

happened. She had to go through "a moral hell," she tells us, when she had to listen to her own son who was brought up in the Communist fashion of blind trust in the party and its leader Stalin, and who accepted the charges against his father at face value, saying to her, "If Stalin says so, then it must be true" (p. 143).

Although Slánská condemns those who did not care for "the honest Communists" whose bones were broken and teeth knocked out as being people without "a conscience," she was no different when her husband was in power. Slánský was coresponsible for the liquidation of thousands of non-Communists, and he received the Order of February for it. The innocent victims of Slánský, who also included some Communists, are not even mentioned in her book. Slánská, who never ceased to be a true believer, had a premonition dream in May 1968; and it is likely that it will come true, as her two previous premonitions did. Perhaps the third ordeal will make her realize that she was wrong when she believed in the Communist Party—the god that failed—and that what she and her nation need is not the nonfeasible "socialism with a human face" but the feasible "democracy with a human heart."

As the Czech philosopher Karel Kosík quoted above put it, the Czech question has been a world-wide question; and he believes that "our present crisis can be solved as a world crisis." Despite the Soviet occupation of his country, he calls for the abolition of the "system of general manipulability." It would seem that only God could do that; and, thus, symbolically, Remington concludes his documentary collection with "A Prayer for Tonight" by Karel Čapek.

All three books are very useful indeed.

JOSEF KALVODA

Saint Joseph College, West Hartford, Conn.

BERZEVICZY GERGELY, A REFORMPOLITIKUS (1763–1795). By *Eva H. Balázs*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1967. 388 pp. Ft. 70.

Gergely Berzeviczy (1763–1822) was one of the precursors of the nineteenth-century Hungarian reform movements. His views differed, however, in many respects from the gentry liberalism that sustained the Hungarian reform movements of the pre-March era. His deviation from the tenets of nineteenth-century gentry liberalism in Hungary has been responsible for the long-delayed assessment of his career, yet the same characteristic also is the reason for his attraction to students of Hungarian and Central European history. The descendant of a noted gentry family of northeastern Hungary, he sympathized from his youth with the reforms of Joseph II. He was especially interested in the possibilities of modernizing the stagnant Hungarian economic system. In his principal treatise of 1806 he pointed out, however, that economic reforms were tied necessarily to the emancipation of the peasants and to the improvement of their economic and social conditions. He viewed the Hungarian relationship to the empire and to the nationalities issue from this fundamental point of view. Though he sympathized with the Hungarian noble movement of 1790, he did so because he realized the fallacy of a centralized political structure for the empire. At the same time he showed little regard for the Hungarian linguistic movement and gentry-led national manifestations after 1790, but emphasized the great need to modernize the economic and political structure of Hungary.

This study is a most successful portrayal of the early life and personal development of Berzeviczy to 1795 done by a noted Hungarian historian associated with the Hungarian Historical Institute. Of particular value is her examination of Berzeviczy's student years at Göttingen and of the impact on his thought of sojourns

in England and France. Berzeviczy studied at Göttingen from 1784 to 1786. He was deeply influenced there by August Ludwig von Schlözer, both as an historian of Russia and as a protagonist of the enlightened policies of Frederick II and Joseph II. Berzeviczy displayed an eager interest in economic innovations. During his travels in Saxony and Prussia he observed new agricultural techniques, salt mining operations, glass manufacturing, and the methods of textile production. He conceived his favorite economic plan in the course of his travels—the export of Hungarian wines from northern Hungary through Poland to Saxony. His visits to England and France in 1786–87 were also of great significance for his reform ideas. In France he was struck by the gulf between the privileged classes and the mass of the population, while in England he saw confirmed his faith in the possibility of creating prosperity and social improvement for the impoverished classes.

The author seeks to develop two interpretations that call for special comment. She argues that Berzeviczy was personally and politically related to the Hungarian Jacobin Conspiracy of 1794, the detection of which ended reform attempts in Hungary for a generation. Though it seems clear that Berzeviczy had personal relations with those who were later condemned as “conspirators,” all available evidence fails to demonstrate his participation in the movement. The extent of his political activity seems to have been the initiation of the reading society (*Lese-cabinet*) of Buda in 1792 and his personal interest in a scholarly society devoted to Hungarian historical research (*Societas eruditorum*). The second interpretation concerns the author’s attempt to show that Berzeviczy was not really a Josephinist but a true Hungarian patriot. It will be interesting to see how the author interprets Berzeviczy’s writings after 1795 in her projected second volume. Only with the information relating to that period will it be possible to understand Berzeviczy’s political and social views and the meaning of his patriotic commitments.

Western students of Hungarian history will welcome the rich documentation in the appendix, which occupies over 150 pages. It includes two autobiographical sketches in Latin and German, dating from 1802 and 1816, and an extensive personal correspondence of Berzeviczy. A useful index of names has also been included. It is to be hoped that the concluding volume will be as valuable in content and documentation as the present study.

PAUL BÖDY
Toronto, Ontario

AZ 1918-AS MAGYARORSZÁGI POLGÁRI DEMOKRATIKUS FORRADALOM. By *Tibor Hajdu*. Budapest: Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 1968. 472 pp. Ft. 50.

A MAGYARORSZÁGI TANÁCSKÖZTÁRSASÁG. By *Tibor Hajdu*. Budapest: Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 1969. 462 pp. Ft. 52.

AUSZTRIA ÉS A MAGYARORSZÁGI TANÁCSKÖZTÁRSASÁG. By *Mrs. Sándor Gábor*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1969. 301 pp. Ft. 60.

Until recently the literature on the historical significance and political meaning of the Hungarian revolutions of 1918–19 has posed more questions than it has provided acceptable answers concerning the background, the social, political, and military record, and the intellectual impact of these upheavals. In fact, it may be argued that no other event in modern Hungarian history has been subjected to more partisan interpretations than Count Mihály Károlyi’s so-called October revolution and the Béla Kun-led Hungarian Soviet Republic of 1919.