

use in several works in various periods. The author points out that earlier researchers tended to use the "barrière de l'est" concept—meaning a defensive policy toward Germany—to describe the essence of France's Eastern policy. Later, especially during the Cold War period, the idea of a "cordon sanitaire" came to dominate in historiography, for the essence of France's Eastern policy was seen as the fight against bolshevism. Both concepts, but less clearly distinguished, were used to describe the international situation of Eastern European countries in the interwar period.

What is Kalervo Hovi's own position? His view is that France's Eastern policy was, on the whole, aimed at establishing a barrier toward the east. During the First World War this barrier was planned against Germany. After the cease-fire and the establishment of Soviet Russia, this clear, unambiguous concept changed slightly to include also the idea of a "cordon sanitaire." The latter element, however, was subordinate to the former and of short duration. The author presents facts in support of his position, but his interpretation and his conclusions are not always well-founded.

The second chapter, dealing with the building of the "barrière de l'est," is especially outstanding. It describes France's first contacts with the Eastern national minorities, Poland's importance to the French foreign policy, France's war aims in the Danube basin, and the crisis in the Franco-Russian alliance. The third chapter examines the situation in Russia after the 1917 October Revolution. It shows the influence of the revolution on France's Eastern federal policy, pointing out that the idea of a "barrière de l'est" came more and more to mean a "cordon sanitaire." This latter problem is only touched upon in chapter 3, but it is discussed at length in the book's final chapter.

The reviewer has a duty to note the shortcomings of even a good book. Thus, I shall mention that my own investigations, especially in the French archives, have found that France feared Bolshevik Russia much more than the author seems to think. The effect and spread of Bolshevik ideology was indeed feared in Paris. This, however, is clear even from the documents published in Hovi's book.

*Cordon Sanitaire or Barrière de l'Est?* will be of significant value to historians of the period in their attempts to understand this complicated subject.

MAGDA ÁDÁM  
Budapest

HABSBURGS AND ZAPOROZHIAN COSSACKS: THE DIARY OF ERICH LASSOTA VON STEBLAU, 1594. Edited and with an introduction by *Lubomyr R. Wynar*. Translated by *Orest Subtelny*. Published for the Ukrainian Historical Association, Inc. Littleton, Colo.: Ukrainian Academic Press, Libraries Unlimited, 1975. 144 pp. \$9.00.

The publication of the English edition of Erich Lassota's diary for the year 1594 is justified by the editor's repeated emphasis of the importance he attaches to Lassota's imperial mission to the Zaporozhian Cossacks for the history of eastern Europe. Emperor Rudolf II wanted to enlist Cossack military forces against the Turks and their allies, the Tatars. With the Cossacks joining the Holy Roman Empire against the Turks, increased tension between Poland and the Ottoman Empire would result and encourage a more friendly attitude of the Poles toward the Habsburgs. As a further extension of Rudolf's *Ostpolitik*, an alliance with the Cossacks would also strengthen the pro-Habsburg candidate for the Polish Crown should that throne become vacated. We are also told that "Lassota's account constitutes an important historical source for the early history of Ukrainian Cossacks, their mores, and their political and social institutions," and should be "considered one of the most valuable"

primary sources for the history of the Zaporozhian Sich. The editor, however, does not tell us about the other primary sources with which he is comparing the *Lassota Diary*.

Lassota was descended from a well-known Moravian noble family and had served the empire in several capacities as a valued observer and adviser on the affairs of Sweden, Poland, and Muscovy. From late February through September 1594 he occupied himself with his mission to the Zaporozhian Cossacks. His diary is a compendium of detailed observations describing the rapids of the Dnieper as well as the population occupying that area. Coherently translated, *The Diary of Erich Lassota von Steblau* comprises forty-one pages with an additional seven pages of footnotes. There are six appendixes of English translations of other primary sources for this period which the editor thought advisable to include. A glossary is provided along with a bibliography and index. The editor provides the reader with a worthwhile lengthy introduction explaining the historical context of the diary within the cross-currents of eastern European history at that time.

The Ukrainian Historical Association, Inc. and the Ukrainian Academic Press should continue its English publications of primary sources of this quality in the future.

HERBERT H. KAPLAN  
*Indiana University*

THE NATIONAL QUESTION: SELECTED WRITINGS BY ROSA LUXEMBURG. Edited and with an introduction by *Horace B. Davis*. New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1976. 320 pp. \$16.50. £9.25.

Lost causes have a certain appeal. Rosa Luxemburg, in eclipse for a number of decades, slipped back into a narrow prominence in the latter 1960s. To many, she was a more palatable Marxist—forever “young”—than those who had been in power for fifty years.

J. P. Nettl's 1966 volumes were followed by a tide of editions and commentaries, a tide now several years in the ebbing, and the present selection of articles is one of the last of these. It seeks to allow “direct study of Rosa Luxemburg's views, without having them filtered through Lenin's polemic.” This is commendable, especially in view of at least one pre-1956 German selection of Luxemburg's works, of which a considerable portion was devoted to Lenin's refutations of certain Luxemburg works which were not even included. The major work here translated, “Kwestia narodowościowa i autonomia” (The National Question and Autonomy), did not appear in any collection until 1959 (*Wybór Pism*, Warsaw) and is quite difficult to locate in its original, serial form in *Przegląd Socjaldemokratyczny* (1908–9). Several shorter articles are also included, translated from Polish and German.

Unfortunately, the Davis collection is not the product of an academic effort, which would have benefited from a bit more distance, precision in annotation, and completeness. Its real audience appears to be those students of socialism who know no Polish and little of Poland (but who wish to have greater light shed upon their “German” subject) and those opponents and adherents of Luxemburg who seek material for yet another disputation. The collection will engender less interest among historians of Poland—as does, indeed, Luxemburg herself. Testimony for the former audience abounds: the editor himself, long a writer on topics of the Left; the publisher, an independent Marxist press; the exclusion of part 6 of “Kwestia” as an “extremely detailed discussion of the special problems of autonomy for Poland, . . . now [lacking] general interest”; and somewhat general footnotes introducing familiar events and personages in the history of Poland. Some rather remarkable and inconsistent spellings of Polish words mar the work, as witness “schlachta,” which betrays further the ac-