

by the appearance of a nationalist deviation in Rumania. Despite accumulating evidence, Western observers were indeed slow to recognize what was occurring. It is also true that Mr. Ionescu discusses the victory of the nativist leadership, the large-scale recruitment and training of a Rumanian technical intelligentsia, the withdrawal of the last Soviet troops in 1958, and other elements vital to any credible explanation. But he does not attempt such an explanation himself, nor deal with the whole body of evidence as to how the deviation developed, nor even give in detail the economic arguments of the two protagonists.

Mr. Ionescu is also open to criticism for something close to Rumanian national bias. He seems to the present reviewer to underplay considerably the importance of the Hungarian autonomous regime in northern Transylvania in 1944-45, and to pass over in silence the atrocities committed by Rumanian forces in the conquest and administration of Transnistria.

But these criticisms notwithstanding, we must be grateful to Mr. Ionescu for a very useful book, one to which students of Eastern Europe and of Rumania will be referring for many years to come.

Wayne State University

R. V. BURKS

Angelo Tamborra, *Imbro I. Tkalac e l'Italia*. Istituto per la Storia del Risorgimento Italiano, Biblioteca Scientifica, Serie II: Memorie, Vol. XXIV. Roma: Istituto per la Storia del Risorgimento Italiano, 1966. Pp. 357.

Italian studies on the Italo-Slav relations of the last century above all on the Risorgimento period, flourish with considerable satisfaction, to both sides of the Adriatic. They are doubly useful as they help develop an Italo-Yugoslav understanding which had been dimmed over a generation by the ominous nationalist propaganda.

One of the Italian historians who has mostly contributed to the study of the relations between the Slavs and Italians in the Risorgimento period is certainly Professor Angelo Tamborra. Already a few years ago in his masterly book, *Cavour e i Balcani* (1958), he discussed the problem dealing with the relations between the leading Risorgimento's personalities and those of the Serbs, Croats, Hungarians, Greeks, Rumanians and Bulgarians. In that book he brought to light major ideas and projects of the Cavourian diplomacy for an Italo-Balkan and Danubian entente, which unhappily after the formation of the new Balkan and

Danubian states was never continued, due mostly to the erosion of Italian fascism. In that volume Tamborra proved how the policy of the Risorgimento — the policy of Mazzini, Garibaldi and Cavour — fundamentally liberal and democratic understood essentially nationalism as a political movement inspired by the principles of human dignity and national self-determination. This policy continued during the World War One by the leading Italian political thinkers like Leonida Bissolati, Gaetano Salvemini, Guglielmo Ferrero and even Count Carlo Sforza, was however discontinued by the rise of Italian national-fascism, represented by the D'Annunzio's and the Mussolini's.

The new Tamborra's volume is devoted to a little known personality of the Croatian national movement of the last century who has not only been greatly inspired by Risorgimento but even later on became active in it. Imbro Ignjatijević Tkalac was born in 1824 in upper Croatia where he was in his early youth active in the national movement. At a certain time of his life he was an editor of the political magazine *Ost und West* published in Vienna, but at the end of 1863 disappointed with the rise of absolutism in the Habsburg Empire, Tkalac went to live first in Turin, then in Florence and finally in Rome, where he died as Italian citizen and former civil servant, in 1912. Although his activity is more related to Italy than to his native Croatia, Tkalac, however, though younger belongs to that great generation of the Croats that like Ban Ivan Mažuranić, the poet, Ljudevit Gaj, the leader of the Illyrian Movement, and Bishop Juraj Strossmayer, the leader of the liberal national party gave to the Croat nation the conscience of its national entity. As it is now accepted the Illyrian Movement started out as a Yugoslav and even as a Pan-Slav movement, but ended up in becoming definitely as Croatian national movement. (This year in March the 130-tieth anniversary of the Illyrian Movement was celebrated in Zagreb sponsored by all the cultural institutions. In all their interventions the Croat historians and writers stressed that same significance of the Illyrian movement as the movement that regenerated the Croat national life).

In describing Tkalac, Tamborra points out that he while acting in Italy, always felt being a Slav. "Sono cittadino Italiano," Tkalac wrote in his political testament, "da una generazione e sotto il profilo politico patriota italiano altrettanto completo come poterono esserlo Cavour e Garibaldi, ma il mio sentimento nazionale slavo è in me ancora così vivo come all'epoca in cui si era in me ridestato." (p. 7). Tkalac's fundamental conviction was that the destiny of Croatia was linked to its

union with Serbia that eventually should develop into what later on became Yugoslavia. In his political thesis, published in Paris, in 1866, under the title, *Pitanje austrijsko: kome, kako i kada valja rešiti ga? Poslanica Brati Hrvatima i Srbima* (The Austrian Question: for whom, in which way and when it should be solved. Message to the Brothers Croats and Serbs), Tkalac lays particular stress on the fact that the future independence and freedom of these two peoples depends on their union and the separation from the Dual Empire. In enlightening this Tkalac's point, Tamborra also takes in consideration another Croat political alternative. That one fought by the wellknown Croat revolutionary exile, Eugen Kvaternik (1825-1871), who opposing the policy of the union of the Croats and Serbs, fought, also in Italy, and in Paris, for the formation of an independent Croatia detached from Austria and Serbia. Kvaternik, though feeling a Slav, as he often pointed out, was hostile to Yugoslavianism and Pan-Slavism, afraid that an engrandized Serbia together with Croatia would have brought inevitably Russia into the Balkans, thus threatening also the independence of the non Slav peoples in the Balkans and in the Danubian Europe. Tamborra, however, makes clear that the policy of the Italian establishment was definitely in opposition with Kvaternik's Croat views. "Gli uomini che realmente contano in Italia," he writes, "come il Re, Visconti Venosta, Cerruti, ecc. sono dunque favorevoli alla tesi di conciliazione fra Serbi e Croati messa innanzi, già con intendimenti jugoslavi, dal Tkalac" (p. 98). The Cavour's death, with whom Kvaternik allegedly had sincere relations, and the Tkalac's growing trust-worthy relations with the leading Italians, the King and the Italian foreign Minister V. Venosta have contributed to the Kvaternik's total eclipse abroad, and eventually pushed him to the ill-advised rebellion against Austria in Rakovica in 1871, that brought also his death. Thus Tkalac's alternative came out to be more real for Yugoslavia became later on a reality.

There is, however, a very important element that Tamborra seems not to have grasped in all its political significance. The Garašanin's "Načertanije" (1844) was not a blueprint for the future Yugoslavia but for a Great Serbia. Had Tamborra read Vaso Čubrilović's, *Istorija Političke Misli u Srbiji XIX Veka* (Beograd, 1958), definitely the most liberal Serbian view on this subject, he would have seen that the "Načertanije" was detrimental to the further concept of the Serbo-Croat unification. "Ultimately Garašanin," Čubrilović writes on page 178 of his masterly study, "does not purpose the formation of a Yugoslav Croatian Serbian State. This is why Garašanin in his "Načertanije" exchanges

the expressions 'South Slav,' 'Yugoslav' and 'Yugoslav State'... with Serb, Serbian, Serbia and Serbian Empire." Thus Garašanin did not follow Tkalac's idealistic remarks, when he wrote: "Ma per questo occorre che i Serbi e i Croati non vengano a contesa in avvenire per l'egemonia sullo slavismo meridionale, ma che si mettano d'accordo, con gli stessi uguali diritti e doveri, per porsi alla testa di tutte le restanti nazioni ed insieme ad esse combattere in nemici della comunità e non smetteranno sino a che non sia stata attuata la libertà comune di esse tuta" (p. 113). As the Serbian historian Čubrilović proved this unfortunately was not avoided for: "When it will come to the formation of Yugoslavia in 1918, the representatives of the conservative, bourgeois, bureaucratic and militaristic Serbia will represent the same ideas about the internal organization of the (Yugoslav) state Illya Garašanin did" (Čubrilović, *Istoriya...* p. 195).

As it has been said Tkalac became a member of the staff of the Italian Foreign Ministry and in that capacity was instrumental in helping his Italian employers to understand the policy of the Habsburg Empire in the Balkan and Danubian areas. One of his most valuable contributions to the Italian government in Florence was his diplomatic mission in Rome during the Vatican Council. The second half of this book reproduces the reports that Tkalac was sending to Visconti Venosta from Rome, from January 20th to July 25th, 1870, in which he reports, day by day, tremendously important developments. Tkalac's first contact in Rome was his meetings with Bishop Strossmayer who at that Council was leading the opposition against Pius IX, and his policy of "infalibility," followed by a considerable number of French, German and other Catholic bishops. In the following words, Tkalac describes Strossmayer's policy: "...il s'efforce du moins d'empêcher autant qu'il est en lui, le mal dont l'Église et la société sont menacées, et ne se lassera pas de défendre les droits de l'humanité contre toute tyrannie spirituelle aussi bien que temporelle. Personne plus que lui ne saurait déplorer la confusion de la religion et de l'Église avec des intérêts tout à fait étrangers à l'une et à l'autre; il était fort satisfait de voir que cette conviction commence à pénétrer dans l'esprit d'un très grand nombre d'évêques non seulement étrangers, mais aussi italiens et espère que cette nouvelle disposition des esprits ne restera pas stérile. Et enfin, personne plus que lui, chef de l'opposition nationale et libéral de son pays, ne saurait plus hautement apprécier les services que l'Italie a rendus à toutes nations opprimées en inscrivant sur son drapeau le mot de liberté et d'indépendance nationale" (Pp. 227-28).

Following in these pages, published here for the first time, the foresighted vision of Bishop Strossmayer at that Council, and comparing it with what has taken place during the last Council the Vatican II, one is profoundly impressed with the prophetic genius of the Djakovo Bishop, whom Pius IX used to call the "eretico croatino" and what not. The Strossmayer "liberal, revolutionary and Pan-Slavist" vision has undoubtedly made a great path ahead, and it is even seen in the present collaboration between the Roman Catholic and the Serbian Orthodox Churches, albeit, on religious grounds.

With this document, Tamborra's book helps the Yugoslav historians to bring a new light on the work of Tkalac and also of Strossmayer, whose aim, as it is well known, was the rapprochement between the Orthodoxy and Catholicism, as a basis for the greater understanding between the two nations, the Croat and Serb. Thus also from this point, the Tamborra's work contributes to the understanding not only between the Italians and the Southern Slavs but the Yugoslavs themselves. Minor errors: Vuk Karadžić was not a "poet" (p. 32) but primarily a philologist, and one of the first to have been valuable in collecting the folk poetry of the Serbs and Croats as in promoting the language reform asking the writers to write as the people speak. The Italian research is complete in this work while the Serbian and the Croat research appears to be partial and incomplete.

Fairleigh Dickinson University  
Teaneck, New Jersey

BOGDAN RADITSA

Milovan Djilas, *Njegoš, Poet-Prince-Bishop*. Introduction and Translation by Michael B. Petrovich. Preface by William Jovanovich. Harcourt, Brace & World, New York, 1966. Pp. XXVII+498.

It is an axiom that the three major South Slav cultural values are the folk poetry, the poetry of Njegoš and the sculptural work of Ivan Meštrović. It was through their expressions that the most human and deepest national character of the Croats and Serbs have attained their highest creative form. That what the folk poetry and Njegoš succeeded to say Meštrović molded in his equally dynamic visualization.

In this new long and ponderous work Milovan Djilas resumes all his considerable critical and literary talent in trying to elucidate the poetic and philosophical albeit national work of the major Serb Montenegrin Poet, Bishop and Prince, Petar Petrović Njegoš (1813-1851).