

sequences this had for the individual agriculturalist, are questions whose importance is underscored in this book.

Some criticisms are nevertheless in order. Population growth is totally ignored, despite its crucial importance from the late nineteenth century onward. Nor is there any definition or analysis of modernization per se, and how it operated in Southeastern Europe. A related deficiency is the presence of many readings on traditional society, but far fewer showing real insight into the new ideological and economic order taking shape in the 1850's and 1860's. This failing may simply stem from the myopia of contemporary observers — it is not surprising that travellers paid much more attention to, say, the *zadruga*, than to those subtle changes in the minds of men which signify the decline of traditional society. Even so, some comment by the editors on the hallmarks, the unique characteristics of the modernizing process would help fulfill the book's avowed purpose.

But to do this properly, it would be necessary to go a long step beyond the study of social and economic developments, into a realm which is largely ignored: that of attitudes, values, and beliefs. To list the economic achievements of, say, Count Szechenyi is clearly useful; to analyze his basic beliefs and assumptions, his views of Hungary's past, present, and future, his attitudes regarding objectives and means to accomplish them, is not merely important but absolutely vital. Hence we should pursue the history of ideas and their effect on individuals, groups, and social classes with as much energy and intelligence as Dr. Warriner and her associates have shown in their concern with social and economic change.

Carnegie Institute of Technology

LEONARD BUSHKOFF

McClellan, Woodford D., *Svetozar Marković and the Origins of Balkan Socialism*. Princeton University Press, 1964. Pp. VIII and 308.

Svetozar Marković is almost completely unknown to the general reader and Mr. McClellan, with his study on him offers a considerable contribution to the understanding of this personality in connection to the evolution of ideas in Serbia during the 19th century. However, though scholarly presentation of such a dubious revolutionary figure as Marković is more than plausible, one may wonder whether the "origins of Balkan Socialism" is an issue in itself. In fact, from what we learn through Mr. McClellan's study we are not convinced that there existed ever any socialism of *Balkan* character. Moreover, present socialist régimes

in the Balkans can in no way be considered as the aftermath of a pre-war socialist movement and less than that of a socialist movement rooted in the period covered by Marković's life (1846-1875). It is true that there exists a recent trend, especially among socialist writers to overestimate the character and the importance of some occasional reactions against the feudal regime of the Balkans in the late 19th century, mostly under the effort to create by all means a socialist "past" for present day consumption. It is also true that neither Mr. McClellan himself seems to believe much of his "Balkan socialism" as his fourth chapter bears the heading "Socialism in Balkans" which is understood as a quite different notion.

Socialism, either Balkan or other, has not an established connotation. Mr. McClellan realising the difficulties that would have been arisen in case his own conception of socialism were not established in advance, adopts at the very beginning Durkheim's approach to this term as "... not a science or a sociology in miniature," but "a cry of grief, sometimes of anger, uttered by men who feel most keenly our collective *malaise*. Socialism is to the facts which produce it what the groans of a sick man are to the illness with which he is affected, to the needs that torment him." Under such a point of view one may consider Marković as a socialist. But we must as well bear in mind that the Balkan people, throughout the 19th century were a chorus of Durkheim's angry voices even if they had never heard of the word socialism. The fundamental difference between this latent sentiment of despair and strife from that of the European socialism was that the former was based mostly on national and not on social preoccupations. Even in cases that the eastern or western socialist ideas had some repercussions on the Balkan intelligentsia they remained an intellectual discipline with a very limited appeal to the people.

In order to place Marković against the background of his era one must remember that Serbian independence from the Turks came very slowly over a lengthy period. After the Serbian revolution, Milos Obrenović, one of its leaders was recognized by the Sultan as supreme prince in Serbia. Fifteen years later Obrenović was recognized as hereditary prince after having murdered George Karageorge. The Obrenović dynasty led Serbia for almost a century and when its last prince, Michael died in 1868, Serbia was led to a grave political crisis out of which there developed a system of party politics. "The problem of Serbia's political and cultural orientation came to a head in the decade 1868-1878 and Svetozar Marković and his followers were to play an important role in the attempt to solve it" (page 19).

Originally Marković was no more than a "progressive" liberal. Liberals, led by Jovanović, were the *avant-garde* of bourgeois ideologists and had nothing in common with the developing eastwards and westwards European socialism. Jovanović, though discharged from his post in the Velika Škola (something between a lycée and a university) under the charge of revolutionism, aspired to nothing more than the complete independence from Turkey and the establishment in Serbia of a constitutional monarchy of the British model. Marković would perhaps have remained to the level of an angry liberal if it was not for his trip to Russia. At that time (1866) both the Russian government and various Pan-Slav organisations offered financial assistance to students from the Slavic south and Marković was granted a scholarship to follow courses in St. Petersburg. During his stay there he was deeply affected by Chernyshevsky's political and philosophical ideas, but he was unable yet to establish in his mind a clear vision of socialism.

Later on, especially after he had travelled to Lausanne and following his participation to the First International, he considered himself to be a close follower of Marx's ideas. His personal conceptions however, on the building of socialist society were almost opponent to those of Marx. He thought that on the basis of a peculiar Serbian social unit, the *Zadruga* (something like a large patriarchal family), Serbia could overpass capitalism and be transformed from a feudal to a socialist society. Despite similar personal conceptions on historical evolution, one may consider as his main contribution to the overall socialism, the understanding of the need of socialism's adjustment to local conditions.

So far as revolutionary action was concerned, Marković reacted spontaneously against the Serbian régime. His character did not help him as an organiser and being undisciplined he never turned to be a true leader. Thus, the repercussions of his ideas and activities did not overpass a small national frame.

Mr. McClellan has very correctly laid stress on the fact that Marković was a "national rather than a social revolutionary" (page 70) and that he tried in vain to "reconcile the nationalism of his country with his theories of social justice" (page 211), though sometimes he seems to overestimate the role of the socialist tide in the Balkan peninsula. Finally it is to be noted that he has almost exhaustively examined every possible source and has followed Marković's life and ideas in a clear and scholarly way. If we judge from his bibliography, his book is the first to appear in English on this subject and this is an accomplishment in itself.