

considerably complements our knowledge of the earliest (and apparently most lasting) influences on Jovanović's thought, previously alluded to in Andrija Stojković's excellent (but more compressed) study of Jovanović's lifelong sociopolitical views.

The author's intention, however, is not simply to delineate Jovanović's intellectual evolution. Indeed, Jovanović is frequently relegated to the penumbra of Stokes's wider concerns. Of these, a solution to the question of how the liberals succeeded in exerting influence in Serbia is most important. Stokes demonstrates that the liberals "legitimized" their program by linking its exigencies with the reputed representative institutions of Serbian antiquity perpetuated in the residual forms of rural communalism. Jovanović, especially, is credited with fashioning a Serbian version of the Whig theory of history. This analysis is shrewd and will survive the author's moot contention that liberalism lacked a material basis in mid-nineteenth-century Serbian society.

Yugoslavia's contemporary historians have viewed Serbian liberalism as a frail floscule. This appraisal is based on the liberals' performance after their introduction to governmental responsibilities in the wake of Mihailo's assassination in 1868. Their willy-nilly partnership with the Regency of Ristić and Blaznavac is usually seen as a volte-face, which was debilitating to the liberals' proclaimed goals. Gale Stokes agrees that "the liberals were unable to put the principles they elaborated during the sixties into practice during the seventies." He offers an explanation of this paradox while holding to the view that the liberals' participation and "acceptance within the Serbian political system constituted [their] greatest success." Stokes is correct if he means to counteract the dubious practice of berating the liberals for "failing" to live up to the standards of Svetozar Marković and his followers. Yet, one wonders whether his backhanded homage to the liberals' "success" can be mitigated by a belief that liberal ideas "lived on to be institutionalized by the Radicals." Hopefully, Stokes's discerning pen will next turn to the question of Marković's Radical heirs.

IVO BANAC
Stanford University

TAKOZVANA NEZAVISNA DRŽAVA HRVATSKA 1941. By *Mladen Colić*.
Belgrade: "Delta-Pres," 1973. 485 pp. Illus. 250 Dinars.

Thirty years after World War II, Yugoslavia has published its first scholarly monograph devoted to the Independent State of Croatia. This volume constitutes partial coverage of a mostly unexplored topic. Even though the author steps beyond his stated time limit, he still leaves the reader ignorant of numerous aspects relevant to the subject. Colić relies heavily, and sometimes exclusively, on secondary sources (which he does not always cite adequately). He makes little use of works published outside of Yugoslavia, either in Serbo-Croatian or in other languages. German, Italian, and even important Serbo-Croatian documents deposited in Yugoslav archives have been consulted sparingly.

The book is divided into four sections. The first part is devoted to a systematic description of the Ustasha (the extreme nationalistic movement which ruled wartime Croatia) from its foundation until April 1941, and is the first such treatment available. The story of the creation of the German-Italian satellite, which constitutes the volume's second section, is weak and unconvincing. Colić's scholarship is obviously marred by political prejudices. For example, his discussion of the

Catholic church and of the Croatian Peasant Party lacks balance. Instead of pertinent primary sources available in Belgrade and Zagreb, as well as in Bonn, London, and Washington, the author uses propagandistic literature published by the Yugoslavian government.

The most important and original contribution in this book is the detailed and factual report on the Croatian armed forces. The writer lists stations of gendarmerie, locates individual armed units, enumerates their manpower, and identifies the commanding officers. The fourth and last section deals with the Ustasha terror machinery and its atrocities. Why, however, was it necessary to copy entire pages of works which have already been published in Yugoslavia?

The volume is mostly descriptive and the book's structure is only partially successful. In Colić's examination of the Croatian denominations, the Roman and Greek Catholic religions are dealt with in nine pages, Islam is passed over with barely eighteen lines, and the Jewish and Old Catholic faiths are disregarded altogether. The extensive analysis of ethnic Germans and of Serbian life calls for a similar treatment of the ethnic Magyars, Slovaks, Montenegrins, and other national, ethnic, and religious minorities. Unfortunately, in all of his analysis, Colić refrains from asking searching and thought-provoking questions. Croatian independence and the Ustasha are still internal problems in Yugoslavia, but current developments constrain the local historian and prevent him from looking astutely and realistically into the past.

In some respects, Colić's study is both an important and a pioneering work. He has invested much effort on an admittedly difficult topic. It is a pity that the treatise is not of uniform value.

YESHAYAHU JELINEK
University of Haifa

STUDII ȘI MATERIALE DE ISTORIE MEDIE, vol. 7. Edited by F. *Constantiniu* et al. Academia de Științe Sociale și Politice a Republicii Socialiste România, Institutul de Istorie "N. Iorga." Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1974. 425 pp. Lei 29.

The subject matter of this latest collection of articles on Rumanian medieval history deals primarily with economic and social, rather than political and cultural, development. There are several significant longer essays. David Prodan describes in detail the abolition of serfdom in Transylvania during the reign of Joseph II. In command of the considerable published literature and archival sources on the subject and treating it against the broader background of similar developments in the other Habsburg hereditary lands, he finds that up to 1780 Transylvania lagged behind neighboring territories in the regulation of landlord-serf relations; there had been no general overhaul of the system, as had occurred in Hungary in 1767 and the Banat in 1780. He stresses Joseph's personal acquaintance with agrarian conditions in Transylvania as a result of his two visits there in 1773 and 1783 and the thousands of petitions he collected from peasants. Joseph's initial act of emancipation, that of August 16, 1783, fell short of granting the serfs the essential freedom of movement. Prodan ascribes this failure to strenuous opposition from the Transylvanian estates. He believes that only the massive uprising led by Horea in 1784–85 could have overcome the opposition and brought the final act of emancipation of August 22, 1785. Even so, he points out, the landowning class succeeded in blocking any specification of peasant property rights, as had been done in the other hereditary lands. Nonetheless, Prodan concludes that freedom of movement