
Sveta Lukić's book is the first in a projected series of books planned by the University of Illinois Press of translations of modern Yugoslav sociology, literature, politics, philosophy and history.

Lukić is one of the group of 'new critics' from Belgrade University. The author is also one of the first literary theoreticians to consider Albanian and Vojvodina literature together with other National Yugoslav literature. His centralist approach in analysing the literature of the Yugoslav nationalities (Slovenes, Croates, Serbs, Macedonians, Albanians and the Regional Province of Vojvodina) is centered in his Marxist philosophical orientation, which is guided by the Central Committee of the Yugoslav Communist Party and its ideological foundations, regardless of the historical background and development of the particular national literature. The major accomplishment of this publication is not an interpretation of literature as such, but rather a political and ideological evaluation of the value patterns of the period 1945-1965. Lukić expounds a theory for Yugoslav literature with an established sociopolitical national theme. He pleads for a social role for contemporary Yugoslav literature as reflecting modern life and becoming an active transformer and educator of society. In analysing this literature, Lukić gives supremacy to momentary ideological significance of certain literary phenomena, while the inherent aesthetic value of the work has been omitted. He justifies his intentions with a hierarchy of value systems which dominates literary criticism in Yugoslavia. He further equates political currents with literary value; one may interpret his book as a socioaesthetic treatise, or a treatise on socialist aestheticism. Lukić classifies contemporary Yugoslav literature in the following groups: traditional literature, early modernism, the surrealalist movement, social literature, the reserve generation, the post-war generation, liberators of the spirit, and the youngest literary creators. On one side, we find a powerful trend toward technocracy and the Americanization of the working intelligentsia. On the other, there continues to be a persistent desire for strong-arm ideology of the Stalinist bureaucratic-dogmatic school, while on the third, the ideological formulations are being squashed by the Yugoslav nationalistic particularism.

Lukić divides his book into three parts: I. The literary situation, in which contemporary Yugoslav literature is described. II. The elements of literature, in which literary currents, criticism, politics and literary organisations are delineated. III. In the conclusion, literary life and literary standards are discussed.

He distinguishes further between two periods of post-War Yugoslav literature: 1) 1945-1950, a time for unification of national realism as a moderate variation of socialist realism. 2) Since 1950, the dominant trend of socialist aestheticism.

The appended chronology of literary events is a very informative compilation of major publications in the Yugoslav literary field between 1945-1965. It provides a good overview of Yugoslav literary creativity, literary awards, prose, poetry, critiques and essays, collections and anthologies, translations of works by Yugoslav authors, translation of works by foreign authors, literary congresses and plenary meetings, articles and polemics.

An important section of the book is the biographical information on contemporary Yugoslav writers; this listing contains a few hundred names of writers and their
Book Reviews

publications. Although the name of Milovan Djilas appeared several times in this publication, there was no mention of Mihajlo Mihajlov, a distinguished literary specialist.

This publication is most useful for the appended chronology of literary events and the biographical notes. It does not, however, provide much valuable information in its theoretical part, which seems to be an interesting experiment centering around Marxist limitations in literature.
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In July 1973 the History Department of the School of Slavonic and East European Studies of the University of London sponsored a conference to reconsider official British attitudes toward the wartime resistance in Greece and Yugoslavia. The conference re-evaluated these attitudes in light of the official British records opened in January 1972 and the recollections of those who participated in formulating and executing official policy. As the editors point out in the preface, the volume, which is based on material delivered at the conference, concentrates on the year 1943 and is not a systematic analysis of British Balkan policy. There is neither an attempt to give a coherent view of events inside Yugoslavia and Greece nor extended coverage of Britain's relations with the exiled governments. The editors' aim is to «elucidate a substantial number of points that are unclear in previously published accounts» by examining the declassified records of the Foreign Office, War Cabinet, and Chiefs of Staffs, which include Special Operations Executive (S.O.E.) papers passed to these agencies. They have the official histories in mind here. The editors are modest, however, for the volume does more than that, especially in regard to the Greek resistance. The book destroys the speculative hypotheses on the conspiratorial character of British policy as found in the works of André Kédros, Dominique Eudes, and Heinz Richter.

The book is divided into two unequal parts, the first of which is longer and consists of seven papers. Part two presents a discussion of the papers by the twenty-one participants. Bickam Sweet-Escott begins the first part with an informative survey of S.O.E. organization and policy regarding the Balkans, and in arguing that the confusion in British policy resulted from «the conflict between the government's short-term military aims and its long-term political needs» states the theme that unites the volume. This view is not new but the richness of detail revealing the decision making process at work is. Elisabeth Barker illuminates this process as she traces the conflicting shifts and turns among individuals as well as departments in London's