

the author's statement that the "Jewish underground movement could not rely on direct aid from any institution abroad, while the non-Jewish resistance groups systematically received arms, manpower, training, and money from their respective governments-in-exile in London" requires a basic qualification. As a special envoy of the Polish wartime authorities in London, this reviewer, though fully aware of insufficient support on the part of the West (including Western Jewry!), was, like many of his fellow paratroopers, personally involved in delivering financial aid to the Jewish underground's representatives: "Borowski," who was Adolf Berman of the Jewish National Committee (Zionist), and "Mikołaj," the late Dr. Leon Fajner of the Bund (Jewish Socialist Labor).

Only one anti-Polish generalization is substantiated by a (single) testimony, that of a Shmuel Lerer, with which Trunk chose to conclude his chapter 17, "The Attitude of the Councils Toward Physical Resistance," implying that Leib Felhendler, the heroic leader of the October 1943 Sobibor revolt, "was killed by some[?]" partisans of the Polish secret army (*Armia Krajowa*, A.K.) in April 1945."

The refusal of the unintelligent officials in Warsaw to give Isaiah Trunk "access to the archives of present-day Poland" is regrettable, but does the author of this otherwise remarkable work believe that justice to the Jewish cause is best served by disregarding the countless Polish friends?

GEORGE J. LERSKI

*University of San Francisco*

**THE BULGARIAN JEWS AND THE FINAL SOLUTION, 1940–1944.** By *Frederick B. Chary*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1972. xiv, 246 pp. \$9.95.

A detailed study of the fate of Jews in Bulgaria during World War II is made in this book. The author surveys step by step the efforts of Nazi Germany to enforce its own solution of the question, the behavior of Bulgarian authorities during the period, and the opposition they faced in attempting to impose the "final solution." Bulgaria was the only country in occupied Europe where the Jewish population was preserved intact. This indisputable fact poses the logical question: who saved the Bulgarian Jews? Chary endeavors to supply the answer.

The author makes use of a strikingly wide range of sources. His investigations took him to numerous archives in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and Israel. There he examined almost the whole literature available, as well as published memoirs, and took interviews from contemporaries of the events—Bulgarians, Jews, and others, and even Hitler's envoy to Bulgaria, the German minister plenipotentiary Beckerle. The author did his best to find all possible sources of information.

On the basis of his broad knowledge of all aspects of the question, Chary offers his analysis. Facts are put forward in great detail, and events are carefully followed up. A picture is outlined of the country's complicated political life and of the strife among diverse groups, which also had its impact on the status of Bulgarian Jews. The various trends and influences are dealt with in detail and with precision.

Considering the complicated nature of the problem and the numerous factors that influenced the fate of the Jews in Bulgaria, the author's conclusion could profit from a certain amount of correction. The main arguments in support of this statement are supplied by some insufficiently used information related to the actions

launched by progressive public opinion in Bulgaria and to the efforts of the Bulgarian Communist Party to channel a comprehensive all-national movement for the salvation of Bulgarian Jews. In this connection a number of new documents, found and published in recent years mainly in the *Annual of the Organization of Jews in Bulgaria*, should be mentioned.

At that time it was Tsar Boris and the cabinet who made official decisions on important state issues. They could not, however, act without taking into consideration existing opinions and conditions. It is here that due emphasis should be given to the staunch resistance of the Bulgarian people to the government's intention to impose the "final solution."

Jews in Bulgaria had the same social status as other Bulgarians, and both shared happiness and suffering throughout many centuries. The intelligentsia in Bulgaria were in the same position, for they were not of aristocratic origin but constituted an inseparable part of the people. Loyal to the inherent spirit of tolerance, internationalism, and traditional forbearance of the Bulgarian people, who are alien to any anti-Semitic feelings and religious fanaticism, Bulgarian public opinion rose in a mass protest against the very first attempts to introduce anti-Jewish legislation. Vasil Kolarov, the eminent Bulgarian Communist, spoke in a historic broadcast of Radio Moscow: "A people who subject another people to disgrace and dishonor, disgrace and dishonor themselves. A people who condemn to slavery and extermination another people, undermine the foundations of their own fate." A large-scale protest movement was launched all over the country, leaflets were circulated, and a resistance was organized in support of Bulgarian Jews. The Union of Bulgarian Lawyers, the Bulgarian Union of Physicians, the Union of the Artists' Societies, artisan associations, eminent public figures, and ordinary men came out with protests. The protests by a group of members of Parliament, headed by Peshev, the deputy speaker of the National Assembly, the leadership of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, a large group of distinguished Bulgarian writers, among whom were Elin Pelin, T. G. Vlaykov, Stilian Chilingirov, and Elisaveta Bagriana, came as a surprise to the government.

In spite of this mass resistance, the government passed its legislative measures. On January 21, 1941, Tsar Boris affixed his signature to the Act in Defense of the Nation; on June 28, 1942, the National Assembly passed an act which empowered the Council of Ministers to take the steps needed for the settlement of the Jewish Question. On November 20, 1942, Tsar Boris signed another decree, approving all anti-Jewish regulations and administration acts. Without renouncing their intentions, however, the pro-Hitlerite ruling circles in Bulgaria were compelled to act with greater caution and to look for an opportune moment and favorable conditions for direct action. Biding their time, they lost many months in waiting. Thus the firm resistance of the Bulgarian people was the main factor in saving the Bulgarian Jews. With its aid precious time was gained.

In the meantime World War II reached a decisive stage. The victories of the Allies, and of the Soviet Army in particular, forced Bulgarian leaders to take into account forthcoming events and to consider their own future. At that time, Beckerle, who was well aware of this fact, wrote in a report to the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs on August 18, 1943: "We shall be able to settle the Jewish Question in full after German successes come again to the foreground." These successes, however, never materialized. The approach of the victorious Soviet armies was thus the other basic factor that helped to save Bulgarian Jews.

This, in my opinion, is the conclusion that follows from Chary's detailed analysis. But without the most recent documents at his disposal, the author does not arrive at that conclusion. His investigations, however, provide a wide view of the difficult war years and the dramatic struggle waged for the salvation of Bulgarian Jews. The excellent appendixes further enhance the value of the book. Beyond any doubt it is one of the most important research contributions to the fate of Bulgarian Jews during the drama-packed years of World War II.

VESELIN TRAIKOV

*Institute of Balkan Studies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences*

DUBROVNIK (RAGUSA): A CLASSIC CITY-STATE. By *Francis W. Carter*.

London and New York: Seminar Press, 1972. xxxi, 710 pp. £9.50.

The purpose of Carter's voluminous book on Dubrovnik is to present the "first complete examination" in English of that city in such a way that it would be "unique both in its approach and subject matter." The book contains twelve chapters, a conclusion, four appendixes, a bibliography, and two indexes. It covers all aspects of Dubrovnik's history from the early Middle Ages to the most recent times. Obviously, to write a work of such breadth and scope there are certain prerequisites, the least of which are a detailed knowledge of sources and a solid knowledge of the languages with which the author has to deal. Dubrovnik's Historical Archives consist of about seven thousand volumes of documents and about one hundred thousand *separata* (eleventh to nineteenth centuries), written mostly in Latin, Italian, and Serbo-Croatian. The modern works on Dubrovnik are published primarily in Serbo-Croatian.

Unfortunately, Carter has not worked on original archival documents, nor does he possess sufficient knowledge of Latin, Italian, or Serbo-Croatian to launch into such a vast enterprise. Although he contends that Dubrovnik's archives "serve as a base for this work" (p. 599), it is obvious to anyone who knows those archives that Carter has never seen the original documents. Suffice it to say that he consistently mentions nonexistent "folders" instead of "folia," for the letter "f" in archival call numbers. Furthermore, his efforts to impress us with his use and knowledge of the archives fail on a quick check of a few of his quotations, which proves their total unreliability and reveals incredible blunders.

The ignorance of Latin, Italian, and Serbo-Croatian is visible throughout the book. Let me just say here that one can hardly find one footnote containing Latin text without errors in it; that there are countless mistakes in Italian in the superfluous reproduction of the outdated archival catalogue (pp. 601-61); and that the complete unfamiliarity with Serbo-Croatian is best exemplified in the absurd citation of Dušan's Code (p. 666). Although the author wants to impress us with a huge and partly deficient bibliography, full of mistakes, at the end of his book, he has used mostly late nineteenth and early twentieth-century works in his actual writing, as can be seen in the notes to his chapters. More serious is the fact that entire paragraphs of the book are simply translations from other works (for example, pp. 446-47, text on Dubrovnik's architecture and sculpture translated from Serbo-Croatian—obviously not by Carter—from vol. 3, p. 154, of the *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*).

The consequences of such methods are disastrous not only for Carter's history of Dubrovnik but also for his discussions of Croatian, Bosnian, and Serbian history.