

in Moscow. Subsequent political events made the realization of this understanding impossible.

Juzwenko's book is an important contribution to the history of Polish-Russian relations of this period. The author shows great objectivity in presenting the actual course of events.

WACŁAW JĘDRZEJEWICZ
Piłsudski Historical Institute, New York

ECONOMIC REFORMS IN POLISH INDUSTRY. By *Janusz G. Zielinski*. Institute of Soviet and East European Studies, University of Glasgow. Economic Reforms in East European Industry series. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1973. xxxvi, 333 pp. \$21.00.

This is not an easy book to read—certainly not one for the general reader and rather heavy going even for the average undergraduate. But for all serious students of East European economies this study is a valuable addition to the existing literature on this subject.

Dr. Zielinski's analysis quite often transcends the narrower boundaries of economic reforms in Polish industry to deal with more general aspects of Communist planned economies and their uphill struggle to evolve more rational methods of planning and management. In this respect his book is also a highly promising forerunner of a series of monographs on economic reforms in East European countries which Alec Nove intends to publish.

Yet the book also has some weaknesses. The author is apparently so absorbed in the finer points of various reform measures adopted in Poland since October 1956 that he pays scant attention to the political aspect of the problem. But in no country of Eastern Europe has the issue of economic reforms been so closely intertwined with the perennial political in-fighting among the ruling elite as in Poland. Zielinski is obviously aware of this interconnection (a brief glossary of the main political events for 1956–71 is included as a part of the introduction). Yet—almost deliberately—he dismisses the pertinent political factors from his subsequent analysis.

Thus the reader gets the impression that the process of reforming the Polish economy was a continuous one, although we have witnessed in Poland not less than four separate attempts at evolving four different reform models (in 1956–58, 1964–66, 1968–70, and the fourth which began in 1971) divided by two periods of dogmatic restoration and one of major political upheaval (the workers' revolt in December 1970, which put an end to fourteen years of Gomułka's rule). In each case (except perhaps for the workers' revolt) the main motives for abandoning the previous reform model were much more political than economic.

But apart from this analytical flaw (which admittedly is a question of approach), Zielinski's book is undoubtedly the best and the most comprehensive study of economic reforms in Poland published in the West. His detailed and penetrating analysis of the various aspects of the new economic model (or models) provides fascinating reading for any specialist on this subject, although he or she might not always agree with the author's conclusions. Especially valuable is his chapter on planning at the branch and enterprise level—if only because most of the existing literature tends to overemphasize the macro-economic approach to the problem of economic reforms.

Apart from its very considerable analytical value, Zielinski's book is also a gold mine of statistical information on various aspects of Polish economy. Most of these data have been accessible to Western scholars in the past only if they could read Polish fluently. This reference material is an additional windfall, which should prove very helpful to many serious students of East European economies.

MICHAEL GAMARNIKOW
Radio Free Europe, Munich

IDEA NÁRODA V HUSITSKÝCH ČECHÁCH. By *František Šmahel*. České Budějovice: Růže, 1971. 230 pp. Kčs. 30, paper.

The precocious emergence of a Czech nation in the fifteenth century, both as idea and as fact, has long been recognized as a problem requiring explanation. The author enlarges this problem into a problematical complex: What were the components of the national idea? What social groups formed the idea? To how much of Czech society did it apply? What were its similarities and differences with other national ideas of the time? With the modern idea? The inquiry is based on a sound combination of semantic and historical analysis, embracing in fact much of the course of Hussite history from the late fourteenth century through the reign of George of Poděbrady, with full and erudite attention to all late-medieval parallels. We see how a national idea originally conceived as a linguistic differential (*jazyk český*), and developed as the self-consciousness of university masters and nobles, passed through the Hussite experience into a mode of religious self-consciousness extensible to all social groups of the Hussite people—even at times to its non-Hussite compatriots. Thus in certain temporary contexts the national idea prevailed over the social and religious categories. Hence the Czechs were indeed “ahead” of other groups destined to become nations, even though it would be wrong, for the reasons here implied, to identify their national idea with the modern one.

The substance of the book was originally published in English in *Historica*, volumes 16 and 17 (Prague, 1969); this is a revision and expansion. It is a solid piece of work, far more comprehensive, sophisticated, and scholarly than any previous treatment. In its own terms it is definitive. Its limits would lie in its problematics, about which historians may reasonably differ. There is the old question about the usefulness of attacking the categories of medieval self-consciousness with the peculiarly disjunctive categories of our own. It seems to me useful only when ideas are systematically ideologized, something that cannot be done by semantic analysis. And there are those who believe, with Durkheim, that the totemic force is that of society rather than that of the totem itself: does it matter, then, whether the totem is this or that? Šmahel himself is scrupulously diffident about the substantive autonomy of the national idea that he disengages from the sources, and often gives the impression that only his program keeps him from dissolving his construction of an idea into straight history.

HOWARD KAMINSKY
Florida International University