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fected the country's foreign relations. The Swabian problem, the author explains, aggravated the Magyar people's major illness, chauvinism. All Hungarian regimes of the period, whether of the democrat Count Michael Károlyi, of the Communist Béla Kun, or of the counterrevolutionary Admiral Nicholas Horthy, practiced the same basic policy toward the Hungarian Germans: they promised them a minimum of concessions to secure their loyalty and the friendship of Austria and Germany, meanwhile resolutely prodding the Swabians toward the ultimate national goal of assimilation and ethnic homogeneity. In the words of Thomas Spira, "Each government adopted what appeared to be a conciliatory stance and each practiced its evasions with such skill that the Swabians were constantly suspended between hope and despair" (p. 14). Despair seems to have been greater than hope, for the Hungarians oppressed much more than they conciliated, especially in education. The result was that ambitious and urbanized Swabians were driven to become Magyars, while Swabian peasant children were taught very little in either German or Hungarian. No wonder then, the author argues, that most Swabians quickly lost their initial sympathy for independent Hungary and waited only for the opportunity to join the ranks of Hitler's followers.

This Swabian saga is told with much learning and ample documentation; and there are some interesting passages, for instance, those on the clash of ideologies in which nationalism was not the inevitable victor. But there is also some confusion and a few contradictions. The absolute need to discuss both diplomatic and domestic developments, which occurred simultaneously but on vastly different planes, leads to repetitions and to the frequent resurrection, in consecutive chapters, of fallen or dead political leaders. It also leads to a plethora of names that are rarely identified in the text and not always listed in the index. Even such basic terms as Swabian or Saxon are left unexplained and are used rather cavalierly. There is no conclusion, nor is there an indication why this complex story stops in 1936. There are such annoying errors as, for instance, identifying Charles as king of Hungary in 1907 (p. 10) and Count Károlyi as a Social Democrat before October 1918 (p. 16). Finally, the introduction, more than any other part of the book, reads like an anti-Magyar political pamphlet, rather than a scholarly essay. We are told that the Magyars were culturally inferior; that they suffered from feelings of inferiority as newcomers; that, because of this, they were "determined to alter their image by transforming the original Magyar stock through absorption of Indo-European strains," (p. x); that they wished to Magyarize the conquered peoples; and that their assimilationist efforts were thwarted by the Mongol raids and the Turkish occupation—all involuntary compliments, because they endow the early Hungarians with the political sophistication of a modern nation. Nor does Austria escape censure. We are informed that the Habsburgs systematically subjected Hungary to Germanization, at least until 1867 when they changed to a policy of "fomenting tension amongst their minorities and thereby weakening them," (p. vii), both gross exaggerations. A little more editing and cutting and a little less political passion would have made this lengthy contribution on ethnic history far more valuable.
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William H. McNeill began observing and analyzing affairs in Greece more than three decades ago. His continuing interest in the development of this nation has resulted in no less than three books on modern Greece, which taken together provide a sustained and unique commentary on the country. The latest reflects both the fund of knowledge about Greece that McNeill has built up these past thirty years and the broad perspective of historical change that has become the trademark of his writing.

The appearance of this work is indeed timely. Events in the country these past ten years have brought changes whose ultimate impact will not be clearly manifested in some instances for several more decades. During the last decade Greece has moved out from under the shadow of persistent low productivity characterized by a low living standard. This economic miracle was attained through the inflow of large amounts of credit from abroad, the vigorous commercial efforts of the people themselves, and the significant contribution of a new diaspora of emigrants to all parts of the world. The resulting demographic and social transformation and the recent political crises, both internal and external, have created a great deal of concern about the country's future among Greek intellectuals. In some ways this period is reminiscent of the era just prior to the First World War, when questions concerning the fate of Hellenism in the modern world stimulated the country's creative writers. As then, many of the nation's intellectuals today have been trained abroad, and their analyses of Greek society tend to reflect a reliance on Western theories of development. Even those who see the need for Greece to find its own way to a better social and political
future do so from the perspective of the Western idea of progress. The value of McNeill’s survey is that it breaks free of established theories of development to consider both the unique and the universal in the Greek experience.

For centuries the Greek world spread across the eastern Mediterranean making its contribution to succeeding civilizations through communities located in the various urban centers in the area. The establishment of the nation state shifted the focus of attention to one center and its periphery. The dilemma of how to confine the nation within the geographic limits of a territorial state brought a century of military and political conflict. To the traditional view of the vicissitudes of Hellenism over the last one hundred and fifty years McNeill seeks out and adds new points of reference.

Since the time of Odysseus, Greeks have exuberantly proclaimed their individual place of origin. Historians of Greece have often noted the continuing role of geographic diversity in shaping modern Greek society. But McNeill fixes upon this verity and probes its full meaning to establish the patterns of life that have been fundamental to Greeks down to this day. From the author’s survey, which combines history and contemporary observation, there emerges a picture of a people full of contradictions. We see the antipodes of food-deficit and food-producing villages; of the heroic versus the calculating, entrepreneurial spirit; of the secular and the devoutly Orthodox individual; the hill and the plains people; and, finally, of the rural and urban world in Greece. By combining these often conflicting tendencies within their culture the Greeks have produced a vigorous society that is both enduring and unique in McNeill’s estimation.

This is a work that has something to offer even to those most knowledgeable about modern Greek life. It is a luminous example of how interpreting the past can serve to make the present more intelligible and the future less of an enigma.
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The alleged collaboration of the Chetniks with the Axis occupiers, especially against Tito’s Partisans, and the culpability of the Chetnik leader, General Draža Mihajlović, have been highly controversial and emotional issues in Yugoslavia and Yugoslav historiography since the actual events upon which these questions are based took place. It was this apparent treachery that led in part to the shift of most Allied and popular support from Mihajlović to Tito in the closing years of World War II. But even the trial and execution of Mihajlović for treason in 1946 by the Tito government did not settle the matter. Although most current historical writing substantiates the Chetniks’ and Mihajlović’s guilt, some critics label this scholarship “revisionist” and incomplete, claiming that it is based on faulty research. They argue that, although a great deal of documentation is readily available, much of it is from the Tito government’s archives and other pro-Partisan and pro-Communist sources.

This volume in the Hoover Institution’s archival documentary series attempts to shed new light on the case of Mihajlović and the Chetniks. The book is composed of the complete Proceedings and Report of the Commission of Inquiry of the Committee for a Fair Trial for Draja Mihailovich, reproduced here for the first time, with a lengthy introductory essay by David Martin, a founder of the Committee for a Fair Trial for Draja Mihailovich and the author of a study on Allied relations with Tito and Mihajlović published in 1946. Most of Martin’s remarks deal with the activities of the committee, a phenomenon of the Cold War, whose membership was made up largely of hundreds of Allied airmen who went down over Yugoslavia and who were rescued by the Chetniks. The committee sought unsuccessfully to have the testimonies of these airmen in defense of Mihajlović placed in evidence at his trial. They testified that, in all the time they collectively spent with the Chetniks, there were no indications of collaboration. Also included in this volume is some British archival material supporting the committee’s contention that the British-led Allied “abandonment” of Mihajlović and the Chetniks was to a large extent based on poor and slanted intelligence.

A major implication of this book is that Mihajlović’s crime was that he resisted the Communists as vigorously as the fascists; if there was any collaboration on the part of the Chetniks, it was by “peripheral units” under local commanders. If this is a valid view, it is not substantiated by the evidence offered here. Neither does this construction really address the broader, more complex situation of Allied cooperation between Chetniks and Partisans, capitalists and Communists against the real and immediate threat of fascism during World War II. The documentation supplied by this extremely interesting volume nevertheless will be valuable to scholars, students, and informed readers alike in achieving a better understanding of the complexity.