

ticularly those of Eastern European origin) that Communism represents a break with the traditional past no less significant than, say, the partitions of Poland or the Ottoman conquest of the Balkans, is in need of serious examination. This examination should perhaps focus more on continuity than on change, and more on deep-seated geographical, ethnic, religious, and psychological factors than on narrowly political phenomena.¹

Carnegie Institute of Technology

LEONARD BUSHKOFF

STANFORD UNIVERSITY CONFERENCE ON YUGOSLAVIA

The annual meetings on Eastern Europe at Stanford University, having begun as a seminar on a local or regional basis, have developed into conferences of national, if not international, stature. "Yugoslavia: An Experiment in Socialism", was held on December 3-4, 1965. As the first conference of its kind, it offered an assessment of the past twenty years of Yugoslav history, since the rise to power of Tito and the Communist Party.

Under the chairmanship of Professor Wayne Vucinich of Stanford University, the program opened with a review by Milorad Drachkovitch of the Hoover Institution, of the history of the "Communist Party of Yugoslavia in the Interwar Period." The inconsistent efforts of an ever-changing leadership to create and maintain an orthodox Bolshevik party in the face of centrifugal nationalist tensions led to inter-Party rifts and virtual extinction until the advent of Tito and, ironically, of Hitler. Opportunity beckoned in April, 1941, with Hitler's destruction of the Yugoslav state. And Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union encouraged the pragmatism and realism which have remained characteristics of the CPY. "Yugoslavia in World War II" was dealt by Professor Jozo Tomasevich of San Francisco State College, who concentrated on the strengths and weaknesses of both sides in the highly controversial Tito-Mihailovich feud. Tomasevich noted among other factors favoring the partisans their energy and activism; their political program, which offered attractive solutions to the national question while de-emphasizing Marxism; the varied capabilities of their leaders; their appeal to various social elements, including women and the young; the mistakes of their opponents; and their skill in organization and propaganda. A lively discussion followed of both papers, which represent a distillation of work in progress by their authors.

1. The entire Winter 1966 issue of the *Journal of International Affairs* is devoted to this very topic: "East Central Europe: Continuity and Change".

The second session was devoted to the political, economic and international development of postwar Yugoslavia. Professor Woodford McClellan of the University of Virginia spoke on "The Yugoslav Experiment: Postwar Political Evolution." Among other things he noted a desire for the rule of law; a growing democratization and liberalization, which precludes any return to Stalinism; and an important conflict between socialism and the desire for individual freedom. His conclusion was that, regardless of labels, Yugoslavia is no longer a Communist state. With Professor George Macesich of Florida State University in Yugoslavia, his paper on "Major Trends in the Postwar Economy" was read and commented on by Professor Jerzy Karcz of the University of California at Santa Barbara. According to Macesich, Yugoslavia's economy is unique in being neither Western nor Eastern, and therefore is criticised by both. He emphasized its pragmatic, mixed character, with a period of centralization and nationalization ending in 1952, a gradual transition to decentralization lasting until 1961, and important changes occurring in 1965. These changes have stressed decentralization and freer markets, but have barely touched the problem of transition from backwardness to modernization. Professor Phyllis Auty of the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London (Visiting Professor at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver), dealt with "International Relations," a field in which she contended that great successes had been achieved by Yugoslavia since 1945. She described the Tito-Stalin break in 1948 as ushering in a "new phase in world history," and helping to bring a more liberal communism to the Soviet Union and to Eastern Europe. According to Professor Auty, Tito's Yugoslavia has had three constant aims: defense of its revolution, defense of its sovereignty and independence, and the defense of Yugoslav security through the maintenance of world peace.

The remaining papers were "Literary Currents in Socialist Yugoslavia" by Professor Ante Kadić of Indiana University, and "Nationalism and Religion" by Professor Vucinich. Kadić described the alienation of many of the best prewar writers and the literary slump occurring during the first decade of Communist rule, followed by an upward trend which has reached the point where some contemporary writers equal in quality those of the pre-Communist era. He also offered an evaluation of the newly-created "Macedonian" literature. Vucinich dealt with nationalism in Yugoslavia (a phenomenon mentioned by every speaker) in both its historical and contemporary aspects. He noted a significant revival of regional nationalism, as expressed in economic rivalry and bargaining, which conflicts with the official propagation of "Yugoslav" nationalism. The conference concluded with summaries by Professors Ivo Lederer of Stanford and James Clarke of the University of Pittsburgh.

Clarke noted that the Yugoslav experience, as revealed in the conference papers, appeared to confirm the view that traditional Communism is bankrupt.

Among those scholars attending the Conference were several from outside the United States, including Professors Rudolf Bičanić of the University of Zagreb, and Ivan Avakumović of the University of British Columbia. The papers of this most successful Conference will be assembled and published by the Stanford University Press in the near future. In December 1967, the Conference will concentrate its attention on the Russian peasant.

University of Pittsburgh

JAMES F. CLARKE

ENGLISH HISTORIES OF BULGARIA

For years a common complaint has been the lack of a history of Bulgaria in English. There was a time when English readers had to depend on the historical portions of Macdonald and Monroe and on Mishev.¹ Then all at once we get several histories of Bulgaria following on each other's heels; Stanley Evans, *A Short History of Bulgaria* (1960); Mercia Macdermott, *A History of Bulgaria. 1393-1885* (1962); and Kossev, Hristov and Angelov, *A Short History of Bulgaria* (1963). For several reasons the most attractive of the three is that by Mrs. Macdermott.²

The date limits of the Macdermott title indicate the emphasis on the period between the loss of independence to the Ottoman Turks and the events in Eastern Rumelia, following Bulgaria's liberation in 1878. The book begins with a very short and rather questionable chapter on Bulgarian history before 1393. A postscript adds little at the other end.³ A note on transliteration, glossary, selected bibliography, end-paper map, and 24 attractive illustrations complement the well-written and well-printed volume. There are almost no references. Although the author's greatest interest is evidently in the revolutionary movements, organizations, leaders and plots climaxing in the 1876 rising, which she describes in detail, she also devotes attention to economic, social, educational and literary matters especially in the national revival. This breadth, along with her evident enthusiasm for her subject and

1. John Macdonald, *Czar Ferdinand and his People* (New York, 1913); Will S. Monroe, *Bulgaria and her People* (Boston, 1914); Dimităr Mishev, *Bulgarians in the Past* (Lausanne, 1919), badly translated from Bulgarian but with good cultural information.

2. Mercia Macdermott, *A History of Bulgaria, 1393-1885* (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd, 1962), pp. 354.

3. The ground covered is essentially that in A. Hajek, *Bulgarien unter der Türkenherrschaft* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1925), still the best account in a Western language.