

puzzled by the relative ease with which brutal force relegated them to the archives of history. The reformers, who in the period before the Spring of 1968 exchanged theories in scholarly journals, came to realize that reform in one area can succeed only if it is accompanied by a radical change in other areas. Democratization of economy, as the author characterizes a set of progressive proposals in the economic sector, cannot succeed without changes in the political life, and this in turn must materially affect the position and the role of the party. Political freedom cannot exist without a system of independent justice. A representative government, protected constitutionally from party pressure, must be responsible to the National Assembly, the supreme organ of the country. The press must be entirely free to make the desires of conflicting interests known—for they exist, contrary to Communist theory, even in a socialist country. These were rather bold and far-reaching thoughts and very concrete propositions, advanced by the reformers as they put to test both the theory and practice of all other Communist systems. They were embodied, with some qualifications and de-emphasis, in the famous Action Program in April.

Another significant factor made the Czechoslovak experiment unique. While the pre-1968 debates signaled what Professor Golan calls a “revolution from above,” the 1968 developments turned into a mass movement, a public cause which received active support from all strata of the populace.

It now appears obvious—and it is strange that the reformers themselves, trained in Lenin’s dictum on “objective evaluation of the situation,” failed to perceive the Soviet attitude—that Moscow and its inflexible allies could not tolerate the moves that ran contrary to their concepts and practices. Nevertheless, even after the invasion, the spirit of reform persisted, and the unity of the nation manifested itself in a fashion that did not permit any doubts about its position. Why was the struggle finally, in April 1969, buried? A combination of pressure, opportunism, and dissension among reformers accounts for the sad results.

Galia Golan’s book tells all this and much more in a most readable manner. It is one of the best on this subject. She presents the case in its entirety, giving the reader a concise picture and inviting him to ask questions on prospects and methods of change in a Communist society—questions which perhaps she herself could have raised. Based exclusively on original sources, mainly newspapers and journals, her narrative has a ring of authenticity, strengthened by a sense of detachment, together with an understanding of a noble effort that failed.

JOSEF KORBEL
University of Denver

THE AUSTRO-SLAV REVIVAL: A STUDY OF NINETEENTH-CENTURY LITERARY FOUNDATIONS. By *Stanley B. Kimball*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society Held at Philadelphia for Promoting Useful Knowledge, new series, vol. 63, part 4. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, November, 1973. 83 pp. \$4.00, paper.

This analytical and comparative study is concerned with the history, organization, activity, and achievements of the most important literary foundations (*matica*) of the Slavic peoples in the Austro-Hungarian Empire during the period of their national revivals in the nineteenth century. It contains a considerably detailed and chronologically organized analysis of Serbian, Czech, Moravian, Croatian, Slovak,

and Slovenian literary foundations, while those of the Poles, Ruthenians, and Lusatian Sorbs are briefly covered in an appendix. In addition, the study includes a short review of the historical, political, and social background from which all these foundations began to emerge and operate, and it also provides a fair amount of information and detail about related societies. The book has two very helpful tables, a reasonably good bibliography, and a serviceable index.

Based on extensive research in published and archival material (some of it made available for the first time), the study constitutes a useful and to some extent original contribution to the understanding of one, mainly institutional, aspect of nineteenth-century Austro-Slavic cultural history. Noteworthy and certainly valuable is the idea of mutuality and cooperation, both in outlook and activity, of all these foundations. This idea enabled the author to conclude: "In spite of their many differences, it is possible to speak of and characterize a *matica movement* which commenced with the Serbs in Hungary in 1826 and thence spread to the other Austro-Slavs."

On the debit side there are, unfortunately, many typographical errors and several factual ones: for example, the first editor of *Vijenac* was Đuro Deželić and not August Šenoa (p. 49). Also Ivan Mažuranić was replaced as *ban* by Ladislav Pejačević not Khuen Hedervary (p. 47). Although some of the errors may be interpretatively dangerous (the Yugoslav Academy always appears under the incorrect name Croatian Academy), they do not seriously detract from the basic value of the book, which is the first systematic presentation of the many-sided *matica* movement. The book will be of interest to both literary critics and historians.

DAVOR KAPETANIĆ
University of Washington

HEINRICH VON HAYMERLE: AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN CAREER DIPLOMAT, 1828–81. By *Marvin L. Brown, Jr.* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1973. xii, 238 pp.

As Austrian foreign minister for the brief period between October 1879 and October 1881, Heinrich von Haymerle is chiefly known for his role in the negotiations which led to the conclusion of the Three Emperors' Alliance of 1881 and to the imposition on Serbia in that same year of an alliance which reduced the Balkan state to a position of subservience to the monarchy. Haymerle has not fared well in historical writing. In some recent accounts he appears as a "cautious, correct, unadventurous official" with a "rather woebegone personality," as the "humdrum Haymerle," or, more favorably, as a "cautiously conservative, indefatigable worker, and a capable organizer." During the height of his career he was the constant target of the sharp and unkind wit of Bismarck, who referred to him as the "colorless, lusterless, wooden Viennese bureaucrat," who "uttered an emphatic 'No' three times on waking up in the morning for fear of having undertaken some commitment in his sleep."

In this biography Professor Brown recounts the career of this Habsburg diplomat through his early assignments and then his appointments as minister to Athens in 1870, to the Hague in 1872, and as ambassador to Rome in 1877. His attendance as an Austrian delegate at the Congress of Berlin in 1878 was followed by his assumption of the ministerial post in 1879. The emphasis throughout this account is on the events of Haymerle's life and career; an analysis of Austrian