

This declaration for a time effectively closed the period of overt intelligence warfare between Poland and Germany. Kopczyk takes the view that the Hitler-Piłsudski pact was a maneuver on Hitler's part to secure a period of peace essential to his military preparations, and to neutralize Poland (p. 7).

This book deals primarily with the pre-Nazi period; the Weimar government was still viewed by the world as nationally pacific and domestically inept. Kopczyk's monograph is based on the examination of Polish police and intelligence records as well as the German and Polish press. The author shows the concentration of German intelligence activity in social, political, cultural, financial, and even sports organizations, as well as assorted amateur intelligence agents who contributed to the Weimar intelligence network. The activities of these organizations and individuals in Pomerania were associated with the Irredentist movement, which was popular among the German people. Kopczyk's method of aggregation has been nicely achieved by pointing out and tracing the extensive web of military and political efforts directed by the Weimar government against Poland.

RICHARD A. WOYTAK

University of California, Santa Barbara

UMĚNÍ BAROKU V ČECHÁCH. By *Oldřich J. Blažíček*. Prague: Obelisk, 1971. 196 pp. Kčs. 150.

The main endeavor of Czech art historians is channeled, quite appropriately, into two periods—the fourteenth-century late Gothic and the eighteenth-century late baroque. For in these two periods, art in Bohemia reached an international level of accomplishment. Czech researchers have attempted synthetic presentations and written monographs on such leading artists as painters Petr Brandl, V. V. Reiner, and Jan Kupecký and sculptors M. B. Braun and F. M. Brokof—the architects faring less well.

Professor Blažíček's text was first published in German, French, and English editions by Artia in 1967, and it was only in 1971 that the Czech edition appeared, perhaps betraying the pragmatism of the *dirigeants* of culture. Blažíček divides his material into five parts, determined more or less historically. He has assembled an astonishing wealth of information, managing to cover even lesser-known artists and those of lesser interest. In each of the chapters he first discusses architecture, then sculpture and painting. His simultaneous discussion is especially rewarding for the style in which the three arts interacted particularly closely.

With an objective and unbiased approach, Blažíček does not try at all cost to make a case for a unique Czech character of style, a claim that would, of course, be absurd, especially for the early period, where the very names of the artists reveal their North Italian and Tyrolean origin. Some of the families became naturalized in Prague, unquestionably the artistic center of the land. Since the commissioners from among the new nobility and clergy were foreigners themselves, the influx from abroad continued throughout the entire period, turning then more to South German and Saxonian newcomers. Especially in architecture, the Italian influence is unrivaled. Strangely enough, eighteenth-century Flemish art, with its exuberant sculpture, had a minimal impact on Bohemia, contrary to our expectation, since Habsburgs ruled both territories. The baroque art of Bohemia is also studied by German and Austrian *Kunstgeschichte*, because of its

ties with those neighboring regions. It is a pity that Blažíček did not enlarge the scope of his study to include Moravia.

The choice of illustrations is well balanced, and only a minor criticism should be voiced concerning the unnecessarily large size of some of the ground plans. Reduction of this megalomania would provide space for additional works of general appeal such as the Prague Loreta, Brokof's Moors, or those large altar-pieces whose dazzling complexity of form Blažíček overlooks as a subject of study.

MOJMÍR S. FRINTA

State University of New York at Albany

THE POLITICS OF CULTURE. By *Antonín J. Liehm*. Translated by *Peter Kussi*. Illustrations by *Adolf Hoffmeister*. Introduction by *Jean-Paul Sartre*. New York: Grove Press, 1972. iii, 412 pp. \$10.00.

In reading Sartre's introduction to Liehm's volume one cannot help raising an interesting question: Is Sartre naïve or is he a true seer? (In the heat of battle seers always seem either naïve or to harbor at the very least an unrecognizable death or destruction wish.) He has with the stroke of a pen become an unperson to the Soviet regime; in his essay he unequivocally chastises the "thing"-makers. There is no doubt that the French writer was extremely influential among intellectuals of Eastern Europe during the fifties, but his voice seems a bit raspy and hollow after the experiences of the sixties. Sartre today seems to be out of step. It is not what he says but the time he has chosen to say it. He should have said these things twenty years ago. In his article he insists on condemning the "five invaders," when he damn well knows that there was but one invader: the slaves of the "thing," as Sartre refers to wholesale Sovietization. The fourteen artists interviewed in this book do not seem to belong to Sartre's time.

One word springs up in every interview: freedom. For Novomeský, "free expression even for those people who are not geniuses" (p. 101); for Krumbachová, "freedom . . . to create" (p. 120); for Kundera, "to start defending his own liberty" (p. 137); for Škvorecký, to realize "human capabilities" (p. 176); for Vaculík, not at the price of "moral devastation" (p. 195); for Mucha, "to be in the midst of the tumult" (p. 212); for Putík it is to "have acted" (p. 235); for Tatarka it is "cultural creativity" (p. 274); for Goldstücker it involves "courageous thinking" (p. 286); for Čivrný it is the "duty to remain productive and young as long as possible" (p. 320); for Karvaš it is "more important than the question of prosperity" (p. 339); for Klíma it simply means "people are not machines" (p. 366); for Havel it is "inner independence" (p. 374); and for Kosík it means that man is a "potential revolutionary, because he finds life in such a manipulated system unbearable" (p. 399). This spectrum of significant phrases is a profound indicator of motives that propelled these intellectuals to act.

Liehm's own questionable thesis is that because of the course of events, the setbacks, and debacles, "many people [are convinced] that socialism is incapable of solving cultural problems and this, in turn, has resulted in an idealization of the cultural life of the West" (p. 66). Liehm proceeds to place the blame on the country's (and the USSR's) "faulty concept of cultural policy." This fact cannot be denied, but there is another explanation: the peoples of Eastern Europe merely idealize what is not within their reach (economic goals) and *not* the "cultural