

This book offers the most readable short political survey of contemporary Bulgaria, from the end of World War I to the present. Although based mostly on previously published research (including Oren's own), the product is a powerful and convincing summary of the rather tragic fate of modern Bulgaria.

Oren not only writes with thorough knowledge of the political history of the country (Communist as well as pre-Communist, which is a rarity) but also makes judgments which often run counter to "popular" views in our literature about the Bulgarians and Bulgaria's relations with neighbors and great powers alike. He places in a much more balanced perspective the motives and actions pertaining to the country's domestic and foreign policies, thus apportioning the blame to others besides the Bulgarian leaders of the pre-Communist era. In fact, this redress of the widespread misinterpretation of pre-Communist Bulgarian history, rather than the coverage of the Communist period, is one of the book's major assets.

As the title suggests, the main emphasis is on the conflict between the peasant majority, rallied primarily around the populist Agrarian Union (which had no backing from abroad), and the Communist minority (which won only because of the support by the Red Army and the Soviet colossus). The book is indeed dedicated to the three exponents of the short-lived Bulgarian democracy—the Agrarian Gichev, the Democrat Mushanov, and the Socialist Pastukhov, who fought and perished in a losing battle against the Soviet-backed regime.

In his excellently integrated conclusion, Oren asks a most pertinent question: "Has the national ego of this small people been impaired in the process [of the relentless Sovietization]?" (p. 172). And he speculates optimistically that the "state of political deep freeze [which he cannot reconcile with the country's past and potential] . . . will have to give way sooner or later" to either a modified domestic system or to marginal maneuverability on the international plane, since "failure to explore either of the two may bring about an uncontrollable explosion" (p. 183).

There are some shortcomings in substance (such as the tendency to overrate the influence of the Agrarians at the expense of other parties, or the neglect of the Bagrianov period), in form (the paucity of direct source references, especially of statistical data, becomes irritating), and in errors of fact (for example, Stamboliiski and Pašić were not heads of state but of government, p. 48). However, the merits, including a substantial bibliography (albeit *minus* periodical literature), are too numerous to warrant petty criticisms.

L. A. D. DELLIN
University of Vermont

PROBLEME DER WIRTSCHAFTLICHEN ENTWICKLUNG ALBANIENS: UNTERSUCHUNG DES ÖKONOMISCHEN UND SOZIOÖKONOMISCHEN WANDLUNGSPROZESSES VON 1912/13 BIS IN DIE GEGENWART. By *Hans-Joachim Pernack*. Südosteuropa-Studien, no. 18. Munich: Eigenverlag der Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft, 1972. xiii, 198 pp. DM 24, paper.

This volume is a comparative analysis of two basically different developmental concepts prevalent in Albania—between 1912–13 and 1939, and since 1945. It analyzes the results in terms of socioeconomic changes in Europe's most backward country. Basically the study deals with problems found in most developing countries. It must be stressed that these two periods of Albania's socioeconomic development

are not quite as comparable as they might at first seem. Different socioeconomic levels existed for the starting-point years of 1912–13 and 1945, and the latter was able to build on some accomplishments of the interwar period. Although the massive Soviet and (after 1960) Chinese aid to Albania (estimated at \$500 million to \$700 million up to 1970) cannot be compared with that of Italy during most of the interwar period, the aid received during the interwar period did permit the building of a basic infrastructure, a beginning of manufacturing industries, and some modernization of agriculture. Also, as the author rightly stresses, the more efficient planning concept after 1945 cannot be compared with developments in the earlier period.

Some progress in Albania's postwar economic development is noted, and the country's economic relations with higher-level economies during its sixty-year history are critically discussed. Two developments stand out: Albania's cancellation of its economic commitments due to political conflict first with Italy and later with the Soviet Union; and its great reliance since the early 1960s on China, along with a nearly complete lack of economic relations with its neighbors or other European countries. Albania's whole postwar economic development and possible accelerated progress strongly point toward the need for integration with European and world trade.

This is a well-organized book, and the author deserves much credit for bringing to the attention of both general and specialized scholars the available facts about Albania's economic progress. Owing to a serious lack of even the most elementary statistical data, and at times even the absence of basic reliable information, some of the author's conclusions obviously must be read with considerable caution. Economists may criticize the many inventory-type discussions or the absence of any detailed analysis comparing prewar and postwar developments, such as national income, foreign trade, and economic assistance, but the scarcity of statistical data (since 1965 no data have been published about the development of foreign trade, other than occasional newspaper reports) simply makes this impossible, and as a result makes Albania the least reported on and understood country in Europe, including the other socialist countries. The discussions about Albanian economic development are reported up to 1970 (the analysis was completed in the spring of 1971). The specialist dealing with socioeconomic developments in other European socialist countries should not expect a comparative analysis that shows the depth and sophistication of the research of scholars working in those countries. The list of tables in the appendix certainly reveals the poverty of data available, and the two maps included must be criticized for their crude and illegible form of presentation.

GEORGE W. HOFFMAN
University of Texas at Austin

EDGAR ALLAN POE IN RUSSIA: A STUDY IN LEGEND AND LITERARY INFLUENCE. By *Joan Delaney Grossman*. *Colloquium Slavicum*, Beiträge zur Slavistik, no. 3. Würzburg: Jal-Verlag, 1973. DM 30, paper.

This treatment of the influence of Poe in Russia offers Slavic studies and the study of comparative literature the answer to a question that has remained in doubt since the time of symbolism. Joan Delaney Grossman has, in her thorough and carefully balanced study, indicated the submerged and forgotten paths by which