan Benigar*. Biblioteca Municipal »Juan Benigar« (Archives). Plaza Hiuncul.
- Boggi, Ruben (1992): »Las huellas de Juan Benigar vuelven a descubrirse en la Patagonia del 2000«. In: *Mañana del Sur*, 23rd April 1992. Neuquen.
- Calotti, Gabriela (1988): »La recuperacion de una obra humilde y gigantesca«. In: *El Diario del Neuquen*, 20th September 1988, pp. 12. Neuquen.
- »En busca de Juan Benigar – Un grupo investiga la dimension de su obra.« In: *Espectaculos*, 23rd April 1986. (Archives Biblioteca Juan Benigar. Plaza Hiuncul.)
- Gimenez, Diego M. Flores (1988): »Memorias de un sabio sin fronteras.« Biblioteca Juan Benigar, Municipalidad de Plaza Hiuncul (Archives). Plaza Hiuncul.
- Guček, Svetozar (1980): »Malo znani Slovenec sredi patagonskih Indijancev«. In: *Delo*, No. 9, 12th January 1980, pp. 30.
- Guček, Svetozar (1982): »Janko Benigar, antropolog in znanstvenik svetovnega slovesa«. In: *Rodna gruda*, No. 7, pp. 32-33. SIM, Ljubljana.
- Juan Benigar – Su personalidad – Su vida y su obra*. Biblioteca Municipal »Juan Benigar« (Archives). Plaza Hiuncul.
- Južnič, Stane (1978): *Socialna in politična antropologija*. Partizanska knjiga. Maribor.
- »La llegada de un sabio« (1941). In: *El Territorio*, 12th April 1941. Neuquen.
- »La Vision de Juan Benigar«. In: *Tribuna*, No. 62, August 1992. Cutral Co.
- Meddobje III* (1956), No. 1, pp. 11-12. SKA, Buenos Aires.
- Mislej, Irene (1988): *Janez Benigar – Izbrano gradivo*. Razprave, FF, Ljubljana.
- Peterlin, Jose: *Biografía de Juan Benigar*. Arhiv (Archives) Biblioteca Juan Benigar, Municipalidad de Plaza Hiuncul.
- Russel, Bernard (1988): *Research methods in Cultural Anthropology*. Sage Publications, London.
- Sulčić, Victorio (1970): *Juan Benigar – El sabio que murio sentado*. Buenos Aires.
- Sulčić, Victorio (1970): *Vida y Obra de Juan Benigar* (Lecture in Hogar Yugoslavo, Avelaneda, Buenos Aires, 20th December 1970).
- »Su obra, en peligro de extincion«. In: *Manana del Sur*, 15th October 1995, pp. 31. Neuquen.
- »Vino de Europa y se quedo para siempre en el alma de la Argentina«. In: *El Diario del Neuquen*, 20th September 1988, pp. 12-13. Neuquen.

POVZETEK JANEZ BENIGAR - ARAVKANSKI SLOVENEK

Namen razprave je predvsem zbuditi zanimanje za osebo, ki je ob vsem izjemnem delu, ki ga je opravila, postala na nek način žrtev lastne protislovnosti in skromnosti. Gradbeni inženir, jezikoslovec in poliglot, filozof, antropolog, borec za pravice južnoameriških Indijancev (in še kaj) Juan, Janko, Ivan ali Janez Benigar se je rodil v Zagrebu slovenskim staršem, večji del svojega življenja je preživel ne le daleč od domovine, ampak tudi daleč od civilizacije, v kateri je zrasel. Svoje delo in življenje je v celoti posvetil patagonskim Indijancem in med njimi tudi živel, zato ga lahko opazujemo kot poseben primer intelektualca v posebne vrste izseljenski situaciji.

Leta 1908 je prišel v Argentino kot gradbeni inženir in se kmalu naselil med Aravkanci. Poročil se je z Indijanko in si zaradi svoje podjetnosti, delavnosti in bistrosti, predvsem pa zaradi prizadevanja za pravice avtohtonega prebivalstva hitro »prislužil« naziv »el casique blanco« – »beli poglavar«. V skromni literaturi, večinoma omejeni na časopišne članke in le nekaj resnejših obravnjav v strokovni literaturi, lahko zasledimo še vrsto drugih laskavih nazivov (»el sabio europeo« – »mislec iz Evrope«...), ki pa jih Benigar ni maral. Genij, ki je obvladoval 14 jezikov, je z lastnimi rokami izkopal na desetine kilometrov namakalnih kanalov, organiziral začetke tekstilne industrije med obubožanim indijanskim prebivalstvom, skrbel za zelo številno družino, ob tem pa v prekratkih nočeh napisal vrsto razprav na različne teme, predvsem s področja antropologije, sociologije, filozofije, primerjalnega jezikoslovja in politike, slovarjev itd.

Čeprav mu je bila »domača« javnost (časopisje v patagonskem mestu Neuquen, prebivalci naselja Alumine) vedno naklonjena, njegovo ime v širši argentinski ali slovenski javnosti ni znano, če odštejemo redke in ozke antropološke in zgodovinarske kroge ter knjigo dr. Irene Mislej *Janez Benigar – Izbrano gradivo*. Zaradi Benigarjeve neomajne pripadnosti indijanskemu avtohtonemu prebivalstvu je bila argentinska država dolgo gluha za njegova raznovrstna prizadevanja, posledica tega pa je (poleg revščine, v kateri je leta 1950 umrl) še danes zelo pomanjkljivo gradivo, ki je sploh še ostalo za tem mislecem. Po nekaterih zapisih naj bi Juan Benigar zapustil kar 375 različno dolgih neobjavljenih beležk, nekaj del je objavil v obliki podlistkov v časopisju, nenatisnjeno pa je ostalo tudi eno njegovih najpomembnejših del – aravkansko-španski slovar.

Nedvoumna je ugotovitev, da ta antropolog slovenskega rodu lahko velja za skrajni – idealen primer znanstvene raziskovalne metode »opazovanja z udeležbo«, pa tudi za specifičen primer kulturne interakcije med izobraženim predstavnikom srednjeevropske in neizobraženimi pripadniki indijanske kulture. Ta zanimiva situacija posameznika je tudi osrednja točka razprave.

CZECHS AND SLOVAKS EXILE AND HOMELAND 1948-1989

The two phenomena 'emigration' and 'exile' have played a significant role in Czech and Slovak history. Although closely intertwined, these two concepts need to be carefully distinguished. Emigration, as used here, refers to the normal movement of people, as emigrants from their homeland and as immigrants to another land, usually for economic reasons, but sometimes for a combination of economic and political motives. On the other hand, exile, or political emigration, as it is sometimes called, refers to something distinct. Exiles leave their native lands mainly for political reasons, sometimes as refugees, fleeing persecution or discrimination, but sometimes as voluntary migrants seeking to escape a hated system. Some among them plan to work actively abroad for a change in the system and hope to return when their homelands have regained their freedom. These are political exiles in the proper sense of the word.

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, there was a substantial emigration, especially of Slovaks and mainly to North America. This took place primarily for economic reasons, although there were also overtones of dissatisfaction with the political systems left behind. They were seeking a better life for themselves and their children. Most of them had no intention of returning home and eventually adapted to life in their new homelands. They formed organizations of *krajané* (compatriots or fellow countrymen) and published newspapers and journals.

During both world wars prominent Czech and Slovak exiles went abroad to strive for national independence of their home countries. Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk and Edvard Beneš, in the first war, and Beneš and Jan Masaryk, in the second, organized and directed what proved to be successful movements for national liberation. In each case the exile leaders formed provisional governments in exile which were recognized by the Western governments and created armed forces which saw military action. Associated with the leading figures was a substantial number of other exiles who were members of the provisional governments, members of the army, intelligence corps and diplomacy. In neither case was there a mass permanent emigration of fellow citizens and most of the exiles eventually returned home after victory.

In each case there were a few other individual Czech and Slovak exiles who did not join the main liberation movements but sought different political goals (Durych, in 1914, Prchala, Osusky, and Hodža in 1939). Even more significant, in the second world war Klement Gottwald and other communist leaders emigrated to Moscow and conducted their own resistance movement. The Gottwald group did not have the same legitimacy in the eyes of Western governments as the Beneš government in exile but enjoyed the trust and support of Moscow. This was to be crucial at the end of the war when the two exiled groups

merged merged their forces to form a coalition government to rule in the liberated homeland.

During the communist period there were two large waves of migration which combined the features of both emigration and exile. In the first two years after the seizure of power by the communists in 1948, approximately 60,000 left the country. Their destination was mainly North America, the United States and Canada. The second wave, after the crushing of the Prague Spring in 1968, numbered about 50,000 in official figures, and was in fact perhaps double that amount.. This time the destination was mainly the German-speaking countries of Western Europe – Germany, Austria and Switzerland, although a substantial minority went to North America. In the seventies and eighties, following the issuance of Charter 77 and the persecution which followed, smaller waves of emigration took place, again mainly to European countries.

Among these migrants there was a substantial difference of motivation and purpose. Many of them, perhaps most, like their predecessors in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, had no thought of returning home and came as permanent settlers in the new homelands. Most had not been politically engaged at home and refrained from political activity abroad. They were either indifferent or offered minimal support to the more active political exiles, to be discussed below. This majority of this exiles belong therefore to the category of emigration.

There were, however, a substantial minority who left their homeland as refugees because of their previous political involvement, either in non-communist parties before 1948, including co-operation with the Communists in the National Front, or in movements to reform communism, before and during 1968 and after the issuance of Charter 77 in 1977. These were political exiles in the proper sense of the word. These refugees came to escape persecution or discrimination at home and in the hope of working actively for the restoration of a free and democratic Czechoslovakia. Most of them hoped eventually to return home but, when, communist rule lasted much longer than expected, indeed for decades, most of them did not do so.

Unlike the case of the two world wars, there was after 1948 no leading personality, such as Masaryk, Beneš or Gottwald, to guide and direct the struggle for freedom and no organized government in exile was formed. Jan Masaryk, who might have done so, was either prevented from leaving the country and executed at the hands of the security police, or chose not to leave and to protest against the regime by committing suicide. Other leading exiles such as Petr Zenkl, Jaroslav Stránský, Hubert Ripka and Václav Majer, were of lesser stature and faced a different situation than their predecessors. In the absence of war the Western powers were unwilling to support a government in exile even during the cold war years and in the subsequent era of detente they were even less ready to countenance such a move.

The leading exiles representing various non-communist parties sought to group their forces by forming in 1949 the Council for a Free Czechoslovakia, headed by Petr Zenkl, with Jozef Lettrich, a Slovak, as associate deputy. This council was predominantly Czech, but included Slovaks who shared a Czechoslovak spirit. There was also formed a permanent conference of Slovak democratic exiles, in which Jozef Lettrich, Martin Kvetko and Rudolf Fraštický were prominent.

These bodies were subject to internal stresses and strains and formed and re-formed under changing leadership. Since they did not aspire to form a government in exile they

were limited to representing the democratic voice of their silenced countrymen, issuing declarations condemning policies pursued by the Communist governments and advancing alternative policies for the future.

Among Slovaks there was a strong current of opinion which favoured Slovak separation from Czechoslovakia in a future post-war situation. This Slovak movement was an heir to an older *krajanske* association, the Slovak League of America (1907); there were also various Slovak liberation committees founded in London in 1946 and elsewhere by former leading figures of the independent Slovak state under Father Tiso during the second world war. These separatist ideas were eventually espoused by the World Congress of Slovaks, with its headquarters in Toronto, headed and financially supported by the Canadian uranium magnate, Štefan Roman. His personal adviser was Josef Kirschbaum, former head of the Slovak Hlinka Guard and Slovak diplomat under the Slovak state and a prominent member of the earlier Slovak liberation committees.

As time passed many of the leading figures of the 1948 generation grew old or died, and could no longer claim the allegiance of the newer post-1968 exiles. The baton of leadership passed to them. Many of them were former communists but some were non-communists who had been active in 1968 or had participated actively in Charter 77. They had no thought of forming a government in exile nor did they establish a coordinating committee. They did have, however, closer contact than the 1948ers with their compatriots at home and sought to provide them with moral, financial, intellectual and political support in their struggle for freedom. An even larger number contributed in their own way as writers, scholars, broadcasters, journalists and publishers to the maintenance of national traditions and to freedom in literature and scholarship. They were disparate in political beliefs and affiliations, mirroring the pluralism of the dissenters at home, and included former reform Communists, socialists, political conservatives, liberals and radicals, and persons not belonging to any party, and differed in their religious persuasions. Most of them sympathized with Charter 77 and its struggle for the implementation of the Helsinki accords. Most of them, too, were Czechoslovak in spirit and did not support the Slovak separatist cause.

This paper concerns itself, not with the post-1948 and post-1968 emigrants in general, but with this narrower group of political exiles, and in particular with those who assumed leading roles in support of the struggle for freedom at home after 1968, and especially after 1977.¹ Although there was a very wide spectrum of political opinions among them, they sought to co-operate with each other in pursuing their common aims. There was, however, often sharp conflict among them and sharp polemics on matters of ideology and tactics. In particular there were differences between them as to whether or not to co-operate with former communists. Some rejected this outright, but others were ready to work with their former enemies. In the interests of a common struggle against the existing communist regime. The relationship of the more active political exiles with the older »*krajanske*« organizations was also not always easy, especially as the latter were mainly controlled by post-1948 exiles. Their links with the homeland were also extremely varied in form, each

¹ I am particularly indebted for the advice and assistance of Vilém Prečan, director of the Centre Documentation Centre for Independent Czechoslovak Literature, in Germany, and head of the Institute for Contemporary History in Prague between 1990 and 1998. He is now mounting a major research project, *Československý politický a kulturní exil, 1948-1989*, for the study of the phenomenon of political exile and its relationship with the homeland.

favouring contacts with distinct groups of the resistance at home and often having distinctive channels of communication.²

The Political Exiles after 1948

Czech and Slovak exiles were widely dispersed in a number of different countries. The pre-1938 emigrants had settled primarily in the United States and Canada. Emigrants after 1938 and 1948, migrated not only to these two countries, but also to Germany, Switzerland, Austria, and even Latin America and Australia. The more political exiles after 1948 were concentrated primarily in the European countries already mentioned, notably Germany, England, Italy, France and Sweden. In each country they formed an extensive structure of institutions, such as associations of exiles, publishing houses, newspapers, press surveys, journals, scholarly associations and other groupings. This international network was able to influence the public opinion of the many countries where they lived.

The earliest emigré was Prince Karel Jan Schwarzenberg, who came to Austria in 1948 as a child of eleven with his mother and grandmother. All members of the Schwarzenberg family had retained the Swiss citizenship which they had had for three hundred years as residents of the Landesgraviate of Klege. This made it possible for the Prince from time to time to visit Czechoslovakia as a private person and later as chairman of the International Helsinki Federation on Human Rights, an umbrella for non-governmental organizations. Appointed to this post on the recommendation of Chancellor Kreisky of Austria, Schwarzenberg was not a figurehead but became an active representative of this organization and was later (1989) awarded the Peace Prize by the Council of Europe for this activity. As a result of the Helsinki Final Act, the Federation had a certain legitimacy, even in the eyes of the Czechoslovak regime, so that Schwarzenberg, on visits to his homeland, was able to have contacts with the official Helsinki Committee in Prague. He took advantage of these visits to hold secret meetings with the Chartists at a hotel named appropriately The Prince.

Pavel Tigríd, active in Czechoslovak politics in the Catholic political movement, left Prague in 1948, and after several years in Germany, the U.S.A., and Belgium, took up permanent residence in Paris. There from 1956 he published the influential intellectual quarterly, *Svědectví* which was smuggled into the homeland and was widely read by Czech intellectuals at home and abroad. For this activity Tigríd was charged with treason and was tried and sentenced in absentia. Tigríd published a number of books on 1968 and often contributed to newspapers such as *Le Monde*. With his wife, Ivana, he established the International Committee for the Support of Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia. Ivana also established the organization Help and Action. Tigríd represented a somewhat liberal-conservative point of view and was strongly anti-communist; he had no belief in the possibility of the reform of communism. Nonetheless he was ready to co-operate with the former communists in exile.

² See my attempt to analyze some of these persons and organizations in 'Archive of Freedom', a study of the work of Vilém Prečan and his documentation centre in Germany, and of some of the other persons and organizations involved in the common struggle. It was published in English in *Acta contemporanea, k padesátinám Viléma Prečana* (Ústav pro Soudobě: Dějiny AV ČR, Prague, 1998), pp.377-99 and will appear in the forthcoming issue of *Kosmas, Czechoslovak and Central European Journal*.

A later arrival in the West was the long-time communist, Jiří Pelikan, who had been head of the International Youth League during the Stalinist days, and then an active protagonist of the Prague Spring. Setting up his base in Rome, from 1969-1970 he began to publish the weekly journal, *Listy* (Letters), which represented an independent socialist viewpoint. Identifying himself with the Italian Socialist Party, he was able in 1979 to win a seat in the European parliament on the socialist ticket. This provided him with a valuable platform for publicizing repression at home and presenting the views of dissidents. He also had close contacts with Italian Communists and with Western European politicians, especially such leading socialists as Willy Brandt, Francois Mitterand, Bruno Kreisky, and others.

In England the most active exile was Jan Kavan, university student activist in 1968, who was associated with what was called revolutionary socialism and was close to Petr Uhl and the small band of Trotskyites at home and the socialist left abroad. His mother was an English woman, his father a former Czech diplomat, a Communist, who had been imprisoned during the fifties. After 1968 Kavan made several trips to England on a temporary basis and in 1969 he decided to stay abroad and to study at L. S. E. and to provide support to the people at home. In 1969 he set up the Solidarity Fund and in 1976 the Palach Press. Later he joined with exiles from other East European countries to form the East European Cultural Foundation for joint action in their homelands. Kavan was also co-founder of the *East European Reporter*, a left-oriented monthly periodical. His chief sources of funds were private donations from the British public, but he eventually received a grant from the National Endowment for Democracy.

A principal function of the Palach Press was to distribute Charter 77 and other materials to the British press, radio and television. He had close relations with leading publicists and thus had an influence on British public opinion and on the British left in particular. Its other principal function was to send home books, periodicals, copying machines and video-cameras, using automobiles and later camping vans with secret compartments. On the return trips the vans brought out dissident manuscripts and Charter 77 documents, clandestine films, and samizdat books and periodicals. His first shipment was made in January 1970 and this was repeated at regular intervals, at the high point five times per year. This service was used by the other exiles; a stop was made in Munich for the distribution of materials.³

After years of successful activity this conspiratorial action came to an abrupt end in April 28, 1981, when a police agent among the Chartists informed the authorities of the next shipment. The van was stopped at the border, its contents confiscated, the drivers detained for a short time; the materials awaiting return shipments were seized in a garage outside Prague. The shipments were resumed a year later, this time with passenger cars, which went more frequently but could not carry as much material.

Kavan also undertook conspiratorial trips to various East European communist countries, where he met local oppositionists and dissidents from Czechoslovakia. In 1987 he decided to risk a trip to Prague, using the methods he had used in 1969, including a disguise; he repeated this twice more in 1988, each time meeting with leading dissidents, including Václav Havel. This action drew criticism from other leading exiles as involving too much risk for the dissidents and for the system of illegal communications.⁴

³ For this, see Jan Kavan, *Spravedlnost s na hubkem* (Doplnek, 1996)

⁴ See also Rosemary Kavanová, *Cena Svobody, Život Angličanky v Praze* (Brno, 1997), *Epilog* by Jan Kavan.

František Janouch, a physicist, a Communist in his beliefs, who went into exile in Sweden 1973, was able to pursue his scientific work at the Royal Academy of Sweden, and to combine this with the support of the independent intellectual life at home. In 1978 he established the Nadace Charty 77 (Charter 77 Foundation) for the support of independent thinking in Czechoslovakia and for »publicizing independent Czechoslovak culture and thought in the West«. At first he obtained financial support from writers organizations of the three Scandinavian countries but his main funding came from the Open Society of George Soros. The funds were used to support of people at home (writers, Charter spokesmen, samizdat periodicals, families of prisoners, etc). Through legal export channels the Foundation delivered technical equipment such as lap-top computers, and video and audio machines. It gave support to exile activities abroad, including exile journals and publishing houses. The Foundation also sponsored a series of literary and peace awards for persons at home.

Vilém Prečan, former member of the Historical Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Science, and in his early years a Communist Party member, first became widely known as the co-author of the Black Book, documenting the Soviet bloc invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968, and later as the author of an appeal on behalf of his fellow historians to the World Congress of Historians in San Francisco in 1975. He was charged with treason for his work on the Black Book but after months of investigation he was not tried and was allowed to emigrate in 1976. Settling in Germany, he resolved to give aid to his fellow historians at home and to set up a documentation centre of the independent literature being produced at home in samizdat form. For some years he pursued this goal with limited funding and from his own residences in Edemissen and Hannover. But in 1986 he received a substantial grant from the National Endowment for Democracy in Washington, D.C. In the same year, Prince Schwarzenberg provided him with place for his Centre in the Schwarzenberg Castle in Scheinfeld, Germany. The Centre was sponsored by Jan Vladislav, in Paris, Jiří Gruša, in Bonn, and by Pelikan, Tigrid, Janouch and other leading exiles abroad, and endorsed by Václav Havel and Ludvík Vaculík and others at home. In the following four years it became a major base of support for the dissidents at home, and the principal channel of communication with them, sending in Western literature and later technical equipment, and bringing out samizdat and other materials.(see below) It created a rich archive of independent literature and had its own publishing activities.

Ivan Medek, an active Catholic Chartist, went into exile still later - in 1978, establishing himself in Vienna, Austria. There with his wife, Helenka, he set up a German-language press and information service, sending to subscribers copies of Charter documents and other dissident materials. His contacts with the homeland were mainly by telephone and by letters sent through the ordinary mail to colleagues of his wife at the Vienna Conservatory of Music. He broadcast regularly on Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America, the latter unjammed, so that he had a wide audience throughout Czechoslovakia.

There were many other persons who occupied important niches in the exile community in different countries. In Germany Adolf Mueller and Bedřich Utitz formed a publishing house, Index, in Cologne which became an important agency for publishing the books of exiles and dissidents. Abbot Anastasius Opasek, who had spent twelve years in prison, and lived in exile in Bavaria after 1969, set up a lay Catholic organization, Opus Bonum, which organized in Franken an annual conference which brought together exiles of diverse viewpoints, including former communists, for discussions. There were Czech scholars such

as Karel Kaplan, in Munich, and Pavel Reimann, in Berlin, Jiří Gruša, writer, Ota Filip, of the Fischer Publishing House, Milan Horáček, who was elected deputy for the Greens in the German Bundestag, Josef Jelinek, an engineer working for Siemen in Erlangen who performed prodigies of photocopying for Prečan, and at Radio Free Europe Vladimir Kussin and Agnesa Kalinová, a Slovak, and others at Deutsche Welle, German short-wave broadcasting system.

In Austria Zdeněk Mlynář, former Communist leader and founder of Charter 77, devoted much of his time and effort to establishing contacts with Western Communist and Social Democratic Parties and organized a series of publications of studies of the Prague Spring and reform in Communist countries. An exiled historian, Josef Hodic, had close ties with Mlynář and other exiles, but later returned home and revealed himself to be a Czechoslovak police agent.

In France Jan Vladislav, the Czech poet and novelist, worked closely with Prečan and the Documentation Centre. Antonin Liehm published the monthly *Czech newspaper*, 150,000 Slov. and Lettres in French. Karel Bartošek, former historian, was active in left-wing socialist circles. Even more radical was Jan Tesař, former historian, who had the support of French Trotskyites. In Basel, Switzerland Karel Hrubý, editor of *Proměny*, was a member of the committee of the Social Democratic Party in exile. In Italy there was Karel Skalický, professor at the Lateran University and publisher of *Studie*. In Sweden in addition to Janaček, there was Pallas, the publisher of rock music, and other Czechs.

In England a number of Czechs were active in the exiled movement: George Steiner, in Amnesty International, George Theiner, editor of *Index on Censorship*, Igor Hájek, professor of Czechoslovak literature at Lancaster University and later Glasgow University, Jacques Rupnik and others at the B.B.C. Alexander Tomský, at Keston College, near London, Harry Hanak, at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies in London, and Karel and Ivan Kyncl, photographers and producers of video tapes. A number of British scholars, such as Roger Scruton and John Keane, were active in the Jan Hus Fund which made grants to individual Czechs at home. An important figure was Johann Wolfgang Bruegel, German Social Democrat from Czechoslovakia, a scholar active in the study of Czech-German relations.

Further afield in North America there were exile organizations such as the Council for Czechoslovak Freedom which represented the political views of the earlier exiles, and the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Science (SVU), founded in 1958, a scholarly organization which also was made up largely of older exiles. The latter's journal, *Kosmas*, edited by Zdeněk Suda, began to publish dissident literature. Another important cog in the machine was Vilém Brzozda, onetime secretary to Hubert Ripka, of the Czechoslovak National Socialist Party. His International Literary Centre in New York City, supported by funds from the United States Congress, secretly distributed multiple copies of books and journals, including exiled periodicals, to all communist nations. Professor Radomír Luža, historian, was a leading figure of Czechoslovak Social Democracy Abroad. Other notable figures were George Kovtun of the Library of Congress, Professor Erazim Kohák, the philosopher, at Boston University, Martin Kvetko, leading Slovak political figure, and Anna Faltusová, of the Czechoslovak Council in America, who supplied members of Congress, U.S. government departments and the American Commission for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) with Czechoslovak materials and information. There were also Czechs and Slovaks who served in the foreign broadcast services of the Voice of America

(František and Larissa Silnický), and others at Free Europe in New York City. There were also a Czechoslovak movement in Latin America (Barteček).

In Canada, in Toronto, the Sixty Eight Publishing House, run by Josef Škvorecký and his wife, Zdena Salivarová, published several hundred books, in Czech, primarily non-fiction, by leading dissidents and exiles. There were others, such as Paul Wilson, translator of Havel and Škvorecký, and distributor of alternative music recordings, and Gordon Skilling who was active in support of Charter 77, and chairman of the Jan Hus Fund of Canada. Also in Toronto Rudolf Fraštacký, financier, a Slovak and onetime head of the Czechoslovak National Council, contributed financially to the samizdat collection at the University of Toronto library. In British Columbia, Professor Marketa Goetz-Stankiewicz, of the University of British Columbia, specialist on independent Czech drama, had close personal contact with the dissidents.

The relations of these persons and groups and organizations in several continents with each other and with the homeland is a subject which would require fuller study than is possible here. The leading figures - Tigrid, Pelikán, Prečan, Medek, Mlynář and others - met from time to time in a kind of strategy session. All of them were founding members of the Documentation Centre. Some of them had their own channels of communication with the homeland but they relied primarily on the shipments organized at first by Kavan and later by Prečan (see below). In spite of wide differences of political viewpoint they were usually able to work together in close cooperation. Kavan was a more controversial figure. At first the other exiles worked closely with him and depended on him for shipping materials home. Kavan gradually lost their sympathy and earned their mistrust.

There were among the exiles a number of individuals who followed their own ways, sometimes representing what has been called integral anti-communism. For instance, Vladimír Škutina and Ludek Pachman wrote openly against Charter 77, as did Milan Zelený. There was also criticism of RFE for the alleged communist leanings of some members of its staff and also of the Czechoslovak National Council in Washington. Prečan was subjected to sharp attacks by anti-Communist and anti-Chartist exiles who suspected him for his one-time party membership and even accused him of being a police agent. Among the Catholic exiles, Alexander Tomský, in London, criticized Abbot Opasek for his willingness to co-operate with former communists. And in the shadowy background the Czechoslovak espionage services undoubtedly exerted influence among exiles, as the case of Josef Hodic demonstrates.

Contacts with the Homeland

The shipment of Western literature and the return of samizdat materials was difficult. After the catastrophe on the frontier in 1981 the exiles sought other means of shipments. In the course of time Prečan and Siklova: developed a new system of transport through the willingness of certain foreign diplomats to cooperate. With the help of Wolfgang Scheuer, a German diplomat in Prague, letters and lighter materials were sent through the Foreign Office to the Embassy in Prague through the diplomatic post, a system which became so reliable that it amounted to a regular courier service on certain days of the week. For heavier shipments the Germans used their immunity from customs inspection at the frontier to carry loads of *samizdat* documents in the trunk of their cars and to return with

their cars laden with Western books and periodicals. For several years Prečan met Scheuer almost every month at Vohenstrauß, a small German border town, where they exchanged their precious cargoes.

This »*great miracle*«, as Prečan called it, lasted for three years but was interrupted with Scheuer's return to Germany. A replacement was found in the person of Peter Bakewell, a Canadian diplomat. From September 1986, Bakewell resumed the practice of meeting with Prečan at a German border town. This somewhat improper use of the diplomatic system had to be kept a close secret but worked successfully without interruption for several years.

The Underground Network at Home

It is impossible to exaggerate the role played by Jiřina Šiklová for many years as the pivot of the network of relationships between home and abroad. Although she was not the first nor the only link with the outside, she did become the main one and the longest functioning. For more than a decade she sent materials regularly, at least once, sometimes several times, each month. She even sent the occasional message of greetings or birthday card from her prison cell!! She was detained, for questioning for the first time in 1972; in 1981 she was jailed for eleven months. On her release she immediately resumed her work as »*a pigeon*«, as she called it.

For a year or two after 1977 she was able to use the services of a Swedish cultural attaché, who was given the code name Vasco de Gama. Later she was helped by people working for the French airlines, who sent in materials on regular flights. Channels were also opened up through certain foreign diplomats – at first Bedřich Lowenstein, a Czech citizen, who worked for the German Commercial Mission in Prague, and then other employees of the German Embassy, and finally the more permanent and lasting co-operation with Scheuer and Bakewell.

Conclusion

In the years since the fall of communism in Central and Eastern Europe there has been a tendency to neglect or underestimate the role of the independent dissident activities in promoting the democratic revolution. Even where this is recognized the part played by external or transnational factors in contributing to this result has been almost totally ignored. In a recent article the role of transnational factors in political change in Eastern Europe was given special attention, but only in the form of foreign social movements, such as the Western peace movements, which offered moral and other support. Nothing was said of the even more crucial role of the exiles and their organizations in the support of the independent activists at home.⁵

⁵ See Patricia Chilton, 'Mechanics of change: social movements, transnational coalitions, and the transformation processes in Eastern Europe', in Thomas Risse-Kappen (ed.), *Bringing transnational relations back in, Non-state actors, domestic structures and international institutions* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 189-226).

There is no doubt, of course, that the main stage of opposition to the communist systems was at home in each of the countries, and the main actors were the dissidents and other independent activists. But a crucial part in the movement for change and reform was played by their fellow citizens abroad who encouraged and assisted them. These external agents did not arrogate to themselves the task of pressing their own ideas and programmes of change upon the domestic actors and were certainly not primarily responsible for the ultimate revolution which took place. But without the transnational support of the exiles the dissident movement would have been much weaker and less successful. Needless to say the exile activities also depended on the activists at home, including the underground organization for distribution, and would have been powerless to affect the course of history without them.

In the case of Czechoslovakia the support of the exiled community and its outstanding persons and organizations has been largely neglected or ignored⁶ and deserves thorough research and study. As Prečan put it in 1993, on receiving the Friedrich Baur award on behalf of the Czechoslovak Documentation Centre, many people at home and abroad were involved: the courageous dissidents, the couriers and messengers, many Czechs in exile, and many foreign supporters in Europe and North America. It was *»a great network of solidarity and of material and spiritual aid to the independent intellectual community in Czechoslovakia«*.⁷

⁶ An exception was Jiří Pelikan in *Charter 77 očima současníku* (Prague, 1997) pp. 122-126. See also my earlier article in 1977 on the international context of Charter 77, reprinted in *ibid.*, pp.315-25.

⁷ The award was given at the Bavarian Academy of Fine Arts, in Munich, Oct. 13, 1993.

*POVZETEK ČEHI IN SLOVAKI – IZGNANSTVO IN DOMOVINA
1948-1989*

V letih po padcu komunizma je bila v Srednji in Vzhodni Evropi zaznavna težnja po prezrtju ali podcenjevanju vloge neodvisnih disidentskih aktivnosti pri pospeševanju demokratične revolucije. Celo tam, kjer so bile take aktivnosti priznane, je delež zunanjih ali mednarodnih dejavnikov, ki so pripomogli k rezultatu, popolnoma ignoriran. V članku je vlogi mednarodnih dejavnikov pri spreminjanju politične slike v Vzhodni Evropi namenjena posebna pozornost, toda le obliki tujih družbenih gibanj, kot so na primer zahodna mirovna gibanja, ki so nudila moralno in drugačno oporo. Ničesar pa ni rečeno o še bolj odločilni vlogi izseljencev in njihovih organizacij pri podpiranju neodvisnih aktivistov v matičnih deželah.

Seveda sploh ni dvoma, da so bili stebri protikomunističnih opozicij v matičnih državah in da so bili glavni akterji disidenti in drugi neodvisni aktivisti. Toda odločilno vlogo v gibanju za demokratične spremembe in reforme so odigrali njihovi sonarodnjaki v tujini, ki so jih spodbujali in jim drugače pomagali; niso si prisvajali pravice vsiljevati domačim akterjem svojih idej in programov v zvezi s spremembami in zagotovo tudi niso bili glavni nosilci revolucije, ko se je zgodila. Toda brez mednarodne podpore izseljencev bi bilo disidentsko gibanje veliko šibkejše in manj uspešno. Seveda je jasno, da so bile izseljenske aktivnosti odvisne od aktivistov v matičnih državah, vključno z ilegalnimi organizacijami za distribucijo, in bi brez njih ne imele moči vplivati na potek zgodovine.

V primeru Češkoslovaške je bila podpora izseljenske skupnosti in njenih izjemnih posameznikov in organizacij skoraj prezrta ali ignorirana in si zasluži temeljito raziskavo in študijo. Kot je dejal Prečan leta 1993 ob prejemanju nagrade Friedricha Baura v imenu Centra, »je v Centru delovalo mnogo ljudi, doma in v tujini, pogumni disidenti, kurirji in sli, veliko Čehov v izgnanstvu in mnogo tujih podpornikov in simpatizerjev v Evropi in Severni Ameriki. To je bila imenitna mreža solidarnosti ter materialne in duhovne pomoči neodvisni intelektualni skupnosti na Češkoslovaškem«.

Halina Florkowska

Frančič

ZYGMUNT MIŁKOWSKI AND AMERICAN POLONIA

Several threads are interwoven in the eventful life of Zygmunt Miłkowski (1824-1915), who was one of the most outstanding emigrational activists and a very popular writer in the 19th century. Miłkowski born in Podole, was the son of a Napoleon officer. Already in his youth he engaged himself in the underground movement founding conspirational organizations: first at school in Niemirów, then in high school in Odessa and finally at the Kiev University. Being older, Miłkowski took an active part in arm conflicts, first fighting for »our and your freedom« in the Spring of Nations in Hungary, and then fighting for the Polish independence in the January Uprising 1863-1864. It is worth mentioning that in the course of service he was promoted to a rank of a colonel. Zygmunt Miłkowski remained faithful to the ideas of democracy and independence to the last minutes of his long life.

The defeats of national uprisings convinced Miłkowski that it was necessary to pursue some other forms of action. In exile he was working for Polish emigrational organizations in England, Belgium, France and in Switzerland where he lived. The Polish Democratic Society, which he joined in 1850, and The Union of Polish Emigration (1866-70) were undoubtedly the most significant ones and Miłkowski was playing an active and important part in their authorities. He was also aware of the importance of international relations. In the 50'ties of the 19th century he was in contact with Alexander Herzen and Giuseppe Mazzini; in the 70'ties he became a member of The League of Peace and Freedom.

Writing was also an important part of Miłkowski's life. He was the author of numerous articles and of nearly a hundred novels. Miłkowski not only earned his living by writing, though being an emigrant with a big family he often had to face poverty, but after the defeat of the January Uprising, writing became his main weapon in the fight for independence.¹

When speaking about Miłkowski today one should not forget his interest and engagement in the problems of Southern Slavs. He was writing about Bulgaria, Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina. He was also interested in the Danube countries e. g. in Romania and in the Balkan ones e. g. in Albania. His novels published under the name of Tomasz Teodor Jeż, devoted to Balkan and Danube problems enjoyed great popularity among his contemporary readers. Many of those books were translated into other languages. Miłkowski had thorough knowledge of the lands in which the action in his novels was taking place, because he actually lived there. After the defeat of the Hungarian Uprising in 1849, he spent some time in Turkey, in the 50'ties he spent three years in Romania and after the

¹ T.T. Jeż [Z. Miłkowski], *Od kolebki przez życie*, ed. by A. Lewak, Kraków 1936-37; cf. biography of Zygmunt Miłkowski by S. Kiciewicz and M. Małcecki, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, (hereafter *PSB*), XXI (1976), 263-8.

defeat of the January Uprising, he lived for two years in Belgrade. Both, Miłkowski's relations with the above mentioned nations and his novels describing life and problems in the countries of the Southern Slavs, have already become subjects of many dissertations of Polish and other literary historians². That is why I shall not pursue this subject.

I have decided to devote my paper to Miłkowski's relations with the American Polonia. This subject is a part of a broader field; namely, the field of relations between the Polish political emigration in Europe and Polish economic immigration in America. The interest of Polish political emigrants, mostly the participants in the January Uprising for their compatriots in the United States grew as the number of Polish peasants overseas increased. It has been estimated³ that between 1860 and 1870, the number of Polish people living in America went up from 30.000 to 50.000 and this fact already in the middle of the 60'ties, attracted the attention of the Union of Polish Emigration (UPE), the main European organization of Polish political emigrants. UPE had its seat in Paris but it had to take care of numerous emigrational centres, united in many European countries in the so-called communes. UPE's interest, its contacts with the Polish-American circles and also activities of certain Poles overseas yielded its fruits. New American branches of that organization: The Polish Commune (Gmina Polska) in Chicago and The Polish Society (Towarzystwo Polskie) in New York were established at that time.⁴

Miłkowski, as I have already mentioned, was one of the Union leaders and in 1867 he edited its paper *Independence* (Niepodległość).⁵ But it is difficult to say, whether and to what degree he himself contributed to the establishment and development of the American branches of the UPE. It is certain that the contacts between Polish circles in Europe and those in America grew closer in the 70'ties. At that time, the famous Polish writer Józef Ignacy Kraszewski who lived in exile in Dresden was in letter contacts with many Poles in the United States.⁶ In the year 1880 the Polish National Alliance of America (PNA), an organization still active in the States, came to being. It was one of the two biggest organizations of the American Polonia, which then had about 500.000 people.⁷ PNA was established under the influence and according to suggestions and instructions sent from Europe, particularly from the circles gathered round the Polish National Museum in Rapperswil, Switzerland.⁸

The next stage of contacts between European and American emigrational circles

² I give here only the titles of some books about Miłkowski: M. Bersano-Beghey, *Zygmunt Miłkowski, contributo alla storia dei rapporti polono-slavi nel secolo XIX*, Roma 1935; M. Ostrowska, (T. T. Jeż) *Zygmunt Miłkowski. Życie i twórczość*, Kraków 1936; J. Reychman, *Die Nationalitätenproblem des Donauraums im Blickfeld eines polnischen Schriftstellers*, Budapest 1943; W. Smochowska-Petrowa, *Balgarija w twórczestwo na Z. Miłkowski (Teodor Tomasz Jeż)*, Sofia 1955; S. Subotin, *Dwa romany Teodora Tomaša Jeza (Zigmunta Miłkovskog) iz srpske prošlosti*, Beograd 1962.

³ For the estimation of number of Polish people living in America before 1914 see A. Brożek, *Polonia amerykańska 1854 - 1939*, (Warszawa, Interpress, 1977), p. 38.

⁴ H. Florkowska-Francić i M. Francić, »Między Europą i Ameryką. Zjednoczenie Emigracji Polskiej (1866-1870) i wychodźstwo za Oceanem«, *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne*, (Kraków, 1993) No. 108, pp 117-129.

⁵ *Zjednoczenie Emigracji Polskiej (1866-1870). Lewica na emigracji*, ed. by C. Bobińska, (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1972).

⁶ H. Florkowska-Francić and M. Francić, »Amerykańscy korespondenci Józefa Ignacego Kraszewskiego. Portret zbiorowy Polonii«, parts I-II, *Przegląd Polonijny*, 12(1986), No. 1-2.

⁷ A. Brożek, op. cit, p. 38.

may be dated from the time of the establishment in exile of a new institution, namely of The Polish National Treasury. In the 80'ties a group of former insurgents (1863) observed that the future fight for Polish independence should be planned and prepared ahead of time. They meant, above all, collection of special funds for that purpose.⁹ Zygmunt Miłkowski was one of the creators of the Polish National Treasury. In his brochure entitled *About Active Defense and National Treasury* he encouraged Poles not only to everyday resistance but also to engagement in long term activities. He set for them the example of the Irishmen and called for money collection which would help to organize the future fight.¹⁰

Since the fall of 1887 to the year 1898, Miłkowski was editor in chief of *A Free Polish Word* (*Wolne Polskie Słowo*), the leading emigrational weekly in Europe which, in course of time, became an organ of the Polish Treasury.¹¹ In the columns of *A Free Word* Miłkowski often placed news from America, informing about more important events taking place in the Polonia circles, about work of the Polonia organizations and about celebrations of Polish national holidays. And even though with time the news concerning American Polonia appearing in *A Free Word* were more frequent and more exhaustive, some Polish-American circles were not satisfied with the coverage and complained about its insufficiency.¹²

The idea of the foundation of the National Treasury became more popular in the 80'ties of the 19th century. In every country where there were groups of Polish emigrants, both in Europe and in America, the so called »local treasuries« came into being. They were to collect money for the benefit of the Polish question. At the beginnings of the 90'ties, an idea of consolidation of efforts and safe deposition of gathered funds appeared for the first time. It was to be talked about at the great convention which took place in Zürich and in Rapperswil at the beginning of May 1891. The convention, with Miłkowski as a chaire, gathered numerous representatives of various Polonia organizations from Switzerland and other countries. Its main aim was the commemoration of the centenary of the May 3 Constitution, but also was to be a discussion concerning both the Polish question in reference to the political situation in contemporary Europe, and the tasks of the Polish emigration. During that meeting the decision to consolidate all the »local treasuries« into one big Polish National Treasury and to deposit it in the Polish National Museum in Rapperswil was made.¹³ In America the year 1894 marked as the »Kościuszko Year«, was crucial for the foundation of one big treasury since the North American Branch of the Rapperswil Polish National Treasury was founded during the celebration of a centenary of the Kościuszko

⁸ H. Florkowska-Frančić, *The Influence of Polish Political Emigration in Switzerland on the Formation of the Polish National Alliance*, »Polish American Studies«, New York 1991, No 2, pp. 27-37.

⁹ H. Florkowska-Frančić, »Do genezy Skarbu Narodowego. Emigracyjne wątki w rodowodzie Skarbu«, *Przegląd Polonijny*, 8 (1982), No. 3, pp. 5-20.

¹⁰ Z. F. M. *Rzecz o obronie czynnej i Skarbie Narodowym*, (Paris, A. Reiff, 1887).

¹¹ H. Florkowska-Frančić, »Prasa Polska we Francji w siedemdziesiątych i osiemdziesiątych latach XIX w.«, *Przegląd Polonijny*: 17(1991), No. 3, pp. 16-17.

¹² F. H. Jabłoński's letter to H. Gierszyński, Chicago, June 3, 1895, Polish Library in Paris (hereafter BPP), Archives of H. Gierszyński (hereafter AHG).

¹³ M. Złotorzycka, »Obchód stulecia Konstytucji 3 Maja w Zurychu w 1891 r.«, *Niepodległość*, 1932, No. 2, pp. 292; cf. W. Śladkowski, »Wychodźstwo polskie w Europie Zachodniej wobec setnej rocznicy uchwalenia Konstytucji 3 Maja«, in: *Konstytucja 3 Maja w tradycji i kulturze polskiej*, cd. by A. Barszczewska-Krupa, (Łódź, 1991), 369; cf. H. Florkowska-Frančić, »Uroczystości rapperswilskie 1868-1918«, *Rocznik Biblioteki Narodowej*, 33 (1998), pp. 276-277.

Insurrection.¹⁴ The Polish Museum in Rapperswil became thus an important place of the Polish national thought and the centre of the liberation movement. Zygmunt Miłkowski, one of the founders of the institution and its propagator, became, of course, chairman of its Board of Directors.

The Polish League was another organization founded by Miłkowski in 1887, in 1893 transformed into The National League in which the representatives of the younger generation (Roman Dmowski and Zygmunt Balicki) played more active parts. They still however, respected and referred to Miłkowski's authority. The National League remained in certain relation with the National Treasury. Its main purpose of activity was to prepare the future fight for independence and its efforts were to be supported financially by the Treasury.

At the same time efforts were made to unite all the Polonia organizations active in Europe into one big legal organization. They yielded fruits in the end of 1891 when The Union of Polish Emigrants with its seat in Geneva was founded.¹⁵ The Union brought together, within the limits of federation, Polish organizations of particular countries e.g. of France and Switzerland etc. Zygmunt Miłkowski again was active in the process of formation of the Union and he propagated its idea also in columns of *Free Polish Word*. The Polish National Treasury stood behind the Union because its status allowed to support current propaganda and political actions when the funds would reach 100.000 CHF. This status allowed that 3/4 percent of the deposited sum in the Switzerland Bank could be used for such purposes.¹⁶

In summer 1895, according to Miłkowski's inspiration, two representatives of the Polish circle in Switzerland (Zygmunt Balicki and Karol Lewakowski), went to Cleveland to take part in the Convention of the Polish National Alliance. They were to agitate for closer cooperation between the American Polonia and the above mentioned Polish organizations in Europe.¹⁷ After their return, Miłkowski also planned to go there to participate in a subsequent Convention of the PNA. Unfortunately, he could not go at that time because of his long and serious illness.

The leaders of PNA however, wanted to offer hospitality to a person of such authority, to a man who had already become a symbol of resistance, a symbol of fight armed both with weapon and with pen. It also seems, that the leaders of PNA understood that Miłkowski's liberal attitude towards religion could strengthen their position in the rivalry with the Polish Roman Catholic Union (PRCU). This organization managed by the Polish clergy wanted to exert control over the souls of Polish peasant emigrants and aimed at the domination over all the organizations of the American Polonia.

¹⁴ *O Lidze Polskiej w Ameryce i Skarbie Polskim w Rapperswylu*, »Przegląd Emigracyjny« [Lwów] June 15, 1894, no 12: 114 - 115; cf. *Jeszcze o Rapperswylu i Skarbie Narodowym*, »Zgoda« [Chicago] April 24, 1895, no 17; cf. S. Osada, *Historia Związku Narodowego Polskiego*, (Chicago, 1905), vol. 1: 401-411.

¹⁵ W. Śladkowski, *Emigracja polska we Francji 1870 - 1918*, (Lublin: Wydawnictwo Lubelskie, 1980), p. 144-145.

¹⁶ *Ustawa Skarbu Narodowego Polskiego*, (Paris: A. Reiff, 1893): 27.

¹⁷ Z. Balicki's letter to H. Gierszyński, Geneva, November 9, 1894 and Z. Miłkowski's letters to H. Gierszyński, Geneva, June 12 and July 2, 1895, BPP, AHG; cf. »Wolne Polskie Słowo«, October 15, 1895, no. 195; cf. K. Groniowski, »Polonia amerykańska a Narodowa Demokracja (1893-1914)«, *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 1972, no. 1: 24-25; cf. S. J. Pastuszka, *Karol Lewakowski. Poglądy i działalność społeczno-polityczna*, Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1980): 204, 226.

That is why again new invitations were being sent from Chicago to Zürich where Miłkowski lived. Finally his visit in the United States became possible in 1900, when the writer's health, who was then already 76, improved considerably. An old emigrant set out on a lonely journey in the middle of August 1900. First he went to Paris to visit the World Exhibition. Then, via Havre proceeded to Southampton where he got aboard the transatlantic German boat »Grosser Kurfürst« which went from Bremen to New York.

Miłkowski's relation from the American expedition is full of interesting observations. There is a detailed description of the journey made in the second class of a huge steam ship. We also have some remarks concerning the changes which had taken place in sea travels in the 19th century when sailing boats had been replaced by steam ships. There are finally some literary references. According to Miłkowski, poetry was the most suitable means to describe a journey by sailing boats, while prose seemed to be more convenient for a description of a journey by steam ships. The steam ship he was traveling by, reminded him much more of a factory than of a ship.¹⁸

Miłkowski's long journey across the States was organized in such a way that he could visit all the important Polonia centers. And the American Polonia was then about 2.000.000 people. After the meeting with the New York Polonia, he went west. He visited Scranton, (what was not planned before) the capital of the Polish National Catholic Church and met there its leader Mr. Franciszek Hodur, a priest. From there he proceeded to Buffalo where the Poles organized him an excursion to see the Niagara Waterfalls. Then he went straight to Chicago which being the capital of PNA was in fact the actual target of his visit. He stayed in this centre of the American Polonia, and at the same time the biggest - after Warsaw - concentration of Polish people in the World, for quite long. He was invited to many homes of various Polonia leaders. He was engaged in discussions with the PNA authorities and during public gathering he agitated for the Polish Treasury. He was explaining why that institution was necessary and so important for the Poles, refuting at the same time counter arguments formulated mainly by the clergy which claimed that it was better to spend money on church and on education and not for a future fight. Miłkowski tried to convince his hearers that education should not be put in opposition to the National Treasury. He emphasized that it was necessary to fight against the partitioners and against their efforts to denationalize the Poles and also to strive for keeping the Polish identity in exile. According to him the National Treasury could help to fulfil all those aims. He reminded that in all political issues funds were of great importance, setting examples of the Irishmen, Jews and Burs fighting in South Africa.

Being in America, Miłkowski met also with the representatives of other Polonia organizations (not only with the leaders of PNA) such as of the Polish Falcons Alliance, Young Men's Alliance and Polish Womens Alliance, because he was of the opinion that he came to visit all the Polonia. Miłkowski never rejected any invitation avoiding thus accusations of partiality. He, for instance, visited the editorial office of the clerical *Chicago Daily* (*Dziennik Chicagoski*) and also schools of St. Stanisław, run by the Ressurrectionists. His good will was not always well interpreted and his visits were used by the hosts as a pretext to pursue the private interests, e. g. the editorial staff of the *Chicago Daily* began to publish in its columns his novel *On the Waters of Babylon*, without Miłkowski's permission and he protested against such an action.

¹⁸ Z. Miłkowski, *Opowiadanie z wędrowki po koloniach polskich w Ameryce*, (Paris 1902): 17-20.

From Chicago he made an excursion to Milwaukee (Wisconsin). He was invited there by Stanisław Osada, a journalist of the local *Polish Courier* (Kurier Polski), who later became one of the leaders of American Polonia. But he always regarded himself as Miłkowski's disciple in the field of journalism because he, just before his voyage to the States in 1893, visited Miłkowski in Switzerland asking him for advice.¹⁹

Miłkowski began his return trip to Europe leaving Chicago on September 28th 1900. Going back East he paid a visit in Detroit to meet the priest Józef Dąbrowski, founder of the Polish Seminary. He wanted to see this complex of Polish schools and to meet its founder personally. He regarded Dąbrowski a paragon of a priest who, being himself a modest person, treated all his work as service. Comparing the Detroit schools with the formerly visited schools in Chicago, he put the Detroit institutions before those of Chicago because, according to him, more modern techniques of teaching were implemented there.

Toledo, Ohio was the next stage of his journey. There he met Antoni Paryski, a famous Polish American publisher, with whom he had been cooperating for some time. The Toledo visit provided him material for reflection on the Polonia press and readership in the Polonia communities as such. Then he went to Cleveland and Pittsburgh. In Washington, when visiting the White House, he had an opportunity to meet in person President William Mc Kinley. From Washington he went to Baltimore and Wilmington where he visited the Polonia organizations which, regarding him as a patron, put his surname in their name. Then, via Philadelphia, he finally reached New York. And, in November 1900, just after his return to Europe, Miłkowski discussed with another member of the National Treasury Board of Directors, dr Henryk Gierszyński, who lived close to Paris, about the results of his journey.²⁰

One can say that Miłkowski's journey across the American continent was a great triumph. He was greeted as a national hero and his visits were solemnly celebrated in almost all the places. There were special meetings, parades, banquets, organized shows. People paid him homage, covered his way with flowers, offered him miscellaneous gifts. Those truly American forms of celebration shocked, confused and embarrassed profoundly that man of great modesty. He, however, accepted all those forms of homage, assuming they were paid not to him but to the issue of independence. Miłkowski was aware that he was not a charismatic speaker because, as he often said: *»on the platform, both lungs and words failed me«*. He ascribed the success of his public performance in the States to his reputation which had preceded him and made him, *»ecce Polonus«*. He wrote about it: *»Understanding patriotism as a matter of great concern, they accepted me as one would accept a teacher, a priest and a leader. That was the reason I was successful as a speaker in America.«*²¹

Agitation for the National Treasury and the Polish League was not Miłkowski's sole preoccupation. He was also interested in the life of the American Polonia. He was concerned about the state of Polish education in America, about the readership of Polish books. He listened to the language of the Poles overseas. He was worried, because he noticed that

¹⁹ Biografy of Stanisław Osada, by F.German, in: *PSB*, XXIV (1979): 323-5; cf. *Odczyt wygłoszony przez Stanisława Osadę na obchodzie rocznicy Konstytucji 3 Maja w Genewie*, *»Wolne Polskie Słowo«*, [Geneva-Paris] Mai 15, 1893, No. 137.

²⁰ Telegram Miłkowski's to Gierszyński, Cherbourg, November 5, 1900, BPP, AHG

²¹ Miłkowski, *op. cit.*: 94-95.

young people, who had already been born in the States used English when they were communicating. He also visited, as I have already mentioned, editorial offices: of *Kurier Polski* edited by Michał Kruszka in Milwaukee, of *Dziennik Chicagowski* and *Echo* edited by A. Paryski in Toledo.

After his return from the States Miłkowski frequently acted as a mediator in the conflicts inside the American Polonia, e. g. between the authorities of PNA located in Chicago and the Polonia centres in the East, particularly in Philadelphia and New York. His letters to Stanisław Osada elucidate that problem thoroughly.²² He was trying to influence the decisions of the PNA concerning the matter of the Treasury (like the introduction of a regular tax for the benefit of the Treasury). Miłkowski advised the Polish diaspora in different matters, for instance, he supported Colonel Smoliński's initiative to erect a monument in the memory of Kazimierz Pułaski as a hero of Poland and America.

It seems, that the most important result of Miłkowski's trip to America was better functioning of the National Treasury and a temporary growth of its income.

American observations made the old writer think that maintenance of the Polish identity in exile was of the utmost importance. The key to keeping Polishness was, as he frequently underlined, knowledge of the Polish language. That is why, after his return to Europe, he tried to organize a shipment of Polish books to America. This action however did not bring any desirable results.²³

All Miłkowski's life was a long term service for the benefit of a free and independent Poland. He wanted to consolidate as many Poles to join that service as possible. That is why he strove for keeping the Polish identity in the Polish Diaspora, particularly in America and fought for their financial participation for the motherland support.

Miłkowski did not regard himself a writer, but a solver of the Polish Question. His attitude of an activist and publicist brought effects because it went hand in hand with his fame and reputation of a writer and also with his renown as a fighter for »our and your freedom«.

²² Z. Jędrzyński, »Listy Teodora Tomasza Jeża (Zygmunta Miłkowskiego do Stanisława Osady«, *Rocznik Kulturalny Kujaw i Pomorza*, (1967/68): 243-277.

²³ H. Florkowska-Francić, »Between Switzerland and America. The Polish Museum in Rapperswil and the Poles in the United States 1870-1914«, in: *Ethnicity. Culture. City. Polish Americans in the USA. Cultural Aspects of Urban Life, 1870-1950 in Comparative Perspective*, ed. by T. Gładsky, A. Walaszek, M. M. Wawrykiewicz, (Warsaw: Oficyna Naukowa 1998): p. 248.

POVZETEK ZYGMUNT MIŁKOWSKI IN AMERIŠKA POLONIA

Zygmunt Miłkowski (1824-1915) je bil pomemben in dejaven poljski izseljenec, popularen pisec (avtor številnih člankov in skoraj stotih novel). Sodeloval je v ilegalnem gibanju, v oboroženih spopadih. V času pomladi narodov se je boril na Madžarskem in kasneje za neodvisnost Poljske v januarski vstaji 1863-64. Zaradi zatrtih narodnih vstaj se je Miłkowski odločil, da si je nujno treba prizadevati za drugačne oblike aktivnosti. Tako je v izgnanstvu sodeloval s poljskimi izseljenskimi organizacijami. Pisanje je bilo pomemben del njegovega življenja in postalo njegovo glavno orožje v boju za neodvisnost.

Bil je eden od ustanoviteljev Poljske narodne zakladnice. V svoji brošuri *O aktivni obrambi in narodni zakladnici* (1887) poziva k zbiranju denarja, s katerim bi organizirali boj za neodvisnost Poljske. Miłkowski je bil tudi predsednik odbora direktorjev te ustanove. Na povabilo Poljske narodne zveze Amerike je leta 1900 obiskal Polonia centre. Njegova pot čez ameriški kontinent je bila veliko zmagoslavje – povsod so ga sprejeli kot narodnega heroja. V želji, da bi v sklad konsolidiral čim več Poljakov, je skušal pregovoriti ameriško Polonio, da bi denarno podprla Narodno zakladnico.

Miłkowski se je imel za rešitelja poljskega problema. Njegova drža aktivista in pisca je bila učinkovita, ker se je skladala z njegovim slovesom borca za »našo in tvojo svobodo«.

Jan Lencznarowicz

POLISH REFUGEE INTELLECTUALS IN AUSTRALIA AFTER WORLD WAR II

*»Tired, embittered,
wary of each other -
like men whose death sentences
have been commuted,
they turned their faces
from a shore
none of them could forget«.*

Peter Skrzynecki, *Sailing to Australia*¹

It is estimated that between 500 000 and 600 000 Poles did not return to Soviet-controlled Poland from the West after World War II. This wave of refugees was composed of wartime exiles, ex-servicemen who fought in the Polish Armed Forces in the West and Displaced Persons. The so-called »Polish London« with the President-in-Exile, Government, political parties, newspapers and main organisations with branches in other non-communist countries became a virtual capital of the Polish post-war emigration.² It was also the leading Polish emigre intellectual centre, although Paris or New York played an important role, too.³ At the end of 1940s and in the early 1950s, apart from the United Kingdom, Poles settled in the USA, Canada, France, and other countries. Some went as far as Australia.

This article discusses the role played by a relatively small number of intellectuals in Polish emigrant community in Australia. In the English-language literature the terms »intelligentsia« and »intellectuals« are often used interchangeably. In this paper by »intelligentsia« I understand the classical intelligentsia, such as it developed in the 19th century Central and Eastern Europe. As a separate social stratum it consisted of people of a wide range of occupations and various intellectual and educational levels, who shared certain beliefs, attitudes and manners. They formed a broad segment of society with a relatively homogeneous spiritual culture. Intellectuals, on the other hand, do not form a separate social stratum. They are usually defined as those members of society who are devoted to the development of ideas and become intellectuals, without changing their class attach-

¹ P. Skrzynecki, *The Polish Immigrant*, Brisbane 1982, p. 8.

² K. Sword, N. Davies, J. Ciechanowski, *The Formation of the Polish Community in Great Britain 1939-1950*, London 1989; J. Zubrzycki, *Polish Immigrants in Britain: A study of adjustment*, The Hague 1956; B. Czaykowski, B. Sulik, *Polacy w Wielkiej Brytanii*, Paryż 1961

³ T. Terlecki (ed.), *Literatura polska na obczyźnie 1940-1960*, Londyn 1964-1965, vol. 1-2; A. Friszke (ed.) *Z dziejów polskiej emigracji politycznej po drugiej wojnie światowej*, Warszawa 1994; *Materiały do dziejów polskiego uchodźstwa niepodległościowego*, Londyn 1994-1997, vol. 1-8.

ment, by virtue of their intellectual interest, activity, training and achievements.⁴ In the discussion of the role of intellectuals in the Polish refugee community in Australia one has to take into account their intelligentsia milieu and its characteristics.

The paper outlines their involvement in the development of the Polish emigre ideology vis-a-vis the situation in the Soviet-dominated homeland as well as the preservation of the Polish cultural identity in the context of the Anglo-Australian cultural pressure. In order to assess Polish intellectuals' contribution to their ethnic group and to the host society it seems advisable to look at some examples of their individual careers, their achievements and failures in the new country.

Approximately 65 000 Polish refugees came to Australia between 1947 and 1951. Most of them were peasants or unskilled workers, predominantly former forced labourers in Germany. In addition, there were ex-servicemen, former inmates of German concentration and POW camps, survivors of the Soviet terror and other groups. All of them formed the post-war Polish community in Australia which was strengthened by new waves of immigrants after 1956 and in the 1980s. Most Polish refugees arriving in Australia through the Displaced Persons scheme were poorly educated. Moreover, in accordance with the Australian government's policy even those with high qualifications had to work as unskilled labourers or domestics.⁵ They had been brought to Australia because of the labour force shortage and were sent to railways and public works, road buildings and other building schemes, timber industry, housing and similar menial occupations, avoided by Australian workers. After the obligatory two year contract the majority of Polish emigrants continued to work in unskilled or semiskilled jobs.⁶ Only some professionals managed to overcome restrictions and move to »white collar« professions.⁷

On the whole, thanks to their hard work and continuous economic growth Polish emigrants of peasant or working class origin were relatively well-to-do and seemed to be proud of their achievements in a new country. Conversely, those representatives of the Polish intelligentsia who earned a living as »blue-collar« workers and could not get recognition of their qualifications found themselves on the margin of the mainstream Australian life. The divergence between these two social strata in their social and economic situation as well as in their ways of life was also seen in their organisational affiliations.

The reduced social status of many Polish intellectuals had some other results as well. It pushed them still stronger into the activities of the Polish emigrant group. Ex-servicemen of the Polish Army, former consular staff, leaders and activists of Polish clubs and organisations formed a hard core of emigre organisational life. Intellectuals rarely occupied the most important positions. In fact they stood aloof from some organisations, most notably those grouping emigrants of peasant origin, and in many cases refrained from any activities. By and large they did not take lead in organising the community. Yet, if we

⁴ A. Gella, An Introduction to the Sociology of the Intelligentsia [in:] A. Gella (ed.), *The Intelligentsia and Intellectuals. Theory, Method and Case Study*, London 1976, pp.20-21.

⁵ E. Kunz, *Displaced Persons. Calwell's New Australians*, Sydney 1988, p. 84, 139-162.

⁶ J. Zubrzycki, *Settlers of the Latrobe Valley. A Sociological Study of Immigrants in the Brown Coal Industry*, Canberra 1964, p. 74; idem, »Some Aspects of Structural Assimilation of Immigrants in Australia«, *International Migration*, 1968, vol. 6, no.3., p.102-110.

⁷ E. Kunz, *The Intruders: Refugee Doctors in Australia*, Canberra 1975; idem, »The Engineering Profession and the Displaced Person Migrant in Australia«, *International Migration*, vol. 7, nos 1-2, 1969, pp.22-30.

take into account all Polish communities in Australia, we can not accept the notion that being caught in their own sterile bubble of culture and exhausted by war and post-war experiences the intelligentsia played no active role in the corporate life of the Polish migrants or there were only some individual efforts on its part.⁸ It is true that ex-servicemen, with their stamina and clearly stated political and ideological vision, dominated organisational life and even succeeded in a kind of conscious-rising role, traditionally assumed by emigre intellectuals.⁹ However, these two groups were not mutually exclusive. Besides, some intellectuals did participate not only in their own inward-oriented exclusive clubs but in general organisations and institutions, as well. They were instrumental in the development of the Polish emigrant community's political and ideological identity.

In accordance with the position of the Polish emigre centre in London they defined the Polish group in Australia in terms of political emigration, linking it with the 19th century tradition of fighting for national independence, and conceived of the emigration as a pilgrimage leading to an independent Poland. They evoked images of Polish patriots who, when forced to leave their partitioned homeland, continued their struggle »for our and your freedom« in Europe and America. In spite of the stability of the post-Yalta order in Europe and the communist power in Poland they insisted on the idea of continuing struggle for their homeland's independence and refugees' mission in its liberation. The adherence to this principle was to distinguish Poles in Australia from the masses of economic immigrants. In this regard, intellectuals active in Polish group's life helped to construct its central ideologies, beliefs and myths. Although they did not any longer monopolise »*the right to preach, teach and interpret the world*« and shared these responsibilities with ex-servicemen and other non-intelligentsia activists, they still met classical Karl Mannheim's definition: »*In every society there are social groups whose special task it is to provide an interpretation of the world for that society. We call these the intelligentsia.*«¹⁰

As makers and guardians of emigre community's symbolic universe they provided significant meaning for emigrants' life and social activity, facilitated the integration of the group vis-à-vis their homeland and the country of settlement and helped to express refugees' bitter experiences.

At the same time some intellectuals attempted to take on an opposite role. Revolted against dominant political, ideological or social beliefs spread by the emigre establishment they fulfilled an important function within the community. They violated some taboos, criticised particular leaders or some attitudes and behaviour, discussed uncomfortable topics or exposed skeletons deeply hidden in the community's cupboard. No wonder that novels, articles, columns or satirical poems written among others by Andrzej Chciuk, Andrzej Gawroński, Adam Nasielski and Jacek Suski provoked strong reactions.

All that was evident in the Polish press published in Australia.¹¹ Of course, its level was not as high as that of leading Polish emigre publications in London or Paris but it expressed similar attitudes and opinions. It attracted such contributors as professional journalists Edmund Jakubowski, Bolesław Korpowski and Ludwik Kruszelnicki, former diplomats Zygmunt Przybytkiewicz, Alfred Poninski, Edmund Parnes as well as writers Andr-

⁸ R. Unikowski, *Communal Endeavours. Migrant Organisations in Melbourne*, Canberra 1978, p.81-82, 89.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 64, 71, passim

¹⁰ K. Mannheim, *Ideologia i utopia*, Lublin 1992, p.8.

¹¹ J. Lencznarowicz, *Prasa i społeczność polska w Australii. 1928-1980*, Kraków 1994.

zej Chciuk, Zbigniew Jasiński and Władysław Romanowski. Most newspapers, with their artistic and cultural sections, articles and reviews focused on literature, history social and political issues, were addressed to the Polish intelligentsia in Australia. They seem to present an attempt to rebuild literary, historical and social debates, so characteristic to the pre-war quality press in Poland.

On the pages of *Wiadomości Polskie* (Sydney), *Tygodnik Polski* (Melbourne) or *Forum* (Sydney) authors and readers could recover, at least to some extent, still vivid to them the world of Polish history and culture. While in their everyday life they rarely had contact with high culture and could not practise their professions, in the Polish-language press journalists, poets, diplomats, historians, judges or teachers found a haven for themselves and an outlet for their literary production. They again adopted roles which were more often than not beyond their reach in the Anglo-Australian mainstream society.¹²

Cultural organisations served similar aims. The researcher who investigated Melbourne-based cultural associations and clubs observed:

»One senses sadness and a certain gallantry in the low-key attempt to recreate in miniature the broken rhythm of a former life, in clinging to the nostalgic memory of European culture. For their members, the small number of intellectuals and professionals bereft of status and acceptable milieu, the cultural groups offer companionship of peers and congenial leisure time pursuits.«¹³

Such associations as Polish Cultural and Artistic Circle in Sydney, and analogous organisations in Melbourne¹⁴ and Adelaide enriched the cultural life of the Polish community. Unlike other groups preoccupied mainly with political, social and educational tasks they put stronger emphasis on cultural and intellectual issues. They also provided a common ground for Polish and Polish-Jewish intellectuals who shared general outlooks, common interests and artistic tastes. As a matter of fact, the assimilated to Polish culture Jewish-Polish intelligentsia was involved as both authors and readers in the Polish emigrant press. They took part as actors and audience in the Polish emigrant theatre, and supported some social and cultural events and organisations. In some cases they passed on the Polish language to their children.

Writers, such as Andrzej Chciuk, Zygmunt Przybytkiewicz, Ludwik Tabaczynski, expressed one of the most severe experiences of Polish emigrants in the Antipodes - longing for their homeland, the country of their childhood memories. Surrounded by Australian natural and social environment, so different from their native country or other European country they knew (even stars in the sky were not the same as in Europe), they dreamt about Poland. But not so much about an actual Poland, which was under Communist rule and only few Australian Poles made up their mind to return there. Their dreams went back to well-known landscapes, hometowns, families and friends. Thus, in their novels, poems, memoirs and occasional articles writers provided their compatriots with the ideal image of their homeland, set in the past and opposed to the Polish People's Republic.

¹² The same function was noticed by V. Turek in case of the Polish press in Canada which served the same post-war wave of Polish refugees. See V. Turek, *The Polish-Language Press in Canada*, Toronto 1962, p. 32.

¹³ R. Unikowski, *Communal Endeavour...*, p. 80.

¹⁴ A. Gawroński, *Polskie Koło Kulturalno-Artystyczne* [in:] Z. Derwiński, *Kronika Federacji Polskich Organizacji w Wiktorii (1962-1992)*, Melbourne 1993, pp. 239-245.

Some Polish intellectuals, notwithstanding their increasing participation in the mainstream Anglo-Australian educational and cultural institutions, insisted on the preservation of Polish language and culture, and handing them over to the next generation.¹⁵ This aim was also embraced by many of those who had no chance to pursue their professional careers in Anglo-Australian setting. They sought to influence their community by the establishment of associations, theatres, choirs, dance and music groups which popularised Polish culture.

Efforts were made to organise archives documenting Polish emigrants' life in Australia or even specific research institutions. Following other centres of the Polish diaspora in the world Warsaw-trained historian Marian Szczepanowski set up the Polish Historical Association in Australia, based in Adelaide. It not only collected documents concerning the history of the Polish group in Australia and books on Polish history in general but it also tried to coordinate historical research and published first results.¹⁶

Lech Paszkowski chose a different way. Born in Warsaw in 1919, after five and a half years as a German POW, in 1948 he arrived in Australia where he worked in many different occupations, including leading hand in a steel factory. Meanwhile he studied English and journalism and contributed to the Polish press in Australia and in other countries. However, Paszkowski's main preoccupation became the study of the Polish presence in Australian history. His research resulted in numerous articles and several books, most notably *Poles in Australia and Oceania 1790-1940*¹⁷ and *Sir Paul Edmund de Strzelecki. Reflections on his life*.¹⁸ In some cases he dug out forgotten Polish (or linked with Poland) explorers, adventurers and settlers who came to the Antipodes in 19th and the first half of 20th century. His single-handed venture had a specific importance for the Polish refugees in Australia. When they arrived they were called »*New Australians*« or with less courtesy »*bloody refsos*« or »*Balts*«. They were expected to settle down quickly and eagerly adopt Australian »way of life« which at that time was equated with the loss of Polish culture, traditions and language. In 1960s and 70s, in a changing cultural atmosphere and with the ideology of assimilation receding, Paszkowski's writings pointed to various and ethnically diversified sources of Australian history and identity, so conveniently ignored in the mainstream Anglo-Australian culture. Paszkowski and other authors provided Polish emigrants

¹⁵ R. McL. Harris, »Educational Initiatives of the Post-War Polish Community in Australia: the Maintenance of Ethnicity«, *Melbourne Studies in Education*, 1980; J.J. Smolicz, M.J. Secombe, *Polish Culture and Education in Australia: A Review of Some Recent Research and Educational Developments* [in:] R. Sussex, J. Zubrzycki (eds.), *Polish People and Culture in Australia*, Canberra 1985.

¹⁶ Under the auspices of the Polish Historical Association in Australia following books were published: M. Szczepanowski, *Pamiętkowe koperty milenijne wydane w Australii*, Melbourne - Adelaide 1969; M. Szczepanowski (ed.), *Polacy w Południowej Australii 1948-1968*, t. I, Adelaide 1971; K. Skwarko, *Osiedlenie Młodzieży Polskiej w Nowej Zelandii w roku 1944*, London-Adelaide-Hamilton 1972; T. Kempa, *Polacy w Tasmanii 1947-1972*, Hobart 1974; M. Szczepanowski (ed.), *Polski Ośrodek Milenium Enfield. Południowa Australia 1948-1979*, Adelajda 1981.

¹⁷ Sydney 1987. Its earlier version appeared in Polish: *Polacy w Australii i Oceanii 1790-1940*, London 1962.

¹⁸ Melbourne 1997. In addition L. Paszkowski is the author of *Social Background of Sir Strzelecki and Joseph Conrad*, Melbourne 1980; co-author and editor of *Dr John Lhotsky - The Turbulent Australian Writer Naturalist and Explorer*, Melbourne 1977 and editor of *Strzelecki's Ascent of Mount Kosciusko 1840*, by Lieutenant Colonel Hugh Powell G. Clews, Melbourne 1973. He contributed to the *Australian Dictionary of Biography* (1969-1990) and *Polski Słownik Biograficzny [Polish Dictionary of Biography]* (1975-1994).

in Australia with historical legitimacy and substantiated emigrants claims that Polish group and its culture should enjoy equal rights in the developing multicultural Australian society.

Here we touch upon the transformation of the Polish group in Australia from refugees, who in a new and alien environment had to build their lives from scratch, into the developed and integrated Polish ethnic community whose members participated in mainstream Australian life. Similarly, a number of refugee intellectuals also found their way to Australian mainstream society. Even though some representatives of the older generation managed to carve a niche for themselves on the Australian labour market (e.g. ex-diplomats contributed to Australian newspapers or became editors), those who arrived in their twenties and thirties had much better chances to adjust themselves to local conditions and mark their presence on the Australian intellectual life. Some succeeded in gaining degrees in Australia or in Great Britain where they could benefit from special academic schemes for Polish ex-servicemen and later migrated to Australia with their British degrees and diplomas. An interesting case in point is the academic career of Jerzy Zubrzycki. Born in 1920 in Cracow, during the war served as a courier from occupied Poland. He graduated from the University of London and did his Ph.D. in sociology at the Free Polish University Abroad in London in 1954. He moved to Canberra and in 1956 took up a post in the Research School of Social Sciences of the Australian National University. After 30 years Professor Zubrzycki retired from the Foundation Chair of Sociology. His main field of interest was sociology of migration and social stratification. Apart from his academic work he was active in social policy, served on many committees and councils, including chairmanship of the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council (1977-1981). His recommendations influenced government's immigration and ethnic policies and Zubrzycki himself played a major part in the shaping of multicultural policy.

Jerzy J. Smolicz, professor of the Adelaide University, represents a younger generation. Born in 1935 in Eastern Poland, during the war was deported by the Soviets. He received his primary education in French in Lebanon and his secondary education in Scotland. Then he studied at Edinburgh University and at Lincoln College, Oxford. In 1965 he came to Australia and was appointed to Adelaide University, where he developed his research on cultural pluralism and multicultural education.

In the Polish community such academic or artistic careers (e.g. Stanisław Ostoja-Kotkowski) were greeted with satisfaction and pride. Particular intellectuals or artists who made them were not always involved in the Polish group's activities, neither were all of them popular with their fellow-countrymen. However, in the Polish eyes their presence in the Australian academic or artistic life testified to the richness of Polish cultural heritage and upgraded the status of the whole Polish community in Australia.

From the very beginning Poles who refused to return to Communist-dominated Poland declared as one of their main objectives in exile the popularization of knowledge about the nature of the Communist system. Their presence in the West was to remind their host societies that the right of the Polish nation to self-determination could not be ignored. In particular the emigre intellectuals aimed at informing the world of the situation under the communist rule in Poland and other communist countries, mobilizing resistance against Soviet growing influence on the international scene and creating a favourable atmosphere for Poland. In 1956 poet Kazimierz Wierzyński explained in London why he could not go back to his homeland:

»If we became silent, we would deny our conscience, we would renounce our fat-

hers, our land and our nation. If we returned, a dead silence about Poland's lost freedom would prevail in the whole world. For our nation Moscow would speak». ¹⁹ However, Polish exiled intellectuals offered a testimony which at that time very few of their Western colleagues were prepared to pay attention to.

In Australia Polish intellectuals, like those from other countries of the Soviet block, saw their role as that of making Australians aware of the communist danger in both foreign policy and internal situation. ²⁰ This seemed all the more important as they were shocked by what they perceived as the Australians' lack of interest in politics, foreign affairs in particular. In their eyes Australian policy gained importance because of the spread of communism in South-East Asia and the confrontation between the USSR and China versus the United States and its allies in the Pacific region. Almost all elements on the Australian political and cultural scene: organisations and people alike were judged by their stand on communism and Soviet policy. Polish commentators tried to reconcile faithfulness to the country of origin with loyalty to the country of settlement, pointing out that »*all attempts to strengthen the Free World are in the best interest of Poland and Australia*«. ²¹ In 1951 Edmund Parnes, the Liaison Officer of the Polish Government in Victoria and South Australia during the war, pointed out that the Australian press and radio was in general unfavourable to Poland. This, he claimed, resulted from the fact that Soviet and Communism sympathizers worked as editors and did their best to stop any honest information about Poland. In his as well as other Polish observers opinion, the only exception was the Catholic press which perceived Poles as allies in the fight against communism and bravely took up Polish affairs. ²²

No doubt that Ryszard Krygier (1917-1986) did more than any refugee from Poland to make Australians aware of totalitarian threats in the modern world. Krygier was a Polish Jew to whom - as his son pointed out - the adjective was no less important than the noun. ²³ In 1939 he graduated in law at Warsaw University. In the 1930s he had been a communist fellow-traveller, a popular front socialist until the Moscow trials and the Soviet-Nazi collaboration in the destruction of the Polish state shocked him. Together with his wife Roma he witnessed the Sovietisation of Wilno (Vilnius) but soon they found themselves among those few who obtained Japanese transit visas. They made a long train trip across the Soviet Union to Vladivostok and via Tokyo and Shanghai reached Sydney just three weeks before Pearl Harbour. As Peter Coleman remarked, »*this youthful survival of both the Holocaust and the Gulag produced in Krygier a democratic, anti-totalitarian, pro-American illumination that the years only deepened*«. ²⁴ Nevertheless, his sympathies were still with the Left.

In Sydney he was a correspondent for the Polish Telegraph Agency and a press officer of the Polish Consulate-General until it was closed down by the Australian Govern-

¹⁹ *Dlaczego nie wracamy. Głos pisarzy polskich w wolnym świecie*, London 1956, p. 29.

²⁰ J. Lencznarowicz, »The Polish Immigrant Press in Australia and Australian Politics 1949-1979«, *Znansztvena Revija* (Maribor) 1991, no.2, vol.3, pp.415-427; on the attitude of the Polish emigre leadership in Australia towards the communist regime in Poland and Poland's international standing see J. Lencznarowicz, *The Polish Press in Australia as a Link Between Polish Emigrants and Their Homeland, 1949-1980* [in:] J.S. Pula, M.B. Biskupski (eds.) *The Polish Diaspora*, New York 1993, pp.103-127.

²¹ R.K., *Wybory i »polskie głosy«*, *Wiadomości Polskie [Polish News]*, Sydney, 23 November 1958, p.4.

²² *Światła i cienie informacji o Polsce*, *Echo* (Perth), 13 May 1951.

²³ M. Krygier, »Stalemated in Poland«, *Quadrant* (Sydney), March 1986.

²⁴ *Quadrant Index 1956-1986 with a Preface by Peter Coleman and a Bibliographical Note by Brian Dibble*, Sydney 1988, p. iv.

ment, following the Yalta agreement. He also worked as a shop assistant and a waiter. Later, apart from his continual involvement in the Polish press and community, he started a modest business.

But above all Krygier was determined to share his understanding of the totalitarian dangers with other Australians. As he put it some years later,

*»I wanted to spread the message. Not by calling for support for any Party, creed or ideology, but simply [...] just to make sure that we never live under a system in which our children could be made to denounce us«.*²⁵

It was not an easy task. At that time in Australia the Soviet mythos, as George Orwell called it, *»was more vibrant among intellectuals than in any English-speaking country except Minnesota«.*²⁶ The Communist Party was at its peak and enjoyed strong influence in trade unions and the left wing of the Labour Party.²⁷ However, Krygier managed to establish contacts with a wide range of politicians, academics, lawyers, unionists, clergy, industrialists and writers, most of them were of a right-wing Labour Party disposition. In 1954 he played a crucial role in the formation of the Australian Committee (later renamed as Association) for Cultural Freedom, affiliated with the Congress of Cultural Freedom set up in Berlin in 1950. Association's aim was to defend liberal democracy and the American alliance against the totalitarian threat. John Lantham, a former Chief Justice of the Australian High Court, became its first President and John Kerr, a leader of the Sydney Bar and later Governor-General of Australia, as well as W.C. Wentworth, Liberal Member of the House of Representatives and Minister for Social Security, were among its activists.

In 1956 inspired by Irvin Kristol, then the co-editor of *Encounter*, Krygier started publishing a literary and cultural journal *Quadrant*. Its first editor was a poet and thinker, former anarchist, then revolted against modernity and converted to Catholicism James McAuley. *Quadrant* focused on widely understood culture, on the crisis of Western civilisation and covered current political as well as social and economic issues.

The Australian Association for Cultural Freedom and the *Quadrant*, along with the circle of contributors and sympathizers played an important, exceptional role in Australian intellectual life.

Conclusion

The handful of Polish intellectuals who in the wake of the Second World War found themselves in Australia faced difficult situation. For the most part they were at odds with the Australian cultural setting, with its pervasive anti-intellectual atmosphere, different values, patterns of behaviour and customs. Language barrier coupled with work in blue-collar jobs, at first enforced on them and latter often continued because of lack of other opportunities, set them farther apart from the mainstream cultural life. The prevailing climate of prompt and aggressive assimilation to Anglo-Australian culture downgraded new-

²⁵ R. Krygier, »The Making of a Cold Warrior. The Prehistory of the Australian Association«, *Quadrant*, November 1986, p.42.

²⁶ P. Coleman, »The Prodigal Sons. The unlikely story of Richard Krygier and the Australian Association for Cultural Freedom«, *Quadrant*, November 1986, p. 11.

²⁷ L. Overacker, *Australian Parties in a Changing Society 1945-1967*, Melbourne 1968, pp.159-161.

comers' culture and its main representatives – refugee intellectuals. Most of them were bitterly opposed to pro-Soviet sympathies, still dominant at that time in the fellow-traveling intellectual milieu of Australia.

They persisted in their intellectual interests and, in some cases, struggled to follow their professions. Some tried to recover, at least partially, their pre-war social position and in the context of the emigrant group fulfil social and cultural functions traditionally attributed to them in Polish society. These attempts were not entirely in vain. They enriched their personal life and contributed to the development of the Polish-Australian community, well-organized and with a strong sense of national identity and mission. Smaller but still considerable group managed to pursue academic or artistic careers in the mainstream Australian context. They brought their experiences and elements of Polish heritage into their respective fields of interests and augmented Australian cultural life. They, too, had their modest part in Australia's transformation into a multicultural society. In recent decades some of them visited Polish universities or even worked there for some time. They have come full circle and now in Poland they introduce students into Australian affairs.

*POVZETEK POLJSKI INTELEKTUALCI – UBEŽNIKI V
AVSTRALJO PO DRUGI SVETOVNI VOJNI*

Po ugotovitvah je v Avstralijo med letoma 1947 in 1951 prispelo 65.000 poljskih ubežnikov. Večinoma so bili to kmetje ali neizobraženi delavci, ki so bili med drugo svetovno vojno prisilno deportirani iz okupirane Poljske v Nemčijo. Poleg njih so bili tudi bivši vojaki, bivši ujetniki nemških koncentracijskih taborišč, tisti, ki so preživeli sovjetsko nasilje, ter druge skupine. Vsi skupaj so tvorili povojno poljsko skupnost v Avstraliji, ki jo je okrepil nov val priseljencev po letu 1956 in v osemdesetih letih.

Ta prispevek skušal pojasniti vlogo, ki jo je imela relativno majhna skupina intelektualcev v družabnem, kulturnem in političnem življenju avstralsko-poljske skupine. Še posebej je predmet raziskave njihov prispevek k ohranjanju poljske kulturne identitete pod anglo-avstralskim kulturnim pritiskom. V središču pozornosti je njihov odnos do razmer na Poljskem pod sovjetsko nadvlado ter njihov vpliv na odnos med poljsko skupnostjo in domovino ter poljsko diasporo v drugih državah (še posebej s »poljskim Londonom«). Posebna pozornost je namenjena tistim vodjem, pisateljem in publicistom, ki so igrali pomembno vlogo pri razvoju poljske emigracijske ideologije, njenih prevladujočih simbolov, mitov in podob.

Avtor razišče poglede, ki jih imajo poljski intelektualci na avstralsko družbo in politiko, ter njihov prispevek k javnemu življenju v Avstraliji. Prikazuje kariere posameznikov, njihove dosežke ali neuspehe v novi državi.

DAVORIN HOSTNIK'S JOURNALISTIC ACTIVITY

Emigration from the Slovene provinces to Russia began in the second half of the 19th century. Unlike Slovene emigration to America, it had no mass-movement character because it involved only the Slovene intelligentsia. Another distinctive characteristic of Slovene emigrants to Russia was their political orientation - the overwhelming majority of them were liberal young people of Russophile orientation.

The Slavic Teachers' Institute in St. Petersburg, which functioned from 1866 to 1882, became an important channel of Slovene emigration. It was founded in connection with school reforms in Russia. The spreading of revolutionary ideas among Russian students, together with a series of terrorist acts committed by them, including Karakozov's attempted assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1866, compelled the ruling circles to reconsider the liberal school reforms from the beginning of the sixties.

The new reforms, drafted by reactionary Count D.A. Tolstoy, stipulated a sharp reduction in so-called »political« subjects (history, literature, natural science, modern languages) and extension of »non-political« subjects (mathematics, ancient languages) in the *gymnasias* (grammar schools). A total of 41% of all study time was devoted to learning Greek and Latin. The *gymnasias* began to feel an acute shortage of teachers of ancient languages. The Slavic Teachers' Institute in St. Petersburg was called on to quickly prepare young Slavs who had graduated from philological faculties in Austria-Hungary. The period of study at the Institute was 1 to 2 years. During this time a scholarship holder learned Russian language and attended lectures in Russian history and Russian legislation. Some of them managed to graduate from the Institute early, including F. Celestin in 10 months and J. Klemenčič in 9 months and 11 days.

According to its lists of scholars, 14 Slovenes graduated from the Slavic Teachers' Institute, namely V. Brezovar, F. Celestin, M. Bole, F. Rebec, J. Klemenčič, M. Kramarič, F. Štifter, S. Širok, V. Šumi, A. Logar, D. Paskolo, V. Kraigher, P. Lešnik and N. Žagar. All of them were sent to Russian *gymnasias*, from St. Petersburg to Irkutsk.

However, the The Slavic Teachers' Institute was not the only channel of emigration for Slovenes to Russia. Many of them came independently, taking advantage of the opportunities offered by the situation. In this way D. Hostnik and L. Leskovec came to Russia. The latter passed examinations at Moscow University to acquire the status of a teacher of ancient languages, and for many years he taught ancient languages in Kishinev and Odessa. I. Kos, a relative of V. Zarnik, succeeded in amassing a fortune in Russia and became the proprietor of a firm, importing to Russia machines and jewelry. He was keen on chess and actively contributed to the first Russian chess magazine *Shaklmatny listok*. An artist from Ljubljana, T. Martelanc, the man of letters J. Lavrin and others emigrated to Russia in the period leading up to the First World War.

The question arises whether there was any emigration of Slovenes from the lower echelons of society to Russia. That such attempts were made is confirmed by certain documents from the Foreign Policy Archive of the Russian Empire.

After the Crimean war a part of the local inhabitants (Tatars, Nagays) left the Crimea. In 1857 The Ministry of State Property took a decision to populate the abandoned land on preferential terms with colonists - Russian national peasants and emigrants from the Turkish lands who shared their religion (Bulgarians, Serbs, Montenegrins, Moldavians and Greeks). By the end of November 1861 in the Tavridean province some 2005 Russian families and 1377 foreign families had been settled.¹

Colonization of the Tavridean province aroused the interest of the Southern Slavs living in the Habsburg dominions. On 23 October/3 November 1861 the Russian consul in Fiume (Rijeka), V.F. Kozhevnikov, sent a report to the director of the Asian Department at the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, P.N. Stremoukhov.

»In June this year« - wrote the consul - *»I had the honour of submitting for the consideration of the Director of the Asian Department the fact that several Slovenes living in Fiume appealed to me with a request to find out whether our government permits Slavs of the Catholic religion to settle in Russia, preferably on the Crimean peninsula, and what are the conditions under which our office can permit such emigration. After some time Viktor Petrovich Balabin [the Russian ambassador in Austria-Hungary - I. Ch.] informed me that His Majesty the Emperor had magnanimously consented to a thousand (1000) Catholic families being settled in Russia«.*²

It is hard to know if the emigration of Slovenes to the Crimea solicited by Kozhevnikov actually took place - I have not come across any documents relating to this. Nevertheless, there is some information about a colony of Catholic emigrants in the south of Russia at the beginning of the 1870's. When the well-known Slovene national figure M. Majar tried to emigrate to Russia in 1870, his Russian friends offered him the position of a priest in a Catholic colony.³ But it is difficult to say whether the members of the colony were Slovenes.

The majority of Slovene emigrant intellectuals who settled in Russia, and proceeded to become well-to-do, turned into entirely loyal Russian citizens. Yet some of them preserved the liberal convictions of their youth. These included L. Leskovec, J. Lavrin, F. Štifter and D. Hostnik. They all wrote for the Russian and Slovene press, acquainting the Russian reader with the situation in the Slovene lands and the Slovene reader with economic, political and cultural life in Russia. They aimed to become a kind of bridge in establishing mutual understanding between the two nations. A great deal was achieved in this respect by Hostnik.

The name of Davorin (in Russian Martin Matveevich) Hostnik was quite widely known as the name of the man of learning who wrote the first Russian-Slovene and Slovene-Russian dictionaries, supplied with Russian grammar for Slovenes and Slovene grammar for Russians. Their publishing in Gorica in 1897 and 1901 was financed by the St. Petersburg Slavic Philanthropic Society. In spite of their shortcomings, these dictionaries were highly regarded in Russian and Slovene society. Until the middle of the 20th century

¹ AVPRI. F. Slavyansky stol. D. 8603. L. 20 ob-21.

² AVPRI. Glav. Arh. V-A2. Op.. 181. D. 1012. L. 34.

³ Churkina *I.V. Matija Maar Ziljski*. Ljubljana/Laibach - Klagenfurt/Celovec 1995, pp. 201-202.

they remained the only textbooks for Russians who wanted to learn the Slovene language and vice-versa.

In the present article I shall not dwell on Hostnik's academic activities, but concentrate on his writing and publishing activities, which are less known in historical literature.

Hostnik was born to a relatively prosperous peasant family near Litija in Lower Carniola on 14 September 1853. From 1865 to 1872 he attended grammar school in Ljubljana. In spite of his excellent learning – he finished six classes with distinction – he had to leave grammar school just before the final year. His parents, who were very religious, demanded that Davorin should become a priest after grammar school. However, at that time he was already a convinced liberal and unequivocally rejected this proposal, whereupon he lost the material support of his family.

Between 1872 and 1873 Hostnik contributed to the liberal newspaper *Slovenski narod* ("Slovene nation"). He then entered military service, staying in the army until 1877. He passed the examinations for the school leaving certificate at Celje grammar school, and in 1878 entered the philological faculty of Vienna University. Throughout this time Hostnik continued to publish in *Slovenski narod*, and for a time was even a member of its editorial staff. Yet differences between him and the editor-in-chief of the newspaper I. Jurič forced Hostnik to leave the editorial staff. Therefore Hostnik participated even more passionately in the creation of the Pan-Slavic Almanac, published by Slavic students in Vienna in 1879. He also worked actively in the Literary Society, closely linked to Slovene poet Josip Stritar, one of the ideologists of Slovene liberalism.

Like the majority of Slovene liberals of the sixties and seventies, Hostnik always regarded as most important the struggle for national rights of the Slovene nation, while economic and social problems were of secondary significance. This proved to be completely justified, because precisely in the 1860's the authorities and German nationalist organizations intensified the Germanization policy regarding the Slovenes. Liberals saw the rescue of the Slovenes from this Germanizing onslaught in the support of Slavic mutual solidarity, where the major role was played by Russia as the only powerful independent Slavic state. They hoped to find salvation for their nation in Russia's support. Later, in 1898, after having lived in Russia for 18 years, Hostnik very clearly expressed his attitude formed as far back as in the seventies, in a letter to the son of his late friend Zabra:

»Let them (the Slovenes) join the Slavic nations, let them know that only Slavonism can bring them salvation, let them completely reject everything that connects them with the Germans, those sworn enemies, ...let them not think that they alone can do something; all Slavic nations should be united if they are attacked ... by all Germans.«⁴

Hostnik had already become interested in Russia at grammar school. In March 1874 he wrote a letter to the Russian academic I.A. Baudoin de Courtenay, asking him to recommend books that would be best for him to learn the Russian language, which he wished to know as well as his mother tongue. Three years later Hostnik once more asked Baudoin de Courtenay to help him get a Russian scholarship at Leipzig University to learn Latin and Greek, to be able to go to Russia later as a teacher of ancient languages in a *gymnasia*.⁵

Hostnik's correspondence with Baudoin de Courtenay did not help him get to Russia. However, with the help of his countryman Jernej Brezovar, who had emigrated to

⁴ NUK, Rokopisna zbirka. Inv.št. 104/54.

⁵ Arhiv RAN (SPb.) F. 102. Op. 2. D. 326. LL. 1 ob, 2,9.

Russia, at the end of 1879 Hostnik succeeded in making the acquaintance of a Russian land-owning lady, Madam Teplova, and went with her to Russia as a tutor. By 1880 Hostnik had passed examinations at Kharkov University as an external student (without attending lectures) and received a Russian diploma. He then secured a position as teacher of German and French in a *progymnasia* (a school with four classes, similar to a lower *gymnasia*) in Borisoglebsk. He soon transferred to the *progymnasia* in the chief district town of Rylsk in Kursk province, where he stayed and worked for more than 40 years.

In spite of the remoteness of Rylsk from major cultural centres, Hostnik did not lose contact with his homeland. He was not only in lively correspondence with his friends, in the second half of the eighties and into the nineties he was also an active correspondent for Slovene liberal publications. Especially well-known and to a certain degree fateful was his writing for *Slovenski narod*, which took place from March 1886 to November 1887. His articles, signed under the pseudonym *Krutorogov* are interesting not only for Hostnik's personal views, but also to understand the ideology of Slovene liberalism of the time, for Hostnik, who lived outside Austria, could openly write about his views without fear of official repression.

His writing activities were noted by Ivan Prijatelj, one of the most thorough researchers of that period of Slovene history. He wrote that

»Krutorogov was in that year (i.e. 1887 - I.Ch.) the most famous name in Slovenia. He was a professor in Russia and was sending to the Narod contributions written not without temperament in a motley Slovene-Russian language. He was a spiritual adherent of the later Slavophiles and was completely under the influence of Katkov.«⁶

Prijatelj's judgement has a certain foundation, yet it does suffer from one-sidedness. Attention to this one-sidedness was brought by D. Kermavner in his commentaries to the last edition of Prijatelj's main work *»Slovene cultural, political and literary history, 1848-1895«*. Indeed, the statement claiming that Hostnik was a supporter of Katkov, one of the reactionary public figures in Russia in the 1880's, is without foundation. In any event, in matters of Russia's internal policy he was rather his antithesis. In his obituary to Katkov, the Slovene writer emphasized that in matters of internal policy Katkov had often been wrong.⁷

A series of Hostnik's articles entitled *»Letters from Russia«* began to be published on 31 March 1886. In his first feature-story, Hostnik dwelt on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the freeing of the peasants from serfdom. With chagrin he noted that the jubilee had passed unnoticed in Russia, *»although no other day is so important for the cultural and social life of the vast northern realm«*. Hostnik emphasized that so many years after the freeing of the peasants, they still had to pay purchase money to landowners. *»The 'muzhik' will remain the landowner's sworn enemy as long as there is still anything reminding him of the old times«*. In this way the Tsar's programme had not abolished the contradictions between the landowner and peasant - the enmity between them had not changed. Hostnik had a completely definite point of view concerning this enmity: as a peasant's son he sympathized with the peasants.

In his *»Letters from Russia«* Hostnik depicted Russian landowners as crude, half-

⁶ Prijatelj J., *Slovenska kulturnopolitična in slovstvena zgodovina, 1848-1895*, Zv. V, Ljubljana 1996, pp. 275-276.

⁷ *Slovenski narod* (SN), 1887, 6. VIII. (No. 177).

educated people, in whom even emotions towards their own children had atrophied. He called upon his compatriots not to believe the Germans, who claimed that the Russian *muzhik* was a drunkard and a thief. The Russian *muzhik* only steals in order not to die of hunger and drinks from grief. For hundreds of years he has lived like an animal and, therefore, he has not developed in the moral sense. It is not his fault, but the fault of the people for whom he has worked as a slave. »Russian people are noble, kind, honest, and do not forget that 25 years ago they were still slaves, the cattle of landowners«,⁸ wrote Hostnik. Hostnik justified peasants even when they rose in rebellion and killed their landowners. They could not expect any protection, he explained, because all the authorities originated in landowners' circles and protected landowners' interests. One of Hostnik's feature-stories was dedicated to Russian self-management. It did not satisfy him because only the owners of real estate (houses, land) had the vote. Therefore, beside the poorest sections of the population, many people from the intelligentsia and officialdom remained outside the circle of voters. »As your constitution gives the powerful the possibility to oppress and stifle the weak, our self-management does exactly the same«,⁹ Hostnik summarized.

In spite of all his sympathy for the poorer sections of society and all his hostility towards landowners and rich people, Hostnik was a convinced tsarist. He considered the Tsar to be the protector of people from their oppressors. For him only the Empress Catherine II was a representative of the feudal lords, and his attitude to her was negative chiefly because of her German origin. For Hostnik the ideal was Alexander II, whom he called the liberator »of Russian and Turkish slaves«.¹⁰ Not only did Hostnik see in the Tsar a protector of Russian people, but also a representative of the »Russian idea, at the same time being also the Slavic idea«.¹¹ In this vision of the Tsar's role he agreed with the Slavophiles.

According to his understanding of the Tsar's role in Russian life, Hostnik's attitude towards members of the revolutionary movement *Narodnaya Volya* (People's Freedom) and anarchists was distinctly negative. He considered them to be »Jews or scoundrels bribed by the Germans«.¹²

The above shows that even in the evaluation of internal events one can feel the anti-German orientation of Hostnik's views. It was manifested even more clearly in his foreign policy discourses. And here the opinions of this Slovene writer were close to the ideological orientation of M.N. Katkov. Standing on a nationalist platform, Katkov considered Germany to be the main enemy of Russia. And this corresponded entirely with Hostnik's opinion. A representative of a small nation, feeling a crushing pressure from Germanizers who threatened to destroy it as an independent ethnic community, he had a hostile attitude towards everything German. For him there was no doubt that the »historical aim of the Germans was to kill the Slav«.¹³ This conviction ensured his complete solidarity with Katkov. Hostnik saw in him a »sincere patriot, a sincere Russian and a passionate protector of Russian grandeur and the Slavic idea«, who was always right in his judgements about Russian foreign policy and was for Russia the same as Bismarck for Germany.¹⁴

⁸ SN, 8. IV. 1886.

⁹ SN, 26. V. 1886.

¹⁰ SN, 5. IV; 8. IV. 1886.

¹¹ SN, 6. IV. 1887.

¹² SN, 31. III. 1886; 30. III. 1887.

¹³ SN, 29. X. 1887.

¹⁴ SN, 6.VIII. 1887.

Hostnik considered that true Russian people, no matter which party they belonged to, shared Katkov's opinion in questions of foreign policy; and in Russia only Germans and German spies could think differently. In his special article »German espionage« the Slovene essayist counted as German spies the Russian nihilists, French anarchists, Bulgarian liberals and everybody who was connected with the Vatican.¹⁵

For Hostnik the main evil was Bismarck's Germany. He devoted to it his article »Future war between Russia and Germany«. In this article Hostnik asserted the inevitability of this war, which would mean »*not a fight for life but for death between the Slavs and the Germans*«. After the victory over France, Russia had become Germany's main enemy. The Germans wanted to destroy Russia and, if they succeeded in this, the German military machine »*will laughingly hold other Slavic nations in their hands and drown them one by one in the German sea*«. Therefore Russia's aim was to destroy German militarism, after which the Slav could become master in his own home, in his own land.¹⁶

For Hostnik Russia was a natural protection for the Slavs against German aggression. He stressed that

*»as an independent, mighty Slavic state, which at present numbers approximately 100 million citizens, Russia is a natural wall protecting the Slavs against German aggression. The mightier Russia becomes, the more difficult it will be to hold her brothers on a leash«.*¹⁷

On the other hand, Russia needed the other Slavs, too.

*»Just as the Slavs have moral support in Russia, an independent, great and mighty state, Russia also derives a great part of its might from the sympathy of the Austrian Slavs«*¹⁸ stressed Hostnik. This was Hostnik's credo of Slavic mutual solidarity – a union between Russia and the other Slavs for victory over the Germans, who were threatening them all equally. The Slavs who came out against this idea (Serbian Prince Milan, Bulgarian minister Stambolov, the Polish nobility) were apologists of German policy. Hostnik dwelt especially on the Polish question. As a passionate adherent of Russia, he did not feel any sympathy for the Polish fight against it. He wrote that the Polish nation was not united. It was divided into *»the nobility, holding in their hands politized Roman Catholic priests, and simple folk«*, whom the nobility called *bydlo*. Under Russian authority the Polish nobility were not permitted to oppress the people, as was the case in Austrian Galicia.

*»The Polish nation should be clearly distinguished from Polish counts and dukes and their allies – Polish priests, who are fanatical enemies of everything non-Polish«.*¹⁹

The nobility would not save the Polish nation, and its revolutionary actions were hostile to simple Poles. In justifying the Russian government's attitude towards the Polish revolutionary movement, Hostnik did not fail to stress, however, that *»in Russia the Polish problem was dealt with by officials of German origin«.*²⁰

Of course, in addition to political questions, Hostnik's correspondence also covered culture. He introduced Slovenes to Pushkin, Lermontov, Gogol, Turgenev and Ostrovsky. Hostnik called upon his compatriots to learn the Russian language in order to read Russian literature and to comprehend Russian culture.

¹⁵ SN, 14.IV.1887.

¹⁶ SN, 3.IV; 5.IV.1886.

¹⁷ SN, 5.VI.1886.

¹⁸ SN, 3.X.1887.

¹⁹ SN, 23.VI.1886.

²⁰ SN, 14.IX.1886.

However the reason why Hostnik urged Slovenes to learn Russian was not just acquaintance with Russian culture. He thought that Russian could become a language of communication among Slavic nations and thereby replace German.

»Let Russian become our cultural language, because it is not possible for everybody to learn all Slavic languages«²¹ he noted. »Learn the language«, appealed Hostnik, »spoken by 80 million people, whose literature is so rich that in recent years the French have been translating it and they literally snatch out of each other's hands books written by Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Pisemsky, Tolstoy, Goncharov«... the Germans, sworn enemies of the Slavs, spend time and money on learning Russian in order to encroach upon Russia and conquer it. »They learn Russian out of hatred for Russia and the Slavs«, continued Hostnik, »but you would learn it out of love for Russia. Learn the Russian language, Russian literature, Russian customs and the Russian nation! And the way to achieve this is Slovene patriotism and support for the Slovene press, which is Slovene not by language but by spirit«. In this way Hostnik in the closest possible way connected Slovene patriotism and love of Russia.

Hostnik severely criticized the Catholic church. He came out against the Slovene clericalist statement that Catholicism was the basic characteristic of the Slovene nation. Being an adherent of the Cyril and Methodius doctrine, Hostnik demanded from the Vatican that the Slovenes and Czechs be allowed to hold divine service in their mother tongue.²² Hostnik's statement about the Catholic church provoked a negative reaction from the clericals. Their publication *Slovenec* published a series of articles written by professor J. Marn, where it was stressed that Catholicism preserved the Slovene nationality and therefore Slavic divine service was unnecessary.²³ Hostnik answered that the most important thing for a nation is not religion, but language and self-consciousness. All Slavs, of both Catholic and Orthodox religions, should be united in their love of the common mother »Slava«. As an example of how Catholicism was not going to save the Slovenes from being extinguished as a nation, Hostnik pointed out that Catholic Rome had been negotiating with Lutheran Bismarck, but on the other hand it would not allow religious Czechs and Slovenes to hold divine service in Slavic languages.²⁴

Such outspoken anti-German and anti-Catholic statements by Hostnik drew the attention of the Carniolian local authorities. Two editions of *Slovenski narod* were seized because of Hostnik's articles (On 23 November and 4 December 1886). This was not limited to Carniola only. At the end of October and beginning of November 1887 *Slovenski narod* published a Hostnik article written in an especially sharp tone. The author criticized the Austrian government for participating in the Germanization of a number of Slavic regions and also came out against the Pope, calling him the scum of the earth.²⁵ Immediately after that, the Austrian emperor Franz Joseph reproached the Slovene deputy in the Viennese parliament, Poklukar, for the Russophilic orientation of Slovene newspapers. This exchange was a signal for the clericals to attack the liberals. On 26 November 1887 Archbishop Missija of Gorica published an epistle which was signed by all the bishops of Gorica archdiocese. It strictly forbade priests and religious people from writing in *Slovenski narod*

²¹ SN, 27. IX. 1887.

²² SN, 25. VIII. 1886.

²³ SN, 3. X. 1887.

²⁴ *Slovenec*, Ljubljana, No. 160, 202, 203, 246. 1887.

²⁵ SN, 3. X. 1887.

or subscribing to it. The liberals had to retreat. At the shareholders' meeting of the National Printing House on 18 December it was decided to form a new editorial staff of *Slovenski narod* and set up control of its activities. There were changes in the management of the National Printing House, too, with Ivan Hribar, the main patron of *Hostnik* in *Slovenski narod*, leaving. *Hostnik*'s last article was published in *Slovenski narod* on 10 November 1887.

Prijatelj evaluated *Hostnik*'s contributions to *Slovenski narod* negatively. In the Slovene historian's opinion, *Hostnik*'s articles helped the clericals to strike a blow against Slovene liberalism. »*Krutorogov dropped in Slovenski narod a fatal bomb*«, wrote Prijatelj. »*Missija then rose from his torpor and struck with his mighty hand not only the Slovene Russophile fanatics, but also Slovene liberalism in general*«. ²⁶ In my opinion, *Hostnik*'s articles were only an opportunity, yet not the reason for such a decisive attack by the clericals upon liberalism. If these articles had not existed, the Catholic clergy, which had been actively united politically, would have found another avenue for attacking the liberals. I contend that *Hostnik*'s fight against Catholic obscurantism played a certain positive role. Undoubtedly, it was also important that *Hostnik* informed the Slovene public about the Russian reality.

Hostnik's writing activities in Slovenia continued in the nineties. He contributed articles to *Ljubljanski zvon* (Ljubljana Bell) and *Slovanski svet* (Slavic World) published by Podgornik. He signed them as »H-k«, Roščin and *Hostnik*. But now a much larger proportion of the articles was devoted to cultural and educational questions, although political areas were not neglected either. In a number of his contributions, *Hostnik* reproached the liberals for renouncing their programme »Everything for the nation and for freedom« after the events at the end of 1887 and for changing their attitude towards Russia. ²⁷ He actively promoted the Cyril and Methodius church doctrine and spoke explicitly not only against Catholic, but also against Orthodox obscurantism. He emphasized that the Orthodox religion was attractive to Slavs not from a religious, but from a national point of view, because the language of divine service and rituals in the Orthodox church was Slavic. »*Our path is not Orthodox Russia, but Slavic Russia*«, ²⁸ he said.

Hostnik's articles in *Slovanski svet* had much less influence on Slovene society than his contributions to *Slovenski narod*, because the latter's audience was much wider.

Hostnik pursued writing activities in Russia, too. Here his main platform was the newspaper *Izvestia S.-Peterburgskogo slavyanskogo blagotvoritelnogo obschestva* (News of the St. Petersburg Slavic Philanthropic Society, below - *Izvestia...*), whose editor was the well-known Slavic scholar and Slavophile Vladimir Ivanovich Lamansky. *Hostnik* placed in *Izvestia...* a series of articles under the common title »Letters about the Slovenes«. The first of these articles was published before the events connected with *Slovenski narod*. In this article *Hostnik*, acquainting Russian readers with the Slovenes, emphasized above all their Russophile nature. Here he obviously transmitted his own feelings to his compatriots.

»*Its (the Slovene nation's - I. Ch.) love for Russia is unfailing*« he claimed. »*All Slovenes have an equally sincere attitude towards the idea of Slavic mutual solidarity; they all love equally their Slavic brothers and, perhaps, no other Slavic nation is so firmly*

²⁶ Prijatelj, Op.cit., pp. 279-281.

²⁷ *Slovanski svet*, 1891, No. 22, pp. 350-353.

²⁸ *Slovanski svet*, 1890, No. 22, pp. 358-360.

convinced that Russia is its only moral support... The awareness that Russian society pays attention to the national struggle of their cousins in Austria would give them great moral strength«. ²⁹

Nevertheless, following the repressive measures against *Slovenski narod* and the replacement of its management, the tone of Hostnik's articles changed, becoming more critical and polemic. Concerning the accusations against *Krutorogov* he observed that »only people with an unclear conscience could see any danger in such small things as articles written by some *Krutorogov* from Russia«. ³⁰ Hostnik's statements about the Habsburg Monarchy became even sharper, and they reflected not only his hostility towards it, but also his undisguised contempt: The Austrian army had been beaten by everyone who wanted to, »and Austria consists only of a mass of various dowries taken from different brides«. ³¹

As in *Slovenski narod*, Hostnik criticized the Slovene clericals, but at the same time he began to express dissatisfaction with his recent brothers-in-arms, the liberals. »Where are the labors (patriotic camps), where is the united Slovenia, where are the enthusiastic responses to everything Russian, because it involves Slavism« he exclaimed with sadness. He was deeply hurt by the fact that the Slovene liberals had renounced open Russophilism and had meekly retreated at the clericals' attack. Hostnik tried to explain to the Russian reader their cowardly behaviour. »What can be the reason for this servility of the Slovenes? The reason is very simple: the Slovene nation is poor and all the intelligentsia in one way or another depends on the government«. ³² Hostnik's writing for *Izvestia*... finished in 1888. He left as a mark of disagreement with the dismissal of the editor-in-chief Lamansky. For the new *Izvestia*... Hostnik wrote only an obituary on the Slovene liberal figure Valentin Zarnik.

As we can see, Hostnik's writing activity took place at the end of the eighties and into the nineties, reaching its climax in the years 1886-1888. In his correspondence he took a position of leftist liberalism: he condemned the Germanizing activities of the Austrian government, its unwillingness to expand the national rights of Slovenes and other Slavs, while he severely criticized the clerical fanatics in Slovenia and the opportunist liberal intelligentsia. Hostnik was a passionate adherent of the ideas of Slavic mutual solidarity and a convinced Russophile. He was certain about the imminence of a decisive struggle between the Slavs and Germans, where Russia would be the Slavs' main support.

Hostnik's contributions in the Slovene press became a noticeable phenomenon in its historical dimension. On the whole, I would positively evaluate his writing activity, both in Slovenia and Russia. It was sufficiently professional and, despite a certain tendentiousness, acquainted Slovene society quite exhaustively with the Russian reality, and Russian readers with the position of the Slovenes.

²⁹ *Izvestia S.-Peterburgskogo slavyanskogo blagotvoritelnogo obschestva. (Izvestia...)* SPb, 1887, No. 10, pp. 494, 495.

³⁰ *Izvestia*... 1888, No. 1, pp. 38-39.

³¹ *Izvestia*... 1888, No. 2, pp. 61.

³² *Izvestia*... 1888, No. 3, pp. 132.

POVZETEK DAVORIN HOSTNIK – PUBLICIST IN ZNANSTVENIK

Davorin (Martin Matvejevič) Hostnik je pripadal krogu slovenskih liberalcev, za katere so bila značilna rusofilski prepričanja. Ker je bil študent dunajske univerze, se je dejavno udeleževal liberalnega gibanja in je moral zaradi grožnje z represijami emigrirati v Rusijo, kjer je bil od leta 1880 do 1923 učitelj francoskega in nemškega jezika v gimnaziji, potem pa v sovjetski šoli v mestu Rlisk v Kurski guberniji.

Od marca 1886 do novembra 1887 je bil Hostnik eden od glavnih dopisnikov liberalnega časopisa *Slovenski narod*. Za njegove članke o notranjih razmerah v Rusiji je bila značilna simpatija do preprostega ljudstva, še zlasti do ruskih kmetov. V ruski družbi je simpatiziral s slovanofili in resno obsojal delovanje narodovoljcev. Hostnikovi članki o ruski zunanji politiki so bili napisani pod močnim vplivom ruskega nacionalista M. N. Katkova. Hostniku so bili njegovi nazori vseč zaradi njihove protinemške usmerjenosti. Prav ti članki so postali vzrok represij oblasti, ki so se konec leta 1887 zgrnile nad *Slovenski narod*.

V 90. letih je Hostnik dejavno sodeloval pri časopisu svojega somišljenika F. Podgornika *Slovanski svet* in objavljaj članke o ruski kulturi. V ruskem slovanofilskem tisku 80. let je Hostnik opisoval življenje v slovanskih deželah in pri tem ostro nastopal tako proti ponemčevalni politiki oblasti kot proti pojavom klerikalizma. Proti začetku 20. stol. se je Hostnikova publicistična dejavnost prekinila.

Konec 19. stol. je Hostnik na predlog sanktpeterburškega slovanskega dobrodelnega društva sestavil prvi slovensko-ruski in rusko-slovenski slovar s slovensko slovnico za Ruse in rusko za Slovence. To njegovo delo so ruski znanstveni krogi visoko ocenili.

Jevgenij Firsov

FILOZOF IVAN ILJIN – INTELEKTUALEC, BOREC, ČLOVEK

(PO NEOBJAVLJENIH PISMIH
MECENOMA KRAMÁŘ V PRAGO
IZ NEMČIJE, ŠVICE IN AVSTRIJE)

Ivan Aleksandrovič Iljin (1883-1954) – vodilni predstavnik ruske intelektualne elite v diaspori. Kot znanstvenik se je pojavil v Rusiji pred revolucijo, kjer se je bleščeče izšolal na Moskovski imperatorski univerzi, ki jo je končal leta 1906. Svoje življenje v letih od 1910 do 1912 je I. A. Iljin pozneje v svoji biografiji opisal kot

»dokaj dolgo znanstveno stažiranje v Nemčiji (Heidelberg – pri Vindelbandu, Lasku, Ellineku, Göttingen – pri Gusserlu, Berlin – pri Simmlu) in Franciji. Od leta 1912 delam kot docent in profesor. Leta 1928 sem dobil višji akademski naziv za delo v dveh knjigah Filozofija Hegla kot nauk o konkretnosti Boga in človeka.«¹

Potem je postal znan še v domovini, malo pred tem ko so ga boljševiki leta 1922 prisilno izgnali v tujino. V biografiji je Iljin poudarjal, da ga je v letih 1917-1922 večkrat aretirala sovjetska oblast *»med težkim bojem za kulturo in dostojanstvo domovine«*.² Čeprav so ga nenehno preganjali, znanstvenik ni niti pomislil na emigracijo. Leta 1922 pa so mu smrtno obsodbo zamenjali z izgnanstvom in odvzemom državljanstva. Tako je bil prisiljen zapustiti domovino in septembra 1922 je bil skupaj s cvetom ruske intelektualne misli izgnan s parnikom. Pozneje, ko je pogosto razmišljal o istem vprašanju: *»Je bilo treba ostati ali oditi?«*, je sklenil: in oditi, ampak zato, da bi se bojeval, in ostati – ampak tudi za boj. Ta odločnost kaže naravo znanstvenika, ki je vse življenje zavračal kakršnokoli obliko totalitarizma. I. A. Iljin je bil prepričan, da prisilno izgnanstvo sploh ne pomeni, da so vezi z domovino pretrgane. Menil je, da se pojem »domovina« ne omejuje na mesto bivanja v danem trenutku in da vzrok patriotizma ni samo vsakdanji življenjski ustroj.³

Ni naključje, da je Iljin v emigraciji (najprej v Nemčiji in od leta 1938 v Švici) postal neke vrste idejni vodja ruske intelektualne diaspore. Leto 1917, ki je bilo katastrofalno za usodo Rusije, je Iljin preučeval v tesni povezavi z usodo celotne vseevropske in svetovne kulture. Njegova znana dela, ki so programskega značaja (danes končno dostopna tudi v Rusiji), odlikuje nenavadna globina, premišljenost in treznost nazorov, samopozrtvovalna pripravljenost služiti demokratskemu sociumu v korist prihodnosti Rusije. Za tako imenovani osnovni steber njegovega življenja lahko štejemo boj za dostojanstveno prihodnost Rusije in kulturo domovine. V tem smislu so bile njegove ideje dobro sprejete in so našle razumevanje ter odziv v širokih krogih ruske emigracije, čeprav je težko reči, da so filozofa povsem razumeli v bistvu omejeni pripadniki emigrantskega okolja, ki so bili preveč navdušeni nad idejami evrazijstva. Šele v našem času se, kakor si zasluži, priznava

¹ Iljin, A. I.: Curriculum vitae. 1925. VIII. // *Ruski arhiv. T. V. M.*, 1994, str. 533.

² Isto, str. 534. Glede tega bolj podrobno glej: Lisica, J.: Ivan Aleksandrovič Iljin // I. A. Iljin: *Zbrana dela. Knjiga I. M.*, 1993, str. 18–27.

³ Te globoke misli je Iljin izrazil v delu *Mi in domovina*, ki je izšlo v Beogradu leta 1926.

njegova nadarjenost pri političnih napovedih, saj je predvideval perspektive razvoja tako Rusije kot Evrope. Njegova koncepcija duhovne preнове, ki jo je oblikoval leta 1937 delu Pot duhovne preнове, objavljenem v Beogradu, in potem razširil v delih, ki so že po njegovi smrti izšla v dveh knjigah *Naše naloge: usoda in prihodnost Rusije* (1956), sodobni Rusiji ne rabi zgolj po naključju plodonosno. Iljin je menil, da je najpomembnejši pogoj za izhod iz krize ne samo Rusije, ampak tudi kulture človeškega duha, ustvarjalna ideja, duhovna prenova vsega sveta. Njegova socialno-politična koncepcija poudarja samoumevnost zasebne lastnine in nepogrešljivost služenja javnosti.

V vrsti svojih naslednjih del Iljin zagovarja premagovanje formalne demokracije, *zmagoslavje ustvarjalne demokracije* ne samo za Rusijo. Ko je živel v diaspori, je oblikoval tri osnove ustvarjalne demokracije – razumevanje svobode in njeno pravilno uporabo, visoko raven samozavedanja in materialno (gospodarsko) samostojnost državljanov.

Filozof A. Guliga je objavil zelo uspešno karakteristiko o knjigi I. A. Iljina o Heglu, ki jo lahko v številnih pogledih razširimo na cel sistem nazorov znanstvenika:

*»Njegova erudicija je neoporečna in samostojna pot misli je izvirna in zanimiva. Iljin ni zagovornik Heglovega nauka (in tudi nikoli ni bil), on vidi napake velikega Nemca ... način, po katerem se resnica doseže s sistemom kategorij ... Za Hegla je bilo pomembno zavedanje svobode, za Iljina pa njena uresničitev v življenju posameznika. Najprej obstajati, zatem delati in šele potem 'filozofirati'«.*⁴

Potem ko je sam preizkusil realnost porevolucijske Rusije in Nemčije v medvojnem času, je I. Iljin natančno dognal, da je bistvo totalitarnega ustroja razširitev posegov v življenje državljanov in prisilno reguliranje njihovih dejavnosti. Če navadno zavedanje in sprejemanje prava temelji na domnevi, da je vse, kar ni prepovedano, dovoljeno, potem totalitaren režim temelji na drugem: vse, kar ni predpisano, je prepovedano.⁵

Z nove, nenavadne strani v vsej svoji globini in mnogostranskosti se Iljin intelektuallec kot borec in človek prikaže v svojih pismih mecenoma iz Prage – Nadeždi in Karlu Kramáru. Ta pisma (približno 40) sem našel v Arhivu Narodnega muzeja v Pragi in so bila prvič objavljena v reviji *Rusija XXI* leta 1997 (št. 5-6, 7-8).

Pisma pomagajo boljše razumeti državljanske, politične in zgodovinsko-filozofske nazore tega misleca evropskega pomena.

Družini Kramář, Karlu in Nadeždi Nikolajevni (s svojim poreklom nekako simbolizirata češko-rusko vzajemnost), velikodušna mecenoma ruske kulture v emigraciji, se ima Rusija res za kaj zahvaliti. Prav onadva, družina s premoženjem, sta pred drugimi slišala, kako kriči duša ruskih beguncev – znanstvenikov, politikov in umetnikov, saj je Praga v dvajsetih letih postala središče ruske inteligence v emigraciji.

Na stotine pism, ki vsebujejo nujne prošnje in besede iskrene hvaležnosti, ki so danes pazljivo shranjene v arhivski zapuščini družine Kramář v Arhivu Narodnega muzeja v Pragi, potrjujejo njuno velikodušno mecenstvo. Treba je takoj navesti vsaj delček duševnih hvaležnih besed, ki izhajajo iz srca. Znani publicist Aleksandr Izgojev, ki so ga leta 1922 boljševiki izgnali skupaj z I. A. Iljinom in drugimi predstavniki ruske inteligence in ki je nekaj let živel v Pragi, je pisal:

»Moje štiriletno bivanje na Češkem me je prepričalo, da je blaginja moje in Vaše domovine med seboj trdno povezana. Kjerkoli bom pristal, povsod bom ohranil v spominu

⁴ Guliga, A.: *Ruska ideja in njeni ustvarjalci*. M., 1995, str. 237–238.

⁵ Iljin, I. A.: *Zbrana dela*. T. 2. knj. 2. str. 159.

slovansko državo, ki je dala zatočišče ruskim izgnancem, in državnega človeka, ki je v nas, v trenutkih potrnosti, podprl vero v Rusijo.«⁶

V drugem pismu je Izgojev spet poudarjal pomembnost Kramářa za celotno rusko emigracijo:

»Nekoč bodo zgodovinarji raziskali, kako se je zgodilo, da ste Vi, evropsko izobraženi Čeh (K. Kramář – op. J. F.), ki jo je prvič obiskal v zrelih letih, Rusijo občutili. Občutili ste jo kot svojo drugo domovino, občutili ste vso nepopisno radost in visoko duhovno napetost njenega javnega življenja in, po eni strani še zmeraj češki domoljub, ste hkrati postali Rusom tako blizu in njihov. Ruski človek, ki se je v tujini znašel v položaju 'subjekta brez domovine', težko govori o takih rečeh. Toda v slehernem med nami obstaja neuničljiva vera, da bo Rusija obstajala. In s to vero sta povezani ljubezen in spoštovanje do Vas, edinega pomembnega državnega javnega delavca Evrope, ki niti za minuto ni izdal Rusije in ji ostal zvest do konca ... Ni treba dokazovati, da Vas imajo Rusi radi in sprejemajo kot svojega, samo da zdaj nimajo druge možnosti za izražanje svojih čustev, razen besed. Brez dvoma, Vi ste za slovansko vzajemnost, ki se bo seveda končno premaknila iz stanja paralize in spet odkrila svojo ustvarjalno moč, naredili več kot katerikoli drug od slovanskih državnikov ...«⁷

Karel Kramář se je zmeraj posvečal cilju in težko ga je bilo prepričati o čem drugem. Rodil se je v podjetniški družini. Dobil je bleščečo pravno izobrazbo in v 90. letih 19. stoletja postal, poleg Masaryka, ugleden član napredne usmeritve v mladočeški stranki. Rusijo je prvič obiskal leta 1890 in se potem večkrat vračal. Leta 1908 je bilo v Moskvi na pobudo K. Kramářa ustanovljeno Društvo slovanske kulture, v Peterburgu pa Društvo slovanske znanosti. V vseh je dejavno sodeloval, predstavljal je referate. Ker je bil od leta 1891 poslanec v avstrijskem parlamentu, si je Kramář v začetku zastavil kot cilj sistematsko utrditev vseh področij življenja češkega naroda v okviru monarhije. Med prvo svetovno vojno je Kramář postal eden od vodij notranjega protiaustrijskega gibanja Upora rusofilske usmerjenosti. Konec odnosov z monarhijo je pomenil njegov projekt združitve slovanskih držav z vodilno vlogo Rusije. Maja 1916 so bili on in njegovi češki prijatelji obtoženi izdaje monarhije in aretirani. Sojenje je trajalo do sredine leta 1916, Kramář je bil obsojen na smrt. Rešila ga je smrt prastarega cesarja Franca Jožefa. Njegov naslednik Karel je smrtno obsodbo zamenjal s 15 leti zapora, potem pa je bil Kramář zaradi amnestije julija 1917 osvobojen. To sojenje, ki je takrat povzročilo veliko hrupa, je nastopilo kot simbol preganjanja češkega naroda. Leta 1918 je bil Kramář izbran za predsednika Nacionalnega komiteja v Pragi, po ustanovitvi neodvisne Češkoslovaške, oktobra 1918, pa je postal prvi premier države in ostal na tem položaju do polovice leta 1919. Tudi v nadaljevanju je Kramář ostal pomemben državnik ČSR, bil je vodja na začetku vplivne (močne) stranke nacionaldemokratov, v parlamentu je zastopal interese industrijsko-finančnih krogov. Med pariško mirovno konferenco leta je bil 1919 Kramář vodja češkoslovaške delegacije. V Parizu je potrdil svojo lojalnost Rusiji in izrazil upanje, da ta ne bo dolgo sovjetska. Pri pogovorih z belo emigracijo je vztrajal pri tem, da je treba zbirati vojsko z namenom aktivne intervencije, ter prepričeval zaveznike, da je tak korak nujno potreben. Njegovo mnenje glede tega vprašanja se ni ujemalo z uradnim, ki sta ga zastopala predsednik repub-

⁶ Archiv Narodneho Muzcea / ANM - Praha. 2/5. 1125. Pismo iz Prage A. Izgojeva K. Kramářu. 25. XII. 1926.

⁷ ANM – Praha. 2/5 1120-1121. Pisma A. Izgojeva K. Kramářu iz Haapsala (Estonija). 21. XII. 1930.

like T. Masaryk in zunanji minister E. Beneš. Skupaj z ruskim veleposlanikom v Parizu Maklakovom se je Kramář jeseni 1919 odločil za potovanje na Krim in v Rostov k Denikinu, kjer je predlagal svojo različico projekta ustave nove demokratične Rusije. Kramář je menil (in o tem pisal tudi predsedniku republike), da se češkoslovaškim legionarjem ni treba vračati domov praznih rok, ampak morajo predvsem pomagati pri prerodu Rusije.

Januarja 1920 je Kramář pisal:

*»Okoliščine so se spremenile, toda moje globoko prepričanje, da bo Rusija vstala od mrtvih, je ostalo. Rusija se bo prerodila! Mogoče pozneje, kot smo pričakovali, toda nedvomno se bo prerodila...«.*⁸

Glavno vlogo pri prerodu močne Rusije je dodeljeval ruski emigraciji ter ji na vse mogoče načine pomagal.

Kramářeva ruska žena Nadežda Nikolajevna je bila zanj poosebljenje Rusije. Izvirla je iz starega bogatega trgovskega moskovskega rodu Hludovih. Njen prvi mož je bil znani industrialec Abrikosov. Postopek ločitve je bil zaradi številnih formalnosti in ovir dolgotrajen in šele leta 1900 sta Karel in Nadežda uspela potrditi svojo gorečo ljubezen s poroko.

Posel družine Kramář v ČSR (nekoč pa tudi v Rusiji) je potekal uspešno.

Nadežda Nikolajevna je bila zelo izobražena in razgledana ter širokosrčna. Imela je tudi presenetljivo neomajen značaj, kar se je posebej izkazalo, kadar so njenega moža preganjali, pa tudi med prvo svetovno vojno. Pisma Kramářa, kjerkoli je bil, so priče temu, da ji je mož zaupal pri vseh (tudi državno-političnih) velikih in malih zadevah ter da se je Kramář k njej pogosto zatekel po nasvet in podporo.

Čeprav so bila samo nekatera od pisem I. A. Iljina namenjena neposredno Karlu Kramářu, so bila vsa njegova številna pisma Nadeždi Nikolajevni namenjena tudi njemu. V vsakem pismu je bil dodan obvezni pozdrav Kramářu od Iljina. Ni dvoma, da je Kramář pozorno bral vsa njegova pisma, zato ni naključje, da je še ves blok pisem Iljina shranjen v skladu K. Kramářa v Arhivu Narodnega muzeja med njegovo splošno korespondenco.

Nadežda Nikolajevna, kot je posrečeno rekel I. A. Iljin, je sodila v kohorto ne samo močnih, ampak tudi plemenitih značajev. S hvaležnostjo je pisal:

*»Gani me Vaše živo in globoko sočutje do mojega življenjskega dela. Od njega imam tako malo veselja in, nasprotno, tako veliko neprijetnega in nevarnega, da me žarki, ki izhajajo od Vas, preprosto tolažijo. Ne verjamem, da je življenje zasnovano na naključjih. Tisti žarki, ki izhajajo od Vas, meni niso dodeljeni po naključju (čeprav nepričakovano), kot tudi ni bila naključna njihova zunanja oblika izražanja...«.*⁹

Te besede hvaležnosti je Iljin rekel točno ob pravem času, kajti življenjska pot Nadežde Nikolajevne se je naslednje leto sklenila.

Osebnostno so se verjetno spoznali leta 1927, ko je Iljin predaval v Pragi. K njihovim srečanjem je, nedvomno, pripomagal tudi Iljinov ljubljeni bratranec – Vasilij Sergejevič Iljin, ki je živel v Pragi po emigraciji. V. S. Iljin je bil znan in nadarjen biolog, delal je skupaj z uglednim češkim profesorjem Bohumilom Němcem. Druženje I. A. Iljina z Nadeždo Nikolajevno in Karlom Kramářem se je nadaljevalo praktično do smrti Nadežde Nikolajevne, ki je bila velikodušna pokroviteljica vseh njegovih znanstvenih del in boja (1936). K. Kramář jo je preživel le za eno leto.

⁸ Kramář, K.: Osnove Ustave Ruske države. *Arhiv ruske revolucije, T. I. M.*, 1991, str. 367–368.

⁹ ANM – Praha. 2/5 1081. Pismo Iljina N. Kramář.

V pismih Nadeždi Kramář je I. A. Iljin natančno definiral svoj kredo v diaspori: »Zastavil sem si nalogo – služiti Rusiji in samo Rusiji. Ne osebam, ne krožkom in ne stran- kam. Pisati o tem, kar je najbolj pomembno za Rusijo – zdaj, to minuto (za boj) in za sto let vnaprej (prenovljeni obraz Rusije).«¹⁰

Na podlagi takih predpostavk je bil razvit program izdaje kakovostne nove revije v diaspori z imenom Ruski zvon. To revijo je Iljin izdajal v letih 1927-30¹¹ prav ob pomoči družine Kramář brez kakršnihkoli zahtev po povračilu. Velikodušna pomoč te mecenске družine je pogosto dobesedno reševala tudi znanstvenika samega, ki ni bil povsem zdrav, v najbolj kritičnem, materialnem pogledu, v trenutkih grenkega emigrantskega življenja.

V pismu Nadeždi Kramář 22. aprila 1928 je pisal:

»V osamljeni in osredotočeni poglobitvi sem izdeloval program revije, njen ton, potrebne teme ter si dopisoval s sodelavci. To je bilo prav poleti (1927, op. J. F.), ko sem Vam pisal, da mi je treba samemu sedeti nekaj časa v vodnjaku: nujno je bilo preveriti zamisel, moči, razčistiti obzorja in pustiti vse to, da se poleže.«¹²

Kot puščavnik samotar se je Iljin za nekaj mesecev »odstranil od zemeljske gneče«. Po njegovih besedah prav v samoti najdeš sebe, svojo idejo in svoje služenje, izmeriš njih z ljudskim odobravanjem ali neodobravanjem, sebi pa sodiš z večjim merilom. Kako je pogrešal majhno družinsko posest na Tuljskem območju, kamor je znanstvenik vsako leto od 1. maja do 1. oktobra hodil z namenom »osamiti se v vodnjaku« in ki so mu ga odvzeli po revoluciji.

»To je duhovno potrebno – ne biti na očeh nikogar; samo takrat se začneš počutiti, kot da te ima Bog na očeh, in potem čutiš, kako te Njegovo oko gleda, in veš, kaj od tebe hoče.«¹³

Tako rešilno zatočišče v času samotarstva pri izdelavi programa Ruskega zvona je ponujal, očitno, jug Francije. Glavni cilj revije je bilo, kot je že bilo poudarjeno, služenje Rusiji. V tem zgodovinskem obdobju je bil namen izdaje dvigniti duha ruske intelektualne diaspore, ki je bil v kritičnem stanju, ter pomagati k ohranitvi zgodovinskega in nacionalnega samozavedanja emigracije.

Tako kot večina njegovih sodobnikov Iljin ni dvomil o tem, da prihodnost naroda v veliki meri temelji na ravni njegovega nacionalnega samozavedanja.

Ruski zvon, prva številka, ki je izšla 22. septembra 1927, je bil, po mnenju Iljina, njegov otrok. Z veseljem je sporočal N. Kramář, da se je revija premaknila, in premaknila se je bolje, kot je bilo pričakovano, čeprav Iljin ni bil zadovoljen z rezultati prodaje na Češkoslovaškem in v ZDA, kjer še niso bile napeljane zveze. Iljin je nameraval priti v Prago, da bi tam organiziral krožek prijateljev *Ruskega zvona*, kakor je bilo že narejeno v Parizu in Berlinu. V skladu s podatki iz aprila 1928 je zagotovljena naklada revije, kot priča urednik založnik profesorja I. A. Iljina, dosegala skoraj tisoč izvodov ter s tem prese-gala naklade najbolj znanih in že razširjenih revij v emigraciji. S svojim strokovnim in odgovornim odnosom je Iljin skušal doseči, da izvodi sčasoma ne bi zastarevali. Znanstvenik je pisal:

¹⁰ Arhiv Narodnoho Muzea – Praha. F. K. Kramář. 2/5 1033-1035; glej tudi: Firsov J. F.: *Neznana pisma I. A. Iljina iz Nemčije, Avstrije in Švice mecenoma ruske emigracije – družini Kramář v Prago* // Rusija XXI. M., 1997, št. 5–6, str. 89.

¹¹ Poudarjam, da je v Malem enciklopedijskem slovarju Ruska filozofija (M., Nauka, 1995), str. 214, napačno naveden datum začetka izdaje Ruskega zvona 1926.

¹² Arhiv Narodnoho Muzea - Praha. F. K. Kramář. 2/5 1033-1035.

¹³ Arhiv Narodnoho Muzea - Praha: F. K. Kramář. 2/5 1030.

»Prav zato sem se odstranil od vsega emigracijsko-vsakdanjega, lokalnega, kar nima splošnega pomena. Zaradi tega bo 'Ruski zvon' prišel s tem valom tujega tiska, ki bo zadovoljeval prvo lakoto notranje Rusije po padcu boljševikov.«¹⁴

Kot urednik in glavni pobudnik revije je Iljin menil, da je zagotovitev duhovne svobode velikega pomena, tako avtorske kot uredniške. Niti za trenutek ni dvomil o tem, da izvaja pravo in najpomembnejše delo. Osnovni rezervni kapital ekipe intelektualcev, ki so se združili okoli filozofa I. A. Iljina, sta sestavljali *vera* in *volja*, ki ju je poznal samo Bog.

»Nihče si ne predstavlja, kakšno delo opravljam za 'Ruski zvon'. Vsak članek (tudi od koga drugega) se rojeva mesece v skrbeh, z bolečim občutkom odgovornosti, kadar je bilo treba izpiliti obliko. Najmanj dela je z I. I. Lappo in V. F. Gefdingom,« je sporočal I. A. Iljin v enem od svojih pisem iz Berlina.¹⁵

Bolj odprto znanstveno razumevanje *Ruskega zvona* je bilo treba opraviti v nadaljnjem obdobju. Toda brez dvomov lahko rečemo, da taka dela Iljina v reviji, kot so Ideja nacionalne znanosti (ob 175. obletnici moskovske univerze), O ruski inteligenci, Žive besele Petra Velikega itn., po globini ocenjevanja in opazovanja avtorja sodijo med nedvomno najboljši del celotne umetniške zapuščine tega vodilnega ruskega intelektualca v diaspori.

Kot je poudarjal Iljin, je on sam rabil rezervo trdovratne volje in čvrstega optimizma, da bi prebil zid emigrantske utrujenosti, brezbriznosti in dekoncentriranosti. Odlikoval ga je nenavadno zahteven odnos do njegove pisateljske obveznosti:

»Bistvo je v tem, da sem strog do svojih pisateljevanj, in pogosto se mi zdi, da je vse, kar sem napisal, slabo in da je treba pisati 'znova'; včasih ta občutek dobi odtенок dejanske pedantnosti in rigoroznosti; in takrat se duša napolni z gnusom in sramežljivostjo – zaradi tega, kar je napisano. To je koristno, in celo več: to pomeni, da se meriš z večjim merilom; da se je duša znašla v 'Božjem žarku', ki zmeraj zahteva od nas samo najboljše. Ampak o 'koristnosti' misliš šele potem, zdaj pa le ostro čutiš svojo neznatnost in površnost.«¹⁶

Ne smemo pozabiti, da je bilo v ustvarjalnem pogledu berlinsko obdobje¹⁷ Iljinovega življenja zelo napeto. *Ruski zvon* ni bil edini njegov podvig. Bil je eden od ustanoviteljev Ruskega znanstvenega inštituta in je veliko časa opravljal dolžnosti dekana in obenem profesorja tega dobro znanega središča ruske kulture v diaspori. Intenzivno je napredovalo njegovo filozofsko delo. Temu je priča spoštljivo dolg seznam del, ki jih je napisal še v sredini dvajsetih let za Berlinski odbor za pomoč ruskim literatom in znanstvenikom. V tem času so v nemškem jeziku izšli njegovi *Pravo in moč: metodološka analiza, Filozofija Hegla, Boljševizem in kriza sodobnega zavedanja prava*. Poleg tega so bila na seznamu za objavo dela *O zgodovini etike, Zgodovina grške filozofije, Filozofija nemškega idealizma, Filozofija religije, Zavedanje prava, Logika* itn.¹⁸ Nedvomno je bil filozof Iljin eden najbolj dejavnih in produktivnih intelektualcev diaspore, ki je nadaljeval ustvarjanje ne glede

¹⁴ Firsov, J. F.: Neznana pisma I. A. Iljina .../Rusija XXI. M., 1997, št. 5–6, str. 90.

¹⁵ Isto, str. 92. Gefding je na primer napisal članek Zedinjenje in spor. I. I. Lappo je v *Ruskem zvonu* objavil vrsto člankov Veliki ustvarjalci Rusije, znani pisatelj in prijatelj Iljina Šmelev je objavil svoje delo *Kaj naj bomo? Iz pisem o Rusiji*. Šmelev je posvetil svojo enkratno knjigo *Leto Gospodovo* (Beograd, 1933) I. Iljinu, ki mu je prinesla veliko veselja in tolažbe. Za Iljina je darilo Šmeleva postalo upodobitev Moskve in celotne Rusije v njenem idiličnem pravoslavnem koledarju.

¹⁶ Isto, str. 100.

¹⁷ To obdobje je trajalo od 1922 do 1938, ko je bil Iljin primoran bežati v Švico, kjer se je nastanil v bližini Züricha.

¹⁸ Glej: Materiali za biografijo I. A. Iljina // *Ruski arhiv. T. V. M.*, 1994, str. 534.

na čedalje večje težave. Znanstveniku je bolj kot ponavadi pomagala prepričanost o tem, da je izbrana pot pravilna; nadaljeval je služenje v diaspori kot »vzdržljiv svinčeni vojak«. ¹⁹

Iz dopisovanja je razvidno, da je v 30. letih v zvezi s političnimi spremembami v Nemčiji nastopilo vse več težav (ne samo materialnih). V pismu iz Berlina ob koncu marca 1931 je znanstveniku uspelo izraziti težko usodo intelektualca v diaspori, ki živi izključno od intelektualnega dela, ter ozračje emigracijskega ustroja:

»Pri nas je pa vse težko in utrudljivo. Kako sem se naveličal živeti med tujci in se bojevati z njihovimi propadajočimi, zlobnimi in omejenimi nazori! Včasih si tako utrujen, da se zdi, da sploh ne moreš živeti, da nikoli več ne bo niti misli niti radosti in da je ves Zahod obsojen na suženjstvo in propad. Na žalost je težko pisati o tem; in komu boš pisal? V kateri nebeški urad boš podal pritožbo? In znova utihneš in vse stisneš v sebi ...«. ²⁰

Samo še znanstveni in literarni uspehi so prinašali veselje, Iljinu pa so se zdeli celo nepričakovani, ker je, kot je poudarjal, v državi bivališča (v Nemčiji) nasprotoval splošnemu toku. »Malokdo sploh sumi, kako težko in nevhvaležno je moje delo v tujini, ob tem, da je moj ton še zmeraj ostal nacionalno neodvisen,« ²¹ se je pritoževal znanstvenik.

Vsako leto se je njegov položaj vse bolj slabšal. Leta 1932, dve leti pred odpustom, je sporočal, da je Ruski znanstveni inštitut, iz katerega je pritekalo 50 % družinskega proračuna, nehal plačevati; poleg tega pa je denar od javnih predavanj prenehal prihajati zaradi bolezni, ki se je »združila z revščino in jo naredila še večjo«. ²² Iljin je imel nevrozo srca in želodca, ki jo je po mnenju zdravnikov povzročilo brezmišlostno napeto delo in boj. Niso bili presenečeni nad diagnozo, pač pa nad tem, koliko so Iljinovi živci že zdržali in koliko še bodo. ²³ Na vrhuncu svetovne gospodarske krize se v pismih v Prago okrepi misel o naraščanju težavnosti življenja: »Življenje je v tem letu težko ... Pa še moja srčna nevroza vsakič trese mojo dušo in telo, prinaša strah in pesimizem.« ²⁴

Aprila 1933 se je pojavilo njegovo pismo praškima mecenoma, v katerem se je pritoževal nad tem, da »življenje je v tem letu postalo posebej težko v vseh pogledih in tudi materialno« ter z grenkobo sklenil, da je postal brezposelni intelektualec. ²⁵ V pismu iz Berlina, ki je brez datuma (najbrž sodi v leto 1935), Iljina skrbijo politične spremembe položaja v Nemčiji: »Tukaj se zbirajo oblaki, kriza se nadaljuje, v valovih se ne vidi nič razen prihajajoče civilne vojne.« ²⁶ Vendarle je ne glede na vse znanstvenik nadaljeval intelektualno dejavnost. Tako je v začetku leta 1935 sporočal N. Kramář:

»Pišem novo knjigo v osmih delih: o veri, svobodi, zavesti, družini, domovini, zavedanju prava, državi in zasebni lastnini, o osmih prvinah, s katerimi se bomo rešili!« ²⁷

Brez dvomov je šlo za Iljinovo knjigo *Pot duhovne preнове*, ki se je kmalu pojavila v Beogradu leta 1937. ²⁸

Od leta 1934 je I. Iljin uvedel nekatere varnostne ukrepe, da bi se izognil odvečnemu preganjanju s strani nacističnega režima. Svoja pisma pariškim korespondentom je

¹⁹ Firsov, J. F. Neznana pisma I. A. Iljina ... / *Rusija XXI. M.*, 1997, št. 7–8, str. 88.

²⁰ Isto, str. 78.

²¹ Isto, str. 83.

²² Isto.

²³ Isto, str. 84.

²⁴ Isto, str. 86.

²⁵ Isto, str. 87, *Pismo Iljina iz Berlina*, 16. IV. 1933.

²⁶ Isto, str. 98.

²⁷ Isto, str. 91.

²⁸ Dandancs je to delo še enkrat izšlo. Glej: I. A. Iljin. *Zbrana dela. T. I. M.*, 1993.

skušal pošiljati iz druge države ali prek zvestega prijatelja (pri tem se ni podpisoval, ampak samo pisal »ta-pa-ta«) in tudi njih je prosil, naj ne pišejo svojih priimkov in ne sprašujejo o kakršnihkoli podrobnostih njegove dejavnosti.²⁹

V enem od svojih zadnjih pisem prijateljema v Prago je Iljin izustil prerokbo, ki ga je že dolgo časa mučila:

*»Strogo je Božje sojenje nad Rusijo! Toda zakaj bi obupali? Saj to je 'Božje sojenje'! Bojim se, da bo sojenje Evropi še bolj strogo. Preberite, prosim, v deveti številki 'Zvona' zadnji članek 'Seneka: O božjem predvidenju' – tega v celoti posvečam ruskemu narodu«.*³⁰

Čeprav je pisma Kramářema pošiljal ne samo iz Nemčije, ampak tudi iz lepih pokrajin Avstrije in Švice (kjer je družina Iljinovih preživljala poletne počitnice), v njih na presenečenje ponavadi ni značilnosti nacionalne mentalitete narodov teh evropskih držav. Samo enkrat, ko je pohvalil rusko medicino, ki je delala resnične čudeže v Evropi, je Iljin zapisal naslednji stavek: *»Nemci so ponosni in zaničujejo vse (posebej vse rusko), toda občudujejo nadarjenost ruskih zdravnikov.«*³¹ Veliko pozornosti v dopisovanju je bilo namenjene značilnostim različnih vej ruske emigracije v Evropi – v Franciji, na Češkoslovaškem, v Pribaltiku. Značilnosti so bile zasnovane na osebnih izkušnjah in neposrednem poznavanju okoliščin emigracijskih zadev, ki je bilo posledica napetega potovanja s predavanji po vsej Evropi. Zadovoljen je bil predvsem z baltsko rusko diasporo:

*»V prvi polovici marca sem imel štiri predavanja v Rigi in dve zaprti za javnost. Ozračje je bilo zelo vroče: tam se Rusi ne počutijo kot priseljenci, počutijo se kot doma, na svoji zgodovinski zemlji.«*³²

Takšen pa je bil Iljinov odziv na emigracijsko okolje v Franciji:

*»V Parizu sem imel konec aprila tri javna predavanja in eno zaprto za javnost; Rusi so v Parizu stari, gumijasti, ne zanimajo se za nič, s skeptičnim nasmeškom in se ne morejo ogreti ali pa je za to potrebnega veliko truda. Razpoloženje se je izboljšalo šele na tretjem predavanju. Mene pa nič ne utruja bolj kot ledeno ravnodušje gumijasto se upirajočega občinstva. Take mrtve tokove začutiš že čez 10-15 minut – nemočnost svojega ognja, brez-zveznost svojega podviga. Počutiš se kot kos oglja, ne pa kot bakla. To je težko, to povzroča bolečino – in potem je to skrb vzbujajoče.«*³³

Ampak kako se je I. Iljin veselil srečanja v Parizu z svojimi prijatelji, tudi uglednimi predstavniki ruske inteligence v diaspori – N. Kmetnerom, S. V. Rahmaninovom, I. S. Šmelevom, A. M. Remizovom in drugimi.

I. Iljin se je bil prisiljen poglobiti v vse težave ruske kolonije v Pragi, kjer je imel podporo svojih sodelavcev v Ruskem zvonu – bratov D. D. in I. D. Grimma, N. A. Curikova in drugih.³⁴ Očitno je, da se je njegovo priznanje v pismu z dne 28. februarja 1930 nanašalo na češkoslovaško vejo emigracije: *»In grem (v Prago – op. J. F) z grenkim občutkom, da ruska emigracija ne vidi glavnega, ne čuti in celo noče ...«*³⁵

Vendar je bil njegova glavna podpora, po mnenju samega Iljina borca, češki mecen

²⁹ Firsov, J. F.: Neznana pisma I. A. Iljina.../ *Rusija XXI. M.*, 1997, št. 7–8, str. 89.

³⁰ Isto, str. 98.

³¹ Isto, str. 82.

³² Isto, str. 79.

³³ Isto.

³⁴ Firsov, J. F.: Neznana pisma I. A. Iljina.../ *Rusija XXI. M.*, 1997, št. 5–6, str. 85.

³⁵ Firsov, J. F.: Neznana pisma I. A. Iljina.../ *Rusija XXI. M.*, 1997, št. 7–8, str. 76.

vse ruske emigracije K. Kramář: *»On je kot otok, kot citadela; v njem čutim rusko dušo in rusko voljo; on je kot predstavnik Rusije na Češkem.«*³⁶

Znanstveniku v celoti ni odgovarjalo dlakocepsko emigracijsko okolje, o katerem je govoril zelo strogo:

*»Kako sem neskončno utrujen zaradi ljudske zlobe in nizkotnosti; in neiskrenosti. Nekaj kuhajo in kuhajo – in vse je osebno, vse je spletko. O naši Rusiji in o tem, kaj se tam dogaja, me je strah misliti. Dandanes je res veliko razlogov, da postaneš mizantrop.«*³⁷

V enem od pisem je jezno zapisal, da je Rusija zavrгла emigracijo, tako kot kača zavrže staro kožo, čeprav so se te besede nanašale na skrajno levo in desno krilo emigracije.³⁸

Kot je razvidno iz dopisovanja, je bilo razmišljanje o sovjetski realnosti v domovini med pomembnimi Iljinovimi dejavnostmi, čeprav je bilo eno najbolj bolečih opravil. To temo je pogosto obravnaval v svojih številnih predavanjih, tako v Nemčiji kot v drugih evropskih državah, tudi na Češkoslovaškem. O svojih predavanjih (sem ne štejejo predavanja na Ruskem znanstvenem inštitutu) je pisal tako: *»Moja prva dolžnost, patriotska, brez možnosti zavrnitve, je pomagati, utrditi, zanetiti ogenj. Okoliščine so pokazale, da so se pred menoj vrata odpirala na stežaj in ni nikogar, da bi me zamenjal. En sloj za drugim se prebujajo; hočejo vedeti resnico in vnaprej so pripravljene na zaupanje. Pozimi sem imel obdobja, ko sem predaval tudi sedem dni zapored (predavanje traja dve uri) in devetkrat v desetih dnevih. Pogosto imam pred sabo tisoče ljudi, ki brez besed in odmorov poslušajo dve uri ... Poslušajo socialisti, komunisti in navadni delavci.«*³⁹

V pismih so sporočila o tem, da je znanstvenik pozorno preučeval sovjetsko literaturo (brošure, časopise, stenografske zapise srečanj), politično literaturo komunistov. Iljin je priznaval utrudljivost tega početja:

*»Če analiziraš kaj svetega, se posvečaš sam. Jaz sem študiral satanovo delo – in bil popolnoma izčrpan od gnusa, jeze in nemoči. Kadar delam in analiziram, se vedno poistovetim s tem, kar analiziram: in ta ocean bede in ponižanja je v Rusiji in ta vulkan odkrite zlobnosti je v komunistih!«*⁴⁰

Kot rezultat tega je leta 1931 izšla brošura v nemščini *Strup boljše vizma*; sredstva za izdajo je prispeval nemški luteranski center.⁴¹

Z neusmiljeno kritiko sovjetske realnosti v ozadju je I. Iljin zmeraj zagovarjal načela politične pravstvenosti. Njega ni nikdar zapustila vera, da se bo Rusija prerodila in začela novo dobo svojega zgodovinskega razcveta. Hkrati pa je njegovo opozorilo v delu *»Kaj ponuja svetu delitev Rusije?«* dobilo preroško napolnjenost, kajti razdeliti ozemlje Rusije pomeni narediti iz nje rano vsega sveta.

Pisma Iljina v Prago vsebujejo enkratne opise narave Švice in Avstrije, kamor sta Iljin in njegova žena zahajala na poletne počitnice in kjer sta svoje krepila načeto zdravje in nabirala moči. Posebej mu je bilo všeč okolje jezera Firwaldstedt, kjer je bil večkrat skupaj z ženo. Očitno ni bilo naključje, da je Iljin izbral Zürich za drugo mesto bivanja v izgnanstvu, potem ko je bil leta 1938 nujno primoran zapustiti Nemčijo (še zlasti ker so bile v Berlinu slabe življenjske razmere).

³⁶ Isto, str. 81.

³⁷ Isto, str. 77.

³⁸ Firsov, J. F.: Neznana pisma I. A. Iljina .../ *Rusija XXI. M.*, 1997, št. 5–6, str. 99.

³⁹ Isto, str. 95.

⁴⁰ Isto, str. 101.

⁴¹ Firsov, J. F.: Neznana pisma I. A. Iljina .../ *Rusija XXI. M.*, 1997, št. 7–8, str. 82.

V Avstriji je družina Iljinovih obiskovala Traunsko jezero v mestu Gmunden ter Vrbsko jezero na Koroškem (ki ga je znanstvenik klical »vetrni otok«). Celó v vprašanjih počitnic ga je odlikoval svojevrsten »znanstveni« pristop. V dopisovanju je poudarjal, da so bila njihova poletna potovanja

»zmeraj usmerjena v glavnem na nenehno iskanje lepote in veličastnosti, miru in opazovanja. Ko smo na enem mestu, kopičimo, in kadar nakopičimo dovolj, gremo naprej. V tem letu smo bili v Gmundnu, na Bodenskem jezeru, v Ragazu, na jezeru Firwaldstedt, na Luganskem jezeru, na Comu, v Bologni, Riminiju in Ravenni. Vrnili smo se čili in sveži.«⁴²

Poletne počitnice so bile zanj povezane z dejansko potrebo organizma, ki je na robu zaradi nenehnega boja, po sprostivni živcev in miru. Za ta zdravilni postopek je Iljin uporabljal nemški izraz »Entspannung«.

Kot človeka ga je odlikovala presenetljiva trdoživost duha. Leta 1935 je pisal N. Kramár:

»Ni težko prostovoljno končati življenje, glede na današnje dosežke kemije in tehnike; vendar oba v svojem življenju tako močno in jasno vidiva prst Božji, da sploh ne misliva na to. Ampak vedno se vidim, kako sem se prisiljen spominjati na Jobovo usodo. Samo da mi žena nikoli ne bo rekla 'prekolni Boga in umri', kot je rekla Jobova žena.«⁴³

Iljin sploh ni dopuščal misli, da je »Bog nanj pozabil in ga pustil umreti nekje tukaj pod ograjo, v ponižanju in klevetah.«⁴⁴

Glede 30. let že lahko trdimo, da je Iljin nakopičil ogromno ustvarjalno in znanstveno zapuščino. Ne glede na to ni hotel živeti, ne da bi kaj počel, in to celo (presenetljivo) priznal v nekem pismu Kramárevima:

»Samo jaz in Natalija Nikolajevna (Iljinova žena – op. J. F.) – samo midva veva, da se še sploh nisem začel. Vse glavno, kar moram povedati in čemur sem namenjen, še ni ugledalo luči; vse je še samo v osnutkih ali delčkih ... On me takšnega ne bo obsodil na slabotno umiranje.«⁴⁵

In lahko rečemo, da so bile njegove prošnje uslišane.

Težko je delo emigranta, s težavo je služil vsakdanji kruh, vseskozi je imel v spominu vrstice A. S. Puškina (iz Slutnje):

*»Ali bom ohranil zaničevalnost do usode?
Ali ji bom nesel potrpljenje
In neomajnost
Svoje ponosne mladosti?«⁴⁶*

Vendarle dobra volja in neomajen duh Iljina nista nikoli zapustila, bil je trden človek, čeprav se življenjski problemi niso in niso hoteli končati:

»Oba sva skrajno utrujena zaradi tega večnega, neskončnega problema, ki se vsakič izkaže za neskončnega in ki se začinja znova. Misliš si, da je že konec, da je problem bil in bo minil – pa ni. Nehote se spomniš na pet let, ki si jih preživel drugje. In spet je srce napolnjeno s prepričanjem, da ne bom niti za milimeter odstopil od načel zvestobe, časti in

⁴² Isto, str. 98.

⁴³ Isto, str. 92.

⁴⁴ Isto, str. 93.

⁴⁵ Isto, str. 93.

⁴⁶ Isto, str. 89.

zavesti.«⁴⁷ V viharju prisilne emigracije se je znanstvenik počutil kot čoln, ki se je odtrgal in ga nese tok, čeprav ni bilo v njegovi navadi pritoževati se nad usodo. In zmeraj je upal, da »zaradi nekakšnih višjih zakonov njegovi naporji navsezadnje ne bodo zaman ... Čutim, kot še nikoli nisem (mogoče pa je bil v petih letih življenja v sovjetski Rusiji ta občutek še močnejši), da se brez Boga sploh ne bi splačalo živeti.«⁴⁸

V sklepu bomo poudarili, da je bil filozof Ivan Iljin velik intelektualen pojav v ruski diaspori v Evropi ter njena duhovna luč. Ni naključje, da se njegova bogata ustvarjalna zapuščina vrača v sodobno Rusijo. Ampak pomen ustvarjalnosti tega misleca enciklopedista se ne omejuje na okvir Rusije, temveč se razširi do evropskega in svetovnega pomena.

In vseeno je treba priznati, da zaradi odločnosti nazorov in ostre kritike dlakoceptva vsakdanjega življenja emigracije Iljina v širokih krogih niso razumeli. Vendar pa je težko zanikati združujoči pomen njegovega Zvona za vso rusko diasporo v medvojnem obdobju.

Strogi demokrat duha v širokem, ne populističnem pomenu besede (ne glede na njegovo kritiko sodobnih demokracij) je Iljin postal zastavonoša določenega intelektualnega sloja ruske elite v diaspori, v katerem sta bili predstavljeni tako nacionalno-ustvarjalna usmerjenost (za katero je bilo značilno nekakšno kritiziranje monarhije pred revolucijo) kot tudi desna tradicionalistična moč.

Pa ni mu treba pripisovati zgolj »religioznega romantičnega ruskega nacionalizma« ter ga napačno ocenjevati na podlagi tega, kakor se včasih počne v publicistiki.

⁴⁷ Isto, str. 89.

⁴⁸ Isto, str. 87.

SUMMARY PHILOSOPHER IVAN ILYIN - INTELLECTUAL, FIGHTER, MAN (ON THE UNKNOWN LETTER TO MAECENASES KRAMÁŘ TO PRAGUE FROM AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND AND GERMANY)

Ivan Aleksandrovich Ilyin (1883-1954) is the outstanding representative of the Russian intellectual elite in the Diaspora. He distinguished with the extraordinary deepness and weighing of the judgements. Ilyin was formed as a scientist in the prerevolutionary Russia. He got the splendid preparation in Moscow imperial university, and then during the two-years scientific training (not long before the World War I) he learned from well-known philosophers: Windelband, Ellinek, Simmel, Husserl and others. Ilyin was far-famed else in Russia (before he was expatriated by bolsheviks in 1922), but his well-known works with the programme character were matured already in emigration in Germany and since 1938 - in Switzerland. Here Ilyin became the ideological leader of the Diaspora.

The pivotal moment of the whole his life was the fight for the homeland's culture and dignity. Now according to Ilyin's deserts is recognized his gift of political prognosis forseen the future both of Russia and of Europe. It is no coincidence that Ilyin's conception of the spiritual renovation (formulated in his work published in Belgrade in 1937 and then detailed in two-volume edition *Our tasks: The Fate and the Future of Russia*) fruitfully serves to contemporary Russia.

Ilyin was by force expatriated in 1922 and under the threat of short shrift deported on the steamship together with the pick of the Russian scientists and writers. But Ilyin underlined - it did not mean that he was disturbed from homeland. By Ilyin - the homeland is not exhausted by the location and the patriotism does not feed only on day-to-day life.

With whole his versatility, from new unusual facet Ilyin appears as the intellectual, fighter and man in his letters to maecenases couple Nadežda and Karel Kramář. These letters (about 40) I discovered in the Archives of the national Museum (Prague) and at first were published in 1997 in journal *Rossija XXI*. The letters allow to deep the civic, political and historiosophy views of this European-level thinker. In these letters Ilyin expressed his credo in Diaspora - to serve to Russia and only to Russia, but not to persons, not to circles or parties; and to publish what is the most necessary to Russia now and for a hundred years in the future for the renovated image of Russia. Proceeding from this Ilyin worked out the clear programme of the publishing of the new journal in emigration - Russian Bell (*Ruskiy kolokol*) and he published it during 1927-1930 with the financial support of couple Kramář. The scientist was advanced by confidence in the correctness of the chosen path. Ilyin compared himself with the staunch tin soldier.

The large passage in this correspondence takes up an important, for us characteristic, of the different branches in the Russian emigration in Europe (in France, Czechoslovakia, Pribaltic and etc.). It was formed on the basis of his own experience and of his acquaintance with the state of affairs in these parts during his strenuous lecture tour all over Europe.

The great part in Ilyin's activities (as it appears from the correspondence) took up the interpreting of the Soviet reality, although he considered this work one of the most agonizing. In the letters Ilyin even confessed that he was tired of living amidst the strange people and fighting with their disastrous views. But Ilyin did not abandon the faith that Russia would revive and began the new period of its historic flourishing.

EXILE AND THE POLITICS OF MULTICULTURALISM: POLISH WRITERS AND INTELLECTUALS IN CANADA

Without much risk of being inaccurate, it can be said that one of the most important characteristics of and common human experiences in this century has been migratory the movements of people, unprecedented in modern times on such a massive scale. Caused by war, political upheavals, terror, disintegration of colonial domination and a search for the betterment of personal lot, it often brought about acute social tensions, clash of cultural values and above all, in the final analysis, it led to a new intermix of population and the rise of ethnic hybrids in which individuals from the most remote corners of the world came to live together and find an indispensable »*modus vivendi*«. To illustrate this point, suffice it to mention that, for example, Edmonton, the capital of the province of Alberta in Canada, (a city of roughly 800.000 inhabitants) is composed of more than one hundred different ethnic groups and nationalities. Of course this global trend of human displacement affected first of all those countries which were traditionally build on immigration (the United States of America, Canada, Australia), but after the Second World War even hitherto homogeneous nations began to reveal cracks in their boundaries: countries like Germany, Sweden, Holland, Great Britain and others had to open their doors to accommodate influx of strangers from the most remote, indeed at times exotic, »*mutually exclusive and disrespecting*«¹ cultural spheres. Exile, understood in both of its meanings, that is, either as a forced removal from one's country or a voluntary absence from it, and in the past a privilege or curse of individuals, became a universal phenomenon. Needless to say, these new ethnic configurations required specific political strategies to alleviate potential conflicts and prevent confrontations of unpredictable proportions. In this situation the call for tolerance and understanding became the immediate call of the day. However, even the most noble appeals expressed by moral authorities would hardly have a desirable effect if an adequate framework for their bearing on the life of aliens had not been established. By and large, their needs and aspirations have been met to a some degree in twofold manner: either by providing material, economic opportunities or by the political process known today as multiculturalism. Let us dwell for a moment on the latter.

In his insightful essay »The Politics of Recognition« Charles Taylor notes that in modern times the human condition has two preoccupations: identity and recognition.² While the former implies primarily an '*individualized identity*' which centers on the individual, concentrates on the »*discovery*« of oneself, the latter results from our communal environ-

¹ Amy Gutmann, »Introduction« to *Multiculturalism and the 'Politics of Recognition'*. An Essay by Charles Taylor. With Commentary by Amy Gutmann, Editor, Steven C. Rockefeller, Michael Walzer, Susan Wolf. Princeton. New Jersey: Princeton University Press. 1992, p. 21

² Charles Taylor, »*The Politics of Recognition*«, p. 26; as above.

ment based at present on democratic principles. To be sure, Taylor specifies his point more precisely when he states that identity is not worked out in isolation but is negotiated

»through dialogue, partly overt, partly internal, with others, (it) depends (...) on dialogical relations with others« and consequently it depends on society, it is »socially derived«. And as for the concept of recognition, it »was built into socially derived identity by virtue of the very fact that it was based on social categories that everyone took for granted«.³

In developing his network of notions, Taylor adds and subjects to examination such terms as dignity, authenticity and inner dialogicality. Time limitation does not allow me to discuss Taylor's views on the historical evolution of the above mentioned concepts and their detailed definition but I would like to stress that they compound the very essence of multiculturalism which Canada as a country, the Canadian government, is credited for both as its devisor and promoter. It is appropriate at this point to sketch its historical background and evolution within the Canadian political and cultural context.

The official policy of multiculturalism in Canada was presaged by the introduction of bilingualism and biculturalism. In 1963 the government appointed Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism to address »the growing unrest among French Canadians in Quebec«.⁴ The Royal Commission completed its work in 1969 and published a six volume *Report*.⁵ The task of the Commission was to examine the use of the two official languages and to recommend the actualization of Canadian cultural dualism. As far as the two official languages are concerned, the Commission addressed the question of their unequal usage and possible ways to correct this situation. Historically, the bilingual character of Canada was recognized in the British North America Act (1867) which acknowledged English and French as the two legislative and judicial languages in federal and Quebec institutions. However, the implementation of these principles left much to be desired. Now the Commission recommended that the English and French minorities throughout Canada would receive public services in their respective languages wherever a reasonable number of people living in a given area would warrant such assistance. It also made provisions to ensure a strict implementation of so-called »institutional bilingualism«, that is, the capacity of all state institutions to function in both official languages. In 1969 the government of P. E. Trudeau legislated the OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ACT. It proclaimed the »equality of status« of both English and French in all federal institutions (parliament, government, departments) and on all levels of their competence. To oversee a proper execution of this new policy the office of Commissioner of Official Languages was established the same year. The act helped to promote new initiatives beyond the federal jurisdiction. For example the province of Ontario extended its services in French, the expansion of French-immersion programs took place throughout all provinces and so on.

However strong the Official Languages Act was in sanctioning the bilingual and bicultural nature of the Canadian federation, it did not take into account in sufficient measure the aspirations of the third component of Canadian society, namely those who were neither of British nor French extraction. The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism responsible for the introduction of the Official Languages Act seems to have been aware of this question and addressed it in vague and general terms by making an

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 34-35.

⁴ *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Vol.1. A-For. Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers. 1985, p.172.

⁵ Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. *Report* (6 vol. 1967-1970).

allusion to cultural pluralism and the possibility of bilingualism and multiculturalism complementing each other. Yet it was not until the seventies that the discussion about multiculturalism and its acceptance as part of the Canadian political process became a reality. The term itself came into usage in the sixties and from Canada spread to other countries. While the concept of bilingualism and biculturalism rested within the domain of federal authority, multiculturalism became part of both the federal and provincial political process. New bills have been passed on both federal and provincial levels of government which implied that provinces could »adjust« the policy of multiculturalism to their own regional needs. In 1972 the Secretary of State also became the first federal minister responsible for multiculturalism, and in 1973 a Canadian Multiculturalism Council and Multiculturalism Directorate was established. Following this development, the Conservative government of Brian Mulroney adopted in 1987 the CANADIAN MULTICULTURALISM ACT. The main thrust of this legislation called for recognition of all Canadians »as full and equal participants in Canadian society«. It can be said that multiculturalism has been build on the principles of the politics of equal respect. Basically it refers to three aspects of the Canadian ethnic formation : (1) to the reality of ethnocultural diversity in its historical and present perspective, (2) the policy of multiculturalism as decreed by the Canadian government, and (3) the idea of ethnic pluralism in which diversity is both observed and respected.⁶ Obviously the policy of multiculturalism was introduced in response to centuries long discrimination: at first against the indigenous population (Indians) and then, later, against all other ethnic groups except French- and particularly British-origin groups which assured their domination thanks to the subjugation of the continent. Of course the struggle for equality of rights was a long-lasting and gradual process. It did not take hold in everyday political and social practice until the late fifties but then took an accelerated turn in the sixties and particularly the seventies.

It would now be a legitimate question to ask to what extent the introduction of multiculturalism has changed cultural and ethnic inequalities in Canadian society. The answer is not so simple. It should be noted, for example, that the unprecedented growth of Canadian universities after World War II, brought about the necessity of hiring scholars from all parts of the world without the policy of multiculturalism being in place. Without their participation, Canada could never have developed its intellectual potential and human resources and consequently, its postsecondary system of education, with such force and speed. Indeed, some campuses became living examples of mini-international cooperation and multiculturalism. This phenomenon clearly demonstrated and proved that immigrant scholars of non- British or French descent could make a significant academic and creative contribution to Canadian society. One may only speculate to what extent this had an impact on the introduction of multiculturalism but the latter certainly assuaged ethnic alienation and laid solid foundations of equality in interethnic relations.

As a result of these changes, the seventies and the eighties saw a growing interest in questions related to the participation of various immigrant groups in the development of the Canadian ethnic mosaic. Ukrainians, Hungarians, Chinese, Italians and so one began to examine their identity, historical past presence and role in building Canada as a country.

⁶ Yasmeen Abu-Laban, »For Export: Multiculturalism in an Era of Globalization« in: *Profiles of Canada*. Second Edition. Kenneth G. Pryke and Walter C. Soderlund, eds. Toronto: Irwin Publishers. 1998, p. 86. See also Avery F. Gordon and Christopher Newfield, eds., *Mapping Multiculturalism*. Minneapolis-London: University of Minnesota Press. 1996, 491 p.

One began to strongly emphasize the difference between the immigration policy in Canada and in the United States of America: While the United States practiced the »*melting pot*« concept, Canada allegedly promoted the idea of »*ethnic mosaic*« or ethnic diversity. Whether this difference withstands critical scrutiny is another matter. What I intend to do is to concentrate on the Polish group and particularly its contribution to the Canadian cultural scene.

The first Poles came to Canada in the mid eighteenth century as individuals rather than groups of any significant numbers. They did not arrive directly from Poland but from other countries. In most cases Polish newcomers were professionals (such as military surgeons, engineers, scientists) who served in the British army and were part of its colonial mission. It was not until the second half of the nineteenth century that the Poles began to come directly from the Polish territory (at that that time partitioned between Russia, Prussia and Austria), and in larger groups. In most general terms one can speak of three waves of Polish immigration to Canada: the first wave included those who settled there between the mid nineteenth century and the outbreak of World War I – mainly poor peasants in search of agricultural land; the second wave spread over the time between the two world wars, and the third came after World War II. The latter can be divided into two stages. The first occurred when over two hundred thousands Polish soldiers who fought at the side of Western allies decided not to return to Poland in fear for persecution from the puppet communist regime imposed by the Soviets. It was a different kind of immigration in that many of its members could boast themselves of having quite a good professional education or high-school diplomas. However, Canadian immigration policy at that time was marked by inconsistency, duplicity and blunt discrimination. On the one hand, it was tempted by the opportunity to bring to the country specialists with high qualifications in technology or business and on other (strange as it may sound), it often discriminated against educated men and women who hid whatever degrees or diplomas they had in order to be accepted as immigrants to Canada. In the eyes of immigration authorities they were capable of manual labor only and were found fitting to work primarily as miners or farm-hands. Suffice here to mention that Canadian immigration law divided immigrants into three categories: (1) Preferred (e.g. Scandinavians, Dutch etc.), (2) Non-preferred (all Slaves) and (3) Restricted (Italians, Greeks, blacks etc.). This humiliating, discriminatory practice lasted well into the fifties; for these newcomers, entering schools to continue their education was not an obvious privilege. They became, indeed, second class citizens. As for the other group of post-war immigrants, they left the country as the result of the conditions created by the communist takeover in 1945. It began in the fifties, increased in the sixties and reached its peak in the eighties. Most of these emigres have been well educated, with university degrees and excellent professional skills.

The first immigration did not yield any personalities of note. An exception was Sir Kazimierz Stanislaw Gzowski (1813-1898) who came to Canada in his early youth and became one of the most prominent figures in Ontario. He was an engineer by profession, became superintendent of public works of the Province of Canada and made himself distinct with the construction of roads, harbors, bridges, railways and so on. He formed the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers; the »Gold Gzowski Medal« was established during his life time as a distinction for engineers. It is annually awarded to those individuals who conduct and publish outstanding research in the field of engineering. He was knighted and in 1879 appointed aide-de-camp to Queen Victoria. His bust, erected in the park of Niagara Falls, stands today as a lasting memory of his service.

The professional, intellectual and artistic activity among Poles who settled in Canada became much more evident after 1945. In spite of discrimination and barriers which the new postwar immigration had to overcome, its members brought to Canada values and ambitions different from their earlier uneducated predecessors. Many of them represented the prewar Polish intelligentsia. Of course their first priority was to promote and advance the cause of Polish independence lost after 1945, but an equally important task consisted of sustaining their presence in Canada. In this respect, a limited success could be noted thanks to some international connections actualized mainly through the Catholic church or political connections. Thus, for example, Teodor Domaradzki who was known for his ties to the Vatican, became a professor and organizer of the Center for Slavic Studies at the University of Montreal – at that time an institution still under firm control of the Catholic hierarchy. Others, like for example, Tadeusz Brzezinski (the father of Zbigniew Brzezinski), thanks to their diplomatic service prior to or during World War II brought with them a certain political clout which enabled them to build a foothold in the Canadian political establishment. A substantial number of young Poles who completed their studies in Great Britain came to Canada in the early fifties. With diplomas from British or West European universities, they obviously had an easier start than their parents. Adam Bromke touched upon this aspect of Polish immigration to Canada in his recently published memoirs *Polak w świecie*⁷ (A Pole in the World). After completing his MA degree in political sciences at St. Andrews University in Scotland, he continued doctoral studies in Montreal and became a prominent professor and chairman of the political sciences Department at the University of Carleton in Ottawa. Similarly, Bogdan Czaykowski, a distinguished emigre poet who studied in Dublin and London later became a well known professor and Head of the Slavic Studies Department at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver. These were not isolated instances of success. Danuta Biekowska became a professor of Polish language and literature at the University of Toronto, Andrzej Busza accepted an offer from the Department of English at the University of British Columbia, Florian Smieja came to occupy a professorship of Spanish literature at the University of Western Ontario, Janusz Ihnatowicz, an aspiring young poet when he arrived in Toronto in 1951, later devoted his life to the priesthood and theology.⁸ To this group of scholars, writers and intellectuals belongs also Professor Paweł Wyczynski who initiated systematic studies in Quebecois literature and founded Research Centre of French-Canadian Civilization. Many of the postwar newcomers eventually came to occupy positions of responsibility in civil administration and government; this group also included many who worked as medical doctors, dentists, engineers and in other professions.

Due to a certain liberalization of the inner political life in Poland, the late fifties, sixties and seventies witnessed another inflow of Polish immigrants to Canada. Among them, positions of prominence gained: Vladimir Krysinski joined the Comparative Literature Program at Carleton University in Ottawa and later became Chairman of the Department Comparative Literature at the Université de Montreal; Dr. Aleksander Matejko, a prominent sociologist of international renown was appointed as a professor of sociology at the University of Alberta; another distinguished sociologist, professor Adam Podgórecki,

⁷ Adam Bromke, *Polak w Świecie*. Warszawa: Graf-Punkt, 1995. 297 p.

⁸ More about it see Ludwik Kos-Zubkowski, *The Poles in Canada*. Ottawa: *Canada Ethnica Series VII*. 1968; also consult an excellent article by Benedykt Heydenkorn »Emigracja polska w Kanadzie« in *Kultura* (Paris), 1952, no. 4(54), pp. 79-93.

joint the staff of Carleton University in Ottawa in the seventies. Nina Skiryecz-Kolesnikoff, a young graduate from the University of Wrocław in 1968 attained the position of professor in Russian literature and is today the Chair of Modern Languages Department at McMaster University in Hamilton. Hundreds of others with similarly successful careers can be mentioned. Their arrival coincided with the dynamic development of the postsecondary system in Canada which created a market for those interested in joining the academia or other research institutions, while those with different, more practical aspirations – after nostrification of their diplomas – joined medical or technical professions. It seems that shortly prior to the introduction of the bilingualism-biculturalism policy, followed by the recognition of multiculturalism, the Polish presence in the Canadian cultural superstructure increased considerably and was composed of threefold layers: those who arrived in 1945 and soon after that date, the second generation of Polish-Canadians who simply realized that Canada is their land and finally the group which left the country as a result of political oppression or economic destitution. There exists a direct interdependency between this development and the introduction of multiculturalism: while the growing participation and emancipation of the third ethnic group (that is other, than English and French) pushed for recognition and acknowledgment of its achievements and contribution to Canadian society, the political establishment felt pressured to sanction this change.

One can now ask the question of whether or to what extent the policy of multiculturalism helped to alleviate the alienation or even the inferiority complex of ethnic groups in relation to their fellow English and French countrymen. Indeed one cannot deny that multiculturalism helped to reveal specific features of various ethnic groups and strengthen their self-confidence which led to their stronger identification with the Canadian society because it helped to perceive Canada as a very tolerant, democratic country. In the seventies and eighties new publications, inspired either by invigorated ethnic activity or academic curiosity, popped up in various parts of the country, tracing the history and origins of the Canadian national mosaics. In 1968 Canadian Ethnic Studies - Études Ethnique au Canada was established. Polish diaspora in Canada took part in this process by reaching for closer ties with other ethnic groups, by organizing conferences and publishing new data related to various aspects of Polish presence in Canada such as for example the work of Polish missionaries, individual contributions to economic and cultural development of Canada, about the achievements of Polish scholars and scientists in Canadian universities and so on. Most importantly, however, this evolution set free the pride of being both Polish and Canadian. Up to that time in Canadian history, the Polish community remained rather self-centered, confined its activity within the boundaries of its own organizations and groups, and limited itself mainly to its own problems; now it began to show interest in sharing its values with others. To conclude, I would like to illustrate this point with one characteristic example, namely, an anthology of poetry entitled *Seven Polish Canadian Poets*,⁹ edited by W. Iwaniuk and F. Smieja with the foreword by Zbigniew Folejewski in 1984. This bilingual edition (Polish-English) made it possible for the Canadian reading public to get acquainted with Polish poetry written in Canada. Does the content of this anthology justify its title apart from the fact that its authors have their domicile in Canada? I do not believe that the poets who participated in this anthology had any illusions about being included into the

⁹ Waclaw Iwaniuk, Florian Smieja, eds., *Seven Polish Canadian Poets*. Toronto: Polish-Canadian Publishing Fund, 223 p.

mainstream of Canadian literature written in English as a result of their publication. However they could enter what has been defined as ethnic literature¹⁰ a term coined by Canadian literary criticism in response to the growing number of writers motivated by the experience of their origins other than English or French.

A short explanation at this point is necessary: Thanks to the official policy of multiculturalism proclaimed by the Canadian government, the adjective 'Canadian' (for example 'writer', 'artist') was no longer reserved so to speak for those who functioned in two official languages; it could be now used in relation to the representatives of other ethnic minorities. In spite of its vulnerability to political manipulation, this broadening of participation in the cultural process defines the specificity of the Canadian literary institution and makes it in many respects worthy of note. The Canadian literary institution includes not only the production, transmission, consumption of artifacts or such components as the function of publishing houses, the media, schools, universities and so on in the dissemination or diffusion of literature, but it also incorporates intentional, conscious and expedient effort on the part of the official authorities to bring about a multiethnic concept of Canadian literature. As I remarked elsewhere this literary situation seems to be favorably predisposed to an analysis in terms of the structuralist conception of literature as a system. In a most abbreviated summary, such a methodological approach implies that any national literature in the course of its evolution cannot be treated as a homogeneous entity but rather as a heterogeneous open system, ready to assimilate or to accommodate within itself other sets of aesthetic values, or, in short, other systems and subsystems, and as such, it should be looked upon as polysystem.

As for the above mentioned collection of poetry, *Seven Polish Canadian Poets* it became a demonstration of presence, a manifestation of Polish literary creativity to prove that, like other ethnic groups, the Polish community has something to offer to Canadian culture and readership. The volume contained some interesting poetic voices, distinct from what one may find in Canadian-English poetry. In his »Notes on Exile«, Czesław Miłosz made the comment that a writer in exile needs »new eyes, new thought, new distance« and it is important that s/he will be able to overcome his/her old (previous) »I« and reveal his/her own inner sources of inspiration which s/he may not have perceived before. New conditions impose on the writer a diversity of perspectives and are conducive to new genres and styles.¹¹ Indeed, the majority of Polish poets in Canada seem to have realized this chance, if not imperative. Out of seven poets included in the collection, at least three of them project a creative attitude which in one way or another goes along with Miłosz's reflections. While inherent in Polish literary tradition, particularly in its twentieth century experimental current, Waław Iwaniuk, Bogdan Czaykowski and Florian Smieja aim at gradual identification with their new country, its social environment and nature.

This is not a painless process. In Iwaniuk's case it substantiates itself in the form of conflict between past and present. This contrast is emphatically illustrated in the poem »Two Cities«. He writes:

*I had a city,
They took it away.*

¹⁰ Edward Możejko, »Ethnic or National (?): Polish Literature in Canada«, *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*, 1989, vol. XVI. no. 3-4, pp.809-825.

¹¹ Czesław Miłosz, »Notes on Exile« in *Books Abroad*, Spring 1976, pp. 281-284.

*I built a new one
Hidden, unapproachable;
There will be no trespassers,*
.....

This imagined city is contrasted with a real one which the poet sees as the site of the encounter between the indigenous people (Indians) and the White Man who came to conquer them. Later his sense of alienation gradually disappears and the growing number of motifs related to the North American continent gives witness to Iwaniuk's departure from the attitude of isolation. This is particularly evident in his collection *Evenings on Lake Ontario* (1981) with the subtitle *From My Canadian Diary*, in which he makes his first attempt to write in English. Here the change of his poetic vision is striking. He writes:

*My fascination with Canada has been long and stable
The country is enormous but its brain is still growing.
The people, Canadians, are not as Canadian
as the Greeks are Greek.
We are all clients of war... (»Post Scriptum«).*

And in another poem:

*I wasn't born here, I don't know the splendor of this land,
but my voice trembles when I speak of it.*

Similar attachment to the new, adopted country can be found in the poetry of F. Smieja, who in his collection of poetry in English¹² under the title *Not a Tourist*, presents his relation to Canada in the following manner:

*Looking at the sun setting in rich crimsons
at the black squirrels fearless on the road
surveying fertile fields and live pastures
I say to myself: no tourist am I,
a bird of passage without a nest of my own,
I do not merely journey with a cold lens.*

A philosophical reflection combined with details of the Canadian landscape and realities constitutes in my view the specificity of B. Czaykowski's later poetry. According to Cz. Miłosz, Czaykowski has »best expressed the predicament of a poet in exile«. Indeed, in Czaykowski's poetry this predicament often amounts to the struggle for the preservation of language and identity:

*I am a poet (I need to name myself)
Language is my chain
Words are my dog-collar.
I was born there.
(I would prefer to be born simply in grass).
(»Revolt in Verse«)*

The poet's encounter with majestic Canadian nature preoccupies his poetic imagination with a particular intensity and inspires his pantheistic vision of the world. He ties it with ultimate questions of death and, as he himself admits, nuclear annihilation.

It is not difficult to note that what constitutes the common denominator of these poets is their tendency to express themselves above all as artists (poets) and not as bearers

¹² Fl. Smieja, *Not a Tourist : Poems*. London: Third Eye, 1986.

of the national tragedy. In this they certainly differ from their nineteenth century great predecessors such as A. Mickiewicz, J. Słowacki, K. C. Norwid. They do not exhort us to revolt or formulate political programs of liberation. And their initial despair, identified in almost all individual cases as loneliness (isolation) caused by being torn out of their national environment and separation from the language, gradually gives way to conciliation and self-examination of their condition. They are above all poets. Their »Polishness« manifests itself mainly through discreet reference to history, to customs, events or individuals, and as indicated above – through their position vis-a-vis the new country. Ethnicity, for instance, can be expressed in yet a second language, that is, either English or French, but to raise this issue would take us away from the main purpose of this presentation.

I have discussed here the significance of poetry as a medium through which the Polish cultural presence is expressed most fully and with interesting artistic results which can hardly be ignored even in a broader international literary context. The question is, however, how lasting and significant this cultural contribution is from Canadian perspective. It seems that multiculturalism functions as a platform of activity intended primarily for the first generation of immigrants: it facilitates its adaptation and teaches tolerance. Their children display an entirely different attitude: they often shun their ethnic roots and are quickly assimilated into the main stream of Canadian cultural life and social fabric. However, the politics of multiculturalism created a much more conducive environment for them, too. Thus, for example, Stanley Haidasz, born in Toronto of Polish parentage, became the first Minister of Multiculturalism, and later the first representative of Polish descent in the Upper House of Parliament – Senate. Don Mazankowski reached the position of Minister of Finance and Deputy Prime Minister in the conservative government of Brian Mulroney. Some other Poles of the same generation became active in provincial politics, particularly in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and later in Alberta. Their participation in public life is aimed not so much at promoting multiculturalism as it is oriented towards integration, a recent buzz word for what seems to emerge as the new direction in the Canadian immigration policy. Indeed, in recent years multiculturalism has come under heavy attack from the press, right wing opposition parties, other organizations and groups. An opinion poll reported in 1993 by the national newspaper *The Globe and Mail*, gave an unequivocal verdict: »Canadians want the mosaic to melt and respondents believe immigrants should adopt Canadian values«. In a book published under significant title *Selling Illusions. The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada*,¹³ Neil Bissoondath claims that multiculturalism helps to play the ethnic deracinated, costumed individual and consequently it plays to stereotypes which in the final analysis means to »abdicate one's full humanity in favor of one of its exotic features, ethnicity«.

Whatever the future of multiculturalism in Canada, it ought to be emphasized that it has played an extremely positive role in the process of emancipation of all national and racial groups which made Canada their home. The policy of multiculturalism raised the awareness of Canadians and helped them to realize that the strength of Canada as a nation rests on its ethnic diversity, that there are no privileged groups and that all Canadians are equal in the wake of the law, all should enjoy the same opportunities, share the same rights and responsibilities. I see the historical merit of multiculturalism if not in the complete achievement of this goal, then in its approximation which may keep alive the dream of what P. E. Trudeau defined as the »just society«.

¹³ Neil Bissoondath. *The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada*. Toronto: Penguin Books, 1994, 234 p.

*POVZETEK IZGNANSTVO IN POLITIKA MULTIKULTULIZMA:
POLJSKI INTELEKTUALCI IN PISATELJI V KANADI*

Uvodni del prispevka se na kratko ustavi pri vprašanju izgnanstva kot fenomenu dvajsetega stoletja. Selitvena gibanja tega časa so privedla do srečanj različnih narodnosti, ras in verstev. Charles Taylor meni, da je glavna preokupacija današnjih etničnih skupin in posameznikov tipično izražena v vprašanjih, kot sta identiteta in prepoznavanje. V nadaljevanju uvoda je opisana evolucija multikulturizma v Kanadi kot odziv na zgoraj omenjena široka vprašanja.

Predhodniki uradne kanadske politike multikulturizma sta bili dvojezičnost in dvo-kulturnost kot uradna politika kanadske zvezne vlade. Uzakonjeni sta bili leta 1969. Naslednji korak je bil narejen v sedemdesetih, ko je bilo ustanovljeno ministrstvo za multikulturizem, vendar pa akt o multikulturizmu ni bil sprejet vse do leta 1987, ko ga je sprejela konzervativna vlada Briana Mulroneyja.

Po predstavitvi ozadja razvoja podaja prispevek pregled poljskega priseljavanja v Kanado. Sočasno lahko med tremi valovi poljske emigracije v Kanado: prvi je trajal od druge polovice devetnajstega stoletja do izbruha prve svetovne vojne, sledilo je obdobje med obema vojnama, tretji val pa je bil po letu 1945. Slednjega lahko razdelimo na dve podskupini: prva je prispela v Kanado kmalu po koncu vojne, druga pa je prišla po letu 1956, večina pa v poznih šestdesetih, sedemdesetih in osemdesetih letih. S tem valom priseljencev je v Kanado prispelo veliko število izobražencev, predstavnikov poljske inteligence – profesorji, umetniki, inženirji, pisatelji in drugi. Čeprav so se mnogi izmed njih soočili z diskriminacijo, so nekateri le uspeli zasesti pomembne položaje v kanadskih akademskih in javnih institucijah. Če naštejemo samo nekatere: A. Bromke, Stankiewicz, B. Czaykowski, D. Bienkowska, F. Smieja in drugi. Ta tendenca se je nadaljevala s prihodom emigrantov iz komunistične Poljske. Osebnosti, kot so A. Matejko, W. Krysinski, N. Kolebnikoff, so veliko prispevale k razvoju kanadskih univerz. V zadnjem delu je raziskano vprašanje, do kakšne mere so se sami poistovetili s kanadsko realnostjo. Prispevek se tudi osredotoči na kratko analizo del treh pesnikov, vključenih v zbirko *Sedem kanadsko-poljskih pesnikov* (Seven Canadian Polish Poets, 1984); to so W. Iwaniuk, F. Smieja in B. Czaykowski.

Prispevek se zaključuje s kratko omembo nedavnih napadov na multikulturizem.

Andrea Panaccione

LA CULTURE POLITIQUE DE L'ÉMIGRATION MENCHEVIQUE ENTRE LES DEUX GUERRES MONDIALES

Émigration, histoire nationale, histoire sociale

L'émigration russe post-révolutionnaire constitue depuis longtemps un sujet de recherche extrêmement riche, ce qui peut s'expliquer facilement par l'importance de sa contribution culturelle et politique à l'histoire du 20^{ème} siècle. Pendant les dernières années, et avec les nouvelles possibilités de consultation des archives après la chute de l'URSS, le nombre des recherches et des publications s'est encore accru, mais surtout, à mon avis, on a vu s'affirmer deux approches qui sont en partie nouvelles et qui vont produire des résultats importants: l'insertion de l'histoire de l'émigration dans l'ensemble de l'histoire russe et soviétique au cours du 20^{ème} siècle – dont elle constitue une partie essentielle, ainsi que l'histoire de l'émigration antisariste pour l'histoire russe du siècle précédent – et l'attention pour une histoire sociale du phénomène dans les différents milieux où il s'est développé.

Émigration russe et émigration socialiste

On sait – et l'ouvrage récent de André Liebich, *From the Other Shore. Russian Social Democracy after 1921*, Cambridge, Mass. – London, 1997, l'a très bien documenté – que les mencheviks russes ont constitué un courant tout à fait particulier dans le monde de l'émigration. En premier lieu, ils ne se considéraient pas des émigrés russes, mais des émigrés socialistes; deuxièmement, leur organisme dirigeant, la Délégation étrangère, a pris tout de suite ses distances des autres partis de l'émigration (y compris ces partis, tels que les socialistes-révolutionnaires et le mencheviks géorgiens, qui faisaient partie, comme les mencheviks russes, de l'Internationale ouvrière socialiste) et cette position n'a pas été modifiée jusqu'aux années de la deuxième guerre mondiale. Cette volonté d'isolement par rapport aux autres courants socialistes de l'ex empire russe était la conséquence d'un contraste de lignes politiques sur les perspectives de changement de la situation en URSS, mais aussi de la persistance d'une différence qui avait déterminé la position du parti pendant les années de la guerre civile en Russie (le refus de s'engager directement et de mener un attaque de front contre le pouvoir bolchevique, qui à leur avis aurait pu engendrer seulement une solution de restauration). Il était question là du poids du passé, qu'on peut voir dans toute expérience d'émigration politique, et de la réflexion sur les causes de la défaite, que les mencheviks avaient entamé depuis l'Octobre; il était question aussi d'affirmer la continuité d'un choix politique, qui pendant nombre d'années a été pratiqué non seulement à l'extérieur, mais aussi dans l'action à l'intérieur de l'URSS, et de sauvegarder ainsi l'identité et l'unité du parti, comme l'on peut voir, par exemple, de l'insistance presque obsédante

avec laquelle la Délégation étrangère des mencheviks discute et stigmatise les épisodes de collaboration aux initiatives ou à la presse des autres groupes socialistes. On peut reconnaître dans tout ça un répertoire d'attitudes, d'imaginaires, de contraintes identitaires, qui fait partie en général de l'expérience de l'exil politique, mais dont les vicissitudes du menchevisme dans l'émigration ont fourni en tout cas une documentation dans la longue durée probablement unique.

Des exils différents et des questions qui se répètent

Les mencheviks – contrairement aux exilés socialistes allemands au lendemain de la conquête naziste du pouvoir – ne font pas appel aux analogies avec leur expérience précédente de l'exil: ils soulignent à plusieurs reprises, au contraire, que la situation et les conditions de la lutte politique sont tout à fait différentes par rapport à l'époque tsariste, en Russie et dans l'émigration. Mais il est évident, d'autre part, que dans la pratique de l'exil on peut facilement reconnaître la répétition des modèles de comportement qui avaient caractérisé pendant une longue période les militants du mouvement révolutionnaire russe, et les mencheviks parmi eux. Au delà du rôle déterminant qu'assument les questions d'organisation et de diffusion de la presse, il faut se confronter, encore une fois, avec les problèmes de relier l'action politique à l'intérieur et à l'extérieur et avec les tensions qui se produisent entre les organisations et les militants qui agissent dans les deux différents contextes. Les archives des mencheviks – aux États Unis, en Russie, en Europe – nous offrent beaucoup de matériaux sur ces questions-là. Dans la correspondance entre la Délégation étrangère à Berlin et le Bureau qui agissait en Russie dans la première moitié des années vingt, au delà des problèmes politiques et d'organisation, on peut percevoir souvent, d'une part et de l'autre, une malaise psychologique, des malentendus et des reproches réciproques, la conviction d'un manque de compréhension de l'un et de l'autre côté (cfr., par exemple, la lettre de Berlin du 28.X.1923, Bachmeteff Archive, Columbia University, New York, Sapir Papers, Box 69).

Le choix du lieu de l'exil et les rapports avec le milieu d'accueil

C'est en premier lieu l'évaluation des conditions les plus favorables pour continuer le travail politique qui détermine le choix du lieu de l'exil. Berlin, le siège de la Délégation étrangère jusqu'à 1933, est un milieu culturel et politique que beaucoup des militants mencheviques ont déjà connu (en qualité d'exilés de la Russie tsariste, mais aussi d'étudiants: cfr. C. Weill, *Étudiants russes en Allemagne 1900-1914*, Paris, 1996), où l'on peut compter sur le soutien des socialistes allemands (bien que les rapports avec la Spd ne soient plus ceux de l'avant-guerre), où il y a nombre de possibilités de communication avec la Russie (même à travers la délégation commerciale soviétique, dans laquelle l'on trouve, parmi les employés, nombre de mencheviks plus ou moins – ou pas du tout – repentis et qui est visitée fréquemment, en «kommandirovka», par les ex mencheviks qui occupent des postes importants dans les institutions économiques soviétiques). Dans l'automne de 1923, lorsque la situation politique en Allemagne oblige la Délégation étrangère à prendre en examen la possibilité de laisser le pays, on établit, sur la base des mêmes considérations qui

avaient dicté le choix de Berlin, un ordre de préférence (Bruxelles, Paris, la Lettonie) au cas d'un nouveau siège de l'exil (cfr. Bakhmeteff Archive, Sapir Papers, Box 66, Réunion du 22 octobre 1923).

Le rapport avec le mouvement socialiste du pays d'accueil est en tout cas une expérience complexe; dans le cas des mencheviks russes à Berlin on peut remarquer facilement les différences politiques avec le groupe dirigeant du socialisme allemand, les rapports privilégiés qui passent à travers les différents courants (Garvi, qui appartient à la minorité de droite, est le spécialiste russe du »Vorwärts«; Dan, le leader de la Délégation étrangère, est en rapport surtout avec les oppositions socialistes de gauche, et en particulier avec le groupe de »Der Klassenkampf«), mais aussi les choix différents de militantisme. L'intégration et le rôle dans le socialisme allemand de Vladimir Vojtinskij, de Jurij Denike / Georg Decker, de Grigorij Binstok / Gregor Bienstock – des militants qui appartiennent à l'histoire du parti mais qui sont restés en marge, à travers des vicissitudes différentes, du menchevisme officiel – semblent indiquer qu'une attitude critique envers la culture politique et les principes d'organisation de son propre parti est un facteur qui aide à s'intégrer dans un autre mouvement socialiste. Mais il faut tenir compte encore des biographies, des occasions, des dispositions personnelles, des intérêts culturels: un éventail d'attitudes, de rapports et de choix qui composent un riche paysage humain et dont la connaissance rendrait nécessaire, au delà des résultats importants de la recherche d'André Liebich, un véritable approche prosopographique.

La durée de l'exil

L'émigration politique de la Russie, suivie tout de suite par l'émigration antifasciste italienne et quelques années plus tard par l'exil allemand, a fait pour la première fois l'expérience de la nécessité de mettre à jour et de réviser périodiquement ses prévisions à propos de la durée de l'exil. Conçu au début comme une parenthèse obligée et temporaire, l'exil va devenir progressivement une situation de durée indéfinie. Cela implique une série de processus de réadaptation, aux niveaux politique, culturel, existentiel, qui ont été vécus par toutes les émigrations citées. Dans l'ensemble de ces processus, la compréhension de ce qui se passait en Union soviétique n'a pas été seulement, pour les mencheviks, l'effort constant dans lequel chaque mouvement d'exilés joue, par rapport au pays de provenance, ses perspectives futures, sa mission de témoignage pour l'opinion internationale, sa capacité de maintenir des liens, mais aussi la mise à l'épreuve d'une culture politique. On peut reconnaître dans les élaborations de l'exil la continuité des éléments portants de cette culture politique, dont l'affaiblissement progressif déterminera la crise du menchevisme même: l'idée d'une »tactique-procès« (L. Haimson), qui se développe depuis l'expérience de 1905 en opposition à la »tactique du plan« de la vieille Iskra et qui sera identifiée, dans les conditions tout à fait différentes de l'Union soviétique aussi, avec la capacité d'adhérer aux transformations d'une société régie par ses propres lois de développement et irréductible de toute façon à une émanation du pouvoir politique; le point de vue des intérêts de la classe ouvrière comme la polaire qui permet de définir la position à assumer par rapport à ce qui se passe dans la société et au niveau politique; la subordination des critères nationaux aux critères de classe; l'unité avec le mouvement socialiste européen comme la condition irremplaçable de tout progrès politique et social en Russie. Dans le tentatif toujours

renouvelé, et imposé aussi par la fonction de spécialistes de la question dans le socialisme international, de comprendre l'Union soviétique, on peut évaluer toute la complication qui est déterminée par l'entrelacement des facteurs de conservation d'une mémoire et d'une tradition et des facteurs de changement, de la volonté de maintenir une cohésion interne et de l'évidence progressive des tendances à la différenciation et à la disgrégation.

L'exil, l'Internationale, l'internationalisme

Pour les mencheviks, la perception de la durée de l'exil veut dire surtout, au cours des années, la nécessité de mettre en question leur rôle de représentants à l'étranger d'une force politique agissant en URSS, de substituer une référence qui devient toujours plus faible, de définir à nouveau un champ d'action.

L'élaboration théorique, l'initiative politique, l'influence des mencheviks dans le socialisme international de l'entre-deux-guerres: tout ça peut évoquer facilement la formule de l'Internationale comme «patrie de substitution». Les contributions des mencheviks aux prises de position des organisations internationales et des partis socialistes sur les grandes questions politiques de l'époque (les rapports avec le mouvement communiste, les questions nationales et la situation internationale, les causes et les conséquences de l'avènement du nazisme, le front unique et le front populaire, les questions de la démocratie et de la paix) ont représenté en effet une quantité d'occasions d'engagement qui ont absorbé autant d'énergies que l'analyse de l'URSS et qui ont été essentielles pour la survivance même de l'organisation. Cet engagement a représenté aussi une façon de vérifier les termes nouveaux dans lesquels la question de l'Internationale, sur la base de la crise de l'internationalisme, avait été posée après la guerre mondiale par Martov, dont les dernières interventions avaient inspiré la position des mencheviks dans l'Union de Vienne et dans la formation l'Ios (je renvoie sur ça à mon article sur «La mue de l'internationalisme avant et pendant la Première Guerre mondiale», *Le mouvement social*, N° 147, avril-juin 1989, pp. 105-116). La réduction du rôle des partis socialistes en exil dans l'Internationale des années '30 – qui aboutit à la décision du Comité exécutif de l'Ios, en mai 1939, de limiter drastiquement la représentation de ces partis dans les organismes dirigeants – sera une preuve du rôle désormais marginal du menchevisme, mais plus encore une autre manifestation de crise de l'internationalisme socialiste.

L'inversion des priorités entre l'action à l'intérieur de l'URSS et celle dans le socialisme international se manifeste d'une façon paradigmatique dans l'épisode du «télégramme de Kazan», la dépêche envoyée au «Populaire» et à l'«Humanité» en août 1934 par trois ex-dirigeants mencheviks (Ezov, Zacharova, Ber) déportés à Kazan', dans laquelle on saluait «avec joie» l'unité d'action entre socialistes et communistes en France et on exprimait l'espoir que «*l'exemple français sera suivi par le mouvement ouvrier international*», sans faire aucune mention des persécutions des socialistes en URSS. La discussion qui se développe dans la Délégation étrangère à propos de ce document, qui fait écouter pour la première fois depuis longtemps la voix d'un groupe de mencheviks à l'intérieur de l'URSS, concerne la question de l'unité d'action au niveau international. Ces débats, ainsi que les échos du télégramme de Kazan' dans la presse socialiste, doivent être colloqués dans le double contexte soit des divisions croissantes qui se manifestent dans l'émigration menchevique depuis le début des années '30 sur les perspectives de l'URSS soit de la lutte

politique dans le socialisme international à propos de la façon de combattre le fascisme et de réaliser l'unité de la classe ouvrière, une discussion entamée publiquement à la conférence socialiste internationale de Paris d'août 1933. En tout cas, la situation des mencheviks à l'intérieur de l'URSS est vue comme un facteur qui peut influencer ou être influencé par les développements internationaux, mais elle n'est plus un domaine autonome d'action politique.

Le voyage le plus long

Les mencheviks qui rejoignent aux États Unis la dernière destination de leurs différents exils – après l'Allemagne de Weimar et la France des années du front populaire et de la guerre – ne constituent plus désormais une organisation unitaire et les positions qu'ils soutiennent ont perdu les références politiques des deux décennies précédentes. Mais il ne dépend seulement de ça si leur voix semblent parler maintenant un langage différent. La distance qui a été établie entre la nouvelle patrie d'adoption et l'Europe va imposer un point de vue tout à fait différent. Plus vivement que pour tout autre courant de l'émigration russe, l'Europe de l'entre-deux-guerres avait représenté pour les mencheviks la conservation des liens avec les sources de leur culture politique, une ambiance qui restait familiale, même dans les conditions les plus difficiles, simplement parce qu'elle était la terre où le socialisme était né et s'était développé, où les questions qui les avaient tourmenté pendant tant d'année avaient été originellement formulées et continuaient à être débattues.

L'arrivée aux États-Unis pourra signifier la sensation d'être finalement à l'abri d'autres déplacements brusques et traumatiques, la fin d'une condition de fuyard toujours paré à faire ses valises (*cemodannoje nastroenie*). La transformation de la vie politique et sociale américaine qui se produit avec la guerre et immédiatement après, avec l'ouverture de la confrontation avec l'URSS, pourra assigner encore un rôle significatif à quelques-uns des derniers représentants du menchevisme (Abramovic est l'un des inspirateurs de la mobilisation du mouvement syndical contre les influences communistes dans les syndicats européens, Dalin e Nikolaevskij figurent parmi les pères fondateurs de la soviétologie américaine). Il sera plus facile, pour ceux qui ont laissé de côté les vieilles questions préjudicielles envers les autres courants de l'émigration, de s'intégrer dans la »Russia abroad« aux États-Unis, sans se sentir encore »une émigration dans l'émigration« (c'est une expression de Garvi que A. Liebich a repris dans son ouvrage cité et dans sa contribution »Eine Emigration in der Emigration: Die Menschewiki in Deutschland 1921-1933«, dans *Russische Emigration in Deutschland, 1918-1941*, hg. V. K. Schlögel, Berlin, 1995, S. 229-241). Mais le rapport avec le mouvement socialiste, qu'ils avaient maintenu pendant le long exil européen, appartient désormais au passé.

Témoins et historiens

Avant de mourir, Dan rêvait le retour en Europe pour participer à un nouveau mouvement socialiste, mais son dernier ouvrage sur les origines du bolchevisme (*Proischozdenie bol'sevizma*, New York, 1946) sera surtout une importante réflexion historique. Les divisions politiques, les querelles personnelles des années américaines n'ont pas empêché

les mencheviks de conserver un sens très fort d'appartenance à une histoire commune. Devenus surtout des témoins et des historiens – en particulier dans le cadre du Menshevik Project dirigé par Leopold Haimson – ils ont donné une dernière contribution très importante à l'histoire du socialisme, ce qui était, encore une fois, une démonstration de la continuité et de la capacité d'intégration de leur culture politique.

*POVZETEK POLITIČNA KULTURA MENJŠEVIŠKE EMIGRACIJE
MED OBEMA VOJNAMA*

Ruski menjševiki so po začetku 20-ih let preživel dolgo dobo pregnanstva, med katero so uspeli ohraniti živo delovanje svoje organizacije ter ustvariti mrežo odnosov, teoretični okvir, politično iniciativo in vpliv v mednarodnem socializmu. Tako so delovali v zelo različnih razmerah in družbenih okoljih: v Nemčiji, v času weimarske republike do zmage nacizma; v Franciji, v letih ljudske fronte do druge svetovne vojne; v ZDA, v letih med državljansko vojno in po njej do druge svetovne vojne in postopnega razpada same menjševiške organizacije. Vloga ruskih menjševikov v mednarodnem socializmu, pri ustvarjanju podobe ZSSR na Zahodu, pri zavzemanju stališč mednarodnih organizacij in socialističnih strank o velikih političnih vprašanjih v obdobju med obema vojnama (odnosi z ZSSR in komunizmom, narodna vprašanja in vprašanja mednarodnih odnosov, pojav nacizma, ljudska fronta, vprašanja demokracije in miru) nedvomno razkriva obstoj bogate politične kulture, ki je rezultat dveh različnih procesov. Znotraj prvega je zgodovinski razvoj stranke v Rusiji oz. v političnih razmerah carskega imperija (ki je spet druga izkušnja preživljanja pregnanstva, poskusov vplivanja na razmere v Rusiji iz tujine, je torej podlaga za primerjavo), poraz leta 1917, prizadevanja za vlogo prave politične opozicije v prvih letih sovjetske oblasti, znotraj drugega procesa pa novosti ruskega in mednarodnega okvira po letu 1917 in prva svetovna vojna, spreminjajoča se stvarnost, ki se ji mora prilagajati stranka, zastopana v emigraciji; kriza internacionalizma delavskega razreda in njegov značaj, ki se bo v prihodnje dolgo pojavljal kot vprašanje; zveze z drugimi skupinami ruske emigracije, drugimi kulturnimi okolji, drugimi socialističnimi partijami.

Medsebojno prepletanje dejavnikov ohranjanja zgodovinskega spomina in tradicije ter dejavnikov sprememb, prizadevanj za ohranitev notranje koherentnosti ter vedno jasnejših teženj po diferenciaciji in disgregaciji, procesov vključevanja ter izolacije borcev na ravni posameznikov: vse to prispeva k nastanku zelo pestre kulturne in politične zgodovine, kljub vedno manjšemu obsegu organizacije, in je vznemirljivo področje za raziskovanje tudi zato, ker omogoča primerjave z drugimi izkušnjami doživljanja pregnanstva v obravnavanem obdobju.

MIHAJLO PUPIN'S CHARACTER IN EMIGRATION AND DOMESTIC PRESS

Professor Mihajlo Idvorski Pupin (1858 - 1935) was not only a worldwide known scientist whose inventions in the field of physics and electronics had brought him fame and wealth. He also was, which is less known, very active in the social and political work and in organizing the scheme of Serbian immigrants and, as a great benefactor, he assisted financially many institutions and individual in exile and back at home. Consequently, such a rich and unusual life style and a universal character were, and still are, subjects to incongruous appreciation, glorification and even mythologization. In this work I will try to present Pupin's character as it has been constructed in the press both in exile and at home. In addition to many newspaper articles, I have benefited from his autobiography, as well as from professional papers and different texts dealing with his socio-political activities as in exile¹ so at home.

Mihajlo Pupin was born in Idvor where he finished his primary school. He attended and finished high school in Pančevo and Prague, and left for America in 1874. The first few years he worked as a laborer, and then he finished his studies at Columbia College in New York, just to move to Cambridge where he obtained the Master's Degree. His next stop was at the University of Berlin where he acquired his Doctorate in physics in 1889. After returning to New York, Pupin worked for thirty years as a professor at Columbia College where, owing to his research works and inventions in the fields of telephony and radiology, he became a worldwide famous scientist. During the period of time from 1894 to 1934, Pupin got forty-three patents,² eighteenth honorary degrees, and six gold medals in tribute for his inventions. He was a member, a president, and an honorary member of many leading scientific and even social institutions in America and around the world, such as: a member of the National Academy of Sciences, USA, a president of the New York Academy of Sciences, a corresponding member of the Royal Serbian Academy, Belgrade, and an honorary doctor of science of the University of Belgrade, and many others.³

¹ On Pupin's engagement in exile see: P. Slepčević, *Srbi u Americi*, Ženeva 1917, 46; P. Hadži-Pavlović, *Mihajlo Pupin medju Srbima u Americi*, *Tehnički list 11 i 12*, Zagreb 1935, 167-171; V. Grečić, *Uloga Mihajla Pupina u organizovanju srpskog iseljništva u SAD*, *Život i delo Mihajla Idvorskog Pupina*, *Zbornik radova naučnog skupa*, Novi Sad 1985, 277 - 289.

² According to Pupin's biography in the publication *život i delo srpskih naučnika*, in our literature it is regularly stated, but wrong, that he had twenty-four patents only, A. Marinčić, *Mihajlo Idvorski Pupin*, *Život i delo srpskih naučnika*, SANU, Beograd 1996, 277.

³ *Ibid* 265-278.

On the other hand, Mihajlo Pupin was also very active when it came to the social life of his fellow-countrymen in America. Among the Serbian immigrants he took the lead in engaging at organizing and bringing together their benefit societies at Sloga the Association of the United Serbs, of which he were the president for some time. Using his means, Pupin established several funds that assisted many cultural, educational and religious institutes of our immigrants. Somewhat later, just before both the Balkan Wars and the World War One, Pupin worked on the popularization of Serbia's national interests.⁴ He joined in her struggle for liberation, helped sending in the volunteers to the Salonica front, called for creation of Yugoslavia, and had an important role at the Peace Conference in Paris in 1919. It was then that, owing to his merit, Banat, Dalmatia and Bled's triangle joined the structure of the Kingdom of Serbia - Croatia - Slovenia.⁵ He also received several awards in tribute for his social and-political engagements. During the period of time from 1911 to 1918 he was the first honorary Consul of the Kingdom of Serbia in America.⁶ In 1929 he was awarded the decoration of the White Eagle, First Order of Yugoslavia. He was also proclaimed as the honorary president of the Serbian National Federation, the oldest, and beside the Serbian Orthodox Church, the most numerous organization of the Serbs in America. He also was the honorary citizen of Bled. Pupin paid eight visits to his homeland. He also wrote an autobiography *From Immigrant to Inventor* for which he received the greatest literary prize in America, the Pulitzer Prize in 1924.

In his eighth decade of life his energy started to wane rapidly. Mihajlo Idvorski Pupin died on the twelfth of March 1935, on the same day he set sail on his voyage to America sixty-one years earlier. He was buried at the Woodlock cemetery in The Bronx, New York.⁷

Headlines on Mihajlo Pupin appeared in the emigrant and domestic press rather late. As for the newspapers of the Serbs in America, his name was mentioned for the first time in *Amerikanski Srbobran* in 1907 in the appeal for donations for newly founded Slavonic Immigrant Society.⁸ Later on, during the period of time when he had an active role in the immigrant life and organizations, almost all of the Serbian newspapers, irrespective of their designation, in one issue after the other, released a great number of articles on his engagement. Subsequently, his name would be mentioned only on occasions referring to the celebration of important events in his life. The press in his homeland regarded him in a similar manner. There were periods of time when it was written a lot and extensively about him, and again there were times when his name was mentioned in an informative way, or was not mentioned at all. One of the first news was the information released in 1915 in the daily *Politika* stating the Pupin established the fund »for research to be carried out by

⁴ Some of the articles in which Pupin emphasized the interests of Serbia are: *Servia's Struggle*, *American Rev.*, Vol. 51, 203 - 208, Feb. 1915.

⁵ M. Jeftić, Mihajlo Pupin na Mirovnoj konferenciji, *Letopis Matice srpske* 331, sv. 1-3, 1932, 101-110; D. Kečić, Diplomatska misija M. Pupina, *Zbornik Matice srpske za istoriju* 51, N Sad 1955, 127-136

⁶ At the time it was written about his appointment in *Srbina* 18/1911 and *Srbobran* 83/1911, newspapers in America at the time.

⁷ A. Marinčić, op. cit

⁸ Slavonic Immigrant Society, *Amerikanski Srbobran*, 16.5.1907, 2.

twenty-five Columbia University students who would spend their summer in Serbia». ⁹ During a long number of years which followed, domestic press mentioned his name only sporadically, while the first comprehensive articles - feuilletons on his life appeared on the occasion of his one hundred and twenty-fifth birth anniversary in *Borba*¹⁰ and *Večernje novosti*,¹¹ while *Politika* merely released information that a congress and exhibition would take place in Idvor on that occasion. However, the real flood of articles on Pupin appeared in *Politika* in late eighties and the beginning of the nineties. Initially, there were few articles in the page *Medju nama* (Among Us), in which the readers, in the light of the actual political events, argued on Pupin's role at the Peace Conference in Paris,¹² as well as on how and how much his mother country paid him back for his patriotism.¹³ It was not long after that, that a spectacular topic brought to the light his fabulous wealth and legacy, as well as the search for his newly discovered heirs who lived in this country.¹⁴

The character of Mihajlo Pupin has been developed in various newspaper articles of the emigrant and the domestic press, both the ones in his time and nowadays, according to the model of a hero. However, not just an ordinary hero, but a hero – emigrant, who transited from one culture into another, and especially due to his success in a foreign country his character has got elements of a cultural and national hero.

In sketches, the most complex newspaper readings, in Pupin's autobiography, on which those feuilletons are based, as well as in other newspaper articles, Pupin was, at first sight, shown as remarkably successful person, an individual, a scientist, while his life was described according to the pattern of fulfillment of the American dream about glory and wealth.

»The man whose life looked like a modern fairy tale;¹⁵ The dream comes true;¹⁶ His name has been recorded in gold letters in the history of science and techniques;¹⁷ Professor Pupin was like a jewel, admired by everyone, irrespective of the point from which he was viewed«.¹⁸

His life story is described not only as unusually rich, but also filled with unexpected turning points, even contrasts. A giant from Idvor;¹⁹ World glory of a shepherd from Banat;²⁰ a scientist, nevertheless rich, glorious, and later on forgotten. The aim of such elabo-

⁹ *Politika* 18.6.1915

¹⁰ V. Savinšek, Gorostas iz Idvora, *Borba* 1.10.-10.10.1979

¹¹ S. Popović, Svetska slava banatskog pastira, *Večernje novosti* 28.5.-7.6.1979

¹² Doprinos M. Pupina odredjivanju granica Jugoslavije, *Medju nama*, *Politika* 5.12.1989; Zaslugom M. Pupina Bled je pripao Sloveniji, *Medju nama*, *Politika* 8.12.1989.

¹³ Da li smo zaboravili Pupina, *Medju nama*, *Politika* 13.12.1989, Pupina nismo zaboravili, *Medju nama*, *Politika* 22.12.1989

¹⁴ Kud se dadoše dolari iz fondacije, *Politika* 20.1.1992; Treći testament stigao iz Australije, *Politika* 7.4.1992; Pupinovi milioni pod šifrom, *Politika* 20.4.1992; Šok dolarskog nasleđe, *Politika* 17.2.1992; Pupinovi naslednici sa svih strana, *Politika* 17.2.1992, Preko Atlantika po Pupinovo bogatstvo, *Politika* 18.5.1992. i dr

¹⁵ Povratak u rodno selo, 3. nastavak feljtona S. Popovića, op. cit. 30.5.1979

¹⁶ Naslov 9. nastavka feljtona: ibid, 5.6.1979

¹⁷ Priznanja na pretek, ibid, 7.6.1979

¹⁸ Dr Pupin Inspired, *Amerikanski Srbobran*, 28.3.1935

¹⁹ Naslov feljtona V. Savinseka, op.cit

²⁰ Naslov feljtona S. Popovica, op.cit.

ration is not just to make those articles interesting and dynamic reading, but to give the exceptional events in his biography even greater importance and make his character supernatural.

Besides that, most of the press articles, due to their structure, do not confirm the pattern of the American life only, but the greatest values of the life in America, too: values of self-made-man, openness and democracy of that society in which everyone may become successful, etc. But Pupin was not an American, he was an immigrant.

However, the contents of the press articles reveal something else, too. Pupin's life in America was most frequently described, even in his autobiography, according to the model of an emigrant's life story whose main motif was transition from one world into another, from the Serbian traditional, patriarchal culture into an urban, industrial and developed country where one lived a different life and the cultural patterns and values were completely new.

Pupin, like most of the immigrants, managed to survive the chaos of adaptation and to adapt to the American way of life. And not only that, his success is both greater and more difficult. He became famous in a new country, and he accepted it as another mother country. That was the reason why his opponents used to accuse him of disloyalty, while many others regarded Americanization as the essence of his autobiography.

In spite of the fact that Pupin might have consciously become Americanized, in his autobiography, in many of his speeches and in numerous interviews made by his friends, acquaintances and collaborators, it was always stressed that he had never forgotten his origin, neither his village, nor his people.

»Worldwide echoed his observations dating from the time when he had walked after his flock of sheep along the meadows of the Old Serbia.²¹ The celebrated inventor did not forget that he was the son of peasants, that he had learned from the Serbian poetry how to be shrewd.²² Throughout his work, from the beginning to the end, the writer feels a Serb.«²³

Anyway, Pupin himself questioned in his speech upon being nominated for a president of the American Scientists Association: *»What will Idvor, my birthplace in Serbia say when they learn that I am the president of the greatest scientific organization in the greatest country in the world.«²⁴* On other occasion he said: *»The longer I live, the older I get, the fonder I am of my folks.«²⁵* Did even great Pupin feel homesick?

So, at first sight, Pupin's distinction lies in his scientific discoveries, which enabled him, an anonymous, to become famous all over the world, enabled him to become university professor and a wealthy man from a shepherd and a manual worker. *»The experiment brought him the world glory and wealth.²⁶ There were rumors about the fabulous amount of money which he got for his patents.«²⁷*

However, glorification of his discoveries presented in the press has a function to

²¹ Dar Americi, *Nation*, New York, prema M. I. Pupin, *Hrvatski glasnik*, Čikago 1924

²² Michael Pupin From Immigrant to Inventor, *The New republic*, 7.12.1924

²³ Jugoslav reviev, New York, novembar 1924,

²⁴ Jugoslovenski doseljenik - vodja americkih znanstvenika, *Hrvatski glasnik*, Čikago 1925

²⁵ Jugoslovenski glasnik, 21. 3. 1935

²⁶ *Otkriće na putovanju*, 1. nastavak feljtona S. Popović, op. cit. 28.5.1979

²⁷ *Bogat preko noći*, 2. nastavak feljtona S. Popović, ibid. 29.5.1979

stress the notability of his character of a scientist. As a matter of fact, he was endowed with some other unusual characteristics that are accessible to neither ordinary people nor to ordinary scientists. »*A large number of well known scientists were striving in vain to solve a big enigma before him,²⁸ the discovery caused sensation.*«²⁹

Apart from that, Mihajlo Pupin became also rich which was not often the case considering scientists and their work. According to the press that happened to him in an unexpected and unusual way, in a short time, as if it was destined to be so.

»*Over the night a former shepherd from Banat has become rich and famous. When he negotiated with a company agent the price for purchase of his patent he asked for a considerably big sum of money which came to his mind at that moment, though, as he admitted later, he would have been satisfied with the half of it.*«³⁰

What was that which made Pupin so special? The press has answered that question, too. It was his origin, his homeland, and the culture from which he came.

As a matter of fact, Pupin understood how powerful the knowledge was, nevertheless, he did not acquire that understanding during his schooling in Pancevo, neither in the European university cities, nor in the far America. Though he was learning persistently and was increasing his knowledge at all those places, the power of knowledge had been revealed to him by his mother, »*an illiterate woman from the place that cannot be found in any of the geographic maps.*« She sed to him: »*Knowledge represents gold ladders which we climb to reach the sky, knowledge is the light which illuminates our way towards the future life of everlasting glory.*«³¹

Pupin, as it has been already pointed out, did never forget his homeland. Just because of that, after a few years spent in America he could recall the special way of communication which shepherds in his village used by burying knives in the soil. It was that, besides all of his knowledge in physics and mathematics, that helped him to solve the problem of long-range sound transmission and to make one of his greatest inventions, the »Pupin's coil«.

»*The starting point in his offensive against the unsolvable mystery was his knowledge which he had taken with him from his Idvor village,³² He never missed to stress how much he owed for this sensational invention to the shepherds with whom he had tended cattle in his birthplace.*«³³

Nonetheless, material wealth was never the measure of value in his homeland, thus Pupin, too, in accordance with the norms of the culture from which he had originated imposed other values to the wealth and money. Hence, when a friend commented that he should have asked for more money for his patent, Pupin replied that for him the award greater than all the money in the world, was the acknowledgement which he received from the experts for his useful invention.³⁴

Likewise, in the traditional and patriarchal culture, to which Pupin owed for all his inventions and whose basic ethical values, at least according to the press, he treasured possessively, the individual interests were subordinated to the collective interests, and se-

²⁸ *Otkriće na putovanju*, op cit.

²⁹ *Bogat preko noći*, op. cit.

³⁰ Ibid

³¹ M.I.Pupin, *Sa pašnjaka do naučenjaka*, N. Sad 1929, 18-19

³² *Otkriće na putovanju*, op.cit

³³ *Povratak u rodno selo*, 3. nastavak feljtona S. Popović, op. cit.

³⁴ *Bogat preko noći*, op. cit

paration from the community was not regarded with favor. Due to that, Pupin's father did not understand his wish to leave Idvor and he questioned himself: »*What's wrong with Idvor, why does he want to go the Wide world to toil and suffer?*«³⁵ However, leaving the family and the community, with no bad consequences, is still possible, but under certain conditions. It is allowed only if it is supported by, or even better if it is done for the community; if the community would benefit by that. That is the reason why in articles on Pupin's life we often read an episode copied down from his autobiography stating that his mother had a dream in which Saint Sava appeared and informed her that her son would soon leave Idvor and go far away where he would become world-famous.³⁶ In that way Pupin did not only receive the community approval to leave, but also the blessing of the greatest Serbian transcendental protector, Saint Sava.

It is not only that the press underlined that Pupin did not forsake his homeland, on the contrary, newspapers revealed that, upon reaching America, Pupin made enormous contribution to the motherland, he established a number of charity fund. He used the money which he had earned in a foreign country to finance the reconstruction of many Serbian churches, schools and museums. He took an active part in his country's struggle for liberation, he was involved in the Peace Conference in Paris etc. Apart from that, the following has been stated in a comment on his autobiography :

»the intention of the book might have been Americanization of Mihajlo Pupin, but instead of that there appeared 'Pupinisation' of America... He gave to America more than it offered him.«³⁷

In that way, Pupin's immigration, his life, his efforts, inventions and his world fame gain their complete meaning. He is a national hero who has widened the borders of his culture.

Profound national ethics and devotion to his nation Pupin also proved by his work among the Serbian emigration in America. For his followers and for the like-minded people, he was a great benefactor, and thanks to him, Serbian benefit societies in America were, for the first time, united, they became financially stable, various fraudulent and racketeering actions which had followed their development until then were stopped. Without his personal and financial support, without the charity funds which he had established through either his investment or his rich American friends' money, many of the Serbian institutions in America would either hardly survive or would be closed down. Thus, for instance, we learn that Pupin took from the School fund in the period from 1927 to 1934 more than twenty thousand dollars³⁸ and donated it to the Serbian monastery in Libertyville for payment of its debts.

In short, once more, Pupin was again pictured as a national hero, the greatest Serb in America.

Pupin as a scientist and innovator was neither during his lifetime, nor later opposed. Yet, his character of a humanist, a benefactor and an organizer of immigrants, especially amongst the Serbs in America in the period of time when he was particularly active, caused

³⁵ *U velikom naučniku veliki rodoljub*, 2. nastavak feljtona V. Savinšek, op. cit 2.10.1979

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Dar Americi, *Nation*, op. cit

³⁸ Spomenica Osvećenje obnovljenog i prosirenog manastira Sv. Sava, Libertivil 1982,7.

various disputes on the grounds of which different interpretations and presentations were spread at that time, and appear even nowadays.

Pupin's opponents presented him in a very bad light, painting his character in the deepest black color. As the dispute, and even the conflict between the different fractions of the immigrants was growing, so was the negative character of Pupin in the opponents' press gradually constructed. At first, Pupin was accused of being a counterfeiter. They ascribed to him that he wanted to be the only representative of the immigrants, naming him »*New Moses*«, then that he imposed an autocratic regime in the Sloga Benefit Organization,³⁹ and that he turned into a »*new Julius Caesar, the dictator*.«⁴⁰ Pupin, though being a Serbian Consul, was accused for sabotaging the recruitment of volunteers for the Serbian Army during the World War One,⁴¹ for linking his life to America, like other Serbo-Americans, for using his fellow country-men to maintain his economic and social position. His opponents discredited him with many epithets, such as: a conservative nationalist, profiteer, traitor.⁴² He was labeled a spy, then a national traitor, by his political opponents in exile because he had sold his patents to Siemens, »*to the Germans for military purposes*« as they used to say. In short, to them he was a degenerate, »*a new Brankovic*.«⁴³

Well, even the opponent press defined Pupin as a special individual, but this time he was a negative hero – an anti-hero – a national traitor.

Numerous articles about Pupin, as we have already mentioned, gave way to periods of time of silence, and even oblivion. On one occasion, Pupin, himself, complained that the Americans were more familiar with his work at the Peace Conference in Paris than his countrymen.⁴⁴ Likewise, the readers of the daily *Politika* in the *Medju nama* column have remarked that Pupin was forgotten, that he deserved more than »*just a name of a blind alley in Senjaka*«. ⁴⁵ On the other hand, others go on proving that homeland has not forgotten him. One big scientific institute in Belgrade has been named after him⁴⁶ and during the last few years, one of the longest streets in town has carried his name, too.

Finally, the latest plentiful texts on Pupin refer, to a certain extent, to a sensational topic about the search for his forgotten treasure. Thus we learn about the money most probably forgotten somewhere in a secrete bank account.⁴⁷ We learn about the misplaced will written by his hand,⁴⁸ about his close relatives – potential inheritors.

³⁹ Nasilje M.I.Pupina, *Amerikanski Srbobran* 27.5.1918, 1; Najnoviji akt Pupinove samovolje, *Amerikanski Srbobran*, 11.8.1920, 1

⁴⁰ Jedna slika gospodina Idvorskog iz prošlosti, *Amerikanski Srbobran* 11.3.1919; Sušnjar, *Narodni glas* 27. 11 1913.

⁴¹ Austrija i Pupin protiv SNO, *Amerikanski Srbobran* 15,16.4.1918; Konzulska komedija, *Amerikanski Srbobran*, 11.3.1919

⁴² Sifkertas i konzul, *Amerikanski Srbobran*, 21.2.1920, 2

⁴³ *Amerikanski Srbobran* 25.1.1911

⁴⁴ Pismo iz 14.12.1934, Zaboravljeni Pupin, *Politika* 27.10.1985.

⁴⁵ Da li smo zaboravili Pupina op. cit, Pupin zaslujuje više, *Politika* 14.10.1992.

⁴⁶ Pupina nismo zaboravili op.cit., Pupin ipak nije zaboravljen, *Politika* 19.4.1985

⁴⁷ Pupinovi milioni pod šifrom, *Politika* 20.4.1992

⁴⁸ *Politika* 27.4.1992, Otkriven i treći testament, *Politika* 24.3.1992; Treći testament stigao iz Australije, *Politika* 7.4.1992.

And so on, and so forth. There is a moment when we think that we know everything about Pupin, and that everything has been already said, and then something new and unknown appears. However, that, as well as the interpretation, and even mythologizing of his character become understandable if we look at the newspaper articles in a chronological order, bearing in mind the readers at the other end of the chain of communication for whom those articles have been written. Interpretations and reinterpretations on Pupin's acts in press, actually tell us more about his as well as contemporary times than about Pupin himself. Thus, for example, Pupin published his autobiography at the time when Americanization was the ruling policy towards the immigrants. That is why many authors explain the popularity of the book, and even the Pulitzer prize.⁴⁹ However, feuilletons are based on it, but they are for his homeland readers, with a remark that they appear a few decades later, due to which they stress Pupin's persistent devotion to his homeland cultural and ethic principles.

In the end, on the grounds of the presented material, we may conclude that Mihajlo Pupin's character in the emigrant and homeland press has been constructed according to the model of a national hero and that it grows into a myth. It bridges the gap between two cultures, the one there and the other here, but it is also at the border between remembrance and oblivion, between the truth and legend.

*POVZETEK OSEBNOST MIHAJLA PUPINA V IZSELJENSKEM
IN DOMAČEM TISKU*

Prof. dr. Mihajlo Idivorski Pupin (1858-1935), svetovno znani srbski znanstvenik, je bil zelo dejaven pri družbeno političnem organiziranju srbskih izseljencev v Ameriki, tudi kot darovalec, ki je finančno podpiral številne ustanove in posameznike v izseljenstvu in domovini. Tako posebna osebnost in nenavadna življenjska pot sta bili in sta še danes predmet različnih tolmačenj, valorizacij, glorifikacij in celo mitologizacij. Prispevek se ukvarja z različnimi interpretacijami in reinterpretacijami Pupinovega življenja, ki oblikujejo njegovo podobo v izseljenskem in domačem tisku – v njegovem času in danes. Z analizo so ločene komunikacijske ravni, na katerih se sledi formalni in simbolični konstrukciji osebe in odkrijejo nekateri aspekti: intelektualec, znanstvenik, izseljenec, domoljub, izdajalec, dobrodelnik z negativnimi in pozitivnimi konotacijami. Pupinova podoba je zgrajena po vzorcu znanega posameznika, pa tudi intelektualca izseljenca, ki s prehodom iz ene kulture v drugo dobi elemente kulturnega in narodnega junaka ali odpadnika in nato neresničnega mitskega heroja. Tako oblikovan večslojni model je imel pomembno vlogo pri valorizaciji določenih vrednot izseljenskega in domačega okolja.

⁴⁹ M.B. Petrovich, Pupin u srpsko-američkom životu pre prvog svetskog rata, *Život i delo Mihajla Idivorskog Pupina, Zbornik radova naučnog skupa*, Novi Sad 1985, 291

SLOVENE POETRY IN THE U.S.A.: THE CASE OF IVAN ZORMAN

Ivan Zorman was a musician and a poet, born in 1889 in Šmarje near Grosuplje and died in 1957 Cleveland (Ohio). In 1893 his family emigrated to the United States of America, first to Ely, Calumet, Cleveland and some other American towns. After a brief return journey to Slovenia in 1898/9, where Zorman attended elementary school in Velesovo near Kranj, they finally settled down in 1904 in Cleveland. In 1907 Zorman took up the study of modern languages (English, French and Italian), history and music at Western Reserve University and graduated only in music in 1912. For a number of years, during 1908 and 1956, he was chief organist and choir leader (like his father) at the parish church of St Lovrenc in Newburgh near Cleveland. During 1920 and 1925 he was professional director of the »Zorman Philharmonic«. Not only was he known as a musician, he was very much present in the public life of the Slovene community living in Cleveland, as the enthusiastic teacher of Slovene literature in the Slovene school of the »Slovenski narodni dom«, a poet, translator, public speaker.

Although it has been claimed that Ivan Zorman is somehow »forgotten« as a poet, this is perhaps not entirely the case, taking into account the extant number of studies and shorter entries written about him and his work. His work as a poet and translator has not been analyzed in great depth nor has it been properly contextualized within Slovene literary history. From among the studies of his work should be mentioned Janez Stanonik's detailed entry on Zorman in *The Slovene Biographical Dictionary*,¹ Jože Bajec's article published in *Slovenski izseljenski koledar*, Jerneja Petrič's entry in her anthology *Naši na tujih tleh*,² Edi Gobec's introduction to his anthology of Zorman's poems *Slovenski ameriški slavček Ivan Zorman* celebrating the hundredth anniversary of his birth, and, most recently, Rozina Švent's article on his books and manuscripts available in The Slovene National Library.³ Also, among the most recent reprints of his poems that I was able to identify is Zorman's frequently quoted poem »Izseljenec« (from his collection *Iz novega sveta*), published in *Misli* (1993) and in *Slovenski izseljenski koledar* (1997).

A number of short reviews have been written about Zorman's poetry over the years by all the major cultural exponents of Slovenes living in America, and some in Slovenia,⁴ most of them favourable, although »they were often intended to be encouraging and positive, but taking into account the circumstances in which the sensitive poet and composer worked, this seems only right and human.«⁵ Aleš Debeljak, however, wrote in 1925 so-

¹ Janez Stanonik, »Ivan Zorman«, *SBL*, XIV. Ljubljana: SAZU, 1986: 855-56.

² Jerneja Petrič, »Ivan Zorman«, *Naši na tujih tleh*. Ljubljana: CZ, 1982: 443-46.

³ Rozina Švent, »Ivan Zorman«, *Slovenski izseljenski koledar '98*. Ljubljana: SIM, 1997: 127-33.

⁴ Edi Gobec, *Slovenski ameriški slavček Ivan Zorman*. Celovec, Dunaj: Mohorjeva založba, 1991: 22-6.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 26.

mewhat critically about his verse collection *Lirični spevi* (1925) that it is »a modest train from which you can see only a wee bit of the not very big Slovene homeland« and that »the search of this book is not very deep.«⁶ On the other hand, Debeljak liked the poetic images taken from nature and Zorman's smooth-flowing verse rhythm. Zorman published his poems in a number of magazines in America and Slovenia alike, and privately in Cleveland five collections of poems: *Poezije* (1919) as the first Slovene verse collection published in the United States, *Pesmi* (1922), *Lirični spevi* (1925), *Pota Ljubezni* (1931), *Iz novega sveta* (1938) and a bilingual book of English translations from Slovene poetry *Slovene (Yugoslav) Poetry* (1928) to be examined here. Ivan Zorman may not be the very best Slovene poet ever to have written abroad, but due to the great variety, formal simplicity and especially the great popularity of his poems among the Slovenes living in America, many of which have been put to music, he can perhaps be said to belong to the very peak of Slovene literature produced in America in the first half of the twentieth century.

Zorman's first translations of Slovene poets into English were published for the first time in his collection of poems *Pesmi* (1922). He translated Prešeren, Jenko, Gregorčič, Levstik, Župančič (»Duma«), Funtek, Medved and Sardenko. A few years later, in 1928, he published a separate bilingual volume of translations into English along with their Slovene originals titled *Slovene (Yugoslav) Poetry*.⁷ In the Preface, where he thanks his friend Dr. F. J. Kern for helpful suggestions, Zorman first states that he has not attempted to produce a fully representative anthology, for it could scarcely be the work of a single translator. The objective of the book »is only in the hope of bringing our younger Slovenes and other students of Slav literature closer to the source that these translations have been prepared«. The important thing, he writes, is that he intentionally left untranslated most of the Slovene feminine rhymes and, in a few instances, the masculine rhymes, »in an effort to remain closer to the original«. He also tried to preserve the original rhythm and meter. In the Introduction Zorman limits himself to a few general observations about Slovenia and poets translated in the book, although

»it would be interesting to delve into Slovene history: the position of the Slovenes in the old Austro-Hungarian monarchy of which they were a part until the close of the World War; their labors and struggles for a place among the free and enlightened peoples of the world; the various stages in their literary development; their present greater opportunities in independent Jugoslavia, and so on«.

He maintains that given its small size, Slovenia has produced a remarkably large number of gifted men, in literature, music, painting, sculpture and science. In describing the Slovene landscape »of unsurpassed beauty« Zorman, being primarily a musician, stresses the fact that just because of this it is »a country rich in song«, for »the principal source of Slovene poetry was the folk song«.

Zorman's Introduction to the anthology is exceptionally well written and the same is true as regards the themes and ideas which are very much contemporary and not at all dated. He interestingly defines as the chief characteristics of Slovene poetry »the typically Slav dreamy cadences and elegiac moods, tenderness, intensity, directness, and singing quality«. It is no coincidence thus, as he himself notes in the Introduction, that more than

⁶ Aleš Debeljak, »Ivan Zorman, Lirični spevi«, *Ljubljanski zvon* (1925): 558.

⁷ Ivan Zorman, *Slovene (Yugoslav) Poetry*. Cleveland: privately published, 1928. All further references in the text will be to this edition.

half of the poems he chose for translation have been actually set to music. He wanted to preserve the original rhymes at all cost, which, of course, sometimes makes the rhyme scheme somewhat forced and artificial, though not too often. As in his own poems, many of which were also set to music by himself or other composers, he was fond of simple, formally consistent lines of verse, primarily quatrains with alternating male and female rhymes without any caesura.

As regards the choice of authors for translation, Zorman seems to have been fascinated by those whose work was characterized by the strong nationally aware feelings. In his brief sketches of the poets translated he makes clear some of his prime concerns in making his selection. First he writes that Prešeren »stepped before the Slovene people unheralded, with scarcely a precursor to prepare the way in poetry«. He goes on to say that although he uses known forms (e.g. the sonnet) and he has learned a lot from other classic European poets, his »subject-matter is altogether original«. He says that despite the fact Prešeren's work ranges from the simple lyric to the »grandiose epic«, all of his poems are characterized by a distinct Slovene national individuality. In referring to Fran Levstik, he stresses his philological studies and critical essays as »invaluable contributions to the Slovene language and literature«. The poem »Two Gulls«, which Zorman masterfully rendered into English, is described as the first Slovene poem to depict the poet's mood, although it is not quite clear whether he meant it to turn out Romantic or Impressionistic. To Zorman, many of Simon Jenko's poems reflect the spirit of the Slovene folk song and »some of them show Heine's influence«. He also finds a deep melancholy and an ardent love that pervade his poems, which evidently appealed to him as he chose several of Jenko's poems for translation. He says it »seems strange that a poet of Jenko's nature should have written the war-like Slovene national hymn 'Advance!'«, which is written in a pan-Slavic spirit and used to be the Slovene national anthem before the state independence in 1991, and which he also decided to translate into English.

Simon Gregorčič seems to have grown closest to Zorman poetic sensibility, because his poems are »characterized by melody, tenderness and intensity« as well as »smooth, melodious quality«. If Zorman is very modern in briefly describing the poets translated, then he is just somewhat too enthusiastic and exaggerates in the description of Simon Gregorčič's work, his first collection of verse, published in 1882, which was »received with an enthusiasm and joy never equalled by any other volume of Slovene poetry«. Anton Aškerc is labelled as the foremost Slovene epic poet, although Zorman concentrated on his lyrical pieces, which also reveal his »direct, realistic style«. There are also Anton Medved and Anton Funtek, nowadays less read Slovene poets. In Medved's verse Zorman found »lofty thoughts«, »pessimistic musings«, and »classic repose«, while some of Funtek's »lightly contemplative« poems attracted him for their »effective musical settings«. Looking at the selection of texts for translation into English, it can be observed that Ivan Zorman primarily relied on the following features of poems: their rhythmical, musical qualities, their nationally aware feelings of Slovene or Slavic awakening, and finally the simple, most frequently rhymed structure that easily lends itself to be set to music.

Zorman's book of verse translations *Slovene (Yugoslav) Poetry* contains altogether 34 poems by the earlier mentioned poets, most of them by Prešeren, Jenko and Gregorčič. All the poems are published bilingually, which was for that time most exceptional, if not daring, and even today bilingual editions of verse translations, as many critics maintain, represent one the best possible ways to publish a selection of any poems in a foreign lan-

guage. Most France Prešeren's poems translated are very well known to a Slovene reader: »To Music«, »Lost Faith«, »Whither?«, »The Sailor«, »The Unwedded Mother«, »Memento Mori«, and »Sonnet«. »Whither?« (»Kam?«) is translated into an immaculate English, and British English it is, not American English as it would be expected. Also the rhyme scheme is mostly perfectly recreated in English, in rhymed couplets (aa, bb, etc):

*When rushing on in stormy wrath,
Friends ask me: Whither speeds thy path?*

*O rather ask the gloomy cloud,
O rather ask the sea wave loud*

*When Master Storm with might profound
Drives on and madly hurls them round.*

*The cloud knows not, nor wave, nor I
Where my despairful goal may lie.*

*I only feel, I only know
That I before her may not go,*

*And that on earth there is no place
Where I my woe could e'er efface (11).*

The well known Prešeren's poem »Nezakonska mati« translated as »The Unwedded Mother« (17) bears witness just how difficult it is sometimes to transpose a poem from one system of linguistic signs into another, from one culture into another. Though translated in perfectly consistent quatrains, each in two couplets rhyming aa, bb..., Zorman added or slightly changed the meaning of individual lines. In the fourth line he, for example, translates »neporočeni materi« (to an unwedded mother) as »a shameful motherhood«, where the adjective »shameful« adds a negative value to Prešeren's rather neutral original »neporočeni«, although shame can indeed be implied from the rest of the poem. A feature that can immediately be discerned, when looking at the original and the *translatio*, is that the English translations are frequently longer, for paraphrase is used, especially since poems are rendered from the syllabic metrical system in which the duration of feet is counted (Slovene) into the (English) accentual-syllabic metrical versification system.

*Kaj pa je tebe treba bilo,
dete ljubo, dete lepo,
meni mladi deklici,
neporočeni materi? -*

*

*Oh, that to me you should have come,
Dear little one, beautiful!
I, a youthful maid, unwed -
Into a shameful motherhood led (16, 17)!*

Prešeren's Petrarchan sonnet »Memento mori« (21) is as regards its form rendered into English most conscientiously in all of its embracing rhymes. The content also closely follows the original, but its details, may one say as a matter of course, occasionally slightly depart from it. For example, instead of the word »slepoto« (the blindness) of this world, Zorman uses »pleasure«, while the expression »v mrtvaškem prtju« (in a death shroud) is simply omitted altogether in order to secure the required number of feet and the appropriate rhyme scheme. It should be said, though, that such frequently unavoidable changes performed on the original are in Zorman's verse translations as rare as they can be, which testifies to his masterful command of both the source and target language of translation, Slovene and English alike, although he never attended Slovene schools but read most avidly.

*Naj zmisli, kdor slepoto ljubi sveta,
in od veselja do veselja leta,
da smrtna žetev vsak dan bolj dozori.*

*Znabiti, da kdor zdaj vesel prepeva,
v mrtvaškem prtju nam pred koncem dneva
molče trobental bo: »memento mori!«*

*

*May he, who pleasure ever contemplates,
And of frivolity and vainness prates,
Think well: death's harvest ripens constantly.*

*Mayhap that he, to-day with mirth aglow,
To us to-morrow will with trumpet blow
And sound: Memento mori! silently (20, 21).*

Fran Levstik's verse opus is lesser than his critical and prose writings. It is interesting that Zorman should choose five of his lyrical (Romantic) pieces for translation. One possible reason for his selection, and such selections are always arbitrary, is that he could easily identify with them, for example with the moody and lonely speaker of the poem in the well-known »Utvi« (»Two Gulls«) or the clearly nostalgic »Domotožnost« (»Longing for Home«). The theme of nostalgia and longing for home meant a lot to him as an emigrant abroad, probably more than to an average Slovene reader at home. It goes without saying that a common motive for all the poems chosen for translation by Ivan Zorman, essentially a trained musician, for the anthology *Slovene (Jugoslav) Poetry* was, as he himself pointed out in introduction, that all of them were very melodious and had been or were easy to be set to music. In »Two Gulls« (27), consisting of two quatrains, interlocking rhymes are preserved, while the original verb »premišljam« (I contemplate) is more to the point than the mere translated »I look at«:

*Premišljam iz okna dve utvi,
a v meni utriplje srce,
zamakneno v dneve nekdanje
na lice usiplje solze.*

*

*I look at the gulls from my window,
My heart with emotion beats fast,
Hot tears down my cheeks come streaming
As I think of the days that are past.*

Levstik's poem »Longing for Home« (32-3) definitely harps on and appeals to the strain of emigrant homesickness abroad combined with a nostalgia for youth that is no more, for »There bloomed the blossoms of my youth, / There first I felt love's magic spell, / There I rejoiced in my own dear land, / On native soil my tear-drops fell« (33).

Simon Jenko was most appealing to Ivan Zorman, since he decided to translate six of his poems into English, among them the former (i.e. before the state independence gained in 1991) Slovene national anthem »Naprej!«. The choice was no surprise in view of Zorman's patriotic feelings in producing this bilingual anthology. The translation itself appears less accomplished than the original, with the pan-Slavonic or Slav idea within the American »melting pot«, which Zorman expressed also on several other occasions: »zastava slave« is translated as »Slavic standards«. Jenko's poem »Adrijansko morje« (»The Adriatic Sea«) was likewise probably chosen by Zorman for translation because of its national awareness, as well as because of its great rhythmical musicality of verse. In contrast to Zorman's other translations, there are relatively numerous changes in »The Adriatic Sea« (43). The translation is thus slightly longer in terms of the length of individual lines, and it also is more abstract than the original, e.g. words like »happiness«, »freedom«, »fame«, »glory« appear in the translation only:

*Ko ob tebi mesta bela
naših dedov so cvetela,
ko so jadra njih vojske,
so nosile njih ime.*

*

*On thy shores their cities towered,
Happiness and freedom flowered
While their vessels bore their name,
And their sails proclaimed their fame.*

Simon Gregorčič's work, the harmony, national consciousness, lyricism, and above all the melodiousness of his verse, seemed a natural text for Zorman's lyrical and musical bent to be translated into English. All of the chosen Gregorčič's poems are lyrical, moody, meditative (»Looking into Innocent Eyes«), and, it could be added, extremely Romantic in stressing the aloneness and melancholy of the speaker of each poem. The choice thus also to some extent reveals Zorman's own nature. Gregorčič's poems are beautifully translated into English, into a literary and perhaps slightly archaic English, which adds to the historical patina of the texts. The poem »Sam« (»Alone«, 68, 69), along with its unmistakable Romantic feeling, indirectly and metaphorically also shows Zorman's own relative isolation from the contemporary Slovene literary creativity. Zorman's English versions are impeccable, in terms of technical aspects, content and the rhythmical-melodious movement of Simon Gregorčič's verse. It must be noted that Ivan Zorman's own poems were likewise

formally simple (a four-line stanza), always most consistently rhymed, which is why many of them were set to music by major music composers, e.g. Emil Adamič, Anton Šubelj, Matija Tomc, etc. Zorman's close affinity with Gregorčič's musical ear and Romantic poetic sensibility made some authors call him, by analogy with Gregorčič, »the Slovene American Nightingale« (Gobec). From among the few translated poems by Anton Aškerc, Anton Medved and Anton Funtek, Aškerc's poem »Mi vstajamo!« (»Our Day is Come«, 79) is very indicative of Zorman's pan-Slavic feeling and pride of belonging to a Slavic nation, with some kind of grudge or even threat against the Anglo-Saxon (and Germanic) immigrants in America.

*Our day is come! And - you're afraid?
Why all your fierce excitement!
You fear the Slav indictment?
Your conscience feels a heavy guilt,
Your trembling hand is on the hilt?
Is it revenge you're fearing
As countless hosts are nearing?*

It is true that Ivan Zorman frequently chose for translation those poems by those authors who showed a great sense of national awareness, but it is also true that he chose from their respective opuses many highly melancholic and musical pieces. This selection reveals and is confirmed also by his own poetic creativity, which, despite its occasional Baroque expression and sentimentality, »brings into Slovene poetry new themes, expresses emotional depth and concern for the destiny of the nation and the future of Slovene emigrants to the U.S.A.«⁸ Many of the Slovene poems translated into English published in Zorman's bilingual anthology *Slovene (Yugoslav) Poetry* could be used also today, in one of the anthological representations of the older classic Slovene literature in the English language. For, translation activity is a two-way traffic: if we Slovenes do promptly translate many and most representative foreign authors, then, we should also do the opposite, »export« our literature and culture to the world, and not just very recent one, as has most frequently been the case.

⁸ Janez Stanonik, »Ivan Zorman«, *SBL*, XIV. Ljubljana: SAZU, 1986: 855-56.

POVZETEK SLOVENSKA POEZIJA V ZDA: IVAN ZORMAN

Članek obravnava delo Ivana Zormana (1889-1957), v Sloveniji rojenega pesnika, skladatelja in zgodnjega prevajalca slovenske književnosti v angleščino, ki je od svojega ranega otroštva živel v Združenih državah. Osredinja se na njegovo relativno obsežno produkcijo kot prvega širokopoteznega prevajalca slovenskih pesnikov v angleščino, kar dolej ni bilo dovolj raziskano. Izbor tekstov za prevod in njihova ustreznost sta analizirana v njegovi zbirki pesniških prevodov *Slovene (Jugoslav) Poetry*, ki jo je izdal v samozaložbi leta 1928 v Clevelandu.

POETRY AND PROSE IN THE *AMERIŠKI DRUŽINSKI* *KOLEDAR*

This article examines creative writing in the almanac with respect to motivation, character, and setting. The predominance of a set of émigré writers and editors in the annual publication from its inception in 1915 through the 1930s allows for generalizations in each of these areas. Illustrations and articles provide insights into the creative works, and other materials, such as advertisements, aid an understanding of the readership. The aim of this article is to describe the nature of Slovene-American intellectual leadership as it may be understood from the almanac's pages.

1. Organization¹

1.1 Editors. The immediate impetus for founding the *Ameriški družinski koledar* (hereafter *Adk*; 1915–55) came from a failed attempt to launch such an annual in Slovenia. The latter almanac appeared in 1913 and 1914, was shipped to the U.S. in a limited number, and quickly sold out. Ivan Molek edited the first two volumes of the *Adk*; Etbin Kristan headed the project until he temporarily returned to Slovenia in 1920. When Kristan once again became active in literary affairs (in the late 1930s), it was as editor of the more esthetically-oriented magazine *Cankarjev glasnik* in Cleveland, although he continued contributing to and consulting on the *Adk*. Frank Zaitz edited the *Adk* until his death in 1939. Throughout its history the *Adk* appears to have been a collective effort, with Katka Zupančič, Ivan Molek, and others making large contributions.²

1.2 Contents: fiction. The *Adk* contains a large portion of Slovene-American creative works published in the United States. Joseph Dwyer's bibliography shows that the almanac published roughly two-thirds of Slovene-American titles during the fifty years he surveyed (Dwyer 1981).³ The overall quality of writing does not recommend an esthetic approach to the almanac's contents but rather a cultural one that relates them to their social context. In this regard, Dirk Hoerder's characterization of the American immigrant or eth-

¹ The fullest chronology of the almanac is Frank Zaitz's »četrtoletje *Ameriškega družinskega koledarja*,« *Ameriški družinski koledar* 1939: 46–57. Zaitz had been editing the *Adk* since 1922.

² A full list of contributors and editors, including a separate list of seventeen in Europe, is printed in the 1944 issue (218–19). It is followed by brief notes on the sixty-six individuals (219–25). See Appendix I.

³ 211 of Dwyer's 295 entries are from *Adk*, but he chose »belles-lettres which reflect in some way on the Slovenian American experience ... and items dealing with Slovenian Americans as a subject« (79). Thus the first six entries, belonging to Louis Adamic, do not include, for example, *Laughing in the Jungle* or *The Native's Return*.

nic press's function – »publication of news about the new culture in the language of the old and news about the old culture from the perspective of the new« (1991: 379)⁴ – applies to *Adk* and is useful. Indeed it would be unexpected, given the social origins of the contributors and readers, were the almanac to contain exceptionally talented creative writing. Pressing topics – work and poverty, shelter and travel, illness, and death – typified the literature and harmonized it with the accompanying essays and reporting. The almanac's history reflects the growth of a Slovene-American literature only haphazardly, and the works were, with the exception of stories about remigration, little related to Slovene literature in Europe.⁵

More Russian and other literature in Slovene translation was published in the almanac than Slovene literature from the homeland. In 1917, for instance, Zofka Kvedrova's story *Zločin* was the only piece of fiction (51-7); the editors included an uncharacteristically dark lyric by Cvetko Golar (*Rojstvo* 57) and a poem by Oton Župančič (Hi!); portraits of Ivan Cankar, Vladimir Levstik, and Fran Govekar are inexplicably scattered over articles about the formation of the continents and naval warfare. The next year's issue, 1918, contains only a poem (*Klic noči* 35) by Župančič, although Izidor Cankar's essay on Rihard Jakopič, with relevant illustrations, gives some insight into Slovene arts. Again in 1919 Župančič's poem *Kovači* (46) is the only original work from Slovenia; a full-page portrait of Ivan Cankar, again, appears on p. 96. This pattern continued throughout the almanac's history.

While trying to cast a new, labor-oriented, Slovene-American literature, the editors demonstrated a museum-like attitude towards European literature and learning in general that calls into question either their familiarity with intellectual matters or uncertainty about how to present the cultural heritage to the readership. (Could they trust to create a proletarian Slovene literature, foregoing teaching the European arts that they obviously respected?) The longest essay on a European Slovene writer that appeared in the *Adk* was about Ivan Tavčar (soon after his death), whose politics and art were distant from those of the *Adk* editors (1924: 133-38). In contrast, Slovene-American »proletarian« literature since 1904 merited only a two-page article in 1930 (»Še en srebrni jubilej: 25 let naše proletarske knjige v Ameriki«, 60-1). One of the few articles on the history of literature describes rare Slovene books in Chicago's Bonaparte Collection, highlighting Dalmatin's Bible and Valvasor's history (Stanko Žele, »Znamenita zbirka slovenskih knjig v Chicagu«, 1939: 136-39). The first substantial essay on Slovene literature as a whole is Josip Vidmar's *Pregled slovenske literature* (1945: 41-57). It seems that only in the 1940s did the intellectuals associated with the *Adk* begin relating themselves to the complex of Slovene culture.⁶

⁴ Hoerder's full description is of a »five-fold function: 1) to provide information about the new society from national politics to detailed legal advice on local and personal matters including naturalization; 2) to keep contact with the society of origin by providing news about national politics as well as details about opportunities for return; 3) to provide information about the ethnic community, the transitional phase between two cultures; furthermore 4) to interpret political, economic, social and cultural developments according to a particular viewpoint and 5) to articulate the interests of the ethnic group or a social section of it vis-a-vis the new and the old societies« (379). The *Adk* was decidedly weaker in the first two, practical functions.

⁵ Edward Ifkovic refers to a »loosely coherent body of South Slavic-American literature ... that reflects the Americanization of the peasant during the first half of the century« (271).

⁶ Frank Zaitz's »Pogled na prošlost Ljubljana« (1942: 166-95) was a signal publication in this regard. If in previous years long travel descriptions of, for example, Slovenc Kansas (1936) and Colorado (sec

Throughout the 1940s this tendency continued until in 1949, for example, pictures of Slovenia (e.g., of a *kozolec* and Triglav) dominated the issue and eight of fifteen poetry entries were contributed by Oton Župančič. The number of fictional works on average dropped from a high of around twenty in the 1930s to twelve after the war, although contributions by Frank Česen, Frank Kerže, Katka Zupančič, and others made the section more interesting in the late 1930s and 1940s.

1.3 Contents: Illustrations. Oftentimes illustrations point out the disjunction in the editors' approach. For instance, between a poem by Etbin Kristan and a short, translated essay on Walt Whitman in the 1920 volume comes a photograph of the Chicago Public Library's elaborate central staircase (126). Photographs of John W. Alexander's six wall paintings from the Library of Congress depicting the history of the book are interspersed throughout the same volume. A social realist story in any volume might be accompanied by a late Romantic illustration by a painter like Jules Breton, seen by the editors in the Chicago Institute of Art. The link between stories and reproductions of art works is frequently thematic. For instance, stories about women or family relations are accompanied by mother and child reproductions, pictures of women workings, paintings of spouses, women in historical genre paints, and so forth. The clash between reproductions of high art objects and the *Adk's* fictional contents is marked, both stylistically and historically: The high art often belongs to the nineteenth century, the European continent, and a worldview the Slovene-American intellectuals had, supposedly, left behind. It may be that the editors were relying on the legitimacy that high culture lent.

Illustrations of labor themes are more often than the former taken from contemporary painters and sculptors, both American and European. For instance, Charles E. Burchfield (1893-1967), a painter of somber urban scenes, was a choice of the editors. The overall selection of reproduction-illustrations can only be termed extremely eclectic, from realist to contemporary socialist realist (American and European) to Cubist and Impressionistic. In addition to complementing literary works, the (varied) choice of reproductions appears to be at once an attempt to inform and educate about art and to lend an international, progressive cast to the almanac. The increased number of photographs of the Slovene homeland that accompanied the almanac's 1940s reorientation to the Slovene homeland meshed poorly with the *Adk's* established cosmopolitan character. The photographs were generally of rural sites and nature as opposed to the industrial and urban American scenes that had predominated in the almanac.

1.4 A Slovene painter. Almost 200 reproductions of paintings and drawings by Slovene and Croatian artists appeared in the *Adk*; of these, only two Slovene-American artists, Katka Zupančič and H. Gregory Prushek (also spelled Prušek), were featured.⁷ This is a surprisingly small number that may indicate a lack of interest on the part of the editors in Slovene-American art. Sixteen of the twenty-five Perushek reproductions and an article on him (Frank Zaitz, »Slovenski umetnik v tujini«, 1928: 94-9)⁸ appeared before 1939; none were published after 1942. Perushek probably broke into the *Adk* thanks to his close acqu-

Frank Zaitz, »Obiski V Coloradu,« 1934: 134-69) sought to inform Slovenes around the U.S. about other communities, Zaitz's article on Ljubljana provided some basic information on the city he tellingly called »the center of our culture« (1942: 166).

⁷ Information on Prushek was gathered by Andreja Wieser in an unpublished paper about the artist. I am grateful to Ms. Wieser for sharing the information and her views with me.

⁸ See also Louis Beninger, »Harvey Gregory Prusheck« (1941: 162-69).

aintance with Anna Krasna, Etbin Kristan, and Ivan Molek in the early 1930s (Anna Praček Krasna 9) and Zaitz's interest in him. His geometric studies of urban landscapes fit well in the *Adk* but his paintings of the U.S. Southwest, for example, were indeed exotic for the almanac. Perushek's exotic works show his individualism and distance from organized Slovene-American culture. He was a typical early Slovene-American intellectual, with a high school education and love of the arts, but unlike others in the independent path he chose. The *Adk* did more than any other Slovene-American institution to inform about and publicize Prushek's work. Yet the fact that he was only one of two Slovene-American artists recognized by the almanac raises doubts about the editors' interests in the varied aspects of Slovene-American culture. They appeared to be rather narrowly interested in writing.

1.5 *Journalistic context.* The quality of Slovene-American journalism in the first third of the century was generally high as compared to that in the ethnic press as a whole, a function, perhaps, of the fact that the Slovene peasant and worker was somewhat more educated than most other Central and Southern Europeans. This is also to the credit of a handful of intellectuals that edited the periodicals and carried out a heroic journalistic task; even in the 1920s a preference for English among the second generation was on the rise.⁹

The *Adk* resembled secular Slovene-American newspapers in the Midwest (e.g., *Glas svobode* and *Prosveta* in Chicago) in that the political viewpoint of its sponsors shaped its contents, although some interesting exceptions and contrasts existed. Since the political frame of reference reflected in the *Adk* was American – international politics being a distant second – it would be more precise to term the journalism American-Slovene, which is to say American in content and Slovene in language, in conformance with Hoerder's definition. (This helps explain why the almanac was not a successful means of helping to preserve Slovene culture and language in emigration: that was apparently not its purpose, and the shift to English that took place within new generations was met on the almanac's pages with resignation.) The Slovene press generally did not aggravate political divisions, in particular the one between free-thinkers – a more accurate epithet than socialist – and Catholics, as did, for example, the Czech-American press.¹⁰ Neither was it as acerbic as Croat and Serb newspapers, which were, in the words of one historian, »much more individualistic affairs. Slovene journalism was much more sophisticated and, though personal attacks also appeared, ... [it] tended to be much more informative and broader in scope,« reflecting the acceptance of diversity within the Slovene community (Stipanovich 88). Compared to the editorial policies of other ethnic periodicals, the *Adk*'s intellectual leadership might be said to have adhered more to American ideals of tolerance and political dialog.¹¹

By coincidence the *Adk*'s socialist political tendency and varied contents resemble important elements of the American little magazine, which also originated in the 1910s:

⁹ Etbin Kristan concluded that »those small handfuls of intellectuals« (*tiste male peščice intelektualcev*) working as editors across the U.S. were, given their circumstances, accomplishing a great deal (Kristan 1927, 841).

¹⁰ While anti-religious caricatures and criticism of organized religion in articles was carried in the *Adk*, negative depictions of clerics in the almanac's fiction were rare. One example is the criminal parish priest in Angelo Cerkvenik's story »Bog jo je kaznova« (1926: 77–94), but his character is balanced against that of the (stereotypical) good older priest and predecessor.

¹¹ The American view of the almanac was, perhaps, much less tolerant. Copies held in the Cleveland Public Library are stamped »communist.«

leftist orientation, regional roots,¹² poetry and experimental writing and eclecticism. More direct links, however, can be drawn to the almanac form in Slovenia and to other ethnic almanacs, such as Czech, in the U.S. In light of the business practices of American periodicals as a whole since the mid-1880s, of course, the *Adk* was hopelessly archaic. In this respect, once again, it recalls the little magazine.

True to the sources of its genre, whether in Europe or North America, the *Adk*'s fiction placed (political) »enlightenment« before entertainment; the almanac also attempted to chronicle Slovenes' settlement in the United States, devoting more attention to the outlying communities (e.g., in Colorado, Kansas, and California), which were relatively more sympathetic to labor's cause. In conspicuous short supply are materials, fiction as well as articles, about such large and vibrant urban centers of immigration as Cleveland and Milwaukee, although these are amply represented in the advertising section. Chicago, where the *Adk* was published, is an exception.

The almanac format suited the editors' enlightenment goals and assigned to the literary contents a like function.

2. Ethnic character

2.1 Language. One of the earliest American observers of Slavic immigrant communities, Emily Balch, recognized the Slovene-Americans' challenge in maintaining a distinct identity when it was language based:

»In spite of having so little beyond a common language to give them a sense of unity or racial significance, the Slovenes have twice enjoyed a nationalistic revival... One does not get the impression of a living, pulsating national tradition as one does, for instance, among the Slovaks, the Little Russians or the Croatsians« (Balch 149-50).

The *Adk*'s editors were far more concerned with socio-political questions in the 1920s and 1930s than with Slovene cultural questions per se; commentary on the status of literary Slovene versus English appears, in retrospect, surprising late in the almanac's life, in the late 1930s. Yet Frank Zaitz had grasped the problem already in 1928: Slovenes arrived in America with a weak national identity and the intention of returning home soon, seemingly united only by language, rather quickly switched to English even in the home, and lacked cultural contacts with the homeland.¹³ By WW II the editors realized that the situation was critical. In an unusual, English-language article, *Second Generation Slovenes; A Comparison between Parents and Children*, (1940: 168-71) Joseph Drasler laments that young Slovene-Americans are ignorant of and even hostile to their parents' progressi-

¹² Strangely missing from the *Adk* are photographs of Slovene-American centers such as Cleveland and Pittsburgh. Urban views of Chicago and New York represent the American city; smaller settlements around the U.S. are pictured.

¹³ »Izmed Slovanov so se Slovenci izkazali za najbolj dostopne amerikaniziranju, celo bolj kakor Čehi. [...] Prva leta so se ameriški Slovenci zelo malo brigali za angleščino. Ni jim bila potrebna, oziroma, zdelo se jim je, da se brez nje čisto lahko izhaja ... Danes se v mnogih slovenskih družinah občuje največ angleško, dasi obvladajo angleški jezik le otroci, starši pa govore svojo angleščino, ki je sicer gladka, toda neopiljena in okorna« (40). [...] »Ameriški Slovence je v glavnem Slovence samo zato, ker govori slovensko. Ni pa aktiven v nobenem pokretu, razun zelo malega odstotka, ki deluje kulturno, politično in gospodarsko za povzdigo naroda, kolikor pač more« (44). (»Ameriški Slovenci včeraj, danes in jutri,« 1928: 38-45.)

ve ideas on the one hand and Slovene culture on the other. The article's dour tone and the language (i.e., English) it is written in suggest that the effort to preserve Slovene-American culture had failed. The *Adk*, however, had been promoting a labor culture, not necessarily Slovene culture, for two decades.

2.2 *Readership*. The question of the Slovene-American's education, and thus receptiveness to literature, is a relevant one. The overall illiteracy rate for Slovene lands in 1900, when schooling had been mandated through age fourteen for the previous twenty-five years, was 15%; however, literacy varied significantly by region (Zgodovina, 552). U.S. sources peg illiteracy among immigrants from Austria-Hungary between 1900 and 1910 at slightly over 24%, and that of Croats and Slovenes together at 34.5% (Drnovšek 1991, 52; Drnovšek 1994; Balch 479).¹⁴ Thus we might estimate that one in five Slovenes was not a reader, and because of their level of education (sixth- to eighth-grade on average), few could be expected to have had much formal training in the esthetic appreciation of literature. A leading émigré writer and the almanac's first editor, Ivan Molek (1882-), received no more formal schooling than this in Bela Krajina. As a leading editor in 1930, thirty years after coming to the U.S., he wrote the poet Anna Krasna:

»We don't care about old forms and sacred rules for producing a poem or a play, but we must be sure to constantly defend our new forms and justify ourselves concretely. And our greatest justification is that we write for simple people, for the mass of workers, men and women, and therefore our words and our art must be simple and in a pure, familiar style that the worker can understand. We don't care at all for those who write for the sake of writing or paint for the sake of painting. In short, poetry, the novel or drama are only a means of depicting our own proletarian culture« (Krasna 215).

Molek's depiction of his readership suggests a perceived gulf between (self-made) intellectual and common man regardless of his utilitarian definition of literature. Molek and Etbin Kristan are two good examples of journalists and organizers turned writers in immigration. Molek's advice to Krasna is also striking for its lack of mention of the ethnic group. By »pure, familiar style« (čisti domači slog) is, of course, meant Slovene, but the language (and its culture) turns out to be a vehicle for political enlightenment. Molek is writing about »proletarian culture.« In sociolinguistic terms, as Rado Lencek has hypothesized, the number of persons in the first generation possessing a command of the social esthetic functions of the language was very small (1992). And in following generations English replaced Slovene as the preferred (i.e., prestigious) language of the educated. Recalling Molek's words, we may conclude that, given immigrant readers' educational level and resulting propensity to switch to English, the communicative function of language was most important in *Adk* and the esthetic function rarely came into play.

2.3 *Slovenia and Slovene culture*. A surprising feature of the *Adk* until the late 1930s was the paucity of material on Slovenia proper and the editors' apparent indifference to the question of how Slovene cultural values, not to speak of the language itself, might be perpetuated in the U.S. *Adk*'s fiction had a contemporary orientation and preoccupation with the rigors of life experienced by the urban workforce. The fiction thus naturally tends to be journalistic and polemical in nature, sketching individual fates amidst the difficult

¹⁴ The data Matjaž Klemenčič has cited, 66.8% literacy for Slovene and Croat immigrants to the U.S., diverges from these figures by less than 2% (Klemenčič 1995, 54). He also points out that approximately 90% of the immigrants were farmers, laborers, servants, women, and children.

social circumstances of immigration and, in the 1930s, economic depression, yet without overtly reflecting on the specific influence of cultural background or social provenance (i.e., preponderantly rural).

The reader found more information on the history of socialism and personalities, great and small, in social movements than on Slovene culture, writers, artists, and so forth. *Adk*'s Slovene-American editors and writers posited, in their works and the entire complexion of the almanac, primary reader identification with the working class, not the ethnic group.

Interest in the homeland appears to have developed only in the late 1930s. Some of the better examples are Ivan Jontez's story *Razklane duše* (1935: 24-45), Etbin Kristan's *Ženin se je vrnil* (1937: 24-41) and Kozma Teleban's *Naši Amerikanci v starem kraju* (1939: 173-97), all of which capture the stereotypes of the remigrant.

2.4 The Slovene immigrant. The image of the Slovene immigrant conveyed on the pages of *Adk* and elsewhere by its leaders is probably in conflict with reality. Marjan Drnovšek singles out a historical essay by Jože Zavertnik, one of those active in the almanac, as an example of the false hypothesis that political oppression in Slovenia was an important motivation for emigration. Likewise, Drnovšek takes issue with the belief that economic distress played a greater role than the allure of economic opportunity and wealth (1991, 36-8). Recent studies on the phenomenon of remigration also contradict the economic distress hypothesis.¹⁵ The most influential person in the early years of the *Adk*, Etbin Kristan, was a leading socialist activist under the old regime. Kristan, Molek, and Zavertnik found the Slovene-American settlements' roots in European political and economic oppression in a very American way, just as Thomas Jefferson had explained the founding of the American colonies (Ellis 1997).¹⁶

The first (1915) issue of the *Adk* opens with a statement of the political ideas and economic themes that became characteristic of its contents. Ivan Molek's twelve-line dedicatory poem to the workers (»*Vam, ki sadite, zidate, gradite*«) scattered across the continent to which they were driven (»*kamor iz grude rodne so vas gnale / želje po tistem, česar tamkaj ni...*«), predicts that labor will achieve freedom (»*Ono bo sveta vladar; / ko svoboda mu bo vzplamtela*«). The curious things about this dedication are: the type of labor Molek mentions may have existed in Slovenia but was not that of the Slovene-American city dwellers and mine workers; there is nothing but the phrase »gruda rodna« that alludes to Slovenia or Slovene culture; the »sons and daughters of labor« would seem more victims of its »holy rule« than expectant beneficiaries of the freedom it anticipates. This is the predominant type of poetry in the *Adk*.¹⁷

The experiences of new immigrants in the mines and factories of the Great Lakes region especially were the major topic of *Adk* prose. Stories about Slovenes' particularly hard lot in the labor force appeared to have a strong basis in fact. The pre-WW II Slovene immigrant's fate as a worker was, however, also explained as a result of his or her lack of

¹⁵ See, for example, Wyman 1993.

¹⁶ One of the only essays to challenge the prevailing view was Anton Garden's revisionist essay on American history, »Iz ranih dni Amerike« (1938: 67-72), which posited a desire for riches and not yearning for freedom as the primary motivation of immigrants in all periods.

¹⁷ Mirko Jurak makes only passing reference to this style of poetry in his outline of post-WW II Slovene poetry in North America, noting the influence of Tone Seliškar and Mile Klopčič on Anna Krasna (Jurak 1989, 406)

ambition and reconciliation with a lesser lot in life. This view appears most often in stories set in the home, where husband and wife confront economic difficulties. For example, Louis Beninger's Peter Ponikvar (1937: 94-8) describes a husband's resolve at long last to look for work instead of letting the family depend upon his wife's night cleaning job. During most of the story the main character is lying on the couch while his son is reading at the table. Beninger's optimistic (American?) resolution to difficult urban conditions contrasts with, for instance, Jože Zaveržnik's Tako žive in umirajo... (1921: 38-44), which explains the protagonist's suicide after a grueling life of work and illness. In both stories economic conditions are to blame, but the protagonists' solutions are quite different.

The danger of the American cultural value of success seems sharpest in stories about women. Etbin Kristan's *Naša Meri* (1930: 37-57) tells of a Chicagoan's success in local beauty pageants and move to Hollywood, where she fails as an actress and finally comes to believe that simple people are happy because they are satisfied with what they have. In *Tut-tut-tuuu, Helena!* (1931: 144-73) Ivan Jontez describes the life of an attractive woman who marries an older man for money, then takes up with a dashing man (who blows the car horn for her, thus the title) and withdraws from her family. She eventually becomes suspicious of him and drives him over a cliff into a lake.

In Anton Slabe's *Butlegar Martin* (1933: 46-51) unemployment drives a factory worker to open a store and then into renting rooms and selling whisky illegally. His family begins falling apart and, after returning from jail, he finds his wife is hosting other men. He kills her and his dream of returning to Slovenia disappears; proletarian morality is poisoned by greed.

Ivan Molek perhaps stated the *Adk* intellectuals' position best in the story *Hotel Carniola* (1935: 46-51), in which the protagonist, disgusted by a Slovene-American's shady entrepreneurship, concludes

»Ameriško pravilo se glasi: 'Ako hočeš kaj biti, ne delaj za druge, delaj zase.' Toda Američanov, ki hočejo nekaj biti in delajo zase je – preveč in se koljejo med seboj kakor zveri. Slovenci smo pa pamentna zverina. Stojimo ob strani, gledamo pokolj in poberemo, kar ostane. Druga stvar je, da smo Slovenci skoro v vsakem primeru rojeni za nekaj drugega kot to, kar smo. Tretjič je za nami to, da ni nikdar prekasno, ko spoznamo to resnico o sebi...«

3. Conclusion

The self-made intellectuals that guided and contributed to the *Adk* may have in many cases, as Molek observes, had talents for other occupations, but they took on the organizational and creative tasks of the editing and writing because there were few others to do the work. Their sometimes competitors and opponents, the Catholic clergy, doubtless had better intellectual support. The birth of a second generation of Slovene-Americans for whom labor's cause, not to mention reading Slovene, was far less important than for their parents, meant the demise of the project. In the end the *Adk* intellectuals' view of the world and the New World was not accepted by the children of the »common people« that they wanted to serve.

WORKS CITED

- Balch, Emily. 1910; 1969. *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens*. New York: Arno.
- Drnovšek, Marjan. 1991. *Pot slovenskih izseljencev na tuje: Od Ljubljane do Ellis Islanda-Otoka solza v New Yorku, 1880-1924*. Ljubljana: Mladika.
- Drnovšek, Marjan. 1994. »Mass Emigration and Slovenes.« *Two Homelands* 5: 19-36.
- Dwyer, Joseph D., comp. and ed. 1981. *Slovenes in the United States and Canada: A Bibliography*. St. Paul: Immigration History Research Center, U of Minnesota P.
- Ellis, Joseph J. 1997. *American Sphinx: The Character of Thomas Jefferson*. New York: Knopf.
- Glavan, Mihael. 1991. »Življenjske postaje« (spremna beseda), in *Newyorški razglednik*. Ljubljana: Prešernova družba.
- Glušič, Hega. 1988. »Sodobna slovenska književnost v Ameriki.« *Slavistična revija* 36.2 (April-June): 233-37.
- Hoerder, Dirk 1991. »Functions of the Immigrant and Ethnic Press in North America: Analysis and Case Studies.« *Znanstvena revija: Humanistika* 3.5: 375-92.
- Ifkovic, Edward. 1983. DiPietro, Robert J. and Edward Ifkovic, eds. *Ethnic Perspectives in American Literature: Selected Essays on the European Contribution*. New York: MLA, 266-307.
- Jurak, Mirko. 1989. »Major Themes in Poetry Written by Slovene Immigrants in the United States of America and Canada.« *Slovenski koledar* (Ljubljana: Slovenska izseljenska Matica) 405-8.
- Klemenčič, Matjaž. 1995. *The Creation of a New Nation and a New World Community: The Slovenes of Cleveland, Ohio*. Novo Mesto: Dolenjska založa.
- Kristan, Etbin. 1927. »Ameriški vtisi,« *Življenje in svet* 1.36 (17 September).
- Lencek, Rado. 1992. »On Poetic Language in the Literature of a Linguistic Diaspora at the Moment of Its Separation from the Native Language.« Ed. Mirko Jurak. *Literature, Culture and Ethnicity: A Festschrift for Janez Stanonik*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Praček Krasna, Anna. 1990. *Življenje in delo v dveh domovinah za en svet: Predstavitev osebnega arhiva*. Ljubljana: Slovenska izseljenska matica.
- Praček Krasna, Anna. 1991. *Newyorški razglednik*. Ljubljana: Prešernova družba.
- Stipanovich, Joseph P. 1978. »'In Unity is Strength': Immigrant Workers and Immigrant Intellectuals in Progressive America: A History of the South Slav Social Democratic Movement, 1900-18.« Diss. U of Minnesota.
- Tebbel, John W. 1969. *The American Magazine: A Compact History*. New York: Hawthorn.
- Wyman, Mark. 1993. *Round-Trip to America: The Immigrants Return to Europe, 1880-1930*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- Zgodovina Slovencev*. 1979. ed. Meta Sluga et al. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.

APPENDIX I

Contributors to the *Ameriški družinski koledar* as listed in the 1944 issue, »Sotrudniki Ameriškega družinskega koledarja« (218)

(The list does not include all European Slovene writers whose works were printed in the *Adk*)

Ambrožič, Jože
Beniger, Louis
Bernik, Peter
Cainkar, Vincent
Chesarek, Josphe
Cvetkov, Teodor
Česen, Frank
Drasler, Joseph
Furlan, Boris
Garden, Anton
Godina, Filip
Hrast, Albert
Jauch, Joseph
Jontez, Ivan
Kaferle, Louis
Kerže, Frank
Kobal, Andrej
Krasna, Ana P.
Kristan, Etbin
Kuhel, Mirko
Medveshek, Ludvik
Medveshek, Milan
Mladineo, Ivan
Molek, Ivan
Novak, Zvonko A.
Oven, Joško
Olip, John
Omahen Marya
Prushek, Harvey G.
Petrich, Frank
Petrovich, Math.
Pogorelec, Charles
Poljšak, Leo
Rus, Viljem

Ručigaj, V. F.
Slabe, Anton
Skubic, Albin H.
Shular, Anton
Šavs, Frank
Tauchar, Frank S.
Vider, Fred A.
Zaitz, Frank
Zakrajšek, Leo
Zavertnik, Jože
Zega, Janko
Zupančič, Katka
Zupančič, Jakob
Žele, Stanley

Starokrajski sotrudniki:

Cerkvenik, Angelo
Čobal, Melhijor
Čulkovski
Čufar, Tone
Ivanovič, Ivan
Jernejčič, Jernej
Klopčič, Mile
Kristan, Anton
Kristan, Boris
Kristan, Cvetko
Mrzel, Ludvik
Rijavec, Vladimir
Seliškar, Tone
Špicar, J.
Teply, Bogo
Vuk, Ivan
Vuk, Jelica

POVZETEK *PESNIŠTVO IN PROZA V
AMERIŠKEM DRUŽINSKEM KOLEDARJU*

Referat obravnava ustvarjalno pisanje letopisa glede na časnikarsko vsebino, zgodovinsko ozadje in vlogo intelektualcev pri tem. Avtor analizira literarno vsebino almanaha glede na zvrst, tematiko in ozadje; proučuje družbene in politične poglede urednikov in avtorjev prispevkov ter primerja neleposlovno literaturo, ilustracije in komercialne oglase v almanahu z njegovim pogosto pristranskim ustvarjalnim pisanjem. Prevladujoča vloga določenega kroga zdamskih pisateljev v almanahu v času njegovih zametkov in v 30. letih omogoča določitev splošnih značilnosti ustvarjalnega pisanja, ki obsega približno polovico (t.j. 150 strani) almanaha. Ilustracije in neleposlovna literatura dajejo vpogled v ustvarjalna dela, druge vsebine, kot so oglasi, pa so bralcem v pomoč in informacijo. Druga, z literaturo povezana tema v razpravi, se nanaša na pomen in način sprejemanja slovenske literature pri ameriških Slovencih. Almanah služi kot okvir, znotraj katerega je mogoče ugotavljati, v kolikšni meri je slovensko-ameriška literatura pripadala slovenski literaturi.

Glavni namen projekta je strnjeno opisati slovensko-(ameriško) kulturo v 20. letih, predstavljeno v almanahu. To obdobje je pomembno, saj je bilo v tistem času vprašanje slovenske identitete - postimperialne, nove jugoslovanske ter delno izseljenske - še pogostejše predmet razprav, ki so pritegnile tudi vodilne intelektualce, med njimi Louisa Adamiča, Josipa Vidmarja in Otona Župančiča. V središču tovrstnih razprav sta bila pogosto jezik in literatura. Ameriški družinski koledar zajema širok opus ustvarjalnih del slovenskih izseljencev v Ameriki, objavljenih v slovenščini. V splošnem velja, da je za pisanje značilnejši kulturološki kot estetski pristop. Uredniki in avtorji prispevkov, sicer izobraženci, pogosto intelektualni samouki, so se uspešneje uveljavljali v novinarstvu kot v leposlovju. Ob koncu 30. let so vedno težje objavljali svoja dela zaradi socialno-političnih sprememb in pozabe, ki je grozila književni slovenščini med priseljenci in njihovimi potomci.

V skladu z naravo zvrsti, tako v Evropi kot v Severni Ameriki, je bil za literarno prozo almanaha višji cilj »prosvetljevanje«, ponavadi v političnem smislu, kot pa razvedrilo. Poskus Ameriškega družinskega koledarja je bil tudi objavljane kronike slovenskih naseljencev v ZDA, ki je sorazmerno več pozornosti posvečala obrobni skupnostim (npr. v Coloradu in Kansasu), očitno bolj naklonjenim delavskemu gibanju. Presenetljivo malo je gradiva o tako velikih in živahnih imigracijskih centrih, kot sta Cleveland in Milwaukee, ki sta sicer obširno zastopana v oglasni rubriki. Izjema je Chicago, kjer je imel almanah svoj sedež.

IN MY LIFE I HAD ONLY TWO WISHES: TO BECOME AN IMMIGRANT TEACHER, OR A COOK

The Work of Jože Čuješ among Australian Slovenes

In order to present the life and work of Jože Čuješ among Australian Slovenes would undoubtedly call for a detailed analysis of the majority, if not all, Slovene organizations and associations in Sydney, the capital of New South Wales. It is estimated that about 10.000 Slovenes live in this city. But the ideas of Jože Čuješ did not extend only beyond Sydney, but also everywhere where during the years following the Second World War Slovenes started to settle and socialize, at first spontaneously, later on an organized basis. It can be safely said that every Slovene on the fifth continent is familiar with the name of Jože Čuješ.

This, however, cannot be said for Čuješ's homeland. He was more or less known only by the readers of periodicals *Rodna gruda* and *Izseljenski koledar*, to which he contributed his accounts of Slovene activities in Australia. This is also the reason why I have gleaned the basic data for his biography mainly from our discussion in Sydney at the end of 1981, and from an In Memoriam written by Lojze Košorok, which was published first in Australia,¹ then in Slovenia.²

Who was therefore the late Jože Čuješ?

Something about the Life of Jože Čuješ

Teacher by occupation, Čuješ was born in Celje, in a region of Slovenia called Štajersko. His father worked in a sawmill, his mother cooked in a tavern. Due to the outbreak of World War II he was unable to perform his original occupation, for

»instead of being sent to a classroom Italians sent him to the Gonars concentration camp. After the capitulation of Italy he reluctantly joined the home guard and served as officer in Notranjsko until the end of the war.«³

Even though in the course of our interviews he never mentioned why he had left his homeland, his activities during the war were reason enough to escape across the border and evade the political system of the then communist Yugoslavia. In May 1945 he joined other refugees in Majnica in Austrian Carinthia. During the three and a half years he had spent among Slovene refugees in different Austrian refugee camps,⁴ he worked as editor of *Koroška kronika*, the first Slovene newspaper in Austria, in Klagenfurt where he participa-

¹ See: Lojze Košorok, In memoriam: Jože Čuješ, *Glas Slovenije/ The Voice of Slovenia*, 3/63, Sydney 1995, p. 9

² Lojze Košorok, In memoriam: Jože Čuješ, *Rodna gruda* 12, Ljubljana 1995, p. 39

³ *ibid.*

⁴ It is estimated that there were 4.300 Slovene so-called Displaced Persons in Spittal and Judenburg in 1947 (see: Rado Genorio, *Slovenci v Kanadi, Geographica Slovenica* 17, Ljubljana 1989, p. 52, 53)

ted in Slovene radio broadcasts for Carinthian Slovenes, was an eager and active participant in the revival of Mohorjeva družba, and tried to introduce Slovene to bilingual schools.

»It was there that I put together a grammar book the teachers had not had before, and a literary review of Slovene history so that they had something to teach from.«⁵

His departure for Australia had been prompted by his meeting with an Australian major in the Spittal camp:

»So he said to me: 'Listen, if you think of going somewhere, go to Australia. It's a good country, with lots of sun, work, lots of life!«⁶

On the evening of June 21, 1949, Čuješ was one of many refugees whose ship reached the Sydney harbour. These were his first impressions of the new country and its people:

»I remember it was cold, it was in the middle of winter, and very rainy. And when we saw those dockers who had potatoes wrapped in newspapers – what we now call chips – Slovenes remarked to one another that this must surely be an awfully wild country in which people wrap food in newspapers... They were all crowded together, holding those paper bags close, reaching for the potatoes which seemed so slimy and greasy, bringing them to their mouths with nothing but bare fingers. It was an awful sight.«⁷

It was not possible to find any data on how many Slovenes already lived in Australia in 1949. The only available data claims that organized ship transports of refugees from European camps to the fifth continent started in 1947 when the International Refugee Organization (IRO) was formed. Based on oral information it is possible to deduce that the first Slovene postwar refugees started to come to Australia in 1948 or 1949, as Čuješ himself had stated: *»I am sure two hundred Slovenes had come to Australia before me.«⁸* Based on this information, it is possible to say that Čuješ was one of the earlier postwar Slovene immigrants to Australia.

After he had landed on Australian soil, his life proceeded along a similar course as the lives of other immigrants: at first he stayed in Bathurst, one of the largest assembly camps for new immigrants in Australia, waiting for work for over a month:

»Well, someday they said that all those who finished high school or college should report in front of an office where they will be assigned work... So we went, regardless of our nationality. Most numerous at that time were Hungarians and Yugoslavs. This was in the middle of July, 1949... So some of those people and I came to an abandoned military camp close to Sydney. They needed a cook. They asked for a volunteer. I volunteered to clean the toilets. This was my first job in Australia.«⁹

In this camp Čuješ cleaned not only the toilets, but also the courtyard, the kitchen, he peeled potatoes, and studied English: *»I bought myself a newspaper and each day I copied from it for an hour or two, looking up the meaning of words in a dictionary.«¹⁰* Since he also spoke German and Italian, he was transferred to another camp named Sant Marys – now a suburb of Sydney – where he worked as an office employee. He had remain-

⁵ Conversation with Jože Čuješ was published in: Breda Čebulj Sajko, *Med srečo in svobodo, Avstralski Slovenci o sebi*, Ljubljana, published by the author, 1994, p. 121

⁶ idem, p. 55

⁷ idem, p. 56

⁸ idem, p. 124

⁹ idem, p. 122, 123

¹⁰ idem, p. 124

ned there for three and a half years, during which he established the basis for the first and all subsequent organized gatherings of Slovenes:

»In Sant Marys Slovenes got together already at the end of the 1940's, and it looked like this: I knew many fellow Slovenes who came on the same ship as myself; they, in turn, knew other Slovenes who had come on another ship, and so forth. We usually got together every Saturday. About ten, twenty Slovenes came to my place, and they spent the night at the camp, either staying with other Slovenes, or sleeping on the floor at my place.«¹¹

From these first beginnings until his retirement and illness in 1987 Jože Čuješ remained continuously involved with the development of Slovene activities on the Australian soil, especially in Sydney, be it by organizing different events, or by initiating them. Since he spoke little of himself, the family he had started in Sant Marys, or his private life, a review of the other turning points in his life is equally scarce. He visited his original homeland only once, in 1990, and died in Brisbane on October 8, 1995.

Jože Čuješ's Work among and for Australian Slovenes

As modest Čuješ would have said, his work spanning three decades among his fellow Slovenes in Australia was the result of mere coincidences and haphazard chances and especially of his ardent wish to become a teacher teaching Slovene immigrants, or a cook. Even though neither wish was completely fulfilled, his tireless activity among his own people *»was, and still is, a source of joy, and not a sacrifice.«¹²* Aside from this Čuješ was one of the few Slovenes whose basic occupation and keen mind enabled him to enlighten and assemble his fellow countrymen, which he had already started to do at the Sant Marys camp. Faced with the problems of others, he realized that Slovenes urgently needed a priest who would travel from one camp to another, gather them together, report about the events at home, comfort them and console their homesickness, etc.

»We knew that the Emigration Department of Australia pays (for such a person, author's note) for visiting especially elderly people. Since the Church is international, isn't it, it provides priest's lodgings and so forth. Well, I wrote to America (to Slovene Franciscans in Lemont, Michigan, author's note), and received a reply that not one of the I don't know how many Slovene priests was ready to go to Australia. That really made us angry. Then two Slovene Franciscan priests in America somehow heard about our wish. So they volunteered to come... and to help Slovenes as much as possible for a certain period. These were Klavdijo Okorn and Beno Korbič.«¹³

These were, as Čuješ says, *»the very first beginnings.«* The arrival of both priests denoted the beginning of organized religious activities among Australian Slovenes, at first combined with socializing after mass: *»People came from everywhere. After the mass we drank a little, ate a bit, bought salami, wine and bread, and sang.«¹⁴* But Čuješ felt that such gatherings at Sant Marys did not bring together enough Slovenes. The basic question troubling him at the time was how to find a way to unite Slovenes throughout Australia. He found his answer in starting a religious newspaper in Slovene, which was also permitted by

¹¹ *ibid.*

¹² *idem*, p. 127

¹³ *idem*, p. 125

¹⁴ *idem*, p. 126

the assimilation politics of the Australian government in this period. Together with the two priests and some other helpers he published the first issue of the religious monthly *Misli* (Thoughts) at the end of 1952. The magazine is still published each month. Says Čuješ:

»That magazine was then made at the camp while I was still there, and later in my home, each month... Since people didn't have any money, we provided the money by ourselves. Those who helped with the newspaper came by, I typed, somebody else made copies... Thus we were sending *Misli* to eight hundred Slovene addresses all over Australia.«¹⁵

Čuješ's role in the founding of Slovene societies was of equal, if not foremost importance as well: in 1953 the editorial board of *Misli* organized the first Slovene public evening with a cultural program which featured a male chorus, accordion players, and a recital of Slovene poems. The result of this evening was the founding of *Zveza Slovencev v Sydneyju* (Sydney Federation of Slovenes),¹⁶ and Jože Čuješ started to publish the society newspaper *Slovenska kronika* (Slovene Chronicle). Several years later, in 1960, he was an active participant when a new association, the so-called *Slovensko društvo Sydney* (Slovene Association Sydney) was founded which replaced the former *Zveza*. In 1961 he and Father Bernard Ambrožič, who was the new Franciscan priest in Australia, directed *Veriga* (Chain) by F. S. Finžgar, the first Slovene play on Australian soil. Čuješ wrote about the play:

»Since the Association does not have its own hall and a stage, scenery had to be improvised. But we had no intention of competing with the Ljubljana National Theatre, or anybody else. We just wanted to prove that despite all the difficulties and obstacles it is possible to stage a Slovene play in Sydney, as long as people are prepared to contribute their share of work.«¹⁷

A few years later, in 1973, a dispute between Sydney Slovenes concerning cooperation with their original homeland resulted in yet another association, *Slovenski klub Triglav* (Triglav Slovenian Club). Čuješ, who was in favor of cooperating with Slovenia (or Yugoslavia at that time), was once again one of the main founders of the club, and simultaneously initiated the publication of the club newspaper with the same name. Three years later he also supported the founding of *Slovensko akademsko društvo* (Slovenian Academic Society) with »the purpose of which was that those (Slovenes and their children, author's note) who study at a university or have already obtained their university degrees get to know one another.«¹⁸

Aside from his extraordinary zeal for founding and leading different societies and their newspapers Čuješ equally strongly affected Slovene schools in Australia. Since in 1950's and 1960's immigrants were not receiving any financial support from the Australian government for organized activity in their mother tongue, for this was the period of pressure for non-Anglo-Saxons to assimilate, all such activities were either performed under the patronage of religious events, or were initiated by individuals. Since 1956 Jože Čuješ thus taught Slovene, again with Father Ambrožič and some other volunteers, in the areas of Sydney with a large Slovene population (Paddington, Woolahra, Leichard, Cabramatta, etc.). Classes were taught after mass and took place in rented, most often church halls. These »schools«, if they can be called that, were named *Slomšek* schools. In 1964 Čuješ wrote *Prvi koraki* (First Steps), published by *Slovensko društvo Sydney*, which was the

¹⁵ *ibid.*

¹⁶ *Misli* 2/5, Sydney 1953, p. 6

¹⁷ Ludvik Klakočer, Finžgarjeva veriga v Sydneyju, *Misli* 10/10, Sydney 1961, p. 8

¹⁸ Čebulj Sajko, *Med srečo...*, p. 131

first Slovene textbook in Australia, for the teachers as well as students of these schools. In the 1970's and 1980's, when the Australian government changed its approach toward immigrants and initiated multicultural policy, these schools evolved into Saturday supplementary schools. Since 1978 Slovene has been taught in some state secondary schools and still in Slovene religious centers, societies and clubs.¹⁹ In that period Čuješ was one of the leaders in Slovenski šolski odbor za Novi Južni Wales (Slovenian School Committee for New South Wales) which united all Slovene associations regardless of the political affiliation of its members. The Committee strived to get Slovene recognized as a secondary school graduation examination, and succeeded in 1979. Similar were Čuješ's endeavours to establish a Slovene language lectorship at the Macquarie University in Sydney, where Slovene has been taught at the Department for Slavic Studies since 1989.

Judging by his words, Jože Čuješ was especially fond of his work for the ethnic radio which still broadcasts two hours of Slovene program weekly. As the program's founder, but also its organizer and announcer, he remained faithful to it from its beginning in the first half of the 1970's until his fateful illness. It was in the course of discussing this work that his concern about the further development of Slovene culture in Australia was most pronounced:

»Those who listen to this program most often are old and lonely. They cannot find anything in common with contemporary Slovene music. Here I am faced with a big problem, one that I cannot seem to solve within myself: is it right to play old melodies and songs by various polka bands on the radio, or is it better to play more modern music such as punk, for instance, which is popular now. I would like to show our youngsters that at home in Slovenia there is not only polka music. This is but part of the period we had lived in... I want to show them that at home we lead perfectly normal lives, the same as elsewhere in the world. I have a few modern records here. This is what I do: we try to play one or two of these songs in each program, just so the young know that we have them; on the whole, however, we prefer to play polka music.«²⁰

By the way, Čuješ's love for everything that is Slovene was also reflected within his own family:

»I am very happy my son speaks Slovene... And my grandchildren love to sing in Slovene. They possess that awareness and know a lot about Slovenia...«²¹ The same goes for his wife, Lithuanian by birth. Čuješ knew what to do in order for the *»Tradition... to continue, is transmitted from the old to the young,«²²* as he said once.

Although the activities of Jože Čuješ were numerous, let me just mention one more. In 1980's he participated in the foundation of *Svobodni razgovori* (Free Talks), a literary art magazine which publishes Slovensko-avstralski literarni in umetniški krožek (Slovenian-Australian Literary and Art Circle), and for twelve years worked as editor of the Slovene page in the Yugoslav weekly *Nova doba* (New Era).

Last but not least, let me cite Čuješ's feelings for the homeland he had not visited for almost four decades:

»I think it is easier to forget one's mother than one's homeland. Mother dies. It is

¹⁹ More about the development of Slovene schools see: Breda Čebulj Sajko, *Koliko časa še »po slovensko« v deželi kengurujev in koal*, *Didakta* 5/26-27, Ljubljana 1996, p. 78

²⁰ Čebulj Sajko, *Med srečo...*, p. 129

²¹ *idem*, p. 132

²² *ibid.*

rough. There is the grave, the burial. But living abroad, one gradually forgets. One's youth, the place where one grew up, however, is never forgotten. For me my homeland is the one that is there, and I always keep in mind that this same Slovenia, these same people are there, and are here. We are bound by something. Not the language! The language is not what is most important, more important is the awareness that we have something in common. I may be sentimental or whatever, but Australians put it this way: 'This is a state of mind.' Of this I am certain. We live with this.»²³

Why did I choose to write about a person like Jože Čuješ? Because he was one of those Australian Slovenes who throughout his life in immigration (1949-1995) continuously and enthusiastically preserved among his fellow Slovenes the awareness of their ethnic identity; as an able teacher and excellent organizer of club, religious, and pedagogical work he managed to additionally develop it on an institutional level. His initiatives to found the first Slovene religious monthly in Australia, the first Slovene associations in Sydney, a town in which Čuješ lived and worked almost until his death, the first Slovene supplementary schools, the Slovene ethnic radio, etc., all of which were realized, spurred a number of his younger followers, also intellectuals in the classical sense of the word, to find space for expressing their ethnic identity within the Slovene community as well as the mainstream, Australian society. The magnitude of his work among Australian Slovenes is exactly in his laying the foundations for Slovene activities in Australia. At the same time he also knew how to draw a multitude of people who still continue his work.

*POVZETEK »IMEL SEM SAMO DVE ŽELJI V SVOJEM ŽIVLJENJU:
DA BI BIL IZSELJENSKI UČITELJ ALI PA KU HAR«
Delo Jožeta Čuješa med avstralskimi Slovenci*

Jože Čuješ (Celje, 1923 – Brisbane, 1995), po izobrazbi učitelj, sodi med tiste avstralske Slovence, ki so ves čas življenja v imigraciji (1949–1995) nepretrgoma in z veliko mero entuziazma ohranjali med svojimi rojaki zavest o etnični pripadnosti in jo hkrati s sposobnostjo odlične organizacije društvenega, verskega, vzgojno-pedagoškega dela, še dodatno institucionalno razvijali. Ravno v njegovih pobudah po ustanovitvi prvega slovenskega verskega mesečnika v Avstraliji, prvih slovenskih društev v Sydneyu, (kjer je živel in deloval skoraj vse do svoje smrti), prvih slovenskih dopolnilnih šol, slovenskega etničnega radia itd., ki so se vse po vrsti tudi realizirale, je vrsta njegovih mlajših somišljenikov našla prostor za izražanje svoje etnične identitete tako v okviru slovenske skupnosti kot tudi v okviru avstralske družbe. Veličina njegovega dela med avstralskimi Slovenci je ravno v tem, da je postavil temelje delovanja slovenstva v Avstraliji. Poleg tega pa je znal k tako široko zastavljenemu delu pritegniti množico ljudi, ki še danes nadaljujejo njegovo delo. O vsem tem na mnogih mestih v članku spregovori Jože Čuješ sam. Zato je prispevek, poleg avtoričinega teksta, delno avtobiografska izpoved slovenskega intelektualca v Avstraliji.

²³ Idem, p. 135, 136

NANČKA FROM AMERICA: MYTH AND REALITY – THE FULL CIRCLE

»Boy, this is really something else. Teta's house is so... jus thow I hoped. She has lights - her beds are really nice, withsheets and blankets. ... None of the homes have heat - justtheir woodburning cooking stoves. And no living room – everyone gets together in the kitchen because that's the only place withheat. ... Jožica's farm is attached right to the house. Thetoilet is really old-fashioned and there is a window in it, andon the other side are the pigs grunting.«¹

These are several excerpts from the first letter a third-generation American Slovene from a city in the American Midwest wrote to her family in the 70's. After graduation, Annie² decided to go to Slovenia to live with her grandmother's relatives for a year. This was her first trip abroad, and onethat was to affect her life for many years after her return tothe States a full year later. Throughout her stay in Slovenia,she wrote home, to her parents, grandparents, sister andfriends. It is these letters, written between September 1977 andAugust 1978 to her parents and grandparents, that form the basisfor this paper. My analysis of these³ letters shall focus on how this correspondence⁴ can reveal information on both thelife and viewpoints of their author as an individual, member of a family and an ethnic group; at the same time they function as a mirror held up in front of our own eyes, reflecting a way of life in a village in Slovenia which, to a large extent, no longer exists.

Annie was born into an ethnically mixed family: while her mother was a second-generation American Slovene, her father's parents came from another part of Eastern Europe. As far as ethnicity is concerned, the family seemed to be much more closely connected to its Slovene origin and traditions. Both Annie and her older sister were taught Slovene expressions by their mother and their maternal grandparents, were taught to sing Slovene songs and dance Slovene dances at Slovene picnics and other ethnic festivities which the family frequented regularly. Influenced by these manifestations of Slovene ethnic traditions, young Annie formed an image of Slovenia in her heart that she wanted to experience in person after she graduated in the spring of 1977

Even though Annie's maternal grandmother was not in the least sentimental about Slovenia she had left in the 1920's, and always stressed how fortunate she had been to be able to leave her life on a farm behind, her stories of Slovenia had a great impact on young Annie. The image of Slovenia was conveyed to her not only through numerous events organized by the strong Slovene community in her home town, but also through the Slovene spoken in her grandmother's house, through the foods her grandmother was always

¹ The letter is dated September 21, 1977.

² All personal names have been changed to protect the privacy of those concerned.

³ 45 letters had been written between September 1977 and August 1978.

⁴ The letters amount to over 200 typewritten pages and were originally written by hand.

preparing for the family, the folk songs her mother had taught her two daughters, the polkas the three had danced in the kitchen of their home. Even though Annie's grandmother always stressed the hardships of her life in »the old county,« the Slovenia of Annie's heart was a mysterious place with exotic people, polka music and old-world festivals and celebrations which were copied in America, but were nevertheless only copies of the real thing. So on a still-warm September Sunday she packed her suitcases, bought a camera in a store that was open on Sunday, and set across the ocean

Her arrival in Slovenia was packed with emotions: disappointment at the airline which had failed to bring her suitcases as far as Slovenia and delivered them only several weeks later, her excitement at the beautiful scenery she had seen from the plane, and the shock she had experienced at discovering that her rudimentary knowledge of Slovene just was not enough to enable her to understand the heavy dialect her relatives were speaking:

»It was a harder adjustment with language than I thought. We use sign language a lot and a mixture of English, Slovenian and German. ... When I got off the plane in Ljubljana I saw a little old lady and a man - and it was Teta and her son! I ran up to them ... and we hugged each other, and then she starts rambling on and on in Slovenian and all I could do was smile and nod! ... I've been showing relatives the pictures I brought of 'moja žlahta' ... They keep asking if I have 'mlada fant v Amerika'. And I say 'Nič jast sem zelo mlada' and they all laugh, just like Grandma and Granpa when I say something in 'Slovenska'.«⁵

The first problems and difficulties Annie had to face were not unlike those Slovene immigrants (and those belonging to other ethnic groups) encountered upon arriving to the U.S. half a century or more earlier. Indeed, in a fashion Annie was also an immigrant in Slovenia, a stranger in a strange land. Annie found herself in a country which, despite all the stories she had heard, differed from the one in her mind. First there were the high mountains which surrounded the village she had come to, the mountains which made the Midwesterner feel like Heidi, as she said many years later. There were initial problems with the intricacies of the language. Then there was the transition which was perhaps the hardest of all: while she came from a relatively well-to-do American family for which a comfortable house in the suburbs of a large, bustling city was something obvious, most of her numerous relatives in Slovenia were farmers living in small villages, even though some also worked in a factory or in a small town nearby. Their life was anything but romantic, paced by the yearly cycle of the work in the fields and everyday chores in the barn. Descending from the mountain to go to a town was perceived as special, and when after a few months in Slovenia Annie had an accident driving a cousin's scooter, she had to wait with a broken arm for her relatives to finish their lunch, take a bath, change into fresh clothes, and only then take her into town for x-rays.

While her first letters home reflect the initial awe at finally being able to realize her childhood dream of coming to Slovenia to live, if only for a limited period, in early winter Annie's observations become more realistic. They also reflect the changed attitude of her relatives toward her: Annie is no longer a guest who has to be wined and dined in every house she goes to, but part of the family, and as such has her daily chores just like everybody else. She soon learns to chop wood, shovel manure, cook local dishes, milk cows. She was especially excited about the latter, and her letter of October 5 starts with capital letters:

»GUESS WHAT! I did it!!! I milked a cow!! I was so excited I almost dropped the

⁵ The letter is dated September 21, 1977.

pail!! ... Jožica gave me a real nice cow and even tied her tail so she wouldn't hit me. That worked fine for my cow, but the one next to me kept swishing me with her tail!!«

Since her grandmother had come from a large family, most members of which settled down with their spouses and children within a few kilometers from each other, Annie was alternately staying with three different families and thus wisely managed to avoid the issue of her »favouring« any one family. She soon established a rhythm she was able to pursue through the whole year:

»I've been trying to spend equal time at all three places, so I usually go to Jožica's Thursday afternoon because of my /Slovene/ lesson. I'm there Friday and Saturday and walk back to Dolenje Saturday night to clean up. I'm in Dolenje then Saturday night, all day Sunday and Monday, and go to Teta's Monday night. I'm there all day Tuesday and Wednesday and back to Dolenje Wednesday night.«⁶

For a young woman who was used to taking a shower every day, keeping clean presented certain difficulties:

»It/ is a job around here. That's why I am here at Dolenje tonight. I've been at Jožica's since Saturday night and she ... doesn't have any place to really wash up. She has a sink in a room, but the door has a window in, so the most I can do is slip a bar of soap under my sweater and wash my armpits and my face. At teta's cleaning facilities are even worse.«⁷

Cultural differences between the two countries were sometimes reflected even in simple items, the use of which presented interesting problems of technical nature:

»Here they have bigger thermometers that you stick under your armpit. ... I didn't know what to do with it when Tefana gave it to me. It looked awfully big to go in my mouth so I felt kind of dumb, but I had to ask where to put it. I was so relieved that it didn't go 'someplace else.'«⁸

Although Annie enjoyed her life with her relatives, there were times when she missed her family and wished she were back home. Such times occurred mostly on Slovene holidays which were not what she had imagined them to be. Especially Christmas was a complete disappointment. In mid-December she wondered at the fact that

»... there aren't any outward signs that Christmas is coming - we didn't get a tree and they don't have any decorations up. ... Here, everyone talks of New Year and wishes each other »Srečno Novo Leto« instead of Merry Christmas.⁹

... Nothing in the stores pertains to Christmas and I guess (I might be imagining things) that you can't even speak of Christmas in the stores. Once, before I knew the situation, I asked Anica if they had Christmas cards when we were in a store. It seemed she kind of hushed it up right away and said no, only New Year's cards.«¹⁰

Then, in a letter written on Christmas Day, she mourns:

»They don't have Christmas cards as I already wrote you and for that matter too, they don't have Christmas! When I talked with Teta about Christmas, she said that when her and Grandma were young, Christmas was really something special. But the Communists took all that away. Today is just like another Sunday. And if Christmas had fallen

⁶ The letter is dated Dec. 15.

⁷ The letter is dated Oct. 12

⁸ The letter is dated Feb. 12

⁹ The letter is dated Dec. 11.

¹⁰ The letter is dated Dec. 15.

during the week, there would've been work and school. As far as I'm concerned, there wasn't Christmas this year. There were small moments of Christmas feeling like when I helped Jožica bake potica Friday night and last night when I cried myself to sleep and listened to the tapes of all of you and the friends and relatives.«

When winter turned into spring, there was a marked change in Annie's letters: while in her earlier letters she used personal pronouns such as »we« and »they« to separate her family and herself (we), or Americans in general when she discussed different cultural traits, from the people among which she lived in Slovenia (they), thus clearly indicating a boundary between the two, in May 1978 she writes to her parents:

...»We've been real busy here. We're all worried about the weather. We've had rain every day for I don't know how long! And we've got to get our potatoes planted!«¹¹

This transformation clearly indicated that Annie has started to identify with the culture, the people and their way of life in which she lived at that time. The »us« vs. »they« relationship had been turned around, and it is now the Americans with their consumer society and an over-abundance of everything that are sometimes criticized in Annie's letters:

...»The newspaper /you had sent me/ was really strange to read. The one thing that I don't miss is all the commercialism in America. It never struck me as much as reading the American ads here in Slovenia - 'FREE, FREE, FREE. USE YOUR MASTER CHARGE. ARTIFICIAL SCOTCH PINE ONLY \$7. It just depresses me, seeing how our lives are run by big business in America. We may be a free country, but we are brainwashed by 'Big Business' into when we start celebrating holidays (which gets earlier every year). ... Here there is very little advertising as there is generally only one or two brands of a product. When we go to the little store /nearby/, we just tell the lady what we need - there's no question of what brand.«¹²

Annie was a keen observer and had a good eye for detail. Her comprehensive »letters from the field« would've overjoyed any anthropologist. They contain exact descriptions of numerous farming occupations, food preparation, village festivals, wedding and death customs, observations of people's social positions. Her observations are mater-of-fact descriptions lacking any judgement or prejudice. The only time her letters are filled with outrage is when she observes the position of women in the families she comes into contact with:

... Here there is no such thing as woman's lib. Women are made for the sole purpose of serving men here. It's like that in all the families. ... Well, I am NOT a Slovenian in that respect! I've watched with disgust how Tone's mother and Jožica are up and down out of their seats about a dozen times during each meal getting this and getting that for /the boys./ ... But when /one of the boys/ asked me if he was supposed to eat with his hands (hinting that I was supposed to get him a fork) I plainly told him in Slovenian that he had two legs.«¹³

In the course of a single year Annie experienced a wedding, a death, a birth, two baptisms, helped her relatives with pig butchering, learned to take care of farm animals, plow with a horse, plant potatoes, rake hay, make sausages, cut the grass with a scythe, make butter in a butter churn. She became used to living with no running water, to wash her

¹¹ The letter is dated May 31.

¹² The letter is dated December 3.

¹³ The letter is dated February 12.

hair in a bucket, to keep her feet warm by heating bricks on top of a stove and then putting them in her bed. Not only did she rarely complain, she enjoyed her new life and valued her newly acquired skills. When her sister sent her a letter asking about her plans after her return to the States, Annie replied:

»I might apply for some position /there/ teaching ... /Slovene/ as well as cooking or sausage making or other Slovenian 'skills' that I've learned.«¹⁴

While she was not sure exactly what she was going to do upon her return, she was determined about one thing: she would have her own farm with a wood-burning stove, with animals, with cows to milk, and live much in the same way that her mother's sister lived in Slovenia.

»I found that I'm very much like Teta, in that I love animals so much and too have to be outside getting dirty and working the land.«¹⁵ »... It's such a neat feeling to work hard out in the fields and get all dirty and then when you finally finish putting in the last potato in the field, you just kind of look over all you've done. Then you can finally walk back home, too tired to talk, but happy and contented that you've completed something.«¹⁶

* * *

Two decades later Annie is exactly where she wants to be with her life, and seems to be one of the fortunate few whose dreams have come true. She lives in a house she had designed by herself, keeps chickens, rabbits and goats, and although her kitchen is equipped with modern appliances, it also has a wood-burning stove. After her return to the U.S. she was an active and eager participant in various Slovene activities, and taught Slovene for the members of the Slovene community in her city. After she had bought her house, however, she moved to the country. She works as a math teacher, but before driving to school each morning she gets up around four and milks the cows at a nearby farm, and also helps with neighbour's horses on the way back to her home. After returning from school in the afternoon she tends to her animals and works in her large garden. Before holidays she brings her two best-behaved rabbits to school to show to her students, along with 'potica', 'flancati' or bits of Slovenian sausage she buys from a Slovene butcher in the city. She shows her students slides she had taken in Slovenia and tells them about the different customs of a small nation across an ocean.

Although Annie's life-style and choices, which are not typical for the third generation of American Slovenes, reflect what can be termed double identity, she does not perceive it as something negative. This is not the split of the first generation which upon coming to the States had to establish its material existence first, but remained forever spiritually tied to its original home. Annie, on the other hand, like so many members of her generation went to Slovenia in order to learn about her roots, all the while knowing that her material existence was not something she would have to fight for from the very bottom of the social ladder. A graduate of a good university, she knew that upon returning to the U.S. she would be able to find a job she was qualified for, so she could afford to fulfill her spiritual need with what she had found in Slovenia. Her present way of life spans like a bridge between her two identities, drawing upon what she feels is best of the two cultures.

¹⁴ The letter is dated March 6.

¹⁵ The letter is dated May 8.

¹⁶ The letter is dated May 31.

»One year ago today, May 15, I graduated from college... And one year later finds me walking through snow and cleaning manure and milking cows. But I've learned more and experienced more than my whole four years of college. College prepared me for a job, but it's here I got an education!«¹⁷

POVZETEK NANČKA IZ AMERIKE: PISMA S TERENA

Referat govori o Nancy, ameriški Slovenki tretje generacije, in njeni razpetosti med svojo domovino in domovino njenih starih staršev. V tem se zelo razlikujejo od večine ameriških Slovencev tretje generacije, ki to povezavo sicer še - občasno - zaznavajo, vendar je v njihovem vsakdanjem življenju le malo pomembna. Korenine teh občutij gotovo segajo v leto, ki ga je Nancy preživela pri sorodnikih v Sloveniji, kjer se je morala soočiti s popolnoma novimi stvarmi, tako različnim od tistih, ki jih je bila vajena na ameriškem Srednjem Vzhodu: velemesto je zamenjalo življenje na deželi, med živalmi in vaščani, ki jim je življenjski utrip določala menjava letnih časov in na njih vezano sezonsko delo na polju in v hlevu. Da bi prebrodila občasno osamljenost, pa tudi ohranila spomine na to leto v Sloveniji, je Nancy vseskozi zapisovala svoja opažanja v obsežen dnevnik, pa tudi v pisma, ki jih je redno pošiljala domov v Združene države. Ta pisma in dnevnik, v katerih prvotno čudenje nad »njihovim« nenavadnim načinom življenja, vrednotami, normami in navadami po nekaj mesecih zamenjajo poročila o »življenju tu pri nas v Sloveniji«, nam odsevajo pozorno opazovalko, ki ob kritičnih primerjavah obeh dežel podrži ogledalo nam samim, tako da smo prisiljeni zagledati svojo deželo skozi skoraj etnološko obarvanih zapisov.

¹⁷ The letter is dated May 14.

ZNAMENITI SRBSKI INTELEKTUALCI V SOSEDNJIH DEŽELAH

V izseljenstvu se inteligenca naroda oblikuje drugače, kakor matična. Obstajajo, seveda, tudi skupne poteze tega procesa. To velja tudi za srbsko inteligenco v sosednjih, madžarskih in romunskih deželah - pod dolgoletno ogrsko oblastjo.

V Združenih Državah Amerike so, na primer, Srbi imeli v preteklosti znamenite posameznike, znanstvenike in humaniste, N. Teslo, M. Pupina, P. Radosavljevića, zdaj imajo M. Petrovića, Đ. V. Tomaševića, Č. Simića in A. Simića, družinske diade B. Maglič in R. Maglič, N. Tešićevo in S. Tešića itd. Posamezni med znamenitimi niso bili, kar je tudi razumljivo, narodnostno zelo zavedni. Podobno je bilo tudi s Srbi, odseljenimi v Rusijo in Ukrajino. Nekaj enklav v svetu se odlikuje z mnogimi znamenitimi Srbi: Trst in Dunaj v preteklosti, Washington – po drugi svetovni vojni.

Etnografski inštitut Srbske Akademije znanosti in umetnosti je pred dvema desetletjema začel raziskovati naselitve Srbov v diaspori. Zaradi pomanjkanja kadrov in sredstev za širša terenska raziskovanja, so 1992 ustanovili izdajo »Življenjepisi«, v kateri so do zdaj, med ostalimi, tiskali tri knjige autobiografij znamenitih srbskih intelektualcev v sosednji Madžarski in Romuniji. Življenjepisi (life-story) pa so, kot je znano, zelo pomemben del vseh poglobljenih etnoloških in folklorističnih raziskovanj. Prispevajo namreč k nujnemu ravnovesju med »objektivizirajočim« pristopom raziskovalca v znanstvenem prispevku ter »subjektivnem« pripovedovanju izprašancev.

Glede na to, da eden od referatov predstavlja življenje in delo znamenitega srbskega intelektualca v ZDA, M. Pupina, ter glede na to, da je v Beogradu v tisku veliki biografski leksikon Kdo je kdo med Srbi v svetu, s podatki o približno tisoč osebah, bomo najprej navedli še en pogled na prispevke navadnih ljudi k življenju in kulturi ameriškega kontinenta.

I.

Med omenjenimi avtobiografskimi knjigami je bila najprej natisnjena osebna povest Sare Vukelić-Ivošević iz Pittsburgha, izreden življenjepis (»bolj nenavaden, kot kak roman«), lastni oris uspešno prehojene poti.

Sara Ivošević je v zrelih letih ponudila svoje spomine in nekatere že objavljene intervjuje Domovinski zgodovinski fundaciji v Pensilvaniji, z željo, da bi del lastne izseljenske izkušnje kot zrno modrosti pustila novim rodovom in s tem prispevala k petstoletnici odkritja Amerike. Potem je celo pet raziskovalcev zapisovalo Sarine spomine in urejalo gradivo vse do leta 1987. Njena knjiga z razpoznavnim »izseljenskim« naslovom Od Jagetića do Pittsburgha je izšla leta 1992, predstavlja pa osebni pogled na dve kulturi,

oziroma opis življenjske poti od gotovega k negotovemu, od revščine k možnemu bogastvu. Fotografije poudarjajo nasprotja dveh okolij: pastoralne lepote hiš in pastirskih stanov v domovini ter sajaste pittsburške jeklarne.

Sara Vukelić-Ivošević, samozavestna in odločna, stroga do sebe in do drugih, trdi, da bi se spet odločila za težko pot od Jagetića do Pittsburgha. Imela bi več otrok in bi jih spet napotila na samostojno življenjsko pot. Pridna in delovna kljub uničenem zdravju ni zapustila svojega dela. Kot življenjski optimist se je odločala za najboljše v določenem trenutku. Ne skriva vere v posmrtno življenje, obljubljala pa je tudi, da bo nekega dne pristopila k nunam.

Raziskovalcem rojakov v diaspori je na voljo še en tip virov. V lokalnih ameriških časopisih je namreč mogoče zaslediti precej obsežne nekrologe someščanom, predvsem umrlim »old-timerjem«, med njimi so tudi Srbi, o znamenitih posameznikih pa piše tudi osrednji srbski tisk. Življenjepisi teh ljudi se hranijo v domačih arhivih, običajno so polni zahvale staršem – »immigrants«, največkrat izpod peres njihovih sinov, Srbov, rojenih v Ameriki – »American born Serb«, pogosto z ne najboljšim znanjem knjižne angleščine. Sorodniki so mi nekatere od njih ljubeznivo odstopili (Biography of Steve Glumac, 1888–1973, by Son Stan), enega pa sem tiskal z naslovom Izselski začetek in konec Srba iz Like – Nikola Obradović (1898–1993). Slednji so, praviloma, nepopolni izvlečki življenjepisov, ki so skromni viri za znanstvena, etnološka raziskovanja.

2.

V sosednjih deželah se je srbska inteligenca oblikovala v boju za ohranjanje jezika in vere, pogoji za to pa so na Madžarskem bili drugačni od tistih na romunskih področjih. Romuni so bili, namreč, v Ogrski, glede na enotnost vere, do konca 19. stoletja skupaj s Srbi pod pristojnostjo Srbskopравoslavne metropolije v Sremskih Karlovcih. Na ogrskih prostorih (središča: Budimpešta, Segedin), ki so zajemali tudi precejšnji del današnje Romunije (središča: Temišvar, Arad), je živelo mnogo Srbov, kar je vplivalo na razvoj humanistične inteligence (S. Tekelija – čigar ime je deloma povezano z Aradom in Budimpešto; J.S. Popović, J. Ignjatović, K. Stanković; D. Obradović, M. Crnjanski), ki je s svojim delovanjem vplivala na vse srbsko ozemlje in imela pomembno mesto v srednjeevropski kulturi tega časa.

Pred kratkim je D. Davidov, skupaj z M. Stepanovim, pripravil prvo multimedijsko publikacijo Kulturna zgodovina Srbov na Madžarskem, ki zajema biografije 55 znamenitih Srbov, kulturnih in javnih delavcev, cerkvenih poglavarjev in vojskovodij, v času med koncem 15. do konca drugega desetletja 20. stoletja.

Po optiranju za Kraljevino Srbov, Hrvatov in Slovencev (1921–24) zaslužnih posameznikov (L. Terzin in drugi) so se znameniti Srbi na Madžarskem (I. Jakšić in drugi) ter v Romuniji osredotočili na boj za ohranjanje etnične identitete tamkajšnjega srbskega prebivalstva, to pa so najprej hoteli izpeljati v lastnih družinah. Otroke so usmerili k obravnavanju narodnostnih vprašanj, čeprav politična klima v Evropi ni bila temu naklonjena. Tako so nastale družinske diade in triade srbskih intelektualcev najprej na Madžarskem (Vujičići, Stepanovi, Lastići in drugi), potem pa tudi v Romuniji. Ta družinska posvečenost delu na etnični ravni je posebnost ne samo srbske skupnosti v sosednjih državah, temveč tudi nekaterih narodnostnih manjšin v Srbiji.

Na Madžarskem obstajajo trije srbski rodovi z najmanj tremi aktivnimi predstavniki v intelektualnem življenju srbske manjšine. Njihovi začetniki so učitelji ali duhovniki, rojeni konec prejšnjega in v začetku 20. stoletja. Rodovni starosta Vujičićev je Dušan Vujičić, učitelj in duhovnik, rojen v Sečuju. Njegova dva sinova, Tihomir in Stojan, sta zelo zaslužna za kulturo, ne samo Srbov, temveč tudi ostalih Južnih Slovanov na Madžarskem. Etnomuzikolog Tihomir je, preden se je tragično ponesrečil z letalom, raziskal in nato objavil knjigo Glasbene tradicije Južnih Slovanov na Madžarskem (Budimpešta, 1978). Njegov brat Stojan je pisatelj in upravnik Srbskega muzeja v Sentandreji, pred kratkim pa je objavil knjigo Srbi v Budimu in Pešti.

Začetnik intelektualnega rodu Stepanovih je Radovan, rojen v Santovi, ki je, odkar pomni živel dve življenji hkrati. Moral je delati, da bi se šolal, potem pa je moral opravljati različna dela, da bi lahko skrbel za duhovno življenje vernikov. Prota Radovan Stepanov na straneh svoje knjige pojasnjuje poti etničnih prepletanj med Južnimi Slovani na Madžarskem. Tako govori o prehajanju Srbov – njegovih prednikov – v katoliško vero in mešanju s Šokci-ikavci (Radovanov brat se piše Stipanov), ter omenja njihovo vrnitev v pravoslavlje zaradi poskusa madžarizacije preko verskih obredov. Večji odpor so imeli do jezikovnega kakor pa do verskega pritiska, živeli so v sožitju z Madžari – piše oče Radovan. Procesi, podobni tistim v preteklosti, so se odvijali tudi pozneje: Radovanov sin Predrag (znani srbit, univerzitetni profesor v Budimpešti) se piše Stepanović, Predragov sin Milan (pesnik in pisatelj romana *Mavzolej*, 1997) pa po starem očetu Stepanov. Očeta Radovana so preimenovali v Vidor, celo v osebnih dokumentih, med drugo svetovno vojno pa matičar Bunjevec v rojstno matično knjigo ni hotel zapisati srbskega imena Predrag. Stepanov je globoko prepričan, da so pri ohranjanju identitete Srbov na Madžarskem največje težave maloštevilnost, teritorialna razvrstitev in razseljevanje ter mešani zakoni – večinoma z madžarsko večino. En njegov sin je poročen z Madžarko, ena vnukinja (med štirimi) je tudi poročena z Madžarom. Dva vnuka poučujeta srbsčino, naučila se jo je tudi snaha Madžarka. Kot primer potujčevanja Radovan Stepanov navaja mohačke Šokce, ki so preko bogoslužnega jezika postali Madžari. Tukaj velja omeniti tudi to, da rod Stepanovih obstaja tudi v Romuniji in je zelo aktiven v življenju srbske manjšine.

Spomini župnika in učitelja Svetozarja S. Lastića (1893–1966), ki jih je pridno zapisoval v drugi polovici svojega življenja, se nanašajo na del jugoslovanskih dežel (Srem, Bosna, Bačka) in večje število madžarskih naselij, kjer živijo Srbi, zajemajo pa čas pred, med in po svetovnih vojnah. Skozi raziskovanje duhovnega življenja in izobraževanja je omenil obilico podatkov iz vsakdanjega življenja Srbov na Ogrskem, kakor tudi veliko etnografskih opazanj, za kar je izkazal izredno nadarjenost. Iz njegovih zapiskov je moč naslutiti, kako trnova je bila pot narodnega razsvetljenca. Kot je to storil Dositej Obradović, tudi Lastić svoje izkušnje daje bodočim rodovom v vednost (*»na polzu potomstva«*), in je mnenja, da *»Srb lahko trpi samo v imenu višjih idealov«*. Pred drugo svetovno vojno je v Mohaču ustanovil srbsko-makedonsko župnijo. Kot izučen bogoslovec je študiral pravo, kljub različnim administrativnim oviram in zadržkom. Spoznal je in lastni koži občutil nevarnost vse močnejšega fašizma in šovinizma. Bil je zapiran, mučen in določen za deportacijo; nekaj časa je bil brez kakršnih koli zaslužkov. Po drugi svetovni vojni je postal aktivist slovenskih organizacij, toda skozi boj za pravice manjšin, je bil proti tako imenovanemu internacionalističnem pristopu k tem vprašanju, predvideval pa je tudi progone in hajke na Srbe ob meji ter večletni zapor za prvega sina, Ljubomirja. V njegovi družini se je ohranila tradicija poimenovanja otrok v znamenju etnične identitete. Posebno so ženska

imena, predvsem pa ljubkovalna, spominjala na jug Srbije. Takšna so: Šana od Aleksandra, Femka od Eufemija, Lenka. Moška pa so: Nedeljko, Vojislav, Radomir, Borivoje, Dimitrije (ljubkovalno Micko, ker je rojen v srbsko-makedonskem okolju). V šestdesetih letih Sve-tozar S. Lastić svoje delo končuje z opisom brezverstva intelektualcev »v narodu, ki sam sebi koplje grob«, poroča o splošnem slabem stanju vere in cerkve, kjer se delovanje žup-nika večinoma omejuje na pogrebe.

3.

V Romuniji so živeli že omenjeni znameniti intelektualci srbske narodnosti S. Te-kelija in D. Obradović, v novejšem času pa M. Tomić, S. Gvozdrenović, S. Bugarski, M. Milin, M. Radan in drugi. Nekateri med njimi, ki so se uveljavili na področju narodnostne-ga udejstvovanja že usmerjajo sinove in nečake, naj po končanem kulturološkem študiju v matičnem okolju kvalificirano in odgovorno prevzamejo skrb za ohranjanje etničnih zna-čilnosti. Tako se bodo tudi v Romuniji ustvarile družinske diade srbskih intelektualcev.

Optant Dejan Adam v svojih spominih z začetka stoletja navaja, da je največ značil-nega za večino naselij najti v t.i. Banatski klisuri (soteski) na Donavi. V knjigi je predstav-ljeno življenje ugledne obmejne družine iz vasi Zlatica ter prva družinska delitev s konca prejšnjega stoletja. Podrobno je opisano šolanje srbskih otrok v nematerinem (madžar-skem) jeziku in prisilno odhajanje učencev v svetišča druge vere. Ker se niso mogli upreti potujčevanju, so se mnogi iz Banatske klisure ter Banata nasploh leta 1920 in pozneje odločili optirati za Jugoslavijo.

Po koncu druge svetovne vojne je število Srbov v Romuniji padlo na polovico (35000). Na tem prostoru je okoli 50 cerkev in 5 samostanov, kar bi podjetni Srbi radi vrnili pravim lastnikom. Preostala je le četrtina srbskih šol (15), ena med njimi je osemletka, gimnazija »Dositej Obradović« pa je ravnokar praznovala pol stoletja obstoja. Tukajšnji intelektualci se s knjigo in peresom ter drugimi kulturnimi prireditvami bojujejo za ohrani-tev narodne identitete. Objavili so več kot 250 knjig, med katerimi je petnajst podrobnih monografij naselij v katerih živijo Srbi. Tiskajo tednike in vsake tri mesece literarno revijo. Organizirajo Dneve srbske kulture v Aradu, posebno pa častijo praznik Svetega Save.

4.

Kot je razvidno, so se družinske triade srbskih navdušencev, predvsem na Madžar-skem, ustanovile v duhovniških in učiteljskih družinah. V njih se ob bogatem duhovnem življenju in knjižnici rešujejo običajna manjšinska vprašanja – od ohranjanja osebnega imena, narodnostno mešanih zakonov, do odnosa do materinega jezika in nadaljnjega šola-nja otrok. To je najmlajšim omogočilo pridobivanje znanj, nujno potrebnih in odločilnih za njihov bodoči poklic. Družine, v katerih živijo tudi po trije intelektualci humanističnih ved različnih generacij, predvsem pa, če so v navpični sorodstveni črti, že celo stoletje vodijo etnično politiko Srbov v diaspori. Iz njihovih prej omenjenih knjig in zapiskov je razvidno, kaj jim je najbolj pomembno, s čim se ukvarjajo v vsakdanjosti in kako si predstavljajo ohranjevanje manjšine. Posebna vrednost njihovih ugotovitev je, da so sami svoji razisko-

valci, nosilci in razlagalci dveh tradicionalnih kultur v stiku ter specifičnih poti sprejemanja globalne kulture v sosednjih deželah.

V določenem pomenu je podobna razvojna pot razvidna tudi pri sicer mnogoštevilnih intelektualcih med jugoslovanskimi Rusini, s pripombo, da njihovi grško-katoliški duhovniki ne živijo obvezno v celibatu, zato lahko ustvarijo mnogoštevilne družine in živijo bogato družinsko življenje na etnični osnovi.

LITERATURA

- Adam, M. Dejan, Sećanje na detinjstvo u selu Zlatici, »*Životopis*« knj. 2, Beograd 1992.
- Bugarski, Stevan, *Po Semartonu kroz prostor i vreme*, Bukarešta 1982.
- Bugarski, Stevan, Umetnost življenja uz ine - iskustva sa teritorije današnje Rumunije, *Etnički odnosi Srba s drugim narodima i etničkim zajednicama, Posebna izdanja Etnografskog instituta SANU knj. 44*, Beograd 1998, 157-174.
- Barjaktarović, R. Mirko, Sudbina odseljenih Srba u Ukrajini, *Zbornik radova SANU, Nova serija, Etnografski institut knj. 5*, Beograd 1971, 139-150.
- Čizmić, Ivan, Neke bitne karakteristike jugoslovenskog iseljeničtva, (1945-1975), *Seobe Srba nekad i sad*, Beograd 1990, 93-103.
- Davidov, Dinko, *Kulturna istorija Srba u Mađarskoj*, Multimedijalna publikacija (kompakt-disk), Beograd-Budimpešta 1998.
- Dnevnik Save Tekelije, besmrtnog blagodatelja naroda srpskog, vođen u Beču 1795-1797*, Novi Sad 1992.
- Drljača, Dušan, Iseljenički početak i kraj Srbina iz Like, Nikola Obradović (1898-1993), *Zadužbina g.VI, broj 23*, Beograd 1993, s. 14.
- Filipović, S. Milenko, *Srbi u Rusiji*, Beograd 1947 (rukopis).
- Gaćinović-Šotra, Milena, *Videnja - iz iseljeničkog života u Americi*, Beograd 1990.
- Gvozdenović, Slavomir, *U kući sa ognjem i ledom*, Beograd 1996.
- Jakšić, Ivan, Srbi u Stolnom Beograd, *Prilozi i građa Vojvodanskog muzeja 2*, Novi Sad, 1962.
- Krstić, Branislav, *Kod Belog breška i oko njega*, Bukarešta 1987.
- Lastić, Ljubomir, Čobanac - selo lepog, romantičnog predela, *Narodni kalendar 1989*, Budimpešta 1989, 140-144.
- Lastić, Ljubomir, Crtica iz života Srba u ovom stoleću, *Narodni kalendar 1900*, Budimpešta 1990, 168-174.
- Lastić, S. Svetozar, Autobiografske beleške jereja Svetozara S. Lastića, *Životopis 4*, Beograd 1997.
- Milanović, Milena, Srbi u svetu - *Ko je ko '96*, Beograd 1998.
- Milin, Miodrag, *Vekovima (Iz istorije srpsko-rumunskih odnosa)*, Temišvar 1995.
- Obradović, Dositej, *Život i priključenija - autobiografija*, Beograd 1892.
- Stepanov, Milan, *Mauzolej*, Beograd 1998.
- Stepanov, Radovan, Život oca Radovana - prote mohačkog, *Životopis 3*, Beograd 1994.
- Stepanović, Predrag, O govoru Srba u Čobancu, *Sentandrejski zbornik 1*, Beograd 1987, 19-26.
- Terzin, Lazar, Narodni običaji pravoslavnih Srba u Mađarskoj, *Sentandrejski zbornik 1*, Beograd 1987, 346-386.

Tomić, Mile, *Po dunavskoj klisuri*, Bukarešta 1989.

Vujičić, Stojan, *Srbi u Budimu i Pešti*, Budimpešta 1997.

Vujičić, Tihomir, *Muzičke tradicije Južnih Slovena u Mađarskoj*, Budimpešta 1978.

Vukelić, Ivošević-Sara, *Životopis 1*, Beograd 1992.

*SUMMARY EMINENT SERBIAN INTELLECTUALS
IN NEIGHBOURING COUNTRIES*

Serbian intellectuals in Hungary and in Romania in past and present. The contribution of Serbian and Serbo-Cincar intellectuals in Hungary (S. Takelija, J. S. Popović, E. Dunča; the works of Vujičić, Stepanov, Lastić), as well as those in Romania (D. Adam, S. Bugarski, M. Milin, M. Tomić and others), to the development of Serbo-Hungarian and Serbo-Romanian ethnic relations.

Do Louisa Adamiča čutim stanovsko solidarnost kot ženska, ki skuša pisati v tujejezičnem okolju, in tudi prijateljstvo, ki ga čutim kot Slovenka do Slovencev na tujih tleh.

Priznati moram, da njegovo literaturo slabo poznam. Nikoli me ni zanimal kot slovenski pisatelj, ker ni pisal v slovenščini, kot ameriški pisatelj pa mi tudi ni vzbudil pozornosti.

Adamič me sili razmišljati o EKSISTENCI Slovencev. Do zdaj smo poznali boj za obstanek, asimilacijo v tuje kulture, zdaj pa doživljamo nekakšno izhlapevanje, izkopernevanje na domačih tleh - v mislih imam evropeizacijo in globalizacijo. Adamič priča o življenju in smrti slovenskega jezika in neposredno torej tudi o preživetju slovenskega naroda.

Kot pisateljica v tujejezičnem okolju sem najprej morala doživeti NIČ, vendar sem prestala krizo in se iz nje izvlekla z VEČ, kot bi lahko naredila iz sebe, če bi ostala doma. Skušala se bom osredotočiti okrog te poante.

Adamič je pisal v angleščini, pa je naredil samomor. Ludve Potokar, ki je živel v Kanadi in je pisal ali vsaj želel pisati v slovenščini, je tudi naredil samomor. Vitomil Zupan, ki je istočasno živel v Sloveniji, šel skozi vso mizerijo v političnem in kulturnem smislu, bil zaprt in porinjen na rob, pa ni naredil samomora, temveč je divje pisal in se kljub boleznim in političnim in pisateljskim razočarnajem oklepal življenja kot alpinist skale. Te tri usode zgovorno pričajo, da nas v temelju določa jezik, da v nobenem drugem jeziku ne moremo biti kreativni, da pisatelj lahko živi in dela samo v svojem jezikovnem svetu, pa naj bo ta še bolj politično »zonegavljen«, in da Slovencev ne bo več, ko se bomo asimilirali v Evropo. Te tri usode me zanimajo predvsem zato, ker sem ali vsaj skušam biti pisatelj, živim zunaj in so mi Adamičeve in Potokarjeve dileme znane, domov pa prihajam zadosti pogosto, da vzdržujem stik, ki ga Adamič in Potokar nista imela, stik s pisatelji, ki še zdaj vitalno, zagrizeno, angažirano dokazujejo, da je status pisatelja vrhunski status, ki si ga lahko Slovenec s svojim delom pridobi.

V stari Grčiji jezik ni bil v nevarnosti, niso se še zavedali, da lahko barbarstvo premaga elitnost. Grki so bili filozofi, njihovi učenci so imeli atletske telo in atletske um. V Rimu so bili na višku vojskovodje. Srednji vek je bilo brezno, ki je pogoltnilo vsako živo, novo misel. V renesančni Evropi so odnose med ljudmi razkrivali slikarji, ki so s prizori iz Svetega pisma poslikali cerkve. Šele ko so v razsvetljenstvu ljudje začeli sami brati, zapisovati žive jezike, se je razbohotila poezija.

Kot Slovenci smo bodisi opismeni ali pa ne. Ni zadosti, da imamo jezik, imeti moramo pesniški jezik. Srednje poti ni. Začeli smo, zdaj lahko nadaljujemo ali odnehamo. Če obstanemo, se vderemo v tla.

Ko sem prenehala pisati in prihajati v Slovenijo, mi je vsiljivo misel na samomor

odgnal ponovni stik s pisatelji. V časih Adamiča in Potokarja ljudje doma niso zaupali Slovencem v tujini. Ni bilo dobro dobivati pošte iz inozemstva. Mladi Gregor Strniša je bil samo zato, ker je prišel na obisk neki stric iz zamejstva, poslan na prisilno delo. Govorilo se je o emigrantskem tisku. Vsi, ki so v zamejstvu objavljali, so bili sumljivi. Jaz sem bila na srečo v stiku s pisatelji, ki so napisali osnutek prve slovenske ustave in pripravili vse potrebno za demokracijo. Govorim o Rudiju Šeligu, Niku Grafenauerju, Danetu Zajcu, o krogu Nove revije v zadnjih petnajstih letih. Adamič ni imel nikogar takih dimenzij, Potokar tudi ne. V petdesetih letih je bilo Društvo slovenskih pisateljev marionetno prizorošče socialrealističnega kulturnega programa. Stik s pisatelji v tujini so držali predvsem špijoni. Mislim, da je bilo tako vse do časov, ko je predsedniško mesto sprejel Dane Zajc.

Konec osemdesetih let, ko sem jaz začela iskati stike, je bilo najhujše že mimo, opozicija že establišana. Slovenski pisatelji so trmoglavili, ustanavljali nove revije. Režimovci so jih zasliševali, poniževali, akademsko onemogočali, nekatere celo zaprli.

Pisatelj nikoli ne piše ZA PREDAL, tudi če ve, da bo večina njegovega pisanja ostala v predalu. Adamič je pisal v angleščini, da je lahko spravil svoje misli v tisk, nenehno si je prizadeval vzdrževati stike z Jugoslavijo. Potokar je pošiljal svoje novele po svetu, si prizadeval ustanoviti literarno revijo v inozemstvu. Zupan se je trmasto pogajal z založniki, trideset let čakal na objavo prvih romanov, pristal celo na psevdonom, kar je ultimatni dokaz, da je pisatelju tekst važnejši kot podpis.

Država je NAJVEČ, kar smo kdaj dosegli. Praktično VSE. Hkrati pa vstopamo v Evropo in se torej vključujemo v večjo državo. Podobno kot so se naši izseljenci v tuje svetove. Med izseljenci sem prvič slišala izraz KULTURNI SAMOMOR. Lahko se zgodi, da bomo doma začutili kolektivni kulturni samomor. Podobno se piše vsem majhnim narodom, ki trkajo na vrata Evrope.

Nekateri slovenski pisatelji že izdajajo dvojezične knjige. Rokopise pošiljajo najprej prevajalcem. Niti ne pišejo več za »domači trg«. Hočejo biti del svetovnega pesniškega gibanja. Iz lastnih izkušenj vem, da lahko zunaj nastopamo samo etnografsko, v tradicijo večjih narodov ne bomo nikoli vključeni, nimamo jim kaj povedati boljše, kot si znajo povedati sami. Naše stiske majhnosti in odrinjenosti na vzhodni rob Evrope in zahodni rob Balkana ostale Evropejce zanimajo toliko kot viki in kriki afriških plemen, ki so številčno večja od nas in je naša deželica v primeri z njihovo kot otroški peskovnik v arabski puščavi. Naši skromni začetniki knjižnega jezika in naši vrhunski mojstri so pomembni SAMO za nas!

Status samostojnega naroda smo morali izsiliti. Najprej z več stoletno tlako, pokorščino, ponižnostjo, pa z ravno toliko sto let staro trmo, odporom in izražanjem gneva nad svojim položajem v Evropi. Staro geslo »le vkup, le vkup, uboga gmajna« izraža našo temeljno naravo: zadosti nas je za upor! Nenehno smo upali, da se nam bojo »časi zjasnili«. Upali, pa NE pasivno! To dokazuje protifašistično gibanje. Če bi samo upali, bi Hitler zmagal! Petdeset let kasneje smo tvegali bombardiranje Ljubljane. Srbskim generalom smo samostojnost praktično izpulili iz tankovskih cevi. Takoj potem smo žal naredili nekaj napak. Sami smo si uredili tako demokracijo, ki nas golta od znotraj kot trakulja, probleme pometamo pod prag. Silimo v drugačen samomor. Ne ubijamo SAMO sebe, temveč tudi prihodnost svojih otrok. Detemorisstvo je pogosto tema naših ljudskih pesmi. Ali je v naši naravi?

Kaj nas določa? Potice, ljubezen do gora, narodna dediščina – vse to je folklorno, neobvezujoče. Domotožno, sterilno. Bolj me zanima STRAH pred prihodnostjo. Samo ta nas angažira, vse drugo nam poje uspavanke in pogrebnice.

Tudi tisti Slovenci so Slovenci, ki še niso bili na Triglavu. Vsi Slovenci ne govorijo slovensko, slovensko se lahko naučijo tudi tujci. Po čem vem, da sem Slovenka? Če gola ležim na plaži ali če plezam na Mt. Everest, po čem sem prepoznavna? Oči? Barva kože? Čevapčiči, pleskavica, baklava, ribe na dalmatinski način, škampi v buzari – to je Portorož. Po čem je slovenski?

Slovenka sem, ker ČUTIM slovensko. To, kar čutim, pa lahko samo v svojem jeziku izrazim. Ne hrepenim po potici in alpski poskočnici, temveč po ljudeh, ki jih imam rada. Vzljubiti sem sposobna samo v Sloveniji. Slovenskim ljubimcem mi čutne govornice ni treba prevajati. Ne gre samo za besede, kriki in vzkliki, renčanja, mrmranja, gruljenja, smeh – vse to znam samo po slovensko.

Louis Adamič je pisal v angleščini. V starih časih se je večina odločala za tuje jezike, po domače so klatili samo neizobraženci. Prešeren je pisal v nemščini in v slovenščini. Če bi na Dunaju damam v nemščini sonetne vence zlagal, bi ga katera uslišala. Tudi advokat bi postal prej kot tik pred smrtjo. Pa se je vrnil na Kranjsko. Izbral je revščino, osamljenost. V zameno za ČUTENJE. Življenje si je samo uničil, ni si ga vzel.

Nekateri so si takrat začeli izmišljevati ilirščino, nekakšno panslovanščino. Na našo srečo si slovenščine niso prisvojili kmetavzarji, ozkosrčneži in potuhnjenci, temveč elitni intelektualci, kot na primer Janez Svetokriški, Primož Trubar, Jurij Dalmatin, Valentin Vodnik, France Prešeren, Matija Čop, Andrej Smole. Srbščina je pustila globok pečat. Naivni esperanto je bila muha enodnevnica. Zadnje čase pa se mnogi spet odpovedujejo slovenščini. Trgovine, delavnice in podjetja že razobešajo tuja imena. Mene sprašujejo, zakaj pravim, da sem lončar. Menijo, da biti keramičar pomeni več.

Prešeren je samo v slovenskem jezikovnem okolju lahko slovensko pisal. To poudarjam, ker se je tolikokrat že pokazalo, kako pisatelji v tujini ne morejo kreativno razmišljati. Njihovo pisanje se mi zdi s pajčevinami prepreženo, ideološko tendenčno, kvazinatURALISTIČNO zaplankano... brez utripa, kalno, postano... plesnive kisle kumarice. To upam napisati, ker sebe nikakor ne izključujem. Vse te lastnosti sem najprej opazila pri sebi, šele kasneje se mi je pokazalo, da gre za splošen izseljenski problem.

Zgodba o Adamiču ponazarja usodo Slovenca v svetu. Tisti hip, ko smo samostojen narod, smo vsi Slovenci v svetu. Prej smo bili Slovenci v rimski Emoni, v francoski Iliriji, v Avstroogrski in v Kraljevini SHS, v Jugoslaviji. Čas bo pokazal, kako se bomo upirali prisilnemu jopiču, ki nam ga že natika Evropa.

Kaj sploh je ASIMILACIJA? Ko otrok pokuka iz maternice, se asimilira v novo okolje. Če nekomu rečemo, da se je dobro znašel, mu to štejemo v dobro – a samo, če se je dobro znašel doma. Če se je kakorkoli znašel v tujini, rečemo, da se je prodal. Zakaj govorimo o asimilaciji Slovencev v tujini kot o nečem sramotnem?

Brez asimilacije ne gre. Samo znosno/neznosno, poniževalno/častno, uporniško/ritolizniško... to so antipodi. Ko odideš v tujino, si nepreklicno Slovenec v tujini, življenje se ti čez noč spremeni, domov greš samo še na obisk. Starec se vrneš umret.

Šola slovenskega jezika ima v Londonu kakšen ducat ali dva učencev. Sramotno je, če ne hodijo, mazohistično je, če hodijo. Mati, ki ne zmore voziti otrok v slovensko šolo, se nenehno in vsem opravičuje. Če ne boš otrok naučila slovensko, si slaba mati. Že sam izraz »materinščina« je politično nekorekten. Ali ni boljše podedovati »očetnjavo«! Po drugi strani pa vsaka mater ve, da bo otroku bolj koristilo, če ga bo poslala na tečaj japonščine. Slovenščino bo rabil samo na počitnicah. Moje zdravilo proti tej ženski izseljenski bolezni je bilo, da nimam otrok.

Zelo moderno je govoriti o sožitju narodov, o ohranjanju posebnosti. V Kanadi in Ameriki namesto bratstva in edinstva pravijo »diferences unite« – različnosti združujejo. Jaz pa pravim, da nikoli ne bo Slovenka bosanskega rodu v širokih hlačah učila slovenščine v Kamniku, tako kot Arabka s črnim pregrinjalom z zarezi za oči ne bo postala kirurginja v Milanu. Ženska ne bo nikoli papež, moški nikoli mama. Pika amen.

Ali ne bi bilo lepo, če bi bili vsi skupaj! Le vkup, le vkup...! Koliko močnejši bi bili! Kaj pa bi bilo, če bi se vsi Slovenci nenadoma res vrnili v Slovenijo? Poglejte si Izrael! Potem bi mogoče lahko izvedli celo kakšno invazijo! Kaj če bi se vrnili tudi nepriznani otroci? V tujini živijo tudi Slovenci, ki so potrebni socialne pomoči, ki so fizično pohabljeni, duševno bolni ali pa imajo neozdravljive bolezni. Lahko pride celo kakšen Slovenec, ki ima Aids, sifilis ali tuberkulozo. Lahko tudi kakšen morilec! Kar tam naj ostanejo! Vrnejo naj se samo bogate in stare in zdrave tete iz Amerike! Zmeraj lahko stlačimo še kakšno v družinsko grobnico. Slovenske banke in zavarovalnice imajo zelo ugodne pakete za izseljence, ki se vračajo v domovino. Verjetno tudi cerkev pristavi svoj piskerček.

Po drugi svetovni vojni sta si Churchill in Stalin delila Evropo. Churchill je pobral smetano, za Trst mu je bilo že vseeno, za Berlin je barantal. Kdo pa pravi, da se po združitvi ne more zgoditi ponovno razkosanje Evrope! Bodimo brez skrbi! Naslednjici nas ne bo več na zemljevidu. V Evropi bomo Slovenci samo etnografska posebnost v alpsko-medetiranski provinci. Takrat bomo samo še lastniki vaških kajžic in predmestij, slovensko bomo govorili samo še v Klubu Nove revije. Ob evropskih praznikih nas bojo oblekli v narodne noše. Jodlali bomo skupaj s Švicarji in Avstrijci. Vsi bomo imeli evropske potne liste. In zvonce okrog vratu – ali pa majceno tetovirano številko. Izvirne literature že zdaj tiskamo zmeraj manj, otroke že pošiljamo v evropske gimnazije in na študij v tujino, prepuščamo jih internetu in kabelski televiziji.

Na letošnjem festivalu vzhodnoevropske kulture v Londonu je neka ameriška poznavalka izjavila, da so vsi intelektualci preddemokratskega obdobja, tako tisti, ki so sodelovali s komunističnimi režimi, kot tisti, ki so bili v opoziciji, ob padcu berlinskega zidu zgubili kredibiliteto. Zgodovina je igra domin. Postaviš jih drugo za drugo, potem pa jih podereš in začneš od začetka. Ali je bil torej Svetokriški norec, ker je vaškim babam tako pridigal, da so ga razumele, ali je bil Trubar bedak, ker je menil, da mora raja znati brati, ali je bil Vodnik usekan, ker se je lotil kmete razsvetljevat? Ali so vsi, ki so po slovensko čutili in pisali in živeli vse do pisateljske ustave pred desetimi leti, vse to počeli v svoj lasten nečimeren ponos? Kaj pa delajo pisatelji zdaj? Prešeren, Cankar, Murn, Kosovel, Gregorčič, Zupan, Kovačič, Strniša, Smole, Zajc, Kovič Grafenauer, Šeligo... Ali sem nora, ker jih občudujem! Ali naj bom ponosna na kakega Schuscharburgerja, Zihiyevicha, Monperreja ali Brezovca, ki bojo vsak čas začeli pisati v angleško evropskem dialektu? Ali si lahko prdstavljate, da vaš otrok ne pozna Cicibana, Muče Copatarice, Pedenjpeda, Bele mačice, Kosovirjev? Naivno vprašanje! Naše profitograbežne založbe že tiskajo ekspres prevode angloameriških strip-uspešnic.

Ali pa bo preprosto izumrlo občudovanje kot tako! Postali bomo hladnosrčni, ohlapnoudi. Tako kot izumira gentelmenstvo, pogovor iz oči v oči, pisanje pisem, topla beseda, ljubljenje v zadnji vrsti kinodvorane. Brali bomo samo še informacije v inernacionalnih kodiranih impulzih.

Leta 1951 je Adamič naredil samomor. Recimo, da je res. Morda je bil ubit. Bil je samo nekaj let starejši, kot sem jaz zdaj. Pravijo, da se je ubil zaradi razočaranja in strahu pred prihodnostjo. V petdesetih letih je titoizem v Jugoslaviji že pokazal svoj pravi obraz.

Mnogi so vračali rdeče knjižice. Avtocenzura je dobila epidemične razsežnosti. Če so se do konca druge svetovne vojne Slovenci delili na rdeče in bele, so se potem razdelili na vohljače in ovohance. Vohljači so spretni. Zdaj jim diši demokracija, takoj so si jo obrnili v svojo korist, prisvajajo si jo celo. Prej so po svoje razlagali zgodovino, zdaj pa po svoje razlagajo sprotnost.

Prepričana sem, da samomor tudi danes mnogim hodi na misel. Ne samo meni. Mnogi so obupani. Mnoge je tudi sram.

Nekateri pa so še zmeraj tako trdoživi, kot je bil Vitomil Zupan. KDOR NJIM ROKE VEŽE, JE NAŠ BIRIČ.

Samo v svobodnih deželah so pisatelji lahko nepolitični. Adamič je živel v svobodni Ameriki. Ameriški pisatelji Arthur Miller, Tennessee Williams, John Steinbeck govorijo o dveh plateg medalje, zlasti o drugi. Adamič je bil življenjsko vezan na Ameriko, politično na Jugoslavijo, pisateljsko na Slovenijo. Imel je najmanj tri razloge za samomor.

Ludve Potokar se ni mogel odpovedati jeziku, ni mogel začeti pisati v angleščini. Naredil je samomor. Adamič je začel pisati šele v Ameriki, Potokar je pisal že pred odhodom. Potomci Slovencev v tujini nimajo več tako ostrih dilem. Odločajo se samo, ali bojo ob praznikih še pekli potico. V Ameriki in Kanadi je slovenščina izumrla v treh generacijah, v Argentini živi v vloženi, sterilni obliki – KOLIKO ČASA BO IZUMIRALA V EVROPI?

Čisto drugače pa je takrat doživljal svojo pisateljsko usodo Vitomil Zupan. Ni imel kaj izbirati. Literaturo je pisal izključno v slovenščini. Znal je nemško, rusko, angleško, francosko, italijansko, špansko, latinsko, grško, precej arabsko in celo kitajsko. Vojne se je aktivno udeležil kot partizan, bil tudi zaprt v Gonarsu, potem pa je bil žrtev političnih čistk. Ko je Adamič obupaval v Ameriki, je Zupan v jugoslovanskem zaporu sedem let iz minute v minuto izumljal načine, kako preživeti. V romanu Levitan je popisal nekaj drobcev iz te kalvarije. Ko sem ga osebno spoznala in se družila z njim, je bil 40 let starejši od mene, pa tega nisem opazila. Bil je zelo bolan, a brezmejno vitalen. Malodušje je premagoval s sarkazmom, s strupeno ironijo. Če je kdaj pomislil na samomor, se mu je to verjetno zdelo premalenkostno, prelahko.

Adamič je pisal v angleščini in ga tudi, če ga imamo za slovenskega pisatelja, ne moremo ocenjevati po jezikovni plati. Ko berem prevode, nikogar ne slišim govoriti izza črk. Potokar je jezikovno obstal – zdi se mi, da je živel v popolnem jezikovnem vakuumu – izhajal je iz realističnega romana s konca devetnajstega stoletja, rahlo naslonjen na Cankarja. Ko berem Zupanove romane, ga vsaka beseda diha. Tako kot so vratolomne njegove teme, tako je atletski z jezikom. Spet sem pri čutenju. Samo čisti čutni jezik lahko čutim.

Ko pišem za slovenske časopise, me lektorji trgajo kot psi. Če pišem v slovenščini, se moram in tudi hočem podrežati pravilom slovenskega knjižnega jezika. Dovolim pa si rahle odmike, nekaj igre, nekaj tipanja v temi. Vem, nalezla sem se angleščine, besede postavljam v nenavadna zaporedja, vrivajo se mi tujke, ki jim pripisujem drugačne pomenne, kot so se jih prijeli doma. Povrhu vsega se pišem Simonović. Dvakrat sem tuja. Ko se pogovarjam z lektorji, mi servirajo klišeje, ustaljene norme, tujke še zmeraj preverjajo izključno po 30 let staremu slovarju tujk. Slovenska univerza vzgaja puritanske zaplankane slaviste. Slovenščino klestijo, da jo bo lažje naložiti na tovornjak in odpeljati na pokopališče. Pravila živega jezika nam kroji akademski starec, ki se ne vozi z avtobusom, temveč z ljudovozom! Če bi bilo vse po njegovem, bi še zdaj ne znali napisati »le vkup, le vkup, uboga gmajna«. To je tujec zapisal namesto nas, saj smo bili takrat še nepismeni!

Seveda pa gre vse skupaj lahko predaleč. Neka Slovenka mi je pokazala zvezek pesmi. V tujini je že 50 let. Takole piše:

Mati in otrok

*Vsakdo, ima le eno drago mati,
kdor se zaveda, v srcu je bogati.
Da jo ljubi in predvsem spoštuje,
zadovoljstvo in sreča, nad njim varuje.*

*Ljubezen matere je kakor svetla luč,
nauki njeni, pa v bodočnost ključ.
A, kdor njene nazore, poslušati noče,
morda večkrat, obžaluje in joče.*

*In če za dobrote, ošabnost vrača,
se nekoč mu vrne, enaka plača.
Ker neve, kaj je materinska dobrota,
je v duši svoji, izgubljena sirota.*

*In če Materinsko, ljubeče srce rani,
se krivde, nikoli več obrani.
Saj materi duša, od bolečine poka,
»in vse« radi nehvaležnega otroka.*

Hudo je, ker marsikdo v tujini ne čuti več, da je s to pesmijo kaj narobe.

Sami v tujini ne znamo biti več samokritični. Znamo se samo dobrikati drug druge-
mu ali pogledati stran.

Jezik je vse, kar imamo. V Jugoslaviji smo zdržali tako dolgo, ker so nam pustili
govoriti, tiskati knjige, imeti svoje šole, časopise, televizijo. Mnogo tekstov je ostalo neob-
javljenih, prepovedanih, mnogo pisateljev je bilo obsojenih na molk, revščino, celo zapore.
V vseh kriznih trenutkih je šlo predvsem za naš jezik. Ni naključje, da so prve osnutke
ustave napisali pisatelji. Gibanje »neminljive Slovenije« v zamejstvu je bilo zgolj akadem-
sko. Samo Slovenci doma so si lahko sami ustvarili svojo državo. Tako kot samo pisatelji
doma ustvarjajo pravo slovensko literaturo.

Najprej pride domotožje, bolečina. Obžalovala sem odhod. Begala sem. Šele ko
sem nekaj naredila iz sebe v Angliji, sem začela domotožje čutiti kot LEPO bolečino.
Čutila sem VEČ, kot bi, če bi ostala doma. Domotožje me bogati in plemeniti.

Odločila sem se za študij lončarstva. Lončarim lahko molče. Začela sem opazati, da
delam posode, ki so pravzaprav slovenske, saj mi je uspelo vdahnuti vanje svoja čustvova-
nja. Posode sem začela prinašati domov. V Sloveniji sem dobila prva vznemirljiva naroči-
la, imela prve razstave, doživela pravi odziv. Šele ko sem zgradila most med jezikom in
molkom, s posodo spregovorila s Slovenci in Angleži, sem ponovno začela čutiti sloven-
skost. Misliła sem, da se bom s posodami poangležila, pa sem se s pomočjo posod vrnila
domov. Začela sem dajati nekaj, čutila sem se potrebno, da tako rečem. V Sloveniji ni lončar-
skih šol. Zdaj že sprejemam prve slovenske lončarje v izpopolnjevanje v londonski studio.

Tako, NOVO, da tako rečem, me je Niko Grafenauer pred petimi leti nagovoril, naj začnem pisati o londonski izkušnji za Novo revijo. Najprej sem bila okorna, zdaj je že lažje. Niko Grafenauer in njegovi sodelavci so me rešili kulturnega samomora. Jezik so mi namazali! Spet čutim z njimi. Spet SEM. Nebogljenost, črnogledost, obup so bili vsi po vrsti vredni izkušnje. Zdaj sem, kakršna pač sem, ravno zato, ker sem izkusila zdomstvo, vse, kar to vključuje, od občutka ničevosti do grandioznosti takih razsežnosti, kot jih v Sloveniji ni mogoče izkusiti. Ne bom odnehala, dokler bo odnehanje ali vztrajanje v mojih rokah.

Nekaj ima v predalu nočne omarice

*s tem se bom ubila ko bom stara
s tem se bom ubila ko bom stara
s tem se bom ubila ko bom stara*

s tem se bom ubila ko bom devetinsedemdesetletna

*s tem se bom ubila drugo leto
s tem se bom še letos ubila
s tem naj bi se lani ubila*

s tem sem se nameravala ubiti ko sem jih imela šele 79

SUMMARY WHEN NOTHING MEANS MORE

Ifigenija Simonovic is a writer and potter who has lived in London for twenty years. In her article for the symposium WHEN NOTHING MEANS MORE she tries to express the predicament she feels as a writer in a foreign language environment. Survival is only possible in »non-language« professions. Writing is only possible in one's own language. But language is living, a person has to hear it, read it, breathe it from day to day, or the ability to receive and express is diminished. The writer describes how after arriving in London she first had to begin with nothing, to sink down to the most basic level of survival, before she could begin building a new creative existence. She states that only after realising that there was something could she communicate to her homeland, and in writing about her »English« experience, in teaching Slovene potters, did she become aware that her life abroad had enriched her. She saved herself from the »cultural suicide« which many emigrants write about by constantly knocking at the door of home and bringing gifts: she writes poetry, prose and essays for *Nova revija*, contributes news items and book reviews to *Delo*, writes fairy tales and radio plays, appears at literary evenings all over Slovenia, and exhibits her pottery.

PROSTOR POD SONCEM, V TUJINI...

Leta 1997 je francoska mreža kanadskega radia posredovala zaporedje oddaj, ki so bile posnete na srečanju francosko pišočių avtorjev, zbranih v Belgiji. Sodelujoči povečini niso bili rojeni v francoskem okolju ali vzgajani v francoščini. Nasprotno, tema njihovih srečanj je bila ravno diaspora, ki si je za jezik izražanja izbrala francoščino. Zanimivo je bilo prepoznavati naglase, od severno-afriških ali romunskih židov do egipčanskih koptov, med katerimi so si številni za novo domovino izbrali Kanado. Vzroki za to so najbrž raznoliki, vsaj od zunaj pa se ta dežela zdi najbolj odprta za prispevke drugih, prišlekov, skorajšnjih doseljencev. Skupna ugotovitev teh intelektualcev, piscev, režiserjev, radijskih animatorjev, je bila, da fizično morda niso nikjer več doma, zato pa da so vsi zavezani jeziku, literaturi, kot prostoru, ki jim zagotavlja notranjo spodbudo, polnost in tudi posebne vrste varnost, rekla bi celo, varnost ne glede na to, v katerem jeziku se izražajo.

Dežele, kot je Kanada, so torej vsaj na videz kozmopolitske in prisiljene prepoznati veljavo doseljencev, saj prav ti »drugi« vnašajo v kulturni prostor nove zagone in novo problematiko. Še leta nazaj sta kanadsko književnost na turnejah po tujih univerzah zastopala Ondaatje in Škvorecki: po eni strani sta imela nalogo, pričati o odprtosti kanadske družbe, kulture in književnosti, po drugi strani pa sta dokazovala tudi nekakšno »revščino« v pisanju »domačinov«¹ Morda pa je na izbor obeh avtorjev za misijonarsko dejavnost v tujini še posebej vplivala tudi katera izmed književnih nagrad (prav Ondaatje se ponša s kar precejšnjim številom priznanj), s katerimi si pisci vsaj za nekaj tednov izborijo prostor na literarnih straneh časnikov, s tem pa tudi »splošno priznanje«. Kanadska vlada razen tega veliko raje po svetu pošilja ljudi, ki so se dobro izkazali v stikih z javnostjo, ki so dobri govorniki in lojalni pristaši uradne politike. Moteče se zdi to, da postajajo te literarne osebnosti »kanadski avtorji«, kar odpira svojsko (in zagotovo preobširno) vprašanje, okoli katerega je težko splesti ustrezen sklop odgovorov. Ob svoji poudarjeni in javno razglašeni naravnosti k »multikulturalizmu« in odprtosti za vse tuje Kanada namreč živi vsaj na dveh tirih. Francoska literarna Kanada ima izredno malo stikov z angleško: o obeh »osamljenostih«, ki težko prenašata nasilno sožitje in se med seboj skoraj ne poznata, sta v pogovorih za radio, predelanih v knjižno obliko, pred nekaj leti spregovorila Margaret Atwood in Victor-Lévy Beaulieu.²

¹ Ondaatje, ki prihaja iz nizozemskega govornega območja (nekdanjih kolonij v Aziji) in Škvorecki, čigar osnovni jezik ustvarjanja je češčina, oba pišeta v angleščini. V Ljubljani sta bila sredi osemdesetih let, med svojo turnejo po tedanji Jugoslaviji. Zastopala sta torej »Kanado«, čeprav ustvarjata le v enem izmed obeh uradnih jezikov. Vsaka podobnost z analognimi situacijami je zgolj naključna...

² Margaret Atwood in Victor-Lévy Beaulieu, *Two Solitudes: Conversations*. Transl. Phillis Aronoff and Howard Scott. Toronto, McClelland & Stewart, 1998. Knjiga, ki je torej ravnokar izšla v angleščini, je prevod dela *Les eux Sollicitudes: Entretiens*.

Med mlini tradicionalnih nasprotij in starih zamer se tako znajdemo še vsi mi, prišleki izpred petih, desetih, dvajsetih let, in si poskušamo izboriti ustvarjalni prostor v enem ali drugem izmed uradnih jezikov – najraje v obeh. Proti temu, se pravi naši želji, da bi presegli notranje meje v tej deželi in s tem ohranili svojo »neodvisnost«, svojo presojo o tem, kje je naš prostor, se najbolj upirajo ravno zagovorniki »narodnostne identitete«, morda bolj na strani frankofone skupnosti kakor v anglofonih krogih. V neprestani opoziciji proti prevladujoči anglosaksonski miselnosti, veliki pošasti, ki da grozi z uničenjem francosko govorečega prebivalstva, si slednje ustvarja trdne okope in za te zidove le redko zares pripušča prišleke. Znotraj province Québec se je precej ustalila miselnost, da bi bila neodvisnost imenitna rešitev za vse težave, ki so bolj kot jezikovno pogojene ekonomsko, spreobračajo pa jih v nacionalizme različnih vrst. Zanimivo je, da je Kvebečanom pogosto zelo težko dopovedati, kako niso edini, ki v tej deželi govorijo francosko, da je njihovo ločevanje od Kanade v bistvu rinjenje v še večjo manjšino vseh tistih v provincah Ontario, Novi Brunswick, ali Manitoba in Saskatchewan, ki z velikimi težavami ohranjajo francoščino kot jezik šolanja za svoje otroke, pa tudi v javnih službah, recimo pri sodnih obravnavah. Vsak občutek ogroženosti, o tem nas uči zgodovina, potegne za seboj zapiranje družbe vase, iskanje grešnih kozlov, ki so navadno »ne dovolj zavedni prišleki«, pa tudi sklicevanje na »nacionalne vrednote«. Še posebej ustvarjalci, ki se znotraj Québece odločijo za dvojezičnost, angleško in francosko, postanejo hitro »sumljivi«. Pisati strokovne članke v angleščini je dostikrat nevarna poteza za nekoga, ki bi si želel ustvariti »ime« med kolegi. Po drugi strani pa se v Združenih državah Amerike dogaja, da večina doktorskih disertacij iz francoščine, nemščine, španščine, itd., ni napisana v teh jezikih, temveč v angleščini: iz negotovosti v tesnejšem stiku s tujim jezikom, ali v prilagajanju na »uradni« žargon, v želji, da doktorat lepega dne doživi objavo, ne da bi bilo treba iskati specializirano založbo, ki se bo pripravljena spopasti še z drugimi jeziki razen angleščine. V Québecu nato objavljanje v angleščini, kadar gre recimo za francosko tematiko, prav hitro sproži mnenje, da gre za »izdajo«, da kolega poskuša »paktirati«, »koketirati« z velikim nasprotnikom.

Zunaj province Québec zna biti vzdušje še bolj zatoхло: v vsakodnevni življenju, v kupoprodajnih odnosih, je morda najlaže zamolčati svojo jezikovno pripadnost in govoriti angleško. V primeru, da nekdo spregovori francosko, najpogosteje ne bo kaj dosti dosegel. Če pa se v angleščini izgovorjeni stavek zdi obarvan malce drugače, sogovorniki ne bodo zamudili priložnosti in bodo vprašali, od kod da smo. To leti tako na frankofono prebivalstvo kakor na vse doseljene »alofone«, se pravi Kitajce, Italijane, Portugalce, Korejce – in Slovence... Morda intelektualci bolj kakor ljudje z nižjo izobrazbo opažajo to pretanjeno segregacijo. Morda se bolje od drugih zavedajo, kolikšni naporji so potrebni, da se vsi skupaj počutimo vsaj malo vključene v novo družbo. Pri tem seveda ni prav nič važno (saj to tudi nikomur ne piše na čelu), kakšna je naša izobrazba, kako dolgo smo tu in ali smo če postali kanadski državljani.

V okoljih, kjer potrebujejo specializirano delovno silo in se ne sprašujejo preveč, od kod jo bodo pritegnili, se najbrž različni doseljenci drugače mešajo med seboj. Na univerzah so problemi vsaj na videz drugače: s tem, ko številni Kitajci ali Indijci postajajo profesorji kemije, biologije ali elektronike, po eni strani pomeni, da so najpogosteje sprejeli nižjo plačo za visoko strokovno delo. Po drugi strani to dejstvo ne njim ne drugim intelektualcem ne zagotavlja, da bodo laže ohranili težko pridobljeni status. Tisti hip, ko država začne rezati subvencije visokemu šolstvu, se kakor po čudežu delovna mesta, ki so nam jih dodelili, spremenijo v kaj drugega; naših pogodb ne obnovijo, pa naj smo se še tako trudili,

da bi se držali vseh navodil in ugodili vsem zahtevam. V različnih plasteh družbenega in družabnega življenja torej veljajo isti, tržni zakoni, ki spodbujajo vedno hujši val antiintelektualizma, pravzaprav povsod v Severni Ameriki. Prisotnost intelektualcev v družbi, na kakršno smo vajeni v Sloveniji, bi tu zelo težko pričakovali. Univerzitetni profesor nima skoraj nikakršne veljave ali ugleda, prej ali slej je družbena nuja, saj je še vedno veliko ljudi, za katere je univerzitetna diploma samo neizogibni potni list za vstop na delovno tržišče. Tako si večina intelektualcev, govorim o univerzitetnih profesorjih, ne išče potrditve za svoje delo v stiku z javnostjo, saj ta pričakuje od univerze, da se obnaša vljudno in prizanesljivo do svojih »strank«, se pravi študentov, ki skupaj s starši ponavljajo, da plačujejo šolnino in zato lahko pričakujejo dobre ocene in najboljše pogoje za najlažjo pridobitev diplome. Kolegi, ki recimo poučujejo tuje jezike, se po svoje počutijo dvojno izobčene ali osamljene: daleč od province Québec se tisti, ki se ukvarjajo s francoščino, sicer lahko zatečejo v lokalno frankofono skupnost, vendar v tem primeru pristajajo na njeno »žrtvenost«, izpostavljenost, družbeno negotovost, kar vse so uradno razglašene razsežnosti na primer »frankoontarijcev« ali »frankomanitobejcev«. V Sloveniji smo recimo bili vajeni, da je univerzitetni profesor bil tudi pesnik, prevajalec, publicist. V vsej Severni Ameriki je borba za obstanek vsak dan hujša in si le redki ustvarjalci privoščijo objave, ki niso neposredno vezane na stroko in zato nimajo prave veljave v strokovnih bibliografijah. Strokovna literatura, razen v primeru, ko je naravnana politično, se pravi precej nacionalistično, je vsekakor vezana na izredno ozek krog bralcev. Knjige, ki jih pišemo in objavljamo, sicer imajo prostor na knjižnih sejmih, vendar zanimajo le zelo malo ljudi. Prav tako tovrstne objave ne naletijo na odmev v dnevnem časopisju. Anonimnost v okolju, kjer deluje vsak izmed nas, je najpogosteje velika, zato je vključevanje v mednarodno (univerzitetno) skupnost že kar vitalna potreba. Somišljeniki se povezujejo v interesne skupine, ki se od časa do časa srečujejo na mednarodnih srečanjih, nato pa komunicirajo po elektronski pošti, potem ko jih vrtnec popravljanja testov in pripravljanja predavanj potegne vase in so najpogosteje za skoraj ves semester do vratu in vsakodnevnih opravilih. Ta opravila sicer jemljejo veliko časa in energije, zagotavljajo pa najpogosteje precejšnjo izoliranost, ko je v neprestanem stiku s študenti ves čas treba paziti na »primerno izražanje«, ko tudi znotraj institucije velja miselnost, da je treba budno bdeti nad tem, kakšno podobo bomo ustvarili o sebi, ker se že najmanjši konflikt lahko obrne proti nam, ko smo na vrsti za oceno svojega dela - in ni malo šol, kjer različne komisije kolege ocenjujejo vsako leto ali vsaj na dve leti. Ameriški vpliv se v Kanadi vse bolj kaže v izraziti samocenzuri v razredu in v stiku s kolegi in administracijo. Univerza je vse kaj drugega od tistega, v kar smo verjeli morda povsod v Evropi, zagotovo pa v Sloveniji, čeprav tudi »doma« ni bilo vse najlepše urejeno in so skrb za posredovanje kar največjega znanja odrinjala na stran različno pogojena trenja. Kljub temu je za osnovno vrednoto najbrž še vedno veljalo širjenje obzorij, seznanjanje z novimi informacijami in preseganje ustaljenih okvirov. V Ameriki, se pravi tudi v Kanadi, so te vrednote morda zapisane v uradnih izjavah univerz, vendar v praksi veliko bolj prevladuje učenje za izpit, ožanje tematike na najmanjšo močno mero in nižanje intelektualne ravni v razredu. Največkrat ta pravila igre prevladujejo v študiju do diplome, nato pa vsaj v »zahtevnih« strokah, na primer v medicini, v podiplomskem študiju prihaja do preobrata, do velike zahtevnosti in težkega dela. Nepisanih pravil o tem, kako naj bi se profesorji znašli v tovrstnem okolju, je zagotovo veliko, vendar jih novim kolegom nihče zares ne prinese na pladnju. Prilagajanje, vsekakor nujno, je naporno in se nekako ne neha, morda zato, ker je pri doseljencih pregloboko zasidrana drugačna miselnost in jih srečeva-

nje s stvarnostjo v novem okolju neprestano navdaja z osuplostjo ali nejevero. Menda se med doseljenci najboljše znajdejo tisti, ki so se šolali vsaj v Severni Ameriki, če že ne posebej v Kanadi.

Poglejmo si primer univerzitetne profesorice, ki se je šolala v Evropi in se želi »uspešno« prebiti, uveljaviti v novem okolju (dovoljujem si, za spremembo, uporabiti žensko obliko za predstavitev nečesa, kar se kaže kot precej tipičen pojav). Univerza, kjer ima možnost delovati, jo pogosto povabi k sodelovanju ravno zato, ker ima »evropsko ozadje«, se pravi široko znanje, kar pomeni, da ni ozko specializirana in da lahko predava izredno veliko »predmetov«. V razredu pogosto velja za »zahtevno«, ker da prinaša preveliko količino informacij, ker da ni dovolj »strukturirana« (se pravi, da ne narekuje gradiva kot v srednji šoli, in tudi, da uporablja »težke« besede in govori »prehitro«...). Konec vsakega semestra študentje ocenjujejo sposobnosti svojih učiteljev. Debat o tem, ali zares znajo oceniti razsežnosti pouka pri tej ali oni profesorici, je veliko, vendar standardni obrazci še vedno ostajajo v veljavi (ali profesor dobro pripravlja predavanja? - in tudi: ali zna motivirati študente? ali ocenjuje pravično?) in jih institucija uporabi proti svojim profesoricam, kadar ji to ustreza. Se pravi, da povsem javno pristaja na ožanje znanja pri bodočih diplomirancih, po drugi strani pa od profesoric zahteva kar najvišjo »znanstveno« raven strokovnih člankov. Kako opredeliti »znanstvenost« članka o literarnem delu je seveda kočljivo, razen če pisce strokovnih besedil in njihovi ocenjevalci pristajajo na menjajočo se modo: v tem primeru bi pred nekaj leti bil »znanstven« članek, ki bi se naslanjal na Foucaulta, danes pa članek, ki bi za edino veljavni pristop razglašal Derridajevo dekonstrukcijo.³

Tako se za našo profesorico največkrat zdi lažje uiti iz začaranega kroga dvojnih meril na domači instituciji in se povezati s kolegi, ki delujejo v isto smer in si tudi sami želijo nekoliko drugačnih oblik sodelovanja. S svetovnim elektronskim spletom danes ni težko izvedeti, kdo bi znal biti blizu naši usmeritvi. Brez objav v strokovnih časopisih skorajda ne gre, ker so prav članki nekakšna osebna izkaznica za prepoznavanje in navezovanje stikov. Zelo težko je vnaprej predvideti, kdaj bo dosežena kritična masa, ko bo v etru dovolj naših misli in bomo pritegnili druge. Vendar se v hipu, ko pride do tovrstne zgostitve, pojavljajo iniciative za oblikovanje zbornikov, za skupinske objave. Veliko kolegic in kolegov je očitno dojelo nujnost skupnega dela, ki zagotavlja večjo udarnost in poglobljanje vezi. To pomeni skoraj obvezno pristajanje na večjezičnost in na iskanje mednarodnih kanalov. Pri skupnih objavah, ki pogosto jemljejo celo več časa kakor samostojno delo, prihaja do zanimivih sprememb v paradigmah sodelovanja: ena ali več oseb prevzame vodstvo projekta, vendar ni hierarhije in vsiljevanja mnenja. Boljši kot bo prispevek vsake posameznice, boljša bo lahko celota, in skupinsko zorenje, skupna gradnja idej, medsebojno dopolnjevanje, imajo čar, ki ga institucije morda še ne sprejemajo v celoti, ker tovrstno delo v resnici presega individualistično zapiranje za lastne zidove in zna zamajati temeljne vrednote intelektualnega dela, se pravi vere v svojo izvirnost, v svojo edinstvenost. Povezovanje v raziskovalne skupine in skupinsko objavljanje tako omogoča preskok, ko več

³ Michel Foucault in Jacques Derrida sta najizrazitejša primera skoraj kulturne in nekritične zavezanosti »enemu samemu Bogu«: takoj ko se subtilno začne uveljavljati nova imponirajoča osebnost ali miselnost, vse tiste, ki so imele veljavo pred tem, nujno umaknejo na stranski tir. Poleg dekonstrukcije je ena izmed vodilnih usmeritev v literarni vedi postkolonializem, ki bi nedvorno lahko v marsičem obogatilo pojmovanje literature iz doslej neznanih območij, vendar na žalost vse prepogosto zahaja v šablonsko politiziranje.

sodelujočih pokaže več zornih kotov iste problematike, kar pomeni združevanje namesto ločevanja, iskanje skupnih imenovalcev namesto grobe konkurence.⁴

Tako torej naša profesorica na svoji koži občuti proces mondializacije in nujnost skoraj enakovrednega izražanja v nekaj jezikih, pri čemer je domači jezik potisnjen ob stran in največkrat ostane le še za privatno rabo. Vendar se prav zaradi grobega okolja, izredno zahtevnih delovnih pogojev in skorajda nasilnosti v odnosih, veliko doseljencev še vedno najraje družijo z ljudmi iz svoje dežele, ali pa si ustvarjajo krog znancev in prijateljev med pripadniki drugih etnij. Dovolj značilen je pojav, ki ga je mogoče zaslediti praktično v vseh deželah, kjer je imigracija močna: veliko lažje je navezati stike s prišleki kakor pa z »domačini«, čeprav so ti, tako kakor v Kanadi, morda prišli na novo celino šele eno ali dve generaciji nazaj.

Poudarjam povezovanje doseljenih intelektualcev v mednarodne skupine, kar zagotavlja vsaj delno občutek svobode, obenem pa prinaša valorizacijo, ki je ožji krogi morda niso pripravljene nuditi. Zanimivo pa si je pogledati stike slovenske intelektualke v slovenskih izseljenskih krogih in možnost za notranji razvoj ali intelektualno zapolnitev v svojem jeziku.

V glavnem se zdi, da v tujini srečujemo tri kategorije Slovencev. Precej je takih, ki želijo skoraj z obema nogama ostati zakoreninjene na oni strani, čeprav živijo tu: navadno njihovo bivanje zaznamuje tradicionalizem, z veliko vlogo cerkve, ki podpira patriarhalne vrednote, vezanost na družino in delitev nalog na »moške« in »ženske«. Ker jih še vedno vleče v domovino, čeprav bi se najbrž težko zares in dokončno vrnili v Slovenijo, se povezujejo v slovenska društva in po svoje poskušajo vplivati na politično sliko na drugi strani oceana. po svoje želijo biti bolj slovenski od Slovencev doma, in vendar je jezik, ki ga govorijo, že postal mešanica slovenščine in angleščine.

Ta vrsta ljudi po moji presoji najzvesteje ohranja »veseliško kulturo« piva, polk in valčkov, z nekaj folklornimi dodatki, slovensko mašo in govori ob posebnih priložnostih, kjer vsi po vrsti poudarjajo svojo pripadnost »narodu«, »rodu«, »domovini«. Ohranja torej kulturo, kjer je znamenje narodne zavednosti, če nekdo pomaga vrteti raženj z odojkom, brisati posodo, polniti krožnike s krompirjevo solato in streči pijačo v katerem izmed številnih (in nemalokrat med seboj skreganih) društev. Kjer je še dodatno znamenje lojalnosti, se pravi taiste »zavednosti«, če vsi sprejemajo z največjo dozo nekritičnosti prav vse, kar se dogaja po »kulturni« plati, če torej nihče ne problematizira dejavnosti ali ne poskuša česa premakniti. Pri tem pa vsi, tudi tisti, ki jim ni bila vseč ne prejšnja ne sedanja domovina, in oni, ki so prišli v Kanado prepozno in so torej produkt »rdeče oblasti«, prikimavajo pamfletom o enotnosti, povezanosti med društvi v Kanadi - in povezanosti z domovino... –

⁴ O tem vsekakor govorim iz svoje izkušnje, pogojene z željo, da preverim, koliko ljudi v krogih, ki jih poznam, misli podobno kakor jaz. Predvsem je bilo zanimivo delo v teamskem urejanju knjig, kjer je bilo enako pomembno, kako povezati skupne ideje in obenem uspešno sodelovati. Na ta način, upam vsaj, so skupine, ki sem jih povezala ali so me pritegnile k sodelovanju, spet vnesle človeško razsežnost v poklic, ki postaja na žalost vse manj človeški. Dovoljujem si navesti naslove svojih objav:

Mythes dans la littérature contemporaine d'expression française, Ottawa, Nordir, 1994;

Réécriture des mythes: l'utopie au féminin, Amsterdam/Atlanta, GA, Rodopi, 1997 (skupaj z Joëlle Cauville);

»Orphée et Eurydice : mythes en mutation«, *Religiologiques*, no 15, printemps 1997;

Le Mal dans l'imaginaire littéraire français (1850-1950), Orléans, Les Éditions David; Paris, Les Éditions L'Harmattan, 1998 (skupaj z Myriam Watthee-Delmotte).

pri čemer vsak posameznik navezuje stike s svojimi krogi, ki nato za druge tu nato niso najbolj sprejemljivi.

Njim nasproti so tisti, ki želijo kar najhitreje postati »tukajšnji«, ki zavračajo jezik, ker ga nič v tej družbi ne valorizira in jim nasprotno daje vedeti, da so od drugod, da niso takšni kot drugi... Konflikt z matico (in tudi s starši) prihaja do izraza predvsem v drugi generaciji, saj predvsem v šolah prevladuje čredni nagon in se mladi ne želijo izolirati od okolja, v katerega bi se radi zasedrali strokovno, finančno in tudi čustveno. Najpogosteje zato skoraj ne znajo več slovensko ali recimo svojim staršem na vprašanja v slovenščini vztrajno odgovarjajo v angleščini. Navezovanje na tradicijo, na poreklo, je zato v tem kontekstu trn v peti procesu, ki se zdi »naraven«: prelivanju v maso, ki se morda še vedno razlikuje po barvi kože, vonju, oblačilom, navadam, ki pa je sprejela neoimperialistično indoktrinacijo in pristaja na asimilacijo, ker želi biti »tu in zdaj«, vključena v prevladujoče vrednote, ki jih najbolje izraža sintagma »low profile«, pretežno konzervativno, nekritično in obenem pridobitniško iskanje svojega kotička na tem prostranem kontinentu, kjer ljudje verjamejo, da jih bodo drugi pustili pri miru, če sami nikogar ne bodo nadlegovali.

V tretjo kategorijo najbrž sodijo vsi tisti, ki poskušajo ustvarjati mostove, ki so jim nacionalizmi preozki, ki se želijo uveljaviti s svojo mislijo, pa naj se izrazi v tem ali onem jeziku, čeprav je jezik prav tako pomemben in so stvari, ki jih je lažje povedati v enem in jih je težje izraziti v drugem govornem okolju. Nekakšna avtocenzura, ki deluje kot varovalni mehanizem, jim pomaga krmariti med različnimi krogi »sonarodnjakov«. Morda se prav ta kategorija najbolj zaveda nujnosti poglobljanja izraznosti v vsakem izmed uporabljenih jezikov, nujnosti izpopolnjevanja in piljenja orodja za prenašanje misli.

Prav kakor za ljudi iz drugih priseljskih okolij najbrž velja, da Slovenci in Slovenke, ki smo odšli v svet, povečini vendarle živimo tisto »vmesno«, ki ni nič več »slovensko«, »naše«, in najbrž zagotovo nikoli ne bo zares »njihovo«. Kakor bi bilo primerno, da opredelim pojem »slovenskega« in »njihovega«, tujega, mi je povsem jasno, da so opredelitve številne in da bi vsaka zase prej ko slej utesnila v kalup posameznika, ki v svojem novem okolju živi še malce drugače od sosedov, ali posameznico, ki na svoje staro okolje ne gleda tako kakor njena izseljenska skupnost. Če torej povzamem svojo misel, pomeni slovenskost v kanadskem okolju precej izrazito tradicionalno, družinsko, tudi klerikalno, predvsem pa na svoj način cenzurirano druženje v klubih, na pristavah, zgrajenih stran od mestnega vrveža, z obilico prostovoljnega dela. In ker je samo po sebi umevno, da nobeno od društev za postavitev družabnega prostora ne bo dobilo državne podpore, prihaja do zanimive mešanice poslovnosti (društva si težko privoščijo nerentabilnost) in obenem pričakovanja, naj bo vse delo zagnancev opravljeno brezplačno, spet za blagor skupnosti in za ohranjanje jezika, navad in celo kulture, kakor pogosto pravijo. Seveda človeška narava zahteva valorizacijo za vloženi trud, kar se pokaže v želji po ugledu, moči – in premoči nad drugimi, »manj gostoljubnimi«, »manj prizadevnimi«...

Morda je po vsem povedanem lažje uvideti, kam se v tem okolju vpisuje intelektualka, ki je živela v nekaj deželah, si pridobila diplome še kod drugod po svetu, ki se trudi govoriti več kakor samo svoj in pridobljeni jezik, razen tega pa živi, piše, govori, deluje ves čas v nekaj plasteh hkrati. V nekaj plasteh družbe, saj ima recimo stike z ljudmi iz različnih okolij, z različno izobrazbo; v nekaj plasteh jezikov, saj poučuje francoščino, živi v pretežno anglofonem okolju, sodeluje pa tudi v slovenski skupnosti, na način, ki se zdi primeren njej in morda nekaterim somišljenikom, ni pa odraz splošne usmeritve. S svojim obnašanjem, načinom življenja, vrednotami, po svoje moti »sonarodnjake« in jih tudi izzi-

va, saj poskuša ustvariti krhko ravnotežje nove paradigme – bivanje na več načinov hkrati. Ravno v svojem sodelovanju pri publikacijah, namenjenih izseljencem, se najlaže srečuje z raznolikostjo, toliko bolj opazno, ker je skupnost majhna in vsaka posebnost ali drugačna usmerjenost veliko bolj prihaja do izraza. Tudi njena drugačnost ima zato v tem okolju svojske razsežnosti: beseda, ki pomeni eno v njenih, recimo univerzitetnih krogih, sproža plaz odporov pri drugih. Trenja so včasih huda in razlike na videz nepremostljive: vendar je morda prav druženje s »svojimi« po svoje terapevtsko: uči veliko mero strpnosti in pomaga ostriti občutek za zaznavanje, za razumevanje narave ljudi, še posebej tistih, ki so čustveno najbrž bližji, ki kljub pritiskom okolja niso pozabili na oblike sožitja, medsebojne pomoči, srčnosti. In tedaj ni več pomembno, ali je nekdo intelektualec ali delavec, profesorica ali kuharica na veselicah...

LITERATURA

- Oeuvres citées dans »A Bord des mythes dans le vaisseau de l'écriture«
Hyvrard, Jeanne, *Les Prunes de Cythère*. Roman. Paris: Minuit, 1975.
Hyvrard, Jeanne, *Mère la mort*. Roman. Paris: Minuit, 1976.
Hyvrard, Jeanne, *La Meurtritude*. Roman. Paris: Minuit, 1977.
Hyvrard, Jeanne, *Les Doigts du figuier*. Parole. Paris: Minuit, 1977.
Hyvrard, Jeanne, *Le Corps défunt de la comédie*. Traité d'économie politique. Paris: Seuil, 1982.
Hyvrard, Jeanne, *Canal de la Toussaint*. Fresque. Paris: Des Femmes, 1986.
Hyvrard, Jeanne, *La Pensée corps*. Dictionnaire philosophique. Paris: Des Femmes, 1989.
Hyvrard, Jeanne, *La Jeune Morte en robe de dentelle*. Roman. Paris: Des Femmes, 1990.

SUMMARY A PLACE TO LIVE, ABROAD...

Intellectuals, especially writers, who belong to different diasporas, seem to primarily connect through the realms of literary, intellectual, and spiritual activities, which became their inner space of freedom and creativity, beyond boundaries of a particular language and culture. Considered to be one of the most welcoming countries to immigrant to, Canada seems to subscribe nowadays, both in anglophone and francophone settings, to the prevailing anti intellectualism, especially in humanities, which creates subtle segregation affecting mostly the newcomers. A scholar has hardly any social visibility, although universities are becoming highly competitive, placing strong demands on teachers, while often lowering their standards regarding the students. Among the most empowering options to overcome the limitations of a particular setting are communications and common activities linking kindred spirits in the academia of different countries and continents. This in-between attitude appears to be part of the new paradigm, associated with the global village concept of living and working. In this regard, connecting with immigrants from one's own country appears to be a grounding and learning experience, in terms of facing different modalities of adapting to life in a new country.

Oba, Mihael Hermann (1822-1883) in Peter Kozler ali Kosler (1824-1879) pripadata isti generaciji, oba sta bila slovenska politika, a po izvoru in rojstvu nista bila Slovenca.

Hermann se je rodil v kraju Grasdorf v župniji Sv. Andrä in Jagerberg – po revoluciji 1848 je spadal ta predel v sodni okraj Kirchbach, južno od njega pa je bil sodni okraj Cmurek (Mureck), ki je segal vse do slovenskega ozemlja.

Po študiju prava v Gradcu je služboval v različnih krajih, nazadnje kot okrajni sodnik v Gradcu. V sredo 20. Marca 1861 so se na Štajerskem začele volitve v deželni zbor, najprej v kmečki kuriji. Na Ptuju so štiri petine volilnih mož glasovale za Hermanna, ki je bil tedaj aktuar okrajnega sodišča. Izredno veliko število glasov, ki jih je dobil, priča o njegovi priljubljenosti. Slovenski kandidat, za katerega so nekateri agitirali – ali je bil to dr. Muršec iz Gradca ali kaplan Raič ali kdo drug, tega ne vemo, je podlegel. Toda še isto leto se je Hermann zavzemal za slovenske jezikovne pravice, dve leti pozneje, 16. (ali 14.) marca 1863 pa je presenetil deželni zbor z govorom, v katerem je ostro nastopil proti germanizaciji, proti frazarjenju o narodnem miru, ki ga Slovencem vsak dan priporočajo ljudje, ki imajo mir in spravo v ustih, trdoto in nemilost pa v srcih, in zahteval, da dobe ljudske šole čisto narodno podlago, v višjih šolah pa slovenščina isto veljavo kot nemščina. Govor je zbudil silno navdušenje na Slovenskem. Levstik je pisal v Napreju 10. aprila:

»Dasi je do zdaj za nas govoril samo en glas v deželnem zboru, vendar je ta glas omajal in do kórena potresnil vso štajersko zemljo, strah je zadal našim nasprotnikom, nam pa veselo upanje srečnejše prihodnosti, v kateri nam več ne bode manjkalo boriteljeva« (8,223).

Najznamenitejše delo, vredno trajnega spomina je opravil Hermann, ko je sestavil interpelacijo za Zedinjeno Slovenijo, ki jo je v ponedeljek 11. oktobra 1869 v imenu slovenskih poslancev prebral v štajerskem deželnem zboru Ivan Žuža. To je bilo precej obsežno besedilo, najbolj jasno in odločno, kar jih je bilo sestavljenih v času taborov in akcij v deželnih zbora. Interpelacija je zahtevala za Slovenijo lastno zakonodajo za pravosodje, šolstvo, bogočastje, upravo. Slovenija naj bi imela lastno vrhovno sodišče, lastno univerzo in lastne finance.

»Segamo nazaj na najstarejše zgodovinsko pravo, na naravno pravo. Spet hočemo biti, kar smo bili nekdaj, en narod, eno telo, svoboden in samostojen narod... Svoje stvari hočemo sami urejati in oskrbovati po svojih potrebah, po svojih pojnih, po svojem lastnem notranjem nagonu.« (V.300)

Pri deželnih volitvah 1870 je v nemških deželah Avstrije izredno močno naraslo število poslancev katoliške konservativne stranke. Tako je bilo tudi na Štajerskem. Na podeželju jih je bilo izvoljenih 11. Skupaj s 6 slovenskimi poslanci so dobili večino v kmečki kuriji, ki je štela 23 članov, deželni zbor v celoti pa je ohranil svojo nemško-linearlno

podbo. Hermann je bil kot zastopnik opozicije iz vrst Slovencev in nemških konservativcev izvoljen za deželnega odbornika, vendar slovenskim liberalcem ta povezava ni bila preveč všeč. Oktobra 1872 ustanovljeni državnopravni stranki (Rechtspartei) se je Hermann takoj pridružil in je bil na strani staroslovencev izvoljen 1873 v dunajski parlament. Stopil je v Hohenwartov klub, kamor so čez nekaj let prišli tudi slovenski liberalni poslanci

Vošnjak pravi, da se je Hermann slovenščine dobro naučil, dasi javnih slovenskih govorov ni rad govoril. Med njegovo korespondenco so tudi slovenska pisma. Za govore v državnem in deželnem zboru se je vestno pripravljaj, jih pisal, popravljaj in prepisoval – njegova nemščina je bila precizna in logična (142)

Deželni in državni poslanec je bil od prve izvolitve do smrti v ptujskem okraju kmečke kurije: v deželnem zboru je torej zastopal sodne okraje Ptuj in Rogatec, v državnem zboru pa razen teh še sodne okraje Šmarje, Sv. Lenart, Gornja Radgona, Ljutomer in Ormož.

Koslerji so živeli na Kočevskem v vasi Rieg, slovensko Kočevska Reka. Dvig rodbine se je začel z Johannom, rojenim 1780, ki je krošnjaril po Kočevskem, se potem odpravil po družinski tradiciji s 35 krajcarji zdoma in uspel na Dunaju, kjer je ustanovil trgovino z južnim sadjem. Obogatel je posebno med dunajskim kongresom, ko je bil baje edini trgovec s pomarančami in jih je prodajal po goldinarju. Leta 1820 je kupil ortneško gospodstvo. Dunaj, Ljubljana, Trst in Reka so bile glavne postojanke njegove trgovine. Od sinov sta Joseph (1822-1917) in Peter (1824-1879) študirala pravo, Joseph je doktoriral 1847 v Padovi, Peter pa je končal študij na Dunaju. Oba sta bila notarja v Primorju in oba sta se v šestdesetih letih posvetila gospodarstvu. Najstarejši brat je bil Johann (1819-1898). Vsem trem je bil materinski jezik nemščina, toda revolucija 1848 je vse tri navdušila za slovensko gibanje. Posebno Petra je napravila dunajska družba, v kateri sta bila Miklošič in Cigale, za aktivnega Slovenca. Pisal je dopise v različne časnike in izdal brošuro o programu levice avstrijskega državnega zbora. Znanstveno dejavnost na zemljepisnem področju mu je nasetoval Matija Vrtovc, župnik v Šentvidu pri Vipavi in pisec popularnih knjig o vinoreji, kemiji in zgodovini, ko je bil nekaj dni na Dunaju. Kozler se je lotil dela, ki je bilo resnično izredno aktualno. Program Zedinjene Slovenije je zahteval vednost o tem, do kod sega Slovenije in kje so njene jezikovne meje. Peter Kozler je začel zbirati statistično gradivo, obračal se je na prijatelje, znance in druge ljudi, zlasti župnike, da so mu pošiljali podatke. Iz vsega tega sta zrasla Zemljovid slovenske dežele in pokrajin (z vrisanimi narodnostnimi mejami) in prvi zemljepisni opis Slovenije.

Najstarejši brat Johann je bil poslanec mestnega kočevskega volilnega okraja v kranjskem deželnem zboru (1861-66, 1867-70). Pridružil se je ustavovorni stranki, ki je držala z vlado. Brat Peter je, deloma v istem času, zastopal kočevski kmečki volilni okraj (1867-1877) kot pristaš nasprotne, slovenske stranke in je bil v letih 1868-77 tudi namestnik deželnega glavarja. Bil je tudi podpredsednik Slovenske matice.

Ob začetkih modernega gospodarskega dviga Ljubljane so bili Kozlerjevi med prvimi. Pri tem začetnem dvigu so bile udeležene pretežno bolj nemško kot slovensko orientirane družine; pri slovenskih je tudi primanjkovalo kapitala. Bratov Kozlarjev pri medsebojnem gospodarskem sodelovanju niso motili različni politični pogledi. Prav tako so bili strpni tudi navzven. Sredi 60. let (10. 11. 1865) so vsi trije bratje s sestro, poročeno Obreza kot četrto, kupili ob robu Ljubljane, v Tivoliju stoječi grad Leopoldsrue – Cekinov grad, ustanovili družbo Gebrüder Kosler in sezidali pivovarno, ki je začela obratovati junija 1867. Peter je imel vodilne funkcije, je pa prvi od bratov umrl (1879). Družina se je udeleževala

tudi pri drugih podjetjih. Imela je pivovarno v Karlovcu na Hrvaškem, hotel v Banjaluki v Bosni. Ko so liberalni Slovenci ustanavljali delniško družbo Narodna tiskarna, je bil Peter podpredsednik osnovalnega odbora (1871), potem pa član prvega upravnega odbora (1872).

V Krainische Baugesellschaft sta bila na prvi skupščini maja 1873 Johann in Peter izvoljena v upravni svet in Johann je postal podpredsednik (1873-85). V Krainische Es-compte Gesellschaft pa je bil podpredsednik Peter.

Po Petrovi smrti, sredi 80. tih let (1885), je družinsko podjetje propadlo in vodilne vloge Kozlerjev v kranjskem gospodarskem razvoju je bilo konec. Pivovarno so si sicer za nekaj časa še znova pridobili, leta 1909 pa je bila preosnovana v delniško družbo Union.

Peter Kozler je bil slovenski poslanec in eden začetnikov slovenskega zemljepisja, slovenske geografske znanosti. Sorodstvo se je s porokami najbolj povezovalo z nemškim meščanstvom Ljubljane in njeni člani so tudi med obema vojnama navajali nemščino kot svoj jezik. Nemška je tudi rodbinska grobnica na ljubljanskem pokopališču.

Hermann, doma z nemškega dela Štajerske, je postal povsem slovenski politik – Kozlerji, kočevarska rodbina, se je leta 1848 navdušila za slovenstvo, pozneje pa je imela deloma slovensko deloma nemško stran. Najbrž ni odveč, da imamo pred očmi tudi take in podobne primere.

SUMMARY HERMANN AND KOZLER

The paper deals with two Slovene politicians from the 19th century, neither of whom were Slovene either by origin or by birth. The first is Mihael Hermann (1822–1883), and the other Peter Kozler or Kosler (1824–1879), both members of the same generation.

Hermann made his home in central Styria, in what was to become the judicial district of Kirchbach. After studying law in Graz he served in various towns and was the actuary of the district court in Ptuj during the first elections of the provincial assembly in March of 1861. He did not consider himself a member of the Slovene party, but was elected deputy by an overwhelming majority and against all expectations became the first representative of the Slovenes. Until his death he was a Slovene provincial and state deputy. He was the author of the most decisive interpellation for a United Slovenia (11 October 1869).

Peter Kozler made his home in the village of Kočevska Reka, in German Rieg, on territory colonized by the Germans in the Middle Ages. His mother tongue was German, and his society was in Vienna, where his studies of law turned him into an enthusiastic Slovene. During the time of the revolution of 1848 he demonstrated this through his political and scientific activities. He compiled the first map of the Slovene territory (with the borders of the nationalities drawn in) and the first geographic description of Slovenia. In the years 1866–77 he was elected by the Slovene party as deputy to the Carniolan provincial assembly, and from 1868–77 also as the deputy governor general of the province.

JAN LEGO – VERKÜNDER DER SLAWISCHEN GEGENSEITIGKEIT

In der Zeitung *Slovan* schrieb Jan Lego 1884 in seinem Beitrag:

»Die Eigenschaften aus denen der Charakter der Slowenen zusammengestellt ist, sind vor allem diese: 1. Scharfsinn, 2. Fremdenhass, 3. Offenherzigkeit und Entschlossenheit, 4. Fröhlichkeit und Liebe zum Singen, 5. Frommheit und 6. Gastfreundlichkeit.«¹

Wahrscheinlich blieb Jan Lego auch wegen dieser Eigenschaften gute 20 Jahre lang unter den Slowenen, von 1857 bis 1870. Er war einer der vielen Gebildeten im Ausland, an denen man nicht vorbeikommt, wenn man über die Intellektuellen spricht – Nichtslowenen, die in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts in Slowenien zu wirken begannen; vor allem im Zeitraum von 1850 bis 1859 ernannte die österreichische Herrschaft die Beamten in der Monarchie ganz nach ihrem Befinden. Nach Slowenien kamen damals nicht nur Beamte, sondern auch Gymnasialprofessoren, Ärzte und Juristen, insbesondere aus Tschechien. Über diese können wir nicht wie über typische Wirtschaftsflüchtlinge sprechen, denn die Regierung sandte sie auf die Posten ausserhalb ihrer Heimat, ebenso nicht wie über die slowenischen Studenten, die bis 1919 an den deutschsprachigen Universitäten studieren mussten. Zwar blieben sie im Rahmen des breiteren Vaterlandes Österreich, kamen aber in ein fremdsprachiges Umfeld. Und so mussten auch die tschechischen Beamten, Professoren und die übrigen Staatsdiener, wie die slowenischen Studenten, ihre vertraute Heimat verlassen und sich völlig neuen Verhältnissen anpassen. Obwohl die Slowenen die Neuankömmlinge zuerst nicht mit grosser Begeisterung annahmen, sie hielten sie für »Streber«, kann man aber sagen, dass sich eben einige dieser Intellektuellen aus Tschechien unter den Slowenen so gut fühlten, dass sie einfach hier blieben, einige mussten aber auf Wunsch ihrer Regierung Slowenien verlassen. Viele hatten auf die slowenischen Schüler einen solch grossen Einfluss, dass sich diese bereits in den Sechzigern des 19. Jahrhunderts entschlossen in Prag zu studieren, zwar noch nicht an den tschechischen Universitäten, jedoch im völlig slawischen Prag.

Unter diesen, mit Einschränkungen gesagt, vorläufigen Emigranten, von denen so manche blieben, erwähne ich hier nur einige: Ivan Vavrů, Professor für Leibeserziehung (zusammen mit Levstik), Gründer der ersten Terminologie des Turnens in slowenischer Sprache, der Schulleiter des Gymnasiums von Ljubljana J.N.Nečasek, der Musiker bzw. Dirigent Nedved, G.A.Lindner, der Anfangs Professor in Celje war und später als städtischer Schulaufseher sein Amt ausübte, der Gynäkologe A.Valenta, welcher von 1857 bis 1898 Oberarzt des Entbindungsheims von Ljubljana war und natürlich Jan Lego. Der letztere hatte auf die Slowenen, ähnlich wie František Palacky politischen Einfluss hatte, in der

¹ Jan Lego, *Karakteristike naroda slovenskega* (Charakteristiken des slowenischen Volkes), *Slovan*, Nr. 16, 1884, Nr. 15,

Zeit der kulturellen und politischen Flaute einen grossen kulturellen Einfluss. Das war von grosser Bedeutung für die slowenische nationale Erweckung, für die Informiertheit der Tschechen über die Slowenen, über das slowenische Land und seine Kultur, und für so manchen Slowenen in dieser Zeit, für die Steigerung des Nationalbewusstseins. Jan Lego kam im Jahre 1857, vor der Verfassungszeit nach Slowenien und blieb fast 20 Jahre. Bereits in Tschechien wirkte er als nationaler Erwecker und Kulturschaffender. So verspürte er bald, schon in der Zeit seines Aufenthalts – hauptsächlich war er Beamter in Kamnik, Ljubljana und Triest und später wieder in Ljubljana – in Slowenien eine Leere und Not an nationaler Arbeit, wie sie in Tschechien war. Aus diesem Grunde knüpfte er eine Reihe von Kontakten mit slowenischen Intellektuellen und Kulturschaffenden aber auch mit einigen Politikern, zu ihnen gehörten Fran Levstik, Anton Aškerc, Ivan Hribar, Andrej Gabršček und andere. Überall wo Jan Lego lebte, brachte er das kulturelle Leben der Slowenen in Bewegung und informierte die Tschechen über die kulturellen Verhältnisse und Ereignisse in Slowenien. Bereits im ersten Jahr, das er in Kamnik verbrachte und wo er als Kanzlei-beamter arbeitete, erlernte er schnell die slowenische Sprache, sein Lehrer war der Schulleiter des Mädchengymnasiums und spätere Redakteur des *Učiteljski tovariš*, M. Močnik, deshalb fiel es Lego nicht schwer bei Organisationen von nationalen Volksvereinen mitzuwirken, um die Slowenen zu einer aktiveren Nationalarbeit zu ermuntern.

In der Verfassungszeit dehnte sich auch in Slowenien die kulturelle und nationalerweckende Arbeit aus, man gründete Kulturvereine, man brachte Zeitungen heraus, so dass auch Lego mehr oder weniger ungestört arbeiten konnte. Sehr bald (unter anderem) erweckte er das Interesse für die slowenische Musik, was später zur Gründung der Glasbena matica führte. Charakteristisch für Lego war es auch, dass er viele seiner Pläne und Anregungen auch finanziell unterstützte, z.B. für den Preis für das beste Lied sammelte er unter Freunden Geld und übergab es Bleiweis.

Auch in Triest, wohin ihn die Regierung im Jahre 1860 wegen seiner zu grossen Hingabe bei seiner Bildungs- und nationalerweckender Arbeit versetzte und wo er die meiste Zeit mit Levstik zusammenwirkte, begann er sofort wieder mit seiner Arbeit. Bald nach seiner Ankunft gründete er den Slovansko pevsko društvo (Slawischer Gesangsverein), aus welchem sich bald darauf der Tržaška Slovenska čitalnica (Triester Slowenischer Kulturverein) entwickelte, in diesem Verein traf sich vor allem die Triester Intelligenz.

Nach der Rückkehr nach Ljubljana begann er erneut mit der Kulturarbeit jener Zeit. Er wirkte bei der Gründung des Alpenausschusses im Rahmen des Sokols mit, aus dem sich später der Slowenische Alpenverein entwickelte. Gleichzeitig war er aber auch Initiator für die Gründung der tschechischen Zweigstelle des Slowenischen Alpenvereins, was tschechische Touristen bzw. Alpinisten ermunterte in unsere Berge zu kommen. Ebenso half er bei der Gründung der Nationalbibliothek und des Dramaturgischen Vereins mit.

Eine aussergewöhnliche Rolle spielte Jan Lego bei der Erweckung der slowenischen Jugend. Seine Anregungen und Unterstützungen lagen in der Schüler- und Studentearbeit, auf dem Gebiet der nationalen Erweckung und begeisterte sie auf diese Weise für die slawische Idee. Lego half bei der Gründung von Jugendbibliotheken mit, denn er war davon überzeugt, dass gerade die Arbeit mit der Jugend, das wichtigste für die Steigerung eines nationalen Bewusstseins ist. Sein Plan war auch die Herausgabe einer Jugendzeitung, was ihm aber erst in Prag gelang, wo er dann das Blatt *Zvonček* herausbrachte und es auch die ganze Zeit finanziell grosszügig unterstützte. Er bemühte sich und tat viel für die Annäherung der tschechischen und slowenischen Schüler- und Lehrerschaft. Die slowenischen

Schüler wurden von ihm angeregt und auch finanziell unterstützt, dass sie nach Prag zum Studieren gehen konnten, obwohl zuerst an die deutsche Universität, in jener Zeit galt Prag aber bereits als eine slawische Stadt. Gleichzeitig riet er ihnen Prag auch in der Ferienzeit zu besuchen. Die Volksradikalen erinnern sich in der *Omladina* 1906 an ihn als einen »*der fürsorglichsten Väter der slowenischen Jugend*«, denn er kümmerte sich auch in Prag um die slowenischen Studenten. Als er im Jahre 1874 nach Prag zurückkehrte, sandte er für den Bedarf der Schülerschaft Bücher, Geld und geistlichen Beistand nach Slowenien. Und gerade deswegen nannten ihn die slowenischen Schüler und Studenten den »*slowenischen Konsul in Prag*«. ²

In der Zeit als Lego in Ljubljana tätig war, bemühte er sich auch das Niveau der slowenischen Lehrerschaft zu heben, seine Anregungen lagen in der grösstmöglichen Zusammenarbeit mit den tschechischen Lehrern, um sich gegenseitig über die slowenische und tschechische Literatur, über Sprache und Brauchtümer auszutauschen und auf diese Weise das Wissen zu erweitern. Einen grossen Beitrag leistete er auch bei der Organisation der slowenischen Lehrer, die im Jahre 1869 den Lehrerverein für das Krainerland gründeten und gleichzeitig begannen auch das Blatt *Učiteljski tovariš* herauszugeben. Das slowenische Schulwesen unterstützte er aber auch auf andere Weise, z. B. sandte er an die Gymnasien in Krain und Ljubljana, an die Volksschulen in Krain und Postojna Mineralsammlungen aus Tschechien und an die höhere Mädchenschule in Ljubljana tschechische Bücher. Die grösste Bedeutung hat aber Legos Schriftwechsel mit den tschechischen Blättern und das Informieren der Tschechen über die slowenischen Verhältnisse. Ebenso entnahm er aus den tschechischen Zeitungen Informationsartikel über Tschechien und veröffentlichte sie in den Bleiweisove *Novice*, womit er erneut das Interesse der Slowenen für den Slawismus und die slawische Idee erweckte. Durch Legos Initiative bekamen die Slowenen im Jahre 1862 die erste Übersetzung tschechischer Literatur, Levstiks Übersetzungswerk von Božena Nemcova *Babica*.

1874 kehrte Jan Lego nach Prag zurück, blieb aber geistig bei den Slowenen. Obwohl er im Museum arbeitete, informierte er weiterhin die tschechischen Leser über die Slowenen, die slowenische Literatur und die kulturellen und politischen Ereignisse. Am aktivsten wirkte er für die Solidarität zwischen beiden Völkern und gründete zu diesem Zweck den *Češko-Slovensky Spolek*, einen Verein, in dessen Rahmen er die Tschechen über die slowenische Landschaft, die Verhältnisse, die kulturellen Errungenschaften usw. informierte. Auch in anderen Vereinen hielt er Vorträge über die Slowenen und ihre Verhältnissen, z.B. im Verein Amerikanischer Damen, im Akademischer Verein *Slavija* und im Klub *Das Kunstwort* (*Umelecki besedi*). Jan Lego tat Vieles für die Gründung einer Schule für slawische Sprachen, wo er auch die slowenische und die kroatische unterrichtete. Er organisierte den Austausch slowenischer und tschechischer Zeitschriften und Illustrierten, propagierte das Lernen der tschechischen Sprache in Slowenien; auf diese Weise begannen auch in Slowenien tschechische Zirkel bzw. Arbeitsgemeinschaften tätig zu sein, diese versorgte er regelmässig mit Büchern.

Lego war Beauftragter der *Slovenska Matica* (Slowenische Vereinsverlags-Organisation) in Tschechien und erwarb viele Mitglieder, nicht nur in Prag, sondern auch in anderen Städten Tschechiens. Er gab auch den Anlass, dass die Slowenen nach dem tschechischen Vorbild der *Schul Matica* die *Ciril-Method-Bruderschaft* gründeten. Seine Artikel wur-

² Dr. P., Jan Lego, *Omladina*, 1907, S.7.

den noch immer in slowenischen Zeitungen veröffentlicht, vor allem in den Blättern Ljubljanski Zvon, Hribars Slovan (er war auch der erste, welcher bei der ersten Herausgabe der Nummer an Hribar seine Glückwünsche schickte), Lego sammelte Biographien slowenischer Kulturschaffender, Literaten und Politiker für das tschechische Ottov Slovník naučný. Die Slowenen brachte er den Tschechen am nächsten mit dem Werk *Reiseführer Slowenien*, den er 1887 herausbrachte und der *Tschechisch-Slowenischen Grammatik*, deren Druck er sogar zweimal, im Jahre 1883 und 1892, auflegen liess. Im Jahr 1895 half bei der Organisation der Ankunft der Slowenen in Prag, aus Anlass der Eröffnung des Nationaltheaters und 1892 half er ebenso die tschechisch-slawische ethnographische Ausstellung in Prag zu organisieren und möglichst viele Slowenen anzuziehen.

Jan Lego hatte in Slowenien aber nicht nur Freunde und gute Mitarbeiter, sondern auch Widersacher. Zu den schärfsten gehörte Anton Mahnič, welcher ihn nicht nur der Freimaurerei beschuldigte, sondern auch der Verführung slowenischer Schüler und Studenten, dass er sie nach Prag zum Studieren locke, um dort den liberalen, gottlosen Geist aufzunehmen. Am meisten regte Mahnič ein Brief auf, den Lego 1885 einem slowenischen Schüler schrieb und mit dem er versuchte, diesem vom Theologiestudium abzuraten und ihn nach Prag zum studieren einlud. Und auch deshalb war Jan Lego nach Mahničs Überzeugung für die Slowenen und das Christentum schädigend und für die Erhaltung der Kontakte mit den Tschechen ein völlig unangemessener Mensch.³

Jedoch würdigten ihn die Slowenen, die seine Arbeit ehrten, damit, dass er Ehrenmitglied der Slovenska Matica, Ehrenbürger der Stadt Kamnik und ebenso der Hauptstadt Ljubljana wurde, sowie Ehrenmitglied des slowenischen *Sokol* und der Glasbena Matica. 1912 enthüllte die slowenische Delegation am 9. Allslawischen Journalistenkongress in Prag das Jan Lego Grabdenkmal zum »Dank und Ausdruck der Hochachtung der Slowenen gegenüber diesem verdienten Verbreiter der tschechisch-slowenischen Solidarität«. Unter anderem betonten sie, dass dieser Tag eine Manifestation aller Slowenen ... »sein müsste, denn wir müssen den Tschechen und allen Slowanen zeigen, wie wir die Menschen, die sich für uns einsetzen, ehren.«⁴

In den zwanzig Jahren seines Aufenthalts in Slowenien und unter den Slowenen, tat Lego am meisten auf dem Gebiet der tschechisch-slowenischen und allgemeinen slawischen Solidarität. So wie später T. G. Masaryk, sah auch Lego das meiste Positive in der Kleinarbeit (drobna praca), durch welche er Bildung verbreitete, das nationale Bewusstsein ehrte, das Bewusstsein über die notwendige Verbundenheit der Slawen in Österreich, die in jener Zeit nicht so viele Anhänger wie in Tschechien hatte, und die allgemeine Kultur in Slowenien. Obwohl Lego nur ein Staatsdiener war, der aus einem kulturell, national und wirtschaftlich viel fortschrittlicheren Umfeld nach Slowenien kam, gelang es ihm, in seinem zwanzigjährigen Aufenthalt bzw. Wirken unter den Slowenen die kulturelle und politische Arbeit zu erwecken bzw. zu erneuern, es gelang ihm das Interesse für die slawische Idee und vor allem den Grundstein für die slowenisch-tschechische Freundschaft zu legen. Er arbeitete mit allen nationalbewussten Slowenen zusammen, ungeachtet auf ihr politisches Bekenntnis, z.B. mit Levstik wie auch mit Bleiweis. Seine Sympathien gegenüber dem slowenischen Volk beschrieb er in seinem Beitrag »Karakteristike slovenske-

³ A. Mahnič, *Slovenci, pazimo s kom se družimo* (Slowenen, passen wir auf, mit wem wir uns verbrüdern), *Rimski katolik*, 1889, S.385.

⁴ Feierliche Denkmalenthüllung zu Ehren Jan Lego in Prag, *Edinost*, 26. Juni 1912, Nr.177,

⁵ *Slovan*, Nr.16, 17, 18, 1884.

ga naroda« (Charakteristiken des slowenischen Volkes)⁵ für das Blatt *Slovan*, welcher in Fortsetzungen erschien. Bereits die erwähnte Beschreibung der Eigenschaften der Slowenen beendete er im Geiste der slawischen Gegenseitigkeit:

»Wie ich mich aufrichtig bemühte, bei meinem besten Wissen und Gewissen hier den Charakter des slowenischen Volkes darzustellen, wünsche ich mir ebenso feurig, dass die Wirkung dessen nicht nur ein besseres Wissen dieses von vielen Unglücken bedrückten Volkes sein wird, sondern dass wir uns von unserer Seite enger an es binden sollen, mit wahrlicher und uns würdiger Bruderliebe binden, was wir den Schwächeren und unserer Unterstützung Bedürftigen in zweifachem Mass schuldig sind.«⁶

⁶ *Slovan*, Nr.18, 1884, S.283.

POVZETEK *JAN LEGO –*
GLASNIK SLOVENSKO-ČEŠKE VZAJEMNOSTI

Prispevek govori o češkem kulturniku in publicistu, ki je – kot začasni emigrant – slabih 20 let (1857–1870) deloval med Slovenci. Kot velik zagovornik slovanske vzajemnosti je skušal tudi med Slovenci vzbuditi navdušenje za slovansko idejo, za slovensko-češko sodelovanje, in prav tako za čim širše kulturno in narodnobuditeljsko delo. Slovenske dijake in študente je navduševal ne le za kulturno delo na Slovenskem, marveč tudi za spoznavanje Češke in Čehov, za študij na praški univerzi, za razvoj mladinske književnosti. V češke liste je poročal o razmerah na Slovenskem in s tem veliko prispeval k spoznavanju Slovencev na Češkem. Velik pomen ima za ustanovitev Glasbene Matice, Planinskega društva, Učiteljskega društva za Kranjsko; po 1874 v Pragi pa za ustanovitev češko-slovenskega društva, kjer je učil slovenski jezik.

AVTORJI • CONTRIBUTORS

Breda ČEBULJ-SAJKO, dr. etnoloških znanosti, je znanstvena sodelavka na Inštitutu za slovensko izseljenstvo ZRC SAZU. Ukvarja se z raziskovanjem slovenskega izseljenstva v Avstraliji. Leta 1995 je doktorirala s temo Posledice dvojne identitete v vsakdanjem življenju avstralskih Slovencev. Izdala je monografijo *Med srečo in svobodo – Avstralski Slovenci o sebi*, Ljubljana, 1992.

Breda ČEBULJ-SAJKO, Ph. D., ethnologist, research fellow at the Institute for Slovene emigration studies ZRC SAZU. Her main research interest is Slovene emigration to Australia. In 1995 she has taken her doctor's degree at the Faculty of Arts on the subject Double Identity and its impact on the every day life of Australian Slovenes. She has published a book Med srečo in svobodo - Avstralski Slovenci o sebi (Between happiness and freedom – Australian Slovenes about themselves), Ljubljana (1992).

Iskra ČURKINA, dr. zgodovine, znanstvena sodelavka na Inštitutu za slovanske študije Ruske akademije znanosti v Moskvi. Raziskuje predvsem slovensko-ruske kulturne odnose v 19. Stoletju, slovenske izobražence v Rusiji v 19. stoletju. Objavila je več knjig s tega področja, med njimi tudi *Rusko-slovenski kulturni stiki*, Ljubljana (1995).

Iskra ČURKINA, Ph. D., senior research fellow at the Institute for Slavic Studies at Russian Academy of Science in Moscow. Her research field are Russian-Slovene cultural relationships in 19th century, Slovene intellectuals in Russia in 19th century. She has published several books, among them also Rusko-slovenski kulturni stiki (Russian-Slovene cultural links), Ljubljana (1995).

Lev DETELA, od leta 1960 živi v Avstriji. Slavistiko, slovansko jezikoslovje in literaturo ter umetnostno zgodovino je študiral v Ljubljani in na Dunaju. Od leta 1970 deluje kot samostojni pisatelj, kulturni publicist, prevajalec, urednik in založnik. V slovenskem in nemškem jeziku je napisal in objavil nad trideset samostojnih del, pesmi, prozo, dramsko literaturo, esejistiko. Posrednik med slovensko in nemško literaturo na področju prevajalstva in literarne kritike. Urednik avstrijske literarne revije *LOG*. Član mednarodnega P.E.N.-a, Društva slovenskih pisateljev in raznih avstrijskih literarnih združenj.

Lev DETELA, since 1960 he lives in Austria. He studied slavistic, Slavic linguistic and literature and history of art in Ljubljana and Vienna. Since 1970 he works as a free-lance writer, translator, editor and publisher. In Slovene and German language he has published numerous books, poems, plays and esseys, etc. He is mediator between Slovene and German literature in the field of translations and literary criticism. Editor of Austrian literary journal LOG. A member of international PEN, Slovene writers Society, etc.

Dušan DRLJAČA, dr. etnologije, znanstveni svetnik na Etnografskem inštitutu Srbske akademije znanosti in umetnosti, Beograd, vodja projekta Srbi v diaspori in narodne manjšine v Srbiji. Izdal več knjig s to tematiko. Od leta 1994 gostujoči profesor na Univerzi v Banjaluki.

Dušan DRLJAČA, Ph. D., ethnologist, senior researcher fellow at the Institute of Ethnography, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts in Belgrade, head of the project Serbs in Diaspora and national minorities in Serbia. He published several books on this subject. Since 1994 a guest professor at the University of Banjaluka.

Marjan DRNOVŠEK, dr., višji znanstveni sodelavec na Inštitutu za slovensko izseljensko ZRC SAZU v Ljubljani. Raziskuje temo »Slovensko izseljensko v 19. in 20. stoletju« – s poudarkom na izseljevanju Slovencev in odnosov izseljenskega okolja (države, cerkve, intelektualcev itd.) do izseljencev in njihovih potomcev. Zadnja monografija: *Usodna privlačnost Amerike*, Ljubljana 1998.

Marjan DRNOVŠEK, Ph. D., historian, senior research fellow at the Institute for Emigration Studies ZRC SAZU in Ljubljana. He is working on »Slovene emigration in 19th and 20th century«, with special emphasis on emigration of Slovenes and the attitude of emigration environment (state, church, intellectuals etc) towards emigrants and their descendants. He recently published Usodna privlačnost Amerike (Fatal attraction of America), Ljubljana (1998).

Jevgenij FIRSOV, dr. zgodovine, je profesor na Fakulteti za zgodovino na Državni univerzi v Moskvi. Ukvarja se predvsem z zgodovino češko-ruskih odnosov, preučuje ruske intelektualce v tujini. Objavil je več knjig in člankov s tega področja.

Jevgenij FIRSOV, Ph. D., historian, professor at the Faculty of History at Moscow State University. His main research interest are Czech-Russian relationships, Russian intellectuals abroad. He has published books and articles on these subjects.

Halina FLORKOWSKA-FRANČIČ, dr., je profesorica zgodovine na Poljskem inštitutu Jagelonske univerze v Krakovu. Področja njenega zanimanja so poljska politična emigracija, Poljaki v Švici in njihovi odnosi s poljskimi skupnostmi v drugih deželah. Izdala je več knjig in člankov s to tematiko.

Halina FLORKOWSKA-FRANČIČ, Ph. D., professor of history at the Polonia Institute at Jagiellonian University in Crakow. Her main interest is Political emigration, the Poles in Switzerland, and their relationships with Polish societies in other countries. She has published several books and articles on these subjects.

Irena GANTAR GODINA, dr. višja znanstvena sodelavka in predstojnica na Inštitutu za slovensko izseljensko in docentka za zgodovino Slovencev in jugovzhodne Evrope v 19. stol. na Pedagoški fakulteti Univerze v Ljubljani. Izdala je dve monografiji (*Masaryk in masarykovstvo na Slovenskem* in *Neoslavizem in Slovenci*), preučuje pa predvsem vplive slovanskih narodov na Slovence in stike Slovencev z drugimi slovanskimi narodi. Trenutno dela na projektu Slovenci v slovanskih deželah v 19. stoletju.

Irena GANTAR GODINA, Ph. D., a senior research fellow and head of the Institute for Slovene Emigration Studies ZRC SAZU, and a lecturer of history at the Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana. She has published two books (Masaryk in masarykovstvo na Slovenskem and Neoslavizem in Slovenci) and several articles on Slovene-Slavic relations. Currently she is working on Slovenes in Slavic lands in 19th century.

Mirko JURAK, dr., je redni profesor za angleško in ameriško književnost na Filozofski fakulteti Univerze v Ljubljani. Objavil je štiri knjige razprav in esejev, štiri učbenike in preko osemdeset znanstvenih člankov (med njimi več iz izseljenske problematike) v *Modern Drama*, *Educational Theatre Journal*, *Melus*, *BELLS*, *Slovene Studies*, *Acta Universitatis Upsalienis*, *Acta Neophilologica*, *Dve domovini/Two Homelands* in drugih revijah zbornikih razprav v Sloveniji in v tujini.

Mirko JURAK, Ph. D., Professor of English and American Literature at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana. He has published four books of articles and essays, four textbooks, and more than eighty scholarly articles (among them several dealing with problems of emigration) in Modern Drama, Educational Theatre Journal, Melus, BELLS, Slovene Studies, Acta Universitatis Upsalienis, Acta Neophilologica, Dve domovini/Two Homelands and other journals as well as in various proceedings in Slovenia and abroad.

Matjaž KLEMENČIČ, dr., je profesor zgodovine na Pedagoški fakulteti Univerze v Mariboru. Je avtor dveh znanstvenih monografij o slovenskem izseljenstvu v Severni Ameriki. Zadnja v angleščini pisana knjiga o zgodovini Slovencev v Clevelandu je *Slovenes of Cleveland: The Creation of a New Nation and a New World Community: Slovenia and the Slovenes of Cleveland, Ohio* (1995).

Matjaž KLEMENČIČ, Ph. D., professor of history at the Faculty of Education at the University of Maribor. He published two books on Slovene emigration in Northern America. Recently he has published a book on the history of Slovenes in Cleveland The Creation of a New Nation and a New Community: Slovenia and the Slovenes of Cleveland, Ohio (1995).

Mihael KUZMIČ, mag., ravnatelj Evangelijskega teološkega centra v Ljubljani, se poleg teološko-izobraževalnega dela na versko protestantskem področju ukvarja z raziskovanjem slovenskega izseljenstva na dveh področjih: slovenski izseljenci iz Prekmurja v Ameriki in slovenski protestantski izseljenci. Objavlja v revijah *Dve domovini/Two Homelands*, *Znamenje*, *Stopinje*, *Slovenski izseljenski koledar* in drugih revijah in v zbornikih.

Mihael KUZMIČ, M.A., principal of Evangelical Theological Center in Ljubljana, beside his theological-educational work in protestant field, he is also working on researches of Slovene emigration, mainly on Slovene emigration from Prekmurje to America and Slovene protestant emigration. He has published several articles in Dve domovini/Two Homelands, Znamenje, Stopinje, Slovenski izseljenski koledar and other journals on this subject.

Jan LENCZNAROWICZ, dr. zgodovinskih znanosti, je docent za zgodovino na Poljskem inštitutu Jagelonske univerze v Krakovu. Preučuje predvsem zgodovino poljske etnične skupnosti v Avstraliji, mednarodna migracijska gibanja, povejno poljsko politično emigracijo na zahodu.

Jan LENCZNAROWICZ, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, Polonia Institute, Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland. Main fields of research: history of the Polish ethnic community in Australia, international migration movements, the post-World War II Polish political emigration in the West.

Marina LUKŠIČ-HACIN, dr. sociologije, je asistentka na Inštitutu za slovensko izseljenstvo ZRC SAZU v Ljubljani. 1998 je doktorirala na Fakulteti za družbene vede s temo *Multikulturalizem v migracijskih situacijah*; primer: švedski multikulturalizem in slovenski izseljenci. Njeno raziskovalno področje je predvsem evropska migracijska situacija –

trenutno s poudarkom na položaju slovenskih izseljencev na Švedskem. Izdala je monografijo *Ko tujina postane dom* (1995).

Marina LUKŠIČ-HACIN, Ph. D., sociologist, assistant at the Institute for Slovene Emigration Studies ZRC SAZU. In 1998 she has taken her doctor's degree at the Faculty of social sciences on the subject *Multiculturalism in migration situations, on the example: Swedish multiculturalism and Slovene emigration*. Her main research field are mainly European migration situations – recently on the situation of Slovene emigrants in Sweden. She has published a book *Ko tujina postane dom (When the foreignland becomes a home)*, Ljubljana (1995).

Igor MAVER, dr., je izredni profesor za angleško in ameriško književnost na Oddelku za anglistiko in amerikanistiko Filozofske fakultete v Ljubljani. Njegova posebna področja raziskave so avstralska književnost, slovenska izseljenska književnost v Avstraliji in v ZDA, angleška romantika in književnost ameriškega Juga. Poleg objav v pomembnejših znanstvenih revijah doma in v tujini so izšle tudi njegove tri knjige: *Ethnic Literature in the U.S.A., Canada, and Australia* (1996), *Readings in Contemporary Australian Poetry* (1997) in *Contemporary Australian Literature Between Europe and Australia* (1999).

Igor MAVER, Ph.D., is and Associate Professor of English and American Literature in the English Department of the Faculty of Arts in Ljubljana. His special fields of research are Australian literature, Slovene emigrant literature in Australia and the U.S.A., English Romanticism and the literature of the American South. Along with the publications in major scientific magazines at home and abroad, there were also published his three books: *Ethnic Literature in the U.S.A., Canada and Australia* (1996), *Readings in Contemporary Australian Poetry* (1997) and *Contemporary Australian Literature Between Europe and Australia* (1999).

Vasilij MELIK, dr., redni profesor za slovensko zgodovino 19. stoletja Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani v pokoju, redni član Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti. Je avtor monografije *Volitve na Slovenskem 1861-1918* in številnih razprav s področja slovenske zgodovine.

Vasilij MELIK, Ph.D., professor of Slovene history in 19th century at her Faculty of Arts University of Ljubljana and member of Slovene Academy of Sciences and Arts. Author of *Volitve na Slovenskem 1861-1918 (Elections in Slovenia 1861-1918)* (1965) and numerous articles, mainly on the Slovenian politics and culture, in books and scholarly journals.

Irene MISLEJ, dr., je umetnostna in kulturna zgodovinarica, rojena v Buenos Airesu, Argentini. Od l. 1978 živi v Sloveniji, kjer je magistrirala in doktorirala. Od l. 1996 je višja kustosinja in vodja Pilonove galerije v Ajdovščini.

Znanstveno raziskovalna dejavnost: predvsem Slovenski izseljenci in kultura, Interdisciplinarne sinteze, (Slovenski likovni ustvarjalci v zunajevropskih deželah in Slovenski likovni umetniki v izseljenstvu – vzporednice z umetnostjo na Slovenskem), Slovenska izseljenska književnost v Južni Ameriki, predvojna slovenska skupnost, prevodi slovenske literature v španščino.

Irene MISLEJ, Ph. D., historian of art and culture, born in Buenos Aires. Since 1978 she lives in Slovenia where she took her MA and PHD. Since 1996 she is senior curator and director of Pilonova galerija (Gallery of Veno Pilon). She has published *Slovene emigrants and culture, Interdisciplinary synthesis (Slovene plastic artists in non-European countries and Slovene plastic artists in emigration – parallels with the art in Slovenia)*.

Edward MOŽEJKO, dr., je profesor primerjalne in slovanske književnosti na Univerzi v Alberti, Kanda. Član Royal Society v Kanadi. Izdal šest knjig in napisal več kot sto člankov. Njegovo delo *Socialist Realism: Theory, Evolution, Decline* (Bonn 1977, København 1977) je bilo eno prvih kritičnih ocen te doktrine na zahodu.

Edward MOŽEJKO, Ph. D., Professor of Comparative and Slavic Literature at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada; Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada. His publications include six books and over hundred articles on Slavic and comparative literature. His book on socialist realism Socialist Realism : Theory, Evolution, Decline (Bonn, 1977; Copenhagen, 1977), was the first critical evaluation of this doctrine in the West.

Andrea PANACCIONE, je direktor Fondacije Giacomo Brodolini v Milanu. Ukvarja se predvsem s preučevanjem mednarodnega delavskega gibanja; napisal je več monografij s tega področja (*Kautsky e l'ideologia socialista*, 1987, *The Memory of May Day*, 1992 in druge).

Andrea PANACCIONE, director of Fondazione Giacomo Brodolini in Milan. His main field of research is international labour movement. He has published several books, among them also Karl Kautsky e l'ideologia socialista (Karl Kautsky and socialist ideology), Milano (1987), The Memory of May Day, Milan (1992).

Mirjana PAVLOVIĆ, mag., etnologinja, Etnografski inštitut, Srbska akademija znanosti in umetnosti, Beograd. Preučuje etnično identiteto izseljencev in srbske manjšine v sosednjih državah, posebej na Madžarskem.

Mirjana PAVLOVIĆ, M. A., ethnologist, working at Institute of Ethnography, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts in Belgrade. She works on ethnical identity of emigrants and Serbian minority in boarding countries, especially in Hungary.

Timothy POGAČAR, dr., je izredni profesor ruščine in predstojnik oddelka za nemški in ruski jezik ter vzhodno azijske jezike na univerzi Bowling Green. Njegovo raziskovalno delo sta predvsem ruska in slovenska literatura v 20. stoletju. Pred kratkim je iz slovenščine v angleščino prevedel Tavčarjevo *Visoško kroniko*.

Timothy POGACAR, Ph. D., associate professor of Russian and chairman of the Department of German, Russian and East Asian languages at Bowling Green State University. His research is twentieth-century Russian literature and Slovene literature. He has recently translated Ivan Tavčar's novel Visoška Kronika into English.

Ifigenija SIMONOVIC je študirala primerjalno književnost in slavistiko v Ljubljani, v Londonu pa lončarstvo. Piše pesmi, prozo, časopisne članke. Za *Novo revijo* že štiri leta piše Sprotnosti, esejistične spise o življenju v Londonu, iz angleščine je prevedla dve knjigi, njene pesmi in proza so uvrščene v številne antologije. Izdala je 13 samostojnih knjig. V Londonu živi kot lončarka že 20 let.

Ifigenija SIMONOVIC, as a potter lives in London for 20 years, studied comparative literature and slavistic at the University of Ljubljana, and pottery in London. She writes poetry, prose and articles. Her poems were published in numerous anthologies. For four ears she has been writing esseys about life in London for the journal Nova revija. She has published 13 books.

H. Gordon SKILLING, dr. zgodovine, je zaslužni profesor na Univerzi v Torontu, Preučuje predvsem zgodovino in politiko bivše Českoslovaške. Je avtor številnih knjig in član-

kov, med njimi *Češkoslovaška prekinjena revolucija (1976) Listina 77 in Človečanske pravice na Češkoslovaškem (1981)*, T. G. Masaryk – *proti toku (1995)*.

H. Gordon SKILLING, Ph. D., historian, professor emeritus at the University of Toronto. His main research field is history and politics of former Czechoslovakia. He is the author of numerous books and articles, among them *Czechoslovakia's Interrupted Revolution (1976)*, *Chart 77 and Human Rights in Czechoslovakia (1981)*, *T. G. Masaryk – Against Current (1995)*.

Nives SULIČ, diplomirana etnologinja in anglistka. Tema njenega preučevanja so Slovenci v ZDA in ohranjanje slovenske etnične identitete pri različnih generacijah.

Nives SULIČ, ethnologist and anglicist. Her main field of work are the Slovenes in USA and conservation of Slovene ethnical identity among different (various) generations. She published a book *Thank God, I am Slovenian*.

Imre SZILÁGYI, dr. politologije, dela na TLA, Közép Európa Intézet, TLA Institut for Central European Studies v Budimpešti, ukvarja pa se z zgodovino in politiko republik nekdanje Jugoslavije, predvsem Slovenije. Izdal je več knjig in člankov o slovenski zgodovini in politiki.

Imre SZILÁGYI, Ph. D., of politology, works at the Institute for Central European Studies in Budapest. His main subject are history and politics of the republics of former Yugoslavia, especially Slovenia. He has published books and articles on Slovene history and politics.

Metka ZUPANČIČ, dr., poučuje francosko literaturo in jezik na Bowdoin College, Maine, ZDA. V svojih dveh doktoratih (1977, 1986) je preučevala predvsem dela Claudea Simonea. Znanstveno-raziskovalno se ukvarja s francoskim romanom, sodobno francosko in frankofonsko literaturo, še posebej s feminističnimi teksti. Objavila je številne članke v severni Ameriki in Evropi in izdala štiri zbornike o mitologiji v francoski in frankofonski literaturi.

Metka ZUPANČIČ, Ph. D., teaches french literature and language at Bowdoin College, in Maine. Her two doctorates (1977, 1988) deal with the novels of Claude Simon. Her scholarly interests include French new novel, contemporary French and francophone literature in general and particularly feminist texts. She published a number of articles in North America and Europe and edited four collective projects on mythology in French and francophone literature.

Zvone ŽIGON, mag., je mladi raziskovalec-asistent na Inštitutu za slovensko izseljenstvo ZRC SAZU. 1998 je na Fakulteti za družbene vede magistriral iz socialne in kulturne antropologije s tezo *Narodnostna identiteta potomcev slovenskih izseljencev v Južni Ameriki*. Izdal je knjigo *Otroci dveh domovin: slovenstvo v Južni Ameriki*, Ljubljana 1998. V strokovnih revijah in dnevnem časopisu je objavil vrsto člankov s področja izseljenstva.

Zvone ŽIGON, M.A., anthropologist, is young researcher-assistent at the Institute for Slovene Emigration Studies ZRC SAZU. His M.A. dealt with social and cultural anthropology titled *National identity of descendents of Slovene emigrants in Southern America*. He has published a book *Otroci dveh domovin – slovenstvo v Južni Ameriki (Children of two homelands – Slovenes in South America)*, Ljubljana (1998), and various articles on emigration.

INŠTITUT ZA SLOVENSKO IZSELJENSTVO • INSTITUTE FOR SLOVENE EMIGRATION STUDIES



ISBN 961-6182-73-0



9 789616 182737