

David Floyd, *Rumania: Russia's Dissident Ally*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965. Pp. xvi + 144.

J. F. Brown, *The New Eastern Europe*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966. Pp. vii + 306.

The increasingly more varied menus provided by the *chefs de cuisine* specializing in East European recipes have now been enriched with Rumania à la Floyd and The New Eastern Europe done up Brown. The connoisseurs will find Brown's *table d'hôte* offering preferable to Floyd's *à la carte* selection.

Brown's work is indeed the best analytical survey of East European problems currently available. The author has concentrated on those political, cultural and socio-economic developments which, in his opinion, are most directly responsible for the gradual dissolution of the Soviet bloc. His treatment of domestic and foreign policies is incisive; his analysis of economic change deft. The chapter on cultural change in a political context is the best of the seven into which the volume is divided; the case study of Albanian and Rumanian nationalism, probably the weakest.

It is difficult to take exception with Brown's judicious views except for his prognosis of increasingly greater independence for the communist nations of Eastern Europe. The only other criticism that may be levied at this authoritative volume is the author's reluctance to draw clear-cut conclusions. Had he underscored the obvious to the expert but strange to the uninitiated, his profound knowledge of the "New Eastern Europe" would have become more evident to all concerned.

By contrast, David Floyd exposes his views on Rumania without equivocation. As a consequence, the specialist on Rumanian history and politics can readily discern the author's political perspicacity and frequent factual inaccuracy. Floyd reaches the conclusions which Ghita Ionescu was unable to draw in 1963 when *Communism in Rumania, 1944-1962* went to the press. The evolution of the Rumanian "independent course," which became apparent only in mid-1963, has been ably described by Floyd on the basis of his own firsthand observations and the wealth of factual information provided by Ionescu and other writers on Rumanian affairs. But his argument is often superficial and his style journalistic. Floyd's conclusions are sound but his premises do not take into account the more complex aspects of Rumanian politics.

It is undeniable that Rumanian national feelings were outraged by the "Russian occupation" and corollary exploitation, political and eco-

nomie, of the Rumanian People's Republic. It is also clear that the Rumanian communist leadership, headed by Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, sought to avenge itself of the Kremlin's abusive treatment of the Rumanian Party as soon as the "objective conditions," national and international, permitted such retaliation. Nevertheless, the Rumanians' motivations transcended mere "nationalist reaction" to foreign interference and their political maneuvers were infinitely more sophisticated than presumed by Floyd. Still, the author's political intelligence has allowed him to prepare a readable if somewhat popular monograph. It may not provide much food for thought but as an *apéritif*, a "Rumanian course," it is unsurpassed.

University of Colorado

STEPHEN FISCHER-GALATI

Milovan Djilas, *Montenegro*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963. Pp. 367.

It is a far cry from the books and articles written by Milovan Djilas during his career as a communist leader to the present work. In rejecting Marxism, Djilas has clearly turned back to something closer to him: the spirit and traditions of his native Montenegro. This small nation of tribes, unique in Europe, seems to involve its sons in a particularly poignant and conscious form of human dichotomy. Djilas says: "For I myself am from Montenegro, torn between ideal and reality." Unlike Bulatović, whose works represent a protest against ideals in the name of humanity or, rather, a total rejection of humanity's power to possess ideals save a mask for corruption, and a disguise of its lowest passions, Djilas accepts the enormous influence and importance of ideals in the life of the individual while remaining fully aware that they are unrealisable, that when realised they become something involving evil and suffering. One imagines that Djilas speaks with rueful experience when he says of one character: "Although he had passed through prisons... and had learned there that every ideal, once realised, loses its ideal quality and is usually transformed into a monstrosity and a tyranny...." Yet the word *although* is important. Another character exclaims: "Kosovo, Kosovo! Destiny of the Serbs and their terrible place of judgement. If there had been no battle at Kosovo, the Serbs would have invented it for its suffering and heroism." Ideals with their suffering and heroism are, therefore, something essential to human existence.

In *Land without Justice*, Djilas wrote of Montenegro from a perso-