

chapters on adjudication—a particular interest of Professor Ulč's—and political communication. In the latter, for example, we find a brief but illuminating treatment of the language of Communist officialdom, its metaphors and euphemisms. In all, Professor Ulč brings to the task a detailed knowledge of his subject matter and presents his coherent, if not entirely objective, analysis with sophistication and wit. (His use of political jokes and cartoons is commendable.)

One must inevitably expect some shortcomings in a work so ambitious and yet so concise. Ulč assumes on his readers' part a considerable prior knowledge, both substantive and conceptual. This is understandable. But in his further zeal to get to the point, he leaves a number of important facts unexplained (for example, the rise and fall of Novotný) and some traditionally vexatious concepts inadequately clarified (Stalinism, ultraleftism, liberal and conservative Communists). The penultimate chapter, "The Resulting Political Culture," is notably unsatisfying, both because of its brevity and for its implication that a political culture is only the result of policy rather than a conditioning factor in mass and elite patterns of belief and behavior. Further, Ulč reflects a far greater sympathy for Czech culture than for Slovak, and his gallant attempt to deal with the problem of Slovak integration falls short because Slovak nationalism is treated as a political phenomenon divorced from its profound cultural basis.

These problems notwithstanding, *Politics in Czechoslovakia* is a valuable addition to the literature on contemporary Eastern Europe, and one might hope for more books of this type.

DAVID W. PAUL  
University of Washington

CZECHOSLOVAKIA 1968–1969: CHRONOLOGY, BIBLIOGRAPHY, ANNOTATION. By Zdeněk Hejzlar and Vladimír V. Kusin. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1975. iv, 316 pp. \$28.00.

Ideas are more difficult to uproot than governments. Politically, the Prague Spring disappeared under the pressure of a long, hot summer of confrontation, followed by what for many luckless Czechs and Slovaks (who had put their political and professional careers on the line) has been an unrelieved winter of discontent. The intellectual core of the Czechoslovak experiment in reform communism remains, preserved (or buried) in a growing mountain of documentary collections, journalistic accounts, economic, sociological, and political analysis.

Hejzlar and Kusin have performed an important service by putting order in this increasingly unwieldy body of source material. Their contribution is a useful reference for students of Eastern Europe, and an invaluable timesaver for historians, sociologists, and political scientists attempting to use the Czechoslovak case for purposes of comparative analysis.

The book offers a painstakingly compiled chronology of events for 1968–69. It directs readers to the main documents on the Prague Spring available in English; provides a bibliography of Dubček's speeches, articles, and interviews; and gives a selected list of Czechoslovak newspapers and periodicals for 1968–69, a bibliography of Czech and Slovak articles relating to the reform from 1968–70, and a world-wide bibliography of books published from 1968 to 1974.

Whether or not one can agree with the authors' interpretation of the events they have so carefully recorded, Hejzlar and Kusin have produced an admirable research tool.

ROBIN REMINGTON

*University of Missouri, Columbia*

A HISTORY OF THE HABSBURG EMPIRE, 1526–1918. By *Robert A. Kann*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974. xiv, 646 pp. Maps. \$25.00.

Professor Kann's new work is well-organized and based upon an extensive and, in many cases, exhaustive knowledge of sources in Western languages, particularly German. The author surveys the development of both the Austro-German and the Hungarian parts of the monarchy from the Turkish and religious wars of the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries through the First World War in a style that is clear and succinct.

Geographically, the emphasis throughout the volume is on the Austro-German regions, and, more often than not, the problems of the monarchy are seen from Vienna as the center. Several examples may be cited: the chapter on the late Renaissance and Baroque period, 1526–1740, is most successful when it deals with the German hereditary and Bohemian lands; the basis for generalization about church-state relations and the peasant problem in the period 1740–1815 is German Austria rather than the monarchy as a whole; and the absolutism of the 1850s and subsequent political developments are discussed mainly with reference to German Austria. There are, of course, good reasons why Vienna should be at the heart of things, and the broad view Kann gives us is valuable, but in his preface he has drawn attention to the fact that the development of the monarchy can be fully understood only if the various political units and ethnic groups that composed it receive proper attention. I don't think he has granted them equal time.

The non-German nationalities are generally dealt with in cursory fashion. To take the first half of the nineteenth century as an example, the Czechs probably get the fullest treatment, as in the discussion of the nationality problem in the chapter covering the period 1815–79. On the other hand, there is little depth to the discussion of social and political realities in Hungary in the decades preceding the revolution of 1848. Slovak, Serb, and Rumanian nationalisms come through as surface manifestations rather than as organic developments within these respective societies. Even the Magyars fare little better. As a result, the reader is unprepared for the events of 1848, and Kann does not fully appreciate the significance of these events for the Slavs and Rumanians, even in defeat. A number of other examples could be cited. Sometimes factual errors occur. Transylvania may serve as an illustration: there were translations of the Scriptures into Rumanian well before Tordassi's (p. 144); Prince George II Rákóczy, a Calvinist, encouraged such translations primarily to convert the Rumanians, not to shield them from Slavic Orthodox influences; the Magyar Calvinist University of Cluj had no chance at all of becoming a Rumanian national university (p. 149); the frequent use of the term "Vlachs" to refer to the Rumanians of Transylvania is inaccurate and confusing, and should be restricted to the nomadic shepherds south of the Danube; George Şincai was not the Uniate bishop of Transylvania; Alexandru Odobescu was, indeed, a distinguished archaeologist, but he was not a