

Soon after Dušan's death, individual regions of his state, starting with those on the periphery, began to assert their independence.

But, according to Mihaljčić, the process of dissolution of the empire lasted longer than is generally believed. He shows clearly that the various feudal regions did not all break away immediately after the death of the first emperor. The domains of Vuk Branković and the Dragoš brothers, for example, did not do so until after the Battle of Maritsa (1371). Moreover, Dušan's immediate successor, Uroš, was in fact a stronger figure than he is often portrayed. By exalting "mighty" Dušan and derogating "weak" Uroš, historians have, according to Mihaljčić, exaggerated the role of personality in history. As he sees it, the reasons for the collapse of the empire lie not so much in the inability of a particular ruler, as in the complex historical process involving the tempo and character of the feudalization which developed independently of the ruler's personality. Feudalization, for example, took place more rapidly in the "Greek" than in the "Serbian lands." In the northern "Serbian lands" the nobility remained loyal to Emperor Uroš longer than they did in other regions, which could be attributed not only to the strength of the cult of the Nemanjići but also to the slower pace of the feudalization of the "Serbian lands."

That the origin and the downfall of the ephemeral medieval Serbian empire has never been adequately explained is due both to a paucity of primary sources and to careless use of those that do exist. Apart from consulting the works of the leading authorities on medieval Serbian history, Mihaljčić reexamined and reassessed the classical Serbian, Byzantine, and Dubrovnik materials and augmented the evidence found in them with data derived from numismatic materials and frescoes. As a result, he has come up with new insights into the period of Dušan's declining empire. Meticulous use of evidence and the clarity of the narrative make his work a valuable contribution to Serbian historiography. The volume contains excellent maps and illustrations, a list of charters issued by Emperor Uroš, a selected bibliography, an index of personal names, and a summary in French.

WAYNE S. VUCINICH

Stanford University and Hoover Institution

LEGITIMACY THROUGH LIBERALISM: VLADIMIR JOVANOVIĆ AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF SERBIAN POLITICS. By *Gale Stokes*. Publications on Russia and Eastern Europe of the Institute for Comparative and Foreign Area Studies, 5. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1975. xvi, 279 pp. \$11.00.

If Svetozar Marković was as preeminent in the entire history of revived Serbia as Skerlić insisted as early as 1910, this was due, at least in part, to the lackluster of his opponents, particularly the nascent liberals. Undistinguished or not, Serbia's moderate reformers merit monographic assessment. Professor Stokes's meticulously researched work fills this need in the case of one of the most important of the array. Vladimir Jovanović belonged to the first generation of Serbia's foreign-educated intellectuals. An eclectic compiler and popularizer, he was a foremost exponent of West European liberalism, which he adapted to Serbian conditions. His purpose was to forge a constitutional and parliamentary alternative to the traditional statecraft of Miloš and Mihailo.

This volume is rewarding not only because it presents a precursory treatment of Serbian liberalism outside Yugoslavia. It is based on solid archival work and

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