

eyes: "Son of working-class parents, brought up and educated in the Soviet Union, loyal *apparatchik*, university in Moscow, a man whose regard for Russia had always been quite unconditional, who seemed, in many ways, more Russian than Czechoslovak" (p. 141). Yet, as Shawcross points out, despite Dubček's great love for all things Soviet, doubts had crept into his mind concerning the practice of communism. Slovak patriot, partisan, organizer of the independent Slovak Communist Party during the war, Dubček resented the return of Czech centralism following the Communist seizure of power in Prague in 1948. The continued conflict with the Czechs disturbed him even more during the long Novotný era (1953–67). Antonín Novotný, the Czech boss of the Czechoslovak Party, was not only unfair to the Slovaks but also resisted de-Stalinization. This gave Dubček, a faithful follower of Khrushchev's more liberal policies, an additional reason to dislike Novotný. Yet, with his sense of duty to the party, Dubček was loyal enough to the Prague regime to be able to climb steadily in the Communist hierarchy.

Dubček, the sentimental Communist, loved the party dearly and wanted everyone to love it. When, with Soviet blessings, he succeeded Novotný in January 1968 as first secretary of the party, Dubček dedicated himself to correcting Novotný's mistakes. The Prague Spring was not of his making, but Dubček shared its sense of euphoria and endorsed the idea of a "socialism with a human face." The reformers in Prague thought that even freedom of the press could be compatible with communism. The Soviet-educated Dubček would never have dreamed of such heresies. But he sided with the heretics and saw no reason why the Kremlin should be upset with Prague's unorthodoxy. The party after all was finally doing what the people wanted, and as a result the party was loved by the people as never before. At least that is what Dubček thought, and he argued accordingly with Leonid Brezhnev and his Kremlin associates.

Shawcross's interpretation makes good sense in explaining Dubček's role in the Prague Spring. He is somewhat less successful in dealing with the Dubček problem in the summer showdown with the Soviet Union. Shawcross justifiably sees Dubček mainly as a man growing in stature, yet he rightly notes that Dubček "is a small town politician rather than an international or even national statesman, a man who feels much more at ease amongst his family in Slovakia than on his own in Bohemia" (p. 83). Of course, Dubček's limited sophistication was not a cause of the Russian armed intervention of 1968. The much more sophisticated Edvard Beneš was no more successful in averting the catastrophes of 1938 and 1948. The causes of Czech and Slovak misfortunes are deeply rooted in the tragic structure of Central European history. The Dubček drama cannot be fully comprehended except in that broader context. Such historical perspective is missing from Shawcross's Dubček biography. Incidentally, he regrettably omits the diacritical marks in Czech and Slovak spelling.

STEPHEN BORSODY
Chatham College

DIE SLOVAKISCHE GESCHICHTSWISSENSCHAFT NACH 1945. By
Horst Glassl. Veröffentlichungen des Osteuropa-Institutes München, vol. 37.
Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1971. 166 pp. DM 28, paper.

In 1962 *Historische Zeitschrift* inaugurated a series of special volumes (*Sonderhefte*) devoted to historiographical surveys. Four volumes have appeared so far

(vols. 1–4, Oldenbourg Verlag, Munich, 1962–70), and Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union are well represented. Czechoslovakia is among the countries covered: Sonderheft number 3 (1968) contains, among other contributions, a twenty-page survey of Slovak historiography by Horst Glassl; and number 4 (1970), written by Ferdinand Seibt, is devoted exclusively to Czech historiography. Glassl's account has now been issued in a much expanded form as a separate volume by Harrasowitz, and may be regarded as a companion piece to Seibt. Both volumes survey the historical output published since 1945. Seibt covers the works dealing with Czech history from the earliest times to the outbreak of World War II, and Glassl's terminal year for Slovak history is 1918. Most of the works reviewed by Glassl are monographs and articles published in Czechoslovakia, but studies published by Western historians also command his attention, and there are a few references to émigré Slovak material.

A volume of this nature on any one of the "established" European nationalities could be regarded as just another historiographical survey. Not so a volume on Slovakia. Before 1945 serious accounts of Slovak history usually began only with the period of national awakening around the year 1800, and the story of Slovakia's past was little more than an appendage to Czech history. It is one of the paradoxes of Slovak historiography that it fell to the Marxists—by definition committed to internationalism rather than nationalism—to redress this imbalance and to develop an overall conception of Slovak national history. This conception reaches back as far as the period of the Greater Moravian Empire in the ninth century. Earlier historiography did not identify this empire specifically with either the Czech or the Slovak element, but the Slovak consensus today is—as Glassl shows—that this state was basically created and inhabited by the forefathers of the present-day Slovaks. In other words, the Slovaks have more or less appropriated for themselves Greater Moravia, with all its achievements and its contributions to Christianity (Cyril and Methodius!). There is a striking resemblance here to the Kievan State and its role in Russian and Ukrainian history. Doubtless some of the findings of Slovak scholars will have to be modified, but nothing is likely to change the fact that the Slovaks now have a past to call their own. To show how this past has been reconstructed in all its important aspects is the chief merit of Glassl's volume. He has helped to etch the Slovaks into Europe's consciousness. One only hopes that their newly found sense of history will not make them too extravagant in staking out a place for themselves in European history.

STANLEY Z. PECH

University of British Columbia

THE RAGUSAN REPUBLIC: VICTIM OF NAPOLEON AND ITS OWN CONSERVATISM. By *Harriet Bjelovučić*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970. 184 pp. 32 Dutch guilders, paper.

This study attempts to show how, between 1750 or 1760 and 1813, the history of Ragusa (Dubrovnik) fits into the pattern of Robert R. Palmer's well-known thesis of a Western democratic revolution initiated during the same general period in large parts of Western and Central Europe and the Americas. In particular, the author sees a close analogy between the Ragusan and Genevan revolutionary patterns, which she explains by the similarity of the political and social institutions