

NACIONALNO PITANJE U DALMACIJI U XIX STOLJEĆU. By Rade Petrović. Sarajevo: "Svjetlost," 1968. 474 pp.

The recent revival of political and economic disputes among the Yugoslav nationalities has been paralleled in the academic arena by the publication of a spate of books and studies examining the establishment of the Yugoslav union in 1918 and the beginnings of Serbo-Croat misunderstandings and conflicts. One of the most valuable and scholarly of the studies probing into the origins of the Serbo-Croat conflict is unquestionably this publication of Rade Petrović's doctoral dissertation on the national question in Dalmatia in the nineteenth century. Petrović's volume is based on massive research in the various Yugoslav archives, where he had access to extensive correspondence between the leading Croat and Serb political leaders, in addition to newspapers and other printed materials of the period.

Petrović focuses on Serbo-Croat relations in Dalmatia in the crucial twenty years between 1860 and 1880, when religious differences between the Catholics (82 percent of the population) and the Orthodox (17 percent) developed into a national division between the Croats and the Serbs. Petrović traces the formation of the National Party, which was organized as a united front of Catholic and Orthodox Slavs of Dalmatia against the numerically weak but politically dominant Italian-speaking element that lived mainly in the cities and monopolized the administration and the cultural life of the province. In the 1870s the National Party captured a majority of the seats in the provincial assembly; but soon the movement began to collapse because of the growing alienation between the Croats and the Serbs.

Petrović's thesis is that the decline of the National Party was due to the encouragement of narrow Croat nationalism by the Catholic clergy, and in particular by the priest and politician Miho Pavlinović, whose insistence on an "exclusively Croatian political nationality, leaning heavily on religion, objectively led to national exclusivism and chauvinism." This in turn caused the "splitting of the united National Party and initiated the problems of Serbo-Croat relations in Dalmatia" (p. 354).

Petrović's contention has been vigorously countered by Croat historians and publications. Trpimir Macan, for instance, writing in the *Zagreb Kritika* (1969, no. 4), asserted that Petrović's thesis is neither substantiated by his own research and voluminous footnotes nor by the findings of Croat scholars, such as Grga Novak and others, who have written on the same subject. Croat scholars believe that Serbian nationalism was created among Dalmatia's Orthodox minority by their clergy working on behalf of the Serbian state and government. The quarrel between the two sides erupted when the Serbs withdrew their earlier support for the union of Dalmatia with Croatia-Slavonia, which was the principal political objective of the Croat leadership both in Croatia proper and in Dalmatia.

Both Petrović and his Croat critics agree, however, that the break between the two factions of the National Party became irreparable over the issue of Austrian occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1878. While the Croats welcomed this move in the hope that it would eventually lead to the unification of all Croat lands into a single kingdom under the Habsburg scepter, the Serbs were adamantly opposed to the occupation because it hindered the establishment of a powerful Serbian state in the Balkans that would embrace all Serbian-inhabited areas. The fate of Bosnia-Herzegovina, of course, remains to the present day, a bitter bone of contention between the Serbs and the Croats.

Despite its limited focus, Petrović's book is extremely valuable for the light it sheds on the beginnings of the Serbo-Croat conflict. It shows, for instance, that the origins of these rivalries go much further into the past than is commonly assumed. It indicates that though the conflict may have been intensified by the conviction of the Croats that they were exploited economically and denied political equality in the first Yugoslavia between 1918 and 1941, the origins go far deeper into the past and long antedate the establishment of the Yugoslav state. The conclusion that Petrović suggests is that though the conflict is both cultural and religious, it is even more importantly the result of the clash between two state conceptions, which were already defined more than a hundred years ago.

MATTHEW M. MEŠTROVIĆ  
*Fairleigh Dickinson University*

POLJOPRIVREDA I PRIVREDNI RAZVOJ. By *Vladimir Stipetić*. Zagreb: Informator, 1969. xvi, 395 pp.

Agriculture's role in economic growth and development is not a new subject. Scores of books and articles have been written on the topic. Conceptual disagreements and diverse policy prescriptions for individual countries are the norm rather than the exception. To some, agriculture is the basic and the most important sector that "ought" to be supported, safeguarded, and developed. To others, agriculture's role is subordinate to other sectors of the economy.

Stipetić has succeeded in bringing divergent and controversial views together for the reader. His familiarity with economic theory in general and with economic policies, particularly those followed in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, makes his book a valuable addition to existing literature on economic development. He traces the genesis of agriculture's role in economic development over the last 150 years with the help of historical, comparative, and quantitative analyses. Much of the information concerns supply and demand of agricultural products in various parts of the world, nutritional standards, changes in population, personal incomes, and other statistical data. Stipetić's forte is his comparative theoretical treatise, which comprises nearly two-thirds of the book and is, in my judgment, the main reason that his book merits attention. Western scholars who may not be familiar with all the Marxist literature in this area will find the book very informative.

The author critically probes and examines the inadequacies of classical and neoclassical theories in failing to explain the causes of agriculture's ills and underscores the "stagnancy" of Marxist economic thought in both its failure to comprehend fully agriculture's role in economic development and its lack of pertinent economic concepts. Many authors still continue to extrapolate the observed behavior of firms in industrial sectors to those in agriculture and fail to realize that the laws applicable to industry may fail when applied to agriculture. While it is true that Soviet industrialization policy, for example, has achieved phenomenal successes in a relatively short time, agriculture has continued to be the problem child of the Soviet economy.

Stipetić's admonition to Marxian agricultural economists for failing to provide needed refinements of Marx's original ideas and for failing to take advantage of available research tools (some of which were developed by Soviet scholars) is justified. Not everyone may fully agree with the author's interpretation of economic theories and their application to problems of economic development or with his