The study's detailed treatment of 1968 presents a vast amount of information and conveys the complexities and contradictions of the reform movement. While most of Professor Skilling's judgments appear thoroughly persuasive, a few can—and should—be questioned. On page 629, for example, he writes that, as far as can be determined, "public opinion continued to be convinced of the value of the alliance with the Soviet Union and with the other socialist countries, and rejected the alternative of neutrality." While the public may have been resigned to the fact of the alliance, most of what was written in the spring of 1968 implicitly pointed out its disadvantages rather than its value. Similarly, Professor Skilling may at times be overestimating the popularity of the Communist Party and the chances of its victory in free elections. Granted, its popularity increased in 1968 and the party led in public opinion polls, but the party leadership consistently refused to allow creation of opposition parties, at least in part out of realization that a well-organized socialist party could pose a serious threat at the ballot box.

Professor Skilling's overall assessment of 1968 seeks to answer some tough questions which are often avoided: Could Dubček have succeeded? Will the Prague Spring serve as a model for other Eastern European reforms? On both counts he is negative, viewing the movement as basically irreconcilable with Soviet interests and thus doomed by external factors, not domestic ones. Such a conclusion is bolstered by his thesis that the Prague Spring was in fact an "interrupted revolution" because "reform is too mild a term to describe accurately what was happening in 1968 and likely to happen thereafter."

Perhaps. On the other hand, most of the revolutionary aspects of 1968 consisted of ideas tossed about but still far from implementation. The government's own objectives and accomplishments were much more modest and thoroughly reformist. We should perhaps be wary here of inadvertently adopting the old Marxist dictum that "the correct understanding of the present is its future potential." We will never know the future potential of the Prague Spring, but, thanks to Professor Skilling, we at least have an excellent account of its history.

Rudolf Vilem Perina
U.S. Department of State

ČEŠI A JIHOSLOVANÉ V MINULOSTI: OD NEJSTARŠÍCH DOB DO ROKU 1918. Edited by *Václav Žáček*. Prague: Academia, 1975. 751 pp. Plates. Kčs. 98.

When Tito and the Soviet Union parted company in 1948, the countries of the Socialist Bloc reacted with amazing promptitude: overnight, Tito became a *persona non grata* and the very subject of Yugoslavia fell under a shadow. Czechoslovakia leaped enthusiastically on the anti-Yugoslav bandwagon and was second to none in the zeal with which it proscribed everything Yugoslav. Whether the topic was twentieth-century Yugoslavia or thirteenth-century Serbia did not seem to make much difference. Czechoslovak historians virtually abandoned serious writing on Yugoslavia; specialists in Yugoslav history became an endangered species. Only the sixties rescued Czechoslovak historiography from these doldrums and the present volume may perhaps be described as atonement for the sins of the past.

The work is something of a companion piece to the two-volume history of Czech-Polish relations, *Češi a Poláci v minulosti* (Prague, 1964–67), an opus that earned high critical acclaim at the time it appeared. Václav Žáček, who was editor in chief of the second of the two volumes on Poland, is the historian in charge of this volume on Yugoslavia, and some of the authors who contributed to the earlier work also appear as contributors in the present work. Although the level of competence that went into both projects is similar, the products are quite different. This is attributable,

https://doi.org/10.2307/2494942 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in part, to the subject matter. Poland had a more or less clearly defined history. The Yugoslav peoples, by contrast, belonged, historically, each to a different state structure and evolved in diverse cultural ambiences. This imposes special difficulties on the authors, and, as a consequence, the volume on Yugoslavia lacks the unity and the clear progression so evident in the work on Poland. The period covered extends from the earliest times to 1918, with two-thirds of the space devoted to the years after 1800. There are three nationalities to deal with, Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, with the fourth, the Macedonians, emerging more distinctly at a later stage. We are informed that the second volume, which will bring the story down to 1945, is in preparation.

It seems that the authors could not quite make up their minds as to whether they were producing a synthesis of Czech-Yugoslav relations or an encyclopedia on the subject. The quality of the work is unimpeachable but, alas, the study is overwhelming in the details with which it confronts the reader. It is awash with the names of people and places, and one suspects that even Czech and Slovak readers will have a hard time finding their bearings amid the surfeit of data. A comparison with *Češi a Poláci v minulosti* is quite illuminating. The latter is rigorously analytical. It does not limit itself to Czech-Polish contacts as the title might indicate. It identifies long-term movements and trends in Czech and Polish history separately, and then proceeds to most fruitful comparisons. In the volume on Czech-Yugoslav relations, the comparative aspect is neglected; and overall trends do not emerge clearly. However, it is a monumental effort filling many blanks that had previously existed and it will serve as a source of valuable information for many years.

STANLEY Z. PECH
University of British Columbia

THE AUSTRIAN MIND: AN INTELLECTUAL AND SOCIAL HISTORY, 1848–1938. By *William M. Johnston.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976 [1972]. xvi, 515 pp. $23.75.

Austrian mind or Austrian minds? It is significant that the German translation of Mr. Johnston's work avoids the issue and retains only the subtitle. And yet it is an essential part of his argument that the ideas generated in the Habsburg Monarchy in this period shared important characteristics that distinguished them, at least in emphasis, from those of France, Germany, or the Anglo-Saxon world: "masters of both surfaces and depths, thinkers from Austria-Hungary devised the premises upon which our self-knowledge is built." A second characteristic is the urge to think holistically, to reduce the explanation of phenomena to a single proposition, or to a series of interconnected propositions, to see connections that others have not seen.

Mr. Johnston must have the capacity to eat libraries for breakfast. He covers not merely the German-speaking culture of Vienna, fed as it was by immigration, but the distinctive and original life of the mind in Hungary, the considerable literary and philosophical schools of Bohemia, and the idiosyncratic exclave of Trieste. It is therefore all the more surprising that he says virtually nothing of Czech culture: we learn of Bartók but not Janaček, Klimt but not Mucha, and of Masaryk only in passing.

A book of this scope is, inevitably, a Baedeker. It cannot afford to linger anywhere very long and this means that for some complex and familiar phenomena, such as psychoanalysis or Austro-Marxism, which obviously cannot be excluded, it is better to go elsewhere. But even for these one needs the Austrian context, which is the book's uniting theme. I find Mr. Johnston's social history, if anything, more convincing than his intellectual history, perhaps because he tries to prove less and sticks in the main to Vienna. Some of his best passages are on the dominance of etiquette and the playing out of roles ("insincerity but not hypocrisy"), the languid defeatism that

https://doi.org/10.2307/2494942 Published online by Cambridge University Press