

disillusionment. Yet the economic modernization carried on by Germany has laid the basis for much of Austria's postwar prosperity. Above all the book portrays the contradictions, tensions, cross-purposes, and internecine struggles of German policy in Austria—phenomena characteristic of Nazi rule everywhere, to be sure, but here proof that finally Hitler did not know what to do with his own native land any more than he did with his other conquests.

In sum, a major contribution.

PAUL W. SCHROEDER

*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*

FERENC DEÁK. By *Béla K. Király*. Twayne's World Leader Series. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1975. 243 pp. Bibliography. \$8.50 in U.S. \$9.35 elsewhere.

Every small European nation produced outstanding men who would receive more than passing attention in history books written in our country were they better known. Ferenc Deák usually rates one sentence as the Hungarian statesman whose negotiating skill produced the Compromise of 1867 and the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Few ever ask the obvious question: Who was Deák and what made him the universally accepted spokesman of his countrymen and also acceptable to Vienna? Those who ask this question would have great difficulty in finding a satisfactory answer in English unless they happen to discover the somewhat dated and overly adulatory work by Florence Foster-Arnold, *Francis Deák, A Hungarian Statesman: A Memoir*, published in London in 1880.

In presenting one of the major but insufficiently known historical figures to the English-speaking world, two basic approaches are possible. One is the scholarly monograph of which a good example—to remain within the limits of nineteenth-century Hungary—is the first volume of the planned two-volume work, *Stephen Széchenyi and the Awakening of Hungarian Nationalism, 1791–1841* by George Barany, published in 1968. The other approach is the one selected by Professor Király for his study of Deák—a less scholarly treatment, but a short work that makes it easy for the average reader to get acquainted with the protagonist. Professor Király can produce admirable scholarly monographs as proven by his *Hungary in the Late Eighteenth Century: The Decline of Enlightened Despotism* (1969). His choice of approaches was made consciously, and the author makes this clear in the preface. The reviewer must accept the author's decision to write a "popular" book this time and must judge the results of his efforts accordingly.

It is no easy task to write a good "popular" study that presents all the relevant and salient information in a relatively simple manner without sacrificing scholarship and accuracy. It is a pleasure to note that Professor Király succeeded in this difficult undertaking. Deák emerges from these pages not as a faultless, idealized knight in shining armor, but as a true human being with shortcomings, foibles, and idiosyncrasies, making him and his greatness even more understandable and admirable. By devoting most of the volume to Deák's political career prior to the crucial years of the mid-1860s, the author not only answers satisfactorily the question raised in the first paragraph of this review, but presents the reader with a picture of a true and amazingly consistent—even dogmatic—"classical" liberal of major magnitude. This is not only important for the understanding of Deák, but is also an important lesson in Hungarian history.

The liberalism of Deák and those who worked with him gave Hungarian politics a steady line from the calling of the Diet of 1830 to the Compromise of 1867, in spite of the violent upheavals and oppression of the events of 1848–49 and the Bach period.

It was the ideological position to which Deák and his friends retreated when necessary and from which they moved on again when the time was right.

Stressing this point, Professor Király also clearly shows that interpretations of Hungarian liberalism equating it with the leaders and programs of the Parliamentary Liberal Party, established in 1875, are wrong. By 1875, Deák and the other true liberals had faded from the scene, and "classical" liberalism's sun had set in Hungary.

The Compromise emerges from these considerations as significant, but certainly not as Deák's major achievement. It is depicted, correctly, as the result of long held principles, and, rather than a final solution, it was simply one more step in the right direction as far as its framers were concerned. Their goals and aims were betrayed by those whose task it became to make the dualist system work. This betrayal was the tragedy of the Habsburg land and of Europe as a whole.

To make issues, such as those mentioned above, clear in scholarly fashion in a book written on the "popular" level is no small accomplishment. A good chronological table and satisfactory bibliography as well as easily readable type add to the volume's value. The number of typographical errors and, in several cases, unfortunate phrasing must be noted on the negative side of the ledger. While the specialist will not learn much from Professor Király's book, general readers will finally learn who Deák was and why he and his work deserve to be remembered. They will turn to this study for information for many years to come.

PETER F. SUGAR

*University of Washington*

DER UNGARISCHE POPULISMUS. By *Gyula Borbándi*. Edited by *Georg Stadtmüller*. *Studia Hungarica*, Schriften des ungarischen Instituts, München, 7. Mainz: Verlag Hase & Koehler, 1976. 358 pp.

The author surveys Hungarian populism from 1919 to the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, when the extinct National Peasant Party, the political organ of Hungarian populism, was briefly reborn as the Petöfi Party only to disappear again once the János Kádár regime had been installed. Hungarian populism, in Borbándi's definition, included an enormously wide range of activities. It was the most significant and enduring literary and political movement in modern Hungary and differed from all others because it was the only one that had any substantial impact on the country's intellectual and political development. It was a movement that grew exclusively out of Hungarian intellectual experience, owing nothing to Western schools of thought, and in this respect it resembled several other populist movements in East Central Europe. Its supporters were acutely critical of the social and political conditions existing in Hungary and laid out very specific plans to cure them. Since it was the most important political and intellectual movement from the interwar period until immediately after World War II, Borbándi still sees populism as a beacon for the Hungarians of today.

Borbándi's analysis mirrors without distortion what was a highly complex and colorful movement. It was begun by young activists who found inspiration in how Béla Bartók collected folk songs of the Hungarians. It was influenced by the social criticism of the novelist Zsigmond Móricz, the poet Endre Ady, and the writer Dezső Szabó. The work of the village explorers became an integral part of it. Its spokesmen included such leading men of letters as Gyula Illyés, Zoltán Szabó, Lajos Nagy, Péter Veres, Imre Kovács, and Ferenc Erdei. Its support came from men of every religious persuasion from Roman Catholics to Jews, from literary figures of every stripe, from members of the gentry as well as the peasantry, from intellectuals bred on Western