

though these events are familiar to students of East European affairs, the narrative is extraordinarily interesting because of the author's special qualifications for writing about the *modus operandi* of Communist diplomacy and the intricacies of policy-making in a small country under Moscow's thumb. The author was a member of the Hungarian foreign service for two decades and was Hungarian chargé d'affaires in Washington from 1962 to 1967. Subsequently he received a Ph.D. from Stanford University and is now associate professor of history at Mississippi State University. He was an inside observer of, or an active participant in, most events discussed in the volume. This special background he has supplemented by thorough research of documents and other publications available in the United States.

The book discusses questions of far wider interest than its title indicates. The narrative shows a connection between the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 and the Hundred Flowers policy in China. Although the Chinese may have sympathized with the Hungarians in the early stage of the revolt, Radványi relates that by the end of October an urgent message from Mao Tse-tung asked the hesitant Khrushchev for quick action "to smash the counterrevolutionary rebellion in Hungary." Several examples illuminate the strong Chinese interest and influence in East European affairs even before 1956. Chairman Mao mentioned to a Hungarian delegation in May 1959 his long-standing argument with Stalin over the leadership question in Eastern Europe. Although Stalin preferred to install Moscow-educated leaders of the Rákosi type, Mao considered homegrown leaders like Kádár to be more desirable.

The description of meetings of the heads of all the Communist embassies in Washington during the Cuban missile crisis reveals the ignorance of the Soviet ambassador, Anatolii Dobrynin, about Soviet policies in Cuba. Mikoyan's account, to the same group, of his stormy negotiations with Castro after the crisis is even more interesting. Mikoyan told the Communist ambassadors in Washington that the missile deployment had aimed at defending Castro and "at achieving a definite shift in the power relationship between the socialist and the capitalistic worlds."

Although Kádár fully supported Soviet foreign policy, Hungarian diplomacy had leeway to maneuver during Radványi's tenure in Washington, mainly because Moscow followed a less anti-American policy than Budapest did. Kádár apparently had more common sense during negotiations with Washington than lesser leaders in the Hungarian Communist Party. Eventually a political amnesty in Hungary, combined with the flexible attitude of some State Department officials and senators, made possible the improvement of United States-Hungarian relations—a practical precondition for removal of the Hungarian question from the General Assembly's agenda and full recognition of the Kádár government by the United Nations. All in all, this book is "must" reading for students interested in the working conditions of Communist diplomacy and the linkage between Communist Party organs and the implementation of foreign policy.

STEPHEN D. KERTESZ  
*University of Notre Dame*

FRAGMENTARIUM ILUMINIST. By *Dumitru Ghișe* and *Pompiliu Teodor*. Cluj: Editura Dacia, 1972. 245 pp. Lei 9.50.

The influence of the Enlightenment on the Rumanians of the Principalities and Transylvania has been one of the most important and fruitful preoccupations of

Rumanian historians since 1945. Beginning with the pioneering synthesis published by Dumitru Popovici in that year, new researches and interpretations have revealed a fusion of European and autochthonous cultural and intellectual currents that may properly be defined as the "Rumanian Enlightenment." The present volume of essays takes stock of what this new direction in scholarship has accomplished over the past quarter-century and at the same time makes its own significant contribution to the study of the phenomenon in Transylvania.

The first essay reviews the high points of recent historiography on the Rumanian Enlightenment and seeks to establish its unique intellectual and social dimensions. The authors recognize the critical importance of Popovici's reinterpretation of it as a general cultural movement closely attached to the French *lumières*, but they find themselves in fuller accord with the corrective to this view offered by David Prodan, who emphasizes the close links between Transylvania and the German-Austrian *Aufklärung* and the value of the native Rumanian contribution. Ghișe and Teodor also point to the significance of the *Frühaufklärung* in Transylvania, which manifested itself in the national political program of Bishop Inocențiu Micu. They characterize the Rumanian Enlightenment proper, which they date from the 1770s to the 1820s, as a period of the laicization of culture, religious nonconformity, and a general questioning of traditional social and political forms, and demonstrate its affinities with the general eighteenth-century movement of ideas.

The three succeeding essays deal with the major figures of the Rumanian Enlightenment—Samuil Micu, Gheorghe Șincai, and Petru Maior. The first presents a full-length portrait of the Rumanian man of the Enlightenment. The reconstitution of Micu's intellectual formation and the analysis of his historical and philosophical works in their relation to the new currents of thought penetrate deeply into the spirit of the age. The treatment accorded Șincai is less original, and the bulk of the piece consists of a detailed examination of his *Natural Science as a Means of Abolishing Superstition Among the People*, which Ghișe and Teodor regard as a characteristic product of the Enlightenment, because its author advocates reason as the key to human progress. The essay on Petru Maior places the Rumanian *Aufklärer* firmly in a European context, as the effects of the Catholic Enlightenment, Josephinism, and Gallicanism on his historical writings are made evident. Maior is treated as a harbinger of the new age of Romanticism, since his most influential work, *The History of the Origins of the Rumanians in Dacia*, is suffused with emotion and the national ideal, even though his historical conception and method continue to be in the tradition of the Enlightenment. The final essay summarizes the role of the Rumanian *Aufklärer* in promoting popular education, an activity which the authors consider a hallmark of the Rumanian Enlightenment.

Although the collection as a whole concentrates on Transylvanian problems, several of the pieces, especially the one on Petru Maior, make valuable additions to the general historiography of the Enlightenment. Through their broadness of outlook the authors place themselves in the European tradition of Popovici and Prodan.

KEITH HITCHINS  
*University of Illinois, Urbana*