Croatian Radical Separatism and Diaspora Terrorism During the Cold War

Mate Nikola Tokić

Croatian Radical Separatism and Diaspora Terrorism During the Cold War

Central European Studies

Charles W. Ingrao, founding editor
Paul Hanebrink, editor
Maureen Healy, editor
Howard Louthan, editor
Dominique Reill, editor
Daniel L. Unowsky, editor
Nancy M. Wingfield, editor

The demise of the Communist Bloc a quarter century ago exposed the need for greater understanding of the broad stretch of Europe that lies between Germany and Russia. For four decades the Purdue University Press series in Central European Studies has enriched our knowledge of the region by producing scholarly monographs, advanced surveys, and select collections of the highest quality. Since its founding, the series has been the only English-language series devoted primarily to the lands and peoples of the Habsburg Empire, its successor states, and those areas lying along its immediate periphery. Among its broad range of international scholars are several authors whose engagement in public policy reflects the pressing challenges that confront the successor states. Indeed, salient issues such as democratization, censorship, competing national narratives, and the aspirations and treatment of national minorities bear evidence to the continuity between the region's past and present.

Other titles in this series:

Jan Hus: The Life and Death of a Preacher
Pavel Soukup

Making Peace in an Age of War: Emperor Ferdinand III (1608–1657)
Mark Hengerer

Universities in Imperial Austria 1848–1918:
A Social History of a Multilingual Space
Jan Surman

A History of Yugoslavia
Marie-Janine Calic

The Charmed Circle: Joseph II and the "Five Princesses," 1765–1790
Rebecca Gates-Coon

Lemberg, Lwów, L'viv, 1914–1947: Violence and Ethnicity in a Contested City
Christoph Mick

Croatian Radical Separatism and Diaspora Terrorism During the Cold War

Mate Nikola Tokić

Purdue University Press ♦ West Lafayette, Indiana

Printed in the United States of America.

Cataloging-in-Publication data is on file at the Library of Congress.

Paperback ISBN: 978-1-55753-891-8
ePub: ISBN: 978-1-55753-892-5
ePDF ISBN: 978-1-55753-893-2

Cover image uses original artwork modified by the author from *Hrvatska gruda: vjestnik hrvatskih oslobodilačkih boraca za domovinu i emigraciju*, vol.6, nos. 42–43 (March–April 1965): 1.

To my family
—immediate and extended, near and far, old and new—
for not just making this book possible
but for making it and indeed everything else I have ever done worthwhile.

Contents

Acknowledgments

In my many years working on this manuscript, I have accumulated innumerable debts. The vast majority, I have come to realize, I will never be able to properly repay. But at the very least, I would like to acknowledge in some small way all those whose contributions have made the book not just far better than it might otherwise have been but, in fact, possible.

That this book exists at all is thanks first and foremost to Donatella della Porta and Heinz-Gerhard Haupt. In 2007–2008, I spent a year as a Jean Monnet Fellow at the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies at the European University Institute as part of a European Forum run by Donatella and Heinz-Gerhard on the topic "Political Violence and Terrorism: Patterns of Radicalization in Political Activism." It was during this year that the seeds for this book were first sown, and it is due to the intellectual generosity of both Donatella and Heinz-Gerhard that this book found life.

In the years since, I have benefited immeasurably from the scholarly, institutional, and financial support of numerous academic institutes across Europe. I am immensely grateful to them all. In Berlin, I am indebted to the dedication and largesse of Karin Goihl at the Berlin Program for Advanced German and European Studies at the Freie Universität Berlin. In Budapest, I am beholden to Éva Fodor, Éva Gönczi, and Adri Kácsor (to whom I owe a lifetime of hugs) for their boundless energy and enthusiasm at the Institute for Advanced Study at the Central European University. In Jena, I am obliged to Joachim von Puttkamer and Włodzimierz Borodziej for the seemingly endless resources they provided at the Imre Kertész Kolleg at the Friedrich-Schiller-Universität. And in Rijeka, I give all my thanks to Sanja Milutinović Bojanić and Kristina Smoljanović at the Center for Advanced Studies–South East Europe at the University of Rijeka for endowing me with quite simply the perfect environment to complete my work. Of course, these institutes are nothing without their fellows. They are too numerous to list by name, but they all contributed in one way or another to the writing of this book and are all deserving of my sincerest thanks. Additionally, I would like to express gratitude to Matteo Fumagalli, Alexander Astrov, and Balázs Trencsényi at the Central European University for facilitating my tenure at the university.

My largest debt, meanwhile, is owed to the passionate and devoted staff of the archives consulted for the writing of this book. They are the true keepers of the history found in these pages. This book incorporates materials from seventeen archives located in ten countries, each as crucial as the next, and I am grateful for the assistance provided at them all. Quite simply, without their hard work and dedication, this manuscript would not exist.

Many others have intersected with this book in quite individual ways, each leaving their personal imprint on it. Some have read early drafts. Others have shared ideas. Still others have simply listened. All have been invaluable. I have no idea how to properly express my gratitude. From Florence, I thank Claudia Verhoeven and Lorenzo Bosi. In New Zealand, I am grateful to Fiona Barker and Alexander Maxwell. From Berlin, I am indebted to Melissa Kravetz, Nadine Blumer, Peter Polak-Springer, Vladimir Ivanović, Mine Erhan, and Ruža Fotiadis. From Budapest, I am obliged to Fabio Giomi, Magdalena Smieszek, Zsolt Czigányik, Elissa Helms, Börries Kuzmany, Myra Waterbury, James Brophy, Gina Neff, and Xymena Kurowska. From Jena, I thank Melissa Feinberg and Paul Hanebrink. From Cairo, I am beholden to Sherene Seikaly and Kim Fox (who will always be number one with a bullet on my chart). Elsewhere, I thank Chris Molnar for not writing this book but a different one, Nikolina Židek for help understanding an entire continent, Manuela Ciotti for her decades of support, and Jonathan Steinberg, Benjamin Nathans, and Günter Pfister for setting me on my way.

Special thanks go to Christian Axboe Nielsen, whose familiarity with this book is second only to my own. He read and reread every word I committed to paper in the process of writing this monograph. It is, without question, all the better for it. I would also like to express my deepest gratitude to Amy Hackett, who returned to me a text that far more resembled a real manuscript than what I had given her, as well as to the two anonymous readers who took their task seriously and provided immensely useful comments and suggestions to help improve future versions of the manuscript. And at Purdue University Press, I would like to thank Susan Wegener, Justin Race, Katherine Purple, Chris Brannan, and everyone else at the press, who have been nothing but helpful and enthusiastic from the start. One could not ask for better people to work with in seeing a book come to life.

Finally, there are no words to express what I owe my parents, Maria and Niko, and my sister and her family, Kristy, André, Mimi, and Marie. So I will simply show them every opportunity I have. The same is true for Jana. There is no way of knowing whether we would have met were it not for this book. I am absolutely certain, however, it would never have gotten finished without her. And that is just a drop in the sea of all she has given me. This book is dedicated first and foremost to them.

List of Acronyms

AdR	Archiv der Republik **(**Archive of the Republic [of Austria])
AHD	Australsko hrvatsko društvo **(**Australian Croatian Association)
AHNO	Australsko hrvatski narodni odpor (Australo-Croatian National Resistance)
AJ	Arhiv Jugoslavije (Archive of Yugoslavia)
ALN	Alianza Libertadora Nacionalista (Nationalist Liberation Alliance)
ALP	Australian Labor Party
ANZ	Archives New Zealand
ASIO	Australian Security Intelligence Organisation
BA	Bundesarchiv (Federal Archives [of Germany])
BKA	Bundeskriminalamt (Federal Criminal Police Office [of Germany])
BStU	Bundesbeauftragte für die Stasi-Unterlagen (Office of the Federal Commissioner for the Stasi Archives)
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
Cominform	Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties
Comintern	Communist International
CPA	Communist Party of Australia
CPF	Commonwealth Police Force [of Australia]
DA MSP RS	Diplomatski arhiv Ministarstva spoljnih poslova Republike Srbije (Diplomatic Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Serbia)
DGB	Deutsche Gewerkschaftsbund (Confederation of German Trade Unions)
DHS	Department of Homeland Security [of the United States]
DOJ	Department of Justice [of the United States]
ETA	Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (Basque Homeland and Liberty)

FALN	Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional (Puerto Rican Armed Forces of National Liberation)
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
FLN	Front de libération nationale (National Liberation Front)
FRG	Federal Republic of Germany [West Germany]
GDR	German Democratic Republic [East Germany]
HBZ	Hrvatska bratska zajednica (Croatian Fraternal Union)
HDA	Hrvatski državni arhiv (Croatian National Archives)
HDO	Hrvatski demokratski odbor (Croatian Democratic Committee)
HDP	Hrvatski državotvorni pokret (Croatian Statehood Movement)
HDS	Hrvatska državotvorna stranka (Croatian State-Forming Party)
HDZ	Hrvatska demokratska zajednica (Croatian Democratic Union)
HKB	Hrvatsko križarsko bratstvo (Croatian Crusaders' Brotherhood)
HNO	Hrvatski narodni odbor (Croatian National Committee)
HNSS	Hrvatska nacionalsocijalistička stranka (Croatian National Socialist Party)
HNV	Hrvatsko narodno vijeće (Croatian National Council)
HOP	Hrvatski oslobodilački pokret (Croatian Liberation Movement)
HOS	Hrvatske oružane snage (Croatian Armed Forces)
HPRO	Hrvatska pravaška republikanska omladina (Croatian Rights Republican Youth)
HRB	Hrvatsko revolucionarno bratstvo (Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood)
HRS	Hrvatski radnički savez za Njemačku (Croatian Worker's Union for Germany)
HSP	Hrvatska stranka prava (Croatian Party of Rights)
HSS	Hrvatska seljačka stranka (Croatian Peasant Party)
HZ	Hrvatska zajednica (Croatian Association)
INTERPOL	International Criminal Police Organization
JAT	Jugoslovenski Aero-Transport (Yugoslav Air Transport)
KPJ	Komunistička partija Jugoslavije (Communist Party of Yugoslavia)
LAC	Library and Archives of Canada

MPE	Movimiento Peronista de los Extranjeros (Peronist Movement for Foreigners)
NAA	National Archives of Australia
NARA	National Archives and Records Administration [of the United States]
NDH	Nezavisna Država Hrvatska (Independent State of Croatia)
NHZ	Narodna hrvatska zajednica (National Croatian Society)
OSA	Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives
Otpor	Hrvatski narodni otpor (Croatian National Resistance)
Ozna	Odjeljenje za zaštitu naroda (Department of the Protection of the People [of Yugoslavia])
PAAA	Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes (Political Archives of the Foreign Office [of Germany])
PCA–Senate	Publications Archives–Parliament of Australia
PIRA	Provisional Irish Republican Army
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization
RAF	Rote Armee Fraktion (Red Army Faction)
RICO	Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act
SAO	Srpska autonomna oblast (Serbian Autonomous Oblast) of Krajina
Säpo	Säkerhetspolisen (Security Service [of Sweden])
SDB	Služba državne bezbednosti (State Security Service [of Yugoslavia])
SFRJ	Socijalistička Federativna Republika Jugoslavija (Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia)
SKH	Savez komunista Hrvatske (League of Communists of Croatia)
SKJ	Savez komunista Jugoslavije (League of Communists of Yugoslavia)
SLS	Slovenska ljudska stranka (Slovene People's Party)
SOHDA	Središnji odbor hrvatskih družtava Australije (Committee of Croatian Associations in Australia)
SOHDE	Središnji odbor hrvatskih družtava Evrope (Central Committee of Croatian Associations in Europe)
SP	Stranka prava (Party of Rights)
Stasi	Ministerium für Staatssicherheit (Ministry for State Security [of East Germany])
TNA	The National Archives [of the United Kingdom]
TO	Teritorijalna obrana (Territorial Defense)

TRUP	Tajne revolucionarne ustaške postrojbe (Secret Revolutionary Ustaša Formations)
TUP	Tajni ustaški pokret (Secret Ustaša Movement)
UAH	Ujedinjeni američki Hrvati (United American Croats)
Udba	Uprava državne bezbednosti (State Security Administration [of Yugoslavia])
UHNj	Ujedinjeni Hrvati Njemačke (United Croats of West Germany)
UMA	University of Melbourne Archives
UNS	Ustaška nadzorna služba (Ustaša Surveillance Service)
VMRO	Vnatrešna Makedonska Revolucionerna Organizacija (Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization)

Introduction
Our Position Is Clear

We live—we are told by politicians, the media, and even scholars—in an unprecedented age of terror. To cite just one example of such rhetoric, the contentious conservative Australian senator Pauline Hanson warned in 2016 that "we have terrorism on the streets that we've never had before."[1] Of course, such claims are patently and indeed often willfully ahistorical. Our present-day age of terror is far from being the first, or even the most formative, epoch of terrorism of the past two centuries. Since the birth of modern terrorism in the mid-nineteenth century, political violence and terrorism have been a continuous presence in the global political landscape, from the anarchists and nationalists of the pre–World War I era, to the state-sponsored terror of the interwar period, to the anticolonial struggles following World War II, on to the militant leftists of the Cold War, and finally to the terrorism of the present day.

Even among those who concede that the contemporary age of terror is not sui generis, many still contend that today's political violence differs fundamentally from that of previous eras. The issue centers on the fundamental question of who today's terrorists are. Prior to September 11, 2001, according to this thinking, terrorism was primarily a domestic problem perpetrated by domestic actors. That is, through the end of the twentieth century, the history of terrorism was essentially national in character, the contributions of various international and transnational forces notwithstanding.[2] With 9/11, however, terrorism moved beyond national borders. Shifts in the political constellations of the post–Cold War world and a radical transformation in the nature of globalization, the reasoning goes, led to a new kind of terrorism that emanated primarily from those considered in one way or another as outsiders, meaning migrants, foreigners, and diaspora communities.

But here again history tells a different story. As one of many examples—not coincidentally the subject of this book—emigrant Croatian separatists who sought the destruction of socialist Yugoslavia and the establishment of an independent Croatian state were among the most dynamic terrorists of

the second half of the twentieth century. Active in countries as widely dispersed as Sweden, Australia, New Zealand, West Germany, and the United States, Croatian extremists were responsible for scores of bombings around the world in the 1960s and 1970s, as well as numerous attempted and successful assassinations. Croatian separatists also launched two guerilla incursions into socialist Yugoslavia and carried out the hijacking of two airplanes. In Australia alone, state security officials attributed at least sixty-five incidents of significant violence to Croatian separatists between 1963 and 1972, no less than twenty of which they characterized as "major."[3] Worldwide, anti-Yugoslav Croats committed on average one act of terror every five weeks between 1962 and 1980.

If today somewhat forgotten, violence perpetrated in the struggle for Croatian national independence was far from inconsequential. To give one example of the seriousness with which Croatian revolutionary separatism was viewed, in 1972 the West German government declared political violence among migrant Croats to be the country's "number one problem with foreigners."[4] Similarly, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) in the United States classified Croats together with the Puerto Rican Armed Forces of National Liberation (FALN; Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional) and the Cuban Omega 7 as the most dangerous foreign national terrorists operating in the country.[5] And in socialist Yugoslavia itself, President Josip Broz Tito characterized ongoing Croatian terrorism as perhaps the greatest "threat to the [Yugoslav] regime and to the survival of the federal state."[6] To be sure, terrorism did not lead to either the breakup of socialist Yugoslavia or the establishment of the Republic of Croatia. But it did help define the discursive, rhetorical, and political parameters that framed the path to both.

As to the supposed novelty of the role played by transnational and international actors in contemporary terrorism and political violence, the basic contours of this argumentation can be seen globally in recent developments in state policies dealing with terrorism as well as in the polemical rhetoric of those who seek to instrumentalize both the real and imagined threat of "foreigner violence" to promote various political agendas. As the scholar of international relations Fiona Adamson observes: "International migration has moved to the top of the international security agenda. Increasingly, policymakers in the United States, Europe, and around the world are making links between migration policy and national security. Much of this discussion has focused on migration flows as a conduit of international terrorism."[7] In other words, the first step in combatting terrorism has shifted from identifying and then addressing the myriad root causes of radicalization to controlling and securitizing transnational migration.[8] If we stop migration—to distill this idea even further—we stop terrorism.

Such policies have been accompanied by a sharp increase in politicized rhetoric on the perceived connection between terrorism and migration, primarily among increasingly emboldened right-wing populists the world over. In January 2018, to provide just one example, US president Donald Trump tweeted his claim that "nearly 3 in 4 individuals convicted of terrorism-related charges are foreign-born," citing a report produced jointly by the United States Departments of Homeland Security (DHS) and Justice (DOJ).[9] Significantly, neither the tweet nor the report upon which it was based made mention of the fact that the alarming statistic included only those found guilty of "international" terrorism and excluded all cases of people convicted of "domestic" terrorism. The political motives for the Trump administration's flagrant misrepresentation of the character of terrorists and terrorism in the current debate over immigration are transparent. Hungary's prime minister Viktor Orbán, meanwhile, has been even more brazen in making claims about the direct relationship between migration and terrorism. To cite just two examples of his rhetoric, "migration is the Trojan wooden horse of terrorism"[10] and "the factual point is that all the terrorists are basically migrants."[11]

As recent scholarship has demonstrated, however, very few facts support either such state policies or rhetorical claims. Studies examining the relationship between migration and political violence have repeatedly found no causal link between the two issues.[12] Indeed, the most current research strongly suggests that, if anything, the opposite may be true. As one of the first large-scale quantitative studies of the relationship between migration and terrorism concludes: "Our arguments and empirical analyses support the . . . hypothesis that immigrants are an important vehicle for the diffusion of terrorism from one country to another. At the same time, . . . our results emphasize that immigration per se is unlikely to positively affect terrorism. On the contrary, we actually find that more migration generally (i.e., when immigration is not necessarily linked to terrorism in the migrants' countries of origin) into a country is associated with a lower level of terrorist attacks."[13] Rather than asserting that there is no relationship between population flows and political violence, this study stresses—in direct contradiction to claims made by political figures such as Hanson, Trump, and Orbán—that the relationship between migration and terrorism is neither intrinsic nor linear. Migration certainly can and indeed has contributed to increased terrorist activity around the world. But it has also served at times as an important factor in processes of deradicalization and peace-building, both in migrants' homelands and in their host countries.[14] And in still other situations, there has been no correlation—causal or otherwise—between migration and political violence. The point is simply, to quote the noted scholar of terrorism Alex P. Schmid, that "the relationship between terrorism and various forms of migration is a complex one."[15]

Difficulty in unraveling the manifold layers of complexity that exist in the linkages between population flows and political violence is at least in part a product of disciplinary segregation that exists within academia. Without making too fine a point about it, only recently have scholars of migration—whose cutting-edge research comes from the field of social anthropology—shown interest in the work of scholars examining political violence and terrorism, topics that in recent years have been primarily the domain of political scientists and political sociologists. As Schmid explains, for much of their respective histories, "the study of terrorism and the study of migration have been two separate fields. While there is a huge literature on both migration and on terrorism, there are no in-depth studies on the intersection of the two phenomena."[16] In many ways, this state of affairs is itself quite revealing, indicating that the relationship between migration and terrorism is perhaps far less essential or compelling than contemporary political figures would have us believe. The flip side, of course, is that the scarcity of academic literature directly exploring the connection between population flows and political violence has left open considerable discursive space for claims of a causal link between increases in migration and terror that are based on perception, anecdote, and political agenda rather than on considered and rigorous research.

One of the more intriguing possible bridges linking migration and terrorism research is an academic discipline that has, broadly speaking, both neglected and been neglected by each—namely, history. Again, echoing the previous point, it is not that there are no histories of either migration or terrorism. Indeed, both migration and terrorism scholarship often draw on historical examples to support their conceptual and theoretical claims. But even if we accept evidence that the humanities and social sciences are moving toward greater multi- and interdisciplinarity, deep-seated and long-standing disciplinary partitions have often led scholars to engage neighboring disciplines in only the most cursory and superficial ways, leaving disregarded perspectives and approaches that could constructively inform their own work. What sets history apart in this constellation is its nature as a truly hybrid discipline, straddling the humanities and social sciences in ways that other disciplines do not.[17] Even if history has a tendency to discover only belatedly theoretical and conceptual developments in other fields, once it does, to quote Isabelle Duyvesteyn, it is singularly equipped to turn "the grey areas between disciplines that used to be dividing walls [into] promising new areas of research."[18] While history alone can never fully solve the problem of understanding, the core tools of the discipline—chronology, narrative, and interpretation—all serve as ready pathways to understanding in numerous and varied disciplines.[19]

To state the point differently, scholars researching both migration and terrorism could learn something from history. Or rather—to be even more precise—they could both learn something from historiography. This serves as the fundamental starting point of this book. While the empirical subject to be explored in the text—Cold War–era anti-Yugoslav separatist Croats—may be of greatest interest to specialists in Croatian and Yugoslav history, the underlying conceptual issues addressed in the book—the origins, development, and character of diasporic political violence—are relatable across disciplines and specialties. The text makes no claims to proposing an overarching model for understanding the relationship between migration and terrorism. It does, however, seek to provide new and formative perspectives for those aiming for this goal. To borrow from the historian and noted scholar of political violence and terrorism Walter Laqueur, this book, like all histories of terrorism, is by no means "a magic wand, a key to all the mysteries of contemporary terrorism." Still, as he continues in his own study of the phenomenon, "in the absence of other satisfactory explanations, it [does] provide some useful insights" that can contribute to the growing—and necessary—debates both within and outside academia about one of the more prominent and pressing issues of the day.[20]

Overview

The central aim of this book is less to recount each individual act of political violence at the hands of Croatian separatists than to explore the social and political factors that led at least some members of the emigrant Croat population to embrace terrorism as an acceptable form of political expression during the Cold War. In other words, its concern is with the discourses and practices of radicalization and the ways in which both individuals and groups engaging in terrorism construct a particular image of the world to justify their actions. Most importantly, it was not simply the extreme nationalism of Croatian separatists that engendered radicalization. Rather, it was an engagement with particular transnational structures and practices that encouraged certain political actors first to imagine, then develop, and finally justify the decision to incorporate violence into their repertoires of political engagement. In this regard—to borrow from the sociologist Arjun Appadurai—landscapes became as important as lands in envisioning, organizing, and realizing violence in the name of national liberation.[21]

While myriad factors contributed to the radicalization of anti-Yugoslav Croats during the Cold War, four stand out as most formative. The first and arguably most important factor in engendering extremist Croatian separatism were patterns of migration. Political violence and terrorism that aimed to destroy socialist Yugoslavia and establish an independent Croatia was in character and practice a diasporic phenomenon. Importantly, "diaspora" is not

understood here as a "bona fide actual entit[y]," as Gabriel Sheffer writes in his influential work on the subject.[22] Rather, this book employs the understanding of diaspora as articulated by Rogers Brubaker—namely, "stances, projects, claims, idioms, practices, and so on."[23] Diasporas, in other words, are not bounded communities that can be described in essentialist terms. Instead, they are the collection of experiences, formulations, and contentions made in the name of said alleged bounded communities. Rather than being characterized by homogeneity and unity, diasporas are always marked by diversity and even discord, resulting in their being—in James Clifford's deft formulation—"a 'changing same,' something endlessly hybridized and in process."[24]

This idea of a "changing same" is central to understanding the process of radicalization among those who came to embrace extremism and militancy in the name of Croatian freedom. Cold War–era diasporic Croatian politics was defined by its fierce infighting and fractional splintering. Among the first generation of emigrants who fled to the West in the immediate aftermath of World War II, this fragmentation actually resulted in something of a deradicalization of the national liberation movement. To be sure, the rhetoric of this first postwar generation of anti-Yugoslav Croats—the majority of whom had been members of the fascist Ustaša movement during the war—contained plentiful calls to political violence during the early years of the Cold War.[25] But actual—as opposed to rhetorical—violence was absent from their activities. The reversion to political violence and terrorism came only with a shift in the demographic makeup of the Croatian community abroad beginning in the late 1950s that fundamentally changed the dynamics of Croatian diasporic stances and practice.

The standard narrative of the history of Cold War–era Croatian separatism attributes the movement's return to terrorism to younger emigrants being exposed to Ustašism by older, post–World War II émigrés.[26] Without minimizing the unquestionably formative role played by both the history and principles of the Ustaše in fostering Cold War–era Croatian political violence, however, this book argues that the violent radicalization of younger emigrants, in fact, developed as a result of direct opposition to the older generation. In the eyes of those who arrived in the West after the late 1950s, the generation of Ustaša émigrés that had fled Yugoslavia following the collapse of the wartime Independent State of Croatia (NDH; Nezavisna Država Hrvatska) had accomplished very little since being forced from their homeland. Indeed, the older generation had brought about not just a general stagnation in émigré separatist politics but had diminished the possibility for revolutionary change in Croatia.[27] This fervent disillusionment with the older generation of Croatian emigrants, as will be explored extensively, became the cornerstone for the radicalization of younger separatists beginning in the 1960s.

A second dynamic contributing to the radicalization of Croats in the emigration were shifts in the political landscape of international relations and politics throughout the Cold War years that influenced both the ideological and organizational development of Croatian separatism and helped define the strategic thinking of radical separatists. For much of the 1950s, the Croatian political emigration bet heavily on what they—together with many others—believed would be the inevitable military confrontation between East and West. In this conflict, according to the logic of anti-Yugoslav separatists in the first fifteen years following the end of World War II, Croats both in the emigration and within Tito's Yugoslavia would side with the West against the forces of the East, fighting together with the Western Powers to liberate eastern Europe from the forces of communism. For their efforts, the Croatian nation would be rewarded with an independent state sponsored by and allied with the West.

In what would prove a fateful concurrence of events, the demographic shift in the Croatian emigration came just as détente among the Great Powers was starting to define Cold War international politics. Of the issues fueling the conflict between the younger and older generations of Croatian separatists in the emigration, few were as contentious as the question regarding the degree to which the national liberation movement should rely on the West for either moral or material support. In direct opposition to postwar émigrés, the younger generation believed the question of Croatian statehood to be irrelevant to the Great Powers and, as such, would never factor into the strategic considerations of global politics. To wait on the Western—or indeed any—Powers to come to the nation's rescue was, simply, to wait on a train that would never come. Instead, the only way forward was for the people of the nation itself to take up arms and bring down Tito's hated Yugoslav state through violent and revolutionary struggle.

This radicalization among Croatian separatists arose at least in part due to a third dynamic—namely, the context of the violence within which the postwar Croatian national liberation movement operated. Among the myriad violent milieus through which anti-Yugoslav Croatian separatism had to maneuver during the Cold War, four can be identified as particularly formative in the radicalization of Croatian nationalists. The first was a deeply ingrained national victim complex that served as an integral component of postwar Croatian diasporic identity discourses. At the heart of this victim complex was the Bleiburg tragedy, when tens of thousands of Croats and others were killed by Yugoslav Partisan forces at the end of World War II. For many Croatian emigrants—and not just radicals—Bleiburg was proof positive of the Belgrade regime's intent to carry out nothing less than the "biological destruction" of the Croatian nation.[28] In other words, "Serbo-communist" rule in Yugoslavia—to

use a favorite term of anti-Belgrade Croats—was not simply autocratic and discriminatory against Croats but was manifestly genocidal. As such, violent struggle against Belgrade was not only legitimate; it was absolutely necessary for the existential survival of the nation.

The second formative milieu of violence within which radical Croatian separatists operated was a particular interpretation of Croatia's own recent history. As much as the younger generation of separatists resented and even vilified postwar émigrés, they praised the older generation for its activities during the interwar period. Indeed, a major point of contention between the two generations was the younger generation's failure to understand why the older generation—in opposing socialist Yugoslavia—had ignored those strategies of uncompromising struggle that had earlier succeeded against interwar royalist Yugoslavia. Younger emigrants asserted that it was the campaign of terror waged by Ante Pavelić's Ustaša movement in the 1930s that had made possible the establishment of the NDH in 1941—Croatia's first state in nearly a thousand years. The same would equally be true, younger radicals argued, for a new independent Croatia. Of course, this reading of history ignored many crucial details regarding the establishment of the NDH, not least the circumstances of World War II and the Axis invasion of the Balkans. But for postwar separatists, the particulars of how the NDH came to be were less important than finding in their own history a model for achieving national liberation.

A third milieu of violence was provided by global events in the early Cold War years that reinforced the idea that revolutionary political violence was an effective political strategy for achieving national independence. To whatever degree bipolar Great Power confrontation determined much of postwar international politics, the younger generation of Croatian separatists recognized that the era was equally defined by revolutionary struggles for national liberation. With special focus on the revolutions in Cuba, Algeria, and the Congo, anti-Yugoslav Croats found in postwar anticolonialism a model for how to frame and wage their conflict with Belgrade.[29] These young radicals asserted that "Serbo-communism" was not just genocidal but imperialistic. Thus, socialist Yugoslavia's incorporation of Croatia was no different than the United Kingdom's occupation of India or Portugal's control over Angola. The only way to break imperial rule, global history was showing, was to rise up against a nation's colonial masters in armed struggle. If the peoples of Africa, Latin America, and Asia could achieve national independence this way, then certainly the Croats could as well.

Finally, the evolution of Croatian anti-Yugoslav separatist politics over the course of the 1960s and 1970s starkly reflects the era's broader culture of terrorism. The decade following the coming of age of the so-called 1968 generation witnessed a striking surge in the adoption of violence as a form of

political articulation. The early 1970s saw the blossoming of groups such as the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA), Red Army Faction (RAF; Rote Armee Fraktion), National Liberation Front (FLN; Front de libération nationale), Basque Homeland and Liberty (ETA; Euskadi Ta Askatasuna), Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), and the Red Brigades (Brigate Rosse), all of which actively embraced terrorism as a legitimate means for pursuing their political aims. Operationally and ideologically, Croatian separatists generally both isolated themselves from and were isolated by others throughout the Cold War era, in large part due to the real and imagined fascist overtones of both their rhetoric and aims. Nevertheless, Croatian separatists functioned within the increasingly radicalized global political environment of the time and were invariably influenced by the strategies, methods, and even principles of other violent groups. While the postwar activities of émigré Croatian separatists predated those of most other radical groups active around the same time, it is no coincidence that the frequency and seriousness of Croatian separatist violence greatly increased after 1968. Whereas Croatian terrorism primarily took the form of late-night bomb attacks and assassination attempts during much of the 1960s, by the end of the decade and into the 1970s, it added the plane hijackings and hostage-taking used by other contemporaneous terrorist groups.

A fourth factor contributing to the radicalization of Croatian separatists could be merged with the third but deserves separate consideration. Throughout the Cold War years, there was little that both affected and helped define the strategies of anti-Titoist extremists more than state-sponsored reactions to their activities. First and foremost, this meant the actions of the Yugoslav State Security Administration (Udba; Uprava državne bezbednosti), which aggressively engaged émigré Croatian separatists for the entirety of the country's existence.[30] Much of the Udba's engagement with what they variably referred to as "the hostile emigration" (*neprijateljska emigracija*), "the fascist emigration" (*fašistička emigracija*), and "the extreme emigration" (*ekstremna emigracija*) involved acts of violence, with Yugoslav agents responsible for potentially dozens of assassinations of separatist Croats over the course of the Cold War. In addition, Udba agents infiltrated a great majority of émigré separatist organizations in Australia, West Germany, the United States, and elsewhere, using agents provocateurs to undermine their efforts. Importantly, the purpose of this infiltration was not the destruction of the separatist movement but rather, for reasons that will later be discussed, its further radicalization.

The behavior of the governments of the countries where Croatian separatists lived and operated and also where the majority of Croatian separatist violence took place was similarly formative. Importantly, this included inaction as an active undertaking. It would be specious to suggest that government

and security officials in places like Bonn, Stockholm, or Canberra either encouraged or even supported Croatian separatist violence against socialist Yugoslavia. It is, however, true that as a result of both irresoluteness and political calculation they often failed to actively pursue stringent policies to curtail that violence. For a full decade after the first significant act of postwar Croatian separatist terrorism took place—in West Germany in 1962—Western capitals viewed the movement ambivalently, which led them to adopt what best can be described as a laissez-faire attitude toward the activities of extremist Croats. This in turn provided separatist radicals with the necessary social and political space in which to organize and operate. Only beginning in the early 1970s did Western governments begin to change their stances toward Croatian extremism. Their adoption of new measures to constrain the movement led to a rapid and ultimately effective deradicalization of the Croatian separatist movement.

These four factors are, of course, far from exhaustive. Equally important, it is crucial not to be overly deterministic as to the radicalizing effect these various social and structural dynamics had on both individuals and organizations. As deadly as anti-Yugoslav Croatian political violence was during the Cold War, it remained the product of a small percentage of the hundreds of thousands of Croats living in the emigration. A West German governmental report from 1972 put it succinctly: "The vast majority of Croats in the Federal Republic are docile. [The problem of terrorism is] a matter of only a tiny, virulent minority."[31] Australian prime minister Gough Whitlam expressed a similar view in a letter written in 1973 at the height of a crisis involving Croatian terrorists: "Only a small minority of Croatian immigrants are engaged in acts of political terrorism in this country." He continued, "The majority of Croatian and other Yugoslav settlers are highly valued citizens and residents of this country."[32] In other words—in a lesson that politicians today would do well to heed—the problem was not with Croats as such. Rather, the problem of radicalization arose with a small group of people for reasons related to complex relationships among myriad and competing social movements, practical and circumstantial limitations, and personal, political, and institutional disruption. This distinction is important.

This said, a critical mass of Croats in the emigration did radicalize, sparking a twenty-year-long campaign of violence and terrorism that led to death and destruction around the globe. It is important to understand that the Croatian separatists' embrace and execution of political violence and terrorism did not result from some dysfunctional irrationality, whether understood systemically, organizationally, or even psychologically. Rather, it was the product of an identifiable development in strategic thinking among anti-Yugoslav radicals that led to coherent—if unquestionably both myopic and distorted—choices

of action. While one can argue that decisions regarding the use of violence by adherents of the national liberation movement were misguided, imprudent, and even amoral, they were made by actors with a particular understanding of the world and their place in it, an understanding shaped by a multitude of factors and experiences.

This book traces the factors that contributed to the radicalization of the second generation of post–World War II Croatian emigrants to the West. The six chronologically arranged chapters conform to pivotal and formative developments in the history of Cold War-era radical Croatian separatism. The opening chapter examines fractures and fissures within the movement in the first postwar decade and their general influence on émigré political engagement. It demonstrates how and why terrorism, once a cornerstone of the Ustaše, ceased to be part of the functional political repertoire of radical émigré separatism. Chapter 2 explores how, during the second half of the 1950s, the focus of émigré separatism shifted away from fighting the hated socialist Yugoslav state to a basic—and ruinous—internal power struggle. As a consequence of this change, active political agitation aimed at securing an independent Croatian state became, at best, only a secondary priority for radical organizations within the diaspora. Instead, by the late 1950s competition for new recruits came to dominate the activities of rival factions. As will be explored, these rivalries were a crucial factor in the radicalization of a younger generation of separatists in the 1960s, but often not in the manner imagined by the older generation.

Chapter 3 explores the general factors that led in the early 1960s—after nearly two decades of inactivity—to a renewal of extremist politics within the diaspora. First and foremost, the chapter focuses on the activity of a new generation of emigrants who left socialist Yugoslavia for the West beginning in the late 1950s and early 1960s. In particular, it looks at the political and strategic thinking of these new radical emigrants, including the role of ideology in the radicalization of many who joined the Croatian separatist movement. Chapter 4 then provides a more narrative exploration of the first acts of terror committed by radical Croatian separatists beginning in 1962. The chapter examines the development of the tactics used to draw attention to the Croatian cause globally during the 1960s and the ways in which purveyors of violence justified their actions. It also explores how émigré violence provoked state-sponsored violence, creating new landscapes of engagement among the various actors invested both positively and negatively in Croatian separatism.

Chapter 5 looks at the period that, in hindsight, proved to be the high point of the radical Croatian separatist movement. It delves into the many social, cultural, and political factors that, taken together, led emigrant separatists to adopt a number of critical changes in their tactical and strategic thinking,

which translated into a period of intense activity. During this period, Croatian separatists hijacked an airplane in Sweden, occupied a Yugoslav consulate, bombed scores of Yugoslav institutions around the world, assassinated several Yugoslav diplomats and representatives, and launched a spectacular if ill-fated armed guerilla incursion into the heart of socialist Yugoslavia. In the short term, the resultant wave of terror brought Croatian terrorists both fame and infamy. In the long term, this increased violence precipitated the imposition of new and ever more debilitating governmental restraints on separatist radicals. Chapter 6, in turn, deals with the repercussions of this greater attention paid to Croatian separatists by various state actors. The mid-1970s was witness to arguably the most brazen acts of Croatian separatist terrorism. At the same time, the period also saw the precipitous marginalization of the movement. Precisely at the time Croatian radicals became most adventurous, states took concerted action to end—definitively once and for all—not just anti-Yugoslav terrorism but terrorism of all kinds. Finally, the epilogue explores how, in the early 1980s, terrorism ceased to be a part of diasporic political engagement, replaced in its stead by other forms of activity.

Here, a word concerning the overall periodization of the book is in order. The title of the book—*Croatian Radical Separatism and Diaspora Terrorism During the Cold War*—refers to a well-understood period of time, from, say, the 1947 publication of George F. Kennan's "X Article"[33] to the 1991 dissolution of the Soviet Union. Anti-Yugoslav Croatian political violence, however, was limited, roughly speaking, to the years 1962 to 1980. The use of "Cold War" to frame the book is nonetheless appropriate for two reasons. First, since this book is equally as concerned with terrorism as such as with the processes of radicalization and deradicalization that led to the use and eventual abandonment of violence, the longer time frame is applicable. Second, "Cold War" serves as more than simply a marker of periodization. Rather, the Cold War is both context and milieu. In the case of radical Croatian separatism, it was a context and milieu that both made the movement possible and gave it shape.

Questions regarding the book's periodization are most likely to be raised regarding the years immediately leading up to and following the end of the Cold War. Readers with an interest in Croatian or Yugoslav history may object that the text fails to explore the link between the radical separatism of the 1960s and 1970s and the paramilitarism and Ustaša revivalism of the early 1990s in Croatia. The explanation, simply, is that the Croatian radical separatist movement had been marginalized and indeed suppressed nearly a decade before the disintegration of socialist Yugoslavia. During the late 1980s and early 1990s, a new form of Croatian diasporic engagement with "homeland politics" developed that was separate—if, of course, still closely related—from that of radical separatism in the preceding decades. To be sure, important

parallels, connections, and continuities can be drawn between the two. In fact, several authors have done just that, most notably Paul Hockenos, Zlatko Skrbiš, and Francesco Ragazzi.[34] However, the substantial and significant differences between earlier radical separatism and later diasporic homeland politics argues for seeing the two as more than simply successive phases of the same basic phenomenon.

The decision to relegate the history of the second half of the 1980s and the wars of the 1990s to this book's epilogue stems from what admittedly might be an exaggerated desire to make a historiographic point. Terrorism was unquestionably both a product and a feature of Cold War–era Croatian diasporic politics. But it is imperative not to conflate the two. As mentioned earlier, those who engaged in acts of political violence represented only a tiny minority of those active in the broader struggle for Croatian independence from socialist Yugoslavia and an even smaller percentage of the overall Croatian emigrant population. This book, to state the point directly, is a history of diasporic separatism that turned to terrorism in an attempt to advance the cause, not a general history of diasporic separatism during the Cold War. Croatian nationalism in the emigration in the late 1980s and early 1990s was often unquestionably radical, militant, and even violent. It did not, however, employ terrorism—or at least the rather narrowly understood form of terrorism explored in this text.

The distinction between violence and terrorism may be minor, but it is also vital. The late 1980s and early 1990s witnessed a revival of Ustaša symbols and ideology within Croatia.[35] To a great degree, this tradition—suppressed in socialist Yugoslavia—had been sustained in the emigration. This book argues that, perhaps against expectations, the radical separatist movement was not the most significant factor in keeping Ustašism alive. Rather, a number of strands within the political emigration nurtured and promoted the cult of the NDH and the Ustaše. Moreover, the revival of Ustašism in the waning days of socialist Yugoslavia owed less to those who had engaged in political violence and terrorism during the middle decades of the Cold War than to others in the diaspora who proved pivotal in the years that followed. For this reason, this book deals only peripherally as opposed to systematically with the diaspora's role in Croatia's political developments in the years immediately before and after the end of the Cold War.

Conceptual and Definitional Frames

The overall narrative and argument of this book relies on some central conceptual and definitional frames. It has become almost obligatory, for example, that academic texts dealing with political violence convey some version of the observation that scholars of terrorism are far more numerous

than terrorists, and that there are, in fact, more definitions of "terrorism" than scholars of the field. Perhaps nowhere has this problem been exposed more starkly than in the opening chapter of Alex P. Schmid, A. J. Jongman, and Michael Stohl's seminal text *Political Terrorism: A New Guide to Actors, Authors, Concepts, Data Bases, Theories, and Literature*, which cites and discusses no less than 109 definitions for the term "terrorism."[36] In contrast—although the term is employed throughout—this narrative study offers no authoritative definition of "terrorism." As Isabelle Duyvesteyn has written, while in the social sciences such definitions are "deemed essential to agree on the basic outline of what the subject entails," in historical studies "this problem is important but less pressing."[37] For the historian, in other words, precise definitions of the terms "terror," "terrorism," and "terrorist" are in many ways ancillary to conveying both the situational and—more important—normative uses of the labels.

In its use of the term "terrorism," this book adopts the language that radical Croatian separatists themselves used to describe their activities. It was broadly understood among extremists in the emigration that national liberation from the clutches of "Serbo-communism" could only come through revolutionary struggle. In time, this revolution would take the form of a mass, popular uprising within the Socialist Republic of Croatia against the regime in Belgrade. Preceding the rising up of the Croatian nation, however, the struggle would by necessity take the form of sabotage, guerilla insurgency, and—importantly—terrorism in order to lay the foundations upon which to build the successful revolution. Some separatist groups called for their followers to engage in acts of "commando-terrorism."[38] Others were a bit more circumspect, describing their actions as the "inversion of standard warfare."[39] Still others simply ordered those in their ranks to "destroy all Yugo-embassies and consulates [and] kill Yugoslav diplomatic representatives": acts of terror by any other name.[40]

Most importantly—as radical separatists themselves recognized—the term used to label the violence perpetrated in service of the revolutionary struggle for national liberation was and in many ways remains arguably ultimately immaterial. This idea was captured bluntly but effectively in a manifesto released to justify the hijacking of an American airplane by radical Croats in 1976:

> We expect all "peace-loving" forces in the world to describe us as terrorists. . . . The point to be made here, obviously, is not to conclusively define "terrorism," an impossible and unnecessary task. . . . One man's terrorist is another man's patriot, depending solely on one's national and political objective and suitability.

> We must remember that today's "terrorists" are often tomorrow's policy makers, having participated in the formation of a new, independent state. Such was the position of the supporters of the Declaration of Independence. . . . With this reality reappearing dependably from one day to the next, all ethical and moral revulsion felt for so-called "terrorist" acts is necessarily irrational.[41]

If hijacking an airplane—or assassinating a diplomat, bombing an embassy, or taking hostages—is terrorism, a radical separatist would respond, so be it. It matters not, the logic continued, whether those active in the revolutionary struggle for national liberation are labeled terrorists or the violence they employ to pave the way to independence are "acts of terror." The Croatian separatist movement was imagined as one without compromise. Both morally and discursively, this meant a potential embrace of any and all forms of violence, including terrorism, in order to further the cause. And embrace violence they did.

This book's second conceptual concern is its engagement with "history." Some of the most prolific and productive areas of academic inquiry in the humanities and social sciences in recent years have concerned the politics of social memory and remembrance. Scholarship contending with the history of socialist Yugoslavia and in particular its collapse into warfare in the 1990s has been at the forefront of this research, both benefiting from and contributing to theoretical and conceptual advances in how academics understand the construction of social memory and its political mobilization.[42] The field of terrorism studies shares these concerns, particularly research dealing with ethno-national terrorism. Indeed, the creation and maintenance of national myths are absolutely central to national liberation movements in serving to rally support for the cause, justify the struggle, and legitimize the use of violence. Of course, such narratives are not presented and treated as myths but rather as "factual histories" that are both proven and incontestable. Broadly, these "histories" serve two purposes. On the one hand, they keep alive a memory of the former glory and greatness of the national group in question, often with a reference to past examples of independence. On the other hand, they nourish a sense of deprivation, marginalization, and even existential threat by propagating the litany of affronts, injuries, and crimes committed against the nation, both in the past and often in the present day.[43] The resultant victim complex then becomes a powerful and compelling force to mobilize populations to action.

The Croatian radical separatist movement not only follows this pattern, but in many ways it serves as a textbook example of how history and memory are instrumentalized to promote a particular political agenda. As will be

seen throughout this book, radical Croatian separatists justified their actions through what generously could only be called highly contentious historical claims. Importantly, this book does not contend historiographically with the myths and interpretations of the past promulgated by extremist Croats in the emigration. As mentioned previously, there is already a large and growing body of literature dealing with the uses and abuses of history and memory among Croats, both in the past and today. Rather, this book focuses on the instrumentalization of particular histories and memories, first to help radicalize the separatist movement and later to legitimize the movement's embrace of terrorism. This distinction should not be confused with an acceptance or validation of the "histories" examined within the text. The point is rather to lay bare how Cold War–era Croatian separatists discursively framed their struggle. The claims made by separatist radicals, for instance, that Tito's socialist Yugoslavia was engaging in genocidal practices against the Croatian nation or that the Bleiburg massacre was a tragedy that far exceeded the crimes of the NDH makes neither true. However, the separatists' belief in their truth is crucial to understanding their radicalization and turn to terrorism.

A third concern central to the book's narrative is the terminology that refers to different groups of actors within the Croatian separatist movement. Broadly speaking, the limited literature on Croatian political violence after World War II describes acts of terror as the work of "émigrés."[44] This book argues that this label obscures as much as it reveals about the origins, development, and nature of Croatian separatist violence during the Cold War. Those who might be considered true "émigrés"—meaning the generation that left Yugoslavia in the immediate aftermath of the war for reasons that can be described primarily if not wholly as political—were not the ones actively engaged in the separatist violence of the 1960s and 1970s. Rather, as already mentioned—and will be explored at length—Croatian separatist violence and terrorism during this period arose out of a direct opposition to the "émigré" generation, not from that "émigré" generation itself.

With no significant exceptions, the perpetrators of Cold War–era separatist violence belonged to what this book refers to as a generation of "semi-émigrés." In contrast to Croats who left for the West immediately following the end of World War II, the generation that left socialist Yugoslavia beginning in the late 1950s and early 1960s did so largely more for economic than political reasons. Nonetheless, to characterize this generation simply as "economic migrants" ignores the complex motivations and forces that led so many Croats to leave their homes. In the experience of most of this second generation of postwar emigrants, the line between "economic" and "political" migration was blurred. The label "semi-émigré" is meant to conceptualize this dual reality. If "émigré" has the connotation of political self-exile, then

"semi-émigré" suggests the shared role played by economics and politics in the story of the second generation of post–World War II Croatian emigrants. Stated more directly, "semi" is not a reference to the space the younger generation occupied (i.e., half in the emigration and half at home) but rather to the motivating factors that led the majority of the generation's members to go abroad in the first place (i.e., half political and half economic). Even more simply, and without intending to reify the two primary groups of Croatian emigrants at the heart of this book's narrative, the distinction between the terms "émigré" and "semi-émigré" is meant to distinguish those who left Croatia directly after World War II from those who made their way to the West a generation later.

The drawing of this distinction between these two generations of emigrants provides a framework for dealing with a fourth issue related to Cold War–era political violence and terrorism—namely, the legacy of the Ustaše. Both contemporary and contemporaneous accounts of postwar Croatian separatist terrorism place blame for the violence on the "Ustaše." The majority of these accounts have a clear normative objective for labeling Croatian violence as such. This was particularly true for the Yugoslav government, whose own political legitimacy relied on keeping a real or imagined Ustaša threat to the regime alive. The reality of Cold War–era Croatian radical separatism, however, both complicates and problematizes such reductionist claims. To be sure, the Ustaše served as a crucial foundation for Croatian separatism throughout the Cold War, and Ustašism was deeply embedded in the DNA of the national liberation movement. In particular, the semi-émigré generation of separatists emulated the extreme national chauvinism of the interwar and wartime Ustaše, expressing contemptuous and often genocidal views toward the Serbs.

This said, the radical postwar separatist movement originated, developed, and operated in a context meaningfully different from that of the prewar, wartime, and even postwar Ustaše, leading to significant distinctions between the two. As will be explored later, these differences were especially pronounced in the highly elastic ideological pragmatism and political opportunism of radical separatists in the 1960s and 1970s. If the defining characteristics of Ustašism were, as Mark Biondich has written, "anti-Serbianism, anticommunism, and its cult of Croatian statehood,"[45] the postwar separatists reduced their message to anti-Serbianism and the cult of Croatian statehood. It was not, of course, that communism somehow became the preferred ideology of radical separatists following World War II. Rather, statehood trumped political philosophy, meaning that separatists were willing to align with supporters of any ideology—including communists—who could potentially help in the destruction of Tito's hated Yugoslav state. As the title page of every edition of *Drina*, one of the leading separatist newspapers of the Cold War era,

declared matter-of-factly: "Our position is clear: Overthrow every Yugoslavia. Overthrow it together with Russians and Americans, with communists, with non-communists, and with anticommunists. Overthrow it together with anyone who is trying to overthrow it. Overthrow it by means of verbal dialectic and dynamite, but overthrow it, for if there is one country without the right to exist, that can only be Yugoslavia."[46] This is not to suggest, of course, that the very real fascist leanings of Cold War–era anti-Yugoslav Croatian separatists should be ignored or even downplayed. Indeed, the "anti-ideological" political realism of radical Croats arose from an excess rather than a deficiency of nationalism within the movement. But it was a nationalism even less burdened by ideological concerns than that of the already ideologically incoherent and self-contradictory Ustaše.[47]

An imperfect analogy can be found in the relationship between Nazism and neo-Nazism. Just as neo-Nazis cannot be understood in isolation from the Nazis under Hitler, Cold War–era radical Croatian separatism cannot be understood without regard to the prewar and wartime Ustaša movement.[48] Many if not most of the symbols, ideas, and aims adopted by postwar radical Croats were either taken from or directly referenced the Ustaše. But as with Nazism and neo-Nazism, the social contexts and historical conditions that underlaid the development of semi-émigré Croatian separatism in the 1960s and 1970s mean that an understanding of the origins, development, and character of the Ustaše can give only a partial picture of these postwar radicals. Circumstances do not just matter but are formative, and as such there is value in exploring movements such as neo-Nazism and semi-émigré Croatian separatism as phenomena unto themselves. Without making any relativistic comparisons between certain movements and their "neo" offspring, discussion of sociological and historiographic differences between, say, Ustašism and postwar radical separatism is meant only to productively complicate how we think of social movements of all kinds.

The difficulty in comparing neo-Nazis and radical semi-émigré Croats is the degree to which—as discussed earlier—postwar Croatian separatism was arguably as much an "oppositional" as a "neo" movement. Here again, the details of history are important. Far more than was the case with the Nazis, the Ustaše maintained a high level of continuity in the decades following World War II. As this book explores at length, intense disappointment in and disillusionment with those Ustaše who continued their political activity well into the Cold War was a central contributor to the adoption of terrorism and political violence in the struggle for Croatian independence beginning in the 1960s. Many members of the semi-émigré generation rejected émigré Ustaša leaders, including the movement's poglavnik—or führer—Ante Pavelić. Indeed, radical separatism developed in a very meaningful way out of a conscious and

deliberate desire by a new generation of semi-émigrés to create an alternative to the Ustaše—or at least to what the Ustaše had become. Consequently, to reduce postwar radical separatism to simply Ustašism or even neo-Ustašism obfuscates an important and even formative feature of the movement.

Historical Background

This said, whatever the differences between the prewar and wartime Ustaše and postwar separatist movements, much more connects than separates the two. Understanding the origins, evolution, and activities of Cold War–era radical separatism requires knowledge of how far-right Croatian nationalism developed from the mid-nineteenth century to the end of World War II.

In the succinct words of Mark Biondich, "the most significant factor shaping modern Croatian nationalist ideology has been the concept of historical rights."[49] Developed in the nineteenth century most prominently by the politician, publicist, and writer Ante Starčević, this notion holds that because the medieval Croatian kingdom had never been truly abolished, independent statehood was a historical right owed to the people of Croatia, above and beyond the natural right to statehood ostensibly enjoyed by all nations. Although first incorporated into Hungary in 1102 and then into the Habsburg Empire in 1527—or so the thinking went—the legal continuity of Croatian political structures such as the diet (*Sabor*) and office of the viceroy (*Ban*) as well as the maintenance of the Croatian political nation as incorporated in the nobility meant that Croatia had never completely lost its autonomy.[50] As argued by adherents of state rights, Croatian statehood was a fact, not just an aspiration. That foreign hegemonic actors—notably Budapest and Vienna—denied and violated this "fact" did not undermine the essence of the Croatian state.

The establishment of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes after World War I did not destroy the convictions of radical adherents to the idea of historical Croatian state rights. For many hard-line Croatian nationalists, "Yugoslavism"—whose advocates called at a minimum for the political union and at a maximum the ethnic assimilation of all South Slavic peoples into a single state—meant little more than the shift in domination over the Croatian nation from the Austrians and Hungarians to the Serbs. The most radical opposition to the new government in Belgrade came from the Croatian Party of Rights (HSP; Hrvatska stranka prava), which was a direct descendent of the Party of Rights (SP; Stranka prava) founded by Starčević, together with Eugen Kvaternik in 1861. The HSP advocated a position of exclusionary nationalism that not only rejected the idea of political cooperation among Croats and other national groups but viewed cooperation as intrinsically harmful to the Croatian nation.[51] Indeed, the party's program viewed any activity whose ultimate aim was not the abolishment of Serbian hegemony over Croatia as

anathema. In the words of one party leader, the entire raison d'être of the HSP was to stand as "the bearer of an uncompromising and revolutionary struggle [against Belgrade]."[52]

During much of the first decade of royalist Yugoslavia's existence, there was little to suggest that such views were more than empty rhetoric. This changed rather dramatically following King Aleksandar's establishment of a royal dictatorship on January 6, 1929, in the aftermath of the assassination of Stjepan Radić, the charismatic leader of Croatia's most popular political party, the Croatian Peasant Party (HSS; Hrvatska seljačka stranka).[53] With all national political parties disbanded and fearful that the regime would begin persecuting Croatian nationalists and political hard-liners, many members of the HSP fled the country, primarily to Benito Mussolini's fascist Italy. In exile, the most militant Croat dissidents coalesced around the HSP's former party secretary, Ante Pavelić. A rising star of the HSP, this young lawyer set out to recruit a dedicated cadre of radical nationalists willing to engage in a violent struggle for the liberation of Croatia from the fetters of Serbian control. In 1932, this movement was formalized as the Ustaša—Croatian Revolutionary Organization (Ustaša; Hrvatska revolucionarna organizacija), with Pavelić as poglavnik, or leader.[54]

It could be argued that Croatian nationalists only truly radicalized in exile, in large part due to engagement with new and formative transnational spaces, practices, and structures. Shortly after escaping to Italy, Pavelić established relations with two groups who put violence at the core of their political programs. The first was the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (VMRO; Vnatrešna Makedonska Revolucionerna Organizacija), with whom Pavelić signed a declaration of agreement to engage in a common struggle to bring about the destruction of both the Yugoslav state and Serbian hegemony over the Croatian and Macedonian nations. The second was Mussolini's fascist party. Mussolini had long held Belgrade to be at least partially responsible for Italy's so-called mutilated victory after World War I, and many of Il Duce's imperialistic pretentions during the interwar period focused on lands contained within royalist Yugoslavia. Invested in the destabilization of the Southern Slav state, Mussolini was more than happy to provide support for enemies of the Belgrade regime.

With inspiration and encouragement from the VMRO and Italian Fascists, the Ustaše came to fully embrace political violence and terrorism as "act" rather than simply "idea." The Ustaše established two military-style camps to train its members in the tactics and methods of terrorism and guerilla warfare, one in the northern Italian town of Bovegno and the other on a Hungarian estate called Janka Puszta, located three kilometers from the border with Yugoslavia. From 1929 to 1934, the Ustaše engaged in a campaign of terror,

sabotage, and political murder in royalist Yugoslavia that included assassinations and assassination attempts as well as bomb attacks on police stations, governmental buildings, and trains. The Ustaše also planned and executed an incursion into the Velebit region of Croatia in hopes of instigating a popular uprising against the state.[55] The revolt never materialized, but the incursion nevertheless rattled authorities in Belgrade. In response, the royalist Yugoslav government moved to suppress revolutionary tendencies among the country's population, instituting a number of stringent security measures.

The most notorious act of violence committed by the Ustaše prior to World War II was the assassination of Yugoslavia's head of state, King Aleksandar. On the afternoon of October 9, 1934, Aleksandar was shot and killed as his motorcade made its way through the French port city of Marseilles at the start of an official state visit to France. The bullets were fired by a Bulgarian member of the VMRO named Vlado Chernozemski, but the assassination had been planned and prepared by the Ustaše. The strategic thinking behind the regicide was that the monarch's death would rob royalist Yugoslavia of its great "unifier"—as Aleksandar's supporters referred to him—subverting the state and paving the way for Croatian independence.

As is often the case with such acts of political violence, expectations did not match reality. Within Croatia itself, the regicide was broadly condemned, with the populace reacting not with revolutionary fervor but with disquiet, misgiving, and even genuine sorrow.[56] Internationally, the fallout from the assassination forced Mussolini to neutralize the Ustaše, as the organization had become more a liability than an asset. The architects of the attentat against Aleksandar—Ante Pavelić and Eugen Dido Kvaternik—were arrested and imprisoned for two years. The remaining Ustaše were sent into internal exile on the Sicilian island of Lipari. Three years after the assassination, in 1937, Mussolini even signed an agreement of friendship with royalist Yugoslavia that included a complete ban of the Ustaše in Italy. The murder of King Aleksandar, which was meant to bring about the destruction of royalist Yugoslavia, actually did more damage to the Ustaše themselves. Broken and disjointed, the movement spent the remainder of the 1930s forced to struggle not for national liberation but simply for some modicum of cohesion and relevance.

An argument could be made that the Ustaše would simply have fallen into obscurity—the assassination of King Aleksandar notwithstanding—and even oblivion, had it not been for World War II. The Axis invasion, defeat, and partition of royalist Yugoslavia in April 1941 not only gave new impetus to the movement but thrust the Ustaše into a position of significant power. Pavelić was not Hitler's first choice to assume leadership of the newly established Independent State of Croatia; HSS head Vladko Maček famously twice was

offered and declined the position. But when given the opportunity, Pavelić embraced the office with a fervor perhaps unmatched in Nazi-occupied Europe. If the ideological underpinnings of Ustašism remained largely underdeveloped and rudimentary prior to the war, its principles became totally clear under the new regime.[57] Greatly indebted to the Italian Fascists and, in particular, the German National Socialists, Pavelić and the Ustaše coupled integral nationalism with a cult of violence that was fiercely hostile to communism, capitalism, and liberal democracy once in power. Moreover, they held the view that the unity of the Croatian nation—which they understood as an organic entity—could be preserved only through the destruction of all threats to the nation, both internal and external.

To this end, the Ustaše implemented a program of ethnic genocide that rivaled any in wartime Europe. State and military authorities brutally persecuted Serbs, Jews, Roma, and Croatian antifascists within the NDH, with Serbs singled out for especially harsh violence. The Ustaša militia was given free rein to terrorize minority populations throughout the NDH, and in the village of Jasenovac, some 100 kilometers from Zagreb, the Ustaše established a network of concentration camps with the aim of eradicating those populations. By war's end, the Ustaše had murdered a minimum of 50,000 people in Jasenovac, with the number likely close to twice that amount.[58] In total, the Ustaše killed upward of 350,000 Serbs between 1941 and 1945, themselves killed or deported to Nazi extermination camps 32,000 of the 40,000 Jews living in the NDH, and eradicated nearly all of the state's 25,000 Roma. Of the more than one million people who lost their lives in Yugoslavia during World War II, 60 percent died in the NDH. This toll places the country third behind only the Soviet Union and Poland for total casualties in Nazi-occupied Europe.[59]

The Allied victory over the Axis Powers in 1945—which includes the defeat of both the Nazis and Ustaše by the Partisan forces of Marshal Tito—brought an end to the Independent State of Croatia. Not entirely unjustifiably, many Croats—soldiers and civilians alike—feared that capture by advancing Partisans in the last days of the war would subject them to retributive violence for Ustaša crimes. Tens of thousands of Croats attempted to flee the territory that comprised the NDH at the end of the war in the hope they might surrender to British forces in occupied Austria and avoid capture by the communists. It was not to be. They reached the Austrian border near the town of Bleiburg, only to have the British deny their request to surrender. Worse, the British proceeded to hand the refugees over to Tito's forces, who executed several thousand on the spot. Many more died over the course of the next several days and weeks during an eight-hundred-kilometer-long "death march" back into Partisan-controlled Yugoslavia. As with almost all estimates regarding mass

violence in Yugoslavia during World War II, the question of how many died at Bleiburg and during the so-called Way of the Cross (*Križni put*) is highly contentious. Recent estimates suggest that of the two hundred thousand people who reached Austria in May 1945, some seventy thousand were killed, of whom fifty thousand were Croats.[60] As will be further explored later, Bleiburg became the cornerstone of a powerful victim complex that permeated postwar Croatian identity discourse, particularly in the emigration.

While most Ustaše sought through emigration to escape the new reality of a reconstituted, communist-led Yugoslav state, at least some continued the struggle for an independent Croatia. For several years after the official end of World War II, guerilla units of Ustaša soldiers known as Crusaders (Križari) waged a sustained, if limited and poorly organized, armed resistance against Tito's fledgling communist authority in Yugoslavia.[61] Among other acts of violence, the Križari sabotaged communications and rail lines, targeted public and governmental officials for assassination, attacked police and army installations, and even destroyed collective farms. Alive to the risk that the insurgency posed, the Yugoslav security services implemented a counterinsurgency campaign called Operacija Gvardijan (Operation Guardian), which involved first and foremost the infiltration of the Križari. The culmination of Gvardijan came in the summer of 1948 when the Križari launched their largest operation of the postwar era, codenamed Akcija 10. travnja (Tenth of April Action) in reference to the date of the NDH's founding. Fully informed of the details of this effort, the Yugoslav security services were able to entrap eighteen separate groups of Križari militants, totaling ninety-six men, including the leader of the operation Božidar "Božo" Kavran. Although small groups of Križari would occasionally appear even into the 1950s, Gvardijan and the subsequent trials of captured Križari extinguished once and for all any pretense of a significant Ustaša presence in postwar Yugoslavia. It was equally clear that, as before the war, the struggle for Croatian national liberation was a battle that would have to be waged from exile.

Chapter 1
There Can Be No More Discussion, 1948–1956

The Križari had predicated their incursions on the belief that Marshal Tito and his communist regime enjoyed—at best—minimal support among Croats in the new state and that a popular uprising was imminent. This expectation proved to be mistaken.[1] Through a combination of violence, authoritarianism, and—most importantly—genuine appeal, Tito and the communists had consolidated power by the summer of 1948, reducing substantially the number of active Ustaše in the country. The few stalwart devotees who had not left the country or died at the hands of Partisan forces were, after the war, systematically hunted and persecuted by the Yugoslav authorities, leaving the domestic movement shattered and in ruins. Opposition to Tito and the communists certainly existed in both Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, as did sympathy for the NDH and Pavelić (although less so for the latter). But both were forced to retreat from public political life.

This said, however devastated the Ustaše were by 1948, they were far from eradicated. In the immediate aftermath of the war, upward of 250,000 individuals from Croatian areas fled Yugoslavia. This included not only quislings, collaborators, and their families but also non-fascist anticommunists, war refugees, and displaced minorities, most notably ethnic German Donauschwaben.[2] Of these, up to one-fifth—between 30,000 and 50,000—were former Ustaše.[3] The majority ended up in refugee and displaced persons camps in bordering Austria and Italy. From there, they moved on to countries traditionally welcoming of immigrants, such as the United States, Canada, and Australia, or countries with regimes more sympathetic to the plight of wartime fascists, such as Argentina, Uruguay, and Spain. Additionally, approximately 12,000 Ustaša émigrés ultimately settled in West Germany.

Unlike 1929 and the period after the proclamation of the royalist dictatorship in Yugoslavia, the Croatian diaspora following World War II was dispersed, disjointed, disoriented, and lacking any real unity. The remnants

of the Ustaše sought to rebuild the movement where it had arisen—namely, in exile. But unlike the first half of the 1930s, the situation both in Yugoslavia and on the larger international stage—along with other factors—encouraged deep cleavages and political infighting among exiled Croatian nationalists and anti-Titoists abroad. These rifts, in turn, led to a splintering of the émigré separatist movement, as rivals for control of the diaspora community fought one another for authority over the remnants of the wartime Ustaša movement. This infighting ultimately led to a general deradicalization of Croatian émigré separatism, even if both the aims and rhetoric of the postwar movement remained as radical as ever. Essentially, even if the Ustaše survived after 1945 (albeit under different guises), terrorism and political violence ceased to be central to the movement—at least until the 1960s.

The Ustaše in Exile

Croats who found refuge in the West included some of the highest-ranking ministers, officials, and military officers of the NDH. The general commander of the notorious Jasenovac concentration camp, General Vjekoslav "Maks" Luburić, for instance, settled in Franco's fascist Spain. Another Jasenovac commander, Dinko Šakić, lived for nearly half a century in Argentina. Rafael Boban, commander of the Black Legion (Crna legija)—perhaps the most notorious military unit in the NDH—disappeared after the war, but at least some evidence suggests he served in the United States Army during the Korean War.[4] Andrija Artuković, who had served in the NDH as both minister of the interior and minister of justice and religion and was known as the "Himmler of the Balkans," ultimately found a new life in Southern California. Other ministers who managed to evade capture and find their way to the West included Vjekoslav Vrančić, minister of craftsmanship and trade; Džafer-beg Kulenović, deputy prime minister; and Stijepo Perić, minister of foreign affairs.

But unquestionably the most prominent Ustaša to forge a new life abroad was the poglavnik himself, Ante Pavelić. After escaping first to Austria and then to Italy, Pavelić ultimately found sanctuary in Juan Perón's Argentina. Like many Ustaše who found their way overseas, Pavelić secured passage to Argentina through the infamous ratlines run by the Croatian Franciscan priest Krunoslav Draganović.[5] Draganović had been sent to Rome in 1943 to serve officially as secretary of San Girolamo degli Illirici, a Croatian seminary college dating back to 1453. Unofficially, Draganović acted as Pavelić's representative to the Holy See.[6] In the half decade following the end of World War II, Draganović became the leading organizational figure in the escape from Europe not only of Croatian Ustaša leaders but also of German Nazis and other east European quislings. While it is impossible to determine precisely

how many Nazi and fascist fugitives Draganović and his network managed to smuggle out of Europe, at least one estimate puts the number at thirty thousand.[7]

Newly based in Buenos Aires, Pavelić attempted to reassert his authority over the Ustaše in exile and reanimate the Croatian separatist movement. As one contemporaneous Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) source in the Argentine capital stated succinctly: "Pavelić's first steps upon arrival in Argentina indicate that he plans to become politically active. . . . Pavelić is convinced that he has a mission to perform, and . . . he and his followers still regard him as the 'Poglavnik.'"[8] This mission, simply, was the reestablishment of an independent Croatian state. Shortly after his arrival in Argentina, Pavelić founded a new political party, the Croatian State-Forming Party (HDS; Hrvatska državotvorna stranka), chaired by the former NDH commissioner of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Oskar Turina.[9] The HDS was for all intents and purposes the Ustaše in different garb, seeking to make the movement more palatable to Western political leaders. To the public, Pavelić trumpeted the democratic and anticommunist character of the HDS, even while maintaining an authoritarian grip over the party, its members, and its ideology.[10] To sustain contact with his followers, Pavelić founded the émigré periodical *Hrvatska* (*Croatia*), which was published in Italy for distribution primarily in refugee and displaced persons camps there and in Austria.[11]

Underlying the HDS was the assertion that the Independent State of Croatia continued to exist, but that it was being occupied by an enemy force—namely, Tito and the communists.[12] Working from this premise, Pavelić established a Croatian government in exile based in Buenos Aires. This government was founded on April 10, 1951, the tenth anniversary of the proclamation of the NDH in Zagreb, a date clearly chosen to demonstrate the continuity of the two administrations. The government's structure further reinforced this connection. Džafer-beg Kulenović, who had fled to Syria after the war, was promoted from vice president of the NDH to president of the government in exile. The minister of internal affairs was Vjekoslav Vrančić, Pavelić's right-hand man in Argentina. Other officials included Marko Pejačević as foreign minister and Ilija Andrić as minister of culture, both of whom resided in England. Finally, the newly appointed war minister was General Rafael Boban, whose (unconfirmed) whereabouts were given as inside Croatia, where he was supposedly organizing armed resistance to Tito's regime.[13]

Pavelić also reestablished the Croatian Armed Forces (HOS; Hrvatske oružane snage) in exile. The HOS was originally formed in late 1944 in order to bring all military forces in the NDH under direct control of the poglavnik's inner circle following the failed Mladen Lorković-Ante Vokić coup against Pavelić earlier that year.[14] In May 1945, much of the HOS was destroyed by

Tito's Third Yugoslav Army after the repatriation of fleeing Croatian soldiers and others back into Yugoslavia by British forces at Bleiburg. The HOS in exile was conceived less as a unified force than as a network of "legions" spread out across the globe. As reconstituted in 1951, the HOS included four geographic divisions, each commanded by a trusted Pavelić underling. The South American unit was led by Ivan Asančaić, the North American by Rudolf Erić, the Australian by Srećko Rover. and the European by Maks Luburić. The cornerstone of the HOS was comprised of members of the Argentina-based Hrvatski domobran (Croatian Home Guard), a paramilitary organization founded in 1928 in royalist Yugoslavia and reconstituted in 1931 in South America. Elsewhere, the HOS consisted almost exclusively of émigrés who had left Croatia after the end of World War II, many of whom had served in the HOS during the war.[15]

Fundamental to Pavelić's political machinations was the belief—held by many Croatian political leaders since the nineteenth century—that Great Power patronage was the key to Croatian independence.[16] Such protective relationships had allowed the Ustaša's rise first to prominence in the 1930s and then to actual power in 1941. By 1948, however, the Grand Alliance among Hitler's enemies was a distant memory, replaced by a new global conflict whose foci were Washington and Moscow. With an eye to this new geopolitical landscape, Pavelić sought to reposition the Ustaša movement so that it had something to offer the Great Powers—namely, military assistance in the anticipated global struggle between communism and liberal democracy. All that would be asked in return were assurances that once the struggle for global hegemony had been won, an independent Croatian state would be accorded a place in the new world order. Of course, the immediate postwar political circumstances did not especially favor Pavelić and his followers, who had taken the side of the defeated Nazis during the war. But if two decades of international political activity had taught Pavelić anything, it was that opportunism and expediency, more than principles, drove Great Power strategic thinking.

Importantly, this perception did not necessarily mean dealing only with the Western Powers. In the dying days of World War II, the Ustaša leadership considered a plan to pursue a separate peace with the Soviets in exchange for guarantees that any new Soviet Croatian state would remain independent of Serbia or any new Yugoslav state.[17] Three years later, in 1948, elements of this plan were actively pursued following Stalin's expulsion of Yugoslavia from the Cominform and the widespread belief that a Soviet-led Eastern Bloc invasion of Yugoslavia was imminent.[18] Many émigré Croatian separatists—their fierce Catholicism and anticommunism notwithstanding—viewed the Tito-Stalin rift as an opportunity to actively push for Croatian independence. Prominent members of the Ustaša leadership, chief among them Vjekoslav Vrančić,

purportedly approached Soviet officials in Buenos Aires and Vienna with a proposition for mutual assistance against the common "Serbo-communist" enemy. Should the Soviets decide to invade Yugoslavia to remove Tito from power, the Croats offered, Ustaša military forces abroad would return to Yugoslavia to fight alongside the Red Army. All that was requested in exchange was that, following their victory over Tito's army, the Soviets would dismantle the federal Yugoslav state and establish a socialist but independent Croatia.[19] To demonstrate the seriousness of this offer, at least according to some sources, Vrančić ordered the Križari forces operating out of Austria to begin coordination of their efforts with Soviet military and diplomatic officials in order to lay the groundwork for a large-scale Soviet invasion.[20]

In the end, Stalin refrained from invading Yugoslavia, and nothing came of the Croats' offer. But the shelving of plans for a Soviet-Yugoslav war did not mean that the Croats had no role to play in the machinations of Great Power politics—at least in their own imaginations. By the early 1950s, as the contours of the Cold War began to take shape, Pavelić and his followers reached the same conclusion that many political observers of the day did—namely, that the expansionist nature of Soviet Marxist-Leninist-Stalinism would inexorably lead to a confrontation between East and West.[21] Rather than fearing the potential catastrophe of such a conflict, however, many émigré Croatian separatists welcomed the idea of a direct confrontation between Moscow and Washington. As they saw it, only a war could save either those already or those soon to be oppressed by the forces of communism. In a 1953 interview published in *Hrvatska* under the title "The Only Solution: A War," Pavelić asserted: "The liberation of East and Southeastern Europe can only come with war, a war waged by the still free peoples of the West against Bolshevik Russia and against World Bolshevism. There can be no more discussion of some kind of "inner" Communist Revolution, as some people would like to believe. The opinion that the people of the free-world have nothing invested in the destiny of those already oppressed by communism is akin to suicide, as communism is not simply international, but in fact universal, with its aim not simply power in Russia and the occupied lands."[22] Such a war, Pavelić continued, would not only undoubtedly be won by the West but would result in a smashing of the prevailing political landscape in Europe. In such a brave new post-communistic world, there would be no more need to prop up an artificial multiethnic state like Yugoslavia, thus leaving the Croats free to pursue their dream of an independent state.

Émigré Croatian separatists sought to position themselves as crucial allies of the West in the struggle against global communism, aiming thereby to ensure that their interests would be considered in the aftermath of the coming war. Pavelić and other exiled separatist leaders spent their energies redefining

themselves as steadfast democrats and model, loyal citizens in the hope that the Croats would be embraced as a "deserving" and "worthy" nation in the future reorganization of post-communist Europe. Indeed, they imagined an active role for Croats in the global struggle against state socialism. Pavelić himself revealed this aspiration in a letter to the signatories of the NATO pact in 1957, declaring:

> The Croat nation, and particularly the former officers and ranks of the Croatian armed forces now living abroad, are experienced in . . . anti-partisan warfare. In fact, during the last war, Communists from all Balkanic lands had been thrown on their territory and the Croatian army was engaged in fighting them. Thanks to these facts, the Croatian Liberation Movement has been in a position to elaborate plans for an efficient antiguerrilla warfare and has at its disposal the necessary personnel for the training of the corresponding cadres, with which we are willing to contribute to the liberation of the Croat nation and all other enslaved peoples, as well as the defense of the free world.[23]

The Croatian struggle for independence was not simply about the "enslaved" peoples of Croatia or even eastern Europe. Rather, the very survival of the democratic world was at stake. The battle against communism was a common one, and the Croats, in partnership with the West, would do their part. In fact, the Croats would by definition be the most effective combatants on the side of the West. As Pavelić explained in his interview published in *Hrvatska*, the task of fighting communism fell first to those, such as the Ustaše, who had seen their families massacred by the disciples of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and Tito. This made them the surest warriors against the forces of "atheistic bolshevism" and the ones who should lead the fight.[24]

The Korean War provided Pavelić with, in the words of one CIA report, "a grand opportunity for coming into the public eye as one of the 'allies' in any anticommunist struggle."[25] In Argentina, public opinion strongly opposed sending Argentine forces abroad as participants in a conflict between East and West. President Perón's solution was to turn to newly arrived political exiles from Europe who had yet to be fully integrated into Argentine society. These exiles would form an "Anticommunist Legion" that could be deployed as needed in the advent of war or armed conflict. Perón did not need to look far for his volunteers. Pavelić, who had close ties with not only the Argentine military but Perón himself, eagerly offered the newly formed HOS to fill the role.[26] Essentially, the South American division of the HOS was envisioned as an ersatz "Anticommunist Legion" to be made available to Perón at his will.[27] Similarly, the fighting forces of the other three continental divisions of

the HOS would be on offer to any government that might call on them in the global struggle against communism. In the same vein, Pavelić even pledged to form a military legion of Croatian emigrants that would fight in Korea alongside United Nations troops.[28]

Not surprisingly, Pavelić's overtures to the West came—as had been the case with the Soviets—to very little. Of the myriad reasons for the lack of interest on the part of the West, two stand out as formative for the later development of émigré separatist strategic thinking. The first, to quote another CIA report from 1951, was the judgment that there was "no indication that the Western Powers would accept the Ustashi in their society."[29] This was not, as one might expect, due to the fact that the Ustaše had fought on the side of the Nazis during the war; by the early 1950s, with both the real and perceived Soviet threat growing larger by the day, anticommunist credentials invariably outweighed any pro-fascist past.[30] "The danger of a Soviet invasion of Europe," the CIA conceded, "is considered to offer the possibility of greater toleration of the extreme right."[31] Indeed, evidence strongly suggests that the ratlines used to get leading Nazis and fascist collaborators out of Europe were tacitly—if not, in fact, actively—supported by Western intelligence services as the post–World War II geopolitical realities grew apparent.[32]

The issue, rather, was that the West had a vested interest in preventing the very thing Pavelić and his supporters desired: the destruction of socialist Yugoslavia. The 1948 split between Tito and Stalin had led directly to a reorientation of Yugoslavia's domestic and foreign policy. In particular, Tito's aim to forge a decidedly "Yugoslav" brand of socialism included closer ties to the West. Eager to exploit any rifts in Moscow's precarious but increasingly menacing Eastern Bloc, the West embraced Belgrade's advances and actively moved to bring Yugoslavia into its sphere of influence. Among other things, this meant that the West pledged its support for the territorial integrity of Tito's socialist state. A strong and unified Yugoslavia, the Western Powers believed, would serve as a bulwark against Soviet expansion in central, eastern, and southern Europe. A fractured and disunited Balkans, meanwhile, would only serve the purposes of the regime in Moscow. As long as Cold War Superpower relations remained frigid, few in the West saw any reason to challenge the status quo in Yugoslavia. Essentially, international politics—once the one true friend of the Ustaše—left those struggling for Croatian independence marginalized and isolated.

Further complicating the situation for Pavelić was that, as would be expected, his renewed political activity caught the attention of the regime in Belgrade. Within days of proclaiming the establishment of the Croatian government in exile in 1951, Tito transmitted to both the Argentinian government and the United Nations a request for the extradition of Pavelić and numerous

other former Ustaše.[33] Not unlike the period following the assassination of King Aleksandar in 1934, Pavelić found himself in the position of having his activities curtailed by the very people protecting him. The United States and its allies, with their focus on courting Tito, were clearly in no position to cultivate any kind of relationship with Croatian separatists. Unfortunately for Pavelić, this position extended to countries such as Argentina that themselves sought the favor of the Western Powers.[34] Following a period of contentious—if not at times openly hostile—relations between Argentina and the United States, Perón hoped to improve ties between the two countries beginning in the 1950s. Consequently, despite having welcomed war criminals from across Europe to Argentina after the war, Perón was forced to defer to the geopolitical interests of the Great Powers when it came to dealing with Pavelić and his supporters. Support that was too open to anti-Yugoslav activities might raise the ire of Washington. Pavelić was more or less free to live openly in Argentina and even to play an active role in public and political life. But, beginning in the mid-1950s, any agitation against Tito's regime was met with resistance in Buenos Aires.

Competition for Power

The unfavorable geopolitical reality of the early Cold War years was and remained the primary obstacle hindering Pavelić's dream of reconstituting an independent Croatian state. But global politics was not the only issue he faced as self-proclaimed leader of the postwar Croatian separatist movement. Despite Pavelić's hopes and claims, the Croatian émigré community in the postwar years was far from united behind the poglavnik. Rather, the émigré separatist movement was beset by deep fractures, fissures, and rivalries among those who had made it their personal mission to continue the struggle for an independent Croatia. From the moment he fled Croatia following the collapse of the NDH, Pavelić faced fierce competition for the loyalty and support of Croatian emigrants, both old and new. Over time, this competition would come in many ways to define separatist politics, as the fight for supremacy over the radical émigré community both shaped and delimited the development of organizations dedicated to Croatian independence. Separatist politics became as much an internal struggle among Croats abroad as a struggle against the forces both of international politics and the so-called Serbo-communist regime of Marshal Tito.

The first complication that Pavelić faced was the need to vie for political space with an already existing and well-established Croatian emigrant community. Mass migration of Croats began as early as the mid-nineteenth century, primarily to the Americas and Antipodes. Their numbers increased precipitously in the last decade of the century as industrial growth in much of the new world—particularly in the United States—attracted workers seeking to escape

the chronic impoverishment of southeastern Europe.[35] In the quarter-century leading up to World War I, an estimated 366,000 people emigrated from lands comprising Croats, with nearly 96 percent of those people—350,000—migrating overseas. Increased unemployment and a rise in poverty following the Great War led the United States to implement strict immigration regulations in the interwar period, leading to a drop in the number of migrants between the wars. But together with the estimated 100,000 Croats who emigrated during World War I, an additional 109,000 individuals sought better fortunes abroad between 1918 and 1941.[36] Of these, the majority settled in the Southern Hemisphere, most notably Argentina, Chile, Australia, and New Zealand.[37]

Two essential features of these nearly six hundred thousand pre–World War II emigrants made them anything but natural allies for Pavelić and his ilk. First, the majority of older migrants—unlike many who left after 1945—lacked a strong sense of their "Croatian-ness."[38] For much of the first half of the twentieth century—to say nothing of the nineteenth century—national identity remained an ambiguous source of personal association and identity, particularly in more rural and less well-educated corners of southeastern Europe, from which the majority of emigrants from Croatian lands had come. The notion of being "Croat" was not necessarily foreign to these early emigrants, but the label often shared equal footing with what would now be considered regional identities, such as Dalmatian, Slavonian, or Istrian, or even more locally rooted identities. Conversely, and equally important, being "Croat" was not intrinsically seen as being incompatible with being "Yugoslav," a notion anathema to the thinking of most postwar émigrés. Subsequently, even if many pre–World War II emigrants understood themselves to be "Croat" in one way or another, the political implications of its meaning—most notably the desire for an independent Croatian state—were not a given for those who migrated before the war.

The second source of difference was that the older generation of emigrants generally held significantly more left-leaning political views than did the former quislings and collaborators who went abroad after 1945. Like their counterparts from countries such as Italy, Greece, and Poland, the vast majority of migrants from Croatian lands before the World Wars were young men from economically depressed rural areas seeking work in the rapidly expanding heavy industry sector of the New World, notably factories, mining, and shipbuilding.[39] The economic and social uncertainty of this migration led to the establishment of ethnically based fraternal benefit societies that provided financial, social, and political support for members of the diaspora community. As with the fraternal organizations of other ethnic groups, the decidedly working class membership of these Croatian (or, as was often the case, "Southern Slav") societies made them natural recruiting grounds for

early industrial labor and socialist movements.[40] Indeed, in many cases these societies were organized in the first place as socialist clubs and only secondly as ethnic support organizations.[41] In the United States, these clubs were ultimately incorporated by the major parties that comprised the "Old Left"—the Socialist Labor Party, the Socialist Party, and the Communist Party—into a system of so-called Language Federations that served as a central feature of early twentieth-century working-class politics in the country.[42]

The influence of leftist elements among Southern Slav emigrants only increased following the move from the "United Front" to "Popular Front" strategies of the Communist International (Comintern) as established at the Seventh World Congress in Moscow in 1935.[43] Free to form alliances with any party willing to oppose fascism, communist parties redoubled their efforts to infiltrate many of the ethnic fraternal societies that represented immigrant workers but remained politically moderate. In regard to the Croatian community, this meant targeting first and foremost the North American–based Croatian Fraternal Union (HBZ; Hrvatska bratska zajednica),[44] by far the largest and most powerful benefit organization for Croatian emigrants worldwide.[45] Although the communists ultimately never managed to wrestle control of the HBZ away from the more moderate although still labor-friendly "National Bloc," they did manage to exert considerable influence on the development of the organization in the period immediately preceding the outbreak of World War II.[46] By 1938, at least according to one source, communists had come to dominate upward of 40 percent of all HBZ lodges.[47]

Even for those emigrants who remained unmoved by the ideological agendas of either the labor unions or communists, the political constellations of World War II conspired to ensure that the Ustaše and the NDH received little support among Croats abroad. From the earliest stages of the war, particularly in North America, emigrant Croats from across the political spectrum in large measure condemned the Nazi-backed regime of Ante Pavelić and expressed patriotic support for the war efforts of the Allied Powers. This sense of allegiance only became more entrenched after Pavelić declared war on the United States on December 14, 1941, following the lead of his masters in Berlin.[48] Even for émigré groups whose very aim was the establishment of an independent Croatia—such as the Hrvatsko kolo (Croatian Circle), founded in 1928—the Ustaše's fascist ideology, ties to Hitler and Mussolini, and draconian racial policies made support for the NDH difficult, if not impossible.[49] The strong communist presence in organizations such as the HBZ, meanwhile, made their support for the Allied Powers a given. Tito was not only seen as a valuable ally in the worldwide struggle against the forces of fascism but provided a vision of a future Yugoslav state that was in line with the political inclinations of many emigrants.[50]

In the postwar period, Tito sought to strengthen—or at the very least shore up—support for Yugoslavia's communist regime among Southern Slav emigrants, particularly Croats.[51] Together with investing heavily in regime-friendly emigrant organizations—in 1953, for instance, the regime in Belgrade secretly contributed US$50,000 to the HBZ—the Yugoslav government courted the emigrant community with a wide variety of social, cultural, and economic programs. The eponymous journal of the Zagreb-based cultural institution Matica Hrvatska (Latin: Matrix Croatica), as an example, was distributed to emigrants free of charge in the tens of thousands by the Yugoslav government. The regime also organized film and slide presentations in lodges and emigrant cultural centers around the world. These programs extolled the social and economic advances made by Tito's new Yugoslav state in the first years of socialist rule. The regime even arranged for high-ranking representatives of emigrant organizations to return to the "homeland" free of charge to experience for themselves the successes of Yugoslavia's particular brand of socialism, on which they would then report back to the emigrant community. Tito was so intent on courting diaspora Croats, in fact, that he employed "progressive" members of the Catholic clergy still residing in the Socialist Republic of Croatia to help appeal to those living abroad.[52]

Many within the pre–World War II generation of Croatian émigrés viewed Tito's Yugoslavia as being, if not a resounding success, certainly an agreeable solution to the "nationalities problem" that had been a feature of southeastern European politics for more than a century.[53] The establishment of an independent Croatian state—although perhaps attractive in theory—was not a priority and certainly not something over which blood needed to be spilled. Ante Pavelić and the Ustaše, meanwhile, were viewed as little more than Hitlerite quislings who represented the opposite of what many early emigrants had come to appreciate and admire about life in their new homelands. Even emigrants who longed to see Croatia one day "liberated" from the clutches of "Serbo-communism"—led primarily by adherents of the Croatian Catholic establishment—found it untenable to join forces with Pavelić and the remnants of the Ustaše.[54]

For both pre- and postwar emigrants who longed for an independent Croatian state, an attractive alternative to Pavelić—at least initially—was Vladko Maček and the Croatian Peasant Party in exile. In the interwar period, the HSS had been the most important Croatian political party in royalist Yugoslavia and served as the main opposition party in the country's Serb-dominated parliament. With many of the characteristics of a mass movement, the HSS enjoyed widespread support among the majority of Croats.[55] Following the war, the party—which, like the Ustaše, operated in exile—appealed to older emigrants and former Ustaše alike who were eager to distance the Croatian separatist movement from the NDH and its wartime crimes.

A voice of moderation but still a champion of Croatian rights, Maček seemed to represent a practical compromise between the extremes of fascism and communism that dominated postwar Croatian political discourse.[56]

Maček had become the leader of the HSS following the mortal wounding of the widely popular Stjepan Radić on the floor of the Yugoslav parliament on June 20, 1928, by the Montenegrin Serb parliamentarian Puniša Račić.[57] Maček did not share Radić's broad appeal among the masses, but he did prove an adroit and skilled promoter of Croatian interests.[58] Shortly before the outbreak of World War II, Maček negotiated an agreement with Dragiša Cvetković, Yugoslavia's prime minister, to establish a province (*banovina*) of Croatia within royalist Yugoslavia that enjoyed considerable and wide-reaching autonomy from Belgrade. Following the dismantling of royalist Yugoslavia by Axis forces in the spring of 1941, Maček—famously—twice refused the advances of Hitler and Mussolini regarding the leadership of the newly established independent state of Croatia. More infamously, however, Maček instructed his supporters to cooperate with the next choice to lead the quisling regime, Ante Pavelić. In the immediate aftermath of the declaration of the Yugoslav royal dictatorship in 1929, there initially had been contact and even collaboration between Maček and Pavelić, although this proved short lived.[59] Even so, Maček was treated with suspicion by the Ustaše. He ultimately spent the majority of the war under house arrest after first being interned for several months at Jasenovac.[60]

Following the war, Maček immigrated first to Paris before ultimately settling in the United States.[61] In contrast to the remnants of the Ustaše in exile who desired an independent Croatia above all else, Maček was dedicated to the principle of establishing a decidedly democratic Croatian state that looked only to the Anglo-American Powers for support. Indeed, for Maček outright independence was only secondary to promoting democratic values in Croatian lands. Both Maček and his presumed successor in the HSS, Juraj Krnjević, promoted the idea of a so-called Danubian federation of Christian democratic states comprising essentially the remnants of the Dual Monarchy. The states of this federation—Austria, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Serbia, and Croatia—would all be bound by the same political structures and principles, including the separation of church and state, the establishment of equality among religions and nationalities, and a strengthening of minority rights. They would not, however, have full independence. Instead, they would all enjoy semiautonomy within a larger federation.[62] While not perhaps ideal, Maček saw this solution as the only realistic mechanism by which democracy could be brought to Croatia. He also viewed the federation as a means to hinder any possible renewal of either Serbian or—for Maček even more worrying—Austrian or Hungarian hegemony over Croatian lands.[63]

If Maček's reasoned and cautious stance toward the "Croatian problem" won him supporters in the immediate aftermath of the war, his continued moderation into the 1950s ultimately proved his undoing. To whatever degree Maček desired an independent Croatian state, he remained convinced that a separation of the Croats from the Serbs was impossible without—in his words—a "bloodletting."[64] Consequently, Maček pursued partnerships with any and all political leaders who might be in a position to promote the idea of a Southern Slav federation that afforded Croatia relative—if not absolute—autonomy. Principally, this meant entering into negotiations with emigrant leaders from other Yugoslavia territories, such as Konstantin Fotić and Milan Gavrilović, both Serbian ministers in the royalist Yugoslav government in exile, and Miha Krek, leader of the anticommunist Slovene People's Party (SLS; Slovenska ljudska stranka) in exile.[65] More troubling for many Croatian emigrants, however, this strategy also meant discussions with Tito himself.[66] By the mid-1950s, both Maček and Tito had become concerned about keeping in check Serbian hegemony in the Socialist Republic of Croatia.[67] Subsequently, the two leaders sought an arrangement by which HSS supporters in exile could be repatriated back into Yugoslavia in exchange for amnesty on the one side and a pledge of allegiance to the socialist regime on the other.[68]

In the end, Maček's discussions with Tito came to nothing—as had his talks with other exile politicians. Even so, many postwar émigrés saw any effort to negotiate with Tito as a betrayal. Moderation vis-à-vis Croatia's neighbors to the north and west was one thing. The attempt to form alliances with not just one but two of the Croats' supposed enemies—Serbs on one side and communists on the other—was quite another. Even worse for many was the care Maček took to never speak out one way or the other concerning Croatian independence.[69] Altogether, Maček's myriad "transgressions" led many of those émigrés who had embraced the HSS in the immediate postwar period to abandon both him and his party by the mid-1950s. Although Maček's position may have been sensible given the prevailing political circumstances surrounding the "Croatian question," it was a stance around which very few could rally, least of all those strongly devoted to the establishment of an independent Croatian state. The backing the HSS enjoyed immediately after the war proved short-lived as Maček failed to keep himself politically relevant among Croatian émigrés. By the time of his death in 1964 at the age of eighty-four, Maček had become marginalized as a political force among Croats, both at home and in the emigration.

Internal Divides

If Pavelić only had to contend with first-wave migrants and the remnants of the HSS as he positioned himself as leader of the Croatian political emigration, his prospects of building an émigré separatist movement in the 1950s would not

have appeared all that different than it had in the 1930s. From its beginnings, the Ustaše had always relied more on support from fresh political émigrés than older economic emigrants, and Pavelić had always had greater appeal than the more moderate Maček among true radical separatists. Following World War II, however, Pavelić discovered that the safety of a life in Argentina meant isolation from developments in faraway but strategically crucial Europe. This separation left Pavelić vulnerable, as he would discover, to challenges from those who wished to usurp authority over the global Croatian separatist movement. By the mid-1950s, Pavelić found himself confronted by two main rivals to his throne: one who attacked the poglavnik from the (relative) left and one who did so from the right. A fierce and bitter competition broke out among opposing factions of nationalist émigré separatists who each claimed to hold the key to national liberation. While armed struggle and political violence very much remained part of the rhetoric of émigré separatism, petty rivalries ultimately subsumed the impetus to act against the Yugoslav state. The end result was an effective diminishing of the separatist movement, even if its rhetoric remained as inflammatory as ever.

Pavelić's position as leader of the Ustaša remnants was most seriously threatened in the immediate postwar period by Dr. Branimir (Branko) Jelić, one of the poglavnik's earliest allies. Jelić began his political career in 1927 as leader of the Croatian Rights Republican Youth (HPRO; Hrvatska pravaška republikanska omladina), the youth wing of the Croatian Party of Rights for which Pavelić was party secretary. The following year, Jelić founded the Hrvatski domobran—Croatian Homeland Defenders—a paramilitary youth organization dedicated to the establishment of an independent Croatian state.[70] Like Pavelić, Jelić was forced into exile following the establishment of the royal dictatorship due to his involvement in radical Croatian politics. Throughout the 1930s, Jelić was one of Pavelić's most valuable—if somewhat independent—lieutenants.[71] Shortly after the founding of the Ustaša movement, Pavelić sent Jelić to South America on a mission to build diasporic support for Croatian independence. This included the founding of local branches of the Hrvatski domobran around the world. Upon returning to Europe, Jelić became propaganda director of the Ustaše. Based in Hitlerite Berlin, Jelić served as editor and publisher not only of the Hrvatski domobran's eponymous periodical but also of the official Ustaša organ *Nezavisna Hrvatska Država* (*The Independent Croatian State*), which was distributed across Europe and the Americas.

In the lead-up to World War II, Jelić continued to serve as Pavelić's principal liaison with Croatian emigrants in the Western Hemisphere, a position that led, through a somewhat auspicious turn of fate, to Jelić avoiding being compromised by the wartime crimes of the Ustaše. When war broke out in

Europe in September 1939, Jelić was in the United States on a fund-raising tour. Eager to assemble his most trusted associates, Pavelić ordered Jelić to travel back to Europe as quickly as possible. In what seemed for Jelić at the time unfortunate but proved fortuitous in the long run, the return to Europe of Pavelić's lieutenant was thwarted. Through his associations with both King Aleksander's assassins and the Nazis, the wartime British government had deemed Jelić a "person of interest." Consequently, when a British naval patrol near Gibraltar stopped the ship upon which he was traveling on October 2, 1939—a full year and a half before the establishment of the NDH—Jelić was taken into custody. After a nine-month internment in Gibraltar's Moorish castle, Jelić was transferred to the United Kingdom, where he served out the remainder of the war as a British prisoner of war.[72]

In the eyes of many postwar émigrés, Jelić's imprisonment made him singularly qualified to lead the postwar separatist movement. First, Jelić was better able than any other former Ustaša leader to distance himself from the atrocities committed by the Pavelić regime during the war. Similarly, he could not be accused of direct Nazi collaboration or otherwise of having fought against the Allied Powers between 1939 and 1945. For émigré nationalists who viewed Western support as essential to the overthrow of socialist Yugoslavia and understood "the unfriendly attitude of the Allies toward [Pavelić's] Nazi-Fascist background," this made Jelić particularly appealing.[73] Secondly, Jelić remained untainted by the compromises Pavelić had made in order to secure the establishment of the NDH, most notably the ceding of much of Dalmatia, nearly all of Croatia's Adriatic islands, and parts of the Croatian Littoral, inter alia, to Italy.[74] Finally, Jelić was spared association with what came to be seen by many former Ustaše as the two great failures of Pavelić's postwar leadership: Bleiburg and the Križari. To whatever degree the Allied defeat of Nazi Germany and its client states was out of Pavelić's hands, the massacre that led to the deaths of tens of thousands of Croats could at least partially be blamed on failures of the Ustaša leadership at war's end.[75] Moreover, the abject failures of the Križari were seen more as a crisis of command than a problem of overwhelming military odds.[76]

Combined, all this gave Jelić—to quote one West German source—unique "moral capital" among many émigré Croats.[77] He was thus—in the words of Australian authorities—the perfect "image man" to return the cause of Croatian independence to respectability.[78] To this end, Jelić founded the Croatian National Committee (HNO; Hrvatski narodni odbor) in October 1950. The HNO garnered the support of numerous members of the so-called Ustaša intelligentsia, including the infamous priest Krunoslav Draganović, whose ratlines had secured passage for Pavelić among others out of Europe to South America. The HNO was conceived of as an umbrella organization

that would coordinate the efforts of all those working for Croatian independence, regardless of political affiliation.[79] The one qualification: adherents of extremist ideologies had no place in the new struggle for Croatian independence. While this meant first and foremost communists, who, of course, were of immediate concern to Croatian nationalists, it also meant fascists. As the founding program of the Croatian National Committee affirmed: "The HNO sets as its primary goal the liberation of Croatia and the re-formation of a sovereign Croatian state within its complete ethnic and historical territory. . . . [In doing so, the HNO] rejects every form of Totalitarianism, including that from the left as well as the right."[80] This last statement was clearly aimed at Pavelić and those former Ustaše who continued to back him.

The bulk of support for Jelić came from urban dissident intellectuals and middle-class professionals who believed, simply, that Pavelić was finished as a political leader.[81] More important for the development of the HNO, however, was the organization's close ties with clerical elements within the Croatian diaspora.[82] Maček and Pavelić both believed that nation came before religion.[83] For Maček, this was a stance aimed at integrating members of the Orthodox Church living in "historical Croatian lands" into the Croatian "nation," regardless of whether they identified themselves as Orthodox Croats, as some did, or as Serbs, as did the majority. For Pavelić, the issue had more to do with incorporating Bosnia's Muslim population—as well as the territory of Bosnia itself—into the Croatian political nation.[84] It also was about ensuring that the interests of the church remained at all times subordinate to the interests of the state. For Jelić and the HNO, however, religion—and by religion they meant the Catholic Church—was integral to both the nation and the state.[85] Subsequently, the HNO garnered the support of large swathes of the Croatian émigré Catholic establishment from both the pre– and post–World War II emigration, in particular members of the Franciscan order.

The relationship between Jelić and clerical elements in the diaspora gave the HNO a distinct advantage in recruiting those who left socialist Yugoslavia during the first half of the 1950s. The first level of integration into the West for the majority of Croatian arrivals from Yugoslavia—whether migrants, refugees, or exiles—was very often the Catholic charity organization Caritas. In its official capacity, Caritas provided new émigrés with food, medicine, clothes, shelter, and assistance in arranging permanent relocation.[86] Unofficially, the organization served as a recruitment center for the HNO in many parts of the world, including Italy, Austria, West Germany, and Australia. Very often, regional branches of Caritas were either headed by leading members of the HNO or by individuals with close ties to the organization. In addition to receiving aid, new émigrés—who often left socialist Yugoslavia in the early 1950s for political reasons and were already committed at least on some level

to the idea of Croatian independence—were steered by Caritas officials toward Jelić and the HNO, and away from Pavelić.[87] In Australia, the mobilization of new emigrants even included military training. The head of the Australian branch of Caritas used the organization to both organize and conceal a secret paramilitary organization called Battalion (Bojna) which, according to Australian sources, was financed at least in part by the Catholic Church.[88] HNO recruitment of new émigrés was aided by the fact that a proportionally high number of those who fled Yugoslavia in the first half of the 1950s were students, young academics, or members of the nationalist intelligentsia.[89] Many saw in the HNO a continuation of Jelić's Croatian Rights Republican Youth from the 1920s, making it a particularly attractive option for political engagement, violent or otherwise.[90]

The emergence of Jelić as a viable leader of the postwar émigré separatist movement posed considerable problems for Pavelić. In losing the support of both intellectuals and clerical elements within the diaspora, Pavelić faced the prospect of commanding a movement that possessed a body but no head. But at least Pavelić still held sway over the body. Where Jelić proved unable to challenge Pavelić was in the latter's appeal to the rank and file of the remnants of the Ustaše. In contrast to the majority of those Croats who left Yugoslavia during the first half of the 1950s, many of those who had fled in the immediate aftermath of the war were not members of the urban intelligentsia or nationalist bourgeoisie but instead generally belonged to the lower-middle and working classes.[91] Although many from this first wave of postwar emigrants flirted with dissident separatist leaders during the brief period in which Pavelić had been politically inactive after the war, most ultimately returned to the poglavnik following the formation of the HDS.[92] While the desertion of the intellectual and clerical elite was undoubtedly a blow, Pavelić could still at least ostensibly support the assertion that he remained the standard-bearer of the Croatian cause through his continued backing from the majority of the so-called Ustaša multitudes. Whatever Pavelić's failings, the Ustaša "masses" saw the former leader of the NDH as continuing to be, to quote one West German report, "the only true guarantee for an uncompromising struggle against the Serbs for Croatian freedom."[93]

But even this claim soon would quickly prove tenuous following a second—and arguably even more damaging—high-level defection from the postwar remnants of the Ustaše: Vjekoslav "Maks" Luburić. Also known as General Drinjanin or "General of the Drina," Maks Luburić was perhaps the best-known and most notorious perpetrator of Ustaša terror during World War II. Following the establishment of the NDH, Luburić quickly rose through the ranks of the quisling state due both to his blind devotion to Pavelić and his ruthlessness in dealing with "enemies of the state."[94] In July 1941, Luburić

was made commander of the Third Bureau of the Ustaša Surveillance Service (UNS; Ustaška nadzorna služba), which had as its mandate the establishment, organization, and administration of the NDH's system of concentration camps. Together with this position, Luburić formed and directed the Ustaša Defense (Ustaša obrana), a unit initially responsible for camp security and the extermination of prisoners but that later took part in the Ustaša campaign against both the Četniks and Partisans. In addition to the mass execution of Serbs, Jews, and Roma, Luburić was responsible for the liquidation of Croats deemed "dangerous" to the Ustaša regime.[95]

In the immediate aftermath of the war, Luburić was one of Pavelić's most trusted and committed devotees. He also was one of the most active figures in the postwar Ustaša movement. Following the collapse of the NDH, Luburić took command of the Križari, which continued to wage war against Tito and the Partisans across Croatia and Bosnia for nearly half a decade. The Yugoslav state's shattering of the Križari forced Luburić—like most Ustaše at the time—into uncertain exile, but it did not affect his position within the postwar émigré separatist movement. In 1951, Pavelić appointed Luburić as one of four commanding officers in the newly re-formed Croatian Armed Forces, "responsible for the co-ordination and direction of all Ustaša activities in Europe, including covert activities in Yugoslavia."[96] Furthermore, Luburić was charged with stemming the tide of defectors from the poglavnik's base of support in Europe. In Pavelić's eyes, no one was better suited at "persuading" deviationist émigrés to return to the poglavnik's camp than the man described by the West German Foreign Ministry as the NDH's "most ruthless liquidator of opponents."[97] If Luburić could win back those who had deserted Pavelić in favor of Jelić and the HNO through simple argumentation, all the better. But if not, Pavelić's orders to Luburić were clear: those who refused to fall in line were to "face the threat of death."[98] Notably, the liquidation of close rivals was nothing new to Pavelić. As early as 1933, for instance, Pavelić ordered the assassination of Gustav Perčec, one of the original founders of the Ustaša movement and a potential rival to Pavelić for control of the movement. In the 1950s, Luburić's efforts to bring intellectuals and leading religious figures back into the fold proved mostly fruitless, but the former Jasenovac camp commander did manage to consolidate at least the poglavnik's position among the rank and file.[99]

The prominent and even formative role Luburić played in Pavelić's early postwar political maneuverings made the general's break with his longtime master that much more devastating. After serving Pavelić not only faithfully but, in fact, fanatically for a solid quarter century, Luburić eventually came to the conclusion—like Jelić before him—that the poglavnik no longer possessed either the political standing or acumen to lead the campaign for true Croatian

independence. In contrast to Jelić, however, Luburić saw the problem as being that Pavelić had moved too far from the fundamentals of Ustašism, rather than the reverse. Essentially, whereas Jelić attacked Pavelić from a position of (again relative) moderation, Luburić assailed the poglavnik from a position of orthodoxy. Luburić, simply, saw himself as being more "Ustaša" than Pavelić himself, thereby making him more qualified than the poglavnik to assume leadership of the émigré separatist movement.

Precipitating Luburić's split from Pavelić was a rivalry that developed between Luburić and Pavelić's inner circle in Argentina, most notably Emil Klaić, Srećko Pšeničnik, Andrija Ilić, and, as leader of the clique, Vjekoslav Vrančić. This faction had been seeking a means—contrary to the wishes of Pavelić—to eliminate the HOS in exile since its founding in 1951. In its place, they wanted to incorporate all former Ustaša soldiers into the South American–controlled Hrvatski domobran.[100] The greatest impediment to this, the Vrančić circle believed, was Luburić, who continued to enjoy Pavelić's full trust in all matters concerning the military. Moreover, the Vrančić clique appreciated that Luburić's "renown" as the NDH's most fervent murderer would burden émigré Croatian separatism as long as he held a prominent position in the movement. In addition, to cite one West German assessment of the situation, Luburić's "arbitrariness, individuality, self-importance, and [unadulterated] leadership ambitions" only further reinforced the Vrančić circle's desire to drive a permanent wedge between Luburić and Pavelić.[101] They viewed the former camp commander of Jasenovac as dangerous and uncontrollable, and therefore in need of marginalization, if not outright elimination. This was true of Vrančić in particular, who saw in Luburić his greatest potential rival for the position of leader of the post-Pavelić Ustaša movement.

In this particular struggle, Pavelić refrained from outwardly supporting either side. He understood that any open rebuke of Luburić could lead to the loss of support among former Ustaša soldiers, particularly officers.[102] But soon enough, the Vrančić circle achieved the split between Pavelić and Luburić it desired. On June 28, 1954—St. Vitus Day, the Serbian national holiday—Pavelić met with the former prime minister of royalist Yugoslavia, Milan Stojadinović, at the latter's residence in Buenos Aires. The two former heads of state reached a deal to join forces in a common effort to bring down socialist Yugoslavia. Much of the arrangement focused on a "peaceful separation between Serbs and Croats."[103] As a compromise, Pavelić purportedly renounced any claim to the "historical borders of Croatia on the Drina," meaning the incorporation of all territory west of the Drina river—which today serves as the border between Bosnia and Serbia—into any new Croatian state. Instead, the two men settled on a return to the borders of the banovina of Croatia as laid out by the Cvetković-Maček Agreement of 1939. Effectively,

the poglavnik conceded large parts of Bosnia to Stojadinović in exchange for assurances that the Serbs would forever relinquish any and all territorial claims within any post-socialist independent Croatian state.[104] Furthermore, to help facilitate Tito's downfall, Pavelić was said to have been willing to offer parts of Istria to Italy in exchange for Rome's support for a new political order in the Balkans.[105]

For a nationalist whose very nickname—Drinjanin—evoked the mission to defend the Croatian nation and state to the banks of the Drina River, the agreement between Pavelić and Stojadinović was nothing short of a betrayal. In an open letter signed "A Croatian Patriot," Luburić attacked his former mentor for "once again" placing his personal interests over those of the nation. Luburić likened the Pavelić-Stojadinović agreement to the one reached between Pavelić and Mussolini during World War II.[106] Joining Luburić in his condemnation of Pavelić was the president of the Croatian government in exile, the Bosnian Muslim Džafer-beg Kulenović.[107] Kulenović believed all Bosnian Muslims—despite their adherence to the Islamic faith—to be ethnically Croat, and thus part of the Croatian nation. Like Luburić, Kulenović demanded that any "re-establishment of a sovereign Croatian state [had to encompass] its historical and ethnic borders."[108] This meant a state that—among its several territories—encompassed a unified Bosnia that stretched from the Adriatic to the Drina and from the Sava to the Bay of Kotor. For both men, anything or anyone that jeopardized this ideal was a traitor to the Croatian nation.

Fanning the flames of the controversy was speculation that the discussions between Pavelić and Stojadinović had actually been arranged by Titoist agents in Argentina. The meeting had been initiated by Josip Subašić, a Croatian immigrant who had arrived in Argentina before World War II. Subašić had a reputation, to quote one Canadian source, for everything "from publishing pornography to Yugoslavism and finally [to] Peronism."[109] He also had a history of left-leaning sympathies. During the Spanish Civil War, Subašić had been a known agitator against Franco and the Nationalists, often singing the praises of communism in a newspaper he published. He also had a close friendship with the Montenegrin-Argentine Eduardo Vuletich, formerly a volunteer for the Republicans in Spain and one-time general secretary of Argentina's General Confederation of Labor (Confederación General del Trabajo). Among Croatian émigrés, Vuletich was known to be a supporter of a "Titoistic form of socialism."[110] Subašić also had a reputation for being unscrupulous, willing to perform almost any task for the right price.[111] As told, the story was that leftist-Titoist elements in Argentina had recruited Subašić to infiltrate Pavelić's inner circle and secure the poglavnik's trust.[112] Once he did so, he would arrange the meeting with Stojadinović, thereby discrediting Pavelić and sowing dissent within the separatist émigré community.

The truth behind Subačić's motivations for bringing Pavelić and Stojadinović together remain shrouded by conjecture, rumor, and propaganda. The result, however, remains the same. The meeting allowed Luburić, in the words of one West German report, "to take into his own hands leadership [of the émigré separatist movement] in Europe without the interference of the Poglavnik."[113] After assailing Pavelić for "selling out" Bosnia to Stojadinović, Luburić went on the offensive against both the poglavnik and his entire inner circle in Buenos Aires. Luburić's most damning accusation concerned Pavelić's role in Juan Perón's struggle against the Catholic Church in the mid-1950s. Not only—so went the charge—had Pavelić headed the Peronist terror organization Nationalist Liberation Alliance (ALN; Alianza Libertadora Nacionalista), but he had also organized the ALN's excesses against the church around the time of Perón's excommunication in 1955.[114] Additionally, Luburić alleged, Pavelić had offered Perón the services of fifteen hundred Croatian soldiers for his "fight against the clerical revolution."[115] These troops formed a section of the Peronist Movement for Foreigners (MPE; Movimiento Peronista de los Extranjeros), which, as Luburić was quick to point out, had Josip Subašić as its head secretary. Much like both Maček and—in particular—Pavelić, Luburić placed nation above religion. At the same time, he also understood the importance of winning the support of clerical elements in the emigration. By condemning Pavelić's position in Perón's Argentina, Luburić could effectively position himself against not just the poglavnik but also Jelić in the ongoing tussle for control of the postwar separatist movement.

Exacerbating the rift was a falling out between Pavelić and Luburić's closest ally, Srećko Rover, the head of the Australian section of the Croatian Armed Forces. Rover fomented a dispute with Pavelić concerning the use of funds sent by him to Buenos Aires from Croatian émigrés in Australia and New Zealand.[116] Essentially, Rover believed that such funds should be used for local anti-Yugoslav recruitment and agitation, rather than to line the already full pockets of the aging and, in his view, generally useless Ustaša old guard in Argentina. Pavelić, meanwhile, believed that it was Rover who was padding his bank account to the detriment of the greater cause of Croatian independence. In response, Pavelić engaged in an active smear campaign against Rover.[117] Most damaging was Pavelić's accusation that Rover was, in fact, an agent of the Yugoslav government and the person responsible for the capture of the fifty-seven members of the Križari who had been executed in 1948. Rover had been part of the guerilla offensive Akcija 10. travnja that was thoroughly routed by the Yugoslav security services. According to Pavelić, the operation had failed because Rover betrayed the Križari and its head of operations, Božidar "Božo" Kavran, to Yugoslav authorities. In return, Pavelić alleged, Rover was allowed to flee socialist Yugoslavia and immigrate to Australia, where he arrived in 1950.[118]

In the wake of all these disputes, Luburić abandoned Pavelić once and for all. The decision was made all the easier by the military uprising against the government of Juan Perón in September 1955. Many exile Croats in Argentina and elsewhere believed that Perón's fall would lead to a backlash against fascist émigrés in the country and potentially even Pavelić's extradition to socialist Yugoslavia.[119] In late 1955, Luburić founded the Croatian National Resistance (Otpor; Hrvatski narodni otpor), headquartered in Franco's Spain. Otpor was a paramilitary organization fashioned along the lines of Pavelić's HOS. Indeed, defectors from the Croatian Armed Forces formed Otpor's core. Together with Rover in Australia, Luburić was joined in Otpor by the head of the North American section of the HOS, Rudolf Erić.[120] Effectively, all that remained of the Croatian Armed Forces was the South American section, which maintained close ties to Pavelić.

Even more than Jelić's HNO, Luburić's Otpor represented a real challenge to Pavelić's control over the postwar émigré separatist movement. Like Jelić, Luburić enjoyed a distinct advantage over Pavelić in having his organizational base in Europe. Although Argentina—at least until 1955—provided Pavelić with both safety and support, it was geographically remote. Pavelić was removed not just from events within Croatia itself but also from recruitment opportunities afforded by the arrival of new émigrés to the West. Luburić also appealed, as did Jelić, to clerical elements within the émigré community. In attacking Pavelić's role in the ALN, Luburić won favor with many clerical emigrants who remained radical in their nationalism but had long become disillusioned with the poglavnik. This was particularly true among Franciscans in the United States, who were split as to whether they should support the politically more agreeable but ideologically more problematic Pavelić or the ideologically more suitable but politically more ambiguous Jelić. At the encouragement of Rudolf Erić, Luburić's right-hand man in the United States, many Franciscans in the United States came to see Otpor as a viable alternative to both Pavelić and Jelić due to the combination of Luburić's fierce nationalism and support of the institution of the Catholic Church.[121]

In contrast to Jelić, however, Luburić undermined Pavelić's support among the masses of remnant Ustaše. Together with the growing number of working-class youth in the emigration, Luburić drew support from younger émigré adherents to the principle of Croatian separatism who had belonged to the rank and file of the Ustaša movement.[122] This younger generation saw Pavelić as too old and Jelić as too moderate to effectively lead the fight against the forces of so-called Serbo-communism. Luburić, however, was not only young—he was in his early forties at the time of Otpor's founding—but remained as militant and uncompromising as ever. As such, for many more younger extremist adherents of Ustašism Luburić came to be seen as the only

leader capable of continuing the uncompromising struggle for Croatian independence. Consequently, by the mid-1950s Luburić enjoyed influence and authority within the postwar political emigration comparable to that of both Pavelić and Jelić. Luburić could not lay claim to having truly usurped the poglavnik's position as leader of the postwar Ustaša. But neither could Pavelić continue to assert with any legitimacy that the émigré separatist movement remained united behind him.

Chapter 2
In Contradiction to Sociopolitical Norms, 1956–1960

Luburić's defection completed what West German officials called the "tragi-comedy" of the Croatian separatist movement in the emigration.[1] Pavelić's HDS, Jelić's HNO, and Luburić's Otpor all ostensibly shared a common aim. But by the mid-1950s, the separatists had shifted their focus away from fighting the hated socialist Yugoslav state to a basic—and ruinous—internal power struggle.[2] An analysis of the Croatian émigré political press by West German authorities—to provide one illustration—determined that a full three-fifths of all articles published during this period focused on "conflicts with opposing [émigré] groups or the polemic with the Serbs" rather than on the politics of independence. Of the remaining two-fifths, half dealt with issues related to life in Croatia and half with world events. But even these were written "by one side or the other as a way to underline the argument for their partisan political interests."[3]

The language used in this fratricidal conflict revealed the depth of the animosity among rival factions. As one of Luburić's supporters avowed at the height of the general's conflict with Pavelić: "Were we to return to the Homeland, we would set up two concentration camps: one for the traitors in the Homeland and one for the traitors in the emigration. Into the latter, should it prove necessary, we would stick Pavelić."[4] More concretely, members of one faction often physically harassed and intimidated supporters of rival groups if they failed to fall in line with one or the other organization.[5] The situation so degenerated that competing groups even drew up liquidation lists for members of rival émigré organizations.[6] One such list made by Pavelić's supporters had Luburić as its first name—a striking and telling development considering the two men's shared history.[7]

Unsurprisingly, such verbal and physical confrontation only led to a downward spiral of antagonism among competing groups within the emigration, leading to ever deeper schisms.[8] Still more important, the zealous and

even extremist posturing belied a fundamental truth about émigré Croatian separatism: the narcissism of minor intergroup differences had rendered the entire movement impotent. As the previously cited West German report from 1956 observed:

> The long list of sensations in the Croatian emigration . . . gives the impression that the whole of the community is engaged in a kind of theatrical farce, in which the individual "character actors" are at loggerheads over the grace of the director, the fees, and the acclamation of the audience. What presents itself here is a tragicomedy, which unveils the shaky foundations upon which the "Independent State of Croatia" of 1941–1945 was built while at the same time—taking into account the other disputes among the various groups—reinforcing doubts that the Croatian emigration as a whole might be able to make a positive contribution to the "liberation" of Croatia and the construction of an independent Croatian state.[9]

The struggle for an independent Croatian state, as émigré leaders were fond of proclaiming, was one without compromise. But in applying this conviction as much to petty and personal rivalries as to the struggle against actual enemies of Croatian liberation, separatist campaigners undercut their own efforts. The deep cleavages and political infighting that came to define émigré separatism in the 1950s stripped the movement of its impetus toward action. First and foremost, this meant that political violence, once a mainstay of émigré Croatian separatism, ceased to be part of the functional political repertoire of radicals. Émigré political leaders remained as fervent as ever in their books, treatises, op-ed pieces, and letters in support of the Croatian cause, including in their continued call to arms against the hated Yugoslav state and its "Serbo-communist" masters. But direct action such as that taken by the prewar incarnation of the Ustaše—that is, terrorism—was effectively abandoned as a form of political engagement.

Pavelić's Last Stand

Exacerbating the prevailing disharmony and derision among radical émigrés was Ante Pavelić's desire to reassert himself as the unchallenged leader of the separatist movement. Pavelić, after all, was still—and in his imagination would always be—the poglavnik, and to whatever degree he may have contributed to the overall devitalization of Croatian separatism in the postwar period, in his mind nothing could change the reality of his singular place in history, not only of radical Croatian nationalism but indeed of the Croatian nation as a whole. Even Pavelić's staunchest critics among his fellow separatists

conceded that the former poglavnik should be praised for having achieved something that no other Croatian political leader had since the year 1102—namely, national independence.[10] Conscious of this legacy, in the mid-1950s Pavelić returned to the basics of the prewar Ustaša movement in an effort to recover the support he had lost to Jelić and Luburić.

Pavelić understood that any enduring appeal he possessed depended first and foremost on his role as founder of the Independent State of Croatia. Rather than viewing the NDH as a dark stain on Croatia's past from which they needed to distance themselves, radical nationalists saw it as confirmation that Croatian independence was a "historical truth" that gave legitimacy to their continued struggle. As Pavelić's Australian rival Srećko Rover wrote in an open letter cum treatise on the prospects for socialist Yugoslavia's survival in 1955: "Nothing is more unfortunate for a nation than unreal politics based on mere imagination, and no one is guiltier of bringing downfall on their own people than are the ones who base their national fight on chimeras, and who do not and could not see real facts."[11] The mere existence of the wartime Independent State of Croatia meant that national liberation inarguably belonged to the politics of the possible, on the grounds that any nation that had once had a state of its own could have one again. Whatever one thought about Pavelić, he had made Croatian statehood a reality—this provided, of course, that one ignored the fact that the NDH's establishment was possible only as a result of the Nazi invasion and subsequent defeat of royalist Yugoslavia, as most radical émigrés did. Thus, for émigré separatists the pursuit of separatist politics intrinsically belonged to the realm of the attainable and not to some indefensible pipe dream.

In both his rhetoric and—perhaps more importantly—his organizational skills, Pavelić mobilized this legacy to help stem the tide of defections to his rivals. In 1956, Pavelić fundamentally restructured both his own post-Ustaša separatist party and the larger global network that linked the organizations that remained loyal to him. He did so—as described by contemporaneous Australian authorities—in an effort to "[re-]activate his political efforts and to give them a broad base."[12] Pavelić began his organizational restructuring by abandoning the Croatian State-Forming Party that he had founded in 1951.[13] Originally, Pavelić had hoped that the HDS might bestow a modicum of respectability on the postwar remnants of the Ustaše. He quickly discovered, however, that this strategy suffered from a double failing. On the one hand, the depravity of the NDH regime ensured that anything that Pavelić touched would be both politically and morally contaminated. Even if the Western Powers preferred former fascists to communists, Pavelić was too intimately connected to Hitler, Mussolini, and the fascist war against the Allies to ever be trumpeted as a figure for democratic national self-determination. On the

other hand, Pavelić's attempts to gain credibility undermined his radical credentials among many of his longtime supporters. Many combatants envisioned a struggle for Croatian independence that rejected compromise, a principle that many felt Pavelić and the Croatian State-Forming Party had abandoned. Essentially, in wanting to be accepted by the West—which was never going to happen—Pavelić alienated his own supports, leaving him isolated.

To replace the HDS, Pavelić established the Croatian Liberation Movement (HOP; Hrvatski oslobodilački pokret) on June 8, 1956. Much like Jelić's HNO, the HOP was conceived not as a party unto itself but as a broad "national front" organization that would integrate the efforts of any and all groups seeking Croatian liberation anywhere in the world.[14] As elucidated in its constitution, the HOP was "a universally Croatian, non-party, and democratic movement . . . [with] its aim being to provide the framework within which to concentrate, coordinate, and reinforce the activities of the adherents of, [inter alia], the Croatian Ustaša Movement, . . . as well as of all the patriots grouped in associations and organizations under a variety of names in a variety of foreign countries, and pursuing the same goal of liberation."[15] Pavelić gave the HOP the appearance of striving to be a relatively loose confederation of like-minded groups that shared a common aim but wished to maintain their own organizational structures. While he sought to cloak the organization with a democratic structure and mission, in reality the HOP was effectively a vehicle for the poglavnik to reconsolidate his position as leader of radical separatist politics.

Central to this rebranding of the HDS was Pavelić's conscious aim to imbue the new organization with the legacy of the interwar Ustaše. He did so most obviously by invoking the name itself in the HOP's constitution. Among all the émigré separatist groups operating in the world, the HOP alone would be the direct successor to the original Ustaše, and thus the only one capable of once again achieving Croatian independence.[16] Less obviously—but possibly more shrewdly—Pavelić sought in particular to channel the spirit of the prewar Ustaše by characterizing the HOP as a movement as opposed to a party. For Pavelić, it was important that the HOP have the appearance—at least in the eyes of his followers—of being a true social and political phenomenon, not simply a legal institution. In naming his organization the Croatian Liberation Movement, he hoped to imbue the HOP with a revolutionary character that would have been muted had it been called a "party" or "organization," regardless of its actual nature. Such a rhetorical strategy, of course, was not new to Pavelić. In 1933, notably, he had rechristened the "Ustaša–Croatian Revolutionary Organization" (Ustaša–Hrvatska revolucionarna organizacija) to "Ustaša–Croatian Revolutionary Movement" (Ustaša–Hrvatski revolucionarni pokret).

More pragmatically, Pavelić gave the HOP a structure that would bring as many of his former followers back into his camp as possible. Five regional Central Committees—South America, the United States, Canada, Australia, and Europe—were given the mandate to organize, administer, and supervise all local and national separatist groups.[17] Essentially, the HOP would serve as an umbrella organization that was open to any group involved in the struggle for Croatian independence. The only proviso, of course, was that "the group has not offended and is not acting against the Croatian Liberation Movement."[18] Nominally, the Central Committees were to be agents of cooperation that operated above and outside party politics. Local branches of the HOP in places such as West Germany and Australia, for instance, formally shared equal status with what might be dozens of ostensibly equal independent affiliates of these Central Committees. In practice, however, leading members of local HOPs controlled not only the executive boards of their own organizations but also those of regional Central Committees. In the end, the Central Committees effectively became little more than subsidiaries of local HOPs, which, in turn, remained steadfastly loyal to the poglavnik.[19]

The most important regional committee was the Central Committee of Croatian Associations in Europe (SOHDE; Središnji odbor hrvatskih družtava Evrope), which comprised delegates from fifty-four separate organizations from across the continent.[20] Together with the HOP in West Germany, SOHDE included groups as diverse as the United Croats of West Germany (UHNj; Ujedinjeni Hrvati Njemačke), a group of hardline radicals founded in 1950, and the Croatian Worker's Union for Germany (HRS; Hrvatski radnički savez za Njemačku), a union of miners that had ties to the Confederation of German Trade Unions (DGB; Deutsche Gewerkschaftsbund).[21] SOHDE also comprised a restructured HOS that replaced the one eviscerated by the loss of three of its four senior commanders following Luburić's split with Pavelić and served as the military wing of the HOP.[22] The similarly diverse Central Committee of Croatian Associations in Australia (SOHDA; Središnji odbor hrvatskih družtava Australije) encompassed twenty-five different organizations.[23] In all, each of the five regional Central Committees gave greater cohesion to the political, organizational, and even military resources available to Pavelić, who was able both to stem the growing tide of dissidence against him and reactivate his remaining supporters.

The changes made by Pavelić largely enabled him to reverse many of the setbacks he suffered during the first half of the 1950s. The HOP's organizational structure acknowledged, accommodated, and indeed exploited the disunity within the émigré separatist movement. This allowed him to create a network of followers that enjoyed greater breadth than either Jelić or Luburić could manage. By the end of the decade, the HOP became the

most prominent organization among radical nationalists within the Croatian diaspora, reclaiming the title from the HNO and Otpor. As one assessment of the HOP by West German Authorities in July 1959 affirmed: "After a severe crisis, which this group underwent in the postwar period, . . . [the HOP] has recently succeeded in gaining new impetus and momentum. Today, it is undoubtedly the strongest, most active, and best organized political group in the Croatian emigration."[24] Pavelić's position as leader of the radical émigré separatist movement remained far from uncontested, but through the HOP the poglavnik ensured at the very least that his own personal vision for a postwar Ustaša movement lived on.

Unfortunately—from Pavelić's perspective—the poglavnik himself could enjoy only briefly the benefits of his structural reorganization. Late in the evening of April 10, 1957—on the sixteenth anniversary of the establishment of the NDH—Pavelić was shot as he left a bus in the Buenos Aires suburb of Lomas del Palomar. The gunman fired five times, striking the poglavnik twice, once near the spine and once in the clavicle. The assailant was most likely Blagoje Jovović, a Montenegrin émigré to Argentina who, during World War II, had fought first with the Partisans and then the Četniks. By Jovović's own account—which he first made public in 1999—the would-be assassin acted independently of the Yugoslav or any other security services.[25] Instead, Jovović shot Pavelić because—as he later claimed to have said at the time of the shooting—"I want to kill the greatest butcher of Serbs, I want to avenge Serbian victims, and I'm going to do it because I'm a Serb; I do it for the nation [narod]."[26]

Pavelić's wounds were not life-threatening. But they were serious enough to require hospitalization. Consequently, both the poglavnik's identity and whereabouts—which had been something of an open but nevertheless still guarded secret—came to the attention of first local, then national, and ultimately international media.[27] They also came to the attention of the government in Belgrade. Within a week of the assassination attempt, Yugoslavia renewed its request for Pavelić's extradition with the government in Buenos Aires, to which the government in Buenos Aires relented on April 28, 1957.[28] To Belgrade's dismay, however, three days previously the still recovering Pavelić had clandestinely fled Argentina to neighboring Chile. For a third time in his life, Pavelić was forced into exile.[29]

While the assassination attempt on Pavelić was unsuccessful, it did effectively bring to an end the Poglavnik's public political career. Following his flight from Argentina, Pavelić was rumored to have taken up the position of head of secret police under Paraguay's dictator Alfredo Stroessner.[30] In truth, Pavelić's movements after April 1957 were somewhat less dramatic. After a short sojourn in Chile, Pavelić opted to return to Europe, at least in part to

reduce the distance between himself and his main rivals in the émigré separatist movement.[31] Unfortunately for Pavelić, as both a former Nazi quisling and a wanted war criminal his options were limited; post–World War II Europe, simply, was not South America. In the end, Pavelić had little choice but to seek patronage from one of the few ideological allies remaining on the continent. Francisco Franco agreed to provide the poglavnik sanctuary in Spain, but only under certain provisions. As with Mussolini in the period following the 1934 assassination of King Aleksandar, the Spanish leader demanded as a condition of refuge that the poglavnik withdraw from both political and public life.[32] With few alternatives, Pavelić accepted Franco's offer and entered into what some would have considered a long-overdue retirement. Occasionally, Pavelić issued communiqués to the émigré community calling for a unified front against continued "Serbo-communist" hegemony over Croatia.[33] But any pretense that Pavelić remained the functional leader of the separatist movement all but disappeared. On December 28, 1959, two years after arriving in Spain and more than two and a half years after being shot, Pavelić died in a German hospital in Madrid, having receded into relative obscurity.

That Pavelić, before being shot, was able to maneuver the HOP to the forefront of Croatian émigré separatism during the second half of the 1950s said less about the strengths of his organization than the weaknesses of not just the poglavnik's rivals but indeed of the separatist movement as a whole. The HOP owed its initial successes as much to the failure of either Jelić or Luburić to build on the promising inroads they had made against Pavelić earlier in the decade as it did to the poglavnik's own maneuverings. The previously cited West German assessment of the HOP's ascendance missed this important detail, thus overestimating the organization's strength. It also explains why Pavelić's death was less of a blow to radical separatism than it might have been under different circumstances. There was no question as to Pavelić's historical and symbolic importance for most—if not all—separatist nationalists through to the end of the 1950s. But Pavelić had by the time of his death ceased to be a unifying political force for the Croatian cause. Although Pavelić enjoyed a bona fide political revival during the second half of the 1950s, his own inefficacy, as well as that of the broader movement in the immediate postwar years, mitigated the significance of his death for those seeking the destruction of socialist Yugoslavia and the establishment of an independent Croatian state.[34]

Disarray, Disfunction, and Deception

The inability of either Jelić or Luburić to expand on their initial gains within the political diaspora spoke to the extreme dysfunction within the radical separatist movement. Of the two pretenders to the throne, the case of Luburić is simpler but also somehow less explicable. Ultimately, internal strife presented less of

a problem than did simple organizational inertia. Luburić functioned well as a firebrand and zealot but less so as a calculating political agent. In the first five or so years of its existence, Otpor did little to galvanize its initial supporters.[35] Luburić's detractors employed the hackneyed but nevertheless effective ploy of emasculating Luburić, blaming Otpor's relative ineffectiveness on Luburić's inability to be master of his own home. As recounted in one West German report, Luburić's enemies declared that his failure to build his base was due to the fact that "he had difficulties with his wife, who demanded that he give up politics."[36] In truth, the issue was Luburić's political inexperience and failure to develop a clear program for Otpor. Organizing, motivating, and leading a diverse and dispersed political organization, Luburić discovered, was not the same as leading fanatical militants into battle, as he had done during World War II. Nevertheless, Luburić made no efforts to coordinate his efforts with others such as Jelić to build a collective alternative to Pavelić and the HOP.[37] In time, Luburić would acquire the political acumen to fulfill to some degree the revolutionary promises made at the time of his split with the poglavnik in the mid-1950s. But in the period leading up to Pavelić's death, Luburić remained passive, after he had stormed onto the scene with such force.

The decline of Jelić's HNO, in comparison, was both more public and more dramatic. During the first half of the 1950s, Jelić had built support for the HNO in part by playing off the organizational infighting within Pavelić's HDS that had initially soured so many to the poglavnik. By the end of the decade, however, the HNO succumbed to the same kind of internal strife. The downward spiral began in September 1958, when the HNO executive committee moved to suspend one of the organization's most prominent members, Miroslav Varoš. In addition to being a member of the executive committee, Varoš was second treasurer of the HNO, vice director of the section for propaganda and information, and chair of the central committee of the HNO's Italian branch.[38] Ostensibly, Varoš was suspended from the HNO for misappropriating funds in his role as second treasurer. The alleged infraction involved the rather paltry sum of 19,429 Italian lira, at the time worth about 130 DM or US$31.[39] In reality—as was all too typical within the émigré separatist movement at the time—the censure of Varoš was the result of a power conflict between the two leading personalities within the HNO.

Importantly, Varoš himself was not one of these two men. Rather, the conflict was between Jelić and Krunoslav Draganović, the leading figure of the Italian wing of the HNO.[40] Draganović is probably most widely remembered for his role in the infamous ratlines that facilitated the escape of thousands of Ustaše—along with other Nazis and Nazi collaborators—to South America following World War II. Despite the overall success of these escape routes, Draganović and Pavelić had—almost predictably—an intractable falling out

soon after the end of the war. The cause of this estrangement between the two prominent Ustaša figures remains clouded in conjecture. The most prominent rumor within the diaspora at the time suggested that Draganović had arrogated part of the Ustaša gold entrusted to him for safekeeping, which understandably angered Pavelić.[41] Whatever the actual cause, the schism between Draganović and Pavelić was all too real, leading the former to ally himself with Jelić from the earliest days of the HNO. Although Draganović never held a prominent position within Jelić's organization, he supported the efforts of Jelić and the HNO through, in his own words, "charitable and social activity."[42] Nevertheless, as reported by West German authorities, "this naturally did not prevent him from becoming behind the scenes the most active personality within the Croatian National Committee as well as its 'Grey Eminence.'"[43]

For much of the 1950s, Draganović remained faithful to the HNO's party line as set out by Jelić. A series of personal setbacks, however, convinced Draganović of the need to broaden his influence within the émigré community, including among those outside the HNO. In early 1958, Draganović had been passed over for the position of rector of the San Girolamo degli Illirici seminary in Rome, a post he long had coveted. To make matters worse, Draganović lost out to a candidate—Giorgio Kokša—favored by the regime in Belgrade. Adding insult to injury, Draganović was then forced to vacate completely his rooms at the seminary where he had resided since 1943 ahead of a visit to the Vatican by the archbishop of the Catholic Church in Belgrade, Josip Antun Ujčić.[44] In what can only be considered a related development, just months after his eviction from San Girolamo, Draganović began working as an informant for United States Army Intelligence against socialist Yugoslavia.[45]

The leadership of the HNO—Jelić in particular—was, of course, displeased by Draganović's actions. Exacerbating tensions between Draganović and Jelić were persistent rumors that thousands of deutsche marks raised in social programs run by the former in the name of the HNO ended up in his own personal bank account and not that of the organization.[46] A further complication was that, as a priest, Draganović was in many ways beyond reproach, creating a problem for Jelić.[47] Beyond the reverence in which many Croats held the Catholic Church, since its founding the HNO relied more than any other émigré group on clerical elements for support, making any public reprimand of Draganović difficult. Instead, Jelić sought to undermine the priest by weakening and marginalizing the entire Italian wing of the HNO, which meant first and foremost removing Draganović's closest collaborator and ally in Italy, Varoš.

This gambit, however, failed when Draganović—whether acting out of necessity or opportunity—found in the HNO Executive Committee's censure of Varoš an occasion to further elevate his position within the émigré

community. Instead of capitulating to Jelić, Draganović and Varoš went on the offensive by detaching the Italian faction of the HNO from the German one. In May 1960, Draganović and Varoš formed yet another new émigré separatist political organization, the Croatian Democratic Committee (HDO; Hrvatski demokratski odbor), headquartered—like Jelić's organization—in Munich but comprised almost wholly of members of the HNO's Italian wing.[48] To be sure, there was real intellectual dissension prior to 1959 between the Draganović/Varoš and Jelić cliques, primarily regarding the potential governmental structure of any eventual independent Croatian state.[49] However, as was often the case in rifts within the radical émigré community, personal rather than political disputes were central to Draganović and Varoš's defections from the HNO.

The impact of this split within the HNO's leadership precipitated a crisis in the organization. As one Australian report asserted: "During the period 1953–7 it can be reasonably said that the [Croatian] National Committee was pre-eminent in Croatian activities in West Germany" and elsewhere. The same, however, could not be said of the HNO's standing by the end of the decade.[50] Both the influence and importance of the organization abated significantly during the closing years of the 1950s, in large measure due to a failure of the HNO to contend with the successes of Pavelić's HOP. If Jelić harbored any plans to reverse this trend once Pavelić was out of the picture, those plans were effectively dashed by the rupture in the HNO brought on by Draganović and Varoš.[51] At precisely the moment when Jelić should have been focusing his energies on expanding the HNO's base—meaning, the period following Pavelić's death—he was forced instead to work full time consolidating his position within the organization he himself had founded.

Unfortunately for Jelić, even this proved too much for the one-time hope of the émigré separatist movement.[52] Just two years after Draganović and Varoš officially broke from the HNO to form the HDO, Jelić faced further revolt within the ranks of his organization. In the early 1960s, a number of prominent members of the Croatian diaspora endeavored to establish an all-encompassing international assembly of political parties, organizations, companies, and individuals dedicated to the cause of Croatian independence called the Croatian National Council (HNV; Hrvatsko narodno vijeće). Simply put, the HNV was ill-fated from the start, as arguably the three most high-profile, which is not to say most important, relevant, or influential, groups in the Croatian diaspora—namely, the HOP, HSS, and HNO—all refused to collaborate on the project. Those who did participate, meanwhile, proved prone to the same kinds of personal and political disputes and conflicts that had plagued the émigré separatist movement since the earliest postwar years.[53] The first meeting of the HNV, held in New York City in August 1962, proved to be the last, at least of the council's first iteration.[54]

Although the HNO executive committee did not endorse the HNV, Jelić attended the meeting in New York anyway, claiming to represent all European-based Croats. Upon his return to Europe, he was confronted by two of his closest confidants and allies, Mate Frković, who had been the last NDH minister of the interior, and Stjepan Buć, a cofounder of the HNO and former head of the Croatian National Socialist Party (HNSS; Hrvatska nacionalsocijalistička stranka). The clash between Jelić and the Frković/Buć clique led to a very public series of recriminations and accusations that ranged, once again, from the political to the personal. This included an article by Frković that echoed the rhetoric of emasculation earlier levied against Luburić, in which he wrote that "the great man and great Croatian politician" Jelić was merely a "completely ordinary plaything in the hands of his wife."[55] In any case, the conflict resulted in yet a further split in the HNO, with Jelić relocating one faction of the organization to West Berlin and Frković and Buć taking over the remnants of the HNO in Munich.

Back in Italy, the disarray in the HNO might have been a boon to Draganović and Varoš's newly formed HDO, had it not inherited the dysfunction endemic to its precursor, and indeed the entirety of the separatist movement. Just one year following its establishment, the HDO experienced a debilitating fracture of its own. The schism followed a familiar script. At a meeting of the HDO held in Münster in November 1961, the group's leading intellectual and one of the more enigmatic figures in the nationalist diaspora, Ante Ciliga, tabled a motion to reorient the group's approach to advancing the cause of Croatian independence.[56] Rather than continuing as a revolutionary political organization, Ciliga argued, the HDO should adopt a policy of promoting passive resistance to Belgrade in the homeland by helping build from the outside a legal, grassroots parliamentary opposition to the regime within the Socialist Republic of Croatia itself.[57]

During the interwar period, Ciliga had been a prominent figure in the left wing of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (KPJ; Komunistička partija Jugoslavije), serving as regional secretary for Croatia and editor of the party's official organ, *Borba*. After his expulsion from royalist Yugoslavia in 1926, Ciliga joined the Soviet Communist Party and moved to Moscow. Due to his close personal and ideological relationship with Leon Trotsky, however, Ciliga was arrested and exiled to Siberia four years after his arrival in the USSR. As an Italian citizen by birthplace—Istria, where he was born, came under Italian control after World War I—Ciliga was released in 1935 as part of a larger agreement between Mussolini and Stalin. Eventually, Ciliga settled in Paris, where as an "ultra-leftist," he issued fervent and embittered denunciations of both Stalinism and Trotskyism. Following the German occupation of the French capital in 1940, he returned to Croatia, only to

be arrested and imprisoned in the Jasenovac concentration camp. Ciliga's fierce anti-Soviet credentials made him useful to the NDH, however, and in 1943 he was released from Jasenovac and drafted to serve as an intellectual critic of Bolshevism and the USSR for the NDH's politico-cultural weekly *Spremnost* (*Readiness*).

After the war, Ciliga ultimately settled in Rome, where he became a leading émigré critic of both communism and fascism as well as a committed supporter of national—and above all Croatian—rights.[58] He was an early supporter of the HNO and for much of the 1950s worked closely with Jelić, most notably through his publication of the HNO's *Bilten Hrvatskog narodnog odbora u Italiji* (*Bulletin of the Croatian National Council in Italy*). When Draganović and Varoš split from the HNO, Ciliga sided with his compatriots in Italy. Within two short years, however, Ciliga found himself on the outs with the HDO leadership, which viewed his ideas not just as a threat to the organization but to the very project of nationalist separatism. Shortly after the meeting in Münster, Ciliga and his supporters were expelled from the organization for "actions incompatible not only with the spirit of the organization's statute, but also with the wishes and actions of Croatians in the homeland and their determination, to the very end, to persevere until victory," adding yet one more rift to the growing number of cleavages besetting the émigré separatist movement.[59]

Ciliga's ouster, meanwhile, was little more than a prelude to a more momentous event later in the decade that would impact the HDO—and indeed the entire émigré separatist movement. While on a visit to the border city of Trieste in September 1967, Krunoslav Draganović disappeared without a trace. For two months, the priest's whereabouts remained a mystery, leading to rampant speculation regarding his fate within the émigré community. Many assumed that Draganović had either been kidnapped by Udba operatives and forcibly repatriated to socialist Yugoslavia or simply had been murdered by agents of the regime.[60] In early November, however, Draganović resurfaced at a press conference organized by the Yugoslav government in Sarajevo. He declared that his return to socialist Yugoslavia had been voluntary. In a letter released by governmental authorities, he also explained that he had come to recognize fundamental changes both within Yugoslavia and in the Holy See's policies toward the countries of eastern Europe, leading him to return to his homeland.[61]

Within the emigration, of course, there was suspicion that both Draganović's repatriation and his sudden praise of the regime had been coerced rather than undertaken freely. With time, however, questions among émigré separatists began to circulate that reconsidered the actions of Pavelić's former right-hand man in the Vatican. After his return to socialist Yugoslavia,

Draganović was allowed to move freely within Bosnia and Croatia, and photographs of his travels appeared often in Yugoslav newspapers.[62] Furthermore, Draganović never appeared before a Yugoslav court, even though the regime had previously declared him a war criminal. These "facts" led many to believe that Draganović had long been an informant for the Yugoslav security services, if not an actual agent provocateur for the Udba.[63]

Such doubts were also fueled by the equally furtive return to socialist Yugoslavia of Draganović's closest postwar ally, Miroslav Varoš. Under circumstances not unlike those of Draganović four years earlier, Varoš—along with his wife and daughter—disappeared following a family trip to Milan in January 1971. Sometime later, the Varoš family appeared in Zagreb before settling down near the coastal city of Split.[64] Over the years, rivals had repeatedly accused Varoš of being an Udba agent, although—as seen in the previous chapter—leveling such a charge was almost obligatory for any attack on an opponent within the émigré separatist movement.[65] For many, however, Varoš's return to socialist Yugoslavia confirmed this claim, especially because he, like Draganović, never faced charges of any kind and was able to live freely until his death.[66] Varoš's voluntary repatriation was also damning for Draganović, as his long-standing relationship with Varoš was cast in a new light. Even more, a long shadow fell over the entire émigré separatist old guard, as once more, the landscape of radical nationalist organizations in the diaspora grew only more convoluted and complex.

A New Generation

The state of disarray that characterized émigré separatism so crippled the movement that active political agitation for an independent Croatian state became only a secondary or even tertiary priority for radical organizations within the diaspora. Instead, competition for new recruits became the foremost priority of rival factions by the late 1950s. As one West German report from 1956 stated bluntly: "The struggle among the three main groups [the HOP, HNO, and Otpor] in Europe . . . has become primarily and foremost about mining the newest group of refugees. Pavelić, for example, has assigned his agents in Austria, Italy, and especially the Federal Republic [of Germany] to conscript [these new refugees] as 'Cadres of the Croatian Liberation Army.'"[67] At the heart of this competition was the employment of ever escalating radical rhetoric, dicta, and doctrines to win new supporters. Such extremism was necessary for groups to both differentiate themselves from one another and for them to establish and prove their nationalistic and revolutionary credentials.[68] While this competition further weakened the movement in many respects, the rivalries that developed ultimately helped stimulate the reradicalization of Croatian émigré separatism.

The target for recruitment among the various factions of postwar emigrants was a new generation of migrants who moved from socialist Yugoslavia to the West in increasing numbers starting in the late 1950s. In contrast to the immediate postwar generation, these new emigrants left socialist Yugoslavia more for economic than political reasons. Between 1952 and 1962, the number of unemployed in Yugoslavia rose by over 500 percent—from 45,000 to 237,000—despite the promise of full employment in socialist ideology.[69] Among the factors behind this problem was the country's rapid urbanization in the decade following World War II. While urbanization helped fuel the modernization of Yugoslavia's economy in the 1950s, employment in factories and other urban industries could not match the growing labor pool migrating from the countryside to the cities.[70] At the same time, the sustained expansion of western Europe's postwar economy—particularly in West Germany with its so-called *Wirtschaftswunder* (economic miracle)—led to an acute labor shortage in the West that increased demand for migrant workers. The lack of work at home and the promise of employment abroad made emigration an attractive option for many young Yugoslavs. In the decade between 1953 and 1963, between a quarter and a half million people migrated from socialist Yugoslavia in search of employment despite emigration from Yugoslavia being illegal from the end of World War II until the early 1960s.[71]

Although the promise of work served as the primary magnet for migration in the 1950s and 1960s, the distinction between "economic" and "political" for this new generation of migrants was intrinsically ambiguous, contingent, and mutable. In part, this was due to the way the state itself dealt with emigration, at least officially, until the 1960s. Economics—and by extension economic migration—was axiomatically politicized in Tito's Yugoslavia. In the immediate postwar period—as was the case elsewhere in state socialist eastern Europe—Belgrade pursued economic policies that were highly planned and centralized.[72] These included, to quote William Zimmerman, "autarchy, full employment through mass underemployment, political factories, nationalization, and the expropriation of foreign holdings."[73] Such measures, the state promised, would lead to the end of capitalism's many afflictions, including unemployment. Crucially, however, socialism's guarantee of employment did not come without obligations of its own. To work—that is, to be employed—was considered to be a moral responsibility for all members of society. Employment functioned as a kind of social contract between the regime and the populace, upon which not just the economic but political and social order of the state rested.

Consequently, Belgrade considered economic migration to be an inherently political act. To leave the country in search of work, to cite the prominent Yugoslav geographer Ivo Baučić, "was in contradiction to socio-political

norms."[74] It challenged the core ideology of the state, undermining one of the regime's principal claims to legitimacy. Thus, to seek employment abroad was not simply frowned upon; it was seen as treasonous. As the official economic organ of socialist Yugoslavia *Ekonomska politika* conceded in 1969, economic migration before the change in policy in the early 1960s by definition "meant also political emigration. . . . Going to work in a foreign country was treated as well nigh a betrayal."[75] Simply, even if an individual's decision to emigrate from socialist Yugoslavia was made for purely economic reasons, there was no escaping either the political significance or ramifications of the act. This remained true even following the regime's pragmatic decision, beginning in the late 1950s, to tacitly tolerate some degree of economic migration as a mechanism for relieving pressure on the domestic economic and political situation.

In any case, the impulse to leave Yugoslavia before the early 1960s was rarely wholly economic. As has often been noted, socialist Yugoslavia fared in most respects substantively better than its Soviet-satellite neighbors in the decades after World War II.[76] The enactment of economic policies particular to Yugoslavia's brand of state socialism—most notably workers' self-management and an openness to economic assistance from the West—led to a higher standard of living than in the Soviet Bloc. Yugoslavs also enjoyed greater personal liberties—including access to foreign goods and popular culture—than those living to the east of the Iron Curtain.[77] Nevertheless, Tito's Yugoslavia retained many of the undemocratic and repressive qualities familiar to postwar European state socialism. The state's approach to both nationalistic chauvinisms—to employ the parlance of the state—and organized religion in particular were often heavy-handed and severe. With the country's experience of brutal ethnic atrocities committed during World War II not yet consigned to history, manifestations of nationalism were simply not tolerated by the regime. While organized religion may have received better treatment in socialist Yugoslavia than within the Soviet Bloc, the environment for believers remained inhospitable and even hostile, in particular for the Catholic Church.[78] Further issues, such as the state's failed attempts to collectivize the country's agriculture and the harsh treatment of the regime's political opponents in the immediate postwar era, contributed to widespread—if still mostly muted—discontent among many within the country.[79] Compared to its eastern neighbors, postwar Yugoslavia may have been a model of progressive and tolerant socialism. But it could not escape many of the authoritarian trappings of one-party rule.

Many of those who did not benefit from the advances made by Yugoslavia's brand of socialism inexorably linked economic hardship to both real and imagined political inequity, alienation, and subjugation. This was particularly true among those who came of age in the late 1950s and early 1960s. For this

generation—which had been born either after the war or too soon before it to have actively participated—the promises of both the regime and socialist ideology held less authority than for those who had contributed to Yugoslavia's wartime antifascist struggle. Economic setbacks and governmental trespasses, for instance, faced greater scrutiny and were afforded less patience by this generation than that of their parents. By the early 1960s, this translated into a growing challenge to the state's legitimacy by the very generation meant to benefit most from socialism's triumph. As one mid-1960s report prepared by the American embassy in Belgrade on the growing generational crisis in socialist Yugoslavia laid bare: "Discontent among the students and working young people . . . is probably the most explosive nationalist element [in the country]. Croatia and Slovenia have a real generation problem. The young people have become adults since the 'revolution' and . . . care little whether their fathers or mothers were or were not partisans. What is important to them is that they have a role in the total life of the country not just one particular sector as most of their parents have, i.e. being producers with a political or social voice."[80] That the issue was more pronounced in Croatia and Slovenia had myriad deeply rooted social, political, and economic reasons. Important here is the degree to which a generational shift was taking place in the country, one that concomitantly had implications not only for domestic politics in socialist Yugoslavia but for the development of separatist nationalism outside the country as well.

That Croats—together with Slovenes—were at the center of growing dissatisfaction with the economic and political situation in socialist Yugoslavia was reflected in the disproportionate percentage of people from the Republic of Croatia and predominately Croatian areas of Bosnia-Herzegovina who migrated illegally out of socialist Yugoslavia in the 1950s and early 1960s.[81] In the first four years of the 1960s, for example, Croats from the Republic of Croatia made up on average 53 percent of those leaving the country, although the republic comprised less than 22 percent of Yugoslavia's total population.[82] Adding in Croats from Herzegovina and other parts of Bosnia, the percentage reached 65 percent.[83] This demography of emigration reflected directly the growing generational crisis in socialist Yugoslavia. In 1959, 75 percent of all emigrants illegally crossing Yugoslavia's borders to the country's non-state socialist neighbors—namely, Italy, Austria, and, to a lesser extent, Greece—were between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five.[84] Similarly, a majority of emigrants—roughly 60 percent—were either unskilled or semiskilled workers.[85] An even higher percentage—around 80 percent—had completed at most an elementary education, with the majority even less.[86]

Taken together, the combination of youth, lack of education, relative impoverishment, and general disaffectedness with socialist Yugoslavia made this new generation of emigrants attractive targets for radical separatist groups in

places like West Germany, Belgium, Sweden, and Australia. Even if, by and large, these new emigrants were not nearly as politically developed or engaged as those émigrés who had left Yugoslav lands in the immediate postwar period, what they lacked in conviction they made up for in the demographic and political characteristics that made them particularly susceptible to recruitment into the ranks of émigré separatism. This danger did not go unrecognized by the regime in Belgrade. In the words of the Central Committee of the Republic of Serbia—as reported by West German authorities—the high number of Croats emigrating out of Yugoslavia in the early 1960s was "not just a socio-economic, but also a political problem."[87] Such was the concern in Belgrade that in 1962 the government adopted a wide-sweeping amnesty law aimed at repatriating upward of 150,000 émigrés living abroad. While the law ostensibly included all those who had left after 1945, the exceptions written into the law meant that generally only the more recent generation of emigrants qualified for the amnesty.[88]

Not unrelated, it was, in fact, the illegal status of most emigrants from the late 1950s and early 1960s that most made this new generation of Croats abroad prone to radical émigré influences. To cross the frontier from Yugoslavia into Austria or Italy made Croatian emigrants illegal twice over, once in the eyes of the country they left and once in the eyes of the country into which they had entered. Instead of being greeted with employment, housing, and entry visas by authorities in Vienna or Rome, for instance, newly arrived emigrants were often consigned to grim refugee camps where they could wait for months, if not years, for the chance to start their new lives, provided, of course, that they were allowed to stay and were not just deported back to Yugoslavia. The situation for Croats who managed to get as far as West Germany—which was the primary destination of choice for the majority of emigrants—was in some ways even worse. In 1957, the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) severed diplomatic ties with socialist Yugoslavia in line with the Hallstein Doctrine following the latter's recognition of the German Democratic Republic (GDR).[89] As a result, Belgrade lacked both the standing and resources to pressure Bonn to expedite the processing of Yugoslav nationals in the country, unlike the governments of other countries with large immigrant populations in the FRG, such as Italy, Turkey, or Greece.[90]

Consequently, many new arrivals sought routes to the West outside those provided by official channels. As often as not, these pathways were controlled by radical separatist émigrés. By the end of the 1950s, postwar émigrés had established a sizeable and influential presence in the refugee camps through which most new emigrants had to pass.[91] Usually, this presence had its roots in the time the older émigrés themselves had been interned in the same facilities in the late 1940s and early 1950s.[92] Émigré separatists also established myriad organizations outside the camps that officially were registered with authorities as being "humanitarian" or "cultural" but were, in fact, political

in nature.[93] Additionally, postwar émigrés infiltrated more "reputable" relief organizations—such as Caritas, as discussed in the last chapter—dealing with the well-being of refugees. This was done both to spread their net as widely as possible in targeting possible recruits and to provide, to quote one Australian security service report, "a legitimate reason for taking part in a variety of Croatian activities" of a political nature involving new emigrants.[94]

Through these various personal, occupational, and political connections, postwar émigrés could first target, then recruit, and finally groom potential recruits among newly arriving emigrants. They did so, plainly, by offering services and benefits that other organizations or governmental bodies simply could not. Older émigrés could arrange jobs, shelter, and even papers for fresh arrivals, removing considerable uncertainty and offering significant stability for new emigrants.[95] Equally important, émigré networks provided a familiar social and cultural—and by extension political—environment within which new emigrants could more easily transition into their new lives abroad.[96] Such was the appeal of these networks, in fact, that—as elucidated in one West German report dealing with the problems with and among Croats in the country—the greater majority of new emigrants came to believe that the "guarantees" necessary to secure a successful new beginning in the West could come only from "the older Emigrants" or "those who came before us" rather than through more official channels, such as local aid organizations, trade unions, or even local governments.[97]

The issue, of course, was that older émigrés unfailingly asked for certain loyalties and commitments in return for the services and support they provided. As the aforementioned report continued: "Political groups exploited the economic situation . . . by coupling guarantees for [living and work] arrangements with their own goals."[98] In some cases, in order to benefit from the assistance offered by older émigrés, young, unmarried emigrants—who were the vast majority of new arrivals to the West—had to "voluntarily enlist" in "Croatian Divisions."[99] Any notion that these divisions were nothing more than social clubs was belied by the ritual oath required of members before they joined. As the pledge of one such division—the Secret Revolutionary Ustaša Formations (TRUP; Tajne revolucionarne ustaške postrojbe)—read:

> I (name) swear to the almighty God, my honor, and all that is dear and holy to me, that I enter into the TRUP and HOP. I will hold secret all that which is trusted to me, even from my relatives and loved ones. I enter into TRUP and will fight for the liberation and re-establishment of the Independent State of Croatia. I dedicate myself to this end with my time and ability. I will trust my superiors and will not work without their knowledge and permission. In case I do not obey, I agree to every punishment laid out in the statutes, so help me God![100]

Furthermore, as part of the "recruitment" process, new draftees were asked about any time spent in the military as well as their highest rank. They were also required to sign a statement declaring themselves ready, should the need arise, "to fight for the establishment of the Independent State of Croatia."[101] Once enlisted, recruits were often compelled to attend community "picnics" that in reality were training camps that provided "courses for espionage and terrorist-diversionist activities against the [Socialist Federal Republic] of Yugoslavia (SFRJ)."[102] The headline for an article in a local separatist newspaper about one such gathering on the banks of the Murray River in the Australian city of Wodonga held in January 1963 read: "Today, the Murray: Tomorrow, the Drina," leaving no doubt as to the intent of such outings.[103]

Young emigrants who balked at the demands of older émigrés, meanwhile, faced the prospect of blackmail, extortion, and even bodily harm. One Australian governmental report, for instance, referenced "information coming to hand from overseas liaison sources to the effect that [radical separatist groups are] prone to use 'strong-arm' squads to threaten Croats in an attempt to either conscript them into their organization or to extract financial contributions for their cause."[104] Similarly, an American report on radical groups in West Germany noted that such groups went "even so far in exerting pressure as to maltreating and beating up these [emigrants] and threatening to report them to the German police as 'Yugoslav spies' and even to kill them."[105] The competition for new members among the various separatist organizations in the West meant that no strategy for bolstering the ranks of one or the other group could be left unexplored, including the victimization of those for whom the movement claimed to be fighting.

One tactic used by older émigrés, for instance, was to threaten those carrying falsified documents such as work permits and driver's licenses with exposure to the police should the holder of those papers refuse to either join or financially support their organizations. That those perpetrating the blackmail had themselves provided the documents to the newly arrived emigrants was by design. Another ploy involved forcing new arrivals to subscribe to radical separatist newspapers and journals. This was done not only to fill the coffers of radical organizations in the diaspora but also to create a mechanism of coercing individuals into providing both personal and financial support for the separatist cause. Those holding subscriptions to the unvaryingly anticommunist and anti-Yugoslav periodicals faced having their "betrayal" revealed to Yugoslav authorities if they did not comply with the demands of older émigrés. The potential punitive consequences of being blacklisted by the regime in Belgrade for separatist tendencies—including not being able to return home to Yugoslavia or having family members back home persecuted by the state—was often enough to keep the victims of the blackmail in line.[106]

In a similar vein, older émigrés were invested in ensuring that the status of illegal migrants to the West remained unsettled. As explicated in one American report, radical separatist organizations "tried to hinder by all means the émigrés in their desire to settle the question of their status in relation to the SFR of Yugoslavia. For this reason they resorted to individual terror against persons who were beginning to regulate their status or were ready to regulate it in the spirit of the [1962] amnesty."[107] Legal or economic insecurity, older émigrés understood, were powerful factors in the radicalization process of illegal emigrants. In perpetuating the legal limbo of new arrivals to the West, older émigrés could both maintain the political uncertainty—and by extension, the intrinsic political engagement—of young emigrants vis-à-vis the regime in Belgrade and ensure that the newer emigrants remained susceptible to, if not indeed reliant on, the influence of radical elements in the diaspora.[108]

No less important, postwar émigrés complemented the material pressure they exerted on the younger generation of émigrés with a steady stream of radical propaganda that sought to reframe the ideological thinking of new arrivals, creating a radical discursive milieu that permeated Croatian diaspora political rhetoric throughout the 1960s and 1970s. Even if a new arrival to the West could successfully navigate the web of influence established by radical separatists—which, of course, most could—avoiding the charged discourses of the older émigrés that pervaded the relatively insular world of recent emigrants was considerably more difficult. Older émigrés ensured that radical discourse became part of the fabric of everyday life in the diaspora community, facilitated by the dissemination of extremist pamphlets, newspapers, and magazines whose content infiltrated the political discussions of every refugee camp, worker's barrack, construction site, factory, restaurant, and bar where emigrants could be found.[109] A young Croat new to the West may not have shared the political or ideological views of radical separatism, but nor could he or she totally evade exposure to the principles advanced by the postwar generation of émigrés.

The problem, of course, is that as much as a new arrival to the West had great difficulty in avoiding the radical politics of many older emigres, so, too, could he or she not avoid the endemic political and personal infighting that characterized the postwar separatist movement. As pervasive as the efforts to recruit new members by the older generation were, they failed to address the one thing that perhaps most hindered the movement for Croatian liberation—namely, the chasms that divided postwar anti-Yugoslav separatism. Consequently, members of the new, "semi-émigré" generation that began to trickle into the West in the 1950s could almost not but regard the "old guard" of former Ustaše more with suspicion and even derision than with reverence or respect. The aims of the older generation may have not just appealed to some

new arrivals in the West; many eagerly embraced them. But this was separate from whether the methods of the older generation held similar attraction. As the "old guard" soon discovered, the answer broadly was that they did not. Quite simply, among those for whom World War II was history and not lived experience, émigrés from the interwar and NDH period were seen simply as incapable of promoting Croatian interests within the "new political realities" of the Cold War. The consequence of this would be nothing less than a fundamental shift in the nature of the anti-Yugoslav separatist movement beginning in the 1960s.[110]

Chapter 3
The Facts as They Exist, 1960–1962

The generation of semi-émigrés who began to leave socialist Yugoslavia in the late 1950s by and large rejected the organizational structures established and promoted by Ustaša emigres.[1] The exploitative nature of the relationship between older and younger emigrants alienated most new arrivals, as did the pressure to join this or the other group, with threats of reprisals if they refused.[2] Most importantly, the semi-émigré generation was far more focused on securing a stable life abroad and reaping the many benefits of life in the West than on toppling Tito's regime. Unquestionably, many young Croats left Yugoslavia in the late 1950s and early 1960s in part because their relationship to Tito's socialist Yugoslavia was strained, if not irrevocably broken. But the main impetus for leaving the country for the vast majority remained the promise of a better life abroad. Simply, most young Croats who left for the West beginning in the late 1950s had little use for revolutionary separatism—however strong their desire might be to see Croatia one day become independent—and they remained decidedly moderate in their engagement with émigré politics.[3]

This does not mean that semi-émigré Croats only rarely supported the aims—if not necessarily the tactics—of older émigrés.[4] Even though the use of violence and terror to achieve a Croatian state was anathema to most new arrivals into the 1960s, the anti-Yugoslav, anticommunist, anti-Serb, and, of course, pro-independence bearing of postwar émigrés nevertheless resonated among many new arrivals.[5] The result, as one Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO) report from the mid-1960s warned, was that "the success of any extremist revolutionary venture, however fanatical, and irrespective of the rights and wrongs, is likely to receive at least the passive approval of a large section of the Croatian community, even the most law-abiding; who will correspondingly provide moral and financial support [even] when such ventures seem likely to fail."[6] Support in this context was, of course, a matter of principle, not participation. To actively embrace the idea of an independent Croatian state—as many emigrants did—was a far cry from promoting, no less engaging in, violent, revolutionary action. But as the ASIO report made clear, such distinctions were often not so clear-cut.

And, of course, some semi-émigrés did, in fact, embrace the postwar generation's call for violent struggle against Yugoslavia. Moreover—and in contrast to the older émigrés—they proved not just willing but indeed eager to engage in acts of terror aimed at bringing about the establishment of an independent Croatian state. What is important to recognize is that while postwar émigrés unquestionably played a defining role in the radicalization of these new extremists, that influence is not as linear as appearances might first suggest. The charged environment and structural forces fashioned by postwar radicals undoubtedly facilitated in many ways the radicalization of young emigrants. But most adherents of radical Croatian separatism in the 1960s viewed postwar émigrés not as leaders or role models but rather as failures. Younger radicals often viewed the aims espoused by the older generation of separatists as laudable. But the record of performance by postwar émigrés—at least in the years since the defeat of the NDH—was decidedly unacceptable. As such, if change was ever to arrive for the Croatian nation in the face of "Serbo-communist" oppression, a not insignificant number of semi-émigrés came to realize that it would have to come in opposition to—rather than in allegiance with—postwar Ustaša émigrés.

Opposing the Older Generation

Discontent and disillusion with the political organization of the postwar émigré generation were sentiments broadly felt among those who left Yugoslavia beginning in the late 1950s. A survey of new arrivals to the West conducted in 1960 by the London-based émigré journal *Nova Hrvatska* (*New Croatia*) conveys a glimpse of this cynicism regarding both the idea of national separatism and, more specifically, the separatist movement itself.[7] The survey—of which 1,100 responses were received among 10,000 sent out—opened with the simple question: What should be the political fate of the Croatian nation? Considering the ardently pro-independence leaning of both the journal and its readership, the overall response was as definitive as it was expected: over 90 percent declared their desire for an independent Croatian state.[8]

More notable—and more telling—was the response readers gave to a second question, one concerning the greatest obstacle to the establishment of an independent Croatia. A plurality of those who returned the survey indicated that the Croats themselves, rather than external factors or larger structural issues, were the problem. More specifically, the number one reason given for the failure of Croatian liberation was the lack of unity within the existing Croatian diaspora political establishment. When asked which organization they would vote for in the event of free elections for political leadership of the émigré separatist movement, survey respondents again revealed their disappointment in the existing order. While close to 25 percent stated that they would support

Pavelić's HOP, almost two in five—421 out of 1,100—felt that the only party they would be willing to support was some new, not yet formed independent Croatian party "based on new political realities."[9]

Of course, disenchantment with the existing politics of the separatist movement was different than having the will or means to be personally involved in establishing an alternative to the "old guard." Nonetheless, beginning in the early 1960s, a small but dedicated number of semi-émigrés began not only to actively attack the strategies and character of their predecessors but began to organize radical separatist groups independent of—and indeed antagonistic to—the postwar émigré generation. These groups were founded on the premise, reflecting the 1960 survey, that the older generation not only had failed to advance the cause of Croatian independence but was setting it back. This new generation of radicals decided that it must reinfuse the movement with the same revolutionary violence that had been a cornerstone of Croatian separatism from its beginnings, but that had been lost in the years since World War II.

One of the most notorious secret revolutionary organizations to emerge in the early 1960s was the Australian-based Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood (HRB; Hrvatsko revolucionarno bratstvo). Established in June 1961 in a coffee bar in the Sydney suburb of Burwood, the HRB was founded by four young dissident members of the HOP who had come to the conclusion that the HOP leadership was either unabashedly self-serving or covert agents of the Yugoslav security services.[10] In a 1964 letter to supporters, leaders of the new group explained bluntly that after "realizing the utter uselessness of the futile politicking among émigrés and of their inane and purposeless pursuit of party games abroad while our country is suffering and groaning under the fetters of Serbo-Communist thralldom, a handful of uncompromising and fanatical Croatian patriots have formed the Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood."[11] Making manifest the founders' disdain for the "old guard," the letter continued: "[The] Croatian youth, whose souls are bleeding from the wounds of our national tragedy, surely cannot and will not fail in the struggle for Croatia, as have failed so many [wartime] Croatian politicians and military officers . . . [who] no longer possess the strength, the will or the determination to continue marching along the thorny paths of revolutionary struggle and who have, instead, spun around themselves a cocoon of narrow-mindedness, self-interest, sectarianism, and émigré complex, and are spending in pointless futile games the closing years of their lives."[12] The time for following the older generation of political émigrés, the leadership of the HRB made clear, was over. And so, too, was the time for waiting submissively while others determined the fate of the Croatian nation. Regardless of how prepared the young generation may or may not have been,

their reasoning continued, it was evident that no one else—not even those who had once fought and claimed still to be fighting for Croatia—could be relied on to continue the struggle.

That role, the organizers of the HRB wrote, fell to the youth and the youth alone: "And so we, the young ones, have found ourselves shouldering this difficult and responsible task, because the others who had better facilities, conditions and means for it, would not or could not do so. Had the others been willing and capable of launching the Croatian revolutionary struggle, we would have been within the ranks of the fighters ages ago. But they rested and waited passively; so it was by the natural law of changing generations that we had been given the honor and the duty to raise the glory-decked Croatian battle standard."[13] To be sure, the HRB conceded, the older generation deserved only praise for how it "tenaciously, self-denyingly, and heroically defended" the Independent State of Croatia during the war.[14] But nearly two decades had passed since then, and postwar émigrés had done little to further the cause of national separatism. Only an infusion of new blood and new energy from a new generation, the thinking went, could breathe new life into the liberation struggle.

The main issue younger separatists had with the older generation was the latter's continued conviction that Croatian independence was only achievable through Great Power—primarily Western—intervention. Such a tactic, semi-émigré radicals dismissed, was entirely out of line with the new political realities of the Cold War. The simple, if painful, truth was that the Croatian nation was not—and never would be—a consideration in global politics. Concomitantly, there was no place for Croatian liberation politics in the greater global power struggle between the East and West. As one HRB revolutionary pamphlet explained:

> Our efforts to convince the Western world of our national existence have cost us no less than nineteen years of moving about in a circle. Money would be collected, national halls built, the football would be chased, churches erected, and old people's homes founded, with each of them bearing the Croatian name. Yet, our nation as such remained unknown to the foreigners. . . . Assurances would be given of alleged American help to the Croats and of the restoration of Croatian independence and of the Tenth of April, by bringing American ships to our Adriatic and American tanks to the Croatian mainland, and, in the main, by shedding American blood for the small Croatian nation which many of the Americans know little about even today. [Meanwhile] memoranda would be drawn up and forwarded to Western government officials [where] they would end up in waste-paper baskets even before being read through.[15]

Younger radicals agreed with postwar émigrés that a major hindrance to successful national liberation was the fact that both the Croats and the idea of an independent Croatia barely registered in the consciousness of Western political leaders. But in contrast to the older generation, semi-émigrés believed that no amount of lobbying, politicking, or campaigning would ever replace the name "Yugoslavia" with the name "Croatia" in the ears of Western political leaders.[16] Thus, younger separatists held, strategies for national liberation that relied on foreign sponsorship were condemned to failure from the outset. As articulated in a letter between HRB members seized in a raid by the Australian Commonwealth Police Force (CPF):

> Many people of little faith doubt that we Croats can ever liberate ourselves by our own effort without some Great Power's intervention or without a Third World War . . . between Western Democracy and Communism, and from which—according to their own vision of the future—the West would emerge victorious and, as such, the gracious West, while drawing up its map of the world-to-be, would mark out the boundaries of an independent State of Croatia for the benefit of our Croatian nation.
>
> In their shortsightedness they fail to see that, in the Western list of the world's nations, we continue to fail to be recognized as one that they would regard as possessing its own national identity and that in such a world-wide confusion of ideas, we would be irretrievably doomed.[17]

Had contemporary separatist leaders learned nothing from Croatia's history? these young radicals asked. For nearly a millennium, they lamented, the Croats had either willfully or by force had their fate tied to that of other nations, beginning with the *Pacta Conventa* of 1102 and extending into the second half of the twentieth century.[18] As a consequence, the only truly defining characteristic of national politics since Croatia's loss of national sovereignty in the twelfth century was that its people had always been subordinate to—if not indeed subjected by—other nations in their own lands.[19] Postwar émigré politics, the new generation of separatists bemoaned, did nothing to disrupt this cycle.

Younger radicals did not dismiss out of hand the need for Great Power intervention in the destruction of socialist Yugoslavia and the establishment of an independent Croatia. The issue was when that assistance should come. Young radicals asserted that the prevailing émigré separatist policy of attempting to secure Western aid in order to spur a general Croatian revolution within Yugoslavia was essentially backward. Rather, they professed, help

would arrive only after an indigenous revolutionary struggle had already brought the Yugoslav state to its knees. As another revolutionary pamphlet out of Australia argued: "The efforts to acquaint the West with our problem . . . is now clearly seen as fruitless. THE ONLY THING RECOGNIZED BY TODAY'S WORLD IS THE FACTS AS THEY EXIST, and Yugoslavia as such is a fact that will continue to be recognized until her foundations have been shaken from within. . . . It is only at that stage that the Croatian revolutionary organization can expect help from the West, or from another quarter by looking to neighboring nations ready to destroy Yugoslavia."[20] The West—or the East, for that matter—was not in principle opposed to Croatian liberation. But it lacked any motivation or incentive to act toward that goal, so long as the political status quo held. The point was to disrupt the existing state of affairs and create new political realities that would incite, if not indeed compel, outside forces to intervene.[21]

For those skeptical of the efficacy of the model for national liberation that placed Great Power politics second to indigenous revolution, young radicals directed their attention to the successes of postwar anticolonial insurgencies in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. While postwar émigrés pursued outdated political strategies divorced from contemporary political realities, young separatists argued, peoples with—in their view—far fewer claims to national self-determination around the world were achieving what for the Croatian diaspora remained only a dream: "Through the years since our loss of the Independent State of Croatia, our political leaders have been theorizing on how to liberate the Croatian people and establish an independent and free Croatian state, whilst in the African Continent, actual freedom has been achieved by practically all the negro tribes whose structure has hardly any national characteristics. . . . [This has been possible because around the world] several revolutions have been supported both by the East and the West, e.g., Cuban, Congolese, and Algerian revolutions."[22] The blueprint for anticolonial struggle—first revolution, then Superpower support, then independence—was the one the Croats had to follow if they ever hoped to secure an independent state, not the one being pursued by the older generation of émigrés. In the contemporary struggle for independence, guidance could come neither from Europe—with the failure of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution the starkest example[23]—nor Croatia's own recent past but rather from events such as the Cuban revolution, which an HRB pamphlet declared to be "the best example of how an emigration can initiate a revolution in their own country."[24] The postwar global challenge to imperialist rule, younger émigrés believed, had fundamentally transformed international politics, and only by adapting to the new realities and possibilities of that change could the Croatian émigré separatist movement ever hope for success.[25]

The real issue for young radicals, however, was not that the postwar generation's strategy of pursuing Western patronage was blind to both history and contemporary politics. Rather, the problem lay in their abandonment of revolutionary struggle in favor of misguided attempts to court the West. The older generation, younger extremists declared, had actively worked to quell any revolutionary tendencies within the separatist movement. The propaganda pamphlet cited earlier described the strategy throughout the 1950s:

> No effort would be made to fan the flame of fighting spirit innate to young Croatian men; instead, attempts would be made to put aside any ideas of an independent solution to our Croatian issue, and to replace them, on our party political leaders' instructions and advice, with their own "wiser" notions and ideas of forming Croatian sporting associations, and organizing excursions, social gatherings, and the purchase of national halls and of a variety of other émigré real estate, where Croats wearing their national costumes would perform their national dances to demonstrate, for the benefit of the few attending foreigners, their existence as a nation on earth.[26]

In the eyes of many semi-émigrés, the remnants of the now-exiled Ustaše had become nothing short of counterrevolutionary. All their radical rhetoric, posturing, and machinations notwithstanding, the older generation had long lost the dynamism and energy necessary to sacrifice all in service of the nation. Worse, they had come to care more about their own comfortable positions within the émigré community than the plight of the millions of Croats suffering under the regime of the "Serbo-communists" in Belgrade. Whatever the success of the interwar Ustaše and whatever their sacrifices in defending the NDH, the stark reality was that, in the words of one young radical, the new generation of separatists would "make a terrible, nay, fatal mistake if it adopted the ideas held by the exiled Croatian parties."[27]

Crucially, use of the word "fatal" by semi-émigrés was not simply melodrama. The terrible reality, younger radicals asserted, was that the Yugoslav state presented an existential threat to Croatia and the Croatian nation. In the words of the HRB, the policies pursued by the regime in Belgrade against Croatia and the Croats were "nothing but a part of the pan-Serbian tactics aimed at gradually eliminating and physically destroying the Croatian people; . . . an aim which they are achieving successfully and rapidly."[28] Similarly, to quote an article from the Spanish-based émigré paper *Obrana*:

> The conditions existing in Yugoslavia today—and the Croatian People are fully aware of the situation—are designed to lead to the Croatian

> People's economic and biological destruction. Innumerable facts in every sphere of national life have been demonstrating and continue to demonstrate the point. The Yugoslav rulers have perpetrated countless crimes against the Croatian People, some of them unforgivable such as the Bleiburg genocide, the destruction of all Croatian institutions, the wholesale plunder, terrorization, and persecution of the Croatians. The policy of the Yugoslav terrorist authorities shows that they have no intention of putting an end to their reign of terror and that their aim is an extirpation of the Croatian People.[29]

The "Serbo-communists" in Belgrade were not satisfied with simply subduing forcibly the Croatian nation into passivity in order to build a "greater-Serbian" Yugoslav state. Rather, the claim was that the ultimate aim of Tito's state was nothing less than the extermination of the Croatian nation.

Importantly, it was not just radicalized youth who held the view that the Yugoslav state was essentially genocidal. Even moderate groups in the emigration were prone to such—and, in fact, even greater—hyperbole. In one of the more blunt expressions of the existential threat facing the Croatian nation within socialist Yugoslavia, the nonviolent Canadian Croatian Federation declared in an anti-Yugoslav treatise from the early 1960s: "WE ACCUSE [THE] TITO MAFIA OF: the most vicious, contemplated, and calculated crimes against the Croatian people, [including] genocidal oppressions against the Croatian people . . . [and] deliberate actions to destroy the Croatian National identity, status, biological existence, and development."[30] Such deliberate actions included "ceaseless killing and jailing," "exiling to other countries," and "artificially caused economic crises."[31] Taken together—along with countless other crimes perpetrated by the "Serbo-communists" since World War II—it was a matter of when and not if the Croatian nation would face national extinction so long as Croatia remained under the heel of Belgrade.

Indeed, an integral component of Croatian postwar émigré identity discourse was a deeply ingrained national victim complex. The very establishment of socialist Yugoslavia, many political émigrés contended, had been possible solely through an act of genocide against the Croatian nation—namely, the Bleiburg massacre and subsequent "Way of the Cross" of May 1945.[32] As the prominent dissident writer Bruno Bušić—who was assassinated by Yugoslav security agents in Paris in 1978—wrote in an essay that quoted the Montenegrin former Partisan commander and later prominent dissident himself Milovan Đilas, the Croats at Bleiburg "had to die in order for Yugoslavia to exist."[33] Those who promoted the cult of Croatian victimization maintained that the Croatian nation had for centuries suffered subjugation and oppression by outside forces, whether Austrians, Hungarians, Turks, Italians, or Serbs.

It was the crimes committed by the Partisans at Bleiburg at the end of the war, however, that represented the greatest tragedy ever to befall the Croatian nation. Indeed, hard-line nationalists continued, it had been a massacre that rivaled any from the war and would forever remain as a reminder of the malevolence and illegitimacy of "Serbo-communism" and the Yugoslav state.

Central to this discourse surrounding Bleiburg was an inflation of the numbers of those murdered by the Partisans in order to prove the genocidal nature of the crime. Published accounts of the massacre within the diaspora community generally placed the number killed anywhere from two-hundred thousand to five-hundred thousand.[34] One author—the Croatian-American academic George J. Prpic—put the number of victims (meaning both killed and forced into exile) at seven digits. In his book on the victimization of the Croatian peoples, from the Turkish invasions to the present, Prpic called Bleiburg not just a "horrifying genocide" but indeed "the bloodiest orgy in the history of the Balkans."[35] In over a thousand years of national consciousness, he claimed, "of all the tragedies [to befall the nation], Bleiburg was the worst such incident in Croatian history, resulting in the death and exodus of over a million men, women, and children."[36]

Indeed, Bleiburg was more than just another wartime atrocity. Within the postwar diaspora community, the events came to be known widely as the "Croatian Holocaust," with all the moral weight and significance the term implied.[37] One prominent émigré Croat from Canada—Ante Beljo—went so far as to assert that the tragedy that befell the Croats at the hands of the communists was worse than that suffered by the Jews during World War II. In his self-published *Jugoslavija Genocid: Dokumentarna analiza* (*Yugoslavia Genocide: A Documentary Analysis*), Beljo calculated that the Partisans killed fifteen thousand Croats a day following the repatriation of Croats back to Yugoslavia following their surrender at Bleiburg. At Auschwitz, Beljo explained, the Nazis killed six thousand Jews a day. If one were to compare the two crimes statistically, the author suggested, the tragedy of Bleiburg was two and a half times worse than the tragedy that was Auschwitz.[38]

Discourses surrounding Bleiburg, meanwhile, were not meant simply to portray the Croatian nation as victims of Tito's socialist Yugoslavia. Equally important was that Bleiburg served as a discursive mechanism to relieve the Croats of any and all guilt for the crimes perpetrated in their name under the NDH. Essentially, those who "were martyred" at Bleiburg cleansed the Croatian nation of the sins committed by the Ustaše, in the way that Jesus suffered for the sins of humanity in his own "Way of the Cross." This exoneration meant that the Croats had no reason to be repentant for anything in their history.[39] As Ante Beljo explained, to cite one example: "The Croatian nation must not, by any means, be ashamed of its past. Throughout history we

have never conquered, plundered, or exploited other nations. We struggled as a people on our own territory and for what was ours throughout our entire history against dozens of conquerors from both East and West."[40] The suffering encountered at Bleiburg made the Croats—at least, in the eyes of many radical and even nonradical Croatian émigrés—both the greatest victims of World War II in Yugoslavia and the greatest victims of Tito's socialist Yugoslavia, notwithstanding the death camp at Jasenovac and racial policies of the NDH, which went wholly unacknowledged among radical émigrés.

If Bleiburg provided absolution for the Croatian nation in general, the same was not true for the political and military leadership of the Ustaše in the closing phases of the war. Many within the diaspora community came to see Pavelić as at least partially responsible for the massacre.[41] Members of the semi-émigré generation in particular viewed Bleiburg as an avoidable tragedy in which tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of innocent Croats lost their lives at the hands of "Serbo-communist" butchers, thanks in no small measure to the incompetence, inaction, or selfishness—or, indeed, all three—of leading Ustaša figures. That Pavelić, together with much of the Ustaša political and military elite, managed to escape capture at the end of the war while so many sons and daughters of the Croatian nation were sacrificed to Tito's Partisans demanded questioning, if not outright condemnation. Such was the pervasiveness of this line of thinking among diaspora Croats that Bleiburg became a real problem for postwar supporters of both Pavelić and the HOP. The official organ of the HOP in Argentina, for instance, downplayed any mention of the massacre in its pages into the 1960s and 1970s, and the HOP itself balked when it came to public memorialization or commemoration of the tragedy.[42]

The "historical tragedy" that was Bleiburg and the Ustaša's role in allowing such a catastrophe to befall the Croatian nation was not, however, the central issue for many semi-émigrés. Rather, Bleiburg served to clearly demonstrate the impotence and ineptitude of postwar émigrés in the face of the ongoing genocide against Croats within socialist Yugoslavia. As is explained in one HRB manifesto: "The policy of our Croatian émigré community, led by our surviving Ministers, Political Leaders, Generals, Colonels, and Majors, has been demonstrated as ineffectual in the struggle for the liberation of our Croatian people who are threatened, more than any other nation on Earth, with national extinction as long as they have to live under the existing conditions within Yugoslavia. The manner in which our political émigré community has been led up till now is taking us along a road to certain disaster."[43] That Belgrade was bent on the biological destruction of the Croatian nation was a truism accepted by many semi-émigrés. More important was the recognition that to do nothing was akin to contributing to the extermination of the Croatian nation, a charge leveled fiercely and squarely at the postwar generation of

émigrés. The failure of the émigré community to confront head-on the genocidal policies and machinations of the Yugoslav state was, to cite a different HRB manifesto, "the most vital reason why the past policy [of postwar émigrés] has become unacceptable to the younger generation who must look for their own novel approaches."[44]

Semi-Émigré Strategic Thinking

First and foremost among the "novel approaches" proposed by semi-émigrés was a return to terrorism in the name of national liberation. The simple, intractable conclusion reached by members of the HRB and similar organizations such as the West German–based Croatian Crusaders' Brotherhood (HKB; Hrvatsko križarsko bratstvo) and TRUP was that Croatian independence could only be realized through violent revolution.[45] As stated plainly in one HRB propaganda pamphlet: "There is no other way to achieve Croatian liberty than by force, by the Croatian people's armed revolutionary struggle. This is a point that must be most strongly ingrained in the minds of us Croatians living in the free world."[46] The "revolutionary strategy" of older political émigrés, younger radicals asserted, had been neither revolutionary nor much of a strategy. Because the postwar generation of radical separatists had become irrevocably corrupted, they continued, the next generation had to take matters into its own hands.

At its most basic, this strategy was predicated on the conviction that only violence could destroy violence, and that since Tito's state was inherently violent, only violent revolution could bring an end to the Yugoslav state. "Yugoslavia," another HRB treatise declared with the organization's usual directness, "is based on terrorism and she can be destroyed only by terrorism and by well-planned GUERILLA struggle, whereupon—on Yugoslavia's ruins—the liberated Croatian people will be in a position to build up a better future for themselves."[47] Power in socialist Yugoslavia was not something to be discussed, negotiated, or bargained for. The state maintained control by force and would continue to do so until that force was violently seized. This message was sharply set forth in a 1968 treatise in *Drina*, the official organ of Maks Luburić's Otpor:

> It must be clear to all, that this state [an independent Croatia] can only be established through a general Croatian revolution, and not through peaceful, legal, or diplomatic means. We know well the character and qualities of our adversary. They will never simply leave on their own, as long as they have the power and bayonets in their hands. One must take them away, so that the Croatian nation once again can have a state of its own and become master of its own destiny. All of us, to the last, must

> finally come to our senses and demonstrate our love for Croatia with acts. We must fight against every Yugoslavia, as the first was bad and the second worse. . . . It is our duty, your duty, to become soldiers of Croatia![48]

Belgrade's position regarding Croatia was resolute and uncompromising. If the Croats ever hoped to achieve the national dream of independence, their position vis-à-vis Yugoslavia had to be equally resolute and uncompromising. As long as the physical power of Tito's regime remained uncontested, it would have no reason to loosen its grip. For this reason, young separatists concluded, the only strategy available to those seeking national liberation was to embrace the same violence used by the oppressors.

The leaders of these separatist organizations derived their conviction that terrorism was essential to Croatian liberation from their particular understanding of what constituted a "revolution." At its most basic, there could be no revolution without violence, which was not just integral to but indeed inherent in all revolutionary struggle. "In revolution," one early HRB treatise declared, "it is only by military action that the desired goal can be reached."[49] But even more important, the argument went, revolutionary struggle was predicated on the failure of nonviolence. "A national-liberation crusader," the treatise further explained, is someone "who, seeing that all the peaceful means have been used in vain, takes up his gun to engage in an armed struggle for his national and social rights."[50] The tactics used by the postwar generation of Croatian émigrés, such as political lobbying and cultural campaigns, were anathema to the semi-émigré generation's definition of revolution and thus had no place. In calling for revolution, groups such as the HRB, HKB, and TRUP meant simply the taking up of arms. "The knife, pistol, hand-grenade, machinegun, and revolutionary terrorism at Home and abroad,—those are the weapons which will enable the Croatian revolutionaries to play the funeral march for Serbo-communist Yugoslavia."[51]

"Violence" as such, however, did not make a revolution. Rather, different stages of the struggle required different types of violence. In terms of the overall fight against socialist Yugoslavia, only the final phase of the revolution would take on the form of conventional combat.[52] Prior to that stage, the revolution would be characterized by guerilla tactics that, to quote the previously cited HRB treatise, "strategically [would be] an inversion of standard warfare."[53] During the opening stages of the revolution, power relations between the Yugoslav state and Croatian separatists would be grossly asymmetric, with the latter at an overwhelming material and military disadvantage. Rather than attempting to confront socialist Yugoslavia directly, semi-émigré radicals declared, the cause would be better served by a series of smaller strikes that cumulatively undermined both the power and legitimacy of the state. In a passage

that anticipated the later writings on insurgency by the French philosopher and revolutionary Régis Debray, the HRB proclaimed: "It is the frequency of attacks, not their strength, that matters. It follows that a larger number of smaller attacks will cause more damage to the enemy than one or two major attacks."[54]

The younger radical understood such attacks as being acts of terror, which they viewed as both inevitable and necessary.[55] In a private letter confiscated in a raid by Australian police, a member of the HRB in Australia discussed initiating a successful revolution: "The answer, brothers, is that only successful commando-terrorist acts . . . [will] bring about a radical change in our Croatian situation both here and anywhere else. You brothers of the [HRB] European Branch must, in this initial phase of the Revolution at least, engage in that type of operation until you have scored successes."[56] Indeed, without such a campaign, any and all hope for Croatian independence would be lost. Terrorism was perhaps not a sufficient condition for a triumphant revolution, but it was an essential one. As the letter continued: "As far as my understanding of the notion of revolution goes, I believe that no mass uprising is even remotely imaginable until we have left behind the phase of commando-terrorist acts. . . . Both we here and you there . . . can be saved only by the effects of such commando-terrorist acts. Without them, we are doomed—all of us."[57] Ultimately, the revolution against "Serbo-communism" would evolve into a mass movement, swelling into an irresistible force. But to reach that stage, the groundwork had to first be laid, with the initial step being a campaign of terrorism.

Conceptually, the terrorist phase of the revolution would involve application—even if radical Croatian semi-émigrés did not acknowledge it by this name—of the principle of "propaganda of the deed" popularized by the nineteenth-century Italian Carlo Pisacane and promoted perhaps most famously by Czarist-era Russian anarchists.[58] Postwar émigrés, younger radicals declared, had penned countless words in the name of Croatian liberation with little, if anything, to show for it. Channeling—again, if only unconsciously—Mikhail Bakunin's famous words "we must spread our principles, not with words but with deeds, for this is the most popular, the most potent, and the most irresistible form of propaganda," leaders of groups such as the HRB, HKB, and TRUP embraced the idea that talk was useless and that only through high-profile acts of terror against the Yugoslav state could support for the Croatian cause be secured both at home and abroad.

The strategic thinking behind this reasoning can be found in another letter written between HRB members from 1964 seized by the CPF that detailed plans for two potential operations. Their first plan—named "Operation Galeb," or Seagull—involved hijacking a major Yugoslav passenger or cargo ship from some European port on the Atlantic. The plan was, first, to overwhelm the ship's crew. Then, the Yugoslav ensign would be removed, burned, and replaced by a

Croatian one. Finally, after its rechristening as "Croatia," the hijackers would sail the boat—for unexplained reasons—to Lisbon. The publicity garnered from the action, so the thinking went, would not only be significant but was sorely needed. As the author of the letter explained to his comrade: "We need—as a famished person needs a piece of bread—a propaganda bomb by which to stir up the international public opinion by restoring topicality to the Croatian problem and the Croatian rebellion against Titoism and Yugoslavia, to improve the image of our organization both at home and abroad and, finally, to tell the whole world once again that the [HRB] exists."[59] More prodigious, meanwhile, would be the follow-up to Operation Galeb, provisionally dubbed simply "Operation G 3." This plan involved the assassination of the Yugoslav ambassador to Greece, Peko Dapčević, a prominent member of Tito's Partisans. A volunteer in Spain during that country's civil war, Dapčević had served as commander of the operation that led to the liberation of Belgrade and was briefly chief of the general staff of the Yugoslav People's Army in the 1950s. For Croatian émigrés, however, Dapčević was primarily reviled for his role as one of the commanders responsible for the Bleiburg massacre. His assassination at the hands of the HRB, the conspirators behind the plan declared, would reverberate the world over: "The echo of the event, I believe, would be tremendous, notably in our country. Just imagine the international press and radio coverage throughout the world, the frantic Yugo-communist press tirades against us, the huge funeral procession in Belgrade, the funerary orations by the senile Tito and a confused Ranković for their wartime comrade who used to be a veritable legend to the partisans, the terror and anxiety among those in power, and, last but not least, the joy among the Croatian nationalists in the Country."[60]

Crucially, neither Operation Galeb nor Operation G 3 went beyond the planning stages. But beginning in the early 1960s and continuing into the 1980s, scores of other acts of "commando-terrorism" did. With very few exceptions, these acts were undertaken with the simple aim, on the one hand, of showing to the Croatian people that the fight against "Serbo-communism" was possible and, on the other, of turning the world's eyes to the plight of the Croats. It was through such acts—as opposed to words—that the foundation for national liberation would be built. As one HRB member explained to another: "Even one blown-up train in Cro(atia) would make for a turn in the situation."[61]

Meanwhile, that such acts had to be undertaken by members of Croatia's emigrant population stemmed from the belief held by many radical semi-émigrés—again, borrowing from older revolutionary models—that the primary role of Croats abroad was to serve as the nation's "revolutionary vanguard."[62] For any national liberation revolution to succeed, leaders of groups such as the HRB, HKB, and TRUP posited, "the Croatian émigré community must play

the principal role, notably in the initial phases of, and the preparations for, the Croatian Revolution. It must prepare and fire the minds of the Croatian nation for a national explosion at the time when the Belgrade dictator's last hour has struck."[63] Conditions within Croatia itself, the argument went, severely hampered any possibility of a "native" revolution. This was the result both of "Red Belgrade's slavery"[64] and the work of domestic collaborators.[65] Consequently, as the aforementioned pamphlet from the HRB explained, although "both the metropolitan and émigré Croats want Croatian freedom," the former needed the latter to both prepare and illuminate the path to freedom. The domination and subjection of the Croatian nation by both foreign (i.e., Serbs) and domestic (i.e., Croatian communist) enemies meant that although the ultimate triumph of the revolution would be won primarily through the efforts of those at home, the foundation for that success had to be laid by those abroad: "The Croatian revolutionary struggle's destructive force and the assurance of our victory are founded upon the muscles of the Croatian people at home. It is the duty of the Croatian political and revolutionary émigrés to move and arouse the oppressed Croatian people at home, to create the conditions for a revolutionary explosion and to build the political conditions for the establishment of a Free Croatian State."[66] The situation for Croats in the emigration was, of course, different from that of those who remained in the homeland. Whereas years of oppression had led Croats in the homeland to feel as though their pitiable situation was and would remain forever immutable, those abroad—through the freedoms and privileges they enjoyed in their adopted homes—retained a faith in the Croatian nation's ability to bring the regime in Belgrade crashing down. The responsibility of young émigrés everywhere was to show those in the homeland just how much potential and indeed power they possessed.

Inciting the struggle for Croatian independence through "commando-terrorism" and other acts of political violence, however, was not just a duty for those young Croats fortunate enough to be living abroad. It was, radical semi-émigrés declared, a "sacred task in the struggle for Croatian liberty, and . . . [in actuality] the only way in which [to] provide for the people at home the spark that will ignite the flame of fight for holy liberty."[67] Unfortunately, circumstances were such that a successful national liberation struggle could only be brought about through the violent actions of young, semi-émigré radical separatists abroad. The Superpowers had no vested interest in the Croats' plight, postwar émigrés had long since compromised their own role in the cause, and those left behind in the homeland lacked the resources to break the subjugation of the regime in Belgrade. All that remained was the new generation of patriots in the emigration. It would be up to them to assume the role of revolutionary vanguard, preparing the stage for Croatia to once and for all finally take its rightful place among the list of free nations.

Ideological Leanings

If the strategies adopted by semi-émigré radicals were relatively straightforward, the ideologies underpinning those tactics at times defy easy categorization. On the one hand, young extremists framed their struggle as one of postcolonial national self-determination, making the fight against Belgrade anti-imperialist in nature and revolutionary in spirit. Similarly, the embrace of "commando-terrorism" as essentially a form of revolutionary propaganda had its precedents in nineteenth-century socialism and anarchism. And, of course, the idea of the need for a revolutionary vanguard is most strongly associated with Lenin. Importantly, while such notions are generally thought of as belonging to the political left, they have historically been as integral to reactionary as to radical movements. This was the case with young, organized, anti-Yugoslav, pro-Croat semi-émigrés in the 1960s and 1970s, who incontestably leaned toward fascism. To whatever degree the radicalization of semi-émigrés was largely a result of a rejection of the interwar and wartime Ustaša generation, the fascist legacy of the latter nevertheless remained instrumental in the political thinking of the former.[68] Young radicals may have come to abhor figures such as Ante Pavelić and his ilk. But this was almost always due to the postwar generation's failure to secure an independent Croatian state and almost never for their actual ideologies.[69]

At the same time, semi-émigré radical separatists not only explicitly rejected every kind of programmatic ideology but formulated what was in essence an "anti-ideological" ideology to underpin their efforts. Again, the HRB provided the most frank and plainspoken expression of this position in one of its propaganda treatises, declaring: "Let us make no mistake—WE ARE FIGHTING FOR CROATIAN LIBERTY, NOT FOR ANY IDEOLOGY. . . . Our supreme ideology of the day, therefore, is that of CROATIAN FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE."[70] While the tendency might be to reject such a proclamation as little more than a rhetorical strategy to mask the fascist underpinnings of the movement, in truth it was a reflection of the one reality deemed unassailable by semi-émigré separatists—namely, that political ideology was meaningless so long as Croatia remained in fetters. As such, independence alone became not just the central but, in fact, the sole motivating force driving separatist organizations. In the struggle for the liberation of the Croatian nation, semi-émigré separatist leaders declared, there could be no chauvinism toward one or the other ideology. All efforts aimed at independence, be they motivated by fascism, liberalism, social democracy, or even communism, had a place, so long as the end result was the establishment of a free Croatian state.

In large measure, this stance was an extension of the radical semi-émigré critique of the postwar generation's enduring focus on securing Western support for the cause. Younger separatists, as discussed, were in principle not opposed to Superpower intervention in the struggle for Croatian independence.

The issue was the degree to which older émigrés relied on those outside forces. The younger generation of separatists welcomed the support of any and all powers interested in the destruction of socialist Yugoslavia while remaining clear that the success of the struggle could and indeed should never be entrusted to anyone but the Croats themselves. More importantly, semi-émigrés were clear that the movement was in no position to pick and choose its allies. While postwar émigrés looked primarily to the West for support—more due to a faith in the West's anticommunist stance than in any particular belief in liberal democracy—the semi-émigré generation believed that friends should be embraced wherever they existed, including in countries or movements whose ideologies were far removed from those espoused by the Ustaše. As elaborated bluntly in the HRB treatise, "A true revolutionary's realistic stand will endorse the idea of elastic diplomacy of winning friends everywhere in the world, thus making sure of a successful outcome of his struggle and mission."[71]

The semi-émigré radicals' approach to allegiances came, unsurprisingly, from a position of insecurity—however unspoken—about the future prospects of both the revolution and the Croatian nation itself. For all the posturing and bravado of newly formed radical groups in the emigration in the 1960s, the urgency of the call to arms in the name of national liberation arose out of a sense of both despondency and desperation. Croatia faced, in their view, nothing short of eradication, and anything that could stem the tide of this annihilation should be considered. As elucidated in a pamphlet distributed in 1970 from yet another radical organization, the Australo-Croatian National Resistance (AHNO; Australsko hrvatski narodni odpor): "We have no prejudices in this critical position of our Croatian people either towards the East or West, except what concerns our ideals of liberty, but we are conscious of the fact that it is necessary, without regard to social or other problems, to first survive this genocide and this mass exodus of the Croatian nation. This is possible only through the realization of the Croatian State and for this end we are prepared to pay the utmost price."[72] That price, metaphorically speaking, was a dance with the devil. Whereas postwar émigrés made manifest their disdain for all things communist—for both ideological reasons and as part of their strategy to court the West—semi-émigrés took a much more flexible position regarding what role communist countries, communist ideologues, and even communist sympathizers could play in the struggle for Croatian liberation. Not, of course, that the younger generation had any sympathy for communism. Nevertheless, they embraced the adage that the enemy of enemy is my friend, regardless of how loathsome that new friend might be. So long as this new friendship resulted in national independence, how and with whom it was achieved was secondary. Even, as demonstrated in one HRB pamphlet, if that "friend" was ideologically indistinguishable from Croatia's greatest enemy:

> It is time to put to an end, once for all, the one-sidedness of our political outlook. Every chance and avenue for help, irrespective of where it may be, must be properly exploited; the only consideration to be borne in mind here is that no provision, in our establishing links and making agreements with other countries, must be allowed to encroach upon the territorial boundaries of the future State of Croatia or upon the sovereignty of the Croatian nation. In seeking outside support, Tirana is our best chance: Albania has always been hostile to any type of Yugoslavia, regardless of the fact that structurally its own regime is identically communist to that of the existing Belgrade government.[73]

The Western Powers had no vested interested in the dismemberment of socialist Yugoslavia. The opposite, in fact, was true, as a unified, Western-leaning Yugoslav state—even if still socialist—served as a bulwark against Soviet expansion in southern Europe, particularly Greece.[74] The same was not true of Yugoslavia's state socialist neighbors, including—in addition to Albania—Bulgaria and Hungary, both of which had claims to large (non-Croat) territories within Tito's state. However self-serving a country's own aims in dismantling Yugoslavia might be, an alliance among Croats, Albanians, Bulgarians, Hungarians, and even Soviets or Chinese could benefit everyone, and was at least worth consideration.[75]

Such thinking, of course, remained trapped in the realm of the unrealistic, if not the absurd.[76] But not all semi-émigré readings of global international politics produced strategies as fully divorced from reality as the idea, for example, of an alliance between Croatian separatists and the government of Albania to bring down the Yugoslav state. A crucial departure for younger radicals from their predecessors was a belief that the development of the doctrine of mutual assured destruction meant that the Great Powers wished to avoid direct military confrontation.[77] Concretely, this meant that both Washington and Moscow actively worked to confine and limit any conflict—direct, proxy, or otherwise—that might arise in the world. Consequently, radical Croats posited, a revolution that was highly organized, meticulously prepared, and flexible in its strategies had a high chance of success because the Great Powers would seek to enforce a workable settlement to end all hostilities as quickly as possible. As explained by the HRB: "Today, there is a desire, both on the part of the West and the East Blocs, to localize wars anywhere in the world. Any planned Revolution within a nation will succeed nowadays, especially if the Revolutionary Leadership adopts, at the very beginning of the revolution, an elastic attitude about seeking armed support for the revolutionary forces."[78] The point here, as already discussed, was that radical émigré separatists did not need to pursue allegiances before the outbreak of the national liberation revolution. They just needed to be

open to working with anyone looking to intercede in the conflict on their behalf. To reject out of hand and precipitously the possibility that this might include communists only served to reduce the chances of ultimate victory.

Of course, the barefaced opportunism of semi-émigré radicals to ally themselves with communists and others who might be considered ideologically suspect—if not abhorrent—resulted not from the tolerance of their nationalism but rather its extremity. Nation, in simplest terms, trumped ideology, so long as the "national" element was willing to contribute to the ultimate goal of Croatian liberation.[79] As one leaflet from Croats in Canada announced: "We stand for the Croatian Revolution and in that revolution there is a place for every Croat who is willing to give his life for the freedom of Croatia, but not for this or that political order of ideology."[80] In 1968, a front-page article in *Obrana*, the official Otpor organ, offered an even more extreme—and incongruous—suggestion: the forming of an "All-Croatian" government with the aim of facilitating national reconciliation that in turn would enable the establishment of an independent Croatia.[81] The author suggested that this government would include the following figures:

> President of the Republic of Croatia: Josip Broz-Tito (Belgrade)
> Vice-President and President of the Supreme Court: Stjepan Hefer (Buenos Aires)
> Prime Minister: Branko Jelić (Berlin)
> Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister: Miko Tripalo (Zagreb)
> Minister of the Interior: Maks Luburić (Madrid)
> Defense Minister: Ivan Gošnjak (Belgrade)
> Justice Minister: Miroslav Krleža (Zagreb)
> Finance Minister: Avdo Humo (Sarajevo)
> Minister for Economic Affairs: Vladimir Bakarić (Zagreb)
> Minister for Industry: Vjekoslav Vrančić (Buenos Aires)[82]

However manifestly—even audaciously—naive, this list demonstrates the degree to which national affiliations exceeded ideology in importance for semi-émigré separatists. Tito, to cite the most unlikely suggestion, was a despot, Marxist ideologue, and even war criminal in the eyes of radical nationalists. But all this would be not just forgiven but indeed forgotten if he were to use his powers to facilitate the creation of an independent Croatia. The same was true for anyone, regardless of ideological stance, prepared to take up the struggle for national liberation.

Crucially, leading radicals employed the same logic in discussing who should be excluded from the movement, which further demonstrated the inherent illiberalism of the semi-émigré separatist movement. If being ideologically suspect did not preclude one from being able to contribute to the cause, the

championing of ideals considered "laudable" did not necessarily make one welcome. However unimpeachable one's political position might be, if those ideologies were not mobilized in pursuit of Croatian independence, they not only had to be rejected but would be treated as a threat.[83] This included, as alluded to in one HRB treatise, even democratic principles: "In view of the fact that the Croatian people, a nation with a democratic outlook, have paid such a terrible price in blood for their democratic feeling to everyone of their allies throughout their history, with the result that they are now on the verge of disaster, everybody acting to the detriment of or against the Croatian Liberation revolution, irrespective of what 'lofty ideals' he may be working for in the process, will be regarded as a criminal."[84] While the rejection of programmatic ideologies by the new generation of radical émigré separatists undoubtedly was the result at least to some degree of a desire to distance semi-émigrés from the interwar, wartime, and postwar Ustaše, in no way did this seemingly tolerant stance toward ideology indicate an innate proclivity for Western-style liberal constitutionalism. Just as the movement would welcome a communist who supported national liberation, so, too, would it accept a Nazi, Ustaša, or fascist. A committed democrat who sought to compromise with the regime in Belgrade or otherwise stopped short of agitating for a fully independent Croatian state would, however, not be welcome. In simplest terms, as expressed by the AHNO: "Anything that does not contribute to the victory or success of the Croatian liberation and state-forming idea has no practical value for the program of the Croatian National Resistance. Such is our political realism."[85]

The apparent ideological elasticity of semi-émigré separatists facilitated the removal of the sheen of fascism that for many characterized post–World War II Croatian nationalism. If Croats were willing to work together with Tirana or even Moscow, they might be absolved of any suspicion of fascist tendencies, the extremeness of their nationalism notwithstanding. This was the view of at least one prominent outside—if invested—observer of Croatian semi-émigré separatism, the acting commissioner of Australia's Commonwealth Police Force, L. S. J. Harper. In a report written a decade after the founding of the HRB, he observed:

> The general impression . . . that Croatian nationalists are simply Nazi quislings whose aims are the re-establishment of a fascist puppet state along the lines of the NDH . . . is a gross over-simplification of a highly complex socio-political problem that has been a major cause of Balkan unrest and intrigue for nearly a millennium. . . . The allegation that Croat nationalists are fascists and strongly anticommunist is also inaccurate. Although Croat organizations generally tend to loudly voice anticommunist slogans, it should never be forgotten that their struggle

> for separatism is essentially an historic rather than ideological one and in their desire to obtain independence for Croatia, even the most apparently right wing Croat could co-operate with Soviet Communists, provided the target was Yugoslavia and Tito.[86]

The historiographical problems of this assessment of Croatian separatism aside, the acting commissioner's perhaps somewhat forgiving view of Cold War–era Croatian nationalism followed from the notion that fascism and communism are inherently anathema to each other.[87] But if fascism—whose ideological basis in any case lacks an easily categorized cohesion[88]—is as much a response to pragmatic concerns as it is the manifestation of ideal-type tropes, the strategic position of semi-émigré radicalism toward communism did not intrinsically repudiate its underlying fascist tendencies.[89] To the contrary, it demonstrated the true militancy of the nationalism within the separatist movement.

Indeed, the extreme national chauvinism of semi-émigré separatists can be found in the one restriction they placed on pursuing potential collaborators—namely, Serbs. In the view of radical semi-émigrés, the Serbs represented an enemy nationality that was intrinsically hostile to the Croatian nation. No Serb, regardless of his or her political or ideological disposition, could be considered an ally of any kind, even those whose hatred for Tito and the socialist Yugoslav state rivaled that of radical Croatian nationalists.[90] Here again, national identification transcended ideology.[91] An article in *Obrana* thus vowed: "We would rather go together with the Croatian communists than with the Serbian and Yugoslav fascists, militarists, or professional anticommunists in the West who speak of Western democracy."[92] However much Serbian émigrés—including former Četniks, royalists, and anticommunists—desired the destruction of socialist Yugoslavia, the mere fact of their "Serbian-ness" prevented their sharing any common aim with Croatian separatists. In the eyes of semi-émigré radicals, Serbs always had sought and always would seek domination over Croatian lands, so that even if Tito's state were to be eradicated, the Serbs would move to replace it with a state as equally hegemonic, oppressive, and even genocidal.

Hatred against the Serbs, however, went much deeper than simply rebuffing potential allies in the struggle against the regime in Belgrade. Radical semi-émigré Croats saw the Serbs as a nation to be fundamentally despised, not least because the Serbs themselves understood only depravity and malevolence. Culturally, intellectually, morally, and politically, the Serbs were inferior not just to the Croats but indeed to all other nationalities within Yugoslavia. Their domination over others was due only to their ruthlessness and general national narcissism. As explained in one HRB pamphlet:

> In both [the first and second Yugoslavia], the power [has been] concentrated in the hands of the Serbians, a nation obsessed with [a] lust for power, devoid of deep human feelings, situate[ed] at a low cultural level and not [in] possess[ion] of the basic qualities by which to establish a government on a modern foundation and in all its proper branches. Yet, they could be [*sic*] still be tolerated if it were not for their one incurable disease—their national egomania, the contempt for the rest of Yugoslavia's people because of the latter's predilection for a peaceable, non-dictatorial, and civilian way of life, and [also because of] their hatred of [the] creative and intellectual abilities [of Yugoslavia's other nationalities].[93]

The language used by extremist Croatian separatists to express their hatred of the Serbs was unabashedly essentialist in its character, distinctly echoing the racist discourses of both the Nazis and the interwar and wartime Ustaše. For many radical semi-émigrés, the Serbs were true *Untermenschen*, lacking the basic qualities of advanced, civilized nationhood. For a people as "hard-working, honest, civilized, and intelligent" as the Croats to suffer under the tyranny of such a people, who knew only how to rape, pillage, and slaughter, was both perverse and unnatural.[94] The only reasonable, indeed righteous, response to the Serbs' primeval hatred of the Croats was to return that hatred. This lesson came from no less authoritative a source than the Old Testament:[95]

> Since the Serbs loathe us Croats with a barbarian, primitive, inhuman, and satanic hatred, we Croats have a full moral and human right to exclaim, like the ancient Israelite hero Samson:
>
> > Oh Samson, thy mother's fruit,
> > Thou glorious and shining guardian of Israel!
> > Hate thou, my son, the Philistines,
> > For the Philistines hate us![96]

As with the ancient biblical enemies, Serbian subjugation of the Croats provoked an enduring rivalry and conflict between the two nations. This state of affairs could only be broken by a final Croatian defeat of the Serbs, which, in turn, would lead to the latter's complete banishment from "Croatian" lands. Although the power enjoyed by the Serbs in Yugoslavia appeared overwhelming, just as David had slain Goliath—to continue the metaphor of the Israelites and the Philistines—so the Croats, led by the revolutionary emigration, would defeat the Serbs.

Moreover, feelings of hatred toward the Serbian nation were not only justifiable; they were a necessary condition for entering the union of radical semi-émigré separatists.[97] The national liberation struggle was not simply about securing Croatian independence; it was also about settling outstanding debts.[98] Vengeance for past as well as ongoing crimes committed against the Croats by the Serbs was central to both the program and appeal of organizations such as the HRB, HKB, and TRUP. The resulting cult of violence within the movement transcended "simply" the strategic employment of terrorism and political violence as revolutionary tactic. Rather, the language used by at least some of the more radical semi-émigrés demonstrated the movement's stark undercurrent of fascism. A treatise entitled "What Have We Risen Against?" issued in 1964 by the HRB's "Supreme Revolutionary Headquarters" posed the question: "Who can ever forget the death marches, cruelly wiping out thousands of Croatian youths, or the mass graves in the ravines of Slovenia hiding tens of thousands of massacred and shot Croatian soldiers, or the camps, gaols, and dungeons still holding in bondage many Croatian men and women, or our burned-down and looted homes, and our raped mothers, wives, fiancées, and sisters? . . . NO, no decent Croatian can or will ignore all these things or must ever forget them until we have paid back with compound interest the exterminators of Croatian freedom and the arch enemies of the Croatian people!"[99] Drawing again from the Old, rather than the New, Testament, semi-émigré radicals held that the Croats, in dealing with the Serbs, had to apply the principle of lex talionis in dealing with the Serbs: an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a massacre for a massacre. Only in this way could the nation ever hope to, first, overcome the traumas of the past and, second, ensure a future forever free from Serbian tyranny. Violence against Serbs was not only a vehicle for achieving independence; if the Croats ever hoped to join the pantheon of hallowed nations, it had to be a condition of that independence: "After all, the enemies too hate us; we are hated by the Serbians who want to exterminate us, wipe out our race, and erase the name of "Croat" from the roll of the nations. 'There is no sanctification without prior revenge,' a wise Arab proverb says. . . . The impending battle must end in a great Croatian victory, so that for a thousand years to come no Serbian will ever dare even to look askance at a Croat."[100]

The singular obsession with independence made radical semi-émigré separatists political opportunists of the highest order, willing to dismiss ideological concerns when seeking allies. The core of the movement, however, remained a dual obsession with national victimhood and redemptive violence, hallmarks not just of crude nationalistic chauvinism but prototypic fascism. Even if left—barely—inexplicit, the implications of the HRB and other groups' rhetoric when addressing the Serbian issue was clear: whatever

the political form of an independent Croatia, there could be no alternative to exacting genocidal retribution against the nation's former oppressors.

To reach this point, however, Croatia first had to be liberated, and this remained the unwavering focus of the radical semi-émigré groups that formed in the early 1960s. Having not just broken ties with, but positioned themselves in opposition to, the postwar generation of Croatian émigrés, members of groups such as the HRB, HKB, and TRUP staked their claim as the nation's new saviors. It was, to return to the biblical imagery they favored, the cross the new generation had to bear. Yet, this struggle would ultimately lead to salvation, not just for those who led the fight but for the whole Croatian nation. The time had come for this new generation of radical separatists to embark on the path of action.

Chapter 4
All Accounts Have Not Yet Been Settled, 1962–1969

The opening salvo in the semi-émigré generation's campaign of violence against socialist Yugoslavia came on November 29, 1962, not coincidently the anniversaries both of Yugoslavia's reestablishment in 1943 and the proclamation of the socialist state in 1945.[1] Shortly before noon, in broad daylight, twenty-six members of the Croatian Crusaders' Brotherhood (HKB) stormed the Yugoslav Trade Mission in the West German capital Bonn's Mehlem diplomatic district. The trade mission functioned as Yugoslavia's de facto embassy to the FRG after the severing of official diplomatic ties between the countries in 1957. After setting off a bomb in the courtyard, the young radicals broke down the trade mission's front doors and forced their way inside. Shouting slogans denouncing Tito and Yugoslavia, they proceeded to ransack the building, destroying furniture, equipment, and documents before setting the wreckage on fire. The Križari—as the members of the HKB referred to themselves, in identification with the same-named postwar Ustaša guerillas—also rigged a number of bombs inside the trade mission to detonate upon their retreat. The short but brazen attack left the building in ruins.[2]

Beyond this destruction, the raid resulted in the death of the building's Serbian porter, Momčilo Popović, and grave injuries to a consular official, Albert Dovgan. Moreover, Dovgan's eleven-year-old son, who had accompanied his father to work that day and so was in the trade mission at the time of the attack, was badly beaten during the storming of the building. He escaped more severe injuries or even death thanks to Popović, who—brandishing a pistol—came to the aid of Dovgan and his son. Unfortunately for Popović, his intervention led to an exchange of gunfire with one of the Križari, Franjo Perčić, which ended with Popović sustaining an ultimately fatal gunshot wound. The number of casualties would most likely have been far higher had much of the trade mission's staff not been absent because of the symbolic value of the date chosen for the attack—socialist Yugoslavia's most important national holiday.

The HKB—like so many of the more radical groups in the 1960s and 1970s—had been formed following a series of rifts within the émigré separatist movement. At the yearly conference of the HOP-aligned UHNj held in Munich in 1960, a split occurred between the organization's Munich and Dortmund factions. Ostensibly, the feud resulted from conflicting strategies between the Munich bloc, led by Mile Rukavina and Nahid Kulenović, and the Dortmund clique, which formed around Ante Vukić, Miroslav Peran, and, above all, the priest Rafael Medić, who had been Ante Pavelić's personal chaplain and confessor during World War II. The former group held the position that the UHNj should maintain the more restrained approach to Croatian independence advocated by the HOP headquarters in Buenos Aires. The latter group pushed for greater use of terrorist and diversionist tactics to promote the Croatian cause.[3] In truth, the schism in the UHNj resulted more from a mundane—and for the movement almost obligatory—power struggle within the ranks of the organization. Regardless of the reason for the split, the result was the same, as Medić, Vukić, and Peran withdrew from the UHNj and established a new, more radical group called the Secret Ustaša Movement (TUP; Tajni ustaški pokret), active in and around the Rhineland and Westphalia.[4]

The HKB, in turn, was established to serve as both a cover for the radical activities of and as a mechanism for recruitment into the TUP. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, several émigré members of the Croatian clergy were active in the Hilfsaktion für die verfolgte Kirche in Ostmittel- und Osteuropa (Relief for the Persecuted Church in Central and Eastern Europe), run by the West German Ostpriesterhilfe, a Catholic aid organization that worked closely with refugees and expellees, particularly priests, from state socialist eastern Europe. During the eleventh international convention of the Ostpriesterhilfe in the Hessian town of Königstein im Taunus, the idea developed among Croatian priests in attendance to form an emigrant Catholic youth organization modeled on the Hrvatski orlovski savez (Croatian Eagle Union) and its successor the Križarska organizacija (Crusaders' Organization), the two most active associations of their kind in interwar Croatia.[5] Officially, the organization would be a social and humanitarian society that combined physical training with religious and political education for young Croatian emigrants to West Germany who suffered from economic and cultural problems.[6] Just as importantly, the HKB would be fully registered with the German authorities, enjoying both the sanction and legitimacy such recognition afforded.[7]

Social, humanitarian, economic, and even religious matters, however, were all at best secondary—if factoring at all—for the HKB. As one West German report written just a week after the trade mission attack explained: "Hidden behind the religious objectives of the 'Križari' was something else: an organization whose members were educated in the spirit of Croatian

exclusivity and maximum nationalism."[8] With Medić at its helm, the HKB served, simply, as a vehicle for radicalizing and mobilizing young emigrants. Those who demonstrated the greatest penchant for anti-Yugoslav tendencies were channeled toward the TUP, where, together with being subjected to extremist nationalistic propaganda, recruits began a program of regimented physical exercise combined with training in guerilla tactics and sabotage. Once fully accepted into the organization, members engaged in small-scale acts of violence, such as physical attacks on representatives of socialist Yugoslavia and Serbian refugees in West Germany, as well as exploits such as tearing down Yugoslav flags at train stations and various international conventions and sports tournaments.[9] The most serious of these incidents came on April 10, 1962—the twenty-first anniversary of the founding of the NDH—when TUP members fired signal rockets into the basement of the Yugoslav Trade Mission in Bonn in an attempt to ignite the building's oil heater and set the entire structure on fire. The damage from the rockets proved minimal, but the act served as a precursor of the events just seven months later in the same building.[10]

Such was the appeal of the TUP's activities for those who joined the HKB that distinctions between the two groups effectively ceased to exist by early 1962. Almost from the time of its founding, the HKB became a magnet for young revolutionary separatists among emigrant Croats in West Germany, undermining any pretensions that its primary purpose was to serve as the "legitimate" wing of the more militant TUP. Quickly, the HKB went from being an instrument of recruitment for the TUP to a hub of revolutionary separatism in its own right. This only increased following a purge—under threat of violence or even death—of more moderate members of the organization who voiced opposition to the HKB's rapid radicalization.[11] The TUP's original membership of forty grew five times, reaching more than two hundred within the HKB, with the latter becoming even more militant than the former. The end result, as described in a December 1962 British embassy report to London, was that by the time of the attack on the trade mission the HKB had developed into the "the most radical and extreme rightist émigré organization in the Federal Republic."[12]

The HKB differed from the Australian-based HRB in that its leadership comprised individuals who had either fought or otherwise been politically active during World War II.[13] The two groups were similar, however, in that the members who ultimately proved willing to actively engage in violence and terror belonged almost exclusively to the semi-émigré generation. Rafael Medić and other older émigrés may have been instrumental in establishing and organizing the HKB, but it was the youth who took the group in a truly revolutionary direction. Nowhere was this more in evidence than in the attack

on the trade mission, where all but one of the twenty-six HKB members who participated had been born between 1936 and 1942, making the oldest just nine at the end of the war and twenty-six at the time of the attack.[14] For nearly two decades, the postwar generation of Croatian separatists had preached the need to do whatever was necessary to end "Serbo-communist" domination over Croatia and the Croatian people, but all the while doing very little. In the trade mission attack, the semi-émigré generation showed that the time of speechifying, editorializing, and letter-writing had come to an end. From this point forward, the struggle for Croatian independence would be both one of the youth and one of violence.

Just as crucially, the trade mission attack also made clear that the semi-émigré generation possessed not only the desire but also the capability to make good on their vow to wage an unwavering violent struggle against socialist Yugoslavia in the name of Croatian independence. Belgrade and its allies could no longer take lightly the Croatian separatist movement. A conference of Croatian organizations held in Cologne in January 1963 affirmed a statement of support for the attack, employing the rhetoric of genocide for Belgrade's intent to "biologically destroy" the Croatian nation. Characterizing the raid as an "assassination," the statement declared the attack on the trade mission to be "the answer to the attempt to exterminate a nation and at the same time a warning to the world community and to all those who support consciously or unconsciously the illegal regime in Croatia and thusly are contributing to the extermination of the Croats."[15] The incessant—and at times farcical—infighting among radical Croatian émigrés together with myriad other internal and external factors had rendered the separatist movement dysfunctional and, subsequently, functionally impotent throughout the 1950s.[16] While such issues continued to plague emigrant separatism for the entirety of the Cold War, the attack on the trade mission provided evidence not just to Croatian nationalists and the Yugoslav government but indeed to the world at large that the arrival of the semi-émigré generation would have real consequences for Croatian separatism. A new, active phase in the struggle for national liberation had begun.

Opening the Struggle

The attack on the trade mission had further significance in what it revealed about the strategic thinking of semi-émigré radicals. Central to their reasoning was the idea that the destruction of socialist Yugoslavia required destruction of the symbols, structures, and institutions of Tito's hated state wherever they existed—not only within socialist Yugoslavia but globally. In keeping with the transnational nature of the separatist movement, these younger radicals formulated their repertoires of violence in transnational terms. To quote one Otpor leader a decade after the trade mission attack: "Yugoslavia does not exist only

within its borders, but also abroad. Similarly, more than half of all Croats fit for action found themselves outside the country. . . . This makes both the responsibility of those of us who live outside the homeland and who enjoy a reasonably sizable freedom completely clear and our cooperation in the revolutionary current justified and essential! We must annihilate Yugoslavia wherever it exists."[17] Embassies, consulates, and offices of the Yugoslav government around the world were seen as not just viable but indeed principal targets of radical separatist violence. So, too, were other institutions of the Yugoslav state operating internationally, such as the offices of JAT—Yugoslavia's official airline—and Jugotours—the government-run tourist bureau. Likewise, agents of the Yugoslav state abroad—such as diplomats, trade and military representatives, and even journalists—were all viewed as fair targets for assassination.[18] Any attack against the institutions of socialist Yugoslavia would be a blow against Belgrade and a step forward for Croatian independence. For this reason, the semi-émigré generation was prepared to fight Yugoslavia wherever the state had a presence, be it in Cologne, Canberra, or Carinthia.

This did not mean that the separatist struggle for national liberty would take place exclusively beyond socialist Yugoslavia. As examined in the previous chapter, semi-émigré radical separatists stressed that small-scale political violence was not an end in and of itself but rather a means to foment widespread revolution among Croats against the oppressors in Belgrade. While acts such as the attack on the trade mission undoubtedly resonated among those still in the homeland—or so the rationale went—an even greater impact would come from striking the "Serbo-communists" on their own terrain. A model for the apparent soundness of this thinking came from none other than the interwar Ustaše. Perhaps the most infamous act of violence executed by the Ustaše before World War II—apart, of course, from the assassination of King Aleksandar—was the September 6/7, 1932, "Velebit Uprising," an attack on a royalist Yugoslav gendarme station in the town of Brušane in the Lika region of Croatia.[19] The assault, which was led by ten Italian-based Ustaše, resulted in no casualties and only limited damage to a provincial outpost.[20] Nevertheless, reverberations from the incident were substantial. The apparent ease with which the Ustaše could infiltrate the country and strike at the state's power structure rattled authorities in Belgrade while simultaneously emboldening anti-Yugoslav elements in neighboring Italy and Hungary. It also energized the Ustaše themselves, causing many in the organization to view the attack as the true beginning of the movement.[21]

The attempt by younger Croatian separatists to carry out an action comparable to the Velebit Uprising came just seven months after the trade mission attack, underscoring not just their radicalization but also their resolve. On the night of July 4/5, 1963, nine members of the HRB crossed the Italian border

near the town of Monfalcone into socialist Yugoslavia.[22] Divided into three troikas, one group of men made for the coastal town of Rijeka, another for the mountainous region of Gorski Kotar, and the last for an area of Bosnia near the Sava River. Each of the troikas were charged with spreading antiregime propaganda, blowing up rail lines and bridges, destroying water supplies and electrical lines, undermining state-sponsored economic projects, and assassinating government officials and army officers.[23] In order to accomplish these tasks, the nine men were in possession among them of twenty kilos of explosives, one hundred detonators, four transistor radios, five pistols, two daggers, and three maps.[24] As with the attack in Bonn, the incursion into Yugoslavia was undertaken by young emigrants with similar migratory biographies: all but one had arrived in Australia as laborers between 1958 and 1961 after having first spent time in refugee camps in Austria or Italy.[25]

Two of the nine insurgents—Josip Oblak and Ilija Tolić—had been founding members of the HRB just two years earlier. The others were among the estimated two hundred members recruited into the organization in the ensuing months.[26] They were trained in weapons handling, the manufacture of explosives, and the art of sabotage at the Croatian Catholic Welfare Centre in the Sydney suburb of Woollahra, as well as on weekend "picnic getaways" in remote rural areas of New South Wales and Victoria.[27] Once preparations in Australia were complete, each of the nine men chosen to undertake "Operation Kangaroo"—the operation's code name—separately made their way back to Europe, with the first setting sail as early as October 1962.[28] Once back in the Northern Hemisphere, the men reunited outside of Stuttgart, where they received additional instruction in the use of firearms and explosives from two members of a radical West German wing of Draganović and Varoš's HDO, Branko Orlović and Nado Gladić.[29] After their sojourn in the FRG, the men traveled again separately to Milan to undertake final preparations before making their way to the Italian/Yugoslav frontier.

By any assessment, Operation Kangaroo was an unmitigated disaster. Yugoslav security forces arrested all nine men within two and a half weeks of them entering the country, with none of the would-be revolutionaries having engaged in a successful act of sabotage or political violence. Speculation by Australian authorities as to reasons for the failure of the incursion ranged from the HRB's complete misreading of the conditions and attitudes within Yugoslavia to the organization's infiltration by Yugoslav security.[30] The HRB's leadership, meanwhile, placed blame on the militants themselves, claiming that they had broken the basic rules of guerilla warfare by returning to their native villages out of a sense of nostalgia and homesickness, which left them open to recognition and, ultimately, betrayal.[31] Either way, the result was the same: although the men had failed to commit any acts of terror, all were found

guilty of criminal acts against the people and the state. Two of the would-be revolutionaries received sentences of fourteen years of hard labor; of the others, one got a thirteen-year term, three got twelve years, another seven years, and two six years.

As was the case with the Velebit Uprising three decades earlier, the larger significance of Operation Kangaroo would not be measured by the physical damage it caused—or, in the case of the incursion, not caused. For the regime in Belgrade, the temporal proximity of the incursion to both the trade mission attack and an unclaimed bombing at the Yugoslav embassy in Brussels on February 3, 1963, raised alarms as indications seemed to point—not altogether incorrectly—to an actual growing threat from Croatian separatist elements in the emigration, even if the capacities of those forces remained limited.[32] The harshness of the sentences handed down by the court reflected the seriousness with which Belgrade viewed the danger radical émigré Croats posed to the delicate balance of the Yugoslav state, much as the royalist government had done after 1932. For the separatists themselves, meanwhile, the initial disappointment brought on by the Operation Kangaroo calamity soon gave way to renewed optimism and vigor, as news agencies around the world reported first on the incursion itself and then on the patently biased trials that followed.[33] The trains in Yugoslavia had not been disrupted, the bridges remained intact, the water and electrical systems functioned as they had before early July, and the state's economic projects remained on course. But for more than just a brief moment, the attention of the world had been drawn to the plight of Croatia and the Croats.

As important as this global awareness of their cause was for radical separatists, however, it remained only a means to an end. Semi-émigré extremists could take heart in the "triumphs" of the trade mission attack and Operation Kangaroo, but they needed to remain focused on the reality that these exploits were only the first steps in the greater struggle against "Serbo-communism." The ultimate goal remained national independence, which could only be achieved through a sustained campaign of violence and propaganda that succumbed to neither compromise nor accommodation. As explained by the Supreme Headquarters of the HRB following Operation Kangaroo: "News [of the incursion] echoed like a bombshell around the world . . . [making Kangaroo a] success, because the world had begun to forget about us and ignore us as such. But we cannot and must never be satisfied in that: the struggle continues and will not end until we either win or honourably fall in battle. Mediocrity is the worst and most despicable human failing."[34] The last line of this quote was an unmistakable dig at postwar émigrés, who, in the opinion of HRB leadership, had wallowed in ordinariness and general ennui for nearly two decades. It was also a warning to the new cohort of younger radicals that

complacency was as much a danger to the cause as any measures taken by Belgrade or other forces opposed to Croatian independence. The storming of the trade mission and incursion into socialist Yugoslavia were powerful statements that the new generation had well and truly taken up the mantle of nationalist separatism. The key now was to build on the achievements of this initial vanguard of Croatian revolutionaries and show that the movement was capable of shaking the very foundations of Tito's Yugoslav state.

In the period immediately following the attack in Bonn and Operation Kangaroo, however, it appeared that such ambition was beyond the resources of these hard-core semi-émigré separatists. As ostensibly positive as the two actions had been—in particular, the former—both proved costly for the organizations that had staged them. For the HKB, while the individual sentences handed down in the West German trial following the assault in Bonn were relatively lenient, the crackdown against the organization itself was ruinous. Franjo Perčić and Rafael Medić received heavy punishments for, respectively, the murder of Popović and the organization of the attack itself, but the majority of the remaining two dozen defendants were released at the conclusion of the trial.[35] The HKB, however, gained the distinction of becoming the first emigrant organization in the history of West Germany to be banned.[36] This led many of its less dedicated members simply to abandon their nascent militant careers, while those more committed to the cause scattered in relative disarray across Western Europe—primarily to Sweden.[37] As for the HRB, the arrest and detention of the nine members of Operation Kangaroo effectively incapacitated the organization, as half of its leadership ended up in Yugoslav prisons together with many of the group's most active and zealous members.

Nevertheless, the die had been cast. Whatever the immediate respective impact on the HKB and HRB, the radical separatist movement as a whole was galvanized by the events of November 1962 and June 1963. After a brief period of relative calm following the trade mission attack and the incursion into socialist Yugoslavia, younger radicals began a more sustained campaign of violence beginning in the second half of the 1960s that would last for nearly two decades.

The first serious act of political violence to rival the raid on the trade mission and Operation Kangaroo came on June 8, 1965, in an episode evocative of something out of a Cold War–era spy novel. In the idyllic resort town of Meersburg, on Lake Constance in southwest Germany, the head of the Yugoslav consulate general in Munich Andrija Klarić was shot while on what his government described as an "official trip."[38] Police investigations determined that Klarić was meeting with a Croatian emigrant waitress named Dara Rogić, whom he had recruited to inform on radical Croats living and operating in and around the area. Rogić, however, operated as a double agent—to use the

term employed by American officials following the case in West Germany—and was, in fact, passing on instructions given to her by Klarić to local leaders of the West German wing of the HRB.[39] In conjunction with the head of the Stuttgart branch of the HRB, Marijan Šimundić, Rogić used Klarić's trip to Lake Constance to lay a trap. She provided the details of Klarić's itinerary for the evening of June 8 to the brothers Stanko and Ante Kardum, who would use that information to assassinate the consul. As Klarić sat in his car at approximately 8:30 in the evening, the twenty-nine-year-old Stanko fired six shots at the consul before fleeing the scene.

To Klarić's relatively good fortune, his wounds were serious but ultimately nonfatal.[40] Klarić's diplomatic colleague Sava Milovanović, chief of the Stuttgart office of the Yugoslav consulate general in Munich, was not so fortunate. On August 30, 1966, just over a year after the assassination attempt on Klarić, Milovanović was shot and killed by Franjo Goreta as the two men met in Stuttgart's Hofbräukeller restaurant. If the attack on Klarić was reminiscent of an event one might find in an Ian Fleming novel, the murder of Milovanović evoked an event that might appear in the murkier spy world of John le Carré. In 1958, Goreta had been arrested and tried in Zagreb for his involvement in a physical altercation that resulted in the then eighteen-year-old receiving an eighteen-month prison sentence, to be served on the infamous Goli Otok penal island.[41] A West German report claims that, according to Yugoslav information, during his internment, Goreta was "more or less pressured" into working for the state security apparatus.[42] To this end, Yugoslav security officials issued him false travel documents in order to infiltrate radical Croatian separatist organizations operating in the FRG. According to another West German report, Goreta's handler was none other than Milovanović, who—so police sources told a local Stuttgart newspaper—was, in fact, a lieutenant colonel in the Udba.[43]

Goreta was "activated"—for lack of a better term—as an informant in March 1966, when he began to receive payments totaling between 10,000 and 15,000 DM for intelligence on the HRB in West Germany.[44] The gathering and reporting of information, however, was not all that the Udba had planned for their "agent." On July 16, Goreta met in Karlsruhe with two Udba officers from Zagreb who gave him instructions to assassinate three leading Croatian radicals in West Germany—Josip Senić, Mirko Ćurić, and Franjo Turk—for which he would receive 20,000 DM.[45] One month later, on August 18, Goreta met directly with Milovanović, who provided him with a 7.65mm Beretta to use in the killings. At some point before any action was taken, Goreta resolved to extricate himself from this situation. On August 24, he went to the State Office for Criminal Investigation for Baden-Württemberg, presented West German police authorities the gun given to him by Milovanović, and informed them of

his directives.[46] Afterward—against the explicit advice of the police—Goreta then met one last time with Milovanović, at the latter's request, in order to plead with the consular officer cum Udba lieutenant colonel to be relieved of the responsibility given to him.[47] When, according to Goreta, Milovanović threatened the well-being of Goreta's wife and two children if he did not carry out his orders, Goreta shot and killed him at the table where they were sitting, in what the would-be assassin described as an act of desperation.[48]

As acts of political violence, the shootings of Klarić and Milovanović differed from the Bonn attack and Operation Kangaroo in that both—particularly the latter—resulted more from opportunity than directed planning. Nevertheless, while neither entailed the preparation or coordination of the events of 1962 and 1963, it is equally true that neither the assassination nor the assassination attempt would have been likely without the growing radicalization of the emigrant separatist movement. Around the same time, a series of incidents involving radical Croats made clear that the separatist movement was laying the groundwork for an expansion of activities against Yugoslav interests around the world. In March 1966, to give one example, customs officers arrested four members of the HDO as they attempted to smuggle forty kilograms of explosives into the FRG from Belgium via Luxemburg, ultimately leading to the banning of the HDO in West Germany.[49] In June of the same year, four HRB members were involved in an automobile accident near the Italian city of Trieste, which—due to police arriving on the scene—foiled an intended major transfer of weapons and propaganda materials from the West to the pro-separatist underground in Yugoslavia. Notably, one of the would-be revolutionaries involved was Josip Senić, whom the Udba had instructed Goreta to kill just one month later.[50] Six months later, on New Year's Day 1967, a bomb exploded in the courtyard of the Yugoslav consulate general in Sydney. Later that year, on the nights of October 19 and 28, 1967, Croatian radicals broke into a weapons depot in the West German town of Bad Säckingen, where they stole more than one hundred kilograms of explosives, blasting caps, and other materials used to fashion explosive devices.[51] Perhaps most seriously, on February 18, 1968, a bomb tore through the Yugoslav Embassy Club in the basement of the Yugoslav ambassador's residence in Paris, resulting in one death, the critical wounding of seven others, and numerous less-severe injuries among the two hundred guests present at the time.[52]

It was a succession of bombings in the heart of the Yugoslav capital in 1968, however, that marked the real tipping point for violence and terror for both radical separatists and authorities in Belgrade. Shortly before nine in the evening on May 23—two days before Tito's nationally celebrated birthday, which was annually marked by a "Relay of Youth" ending in Belgrade—two explosions rocked the city's main railway station.[53] No one was killed in the

blasts, but fourteen people were injured, two seriously. The bombs had been planted by Ivan Jelić,[54] a twenty-four-year-old Bosnian Croat who had been employed since 1966 as a *Gastarbeiter* (migrant guest worker) in the far western Austrian town of Dornbirn, in the hills overlooking Lake Constance.[55] A month before the successful attack—on April 27—he had placed a suitcase-bomb in the station, but the timing mechanism had failed.[56] In both cases, Jelić acted in concert with members of a Lake Constance–based offshoot of the UHNj. Dubbed the "*Bodenseegruppe*" (Lake Constance Group) they prepared the bombs and trained the young militant in their use.[57] In coordination with West German authorities, Yugoslav police arrested Jelić on May 31, while five Croats living in the area near Lake Constance—Žarko Odak, Božo Pašalić, Ivan Kutuzović, Dane Šarac, and Marko Uremović—were detained in the FRG. After a two-day trial, Jelić was sentenced to death on July 25 by Yugoslav authorities, while those apprehended in Germany ultimately received sentences ranging from five to twelve years.[58]

The capture of Jelić momentarily helped the Yugoslav security services save face after their failure to prevent the bombing in the first place. Over the next several months, however, two further, even more destructive, bombings in the capital put the Udba and Yugoslav government under even greater pressure. The first—and more devastating—attack came on July 13, during an evening screening of the French thriller *Du rififi à Paname* (released in English as *The Upper Hand*). The explosion ripped through the 20. oktobar cinema in downtown Belgrade, injuring eighty-seven of the nearly two hundred people in attendance, thirteen of whom required hospitalization. Of the seriously injured, the twenty-four-year-old Sava Čučurović died from his injuries, while another, the twenty-year-old student Magdalena Novaković, survived but lost both legs.[59] Two months later, a second bomb exploded at the main railway station, when, shortly after two in the morning on September 25, a bomb tore through the station's checkroom and adjacent police offices. The early morning timing of the explosion prevented greater causalities, but the bombing still resulted in serious injuries to two police officers and lesser injuries to fourteen others.[60]

Responsibility for the bombings was attributed to Miljenko Hrkać and Ante Penavić, two Herzegovin Croats from the village of Duboko Mokro near Mostar. Penavić, the older of the two, had illegally fled Yugoslavia in 1965 at age twenty-four, eventually settling in Stuttgart, where he married a Serbian woman and regulated his status in West Germany, which granted him access to a Yugoslav passport.[61] According to Yugoslav sources, Penavić became involved with the same radical clique as Ivan Jelić, receiving a similar mandate to commit acts of terror in Belgrade. To assist in the plot, Penavić sought out a familiar and trusted acquaintance—Hrkać—who at the time was working

and living in the Slovenian town of Maribor. The Yugoslav government later charged that they had received training and instructions from Dane Šarac in Stuttgart before traveling to Belgrade to carry out their assignment.[62] Penavić smuggled the explosives into the country, while the twenty-year-old Hrkać had the task of planting the bombs at the train station. Penavić escaped back to West Germany, but Hrkać, after an eleven-month manhunt, was eventually arrested in Zagreb in June 1969.[63] Yugoslavia petitioned Bonn for Penavić's extradition, but a court in Munich denied the request.[64] Hrkać, meanwhile, was tried on four separate occasions, due to various technicalities and political maneuvers, before his execution on January 11, 1978, although at the time of his crimes he had been under twenty-one years of age, the minimum age of eligibility for capital punishment under Yugoslav law.

Literally and figuratively, the cinema and railway station bombings hit close to home. With the storming of the trade mission and the shootings of Klarić and Milovanović, extremist Croats had shown that they were a credible threat to Yugoslav interests abroad. The attacks in Belgrade brought into sharp relief that radical separatism posed a real danger to public safety and security within socialist Yugoslavia itself. At the same time—and just as important—while the acts of terror in the Yugoslav capital were the most serious undertaken by anti-Yugoslav Croatian elements during the mid-1960s, they were far from isolated. On the same day as the second bombing of Belgrade's central train station—September 25, 1968—the Yugoslav federal minister for internal affairs Radovan Stijačić revealed in a speech to the Yugoslav Federal Assembly the extent to which antiregime radicalism had developed during the previous two years. According to Stijačić, the Yugoslav security services possessed information that in the fifteen months prior to the second train station bombing, "enemies of the state" had planned no less than 161 diversionist actions against Yugoslav interests globally, 22 of which were carried out, 19 internationally and 3—those in Belgrade—in Yugoslavia itself. A further 9 other planned attacks within the country, Stijačić claimed, had been prevented by direct security service intervention.[65] So, too, had an assassination plot on Tito himself during an official state visit to Austria in February 1967 that had been planned by Mirko Grabovac, a close acquaintance of the Kardum brothers who had been involved in the shooting of Klarić.[66]

If the timing of Stijačić's report—suggesting a marked defensiveness on the part of the security services to the escalating crisis in the Yugoslav capital—begs scrutiny of the minister's assertions, the essence of his speech (that radical separatists were increasingly willing and able to employ violence against the Yugoslav state) was well founded. Corroborating Stijačić's claims, West German authorities estimated that between 1962 and the end of 1968, at least forty acts of political violence had been perpetrated by Croatian

separatists in the FRG.[67] Similarly, albeit over a somewhat broader period, Australian security services recorded sixty-five incidents of violence involving extremist Croats between 1963 and 1972, twenty of which the ASIO classified as "major," further affirming the threat posed by radicals in the emigration.[68] Granted, few of these acts came close to the impact of the trade mission attack, the assassination of Milovanović, or the bombing of the 20. oktobar cinema, but neither were they insignificant. And taken together, the scores of violent incidents involving anti-Yugoslav Croats demonstrated that the younger generation's declarations regarding revolutionary action to help bring about an independent Croatian state was not simply empty rhetoric. By the end of the 1960s, the violent struggle for national liberation was in full swing.

State Reactions

If the precipitous upsurge in political violence and terrorism committed by Croatian extremists was not evidence enough of how dangerous radical separatism had become, the stark and even ruthless responses by Yugoslav security services leaves no doubt. So long as émigré nationalist politics remained enfeebled as a result of personal and organizational infighting, the Yugoslav government not only abided but found utility in the continued existence of the movement.[69] But once the semi-émigré generation returned an aura of energy to the separatist movement, the regime's tolerance came to an abrupt end, as the regime in Belgrade met radical separatist terrorism with its own comparably bloody transnational and primarily extralegal campaign of violence. From the mid-1960s, the regime in Belgrade adopted a policy of targeted assassinations of émigré separatist leaders that would remain a feature of Yugoslav engagement with radical Croats until the end of the 1980s.[70]

While the assassination and abduction of radical emigrant Croatian separatists intensified from the mid-1960s onward, the practice had been a feature of socialist Yugoslav politics from the state's earliest days.[71] The first émigré Croatian victim of the Yugoslav security services, according to available evidence, was Ivan Protulipac, founder of the interwar Croatian Eagle Union and its successor, the Crusaders' Organization. Protulipac was shot and killed on January 31, 1946, in the streets of Trieste, by Gino Benčić, an alleged agent of the Ozna, the precursor to the Udba. Two years later, a second émigré Croat—a refugee by the name of Ilija Abramović—was killed in the Austrian city of Klagenfurt, near Bleiburg. And on March 16, 1949, Drago Jelik, the former head of the NDH's Ustaša Surveillance Service disappeared while living in Rome, very likely abducted by Udba agents and secretly repatriated to Yugoslavia to undergo interrogation before being executed. Additionally, the Yugoslav security services failed in at least one further assassination

attempt—on Mate Frković in Austria in 1948—as well as in the kidnapping of Branko Jelić in West Germany in 1950.[72]

During the 1950s and the first half of the 1960s, Belgrade largely suspended the practice of violently targeting members of the émigré Croatian separatist community. Even the most partisan anti-Yugoslav accounts of Udba activities against emigrants concede that between 1950 and 1966 at most two murders of émigré Croats took place, including none in the entire decade of the 1950s.[73]

This pause in the use of violence against enemies of the state living abroad came to a swift and firm end, however, following the Croats' own return to terrorism in the early 1960s. Starting in the summer of 1965, the regime in Belgrade made it clear that acts of violence on the part of émigré Croatian separatists would be answered in kind. The first indication of this shift came with a failed assassination attempt on the publicist Berislav Đuro Deželić, his wife, and their pregnant daughter Marijana in Düsseldorf on June 30, 1965. Deželić was known for his pro-separatist, anti-Yugoslav politics, particularly his defense of the trade mission attack.[74] Complicating the plot, Marijana was married to Nahid Kulenović, a journalist and activist who was perhaps more notably the son of Džafer-beg Kulenović, former vice president of the NDH and president of the postwar Croatian State-Forming Party. Just over two weeks later—on July 17—Geza Pašti, a founding member of the HRB in Sydney, was "disappeared" near his home in Nice, France. Pašti had traveled to Europe around the time of Operation Kangaroo—as described by West German prosecutors at his 1963 trial in Stuttgart for illegal possession of firearms—to "prepare acts of terror in order to do away with the Yugoslav Regime and also to carry out activities in Germany and Western Europe to encourage actions against the Yugoslav Regime."[75] Pašti's fate appears similar to that of Jelik in 1949—namely, abducted by Udba agents, repatriated back into Yugoslavia, interrogated, tortured, and, finally, executed.[76]

The first true "reprisal" assassination for a specific act of violence committed against a Yugoslav official came just over two years later with the murder of Marijan Šimundić on September 13, 1967. If the circumstances of Šimundić's extrajudicial execution—like his own involvement in the attempted murder of Andrija Klarić the year before—appeared in a spy novel, they might be judged as clichéd and hackneyed. Unfortunately for Šimundić, the events were all too real. At some point in early 1967, the twenty-nine-year-old Šimundić began an affair—he believed—with a wealthy jewelry dealer by the name of Doris Andres. Andres, however, was, in fact, Brunhilde Coblenz, a West German citizen romantically involved with an Udba operative named Josip Cvitanović, himself a married father of five.[77] Cvitanović knew of Šimundić's weakness for both women and money, leading the security service

agent to persuade his lover to assume an affluent persona in order to seduce the radical separatist, with the aim of making the normally cautious HRB leader lower his defenses. On the night of his death, Šimundić and Coblenz drove to the outskirts of Stuttgart for an illicit rendezvous.[78] After parking in a secluded area off the main road, Cvitanović—who had been lying in wait—approached the car and shot Šimundić five times at point-blank range. The following day, Cvitanović and Coblenz together fled West Germany for socialist Yugoslavia.[79]

If there was any misgiving within the leadership of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia (SKJ; Savez komunista Jugoslavije) regarding the precedent set by the covert and unlawful targeting of Šimundić, such concerns vanished following the train station and cinema bombings in Belgrade the following year. That Croatian extremists had pulled off three attacks in the heart of the Yugoslav capital demonstrated the extent of radical separatist organization, determination, and capability, as well as the failure of the security services to keep the movement in check. In the aftermath of the attacks in Belgrade, the regime unambiguously adopted the position that an appropriate response to those who actively sought the destruction of Tito's state was swift, retributive, and uncompromising acts of violence by the government itself that would cripple all opposition to Belgrade, no matter where in the world it manifested itself.[80]

And by swift, the Yugoslav government meant immediate. On September 27, 1968, just two days after the second train station bombing, a leading member of the HDO in Frankfurt—Hrvoje Ursa—was shot in the head with a 7.65mm pistol before being dumped in the Fulda River with a four-kilogram automotive coupling ring tied around his neck.[81] One month later, on October 26, three more radical separatists—Mile Rukavina, Krešimir Tolj, and Vid Maričić—were shot and killed in the Munich offices of the official organ of the UHNj, *Hrvatska Sloboda* (*Croatian Freedom*). Rukavina was president of both the UHNj and the more militant TRUP, which he had founded together with Nahid Kulenović and others in late 1961 following the previous year's split in the UHNj between the group's Dortmund and Munich factions.[82] He had also been on socialist Yugoslavia's list of war criminals for both his alleged participation in the mass murder of Serbs during the war as well as for personally shooting two downed American pilots after they were captured by Ustaša forces.[83] Tolj, meanwhile, was editor in chief of *Hrvatska Sloboda* as well as a member of UHNj and TRUP, while Maričić was a member of the HRB who had only recently arrived in Munich from Australia.

As an American embassy official in Belgrade reported back to the State Department in November 1968, the shootings of Rukavina, Tolj, and Maričić "were meant as [a] clear and brutal warning [that] the Yugoslav authorities will

no more tolerate such terrorism [as had happened in Belgrade in the previous months] and those who may be contemplating it now will have to take into account what their final end may be."[84] More ominously, the official wrote, all indicators pointed to the murders as being just the beginning of Udba retaliation against Croatian separatist elements in the emigration, quoting the Socialist Republic of Croatia's leading party organ *Vijesnik u Srijedu* as having written: "All accounts have not yet been settled."[85] As confirmation of the American official's warning, in the first half of 1969 three more "enemies of the state" were killed in Munich to go with the three killed in October. The first, Mirko Ćurić, had been one of the three men Milovanović had ordered Goreta to assassinate in 1966. The second, Nahid Kulenović, was Džafer-beg Kulenović's son, Berislav Đuro Deželić's son-in-law, and Rukavina's co-conspirator. And the third was Ratko Obradović, editor of the Serbian exile newspaper *Iskra*.[86] In addition to these three murders in Munich, Udba failed in a fourth assassination attempt, this time in Frankfurt. In August, 1969, Mirko Grabovac—who had been arrested in Vienna in 1967 on suspicion of planning to assassinate Tito—was shot four times by unknown assailants but ultimately survived the attack.

The most prominent victim at the hands of an assassin during the first wave of state-sponsored Udba murders, however, was unquestionably Maks Luburić. The emergence of a younger generation of radical émigrés in the late 1950s and early 1960s had diminished Luburić's overall role within the separatist movement in the years leading up to his death.[87] Nevertheless, for both radical emigrants and the Yugoslav government, the former Jasenovac camp commander remained a central—if not preeminent—figure in the struggle for Croatian independence.[88] Luburić was killed in his home in Carcaixent, Spain, on April 20, 1969. The assassin was his own godson, Ilija Stanić, who had arrived in Spain in 1967 and over the next two years had worked his way into Luburić's confidence. In contrast to the professional nature of the assassinations in West Germany, Luburić's murder was crude and even brutal. Stanić struck Luburić in the head several times with a hammer, stabbed him in the neck, and stuffed his corpse under an ottoman. He then fled Carcaixent, crossing the border to France before making his way back to Yugoslavia. Stanić's motives for the murder remain elusive to this day. Still a resident of Sarajevo, Stanić—as recently as 2009—has claimed that he killed Luburić for having abandoned Pavelić.[89] At least one recent investigative newspaper account from Croatia, however, claims to possess documentation that Stanić acted in accordance with orders from the security services in Belgrade.[90]

Luburić was the nineteenth of twenty emigrant Croats to be killed between 1966 and 1969. In total, upward of seventy-three émigré nationalists may have been the victim of Yugoslav-targeted assassination between 1945

and 1991.[91] It is important to point out, however, that while contemporary apologists for radical émigrés attribute blame for every violent death of a Croatian nationalist in the emigration during the Cold War to the Udba, the actual number of those killed is not only unverified but indeed unverifiable.[92] One such instance where attribution for the deaths of Croatian radicals is difficult is the case of Ante Znaor and Josip Krtalić, who died in Trieste when three bombs ripped through their parked car on August 16, 1968. French-based members of the HOP, the two men were parked just one kilometer away from the Yugoslav consulate in the coastal Italian city and are believed to have been preparing an attack on the building when the bombs exploded.[93] Whether the radical separatists accidently set off the bombs themselves while preparing them for the strike or the explosives were planted by a third accomplice who was, in fact, a covert Udba agent remains a matter of dispute, one that is unlikely to ever be resolved. Similar questions persist regarding a number of deaths among Croats in the emigration, where evidence is either lacking or ambivalent.

This said, Belgrade was unequivocally responsible for the killing of many—if not the majority—of radical separatists murdered over the course of the Cold War. As one West German report on the series of murders in Munich in 1968 and 1969 affirmed glibly—quoting favorably from an unidentified source—"only the mentally ill could believe and assert that the Serbian emigration is killing the Ustaše and the Croatian emigration the Četniks," as Yugoslav officials were wont to claim at the time.[94] In lieu of actual evidence—which in and of itself was notable and suggested the professionalism of the hits—both police officials and national security personnel involved in the investigation of the deaths of known Croatian radicals throughout the West pointed to a combination of factors that implicated the Udba in the majority of murders. These included the similarity of the methods employed, the regular use of a 7.65mm Beretta pistol, the correlation between those killed and an alleged Udba hit list circulating within the Croatian community, and the "perfection"—the term used by West German authorities—of the murders themselves.[95] More concretely—although still circumstantial—the West German Federal Criminal Police Office (BKA; Bundeskriminalamt) also found that in the seventeen cases where a 7.65mm Beretta was used to kill an émigré Croat, not only did ten of the weapons have a special barrel for attaching a silencer but in seven of those ten cases, the exact same barrel was employed.[96] Udba agents were trained to be astute and attentive enough to avoid capture after committing a murder, but their signature was unmistakable, leaving no doubt in the minds of police and security forces in the West—to say nothing of those in the émigré community itself—exactly whom to blame when investigating the murder of a known Croatian nationalist.[97]

The regime in Belgrade, of course, never explicitly acknowledged its violent targeting of enemies of the state in the emigration. To do so would not only have created a number of legal and political issues both domestically and internationally but also, from a security standpoint, potentially could have endangered continuing operations abroad.[98] But neither did the state keep its policy and its activities a secret. As much as the assassinations were aimed at "neutralizing" the activities of radical separatists, they were also a mechanism to demonstrate to political, economic, and other migrants—to say nothing of those at home—just how long the arm of the Udba truly reached.[99] To agitate for Croatian independence in Kitchener (a suburb of Toronto)—Belgrade meant to make perfectly clear—was no safer than doing so in Konjic (a small town in northern Herzegovina) and would be just as little tolerated.

As such, party leaders in Yugoslavia such as Stijačić spoke of how "appropriate measures have been taken against [enemies of the state] abroad" when discussing state responses to the growing number of acts of terror committed by emigrant Croatian separatists, remaining simultaneously vague but absolutely clear as to what he meant.[100] Similarly, in an interview in the journal *Ekonomska politika* written to coincide with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Yugoslav security services, a member of the Foreign Policy Committee of the Croatian Parliament, Duka Matošić, stated: "We have proven in the years since the last war that we, and especially the security services of [the socialist republic of] Croatia, are in a position to settle accounts in the centers of enemy émigré activity."[101] Even Tito himself hinted strongly at Udba responsibility for the spate of murders within the émigré community in late 1968 and early 1969, noting in a speech on May 20, 1969—shortly after the fifth of the six murders to be committed in Munich and exactly one month following the assassination of Luburić in Spain—how the service had achieved remarkable successes, "especially recently."[102]

Crucially, the gauge used by Belgrade to measure the "success" of specific operations against individual émigré leaders was not the same as the one used to assess the regime's overall struggle against radical separatism. Contrary to both state rhetoric and—perhaps—broader expectations regarding antiterrorism policies, the assassination of prominent extremists was not done with the ultimate goal of eradicating the Croatian liberation movement as a whole. Rather, socialist Yugoslavia's campaign of violence against radical separatists aimed to effectively assert—or, as will be explored below, reassert—some level of control over organizations working toward the destruction of Tito's state, without removing altogether the "threat" those groups posed. By the summer of 1968, radical émigré Croatian separatism had become something of an unmanageable problem for the Belgrade regime as acts of terror grew more

violent and more frequent, as well as further-reaching. At the same time, the Yugoslav government understood from the earliest days of the state the value of the continued existence of "nationalist/chauvinist"—to use a phrase favored by the regime—elements in the emigration. Essentially, Belgrade wanted to incapacitate radical émigrés while at the same time keeping the movement as such more or less intact.

The underpinnings of Belgrade's somewhat enigmatic position toward extremist separatism can be traced to the very founding myth of Tito's state. More than in any other state socialist country established after World War II, political legitimacy in socialist Yugoslavia was rooted first and foremost in the history and memory of the "national liberation" struggle of the native Partisan movement against the forces of fascism—both foreign and domestic—in the country.[103] Émigré extremism, in many ways, proved an ideal foil against which the regime in Belgrade could effectively and repeatedly instrumentalize this legitimizing myth toward political ends throughout the life of the country. On the one hand, the existence of radical émigré Croatian separatism did not challenge the fundamental premise of the state's founding myth—the defeat of fascism in Yugoslavia—insofar as the movement existed outside the borders, and therefore the responsibility, of the state. On the other hand, émigré radicalism demonstrated that the resurgence of "counterrevolutionary" and "exclusionist ethnic revanchist" forces remained an enduring threat to the government and peoples of Yugoslavia, thereby justifying the authoritarian policies and practices—both domestically and extraterritorially—of the regime.

A West German Foreign Ministry report written in late 1961 in response to growing domestic radicalization among Croatian emigrants pinpointed four factors that explained why Belgrade was heavily invested in the perseverance of the Croatian liberation movement, as opposed to its elimination. As explained in the report, whose main focus was the infiltration by Yugoslav agents of FRG-based extremist groups: "For the communists [in Yugoslavia], the Ustaše have multiple uses: as a 'trouble spot' within the Croatian emigration; as a 'bogeyman' for the Serbian emigration; as an 'instrument of fear'—in conjunction with the Četniks—for the population of Yugoslavia; and, finally, as 'proof' of the incorrigible Nazism, chauvinism, pan-Germanism, militarism and so on of the Germans, who are supporting the Ustaša."[104] Understood in practical terms, Belgrade viewed the existence of émigré Croatian radical separatism as an effective tool to help cripple potential opposition to the regime, both at home and abroad.[105] First, organizations calling for the violent overthrow of the socialist regime in Yugoslavia provoked divisions and dissent within the totality of the Croatian community abroad, weakening all efforts to mobilize against the state, including those that were more moderate but

also potentially more dangerous than radical terrorism. Second, chauvinistic Croatian nationalism helped perpetuate unresolved hostilities among former wartime enemies—that is, Ustaše and Četniks—within the larger Yugoslav emigration, which helped channel the organizational energies of various anti-Titoist émigré groups as much into factional battles as toward opposition to the regime in Belgrade. Third, within socialist Yugoslavia itself, the threat of a revival of fascism was used to help maintain the status quo; as described in a West German Interior Ministry report from 1969, keeping alive the fear of fascism in the emigration was an effective "means by which to draw the attention of the Yugoslav population away from the internal economic, political, and national difficulties" plaguing the country.[106]

Finally, Yugoslavia's use of a fascist threat to vilify Western governments was useful as a kind of "joker" in Belgrade's political relations with the countries of the West. Socialist Yugoslavia was not entirely at a disadvantage in dealing with Western capitals due to its unique position within the broader Cold War. Nevertheless, the country's reliance on both trade and aid from the West to maintain the country's impressive gains in the national economy during the immediate postwar years meant that the state had little leverage when negotiating bilateral relations with its market-orientated partners.[107] The presence and activities of radical separatists throughout the West, however, allowed socialist Yugoslavia to at least partially dictate the conditions of mediation with the West on any number of issues, as Belgrade could reliably use the problem of Croatian extremists to play up issues of national security, state sovereignty, and—not least—moral indignation to break off, speed up, or even reframe the terms of whatever discussions were taking place.

While socialist Yugoslavia instrumentalized the "émigré problem" in its relations with all countries of the West, it did so most frequently and most aggressively in its dealings with Bonn. First and foremost, this was due to the fact that West Germany—together with Australia—was home to many of the most active and violent organizations fighting for Croatian liberation. Only slightly less significant was the fact that the most contentious issues in the bilateral relations between socialist Yugoslavia and West Germany lent themselves to Belgrade's heavy use of discursive politics. By employing moralizing ideology, Yugoslavia hoped to undermine the often superior negotiating position held by Bonn.[108] Nowhere was this more evident than in discussions concerning wartime reparations, which remained unresolved into the 1970s. In moments of dissatisfaction with the pace and conditions of negotiations, Belgrade often focused on West German–based radical Croatian separatists in order to strongly imply that Nazism—or at least Nazi sympathies—ran rampant within the government of the FRG.[109] In basic terms, Belgrade argued that the perseverance of the "Ustaše" in West Germany and the stalled progress

in ongoing discussions over restitution for wartime damage were indelibly linked, consequences of the same intrinsic fascistic leanings that were not just present but indeed active in West German society and politics. Whether such accusations were accurate was, of course, entirely beside the point. The aim was to strike a nerve both in Bonn and in public opinion in order to gain an edge in Belgrade's pursuit of its political interests.

Importantly, it was not that Belgrade sought to simply exploit an existing problem for its own benefit in domestic and international politics. Rather, socialist Yugoslavia—from the 1950s onward—both encouraged and indeed actively incited radicalization of the émigré Croatian separatist movement. Separatism, Belgrade understood, was an established facet of Croatian diaspora politics that would likely remain active one way or the other so long socialist Yugoslavia continued to exist. At the same time, general support of the idea of an independent Croatian state was quite different from a willingness to defend advocates of violent national revolution. Belgrade hoped that by fomenting radical tendencies within the diaspora, the separatist movement as a whole could be weakened by way of the tried-and-true practice of divide and conquer. The more radical a minority of the émigré community became—so the thinking went—the greater the chance that the majority would become repelled not just by extremists but by the very movement itself. This would not only help reduce the overall numbers of those willing to be actively involved in the struggle for national liberation but would also ensure a diminishing in the number of moderate—and broadly more appealing—elements within the movement.

The manner by which the Yugoslav government went about fostering radicalization within the movement was by covertly placing agents provocateurs in the vast majority of radical separatist organizations. That the Yugoslav government stationed at least one Udba agent at every Yugoslav embassy and consulate in order to spy on politically active emigrants was taken for granted by security agencies in the West.[110] So, too, was the Udba's infiltration of the vast majority of organizations fighting for Croatian independence.[111] As one West German Foreign Ministry report observed matter-of-factly: "Based on multitudinous information, it can be said that *the Ustaše have in great measure been infiltrated by the communists*, and that the infiltrated elements belong to the most vocal 'champions' of 'Croatian state independence.'"[112] These "champions" of the revolutionary struggle were tasked with paralyzing the émigré separatist movement by pushing it to its moral, ideological, organizational, and operational extremes.[113]

Such extremism, it was thought, would alienate many people who otherwise may have been sympathetic to the cause of Croatian independence. Importantly, this included not just Croats within the emigration but others

as well, including Catholic, conservative, anticommunist, or otherwise anti-Yugoslav political actors in countries like West Germany, Australia, Canada, or the United States who saw in the Croats a potential ally in whatever struggle they themselves were involved. Belgrade believed—not unjustifiably—that political violence and terrorism served as a redline for many people in the West. If the Croats could be provoked into crossing that line, whatever sympathy they may have enjoyed would quickly be lost. This applied also to the governments of the countries where radical Croats settled and operated. The more radical the Croatian émigré community appeared to those in power in the West, the greater the chance governments would take action against émigré political actors of all stripes, not just extremists. As David McKnight has observed in reference to Australia, "it was an article of faith among some [intelligence] officers that [the Udba itself] set off some of the bombs in an attempt to prompt the Australian government into action against the Croatians."[114]

The danger in socialist Yugoslavia's strategy of radicalizing émigrés in an effort to paralyze the separatist movement, of course, was that Belgrade risked losing control of the monster it itself had helped create. By the summer of 1967, this is what had happened. The Udba's campaign of violence against émigré leaders following the attacks in Belgrade was a concession that the overall policy toward émigré separatists—including helping incite radicalization in the 1950s and early 1960s—was faulty and needed correction. The infighting and general ineffectiveness of the immediate postwar generation had helped keep things manageable for the Udba and the government in Belgrade from the end of the war through to the early 1960s. But the emergence of the semi-émigré generation as the driving force behind the struggle for national liberation was something for which socialist Yugoslavia had neither properly planned nor prepared. Belgrade would soon discover that the Croatian separatist terrorism of the early and mid-1960s was just the beginning of the political violence to be directed against Tito's state. By the early 1970s, the movement that socialist Yugoslavia had itself had a hand in creating would only become more mobilized and emboldened, taking Croatian revolutionary violence to an entirely new level.

Chapter 5
We Have Chosen No One but Ourselves, 1969–1972

The Yugoslav government's assassination campaign against the "enemy fascist emigration" was a corrective measure that aimed to redress the unintended consequences of the regime's own efforts to instrumentalize Croatian diaspora separatism for its own ends. Unfortunately—as seen from Belgrade's perspective—the violent and repressive methods employed by the state had unintended consequences of their own. Yugoslavia's experience conforms to a pattern well documented in the literature of terrorism and political violence—namely, that harsh and/or disproportionate countermeasures taken by state actors against purveyors of terror often result in an effect directly opposed to the one desired. This includes both an increase in the frequency and scale of acts of violence against the state and an expansion in public support for the aims—even if not always the methods—of those in conflict with the ruling regime.[1] Without overstating the causal link between the two phenomena, socialist Yugoslavia's targeting of leading Croatian separatist figures was followed by an intense escalation of violent activity among groups seeking an independent Croatian state. Unquestionably, the assassination of leading radical émigré figures had been viewed in Belgrade as an important step in controlling the political emigration. But as the regime discovered, taking one step forward ultimately led to two steps back.

Indeed, the most intense period of Cold War–era radical political violence against the Yugoslav state came in the three years immediately following Belgrade's most high-profile assassination of a radical emigrant: Maks Luburić. As alarming and damaging as Croatian separatist terrorism from the Bonn Trade Mission bombing in 1962 to the attacks in Belgrade in 1968 was, it is the period from June 1969 to September 1972 that stands as the apogee of the Croatian struggle for national liberation. The gradual "evolution" of terrorism over the 1960s among radical semi-émigrés, in both strategy and effectiveness, reached full maturity at the start of the 1970s,

stimulated in large part by Belgrade's embrace of heavy-handed measures to combat Croatian nationalism, both in the emigration and within the Socialist Republic of Croatia itself. Acts of semi-émigré separatist violence moved from the local news sections of regional newspapers to the front pages of some of the world's most prominent broadsheets, drawing more global attention to the Croatian independence movement than at any time since the assassination of King Aleksandar in 1934. These separatists would never achieve the prominence reached by the more notorious national liberation terrorists of the day—such as the PIRA or PLO—and the growing attention to the Croatian cause was, unquestionably, relative. But especially in those countries most affected by anti-Yugoslav political violence—in this period predominately Sweden, Australia, and socialist Yugoslavia itself—the Croatian struggle for national liberation at least for a brief period moved from the background to center stage.

The Enemy of My Enemy

As serious as the acts of violence committed by semi-émigré Croatian separatists in the early 1970s were, it was actually a related but separate unintended consequence of Belgrade's violence against the diaspora Croatian liberation movement that initially proved most troubling to the regime at the start of the new decade. The assassination of Maks Luburić in 1969 had eliminated the second—after Ante Pavelić—of the three leading anti-Yugoslav Croatian separatist figures of the immediate postwar generation. This led to an upsurge in support for the last of the remaining "big three": Branko Jelić. As Jelić would quickly discover, however, his newfound support was in many ways illusory. Jelić's HNO could count greater numbers after Luburić's murder but not greater dynamism or political engagement.[2] Much like the man himself, Luburić's supporters had been marginalized and upstaged by the younger generation of separatists over the course of the 1960s. Jelić, in turn, understood that inheriting new adherents from the former general alone would not ensure his continued relevance within the liberation movement. Rather, his organization would have to change course and present a radical new strategy for liberating the homeland. This meant, primarily, competing with younger extremists who promised action where the older generation had provided none.

In certain respects, Jelić might have been able simply to embrace political violence and terrorism as the principal means by which to achieve Croatian independence. From the start of the semi-émigré separatists' campaign of violence against Tito's state, Belgrade had portrayed Jelić as the number one architect behind nearly every act of violence against Yugoslav property, persons, or interests anywhere in the world.[3] Jelić's decades-long commitment to national liberation both before and after World War II, his high rank within the

Ustaša movement, and his ongoing close ties to some of the most conservative political figures in postwar West Germany—the most prominent being Franz Josef Strauss—made him, for Belgrade, a compelling representative of the "violent enemy fascist emigration."[4] While Jelić repeatedly criticized the use of violence, his constant expressions of sympathy, understanding, and especially moral—if not actual—support for those who employed terrorism as an act of political engagement contributed to Belgrade's portrayal of him as an enemy of the state.[5] That the radicalization of younger emigrants happened in large part because of antagonism toward, rather than acceptance of, Jelić's politics and policies was, of course, irrelevant to the regime. So, too, was the fact that, of those who actually engaged in political violence, few held Jelić and others of his generation in high regard. Nevertheless, it is not difficult to imagine a scenario in which Jelić—already maligned by socialist Yugoslavia as a mastermind of separatist terrorism—might have seized upon the persona ascribed to him by Belgrade in an effort to appeal to the more radical among the younger generation.

Contrary to Belgrade's portrayal, however, Jelić did not view violence as an effective or even acceptable way to promote the cause of national liberation. Instead, he remained steadfastly attached to the idea that Croatian independence could only be achieved through Great Power intervention. The area where Jelić radically readjusted his strategic thinking in the early 1970s regarded which Great Power he believed should henceforth serve as Croatia's patron. From the start of his political activism in the immediate postwar period, Jelić made a commitment to the West a cornerstone of the HNO's struggle for national independence.[6] In part, of course, this was a matter of political expediency. In championing Western values such as democracy, Jelić could distance himself and the HNO from the NDH and the Ustaše both in the eyes of the West and among those in the political emigration looking for a more moderate alternative to organizations such as Pavelić's HOP and Luburić's Otpor. Jelić was also keen to position the HNO squarely in the Western camp in the struggle between democracy and communism. This said, all indications suggest that—at least during the 1950s and 1960s—Jelić genuinely believed that an independent Croatia could only profit from Western-style governance, questions of expediency aside.[7]

By the end of the 1960s, however, Jelić came to acknowledge that the semi-émigré generation had been correct in arguing that placing Croatia's fate in the hands of Washington, London, Paris, or Bonn would consign the nation to a destiny of misfortune. The conclusion that Jelić drew from this realization, however, was not the same as that drawn by semi-émigré radicals—namely, that terrorism and revolution represented the only path to national liberation. Instead, Jelić came to a different but equally startling deduction. The best

hope for Croatian independence, Jelić determined after a quarter-century of putting his full faith in the Western Powers, lay not in allying the movement with Washington and its allies but rather with Moscow and the Red Army.

The catalyst for this radical shift in Jelić's strategic thinking regarding the Soviet Union can be found in a number of geopolitical developments during the latter years of the 1960s. The first was the reestablishment, after eleven years, of diplomatic relations between West Germany and Yugoslavia in 1968 and the signing of a bilateral agreement regarding the recruitment and employment of workers between the two countries. As mentioned previously, Yugoslavia had been the first of two countries (Cuba being the other) to have its diplomatic relations with the FRG revoked as a result of the Hallstein Doctrine. That policy had become untenable by the late 1960s, leading to its abandonment by the Foreign Ministry in Bonn. The second development was the onset of détente between Washington and Moscow after the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, which only deepened following the election of Richard M. Nixon as president of the United States in 1968. The third shift in geopolitics, meanwhile, was the introduction of a fundamental turn in West Germany's foreign policy following the election of Willy Brandt as chancellor in 1969. Commonly known as Ostpolitik, this new policy sought to normalize West German relations with the countries east of the Iron Curtain after twenty years of Christian Democratic Union hostility toward allies of the German Democratic Republic, which manifested itself at all levels of West German international relations.

For Jelić, however, it was a fourth development that proved most formative—namely, the August 1968 Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia and the West's concomitant inaction in the face of Moscow's military intervention in the heart of Europe. Not just for Jelić but indeed for many others—including the political leadership in socialist Yugoslavia—the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia revived the so-called fifty-fifty myth that had been popular during World War II but had remained relatively dormant in the subsequent two decades.[8] The myth referred to a very real wartime deal made between Churchill and Stalin in which the two leaders agreed to an equal division of postwar influence over Yugoslavia. As explained by the British ambassador to Yugoslavia, this "fifty-fifty" division between East and West meant that "the Europeanized, Catholic, Latin-scripted north and west [would fall] to the American sphere; while the underdeveloped, traditionally Slavophile south and east, with its Orthodox religion and its Cyrillic script, would be annexed to the Soviet bloc."[9]

After the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, party officials in Belgrade became obsessed with the idea that the Soviet Union had plans to exert its "rightful" influence over Yugoslavia once Tito—who turned seventy-six in

1968—was no longer on the scene.[10] In the weeks and months after the events of 1968, to quote one CIA report, "again and again [Yugoslav officials] quer[ied] their American and British contacts about the possibility of a spheres-of-influence agreement between the Soviet Union and the West,"[11] while the British ambassador to Yugoslavia reported that "Tito himself trotted [the "fifty-fifty" myth] out in his speech at Kraljevica in April 1969 and it has been brought in conversation with me by a score or more of otherwise rational politicians, party officials, and journalists."[12] Importantly, it should be noted that while American officials obviously gave no credence to the myth itself, they viewed the possibility of a Soviet invasion of Yugoslavia to be both distinct and imminent enough to warrant the drafting of a speech for the US president in the event that Moscow were to take military action against Belgrade.[13]

For Jelić, the intersection of the Soviet Union's clear willingness to employ force in pursuit of its strategic interests on the European continent with the apparent quid pro quo regarding Yugoslavia presented a real possible solution to the Croatian question. The idea was so attractive, in fact, that in a front-page article of the March–April 1970 edition of the HNO's official organ, *Hrvatska Država*, Jelić declared the pursuit of an alliance with the Soviet Union against Belgrade to be the HNO's new core strategy. In the article, Jelić explained how recent fundamental shifts in the dynamic of the Cold War spelled doom for socialist Yugoslavia. The United States policy of détente, he claimed, signaled the beginning of a new era of American isolationism that ultimately would result, under certain conditions, in the removal of American military forces from Europe. The Soviets, meanwhile, would be open to negotiating such conditions because the party leadership in Moscow had come to see a stable situation in Europe as being in its own interests. This position, Jelić explained, resulted from the expectation within the Soviet Union that its conflict with China would only escalate in the coming years, demanding the full attention and resources of the regime. Consequently, future negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union over the establishment of a balanced status quo in Europe would invariably involve—as per the fifty-fifty agreement from World War II—a division of Yugoslavia that allowed for greater Soviet influence in the Balkans peninsula but that blocked Moscow's direct access to the Adriatic.

This solution would be best achieved, Jelić asserted, through the establishment of a neutral but independent Croatian state. The precedent and model for such an outcome, Jelić declared, was Finland, a country crucial to Soviet political interests but also one whose state sovereignty was unambiguous. Moscow had signed a number of international agreements with Helsinki whereby, on the one hand, the Soviet Union was able to safeguard its interests in the Baltic, while, on the other, Finland was able to both affirm and guarantee its political

neutrality. Jelić imagined a similar scenario for Croatia. Like the Finns, he claimed, the Croats had come to the realization that their interests were tied much more closely to those of the Soviet Union than to those of the United States. As such, it only made sense that the Croats should work closely with the Soviets to forge the conditions by which the aims of both nations could be met. The foundation of any such cooperation, Jelić assured his readers, would be "true neutrality, independence, and non-interference" in all political affairs, both foreign and domestic, of any newly established state. On matters that did not infringe on its autonomy, however, the Croatian state had no reason not to enter into agreements with the Soviet Union that protected the interests of both Zagreb and Moscow. Simply, the "Finlandization of Croatia," as Jelić called it, had no downsides for anyone involved: the Soviet Union could remove a long-standing thorn—Tito—from its side, the United States could withdraw from Europe with its strategic interests intact, and Croatia could finally be welcomed fully into the community of nations.[14]

At its core, Jelić's "Finland solution" overlapped to a large degree with the views espoused by younger radicals since the early 1960s in terms of its unabashed political opportunism. It was one thing, however, for members of the extremist youth to shun ideological considerations—at least rhetorically—when calling for an uncompromising struggle for national liberation. It was quite another for a man such as Jelić to do so. For four full decades, Jelić had made anticommunism a cornerstone of his politics, and his popularity at least in the early postwar period was largely due to his close ties with clerical elements within the diaspora.[15] Jelić might have failed to ever gain the support of the most radical elements within the semi-émigré generation, but within the broader Croatian emigration he maintained a position of respect and even reverence. His new stance regarding the Soviet Union, however, undeniably strained the devotion of his remaining supporters. An important distinction between Jelić's followers and those in groups such as the HRB was that whereas the latter had declared the struggle for Croatian independence to be one without compromise—primarily to justify its use of violence—the former had been drawn to the HNO precisely because of Jelić's more moderate position on issues they viewed as crucial red lines not to be crossed. Collaboration with the Soviets, it turned out, was one such line.

The disquiet among Jelić's supporters, however, paled in comparison to the foreboding that gripped Belgrade following the publication of his article. The Yugoslav leadership had become preoccupied with the prospect of a Soviet invasion following the Warsaw Pact's attack on Czechoslovakia in 1968, and fears were high that the Soviet Union would attempt to undermine the country's stability by supporting those seeking its destruction, including radical elements within the diaspora. The almost conspiratorial quality of this

fixation can be seen in an exchange in November 1968 between an American official and Anton Kolendić, the head of the Yugoslav Military Mission in West Berlin. As reported back to the US State Department, Kolendić explained to the American how

> Ustashi [*sic*] activity [in West Berlin] would be a normal phenomenon of Yugoslav emigre life abroad except for the suspicion that the Ustashi may have ties in East Berlin. The most active black marketers in Berlin are Bulgarian émigrés, some of whom have direct links with the Bulgarian intelligence service. The Ustashi have close ties with these Bulgarians and hence with the Bulgarian intelligence network. Everyone knows who stands behind that intelligence service (i.e., the Soviets) and one therefore wonders if the Soviets are not now indirectly supporting the Ustashi in Berlin, and perhaps elsewhere, with a view to creating as many problems as possible for the Yugoslav Government both inside and outside the country.[16]

The tenuousness of Kolendić's line of reasoning is perhaps striking but not surprising; Belgrade's conviction that collusion between the Soviets and the "enemy fascist emigration" was not just plausible but indeed likely meant that evidence followed from logic rather than the other way around.

The unveiling of Jelić's staunchly pro-Soviet Finland proposal just two years later gave the regime all the proof it needed. Whether Moscow had, as Jelić claimed, pledged Soviet support for Croatian separatists or was simply exploiting Jelić's desperation in order to sow disinformation and confusion to unsettle the leadership in socialist Yugoslavia was irrelevant. The existence at all of a relationship between the two of them was enough to substantiate Belgrade's fear that Moscow was laying the groundwork for an eventual dismantling of Yugoslavia.

What remains—and will almost certainly continue to remain—unclear is the nature of the relationship between the Soviets and Jelić, if indeed there even was one. On several occasions in the months following publication of his article on the "Finland solution" for Croatia, Jelić openly spoke about his "conversations with the Soviets."[17] There is, however, no available evidence to verify actual contact between Jelić and the USSR. Intelligence agencies in the West—who trusted Moscow with almost any political machination—entertained the very real possibility that the Soviet Union had made contact with emigrant Croatian separatists, although they themselves had no proof of collusion between Moscow and Jelić beyond the latter's own assertions.[18] The Soviets for their part—entirely expectedly—never confirmed or denied any contact with members of the anti-Yugoslav Croatian diaspora. The

Yugoslavs, meanwhile, aggressively shared with Western intelligence and other officials their concerns about the apparent Soviet/Croatian alliance. In their exhortations about the dangers of such a relationship, however, they repeatedly failed to provide evidence other than the claims made by Jelić himself.

Meanwhile, throwing further intrigue into the entire affair was the suggestion made by one of the highest-ranking members of the SKJ that those pulling the strings behind the scenes were to be found not in Moscow but rather in Belgrade. In February 1971, a consular official from the British embassy in Belgrade met with Vladimir Bakarić, chairman of the League of Communists of Croatia (SKH; Savez komunista Hrvatske) from 1948 to 1969 and arguably the most important Croatian politician in socialist Yugoslavia at the time.[19] The meeting covered a number of topics, but regarding the specific question as to the veracity of the claim that the Soviets and Jelić were in cahoots, the officer reported back to Whitehall that "Dr. Bakarić said that this story rested entirely on the Jelić letters. He had seen no shred of evidence in support of it. Asked if it should be regarded, therefore, as a piece of Russian or Ustaša disinformation, he said that it was disinformation all right, but it was manufactured in Belgrade, 'not far from where you live.' It transpired that he was referring not to Dedinje [meaning, Tito's residence] but to the Foreign Ministry and, more precisely 'that part of it which deals with consular questions and Yugoslav communities abroad.'"[20] As with Jelić, Bakarić provided no evidence to substantiate his claims. But as examined in the previous chapter, the employment of agents provocateurs was a tried-and-true method used by socialist Yugoslavia to weaken the separatist movement in the emigration.

The use of an intricate manipulation to induce Jelić to abandon the West and speak out forcibly in favor of the Soviet Union and its regime would in many ways fit the modus operandi of the Yugoslav government. If the Soviet variable is taken out of the equation, the advantages from Belgrade's standpoint of a radical political shift toward Moscow on the part of Jelić becomes clear. First, Jelić's adoption of a Soviet-oriented position would undoubtedly discredit him and the HNO among many emigrants, both those more moderate and those more extreme.[21] Second, the taint of communism on Jelić and—by extension—on the totality of the emigrant separatist movement would force Western states to reevaluate the activities of the Croatian diaspora, treating them not just as a nuisance but indeed as agents of Moscow and an emerging communist fifth column in their own countries.[22] Finally, a pro-Moscow Jelić would be evidence of the development of a new united front of the state's two most threatening internal enemies—namely, chauvinistic nationalists on the one side and hard-line Cominformists on the other.[23]

The idea that Jelić's "Finland solution" and turn toward Moscow arose out of discussions not with Soviet officials but rather Yugoslav agents posing as Soviet representatives, while intriguing, cannot be confirmed. Regardless, it seems that Jelić had truly come to believe that an alliance with Moscow represented the best hope for Croatian independence. In the eyes of many, this position was as radical as the one adopted by the semi-émigré generation of separatists. It also arose out of both the same disillusionment with the West and cynicism regarding the prospects for any near-term Croatian independence that had motivated the younger generation to turn to violence. The difference was only that Jelić had drawn a different conclusion as to the way forward. As he declared in defending his new position: "We have chosen no one but ourselves. We are prepared to be friends with the USSR and the USA, as long as they are prepared to be our friends. And what is wrong with that? . . . From our position as good democrats, we can only say that we are prepared to work together with all those who are prepared to be our friends, including with the Soviet Union, without shame or excuse. We are not concerned with whom we may insult or annoy. Our only concern is Croatian freedom and independence."[24]

Unfortunately for Jelić, his proposal for the "Finlandization" of Croatia would be his last significant contribution to the independence movement. Following the publication of his new position, Jelić was the target of two assassination attempts, one in September 1970 and the second in May 1971. Neither attack proved fatal, although the second seriously wounded his German wife. Jelić himself died after a heart attack one year later—in May 1972—shortly after he returned to his home in West Berlin following an extended fund-raising tour of Canada.[25]

Still, the impact of Jelić's "Finland solution" would be felt around the world, primarily in Belgrade and within the diaspora community but also in the halls of power in major Western capitals. Whatever the various views held regarding the Croatian political emigration during the postwar period, the separatist movement was viewed as dependably and often even vehemently anticommunist. With one article, Jelić fundamentally altered this perception. Semi-émigré separatists, of course, had long held to the proverb that "the enemy of my enemy is my friend," making cooperation with state socialist countries acceptable so long as it advanced the cause of Croatian independence. But the younger generation enjoyed neither Jelić's authority nor his standing, even if he lacked the newer movement's fervent following. That Jelić not only argued for an alliance with the Soviet Union but did so in a manner far more pointed and forcible than any semi-émigré radicals had done was truly significant. Jelić's role in the struggle for national liberation may have become more symbolic than substantive by the 1970s, but his words still carried considerable symbolic weight.

The Next Phase

Jelić's "turn toward Moscow" truly was a bombshell. Still, its explosive power remained purely metaphorical. The same could not be said for the actual dynamite that the semi-émigré generation employed with greater frequency and effectiveness at the close of the 1960s and early 1970s. The backdrop for Jelić's political volte-face was an escalation in the use of violence by younger separatists who interpreted the surge in Udba assassinations against Croats in the emigration to be a sign that terrorism was an effective means to not just rankle the regime in Belgrade but to expose its intrinsic weakness. Moreover, the violence grew far more dangerous in the 1970s as semi-émigré radicals gained experience and learned to develop and refine their tactics. Bombings and assassination attempts were complemented with highly coordinated actions such as the occupation of consular buildings, airplane hijackings, and—after Operation Kangaroo in 1963—a second military-style incursion into socialist Yugoslavia that was as professional as the earlier one had been amateurish, even if both were misguided and proved unsuccessful.

Radical separatists initially responded to Belgrade's campaign of violence with targeted bombings of Yugoslav consular buildings around the world. Early in the morning of June 9, 1969, a bomb ripped through the Yugoslav consulate general in Sydney, causing extensive damage. Five months later, on November 29, Yugoslavia's national holiday, another explosive was detonated in Australia, this time at the compound of the Yugoslav embassy in Canberra. Less than a year later, on October 21, 1970, a third diplomatic building in Australia was hit, this time the Yugoslav consulate general in Melbourne. One bomb created heavy damage, but further destruction and even loss of life was prevented when a second device on a timer was deactivated and removed from the scene.[26] Back in Europe, Brussels bore the brunt of this radical separatist bombing campaign. On May 7, 1970, two bombs exploded in the Belgian capital, one at the Yugoslav embassy and one at the Drina restaurant, a location popular with Yugoslavs living in Belgium. Three months later, on August 1, the Yugoslav embassy was targeted a second time, when assailants lobbed three bombs onto the compound's premises. And on New Year's Day 1971, a second restaurant in Brussels—the Dubrovnik—suffered a further bomb attack.

On June 30, 1969, meanwhile, the head of the Yugoslav Military Mission in West Berlin, Anton Kolendić—who was cited earlier regarding Jelić, the Bulgarian black market in Berlin, and the Soviets—was shot three times in his office, causing critical but nonfatal injuries.[27] The assailant—who also shot and lightly wounded the mission's porter—was a twenty-seven-year-old Croatian *Gastarbeiter* named Drago Đolo, who had recently moved from Hamburg to West Berlin. During police interrogation, Đolo denied membership in any Croatian emigrant organization. He also insisted that he had made

the decision to murder Kolendić fully on his own initiative.[28] At the same time, he made no effort to mask his political affinities, declaring simply and directly that "I agree theoretically with the Ustaše."[29]

The timing of the murder attempt led to speculation on all sides as to both the true motivation for the shooting and the real actors behind the scenes. The Yugoslav press reported that Đolo had shot Kolendić in retaliation for the arrest two weeks earlier of Miljenko Hrkać, the man held responsible for the 20. oktobar cinema bombing in Belgrade the previous year. Đolo and Hrkać, according to reports, must have known each other as they came from the same municipality of Bosnia-Herzegovina and both were acquainted with Ante Kardum, one of the would-be assassins of Andrija Klarić in 1965.[30] The Yugoslav security services, meanwhile, passed on to their West German counterparts their belief that the KGB was involved in Đolo's actions, a claim that authorities in Bonn seriously entertained.[31] The Croatian diaspora community, meanwhile, painted Đolo's actions also as an act of revenge, but rather than being a response to Hrkać's arrest, the assassination attempt had been provoked by the murder in Munich of Nahid Kulenović, who had been killed just two days earlier.[32] As for Đolo himself, he portrayed his assault on Kolendić in terms similar to those used by other radical members of the younger generation—namely, by channeling, however unconsciously, the notion of the "propaganda of the deed." As quoted in the Belgrade mass-circulation daily *Večernje Novosti*, Đolo viewed his act as a spark that would ignite the Croatian nation to action, stating bluntly: "I am against Communism. My shot should serve as the starting signal for the struggle."[33]

The spate of bombings between June 1969 and New Year's Day 1971 as well as the assassination attempt on Kolendić hardly resembled the mass uprising in the name of national liberation that Đolo and other young radicals imagined. They did, however, mark an unmistakable shift in both the tenacity and severity of the diaspora separatist movement. The bombings also served as precursors to a nineteen-month period in which the full force of the renewed focus and energy of the diasporic separatist movement came to the fore. Not coincidentally—as will be explored—the increase in both the capabilities and brazenness of semi-émigré radicals coincided with perhaps the most critical domestic crisis in socialist Yugoslavia's history. Whereas the younger generation of extremists believed in the 1960s that the revolution for national liberation was merely inevitable, by the end of 1971 it appeared truly imminent. And as the self-appointed vanguard of said revolution, they acted to promote the coming struggle for independence in new and aggressive ways. If the acts of political violence and terror up to 1970 had not been sufficient to demonstrate that the semi-émigré generation of radical separatists was a force to be reckoned with, those committed in 1971 and 1972 left no doubt.

A major contributing factor in the escalation of violence beginning in early 1971 was the retrial of Miljenko Hrkać following the annulment of his original conviction by the Serbian Supreme Court in April 1970. As in his first trial, Hrkać was found guilty of the 20. oktobar cinema bombing, and in December 1970, the man whom the Croatian émigré press referred to as the "Croatian Dreyfus"[34] was once again sentenced to death by firing squad. Somewhat unexpectedly for many observers at the time, the epicenter of violent protest against Hrkać's second conviction was Sweden, which was home to a total of only six thousand Croats in the early 1970s.[35] Among the six thousand, however, was a disproportionally high number of radicals, the majority of whom had migrated to Sweden from the FRG following the trade mission attack in 1962. As a result of the events in Bonn, both West German officials and agents of the Udba took measures that significantly curtailed the room to maneuver for pro-independence, anti-Yugoslav Croats living in the FRG, leading many West German–based semi-émigré radicals to move their base of operations north.[36]

The first act of violence spurred by the "fabrication" and "provocation against Croats,"[37] which was Hrkać's sentencing, came on February 10, 1971, in Gothenburg, Sweden. Between eight and nine in the morning, twenty-six-year-old Blago Mikulić and twenty-two-year-old Ivan Vujičević entered the Yugoslav consulate in Sweden's second city armed with three pistols and a butcher's knife.[38] Mikulić came from the same village as Hrkać, and the plan had been to demand his release in exchange for the safe return of the consul general.[39] Through either fate or—more likely—poor planning, however, neither the consul general nor the vice consul were present at the time of the raid. Absent the consulate's two highest-ranking officials, Mikulić and Vujičević settled for those present at the time, taking hostage the building's porter, his wife, and the wife of a low-level consular officer.[40] After barricading themselves in the building, Mikulić and Vujičević declared that they would execute the hostages at the same time the next morning if their demands were not met—namely, the release of Hrkać, payment of US$100,000, and safe passage to Spain. Over the next several hours, Mikulić and Vujičević oscillated between negotiating with the police and giving—to quote West German Foreign Ministry sources—"countless" interviews with newspapers and radio condemning the regime in Belgrade and championing the cause of Croatian independence.[41] Ultimately, the drama ended without incident as—shortly after the expiration of the deadline set by the hostage-takers—family and friends of Mikulić and Vujičević convinced the two to voluntarily disarm and surrender without bloodshed.[42]

If Swedish or Yugoslav officials felt any sense of relief at the peaceful resolution of the occupation of the consulate, the sentiment proved short lived. Less than two months later, a nearly identical scenario to the one in

Gothenburg played out at the Yugoslav embassy in Stockholm, but this time with a deadlier outcome. On April 7, 1971, Miro Barešić, age twenty, and Anđelko Brajković, twenty-three, burst their way into the offices of Vladimir Rolović, the relatively newly appointed Yugoslav ambassador to Sweden. Rolović was well known among anti-Yugoslav Croatian nationalists in the emigration, as he was, in their view, one of the central figures responsible for the subjugation and repression of Croats in Tito's state. Born in Montenegro, Rolović joined the then-illegal Communist Party of Yugoslavia (KPJ) as a teenager in the 1930s, which led to his twice being arrested by the royalist government. During the war, Rolović quickly rose up the ranks of the KPJ, playing a leading role in the Montenegrin July 13 Uprising in 1941 against the occupying forces of Nazi Germany and, particularly, fascist Italy. After the war, Rolović first served as a departmental head in the Ozna, the precursor to the Udba, overseeing the final defeat of the Croatian Križari insurgency during the second half of the 1940s. He was also alleged to have been a commander at the infamous island prison of Goli Otok. Later, in the 1960s, Rolović was made assistant secretary for foreign affairs, tasked mainly with dealing with the "enemy fascist emigration."[43] Justifiably or not, many Croats in the emigration held Rolović responsible for the targeted assassinations undertaken by the Yugoslav government against opponents to the regime abroad.

At their trial, Barešić and Brajković claimed that their intention had been the same as that of Mikulić and Vujičević in Gothenburg two months earlier—namely, to take Rolović hostage and hold him until the regime in Belgrade released Hrkać.[44] The Stockholm kidnapping, the two men testified, was intended to be the first act of a newly formed radical organization in Sweden named the Black Legion (Crna legija), the popular name of one of the most notorious Ustaša fighting divisions in World War II, the 1st Standing Active Brigade (Prvi stajaći djelatni sdrug). Crna legija was effectively imagined as a radical Croatian nationalist kangaroo court, comprising a judge and two jurors who would be "capable of handing down death sentences" against those within the Swedish Yugoslav community—which was comprised predominantly of Serbs and Macedonians[45]—deemed to be working with the regime in Belgrade in the suppression and subjugation of the Croatian nation.[46] The kidnapping of the ambassador would serve a different purpose than the one imagined for Crna legija but would help establish both the resoluteness and potency of the group.

For his part, however, the ambassador had no intention of passively surrendering to his would-be kidnappers. As Barešić and Brajković burst into his office, Rolović drew a revolver to fend off his assailants. In the ensuing melee, both Croats opened fire, shooting Rolović in the head and striking his secretary Mira Štempihar in the chest. Štempihar's wounds were critical but

nonfatal. Rolović was less fortunate. Eight days after the botched kidnapping attempt, Rolović died from his injuries, never having recovered consciousness and with the bullet still lodged in his brain.

Barešić and Brajković surrendered within an hour of the shooting. Three more Croats—Marinko Lemo, age twenty-eight; Stanislav Miličević, twenty-one; and the alleged mastermind behind the plot, Ante Stojanov, thirty-five—were arrested shortly thereafter for their involvement in planning and preparing the embassy attack. Although the plan had been to kidnap the ambassador, the assassins expressed no regrets about the deadly turn of events. As Barešić declared during the trial: "It makes no difference whether I fired five or 10 shots. I am not sad about the ambassador. I hated him so much that I could have cut him into pieces because of all the thousands of Croats he killed in the forties."[47] Within the emigration, the impact of Rolović's assassination was both immediate and far-reaching, with anti-Yugoslav separatists of all stripes energized by the attack. Radical Croats had never before taken the life of such a high-ranking official of the Yugoslav regime, and the murder of Rolović seemed to mark a new phase in the war against the hated regime in Belgrade. As one typical article in support of the Stockholm attack from the Canadian-based emigrant newspaper *Naš put* (*Our Way*) put it, with this act, "Tito has understood that the heads of not one of his ambassadors is safe and that their lives rely on the mercy of the Croatian emigration," concluding, "if we are to be honest, there is no easy path to the liberation of Croatia. Freedom is worth all the gold in the world, but the path to freedom is bloody."[48]

The attacks in Gothenburg and Stockholm were, of course, met with indignation by the regime in Belgrade, which chastised the Swedish government for its lack of attentiveness to the threat posed by radical Croatian emigrants. The Yugoslav government, however, was arguably less troubled by the violence itself—the seriousness of Rolović's assassination, in particular, notwithstanding—than by its timing. Notably, the two acts of terror in Sweden coincided with a growing domestic crisis in socialist Yugoslavia that had been developing since, at the very latest, the fall of Aleksandar Ranković—the head of the Udba and arguably the third most powerful man in Yugoslavia, after Tito and Edvard Kardelj—in 1966.[49] Together with a downturn in the country's economy, the purge of Ranković precipitated a shift in Yugoslav politics away from the centrism of the postwar era toward increased federalism within the state. Spurred by Tito himself, Yugoslav political leaders enacted numerous political and economic reforms with the intent of transferring power away from Belgrade toward the country's constituent republics. As soon became apparent, however, Tito's personal involvement in moving the country toward greater decentralization was by itself no guarantee of a smooth transition to a truly federal Yugoslavia. The push for political and economic liberalization was accompanied in some

quarters by appeals for social and cultural liberalization, particularly in areas related to national identity.[50] From the late 1960s onward, such voices grew louder, drowning out those of advocates for a more limited and conservative model of decentralization. By the spring of 1971, even the staunchest supporters of decentralization could not ignore the potential implications of the course they had set.

The most assertive and emphatic advocates for broad decentralization and the expansion of autonomy and even sovereignty for Yugoslavia's constituent republics came from the Socialist Republic of Croatia. The direction of Croatia's engagement with liberalization in Yugoslavia was set in March 1967 with the publication of the "Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika" (Declaration on the Status and Name of the Croatian Literary Language). Signed by some 130 prominent Croatian intellectuals, linguists, and writers—the majority of whom were members of the League of Communists—the declaration called for Croatian to be recognized as a separate, official language in Yugoslavia on equal terms as a literary language to Slovenian, Macedonian, and Serbian.[51] The stakes were then raised even further in January 1970 at the Tenth Plenum of the SKH when the party—led by Savka Dabčević-Kučar, Miko Tripalo, and Pero Pirker—affirmed that open discussions of perceived injustices or other issues related to national politics would be allowed and even welcomed in public political discourse.[52] By 1971, popular demands for political, economic, and cultural reforms that promoted "Croatian national interests" grew into a true mass movement that sought a thorough and even radical overhaul of Yugoslavia's federal structure.[53]

As calls for greater national autonomy grew in Croatia, so, too, did apprehension elsewhere in Yugoslavia about the possible repercussions of the path undertaken by the SKH, notwithstanding Tito's initial approval—or at least tacit acceptance—of measures taken by Zagreb. One of the first mini-crises of what the communists came to call "maspok" (short for *masovni pokret*, or mass movement) erupted in the spring of 1971, as those opposed to developments in Croatia sought to undermine the republic's party leadership. Conspicuously, at the core of the crisis was none other than the "enemy fascist emigration." In March and April, reports began to circulate within Yugoslavia—including in a number of official state organs—that the SKH leadership had been in direct contact with members of various anti-Yugoslav organizations in the emigration.[54] The only very lightly veiled insinuation of the reports was that the Croatian party leadership was working with Ustaša elements abroad to undermine the political unity of Yugoslavia.[55] The assassination of Ambassador Rolović only added to the conspiratorial character of the accusation as rumors circulated within political circles that Rolović specifically had been targeted because just days before his assassination he had remitted a message to the Yugoslav Foreign Office in Belgrade that proved a definitive link between émigré Ustaše and high-ranking members of the SKH.[56]

For their part, the leadership of the SKH aggressively rejected the charge of involvement with nationalists in the emigration, going so far as to issue a communique attacking the "hostile" campaign being waged by those seeking to delegitimize the reforms being undertaken in Croatia.[57] While authorities within both the Serbian party leadership and the federal security services formally denied any role in the production or dissemination of such reports, it was only after what was described as "a stormy meeting" of the SKJ Party Presidium on Brioni at the end of April that a further escalation of the crisis was averted.[58] The incident, however, demonstrated the seriousness with which many outside of the Republic of Croatia in socialist Yugoslavia viewed political developments in Zagreb. Few charges were more severe in Tito's state than association—no less collaboration—with the "enemy fascist emigration." That opponents of SKH reforms sought to discursively discredit the party leadership in Croatia by smearing them with the taint of "Ustašism" laid bare just how grave anxiety among centralists had become.

The height of the crisis between those who promoted far-reaching liberalization and those who favored more limited decentralization came just seven months following the Party Presidium meeting on Brioni. Over the spring and summer of 1971, Croatia witnessed a surge in popular agitation pressing for an increase in national autonomy, emboldening reformers within the SKH Party leadership, on the one hand, while intensifying unease among observers outside the republic, on the other. The culmination of this campaign came in November 1971, when thirty thousand students in Zagreb declared a ten-day strike as a show of support for the SKH's liberal reformist policies. For Tito, the student action proved a bridge too far, bringing to an end his tolerance of the political course undertaken by the party leadership in Croatia. At a meeting of the SKJ Party Presidium in Karađorđevo in early December, Tito openly accused the party leadership in Croatia of promoting nationalist chauvinism, "rotten liberalism," and even counterrevolution.[59] Within days, Dabčević-Kučar, Tripalo, and Pirker were all forced to resign, sparking several days of mass student demonstrations in Zagreb protesting the triumvirate's ouster. The federal government responded to the unrest with large-scale mobilization of both police and militia forces, sweeping arrests of protesters, and, ultimately, a widespread expulsion of members of the SKH. The message was unequivocal: the drive for liberalization and greater autonomy within Croatia was over.

Tito's harsh crackdown against participants in what has come to be popularly known as the "Croatian Spring" effectively brought the republic to heel. Strict party loyalists replaced reformers in the government, and popular leaders—most notably among students and in the cultural sphere—faced repressive measures. For nearly a generation—from early 1972 until the final

years of socialist Yugoslavia's existence—Croatia would come to be known pejoratively but not entirely inaccurately as the "silent republic," primarily due to its political quiescence vis-à-vis the federal government in Belgrade following the crushing of the Croatian Spring.[60]

In the emigration, however, the impulse behind, support for, and quelling of the reformist movement in Croatia only energized the separatist movement. The mass mobilization of support for reform made manifest for those living abroad that Croats in the homeland were no longer willing to be—as described in a front-page article in *Obrana*—"subjected to the worst possible reign of terror by Tito's nazi-fascist regime." Equally, the tactics by which the Belgrade regime "savagely and brutally suppressed all the attempts of the Croats to achieve their aims in a peaceful and civilized manner"[61] reaffirmed in the starkest possible manner that the liberation of Croatia could only be achieved through violent revolutionary struggle. Tito's actions in response to the students' strike and reformist actions of the SKH leadership resolved the debate once and for all—as much as there was any real debate among semi-émigré separatists—as to whether the emancipation of the Croatian nation from the clutches of "Serbo-communism" could ever be won through democratic, nonviolent, or institutional means. As the article in *Obrana* concluded: "In view of the [events surrounding the crushing of the Croatian Spring], the Croatian People have nothing left but to use every means available, if they are to achieve their aims, their freedom, and their independence."[62]

In the weeks that followed Tito's abrupt and punitive response to the Croatian Spring, radical semi-émigré separatists escalated their campaign of violence against Tito's hated state, further building on the wave of terror that had followed the assassination of Maks Luburić. On December 26, 1971, a bomb exploded outside the offices of Yugoslavia's national flag carrier JAT (Jugoslovenski Aero-Transport; Yugoslav Air Transport) in downtown Belgrade, injuring two. Ten days later, on January 5, 1972, a mail clerk at the Belgrade daily *Borba*—Ivan Gluić—was killed when a parcel bomb detonated in the newspaper's Zagreb printing plant.[63] A week after that attack, on January 13, two emigrants in West Germany—Ivan Andabak and Mirko Radas, both eighteen—were arrested after throwing several firebombs at the Yugoslav Tourist Office in downtown Frankfurt.[64] No one was injured, but the building suffered 10,000 DM in damage.[65]

A fourth bomb attack in four weeks occurred just after midnight on January 27 when a powerful explosion ripped through the last car of a Ljubljana-Belgrade passenger train near the border between the Republics of Slovenia and Croatia, injuring six. The railcar with the bomb had originated in Austria and was later coupled to the train in the town of Zidani Most, halfway between Ljubljana and Zagreb.[66] During Easter week 1972, two further

Yugoslav institutions suffered bomb attacks on opposite sides of the globe. On March 29, the Yugoslav Tourist Office in downtown Stockholm was leveled by an explosive planted by a group calling itself the Croatian Socialist Guerilla Army.[67] Eight days later, on April 6, a bomb exploded in the Melbourne offices of the Australian–New Zealand Bank that housed the Centre for Advice and Aid to Yugoslav Immigrants and where an exhibition of Yugoslav handicrafts was to have been held.[68] On that same day, also in Melbourne, a second bomb exploded outside the residence of Marijan Jurjević, a former informant for the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation and well-known supporter of socialist Yugoslavia.[69]

The most serious incident in the spate of terror attacks that followed the quashing of the Croatian Spring, meanwhile, remains to this day shrouded in controversy. On January 26, just hours before the bombing of the train between Ljubljana and Belgrade, and a month after the bombing of the airline's office in Belgrade, JAT flight 367 from Stockholm to Belgrade via Copenhagen and Zagreb exploded midflight over Czechoslovakia shortly after leaving East German air space.[70] Responsibility for the blast was immediately attributed to Swedish-based radical Croatian separatists, with speculation that a time bomb had been placed in the plane with the aim of killing Yugoslav prime minister Džemal Bijedić. Of the twenty-three passengers and five crew aboard the flight, all but one were killed. The remarkable exception was the Serbian flight attendant Vesna Vulović, who survived the crash after having been pinned to the fuselage by a catering trolley, preventing her from being blown out of the decompressed aircraft. In 1985, *Guinness World Records* conferred upon Vulović the record for "the highest fall survived without a parachute," documented as 10,160 meters.[71] In the years following her experience, Vulović became a celebrity both within and beyond socialist Yugoslavia.[72] Not among the casualties, however, was Bijedić, who had returned to Belgrade from Copenhagen—where he had been for the funeral of King Frederik IX of Denmark—earlier than planned on a different flight.

The day after the crash, Malmö's evening paper *Kvällsposten* reported that it had received an anonymous call from a member of a previously unknown Croatian nationalist group claiming responsibility for the attack.[73] Subsequent investigations by Swedish authorities, however, found no further leads in the case, and no arrests were ever made. Meanwhile, the implausibility of Vulović's extraordinary survival provoked the cultivation of a number of conspiracy theories regarding the true cause of the DC-9 aircraft's downing in the years and even decades following the crash. In January 2009, notably, a report for the German television news magazine *Tagesschau* gave credence to the most popular theory concerning the downing of the plane—namely, that JAT 367 did not crash due to a bomb planted onboard but rather had mistakenly

been shot down by a Czechoslovak Air Force MiG fighter. In this scenario, Vulović's fall would have been from "just" six hundred to nine hundred meters rather than the ten thousand meters claimed, a feat more believable—if still incredible—than the one in the official story. Citing newly obtained documents from the Czech Civil Aviation Authority, the report alleged that shortly after crossing into Czechoslovak airspace, the aircraft had experienced a rapid but controlled descent due to some unexpected and undetermined difficulty. The attempted emergency landing, however, brought the aircraft near a sensitive military area, which resulted in the scrambling of the Czechoslovak MiG. Mistaking the commercial jet for an enemy plane, the MiG fired on the DC-9, resulting in the destruction of the low-flying aircraft.

In the immediate aftermath of the downing of the airplane, according to the *Tagesschau* report, Czechoslovak state security worked in conjunction with authorities in Belgrade to falsify the official report on the crash, including the forging of documentation to indicate that the plane had been destroyed at high altitude by a bomb placed in a briefcase. For their part, the Czechoslovaks were happy to cover up such a grievous and tragic error. Meanwhile, Yugoslavia had more to gain politically from a tragedy that could be blamed on the "enemy fascist emigration" than on a blunder committed by a relatively friendly government. An airplane bombing was guaranteed to outrage all but the most hard-core radical separatists, while Vulović's heroic feat would provide a heroine who represented the enduring spirit of socialist Yugoslavia's struggle against the counterrevolutionary forces of fascism. The destruction of JAT 367 also provided impetus—if it was needed—for the Yugoslav security services to continue targeting radical separatists in the emigration. On March 9, just six weeks after the crash, Josip Senić—a leading HRB member and one of the men who Franjo Goreta alleged that Sava Milovanović had instructed him to kill in 1966—was found murdered in a hotel in the town of Wiesloch, near Heidelberg.[74] The nature of the murder—Senić was shot twice in the head at close range by a 7.65mm pistol in addition to having had his throat slashed—pointed clearly to Udba's involvement in the assassination. As was almost always the case, however, no arrests were ever made.[75]

Ultimately, the truth behind the destruction of JAT 367 remains—in the best-case scenario—securely locked away in the archives of the Czechoslovak and Yugoslav state security agencies.[76] But even if the destruction of the DC-9 cannot be attributed to Croatian radicals, their many other attacks made it clear that the separatist movement had become a formidable force. In particular, that the younger émigré radicals could react as they did so soon after the December 1971 Karađorđevo meeting made clear how extensive and entrenched radical opposition to the regime in Belgrade within the Croatian diaspora had grown.

The movement still lacked the unity necessary to become a true threat to the political stability of socialist Yugoslavia, no less a danger to continued communist party rule. But what these young semi-émigré separatists lacked in terms of unity they compensated for with enthusiasm and fervor.

If any questions remained about the strength of the semi-émigré radical separatist movement following the upsurge of violence in the early months of 1972, they were vigorously dispelled by three major acts of political violence that summer. The first and most deadly came—or rather began—in the early morning hours of June 20, 1972, when nineteen heavily armed men crossed the border from Austria into socialist Yugoslavia. Inspired by the success of Fidel Castro's revolution in Cuba, the band of men—all of whom were members of the HRB—entered Yugoslavia with the ambitious aim of inciting a popular Croatian uprising against the regime in Belgrade.[77] The events of the Croatian Spring had convinced the members of Operacija Feniks (Operation Phoenix)—the incursion's code name—that the Croatian nation at long last was ready to free itself from the shackles of "Serbo-communism." As a manifesto taken by Yugoslav authorities from one of the insurgents following his capture read: "We Croats have two alternatives: either to disappear completely as a nation or with arms in hand to fight until the end, that is until complete freedom and the establishment of a free Croatian state. We are convinced that the entire Croatian people, except for a few miserable mercenaries of Belgrade, prefers battle to shameful slavery."[78] All that was needed, the HRB militants believed, was a vanguard action to set the revolution alight.

Feniks could most generously be described as a misguided adventure. After crossing the border, the men hijacked a lorry belonging to a mineral water company and drove nearly five hundred kilometers to a mountain range close to the central Bosnia town of Bugojno, an area known both for being the location of one of Tito's favorite hunting lodges and as being an Ustaša stronghold during World War II. After setting up camp, the insurgents sought to rouse the inhabitants of nearby villages into revolutionary action. The local population, however, met the insurgents with either apathy or outright hostility. Unable to expand their numbers but undeterred, the guerillas still sought to galvanize what they believed was a latent desire for a popular insurrection among Croats in Yugoslavia by striking militarily at the levers of communist control over the people. In short succession, Operacija Feniks attacked a police station, a military post, and a camp of the Yugoslav Territorial Defense (TO; Teritorijalna obrana).[79]

In response, the Yugoslav government mobilized the TO, dispatching ten helicopters to help scour the mountainous forest for the would-be revolutionaries. The government also effectively placed much of central Bosnia under quarantine. In the first pitched battle between the insurgents and the TO on

June 25, the HRB suffered heavy losses, throwing the operation into disarray. It would take another four weeks, however, before Yugoslav military forces fully brought the insurrection to an end, with fifteen insurgents having been killed and the remaining four in custody.

Adding intrigue to the incursion were concerns not just in Yugoslavia but also at NATO headquarters in Brussels that the attack had been orchestrated by Moscow. Upon being "subjected to 'pressure'"—as the Italian ambassador to Belgrade put it in quoting a source in the Yugoslav government—those members of Feniks who were arrested "admitted" that the entire enterprise had been undertaken with Soviet backing.[80] Vocal supporters of the plausibility of this claim were two prominent Western military officials, Brigadier Karl Lütgendorf, the Austrian defense minister, and Major General Jan Šenja, an American military advisor who had been an officer in the Czechoslovak military before defecting shortly before the Prague Spring, thereby becoming the highest-ever ranking officer to defect from the Eastern Bloc to the West.[81] Both Lütgendork and Šenja endorsed the possibility—without providing evidence—that Operacija Feniks was part of the Warsaw Pact military plan "*Polarka*" (Pole Star). According to Lütgendork and Šenja, *Polarka* involved the Soviet Union sending troops into Yugoslavia to assist the government there in the advent of an invasion by "fascist forces" entering the country from Austria. However, while the Red Army was in Yugoslavia, Czechoslovak and Hungarian forces would invade Austria, taking control of the eastern half of the country. The idea was that, in exchange for the withdrawal of Warsaw Pact forces from Austria, the West would recognize a new, Moscow-friendly regime in Belgrade, to be installed by the Soviets in exchange for having saved Yugoslavia from the forces of fascism—which, if reports concerning Feniks were to be believed, the Soviets themselves had set on the country.[82]

Whatever the veracity of assertions regarding Warsaw Pact designs on central and southeastern Europe, the end result of Feniks is that with or without Soviet support, the operation had little more success than the HRB's previous incursion into socialist Yugoslavia, 1962's Operation Kangaroo. Within five weeks of crossing the border, the insurrectionist adventure was in shambles and the supposedly imminent mass popular uprising against Tito and his "Serbo-communist" henchmen remained as much a chimera as ever. The actions of the Bugojno Group (Bugojanska skupina)—as the insurgents are generally called—was so enigmatic for locals that many believed both the military mobilization and frequent exchange of gunfire in the surrounding hills over the course of the summer to be part of the shooting of a film about World War II–era Partisans.[83] On the international stage, interest in the incursion invariably revolved around Great Power issues rather than on the legitimacy, desirability, or viability of establishing an independent Croatian

state.[84] Only in Australia did Feniks garner much political or popular attention. Many of those involved in the incursion had spent considerable time in that country, with eight even having been naturalized. The killing, capture, and—eventually—execution of Australian citizens understandably became for a short time a serious diplomatic issue between Belgrade and Canberra.[85]

Whereas Kangaroo could rightly be characterized as a calamity, however, it would be inaccurate to portray Feniks as such.[86] The Bugojno Group was defeated only following the largest deployment of the TO in socialist Yugoslavia's history, with some thirty thousand citizen-soldiers mobilized to track down and vanquish the nineteen insurgents. Before the completion of Akcija Raduša—as the military maneuver to counter Operacija Feniks was dubbed—thirteen members of the TO had been killed, with an additional fourteen wounded.[87] Belgrade's concern was such that, as a CIA report written just two months following the final defeat of Feniks observed, "the Yugoslav government is treating the issue [meaning both the HRB guerilla action specifically and émigré Croatian separatism generally] as if it involved a threat to the regime and to the survival of the federal state."[88] The leadership of socialist Yugoslavia may not have been—as the HRB declared in a report to its members in the aftermath of the incursion—"panicking as a result of their realization that they are being confronted by mountains alive with virile humanity and by a giant mailed fist wielding a weapon of fire in the Croatian forests."[89] But neither could there be any question that the violent separatism of the younger generation of emigrants had grown more competent, more proficient, and, by extension, more existentially dangerous.

While Feniks demonstrated the capacity of radicals to improve on the effectiveness of existing tactics, events that soon followed showed the degree to which extremist separatists were both willing and able to adopt new, bolder strategies. Just six weeks after the final defeat of the Bugojno Group, on September 15, three Swedish-based Croatian radicals—Tomislav Rebrina, age thirty-five; Nikola Lisac, forty; and Rudolf Prskalo, twenty-nine—took control, five minutes after takeoff, of SAS flight 130 from Gothenburg to Stockholm, with eighty-six passengers and four crew members on board. For the hijackers—who had arrived in the country in 1961, 1964, and 1965, respectively—life in Sweden had been less than placid. Each man had spent time in Swedish prisons: Lisac and Prskalo for bank robbery and Rebrina for criminal fraud, extortion, and illegal possession of weapons.[90] After diverting the plane to Malmö's Bulltofta airport, the three hijackers informed Swedish authorities that they would blow up the DC-9 if all seven Croats serving prison terms for the occupation of the Yugoslav consulate in Gothenburg and the assassination of Ambassador Rolović were not released. They also demanded the handover of one million kroner—then around US$211,400—as a "claim for damages."

If Swedish authorities were not in any case already inclined to bring the hijacking to a peaceful conclusion, they were doubly determined to do so due to its timing. The taking of SAS 130 came just over a week following the Black September terrorist attack at the Munich Olympic games that had resulted in seventeen deaths—six Israeli coaches, five Israeli athletes, five of the eight hostage-takers, and a West German police officer. As a result, Swedish authorities were particularly sensitive to the need to end the operation without any loss of life. Perhaps ironically, the problems that did arise were due less to a lack of cooperation on the part of the Swedish government—who conceded to the hijackers' demands at every stage—than to that of the seven prisoners themselves.[91] The first issue was that one of the men to be set free—Stanislav Miličević—refused to go with his compatriots. Having only two months of his sentence to serve, he believed the risks involved in the hijacking would outweigh the reward.[92] The second issue was that the remaining six prisoners were initially highly skeptical of the three hijackers' intentions. Reflecting the prevailing conspiratorial climate within the Croatian emigration, the six convicts expressed concern that the hijackers were, in fact, either agents of the Yugoslav government or a group of Serbs bent on revenge for the murder of Rolović and not fellow separatist Croats. Only after lengthy telephone conversations between the prisoners and the hijackers did the former agree to board the aircraft.[93]

At 8:30 the next morning, over sixteen hours into the ordeal and after the release of all but one of the passengers, the plane was again cleared for takeoff, with the three hijackers, six prisoners, four crew, last remaining passenger, and half the demanded one million kroner.[94] To the chagrin of both the Swedish and Yugoslav governments, the hijackers' destination—which became clear only upon landing—was the one country in Europe most ideologically favorable to the Croatian cause, Franco's Spain. Further complicating the issue for Sweden was that the country had terminated its extradition agreement with Spain some twenty years earlier and had also failed to ratify the 1971 Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation—more commonly known as the Montreal Convention—which would have required Spain to either punish those involved in the hijacking or extradite the perpetrators back to Sweden for trial.[95] After arriving in Madrid, all nine Croats surrendered to Spanish authorities, hopeful that Franco would demonstrate leniency toward them, a confidence, it turns out, that was not misplaced. The six freed prisoners ultimately faced no charges and were granted permission to leave Spain for Paraguay in June 1974.[96] The hijackers, meanwhile, faced trial and were even sentenced to twelve-year prison terms. Shortly afterward, however, in January 1975, General Franco granted a full pardon to all three, who then also left Spain for Paraguay.[97]

Giving added weight to the significance of the Bulltofta skyjacking—as the hijacking of SAS 130 came to be known—was the fact that it appeared to be part of a coordinated global attack against socialist Yugoslavia. At precisely the moment negotiations between the hijackers and Swedish authorities were at their most critical, two further pro-Yugoslav institutions came under attack on the other side of the world. Between 11:30 and noon on September 16, two bombs exploded along Sydney's George Street, the city's main commercial thoroughfare—the first on the premises of the Yugoslav General Trade and Tourist Agency and the other outside the Adria Travel Agency.[98] The second bomb caused extensive damage to a number of buildings but caused no injuries. The first bomb, however, was more destructive, injuring sixteen, including two critically, in addition to the severe physical damage caused to the surrounding area. Contributing to the damage was the fact that the bombs exploded on a Saturday morning, a popular time for shoppers along what had been Sydney's original High Street.

It is unlikely that the perpetrators of the Sydney bombings and the SAS hijackers had acted in unison; the bomb attack most probably was a reaction to the defeat of Operacija Feniks, many of whose members had strong ties to Australia. Nevertheless, the simultaneity of the acts could not but raise alarms in Belgrade and elsewhere. Still, the apparent coordination of actors on opposite ends of the earth was not the real issue. For much of the 1960s, Croatian terrorists had unquestionably been an irritant for the regime in socialist Yugoslavia and the countries in the West where they were active. But the general view held by governments, police forces, and security services around the globe was that the threat posed by semi-émigré radical Croats was more or less manageable. While this conviction was certainly shaken by the escalation of violence between 1969 and the summer of 1972, it had not been shattered. Even the Bugojno incursion, as serious as it was, followed the relatively narrowly defined pattern of violent acts committed by anti-Yugoslav Croatian nationalists that had been established by the interwar Ustaše. The George Street bombings and hijacking of SAS 130, however, represented something new. In one short twenty-four-hour period, the very character of Croatian separatist political violence seemed to experience a dramatic transformation, with the rules of the game having suddenly radically changed. The events of September 1972, simply put, were less a continuation of the old than the introduction of something novel, giving birth to a new era in the radical struggle for Croatian independence. Going forward, nothing would be the same for either the movement for national liberation or for those who were tasked with trying to keep it in check.

Chapter 6
Simply, It Comes Down to This, 1972–1980

The fundamental change ushered in by the George Street bombings and Bulltofta skyjacking was that radical separatists appeared to accept that injury to or even the death of innocent victims was both unavoidable and defensible.[1] Before September 1972, acts of anti-Yugoslav terrorism in the West had, without exception, been calculated to target only individuals and institutions with direct ties to Yugoslavia. In cases where acts of violence against such targets risked inflicting indiscriminate harm—such as the bombing of travel agencies—the attacks were carried out late at night or in the early morning hours, thus reducing the chances of unnecessarily shedding the blood of innocent bystanders.

Of course, the issue of who got to be deemed "innocent" is a relative one. The train station and—in particular—cinema bombings in Belgrade in 1968 made manifest that extremists in the Croatian liberation movement found violence against civilians to be as morally justifiable as that against state officials and institutions. The argument rationalizing this moral position—as examined in chapter 3—was that no Serb, as a member of socialist Yugoslavia's allegedly hegemonic nationality, could by definition ever truly be considered "innocent," regardless of their position in society. The victims at the 20. oktobar cinema, for instance, might not have been actively involved in the continued subjugation and denigration of the Croatian nation. But by virtue of their ethnic identity they both benefited from and were intrinsically complicit in the crimes of Yugoslavia's "Serbo-communist" regime. The same logic would have been held by those responsible for the downing of JAT 367, assuming that Croatian separatists were indeed behind the crash.

But semi-émigré radical Croatian separatists had maintained a clear redline up to the summer of 1972 regarding the populations of their adopted host lands. This line was dramatically and irrevocably crossed in Australia with the brazen disregard for the welfare of Saturday morning shoppers on George Street and in Sweden with the midflight taking of nearly one hundred hostages. With an eye toward the tactics of more prominent and arguably more

successful terrorist organizations of the time, younger separatists came to believe that greater exposure for their cause outweighed both the greater risks and greater moral concessions involved when considering the possible victims of their acts of political violence. Terrorism that resulted in harm—or even worse—to Swedish travelers or Australian shoppers was, perhaps, regrettable. But a full generation of "moving about in a circle"[2] had shown that such sensitivities had only held the cause back. If violence against the citizens of countries such as Sweden, Australia, or West Germany meant greater publicity and exposure for the plight of the national liberation struggle, then so be it. Since World War II, the emigrant Croatian liberation movement had declared the fight for national independence to be one without compromise. With the events of September 15/16, 1972, separatist extremists showed that this mantra was to be taken deadly seriously.

Importantly, the real significance of this shift in semi-émigré attitudes toward so-called innocent victims lay not in the strategic or moral implications of the move but rather in an issue that was simultaneously more mundane but also ultimately more formative. It would perhaps be a stretch to suggest that countries such as Australia, West Germany, and Sweden had tolerated the violence perpetrated both by Croats and the Yugoslav security services in the decade following the trade mission attack in Bonn, although in the case of Australia—as is explored later in this chapter—this is actually an apt description.[3] But Western governments had long been willing to put the issue on the back burner so long as the violence remained firmly rooted within the Yugoslav community and rarely affected the country's broader population. This indulgence, however, came to a swift end with the George Street bombings and Bulltofta hijacking. The redline the Croats held to before 1972 had been one the security services of the West tacitly accepted. When the former crossed that line, the latter had no choice but to act.

Consequently, while the decade following the George Street bombings and the hijacking of SAS 130 might be remembered for the most brazen and indeed infamous acts of terror committed by radical separatists in their struggle for national liberation during the Cold War, it was also the period when Western governments progressively curtailed the room to maneuver for Croatian extremists. Stated more succinctly, although Croatian terrorists would continue their campaign of political violence into the 1980s, the events of September 15/16, 1972, marked in a clear and direct way the beginning of the end of the Croatian separatist movement. Faced for the first time with a manifest threat to their own populations, Western governments moved both to tighten their laws concerning political violence and terror and to loosen restraints for dealing with those deemed to be a public threat. While Croatian separatists were not the only terrorists Western governments had to contend

with in the 1970s—the era, after all, is known for its proliferation of radical organizations and acts of terror—these Croats, in fact, provided the stimulus for many key examples of the period's international movement to enact antiterrorist legislation. In this way, the separatist movement became, to coin a phrase, a victim of its own success. For a decade, semi-émigré radicals had demanded greater attention to their cause. After September 1972, they had it. Unfortunately for them, rather than helping them to achieve national liberation, that attention led to the movement's eventual obsolescence.

Tightening the Screws

The Swedish response to the Bulltofta skyjacking provides perhaps the starkest example of the importance of victims' identity in shaping the responses of Western governments to radical Croatian terrorism. During the second half of the 1960s, Sweden experienced a precipitous upsurge in anti-Yugoslav political violence following the migration of many of West Germany's most radical Croats to the country following the FRG's measures against the separatist movement in the aftermath of the trade mission attack.[4] Such incidents included a shooting at the Yugoslav ambassador's residence in Stockholm in 1968, the assassination of the leader of a Serbian exile organization in Gothenburg in 1969, and a woman killed in a bomb blast in a Yugoslav club in Malmö in 1970.[5] Even so, the Swedish security service the Säpo (Säkerhetspolisen) showed little interest in investigating terrorism within the Yugoslav emigrant community.[6] In the half decade before the attacks on Yugoslavia's consulate in Gothenburg and embassy in Stockholm in early 1971, just a single Säpo agent showed any interest in Croatian and Yugoslav political violence in Sweden, and his appeals for more resources to combat Croatian violence were mostly disregarded.[7] The murder of Ambassador Rolović naturally precipitated something of a shift in this position both within the Säpo and the Swedish government more generally. But even then, discussions of counterterrorism were confined to parliamentary debates and governmental press releases.[8]

The attitude of the Swedish government changed markedly with the hijacking of SAS 130.[9] Less than a week after the conclusion of the Bulltofta skyjacking, the Swedish parliament appointed a special committee called the Commission for the Prevention of Political Terrorism, which was tasked with drafting the country's first antiterrorist legislation.[10] The commission's recommendations were submitted for review just two months later, on December 8, in a report entitled *Action to Combat Certain Acts of Violence with an International Background*. In the words of a press communique issued by the Swedish government, the commission concluded that in light of the "several acts of violence of a political nature [that] have been committed by Croatian nationalists," measures had to be taken to "reduce the risk of

Sweden becoming a refuge for members of terrorists organizations of various kinds."[11] These measures included the suspension of Sweden's visa-exemption agreement with Yugoslavia, the establishment of a law to give the Swedish government the right to refuse entry into the country of any foreign national—including refugees and asylum seekers—the right of the government to examine and expel persons of foreign nationality presumed to belong to violent political organizations or groups, and greater security services latitude to control and supervise alien residents in the country, including house- and body searches, telephone wiretapping, and the interception and inspection of personal mail and other sealed documents.[12]

By any measure, the vagueness of the categories employed in the new laws to justify state action against those either hoping to gain entry into Sweden or already residing in the country fell well short of the normal standards of penal law.[13] Critics of the commission's work declared the proposed laws to be "emergency legislation without a state of emergency existing," with the government exploiting public outrage at the Bulltofta skyjacking to pursue security measures that otherwise would not have been possible in Sweden.[14] The main issue raised by the proposed legislation, critics protested, was that one need not have committed a crime to be subject to punitive legal measures. The only criteria for the restriction of an individual's civil liberties was for that individual to be "presumed to belong to or be active for an international terrorist organization."[15] How this presumption might be reached, however, was left solely to the Säpo, for whom the burden of proof was neither legally defined nor—for security reasons—reviewable or refutable by those charged. A Croat living in Sweden, for instance, did not need to be a member of an organization such as the HRB or Otpor to face investigation, search, arrest, or even expulsion from Sweden. It would be sufficient simply to openly express solidarity with the aims of the Croatian separatist movement to be considered a presumptive terrorist, even if agreement with the ultimate goal of national liberation did not mean agreement with the methods used in the pursuit of independence.

From today's post-9/11 perspective, the commission's recommended measures might appear—rightly or wrongly—neither particularly draconian nor egregious. In 1972, however, with both national and international laws regarding the growing spread of terrorism and political violence in their infancy, the proposed legislation was viewed by many as a direct assault on the basic democratic and legal values of Sweden.[16] Importantly, the commission itself conceded that its recommendations were truly exceptional, stating that the laws being proposed were "of an extraordinary nature"[17] and that they represented a "deviation from principles we otherwise usually follow in legislation."[18] To allay the concerns of those who feared that the new anti-terrorism law would serve as just the first step in a more systematic undermining of

civil liberties in Sweden, the commission proposed to make the legislation valid only for one-year terms, to expire automatically every twelve months unless renewed by the Riksdag, Sweden's parliament. With this provision in place, the commission's recommendations moved quickly through parliament. The final bill, dubbed simply the Terrorism Act, was put before the Riksdag in April 1973—just seven months after the Bulltofta skyjacking—where it passed with an overwhelming majority, 254 votes to 22, with 5 abstentions.[19]

As with most legal measures to combat political violence, the covert and secretive nature of the Säpo's efforts to neutralize "presumptive" terrorists before they became actual terrorists makes it difficult to draw definitive conclusions about the effectiveness of the Terrorist Act. It is, however, clear that separatist activity by radical Croats in Sweden experienced a sharp decline from 1973 onward. The explanation might simply be that the most radical members of the movement had been on SAS 130. As dramatic and deadly as the eighteen-month-long period between the attack on the Yugoslav consulate in Gothenburg and the Bulltofta skyjacking had been, the circle of truly dedicated Croatian separatists prepared to engage in acts of violence in Sweden remained quite small. The few radicals who remained in the country after the escape to Spain by those on SAS 130 were left leaderless, disjointed, and perhaps even disaffected by the backlash in Sweden to the movement's violent tactics.

There can, however, be little question that the Terrorist Act greatly constricted the ability of Croatian extremists living in Sweden to operate. The new measures implemented in 1973 were much further-reaching than those enacted in West Germany in the 1960s, which had been the impetus for the move to Scandinavia in the first place, leaving Swedish-based Croats with few options to organize and little space in which to maneuver. The Riksdag renewed the law in both 1974 and 1975, reflecting the government's conviction that it was both necessary and effective. In 1976, the law was effectively divided in two. The part dealing with special investigative and coercive measures remained essentially an emergency power, requiring yearly renewal. The majority of the legislation, however, was incorporated—with added amendments—on a permanent basis into Sweden's Aliens Act of 1954.[20] Ultimately, Sweden was determined to prevent the country from becoming a bastion of anti-Yugoslav Croatian violence. As a result, if semi-émigré radical separatists were going to build on their "successes" of the previous three years, they would have to do so from somewhere other than Sweden.

Perhaps the most obvious country to which semi-émigré separatists could have turned to consolidate their movement was Australia, which an early missive from the Supreme Headquarters of the HRB had declared to be "the citadel of Croatian national consciousness abroad."[21] Australia had been first

a stronghold of wartime Ustaša émigrés and then later one of the true birthplaces of semi-émigré radical separatism. One reason for this is that arguably no other government was more accommodating to Croatian extremists over a longer period than that of Australia's Liberal Party, which held power from 1949 until December 1972. A defining characteristic of the Liberal Party's near quarter-century reign was a preoccupation with the threat posed to Australia by the forces of communism. From the earliest days of the Cold War through to the anti–Vietnam War protests of the 1960s and early 1970s, the Liberal Party was convinced that Moscow was using the Communist Party of Australia (CPA) to prepare the country for revolution.[22] This fixation was shared by ASIO, which, despite ostensibly enjoying both bureaucratic independence and an apolitical mission, had become by the mid-1950s, to quote the political scientist Jenny Hocking, little more than "the political police of the Liberal-Country Party government."[23] As relates to Croatian immigrants, the fierce anticommunism of both the Australian government and security services translated into a rather indifferent—if not welcoming—position among those in power in Canberra to anti-Yugoslav elements in the country.[24]

ASIO's attitude toward the overtly violent and even fascist affinities of Croatian immigrants to Australia after World War II can be seen in an early engagement between the security organization and one of the country's most influential émigré groups, the Australian Croatian Association (AHD; Australsko hrvatsko društvo). In 1953, an ASIO field officer submitted a report warning that those connected to the AHD were "intensely Nationalistic, bordering on fanaticism," and that if left unchecked, the organization's publication *Hrvat* (*The Croat*) "will become the official organ of Fascist propaganda in Australia."[25] Rather than finding this report troubling, ASIO's director-general colonel Charles Spry dismissed his officer's concerns, choosing to focus on what the association and like-minded Croats were against rather than what they were for. In a memorandum submitted to the secretary of the Department of Immigration, Spry wrote that while he did not dispute the field officer's view that "the Australian Croatian Association was extremely pro-Ustachi and constantly in touch with the Croat terrorist Ante PAVELICH," it mattered much more that "the Australian Croatian Association is anticommunist and anti-Tito . . . [and] therefore [ASIO has] no security objections" to either the Australian Croatian Association or the publication of *Hrvat*.[26]

This laissez-faire attitude toward pro-independence, anti-Yugoslav Croatian immigrants by both Australia's government and its security services not only remained unchanged following the Croatian separatist movement's embrace of violence beginning in the early 1960s, but in many ways it became further entrenched. While the reasons for this are manifold, it was the government's obsession with the communist threat that arguably proved most

formative.[27] As explored in chapter 4, the Yugoslav government had made the infiltration of radical separatist groups one of its top priorities, employing agents provocateurs to subvert and weaken the movement by forcing host governments to deal with the growing violence of Croatian immigrants. Rather than viewing Udba activities on Australian soil as an infringement of sovereignty or otherwise a national security threat, ASIO saw them as an opportunity to observe up close how the security services of a state socialist country operated. While Yugoslavia was outside the orbit of the Soviet Union and not a member of the Warsaw Pact, the country remained nevertheless in the eyes of the Australian government and ASIO firmly in the communist camp. As such, as much as could be learned about how the Udba functioned would help in the larger struggle against the communist threat both in Australia and globally.[28] As long as radical Croats posed no real security threat to Australia itself—as the thinking within the government and ASIO went—the benefits of allowing the separatist movement to operate more or less unimpeded in order to better monitor and scrutinize the Udba's tactics outweighed the costs.

Even when it became clear that radical Croatian separatism did, in fact, represent a national security issue, the Liberal Party government took pains to downplay and relativize the nature of the threat. In a press release issued on July 20, 1972—one month to the day after eight naturalized Australian citizens together with eleven others launched the Operacija Feniks incursion into socialist Yugoslavia—the Commonwealth attorney general Ivor Greenwood stated publicly that the Australian government possessed no intelligence regarding organized extremist activity among Australian Croats. "Investigations by the Commonwealth Police," Greenwood declared in direct contradiction to what both the Commonwealth Police and ASIO had, in fact, determined, "so far have not revealed any credible evidence that any Croatian revolutionary terrorist organisation exists in Australia."[29] He went on to assert:

> That there have been bomb attacks and other incidents of violence is fact. Investigations of incidents are a State matter. The persons responsible for these attacks and incidents have, generally, not been able to be identified; this difficulty is not unique to Australia. In the absence of such identification there has been a tendency to attribute responsibility to extremist Croatian Nationalists. This tendency ignores the fact that Croatians and at least one Croatian building have been the subject of attacks.
>
> The pattern of events, worldwide, discloses that there are extreme Croatian Nationalists who will resort to terror, violence, and murder. There is also evidence that Croatian Nationalists have also been murdered by those opposed to them.[30]

More strikingly, even in the immediate aftermath of the George Street bombings two months later, Greenwood doubled down on his denial that radical Croatian terrorist organizations existed in Australia. In parliamentary debates just three days after the attack in Sydney, Greenwood not only repeated his claim that the Commonwealth Police had no substantial proof that Croatian terrorists were operating in Australia but implied that those who claimed otherwise were siding with the communists in Yugoslavia over law enforcement in Australia. As he stated, "Our investigation of those allegations [regarding Croatian terrorism] in Australia has proved that the allegations are without such a basis. Simply, it comes down to this: Does this Senate accept what is alleged by the President and the Prime Minister of Yugoslavia in preference to what our own Commonwealth Police have found and what I have stated?"[31]

As happens, many within both the Senate and Australia's general public did, in fact, accept the allegations of the Yugoslav regime over those of the attorney general. Before September 15, 1972, radical Croatian separatist political violence was both conceptually and spatially abstract for most Australians. On the one hand, the seemingly inscrutable history of ethnic relations in the Balkans discouraged broad engagement with the so-called Croatian Question. On the other hand, the violence of groups such as the HRB remained removed from the experience of most Australians, whether that violence took place on the far side of the globe or on the other side of town but safely cloistered within the "Yugoslav community." The George Street bombings, however, were much more concrete, literally hitting hard at home. At best, attorney general Greenwood's statements had the appearance of obliviousness on the part of the government. Worse was that many saw the attorney general's position as obstructionist and willfully disingenuous.[32] Either way, the repercussions for the ruling Liberal Party were the same. In federal elections held less than three months after the George Street bombings, the Australian electorate voted the Liberal Party out of power in favor of the Australian Labor Party (ALP), ending after twenty-three years what to date is still the longest continuous reign of one party in the country's history.

The issue of Croatian separatist terrorism in Australia was, of course, just one of many contributing to the Liberal Party's electoral defeat. But there is no doubt that growing discontent with the government's blasé approach toward both Croatian extremism broadly and the George Street attacks specifically helped intensify already mounting dissatisfaction with the Liberal Party. Importantly, there is also no question that the incoming prime minister Gough Whitlam and—in particular—his attorney general Lionel Murphy viewed the relationship among the Liberal Party, ASIO, and Croatian radicalism as one of the new government's most pressing concerns. During its many years in opposition, the ALP had come to see Australia's security service establishment as

not just politically partisan but indeed conspiratorial. Driving this view were misgivings about ASIO's long-standing obsession with both the anti–Vietnam War movement and those the security agency believed to represent the vanguard of communist and revolutionary subversion in the country—meaning students, intellectuals, artists, and members of the New Left.[33] But ASIO's manifest dereliction in dealing with the equally—if not indeed more—serious national security threat posed by radical Croatian separatists stood a close second, buttressing concerns within the ALP that ASIO was both politically tainted and operationally impaired.

Once in power, the ALP wasted little time in making moves to bring ASIO into check, and it was the Croatian issue that provided the desired pretext for the new government to act. A major preoccupation of the Commonwealth Police Force (CPF) in the early weeks of 1973 was assessing the security risk associated with the impending late-March arrival of Yugoslav prime minister Džemal Bijedić, who had scheduled a state visit to Australia as part of a larger tour of South Asia. In the course of their investigations, the CPF unearthed at least one definitive plot to assassinate the prime minister by anti-Yugoslav Australian Croats and evidence of several others. The police force also found that the likelihood of both organized and spontaneous violence by demonstrators protesting Bijedić's visit to be extremely high. Even with diligent and careful planning, the CPF was forced to conclude, no guarantees could be made for Bijedić's physical safety during his visit.[34]

In addition to painting an alarming picture of the security threat posed by Croatian extremists within Australia, the CPF's report was viewed by Attorney General Murphy as proof positive that the previous government had, in conjunction with ASIO, deliberately suppressed evidence of active and well-organized terrorists operating on Commonwealth soil.[35] Murphy's response was as dramatic as it was rapid. In the late night/early morning hours of March 15/16, 1973, the attorney general made a surprise visit to ASIO's local offices in Canberra, demanding to see all available files held there related to radical Croats operating in Australia. Among the files Murphy found was one outlining a strategy of how ASIO should share information with the new government. According to the document, intelligence officers were to frame their information in such a way as to ensure that statements made by the current attorney general on the issue of Croatian radicals "should not be contrary or inconsistent to that of the previous government."[36]

Convinced that this document pointed to a conspiracy at the highest levels of ASIO, Murphy ordered the CPF to immediately seal off ASIO's central headquarters in Melbourne. All safes, cabinets, and containers in the building were to be made secure, and staff was to be barred from their offices and work spaces.[37] Murphy himself then took an early morning flight to

Melbourne—just hours after his visit to ASIO's offices in Canberra—to meet the waiting CPF officers. Together, they then proceeded to search the building for further evidence of what the attorney general believed to be politically motivated obstructionism on the part of the security organization.

Ultimately, the "Murphy Raid"—as the visits came to be known—uncovered less than the attorney general had perhaps hoped. To be sure, what Murphy did find in Melbourne was damning. ASIO's myopia when it came to the supposed communist menace to Australian security had led the agency to thoroughly neglect the threat posed by the radicalization of Croatian separatists in the country. Beyond failing to gather any meaningful intelligence on extremist Croatian organizations operating in Australia, ASIO possessed neither informants from nor agents within the movement.[38] Still, the picture painted by the documents seized at ASIO headquarters was more one of indifference and incompetence than of political corruption and malevolence.[39] The previous government had certainly been obstructionist regarding ASIO's knowledge of radical Croatian terrorism. The reality, however, was that the obstruction had been more to cover up its own ignorance and ineptitude than a smoke screen for some more insidious plot within the Liberal Party and ASIO.

The repercussions of the raid—Murphy's failure to find the evidence of a conspiracy that he had sought, notwithstanding—were deep and long-lasting. Operationally, ASIO took an immediate hit, as the raid was viewed as a gross violation of the organization's autonomy and security. Agents, informants, and contacts working for ASIO became spooked, fearing that their covers were no longer secure.[40] Similarly, the raid prompted widespread anxiety within the security agencies of friendly nations, most notably the United States, leading to a more cautious approach to the sharing of intelligence of all kinds with ASIO and the Australian government.[41] Organizationally, meanwhile, a direct consequence of the raid was the establishment by the Whitlam government of the Royal Commission on Intelligence and Security, which was charged with undertaking a thorough and systematic inquiry into the history, structure, operations, and functions of Australia's security services. In a real sense, the commission marked the end of ASIO as it had existed since the 1950s. While the commission report, which was presented to the government in 1977, actually recommended that some of ASIO's powers be expanded, it also laid out a plan to substantially and fundamentally restructure the organization to make it both more modern and accountable.[42]

Meanwhile, for the radical Croatian separatist movement in Australia the raid brought the era of general governmental indifference to their activities to an end. Having served as the impetus for Murphy's assault on ASIO's offices, the attorney general was deeply invested in bringing extremist Croats to heel. ASIO was ordered to cooperate and coordinate with the Commonwealth

Police Force in the monitoring and investigation of suspected terrorist organizations—something that remarkably had not occurred before 1973—making radical Croatian separatism for the first time not just a criminal but indeed a state security matter. To a far greater degree than before the raid, members of pro-independence nationalist groups were closely surveilled through both overt and covert means, resources went into research and translation, and known Croatian separatists were denied travel documents in an effort to upset international networks.[43] As in West Germany earlier and Sweden at the same time, radical separatists experienced a rapid contraction of their room to maneuver in Australia.

That room shrank even further five years later, in 1978, with passage of the Foreign Incursions and Recruitment Crimes Act. The act made it illegal to engage in any hostile activity in or against a foreign state, the very raison d'être of pro-independence, anti-Yugoslav Croatian extremist groups. For more than twenty years—from the early 1950s until the George Street bombings—the Australian government had afforded radical Croatian separatists remarkable latitude to organize, operate, and act. Starting with the Murphy raid, it was clear that the Commonwealth government no longer would tolerate extremist politics within the Croatian community.

That the Murphy Raid in Australia and the passage of the Terrorist Act in Sweden had been effective can be seen in the precipitous drop in global incidents of Croatian separatist terrorism in the months that followed both. A 1979 report prepared by the Canadian Ministry of External Affairs concerning global anti-Yugoslav activities since 1962, for instance, lists not one single significant act of political violence between September 1972 and June 1976.[44] Similarly, a report from the West German Ministry of the Interior from June 1976 records only two notable incidents involving radical Croatian separatists between 1972 and 1976, neither of which were, in fact, acts of terror.[45] And in one of the most detailed catalogues of anti-Yugoslav emigrant activity compiled by any security service in the world—the East German Ministry for State Security (Stasi; Ministerium für Staatssicherheit)—the period from September 1972 to early 1975 is notable for its lack of entries. Of the total sixty-four pages in the Stasi report covering the years 1962 to 1984, 1973 and 1974 are given just one page each.[46] Put simply, if the three-year period preceding the Bulltofta skyjacking and George Street bombings were characterized by a pronounced upsurge in the number of acts of political violence committed by semi-émigré radicals, the three years following the attacks showed an equally sharp decline in separatist terrorism.

Of course, it is important not to overstate the effectiveness of antiterrorist measures such as those implemented first in West Germany and later in Sweden and Australia. While the relatively limited number of those involved

in separatist terrorist acts made the movement particularly susceptible to governmental controls in individual countries, the transnational network of extremists stretching from Melbourne to Munich to Mississauga provided the movement with an intrinsic flexibility and resilience. To be sure, the governmental measures taken against radical Croatian nationalists in Sweden and Australia undermined the movement's ability to operate and ultimately forced it into retreat. But retreat was not the same as defeat, a fact that radical Croatian separatists would lay bare with deadly effect in the second half of the 1970s.

Initial signs that a plunge in the number of terrorist acts by anti-Yugoslav Croatian radicals following the events of September 1972 represented only a lull rather than a cessation in political violence began to appear in late 1974. On October 29, two West German–based members of the HRB, Ivan Matičević and Mate Prpić, were "liquidated"—in the language of Yugoslav authorities—in a firefight in the Velebit mountains near the town of Gospić.[47] According to official reports, Matičević and Prpić had been responsible for the murder of Đuro Uzelac, commander of a police station in the Croatian coastal town of Karlobag, in September 1972 and had made frequent incursions into Yugoslavia in the following two years to engage in subversive and seditious activities. When killed, they were armed with mortars, submachine guns, and other weapons.[48]

Less than a week later, two militant Croats who had also been living in West Germany infiltrated socialist Yugoslavia armed with grenades and submachine guns, allegedly with the aim of assassinating prominent political figures, chief among them the former chairman of the SKH Vladimir Bakarić.[49] Before they were able to carry out an attack, however, both men, together with eleven local accomplices, were arrested. Just over two weeks later—in an incident possibly related to the two abortive incursions—a parcel bomb exploded in Zagreb's central post office on November 15, killing one postal worker and injuring two others. Shortly afterward, in a further incident pointing to potential plans for a larger raid on Yugoslav soil by radical separatists, a joint operation of authorities in West Germany and socialist Yugoslavia arrested five Croats in possession of arms, explosives, and antitank rockets that had been stolen from a United States Army munitions depot in West Germany.[50] Meanwhile, on March 29, 1975, the Yugoslav vice consul in Lyon Mladen Đogović was seriously wounded after being shot in his basement garage.[51] And on June 7, 1976—in an incident that would qualify as farcical had it not been tragic—a Croatian separatist named Jozo Damjanović mortally wounded in downtown Asunción the Uruguayan ambassador to Paraguay, Carlos Abdala, whom he had mistaken for the Yugoslav ambassador accredited to Paraguay, Momčilo Vučeković.

Initially, it seemed that Croatian extremists had revived West Germany as their primary base of operations. On Christmas Eve 1975, a bomb ripped through the Stuttgart offices of JAT, causing considerable damage but causing no injuries. Ten days later, on January 3, 1976, a second bomb attack took place in Stuttgart, this time at the home of the Yugoslav consul general, with a similar outcome.[52] A third nonfatal bombing occurred on May 15, this time in Cologne at the entrance of the Yugoslav Information Center. And on June 28, the Yugoslav vice consul in Düsseldorf, Vladimir Topić, was critically wounded after being shot as he arrived at work. The gunman was Marko Krpan, a member of the Croatian National Resistance–Friends of the Drina (Hrvatski narodni odpor–Prijatelji Drine), a West German branch of Maks Luburić's Otpor.[53] Of particular note is that Krpan's accomplice in the shooting, the student Pavle Perović, was known by West German officials as being an informant for—if not an actual agent of—the Udba.[54]

Meanwhile, the most serious incident during the first half of 1976 was the assassination of the Yugoslav vice consul in Frankfurt, Edvin Zdovc, on February 7. He was shot several times by two assailants in front of his garage as he was leaving his house early on a Saturday morning. Zdovc died at the scene, and no suspects were ever arrested.

The government in Bonn, however, was both alert and sensitive to the danger posed by the resurgence of anti-Yugoslav violence on West German soil. The rise since the late 1960s and early 1970s of groups such as the RAF and the 2nd of June Movement (Bewegung 2. Juni) and events like the Black September attack during the Munich Olympics had not surprisingly greatly hardened governmental, security, and law enforcement attitudes toward any manifestation of political violence in the country. Consequently, authorities moved quickly to smother the fire of this new wave of radical semi-émigré Croatian terror before it was able to spread. In direct response to the attacks of the first half of 1976, two of the most active Croatian emigrant organizations in West Germany—the HNO and the Croatian Society Drina (Kroatischer Verein Drina e.V.)—were officially banned and their members required to register with the police every four weeks.[55] Additionally, federal officials established a special unit within the state security division of the West German Federal Criminal Police Office (BKA) to deal exclusively with "Croatian extremism."[56]

These measures complemented and further strengthened those that the government in Bonn had put into place before 1976. In 1973, the BKA had entered into an informal agreement with their Yugoslav counterparts for a "greatly intensified exchange," whereby Bonn would provide Belgrade with information about Croats operating in West Germany in exchange for information on the activities of the PLO—who often worked with left-wing groups in the FRG—which the Yugoslav government supported.[57] Importantly, this

exchange included information not normally passed to the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) due to its political nature. More formally, Bonn and Belgrade concluded an extradition treaty in 1974 that broadened possible action against Croatian radicals operating in and out of West Germany. And following the revival of anti-Yugoslav violence in 1976, the West German Ministry of the Interior redoubled exchanges among domestic institutions, including the sharing of information on radical Croats among the country's security agencies, the Foreign Ministry, the Ministry of Justice, and the police forces of West Germany's individual federal states.[58] Taken together, these myriad measures allowed the West German government to quell the new campaign of violence by semi-émigré nationalists operating in the country almost as quickly as it had started.

The Final Act

The actions taken by the governments of Sweden, Australia, and West Germany made it clear to those involved in the Croatian independence movement that if the struggle for independence was to continue, it would have to happen from somewhere that had so far been relatively unaffected by anti-Yugoslav political violence and therefore relatively unchecked by governmental control. That place was the United States. In the decade following the first postwar act of Croatian terrorism in Bonn in 1962, the United States was conspicuously spared the violence that had become somewhat commonplace in countries like West Germany, Australia, Sweden, and even Belgium and France. To be sure, anti-Titoist Croatian nationalists living in the United States were far from passive in the 1960s and the first half of the 1970s. But their activities remained by and large within the bounds of legal and political norms. Croats held protests, penned treatises and articles, wrote letters, and formed political organizations. But the radicalization that Europe and the Antipodes had experienced remained more or less in check.

As evidence, a list of the most grievous acts of "subversion" and "terrorism" perpetrated by Croatian separatists in the United States from January 1967 to September 1976 published by *Tanjug*, the official news agency of socialist Yugoslavia, includes only six entries before 1975. Of these, three involved the smashing of shop windows, one was a failed attempt to mine a Yugoslav vessel in the port of Charleston, South Carolina, and one was a demonstration that ended with protesters breaking the windows of the permanent Yugoslav Mission to the United Nations in New York.[59] The sixth incident on the list, meanwhile, was an attack committed not by Croats but rather by anti-Titoist émigré Serbian nationalists.[60] In what was by far the most serious and significant act of anti-Yugoslav violence in North America before 1976, Serbian terrorists simultaneously bombed six Yugoslav diplomatic missions

on January 29, 1967, including the embassies in Washington, DC, and Ottawa, and consulates in New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and Toronto. The explosions resulted in no loss of life and no serious injuries, but they did cause extensive damage, both to the buildings themselves and to US/Yugoslav and Canadian/Yugoslav relations.[61]

Starting in 1975, however, the relative immunity to violence that the Croatian separatist movement in the United States seemed to possess showed signs of weakening. In May, three Croats were charged with assaulting the Yugoslav consul general in New York City, Milan Bulajić and his wife, at a party. Less than two weeks later, on May 14, two armed men attempted to storm the Yugoslav Mission to the United Nations, only to be thwarted by members of the mission's security staff. Five weeks later, on June 23, the Yugoslav Mission to the United Nations was again targeted, when a time bomb exploded in front of the building. And just before New Year's Day, on December 29, a plastic explosive detonated outside the home of the Yugoslav consul general in Chicago.[62] In each of these instances, as had been the case throughout the 1960s and the first half of the 1970s, both the material and bodily damage caused by radical separatists was minimal. The tactics employed and the targets chosen, however, signaled a clear shift in the strategic thinking of US-based separatists. As Croatian nationalists in the United States declared in 1976, echoing language long used in Europe and Australia: "In countries where no opportunity for democratic change, peaceful lobbying, or publication [of] one's views exist, another method must necessarily be utilized."[63]

If there was any doubt as to what that method was, it was emphatically removed on September 10, 1976. In what arguably remains the most infamous act of Cold War–era anti-Yugoslav Croatian separatist political violence, four men and one woman claiming to represent an organization called "Fighters for Free Croatia," hijacked TWA flight 355 scheduled to fly from New York's LaGuardia Airport to Chicago O'Hare. Declaring that they possessed five gelignite bombs, the hijackers—Zvonko Bušić, Frane Pešut, Slobodan Vlašić, Petar Matanić, and Bušić's American wife, Julienne Bušić (née Eden Schultz)—ordered that the plane carrying eighty-seven passengers and seven crew be rerouted to London. They also directed the flight's captain to inform authorities in New York to inspect a storage locker at the entrance to the 42nd Street subway station in Manhattan. In the locker, the captain was told, authorities would find a live bomb to prove that the explosives onboard were genuine. The locker also contained a letter with further demands. If the instructions in the letter were not followed, the hijackers threatened, a second timed explosive device planted somewhere in the city in a highly trafficked location would detonate.

The letter found in the locker contained only one demand: two manifestos written by the hijackers were to be published the next day in five major newspapers, the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and the *International Herald Tribune*.[64] The first text, entitled "Declaration of the Headquarters of the Croatian National Liberation Forces," was a three-thousand-word treatise exploring broadly the global history of national self-determination and specifically the oppression, humiliation, and even genocide allegedly faced by the Croatian nation within socialist Yugoslavia. The second piece, entitled "Appeal to the American People," was a slightly shorter tract that, on the one hand, compared the contemporary Croatian struggle for national liberation with the colonial American Revolutionary War against the British but also, on the other, accused the American government of abandoning its own founding principles through its continued support of "the colonialistic enslavement of the non-Serbian nations within Yugoslavia."[65]

The texts themselves aside, the nature of the demand itself marked a significant departure from the prevailing tactical thinking of most radical Croatian separatists. Stated simply, the hijackers of TWA 355 were interested less in the "propaganda of the deed" that had characterized anti-Yugoslav political violence since the early 1960s than in the spreading of actual propaganda. As explained in the "Appeal to the American People": "We decided to undertake this particular action for many reasons. First, our goal was to present an accurate picture of the brutal oppression taking place in Yugoslavia. . . . Next, we decided on this method [hijacking a plane] to illustrate the idea that there indeed exists nobler values than the preservation of a bloody, totalitarianistic and imperialistic creation."[66] Unlike not just the Bulltofta skyjacking four years earlier but diverging from nearly every other act of Croatian political violence since 1962, the principal aim of the hijacking of TWA 355 was not to incite fellow Croats to revolutionary action in the struggle for national independence or—as had been the case with SAS 130—to liberate those who had been imprisoned for doing just that. Rather, the purpose behind the hijacking of TWA 355 was first and foremost to publicize as widely as possible the Croatian cause among the broader public in the West. The despotic nature of "Serbo-communist" rule in socialist Yugoslavia meant that the struggle for national liberation would by necessity have to be a violent one. But violence alone would not ensure the establishment of an independent Croatian state. The Croatian nation would also need to win the battle for public opinion. Having the truth told through the publication of the two manifestos would help further this aim, ensuring that, in the words of the hijackers, "when the eventual uprising against Serbian Imperialism begins, the American people will not, then, allow themselves to be further manipulated regarding the justifications of such an occurrence."[67]

The commandeering of TWA 355, however, ultimately did more harm than good for the cause of Croatian national liberation.[68] Reflecting a lack of planning on the part of the hijackers, the operating aircraft of TWA 355 was a Boeing 727, a midsize plane designed for short flights. Neither the plane itself nor the crew were cleared for a transatlantic flight, meaning that the hijacked plane would both need to make several stops on the way to Europe and be accompanied by a plane with the proper navigational equipment. After first stopping in Montreal, the plane flew on to Gander, Newfoundland, where they were met by a Boeing 707 that would guide them over the Atlantic. In Gander, the aircraft was refueled, thirty-five passengers were released, and copies of the two manifestos were unloaded and given to authorities to be dropped by aircraft over Montreal, Chicago, and New York City. After stopping again in Reykjavik—where more copies of the manifestos were loaded onto the accompanying 707—the planes continued to London and Paris, over both of which leaflets were again dropped. Running low on fuel, the plane was ultimately forced to land in the French capital, where authorities—who took a hard-line approach to the hijacking—shot out the plane's tires and issued an ultimatum that the hijackers either surrender or face execution.[69] Following an eight-hour standoff—and some thirty hours after seizing the aircraft—the hijackers relented, surrendering to the French police.

Had TWA 335's transatlantic adventure been the whole story, the five hijackers might have been able to declare their undertaking a success. Tragically, it was not. After the skyjackers surrendered, it was revealed that their bombs were fakes, constructed from an assortment of pots, wires, switches, black tape, and plastic putty. What was real, however, was the bomb left in the storage locker in midtown Manhattan. After securing the area around the locker, the New York City bomb squad removed the device and transferred it for inspection to a police facility in the Rodman's Neck section of the Bronx. After several failed attempts to manually trigger the device, four members of the bomb squad—believing the device to have been deactivated—approached the sandpit where the explosive had been placed. Wearing only bulletproof vests and not the regulation protective gear, the men were left tragically exposed when the bomb unexpectedly detonated. One of the officers, Terence McTigue, was gravely wounded, with two others, Henry Dworkin and Fritz Behr, suffering less serious injuries. Absorbing the full force of the blast, however, was Brian J. Murray, who was killed instantly by the explosion.[70]

Whatever sympathy the hijackers might have hoped to gain through their exposure of the Belgrade regime's crimes against the Croatian nation was lost with the death of Officer Murray. The stark anticommunism of the separatists coupled with their youthful and perhaps even alluring idealism resonated with many in the United States, just as the skyjackers themselves had hoped.[71] But

in direct contrast to the hijackers' assertion that their struggle resembled that of the American Founding Fathers, for most Americans the violent death of an innocent New York City police officer evoked nothing but revulsion. Although the hijackers had hoped to present themselves and the cause of Croatian independence as principled and high-minded, the plight of an unknown nation in a far-off country was an abstraction that could not compete with the more tangible reality that Officer Murray's wife had been widowed and that his two small sons would grow up without their father. The hijacking of TWA 355 was intended to strike a massive blow for the Croatian separatist movement in the battle for public opinion. In the end, the undertaking proved to be a public relations disaster, with the death of Officer Murray overshadowing the entire episode to the detriment of any message the skyjackers had hoped to spread.[72]

Within the American Croatian community, reaction to the hijacking was generally one of muted support, mirroring the responses to comparable acts of radical semi-émigré political violence in West Germany and Australia.[73] The actors involved in the hijacking were themselves widely defended while the act itself was treated with reproach. Air piracy was not the preferred mechanisms by which most emigrant Croats wanted to bring the suffering of their conationals at the hands of the "Serbo-communists" to the attention of the American public. The murder of a New York City police officer less so. But in the face of the oppression and even genocide taking place in the homeland, such actions were deemed not just understandable but justifiable. In the eyes of many Croatian emigrants in the United States, the skyjackers were viewed as freedom fighters, willing to sacrifice their own personal freedom in an effort to advance the cause of freedom for the whole of the Croatian nation.[74] The hijacking may have ended in tragedy, but the principles and motives behind the undertaking—if nothing else—were deemed noble.[75] Still, the moral ambiguities of the hijacking and its outcome were enough to give most American Croats pause, tempering any potential for widespread mobilization of the diaspora community.[76]

The exception, of course, was among those members of the semi-émigré generation living in the United States for whom the national liberation movement was conceived in revolutionary terms. If the hijacking and killing of Officer Murray broadly elicited feelings of indignation among Americans generally and ethical disquietude among Croatian-Americans more specifically, it helped galvanize those extremist separatists for whom any questions about the means were secondary to the ends. Following the hijacking, Croatia was the subject for weeks of front-page headlines, back-page editorials, and television news spotlights. Granted, much of the news and commentary was negative, thanks both to the pervasive repulsion expressed in the media for terrorism generally and the death of Officer Murray specifically.

But at least Croatia was being talked about, whereas before the hijacking few Americans would have heard of the nation at all, much less have had any understanding of the existential peril it faced inside socialist Yugoslavia. For many of the more radical members of the separatist movement, this was a victory unto itself, even if the hijackers themselves had hoped their action would actually win the support of the general American public to their cause. The key now was to keep the topic of Croatia in the public eye and from there work slowly toward building sympathy for the struggle.

Insight regarding some of the moral ambiguities of the hijacking can potentially be found in a coda to the story. In July 2008, the acknowledged leader of the hijacking, Zvonko Bušić, was released from prison in the United States on parole after thirty-two years of incarceration. He returned to Croatia—which had achieved its independence in 1991—as a hero, greeted at the airport in Zagreb by hundreds of supporters and many of the country's leading nationalist figures.[77] He was also greeted by his wife, Julienne, who had been released from prison some nineteen years earlier and had spent most of the subsequent years living in Croatia. Just five years after returning, however, Bušić committed suicide by gunshot in his home on September 1, 2013. In a letter explaining the decision to take his own life, Bušić wrote that he "could no longer live in Plato's cave," and that "it was easier to dream of a free Croatia with all the trouble than to endure the Croatian reality."[78] Of course, how much the decision taken by Bušić was directly related to his later feelings regarding the hijacking is impossible to know, but unquestionably it weighed heavy.[79]

The next major act of terror committed by radical émigré separatists in the United States came nine months after the hijacking of TWA 355. Early in the afternoon of June 14, 1977, Vladimir Dizdar, age twenty-three, Jozo Brekalo, thirty, and Marijan Buconjić, twenty-eight, forced their way into the Yugoslav Mission to the United Nations in midtown Manhattan with the aim of taking hostage the Yugoslav delegate to the United Nations, Jakša Petrić. As in the 1971 incidents in Sweden at the Yugoslav consulate in Gothenburg and embassy in Stockholm, the assailants had hoped to leverage their hostage to gain a platform—as federal prosecutors later charged—"for the purpose of publicizing a political cause."[80] In what can be ascribed to either poor planning or bad luck, Petrić was not at the mission at the time, recalling the raid in Gothenburg where the consul general had also been absent. However, the mission's driver Radomir Medić was present and was shot in the abdomen by Dizdar as he tried to confront the three intruders, sustaining serious but nonfatal wounds.

The separatists then barricaded themselves in a third-floor room facing Fifth Avenue, one of New York City's most prestigious thoroughfares. Falsely claiming to be holding a woman hostage, the Croats made only one demand,

that United Nations secretary general Kurt Waldheim be notified that the Yugoslav embassy had been occupied and that he be given a copy of a leaflet that condemned Tito's Yugoslavia and called for the United Nations to take up measures to promote the establishment of "a free and independent Croatian State."[81] The assailants also dropped several dozen of the leaflets out the window, removed the Yugoslav flag from the side of the building, and attempted to hang American and Croatian flags from the mission's windows.[82] With no ambassador as a hostage, however, and having shot a public servant of Tito's state on what was officially Yugoslav soil, the assailants had little recourse but to abandon their enterprise and quickly surrender to the police.

Just over a year later, a strikingly similar act of violence took place, but with the added drama of radical Croats playing a role in a sensitive international diplomatic incident. In May 1978, Yugoslav authorities in Zagreb arrested four members of the RAF. Each of the four—Brigitte Mohnhaupt, Peter-Jürgen Boock, Sieglinde Hofmann, and Rolf Clemens Wagner—had been involved the previous autumn in the kidnapping and murder of the German industrialist Hanns-Martin Schleyer in what remains one of the most notorious acts of terrorism in postwar German history. Pursuant to the extradition agreement signed in 1974 by the West German and Yugoslav governments, Bonn requested release of the four into West German custody. In response—in what the West German ambassador to Yugoslavia Jesco von Puttkamer described to his British counterpart as "blackmail"—Belgrade petitioned Bonn for the surrender of eight Yugoslav nationals residing in West Germany whom Yugoslavia declared to be terrorists.[83] At the top of the list of eight—which included six Croats, one Serb, and one Kosovar Albanian—was Stipe Bilandžić.[84] Following his three-year incarceration in a West German prison for his involvement in storming the Yugoslav Trade Mission in Bonn, Bilandžić served as leader of the West German branch of Maks Luburić's Otpor. Among other acts, the Yugoslav regime charged Bilandžić with masterminding the second of the two failed incursions into Yugoslavia in the fall of 1974, the theft of arms from a US Army munitions depot in West Germany in the same year, and the June 28, 1976, shooting of Vice Consul Topić.[85]

The beginnings of what the British Foreign Office came to call "the Yugoslav/FRG debacle" dated from early August, when West German courts blocked the extradition of seven of the eight individuals requested by Belgrade on the basis that the justification given for the petition was "extremely flimsy."[86] The one exception was Bilandžić, who made an immediate appeal to the West German Constitutional Court on the basis that the political system in socialist Yugoslavia precluded the possibility that—if extradited—he would receive a fair trial. Before the court could hear his case, however, the West German

federal government stepped in and announced that Bilandžić would not face extradition. The crimes for which Bilandžić was wanted by the Yugoslav government, Bonn declared, had taken place in the FRG and were already being investigated there.[87] In addition, West German officials had evidence that Yugoslav security agents were involved in at least two plots to assassinate Bilandžić, reinforcing his contention that extradition would be tantamount to a death sentence.[88] Outraged, the government in Belgrade responded to Bonn's decision with what can fairly be described as provocative defiance. On November 17—without prior warning—Yugoslav officials informed the West German ambassador in Belgrade that the four Germans being held had sometime previously been released from custody and that they had left the country with the assistance of an unspecified "friendly" embassy,[89] identified in a 1984 Stasi report as being Iraq.[90]

While not publicly acknowledged, a significant factor contributing to the West German refusal to extradite Bilandžić was that—as the desk officer for Yugoslavia in the West German foreign ministry informed his British counterpart—"the Federal government had not wanted to provoke a wave of Croatian terrorist attacks in the FRG or against FRG government buildings abroad."[91] The West German government had, to a greater or lesser degree, been successful in controlling the activities of radical separatists following the brief flare-up of violence during the first half of 1976. But authorities recognized that the problem had only been contained and not solved. This was particularly true internationally, where Croatian extremists were viewed as a force still to be reckoned with, even if globally their overall activity had waned in the previous years. Bolstering such concerns were threats made against institutions of the West German state following the court decision to allow Bilandžić's extradition. Government officials received warnings, for example, that for every Croat handed over to Yugoslavia, two West German police officers would be murdered.[92] And even one of Bilandžić's lawyers openly declared that should his client be extradited, West Germany would experience a surge of violence compared to which "Baader-Meinhof terrorism will have seemed like a mosquito" bite.[93]

Threats alone, however, were not all that stoked West German fears of a violent backlash against the state should Bilandžić or any of the seven others requested by Yugoslavia be extradited. On August 14, a group calling itself the Croatian Liberation Force planted two bombs in New York City, one at the Dag Hammarskjöld Library in the United Nations' main headquarters and one in a locker at Grand Central Station. Both of the bombs—which New York City police officers were able to disarm—had notes attached demanding Bilandžić's immediate release from West German custody. Three days later, two armed Croats—Božo Kelava, age thirty-six, and Mile Kodžoman,

thirty-two—stormed the West German consulate in Chicago, taking Vice Consul Werner Ickstadt and five other consular officers hostage. The Croats barricaded themselves and their captives in the consulate, with the radicals threatening to throw each of the hostages one by one from the building's tenth-story window until Bilandžić was freed by West German authorities. Before harm came to any of the six hostages, the siege was brought to an end by Bilandžić himself, who called Kelava and Kodžoman from a prison in Cologne and convinced them over the telephone to release the hostages and surrender to police.[94]

Ultimately, the planting of bombs and the assault on the consulate were not decisive factors in West Germany's final treatment of Bilandžić. The government in Bonn was more concerned with avoiding a Constitutional Court ruling on his case due to the probability that the outcome—regardless in whose favor—would create a troubling precedent. To prevent this, the government would have denied Yugoslavia's extradition request in any case.[95] Indeed, if anything—to quote a British Foreign Office assessment of West Germany's handling of the extradition affair—the incidents in New York and Chicago actually complicated Bonn's desire to keep Bilandžić in the country and out of Yugoslav custody due to the fact that the acts of violence "lost [the Croats] much public sympathy."[96] At the same time, the planting of bombs and the hostage situation in August 1978, together with the storming of the Yugoslav Mission to the United Nations the year before, yet again made clear to government officials on both sides of the Atlantic that even if semi-émigré radicals proved somewhat lacking in terms of planning, preparation, and implementation, they made up for it with a fervor and ardor that made them no less threatening. As much as one might question the effectiveness of the Croatian separatist movement, and despite measures already taken in Sweden, Australia, and West Germany, there could be no doubt that radical émigré Croats remained a serious problem in need of a solution.

When American authorities finally took resolute action to deal with the issue of Croatian radicalism, they notably took a different path than their counterparts in Europe and the Antipodes. Measures taken in Sweden, Australia, and West Germany for the most part all addressed directly the political dimension of semi-émigré violence in their countries. In the United States, the strategy taken for dealing with extremist Croats was to treat their actions as a criminal issue. Civil liberty concerns in the United States made efforts to monitor, infiltrate, and ultimately prosecute radical Croatian nationalists exceedingly difficult. As a federal judge explained before handing down the sentences of four Croats in a 1981 case: "The freedom to hold and to express political views, free of reprisal, extends to all inhabitants."[97] As such, the government had little recourse to stop politically motivated Croatian violence

before it happened. What was not subject to such qualifications, however, were the criminal activities surrounding the planning and financing of acts of terror and political violence. It was along this avenue that American authorities sought to extinguish radical Croatian separatism in the country.

To wit, the primary focus of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) scrutiny of extremist Croatian nationalists in the United States revolved not around political violence and terrorism as such but rather on an international extortion campaign targeting Croatian-Americans. Starting in early 1978, members of the Croatian diaspora community began receiving letters claiming to come from a group calling itself the Croatian Nationalist Army, demanding payments of anywhere between US$5,000 and US$20,000. The letters were all mailed to the United States from West Germany, with payment to be made to a post office box in Asunción, Paraguay. The recipients of the letters—which numbered at a minimum fifty—were warned that failure to comply would result in reprisals carried out against them.

Fatefully, the extortionists were true to their word. On September 28, 1978, an immigrant named Anthony Cikoja—who had moved to the United States eleven years earlier—was shot and killed on the front lawn of his Greenburgh, New York, house after refusing to pay the demanded money. One week later, on October 4, Daniel Nikolić survived a firebomb attack at his custom cabinet-making business on the southeast side of Chicago when he, too, balked at submitting to the extortionists. And in a virtual reproduction of Cikoja's murder, Križan Brkić became the third victim in under two months, when he was fatally shot outside his home in Glendale, California, on November 22.[98]

The following year, the campaign against those refusing to acquiesce to the extortion intensified, as several Croatian-Americans were victims of bomb attacks. In February, Joseph Badurina, a journalist and politician from Queens, New York, and Timothy Majić, a Catholic priest in Milwaukee, Wisconsin—received identically constructed book-bombs through the mail. The device sent to Majić severely injured a police detective when it detonated as he tried to remove it from the parochial elementary school to which it had been sent.[99] Less than two months later, on April 6, 1979, the Los Angeles–area homes of Mario Forgiarini and Frank Striskovitch were rocked by separate pipe bomb explosions after both men had refused to submit to the extortionists' demands.[100] And on May 23—in an incident that undoubtedly helped bring the extortion bombing campaign to an end—Zvonko Šimac, age twenty-five, and Mario Rudela, twenty-one, were killed in their pickup truck in San Pedro, California, when a pipe bomb they were transporting to an unknown victim prematurely exploded.[101] Meanwhile, political violence by militant Croats returned to New York City. On December 4, 1979, a bomb ripped through

a Yugoslav travel agency in the Astoria neighborhood of Queens, injuring three,[102] while on March 17, 1980, the Fifth Avenue offices of Jugobanka were destroyed when a bomb left in a stairwell outside the bank tore through the thirtieth story of the midtown high-rise where the office was located.[103]

According to federal officials, the mastermind of the extortion campaign, who also tended the post office box in Asunción, was Miro Barešić, the man who had also been responsible for the murder of Ambassador Rolović in Sweden in 1971 and one of the men liberated from prison as part of the hijacking of SAS 130.[104] Barešić's life trajectory following his escape from jail in Sweden reads like something out of a pulp spy novel. After fleeing to Spain, Barešić traveled with Franco's permission to South America, settling in Paraguay with the help of that country's deputy foreign minister, who provided him with passports and other travel documents under a false name.[105] Barešić joined the Paraguayan military, reaching the rank of captain while working primarily as a karate instructor. Later, he became the personal driver and bodyguard of the Paraguayan ambassador to the United States under the name Tony Favik. Barešić's sojourn in the United States would be short, however, as American officials uncovered his true identity following a traffic incident leading the government to deport Barešić back to Paraguay.

Although brief, Barešić's time in America was long enough for him to make contact with American-based radical separatists with whom he hatched the extortion plan. For his role in the scheme, Barešić would later be extradited from Paraguay back to the United States at the request of American authorities. A New York court, however, ultimately acquitted Barešić and several other Croatian codefendants, reportedly due to witnesses refusing to testify at the trial because of threats made against them and their families.[106] Barešić did not escape jail time, however, as American authorities deported him to Sweden to serve out the remainder of his sentence for the assassination of Ambassador Rolović. Barešić would be released from Swedish prison in 1987, after which he returned to Paraguay.[107]

Following Croatia's declaration of independence in June 1991, Barašić then returned to his homeland to help establish a paramilitary unit in support of Croatia's secession from Yugoslavia. Barašić's role in what has come to be known in Croatia as the Homeland War (Domovinski rat), however, proved short lived. Just three weeks after his return, he was killed in one of the earliest campaigns of the conflict. Perhaps fitting for his biography, the circumstances of his death have recently become the source of some controversy. Claims have surfaced suggesting that Barešić was killed not by soldiers fighting for the Serbian Autonomous Oblast (SAO; Srpska autonomna oblast) of Krajina, as originally reported, but rather by a member of his own unit.[108] According to this theory, Barešić was killed to protect the identities of former Udba agents

who had worked against Croatian dissidents and radicals abroad during the Cold War whom Barešić—a target of such operations—might be able to expose.[109] If this were not controversy enough, on the fifteenth anniversary of Barešić's death—July 31, 2016—a monument to Barešić was unveiled in the seaside village of Drage, leading to a heated diplomatic rows between Croatia and Serbia and Croatia and Sweden.[110]

Of course, Barešić was not the only figure involved in the extortion plot. According to prosecutors, the campaign's concomitant acts of murder and criminal violence—as well as its corresponding acts of political violence—had all been the work of leading members of the American branch of Otpor, which was registered as a legal entity in the United States. Rather than make the organization itself the focus of investigation, federal prosecutors chose instead to target high-ranking individuals within the group through provisions made into law by the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) Act of 1970. Originally designed to combat the criminal activities of the Italian-American Mafia, the RICO Act made leaders of criminal organizations legally accountable not just for crimes that they themselves committed but also for crimes that they ordered others to commit. Despite the undeniably radical proclivities of Otpor's nearly three hundred members nationwide, federal officials determined that both the criminal and political violence of the group was being organized and orchestrated by just a small minority. If law enforcement officials could put Otpor's key figures behind bars, they believed, the remainder of the organization—and indeed the remainder of the radical semi-émigré separatist movement in the United States—would be irrevocably crippled.

And they were right. Following a six-year-long investigation by the FBI, federal prosecutors secured convictions of eleven leading members of Otpor on charges of racketeering and conspiracy in two trials held in 1981 and 1982.[111] The verdicts amounted to a death sentence for the organization. The jailing of the group's leadership left Otpor directionless and broken. As Lee F. Laster, head of the FBI's New York office, stated bluntly, the arrests were "a crushing blow" to the radical Croatian separatist movement.[112] But it was not just Otpor that was left shattered by American federal prosecutors. Globally, the effects of the measures taken by law enforcement officials in the United States reverberated far and wide. Throughout the 1970s, countries like Sweden, Australia, and West Germany had been successful in stifling radical separatists operating within their borders, leaving America the last stronghold of the radical Croatian national liberation movement by the end of the decade. Due in no small part to the kind of splintering, disorganization, and dysfunction that had beleaguered the postwar national liberation movement from its very beginnings, Otpor in turn was the only organization in

America with both the resources and ideological dedication to continue the violent struggle for Croatian independence. As such, the fall of Otpor's leadership meant not only the fall of Otpor itself but indeed the end of the radical semi-émigré generation's use of terrorism and political violence in support of Croatian national liberation. After nearly two decades, the last flame of the revolutionary struggle had been all but extinguished.

Epilogue
Fixated for Many Years on This Day, 1980–1991

After thirty-five years in power and just three days shy of his eighty-eighth birthday, Josip Broz Tito died on May 4, 1980. Stated only somewhat glibly, the events of May 5 best demonstrate the status of the semi-émigré separatist movement at the time. In short, nothing happened. In the months and years leading up to Tito's death, many opponents, outside observers, and even some supporters of socialist Yugoslavia had come to believe that the state simply could not survive without Tito. Once he and his cult of personality were gone, as the thinking went, Yugoslavia's many social, economic, and above all nationality problems would quickly escalate beyond the control of the regime in Belgrade, leading to the collapse of the state. In the imagination of radical semi-émigré separatists, Tito's death would weaken the state's hold over the Croatian populace just enough to tip the balance in favor of the forces of national liberation, prompting a popular nationalist uprising in Croatia that had long been simmering but equally had long been suppressed. The vanguard of this struggle, of course, would be those in the emigration who had been working tirelessly over the years and even decades preparing for that day to come.

But as the yearly Stasi report on the activities of exile Yugoslavs for 1980 stated matter-of-factly: "Tito's death on May 4 triggered no violence against Yugoslavia by Croatian nationalists despite having been fixated for many years on this day."[1] Since the late 1960s, intelligence services from around the world had collected evidence of concrete plans made by radical separatists for Tito's death. One such plan involved the formation of "action cells" in countries neighboring Yugoslavia that could be immediately mobilized to expedite the nationalist uprising in Croatia at the moment of Tito's demise.[2] A second entailed the assassination of upward of fifteen leading members of the Yugoslav government in order to "create a situation which would be favorable to extremist ambitions."[3] When the day finally arrived, however, extremist Croats were conspicuous by their absence. The measures undertaken

by countries like Sweden, Australia, West Germany, and the United States had reduced the semi-émigré separatist movement to a shadow of what it had been in 1970, leaving them unable to capitalize on what they had hoped would be their crowning moment.

To be sure, Croatian separatists were not completely passive in the aftermath of Tito's death. The Stasi's observation that the passing of Yugoslavia's leader "triggered no violence" was a reflection of how far below their expectations Croatian militant action after May 4 had been, not a comprehensive account of those activities.[4] Just less than a month after Tito's death—on June 3—Croatian separatists carried out two noteworthy attacks in the United States, providing a reminder of the potency the movement once had had. In the early morning hours, a bomb planted in a window flower box tore through the Washington, DC, residence of the Yugoslav chargé d'affaires and acting ambassador Vladimir Sinđelić, causing extensive damage to the house but no injuries.[5] Some fifteen hours later, in New York City, a second explosion rocked the museum story room at the base of the Statue of Liberty, just seventy minutes after the last visitors' ferry boat had left the island, resulting in damage to historic objects in the museum but again no personal injuries.[6]

If the two attacks were meant to instigate a larger campaign of violence in support of Croatia's national liberation struggle, the perpetrators were left disappointed. Despite the symbolism of both the Statue of Liberty and Yugoslavia's embassy in arguably the most powerful nation on earth, the bombings neither attracted useful media attention nor prompted others to act. Had Tito died a decade earlier, the Washington, DC, and Statue of Liberty strikes might perhaps have either instigated or been part of a larger wave of violence aimed at bringing down the Yugoslav state. But in 1980, the separatist movement was at its weakest in nearly twenty years. The few remaining extremists in the emigration who were truly dedicated to the cause were simply unable to marshal enough resources to follow up or build on the attacks of June 3. With the arrest in the United States and Canada of five high-ranking Otpor members in December 1980 and a further nine in June 1981, the possibilities for action shrank even further. Ultimately, as high-profile as the targets in Washington, DC, and New York City were, the bombings remain notable today less for the acts themselves and more for serving as the exceptions that proved the rule about the decline and even obsolescence of the radical semi-émigré separatist movement.

The failure of extremist nationalists to mobilize a meaningful campaign in the wake of Tito's death, as discussed in chapter 6, can be chalked up primarily to the measures undertaken by Western governments throughout the 1970s. Complementing these actions were ones taken by the regime in Yugoslavia over the same period. If the sharply escalating violence committed

by extremist Croats in the late 1960s and early 1970s in response to the first wave of Yugoslav assassinations against the "enemy fascist emigration" led officials in Belgrade to question their approach to confronting radical separatists, it is in no way evidenced by the government's actions in the subsequent decades. The 1970s continued as the 1960s had ended, with Udba operatives committing a string of targeted killings of Croat and other opponents of the state living in the emigration. According to Croatian sources, the Udba was responsible for the murder of no less than twenty-eight emigrant Croats, thirteen further failed assassinations, one kidnapping, and four failed kidnappings between 1970 and 1979.[7] While such numbers are ultimately unverifiable, there is no dispute that the Yugoslav security services carried out such violence.[8]

Among the most callous acts committed by the Udba in the 1970s was the triple murder of Stjepan Ševo, his wife Tatjana, and her nine-year-old daughter, Rosemarie Bahorić. All three were shot in the back of the head as they sat in the front seat of their car in San Donna di Piave near Venice on August 23, 1972.[9] Ševo and his family were executed as retaliation for Operacija Feniks from earlier that summer, which the Yugoslav security services believed Ševo had helped organize. Another high-profile assassination was that of Nikola Martinović, who was shot three times in the head in the fruit and vegetable market he ran in Klagenfurt, Austria, on February 17, 1975. Martinović had been caretaker of the graves in nearby Bleiburg and organized twice-yearly memorial services for the dead at the contentious site of memory.[10] The most prominent Udba victim in the decade preceding Tito's death was arguably the writer and dissident Bruno Bušić, who was murdered outside his apartment in Paris on October 16, 1978.[11] A vocal and prominent critic of Yugoslav communism, Bušić was a distant relative of Zvonko Bušić and had written the two manifestos published as part of the hijacking of TWA 355.

In addition to targeted killings, Udba officials also continued to employ agents provocateurs to infiltrate and penetrate radical separatist groups in an effort to discredit the movement as a whole. The best example of such tactics can be seen in the so-called Croatian Six case from 1979.[12] On February 8, a series of raids by the Australian Commonwealth Police Force in the cities of Sydney and Lithgow led to the arrest of Max Bebić, Vic Brajković, Tony Zvirotić, Mile Nekić, and the brothers Joe and Ilija Kokotović. The six men were accused of planning to plant fifty kilograms of explosives among six targets in Sydney that same evening, including a Yugoslav travel agency, a Yugoslav social club, the Elizabethan Theatre where a Yugoslav music and dance troupe was scheduled to perform, and in Sydney's main water pipeline.[13] Police had been tipped off by a seventh member of the group, Vico Virkez, who also later served as a pivotal witness for the prosecution. As was revealed some years later, Virkez was, in fact, a Bosnian Serb by the name of Vitomir

Misimović and an Udba operative.[14] His job had been to provoke Australian authorities into acting against known or suspected ardent nationalists within the Australian-Croatian community in order to neutralize them. And he succeeded. The six men were all convicted of a conspiracy to engage in acts of terror and sentenced to fifteen years in prison, despite widespread indications that the evidence against them had been fabricated.[15]

By the early 1980s, the Udba's operations—like those implemented in the West—had taken their toll. Belgrade's campaign to undermine the radical national liberation movement stripped those few extremists still engaged in the violent struggle for Croatian independence of much of their remaining dynamism. Radical separatists had responded vigorously to Yugoslavia's assassination and defamation campaigns in the late 1960s and early 1970s, but two decades of violent reprisals had both successfully culled the Croatian diaspora of its most radical adherents and discouraged others who might have supported the struggle for national liberation but chose to stay passive out of fear of the possible repercussions. The Yugoslav security service was so persuaded of the effectiveness of the Udba's targeted killings that Belgrade maintained the campaign until the end of the 1980s. As many as eighteen diaspora Croats fell victim to Udba assassins between 1980 and 1989. The last—according to Croatian sources—was Anto Đapić, who was stabbed to death on June 28, 1989, in his apartment in Nuremberg.[16]

An important determining factor in Belgrade's decision to continue its assassination campaign, even after it had become apparent that extremist Croatian separatism had run its course, was the fact that the regime viewed political violence and terrorism to be just one dimension of the overall Croatian diasporic threat to the state. While radical separatists garnered the greatest amount of attention from both the Yugoslav regime and the international community throughout the Cold War, they were not the only Croats in the emigration engaged in efforts to secure national independence. Particularly from the mid-1970s onward, a separate strand of diasporic separatism emerged that eschewed violence and instead sought other means to bring about the destruction of socialist Yugoslavia. These advocates for independence asserted that no amount of terrorism could bring socialist Yugoslavia to its knees. However, the authoritarian nature of the Yugoslav state, they argued, made it—like all authoritarian states—susceptible to the inexorable force of the structures and discourses of Western-style liberal civil society. The efforts of the diaspora community, the thinking went, should be dedicated wholly to spreading the ideals of liberalism in socialist Yugoslavia.[17] Over time, this would undermine the legitimizing principles of the state and result in its eventual but inevitable collapse. Such an approach to eroding support for the regime in Belgrade was, of course, less dramatic than revolutionary terrorism and required greater

patience, planning, and persistence. But it was a tactic, its supporters argued, that demonstrated a far greater sensitivity to both the domestic situation in Yugoslavia and the realities of global politics than had ever been exhibited by semi-émigré extremists.

This "liberal democratic" form of separatism was not simply an offshoot of semi-émigré radicalism. Rather, it represented a break with the movement. Nevertheless, authorities in Belgrade were deeply invested in associating the two movements with each other. This was the case first and foremost in order to delegitimize the former by tying it intrinsically to the latter. Simply, to demonize a movement calling for democratic pluralism was considerably easier both at home and abroad if it could be shown to have fascist and/or violent roots. As the secretary of the SKH Central Committee Milutin Baltić remarked in a speech given on June 5, 1980:

> Under cover of the struggle for freedom, for a multiparty system, this group [of émigrés] has been making efforts to form a much broader foundation for attracting the most diverse forces opposing our socialist self-management development. The advocates of this policy have grasped that they could not achieve anything by their stupid terroristic tactics; this is why they would like to turn their fascist nationalistic group into a broader political opposition by using the liberalist oppositional basis as a means of linking up other groups and individuals fighting socialist self-management development in our country. Their wish is to emerge legally onto the sociopolitical scene in Yugoslavia and to gain positions which would gain them greater success than they have so far had.[18]

What the Yugoslav regime recognized—as Baltić's remarks demonstrate—is that diasporic separatism based on a strategy of promoting democratic pluralism in socialist Yugoslavia posed a greater threat to the survival of the federal state than one focused only on political violence. Terrorism, perhaps, was more visible and dramatic than liberal democratic advocacy and agitation. But the various structural insecurities of socialist Yugoslavia made the state more vulnerable to the latter. As such, there was much to fear in this new form of diasporic separatism. To quote a press release from 1984 issued by the Foreign Policy and Internal Policy Committees of the Federal Chamber of SFRJ: "Terrorist activity has been set aside and a more modern and subtle form of activity has been adopted which is even more dangerous to our country."[19]

As the Yugoslav government would soon discover, their assessment of the danger posed by the "liberal democratic" strand of diasporic separatism was not misplaced. In early June 1987, the former general turned political dissident Franjo Tuđman was granted permission to travel to Canada despite

having twice in the previous fifteen years spent time in prison for expressing "nationalist-chauvinistic" views. Tuđman had fought with the Partisans during World War II, and in 1958, at the age of thirty-eight, became the youngest general in the history of socialist Yugoslavia. Shortly afterward, however, Tuđman retired from active army service to embark on an academic career. By the end of the 1960s, he had become a leading proponent of nationalist historical revisionism and an active supporter of the movement for greater decentralization in socialist Yugoslavia. In 1972, Tuđman was sentenced to two years in prison—later reduced to nine months—for his role in the Croatian Spring. Nine years later, in 1981, he was imprisoned again for an interview he gave to Swedish TV on the position of Croats within socialist Yugoslavia, which the regime in Belgrade considered subversive.

The motivations behind Belgrade's decision to allow Tuđman, one of Croatia's leading opposition figures in the second half of the 1980s, to travel abroad remain a matter of speculation. Part of the answer may simply be that earlier in 1987 Yugoslavia's most well-known dissident, the Montenegrin Milovan Đilas, had been permitted to travel abroad and that in the interest of appearing "nationally impartial" the regime afforded Tuđman the same privilege. Another theory posits that high-ranking officials in both the Croatian Party leadership and Croatian security services arranged the trip themselves as a strategy to help build a nationalist base of support for Croatia, both abroad and at home, in the face of growing concern about rapidly expanding nationalism in Serbia under Slobodan Milošević. In this version of events, Tuđman served as a kind of nationalist insurance policy should—as indeed happened—federal politics in Yugoslavia become fractured and factionalized along ethnic lines.[20]

Whatever the reason for granting Tuđman permission to travel abroad, the result was the same. Tuđman's trip to Toronto and Ottawa was originally met with some skepticism among North American Croats due to his Partisan past and former position as a general in Tito's army. By the time he left Canada, however, Tuđman had successfully laid the foundation for far greater diasporic involvement in homeland politics.[21] Tuđman's visit became the first of what would ultimately be hundreds of meetings between members of the Croatian diaspora globally and leading figures of the burgeoning opposition movement within Croatia.[22] These meetings, in turn, led to a relationship and even interconnectedness between the two that in many ways lasts until this day.[23] Perhaps most tangibly, in the spring of 1990 the diaspora played a crucial role in Croatia's first democratic elections, as they contributed more than US$4 million into the party both founded and personified by Franjo Tuđman, the Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ; Hrvatska demokratska zajednica). With a campaign war chest far exceeding that of

any other party contesting the election—in conjunction with a favorable electoral system—Tuđman and the HDZ swept to an overwhelming victory.[24] Just over a year later, on June 25, 1991, the Croatian parliament, led by Franjo Tuđman as president, declared independence from the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRJ; Socijalistička Federativna Republika Jugoslavija).[25]

To be sure, in the ranking of factors contributing to socialist Yugoslavia's demise, the activities of anti-Yugoslav Croats living in the emigration falls short of a spot in the top tier, not least when compared to dynamics such as Serbian president Slobodan Milošević's mobilization and instrumentalization of Serbian nationalism in the late 1980s.[26] At the same time, there is little debate that separatist Croats living abroad played both a significant and formative role in helping create the conditions for socialist Yugoslavia's dissolution. On the one hand, Croats in the emigration were vital in providing material and financial support for the nascent nationalist opposition that emerged in Croatia toward the end of the 1980s, specifically in support of Tuđman and the HDZ. Croats in wealthy countries in the West had access to funds far beyond what was available in socialist Yugoslavia itself, giving opposition parties supported by the diaspora a distinct advantage. On the other hand, the diaspora served as a vibrant fount of nationalist and other identity discourses that had long been suppressed in socialist Yugoslavia. While not all of these discourses focused on the Ustaše or the NDH, many, of course, did. What they all can be said to have shared, however, were claims regarding both the right and the aim of national independence.

The most important of these discourses, it could be argued, was the idea of national reconciliation.[27] At its most basic, national reconciliation was the idea that any independent Croatian state should serve as the homeland of all Croats, regardless of political affiliation or personal history. Former Ustaše and former Partisans, according to the reasoning of the idea's promoters, had all fought for "Croatia" during World War II, even if from different ideological positions. That the Serbs had essentially hijacked the efforts of Croatian communists to form socialist Yugoslavia did not change the fact that the Croats who had fought with Tito and the Partisans had done so for their "homeland." The political utility of this argument—as proponents of national reconciliation understood—was threefold. First, it was a mechanism by which to rehabilitate the wartime Ustaše and their descendants and invite them back into the fold of domestic politics. Second, it was a way to convince those in the emigration that Croats in the homeland would, in fact, support them and their brand of nationalism. And finally, it was a means by which to build national unity against what was seen as the common enemy of all Croats—at home or abroad—namely, the Serbs.[28]

The impact of the campaign to promote the idea of national reconciliation on Croatian politics and society has been well documented.[29] Whether intended or not, national reconciliation helped create the conditions for a rapid proliferation of Ustaša symbols, imagery, and political discourses within Croatia at the beginning of the 1990s. In turn, this new Ustaša revival served as a driving force behind a precipitate deterioration within Croatia of ethnic relations between Serbs and Croats. It was also critical for the resurgence of a potent and destructive militancy in Croatia in the run-up to the war of independence.[30] Again—to repeat the point made above—these developments should be treated as contributing as opposed to causal factors in the breakup of socialist Yugoslavia and the wars that followed. But what they contributed was fuel to an already growing fire of chauvinistic, hostile, and belligerent politics in the region.

The point here is that while the influence of diasporic separatism on domestic politics in Croatia during the half decade preceding socialist Yugoslavia's collapse is relatively easy to trace, it is far more difficult to draw a clear connection between radical semi-émigré separatism and Yugoslav and Croatian politics at the end of the 1980s and early 1990s. By the late 1980s and early 1990s, the semi-émigré generation of radical separatists was almost a full decade removed from having possessed any real impact or influence. The counterterrorism policies of both Western states and socialist Yugoslavia had effectively neutralized the most extremist members of the diaspora, leaving them nonfactors in Croatian politics. Instead, those in the emigration who became involved in Croatian domestic politics were not former or active terrorists but rather entrepreneurs and successful small business owners who couched their hard-line nationalism—and their Ustaša revisionism—not as a violent revolutionary struggle but rather as a liberal democratic response to communist repression and Serbian hegemony.

Certainly, there is an element here of overstating the case in order to make the case, and there can be no question that Cold War–era terrorism was present in the politics of the 1990s. Each bomb thrown and every bullet fired in the name of Croatian independence during the 1960s and 1970s embodied, perpetuated, and mobilized tropes related to the culture and politics of Croatian national identity that were central to events both before and after Croatia's declaration of independence from Yugoslavia in 1991. A deeply embedded sense of victimhood, a dedication to uncompromising struggle, a perception of being alone in the world without allies, a commitment to personal sacrifice for the good of the nation: these were all concepts deeply rooted in extremist Croatian semi-émigré separatism during the Cold War and central to the political discourse of the independence movement of the late 1980s and early 1990s. They also informed the subsequent national mobilization in defense

of the homeland. While none of these tropes were the exclusive province of the radical diasporic separatist movement, it was the extremist violence of the semi-émigré generation of Croatian separatists that arguably most reinforced and reified them as integral components of Cold War–era Croatian identity discourses, both in the emigration and at home.

The point, simply, is that in trying to identify those diasporic actors who played the most critical roles in Yugoslavia's disintegration and the wars that followed, it is important not to assume a linear and intrinsic relationship between the semi-émigré radicalism of the 1960s and 1970s and the diasporic militancy and neo-Ustašism of the 1980s and 1990s. To do so runs the risk of glossing over divergent and often conflicting interests within the Croatian diaspora that were crucial to the political and ideological development of emigrant actors during the period leading up to Yugoslavia's collapse. More problematic, conflating Cold War–era terrorism with later revisionist Ustaša militancy obscures the crucial relationship that existed between liberal-democratic and militant-nationalist programs and discourses in diasporic politics during the late 1980s and early 1990s. Such a relationship is generally lacking in Cold War–era Croatian revolutionary separatism. To view diasporic political activity after 1980 and particularly after 1987—when Tuđman went to Canada—as simply an evolution of semi-émigré separatism cannot but help to cloud our understanding of the interplay among democratic, nationalist, and even protofascist (if not fully fascist) political tendencies within the Croatian diaspora community.

In short, the relationships among interwar and wartime Ustaše, Cold War–era radical separatists, and early 1990s nationalist militants are complicated. This is not to call into question whether acts of terror committed in the name of Croatian national liberation between World War II and the collapse of state socialism did not bear directly on the contested, indeed violent, struggles that ultimately led to the dissolution of Yugoslavia and the establishment of the independent Republic of Croatia. They did. Rather, the point is to illuminate significant and meaningful distinctions and subtleties that have long been smoothed over in discussions of the history of radical separatism during the Cold War in order to expose previously unexplored pathways for elaborating new and novel insights and approaches regarding recent Croatian history.

At its most basic, the mission of history as academic discipline is to reveal—to reveal detail, reveal evidence, reveal connections, reveal developments, reveal change, and even to reveal meaning. That any given history is one of many discourses about the past does not change this fact, nor does the reality that what history reveals is intrinsically shifting and open to interpretation. What is often overlooked, however, is that the discipline is also about muddling, of views, beliefs, ideas, claims, rhetoric, and—again—even

meaning. As much as history as enterprise is meant to build, to state the point differently, it also seeks to destabilize. What is crucial is not to view these two tasks in opposition to each other. The muddling that history does is constructive, laying bare defects in prevailing ontological positions in order to help foster new ones. The devil, as the saying goes, is in the details. But so, too, potentially, are the foundational blocks to thinking differently about the world. To complicate can also be to illuminate, providing context, nuance, and sensitivity that otherwise might be missing from established, intuited, and even hegemonic assumptions.

This book argues that the history of radical Croatian terrorism is not nearly as straightforward as previously portrayed. Its roots lay in complex relationships among divergent and competing social movements, practical and contextual constraints, and personal and institutional upheaval that are separate from—if still related to—other trends in Croatian, Yugoslav, and even global history. Radical Croatian separatist violence of the 1960s and 1970s was deeply embedded in larger milieus that encompassed not just international Cold War–era politics but the ever-expanding transnational landscapes of global modernization and its concomitant mobility of ideas and practices that in many ways came to define the post–World War II era. Militant anti-Yugoslav semi-émigrés both adapted to and reinforced the revolutionary theories, political strategies, ideological foundations, and geopolitical opportunities of their time. This dynamic, in turn, created the specific conditions by which radical separatist actors could first imagine, then develop, and finally justify their decision to turn to violence in the struggle for national independence.

If this book does not fully resolve the complex story it sets out to tell, hopefully it manages to untangle at least some of the myriad factors that contributed to the two-decades-long campaign of political violence and terrorism committed by Croatian separatists during the Cold War. Equally, the light shed by the book's argument and narrative hopefully disrupts as much as it enlightens. This aim concerns both the book's narrow empirical focus and broader prevailing concepts regarding the relationship between migration and terrorism. Regarding the former, the book seeks to bring Cold War–era semi-émigré political violence out of the shadows and into the spotlight. Anti-Yugoslav terrorism during the post–World War II era has long been ignored as a phenomenon in itself worthy of study, treated instead as a feature of broader phenomena, be it postwar Ustašism as discussed in the introduction or militant Croatian diaspora politics as examined in this epilogue. But as explored throughout the book, the specifics of both the discourses and the practices of radicalization among extremist semi-émigré Croats complicate and problematize not just how the history of Croatian separatist terrorism should be portrayed but even how it should be categorized.

As to the latter, *Croatian Radical Separatism and Diaspora Terrorism During the Cold War* hopefully provides new insights and perspectives on how to think about the link between population flows and political violence. As discussed in the introduction, contemporary political, economic, and even popular discourse tends to treat the relationship between migration and terrorism like a jigsaw puzzle: one knows in advance what the picture will ultimately look like and only pieces from the box can be used to complete the puzzle. Such an approach, however, is, of course, anathema to critical knowledge production, historical or otherwise. Rather than being a problem that requires completing a known picture, what actually is needed is a continuous reimagining of the picture itself. This entails engaging in a constant and shifting process of refining both our understanding and interpretation of the relationships that exist among the details, textures, shapes, and patterns that form the basis for the picture. The history of diasporic Croatia terrorism explicated in this book hopefully conveys a refinement of thinking that sharpens our comprehension of the contours of the relationship between migration and terrorism. The outcome may be a picture that is more complicated than the previous one, but also one that is richer.

Notes

Introduction: Our Position Is Clear

1. Paul Daley, "Catholic Extremism Fears in 1970s Australia Made Croats 'the Muslims of Their Time,'" *Guardian*, July 29, 2016.
2. Bruce Hoffman et al., ed., *The Radicalization of Diasporas and Terrorism: A Joint Conference by the RAND Corporation and the Center for Security Studies, ETH Zurich* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND National Security Research Division, 2007), vii. The Munich Olympic attacks in 1972 often stand as the exception that proves the rule.
3. National Archives of Australia (hereafter NAA). Series A6980 (A6980T1), Control Symbol S250691, Item 7117143, Doc.: "Croatian Extremists," 1.
4. Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes (hereafter PAAA). Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1475, Dok.: 5. Mai 1972. "Besprechung mit dem Beauftragten für das Konsularwesen der jugoslawischen Regierung, E. Kljun, am 19.4.1972 um 10.30 Uhr über Aktivitäten kroatischer Emigrantenorganisationen."
5. Harvey W. Kushner, *Encyclopedia of Terrorism* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2003), 346.
6. Central Intelligence Agency, Office of National Estimates, "Memo: Yugoslavia—The Ustashi and the Croatian Separatist Problem, 27 September, 1972," in Thomas Fingar, *From "National Communism" to National Collapse: U.S. Intelligence Community Estimative Products on Yugoslavia, 1948–1990* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2007), 470.
7. Fiona Adamson, "Crossing Borders: International Migration and National Security," *International Security* 31, no. 1 (Summer 2006): 165.
8. Nina Glick Schiller, "The Transnational Migration Paradigm: Global Perspective on Migration Research," in *Migration and Organized Civil Society: Rethinking National Policy*, ed. Dirk Halm and Zeynep Sezgin (London: Routledge, 2013), 25–43.
9. Salvador Rizzo, "Fact Checker Analysis: President Trump's Claim That 'Nearly 3 in 4' Convicted of Terrorism Are Foreign-Born," *Washington Post*, January 22, 2018. For the report itself, see "Executive Order 13780: Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States Initial Section 11 Report," Department of Homeland Security and Department of Justice of the United States of America (January 2018).

10. Pablo Gorondi, "Hungary's Leader Calls Migration 'Trojan Horse' of Terrorism," *Associated Press* (March 7, 2017).
11. Mathew Kaminski, "Interview: 'All the Terrorists Are Migrants.' Viktor Orbán on How to Protect Europe from Terror, Save Schengen, and Get Along with Putin's Russia," *Politico* (November 23, 2015).
12. Ben Emmerson, "Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms while Countering Terrorism," United Nations Human Rights Council, A/71/384 (September 13, 2016): 1–23; Vincenzo Bove and Tobias Böhmelt, "Does Immigration Induce Terrorism?" *Journal of Politics* 78, no. 2 (2016): 572–88; Axel Dreher, Martin Gassebner, and Paul Schaudt, "The Effect of Migration on Terror—Made at Home or Imported from Abroad?" *CESifo Working Papers*, no. 6441 (April 2017): 1–43; Alex P. Schmid, "Links between Terrorism and Migration: An Exploration," *ICCT Research Paper* (May 2016): 1–62.
13. Bove and Böhmelt, "Does Immigration Induce Terrorism?" 584.
14. Hazel Smith and Paul Stares, eds., *Diasporas in Conflict: Peace-Makers or Peace-Wreckers* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007); Abdullah A Mohamoud, "Diasporas: Untapped Potential for Peacebuilding in the Homelands," in *People Building Peace II: Successful Stories of Civil Society*, ed. Paul van Tongeren, Malin Brenk, Marte Hellema, and Juliette Verhoeven (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2005), 339–63; Yossi Shain, "The Role of Diasporas in Conflict Perpetuation or Resolution," *Sais Review* 22, no. 2 (2002): 115–44.
15. Schmid, "Links between Terrorism and Migration," 13.
16. Schmid, "Links between Terrorism and Migration," 3.
17. John Tosh, *The Pursuit of History: Aims, Methods and New Directions in the Study of Modern History*, 2nd edition (London: Longman, 1991), 28–29.
18. Isabelle Duyvesteyn, "The Role of History and Continuity in Terrorism Research," in *Mapping Terrorism Research: State of the Art, Gaps, and Future Direction*, ed. Magnus Ranstorp (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2007), 54.
19. Duyvesteyn, "The Role of History," 54.
20. Walter Laqueur, *A History of Terrorism* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2002), vii–viii.
21. Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996).
22. Gabriel Sheffer, *Diaspora Politics: At Home Abroad* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 245.
23. Rogers Brubaker, "The 'Diaspora' Diaspora," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28, no. 1 (January 2005): 13.
24. James Clifford, "Diasporas," *Cultural Anthropology* 9, no. 3 (August 1994): 320.
25. "Ustaše" is the Croatian plural of "Ustaša" and will be used as the plural form throughout the book.
26. Stephen Clissold, "Croat Separatism: Nationalism, Dissidence, and Terrorism," *Conflict Studies*, no. 103 (January 1979): 1–21.

27. Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia–Senate (hereafter PCA–Senate). Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: Exhibit 30. "Cr(oatian) Rev(olution) and Its Preparations," 4.
28. Archives of New Zealand (hereafter ANZ). ABHS, 950, Acc W4627. Box 4123, 275/2/1 Part 6. Doc.: "The Canadian Croatian Federation," 1.
29. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix C.10, Doc.: "Curse," 1.
30. Use of the term "the Udba" to describe the Yugoslav security services is imprecise. The security service was called the Udba only from March 1946—following the division of the wartime Department of the Protection of the People (Ozna; Odjeljenje za zaštitu naroda) into separate civilian and military intelligence and state security services—until 1966, when it was renamed the State Security Service (SDB; Služba državne bezbednosti). "The Udba," however, was and still is broadly used both in the emigration and within socialist Yugoslavia and its successor states to describe the country's security services even after 1966. This text will follow this convention, referring to the Yugoslav security services consistently as the Udba even when dealing with historical eras where it was not the official name of the organization. For a detailed discussion of the actual structure of socialist Yugoslavia's security services, see Christian Axboe Nielsen, "The Yugoslav State Security Service and the Bleiburg Commemorations," *Politička misao* 55, no. 2 (June 2018): 51–52.
31. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1475, Dok.: 5. Mai 1972. "Besprechung mit dem Beauftragten für das Konsularwesen der jugoslawischen Regierung, E. Kljun, am 19.4.1972 um 10.30 Uhr über Aktivitäten kroatischer Emigrantenorganisationen."
32. National Archives of Australia, Sydney (hereafter NAA–Sydney). Series 503 (M503/0), Control Symbol 20752, Item 6834280, Doc.: "Letter from E. G. Whitlam to Captain R. Dezelin, New Australia Centre" (March 23, 1973), 1.
33. X [George F. Kennan], "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," *Foreign Affairs* 25, no. 4 (July 1947): 566–78, 580–82.
34. Paul Hockenos, *Homeland Calling: Exile Patriotism and the Balkan Wars* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003); Zlatko Skrbiš, "The Mobilized Croatian Diaspora: Its Role in Homeland Politics and War," in Smith and Stares, *Diasporas in Conflict*; and Francesco Ragazzi, *Governing Diasporas in International Relations: The Transnational Politics of Croatia and Former Yugoslavia* (London: Routledge, 2017).
35. Vjeran Pavlaković, "Flirting with Fascism: The Ustaša Legacy and Croatian Politics in the 1990s," in *The Shared History: The Second World War and National Question in ex-Yugoslavia*. (Novi Sad: Center for History Democracy and Reconciliation, 2008), 115–43; Gordana Uzelak, "Franjo Tudjman's Nationalist Ideology," *East European Quarterly* 31, no. 4 (1998): 449–73; and Dario Brentin, "Ready for the Homeland? Ritual, Remembrance, and Political Extremism in Croatian Football," *Nationalities Papers* 44, no. 6 (2016): 860–76.

36. Alex P. Schmid, A. J. Jongman, and Michael Stohl, *Political Terrorism: A New Guide to Actors, Authors, Concepts, Data Bases, Theories, and Literature*, (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1988), 1–39.
37. Duyvesteyn, "Role of History and Continuity," 55.
38. NAA. Series A432/15, Control Symbol 1963/2357 Part 3, Item 1111184, Doc.: Exhibit 000068—2nd Sheet. (June 17, 1966), 3.
39. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5/F, Doc.: "REVOLUTION," 1.
40. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix C.11, Doc.: "Upute Hrvatima izvan domovine!"
41. "Text of 'Croation [*sic*] Fighters,'" *New York Times*, September 11, 1976.
42. Bette Denich, "Dismembering Yugoslavia: Nationalist Ideologies and the Symbolic Revival of Genocide," *American Ethnologist* 21, no. 2 (May 1994): 367–90; Ljubo Boban, "Jasenovac and the Manipulation of History," *East European Politics and Societies* 4, no. 3 (1990): 580–92; Robert Hayden, "Recounting the Dead: The Rediscovery and Redefinition of Wartime Massacres in Late- and Post-Communist Yugoslavia," in *Memory, History, and Opposition under State Socialism*, ed. Rubie S. Watson (Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, 1993); Wendy Bracewell, "National Histories and National Identities Among the Serbs and Croats," in *National Histories and European History*, ed. Mary Fulbrook (Boulder: Westview Press, 1993); and Wolfgang Höpken, "Von der Mythologisierung zur Stigmatisierung: 'Krieg und Revolution' in Jugoslawien 1941–1948 im Spiegel von Geschichtswissenschaft und historischer Publizistik," in *Kommunismus und Osteuropa: Konzepte, Perspektiven und Interpretationen im Wandel*, ed. Eva Schmidt-Hartmann (München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1994).
43. David J. Whittaker, ed., *The Terrorism Reader* (London: Routledge, 2001), 94–103.
44. Clissold, "Croat Separatism," and Hockenos, *Homeland Calling*.
45. Mark Biondich, "'We Were Defending the State': Nationalism, Myth, and Memory in Twentieth-Century Croatia," in *Ideologies and National Identities: The Case of Twentieth-Century Southeastern Europe*, ed. John Lampe and Mark Mazower (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2004), 60.
46. For a discussion of the origin of the quote, see Library and Archives of Canada (hereafter LAC). RG 25, vol. 9361, File 20–18–1–5, Part 15, Doc.: "The Chicago Danica (Morning Star): Executive Committee of the Croatian National Council" (April 9, 1975), 11.
47. For a brief exploration of the evolution of Ustaša ideology in the years leading up to and including World War II, see Ana Antić, "Fascism under Pressure: Influence of Marxist Discourse on the Ideological Redefinition of the Croatian Fascist Movement 1941–1944," *East European Politics and Societies* 24, no. 1 (Winter 2010): 116–58.
48. Bradden Weaver, "Violence as Memory and Desire: Neo-Nazism in Contemporary Germany," in *The Legitimization of Violence*, ed. David E. Apter (London: Macmillan, 1997), 128–58.
49. Biondich, "We Were Defending the State," 55.

50. Biondich, "We Were Defending the State," 55, and Nevenko Bartulin, "From Independence to Trialism: The Croatian Party of Right and the Project for a Liberal 'Greater Croatia' within the Habsburg Empire, 1861–1914," in *Liberal Imperialism in Europe*, ed. Matthew P. Fitzpatrick (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).
51. Ivo Banac, *The National Question in Yugoslavia: Origins, History, Politics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984), 260–70.
52. Quoted in Biondich, "We Were Defending the State," 58.
53. Christian Axboe Nielsen, *Making Yugoslavs: Identity in King Aleksandar's Yugoslavia* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014).
54. "Ustaša" is the Croatian word for "insurgent." After 1933, *organizacija* (organization) in the name was changed to *pokret* (movement) to better fit the vision Pavelić had for the Ustaše.
55. For a remarkably insightful contemporaneous examination of the Ustaša movement and its activities, see: R. W. Seton-Watson, "King Alexander's Assassination: Its Background and Effects," *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1931–1939)* 14, no. 1 (January–February 1935): 20–47.
56. Dejan Djokić, *Elusive Compromise: A History of Interwar Yugoslavia* (London: Hurst and Company, 2007), 98.
57. Sabrina Ramet, *The Three Yugoslavias: State-Building and Legitimation, 1918–2005* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 114–29.
58. For an overview of the NDH, see Sabrina Ramet, "The NDH—An Introduction," *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 7, no. 4 (December 2006): 399–408. For a discussion of atrocities committed within the NDH, see Alexander Korb, "Understanding Ustaša Violence," *Journal of Genocide Studies* 12, nos. 1–2 (March-June 2010): 1–18; and Rory Yeomans, *Visions of Annihilation: The Ustasha Regime and the Cultural Politics of Fascism, 1941–1945* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2013).
59. The issue of the number killed by the Ustaše during the war is highly contentious and a matter of considerable dispute. See Srdjan Bogosavljević, "Nerasvetljeni genocide," in *Srpska strana rata: Trauma i katarza u istorijsko pamćenju*, ed. Nebojša Popov (Belgrade: BIGZ, 1996), and David Bruce MacDonald, *Balkan Holocausts? Serbian and Croatian Victim-Centered Propaganda and the War in Yugoslavia* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).
60. Pål Kolstø, "Bleiburg: The Creation of a National Martyrology," *Europe-Asia Studies* 62, no. 7 (September 2010): 1153–74.
61. Zdenko Radelić, *Križari gerila u Hrvatskoj, 1945–1950* (Zagreb: Dom i Svijet, 2002); Tomislav Jonjić, "Organised Resistance to the Yugoslav Communist Regime in Croatia in 1945–1953," *Review of Croatian History* 3, no. 1 (February 2007).

Chapter 1: There Can Be No More Discussion, 1948–1956

1. As we will see in subsequent chapters, this is a mistake that Croatian émigrés would make repeatedly over the next several decades, most notably in 1963 with Operation Kangaroo and in 1972 with Operacija Feniks.

2. Ivica Nejašmić, "Iseljavanje iz Hrvatske. Brojčani aspekt stoljetnog procesa," in Ivan Crkvenčić, *Političko-geografska i demografska pitanja Hrvatske* (Zagreb: Savez geografskih društava Hrvatske, 1991), 69.
3. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 65.
4. Zdravko Dizdar, *Tko je tko u NDH: Hrvatska 1941–1945* (Zagreb: Minerva, 1997), 42.
5. For one account of Pavelić's movements between 1945 and 1948, see chapter 4 in Mark Aarons and John Loftus, *Unholy Trinity: The Vatican, the Nazis, and the Swiss Banks* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998). This text, however, should be treated with caution due to its many sensationalist claims. Regarding the role of Draganović in the ratlines, however, the book's findings match those found in two other texts on the subject: Uki Goñi, *The Real Odessa: How Perón Brought the Nazi War Criminals to Argentina* (London: Granta Books, 2002), and Michael Phayer, *Pius XII, the Holocaust, and the Cold War* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008).
6. Goñi, *Real Odessa*, 204.
7. Aarons and Loftus, *Unholy Trinity*, 87. Equally crucial, Draganović—together with others—was responsible for first the safekeeping and later the transport abroad of the State Treasury of the NDH. Much of this treasure, which included upward of 2,400 kilos of gold, a large cache of diamonds, and considerable sums of foreign currencies, was ill-gotten from victims of the Ustaša's genocidal practices. Goñi, *Real Odessa*, 206–208.
8. Quoted in Richard Breitman et al., *U.S. Intelligence and the Nazis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 216.
9. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 73.
10. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: "Die nationalistischen Organisationen der Ostemigranten. III. Teil (Jugoslawische Emigration) (Stand: 15. Januar 1963)," 6–7.
11. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.6, Doc.: "A.S.I.O. Position Paper on the Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood, Command of the Croatian Liberation Movement, and Croatian Youth" (October 1, 1967), 3.
12. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 73.
13. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 73.
14. For a brief discussion of the Lorković-Vokić plot, see Jozo Tomasevich, *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia, 1941–1945: Occupation and Collaboration* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001), 422–423.
15. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 74.
16. National Archives and Records Administration (hereafter NARA). CIA. "Yugoslavia/Argentina, Ustasha Activity Abroad" (October 2, 1951), 2.

17. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: 1222/61. "Die kroatischen Exil–Ustaschen: Nationalistischer Extremismus und kommunistische Unterwanderung/Zum Stuttgarter Zwischenfall" (December 1, 1961), 5–6.
18. In the immediate aftermath of the war, Yugoslavia had been arguably the most Moscow-friendly of eastern and central Europe's new communist states. Relatively quickly, however, it developed into the most independent. This led to increasing friction between Belgrade and Moscow as Stalin feared the broader effects of an open show of defiance to Soviet hegemony in state socialist Europe. In mid-1948, finally frustrated by his failed attempts to bring Tito into line, Stalin expelled Yugoslavia from the official forum of the international communist movement and openly denounced Tito. For detailed discussions of the split and its consequences, see Ivo Banac, *With Stalin against Tito: Cominformist Splits in Yugoslav Communism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988), and the more recent Jeronim Perović, "The Tito-Stalin Split: A Reassessment in Light of New Evidence," *Journal of Cold War Studies* 9, no. 2 (Spring 2007): 32–63.
19. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: 1222/61. "Die kroatischen Exil–Ustaschen: Nationalistischer Extremismus und kommunistische Unterwanderung/Zum Stuttgarter Zwischenfall" (December 1, 1961), 5–6, and PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1308/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen im Ustaschen-Lager (Kroatische Emigration Juli–August 1956)" (September 14, 1956), 6–7.
20. This order, however, was met with serious opposition within the Križari ranks and was never implemented. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: 1222/61. "Die kroatischen Exil–Ustaschen: Nationalistischer Extremismus und kommunistische Unterwanderung/Zum Stuttgarter Zwischenfall" (December 1, 1961), 5–6, and PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1308/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen im Ustaschen-Lager (Kroatische Emigration Juli–August 1956)" (September 14, 1956), 6–7.
21. NARA. CIA. "Argentina/Yugoslavia, Current Activities of Ante Pavelic" (April 25, 1951), 1.
22. *Hrvatska*, no. 6 (March 24, 1953).
23. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: "Letter from the HOP to the Signatories of NATO" (December 1957).
24. *Hrvatska*, no. 6 (March 24, 1953).
25. NARA. CIA. "Argentina/Yugoslavia, Current Activities of Ante Pavelic" (April 25, 1951), 1.
26. NARA. CIA. "Argentina/Yugoslavia, Current Activities of Ante Pavelic" (April 25, 1951), 2.
27. Plans for this division were shelved following Perón's ouster in 1955.
28. NARA. CIA. "Yugoslavia/Argentina, Ustasha Activity Abroad" (October 2, 1951), 2.
29. NARA. CIA. "Yugoslavia/Argentina, Ustasha Activity Abroad" (October 2, 1951), 2.
30. For a broad review of Cold War émigré anticommunism in the United States, often by former fascists, see Ieva Zake, ed., *Anti-communist Minorities in the U.S.: Political Activism of Ethnic Refugees* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

31. NARA. CIA. "Yugoslavia/Argentina, Ustasha Activity Abroad" (October 2, 1951), 1.
32. For an examination of the role of both Western intelligence services and the Vatican in running the ratlines, see Phayer, *Pius XII*.
33. The National Archives (hereafter TNA). FO 371/95565, Doc.: "Despatch no. 122, British Embassy Buenos Aires" (May 26, 1951).
34. NARA. CIA. "Yugoslavia/Argentina, Ustasha Activity Abroad" (October 2, 1951), 2.
35. Dubravka Mlinarić, "Emigration Research in Croatia: An Overview," in *Transnational Societies, Transterritorial Politics: Migrations in the (Post-) Yugoslav Region, 19th–21st Century*, ed. Ulf Brunnbauer (Munich: Oldenbourg Verlag, 2009), 172.
36. Mlinarić, "Emigration Research in Croatia," 189.
37. Mlinarić, "Emigration Research in Croatia," 173.
38. For a broad overview of the development of Croatian national identity, see Alex J. Bellamy, *The Formation of Croatian National Identity: A Centuries-Old Dream?* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003). For an examination of identity politics in royalist Yugoslavia, see Nielsen, *Making Yugoslavs*.
39. Mlinarić, "Emigration Research in Croatia," 172.
40. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: "Die kommunistische Infiltration der jugoslawischen Auswanderer in USA" (October 26, 1956), 1–12.
41. John Kraljić, "The Croatian Section of the Communist Party of the United States and the 'United Front': 1934–1939," *Review of Croatian History* 5, no. 1 (2009): 137–145.
42. Kraljić, "The Croatian Section of the Communist Party."
43. Kraljić, "The Croatian Section of the Communist Party," 138–40.
44. Founded in 1894 as the Croatian Association (HZ; Hrvatska zajednica), the HBZ changed its name to National Croatian Society (NHZ; Narodna hrvatska zajednica) in 1897 before adopting its present name in 1926. For a broad history of the HBZ, see Ivan Čizmić, *History of the Croatian Fraternal Union of America, 1894–1994* (Zagreb: Golden Marketing, 1994).
45. In 1954, just to give some perspective, the HBZ had more than 110,000 members in the United States and Canada, with an operating budget of US$25 million. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 60.
46. For a full description of the internal struggle between communists and non-communists in the HBZ throughout much of the first half of the twentieth century, see Kraljić, "Croatian Section."
47. Nathan Glazer, *The Social Basis of American Communism* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961), 232. Cited in Kraljić, "Croatian Section," 165.
48. For a more detailed discussion of the debates within the Croatian emigrant community regarding the issue of independence, allegiance to their new homes, and support for both the Ustaše and the Communists, see Jure Krišto, "Communist Penetration of Croatian American Organizations during World War II," *Review of Croatian History* 5, no. 1 (2009): 169–188.
49. Krišto, "Communist Penetration of Croatian American Organizations," 172–73.

50. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 61.
51. Of course, these efforts did not go unnoticed by the governments that played host to the vast majority of Croatian emigrants. At the height of the Red Scare in the United States, for instance, no fewer than six Croatian or Croatian-dominated organizations were included in the Attorney General's List of Subversive Organizations. Similarly, several leaders of the HBZ were investigated—and, in fact, blacklisted—for "un-American" activities by the United States Senate due to their supposedly communist leanings. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 62–63. For a list of those organizations labeled as subversive, see *Digest of the Public Record of Communism in the United States,* (New York: Fund for the Republic, 1955), 67–74.
52. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 62–63.
53. For instance, the Croatian Benevolent and Cultural Society of New Zealand Incorporated changed its name in 1947 to the Yugoslav Society Marshall Tito Incorporated as a show of support for the postwar socialist Yugoslav State. ANZ. AATJ, 838, Acc, W5385, Box 1, 2–18–16 (Incorporated Societies—Yugoslav Society), Doc.: "The Registrar of Incorporated Societies, Head Office, Stamp Duties Department, 2nd June 1948."
54. Beyond any issue of uniting forces, postwar emigrants were often forbidden from even joining older organizations. In a complaint to the New Zealand government, for instance, new emigrants to the country claimed that they were not allowed to join the Yugoslav Society without a valid passport signed by Tito, a clear attempt to weed out former Ustaše. ANZ. IA, I, Box 1853, 116/41/3 (Foreign Nationalities, Clubs, Associations Yugos), Doc.: "Meeting with Mr. Lajaric, 8/8/1952."
55. Mark Biondich, "Vladko Maček and the Croat Political Right, 1928–1941," *Contemporary European History* 16, no. 2 (May 2007): 203.
56. NARA. RG 65, Entry A1–136Z, Box 30, Folder, 100–148034 (1 of 2), Doc.: "Dr. V. Macek's Future Plans" (January 15, 1947), 2.
57. For an overview of the importance of Stjepan Radić in Croatian history, see Mark Biondich, *Stjepan Radić, the Croat Peasant Party, and the Politics of Mass Mobilization, 1904–1928* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000).
58. By one estimate, Maček was, in fact, a stronger advocate for Croatians than Radić. To quote Sabrina Ramet: "When compared with his more charismatic predecessor as head of the Croatian Peasant Party, Stjepan Radić, Maček was more skilled in building coalitions, more practical in the measures he adopted, and, I would argue, overall more effective as a champion of the interests of Croatian peasants." Sabrina Ramet, "Vladko Maček and Croatian History: An Introduction," *Contemporary European History* 16, no. 2 (May 2007): 200.
59. Biondich, "Vladko Maček," 206–212.
60. For a discussion of the longer relationship between Maček and the Ustaše, see Biondich, "Vladko Maček," 203–213.

61. Branka Boban, "Vladko Maček u emigraciji—od izlaska iz zemlje do odlaska u SAD," *Institute of Croatian History, RADOVI—Zavod za hrvatsku povijest* 39, no. 1 (October 2007): 243–258.
62. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 69.
63. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 65–69.
64. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 5197/55. "Die Verhandlungen zwischen Dr. Vlatko [*sic*] Maček und Tito" (December 16, 1955), 2.
65. PAAA, Bestand B11, Band 1227, Dok.: 1155/55. "Aus der kroatischen Emigration (Berichtszeit März–Juni 1955)" (July 12, 1955), 1.
66. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 5197/55. "Die Verhandlungen zwischen Dr. Vlatko [*sic*] Maček und Tito" (December 16, 1955), 1–3.
67. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 5197/55. "Die Verhandlungen zwischen Dr. Vlatko [*sic*] Maček und Tito" (December 16, 1955), 3.
68. Maček for his part believed that Tito's regime was on the verge of collapse and feared that in the chaos following the dissolution of the country that Serbs in many parts of Croatia would exact revenge on the Croatian population for the crimes perpetrated by the NDH. Maček hoped that the return of large numbers of anti-Ustaša HSS supporters would have a mollifying effect on ethnic relations in Croatia. Tito, meanwhile, believed that a return of HSS supporters would help dampen growing unrest among Croats in Yugoslavia. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 5197/55. "Die Verhandlungen zwischen Dr. Vlatko [*sic*] Maček und Tito" (December 16, 1955), 1–2.
69. Maček himself was proud of his non-committal stance towards Yugoslavia's existence. As he stated in an open letter published in a book by the Argentine-Croat publicist Vlaho Raić, "I am so careful that I have never once during my period in the emigration spoken in favor of the preservation of Yugoslavia nor for its destruction." PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956). p.66. For the entire letter, see: Vlaho A. Raić, *Hrvatska i Srbija Prilog Sredjenju Podunavsko-jadransko-balkanskog Sektora* (Buenos Aires: Pišćeva Naklada, 1953).
70. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 9.
71. NARA. CIA. "Activities of Ustasha and Croatian Peasant Party Representatives in London" (February 5, 1947), 1.
72. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 441/63. "Übersicht über die Organisationen der Emigranten aus Jugoslawien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Stand: 31. Dezember 1962)," 13–14.
73. NARA. CIA. "Yugoslavia/Argentina, Ustasha Activity Abroad" (October 2, 1951), 1.
74. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 78.

75. This topic will be explored at length in chapter 3.
76. NARA. CIA. "Argentina/Yugoslavia, Current Activities of Ante Pavelic" (April 25, 1951), 1–2.
77. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 441/63. "Übersicht über die Organisationen der Emigranten aus Jugoslawien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Stand: 31. Dezember 1962)," 14.
78. NAA. Series A432, Control Symbol 1983/5332, Item: 8209206. Doc.: "Dr. Branko JELIC. Proposed Visit to Australia (20 April, 1971)," 3.
79. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 81–85.
80. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1702/56. "Das Grundsatzprogramm des Kroatischen National-Komitees und die Stellungnahmen der übrigen Exilgruppen" (December 8, 1956), 2.
81. As one Australian report stated: "In the years immediately following World War II, a considerable number of Croatian intellectuals and dissident former Ustasha members reached the conclusion that Dr. Ante PAVELIC . . . by virtue of his unsavoury reputation gained as the Poglavnik (leader) of the Independent Croatian State (NDH) during the period 1941–45, was doing more harm than good for the postwar Croatian cause." NAA. Series A432, Control Symbol 1983/5332, Item: 8209206. Doc.: "Dr. Branko JELIC. Proposed Visit to Australia (20 April, 1971)," 3.
82. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 304/81. "Machtkämpfe in der kroatischen Emigration" (January 8, 1958), 1.
83. PAAA, Bestand B11, Band 1227, Dok.: 1155/55. "Aus der kroatischen Emigration (Berichtszeit März–Juni 1955)" (July 12, 1955), 4.
84. For an overview of the relationship between religion and nation in Ustaša ideology, see Mark Biondich, "Religion and Nation in Wartime Croatia: Reflections on the Ustaša Policy of Forced Religious Conversions, 1941–1942," *Slavonic and East European Review* 83, no. 1 (January 2005): 71–116.
85. PAAA, Bestand B11, Band 1227, Dok.: 1155/55. "Aus der kroatischen Emigration (Berichtszeit März–Juni 1955)" (July 12, 1955), 4.
86. NAA. Series A6122 (A6122/2), Control Symbol 311, Item 12500624, Doc.: "Croat Activities (23rd April 1953)," 1–2.
87. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 985/56. "Aus der kroatischen Emigration, Mai–Juni 1956, Nachtrag April 1956" (July 14, 1956), 5–6.
88. NAA. Series A6122 (A6122/2), Control Symbol 313, Item 279236, Doc.: "Section Officer "B" Western Australia. 1. USTACHI Movement. 2. Croatian Welfare Assocation [*sic*]" (January 27, 1953), 1.
89. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 304/81. "Machtkämpfe in der kroatischen Emigration" (January 8, 1958), 1.
90. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 985/56. "Aus der kroatischen Emigration, Mai–Juni 1956, Nachtrag April 1956" (July 14, 1956), 6.
91. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 304/81. "Machtkämpfe in der kroatischen Emigration" (January 8, 1958), 1.

92. NARA. CIA. "Yugoslavia/Argentina, Ustasha Activity Abroad" (October 2, 1951), 2.
93. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 74.
94. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 441/63. "Übersicht über die Organisationen der Emigranten aus Jugoslawien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Stand: 31. Dezember 1962)," 35.
95. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 441/63. "Übersicht über die Organisationen der Emigranten aus Jugoslawien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Stand: 31. Dezember 1962)," 35.
96. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.13, Doc.: no. 10/71. "The Croatian National Resistance (HNO)—Recent Developments" April 2, 1971, 1.
97. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 441/63. "Übersicht über die Organisationen der Emigranten aus Jugoslawien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Stand: 31. Dezember 1962)," 35.
98. NARA. CIA. "Yugoslavia/Argentina, Ustasha Activity Abroad" (October 2, 1951), 2.
99. NARA. CIA. "Yugoslavia/Argentina, Ustasha Activity Abroad" (October 2, 1951), 2.
100. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1308/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen im Ustaschen-Lager (Kroatische Emigration Juli–August 1956)" (September 14, 1956), 2.
101. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1308/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen im Ustaschen-Lager (Kroatische Emigration Juli–August 1956)" (September 14, 1956), 2.
102. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1308/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen im Ustaschen-Lager (Kroatische Emigration Juli–August 1956)" (September 14, 1956), 2–3.
103. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1308/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen im Ustaschen-Lager (Kroatische Emigration Juli–August 1956)" (September 14, 1956), 3.
104. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 75.
105. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1308/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen im Ustaschen-Lager (Kroatische Emigration Juli–August 1956)" (September 14, 1956), 6.
106. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 153/56: "Aus der kroatischen Emigration, Dezember/Januar 1955/56" (February 3, 1956), 1–2.
107. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 20–18–1–5, Part 5, Doc.: "Berislav Djuro Dezelić: Comments on Agreement Pavelić-Stojadinović," 1–2.
108. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 93.
109. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 20–18–1–5, Part 5, Doc.: "Berislav Djuro Dezelić: Comments on Agreement Pavelić–Stojadinović," 1.
110. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 5006/55. "Aus der kroatischen Emigration (Berichtszeit 1. September bis 30. November 1955)," 8.

111. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1308/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen im Ustaschen-Lager (Kroatische Emigration Juli–August 1956)" (September 14, 1956), 7.
112. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 75–76.
113. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 5006/55. "Aus der kroatischen Emigration (Berichtszeit 1. September bis 30. November 1955)," 8.
114. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 5006/55. "Aus der kroatischen Emigration (Berichtszeit 1. September bis 30. November 1955)," 5.
115. PAAA, Bestand B11, Band 1227, Dok.: 1155/55. "Aus der kroatischen Emigration (Berichtszeit März–Juni 1955)" (July 12, 1955), 9.
116. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.13, Doc.: no. 10/71. "The Croatian National Resistance (HNO)—Recent Developments" April 2, 1971, 1.
117. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.13, Doc.: no. 10/71. "The Croatian National Resistance (HNO)—Recent Developments" April 2, 1971, 1.
118. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1308/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen im Ustaschen-Lager (Kroatische Emigration Juli–August 1956)" (September 14, 1956), 4–5.
119. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 5006/55. "Aus der kroatischen Emigration (Berichtszeit 1. September bis 30. November 1955)," 5–6.
120. NAA. Series A6122 (A6122/2), Control Symbol 303, Item 12500627, Doc.: "To all those who belong to the Resistance."
121. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 5006/55. "Aus der kroatischen Emigration (Berichtszeit 1. September bis 30. November 1955)," 8–9.
122. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 153/56. "Aus der kroatischen Emigration, Dezember/Januar 1955/56" (February 3, 1956), 3.

Chapter 2: In Contradiction to Sociopolitical Norms, 1956–1960

1. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1308/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen im Ustaschen-Lager" (September 14, 1956), 1.
2. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 678/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen in der kroatischen Emigration" (June 4, 1956), 1–4.
3. PAAA. Bestand B11, Band 1227, Dok.: 113/55. "Heimat und Emigration: Kroatische Emigranten von 1954 und 1945," 5.
4. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 5006/55. "Aus der kroatischen Emigration–1.9 bis 30.11 1955," 6.
5. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1308/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen im Ustaschen-Lager" (September 14, 1956), 8–9. For another example, see PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 816/59. "Die kroatische politische Emigration in Westdeutschland" (September 18, 1959), 20.
6. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1308/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen im Ustaschen-Lager" (September 14, 1956), 8–9.

7. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1308/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen im Ustaschen-Lager" (September 14, 1956), 8–9.
8. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 678/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen in der kroatischen Emigration" (June 4, 1956), 1.
9. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1308/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen im Ustaschen-Lager" (September 14, 1956), 1.
10. Celebrating April 10, the anniversary of the NDH's establishment in 1941, became a central part of Croatian political life in the diaspora for much of the Cold War period. This was true for both supporters and detractors of Ante Pavelić. For opponents of Pavelić and the postwar remnants of the Ustaše, the date became "de-historicized"—that is, it became simply a symbol of the Croatian quest for independence and in no way associated with the Ustaše, NDH, or Axis Powers. For example, in announcing a celebration of "the Day of Croatian Statehood" in Toronto in 1973, the city's Coordinating Committee of Croatians stated: "This celebration will be in the all-embracing Croatian spirit as it corresponds to historical facts, and not the way it was practiced in the past." LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 20–18–1–5, Part 8, Doc.: "Celebration of the Day of Croatian Statehood" (March 30, 1973), 1–2. In a related note, Ronald Reagan declared April 10 to be "Independent Croatia Day" while governor of California, although he later rescinded the resolution under pressure from the Yugoslav government.
11. Srećko Rover, *Otvoreno Pismo: Urednictvu srbo-jugoslavenskih novina "SLOGA" Perth*, (Sydney: Medjudružtveni odbor hrvatskih društava u Australiji i Novom Zealandu, 1955), 1. The irony of this sentiment needs no comment.
12. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.6, Doc.: "A.S.I.O. Position Paper on the Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood, Command of the Croatian Liberation Movement and Croatian Youth" (October 1, 1967), 4.
13. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 688/59. "Kroatische Befreiungsbewegung" (July 31, 1959), 1.
14. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: 74/62. "'Kroatische Befreiungsbewegung in Europa' (HOP)" (January 12, 1962), 1.
15. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.1, Doc.: "Poslovnik Hrvatskog oslobodilačkog pokreta—Constitution of the Croatian Liberation Movement," 1.
16. This is reflected in the introduction to a report on the HOP by West German authorities, which stated: "In the strictest sense, only the Croatian Liberation Movement founded by Dr. Ante Pavelić in June 1956 can be referred to as the 'Ustaša.'" PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 441/63. "Übersicht über die Organisationen der Emigranten aus Jugoslawien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Stand: 31. Dezember 1962)," 4–5.
17. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.6, Doc.: "A.S.I.O. Position Paper on the Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood, Command of the Croatian Liberation Movement and Croatian Youth" (October 1, 1967), 6.

18. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.1, Doc.: "Poslovnik Hrvatskog oslobodilačkog pokreta–Constitution of the Croatian Liberation Movement," 2.
19. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.6, Doc.: "A.S.I.O. Position Paper on the Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood, Command of the Croatian Liberation Movement and Croatian Youth" (October 1, 1967), 6.
20. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 441/63. "Übersicht über die Organisationen der Emigranten aus Jugoslawien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Stand: 31. Dezember 1962)," 6–7.
21. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 688/59. "Kroatische Befreiungsbewegung" (July 31, 1959), 1–5. Note that while the United Croats of West Germany supported Pavelić, the similarly named United American Croats (UAH; Ujedinjeni američki Hrvati) had as its vice president Rudolf Erić and belonged to the camp of Luburić and Otpor. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 684/56. "Die jugoslawische Emigration von 1914 bis zur Gegenwart, 1956" (June 20, 1956), 79–80.
22. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 688/59. "Kroatische Befreiungsbewegung" (July 31, 1959), 1–5.
23. The Central Committee of Argentina, meanwhile, had thirty-one groups under its umbrella. The United States and Canadian Central Committees had a combined total of twenty-six groups. NAA. Series A1209 (A1209/66), Control Symbol 1972/6769, Item 12068600, Doc.: "Yugoslavs in Australia, May, 1964: Paper 3. Croatian Liberation Movement (Hrvatski Oslobodilački Pokret) H.O.P.," 2–4.
24. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 688/59. "Kroatische Befreiungsbewegung" (July 31, 1959), 1.
25. Tihomir-Tiho Burzanović, *Dva metka za Pavelića: knjiga o Blagoju Jovoviću* (Bijelo Polje: Pegaz, 2002).
26. Burzanović, *Dva metka za Pavelića*, 42.
27. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 430/57. "Ein Revolveranschlag auf Ante Pavelic" (April 18, 1957), 1.
28. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 485/57. "Auslieferung des früheren kroatischen Staatschefs Ante Pavelić an Jugoslawien" (April 30, 1957), 1–6. In 1951—when Yugoslavia first sought Pavelić's surrender—Argentina was still ruled by Perón. After the removal of Perón as a result of the 1955 military coup, the Argentinian government was less keen on harboring former fascists, leading it to be much more amenable to Yugoslavia's request.
29. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 492/57. "Um die Auslieferung von Ante Pavelic" (April 29, 1957), 1–2.
30. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.6, Doc.: "A.S.I.O. Position Paper on the Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood, Command of the Croatian Liberation Movement and Croatian Youth" (October 1, 1967), 4, and PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 688/59. "Kroatische Befreiungsbewegung" (July 31, 1959), 2.

31. Hrvoje Matković, *Povijest Nezavisne Države Hrvatske* (Zagreb: Naklada P.I.P. Pavičić, 2002), 98–99.
32. Matković, *Povijest Nezavisne Države Hrvatske*, 99.
33. Matković, *Povijest Nezavisne Države Hrvatske*, 99.
34. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: 504/61. "Die Entwicklung der Emigration aus Jugoslawien" (May 8, 1961), 17–19.
35. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 441/63. "Übersicht über die Organisationen der Emigranten aus Jugoslawien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Stand: 31. Dezember 1962)," 31.
36. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 441/63. "Übersicht über die Organisationen der Emigranten aus Jugoslawien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Stand: 31. Dezember 1962)," 35.
37. PAAA. Bestand B121, Band 105803, Dok.: "Auswertung der Jugoslavischen Exilpresse für Dezember 1960," 3.
38. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 441/63. "Übersicht über die Organisationen der Emigranten aus Jugoslawien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Stand: 31. Dezember 1962)," 14.
39. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 816/59. "Die kroatische politische Emigration in Westdeutschland" (September 18, 1959), 12.
40. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 441/63. "Übersicht über die Organisationen der Emigranten aus Jugoslawien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Stand: 31. Dezember 1962)," 17.
41. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 816/59: "Die kroatische politische Emigration in Westdeutschland" (September 18, 1959), 16. Beyond the Ustaša gold issue, Draganović "was often accused of intrigues, [including] countless contacts with all manner of intelligence agencies and secret operatives of all types (without which, to be sure, Draganović would not have been able to perform many of the feats ascribed to him, especially after World War II); he was also often faulted for aspiring to place under his supervision the widest possible circle of people and the largest sums of money." Tomislav Jonjić, "Review of *Krunoslav Draganović—Iskazi komunističkim istražiteljima*, by Miroslav Akmadža," *Review of Croatian History* 6, no. 1 (2010): 254.
42. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 816/59. "Die kroatische politische Emigration in Westdeutschland" (September 18, 1959), 17–18.
43. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 816/59. "Die kroatische politische Emigration in Westdeutschland" (September 18, 1959), 18.
44. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 816/59. "Die kroatische politische Emigration in Westdeutschland" (September 18, 1959), 17.
45. NARA. Nazi War Crimes and Japanese Imperial Government Records Interagency Working Group, News Release: "Opening of CIA Records under Nazi War Crimes Disclosure Act" (May 8, 2002), 1. While it is likely that Draganović had contact with Western (particularly American and British) intelligence officers during the ratlines, he was directly employed by US Army Intelligence only from 1959 to 1962. Draganović's tenure as an agent lasted just three years because, as

explained in the aforementioned news release, his "CIA file shows the Agency's skepticism regarding Draganović's reliability—skepticism that resulted in the termination of his employment with the U.S. Army."

46. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 816/59. "Die kroatische politische Emigration in Westdeutschland" (September 18, 1959), 13.
47. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 816/59. "Die kroatische politische Emigration in Westdeutschland" (September 18, 1959), 13.
48. NAA. Series A432, Control Symbol 1983/5332, Item: 8209206, Doc.: "Dr. Branko JELIC. Proposed Visit to Australia (20 April 1971)," 3–4.
49. NAA. Series A432, Control Symbol 1983/5332, Item: 8209206, Doc.: "Dr. Branko JELIC. Proposed Visit to Australia (20 April 1971)," 3.
50. NAA. Series A432, Control Symbol 1983/5332, Item: 8209206, Doc.: "Dr. Branko JELIC. Proposed Visit to Australia (20 April 1971)," 3.
51. PAAA. Bestand B121, Band 105803, Dok.: "Auswertung der Jugoslavischen Exilpresse für Dezember 1960," 3.
52. For a detailed blow-by-blow of the salacious clash between Jelić and the Frković/Buć clique, see PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 467/63. "Die Situation in der kroatischen Emigration" (23 April 1963), 1–11.
53. Bundesarchiv (hereafter BA). Bestand 206, Band 1110, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (April 10, 1974), 46.
54. In the mid-1970s, the idea of an overarching assembly of émigré Croatian parties was revived with considerably more success, if not necessarily more effectiveness. The first meeting of the refashioned and generally more moderate HNV took place in Toronto in February 1974. The council continued to meet with reasonable regularity up through to the first democratic elections in Croatia in 1990.
55. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 467/63. "Die Situation in der kroatischen Emigration" (April 23, 1963), 3.
56. For Ciliga's most important works, see *Au pays du grand mensonge*, trans. A. Gourevitch (Paris: Gallimard, 1938), and *The Russian Enigma*, trans. Fernand G. Renier and Anne Cliff (London: Labour, 1940). On Ciliga's relationship to Trotskyism, see Michael S. Fox, "Ante Ciliga, Trotskii, and State Capitalism: Theory, Tactics, and Reevaluation during the Purge Era, 1935–1939," *Slavic Review* 50, no. 1 (Spring 1991): 127–43. For Ciliga's role in the NDH and Croatian nationalist views of communism, see Nada Kisić Kolanović, "Komunizam u percepciji hrvatske nacionalističke inteligencije 1938–1945. Godine," Časopis za suvremenu povijest 43, no. 1 (May 2011): 131–34.
57. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 441/63. "Übersicht über die Organisationen der Emigranten aus Jugoslawien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Stand: 31. Dezember 1962)," 20.
58. Ciliga's most important work in the postwar period was his memoir *Sam kroz Europu u ratu* (*Through Europe Alone during the War*). This book played an important role in the eventual breakup of socialist Yugoslavia, as Ciliga's discussion of his time in the Jasenovac concentration camp served as an important source for the future Croatian president Franjo Tuđman's highly controversial book *Bespuća*

povijesne zbiljnosti (*The Horrors of War*). In particular, Tuđman repeated many of Ciliga's most problematic claims about the actions and attitudes of Jewish prisoners in the camp. For the connection between Ciliga and Tuđman and their assertions regarding Jews, see Ivo Goldstein and Slavko Goldstein, "Revisionism in Croatia: The Case of Franjo Tuđman," *East European Jewish Affairs* 32, no. 1 (Summer 2002): 60–62.

59. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 441/63. "Übersicht über die Organisationen der Emigranten aus Jugoslawien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Stand: 31. Dezember 1962)," 20.
60. As will be explored in chapter 4, the Yugoslav regime did indeed engage both in such abductions and political assassinations.
61. NARA. RG 59, Box 2841 (1967–69), Folder: Pol 2–1 – 8/1/67, Doc.: A–353. "Airgram: Joint Weeka [*sic*] No. 46" (November 21, 1967), 2.
62. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1093, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (October 30, 1967), 67–68.
63. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1098, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (December 5, 1972), 66–67.
64. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1097, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (February 5, 1971), 58–59.
65. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1097, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (February 5, 1971), 58.
66. An extenuating circumstance contributing to the timing of Varoš's move back "home" was undoubtedly his declining health. Varoš died in December 1971, just eleven months after returning to socialist Yugoslavia.
67. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1308/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen im Ustaschen-Lager (Kroatische Emigration Juli–August 1956)" (September 14, 1956), 1–2.
68. Even the ostensibly "moderate" Jelić, for instance, was forced to declare that in the HNO "we are all adherents of the domobran-Ustaša movement" in 1960 following the split with Miroslav Varoš and Krunoslav Draganović. PAAA. Bestand B121, Band 105803, Dok.: "Auswertung der Jugoslawischen Exilpresse für Dezember 1960," 2.
69. William Zimmerman, *Open Borders, Nonalignment, and the Political Evolution of Yugoslavia* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987), 96. For a full discussion of unemployment in socialist Yugoslavia, see Susan Woodward, *Socialist Unemployment: The Political Economy of Socialist Yugoslavia, 1945–1991* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995).
70. Zimmerman, *Open Borders*, 95.
71. Milan Mesić, *Vanjske migracije i društveni razvitak* (Zagreb: Institut za migracije i narodnosti Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 1991), 13.
72. Of course, the introduction of workers' self-management in 1950 distinguished socialist Yugoslavia from those countries within the Soviet sphere of influence. For more on workers' self-management and Yugoslavia's economic policies, see Woodward, *Socialist Unemployment* as well as Olivera Milosavljević, "Država

i samoupravljanje: 1949–1956" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Belgrade, 1987). For a recent reappraisal of the origins of workers' self-management, see Vladimir Unkovski-Korica, "Workers' Councils in the Service of the Market: New Archival Evidence on the Origins of Self-Management in Yugoslavia, 1948–1950," *Europe-Asia Studies* 66, no. 1 (January 2014): 108–34.

73. Zimmerman, *Open Borders*, 74.
74. Ivo Baučić, "Stanje vanjskih migracija iz Jugoslavije krajem sedamdesetih godina," *Rasprave o migracijama*, no. 57 (Zagreb: Centar za istraživanje migracije, 1979), 7.
75. *Ekonomska politika* (February 24, 1969). Quoted in Zimmerman, *Open Borders*, 74.
76. For an unreticent assertion of this point, see John Lampe, *Yugoslavia as History: Twice There Was a Country* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 265.
77. Radina Vučetić, *Coca-Cola Socialism: Americanization of Yugoslav Culture in the Sixties* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2018), and Patrick Hyder Patterson, *Bought and Sold: Living and Losing the Good Life in Socialist Yugoslavia* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011).
78. On the relationship between the Yugoslav government and the Catholic Church, see Stella Alexander, *Church and State in Yugoslavia since 1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979); chapter 6 of Sabrina Ramet, *Nihil Obstat: Religion, Politics, and Social Change in East-Central Europe and Russia* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998); Pedro Ramet, "The Catholic Church in Yugoslavia, 1945–1989," in *Catholicism and Politics in Communist Societies: Christianity under Stress*, vol. 2, (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990); Jure Krišto, "Catholicism among Croats and Its Critique by Marxists," in *Religion and Nationalism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union*, ed. Dennis J. Dunn (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1987); and Vjekoslav Perica, "Interfaith Dialogue versus Recent Hatred: Serbian Orthodoxy and Croatian Catholicism from the Second Vatican Council to the Yugoslav War, 1965–1992," *Religion, State and Society* 29, no. 1 (March 2001).
79. It is important to note that the most severe political persecutions in the period from 1948 to 1956 targeted party members charged with siding with Cominform against Tito in the Yugoslav leader's conflict with Stalin.
80. NARA. RG 59, Box 3032 (1964–66), Folder: Pol 11 Nationalism–1/1/64, Doc.: "Croatian and Slovenian Nationalism" (March 15, 1966), 2.
81. As important as politics and economics were in contributing to this migration, other factors contributed to the fact that Croats and Slovenes migrated at a much higher rate than those from other parts of Yugoslavia, including the fact that both Croatia and Slovenia had much longer traditions of foreign migration and therefore more established networks to facilitate such movement.
82. Savezni zavod za statistiku, "Lica na privremenom radu u inostranstvu: prema popisu stanovništva i stanova 1971," *Statistički Bilten*, no. 679 (1971): 9. During this same period, Slovenes were equally disproportionately represented among

those leaving the country. Although only 8 percent of the country's population, Slovenes comprised on average 13 percent of emigrants in any given year.

83. For a discussion from the perspective of West German authorities, see PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1007, Dok.: 1003/65. "Probleme der jugoslawischen Gastarbeiter: Wirtschaftsreform und Arbeitslosigkeit–Devisen und politische Infektion" (October 1, 1965), 2–4.
84. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 999, "Probleme der jugoslawische Jugenderziehung" (January 28, 1959), 1.
85. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1007, Dok.: 1003/65. "Probleme der jugoslawischen Gastarbeiter: Wirtschaftsreform und Arbeitslosigkeit–Devisen und politische Infektion" (October 1, 1965), 3.
86. Zimmerman, *Open Borders*, 87–89.
87. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1007, Dok.: 1003/65. "Probleme der jugoslawischen Gastarbeiter: Wirtschaftsreform und Arbeitslosigkeit–Devisen und politische Infektion" (October 1, 1965), 3. As will be explored in the next chapter, many extremist Croats in the diaspora viewed the high rate of emigration among Croats to be part of a conscious policy pursued by Belgrade to bring about the "biological destruction" of the Croatian nation within Yugoslavia.
88. *Uradni list SFRJ*, 12/156 (March 21, 1962). In addition to affecting 150,000 individuals abroad, the amnesty led to the release of 1,000 political prisoners within Yugoslavia itself. For an extensive analysis of the law by the British embassy in Belgrade, including its aim in bringing recent emigrants back into the fold, see TNA. FO 371/163964, Doc.: CY1821/4. "Despatch no. 38, British Embassy, Belgrade" (March 21, 1962), 1–11. As for the effectiveness of the amnesty, *Tanjug*—the official press agency of socialist Yugoslavia—claimed that 25,000 people took advantage of the offer made the by regime. The undersecretary of the Interior Ministry Svetislav Stedanović, meanwhile, put the number at 50,000. The émigré press, by contrast, asserted the true number to be just 369. BA. Bestand 206, Band 1088, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (March 20, 1963), 29–30.
89. The Hallstein Doctrine was a central pillar of early postwar West German foreign policy. Named after the West German Foreign Minister Walter Hallstein, the doctrine's premise was that there was only one German state—the Federal Republic—and that any country that legitimized the existence of the German Democratic Republic would have its relations with Bonn terminated. The first country against which this doctrine was applied was socialist Yugoslavia, which established diplomatic relations with East Berlin in October 1957. Bonn and Belgrade would reestablish relations again only in 1968. For a brief background of the severing of relations between West Germany and socialist Yugoslavia, see Kaja Shonick, "Politics, Culture, and Economics: Reassessing the West German Guest Worker Agreement with Yugoslavia," *Journal of Contemporary History* 44, no. 4 (October 2009): 723–25.
90. Karen Schönwälder, "Assigning the State Its Rightful Place? Migration, Integration, and the State in Germany," in *Paths of Integration: Migrants in Western Europe (1880–2004)*, ed. Leo Lucassen et al. (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006), 85.

91. NAA. Series A1838/2, Control Symbol 1520/13/16 Part I, Item 554644, Doc.: "New South Wales Police Department; Subject: Activities of Croation [*sic*] and Yugoslav Community" (September 10, 1964), 1.
92. NARA. RG 59, Box 4151 (1963), Folder: Pol 25 Demonstrations, Protests, Riots (2/1/63), Doc.: "Activities of the Ustashi Terrorist Organizations," 11.
93. NARA. RG 59, Box 4151 (1963), Folder: Pol 25 Demonstrations, Protests, Riots (2/1/63), Doc.: "Activities of the Ustashi Terrorist Organizations," 10.
94. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5, Doc.: "'The Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood'; Hrvatsko Revolucionarno Bratstvo—H.R.B. (Position Paper as at 1st May, 1967)," 8.
95. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: "Die Auseinandersetzungen in der kroatischen Emigration" (no document number or date given, summer 1956), 2–4.
96. As one Australian report on the problem of Southern Slav emigrants to the country noted: "The major cause of trouble appears to be the numbers of young men who have left Yugoslavia during the postwar period and who were of the age group, fourteen years to twenty years, at the time of their departure from their native country. On arrival in this country they have been domiciled in migrant camps and subsequently in development projects, such as the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Scheme and the larger industrial undertakings, such as the Australian Iron and Steel Works. In these circumstances they have lived in hostel or community accommodation. Their associates have been persons of their own language and national groupings. . . . Organisations cater for migrants of the various religious persuasions and in addition other organisations cater for the various political factions." NAA. Series A1838/2, Control Symbol 1520/13/16 Part I, Item 554644, Doc.: "New South Wales Police Department; Subject: Activities of Croation [*sic*] and Yugoslav Community" (September 10, 1964), 1.
97. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 999, Dok.: 747/62. "Probleme der jugoslawischen Gastarbeiter" (October 9, 1962), 2.
98. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 999, Dok.: 747/62. "Probleme der jugoslawischen Gastarbeiter" (October 9, 1962), 2.
99. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: "Die Auseinandersetzungen in der kroatischen Emigration" (no document number or date given, summer 1956), 3.
100. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 101, Dok.: "Der Leitende Oberstaatsanwalt bei dem Landgericht Dortmund: Anlageschrift" (August 20, 1963), 8.
101. PAAA. Bestand B12, Band 588, Dok.: "Aide Memoire from Yugoslavia to the FRG" (May 6, 1960), 3.
102. NARA. RG 59, Box 4151 (1963), Folder: Pol 25 Demonstrations, Protests, Riots (2/1/63), Doc.: "Activities of the Ustashi Terrorist Organizations," 10. See also NAA. Series A1838/2, Control Symbol 1520/13/16 Part I, Item 554644. Doc.: "Croatians" (June 19, 1964), 1–2.
103. *Spremnost*, January–February 1963, 1.

104. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.15A, Doc.: "Extract from Commonwealth Police Report of 20 October 1972 United Croats of West Germany," 3.
105. NARA. RG 59, Box 4151 (1963), Folder: Pol 25 Demonstrations, Protests, Riots (2/1/63), Doc.: "Activities of the Ustashi Terrorist Organizations," 10.
106. BA. Bestand B106, Band 28217, Dok.: 689/70. "Kroatische Emigration: Stellungnahme zur Panoramasendung der ARD vom 4.5.1970" (May 25, 1970). Appendix: "Auszug aus der Panorama-Sendung vom 4.5.1970," 1–6.
107. NARA. RG 59, Box 4151 (1963), Folder: Pol 25 Demonstrations, Protests, Riots (2/1/63), Doc.: "Activities of the Ustashi Terrorist Organizations," 11.
108. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1007, Dok.: 1003/65. "Probleme der jugoslawischen Gastarbeiter: Wirtschaftsreform und Arbeitslosigkeit–Devisen und politische Infektion" (October 1, 1965), 1–15.
109. NAA. Series A1838/2, Control Symbol 1520/13/16 Part I, Item 554644, Doc.: "New South Wales Police Department; Subject: Activities of Croation [*sic*] and Yugoslav Community" (September 10, 1964), 1.
110. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: 504/61. "Die Entwicklung der Emigration aus Jugoslawien" (May 8, 1961), 17–19.

Chapter 3: The Facts as They Exist, 1960–1962

1. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: 504/61. "Die Entwicklung der Emigration aus Jugoslawien" (May 8, 1961), 17–19.
2. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: 1222/61. "Die kroatischen Exil–Ustaschen: Nationalistischer Extremismus und kommunistische Unterwanderung/ Zum Stuttgarter Zwischenfall" (December 1, 1961), 5.
3. BA. Bestand 119, Band 3027, Dok.: "Probleme der jugoslawischen Gastarbeiter: Politisches Desinteresse—Titoistische Infiltrationsversuche" (October 9, 1961), 2.
4. BA. Bestand B106, Band 28217, Dok.: 689/70. "Kroatische Emigration: Stellungnahme zur Panoramasendung der ARD vom 4.5.1970; Appendix: "Auszug aus der Panorama-Sendung vom 4.5.1970" (May 25, 1970), 1.
5. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5, Doc.: "'The Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood'; Hrvatsko Revolucionarno Bratstvo—H.R.B. (Position Paper as at 1st May, 1967)," 1.
6. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5, Doc.: "'The Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood'; Hrvatsko Revolucionarno Bratstvo—H.R.B. (Position Paper as at 1st May, 1967)," 1.
7. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: 504/61. "Die Entwicklung der Emigration aus Jugoslawien" (May 8, 1961), 17–18. Quoting: *Nova Hrvatska* [London], nos. 8 and 12, 1960.
8. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: 504/61. "Die Entwicklung der Emigration aus Jugoslawien" (May 8, 1961), 17–18. Quoting: *Nova Hrvatska* [London], nos. 8 and 12, 1960.

9. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: 504/61. "Die Entwicklung der Emigration aus Jugoslawien" (May 8, 1961), 17–18. Quoting: *Nova Hrvatska* [London], nos. 8 and 12, 1960.
10. The oldest of the founders was thirty and the youngest was twenty-three, all too young to have been active participants in the war. The four founding "conspirators"—as the Australian Commonwealth Police Force called them—were Jure Marić (twenty-nine), Geza Pašti (twenty-seven), Josip Oblak (twenty-three), and Ilija Tolić (thirty). PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.7, Doc.: "Commonwealth Police Crime Intelligence: The Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood. Hrvatska [*sic*] Revolucionarno Bratstvo," 3.
11. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5/D, Doc.: "Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood Committee Area No. 4: Letter from Supreme Headquarters to Revolutionaries in this Committee Area" (July 15, 1964), 1.
12. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5/D, Doc.: "Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood Committee Area No. 4: Letter from Supreme Headquarters to Revolutionaries in this Committee Area" (July 15, 1964), 1.
13. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5/D, Doc.: "Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood Committee Area No. 4: Letter from Supreme Headquarters to Revolutionaries in this Committee Area" (July 15, 1964), 1–2.
14. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5/D, Doc.: "Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood Committee Area No. 4: Letter from Supreme Headquarters to Revolutionaries in this Committee Area" (July 15, 1964), 1.
15. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: Exhibit 30. "Cr(oatian) Rev(olution) and Its Preparations," 4.
16. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: Exhibit 30. "Cr(oatian) Rev(olution) and Its Preparations," 3.
17. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: Exhibit 000132, 1.
18. The *Pacta Conventa* is a supposed agreement between the Croatian nobility and the Hungarian royal house that brought the two crowns into a common state following the Hungarians' defeat of Croatian forces. Historians continue to debate not only the circumstances under which the *Pacta Conventa* was signed but whether the document itself is a fourteenth-century forgery. See Bellamy, *Formation of Croatian National Identity*, 37, and John van Antwerp Fine, *When Ethnicity Did Not Matter in the Balkans: A Study of Identity in Pre-Nationalist Croatia, Dalmatia, and Slavonia in the Medieval and Early-Modern Periods* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006), 67–71.
19. To wit: "Every one of our past political leaders has been vainly seeking friendship from the West Bloc countries. This is a policy that we Croats have been pursuing

for many centuries, and the result of this one-sided policy has been that the only outstanding feature of our national annals is the fact that we have always belonged to a State in partnership with other nations and that our status in the partnership was consistently inferior to anybody else's." PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: Exhibit 000132, 1.

20. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix C.10, Doc.: "Curse," 1–2.
21. *Drina*, June 6, 1968.
22. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix C.10, Doc.: "Curse," 1.
23. As explained by HRB radicals: "The Hungarian revolution can never be considered as a pattern as far as the Croatian revolution is concerned, except as a demonstration of how not to organize, and as a lesson of what happens to a spontaneous uprising which, apart from its underlying cause of any rebellion, has no established direction or goal." PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix C.10, Doc.: "Curse," 2.
24. Apostol Plemić (Adolf Andrić). *Osvetnici Bleiburga: "Priručnik" za vođenje Hrvatske gerile* (Drugo izdanje: Osvetnici Bugojna, 1974), 29.
25. The comparison of the Croatian struggle with other postcolonial efforts at gaining national self-determination was not limited to the most radical groups. As Jelić's HNO declared in a December 1962 meeting: "We demand that those principles applicable to the Algerians and other African and Asiatic peoples fighting for their freedom should also apply to the old Croatian European people." TNA. FO 371/169665, Doc.: CY41821/6 (A). "Rough Translation—Declaration" (January 25, 1963).
26. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: Exhibit 30. "Cr(oatian) Rev(olution) and Its Preparations," 4.
27. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix C.10, Doc.: "Curse," 4.
28. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix C.10, Doc.: "Curse," 3.
29. *Obrana*, January 1973.
30. ANZ. ABHS, 950, Acc W4627. Box 4123, 275/2/1 Part 6. Doc.: "The Canadian Croatian Federation," 1.
31. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix C.10, Doc.: "Curse," 3.
32. For a general discussion of the place of Bleiburg in Croatian political discourse, see Kolstø, "Bleiburg," 1153–1174.
33. Bruno Busić, *Jedino Hrvatska! Sabrano spisi* (Toronto: ZIRAL, 1983), 134.
34. For an English-language discussion of émigré discourses surrounding the number of Bleiburg victims, the political implications of this discourse, and the relationship among discourses related to Bleiburg and Jasenovac, see chapter 6 of MacDonald, *Balkan Holocausts*.
35. George J. Prpic, *Tragedies and Migrations in Croatian History* (Toronto: Hrvatski Put, 1973), 5.

36. Prpic, *Tragedies and Migrations in Croatian History*, 24.
37. Similarly, drawing further comparisons between the Croats' plight under the communists and that of the Jews during World War II: "Yugoslavia in any shape or form, especially the communist brand of it, is a dungeon and graveyard of the Croatian people. To put it more vividly, it is one huge concentration camp into which our people have been herded against their express and explicit will. Every one of us is a witness of the hair-raising and grisly spectacles that have been enacted throughout our beloved, soaked-in-blood, Country. We have witnessed the innumerable crimes committed by the Serbo-communist partisans, the OZNA and the UDBA in every Croatian region." PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.7, Doc.: Exhibit 000127. "What Have We Risen Against? Issued at the Supreme Revolutionary Headquarters on 4th November 1964," 2. For a general discussion of the appropriation of the trope of the Holocaust by non-Jewish groups in an effort to attract attention, see Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1999).
38. Ante Beljo, *Jugoslavija Genocid: dokumentarna analiza* (Sudbury, ON: Northern Tribune Publishing, 1985), 281.
39. Indeed, Bleiburg became perhaps the most powerful symbol of righteous vengeance among extremists in the emigration, as will be discussed below. The paramilitary wing of one Croatian émigré organization, for instance, was called the Bleiburg Platoon of Honor, which held commemorations each year in the town of Bleiburg. Among the effects left by one of the nineteen guerillas killed in a Croatian émigré incursion of Yugoslavia in 1972 was a manual for the Croatian revolutionary struggle entitled *Osvetnici Bleiburga: "priručnik" za vođenje hrvatske gerile* or *Avengers of Bleiburg: "Guide" for Leading Croatian Guerillas*. See: Đorđe Ličina, *Dvadeseti čovjek* (Zagreb: Centar za informacije i publicitet, 1985), and Đorđe Ličina, *Roverova braća* (Zagreb: Centar za informacije i publicitet, 1987).
40. Beljo, *Jugoslavija Genocid*, 43.
41. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 20–18–1–5, Part 5, Doc.: "Foreign Language Press Review Service; Summary of Material from *Hrvatski Glas*" (Winnipeg, May 13, 1970), 1.
42. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 20–18–1–5, Part 5, Doc.: "Foreign Language Press Review Service; Summary of Material from *Hrvatski Glas*" (Winnipeg, May 13, 1970), 1.
43. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: Exhibit 000131. "Dedication," 4.
44. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix C.10, Doc.: "Curse," 3.
45. Like the HRB, the HKB and the TRUP were both founded in 1961. The two organizations—and in particular the HKB—will be explored in greater detail in the next chapter.
46. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: Exhibit 30. "Cr(oatian) Rev(olution) and Its Preparations," 1–2. Similarly, another HRB treatise observed: "Twenty years have passed since the

Croatian émigré community's first pleas to the Western Allies for support in the struggle for liberty. Well, the support was never received, which provides ample evidence of the fact that, if we are to hope for any help at all, we must use our own fighting strength to shape our destiny." PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix C.10, Doc.: "Curse," 2.

47. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: Exhibit 000131. "Dedication," 4.
48. *Drina*, June 6, 1968. Of the groups formed in the 1950s, Luburić's Otpor held a position closest to that of groups such as the HRB, HKB, and TRUP. It also remained more relevant and appealing to extremists than did Pavelić's HOP or Jelić's HNO, even if the latter remained more high-profile.
49. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5/F, Doc.: "REVOLUTION," 1.
50. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5/F, Doc.: "REVOLUTION," 5.
51. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.7, Doc.: Exhibit 000126. "Chin Up, Brother and Sister Revolutionaries!" 3.
52. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5/F, Doc.: "REVOLUTION," 3.
53. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5/F, Doc.: "REVOLUTION," 1.
54. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5/F, Doc.: "REVOLUTION," 2. Compare this with the strategic guidance provided by Régis Debray: "Here [i.e., in the opening stages of a revolution], the correct course is that as large a number as possible of smaller, not a small number of larger actions be undertaken." See Debray's *Révolution dans la révolution? Lutte armée et lutte politique en Amérique latine*, a handbook outlining revolutionary strategy published in 1967. Excerpts from the book were translated and distributed to radical Croatian separatists throughout the late 1960s and 1970s. Quotation taken from: *Hrvatska borba*, no. 11 (September 1972).
55. As stated plainly in a guide to revolution distributed by the HRB entitled "Questions and Answers Every Revolutionary Must Know," the Croatian revolution's "first operations are in fact of a subversive and terrorist nature." PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: "Questions and Answers Every Revolutionary Must Know," 14.
56. NAA. Series A432/15, Control Symbol 1963/2357 Part 3, Item 1111184, Doc.: Exhibit 000068—2nd Sheet. (June 17, 1966), 3.
57. NAA. Series A432/15, Control Symbol 1963/2357 Part 3, Item 1111184, Doc.: Exhibit 000068—2nd Sheet. (June 17, 1966), 3.
58. For a general history of nineteenth-century anarchist terrorism, see Richard Jensen, "Daggers, Rifles, and Dynamite: Anarchist Terrorism in Nineteenth-Century Europe." *Terrorism and Political Violence* 16, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 116–53.
59. NAA. Series A432/15, Control Symbol 1963/2357 Part 3, Item 1111184, Doc.: Exhibit 000104. Letter from Geza Pašti to Jure Marić (August 2, 1964), 1.

60. NAA. Series A432/15, Control Symbol 1963/2357 Part 3, Item 1111184, Doc.: Exhibit 000104. Letter from Geza Pašti to Jure Marić (August 2, 1964), 3.
61. NAA. Series A432/15, Control Symbol 1963/2357 Part 3, Item 1111184, Doc.: Exhibit 000068—2nd Sheet. (June 17, 1966), 4.
62. "Revolutionary vanguardism" is, of course, most closely associated with Marxist thinkers Karl Kautsky and, especially, V. I. Lenin, but the concept has been applied much more broadly in revolutionary movements since the mid-nineteenth century. For a recent study on revolutionary vanguardism in a non-European, non-Marxist context, see Eitan Azani, "The Hybrid Terrorism Organization: Hezbollah as a Case Study," *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 36, no. 11 (November 2013): 899–916.
63. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: Exhibit 30. "Cr(oatian) Rev(olution) and Its Preparations," 2.
64. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: Exhibit 30. "Cr(oatian) Rev(olution) and Its Preparations," 1.
65. For a detailed breakdown of the supposed "enemies" of the Croatian nation, see PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: "Croatian National Resistance 'SUD' Armed Forces Headquarters: Principles of our Security Service" (March 25, 1964), 1–11. The most dangerous enemies according to the document are not the Serbs or those who promoted the idea of a unified Yugoslav state but rather the Communists, Croats included. Of the more than ten pages of the document, nine are dedicated to combating communists of different types, including "old communists," "communist-opportunists," "unconvinced communists," "vacillating communists," "communist dupes," and "communist infiltrators."
66. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: Exhibit 30. "Cr(oatian) Rev(olution) and Its Preparations," 1.
67. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: "Questions and Answers Every Revolutionary Must Know," 3.
68. As with the interwar and wartime Ustaše, the postwar generation of semi-émigrés produced little in terms of programmatic or ideological specifics, and what they did produce was often written to appeal to Western democratic states. One HRB treatise, for instance, declared that "women are fully equal to men in their rights and duties," a position generally antithetical to most fascisms. At the same time, they also declared that while being "a proven adversary of the communist ideas, [the HRB] also believes in all-out opposition to any possible restoration of capitalism in the Croatian state territory," an economic stance associated with fascism. Most crucially, however, semi-émigré radicals maintained a very fascistic position regarding "holistic nationalism," proclaiming, for instance, that the social order in the new Croatia would include "no aristocrats or peasants, no bourgeois or proletarians, no commissars or serfs, but only an organic unity of the peasants, workers, and intellectuals, one large family of men handling plows, machines, pens, and swords." PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.7, Doc.: "Commonwealth

Police Crime Intelligence: The Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood. Hrvatska [*sic*] Revolucionarno Bratstvo," 4.

69. Categorizing interwar and wartime Ustaša ideology—particularly regarding the degree to which Ustaša ideology was truly "fascist"—is itself contested and the subject of a growing literature. For an introduction to the topic, see the 2006 special issue of *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* on the NDH, particularly Stanley G. Payne, "The NDH State in Comparative Perspective," *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 7, no. 4 (November 2006): 409–15. For a more recent collection of works on Ustaša ideology, see Rory Yeomans, ed., *The Utopia of Terror: Life and Death in Wartime Croatia* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2015).
70. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix C.10, Doc.: "Curse," 4.
71. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix C.10, Doc.: "Curse," 4.
72. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.8, Doc.: "Australo-Croatian National Resistance" (December 12, 1970), 1.
73. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: Exhibit 000132, 1–2.
74. For a useful history of American foreign policy toward socialist Yugoslavia, see Lorraine M. Lees, *Keeping Tito Afloat: The United States, Yugoslavia, and the Cold War* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997).
75. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5, Doc.: "'The Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood'; Hrvatsko Revolucionarno Bratstvo—H.R.B. (Position Paper as at 1st May, 1967)," 15.
76. One of the larger controversies within the émigré community during the Cold War would revolve around this topic. In 1970, Branko Jelić abruptly announced that the HNO had been in discussions with Moscow to actively collaborate in bringing down the Yugoslav state. This supposed agreement is discussed in detail in chapter 5.
77. As the HRB explained in their typically straightforward fashion: "Speaking from a scientific point of view, the 3rd World War would mean the destruction of Mankind on this planet, in view of the fact that the belligerents possess enough atomic weapons for the whole of our Globe to be wiped out and destroyed by atomic radiation. In a global war, even if atomic weapons were not used at the outset, they would be inevitably employed by any belligerent seeing himself facing defeat in conventional warfare, as a drowning man will catch at a straw." PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: Exhibit 000132, 1.
78. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: Exhibit 000132, 1.
79. See, for instance, PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.8, Doc.: "Australo-Croatian National Resistance" (December 12, 1970), 1–2.

80. LAC, RG 25, vol. 9361, File 20–18–1–5, Part 15, Doc.: "Department of the Secretary of State: Translation Bureau" (April 25, 1974), 11.
81. The idea of "national reconciliation" among ethnic Croats regardless of ideological leaning for the sake of the greater "Croatian state idea" was central to the politics of Croatia's first post-socialist president, Franjo Tuđman. Most controversially, Tuđman proposed the reburial of Bleiburg victims in Jasenovac as a sign that both the Ustaše killed in Bleiburg and those killed in Jasenovac—or at least the Croatian antifascists killed there—had all died for Croatia, albeit for different visions of Croatia. Of course, among the myriad issues with the proposal, the one that most stands out is the fact that most of those who died at Jasenovac were Serbs, Jews, and Roma. This issue is examined further in the epilogue. For a discussion of the issue of national reconciliation in the late 1980s and early 1990s, see Dejan Djokić, "The Second World War II: Discourses of Reconciliation in Serbia and Croatia in the Late 1980s and Early 1990s," *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans* 4, no. 2 (2002): 127–40.
82. *Obrana*, December 1968. Tito needs no introduction. Jelić, Luburić, and Vrančić have all been discussed. Hefer was a former HSS official who held a position in the NDH and later became leader of the HOP following Pavelić's death in 1959. Tripalo, Gošnjak, Bakarić, and Humo were all former Partisans who rose to prominence in the League of Communists, the first three in the Republic of Croatia and the last in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Krleža, meanwhile, is considered by many to be Croatia's greatest 20th-century writer.
83. See, for instance, PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.8, Doc.: "Australo-Croatian National Resistance" (December 12, 1970), 1–2.
84. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix C.10, Doc.: "Curse," 4.
85. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.8, Doc.: "Australo-Croatian National Resistance" (December 12, 1970), 1.
86. NAA. Series A432 (A432/31), Control Symbol 1972/7051 Part 2, Item 7860484, Doc.: "Croatian Nationalism in Australia" (April 11, 1972), 1.
87. Both Australia's ruling Liberal Party and the state's internal security services—the Australian Security Intelligence Organization—were relatively tolerant of Croatian émigré political violence throughout the 1960s and early 1970s for reasons that are examined at greater length in chapter 6.
88. For a general, if provocative, overview of the literature on fascism and ideology, see David D. Roberts, "How Not to Think about Fascism and Ideology, Intellectual Antecedents and Historical Meaning," *Journal of Contemporary History* 35, no. 2 (April 2000): 185–211.
89. For an exploration of the multifaceted nature of fascism in east-central and southeastern Europe, particularly as it relates to ideology, expediency, and circumstance, see Constantin Iordachi, "Fascism in Interwar East Central and Southeastern Europe: Toward a New Transnational Research Agenda," *East Central Europe* 37, no. 2/3 (2010): 161–213.

90. While not nearly as active as Croatian separatists, Cold War–era Serbian émigrés also organized against Tito's socialist Yugoslavia, themselves sometimes engaging in political violence, including a series of bombings of Yugoslav consulates in the United States and Canada in 1967 (to be discussed in chapter 6) and an airplane hijacking in 1979.
91. It is important to note that the issue of religion as related to identity is a complex one among extreme Croatian nationalists. Historically, religion was actually deemphasized as a defining characteristic of "Croatian-ness" by many leading national ideologists, including Ljudevit Gaj, Ante Starčević, and Josip Juraj Strossmayer. Despite being overwhelmingly Catholic, true Croats could just as easily be Muslim or Orthodox. This remained more or less true within both the Ustaša movement and NDH, despite the strong collaboration after 1941 between the Ustaša and the Catholic establishment, although the introduction of racial ideas into Ustaša political thinking complicated the matter. Nevertheless, even for radical postwar semi-émigrés, religion alone was not what marked a Serb. As explained in one HRB document: "Religion is every individual's own concern. In view of the fact that the overwhelming majority of the Croatians belong to the Roman Catholic Church, the Islamic Religious Group, and the Croatian Orthodox Church, the State of Croatia will closely collaborate with those religious bodies, whilst also giving full support to the rest of the religious institutions. Atheist propaganda and any spreading of pernicious destructive ideas, damaging to the social and national setup are to be banned by law." For a more detailed examination of the relationship between religion and identity as understood by radical Croatian nationalists, see Mark Biondich, "Controversies Surrounding the Catholic Church in Wartime Croatia, 1941–1945," *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 7, no. 4 (December 2006): 429–57.
92. *Obrana*, January 1969.
93. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.7, Doc.: Exhibit 000043. "Stozher," 1.
94. "Croatia is a fair, rich, and beautiful country, while our people are hard-working, honest, civilized, and intelligent. Are we to allow the Serbian blackguards to help themselves to Croatian riches, enjoy the Croatian natural beauties, reap the fruits of the Croatian toil, sweat, and blood and to embrace with their covetous and animal arms the bodies of our women and girls whose fathers and brothers they have slaughtered earlier? No! Never! Never, as long as any of us survives." PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.7, Doc.: Exhibit 000127. "What Have We Risen Against? Issued at the Supreme Revolutionary Headquarters on 4th November 1964," 3.
95. For a brief examination of the relationship between the Bible and politics in the former Yugoslavia, see Nancy C. Lee and Borislav Arapović, "The Bible in Political Context: New Republics from Old Yugoslavia and the Former Soviet Union," *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 55, no. 4 (2001): 378–88.
96. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.7, Doc.: Exhibit 000127. "What Have We Risen Against? Issued at the Supreme Revolutionary Headquarters on 4th November 1964," 3.

97. To provide another blunt example: "Since its very inception, the Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood has been enjoining it upon the Croatian revolutionaries that the enemy must be detested, hated to the limit, with everything in one's own self, with consuming passion and with the just indignation of a wronged and oppressed righteous man and rebel." PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.7, Doc.: Exhibit 000127. "What Have We Risen Against? Issued at the Supreme Revolutionary Headquarters on 4th November 1964," 2.
98. For example, "Not only have we to and must hate our enemies, especially the Serbians; we must also do our relentless utmost to pay what we owe them as soon as possible." PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.7, Doc.: Exhibit 000127. "What Have We Risen Against? Issued at the Supreme Revolutionary Headquarters on 4th November 1964," 3.
99. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.7, Doc.: Exhibit 000127. "What Have We Risen Against? Issued at the Supreme Revolutionary Headquarters on 4th November 1964," 2. The reference to the violent violation of the nation's women is typical—although, of course, not exclusive—to fascist rhetoric.
100. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.7, Doc.: Exhibit 000127. "What Have We Risen Against? Issued at the Supreme Revolutionary Headquarters on 4th November 1964," 3.

Chapter 4: All Accounts Have Not Yet Been Settled, 1962–1969

1. For a list of small-scale incidents such as the tearing up of Yugoslav flags in West Germany and physical confrontations between radical Croats and both Serb emigrants and representatives of the Yugoslav state in the FRG between 1959 and 1962, see NARA. RG 59, Box 4151 (1963), Folder: Pol 25 Demonstrations, Protests, Riots (2/1/63), Doc.: "Activities of the Ustashi Terrorist Organizations," 10–11.
2. For a detailed description in English of the attack and its aftermath, see Alexander Clarkson, *Fragmented Fatherland* (New York: Berghahn, 2013), 65–71.
3. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 101, Dok.: 958/63. "Material der jugoslawischen Regierung über subversive Tätigkeit von Ustascha-Gruppen in der Bundesrepublik: Teil I, Die Taetigkeit der terroristischen Ustascha-Organisationen" (December 12, 1963), 9–10.
4. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 101, Dok.: 958/63. "Material der jugoslawischen Regierung über subversive Tätigkeit von Ustascha-Gruppen in der Bundesrepublik: Teil I, Die Taetigkeit der terroristischen Ustascha-Organisationen" (December 12, 1963), 10.
5. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: 912/62. "Kroatische Kreuzbrüderschaft e.V., Bensberg b. Köln, Neuenweg 13" (December 4, 1962), 1–2. For a history of the interwar period Catholic organizations, see Sandra Prlenda, "Young, Religious, and Radical: The Croat Catholic Youth Organizations, 1922–1945," in Lampe and Mazower, *Ideologies and National Identities*, 82–109.

6. TNA. FO 371/169665, Doc.: CY1821/11. "Dissolution of the Brotherhood of the Croatian Cross, a Yugoslav Catholic Refugee Organisation in West Germany" (March 14, 1963), 1.
7. The HKB was officially registered in the town of Bensberg, a suburb of Cologne, on May 31, 1961. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: 912/62. "Kroatische Kreuzbrüderschaft e.V., Bensberg b. Köln, Neuenweg 13" (December 4, 1962), 1.
8. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: 912/62. "Kroatische Kreuzbrüderschaft e.V., Bensberg b. Köln, Neuenweg 13" (December 4, 1962), 1.
9. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 101, Dok.: 958/63. "Material der jugoslawischen Regierung über subversive Tätigkeit von Ustascha-Gruppen in der Bundesrepublik: Teil I, Die Taetigkeit der terroristischen Ustascha-Organisationen" (December 12, 1963), 8–9.
10. NARA. RG 59, Box 4151 (1963), Folder: Pol 25 Demonstrations, Protests, Riots (2/1/63), Doc.: "Activities of the Ustashi Terrorist Organizations," 12–13.
11. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 101, Dok.: 958/63. "Material der jugoslawischen Regierung über subversive Tätigkeit von Ustascha-Gruppen in der Bundesrepublik: Teil I, Die Taetigkeit der terroristischen Ustascha-Organisationen" (December 12, 1963), 11.
12. TNA. FO 371/169665, Doc.: CY1821/11. "Dissolution of the Brotherhood of the Croatian Cross, a Yugoslav Catholic Refugee Organisation in West Germany" (March 14, 1963), 1.
13. Clarkson, *Fragmented Fatherland*, 67–68.
14. The notable exception to this was Perčić, the man responsible for shooting Popović. Thirty-nine at the time of the attack, Perčić had spent the war interned in Dachau due to his agitation for Croatian language rights in Croatian lands under direct German and Hungarian control. Clarkson, *Fragmented Fatherland*, 68.
15. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1088, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (May 30, 1963), 41.
16. PAAA. Abteilung 7 [Bestand B12], Band 562, Dok.: 1308/56. "Die Auseinandersetzungen im Ustaschen-Lager" (September 14, 1956), 1.
17. *Otpor*, no. 2 (1975).
18. As the HRB instructed its members, for instance: "Destroy all Yugoslav embassies and consulates, kill Yugoslav diplomatic representatives because they are common criminals and Fascists. Prevent migrants from traveling on Yugoslav aircraft and destroy Yugoslav aircraft. Wreck the travel agencies." Quoted in Clissold, "Croat Separatism," 16.
19. The name Velebit Uprising (Velebitski ustanak) comes from the mountain range where the attack took place. The incident is sometimes referred to as the Lika Uprising (Lički ustanak), after the larger general region.
20. Although the incursion itself resulted in no deaths, one fatality came as a consequence of the raid. While the Ustaša Stipe Devčić was being pursued by royalist police following the attack, Devčić used a hand grenade to take his own life rather

than face the "ignominy" of capture. Within the Ustaša movement, Devčić's actions were lauded as a paradigm of self-sacrifice and martyrdom. See Yeomans, *Visions of Annihilation*, 298 and 340.

21. Ivo Goldstein, *Croatia: A History*, trans. Nikolina Jovanović, (London: Hurst & Co., 1999), 125–26.
22. Dates for the actual timing of the incursion vary from source to source, ranging from late June to the night of July 7/8. July 4/5 is the date claimed by HRB sources themselves. See: PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5/D, Doc.: "Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood Committee Area No. 4: Letter from Supreme Headquarters to Revolutionaries in this Committee Area" (July 15, 1964), 3.
23. NARA. RG 59, Box 3036 (1964–66), Folder: Pol 29 Arrests. Detention—1/1/64, Doc.: A–152. "Airgram: Another Group Sentenced for Anti-Regime Activities" (April 29, 1964), 1.
24. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5, Doc.: "'The Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood'; Hrvatsko Revolucionarno Bratstvo—H.R.B. (Position Paper as at 1st May, 1967)," 10.
25. The oldest was born in 1930 and the youngest in 1942. The nine men were: Miko Fumić (b. 1939), Vlado Leko (b. 1942), Josip Oblak (b. 1937), Branko Podrug (b. 1933), Rade Stojić (b. 1939), Krešimir Perković (b. 1935), Dražen Tapšanji (b. 1931), Ilija Tolić (b. 1930), and Stanko Zdrilić (b. 1939). Tapšanji arrived in October 1954. For more detailed biographies, see PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.7, Doc.: "Commonwealth Police Crime Intelligence: The Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood. Hrvatska [*sic*] Revolucionarno Bratstvo," 2–3.
26. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.7, Doc.: "Commonwealth Police Crime Intelligence: The Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood. Hrvatska [*sic*] Revolucionarno Bratstvo," 7.
27. NAA. Series A432 (A432/107), Control Symbol 1983/5332 Part 2, Item 8209206, Doc.: "Croatian Nationalism in Australia (11 April 1972): A Catalogue of Fascist Incidents," 2–3.
28. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.7, Doc.: "Commonwealth Police Crime Intelligence: The Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood. Hrvatska [*sic*] Revolucionarno Bratstvo," 1.
29. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5, Doc.: "'The Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood'; Hrvatsko Revolucionarno Bratstvo—H.R.B. (Position Paper as at 1st May, 1967)," 10.
30. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5, Doc.: "'The Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood'; Hrvatsko Revolucionarno Bratstvo—H.R.B. (Position Paper as at 1st May, 1967)," 11.
31. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5/D, Doc.: "Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood Committee Area No. 4: Letter from Supreme Headquarters to Revolutionaries in this Committee Area" (July 15, 1964), 3–4.

32. NARA. RG 59, Box 4151 (1963), Folder: POL—Political Affairs & R&L, Doc.: A–886. "Airgram: Recent Attempts on Bloc Embassies in Brussels" (February 8, 1963), 1–2.
33. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5/D, Doc.: "Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood Committee Area No. 4: Letter from Supreme Headquarters to Revolutionaries in this Committee Area" (July 15, 1964), 1–7.
34. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5/D, Doc.: "Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood Committee Area No. 4: Letter from Supreme Headquarters to Revolutionaries in this Committee Area" (July 15, 1964), 3–5.
35. Perčić received a sentence of fifteen years for manslaughter, unlawful compulsion, offenses under the Arson Act, and arson itself. Medić, meanwhile, was sentenced to four years in prison for offenses under the Arson Act, arson, and aggravated damage. Twelve of the accused received sentences of three and a half years, while the remaining defendants received prison terms of fifteen months. Seventeen of those on trial, however, were released at the conclusion of the proceedings, as their pretrial detention was considered time served. NARA. RG 59, Box 3036 (1964–66), Folder: Pol 29 Arrests. Detention—1/1/64, Doc.: A–2271. "Incoming Telegram: Bonn-Washington: Secstate: 4874" (June 26, 1964), 1.
36. BA. Bestand 106, Band 63086, Dok.: "Auszug 'Freiheit und Recht' nr. 4 vom April 1963: Auflösung der Kroatischen Kreuzer-Bruderschaft." See also Julia Gerlach, *Die Vereinsverbotspraxis der streitbaren Demokratie: Verbieten oder Nicht-Verbieten?* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2012), 138.
37. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1090, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (June 30, 1963), 44–45.
38. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1000a, Dok.: Nr. 174. "Verbalnote: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Sweden" (June 15, 1965), 2.
39. NARA. RG 59, 3037 (1964–66), Folder: POL—Political Aff. & Rel.—1/1/64, Doc.: "Incoming Telegram; Control 12400; From: Stuttgart; Info: Bonn 114, Belgrade 09, Munich 15" (June 14, 1965), 1. NARA. RG 59, Box 3036 (1964–66), Folder: Pol 29 Arrests. Detention—1/1/64, Doc.: A–2271. "Incoming Telegram: Bonn-Washington: Secstate: 4874" (June 26, 1964), 1.
40. Stanko Kardum received a two-year, nine-month sentence for the assassination attempt.
41. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1092, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (December 15, 1966), 78.
42. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1092, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (December 15, 1966), 78.
43. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1101, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration: Terror und Mord als politisches Mittel in den Beziehungen zwischen der jugoslawischen Emigration und ihrem Heimatland" (July 1, 1975), 3–4. On Milovanović's rank in the Udba, see NARA. RG 59, 3037 (1964–66), Folder: POL—Political Aff. & Rel.—1/1/64, Doc.: "Airgram: Assassination of Yugoslav Consular Officer" (September 15, 1966), 1.

44. NARA. RG 59, 2844 (1967–69), Folder: POL 29—1/1/68, Doc.: "Airgram: Trial of Franjo GORETA, Assassin of Yugoslav Consular Officer" (April 25, 1967), 2, and BA. Bestand B206, Band 1101, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration: Terror und Mord als politisches Mittel in den Beziehungen zwischen der jugoslawischen Emigration und ihrem Heimatland" (July 1, 1975), 4.
45. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1101, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration: Terror und Mord als politisches Mittel in den Beziehungen zwischen der jugoslawischen Emigration und ihrem Heimatland" (July 1, 1975), 4.
46. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1101, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration: Terror und Mord als politisches Mittel in den Beziehungen zwischen der jugoslawischen Emigration und ihrem Heimatland" (July 1, 1975), 4.
47. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1101, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration: Terror und Mord als politisches Mittel in den Beziehungen zwischen der jugoslawischen Emigration und ihrem Heimatland" (July 1, 1975), 4.
48. To quote from Goreta's trial: "The accused soon saw that he was driven into a corner. He had to admit to himself that he had gone too far in his relations with Milovanović. He had promised the latter to kill exile Croats, and when he wished to withdraw from this arrangement with Milovanović, it was too late. The accused found himself in a mental dilemma and in a hopeless situation. He acted out of fear, rage, and anger: out of fear of Milovanović's threat, out of rage because Milovanović had maneuvered him into a nasty situation, and out of anger that, as a Croat with Croatian national feeling, he had fallen into the clutches of the Communist Secret Service. This was the reason for the violent deed." Goreta was found guilty of manslaughter rather than murder due to the act coming under duress and not the result of malice, but nevertheless was sentenced to eight years imprisonment at hard labor. NARA. RG 59, 2844 (1967–69), Folder: POL 29—1/1/68, Doc.: "Airgram: Trial of Franjo GORETA, Assassin of Yugoslav Consular Officer" (April 25, 1967), 3.
49. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1342, Dok.: "Tätigkeit von Exilkroaten in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland; hier: Unerlaubter Waffenbesitz" (April 1, 1971), 1.
50. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.7, Doc.: "Commonwealth Police Crime Intelligence: The Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood. Hrvatska [*sic*] Revolucionarno Bratstvo," 14.
51. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1342, Dok.: "Tätigkeit von Exilkroaten in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland; hier: Unerlaubter Waffenbesitz" (April 1, 1971), 2.
52. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1094, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (January 25, 1968), 61.
53. The Relay of Youth (Štafeta mladosti) was one of the most prominent expressions of the cult of personality surrounding Tito in socialist Yugoslavia. In the three weeks leading up to Tito's birthday, young Yugoslavs participated in a large-scale relay, in which batons filled with birthday wishes for the president would be carried across the country, culminating in a grandiose celebration in the Yugoslav Army Stadium in Belgrade.

54. Unrelated to Branko Jelić, Ivan Jelić should not be confused with Branko's brother, also named Ivan Jelić.
55. "Bombe im Koffer," *Spiegel* 43/1968 (October 21, 1968).
56. "Bombe im Koffer," *Spiegel* 43/1968 (October 21, 1968).
57. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1000a, Dok.: Nr. 174. "Aide Memoire (Bonn, 5. Juni 1968)," p. 1–2.
58. Jelić was executed on November 3, 1968. All the members of the "Bodenseegruppe"—also known as the "Ravensburggruppe" among émigré Croats for the location of their trial—were found guilty by West German courts, with Žarko Odak and Božo Pašalić receiving twelve-year sentences, Ivan Kutuzović ten, Dane Šarac six, and Marko Uremović five.
59. "Bombe im Koffer," *Spiegel*, 43/1968 (October 21, 1968).
60. "Bombe im Koffer," *Spiegel*, 43/1968 (October 21, 1968).
61. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1095, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (July 28, 1969), 52–53.
62. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1095, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (July 28, 1969), 53.
63. NARA. RG 59, 2844 (1967–69), Folder: POL 23–8—1/1/69, Doc.: "Airgram: Yugoslav Terrorist Arrested" (June 21, 1969), 1–2.
64. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1095, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (July 28, 1969), 54–56.
65. *Tanjug*, September 25, 1968.
66. Archiv der Republik (hereafter AdR). 1968—Karton 1366 (Jugoslawien (1,2,3,5, 6,9/2,9/2/1,9/5,11,49), Schutzmacht Jugoslawien), Folder 1, Dok.: 24137–17/67. "Grabovac Mirko; Festnehmung wegen Verdachtes der Vorbereitung eines Mordanschlages an dem jugoslawischen Staatspräsidenten Josip Broz TITO während seines Staatsbesuches in Österreich. Hier: Information des BMfAA zur Weitergabe an die Botschaft der SFRJ" (March 16, 1967).
67. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1000a, Dok.: "Tätigkeit Jugoslawischer Emigranten" (October 31, 1968), 2.
68. NAA. Series A6980 (A6980T1), Control Symbol S250691, Item 7117143, Doc.: "Croatian Extremists," 1. NAA. Series A432 (A432/107), Control Symbol 1983/5332 Part 2, Item 8209206, Doc.: "Croatian Nationalism in Australia (11 April 1972): A Catalogue of Fascist Incidents," 1–7.
69. The Yugoslav regime's engagement with émigré separatism, including not only the infiltration of extremist groups but also the policy of actively radicalizing those groups, will be discussed below.
70. The campaign of violence against members of "the hostile emigration" by the Udba is a woefully underresearched subject. This will be rectified with Christian Axboe Nielsen's upcoming monograph provisionally titled *Yugoslavia and Political Assassinations: The History and Legacy of Tito's Campaign against the Emigres* (to be published by Bloomsbury).
71. Making categorical assertions about security service violence against Croatian

émigrés is both difficult and highly politicized. In the vast majority of émigré Croat murders, the real perpetrators of the crimes remain either unknown or unverified, with evidence linking the Udba to the killings often circumstantial. Definitive lists of Udba assassinations by contemporary authors—by and large Croatian nationalists—maximize the number of killings, attributing every violent Croatian émigré death to the regime in Belgrade, often without providing evidence. Often, such assertions about Udba involvement, particularly in assassinations, are correct. Nevertheless, evidence in some cases points to personal grudges, political infighting, or both.

72. "Poratne žrtve državnog terora SFRJ u inozemstvu," *Komisija za utvrđivanje ratnih i poratnih žrtava* (September 30, 1999): 1–38. This document was produced by the "Commission for the Establishment of War and Postwar Victims," a commission of the Parliament of Croatia established in 1992. The commission, which completed its work in 1999, effectively served as a tool of the regime of Franjo Tuđman to relativize the crimes of the NDH, if not indeed to rehabilitate the Ustaše. Most contentiously—and in the opinion of this author most egregiously—the commission concluded that only 2,238 individuals had been murdered at the Jasenovac concentration camp. The document cited here—on Udba crimes against Croatian émigrés—is less controversial but nevertheless still highly polemical. This said, for better or worse, it remains one of the better sources regarding the Udba's activities against Croatian nationalists abroad between 1945 and 1991. It should be noted that the Croatian Sabor (parliament) never officially accepted the commission's report.
73. The two murders attributed by Croatian authors to the Udba in this period both took place in Argentina. The first victim, Dinka Domančinović, was a three-year-old girl who died following a bomb attack on the Croatia House (Hrvatski Dom) in Buenos Aires on July 16, 1960, that injured seventeen others and resulted in the death of one Argentine, eighty-year-old David Martinez. The second suspected victim of the Udba was Rudolf Kantonci, who was killed in 1962.
74. The year before being shot, Deželić published two pamphlets that riled the regime in Belgrade: *An Widerständen wächst ein Volk: Der Freiheitskampf des kroatischen Volkes von 1918–1963* (Krefeld-Uerdingen: Draga-Druck und Verlag, 1964), and *Wen trifft die Schuld für das Attentat von Mehlem?* (Krefeld: Draga-Druck u. Verlag, 1964).
75. Pašti was arrested in October 1963 and ultimately sentenced to eight months in prison. Upon his release in May 1964, Pašti moved his base of operations to Nice, where his abduction took place. NAA. Series A1838 (A1838/2), Control Symbol 1520/13/16/PART 1, Item 554644, Doc.: "Staatsanwaltschaft bei dem Landgericht Stuttgart; An: The Australian Embassy, Consular Section; Re: Preliminary Proceedings against Geza PASTI, Born 6.6.1934 in Cepin, Yugoslavia, Because of a Charge of Being a Member of a Secret Society and Offence against the Law regarding Fire Arms" (November 7, 1963), 1.
76. "Poratne žrtve državnog terora SFRJ u inozemstvu," 12–13.

77. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1342, Dok.: "Ermittlungsverfahren der Staatsanwaltschaft Stuttgart gegen Josip Cvitanovic und Brunhilde Coblenz wegen gemeinschaftlichen Mordes an dem Exilkroaten Marijan Simundic am 13. September 1967 in Stuttgart; hier: Auslieferung der deutschen Staatsangehörigen Brunhilde Coblenz aus Jugoslawien durch Österreich nach Deutschland zur Strafverfolgung wegen Mordes" (March 20, 1970).
78. "'Lockvogel' für tödlichen Plan: Neun Jahre Haft für Beihilfe zum Mord an einem Exilkroaten," *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, January 29, 1985.
79. The government in Bonn appealed—unsuccessfully—for the extradition of the West German citizen Coblenz, which Belgrade circumvented by granting Yugoslav citizenship to the coconspirator. In December 1983, Coblenz attempted a clandestine return to West Germany, following Cvitanović's death earlier that year, only to be arrested at the airport upon her arrival. She was tried and convicted for her role in Šimundić's murder, receiving a nine-year sentence. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1342, Dok.: "Ermittlungsverfahren der Staatsanwaltschaft Stuttgart gegen Josip Cvitanovic und Brunhilde Coblenz wegen gemeinschaftlichen Mordes an dem Exilkroaten Marijan Simundic am 13. September 1967 in Stuttgart; hier: Auslieferung der deutschen Staatsangehörigen Brunhilde Coblenz aus Jugoslawien durch Österreich nach Deutschland zur Strafverfolgung wegen Mordes" (March 20, 1970) and "'Lockvogel' für tödlichen Plan."
80. This meant primarily, but not exclusively, Croatian separatists. While Croats comprised the majority of those targeted by the regime in Belgrade over the course of the Cold War, émigré Serbs, Kosovar Albanians, and others experienced the wrath of the Yugoslav security services.
81. "Mord an Jugoslawen aus politischen Motiven?" *Frankfurter Rundschau*, October 2, 1968.
82. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 101, Dok.: 31 Js 511/63. "Der Leitende Oberstaatsanwalt bei dem Landgericht Dortmund: Anklageschrift" (August 20, 1963), 1–11.
83. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1094, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (October 28, 1968), 59–60.
84. NARA. RG 59, Box 2843 (1967–1969), Folder: Pol 13 (1/1/67), Doc.: "R. Clayton Mudd, Counselor for Political Affairs, Embassy of the United States of America, Belgrade to Orme Wilson, Jr., Esquire, OIC Yugoslav Affairs, EUR/EE Department of State" (November 12, 1968), 1.
85. NARA. RG 59, Box 2843 (1967–1969), Folder: Pol 13 (1/1/67), Doc.: "R. Clayton Mudd, Counselor for Political Affairs, Embassy of the United States of America, Belgrade to Orme Wilson, Jr., Esquire, OIC Yugoslav Affairs, EUR/EE Department of State" (November 12, 1968), 1.
86. Ćurić was killed by a bomb as he attempted to enter the Munich restaurant he owned on April 9. Kulenović was found shot in his bathtub on June 30. Kulenović's killer was most likely Ivo Galić, who shared biographical similarities with Franjo Goreta, in that both men had spent time in a Yugoslav prison, increasing his susceptibility to Udba influence. Obradović, editor of the Serbian exile newspaper

Iskra, was killed on the street after parking his car on April 17. Obradović was the first émigré Serbian victim of the Udba. See BA. Bestand B206, Band 1095, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (July 28, 1969), 60–62, and NARA. RG 59, Box 2845 (1967–1969), Folder: Pol 30 (1/1/67), Doc.: "Airgram: Assassination of Croatian Exiles in Munich Continues" (April 25, 1969), 1–2.

87. For a discussion of how Luburić's Otpor had come to be "regarded as a relatively moderate organization" by ASIO and other security services in the lead-up to his death, see PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.13, Doc.: "The Croatian National Resistance (HNO)—Recent Developments" (April 2, 1971), 2.
88. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1095, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (April 30, 1969), 53–58.
89. "Ilija Stanić: Ubili smo Luburića jer se razišao s Pavelićem," *Jutarnji list*, July 15, 2009. For a more detailed discussion with and about Stanić, see Francesc Bayarri, *Cita en Sarajevo* (Barcelona: Montesinos, 2009).
90. Renata Rašović, "Agent Udbe: Luburića sam ubio jer je uvrijedio mog ćaću," *Večernji list*, May 5, 2012.
91. This in addition to twenty-four failed assassinations, five kidnappings, two failed kidnappings, and five disappearances over the course of the entirety of the Cold War. Tomislav Đurasović, *Svjedok olovnih vremena* (Zagreb: Vlastita Naklada, 2011). Đurasović's list is more or less identical to the one found in the *Komisija za utvrđivanje ratnih i poratnih žrtava* report but with even more—seventy-three compared to sixty-eight—victims.
92. Until the archives of the Yugoslav security service are fully opened to researchers, separating targeted killings by Udba agents from fratricidal or criminal (as opposed to political) murders, or even accidental deaths is fraught with difficulties. This said, even in the event of a full opening of the archives, it is unlikely that definitive proof regarding many of the Udba's targeted killings during the Cold War will be found, since documentation regarding targeted killings either never existed or was destroyed before it reached the archives.
93. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1094, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (September 27, 1968), 64.
94. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1095, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (April 30, 1969), 57.
95. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1095, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (April 30, 1969), 57.
96. Manfred Schell, "Stammen die Mordwaffen aus Belgrads Arsenalen?" *Die Welt*, no. 47 (February 25, 1980).
97. For a non–West German report implicating Belgrade for the murder of a number of émigré Croats and other enemies of the state, see NAA. Series A432 (A432/31), Control Symbol 1972/5775 Part 2, Item 7860480, Doc.: "Extremist Croatian Émigrés; IAC Brief No. 10/72; Published on Authority of the Chairman, Intelligence Advisory Committee [of the Government of Canada]. For CAN/UK/US/AUST/NZ Eyes Only" (July 6, 1972), 3–4.

98. This is to say nothing, of course, of moral or ethical problems related to admitting culpability—however legitimized—for multiple murders.
99. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1095, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (April 30, 1969), 57.
100. NARA. RG59, 2844 (1967–69), Folder: POL 23—1/1/67, Doc.: "Airgram: Yugoslav Security Service Celebrates Its 25th Anniversary" (June 14, 1969), 3.
101. "Plastikeri u ideološkom ruhu," *Ekonomska Politika*, no. 893 (May 12, 1969). As the author of this article further elaborated: "Terrorist actions of emigrants no longer have the unreserved blessing of authorities. It is certain that these actions will be combatted in the future either independently or in cooperation with other organs. The Yugoslav secret service is not exclusively active on Yugoslav soil."
102. NARA. RG59, 2844 (1967–69), Folder: POL 23—1/1/67, Doc.: "Airgram: Yugoslav Security Service Celebrates Its 25th Anniversary" (June 14, 1969), 1.
103. For a discussion of the relationship between World War II and state legitimacy in socialist Yugoslavia, see Wolfgang Höpken, "War, Memory, and Education in a Fragmented Society: The Case of Yugoslavia," *East European Politics and Society* 13, no. 1 (Winter 1999): 190–227.
104. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: 1222/61. "Die kroatischen Exil–Ustaschen: Nationalistischer Extremismus und kommunistische Unterwanderung/Zum Stuttgarter Zwischenfall" (December 1, 1961), 6–7.
105. To give one concrete example, as one West German report explicated: "The Crusaders and their organization [the HKB] are for the Yugoslav communists undoubtedly—and unfortunately—a greatly appreciated object in their attacks against the Catholic Church and the Catholic Clergy." PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 441/63. "Übersicht über die Organisationen der Emigranten aus Jugoslawien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Stand: 31. Dezember 1962)," 30.
106. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1095, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (April 30, 1969), 57.
107. For a collection of works discussing different facets of American-Yugoslav economic relations, see John R. Lampe, Russell O. Prickett, and Ljubiša S. Adamović, eds., *Yugoslav-American Economic Relations since World War II* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990).
108. The application of this strategy, of course, depended greatly on socialist Yugoslavia's own needs. An American embassy report from Bonn to Washington concerning Belgrade's response to the shooting of Klarić noted: "Yugo reaction so far relatively restrained. In view of fact GOY [government of Yugoslavia] will be approaching FRG for assistance (rollback on debts if nothing else) in connection [with] forthcoming economic reforms, wisdom may prevail over viscera in determining Yugo stance." NARA. RG 59, Box 2231 (1964–1966), Folder: POL—Political Affairs & Rel. Ger W-Yugo (1/1/64), Doc.: "Incoming Telegram, Control: 18076, Info: Bonn 103; Zagreb [Unnumbered]" (June 19, 1965), 2.
109. As one example of the (only lightly) veiled accusations Belgrade made about enduring Nazi affinities within the halls of power in Bonn: "The Yugoslav Government

wishes on this occasion also to draw attention to the fact that behind the anti-Yugoslav provocations and these actions stand elements, who, during the Second World War, belonged to fascist military formations and who had committed innumerable crimes, because of which some of them have been pronounced as war criminals by the Yugoslav courts. Many of these criminals were not only given *shelter and hospitality* in the Federal Republic of Germany after the war but are continuing, *without hindrance*, with their diverse and organized subversive activity against the sovereignty and integrity of the SFRY [Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia]." PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1000a, Dok.: Nr. 174. "Verbalnote: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Sweden" (June 15, 1965), 2; emphasis added.

110. See, for instance, LAC. RG 25, vol. 9362, File 20–18–1–5, Part 21, Doc.: "Undersecretary of State for External Affairs, Ottawa; Canadian Embassy Belgrade: Anti-Yugoslav Activities in the Federal Republic of Germany" (March 1, 1978), 2, as well as PAAA. Abteilung 7 (B12), Band 588, Dok.: "Die Jugoslawische Aktivität in Westdeutschland: Eine erste Übersicht," 1–15.
111. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 99, Dok.: 441/63. "Übersicht über die Organisationen der Emigranten aus Jugoslawien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Stand: 31. Dezember 1962)," 29.
112. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 98, Dok.: 1222/61. "Die kroatischen Exil–Ustaschen: Nationalistischer Extremismus und kommunistische Unterwanderung/Zum Stuttgarter Zwischenfall" (December 1, 1961), 6.
113. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1093, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (April 10, 1967), 67.
114. David McKnight, *Australia's Spies and Their Secrets* (St. Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin, 1994), 256.

Chapter 5: We Have Chosen No One but Ourselves, 1969–1972

1. On this point, see, for instance, Bruce Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism*, 2nd edition (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), 52–53, and William F. Shughart II, "An Analytical History of Terrorism, 1945–2000," *Public Choice* 128, no. 1 (2006): 20.
2. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 20–18–1–5, Part 8, Doc.: "Croatian Émigré Activities: Branko Jelic and the Orientation of Croatian-Canadian Groups" (March 13, 1972), 1–2.
3. For perhaps the most graphic example of this, see the 1970 documentary film *Teroristi* (*Terrorists*) produced by Dunav Film. The film both directly links Ustaša "excesses" during World War II with contemporaneous anti-Yugoslav emigrant terrorism and frames Jelić as the principal figure in the Croatian separatist movement. It should be noted that the film was highly controversial within Yugoslavia. A leading member of the Executive Committee of the League of Communists of Croatia, Josip Vrhovec (who would later serve as minister of foreign affairs), called the film "negative, ideologically, and politically unacceptable" with a clear anti-Croatian bias. For Vrhovec's full critique of the film and its politics, see Josip Vrhovec, *Vjesnik*, November 24, 1970.

4. Among his many roles, Jelić was also cofounder and deputy chairman of the "Friendship Circle of the CSU," an organization that supported throughout West Germany the Franz Josef Strauss–led, Bavarian-based, conservative Christian Social Union (Christlich-Soziale Union). See: "'Aus Unserer Seele': *Spiegel* Interview mit dem Stellvertretenden Vorsitzenden des Berliner 'Freundschaftskreises der CSU' Branko Jelić." *Der Spiegel* (February 16, 1970), 67.
5. On this point, see the communique from the West German Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution (*Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz*) to the Ministry of the Interior in reaction to a May 4, 1970, edition of the West German ARD broadcasting service's *Panorama* television magazine reporting on anti-Yugoslav Croats living in the FRG. BA. Bestand B106, Band 28217, Dok.: "Kroatische Emigration; hier: Stellungnahme zur Panoramasendung der ARD vom 4.5.1970" (May 25, 1970), 5.
6. For a detailed and forceful example of this position, see PAAA. Bestand B11, Band 564, Dok.: "Croatian Information Bulletin: Rede des Dr. Branimir R. Jelić anläßlich der Feier der Wiedererrichtung des Kroatischen Staates, gehalten am 11. April 1954 in München im Kreuzbräu."
7. PAAA. Bestand B11, Band 564, Dok.: "Croatian Information Bulletin: Rede des Dr. Branimir R. Jelić anläßlich der Feier der Wiedererrichtung des Kroatischen Staates, gehalten am 11. April 1954 in München im Kreuzbräu."
8. For an overview of the myth from the perspective of the British ambassador to Yugoslavia, see ANZ. ABHS, 950, Acc W4627, Box 4288, 275/4/1 Part 8 (Yugoslavia Political Affairs General), Doc.: Diplomatic Report no. 489/70. "Fifty-Fifty and All That." *British Ambassador in Yugoslavia to the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs* (Yugoslavia, October 21, 1970).
9. ANZ. ABHS, 950, Acc W4627, Box 4288, 275/4/1 Part 8 (Yugoslavia Political Affairs General), Doc.: Diplomatic Report no. 489/70. "Fifty-Fifty and All That." *British Ambassador in Yugoslavia to the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs* (Yugoslavia, October 21, 1970), 2.
10. For an American analysis of the Soviet threat to Yugoslavia, see NARA. CIA. Reference Title: ESAU XLVII. Doc.: "Intelligence Report—Yugoslavia: The Outworn Structure" (November 20, 1970), 39–50.
11. NARA. CIA. Reference Title: ESAU XLVII. Doc.: "Intelligence Report—Yugoslavia: The Outworn Structure" (November 20, 1970), 39–50, 47.
12. ANZ. ABHS, 950, Acc W4627, Box 4288, 275/4/1 Part 8 (Yugoslavia Political Affairs General), Doc.: Diplomatic Report no. 489/70. "Fifty-Fifty and All That." *British Ambassador in Yugoslavia to the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs* (Yugoslavia, October 21, 1970), 2.
13. NARA. RG 59, Entry A–1 (5584), Box 3, Folder: "Yugoslavia Contingency Plan: Draft Action Documents," Doc.: "Yugoslavia: Draft Pre-Invasion Statement by the President."
14. Of course, the interests of the Serbs or of any others who supported Yugoslavia's continued existence as a state socialist country did not factor into Jelić's calculations.

15. In one of his more widely reported polemics in the 1950s, Jelić declared a theme that echoed through the entire body of his political work until 1970: "Better death than communism." PAAA. Bestand B11, Band 564, Dok.: "Croatian Information Bulletin: Rede des Dr. Branimir R. Jelić anläßlich der Feier der Wiedererrichtung des Kroatischen Staates, gehalten am 11. April 1954 in München im Kreuzbräu," 6.
16. NARA. RG59. Box 2840 (1967–69), Folder: POL 1 Yugo (1/1/67). Doc.: A–936. "Airgram: Yugoslav Diplomat Discusses Current Issues" (November 26, 1968), 2–3.
17. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 20–18–1–5, Part 6, Doc.: "Our Memorandum of January 6. Yugoslav Émigré Activities: Dr. Branko Jelić" (January 13, 1971).
18. See, for instance, NARA. CIA. "Yugoslavia-USSR." *Central Intelligence Bulletin* (April 26, 1971).
19. Bakarić—a leading member of the Partisan resistance during World War II—was throughout his political career seen as one of the central figures, together with Edvard Kardelj, in the liberal wing of the Yugoslav political establishment. A supporter of greater federalization in Yugoslavia, Bakarić is credited with helping to strengthen the power of individual republics in socialist Yugoslavia. At the same time, Bakarić opposed nationalistic politics and remained a champion of the socialist Yugoslav project.
20. TNA. FCO 24/1644. Doc.: "Head of Chancery, Interview with Dr. Bakarić, 18 February 1971" (February 20, 1971), 2.
21. For two examples of the growing vocal opposition to Jelić's position on the Soviets within the Croatian diaspora, see Juraj Krnjević, *Hrvatski Glas*, April 1, 1970, and LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 20–18–1–5, Part 9, Doc.: "United Croats of Canada Hold Convention" (May 20–22, 1972).
22. See, for example, PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.13, Doc.: no. 10/71. "The Croatian National Resistance (HNO)—Recent Developments" April 2, 1971.
23. Indeed, Yugoslav officials viewed a "dusting off [of] old Cominformists" by the Soviet Union in the early 1970s to be as large a threat—if not a greater one—to Yugoslav state security than were radical Croats in the diaspora. For a detailed report on the prospect of the Soviets attempting to subvert the Belgrade regime through divisive elements such as Cominformists and nationalist separatists in the emigration, see NARA. RG 59, Box 2766 (1970–73), Folder (POL USSR-YUGO 1/1/71), Doc.: Intelligence Note, Bureau of Intelligence and Research. "Soviet-Yugoslav Relations: New Wave of Polemics" (June 24, 1971).
24. Branko Jelić, *Hrvatska Revija*, July 10, 1971.
25. It should be noted that Jelić had hoped to visit the United States during the same trip but was denied an entry visa by the State Department. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 15–8–1–5, Part 7, Doc.: "Memorandum: Dr Branko Jelic" (January 28, 1972). Jelić was reported to have raised C$300,000 over the course of his trip, including C$50,000 in just twenty minutes at one event. The large figures—which are almost certainly greatly exaggerated—raised eyebrows within the Canadian foreign ministry and led to a call for heightened scrutiny of Croatian

organizations within the country. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 15–8–1–5, Part 7, Doc.: "Croatian Activities Outside of Yugoslavia" (January 19, 1972).

26. NAA. Series A432 (A432/15), Control Symbol 1964/2357 Part 5, Item 111111188, Doc.: "Incidents within the Yugoslav Community, 1963–1972," 5.
27. Kolendić later became a central figure in the so-called Waldheim Affair, in which the secret Nazi past of the former UN secretary general and president of Austria Kurt Waldheim was disclosed. Kolendić revealed that the Yugoslav government was aware of his activities during World War II and that in the winter of 1947–48 the Yugoslav security services together with those of the Soviet Union had attempted to recruit Waldheim through blackmail. See Dusko Doder, "47 Soviet-Bloc Bid to Recruit Waldheim as Agent Described," *Washington Post*, October 30, 1986.
28. *Tagesspiegel*, July 2, 1969.
29. *Tagesspiegel*, July 2, 1969. The formulation of Đolo's statement about the Ustaše is worth noting. As with other younger radicals, Đolo agreed in principle with the aims of the remnants of the early postwar generation of exiles, but he did not identify himself as belonging to them.
30. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1095, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (July 28, 1969), 49.
31. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1095, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (July 28, 1969), 50.
32. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1095, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (July 28, 1969), 49.
33. *Večernje Novosti*, July 2, 1969.
34. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9361, File 20–18–1–5, Part 17, Doc.: "United Croats of Canada—Croat Miljenko Hrkać a New Dreyfus Case in Belgrade" (February 1976).
35. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 20–18–1–5, Part 11, Doc.: "Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs: Anti-Yugoslav Activities—Canada and Sweden" (January 29, 1973), 1.
36. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1090, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (June 30, 1964), 44–45.
37. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9361, File 20–18–1–5, Part 17, Doc.: "United Croats of Canada—Croat Miljenko Hrkać a New Dreyfus Case in Belgrade" (February 1976), 1.
38. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1342, Dok.: "Gewaltsame Besetzung des jugoslawischen Konsulats in Göteborg durch zwei Angehörige der kroatischen Befreiungsfront" (February 15, 1971), 1.
39. Vujicević's hometown, Mostar, was just twenty kilometers away from Hrkać and Mukulić's village. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1097, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (March 5, 1971), 36.
40. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1342, Dok.: "Gewaltsame Besetzung des jugoslawischen Konsulats in Göteborg durch zwei Angehörige der kroatischen Befreiungsfront" (February 15, 1971), 1.
41. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1342, Dok.: "Gewaltsame Besetzung des jugoslawischen Konsulats in Göteborg durch zwei Angehörige der kroatischen Befreiungsfront" (February 15, 1971), 2.

42. PAAA. Referat IIA5 [Bestand B42], Band 1342, Dok.: "Gewaltsame Besetzung des jugoslawischen Konsulats in Göteborg durch zwei Angehörige der kroatischen Befreiungsfront" (February 15, 1971), 3.
43. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 20–18–1–5, Part 6, Doc.: "Attack on Yugoslav AMB in STKHM" (April 8, 1971).
44. "Accused Croatian Describes Attack on Ambassador," *Reuters*, June 29, 1971.
45. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 20–18–1–5, Part 11, Doc.: "Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs: Anti-Yugoslav Activities—Canada and Sweden" (January 29, 1973), 1.
46. "Croats Tell of Recruitment Problems," *United Press International*, June 30, 1971.
47. "Accused Croatian Describes Attack on Ambassador," *Reuters*, June 29, 1971.
48. Mahmut Muftić, "Kriv i ispaštanje," *Naš put*, May 1971. Mahmut (also Mahmoud) Muftić, like many anti-Yugoslav émigrés, possesses a noteworthy biography. Professionally, he was a medical doctor who specialized in microbiology and hypnosis. Politically—in addition to his involvement in Croatian separatism—Muftić was a central figure in the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood and a close confidant of Said Ramadan, who received extensive CIA backing for his anticommunist activities. Muftić was assassinated shortly after the publication of the aforementioned article, allegedly because he was believed to be an agent of the Israeli security service, Mossad.
49. The fall of Ranković was a seminal moment in the history of socialist Yugoslavia. He had founded first the Ozna and then the Udba and served in a number of central political roles on both the national and Serbian republican levels. The circumstances of his removal from power are manifold. Perhaps more important are the consequences of his fall, which led to a period of decentralization in socialist Yugoslavia that culminated in the Republic of Croatia's efforts to achieve greater political and cultural autonomy in the early 1970s. For a brief narrative of Ranković's fall, see Ramet, *Three Yugoslavias*, 218–19. For a recent reassessment of the reasons for his fall, see Milan Piljak, "Power Game in Tito's Yugoslavia: Conundrum of Aleksandar Ranković's Overthrow from Power," *Tokovi istorije*, no. 3 (2014): 159–76.
50. Steven L. Burg, "Ethnic Conflict and the Federalization of Socialist Yugoslavia: The Serbo-Croat Conflict," *Publius* 7, no. 4 (Autumn 1977): 119–43.
51. "Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika," *Telegram: jugoslavenske novine za društvena i kulturna pitanj*, no. 359 (March 17, 1967): 1. The declaration was in large measure a response to the Novi Sad Agreement (*Novosadski dogovor*) signed in 1954, which officially declared Serbian, Croatian, and Montenegrin to be a single language with regional dialects. For more on the declaration and language politics in socialist Yugoslavia, see Sabrina Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia, 1962–1991* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992), 101–3.
52. Jill Irvine, "The Croatian Spring and the Dissolution of Yugoslavia," in *State Collapse in South-Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on Yugoslavia's Disintegration*, ed. Lenard J. Cohen and Jasna Dragović-Soso (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2007), 155.

53. For a compelling, if problematic, contemporaneous English-language reflection on politics in Croatia and Yugoslavia in the early 1970s, see Paul Lendvai, "Yugoslavia in Crisis," *Encounter* 39, no. 2 (August 1972): 68–74.
54. TNA. FCO 28/2418, Doc.: "Memorandum: Levers of Soviet Pressure against Yugoslavia," 5.
55. NARA. RG 59, Box 2837 (1970–73), Folder: POL 12 YUGO (1/1/71). Doc.: A–82. "Airgram: Soviet Interest in Croat Party Communique" (April 14, 1971).
56. NARA. RG 59, Box 2838 (1970–73), Folder: POL 13–3 YUGO (1/1/70). Doc.: "Telegram AmEmbassy Belgrade to SecState Washington, D.C., 'Ustashi Claim Soviet Support'" (April 1971), 2.
57. Notably, the communique was issued on the same day as Rolović's assassination. NARA. RG 59, Box 2837 (1970–73), Folder: POL 12 YUGO (1/1/71). Doc.: A–82. "Airgram: Soviet Interest in Croat Party Communique" (April 14, 1971), 1.
58. TNA. FCO 28/2418, Doc.: "Memorandum: Levers of Soviet Pressure against Yugoslavia," 5.
59. Quoted in Dennis Rusinow, *Yugoslavia: Oblique Insights and Observations*, essays selected and edited by Gale Stokes (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2008), 105.
60. In the aftermath of the Croatian Spring, the Socialist Republic of Croatia came to be known as the "silent republic" (*šutljiva republika*) for its conspicuous avoidance of ethnic or nationalist debates. For a relatively early discussion of the implications for this development on political pluralism within the republic, see Jasna Babić, "Novi pluralizam šutljive republike," *Danas*, February 28, 1989.
61. *Obrana*, January 1973.
62. *Obrana*, January 1973.
63. NARA. RG 59, Box 2839 (1970–73), Folder: POL 23 YUGO 1/[illegible]/70. Doc.: A–26. "Airgram: Possibly Émigré-Related Terror Incidents" (January 28, 1972), 2.
64. NARA. RG 59, Box 2839 (1970–73), Folder: POL 23 YUGO 1/[illegible]/70. Doc.: A–26. "Airgram: Possibly Émigré-Related Terror Incidents" (January 28, 1972), 3. Andabak later played a key role in the Croatian Homeland War of 1991–95. He was a founder and commander of the Kažnjenička bojna (Captive Battalion) of the Hrvatsko vijeće obrane (Croatian Defense Council), a special military unit comprised of individuals incarcerated and persecuted by the communist regime before 1991. He later served as a general in the Vojska Federacije Bosne i Hercegovine (Army of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina).
65. NARA. RG 59, Box 2839 (1970–73), Folder: POL 23 YUGO 1/[illegible]/70. Doc.: A–26. "Airgram: Possibly Émigré-Related Terror Incidents" (January 28, 1972), 3.
66. NARA. RG 59, Box 2839 (1970–73), Folder: POL 23 YUGO 1/[illegible]/70. Doc.: A–26. "Airgram: Possibly Émigré-Related Terror Incidents" (January 28, 1972), 1.
67. NARA. CIA. "Yugoslavia." *Central Intelligence Bulletin* (March 30, 1972).
68. NAA. Series A432 Series A1209 (A1209/66), Control Symbol 1972/6769, Request Item 12068600, Doc.: "Croatian Nationalist Activities in Australia," 2.
69. Jurjević was an active opponent of nationalist groups in the Australian diaspora who self-published a number of works, the most notable of which is *Ustasha under*

the Southern Cross (Melbourne: M. Jurjevic, 1973). For a critical assessment of Jurjević's personality and unreliability as an intelligence asset written by ASIO officials, see NAA. Series A432 (A432/15), Control Symbol 1964/2357 Part 1, Request Item 1111179, Doc.: "Marjan Jurjevic, 210 Blyth Street, East Brunswick" (March 21, 1966).

70. Somewhat improbably, the plane crashed near a village named Srbská Kamenica. The "Srbská" in the village's name, however, referred to Sorbs and not Serbs.
71. "Highest Fall Survived without Parachute," *Guinness World Records*, http://www.guinnessworldrecords.com/world-records/highest-fall-survived-without-parachute (accessed October 29, 2017).
72. Among other recognitions, Vulović was decorated by Tito himself, served as the inspiration for a popular Serbian folk song, and was even honored by Paul McCartney, who presented her with an award at the ceremony in London recognizing her entry into the *Guinness Book of World Records*. Kate Connolly, "Woman Who Fell to Earth: Was Air Crash Survivor's Record Just Propaganda?" *Guardian*, January 13, 2009.
73. "Croatian Nationalists Blamed in Yugo Plane, Train Blasts," *International Herald Tribune*, January 28, 1972.
74. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1098, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (April 14, 1972), 33–35.
75. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1098, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (April 14, 1972), 33–35. Police in Heidelberg suspected Vinko Sindičić of the murder but were never able to gather enough evidence to indict him. Sindičić would later serve ten years in jail for the 1988 attempted murder of Nikola Štedul—president of the Croatian Statehood Movement (HDP; Hrvatski državotvorni pokret)—in Kirkcaldy, Scotland. Sindičić was also suspected in the murders of Stjepan Ševo, his wife, Tatjana, and her nine-year-old daughter Rosemarie Bahorić in San Donna di Piave near Venice in August 1972, as well as in the assassination of the Croatian dissident writer Bruno Bušić in Paris in 1978.
76. More likely is that, if a Czechoslovak fighter jet did cause the crash, the archives have been scrubbed of any related evidence or that no documentation regarding the evidence had ever been produced, leaving only those involved in possession of the truth.
77. The guerilla handbook used in preparation for and strategy behind the incursion was entitled *Avengers of Bleiburg: "Handbook" for the Guidance of Croatian Guerillas* (*Osvetnici Bleiburga: "Priručnik" za vođenje Hrvatske gerile*). Written by Adolf Andrić, the commander of the incursion, the *Avengers of Bleiburg* manual was modeled on the influential revolutionary pamphlet *150 Questions for a Guerilla*, written by General Alberto Bayo, a Cuban veteran of the Spanish Civil War and the man tasked with training Fidel Castro's revolutionary army—including Che Guevera—in guerilla combat in preparation for the overthrow of the Batista regime. Andrić—who wrote under the pseudonym Apostol Plemić—wrote in the *Avengers* manual that the Cuban revolution represented "the best example of how an emigration can initiate a revolution in their own country." Apostol Plemić (Adolf Andrić), *Osvetnici Bleiburga*, 29.

78. TNA. FCO 28/2153. Doc.: Aide-Memoire from SFRY to Australia, Annex no. 1. "Hrvatsko revolucionarno bratsvo," 3.
79. For a detailed and fairly accurate contemporaneous description of Operacija Feniks, see "Leere Flaschen," *Spiegel*, no. 32 (July 31, 1972): 54–55.
80. TNA. FCO 28/2154. Doc.: "Ambassador Ducci and Yugoslavia" (October 10, 1972).
81. Over the course of the Cold War, only one officer of a higher rank than Šenja would defect, Lieutenant General Ion Mihai Pacepa of the Romanian Securitate, in 1978.
82. For a description, see Clissold, "Croat Separatism," 11.
83. Eric Borne, "Tensions in Yugoslavia," *Christian Science Monitor*, August 2, 1972.
84. In addition to the question of the Warsaw Pact's Polarka plan, leaks by Yugoslav authorities suggested that captured guerillas confessed to having been trained by the CIA. TNA. FCO 28/2154. Doc.: "Soviet Involvement with Croat Émigrés" (October 26, 1972), 1.
85. All three of those executed after being captured were naturalized Australian citizens.
86. For a security service analysis of Operation Kangaroo, see PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5, Doc.: "'The Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood'; Hrvatsko Revolucionarno Bratstvo—H.R.B. (Position Paper as at 1st May, 1967)," 11–12.
87. Raduša is the mountain range south of Bugojno where the heaviest fighting between the HRB guerillas and the TO took place.
88. "Yugoslavia—The Ustashi and the Croatian Separatist Problem," 470.
89. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.23, Doc.: "Izvještaj sa revolucionarnog fronta," 1. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 27, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix A.5/D, Doc.: "Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood Committee Area No. 4: Letter from Supreme Headquarters to Revolutionaries in this Committee Area" (July 15, 1964), 3.
90. TNA. FCO 28/2153. Doc.: "Croat Hijacking of a Scandinavian Airlines Aircraft" (September 26, 1972), 1–2.
91. It is worth noting that British governmental observers of events in Sweden conceded that the Swedish government's strategy to bow to the hijackers' demands was "a defensible point of view" but also cautioned that "the Swedes may well pay a price for their decision in the future." TNA. FCO 28/2153. Doc.: "Croat Hijacking of a Scandinavian Airlines Aircraft" (September 26, 1972), 6.
92. TNA. FCO 28/2153. Doc.: "Croat Hijacking of a Scandinavian Airlines Aircraft" (September 26, 1972), 4.
93. TNA. FCO 28/2153. Doc.: "Croat Hijacking of a Scandinavian Airlines Aircraft" (September 26, 1972), 3–4.
94. Swedish officials were able to negotiate the lower sum by claiming that it was impossible on such short notice to collect the full one million Kroner from local banks. This and other aspects of the hijacking led the pilot to comment after the ordeal had ended that "there was something 'naïve' about the hijacking—almost as if it had been dreamed up over a bottle of slivovitz." *Radio Free Europe*, September 18, 1972.

95. TNA. FCO 28/2153. Doc.: "Croat Hijacking of a Scandinavian Airlines Aircraft" (September 26, 1972), 9.
96. NARA. CIA. "Spain Pardons Croatian Hijackers" (February 18, 1975).
97. NARA. CIA. "Spain Pardons Croatian Hijackers" (February 18, 1975).
98. NAA. Series A432 (A432/107), Control Symbol E1983/5357, Item 8209209, Doc.: "Croatian Nationalist Activities: Bombing Incidents—Sydney 16.9.1972" (September 1972).

Chapter 6: Simply, It Comes Down to This, 1972–1980

1. By definition, as examined in chapter 3, neither Serbs nor other individuals who supported in any way the Yugoslav regime could be considered innocent. This justified the Belgrade bombings of 1968, which targeted civilians as opposed to state institutions.
2. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.18, Doc.: Exhibit 30. "Cr(oatian) Rev(olution) and Its Preparations," 4.
3. Mate Nikola Tokić, "Party Politics, National Security, and Émigré Political Violence in Australia, 1949–1973," in *Control of Violence. Historical and International Perspectives on Modern Societies*, ed. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt et al. (New York: Springer, 2011), 395–414.
4. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1090, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (June 30, 1964), 44–45.
5. These cases remain unsolved. Most likely, the assassination was the work of the Udba. The circumstances of the club bombing remain shrouded in mystery. Dan Hansén, "Crisis and Perspectives on Policy Change: Swedish Counter-terrorism Policymaking," PhD diss. (Stockholm: Swedish National Defence College, Center for Crisis Management Research and Training, 2007), 48.
6. The abbreviation Säpo was first adopted by the Säkerhetspolisen in 1987; RPS/Säk was the previous designation. Like the acronym Udba, Säpo commonly refers to the security service across historical periods.
7. Hansén, "Crisis and Perspectives," 47–48.
8. Importantly, prior to 1971 the Säpo not only failed to confront the issue of Croatian or Yugoslav political violence in Sweden but ignored the broader threat of terrorism generally. Instead, the resources of Sweden's security services had focused, as was the case in Australia, almost exclusively on communist countersubversion and counterespionage. Hansén, "Crisis and Perspectives," 41–54.
9. Hansén, "Crisis and Perspectives," 41–46.
10. It should be noted that while Croatian terrorist activity was front and center in the minds of Swedish officials in establishing the commission, concurrent events such as those at the Olympic Games in Munich earlier in the month and the West German capture of the RAF leadership in June impressed on the government that action was necessary.
11. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 20–18–1–5, Part 10, Doc.: "Official Translation: Press Communique I—Action to Combat Certain Acts of Violence with an International Background," 1–2.

12. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 20–18–1–5, Part 10, Doc.: "Official Translation: Press Communique II—Further details about Action to Combat Certain Acts of Violence with an International Background."
13. For a contemporaneous critique of the work of the commission and the anti-terror law adopted by the Swedish government, see Göran Elwin, "Swedish Anti-Terrorist Legislation," *Contemporary Crises* 1, no. 3 (July 1977): 289–301.
14. Elwin, "Swedish Anti-Terrorist Legislation," 290.
15. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 20–18–1–5, Part 10, Doc.: "Official Translation: Press Communique I—Action to Combat Certain Acts of Violence with an International Background," 2.
16. Elwin, "Swedish Anti-Terrorist Legislation," 294, and Hansén, "Crisis and Perspectives," 137.
17. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9360, File 20–18–1–5, Part 10, Doc.: "Official Translation: Press Communique I—Action to Combat Certain Acts of Violence with an International Background," 2.
18. Proposition 1973:37 of the Swedish government, quoted in Elwin, "Swedish Anti-Terrorist Legislation," 291.
19. Hansén, "Crisis and Perspectives," 55.
20. The primary impetus for the change in the law was the April 1975 siege of the West German embassy in Stockholm by RAF members, resulting in the deaths of two embassy officials and two terrorists and nonfatal injuries to fourteen others—mostly severe burns—caused by the accidental detonation of fifteen kilos of TNT brought to the embassy by the attackers. Hansén, "Crisis and Perspectives," 61–67.
21. PCA–Senate. Tabled Papers, March 28, 1973: "Croatian Extremists." Appendix B.17, Doc.: "Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood Committee Area No. 4: Letter from Supreme Headquarters to Revolutionaries in This Committee Area" (July 15, 1964), 1.
22. A major component of the Liberal Party's election campaign in 1949 was a pledge to declare the CPA illegal. Once in power, banning the CPA became a leading priority for the new government. Prime Minister Robert Menzies, in fact, succeeded in passing the Communist Party Dissolution Act 1950, which the High Court of Australia later deemed unconstitutional and undemocratic. Menzies then launched a national referendum to change the constitution to outlaw the CPA but again faced defeat, with those opposed at 50.48 percent versus 49.07 percent in favor.
23. Jenny Hocking, *Terror Laws: ASIO, Counter-Terrorism and the Threat to Democracy* (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2004), 30. ASIO was established just nine months before the Liberal Party's electoral victory in 1949 over Prime Minister Ben Chiefley's Labor Party government. That party's socialist leanings and support for trade unions made it the object of Australian military intelligence prior to World War II. Labor made political independence a crucial part of ASIO's 1949 founding charter, which said that "the Security Service should be kept absolutely free from any political bias or influence . . . [or] any matters of a party

political character." The Menzies government had no such qualms. "The 1949 charter of ASIO" is quoted in Justice Robert Hope, *The Royal Commission on Intelligence and Security*, report 4, vol. 2 (Canberra: AGPS, 1977), appendix 4–A.

24. In the words of one senior ASIO officer from an interview conducted in 1992: "The attitude was, because they were anticommunist, we'll look at them later. We'll concentrate on these [communist] bastards because they're dangerous!" Quoted in McKnight, *Australia's Spies*, 177.
25. NAA. Series A6122, Control Symbol 304, Item 12500631. Doc.: "Field Officer Report: Croatian Newspaper 'Hrvat'" (September 30, 1953), 1.
26. NAA. Series A6122, Control Symbol 304, Item 12500631 Doc.: "Memorandum for the Secretary of Immigration: Publication of Newspapers in Foreign Languages: 'Hrvat'—Croatian" (April 12, 1954), 1–2.
27. One reason was that both ASIO and the Liberal Party held the view that political violence and terror were the products of revolutionary ideologies such as communism and not reactionary ideas such as those touted by Croatian separatists. Moreover, the Liberal Party recognized the voting potential of Croatian immigrants due in large part to their shared anticommunist beliefs. While the great majority of Croats in Australia were in no way associated with radical or terrorist organizations, many supported the aims, if not necessarily the means, of groups such as the HRB. The Liberal Party did not want to risk alienating a potentially sizable voting bloc by taking too hard a stance against active pro-independence, anti-Yugoslav immigrants.
28. As stated by John Blaxland in his official history of ASIO: "ASIO believe the Yugoslav Intelligence Service had penetrated extremist Croatian organisations and used that knowledge to further its own intelligence ends." John Blaxland, *The Protest Years: The Official History of ASIO, 1963–1975*, vol. 2 (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2015), 329.
29. NAA. Series A432 (A432/15), Control Symbol 1964/2357 PART 8, Item 1111193. Doc.: "Statement by the Commonwealth Attorney-General, Senator Ivor J. Greenwood, G.C." (July 20, 1972), 3. That Greenwood referred only to the Commonwealth Police and not ASIO was deliberate. By stating that only the Commonwealth Police and not ASIO had looked into the issue of radical Croatian separatism, Greenwood strongly implied that the matter not only had no national security dimension but indeed did not warrant investigation as such.
30. NAA. Series A432 (A432/15), Control Symbol 1964/2357 PART 8, Item 1111193. Doc.: "Statement by the Commonwealth Attorney-General, Senator Ivor J. Greenwood, G.C." (July 20, 1972), 1–2.
31. Commonwealth of Australia, *Parliamentary Debates: Senate: Official Hansard*, no. 38 (September 19, 1972): 929.
32. As an example of the latter, one member of the opposition Australian Labor Party (ALP), Jim Cain, declared in no uncertain terms that the Liberal Party's active indifference and unresponsiveness to Croatian separatist extremism in Australia was at least in part responsible for its development, stating that "there is ample evidence of the existence of well-organized terrorists for those who wish to act

on it. But the Government seems curiously reluctant to do so. . . . [Furthermore, Greenwood's] attitude must have contributed substantially to the growth of this criminal Croatian movement." *Sunday Telegraph*, September 17, 1972.

33. See the chapter entitled "The Anti-Vietnam War Movement and ASIO's Counter-insurgency Planning," in McKnight, *Australia's Spies*, 209–26.
34. Blaxland, *Protest Years*, 325–30.
35. Blaxland, *Protest Years*, 325–26.
36. Blaxland, *Protest Years*, 331.
37. For two hour-by-hour descriptions of Murphy's raid on ASIO, one more sympathetic and one somewhat less so, see McKnight, *Australia's Spies*, 267–71, and Blaxland, *Protest Years*, 330–37.
38. McKnight, *Australia's Spies*, 270.
39. McKnight, *Australia's Spies*, 270.
40. Blaxland, *Protest Years*, 338.
41. Blaxland, *Protest Years*, 342–45.
42. McKnight, *Australia's Spies*, 295–300.
43. NAA. Series A6980 (A6980T1), Control Symbol S250164, Item 1032578, Doc.: "Special Procedure for Handling Passport Applications from Persons Reported to be Connected with Extreme Croatian Nationalist Activity" (August 1974).
44. LAC. RG 25. vol. 9362. File 20–18–1–5, Part 24 (CND), 27, Doc.: GEA–1312. "Anti-Yugoslav Activities in Canada; Appendix D: 'Chronology of Violence Assocated [*sic*] with anti-SFRY Activities'" (June 20, 1980). The list, it should be noted, is qualified as being "illustrative, but not necessarily complete."
45. The first was the accidental detonation in a Frankfurt apartment of a "book bomb" being prepared by a recently arrived Australian-based Croat in January 1975 that led to the amputation of the bomb-maker's right arm. The second was a raid on the Munich apartment of a suspected Croatian extremist in December 1975 that led to the discovery of fifteen hundred rounds of ammunition and numerous bomb detonators. BA. Bestand B106, Band 111220, Dok.: "Der Bundesminister des Innern: Kroatischer Verein Drina e.V., Verbotsverfügung" (June 1, 1976), 13.
46. Bundesbeauftragte für die Stasi-Unterlagen (hereafter BStU), MfS—HA XXII, nr. 802/8, 0034–0035.
47. During the shoot-out between Matičević and Prpić and Yugoslav military forces, one soldier—Milan Vučinić—was killed and a second wounded. NAA. Series A5034 (A5034/1), Control Symbol 1973/2136 Part 1, Item 12099778. Doc.: "Australian Security Intelligence Organisation: Croatian Extremist Activity," 2.
48. *Tanjug*, November 1, 1974.
49. "New Wave of Croatian Violence Feared," *Reuters*, November 15, 1974.
50. NAA. Series A5034 (A5034/1), Control Symbol 1973/2136 Part 1, Item 12099778. Doc.: "Australian Security Intelligence Organisation: Croatian Extremist Activity," 2.
51. "Yugoslav Official Shot in France," *Reuters*, March 30, 1975.
52. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1102, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (March 1, 1976), 40.

53. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1102, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (July 1, 1976), 27–28.
54. BA. Bestand B206, Band 1102, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (July 1, 1976), 28. See also "Terrorismus: Hals über Kopf," *Spiegel*, 30/1976 (July 19, 1976), 84.
55. For the legal rulings concerning the banning of the organizations, including lengthy discussions of the reasons for the bans, see BA. Bestand B106, Band 111220, Doks.: "Bundesverwaltungsgericht, BverwG 1 A 4.76" (January 25, 1978), and "Der Bundesminister des Innern: Kroatischer Verein Drina e.V., Verbotsverfügung" (June 1, 1976).
56. "Bundeskriminalamt setzt Terrorfahnder auf radikale Kroaten an," *Münchner Merkur*, December 8, 1978.
57. BStU, MfS—HA XXII, nr. 78/10, 000002–000004, and TNA. FCO 28–2151, Doc.: "Palestinian Terrorists in Eastern Europe" (October 7, 1972).
58. BA. Bestand B106, Band 111220, Dok.: "IMK-Sitzung am 24. November 1978; Beschlußvorschlag und Begründung zum Tagesordnungspunkt Maßnahmen gegen extremistische Ausländer und ausländische Organisationen."
59. "History of Ustashi Terrorism in U.S. Recounted," *Tanjug*, September 22, 1976.
60. Douglas E. Kneeland, "Croats and Serbs in Chicago: Pride and Fear over Growing Violence," *New York Times*, December 9, 1978.
61. NARA. RG 59—A1(5584), Box 2 (1957–75), Folder "POL—Political AFF. & Rel. / POL 23–8 / Incidents / Bombing" (January 29, 1967).
62. "History of Ustashi Terrorism in U.S. Recounted," *Tanjug*, September 22, 1976.
63. "Text of 'Croation [*sic*] Fighters,'" *New York Times*, September 11, 1976.
64. With the exception of the *International Herald Tribune*, each of the newspapers published the two manifestos. The only reason the *Herald Tribune* did not is because the weekend edition had already gone to press. For a take on the editorial decision to comply with the terrorists' demands, see Frank J. Prial, "Editors of 4 Newspapers Explain Their Decisions to Print Demands," *New York Times*, September 14, 1976.
65. "Text of 'Croation [*sic*] Fighters,'" *New York Times*, September 11, 1976.
66. "Text of 'Croation [*sic*] Fighters,'" *New York Times*, September 11, 1976.
67. "Text of 'Croation [*sic*] Fighters,'" *New York Times*, September 11, 1976.
68. For a detailed hour-by-hour account of the hijacking, see J. Bowyer Bell, *A Time of Terror: How Democratic Societies Respond to Revolutionary Violence* (New York: Basic Books, 1978), 6–35.
69. "Five Seized Hijackers Flown Back to Face Air Piracy Charges," *New York Times*, September 13, 1976.
70. Bell, *Time of Terror*, 10–15.
71. For examples of relatively positive portrayals of both the skyjackers and their cause published in the weeks following the hijacking, see Molly Ivins, "New York's Croatians: Close-Knit and Fiery," *New York Times*, September 18, 1976; Georgie Anne Geyer, "Terrorists Are 'Nice Guys,' Their Victims Say—Why?" *Los Angeles Times*, October 5, 1976; and Marilynn Preston, "Tempo: Julie Schulz—Just a Nice Girl from Portland," *Chicago Tribune*, October 25, 1976.

72. For a not altogether unproblematic firsthand account of not just the hijacking but events in the years leading up to it, see Julienne Eden Bušić, *Lovers and Madmen: A True Story of Passion, Politics, and Air Piracy* (New York: Writers Club Press, 2000).
73. For an illustration of the difficulty Croatian-Americans had in dealing with the hijacking, see the editorial treatment of the hijacking in the weekly newspaper of the Croatian Fraternal Union, which remained the largest organization of its kind in 1976 with 110,000 members: John Bodavinac et al., "An Editorial," *Zajedničar*, September 22, 1976.
74. At their trial in New York, Zvonko and Julienne Bušić both received life sentences for their role in the hijacking, while Frane Pešut and Petar Matanić each received thirty years. Before the trial, Slobodan Vlašić pled guilty to aircraft piracy and also was given a thirty-year sentence.
75. Part of the support shown for the hijackers was a letter-writing campaign to the American president, Jimmy Carter. The text of a postcard Croats living in America mailed en masse to the president read: "These people are fighters for a free Croatia. In the principles of the American Declaration of Independence, they have found the centuries-old ideals of their Croatian people. Deeply moved by the examples of your great predecessors, Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and other American humanists, these young Croatians have revolted against the occupying power in their homeland. We hope that you will understand them, taking into account their motives, and that you, as the President of the U.S.A., will help the just cause of Croatia by doing what you can to insure these five a fair trial." From the author's private library.
76. The two most noteworthy actions undertaken by the American Croatian community were a fund-raising drive to help finance the skyjackers' defense and the above referenced letter-writing campaign to Jimmy Carter asking the American president to ensure that the motivations leading to the hijacking be taken into consideration at the trial in order to ensure its fairness.
77. "Zvonko Bušić: Htjeli su me izbaciti kao lopova," *Slobodna Dalmacija*, July 24, 2008.
78. "Bušić zamolio za oprost jer više nije mogao izdržati," *HRT Vijesti*, September 1, 2013.
79. "Bušić zamolio za oprost jer više nije mogao izdržati," *HRT Vijesti*, September 1, 2013. As a further note, allegations have persisted since the 1970s that Bušić was responsible for another—even more deadly—terrorist attack in the United States, the December 29, 1975, bombing at LaGuardia Airport in New York that killed eleven and injured another seventy-five. To this day, the bombing remains the deadliest unsolved act of terrorism ever committed in the United States. To his death, Bušić denied any involvement in the bombing, and no credible evidence linking him with the attack has ever surfaced. On both the allegations themselves and their persistence, see Al Baker, "Terrorist's Release Reopens Wound of Unsolved Bombing," *New York Times*, August 9, 2008, and John R. Schindler, "Why Hasn't Washington Explained the 1975 LaGuardia Airport Bombings," *Observer*, January 4, 2016.

80. "Yugoslavs Convicted for Invasion Scheme," *United Press International*, October 13, 1977.
81. Carey Winfrey, "Three Croats Invade Yugoslavs' Mission," *New York Times*, June 15, 1977.
82. The attempt to replace the Yugoslav flag with those of the United States and Croatia was aborted when the assailants noticed that the police had positioned snipers on adjacent roofs. Winfrey, "Three Croats Invade Yugoslavs' Mission."
83. TNA. FCO 28/3596, Doc.: "Release of German Terrorists Held in Yugoslavia" (December 15, 1978), 1.
84. The seven others were Franjo Mikulić, Ivan Dragoja, Ilija Papac, Emin Fazlija, Vladimir Čudić, Nikola Miličević, and Damir Petrić.
85. "Der Exilkroate Stepan Bilandzic ist kein politischer Täter," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, August 17, 1978.
86. TNA. FCO 28/3596, Doc.: "Release of German Terrorists Held in Yugoslavia" (December 15, 1978), 1.
87. "Bonn Won't Extradite Three Sought by Belgrade," *Wall Street Journal*, September 13, 1978.
88. TNA. FCO 28/3596, Doc.: "Yugoslavia/FRG: Extradition of Terrorists" (September 22, 1978), 2.
89. TNA. FCO 28/3596, Doc.: "Release of German Terrorists Held in Yugoslavia" (December 15, 1978), 2.
90. BStU, MfS—HA XXII, nr. 78/10, 000002. The document posits no theories as to why specifically Iraq and not some other country.
91. TNA. FCO 28/3596, Doc.: "FRG/Yugoslavia: Release of Suspected Terrorists" (November 27, 1978), 2.
92. Stefan Piller, "Das schwere Kreuz der Kroaten," *Deutsche Zeitung*, August 25, 1978.
93. John Dornberg, "One Man's Terrorist . . . ," *International Herald Tribune*, August 22, 1978.
94. "Jury Hears More Evidence in Croatian Case," *Reuters*, November 29, 1978.
95. TNA. FCO 28/3596, Doc.: "Yugoslavia/FRG: Extradition of Terrorists" (September 22, 1978), 1–2.
96. TNA. FCO 28/3596, Doc.: "Yugoslavia/FRG: Extradition of Terrorists" (September 22, 1978), 3.
97. Arnold H. Lubasch, "4 Croatians Given 20 to 35 Years for Plot," *New York Times*, May 13, 1981.
98. "United States of America, Appellee, v. Milan Bagaric, Mile Markich, Ante Ljubas, Vinko Logarusic, Ranko Primorac, and Drago Sudar, Defendants-Appellants," 706 F.2d 42 (2d Cir. 1983).
99. "Bomb Mailed to a Priest Hurts Detective in Blast," *New York Times*, February 28, 1979.
100. "United States of America, Appellee, v. Milan Bagaric, Mile Markich, Ante Ljubas, Vinko Logarusic, Ranko Primorac, and Drago Sudar, Defendants-Appellants," 706 F.2d 42 (2d Cir. 1983).

101. "FBI Investigating Yugoslavian Tie in L.A. Violence," *Washington Post*, June 10, 1979.
102. Robert McG. Thomas Jr., "Bomb Laid to Croats Damages Queens Travel Agency," *New York Times*, December 5, 1979.
103. Peter Kihss, "Bomb in 5th Ave. Tower Shatters Yugoslav Bank," *New York Times*, March 18, 1980.
104. "United States of America, Appellee, v. Milan Bagaric, Mile Markich, Ante Ljubas, Vinko Logarusic, Ranko Primorac, and Drago Sudar, Defendants-Appellants," 706 F.2d 42 (2d Cir. 1983).
105. Alan Riding, "Paraguay Accepts Terrorist and Stir Is Minor," *New York Times*, December 27, 1987.
106. Riding, "Paraguay Accepts Terrorist and Stir Is Minor."
107. If not for his time in prison, Barešić would undoubtedly be implicated in the murder on February 28, 1986, of the Swedish prime minister Olof Palme. Over the years, as with the theory concerning Zvonko Bušić's role in the 1975 LaGuardia bombing, Croatian radicals have been tied to the murder of Palme. Both of these theories, in fact, have been given new life recently by the former National Security Agency intelligence analyst and author John R. Schindler, who is, inter alia, a frequent commentator on the activities of the Yugoslav security services during the Cold War. See Schindler, "Why Hasn't Washington Explained" and John R. Schindler, "Who Murdered Olof Palme?" *Observer*, November 16, 2016. Along similar lines, a recent investigative report in the German weekly *Focus* purports to present new evidence of the Yugoslav security service's responsibility for the assassination of Palme. Josef Hufelschulte, "Heiße Spur im Mordfall Palme," *Focus*, January 16, 2011.
108. The SAO of Krajina was a self-proclaimed autonomous region comprised of Serbian-majority municipalities within Croatia.
109. Davorka Blažević, "Barešića su ubili hrvatski zavjerenici, a ne četnici," *Slobodna Dalmacija*, February 4, 2012, and "Život i smrt puni kontroverzi: Miro Barešić je u grob odnio brojne tajne," *Slobodna Dalmacija*, August 2, 2016.
110. "Serbia and Croatia in War of Words over Assassin Statue," *BBC*, August 2, 2016.
111. LAC. RG 25, vol. 9362, File 20–18–1–5, Part 26, Doc.: "Croatian National Resistance—Hrvatski narodni otpor (HNOtpor)," 1. In total, fifteen Croats were arrested. Four were acquitted, with the remaining eleven receiving sentences ranging from twenty to forty years.
112. Arnold H. Lubasch, "8 Indicted as the Leaders of Croatian Terror Group," *New York Times*, June 26, 1981.

Epilogue: Fixated for Many Years on This Day, 1980–1991

1. BStU, MfS—HA XXII, nr. 16844, 0048.
2. NAA. Series A432 (A432/15), Control Symbol 1964/2357 PART 4, Item 1111186. Doc.: "Current Trends in the Croatian National Movement," 1.
3. LAC. RG 9361. File 20–18–1–5, Part 16. Doc.: "Conversation between Mr. N. Radjenovic, Counsellor, Embassy of Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and

Mr. R. H. Robertson, First Assistant Secretary, Western Division on 22 August 1975. SUBJECTS(S): MOVEMENT OF CROATIAN EXTREMISTS," 2.

4. For a commentary on such fears and expectations, see Robert Pear, "Violent Acts in US Feared on Tito's Death," *New York Times*, March 24, 1980.
5. Timothy S. Robinson, "Croatian Group Says It Bombed Yugoslav Envoy's Home Here," *Washington Post*, June 5, 1980.
6. Peter Kihss, "Statue of Liberty Bomb Caused Only Minor Damage to 3 Museum Items," *New York Times*, June 5, 1980.
7. "Poratne žrtve državnog terora SFRJ u inozemstvu," *Komisija za utvrđivanje ratnih i poratnih* žrtava (September 30, 1999), 5–7.
8. Christian Axboe Nielsen, "Die Arbeit des jugoslawischen Staatssicherheitsdienstes zur Bekämpfung der 'feindlichen Emigration': Eine Analyse der Maßnahmen und Mittel." Expert Report for Oberlandesgericht München, 2015, and Christian Axboe Nielsen, "Ergänzung des Gutachtens: Die Arbeit des jugoslawischen Staatssicherheitsdienstes zur Bekämpfung der 'feindlichen Emigration': Eine Analyse der Maßnahmen und Mittel." Expert Report Addendum for Oberlandesgericht München, 2016.
9. BA. Bestand 206, Band 1098, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (October 23, 1972), 59–60.
10. BA. Bestand 206, Band 1101, Dok.: "Informationen über Emigration" (April 1, 1975), 72–73.
11. TNA. FCO 28–3596. Doc.: "British Embassy Belgrade: Terrorism and Internal Security" (November 7, 1978).
12. John Blaxland and Rhys Crawley, *The Secret Cold War: The Official History of ASIO, 1975–1989*, vol. 3 (Crows Nest, NSW: Allen and Unwin, 2016), 136–142.
13. Hamish McDonald, *Framed* (Sydney: Fairfax Media, 2012), 6–7.
14. Blaxland and Crawley, *Secret Cold War*, 139.
15. For an investigative journalistic account of the entire "Croatian Six" case, see McDonald, *Framed*.
16. "Haftbefehl gegen mutmaßlichen Agenten des ehemaligen Jugoslawien wegen Verdachts der Beihilfe zum Mord an einem Exilkroaten 1983," *Generalbundesanwalt beim Bundesgerichtshof*, July 8, 2005. The last likely victim of an Udba targeted killing before the collapse of socialist Yugoslavia in 1991 was the Kosovar Albanian Enver Hadri, who was murdered in Brussels on February 25, 1990.
17. Skrbiš, "Mobilized Croatian Diaspora," 225–26.
18. "Croatian Party Leader Warns against Pro-Soviet Elements," *RAD/Radio Free Europe*, June 9, 1980.
19. "SFRY Assembly Committees Discuss Emigree [*sic*] Hostility," *Tanjug*, June 26, 1984.
20. Hockenos, *Homeland Calling*, 21–22.
21. Skrbiš, "Mobilized Croatian Diaspora," 227.
22. Skrbiš, "Mobilized Croatian Diaspora," 228.
23. Ragazzi, *Governing Diasporas*.

24. Skrbiš, "Mobilized Croatian Diaspora," 231.
25. The Slovenian parliament made a similar declaration on the same day.
26. A great deal, of course, has been written as to the reason for Yugoslavia's collapse in 1991. For useful and readable explanations of the breakup of Yugoslavia, see Christopher Bennett, *Yugoslavia's Bloody Collapse: Causes, Course and Consequences* (London: Hurst and Company, 1995); Laura Silber and Allan Little, *The Death of Yugoslavia* (London: Penguin Books, 1995); Lenard J. Cohen, *Broken Bonds: Yugoslavia's Disintegration and Balkan Politics in Transition* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993); and Branka Magaš, *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracing the Break-Up, 1980–1992* (London: Verso, 1993).
27. Skrbiš, "Mobilized Croatian Diaspora," 229–30, and Djokić, "Second World War II."
28. Pavlaković, "Flirting with Fascism"; Hockenos, *Homeland Calling*; and Skrbiš, "Mobilized Croatian Diaspora."
29. Pavlaković, "Flirting with Fascism"; Hockenos, *Homeland Calling*; and Skrbiš, "Mobilized Croatian Diaspora."
30. Pavlaković, "Flirting with Fascism."

Bibliography

Archives

Australia:
National Archives of Australia, Canberra (NAA)
National Archives of Australia, Melbourne (NAA–Melbourne)
National Archives of Australia, Sydney (NAA–Sydney)
Publications Archives, Parliament of Australia, Canberra (PCA–Senate)
University of Melbourne Archives, Melbourne (UMA)

Germany:
Bundesarchiv (Federal Archives), Koblenz (BA)
Bundesbeauftragte für die Stasi-Unterlagen (Office of the Federal Commissioner for the Stasi Archives), Berlin (BStU)
Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes (Political Archives of the Foreign Office), Berlin (PAAA)

Serbia:
Arhiv Jugoslavije (Archive of Yugoslavia), Belgrade (AJ)
Diplomatski arhiv Ministarstva spoljnih poslova Republike Srbije (Diplomatic Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Republic of Serbia), Belgrade (DA MSP RS)

Croatia:
Hrvatski državni arhiv (Croatian National Archives), Zagreb (HDA)

United States:
National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD (NARA)

Canada:
Library and Archives of Canada, Ottawa, ON (LAC)

United Kingdom:
The National Archives, London (TNA)

New Zealand:
Archives New Zealand, Wellington (ANZ)

Austria:
Archiv der Republik (Archive of the Republic), Vienna (AdR)

Hungary:
Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives, Budapest (OSA)

Published Sources

Aarons, Mark. *War Criminals Welcome: Australia, a Sanctuary for Fugitive War Criminals since 1945*. Melbourne: Black Inc., 2001.

Aarons, Mark, and John Loftus. *Ratlines: How the Vatican's Nazi Networks Betrayed Western Intelligence to the Soviets*. London: Heinemann, 1991.

---. *Unholy Trinity: The Vatican, the Nazis, and the Swiss Banks*. New York: St. Martin's, 1998.

Adamson, Fiona. "Crossing Borders: International Migration and National Security." *International Security* 31, no. 1 (Summer 2006): 165–99.

Akmadža, Miroslav. *Krunoslav Draganović, Iskazi komunističkim istražiteljima*. Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2010.

Alexander, Stella. *Church and State in Yugoslavia since 1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

---. *The Triple Myth: A Life of Alojzije Stepinac*. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1987.

Alexander, Yonah, and Kenneth A. Myers, eds. *Terrorism in Europe*. London: Croom Helm, 1982.

Allcock, John B. *Explaining Yugoslavia*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

---. "In Praise of Chauvinism: Rhetorics of Nationalism in Yugoslavia." *Third World Quarterly* 11, no. 4 (1989): 208–22.

Amnesty International. *Yugoslavia: Prisoners of Conscience*. London: Amnesty International Publications, 1985.

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

---. *Long-Distance Nationalism: World Capitalism and the Rise of Identity Politics [The Wertheim Lecture 1992]*. Amsterdam: Centre for Asian Studies, 1992.

Anderson, Scott, and Jon Lee Anderson. *Inside the League: The Shocking Expose of How Terrorists, Nazis, and Latin American Death Squads Have Infiltrated the World Anti-Communist League*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1986.

Antić, Ana. "Fascism under Pressure: Influence of Marxist Discourse on the Ideological Redefinition of the Croatian Fascist Movement, 1941–1944." *East European Politics and Societies* 24, no. 1 (Winter 2010): 116–58.

Apostol Plemić (Adolf Andrić). *Osvetnici Bleiburga: "Priručnik" za vođenje Hrvatske gerile*. Drugo izdanje: Osvetnici Bugojna, 1974.

Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Apter, David E., ed. *The Legitimization of Violence*. London: Macmillan, 1997.

Armstrong, John. "Toward a Framework for Considering Nationalism in East Europe." *Wilson Center Occasional Papers*, no. 8 (April 1987): 280–305.

Bajo y Giroud, Alberto. *150 Questions for a Guerilla*. Denver, CO: Panther Publications, 1963.

Bakić-Hayden, Milica. "Nesting Orientalisms: The Case of Former Yugoslavia." *Slavic Review* 54, no. 4 (Winter 1995): 917–31.

Bakić-Hayden, Milica, and Robert Hayden. "Orientalist Variations on the Theme 'Balkans': Symbolic Geography in Recent Yugoslav Cultural Polities." *Slavic Review* 51, no. 1 (Spring 1992): 1–15.

Baković, Nikola. "Tending the 'Oasis of Socialism': Transnational Political Mobilization of Yugoslav Economic Emigrants in the FR Germany in the Late 1960s and 1970s." *Nationalities Papers* 42, no. 4 (March 2014): 674–90.

Balantič, Polona. "Jugoslavija in mednarodni terorizem v sedemdesetih letih: Dva primera neizročitve teroristov Zvezni republiki Nemčiji." *Prispevki za novejšo zgodovino* 55, no. 1 (2015): 143–91.

Balas, Sven. "The Opposition in Croatia." In *Burn This House: The Making and Unmaking of Yugoslavia*, edited by Jasminka Udovički and James Ridgeway, 267–80. London: Duke University Press, 1997.

Balić, Emily Greble. "When Croatia Needed Serbs: Nationalism and Genocide in Sarajevo, 1941–1942." *Slavic Review* 68, no. 1 (Spring 2009): 116–38.

Banac, Ivo, ed. *Eastern Europe in Revolution*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press 1992.

---. "The Fearful Asymmetry of War: The Causes and Consequences of Yugoslavia's Demise." *Dædalus* 121, no. 2 (Spring 1992): 141–74.

---. "Misreading the Balkans." *Foreign Policy*, no. 93 (Winter 1993–94): 173–82.

---. *The National Question in Yugoslavia: Origins, History, Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984.

---. "Nationalism in Southeastern Europe." In *Nationalism and Nationalities in the New Europe*, edited by Charles A. Kupchan, 107–21. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995.

---. "Political Change and National Diversity." *Dædalus* 119, no. 1 (Winter 1990): 141–59.

---. *With Stalin against Tito: Cominformist Splits in Yugoslav Communism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Bartulin, Nevenko. "From Independence to Trialism: The Croatian Party of Right and the Project for a Liberal 'Greater Croatia' within the Habsburg Empire, 1861–1914." In *Liberal Imperialism in Europe*, edited by Matthew P. Fitzpatrick, 115–40. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Basch, Linda, Nina Glick-Schiller, and Cristina Szanton Blanc. *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments and Deterritorialized Nation-States*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Bašić, Natalija. "Transnationalism in the Balkans: An Introduction." In *Transnationalism in the Balkans*, edited by Denisa Kostovicova and Vesna Bojicic-Dzelilovic, 1–5. London: Routledge, 2008.

Batović, Ante. "The Balkans in Turmoil—Croatian Spring and the Yugoslav Position between the Cold War Blocs, 1965–1971." LSE Ideas, Cold War Studies Programme, 2003 [2009].

---. *The Croatian Spring: Nationalism, Repression, and Foreign Policy under Tito*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2017.

Bauböck, Rainer. "Towards a Political Theory of Migrant Transnationalism." *International Migration Review* 37, no. 3 (2003): 700–723.

Baučić, Ivo. "Stanje vanjskih migracija iz Jugoslavije krajem sedamdesetih godina." *Rasprave o migracijama,* no. 57. Zagreb: Centar za istraživanje migracije, 1979.

Bauerkämper, Arnd. "Transnational Fascism: Cross-Border Relations between Regimes and Movements in Europe, 1922–1939." *East Central Europe* 37, nos. 2–3 (2010): 214–46.

Becherelli, Alberto. "The National Question in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes: The Croatian Case." *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 2, no. 3 (September 2011): 265–70.

Beljo, Ante, ed. *Greater Serbia: From Ideology to Aggression*. Zagreb: Croatian Information Center, 1993.

---. *Jugoslavija Genocid: Dokumentarna analiza*. Sudbury, ON: Northern Tribune Publishing, 1985.

---. *YU-genocid: Bleiburg, Križni put, Udba*. Toronto: Hišak, 1990.

Bell, J. Bowyer. *A Time of Terror: How Democratic Societies Respond to Revolutionary Violence*. New York: Basic Books, 1978.

Bellamy, Alex J. *The Formation of Croatian National Identity: A Centuries-Old Dream?* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.

Beloff, Nora. *Tito's Flawed Legacy: Yugoslavia and the West, 1939–1984*. London: Gollancz, 1985.

Beniger, Aleksa. *Alojzije Stepinac Hrvatski Kardinal*. Rome: ZIRAL, 1974.

Bennett, Christopher. *Yugoslavia's Bloody Collapse: Causes, Course, and Consequences*. London: Hurst and Company, 1995.

Bergholz, Max. *Violence as a Generative Force: Identity, Nationalism, and Memory in a Balkan Community*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2016.

Bhatia, Michael. 2005. "Fighting Words: Naming Terrorists, Bandits, Rebels, and Other Violent Actors." *Third World Quarterly* 26, no. 1 (2005): 5–22.

Biondich, Mark. *The Balkans: Revolution, War, and Political Violence since 1878*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

---. "Controversies Surrounding the Catholic Church in Wartime Croatia, 1941–1945." *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 7, no. 4 (December 2006): 429–57.

---. "The Need for a More Rigorous Historiography of Fascism." *East Central Europe* 37, nos. 2–3 (2010): 359–61.

---. "Religion and Nation in Wartime Croatia: Reflections on the Ustaša Policy of Forced Religious Conversions, 1941–1942." *Slavonic and East European Review* 83, no. 1 (January 2005): 71–116.

---. *Stjepan Radić, the Croat Peasant Party, and the Politics of Mass Mobilization, 1904–1928*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

---. "Vladko Maček and the Croat Political Right, 1928–1941." *Contemporary European History* 16, no. 2 (May 2007): 203–13.

---. "'We Were Defending the State': Nationalism, Myth, and Memory in Twentieth-Century Croatia." In *Ideologies and National Identities: The Case of Twentieth-Century Southeastern Europe*, edited by John Lampe and Mark Mazower, 54–109. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2006.

Blaxland, John. *The Protest Years: The Official History of ASIO, 1963–1975*. Vol. 2. Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 2015.

Blaxland, John, and Rhys Crawley. *The Secret Cold War: The Official History of ASIO, 1975–1989*. Vol. 3. Crows Nest, NSW: Allen and Unwin, 2016.

Boban, Branka. "Vladko Maček u emigraciji—od izlaska iz zemlje do odlaska u SAD." *Institute of Croatian History, RADOVI—Zavod za hrvatsku povijest* 39, no. 1 (October 2007): 243–58.

Boban, Ljubo. "Jasenovac and the Manipulation of History." *East European Politics and Societies* 4, no. 3 (1990): 580–92.

---. *Kontroverze iz povijesti Jugoslavije: Dokumentima i polemikom o temama iz novije povijesti Jugoslavije*. Vols. 1–2. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1987–89.

Bock-Luna, Birgit. *The Past in Exile: Serbian Long-Distance Nationalism and Identity in the Wake of the Third Balkan War*. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2007.

Bogosavljević, Srdjan. "Nerasvetljeni genocide." In *Srpska strana rata: Trauma i katarza u istorijsko pamćenju*, edited by Nebojša Popov, 159–70. Belgrade: BIGZ, 1996.

Bokovoy, Melissa K., Jill A. Irvine, and Carol S. Lilly, eds. *State-Society Relations in Yugoslavia, 1945–1992*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Bonifaćić, Antun F., and Clement S. Mihanovich, eds. *The Croatian Nation in Its Struggle for Freedom and Independence: A Symposium by Seventeen Croatian Writers*. Chicago: "Croatia" Cultural Publication Center, 1955.

Bove, Vincenzo, and Tobias Böhmelt. "Does Immigration Induce Terrorism?" *Journal of Politics* 78, no. 2. (April 2016): 572–88.

Bracewell, Wendy. "National Histories and National Identities among the Serbs and Croats." In *National Histories and European History*, edited by Mary Fulbrook, 141–60. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993.

Brawley, Sean. "'Days of Rage' Downunder: Considering American Influences on 'Home-Grown' Terrorism and ASIO's Response in 1970s Australia." *Australian Historical Studies* 47, no. 2 (May 2016): 295–310.

Breitman, Richard, Norman J. W. Goda, Timothy Naftali, and Robert Wolfe. *U.S. Intelligence and the Nazis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Brentin, Dario. "Ready for the Homeland? Ritual, Remembrance, and Political Extremism in Croatian Football." *Nationalities Papers* 44, no. 6 (2016): 860–76.

Breuilly, John. *Nationalism and the State*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985.
Brinkerhoff, Jennifer. "Diaspora Identity and the Potential for Violence: Toward an Identity-Mobilization Framework." *Identity* 8, no. 1 (2008): 67–88.
Brkljačić, Maja. "What Past Is Present?" *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 17, no. 1 (Fall 2003): 41–52.
Brown, Gregory Scott. "The Diasporic Challenge to Identity: Insights from the Australian-Croat Experience." *People and Place* 8, no. 3 (2000): 68–73.
Brubaker, Rogers. "The 'Diaspora' Diaspora." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28, no. 1 (January 2005): 1–19.
Brunnbauer, Ulf. *Globalizing Southeastern Europe: Emigrants, America, and the State since the Late Nineteenth Century*. New York: Lexington Books, 2016.
---, ed. *Transnational Societies, Transterritorial Politics: Migrations in the (Post-) Yugoslav Region, 19th–21st Century*. Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2009.
Buchenau, Klaus. "What Went Wrong? Church-State Relations in Socialist Yugoslavia." *Nationalities Papers* 33, no. 4 (December 2005): 547–67.
Budding, Audrey Helfant. "Yugoslavs into Serbs: Serbian National Identity, 1961–1971." *Nationalities Papers* 25, no. 3 (1997): 407–26.
Bukowski, Charles. "Politics and the Prospects for Economic Reform in Yugoslavia." *East European Politics and Societies* 2, no. 1 (December 1987): 94–114.
Burg, Steven L. *Conflict and Cohesion in Socialist Yugoslavia*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983.
---. "Elite Conflict in Post-Tito Yugoslavia." *Soviet Studies* 38, no. 2 (April 1986): 170–93.
---. "Ethnic Conflict and the Federalization of Socialist Yugoslavia: The Serbo-Croat Conflict." *Publius* 7, no. 4 (Autumn 1977): 119–43.
---. "Nationalism and Democratization in Yugoslavia." *Washington Quarterly* 14, no. 4 (Autumn 1991): 5–19.
Burg, Steven L., and Michael L. Berbaum. "Community, Integration, and Stability in Multinational Yugoslavia." *American Political Science Review* 83, no. 2 (June 1989): 535–54.
Burzanović, Tihomir-Tiho. *Dva metka za Pavelića: Knjiga o Blagoju Jovoviću*. Bijelo Polje: Pegaz, 2002.
Bušić, Bruno. *Jedino Hrvatska! Sabrano spisi*. Toronto: ZIRAL, 1983.
Bušić, Julienne Eden. *Lovers and Madmen: A True Story of Passion, Politics, and Air Piracy*. New York: Writers Club Press, 2000.
Butler, Kim. "Defining Diaspora, Refining a Discourse." *Diaspora* 10, no. 2 (Fall 2001): 189–219.
Cain, Frank. *The Australian Security Intelligence Organization: An Unofficial History*. Essex: Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., 1994.
---. *The Origins of Political Surveillance in Australia*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1983.
Carter, Sean. "The Geopolitics of Diaspora." *Area* 37, no. 1 (March 2005): 54–63.
Caruso, Clelia, Jenny Pleinen, and Lutz Raphael, eds. *Postwar Mediterranean Migration to Western Europe: Legal and Political Frameworks, Sociability, and Memory Cultures*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2008.

Caspersen, Nina. "Between Puppets and Independent Actors: Kin-State Involvement in the Conflicts in Bosnia, Croatia, and Nagorno Karabakh." *Ethnopolitics* 7, no. 4 (2008): 357–72.

Central Intelligence Agency, Office of National Estimates. "Memo: Yugoslavia—The Ustashi and the Croatian Separatist Problem, 27 September, 1972." In *From "National Communism" to National Collapse: U.S. Intelligence Community Estimative Products on Yugoslavia, 1948–1990.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2007.

Cesarani, David, ed. *The Final Solution: Origins and Implementation*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Čizmić, Ivan. *History of the Croatian Fraternal Union of America, 1894–1994*. Zagreb: Golden Marketing, 1994.

Clarkson, Alexander. *Fragmented Fatherland*. New York: Berghahn, 2013.

---. "Home and Away: Immigration and Political Violence in the Federal Republic of Germany, 1945–90." *Cold War History* 8, no. 1 (February 2008): 1–21.

Clifford, James. "Diasporas." *Cultural Anthropology* 9, no. 3 (August 1994): 302–38.

Clissold, Stephen. "Croat Separatism: Nationalism, Dissidence, and Terrorism." *Conflict Studies*, no. 103 (January 1979): 1–21.

Cohen, Lenard J. *Broken Bonds: Yugoslavia's Disintegration and Balkan Politics in Transition*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995.

---. *The Socialist Pyramid: Elites and Power in Yugoslavia*. London: Mosaic Press, 1989.

Cohen, Lenard J., and Jasna Dragović-Soso, eds. *State Collapse in South-Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on Yugoslavia's Disintegration*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2007.

Cohen, Robert S., and Mihailo Marković. *Yugoslavia: The Rise and Fall of Socialist Humanism*. Nottingham: Spokesman, 1975.

Cohen, Robin. "Diasporas and the Nation-State: From Victims to Challengers." *International Affairs* 72, no. 3 (July 1996): 507–20.

Colic-Peisker, Val. "'Ethnic' and 'Cosmopolitan' Transnationalism: Two Cohorts of Croatian Immigrants in Australia." *Migracijske i etničke teme* 22, no. 3 (2006): 211–31.

---. *Migration, Class, and Transnational Identities: Croatians in Australia and America*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2008.

Connor, Walker. *The National Question in Marxist-Leninist Theory and Strategy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Connor, Walter D. "Dissent in Eastern Europe: A New Coalition?" *Problems of Communism* 29, no. 1 (January-February 1980): 1–17.

Conversi, Daniele. "Irresponsible Radicalisation: Diasporas, Globalisation, and Long-Distance Nationalism in the Digital Age." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 38, no. 9 (July 2012): 1357–79.

Coppieters, Bruno, and Michel Huysseune, eds. *Secession, History, and the Social Sciences*. Brussels: Brussels University Press, 2002.

Crenshaw, Martha. "The Causes of Terrorism." *Comparative Politics* 13, no. 4 (1981): 379–99.

Crkvenčić, Ivan. *Političko-geografska i demografska pitanja Hrvatske*. Zagreb: Savez geografskih društava Hrvatske, 1991.

Crkvenčić, Ivan, and Mladen Klemenžić. *Aggression against Croatia: Geopolitical and Demographic Facts*. Zagreb: Republic of Croatia Central Bureau of Statistics, 1993.

Crone, Manni, and Martin Harrow. "Homegrown Terrorism in the West." *Terrorism and Political Violence* 23, no. 4 (2011): 521–36.

Curry, Jane Leftwich, ed. *Dissent in Eastern Europe*. New York: Praeger, 1983.

Čuvalo, Ante, ed. *Croatia and the Croatians*. Zagreb: Northern Tribune Publishing, 1991.

---. *The Croatian National Movement, 1966–1972*. New York: East European Monographs, 1990.

Cvetković, Srđan. "Političko-propagandno delovanje jugoslovenske političke emigracije na Zapadu 1945–1985." *Hereticus*, no. 4 (2009): 41–68.

Daley, Paul. "Catholic Extremism Fears in 1970s Australia Made Croats 'the Muslims of Their Time.'" *Guardian*, July 29, 2016. https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/postcolonial-blog/2016/jul/29/catholic-extremism-fears-in-1970s-australia-made-croats-the-muslims-of-their-time.

Danilović, Rajko. *Upotreba neprijatelja: Politička sudjenja 1945–1991 u Jugoslaviji*. Valjevo: Anecija Valjevac, 1993.

"Deklaracija o nazivu i položaju hrvatskog književnog jezika." *Telegram: Jugoslavenske novine za društvena i kulturna pitanj*, no. 359 (March 17, 1967): 1.

della Porta, Donatella. *Clandestine Political Violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

---. *Social Movements, Political Violence and the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Demmers, Jolle. "Diaspora and Conflict: Locality, Long-Distance Nationalism, and Delocalisation of Conflict Dynamics." *Javnost* 9, no. 1 (2002): 85–96.

Denich, Bette. "Dismembering Yugoslavia: Nationalist Ideologies and the Symbolic Revival of Genocide." *American Ethnologist* 21, no. 2 (May 1994): 367–90.

Denitch, Bogdan Denis. *Ethnic Nationalism: The Tragic Death of Yugoslavia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

---. *The Legitimation of a Revolution: The Yugoslav Case*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1976.

---. *Limits and Possibilities: The Crisis of Yugoslav Socialism and State Socialist Systems*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990.

Deželić, Berislav Đuro. *Wen trifft die Schuld für das Attentat von Mehlem?* Krefeld: Draga-Druck u. Verlag, 1964.

---. *An Widerständen wächst ein Volk: Der Freiheitskampf des kroatischen Volkes von 1918–1963*. Krefeld-Uerdingen: Draga-Druck und Verlag, 1964.

Dizdar, Zdravko. *Tko je tko u NDH: Hrvatska 1941–1945*. Zagreb: Minerva, 1997.

Djilas, Aleksa. *The Contested Country: Yugoslav Unity and Communist Revolution, 1919–1953*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.

---. "Fear Thy Neighbor: The Breakup of Yugoslavia." In *Nationalism and Nationalities in the New Europe*, edited by Charles A. Kupchan, 85–106. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Djokić, Dejan. *Elusive Compromise: A History of Interwar Yugoslavia*. London: Hurst and Company, 2007.

---. "Nationalism, History, and Identity in the Balkans: An Overview of Recent Histories of Europe's South-East." *Slavonic and East European Review* 81, no. 3 (July 2003): 511–24.

---. "The Second World War II: Discourses of Reconciliation in Serbia and Croatia in the Late 1980s and Early 1990s." *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans* 4, no. 2 (2002): 127–40.

---, ed. *Yugoslavism: Histories of a Failed Idea, 1918–1992*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2003.

Djuric, Ivana. "The Croatian Diaspora in North America: Identity, Ethnic Solidarity, and the Formation of a 'Transnational National Community.'" *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 17, no. 1 (Fall 2003): 113–30.

Dragnitch, Alex. "The Rise and Fall of Yugoslavia: The Omen of the Upsurge of Serbian Nationalism." *East European Quarterly* 23, no. 2 (June 1989): 184–98.

---. *Serbs and Croats: The Struggle in Yugoslavia*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1992.

Dragojević, Mila. "Competing Institutions in National Identity Construction: The Croatian Case." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 11, no. 1 (2005): 61–87.

Dreher, Axel, Martin Gassebner, and Paul Schaudt. "The Effect of Migration on Terror—Made at Home or Imported from Abroad?" *CESifo Working Papers,* no. 6441 (April 2017): 1–43.

Dulić, Tomislav. "Tito's Slaughterhouse: A Critical Analysis of Rummel's Work on Democide." *Journal of Peace Research* 41, no. 1 (2004): 85–102.

Dunn, Dennis J., ed. *Religion and Nationalism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1987.

Đurašković, Stevo. "National Identity-Building and the 'Ustaša-Nostalgia' in Croatia: The Past That Will Not Pass." *Nationalities Papers* 44, no. 5 (2016): 772–88.

Duyvesteyn, Isabelle. "The Role of History and Continuity in Terrorism Research." In *Mapping Terrorism Research: State of the Art, Gaps, and Future Direction*, edited by Magnus Ranstorp, 51–75. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2007.

Dyker, David A. *Yugoslavia: Socialism, Development, and Debt*. London: Longman, 1990.

Dyker, David A., and Ivan Vejdoda, eds. *Yugoslavia and After: A Study in Fragmentation, Despair, and Rebirth*. London: Longman, 1996.

Eatwell, Roger. "Fascism." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*, edited by Michael Freeden, Lyman Tower Sargent, and Marc Stears, 474–92. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Elwin, Göran. "Swedish Anti-Terrorist Legislation." *Contemporary Crises* 1, no. 3 (July 1977): 289–301.

Ember, Melvin, Carol R. Ember, and Ian Skoggard, eds. *Encyclopedia of Diasporas*. New York: Springer, 2005.

Emmerson, Ben. "Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms while Countering Terrorism." United Nations Human Rights Council, A/71/384 (September 13, 2016): 1–23.

Evans, Martin, and Ken Lunn, eds. *War and Memory in the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Berg, 1997.

"Executive Order 13780: Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States Initial Section 11 Report." Department of Homeland Security and Department of Justice of the United States of America, January 2018.

Fitzpatrick, Matthew P., ed. *Liberal Imperialism in Europe*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Fleck, Hans-Georg, and Igor Graovac, eds. *Dijalog povjesničara—istoričara*. Vols. 1–4. Zagreb: Friedrich Naumann Stiftung, 2000–2001.

Fox, Michael S. "Ante Ciliga, Trotskii, and State Capitalism: Theory, Tactics, and Reevaluation during the Purge Era, 1935–1939." *Slavic Review* 50, no. 1 (Spring 1991): 127–43.

Fox, Richard G., ed. *Nationalist Ideologies and the Production of National Cultures*. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association, 1990.

Freeden, Michael, Lyman Tower Sargent, and Marc Stears. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Freeman, Michael, Dragomir Pantić, and Dušan Janjić, eds. *Nationalism and Minorities*. Belgrade: Institute of Social Sciences, 1995.

Fingar, Thomas. *From "National Communism" to National Collapse: U.S. Intelligence Community Estimative Products on Yugoslavia, 1948–1990*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2007.

Fulbrook, Mary, ed. *National Histories and European History*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993.

Gage, Beverly. *The Day Wall Street Exploded: A Story of America in Its First Age of Terror*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Ganović, Dragan. *Teroristi iz 'Šeste kolone': Dokumentarna hronika o terorističkoj aktivnosti protiv Jugoslavije*. Belgrade: Borba, 1979.

Geiger, Vladimir. "Human Losses of the Croats in World War II and the Immediate Post-War Period Caused by the Chetniks (Yugoslav Army in the Fatherland) and the Partisans (People's Liberation Army and the Partisan Detachments of Yugoslavia/Yugoslav Army) and the Yugoslav Communist Authorities. Numerical Indicators." *Review of Croatian History* 8, no. 1 (2012): 77–121.

Gellner, Ernest. *Culture, Identity, and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

---. "Ethnicity and Faith in Eastern Europe." *Dædalus* 119, no. 1 (Winter 1990): 279–94.

---. *Nations and Nationalism: New Perspectives on the Past*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.

Gerlach, Julia. *Die Vereinsverbotspraxis der streitbaren Demokratie: Verbieten oder Nicht-Verbieten?* Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2012.

Glazer, Nathan. *The Social Basis of American Communism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.

Glenny, Misha. *The Fall of Yugoslavia: The Third Balkan War*. London: Penguin, 1992.

Glick Schiller, Nina. "Long-Distance Nationalism." In *Encyclopedia of Diasporas*, edited by Melvin Ember, Carol R. Ember, and Ian Skoggard, 570–80. New York: Springer, 2005.

---. "The Transnational Migration Paradigm: Global Perspective on Migration Research." In *Migration and Organized Civil Society: Rethinking National Policy,* edited by Dirk Halm and Zeynep Sezgin, 40–58. London: Routledge, 2013.

Glick Schiller, Nina, Linda Basch, and Cristina Szanton Blanc. "From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration." *Anthropological Quarterly* 68, no. 1 (1995): 48–63.

Gligorov, Vladimir. *Why Do Countries Break Up? The Case of Yugoslavia*. Uppsala, Sweden: Uppsala University Press, 1994.

Goebel, Simon, Thomas Fischer, Friedrich Kießling, and Angela Treiber, eds. *Flucht, Migration und gesellschaftliche Transformationsprozesse*. Wiesbaden: Springer, 2017.

Goldstein, Ivo. *Croatia: A History*. Translated by Nikolina Jovanović. London: Hurst and Company, 1999.

---. *Holokaust u Zagrebu*. Zagreb: Novi Liber, 2001.

Goldstein, Ivo, and Slavko Goldstein. "Revisionism in Croatia: The Case of Franjo Tuđman." *East European Jewish Affairs* 32, no. 1 (Summer 2002): 60–62.

Goñi, Uki. *The Real Odessa: How Perón Brought the Nazi War Criminals to Argentina*. London: Granta Books, 2002.

Gorondi, Pablo. "Hungary's Leader Calls Migration 'Trojan Horse' of Terrorism." *Associated Press*, March 7, 2017. https://www.businessinsider.com/ap-hungarys-leader-calls-migration-trojan-horse-of-terrorism-2017-3.

Gow, James. *Legitimacy and the Military: The Yugoslav Crisis*. London: Pinte, 1992.

Grahek Ravančić, Martina. *Bleiburg i križni put 1945: Historiografija, publicistika i memoarska literatura*, 2. izmijenjeno i dopunjeno izdanje. Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2015.

Gruenwald, Oskar. "Yugoslav Camp Literature: Rediscovering the Ghost of a Nation's Past-Present-Future." *Slavic Review* 46, nos. 3–4 (Autumn/Winter 1987): 513–28.

Gruenwald, Oskar, and Karen Rosenblum-Cale, eds. *Human Rights in Yugoslavia*. New York: Irvington Publishers, 1986.

Guarnizo, Luis Eduardo, Alejandro Portes, and William Haller. "Assimilation and Transnationalism: Determinants of Transnational Political Action among Contemporary Migrants." *American Journal of Sociology* 108, no. 6 (May 2003): 1211–48.

Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." In *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, edited by Jonathon Rutherford, 222–37. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990.

Halm, Dirk, and Zeynep Sezgin, eds. *Migration and Organized Civil Society: Rethinking National Policy*. London: Routledge, 2013.

Hansén, Dan. "Crisis and Perspectives on Policy Change: Swedish Counter-terrorism Policymaking." PhD diss., Swedish National Defence College, Center for Crisis Management Research and Training, 2007.

Hastings, Adrian. *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion, and Nationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard, Wilhelm Heitmeyer, Andrea Kirschner, and Stefan Malthaner, eds. *Control of Violence: Historical and International Perspectives on Modern Societies*. New York: Springer, 2011.

Hayden, Robert. "Imagined Communities and Real Victims: Self-Determination and Ethnic Cleansing in Yugoslavia." *American Ethnologist* 23, no. 4 (November 1996): 783–801.

---. "Recounting the Dead: The Rediscovery and Redefinition of Wartime Massacres in Late- and Post-Communist Yugoslavia." In *Memory, History, and Opposition under State Socialism*, edited by Rubie S. Watson, 167–84. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, 1993.

Hefer, Stjepan. *Croatian Struggle for Freedom and Statehood*. Argentina: Croatian Liberation Movement, 1979.

Himka, John-Paul. "The Importance of the Situational Element in East Central European Fascism." *East Central Europe* 37, nos. 2–3 (2010): 353–58.

Hockenos, Paul. *Homeland Calling: Exile Patriotism and the Balkan Wars*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Hocking, Jenny. *Lionel Murphy: A Political Biography*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

---. *Terror Laws: ASIO, Counter-Terrorism and the Threat to Democracy*. Sydney: UNSW Press, 2004.

Hoffman, Bruce. *Inside Terrorism*. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006.

Hoffman, Bruce, William Rosenau, Andrew J. Curiel, and Doron Zimmerman, eds. *The Radicalization of Diasporas and Terrorism: A Joint Conference by the RAND Corporation and the Center for Security Studies, ETH Zurich*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND National Security Research Division, 2007.

Holian, Anna. "Anticommunism in the Streets: Refugee Politics in Cold War Germany." *Journal of Contemporary History* 45, no. 1 (January 2010): 134–61.

Höpken, Wolfgang. "Von der Mythologisierung zur Stigmatisierung: 'Krieg und Revolution' in Jugoslawien 1941–1948 im Spiegel von Geschichtswissenschaft und historischer Publizistik." In *Kommunismus und Osteuropa: Konzepte, Perspektiven und Interpretationen im Wandel*, edited by Eva Schmidt-Hartmann, 165–201. Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1994.

---. "War, Memory, and Education in a Fragmented Society: The Case of Yugoslavia." *East European Politics and Society* 13, no. 1 (Winter 1999): 190–227.

Horner, David. *The Spy Catchers: The Official History of ASIO, 1949–1963*. Vol. 1. Crows Nest, NSW: Allen and Unwin, 2015.

Ilardi, Gaetano Joe. "The Whitlam Government's 1973 Clash with Australian Intelligence." *International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence* 14, no. 1 (2001): 62–88.

Iordachi, Constantin. "Debate: Fascism in East Central and Southeastern Europe: Mainstream Fascism or 'Mutant' Phenomenon?" *East Central Europe* 37, no. 2/3 (2010): 331–33.

---. "Fascism in Interwar East Central and Southeastern Europe: Toward a New Transnational Research Agenda." *East Central Europe* 37, no. 2/3 (2010): 161–213.

Irvine, Jill A. *The Croat Question: Partisan Politics in the Formation of the Yugoslav State*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993.

---. "The Croatian Spring and the Dissolution of Yugoslavia." In *State Collapse in South-Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on Yugoslavia's Disintegration*, edited by Lenard J. Cohen and Jasna Dragović-Soso, 149–78. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2007.

---. "Tito, Hebrang and the Croat Question." *East European Politics and Societies* 5, no. 2 (Spring 1991): 306–40.

---. "Ultranationalist Ideology and State-Building in Croatia, 1990–1996." *Problems of Post-Communism* 44, no. 4 (July-August 1997): 30–43.

Ivanović, Vladimir. "Ekstremna emigracija u SR Nemačkoj i Jugoslavija." *Istorija 20 veka*, no. 1 (2009): 139–47.

---. *Geburtstag pišeš normalno: Jugoslavenski gastarbajteri u Austriji i SR Nemačkoj*. Belgrade: ISI, 2012.

---. "Obnavljanje diplomatskih odnosa između Socijalističke Federativne Republike Jugoslavije i Savezne Republike Nemačke." *Istorija 20 veka*, no. 2 (2005): 129–45.

Jaggar, Alison. "What Is Terrorism, Why Is It Wrong, and Could It Ever Be Morally Permissible?" *Journal of Social Philosophy* 36, no. 2 (2005): 202–17.

Jareb, Jere. *Zlato i novac. Nezavisne Države Hrvatske izneseni u inozemstvo 1944. i 1945: Dokumentarni prikaz*. Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest—Dom i svijet, 1997.

Jedlicki, Jerzy. "Historical Memory as a Source of Conflicts in Eastern Europe." *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 32, no. 3 (1999): 225–32.

Jelavich, Barbara. *History of the Balkans*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Jelić-Butić, Fikreta. *Ustaše i nezavisna država Hrvatska 1941–1945*. Zagreb: Liber, 1977.

Jones, Bryan D. "Bounded Rationality." *Annual Review of Political Science* 2, no. 1 (1999): 297–321.

Jonjić, Tomislav. "Organised Resistance to the Yugoslav Communist Regime in Croatia in 1945–1953." *Review of Croatian History* 3, no. 1 (February 2007): 109–45.

---. "Review of Krunoslav Draganović—Iskazi komunističkim istražiteljima, by Miroslav Akmadža." *Review of Croatian History* 6, no. 1 (2010): 253–66.

Jupp, James. "Yugoslavs and Australian Politics." *Politics* 23, no. 2 (1988): 16–27.

Kallis, Aristotle A. "To Expand or Not to Expand? Territory, Generic Fascism, and the Quest for an 'Ideal Fatherland.'" *Journal of Contemporary History* 38, no. 2 (April 2003): 237–60.

Kaminski, Matthew. "Interview: 'All the Terrorists Are Migrants': Viktor Orbán on How to Protect Europe from Terror, Save Schengen, and Get Along with Putin's Russia." *Politico*, November 23, 2015. https://www.politico.eu/article/viktor-orban-interview-terrorists-migrants-eu-russia-putin-borders-schengen/.

Katalinić, Kazimir. *Od poraza do pobjede: Povijest hrvatske političke emigracije, 1945–1990*. Vols. 1–3. Zagreb: Naklada Trpimir, 2017–18.

Katich, Boris, ed. *So Speak Croatian Dissidents*. Toronto: Ziral, 1983.

Kisić Kolanović, Nada. "Komunizam u percepciji hrvatske nacionalističke inteligencije 1938–1945. Godine." *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 43, no. 1 (May 2011): 131–34.

Klein, George. "The Role of Ethnic Politics in the Czechoslovak Crisis of 1968 and the Yugoslav Crisis of 1971." *Studies in Comparative Communism* 8, no. 4 (Winter 1975): 339–69.

Knight, Robert. "Transnational Memory from Bleiburg to London (via Buenos Aires and Grozny)." *Zeitgeschichte* 38, no. 1 (2010): 39–53.

Kolstø, Pål. "Bleiburg: The Creation of a National Martyrology." *Europe-Asia Studies* 62, no. 7 (September 2010): 1153–74.

Korb, Alexander. "Understanding Ustaša Violence." *Journal of Genocide Studies* 12, nos. 1–2 (March–June 2010): 1–18.

Kostovicova, Denisa, and Vesna Bojicic-Dzelilovic, eds. *Transnationalism in the Balkans*. London: Routledge, 2008.

Kovačević, Sreten. *Hronologija antijugoslovenskog terorizma, 1960–1980*. Belgrade: IŠRO–Privredno finansijski vodić, 1981.

Kraljić, John. "The Croatian Section of the Communist Party of the United States and the 'United Front': 1934–1939." *Review of Croatian History* 5, no. 1 (2009): 137–67.

Krišto, Jure. "Communist Penetration of Croatian American Organizations during World War II." *Review of Croatian History* 5, no. 1 (2009): 169–88.

Križman, Bogdan. *Ante Pavelić i Ustaše*. Zagreb: Globus, 1983.

Kroessler, Jeffrey A. "Bombing for Justice: Urban Terrorism in New York City from the 1960s through the 1980s." *Criminal Justice and Law Enforcement Annual* 6, no. 1 (2014): 63–112.

Kupchan, Charles A., ed. *Nationalism and Nationalities in the New Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Kushner, Harvey W. *Encyclopedia of Terrorism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2003.

Lampe, John R. *Yugoslavia as History: Twice There Was a Country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Lampe, John R., and Mark Mazower, eds. *Ideologies and National Identities: The Case of Twentieth-Century Southeastern Europe*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2006.

Lampe, John R., Russell O. Prickett, and Ljubiša S. Adamović, eds. *Yugoslav-American Economic Relations since World War II*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990.

Laqueur, Walter. *A History of Terrorism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2002.

Lee, Alexander. "Who Becomes a Terrorist? Poverty, Education, and the Origins of Political Violence." *World Politics: A Quarterly Journal of International Relations* 63, no. 2 (April 2011): 203–45.

Lee, Nancy C., and Borislav Arapović. "The Bible in Political Context: New Republics from Old Yugoslavia and the Former Soviet Union." *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 55, no. 4 (2001): 378–88.

Lees, Lorraine M. *Keeping Tito Afloat: The United States, Yugoslavia, and the Cold War*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997.

Lendvai, Paul. "Yugoslavia in Crisis." *Encounter* 39, no. 2 (August 1972): 68–74.

Levitt, Peggy, and B. Nadya Jaworsky. "Transnational Migration Studies: Past Developments and Future Trends." *Annual Review of Sociology* 33 (2007): 129–56.

Ličina, Djordje. *Dvadeseti čovjek*. Zagreb: Centar za informacije i publicitet, 1985.

Lilly, Carol S. *Power and Persuasion: Ideology and Rhetoric in Communist Yugoslavia, 1944–1953*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1991.

---. "Problems of Persuasion: Communist Agitation and Propaganda in Post-War Yugoslavia, 1944–1948." *Slavic Review* 53, no. 2 (Summer 1994): 395–413.

Lopušina, Marko. *Ubice u ime države*. Novi Sad: Prometej, 2012.

Lucassen, Leo, David Feldman, and Joachim Oltmer, eds. *Paths of Integration: Migrants in Western Europe (1880–2004).* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.

Lučić, Ivica. "Hrvatska protukomunistička gerila u Bosni i Hercegovini od 1945. do 1951." *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 42, no. 3 (2010): 631–70.

Lustgarten, Laurence, and Ian Leigh. *In from the Cold: National Security and Parliamentary Democracy*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

Lydall, Harold. *Yugoslavia in Crisis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Macan, Trpimir. *The History of the Croatian People*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb/ Matica Hrvatska Iseljenika, 1994.

MacDonald, David Bruce. *Balkan Holocausts? Serbian and Croatian Victim-Centered Propaganda and the War in Yugoslavia*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Magaš, Branka. *The Destruction of Yugoslavia: Tracing the Break-Up, 1980–1992*. London: Verso, 1993.

Magaš, Branka, and Ivo Žanić, eds. *The War in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1991–1995*. London: Frank Cass, 2001.

Malcolm, Noel. *Bosnia: A Short History*. London: New York University Press, 1994.

Malešević, Siniša. *Ideology, Legitimacy and the New State: Yugoslavia, Serbia, and Croatia*. London: Frank Cass, 2002.

Marković, Predrag J. *Beograd izmedju istoka i zapada 1948–1965*. Belgrade: Službeni list SRJ, 1996.

Matković, Hrvoje. *Povijest Nezavisne Države Hrvatske*. Zagreb: Naklada P.I.P. Pavičić, 2002.

McClellan, Woodford D. "Postwar Political Evolution." In *Contemporary Yugoslavia: Twenty Years of Socialist Experiment*, edited by Wayne S. Vucinich, 119–53. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

McDonald, Hamish. *Framed*. Sydney: Fairfax Media, 2012.

McKnight, David. *Australia's Spies and Their Secrets*. St. Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin, 1994.

---. "The Comintern's Seventh Congress and the Australian Labor Party." *Journal of Contemporary History* 32, no. 3 (July 1997): 395–407.

Mesić, Milan. *Vanjske migracije i društveni razvitak*. Zagreb: Institut za migracije i narodnosti Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 1991.

Miletić, Antun. *Koncentracioni logor Jasenovac*. Vols. 1–3. Belgrade: Narodna Knjiga, 1986–87.

Miljan, Goran. "From Obscure Beginnings to State 'Resurrection': Ideas and Practices of the Ustaša Organization." *Fascism* 5, no. 1 (2016): 3–25.

Milosavljević, Olivera. "Država i samoupravljanje: 1949–1956." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Belgrade, 1987.

Mirković, Damir. "The Historical Link between the Ustasha Genocide and the Croato-Serb Civil War: 1991–1995." *Journal of Genocide Research* 2, no. 3 (2000): 363–73.

Mlinarić, Dubravka. "Emigration Research in Croatia: An Overview." In *Transnational Societies, Transterritorial Politics: Migrations in the (Post-) Yugoslav Region, 19th-21st Century*, edited by Ulf Brunnbauer, 169–91. Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2009.

Mohamoud, Abdullah A. "Diasporas: Untapped Potential for Peacebuilding in the Homelands." In *People Building Peace II: Successful Stories of Civil Society*, edited by Paul van Tongeren, Malin Brenk, Marte Hellema, and Juliette Verhoeven, 339–63. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2005.

Mojzes, Paul. *Yugoslavian Inferno: Ethnoreligious Warfare in the Balkans*. New York: Continuum, 1994.

Molnar, Christopher A. "Imagining Yugoslavs: Migration and the Cold War in Postwar West Germany." *Central European History* 47, no. 1 (2014): 138–69.

---. *Memory, Politics, and Yugoslav Migrations to Postwar Germany.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2019.

Morawska, Ewa. "Disciplinary Agendas and Analytic Strategies of Research on Immigration and Transnationalism: Challenges of Interdisciplinary Knowledge." *International Migration Review* 37, no. 3 (2003): 611–40.

Morgan, Philip. "Studying Fascism from the Particular to the General." *East Central Europe* 37, nos. 2–3 (2010): 334–37.

Mursalo, T. A. *In Search of a Better Life: A Story of Croatian Settlers in Southern Africa*. Cape Town: Printpak, 1981.

Nagengast, Carole. "Violence, Terror, and the Crisis of the State." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23 (1994): 109–36.

Naimark, Norman M., and Holly Case, eds. *Yugoslavia and Its Historians: Understanding the Balkan Wars of the 1990s*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003.

Nakarada, Radmila. *The Disintegration of Yugoslavia and the New World Order*. Belgrade: Institute for European Studies, 1994–95.

---. "The Mystery of Nationalism: The Paramount Case of Yugoslavia." *Millennium* 20, no. 3 (1991): 369–82.

Neumann, Peter, and M. L. R. Smith. "Strategic Terrorism: The Framework and Its Fallacies." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 28, no. 4 (2005): 571–95.

Newman, John Paul. "Post-imperial and Post-War Violence in the South Slav Lands, 1917–1923." *Contemporary European History* 19, no. 3 (August 2010): 249–65.

Nielsen, Christian Axboe. "Die Arbeit des jugoslawischen Staatssicherheitsdienstes zur Bekämpfung der 'feindlichen Emigration': Eine Analyse der Maßnahmen und Mittel." Expert Report for Oberlandesgericht München, 2015.

---. "Ergänzung des Gutachtens: Die Arbeit des jugoslawischen Staatssicherheitsdienstes zur Bekämpfung der 'feindlichen Emigration': Eine Analyse der Maßnahmen und Mittel." Expert Report Addendum for Oberlandesgericht München, 2016.

---. *Making Yugoslavs: Identity in King Aleksandar's Yugoslavia*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.

---. "The Yugoslav State Security Service and the Bleiburg Commemorations." *Politička misao* 55, no. 2 (June 2018): 50–70.

Novinšćak, Karolina. "From 'Yugoslav Gastarbeiter' to 'Diaspora-Croats': Policies and Attitudes toward Emigration in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republic of Croatia." In *Postwar Mediterranean Migration to Western Europe: Legal and Political Frameworks, Sociability and Memory Cultures*, edited by Clelia Caruso, Jenny Pleinen, and Lutz Raphael, 124–44. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2008.

O'Brien, Conor Cruise. *God Land: Reflections on Religion and Nationalism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Omerza, Igor. *HRB, Fenix i Udba: Slučaj Stjepana Crnogorca*. Radenci: Društvo za raziskovanje polpretekle zgovodine, 2014.

Omrčanin, Ivo. *The Pro-Allied Putsch in Croatia in 1944 and the Massacre of Croatians by Tito's Communists in 1945*. Philadelphia, PA: Dorrance and Company, 1975.

---. *Sacred Crown of the Kingdom of Croatia*. Philadelphia, PA: Dorrance and Company, 1973.

Ozkirimli, Umut. *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*. London: Macmillan, 2000.

Patterson, Patrick Hyder. *Bought and Sold: Living and Losing the Good Life in Socialist Yugoslavia*. Ithaca. NY: Cornell University Press, 2011.

Pavković, Aleksandar. *The Fragmentation of Yugoslavia: Nationalism in a Multinational State*. London: Macmillan, 1997.

Pavlaković, Vjeran. "Flirting with Fascism: The Ustaša Legacy and Croatian Politics in the 1990s." In *The Shared History: The Second World War and National Question in ex-Yugoslavia,* 115–43. Novi Sad: Center for History Democracy and Reconciliation, 2008.

Pavlaković, Vjeran, and Davor Pauković, eds. *Framing the Nation and Collective Identities: Political Rituals and Cultural Memory of the Twentieth Century Traumas in Croatia*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019.

Pavlica, Branko. *Antijugoslovenska aktivnost neprijateljske emigracije u SR Nemačkoj (1951–1984)*. Belgrade: Naš glas, 1990.

---. "Migrations from Yugoslavia to Germany: Migrants, Emigrants, Refugees, and Asylum-Seekers." *Medjunarodni problem* 57, nos. 1–2 (2005): 121–58.

Pavlowitch, Stevan K. *History of the Balkans, 1804–1945*. London: Longman, 1999.

---. *The Improbable Survivor: Yugoslavia and Its Problems, 1918–1988*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1988.

---. *Tito: Yugoslavia's Great Dictator: A Reassessment*. London: Hurst, 1992.

Paxton, Robert. "The Five Stages of Fascism." *Journal of Modern History* 70, no. 1 (March 1998): 1–23.

Payne, Stanley G. "The NDH State in Comparative Perspective." *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 7, no. 4 (November 2006): 409–15.

Perica, Vjekoslav. *Balkan Idols: Religion and Nationalism in Yugoslav States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

---. "The Catholic Church and the Making of the Croatian Nation, 1970–1984." *East European Politics and Societies* 14, no. 2 (2000): 532–64.

---. "Interfaith Dialogue versus Recent Hatred: Serbian Orthodoxy and Croatian Catholicism from the Second Vatican Council to the Yugoslav War, 1965–1992." *Religion, State, and Society* 29, no. 1 (March 2001): 29–68.

Perović, Jeronim. "The Tito-Stalin Split: A Reassessment in Light of New Evidence." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 9, no. 2 (Spring 2007): 32–63.

Phayer, Michael. *Pius XII, the Holocaust, and the Cold War.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008.

Piljak, Milan. "Power Game in Tito's Yugoslavia: Conundrum of Aleksandar Ranković's Overthrow from Power." *Tokovi istorije,* no. 3 (2014): 159–76.

Pluchinsky, Dennis. "Political Terrorism in Western Europe: Some Themes and Variations." In *Terrorism in Europe*, edited by Yonah Alexander and Kenneth A. Myers, 40–78. London: Croom Helm, 1982.

Pollack, Detlef, and Jan Wielgohs. *Dissent and Opposition in Communist Eastern Europe: Origins of Civil Society and Democratic Transition*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

Popov, Nebojša, ed. *Srpska strana rata: Trauma i katarza u istorijsko pamćenju*. Belgrade: BIGZ, 1996.

"Poratne žrtve državnog terora SFRJ u inozemstvu." *Komisija za utvrđivanje ratnih i poratnih žrtava* (September 30, 1999): 1–38.

Portes, Alejandro. "Introduction: The Debates and Significance of Immigrant Transnationalism." *Global Networks* 1, no. 3 (2001): 181–94.

Poulton, Hugh. *Balkans: Minorities and States in Conflict*. London: Minority Rights Group, 1991.

Prijevec, Jože. "Yugoslav Political Emigration to Australia after World War II." *Annales—Series historia et sociologia* 16, no. 1 (2006): 1–6.

Prlenda, Sandra. "Young, Religious, and Radical: The Croat Catholic Youth Organizations, 1922–1945." In *Ideologies and National Identities: The Case of Twentieth-Century Southeastern Europe*, edited by John Lampe and Mark Mazower, 82–109. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2006.

Procter, Nicholas G. *Serbian Australians in the Shadow of the Balkan War.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.

Prowe, Diethelm. "'Classic' Fascism and the New Radical Right in Western Europe: Comparisons and Contrasts." *Contemporary European History* 3, no. 3 (November 1994): 289–313.

Prpic, George J. *Tragedies and Migrations in Croatian History.* Toronto: Hrvatski Put, 1973.

Pryke, Sam. "British Serbs and Long Distance Nationalism." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 26, no. 1 (January 2003): 152–72.

Pusić, Vesna. "A Country by Any Other Name: Transition and Stability in Croatia and Yugoslavia." *East European Politics and Societies* 6, no. 3 (1992): 242–59.

---. "Dictatorships with Democratic Legitimacy: Democracy versus Nation." *East European Politics and Societies* 8, no. 3 (Fall 1994): 383–401.

Radelić, Zdenko. *Križari gerila u Hrvatskoj, 1945–1950*. Zagreb: Dom i Svijet, 2002.

---. "Ozna/Udba: Popisi neprijatelja i njihova kategorizacija (1940-ih i 1950-ih)." *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 49 (2017): 59–99.

Ragazzi, Francesco. *Governing Diasporas in International Relations: The Transnational Politics of Croatia and Former Yugoslavia*. London: Routledge, 2017.

Ramet, Pedro, ed. *Catholicism and Politics in Communist Societies: Christianity under Stress*. Vol. 2. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990.

---. *Cross and Commissar: The Politics of Religion in Eastern Europe and the USSR*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.

---. "Factionalism in Church-State Interaction: The Croatian Catholic Church in the 1980s." *Slavic Review* 44, no. 2 (Summer 1985): 298–315.

---. *Religion and Nationalism in Soviet and East European Politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1989.

---. *Yugoslavia in the 1980s*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1985.

Ramet, Sabrina P. *Balkan Babel: The Disintegration of Yugoslavia from the Death of Tito to Ethnic War*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996.

---. "Eastern Europe's Unfinished Business." *East European Politics and Societies* 13, no. 2 (Spring 1999): 345–52.

---. *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia 1962–1991*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992.

---. "The NDH—An Introduction." *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 7, no. 4 (December 2006): 399–408.

---. *Nihil Obstat: Religion, Politics, and Social Change in East-Central Europe and Russia*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.

---. *The Three Yugoslavias: State-Building and Legitimation, 1918–2005*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006.

---. "Vladko Maček and Croatian History: An Introduction." *Contemporary European History* 16, no. 2 (May 2007): 199–202.

---. "Vladko Maček and the Croatian Peasant Defence in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia." *Contemporary European History* 16, no. 2 (May 2007): 215–31.

Ramet, Sabrina P., and Ljubiša S., eds. *Beyond Yugoslavia: Politics, Economics and Culture in a Shattered Community*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995.

Ranstorp, Magnus, ed. *Mapping Terrorism Research: State of the Art, Gaps, and Future Direction*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2007.

Ravančić, Martina Grahek. "The Historiography of Bleiburg and the Death Marches since Croatian Independence." *Politička misao—Croatian Political Science Review* 55, no. 2 (2018): 133–44.

Rizzo, Salvador. "Fact Checker Analysis: President Trump's Claim That 'Nearly 3 in 4' Convicted of Terrorism Are Foreign-Born." *Washington Post*. January 22, 2018. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2018/01/22/president-trumps-claim-that-nearly-3-in-4-convicted-of-terrorism-are-foreign-born/.

Roberts, David D. "How Not to Think about Fascism and Ideology, Intellectual Antecedents and Historical Meaning." *Journal of Contemporary History* 35, no. 2 (April 2000): 185–211.

Roksandić, Drago. "Shifting References: Celebrations of Uprisings in Croatia." *East European Politics and Societies* 9, no. 2 (Spring 1995): 256–71.

Rosandić, Ružica, and Vesna Pešić, eds. *Ratništvo, patriotizam, patrijarhalnost*. Belgrade: Centar za antiratnu akciju, 1994.

Rosenbaum, Alan S., ed. *Is the Holocaust Unique? Perspectives on Comparative Genocide*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996.

Rover, Srećko. *Otvoreno Pismo: Urednictvu srbo-jugoslavenskih novina "SLOGA" Perth*. Sydney: Medjudružtveni odbor hrvatskih društava u Australiji i Novom Zealandu, 1955.

Roverova braća. Zagreb: Centar za informacije i publicitet, 1987.

Rusinow, Dennison I. "Crisis in Croatia, Part III: The Road to Karadjordjevo." *Southeast Europe Series* 19, no. 6 (1972): 1–25.

---. *The Yugoslav Experiment, 1948–1974*. London: Hurst, 1977.

---. *Yugoslavia: Oblique Insights and Observations*. Essays selected and edited by Gale Stokes. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2008.

---, ed. *Yugoslavia, a Fractured Federalism*. Washington, DC: Wilson Center Press, 1988.

Rutherford, Jonathon, ed. *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990.

Schäuble, Michaela. "How History Takes Place: Sacralized Landscapes in the Croatian-Bosnian Border Region." *History and Memory* 23, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2011): 23–61.

Schmid, Alex P. "Links between Terrorism and Migration: An Exploration." *ICCT Research Paper* (May 2016): 1–62.

Schmid, Alex P., A. J. Jongman, and Michael Stohl. *Political Terrorism: A New Guide to Actors, Authors, Concepts, Data Bases, Theories, and Literature*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1988.

Schmidt-Hartmann, Eva, ed. *Kommunismus und Osteuropa: Konzepte, Perspektiven und Interpretationen im Wandel*. Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1994.

Schönwälder, Karen. "Assigning the State Its Rightful Place? Migration, Integration, and the State in Germany." In *Paths of Integration: Migrants in Western Europe (1880–2004)*, edited by Leo Lucassen, David Feldman, and Joachim Oltmer, 78–97. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.

Schöpflin, George. "The Ideology of Croatian Nationalism." *Survey* 19, no. 1 (1973): 123–46.

---. *Politics in Eastern Europe, 1945–1992*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.

Schulte, Axel. *Ausländer in der Bundesrepublik: Integration, Marginalisierung, Identität*. Frankfurt am Main: Materialis-Verlag, 1985.

Schwartz, Stephen. "Ante Ciliga (1898–1992): Život na povijesnim raskrižjima." *Društvena Istraživanja* 4, nos. 2–3 (1995): 315–39.

Sekelj, Laslo. *Yugoslavia: The Process of Disintegration*. Boulder, CO: Social Science Monographs, 1993.

Sekulić, Duško. "Civic and Ethnic Identity: The Case of Croatia." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27, no. 3 (May 2004): 455–83.

Seroka, Jim, and Vukašin Pavlović, eds. *The Tragedy of Yugoslavia: The Failure of Democratic Transformation*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1992.

Seton-Watson, R. W. "King Alexander's Assassination: Its Background and Effects." *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1931–1939)* 14, no. 1 (January–February 1935): 20–47.

Shain, Yossi. "The Role of Diasporas in Conflict Perpetuation or Resolution." *Sais Review* 22, no. 2 (2002): 115–44.

Sheffer, Gabriel. *Diaspora Politics: At Home Abroad*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Shonick, Kaja. "Politics, Culture, and Economics: Reassessing the West German Guest Worker Agreement with Yugoslavia." *Journal of Contemporary History* 44, no. 4 (October 2009): 719–36.

Shoup, Paul. *Communism and the Yugoslav National Question*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.

---. "Crisis and Reform in Yugoslavia." *Telos* 79 (Spring 1989): 129–47.

---. "The National Question in Yugoslavia." *Problems of Communism* 21, no. 1 (January–February 1972): 18–29.

Shughart II, William F. "An Analytical History of Terrorism, 1945–2000." *Public Choice* 128, no. 1/2 (July 2006): 7–39.

Silber, Laura, and Allan Little. *The Death of Yugoslavia*. London: Penguin Books, 1995.

Simon, Herbert A. "Rationality in Political Behavior." *Political Psychology* 16, no. 1 (March 1995): 45–61.

Singleton, Fred. *A Short History of the Yugoslav Peoples*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

---. *Twentieth-Century Yugoslavia*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.

---. "Yugoslavia: Economic Grievances and Cultural Nationalism." *World Today* 39, nos. 7–8 (July–August 1983): 284–90.

Skrbiš, Zlatko. "The Distant Observers? Towards the Politics of Diasporic Identification." *Nationalities Papers* 25, no. 3 (1997): 601–10.

---. *Long-Distance Nationalism: Diasporas, Homelands and Identities*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.

---. "The Mobilized Croatian Diaspora: Its Role in Homeland Politics and War." In *Diasporas in Conflict: Peace-Makers or Peace-Wreckers*, edited by Hazel Smith and Paul Stares, 218–38. Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007.

---. "Nationalism in a Transnational Context: Croatian Diaspora, Intimacy, and Nationalist Imagination." *Sociological Review/Revija za Sociologiju* 32, nos. 3–4 (2001): 133–45.

Smith, Anthony D. *National Identity*. London: Penguin Books, 1990.

Smith, Hazel, and Paul Stares, eds. *Diasporas in Conflict: Peace-Makers or Peace-Wreckers*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007.

Snel, Erik, Godfried Engbersen, and Arjen Leerkes. "Transnational Involvement and Social Integration." *Global Networks* 6, no. 3 (2006): 285–308.

Sopta, Marin. *Unknown Journey: A History of Croatians in Canada*. Downsview, ON: Polyphony, 1994.

Spalatin, Christopher. "Language and Politics in Yugoslavia in the Light of the Events Which Happened from March 17, 1967, to March 14, 1969." *Journal of Croatian Studies* 11–12 (1970–71): 83–104.

---. "Language Situation in Croatia Today." *Journal of Croatian Studies* 14–15 (1973–74): 3–12.

Spasić, Božidar. *Lasica koja govori: Osnovne pretpostavke borbe protiv terorizma*. Belgrade: Grafoprint, 2000.

Spehnjak, Katarina, and Tihomir Cipek. "Croatia." In *Dissent and Opposition in Communist Eastern Europe: Origins of Civil Society and Democratic Transition*, edited by Detlef Pollack and Jan Wielgohs, 185–205. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

Stanković, Slobodan. *The End of the Tito Era: Yugoslavia's Dilemmas*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1981.

Steinberg, Jonathan. *All or Nothing: The Axis and the Holocaust, 1941–43*. London: Routledge, 1990.

---. "The Roman Catholic Church and Genocide in Croatia, 1941–1945." *Studies in Church History*, no. 29 (1993): 463–80.

---. "Types of Genocide? Croatians, Serbs, and Jews, 1941–45." In *The Final Solution: Origins and Implementation*, edited by David Cesarani, 175–93. London: Routledge, 1994.

Stokes, Gale. *Three Eras of Political Change in Eastern Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Stokes, Gale, John Lampe, and Dennison Rusinow, with Julie Mostov. "Instant History: Understanding the Wars of Yugoslav Succession." *Slavic Review* 55, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 136–60.

Stuparić, Darko. *Tko je tko u NDH: Hrvatska 1941–1945*. Zagreb: Minerva, 1997.

Sugar, Peter, and Ivo Lederer, eds. *Nationalism in Eastern Europe*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1971.

Šuljak, Dinko N. *Croatia's Struggle for Independence: A Documentary History*. Arcadia, CA: Croatian Information Service, 1977.

Sunić, Tomislav. *Titoism and Dissidence: Studies in the History and Dissolution of Communist Yugoslavia*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH, 1995.

Tanner, Marcus. *Croatia: A Nation Forged in War*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.

Thaden, Matthias. "Berichte von der 'bauštela duha': Positionierungen der kroatischen katholischen Mission in Berlin zwischen Seelsorge und Identitätsstiftung." Repräsentationen des sozialistischen Jugoslawiens im Umbruch, Working Papers 5, Berlin, 2013.

---. "Ein völlig liberalisiertes Ausländertum? Politischer Aktivismus von Exilkroaten als Herausforderung für die bundesdeutsche Innen- und Sicherheitspolitik, 1950er–60er Jahre." In *Flucht, Migration und gesellschaftliche Transformationsprozesse*, edited by Simon Goebel, Thomas Fischer, Friedrich Kießling, and Angela Treiber, 85–110. Wiesbaden: Springer, 2017.

Thompson, Mark. *A Paper House: The Ending of Yugoslavia*. New York: Pantheon, 1992.

Tilly, Charles. "Terror, Terrorism, Terrorists." *Sociological Theory* 22, no. 1 (2004): 5–13.

Todorova, Maria, ed. *Balkan Identities: Nation and Memory*. London: Hurst and Company, 2004.

---. "The Balkans: From Discovery to Invention." *Slavic Review* 53, no. 2 (Summer 1994): 453–82.

---. "Notes and Comments: Ethnicity, Nationalism, and the Communist Legacy in Eastern Europe." *East European Politics and Societies* 7, no. 1 (Winter 1993): 135–54.

Tökes, Rudolf, ed. *Opposition in Eastern Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

Tokić, Mate Nikola. "Avengers of Bleiburg: Émigré Politics, Discourses of Victimhood, and Radical Separatism during the Cold War." *Politička misao—Croatian Political Science Review* 55, no. 2 (2018): 71–88.

---. "The End of 'Historical-Ideological Bedazzlement': Cold War Politics and Émigré Croatian Separatist Violence, 1950–1980." *Social Science History* 36, no. 3 (Fall 2012): 421–46.

---. "Landscapes of Conflict: Unity and Disunity in Post–Second World War Croatian Émigré Separatism." *European Review of History: Revue europeenne d'histoire* 16, no. 5 (2009): 739–53.

---. "Party Politics, National Security, and Émigré Political Violence in Australia, 1949–1973." In *Control of Violence: Historical and International Perspectives on Modern Societies*, edited by Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, Wilhelm Heitmeyer, Andrea Kirschner, and Stefan Malthaner, 395–414. New York: Springer, 2011.

---. "La violenza politica del separatismo croato nella Repubblica federale tedesca (1965–1980)." *Ricerche di Storia Politica* 11, no. 3 (December 2008): 293–310.

Tölölyan, Khachig. "Rethinking Diaspora(s): Stateless Power in the Transnational Moment." *Diaspora* 5, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 3–36.

Tolstoy, Nikolai. *The Minister and the Massacres*. London: Century Hutchinson, 1986.

Tomasevich, Jozo. *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia, 1941–1945: Occupation and Collaboration*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001.

Tosh, John. *The Pursuit of History: Aims, Methods and New Directions in the Study of Modern History*. 2nd edition. London: Longman, 1991.

Tošić, Desimir. *Srpski nacionalni problemi*. Paris: Oslobodjenje, 1952.

Trifunovska, Snežana, ed. *Yugoslavia through Documents: From Its Creation to Its Dissolution*. Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1994.

Tripalo, Miko. *Hrvatsko proljeće*. Zagreb: Globus, 1990.

Tudjman, Franjo. *Bespuća povijesne zbiljnosti: Rasprava o povijesti i filozofiji zlosilja*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, 1989.

---. *Horrors of War: Historical Reality and Philosophy*. Translated by Katarina Mijatović. New York: M. Evans and Company, 1996.

---. *Nationalism in Contemporary Europe*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.

Udovički, Jasminka, and James Ridgeway, eds. *Burn This House: The Making and Unmaking of Yugoslavia*. London: Duke University Press, 1997.

---. *Yugoslavia's Ethnic Nightmare: The Inside Story of Europe's Unfolding Ordeal*. New York: Lawrence Hill Books, 1995.

Umland, Andreas. "Is There a Post-Soviet Fascism? A Brief Deliberation on the Cross-Cultural and Inter-Epochal Study of Right-Wing Extremism in the Post–Cold War Era." *East Central Europe* 37, nos. 2–3 (2010): 345–52.

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. *Genocide in Yugoslavia during the Holocaust*. Washington DC: United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 1995.

Unkovski-Korica, Vladimir. *Economic Struggle for Power in Tito's Yugoslavia: From World War II to Non-Alignment*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2016.

---. "Workers' Councils in the Service of the Market: New Archival Evidence on the Origins of Self-Management in Yugoslavia, 1948–1950." *Europe-Asia Studies* 66, no. 1 (January 2014): 108–34.

Uzelak, Gordana. "Franjo Tudjman's Nationalist Ideology." *East European Quarterly* 31, no. 4 (1998): 449–73.

Valkenier, Elizabeth. "Eastern Europe in Exile." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 317, no. 1 (May 1958): 146–52.

van Antwerp Fine, John. *When Ethnicity Did Not Matter in the Balkans: A Study of Identity in Pre-Nationalist Croatia, Dalmatia, and Slavonia in the Medieval and Early-Modern Periods*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006.

Várady, Tibor. "Collective Minority Rights and Problems in Their Legal Protection: The Example of Yugoslavia." *East European Politics and Societies* 6, no. 3 (Fall 1992): 260–82.

Veljak, Lino. "The Collapse and Reconstruction of Legitimacy: An Introductory Remark." *Nationalities Papers* 25, no. 3 (September 1997): 443–54.

Vertovec, Steven. "Diasporas Good, Diasporas Bad." *Metropolis World Bulletin* 6 (2006): 5–8.

---. "Migration and Other Modes of Transnationalism: Towards Conceptual Cross-Fertilization." *International Migration Review* 37, no. 3 (2003): 641–65.

Vojtěchovský, Ondřej. *Iz Praga protiv Tita! Jugoslavenska informbiroovska emigracija u Čehoslovačkoj*. Zagreb: Srednje Europa, 2016.

Vučetić, Radina. *Coca-Cola Socialism: Americanization of Yugoslav Culture in the Sixties*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2018.

Vucinich, Wayne S., ed. *Contemporary Yugoslavia: Twenty Years of Socialist Experiment*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

---. "Postwar Yugoslav Historiography." *Journal of Modern History* 23, no. 1 (March 1951): 41–57.

Vučković, Vladeta. "Žrtve rata: Sahrana jednog mita." *Naša reč* [N. Harrow, Middlesex], no. 368 (October 1985): 2–3.

Vukliš, Vladan. "Writing Social History of Socialist Yugoslavia: The Archival Perspective." *Archival Science* 17 (2017): 55–77.

Vukušić, Bože. *HRB—Hrvatsko revolucionarno bratstvo: Rat prije rata*. Zagreb: Klub hrvatskih povratnika iz iseljeništva, 2010.

---. *Tajni rat UDBE protiv hrvatskoga iseljeništva*. Zagreb: Klub hrvatskih povratnika iz iseljeništva, 2002.

Waldinger, Roger, and David Fitzgerald. "Transnationalism in Question." *American Journal of Sociology* 109, no. 5 (2004): 1177–95.

Watson, Rubie S., ed. *Memory, History, and Opposition under State Socialism*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, 1993.

Weaver, Bradden. "Violence as Memory and Desire: Neo-Nazism in Contemporary Germany." In *The Legitimization of Violence*, edited by David E. Apter, 128–58. London: Macmillan, 1997.

Weinhauer, Klaus, Jörg Requate, and Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, eds. *Terrorismus in der Bundesrepublik: Medien, Staat und Subkulturen in den 1970er Jahren*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2006.

West, Richard. *Tito and the Rise and Fall of Yugoslavia*. New York: Carroll and Graf Publishers, 1994.

Whittaker, David J., ed. *The Terrorism Reader.* London: Routledge, 2001.

Wielgohs, Jan, and Detlef Pollack. "Comparative Perspectives on Dissent and Opposition to Communist Rule." In *Dissent and Opposition in Communist Eastern Europe: Origins of Civil Society and Democratic Transition*, edited by Detlef Pollack and Jan Wielgohs, 231–66. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

Wilner, Alex S., and Claire-Jehanne Dubouloz. "Homegrown Terrorism and Transformative Learning: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Understanding Radicalization." *Global Change, Peace & Security* 22, no. 1 (2010): 33–51.

Winland, Daphne N. "Croatian Diaspora." In *Encyclopedia of Diasporas*, edited by Melvin Ember, Carol R. Ember, and Ian Skoggard, 76–84. New York: Springer, 2005.

---. "The Politics of Desire and Disdain: Croatian Identity between 'Home' and 'Homeland.'" *American Ethnologist* 29, no. 3 (August 2003): 693–718.

---. "Ten Years Later: The Changing Nature of Transnational Ties in Post-Independence Croatia." In *Transnationalism in the Balkans*, edited by Denisa Kostovicova and Vesna Bojicic-Dzelilovic, 79–91. London: Routledge, 2008.

---. *We Are Now a Nation: Croats between 'Home' and 'Homeland.'"* Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2007.

---. "'We Are Now an Actual Nation': The Impact of National Independence on the Croatian Diaspora in Canada." *Diaspora* 4, no. 1 (Spring 1995): 3–29.

Winterhagen, Jenni. *Transnationaler Katholizismus: Die kroatischen Migrantengemeinden in Deutschland zwischen nationalem Engagement und funktionaler Integration*. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2013.

Woodward, Susan. *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution after the Cold War.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1995.

---. *Socialist Unemployment: The Political Economy of Socialist Yugoslavia, 1945–1991*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995.

X [George F. Kennan]. "The Sources of Soviet Conduct." *Foreign Affairs* 25, no. 4 (July 1947): 566–78, 580–82.

Yeomans, Rory. "Militant Women, Warrior Men, and Revolutionary Personae: The New Ustasha Man and Woman in the Independent State of Croatia, 1941–1945." *Slavonic and East European Review* 83, no. 4 (October 2005): 685–732.

---, ed. *The Utopia of Terror: Life and Death in Wartime Croatia*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2015.

---. *Visions of Annihilation: The Ustasha Regime and the Cultural Politics of Fascism, 1941–1945.* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2013.

Yugoslavia: The Failure of 'Democratic' Communism. New York: Freedom House, 1987.

Zake, Ieva, ed. *Anti-communist Minorities in the US: Political Activism of Ethnic Refugees.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Žerjavić, Vladimir. *Gubici stanovništva Jugoslavije u drugom svjetskom ratu*. Zagreb: Jugoslavensko viktimološko društvo, 1989.

---. *Jugoslavija—Manipulacije žrtvama drugog svjetskog rata*. Zagreb: Hrvatski Informativni Centar, 1993.

---. *Opsesije i megalomanije oko Jasenovca i Bleiburga*. Zagreb: Globus, 1992.

Židek, Nikolina. "A Day of Unfinished Mourning: Historicizing Commemorative Practices of Bleiburg among the Croatian Diaspora in Argentina." *Memory Studies* (January 2019): 1–16.

---. "Homeland Celebrations Far Away from Home: The Case of the Croatian Diaspora in Argentina." In *Framing the Nation and Collective Identities: Political Rituals and Cultural Memory of the Twentieth Century Traumas in Croatia*, edited by Vjeran Pavlaković and Davor Pauković, 211–24. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019.

Zimmerman, William. *Open Borders, Nonalignment, and the Political Evolution of Yugoslavia*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Index

About the Author

Mate Nikola Tokić is Humanities Initiative visiting professor in the Department of History and School of Public Policy at the Central European University (CEU) in Budapest and Vienna. He holds a PhD in history from the University of Pennsylvania, an MA in international history from the London School of Economics, and a BA in history and European studies from Goucher College. Prior to joining the CEU, Dr. Tokić was assistant professor of European and East European history at the American University in Cairo. Professor Tokić has held a number of positions at some of Europe's most highly regarded research institutes, including at the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Study at the European University Institute in Florence, the Berlin Program for Advanced European and German Studies at the Freie Universität in Berlin, the Institute for Advanced Study at the CEU in Budapest, the Imre Kertész Kolleg at the Friedrich Schiller Universität Jena, and, most recently, the Center for Advanced Study–South East Europe at the University of Rijeka. In addition to several articles on political violence and radicalization among émigré Croats, he has worked extensively on the relationship between social memory and political legitimacy in socialist Yugoslavia.