

attention since World War II, the problem is only rarely seen in historical and cultural perspective. Among other things, he suggests that, without the breakdown of traditional structure and attitudes, modern economic and technical assistance may produce little change conducive to growth.

The book is beautifully published. There is a very useful glossary of Turkish terms, together with a comprehensive, if selective, bibliography. No student of recent Ottoman and Turkish history can afford to miss this volume.

The School of International Service
The American University
Washington D.C.

HARRY N. HOWARD

Columbia University, The Russian Institute. *Russian Diplomacy and Eastern Europe, 1914-1917*. Introduction by Henry L. Roberts. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963. Pp. XVIII + 305.

This collection of essays results from international relations seminars at Columbia University. The essays complement C. Jay Smith's *The Russian Struggle for Power, 1914-1917* (New York, 1956) by examining in detail Russian attitudes and policies in regard to Poland, Austria-Hungary, Germany, Bulgaria, Rumania, and the Italo-Yugoslav boundary dispute. Like Mr. Smith, the authors of these essays make good use of *Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia vepokhu imperializma*, an essential Soviet collection of diplomatic documents that has been too frequently neglected by Western diplomatic historians.

Alexander Dallin's "The Future of Poland" and Merritt Abrash's "War Aims toward Austria-Hungary" are particularly valuable. Dallin's essay, based on a careful examination of Polish and Russian memoirs, published documents, and secondary works, skilfully analyzes the interaction between internal Russian and Polish politics, and Great Power attitudes toward the Polish question during World War I. Abrash displays a similar awareness of the complexities of Central and Eastern European politics and nationalism. Both his evidence and arguments support the conclusion that "there was no consistent Russian policy toward Austria-Hungary during the thirty-odd months from the outbreak of war to the revolution." (p. 123).

It is surprising that no article on the Straits problem is included in this volume, for the Straits perhaps concerned Russian statesmen more than any other Eastern European question between 1914 and 1917. In comparison, the Italo-Yugoslav boundary question, 1914-1915, which is discussed in Michael B. Petrovich's well-wrought article, was

of secondary importance for St. Petersburg. Winning Bulgaria and Rumania for the cause of the Entente was of course a major objective for Russian diplomats. Russia failed in Bulgaria because, as James M. Potts points out, the Central Powers won impressive military victories in 1915 and satisfied Bulgarian aspirations in Macedonia. Success in Rumania, as Alferd J. Rieber shows, was not complete, for Rumania's final decision to join the Entente was made on Rumanian, not Russian terms. There is too much emphasis on Russian diplomatic blunders in Mr. Rieber's article. Insufficient analysis is made of both Rumanian political conditions and general Allied and Russian diplomacy at the time to say with certainty whether or not St. Petersburg seriously erred in dealing with Bucharest.

Germany was obviously a consideration of great importance for Russia in Central and Eastern Europe. Germany's industrial and military power before and during World War I undeniably threatened vital Russian interests. Gifford D. Malone's essay on "War Aims toward Germany," being based mainly on published diplomatic documents and Paleologue's memoirs, is too narrow in conception to do justice to this theme. The article also fails to focus on Eastern Europe, discussing at length Russia's rivalry with Germany in the Far East.

The essays in this collection fill many gaps in our knowledge concerning Russia's relations with Eastern Europe during World War I. Henry L. Roberts' excellent introduction also suggests the relationship of the issues they raise to "deeply grounded facts" of Eastern European history and geography. A weakness of the majority of these essays is their tendency to underestimate the relevance of these "deeply grounded facts" to Russian diplomacy. Our authors are, however, in good company. Western historians interested in Russian diplomatic relations with Eastern Europe generally know too little about Eastern European internal conditions and history to understand some of the principal reasons for the apparent uncertainties of St. Petersburg (or Moscow) policy makers.

Pennsylvania State University

EDWARD C. THADEN

S. Hafner, *Studien altserbischen dynastischen Historiographie* (= Südost-europäische Arbeiten 62), München, Verlag R. Oldenburg, 1964. S. VIII + 141.

Der Verf. des vorliegenden Buches hat sich die Untersuchung der altserbischen Literatur und ihres Aussagewertes in bezug auf die Herrscherideologie des mittelalterlichen serbischen Staates zum Ziel gestellt.