

centuries, when Habsburg (non-Turkish) Hungary consisted of little more than Croatia and Slovakia, there was a numerous Slovak-speaking Hungarian nobility, comprising gentry as well as magnates, and this nobility played an important political and cultural role in the country. Even in the eighteenth century a Slovak, Matej Bél (1684–1749), was the foremost scholar in the country.

In the second volume, covering the period of national awakening (1790–1848), Gogolák provides an excellent analysis of the roots of modern Slovak nationalism. He identifies the Slovak Protestants as the original ideologists of Czechoslovak unity and Pan-Slavism, both of which he regards as spurious movements. He shows no more patience with the exaggerations of Slovak nationalist historiography than with the distortions of Magyar and Czech nationalist historians. He dismisses the Slovak national uprising of 1848 in one sentence, and relegates the monumental work about the insurrection by Daniel Rapant, the foremost Slovak nationalist historian, to a single footnote. He pairs it there with an Hungarian account of the event and dismisses both as nationalist propaganda. In this cavalier treatment he shows a serious lack not only of a sense of proportion but also of psychological insight. It is true that the Slovak national insurrection was only a small episode in the total picture of war and revolution in Hungary in 1848–49, but it was the first conscious Slovak attempt to determine their fate with arms in hand. As such, it exercised a strong influence on the imagination of later generations of Slovak nationalists.

The last volume, covering the period from 1848 to 1918 during which Slovak national development reached its nadir, is the least satisfactory. Gogolák is at his best in dealing with the Slovak elites. In the second half of the nineteenth century, however, there no longer was a Slovak-speaking nobility, and the Slovak intelligentsia lapsed into silence under the relentless pressure of Magyarization. There remained the concerns of the Slovak masses. But these were mainly economic and social. They do not appear to interest Gogolák, who seems completely untouched by his exposure to Marxist historiography in Hungary before 1956. Thus he says nothing about the vast Slovak emigration to the United States and its causes and impact on Slovak life. His treatment of the Slovak movement for independence during World War I is perfunctory. Although he is generally free of the shibboleths of Hungarian nationalism, he invokes those old bugaboos of Hungarian revisionism—Masaryk's trickery and the obtuseness of Allied policy—to explain the collapse of Hungarian rule in Slovakia.

To write history without provoking controversy is scarcely possible. Although this reviewer does not fully agree with Gogolák's interpretation of Slovak history, he finds his book an impressive tour de force of historical writing. It is the most ambitious scholarly synthesis of modern Slovak history ever written in a Western language, and is likely to remain unsurpassed for a long time.

VICTOR S. MAMATEY
University of Georgia

REFORM RULE IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA: THE DUBČEK ERA, 1968–1969.

By *Galia Golan*. New York and London: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
vii, 327 pp. \$18.50.

Reading the story of the proposed reforms, and their shattering collapse, one is impressed by their completeness, consistency, and imaginativeness, as well as

puzzled by the relative ease with which brutal force relegated them to the archives of history. The reformers, who in the period before the Spring of 1968 exchanged theories in scholarly journals, came to realize that reform in one area can succeed only if it is accompanied by a radical change in other areas. Democratization of economy, as the author characterizes a set of progressive proposals in the economic sector, cannot succeed without changes in the political life, and this in turn must materially affect the position and the role of the party. Political freedom cannot exist without a system of independent justice. A representative government, protected constitutionally from party pressure, must be responsible to the National Assembly, the supreme organ of the country. The press must be entirely free to make the desires of conflicting interests known—for they exist, contrary to Communist theory, even in a socialist country. These were rather bold and far-reaching thoughts and very concrete propositions, advanced by the reformers as they put to test both the theory and practice of all other Communist systems. They were embodied, with some qualifications and de-emphasis, in the famous Action Program in April.

Another significant factor made the Czechoslovak experiment unique. While the pre-1968 debates signaled what Professor Golan calls a “revolution from above,” the 1968 developments turned into a mass movement, a public cause which received active support from all strata of the populace.

It now appears obvious—and it is strange that the reformers themselves, trained in Lenin’s dictum on “objective evaluation of the situation,” failed to perceive the Soviet attitude—that Moscow and its inflexible allies could not tolerate the moves that ran contrary to their concepts and practices. Nevertheless, even after the invasion, the spirit of reform persisted, and the unity of the nation manifested itself in a fashion that did not permit any doubts about its position. Why was the struggle finally, in April 1969, buried? A combination of pressure, opportunism, and dissension among reformers accounts for the sad results.

Galia Golan’s book tells all this and much more in a most readable manner. It is one of the best on this subject. She presents the case in its entirety, giving the reader a concise picture and inviting him to ask questions on prospects and methods of change in a Communist society—questions which perhaps she herself could have raised. Based exclusively on original sources, mainly newspapers and journals, her narrative has a ring of authenticity, strengthened by a sense of detachment, together with an understanding of a noble effort that failed.

JOSEF KORBEL
University of Denver

THE AUSTRO-SLAV REVIVAL: A STUDY OF NINETEENTH-CENTURY LITERARY FOUNDATIONS. By *Stanley B. Kimball*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society Held at Philadelphia for Promoting Useful Knowledge, new series, vol. 63, part 4. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, November, 1973. 83 pp. \$4.00, paper.

This analytical and comparative study is concerned with the history, organization, activity, and achievements of the most important literary foundations (*matica*) of the Slavic peoples in the Austro-Hungarian Empire during the period of their national revivals in the nineteenth century. It contains a considerably detailed and chronologically organized analysis of Serbian, Czech, Moravian, Croatian, Slovak,