

hands tied; the constitution, the author contends, concentrated considerable powers in the person of the monarch. It was Poniatowski's concern for dealing with internal opposition, insignificant by itself, which sapped his efforts and deflected them away from the necessity of coming to an understanding with the Russians. Because of Russian indecision over how to react, Łojek feels that accommodation through negotiation was feasible, even as late as the spring of 1792. The chances for a political solution preserving the essence of the new constitutional structure were far greater than subsequent historiography has allowed. This argument, based on a combination of printed Russian original sources as well as on various other material—including the reports of Deboli, the Polish envoy in St. Petersburg—appears as a leitmotif throughout the work. It is also one of the work's weaknesses. In spite of the author's forceful presentation of his case, conclusive evidence of what transpired at the St. Petersburg court is unavailable. His argument must remain hypothetical: the problem cannot be solved as long as relevant Russian archives are closed. Furthermore, uncertainty on this question in turn affects other principal arguments which depend on this premise.

Stanislaus Augustus is also excoriated for his decision to accede to the Targowica Confederation at a time when continued military resistance remained possible. Łojek does not believe that the disproportion of strength between the invading Russians and the Polish army was large enough to render a successful defense impossible. Premature capitulation, based on the fear of a second partition which in any event was not averted, both quashed any possible organization of popular resistance of the kind that developed in 1794, and eliminated the chances for a negotiated settlement.

The patriot leaders are also faulted. Some, like Malachowski or I. Potocki, failed to influence the king sufficiently, allowing him to vacillate and eventually to come under the influence of defeatists. Kołłataj proved a mere political opportunist; others, fleeing into ignominious exile at a time when the army had not yet been beaten and when public opinion counted on their continued leadership, ensured the victory of the Russian-backed Targowica conservatives.

In spite of the fact that Łojek's polemics and passionately argued thesis are likely to fuel the controversy which has recently surrounded another of his works, this monograph is a serious and significant contribution to the history of the partitions. That it was published by the Institute of Literary Studies of the Ossolineum rather than by the Historical Institute, as might have been expected, is a minor point of curiosity.

ROMUALD J. MISIUNAS  
*Williams College*

ZBORNÍK ÚVAH A OSOBNÝCH SPOMIENOK O SLOVENSKOM NÁRODNOM POVSTANÍ. Edited by *Martin Kvetko* and *Miroslav Ján Ličko*. Toronto: Stála Konferencia Slovenských Demokratických Exulantov, 1976. 434 pp. Illus. \$10.80, paper. (Available from Dr. Martin Kvetko, c/o Czechoslovak Store, Inc., 1363 First Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10021.)

The Slovak National Uprising of 1944 is a significant, but controversial, theme of modern Slovak history. The uprising—the independent action by the newly formed bloc of forces of the Slovak national resistance movement—was provoked by their reluctance to wait passively for the end of the war, their desire to contribute to the defeat of Nazi Germany, and the need to demonstrate the will of the Slovak nation to act as a free agent in European affairs, as well as the autonomous partner of the Czechs in the newly liberated single state.

The uprising again came to play an important role in postwar Czechoslovakia: in the 1960s, the dispute over the interpretation of the background of the Slovak National Uprising and the revival of its tradition became a part of the reassessment of the system induced by the sociopolitical movement, whose aim it was to overcome

the heritage of Stalinism. These discussions, among others, culminated in the demand to federalize the state. For both Slovak and Czech historians, the great "comeback" of the uprising was concomitant with the process of their emancipation from the Communist ideology which had restricted the scope of historical inquiry, and which, for over fifteen years, had dictated the approach to, and conclusions of, historical research.

In the early 1970s, a Neo-Stalinist regime was restored, and with it strict control over work in the social sciences. This spelled stagnation for research concerned with the Slovak National Uprising. Moreover, the majority of historians, who had published relevant work regarding this topic in the 1960s, were dismissed from universities and research centers and were not allowed to publish. Consequently, research and publication of works concerning contemporary Slovak history (in which the freedom of scientific work is a matter of principle) have assumed crucial importance.

The greater, therefore, our debt of gratitude to those responsible for the publication of this collection containing recollections and studies of the Slovak National Uprising, which has seen the light of day because of the efforts of an organization of exiled Slovak Democrats.

The collection contains twenty contributions by fourteen authors; twelve of these can be classified as memoirs and were written by people who played a prominent role in the 1944 events either as political protagonists (in the non-Communist camp) or as military commanders and combatants. Each of these recollections yields relevant information for further historical study in this field and for the interpretation and critique of existing sources. In particular, the reflections and recollections by J. Lettrich, M. Kvetko, P. Beharka, and R. Frašťacký merit careful analysis. They are, by far, more informative than their recollections of the uprising published immediately after the war, at a time when they were collaborating with Communists in the National Front.

Of the historical studies, L. Lipscher's "The Participation of the Jews in the Resistance Movement in Slovakia" has brought to light new facts, as have two studies written by M. J. Ličko. One of them, concerned with the question of the aid accorded by the Allies to the Slovak National Uprising, treats one of the most complex questions of the uprising in great detail and with objectivity. Unfortunately, it has drawn only on the archival sources available in Czechoslovakia. Either the author was not aware of the valuable documentary material deposited in the Public Record Office in London, or he did not have the opportunity to make use of it.

Unfortunately, apart from M. Kvetko, the authors have failed to consider the complex of questions and problems arising in connection with the official establishment of the Slovak Republic and the issues within the context of Slovak political catholicism, which, even after the uprising, was an important political factor (as the 1946 elections made evident). It would also have been to the advantage of the collection if a critical review evaluating and classifying the existing extensive literature on the uprising had been included.

VILÉM PREČAN  
Munich

WINTER INTO SPRING: THE CZECHOSLOVAK PRESS AND THE REFORM MOVEMENT 1963–1968. By *Frank L. Kaplan*. East European Monographs, 29. Boulder, Colo.: *East European Quarterly*, 1977. viii, 208 pp. \$14.00. Distributed by Columbia University Press, New York.

Western students of Czechoslovakia generally agree that Czechoslovakia's communications media, especially the press and cultural periodicals, played a major role in the liberalization process that culminated in the "Czechoslovak Spring" of 1968. In his monograph, Professor Kaplan has gathered solid evidence in support of the above thesis.