

gently. In addition, her analysis of the Ustasha movement is unimaginative and stereotyped. She downgrades its regional and social support and sees its members merely as individuals. These and similar shortcomings, however, do not take away from the value of the volume.

YESHAYAHU JELINEK
Denison University

PRAXIS: MARXIST CRITICISM AND DISSENT IN SOCIALIST YUGOSLAVIA. By *Gerson S. Sher*. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1977. xx, 360 pp. \$15.00.

In his book, Gerson Sher presents a sympathetic and thorough treatment of the dissenting Yugoslav Marxist intellectuals who came together around the journal *Praxis* during its short precarious existence in 1964–75. Basing their critiques on the writings of “the young Marx,” these philosophers and social scientists—centered primarily in Zagreb and Belgrade university communities—engaged in ideological combat with the state and party in an effort to further humanize Yugoslav socialism. As Sher points out, they thus fostered “a heresy within a heresy.”

The opening chapter provides an organizational profile of the journal and considers the critical philosophical antecedents to the *Praxis* dissenters. Sher indicates that they were actually part of an ongoing tradition of criticism and that they viewed themselves as a legitimate continuation of the Yugoslav revolution. Succeeding chapters discuss the specific points of departure in the *Praxis* critiques and trace the history of the journal. *Praxis* initially carried largely theoretical commentary, and in 1969, because of its subject matter and chronic economic difficulties, it languished. Thereafter, a revitalized *Praxis* stepped up its criticism of socialism in practice, but it never overcame its financial problems. The journal’s publication was underwritten by the state, and the withdrawal of support and the continued official harassment of the members of the *Praxis* group finally brought its activities to a halt.

Sher attempts to put the *Praxis* experience into perspective with other facets of Yugoslav dissent—Djilas, Mihajlov, radical students, and so forth—but he does not fully succeed. Neither does he offer any substantial criticism of the *Praxis* critiques. He also concentrates on the domestic edition of *Praxis* and generally neglects its foreign counterpart. Nevertheless, Sher has produced an important book which is well written and documented with English, Serbo-Croatian, and other sources and interviews with many of the principals involved.

DENNIS REINHARTZ
University of Texas, Arlington

YUGOSLAVIA AFTER TITO: SCENARIOS AND IMPLICATIONS. By *Gavriel D. Ra’anan*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1977. xiv, 206 pp. \$14.50.

Some annual events such as the World Series or the Rose Bowl are eagerly anticipated. Others, like the tax deadline or the annual dental check-up are not similarly awaited. Ra’anan’s *Yugoslavia After Tito* falls into the latter category. It is the 1977 attempt to detail the probable nightmare following President Tito’s retirement or death.

The major focus of the book is the presentation of various forecasts about Tito’s successors and the implications of these predictions for the United States and NATO. Ra’anan’s discussion is interesting but incomplete. Not all prognostications are included, nor does the author attempt to estimate the probability of occurrence of any single one. The major utility of the book is Ra’anan’s clear demonstration of the importance

to the United States of a nonaligned Yugoslavia. Obviously, this is a message that should be heeded, and for that reason alone I would recommend *Yugoslavia After Tito* to the general public.

In a scholarly sense, *Yugoslavia After Tito* is a failure. The author, I believe, may have the distinction of writing the first full-length manuscript on the subject without using a single non-English-language source or even making a single reference to any personal knowledge of the country. In fact, he may be the first of the "post-Tito groupies" to rely exclusively on materials produced by his predecessors.

The organization of *Yugoslavia After Tito* is similar to an army intelligence briefing, but it lacks the sophisticated analysis that usually follows. Its analysis is grossly simplistic, uncomprehensive, and almost completely ignores the impact of Yugoslav domestic politics on foreign policy behavior. To his credit, however, Ra'anan does not make sweeping conclusions about the probability of Soviet intervention in Yugoslavia, nor does he raise the traditional clarion call for the forces of NATO to come to "little Yugoslavia's" rescue.

The author's rhetoric is frequently emotional or imprecise, for example, when he refers to the "alleged Soviet-Egyptian rift" (p. 79). At other times, the logic is not fully developed, such as when he claims that the Italian Communist Party is more likely than the Christian Democrats to renew attempts to repress Italian grievances in Yugoslavia (p. 126).

On the whole, the style of *Yugoslavia After Tito* makes it easy to read and understand, and it can be quite entertaining. Nevertheless, Ra'anan's book should not be perceived as the definitive word on the subject, and it should not be taken as a serious, scholarly tract. Finally, the book may help others to produce an annual encyclopedia of similar works, including "Poland after Gierak," "Korea after Kim Il Sung," and even "CBS after Cronkite."

JAMES H. SEROKA

Southern Illinois University

SOCIAL CHANGE IN ROMANIA, 1860-1940: A DEBATE ON DEVELOPMENT IN A EUROPEAN NATION. Edited by *Kenneth Jowitt*. Institute of International Studies, Research Series, no. 36. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California, 1978. xii, 207 pp. \$4.50, paper.

A new paradigm for understanding Eastern Europe seems to be in the making. Until recently, scholars wishing to go beyond national histories have used two basic models. Social scientists have investigated various aspects of the struggle between capitalist democracies and Communist autocracies, whereas historians have studied diplomatic relationships as a way to relate Eastern Europe to the West. Recently, these frameworks have been challenged by a refurbished Marxian idea, the notion that Eastern Europe is a dependency area, the semiperiphery of the world economic system of capitalism.

One does not have to accept the controversial thesis of Immanuel Wallerstein (*The Modern World System*, 1974) to agree that new and interesting points can be made by those who are familiar with dependency theory. For example, the editor of this collection, Kenneth Jowitt, describes Rumania's development in terms of Max Weber's distinction between class and status societies. When the shift from Ottoman to European dependency imposed a class style of political structure on a society still regulated by status relationships, a tension was created that no amount of speculation over the content of the national character could resolve. This suggestive analysis is complemented by Andrew Janos, who comes to the arresting conclusion that neither communism nor fascism have to do primarily with industrialization, since the impera-