EUGEN BROTE (1850–1912). By *Lucian Boia.* Bucharest: Editura Litera, 1974. 211 pp. Lei 13.50.

This book is a valuable addition to the historical literature on the Rumanians of Transylvania during the dualist period. Lucian Boia, an instructor in history at the University of Bucharest and the author of numerous articles on the nationality problem in Austria-Hungary, has reconstructed the biography of a public figure who played a significant role in the life of his times but was quickly forgotten after his death. Eugen Brote's name will be familiar to Western historians as the author of *Die rumänische Frage in Siebenbürgen und Ungarn* (1895), which is still the only extensive collection of sources on the Rumanian national movement in a Western language. Although he was not a political leader of the first rank, we cannot fully understand either the Rumanian national movement or the general development of the Rumanians in Austria-Hungary without reference to his contributions. But this study is more than a biography; it is a general introduction to Rumanian society of the times.

The many-sidedness of Brote's career imposes a broad treatment of the political, economic, and cultural development of the Rumanians. An agronomist by training, he served as secretary of ASTRA, the Rumanian cultural and literary society of Transylvania, and as financial adviser to the Rumanian Orthodox Metropolitanate for many years, but it was as a journalist and politician that he made his mark on his own times. Boia describes how, as one of the Tribunists, a remarkable group of younger national leaders who exerted a decisive influence on political and intellectual life in the 1880s and 1890s, he participated in the founding of *Tribuna* and *Tribuna Poporului* and how the editorial boards of both newspapers became vehicles for his own ideas and policies even after he had gone into exile in Bucharest in 1893. Threading his way carefully through the tangle of national politics in the 1890s and early 1900s, Boia reveals the fundamental consistency of Brote's actions. He shows how Brote never really abandoned "activity" (as opposed to the National Party's official boycott of parliamentary elections, that is, "passivity"), which he had inherited from earlier generations, and he explains convincingly how Brote's commitment to this policy led him to advocate participation in the existing Hungarian political system and why, as a result, he was accused of "treachery" by most national leaders.

Boia also sheds considerable light on both the involvement of the National-Liberal Party of Rumania in the political affairs of the Transylvanian Rumanians and the economic orientation of the Tribunists—matters which stand at the very heart of the national movement. He describes the close relationship between Brote and Dimitrie Sturdza, the leader of the Liberals and sometimes prime minister, and its implications for the national struggle in Transylvania, and he attributes their final break to fundamental differences over social policy. He argues that Brote and his fellow Tribunists, who made up what Boia calls the left wing of the national movement, believed that their success depended on the continuous improvement of the material life of the peasantry. Consequently, they were repelled by the bloody repression of the peasant uprising of 1907 in Rumania and the failure of Sturdza and his party to carry out a thorough agrarian reform.

The author has treated his subject with sympathy. To be sure, he is aware of Brote's faults, but he judges him within the context of his own times. He has made an exhaustive investigation of unpublished documents and newspapers dealing with

Brote's life and public career. His use of them is judicious and reveals both a deep understanding of the period and a sense of history.

KEITH HITCHINS
University of Illinois, Urbana

SVETOZAR PRIBIĆEVIĆ I SAMOSTALNA DEMOKRATSKA STRANKA DO ŠESTOJANUARSKE DIKTATURE. By *Hrvoje Matković*. Zagreb: Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Institut za Hrvatsku Povijest, 1972. viii, 270 pp.

SVETOZAR PRIBIĆEVIĆ U OPOZICIJI (1928–1936). By *Ljubo Boban*. Zagreb: Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Institut za Hrvatsku Povijest, 1973. viii, 286 pp.

These two books, produced at the Institute of Croatian History in Zagreb, are about a Serbian political leader who played a critical role—some would say a fatal one—in the first decade of the newly created Yugoslav state. Matković's volume begins with Pribićević's activities in the days of the creation of Yugoslavia, concentrating in the main on his career as organizer and leader of the splinter Independent Democratic Party, and ends with the abolition of political parties by the proclamation of King Alexander's dictatorship on January 6, 1929. Boban's volume deals with Pribićević in opposition, in large part from his leaving Yugoslavia in 1931 until his death in Prague in 1936. The appendix of Boban's book contains a number of letters between Pribićević and some of his political allies in Yugoslavia. There is a brief summary in English at the end of each volume.

Svetozar Pribićević had a stormy political career, frequently changing direction. He began as an admirer of monarchy and a champion of centralism, but near the end of his life he expounded republicanism and federalism, sometimes bordering on revolution and anarchy. As a Serb from Croatia he convinced Alexander that the Croats recognized only power and respected the tight fist. As the first minister of the interior in the new state, Pribićević, by his centralist actions, offended proponents of local self-government, not only in Croatia but elsewhere as well. This was two years before he collaborated with Nikola Pašić and the Serbian Radical Party to produce Yugoslavia's first constitution (1921), a unitarist document. By 1927 he had formed an alliance with Stjepan Radić, the leader of the Croatian Peasant Party, a man whom he had earlier publicly despised.

Although these volumes are written from the Marxist point of view, much can be learned from them not only about Pribićević but also about Yugoslav politics in the period covered. Unfortunately, there is much repetition and a great deal of excess verbiage. And there are the myths that die hard—particularly the alleged "Great Serbianism" and "Serbian hegemony." It is high time that scholars who have accepted these myths do some serious research on them. A good place to begin might be the brief portrait of Svetozar Pribićević in *Ljudi, Ljudi . . .*, by Dragoljub Jovanović (Belgrade, 1973), pp. 396–404. Jovanović was an opponent of King Alexander and a collaborator with Radić and other Croatian leaders.

It seems ironic that while the volumes under review depict Pribićević's stormy political past—so much identified by Yugoslav Communists with what they consider wrong in the first Yugoslavia—the authors in the end also portray Pribićević as something of a hero, reporting that when his remains were cremated in