

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

Transylvanian (p. 403); and so on. Small points, no doubt, but taken together they indicate a certain unfamiliarity with the subject.

As for subject matter, emphasis is given to political and administrative history and foreign affairs. There are some very good chapters here, particularly those concerned with the political evolution of the monarchy from 1648 to 1748 (in which Kann argues convincingly that the monarchy's beginnings as a great power should be dated from 1648 rather than 1700–1748), the reforms between 1740 and 1792 (which he treats as a single, unified period), and finally the *Ausgleich* and its ramifications, Austrian political life and administration, 1879–1914, and the history of the First World War—all of which are detailed and balanced accounts. Economic questions are by no means neglected, but they are accorded less importance and space than politics and foreign affairs. Cultural matters are not well integrated into the whole, and, except for the Austro-Germans, they tend to become catalogs of authors and their works. In those sections dealing with the cultural achievements of the non-Germans we discern the main weakness of Kann's treatment of the nationalities: he does not penetrate to the inner sources of their nationhood and individuality and is, therefore, unable to give a connected history of their development. Largely for this reason, the final chapter—which deals with cultural trends from the 1860s to 1918 and is intended to prove the point that the dissolution of the monarchy was neither the end of the old era nor the beginning of a new one—lacks the force intended by the author.

These reservations notwithstanding, the book, as a whole, is a useful addition to the literature in English on the Habsburg monarchy; indeed, it is the most extensive account we have for the period covered. The narrative is supplemented by a long, well-arranged bibliographical essay, stressing works in German, English, and French, and a valuable appendix containing population and nationality statistics and maps.

KEITH HITCHINS

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

THE ANSCHLUSS MOVEMENT 1918–1919 AND THE PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE. By *Alfred D. Low*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1974. xvi, 495 pp. \$8.00, paper.

This is an account of the abortive socialist-inspired movement to unite Austria and Germany in the final days of World War I and during the Paris Peace Conference.

The Anschluss movement of 1918–19 is less well known than the successful Nazi-inspired Anschluss movement in the 1930s. When the Germans occupied and annexed Austria in 1938, the Western press generally represented it as one more of Hitler's villainies perpetrated on an outraged but helpless Austrian people. Actually, the Anschluss movement had a long history, and the initiative toward it often came from the Austrians. It had its roots in the debates between the proponents of the "great" and the "small" German unification in the Frankfurt National Assembly in 1848. Bismarck, who was resolutely *kleindeutsch* in outlook, deliberately renounced any attempt to bring Austria into the Second German Empire. After unification, he ignored the agitation of Austrian Pan-Germans to return "home to the Empire" (*heim ins Reich*) and the movement subsided by the turn of the century. Toward the end of World War I when