

the Radom Workers, the emigration or expulsions of intellectuals from East Germany, the influence of President Carter's emphasis on human rights, the new Moscow trials, and the way in which each regime tries to isolate its respective dissidents. All these developments are foreshadowed in Jiri Pelikan's perceptive preface, and confirm his basic point, namely that opposition in Eastern Europe, and particularly in Czechoslovakia, is on the increase, and that democratic forces in the West, particularly the West European Left, should join forces with them.

Much of what has happened recently, however, tends to challenge (at least in part) one of Pelikan's implicit and sometimes explicit theses: that the significant opposition in Eastern Europe is essentially socialist, and that there is universal value in the Czechoslovak example of reform within the party leading to a new alliance with the masses. In fact, not only the great majority of Soviet dissidents (with the exception of the Medvedev brothers and their group) rejects the very idea of socialism, but in Poland and Czechoslovakia itself, liberal and nationalist forces seem as important to the new opposition movements as socialist ones. On the other hand, the idea that reform must start within the ruling Communist Party and that the hopes of democratization lie with the moderate wing of the latter has been eloquently challenged, precisely in a debate with Pelikan, by the young Polish historian and dissident Adam Michnik, at the "56" Conference held in Paris in November 1976. His thesis is that "revisionism," as it was understood in Poland in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968, is dead, and that the only hope now lies in society taking the initiative and forcing the ruling elite to compromise (see Michnik's article "The New Evolutionism," in *Survey*, 22, no. 3/4 [100/101] [Summer/Autumn 1976]: 267-77).

The two theses are not exactly contradictory, but they do show a difference in emphasis between the two movements, and Charter 1977 may be seen as a Czechoslovak move in the direction indicated by Michnik. The recent accent on human rights similarly transcends the classical oppositions between right and left, socialists and nonsocialists. Similar differences or shifts of emphasis can be observed in the attitudes of East European dissidents toward Eurocommunism or toward détente: the Czechoslovaks and the East Germans seem the most favorable, the majority of the Russians the most hostile, the Poles and the Hungarians more divided or more reserved in their judgment.

One of the most interesting subjects to be studied today may be the comparison between the attitudes of the various opposition movements in Eastern Europe. Pelikan's volume has made an important, albeit partial, contribution to this study by asking all the right general questions and by providing ample documentation and a lucid analysis about the Czechoslovak answers to these questions.

PIERRE HASSNER

*Centre d'Études et de Recherches Internationales, Paris*

A MAGYAR KÖZIGAZGATÁS FEJLŐDÉSE A XVIII. SZÁZADTÓL A TANÁCSRENDSZER LÉTREJÖTTÉIG. By *Andor Csizmadia*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976. 560 pp. 122 Ft.

This important, pragmatic study, published in 1976, was completed four years earlier by a civil servant of many years' standing and a lifelong student and teacher of his subject. Ever since his first article was published in 1936 (apart from a brief gap between 1947 and 1950), Andor Csizmadia has been coming out year after year with books, pamphlets, and articles on the theories, laws, institutions, and practices of Hungarian public administration, on plans for its reform, and on its successes and failures. Some of his writings have dealt with periods as early as the reign of King Matthias Corvinus (1458-90), but the focus of his interest, as in the present case, has been the years since the Compromise of 1867. He is a productive, precise, and practical

scholar, many of whose works have appeared in both West and East European-language translations.

The present book covers the development of a modern and increasingly professional civil service and public administration, a process that began immediately after Hungary's liberation from Ottoman occupation at the end of the seventeenth century. Later, the ideas of Joseph von Sonnenfels influenced the shaping of theories of public administration and advanced education in the subject. This statesman and scholar, however, based himself exclusively on the Habsburg hereditary provinces and never delved into Hungary. Specifically, Hungarian theories and practices had to evolve separately, and eventually did so. They were interrelated with Hungarians' efforts to preserve the autonomous status of Hungary's government and public administration within the Habsburg Empire.

The author carefully explains constitutional law, administrative institutions, and day-to-day practice and puts them into historical perspective. Csizmadia presents his findings with historical objectivity and includes every phase of Hungarian public administration in his account. Thus he expounds on the revolutionary regime of 1848–49, the neoabsolutism of the Bach government, the administration of dualist Hungary, the Béla Kun regime, the Horthy era, and the present system.

The author has had to marshal a vast amount of material. His approach is descriptive, and he properly, if briefly, analyzes each case. Historical, political, social, and economic factors all enter into his analyses. There is no synthesis, but what valid synthesis is possible of a system that has undergone such changes? Perhaps there is one: regimes change, but since its consolidation in the nineteenth century the civil service system has endured.

The book, prepared for the professional, is so clearly and attractively written that it should prove useful and accessible equally to the layman. Csizmadia's pioneering and comprehensive study is a significant contribution to the understanding of Hungarian government and deserves to be well received.

BÉLA K. KIRÁLY

*Brooklyn College and Graduate School, CUNY*

ALBUM ELÉMER MÁLYUSZ. Studies presented to the International Commission for the History of Representative and Parliamentary Institutions, no. 56. Székesfehérvár-Budapest, 1972. Brussels: Les Éditions de la Librairie Encyclopédique, 1976. xxiii, 404 pp.

The International Commission for the Study of Representative and Parliamentary Institutions was established at the 1933 International Historical Congress in Warsaw, Poland. It was founded on the initiative of Professor É. Lousse of France and with the assistance of, among others, two Hungarian historians: Ferenc Eckhart, professor of constitutional and legal history at the University of Budapest, and E. Mályusz, professor of medieval Hungarian history at the same institution. Of the two Hungarian scholars, only Professor Mályusz is alive today. Thus, when contemplating the publication of the papers presented at its 1972 congress, the commission decided to dedicate the volume to its only surviving Hungarian founder. The commission's decision was both wise and warranted, for if any one of Hungary's living historians deserves this honor, it is undoubtedly Professor Mályusz.

As the founder of the so-called Hungarian ethnohistory school during the interwar period—the first significant Hungarian rival of the German-inspired and German-oriented *Geistesgeschichte* school—and as the author of numerous weighty and pioneering studies on various aspects of medieval and early modern social, cultural, and institutional history, Mályusz's contributions to Hungarian historiography are matched by very few of his predecessors and contemporaries in East Central Europe.