

considerations" rather than by a political "conspiracy" (74). Barker also notes that it is high time for the people of Austria to come to grips with their Nazi past.

Thomas Barker has been known for his expertise on the Carinthian Slovenes since the 1950s, and this book reflects his broad knowledge in the field. He also deserves high praise for his efforts to deal with friends and foes alike in an objective fashion. *Social Revolutionaries and Secret Agents* has some weaknesses, though. To begin with, it contains a number of stylistic infelicities and obscure passages which make it difficult, at times, to follow the author's train of thought. Moreover, too many important details are buried in the back-notes, and some of these are rather puzzling (see, for instance, the reference to SS General Artur Phleps' allegedly "obscure fate" (221), and to Paul Hehn's work (225)). But by far the most serious defect of the book is the fault of the publisher! Like so many other volumes in the *East European Monographs* series, this one has, on average, at least two misprints per page, and at least three picture captions (out of twelve) are either transposed or make no sense at all.

Nevertheless, the patient reader will learn much that is useful from this book.

Ulrich Trumpener, University of Alberta

Thomas M. Barker, *Social Revolutionaries and Secret Agents: The Carinthian Slovene Partisans and Britain's Special Operations Executive*. Boulder CO: East European Monographs. Distributed by Columbia University Press, New York, 1990. xiii, 249 pages.

The book which we wish to briefly discuss is, in fact, a surprise, and not just for those readers who have not yet heard of the American historian Thomas Barker. It is clear in this context that historians in the small Slovene world cannot afford to overlook this *via facti* by a friend of the Carinthian Slovenes; for it is well known that it was to the history of this sternly tested sector of the Slovene people that his doctoral dissertation—published in book form twice—was devoted.¹ The author, Professor at the State University of New York at Albany, is a specialist in modern European history; here we must voice the complaint that the book does not provide a more detailed introduction to Barker himself. Only in part, and only indirectly, does the author disclose himself as an individual, and namely in the book's introductory paragraphs, where he explains the genesis of his interest in the Carinthian Slovenes and thus the genesis of the book. Indeed, his dissertation on the problems of the anti-Fascist resistance in Slovene Carinthia attracted too little attention and apparently Barker has attempted to repay this 'debt' with this latest book. We must confess however in advance that he has done so in a very original way. Indeed the combination of themes which is evident in the title and is also followed in the book is very surprising; and it is this that we have in mind when, above, we mention the idea of surprise. Here let us just mention that the author already presented an extensive summary of the contents of the book, although with a more classic kind of title, in the pages of *Slovene Studies*.² By virtue of its surprising contents and also its factual and yet lucid style this work has already reverberated on both sides of the Austrian-Slovene border. Professor Janez Stergar, our well-known specialist in the history of the Carinthian Slovenes, has published favorable reviews.³ In 1990 Professor Barker was interviewed in a number of Slovene newspapers; for 1991 both Slovene and German translations of the book have been announced, and to the latter we may expect a response also in the German-speaking regions, especially in Carinthia.

From all of the above it is evident that Barker's book is neither a synthesis nor an extensive monograph on the history of the anti-Fascist resistance in Slovene Carinthia, but is rather the treatment of a very-finely selected specific theme. In our judgment, this theme is, in spite of everything, first and foremost the contribution and the aims of the British Special Operations Executive [SOE] in the final period of the War. This theme is however not presented in isolation, but is organically incorporated into its Carinthian Slovene background, into the social, ideological, military and even the geographical circumstances. The author is therefore constrained to present in the first part of the book a concise overview of the historical events involved, an overview which pretends to a synthesis. In this he reaches a high level, to which the extensive notes and objective annotations contribute. Let us merely mention at this juncture that contemporary Slovene historiography has not yet managed to produce a complete monograph about, let alone any synthetic picture of, Slovene Carinthia in the 1941-45 period. Of course, much detailed sectoral research has been performed, and the investigations of Bogdan Žolnir, Milet Pavlin, Janez Stergar and Marjan Linasij in particular approach the status of monographs. The first real attempt at a synthesis is expected from this year's dissertation by Rist Stojanovič. How much work—however scattered it may be—has nevertheless been performed may be seen from the bibliography by Marija Suhadolčan, which Barker unfortunately does not mention. On the other hand we do also have some notable works of Germanophone Carinthian and Austrian historiography, although among them are some fervent defenders of an indivisible and above all German Carinthia, which means that we cannot speak about any special objectivity on their part. Of course to some extent, but in the reverse direction, the situation is similar on the Slovene side. It is surely unfortunate that the recent history of the Carinthian Slovenes, in what is a very sublimated fashion, is the continuing subject of this nationalistic contest, which (as Barker shows in this book) was manifested in extreme forms during the war. Our author must however admit that he tries to rise above the siren voices of prejudice, taking into account both German and Slovene sources and building on the basis of their data with the aid of British reports, from both during and after the War, and eyewitness accounts of still-living participants. Here the author ran the risk of being influenced by these extremely suggestive sources; and our opinion is that he was not altogether able to avoid that influence.

This brings us finally to the contentive and methodological difficulties in Barker's book. Of course we do not intend to reiterate the contents; for those, as mentioned above, are already known to readers of *Slovene Studies*. We shall just call attention to some specifics with respect to previous literature and also of course to several problems that we discern in the actual structure of the book and also in some of the author's statements. What is most apparent, however, is that the book's layout is conspicuously bipartite: it consists, first, of the introductory synthetic overview of historical events and, second, of the publication of eleven documents from the London Public Record Office [PRO] which illustrate, demonstrate and also expand upon the picture that emerges from the introductory material. In addition we may mention, as a kind of combination of the two kinds of materials, the extensive commentary; the sketches and photographs should not be forgotten; and a general index of persons, places and concepts facilitates the reader's overview of the contents. With respect to the last-named: the author is to be lauded for his efforts to seek the incentives of and causes for the anti-Fascist resistance of the Carinthian Slovenes also in the area of psychosociology; this is a rarity even among Slovene historians themselves. It was therefore logical for the author not to ignore various negative aspects and phenomena of the guerrilla war. The Nazi system of repression is, in the introduction and later, well

presented, although in our opinion too little emphasis is placed upon both the plans and the measures leading to the genocide of the whole Slovene people, especially its Carinthian constituent. It is for this reason, perhaps, that the national liberation struggle of the Slovene people, as a dominant element in the whole sequence of events, is to some extent ignored and undervalued. The author is more or less deaf to the project of a United Slovenia (which is mentioned by the British intelligence officers), and emphasizes only the territorial demands made by the Slovenes and later by Tito. On the other hand he justifiably exposes the Communist character and the revolutionary aims and methods of the leadership of the Slovene resistance, indeed he does so, emphatically, in the very title of the book. Well, we consider this to be exaggerated: in Carinthia, at least, the national liberation aspect of the resistance prevailed, and this is indirectly demonstrated by the fact that there were never in Carinthia even the most elementary attempts at forming anti-revolutionary White Guard units. Indeed, all this is well presented by the writer in the main text as well as in the notes, but the generally convoluted drama of its origin, its operation and its numerous manifestations is a hard nut for even Slovene specialists to crack. Also well presented is the increasingly sharp distinction between the strategic goals of the Slovene and Yugoslav partisan army and policy on the one hand, and on the other the British and overall Allied plans for the postwar political geography of Central Europe. The chief protagonist of Barker's story, which with giant strides treads the Carinthian stage towards the end of the War—the SOE's "Clowder" mission and above all its central personality, Hesketh-Prichard—acted, for the revolutionary partisan leadership, like a kind of red rag to a bull. Its plans to organize an Austrian-German resistance movement were not greeted sympathetically, for this would have narrowed the operative (and even more the moral and political) scope of the Slovene partisan movement in the North. The author does not really emphasize enough the fact that the Allied missions in this area were completely dependent on partisan support and, secondly, that the Britons never succeeded in organizing anything among the Austrian Germans. The postwar allusion to certain successes is not sufficiently supported by evidence. But did this conflict between Hesketh-Prichard and the local revolutionary leaders also lead to the premeditated homicide of the British agent? The British authorities investigated the events of December 1944 on the Svinja Planina/Saualm, but clearly did not clarify the affair. The author rather illogically leaves the affair open and hints at the guilt of Dušan Pirjevec. In general Hesketh-Prichard's personality and his fate are given (over-)much attention in the book, and it is does not appear to be by chance that the book opens with a full-page photograph of him, and that he reappears four times in the illustrative appendix. Did the author in fact search out the documents from this investigation? Even in the context of the anti-Fascist armed struggle in Carinthia, Barker overestimates the contribution and significance of the SOE and of its missions, and underestimates the assistance rendered by the partisans in Central Slovenia. In one place he cites the concrete assistance in arms given by Britain to Tito's partisans, but he should have given concrete evidence of the same with respect to Carinthia so that his above-cited affirmation would be more credible.

The author describes very well the ever-increasing ideological and political split between the Britons and the Slovene partisans which at the end of the war grew into a real mutual contest—also during the occupation of Carinthia—, and immediately afterward became the cold war (which almost became a hot war). The tragedy of the partisans at Borovlje/Ferlach is described, and the fact is emphasized that the Yugoslav collaborationists with their last attempt at opposition also, in the final analysis, enabled the British forces to occupy Carinthia before the Yugoslav forces. When the author assesses the policy and the activities

of the Yugoslav authorities in Carinthia, and the relationship of the Slovene inhabitants to them, he cites only British and Austrian-German sources, and this does not allow for fully correct conclusions. Far too unsystematic a picture is given in the book of those Carinthians who were deported; here, the author could have relied on the postwar report made by Colonel Josef Stossier.

A particular thematic role is played by the question of the repatriation of the Yugoslav collaborationists from Carinthia in the second half of May 1945. Professor Barker could of course not avoid this question, especially because it has been an interesting historiographic puzzle and at the same time also a political question in both the Yugoslav and the British public domain. Here the author is very inflexible and even insulting towards the first investigator and proponent of the conspiracy theory, Count Nikolay Tolstoy. Barker's indictment of Tolstoy, for first setting up an hypothesis and then attempting to prove it with a selection of documents, is formally justified, but is however relative in view of the fact that the use of an hypothesis is a completely normal methodological approach in all sciences, and the selection of documents is the general rule in historiography. The question of the motives for a particular selection is, of course, a different matter. It is a fact that the British military authorities amended their previously established policy toward the refugee collaborationists, and that during the actual repatriation they utilized lies so that they could the more easily put the policy into effect. Given the consequences that befell those who were sent back it is not surprising that people who are directly or indirectly affected use the term "conspiracy," which is indeed a mild one. Barker's statement that the conspiracy theory is supported by the Soviet intelligence service is very questionable and is unsupported by proofs. When he speaks about the negotiations between British and Yugoslav officers concerning the handing-over of the collaborationists, and of the latter's assurances of humane treatment, he explicitly emphasizes that it was not a question of trading in human lives, and that appearances are deceptive. Let us emphasize at once that this is unpersuasive, and that, in view of the subsequent course of events, it was clearly a matter of doing business on the backs of the collaborationists. The British may have entered into this purely on logistic grounds, to "clear the decks," since these refugees would have impeded them in their preparations for war with the Yugoslavs and in the actual fighting. The initial plan to exclude the Serbian *četniks* from the repatriation shows that it was not just a question of logistics. All the same, there is here rather much that is illogical, although we cannot go into too much detail here. The question arises, for instance, how the small camp at Vetrinj/Viktring could have been an obstacle to the campaign against Yugoslavia; here there were Yugoslavs who had fled for their lives from Tito's partisans, who would therefore not have impeded the campaign. The British could not, according to Barker, have had any inkling of the fate that would befall the repatriated collaborationists. This means that they accepted the word of people with whom they were intending to shortly do battle; and they did know about the partisan terror in Carinthia, as is attested by their reports; and so on. Why the Yugoslav authorities treated the repatriated refugees the way that they did treat them is a similar problem; the theory is suggested that it was because of the Trieste crisis, thus again on logistical grounds, that the Yugoslav sailors in this way cleared the decks! Nevertheless, Yugoslav and British or some other historiography will have the final word about these questions; and in this connection Barker is indeed indulgent, in that he does not more decisively condemn the relevant inaccessibility of the Yugoslav archival sources, or of the British ones, or in other respects that of the Austrian archives either.

The documents published in the central part of the book are all from the British PRO.

Clearly Barker made this decision; we however must ask why he did not include the appropriate American documents. Given this selection, too, we must note the fact that the concluding report from the PRO is omitted, as is the report by Villiers that is utilized elsewhere, as also is the assumed report by Jones from 1943, and so on. Some documents have been published, both in Celovec/Klagenfurt and in Ljubljana, the latter by Dr. Dušan Biber, who also (as we are informed) provided Barker with some advice during the preparation of this book.

The style of the book is very interesting, pleasant, measured, and occasionally also flowery and extremely expressive. The author, in comparison with the practice in Slovene historiography, utilizes a rather unusual methodological terminology; at first he cites place-names consistently in both languages, but later gets a little tired of this; on the other hand he uses bilingual nomenclature also for places in Gorenjsko, and even with some mistakes. There are also some errors in the quotations and in the Slovene expressions, and also in the purely English text. Surprisingly, too, the print is not of the best.

Nevertheless, the book is—for all the reasons cited, and for others not mentioned—very interesting; it is new in its thematic foundation and in its methodological realization. To a certain extent it has added to our knowledge; it has drawn our attention to new aspects of the theme that it treats; and finally and most importantly, it has placed new questions before us. Our progress towards historical truth will be advanced, given the assistance of this significant step by Professor Barker.

Boris Mlakar, Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, Ljubljana.
Translated by Tom Priestly

NOTES

1. Thomas M. Barker, *The Slovenes of Carinthia. A National Minority Problem*. New York: League of CSA, 1960 [Studia Slovenica]; and Thomas M. Barker with the collaboration of Andreas Moritsch, *The Slovene Minority of Carinthia*, Boulder CO: East European Monographs. Distributed by Columbia University Press, New York, 1984.
2. Thomas M. Barker, "Partisan warfare in the bilingual region of Carinthia," *Slovene Studies* 11/1-2 (1989) 193-210.
3. First, in *Zgodovinski časopis* 44/4 (1990); and then further, and in much more detail, in the *Vestnik koroških partizanov* (1990).

Andrej Vovko, Ferdo Gestrin et al., eds. *Dve domovini. Razprave o izseljenstvu. Two Homelands. Migration Studies. 1*. Ljubljana: Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti, Inštitut za slovensko izseljenstvo, 1990. 415 pp. YU SSSN 0353-6777.

This monographic volume from the Institute for Migration Research at the Slovene Academy of Arts and Sciences documents the scope and vitality of the Institute's active research into Slovene emigration. The twenty-four articles, two book reviews, and selected bibliographies of Institute members comprise original and new contributions, summaries of extensive research (both previously published and unpublished), research notes, re-evaluations, and timely commentaries. The contributors to this volume include Institute members, scholars from related institutions, and external contributors from Slovenia,