

beziehungen beigetragen. Tzitzilis gehört der jüngeren griechischen Generation von Sprachwissenschaftlern an und verspricht viel für die Balkanlinguistik, die in Griechenland noch keine Tradition hat und erst in den Siebzigerjahren sich aus laienhaften Anfängen zu einem wissenschaftlichen Fach zu wandeln versucht.

Universität Thessaloniki

CH. SYMEONIDIS

Apostolos E. Vacalopoulos, Constantinos D. Svolopoulos, Béla K. Király (eds.), *War and Society in East Central Europe, Vol. XXIII: Southeast European Maritime Commerce and Naval Policies from the Mid-Eighteenth Century to 1914*. Social Sciences Monographs (Boulder, Colorado: Atlantic Research and Publications, Highland Lakes; Co-Publisher, Institute for Balkan Studies: Thessaloniki, Greece; Distributed by Columbia University Press, 1988), 410+XVI pp. Biographical index.

This collection of papers was presented at the Seventeenth Symposium held in Thessaloniki under the auspices of the Brooklyn College Program on Society and Change in East Central Europe, in cooperation with the Institute for Balkan Studies, Thessaloniki, Greece. The study covers primarily southeastern Europe, that is, the geographical area between the Lower Danube and the Eastern Mediterranean.

The articles published in the volume are the work of twenty-four contributors from Greece (10) the United States and Canada (8), Bulgaria (3), and (1) respectively from Italy, Austria, and Hungary. They examine the diverse aspects of political and economic history, maritime commerce and navigation, naval policy and strategy, riverine trade, cities and ports, commercial companies and traders, relations among the peoples and nations and their interaction to the development of the region, the role of the European powers, and, finally, the effects of war and trade on society from about 1740 to 1914.

The work is divided into seven sections. It opens with a succinct and pointed introduction by the eminent historian of Balkan history, Professor Stephen Fischer-Galati, on the maritime commerce and the Balkans before the French Revolution, setting the stage for the general treatment of the topics in the volume. It further examines the commercial and naval policy of France and Great Britain in the Balkans, particularly the area of the Ottoman empire, from the end of the eighteenth century to the end of World War I. The next section deals with the history of Danubian navigation, the role of Austria-Hungary, and the commercial activity on the Lower Danube along Romania and Bulgaria. The following portion takes up the creation of the Greek commercial navy in the 19th century and navigation and trade in the Adriatic, Ionian, and Black Seas and the Mediterranean. The next six articles discuss the role of the ports of Trieste, Thessaloniki, Syra, and Smyrna and their commercial and economic importance. The following segment analyzes the Greek contribution to maritime law, Austrian quarantine reform, piracy during the Greek war of independence, and the role of the U.S. navy in the Aegean during the same period. The last concluding article reviews major works on maritime war, trade, the geopolitical setting, and issues that influenced the course of history of this pivotal region of Southeastern Europe from 1740 to 1920.

Most of the studies in the collection utilize archival sources, unknown until now, secondary works, or general bibliographies. The contributors from the United States, Canada,

Greece, Italy, Austria, and Eastern bloc participants in the symposium present diverse opinions, different disciplines and languages, interpretations, schools of thought, and level of research and standards of scholarship, making the work a valuable contribution to the maritime commerce and naval history of the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe. Several articles include varied statistical information and other useful data on trade, volume of export-import commodities, money transaction, price study formation, commercial and shipping companies, merchant fleet, sailing vessels, steamers, ships, passengers, tonnage of goods loaded and unloaded on principal ports, and other bits of interesting facts which enhance the scholarly presentation of the study.

There are several fine papers which offer penetrating analysis. Barry Dennis Hunt's study "The Eastern Question in British Naval Policy and Strategy, 1789-1913", presents a balanced discussion of Britain's naval and strategic interests and dilemmas on the perplexing issues concerning the Eastern Question and the fate of the Ottoman empire. Elena Frangakis's paper on "The Port of Smyrna in the Nineteenth Century" is a documented research study focusing on the commercial activities of the port of Smyrna with France, England, and the United States, the latter being "particularly active in the Smyrna trade" and "in 1832 accounted for 49.1% of its imports". However, it would be interesting to add that American ships were also among the principal carriers of cargoes of opium (the opium poppy was cultivated in Asia Minor), loaded from the port of Smyrna and subsequently transported to China, leading to the Opium Wars in 1840's and 1850's between China and Britain, in which the United States, including other European powers, played an active part. Spiridon G. Focas's study on "The Greeks and Navigation on the Lower Danube, 1789-1913", is an account of bygone years, describing the bustling commercial activity of Greek captains and merchants—including the author's grandparents and parents—in the Romanian ports, from the Iron Gates to the Black Sea. But events following the Balkan wars in 1913, led to the decline and, immediately after World War II, to the end of Greek presence in the Romanian city-ports of Braila, Galați, and Constanța.

There are, however, some observations and comments which must be offered. Most of the articles in the collection deal mainly with Greece, Bulgaria, the Habsburg empire (Hungary), the Lower Danube and the Ottoman empire in its southeastern extension along the Mediterranean. There are no contributions from Romanian, Serbian, or Turkish specialists, and studies about these countries are partially contributed by other participants in the symposium. This was obviously not a deliberate omission by the organizers of the symposium; nevertheless, contributions by historians and specialists from these countries would have perhaps improved the scope of the work as a whole.

A few of the articles written by specialists from East European countries appear rather overly political and inaccurate in their historical interpretation. Simion Damianov's article on "French Commerce with the Bulgarian Territories from the Eighteenth century to 1914", presents an interesting case. The author considers France the "oldest and most traditional trading partner" with the "Bulgarian lands" [*Bŭlgarskite zemi*]. For Damianov the "Bulgarian lands" comprised a large territory, which included Rumelia (southeastern region), the coast of the Black Sea, northern Bulgaria, inclusive the province of Dobrudja (p. 18), and the entire region of Macedonia and Thrace—from Thessaloniki to Kavalla, Alexandroupolis (Dedeagach) and beyond! (p. 24, Table 2). (Was it the Bulgaria of the San Stefano Treaty of 1878, which the author implies in the article?). Bulgaria was actually part of the Ottoman empire, throughout much of the 19th century, became an autonomous principality in 1878, and proclaimed its independence in 1908. If France carried an intensive trade, it was with

such cities and ports as Thessaloniki, Kavalla, Constantinople, Smyrna, the Levant area, and Egypt. It is therefore fair to assume that the "Bulgarian lands"—part of this empire, did not play as prominent a role in the overall trade with France and Western Europe as, the author suggests or attempts to prove in his study. Similarly, he is inaccurate in another of his assertions that "in the course of a century and a half France by her commercial activity contributed to the integration of the Bulgarian economy into the system of European capitalism, and hence, to Bulgaria's entrance to the modern world economy". To the contrary, one can argue that Bulgaria, and indeed most of the Balkan countries, did not develop any viable capitalist economy, nor did she become part of the European capitalist system in the 19th century, or even in the 20th century. The Bulgarian economy remained basically agrarian and Bulgaria remained the most typical peasant country of southeastern Europe until mid-1940's and beyond. In fact, prior to 1914, wheat was Bulgaria's main agricultural product and the principal article of export. The industrial sector was almost non-existent. Following this line of reasoning, he goes on to say that "by this [commercial] activity between France and Bulgaria, were prepared, consciously or not, the conditions for the speedy liberation of Bulgaria from Ottoman domination". This is a general statement without providing any evidence how France had any part in bringing about "the speedy liberation of Bulgaria". A close look at the course of France's history during the second half of the 19th century would suggest otherwise. One may even ask: What was, then, Russia's role in the liberation of the "Bulgarian lands" from the Turks during the Russo-Turkish war in 1878? Lastly, a careful historian will dispute his claim that "the growing importance of the Bulgarian lands for Western commerce was one of the causes for France and England to oppose dismemberment of the Ottoman empire during the Crimean War". It is not the place here to recount the background of the Crimean war and its economic, political, military, and religious causes which precipitated this major European conflict in 1853-1856. Suffice to say that, if the two Western powers upheld the territorial integrity of the Ottoman empire, it was not because of the economic importance of "the Bulgarian lands for Western commerce", but rather, because England and France joined forces to stop Russian expansion in the direction of Southeastern Europe and the Near East. The economic or commercial importance of the "Bulgarian lands" did not have any direct influence on France's and England's stand in preserving the Ottoman empire.

There are some errors and inconsistencies in the collection which might confuse a student or the general reader. The Treaty of Paris (1856), ending the Crimean War, is referred to as the Congress of Paris. Spelling names in English presents another problem. For example, the name *Kuchuk Kainardji*, referring to the Russo-Turkish treaty of 1774, is spelled differently more than five times! Other words and names are misspelled or spelled variously throughout the collection. A uniform spelling of names in English would have eliminated such confusion.

These observations do not, in any way, minimize the importance of the study. The collection is a pioneering effort by American and European scholars and specialists on a topic that can lead to further studies and research, on regional or national level, about a subject which is of common interest among the peoples and countries of Central and Southeastern Europe. Browsing through the pages of the collection, the reader will be carried way back, to another era of bygone glories, great empires and leaders, successful merchants and brave captains, famous companies and cities, busy ports and bustling rivers, open seas and sailing ships, large steamers and barges cruising through the Blue Danube and sailing across the

Black Sea, the Adriatic, Ionian and Aegean Seas, and the Mediterranean. Their history is aptly captured in the pages of this book on war and society in Central East and Southeastern Europe.

University of South Carolina—  
Coastal Carolina College

JAMES J. FARSOLAS

Ivo Banac, *The National Question in Yugoslavia: Origins, History, Politics*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, paperback edition, 1988, p. 452.

All too often in the past, accounts of Balkan politics have suffered from stereotyping and condescending disparagement. Yet the complexity of the region, stemming from the ethnic and religious diversity of the peoples, the tangled demographic conditions and the historical vicissitudes of state and social development make the study of political life here a rewarding experience for the patient and discerning observer. And among the interesting societies in the Balkans none is more striking than the Yugoslav multinational state. It is a subject that is bound to elicit emotion and even passion. The author of this work is well aware of this as he issues his own caveat to those who read his study.

The Triune Kingdom was born in controversy and emotion out of war and political upheaval. Rather than recount the political maneuvering that went into the creation of the state edifice, Banac focuses on the political groups among the South Slavs and their historically conditioned ideas and ideals that became ideologies in the crucible of the Great War.

Before proceeding to the detailed account of the political personalities and their parties, which confronted one another as Yugoslavia took form, the author reaches back in time to delineate the broader forces that shaped the complex world of the South Slav lands and peoples. The role of religion, territory, language, and social estates are examined in the shaping of culture and national identities. Rather than searching for "purity" (whatever that dangerous term connotes) and fixed identities among the peoples of the area, the author correctly emphasizes the alterations societies underwent through demographic developments such as migrations, whether voluntary or enforced by overlords. But the notion of "nations" and "national consciousness" formed and existing before the development of nationalist ideology and politics based on it, is asserted by Banac. Through the centuries of development by the South Slavs, especially with regard to the Croatian political leadership during the nineteenth century, the author is really dealing with high culture and intellectuals when describing the "national consciousness" of the various peoples.

The bulk of the book is an extensive and extended examination of the personalities, their groups, and their political objectives, which were the basis of the paradox that became the multinational Yugoslav state in an era of nationalist demands. All groups are given their due, which is one of the author's real contributions to the history of Yugoslavia. However, the study focuses on the Serbs and their supporters in their drive to create a unitary, centralized state and the opposition, primarily by the Croat political leaders, to such a vision. The strength and weaknesses in the character of political figures, the position of their parties when dealing with each other, and the tactics adopted by them are described and assessed, often with a biting turn of phrase.