640 Slavic Review

It is interesting to recall that Marković, the pioneer of Serbian socialism, and Pašić, the bourgeois nationalist politician par excellence, were fellow radicals as students in Zurich. Pašić entered Serbia's political arena in 1875, the year in which Marković died at the age of twenty-eight. Throughout most of the following fifty years, until his own death in 1926, Pašić was undoubtedly the leading Serbian political figure both in Serbia and Yugoslavia. Pašić was leader of the Serbian Radical Party, serving as premier in twenty-two cabinets, and, at various times, as foreign minister and envoy to Russia and Versailles. To find anyone of comparable stature and significance in other Balkan countries during those five decades, one must think of pairs—Trikoupis and Venizelos in Greece, Stambolov and Stamboliiski in Bulgaria, or Ioan and Ion Brătianu in Rumania.

Yet, except for the recollections of a few contemporaries and two commemorative volumes, there has been no full-scale biography of Pašić. The closest anyone has previously come to this task was the Italian statesman Carlo Sforza, whose book, *Pachitch et l'union des Yougoslaves*, has had to serve even Yugoslav readers in a 1937 Serbian translation.

Alex N. Dragnich offers the first scholarly biography of Pašić in any language. Professor Dragnich has served as public affairs officer and cultural attaché in the American embassy in Belgrade, and knows Serbo-Croatian by virtue of his Montenegrin ancestry. While he lacks the personal touch of the memoirists, he enjoys the advantages of scholarly training, perspective, and the availability of recently published, and some unpublished, sources.

It may be precisely because of these advantages that Dragnich's book is at the same time a welcome contribution and somewhat of a disappointment. Dragnich has given his readers a conscientious synthesis of the political activities of an important figure. Yet he tells little that is new and too little of what is already known. Thus his account suffers from all kinds of tantalizing gaps. Moreover, he neglects the intimate side of a personality that has impressed Serbs more than any other Serbian leader except Prince Miloš Obrenović.

Finally, Dragnich occasionally seems to be not only an admirer of Pašić, but an apologist for him as well. He is especially zealous in combating the accusation "that Pašić was not sincere about the creation of Yugoslavia and really wanted a Greater Serbia." He is also sensitive to the charge of Serbian hegemony in the new Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, though he is less sensitive about portraying the Croats as historically determined connivers against governmental authority. Some informed readers will doubtlessly find Dragnich's definition of the issues to be too superficial and his arguments unconvincing. Nevertheless he presents a point of view that is not without merit and which may offer a useful corrective to the more extravagant charges of Pašić's earlier critics.

MICHAEL B. PETROVICH University of Wisconsin, Madison

REVOLUCIJA KOJA TEČE: MEMOARI. 2 vols. By Svetozar Vukmanović-Tempo. Belgrade: "Komunist," 1971. Vol. 1: 437 pp. Vol. 2: 501 pp. Illus. Maps. Plates. 300 dinars.

Vukmanović-Tempo's memoirs are unusual and important volumes. They offer the first complete story of the Yugoslav revolution told by a high-ranking participant, and are the first volumes of this kind to be published in Yugoslavia. The Reviews 641

only similar accounts are by that other rebellious Montenegrin, Milovan Djilas. Djilas's accounts, however, do not cover the important years 1941-52, and Djilas's works have not been published in Yugoslavia since 1954.

Tempo's memoirs were published by the party's publishing house, "Komunist," reputedly only after several direct appeals by Tempo to Tito. Obviously, the memoirs deal with troublesome matters, events hitherto unknown, or events for which official explanations differ from Tempo's knowledgeable account. The controversial content, combined with the end of the liberal era and the subsequent return to greater centralization and ideological rigidity, undoubtedly prompted the party's reluctance to publish the material.

Volume 1 ("The Party" and "The Struggle for Power") covers events from 1912 (the year of Tempo's birth) up to the victory of the revolution in 1945. It is the story of a student revolutionary, illegal party organizer, and heroic wartime partisan leader. Volume 2 ("Changes and Battles," "Roads to Self-Management," and "Dilemmas") encompasses events from 1946 through 1966, during which time Tempo occupied positions of military, economic, and trade union leadership. Although the memoirs were written between 1968 and 1970, Tempo chooses to end them with the downfall of Ranković in 1966 (a victory of decentralization over the forces of centralization and the secret police), rather than with the student unrest of 1968 and the clamor for a more egalitarian and democratic society.

Tempo's memoirs are frank. By his own account, he was an ambitious, dedicated and tireless revolutionary. Party activities were more important to him than his personal life (for example, he was too busy to court his first love and she married another). Having earned a law degree, he used his knowledge of the law to advantage in ceaselessly organizing revolutionary activity and in protesting the illegal activities of the royal authorities. His absolute dedication is shown in his refusal to intervene to save the life of his brother, Luka, an Orthodox priest who was executed by partisans at the end of the war. He helped his sister-in-law bring up Luka's children, but he never told his mother about her son's death. At her deathbed he led her to believe that her elder son had escaped with the Chetniks to America.

Tempo possesses the quarrelsome Montenegrin temper as well as Montenegrin pride, sincerity, and courage. After the victory of the revolution he came to see that bureaucracy and centralization were major obstacles to further democratization and to true workers' management. He was among the sharpest critics of manipulation of power by the technocratic elite, and he also criticized the impotence of the trade unions in representing the interests of the workers. He concludes his memoirs with the observation that even in socialism the worker is in the worst position, while administrators and those "on top" prosper.

The importance of Tempo's writings for the student of the revolutionary process, or for the historian, is his insight as a participant into one of the most intriguing and unorthodox communist revolutions. Despite Tempo's compulsion to "tell things as I saw them," however, one must read his memoirs carefully, for caution, or perhaps his enduring commitment to the party, compels Tempo to understate some of the most interesting and important historical material. Tempo's description of the war in volume 1 both complements and confirms Walter Robert's work, *Tito, Mihailović and the Allies, 1941–1945* (1973), which shows that even Tito sanctioned the exploration of nonhostility with the Germans in order to weaken

642 Slavic Review

the Chetniks (evoking an official protest from the Yugoslavs). Tempo also confirms that Khrushchev made a secret trip to Brioni in the midst of the 1956 Hungarian revolution, at which time Tito "gave approval for the intervention of Soviet troops in order to prevent counterrevolution" in Hungary (vol. 2, p. 276).

Volume 2 is full of observations about Soviet leaders. Where Djilas provides us with an insider's view of Stalin, Tempo gives us a frank and unflattering appraisal of Khrushchev. (There is an important difference, however; Djilas was sentenced to jail for "revealing state secrets," while Tempo lives in semiretirement and honor.) According to Tempo, Khrushchev proposed in 1955 to pave the way for a reconciliation between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union by blaming Beria and Djilas for the Soviet-Yugoslav dispute of 1948, but the proposal was rejected by Tito (p. 210). His discussion of the wheat deal with the United States in 1954 shows the extent to which the Americans were "taken for a ride" (pp. 211–21). Even more telling are the accounts of his personal encounters with communist luminaries, such as his shocked reaction to Bulganin's duplicity in attacking Stalin in 1955 (p. 238), his bewilderment when Rakosi told him authoritatively that it was Lenin and not Stalin who introduced "centralism . . . and did not tolerate any democratic discussion within the Party" (p. 252), and his realization during conversations with Mikoyan that the tragedy of the communist is that he cannot say what he feels and knows to be true, but only what is proper at the moment.

In short, the volumes are both disturbing and comforting. Disturbing, because they outline the efforts of a dedicated, ambitious communist to win power at any cost. Comforting, because they assure us that even the most dogmatic and efficient communist leader, if he possesses any sense of truth and justice, cannot fail to see the warping of revolutionary aims.

MICHAEL M. MILENKOVITCH Lehman College, CUNY

VODIČ KROZ ARHIVSKE FONDOVE. Vols. 1, 2 and 3. Naučno-obaveštajna sredstva o arhivskoj gradi u arhivima Vojvodine, 4/1—. Sremski Karlovci: Izdanje zajednice arhiva Vojvodine. Vol. 1: ISTORIJSKI ARHIV SUBOTICA. Compiled by Emil Vojnović et al. 1970. xix, 176 pp. Paper. Vol. 2: ISTORIJSKI ARHIV SENTA. Compiled by Nestor Vukov et al. 1972. xxv, 273 pp. Paper. Vol. 3: ISTORIJSKI ARHIV SREMSKA MITROVICA. Compiled by Vilma Djonlić et al. 1972. xxiii, 286 pp. Paper.

The three volumes reviewed here, describing the archives of Subotica, Senta, and Sremska Mitrovica, are part of a projected series of guides to nine archives of the Vojvodina. At this writing, the volumes for Pančevo and Kikinda (vols. 4 and 5) have also appeared, with guides to the archives of Bela Crkva, Novi Sad, and Zrenjanin, as well as the Arhiv Vojvodine in Sremski Karlovci, to follow. This series, the first detailed delineation of the archives of the Vojvodina, follows a consistent organizational plan and format, facilitating rapid orientation to the holdings of the individual archives and comparison among them. The material is organized chronologically and the fonds are numbered accordingly, with subsectional numbering for mixed fonds. Each volume contains an alphabetical and a subject index of the fonds and an alphabetical index of content (proper name and subject). All three archives were founded in 1952. An account of the history of each archive—its facilities, jurisdiction, staff, basic statistics, and prospects for development—precedes the detailed description of its holdings.