

emigration from Slovenia in the fifteen years after World War II are also enlightening. Information for the subsequent period, when Slovene emigration lessened as a proportion of the overall Yugoslav emigration (p. 92), is lacking but would have been welcomed.

This book would be more aptly entitled *Slovenci iz Slovenije v južnem Ontariju/Slovenes from Slovenia in Southern Ontario*. Some of my criticism would then be eliminated. However, serious reservations would still remain. While this book is to be appreciated as an initial attempt to handle the topic, clearly, a satisfactory *Slovenci v Kanadi* remains to be written.

David Stermole, Toronto.

**Darko Friš.** *Korespondenca Kazimirja Zakrajška, O.F.M. (1907-1928)* Ljubljana: Arhivsko društvo Slovenije, 1993. 127 pp. [= *Viri za slovensko izseljensko zgodovino*, 6]

Darko Friš belongs to the younger generation of researchers who became interested in the past and present of Slovene Catholic communities in the United States. Prior to the collapse of the communist regime, Slovene Catholic activities abroad were a forbidden field, a taboo, for any objective historian in Slovenia. The present publication is one of the harbingers of the changing times. It deals with the correspondence of Father Zakrajšek, who established the Slovene Franciscan community in the United States and founded the Franciscan monastery in Lemont, Illinois.

*Korespondenca Kazimirja Zakrajška, O.F.M.* is divided into two main parts: the first 37 pages include an introduction, a short outline of the history of the Catholic Church in the United States, and a longer description of the activities of Slovene Franciscans in the United States.

The first section is concluded by a six-page summary in English covering the above material and translated into English by Nada Šabec. The second part, 82 pages, consists of 97 letters, arranged in chronological order, which were written either by or to Father Zakrajšek. According to Friš, these 97 letters represent about one-half of the correspondence he gathered from different archives. In Slovenia, letters came from the Franciscan Provincial Archives in Ljubljana, from the archives of the Archdiocese of Ljubljana, and from the Diocese of Maribor. In the United States, he consulted the archives of the Diocese of Cleveland, Ohio, and the Arch-diocese of Chicago, Illinois. Friš also checked the materials in the Immigration History Research Center in St Paul, Minnesota, and made use of the periodical literature published in

the United States and in Slovenia. The latter information was especially important for his extensive footnotes in which he identifies the person mentioned in the letter and clarifies other obscure data for the reader. The *Korespondenca* is illustrated and has three indexes: personal names, published letters, and illustrations.

Let me add some well-intended criticism. One misses the letters concerning Father Zakrajšek from the archives of the Greater New York area. Since the *Korespondenca* was published as a volume of *Viri* (Sources), the question arises why Friš omitted some important contemporary documents such as the *Relatio* (Report) of Father Rafael Rodić, Provincial of the Croat Franciscan Province in Zagreb, and later Archbishop of Belgrade, regarding his official visit to the Slovene Franciscan Commisariat in the United States, dated May 22, 1914. Also absent is the *Izjava* (Statement) signed by the Franciscan fathers in New York against Father Zakrajšek, dated Feb. 13 1922, as well as other important documents. Without the *Izjava* it is difficult to understand the context of Father Zakrajšek's correspondence and the tensions inside the Slovene Franciscan community in America during this period.

Friš makes certain one-sided assertions with a youthful self-confidence, but without sufficient research to prove or disprove his statements. For example, in footnote 204 (p.93) he writes that part of Zakrajšek's letters were omitted because unsubstantiated assertions might have offended the dignity of individuals mentioned in the letter, and because the missing pages had little value for history. Certainly, the author has the right to delete any offensive content. But before making a statement that assertions are unproven ('nedokazane trditve'), hence very likely not true, one must be careful. Disregarding the articles of *Glas Naroda* which was known for its anti-Catholic bias, statements similar to Zakrajšek's assertions about Fr. Anzelm Murn and Fr. Ambrož Širca can be found in the minutes of the meeting of discrets on May 20, 1921, and in other documents and letters not written by Fr. Zakrajšek.

This and other interpretations give the impression, rightly or wrongly, that Friš lacks a full understanding of the ideological tensions between the two Catholic groups in Slovenia and in the United States. On one side was Anton Mahnič and his followers who demanded a clear-cut separation of ideas and ideologies, resulting in the formation of Catholic, Liberal and Socialist political groups. On the other was the old attitude of avoiding ideological conflicts and trying to live in peace and harmony with one another. Zakrajšek was close to the ideas of Mahnič and encountered strong opposition not only from the L/liberals and S/socialists, but also from the Franciscan confreres. Inside this

broader framework, one must also take into consideration other factors, such as the peculiar organization of the Catholic Church in the United States, the moral qualification of priests who came to America, the animosities within the various ethnic groups, and the democratic (and hence different) political system in the United States.

Because of the above complexities one wonders if some of the unpublished letters might not be important enough to be published in order to provide a better understanding of these related issues, even if at first glance these letters seem to describe petty quarrels among individual priests. Finally, before publication, a manuscript should be read and carefully compared with the originals by a qualified editor, to avoid so many printing errors and omissions, especially in letters written in Latin, German and English. A typical example is the letter of March 21, 1921 (p. 75). Without the reproduction of the original on the same page, some sentences would make no sense and no one would know of the omission at the letter's conclusion.

Despite these criticisms, one has to congratulate Friš for entering a new and, until recently, forbidden field. With deeper research and the study of ideological and political trends, Friš's understanding and judgement will mature. He already possesses the qualities and enthusiasm needed to become a serious, recognized scholar.

Bogdan C. Novak, Professor Emeritus,  
The University of Toledo.

**Janja Žitnik.** *Louis Adamič in Sodobniki: 1948-1951.* Slovenska Akademija znanosti in umetnosti. Razred za filološke in literarne vede. Ljubljana, 1992. (ISBN 86-7131-066-3).

This monograph is part of a 1992 doctoral dissertation completed at the University of Ljubljana. The dissertation is scheduled for publication at a later date. The study describes the contacts of seventeen individuals with Adamic during the four years between 1948 and 1951, the year of Adamic's death. Six are Slovene Americans: Janko N. Rogelj, Vatro J. Grill, John A. Blatnik, Ana Praček Krasna, Ivan Molek, and Andrej Kobal; thirteen are Slovenes: Edvard Kardelj, Joža and Maria Vilfan, Josip Vidmar, Tine Kurent, Stane Valentinčič, Stefan Urbanc, Mira Mihelič, Slavko and Nada Zore, Aleš and Vera Bebler, and Jože Smole; and one is a non-Slovene, Vladimir Dedijer. The time parameter would explain why some of his close associates were