

Dedijer's work goes over much old ground. Its rambling journalistic style, minimal documentation, many digressions and asides, and occasionally breathless "gee whiz" tone detract from its worth. Nevertheless, this is an important account, by an influential insider, of a small power's struggle to retain its independence against great odds, and reminds us of the often underestimated influence of small countries on world affairs.

PAUL N. HEHN

*State University College at Brockport, New York*

YUGOSLAV CIVIL LAW: HISTORY, FAMILY, PROPERTY. By A. G. Chloros. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970. xv, 285 pp. \$9.75.

This excellent book does not attempt to treat the whole civil legal system of Yugoslavia. Three fields are chosen for discussion: the history of Yugoslav law is summarized in forty-two pages; family law takes about twice that length; and the law of property occupies seventy-six pages. The book is supplemented by four basic statutes (all dealing with domestic relations) and a minutely prepared index. For the two branches of the law he considers, Professor Chloros has collected and thoroughly mastered a wealth of available materials in Serbo-Croatian, and offers his conclusions. His style is simple, his presentation lucid, and the book will be easily understood by persons having no legal background.

The author discusses the various elements that have blended with and influenced each other to create especially difficult problems: local customary law (which prevailed particularly in Montenegro), Greek-Byzantine thinking (introduced mainly into Serbia, which later was for centuries a part of the Ottoman Empire), and Hungarian and then Austrian solutions (in force in Croatia). Besides unwritten law, numerous codes and statutes have from early times shaped the legal systems of present-day Yugoslavia. The Byzantine code *Hexabiblos* (1345), the Code of Emperor Dušan (1349), the Austrian Civil Code (1811), and the Serbian Civil Code (1844) were most important.

Thus a maze of legal rules were in force when a united Yugoslavia was established at the end of World War I. Before a uniform codified system could be achieved, the country was conquered by communism. To former problems was added a new "dilemma." Chloros finds that the Yugoslavs have acted with caution when faced with the problem of "how to retain the doctrinal link with Marxism, yet interpret it in a way which takes into account the faults of the Soviet system and the changed conditions of today" (p. 39).

The author finds that post-World War II Yugoslav family law is "not unlike modern French or German law" (p. 50). In the Marxist approach it is not considered to be part of civil law. The Marxist view is that in traditional society the family is an economic institution that is based on the class structure (the husband, the stronger partner, exploits his wife, the weaker one). Family law is thus considered to be quasi-public law (p. 46). Chloros sees property law (which in general follows the pattern of Roman law) as the field in which the Yugoslavs "can lay the greatest claim to originality" (p. 133), and explains his conclusion by analyzing the outstanding features of "social property" and private ownership. He also discusses the Yugoslav principle of workers' self-management.

Chloros does not expect that complete codification will be achieved soon—

though many jurists favor such a development—because Yugoslav law is “too much in a state of flux to be amenable to any stabilization” (p. 39).

This book should be read by everyone interested in Southeastern Europe.

W. J. WAGNER  
*University of Detroit Law School*

IZ ISTORIATA NA INTERNATSIONALNITE VRÜZKI NA V. I. LENIN S REVOLIÜTSIONNOTO RABOTNICHESKO DVIZHENIE V BÜLGARIIA (1896–1923 G.). By *A. M. Shnitman*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bülgarskata komunisticheska partiia, 1970. 509 pp.

The vaunted master-pupil relationship between Lenin and the Bulgarian revolutionary Marxists, which Bulgarian and Soviet propagandists have greatly exaggerated and distorted, has finally received a comprehensive treatment at the hands of a scholar. Shnitman, until recent years professor at the Murmansk State Pedagogical Institute and now at the University of Leningrad, manifested his interest in the subject with his *kandidat* dissertation devoted to one aspect of it and defended at that university in 1951. In the ensuing years he published a number of short investigations which he consolidated and enlarged in the original Russian version of the present work issued in Murmansk in 1967.

Lenin's advent to power in 1917 was, as Shnitman points out, the watershed in his “ties” and influence among the Bulgarians. Before 1917 his connections with the few Bulgarian Marxists he met in exile were incidental and insignificant in affecting the line the Bulgarian party followed under the leadership of Dimitür Blagoev. A member of Plekhanov's generation, Blagoev regarded Plekhanov, not Lenin, as the mastermind of Russian Marxism. In 1902, for example, he could not conceive that anyone but Plekhanov could be the author of *Chto delat'?* and assumed that “Lenin” was one of Plekhanov's pseudonyms. At the Copenhagen congress of the Second International in 1910 he finally had an opportunity to meet both Plekhanov and Lenin and remained convinced that Plekhanov was the authoritative Russian Marxist. It was not until 1914 that Blagoev came to question Plekhanov's authority regarding the desirability of a Russian victory in World War I, which Plekhanov advocated and which Blagoev dreaded as reinforcement of Russian imperialism. The ensuing estrangement, however, did not make Blagoev a follower of Lenin, and he never understood or accepted Lenin's tactical alliance with segments of the peasantry. Georgi Dimitrov, Blagoev's eventual successor as leader of the party, was not aware of Lenin's specific views until 1914 and did not meet him until 1921.

The seizure of power in 1917 changed Lenin's status from a Russian factional leader in the isolation of exile in Switzerland to head of the first Marxist power in the world and a voice of authority to be reckoned with. Still, until his first stroke took Lenin out of active public role in May 1922, the contact of younger Bulgarian party functionaries with him was minimal and the impact of his views on them remained limited by the *tesniachestvo* (narrow doctrinairism) of Blagoev. The “Leninization” (or Bolshevization, as party historiography prefers to call it) of the Bulgarian Communists belongs to the years after their unsuccessful uprising in 1923 and the deaths of Lenin and Blagoev.

In the face of these uncomfortable central facts Shnitman has elected to dwell on the various biographic and bibliographic details of Lenin's “ties” with Bulgarians