

detailed account should be greatly appreciated, since it corrects several previous biased versions. His effort to base the book on primary sources and interviews with eyewitness participants, and reviews of extensive bibliographical accounts, makes it more valuable.

Since the Russian sources are inaccessible, this account relies heavily on Polish materials, but is comprehensive enough to be reliable. The book is well annotated and has a detailed index. It can be read with confidence and great benefit by general readers and students, as well as historians.

LUDVIK NEMEC

*Rosemont College and Chestnut Hill College*

DĚLNICKÉ HNUTÍ V ČESKÝCH ZEMÍCH DO ROKU 1918. By *Eva Myšková*. Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1973. 107 pp. Kčs. 8, paper.

This book, a short survey of Czech history from 1848 to 1918 with emphasis on the labor and socialist movement, presents neither new concepts nor unknown facts. The book is, however, an important document. As one of the official handbooks on Marxism, approved by the Prague Ministry of Education for Czech Universities, it indicates the possibilities and limitations of historical writing in a country occupied for five years by the Soviet army.

The book's description of a key era in modern Czech history concretely and concisely indicates the degree to which the new leadership in Czechoslovakia finds it necessary to adapt historiography to contemporary political needs. In this regard, the omission of the thesis about the causal relation between the Russian Revolution and the origin of Czechoslovakia is the first pleasant surprise. The slogan, "Without the Russian Revolution of 1917 it would never have been Czechoslovakia of 1918," coined in the public communications media in 1950, became for more than a decade a must for all textbooks and surveys of modern Czechoslovak history, and the starting point for many publications and theses.

Other omissions, however, are of a different kind. This holds true particularly of Masaryk's role in the birth of the Czechoslovak republic. The omission of the names from the bibliographical notes of all Czech historians of the labor and socialist movement who were active in Dubček's Prague Spring is typical of present-day historiography in Czechoslovakia.

The most significant flaw lies in the account of the Czech national movement, which the author has described in hackneyed phrases. The analysis of the national problems in the early phases of the Czech socialist movement is faulty. The fact that the Marxist and international orientation of J. B. Pecka's and L. Zápotocký's faction was defeated during the first Congress of the Czech Social Democrats in 1878 is completely distorted. This misrepresentation has traditionally appeared in almost all studies devoted to the history of the Czech socialist movement published in recent decades. It has sprung presumably not only from political opportunism but also from an erroneous and superficial interpretation of documents.

GEORGE J. SVOBODA

*Richmond, California*