

leading actors. On most subjects it is possible to write objective history in Yugoslavia today and Krizman does so, without following an ideological line. But one senses his satisfaction in recording how much at home Alexander, Paul, and the bourgeois politicians were in dealing with the Fascist powers and how badly, in some respects, they served the interests of their country. Throughout the volume, and especially where he digs more deeply—as into Alexander's secret talks with Italy, the question of recognition of the USSR, the attempt to maintain neutrality, and finally the road to the signing of the Tripartite Pact—Krizman makes use of the voluminous published documents on the policies of the Great Powers to complement the Yugoslav side of the story.

JOHN C. CAMPBELL  
*Council on Foreign Relations*

YUGOSLAVIA AFTER TITO. By *Andrew Borowiec*. New York and London: Praeger Publishers, 1977. xii, 123 pp.

The Cold War has not died; it has been resurrected in the pages of Borowiec's confused diatribe against "Titoism." His one hundred and nine pages of sweeping and unfounded generalizations, gross simplifications, scare tactics, misquotes, and yellow press journalistic methods carry on a tradition that should gratify the nostalgic urges of those Western political commentators who yearn for that simpler time. The basic theme of the book is that in Yugoslavia there exists a high probability of violence and Soviet interference following Tito's death, and that Yugoslavia must align itself more closely with the West in order to forestall this eventuality. The theme itself may be legitimate, but the author's unrestrained rhetoric and poor standards of argumentation make critical and scholarly review very difficult.

Although *Yugoslavia After Tito* is being marketed as a scholarly text, it offers very little new information about current political affairs in that country. The book seems to be oriented more toward the general population with its limited sources of information. In terms of its premises, assumptions, outlook, and conclusions, Borowiec's work reinforces the opinion of some Western security and military organizations: namely, that nonalignment is impossible and that Yugoslavia's sole salvation from the Soviet Union's deadly embrace entails closer cooperation, if not alignment, with the Western powers. It is certainly not an unbiased, objective treatment of the subject; if anything, *Yugoslavia After Tito* lays a foundation for justifying Western preemptive action in the eventuality of instability following Tito's death.

Although Borowiec uses precious few sources and has a pitifully small bibliography, he still manages to misquote or misinterpret these sources. For example, as a result of the author's convoluted reasoning and misinterpretation, Dr. Najdan Pašić, a mild-mannered Yugoslav professor whose aggressive instincts are limited solely to the chessboard, becomes a supporter of repressive action to solve the nationality crisis (p. 13). Through sloppy writing, Professor Gary Bertsch is quoted as if he were a spokesman for the Yugoslav regime (p. 28).

*Yugoslavia After Tito* presents some sweeping general statements with strong policy implications that are unsubstantiated by any data. Borowiec states, for example, that the Cominform organization may have as many as 200,000 members and that there "are some 3,000 anti-Tito exiles in the Soviet Union." The author's analysis of self-management is limited to ridiculing the amount of time spent in meetings, and the League of Communists is dismissed as a group of opportunists. He also claims, without evidence, that the hope of Yugoslavia resides in the army since it is not "shackled by the constraints of self-management" (p. 91), that the security forces "have been keeping

Yugoslavia together" (p. 91), and that these organizations are "omnipresent and omnipotent" (p. 101). The credibility of the reader, however, becomes seriously strained when the author refers to the Belgrade-Bar Railroad as a "Soviet Trojan Horse" (p. 49). Soviet troops will ostensibly land at Kotor Bay in the Adriatic, located one hundred miles from Italy, and with lightning speed use this Western-financed, easily sabotaged railway to attack and occupy Belgrade. Rube Goldberg could not have devised a better scenario.

The most discouraging aspect of this entire effort is that the book was published as part of the Praeger Special Studies Series, a series noted until now for its fine contributions to East European social sciences and for its high scholarly standards. Borowiec's text is atypically weak for this series, and I am afraid that the misinformed or uninformed will use the Cold-War propaganda it contains as objective evidence to buttress their respective positions about the future of post-Tito Yugoslavia. Thankfully, the text is priced outside the range of the general readership.

JAMES H. SEROKA  
*Appalachian State University*

AN INTRODUCTION TO RUSSIAN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE. Edited by *Robert Auty* and *Dimitri Obolensky*, assisted by *Anthony Kingsford*. Companion to Russian Studies, vol. 2. New York and London: Cambridge University Press, 1977. xiv, 300 pp. \$24.50.

According to the preface, this book "aims at providing a first orientation for those embarking on the study of Russian civilization in its most important aspects." What was planned as one volume was published in three because of "economic considerations beyond our control." (Thus oil affects scholarship!) The other two volumes in the series deal with history and with art and architecture. Donald W. Treadgold has already reviewed the history volume in *Slavic Review* (vol. 36, no. 4 [December 1977]: 494-95). The second part, like the first, does not mention the price either on the book itself or on the dust jacket.

The language and literature volume contains ten essays, nine of which were written by British academics; the tenth, on Russian literature from 1820 to 1917, is by Vsevolod Setchkarev of Harvard University. The studies include a linguistic treatment of the development of Russian, Russian writing and printing, and Russian literature from its beginnings to 1975; the five essays on literature form the bulk of the book. There are also three sketches on the Russian theater from its initial stages to the present. Each chapter closes with a minibliography entitled "Guide to Further Reading."

The contributions to this book range from highly professional to brilliant. Examples of outstanding work include Setchkarev's comments on how Dostoevsky revolutionized the novel, and on Saltykov-Shchedrin and Chekhov as Christian (*sic*) writers, and Max Hayward's all too brief remarks on the temporary and permanent Russian émigrés of the immediate post-Revolutionary period; one need not agree with all the points they make to find them stimulating. The true audience of this book, I think, would range from graduate students firmly committed to Russian to full professors who wish (and often need) to be shaken up by informed but differing viewpoints. It is difficult to understand why "first orientation," however, should presume fluency in Russian.

One could argue with the dates that divide the essays on literature (1300, 1700, 1820, and 1917), but obviously some divisions must be made and none is universally satisfactory. More important is the fact that the book includes no essay on Russian