

The author's only digression is the chapter on the revolution of 1848–49, essential for a better understanding of Eötvös's career both before and after this period. Although he took little part in the events, the account of the revolution illustrates well the differences between his position and that of Kossuth. Perhaps the best part of the book is the section devoted to what Mr. Bödy has to say about Eötvös's critique of nationalism. Not only is Eötvös placed in a broader East European context (for example, comparison to Palacky's doctrine on nationality), but the growing intellectual isolation of Eötvös, the minister, is also linked, in an excellent analysis, to the twilight of Hungarian liberalism.

Bödy's book is a major contribution to the extensive Eötvös literature. Unfortunately, however, even Mr. Bödy does not seem to be aware of D. Mervyn Jones's penetrating and meticulous textual analysis of Eötvös's chief theoretical work, *The Dominant Ideas of the 19th Century and their Influence on the State (1851–54)*.

LÓRÁNT CZIGÁNY
London

A MAGYARORSZÁGI SZOCIÁLDEMOKRATA PÁRT ÉS AS AGRÁR-KÉRDÉS—1900 ÉS 1914 KÖZÖTT. By *Dezső Farkas*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1973.

A MAGYARORSZÁGI SZOCIÁLDEMOKRATA PÁRT ELLENZÉKE ÉS TEVÉKENYSÉGE, 1906–1911. By *Lajos Varga*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1973.

Contemporary Marxist historians in Hungary have an avid interest in the period between the 1890s and 1914, a period that exhibited agrarian unrest in a countryside characterized by the extremes of landless millions and giant estates and the struggle of a majority of peasant landowners to survive on tiny, uneconomical plots. This period also witnessed the birth and growth of the Hungarian Social Democratic Party which, however, was primarily concerned with socialist education and organization of industrial workers in the cities.

The books by Dezső Farkas and Lajos Varga deal respectively with the agrarian position of the party and with its overall political tactics. Both are critical of the Social Democratic leadership, which, torn between faithful adherence to orthodox Marxism and the realities of a primarily agrarian country, alternated between emphasis on revolutionary rhetoric, strikes and demonstrations and a policy of compromises and negotiated deals.

The critical approach is certainly warranted in the case of the party's agrarian policy, described by Farkas in a thorough, scholarly, and well-documented, though somewhat dry manner. This well-organized book presents a methodical survey of views on the agrarian issue, including those of the party's opponents. But the emphasis is heavily on the arguments themselves, at the expense of the human drama involved in the agonizing ambivalence of the party leadership toward the peasantry. Nevertheless, the book focuses sharply on the confusion of opinions in the party, the doctrinaire rigidity of most leaders, and their inexcusable blindness to the real needs of millions of impoverished peasants.

Farkas's criticism is basically sound and valid in the theoretical sphere. It does not deal with the methods and tactics actually used by the party in the countryside. Such an omission, whether intentional or accidental, saves his book from the

pitfall confronting Varga's treatment of tactical issues in the party's uphill struggle. Apart from the syndicalist arguments of Ervin Szabó, a much respected theoretician but somewhat of an outsider, the bulk of discussions between the leadership and the opposition within the party did not concern doctrinal purity, as they were all orthodox Marxists. Rather, they argued about whether to apply the accelerator or the brake to the occasionally violent temper and radicalism of the industrial and agricultural proletariat. Varga has written an interesting, lively, and dynamic book on this subject. He carefully avoids painting a one-sided picture by acknowledging the genuinely socialist credentials of the leadership and the human frailties of the opposition, and of Gyula Alpári in particular. Yet he maintains the impossible assumption (pp. 114 and 186) that somehow a more radical socialist policy could have succeeded in pre-1914 Hungary. In fact, the socialist leadership could be faulted for doctrinaire rigidity, mistaken notions on many issues, misplaced trust in opponents, and occasional tactical errors, but their basic instinct toward caution was a critical choice of self-preservation over self-annihilation in the best interest of the Hungarian working class. This critical choice does not emerge in Varga's book because he treats the Social Democratic Party in isolation. He ignores, just as Gyula Alpári did, the decision-making responsibilities of the party leadership, which were ultimately determined not by quotations from Marx or Kautsky but by the reality of the Hungarian political situation, where the party was smothered by a combination of generally hostile press and national and local authorities, from cabinet ministers down to the village gendarmes.

In conclusion, both books are important and valuable contributions to our knowledge of the period immediately preceding World War I. However, neither a purely theoretical nor a somewhat unhistorical approach can do full justice to the complex problem of Hungarian socialism at the turn of the century.

GABOR VERMES
Rutgers University, Newark

A MOVE: EGY JELLEGZETES MAGYAR FASISZTA SZERVEZET, 1918–1944. By *Rudolfné Dósa*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1972. 228 pp. + 24 pp. photographs. 60 Ft.

A BUDAPESTI LIBERÁLIS ELLENZÉK, 1919–1944. By *Zsuzsa L. Nagy*. *Értekezések a történeti tudományok köréből*. Új sorozat, 59. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1972. 178 pp. 22 Ft., paper.

Both works deal with the same period—the years between the two World Wars—and both deal with the Hungarian middle classes. Hungary developed two middle classes as a result of the “Ausgleich,” and the Trianon (Versailles) Peace Treaty. On one hand, there was a non-Western, reactionary, gentry-aping middle class (the hotbed of Hungarian fascism); and on the other, a more Westernized middle class about 90 percent Jewish. Rudolfné Dósa's work describes the reactions of the non-Western middle class to the challenges of the twentieth century, while Zsuzsa Nagy deals with the weak self-defense of the predominantly Jewish middle class against the aggressive actions of the reactionary middle class.

By and large, one can only applaud the efforts of Hungarian historians in recent years to deal with this “sensitive” period. Dósa has chosen, quite appropriately, a powerful, paramilitary social organization, the MOVE (one out of 10,000)