seeks the answer through an intensive secondary analysis of undoubtedly all available public opinion data from the two Germanys. In contrast to the rich store of data from the FRG on such topics as the territories east of the Oder and Neisse rivers (formerly German but now Polish and Soviet), recognition of the GDR, and attitudes toward emerging political institutions and processes in the FRG, the GDR has provided scholars with a weaker empirical basis. Accordingly, Schweigler must rely not only on ideological reformulations but also, and more important, on attitudes expressed by GDR citizens visiting the West. Although such data pose serious analytic problems—for example, how to determine the overall representativeness of the respondents—they nonetheless indicate the general drift of attitudes and, especially (since we can assume that sampling biases are fairly constant over time), trends in changing perspectives. Schweigler concludes that the single *Bewusstseinsnation* characterizing Germany before 1945 has been replaced by two states, each with its own national consciousness. This view is particularly strong among younger Germans in both the FRG and the GDR. Moreover, present trends point to the probability that the chasm between the two *Bewusstseinsnationen* will widen in the future.

Despite the significance of Schweigler’s findings and interpretations, it seems decidedly premature, at least on the basis of mass survey data alone, to declare dead the idea of an all-German national consciousness. The history of nationalisms, steady flows of visitors across the border between the FRG and the GDR, and recent hints of national bolshevism in the GDR might lead us to wonder whether the German question has really been answered once and for all. The 1973 German edition discusses conclusions more extensively and provides an excellent bibliography, but does not include the chapter in which Schweigler reports his multiple regression analysis of responses to selected questions (which, even in the English version, is neither fully elaborated nor integrated into the rest of the text).

Jonathan Steele, in *Inside East Germany*, shares Schweigler’s view that the GDR has developed its own national consciousness. In general, however, the book reads like an authorized biography of a candidate for high public office. Full of interesting information, easily read, and even at times critical of the GDR and especially the Soviet Union, it nonetheless reads as though written on a rose-colored typewriter.

Steele is at his best when describing the “German face” that Ulbricht and his colleagues have put on socialism. The view that Ulbricht is “arguably the most successful German statesman since Bismarck” deserves greater attention, as does Steele’s interpretation that the growth of national self-confidence is partially attributable to humiliations perpetrated by West Germans. But ultimately the reader, this one at least, tires of the all-too-frequent oversimplifications—such as the comparison of the FRG’s Willy Brandt with the GDR’s Otto Winzer (Otto who?)—which obscure important points. A more thorough and analytic treatment of the GDR is definitely in order.

RICHARD L. MERRITT

*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*


A curious combination of Ukrainian patriotism and Communist fanaticism, Mykola Skrypnyk was a prominent theoretician and historian of Ukrainian communism. As a member of the Bolshevik Old Guard and close associate of Lenin, he was chiefly responsible for the formulation and implementation of Soviet policy toward non-Russian nationalities in the 1920s and occupied a number of rather important positions in the
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Soviet apparatus at that time. It is sufficient to say here that it was Skrypnyk who served as the first chairman of the Soviet Ukrainian People's Secretariat, thus becoming a cofounder of the first Soviet government in the Ukraine. As a member of the Central Committee of both the All-Union and Ukrainian Communist parties, Skrypnyk was also chairman of the Ukrainian delegation to the Comintern and served as a permanent member of its executive committee. After he assumed responsibility for the educational network in the Ukraine, Skrypnyk became the chief architect of the policy of Ukrainianization of the Soviet apparatus in the Ukraine. Although initially successful, this policy brought him into direct conflict with Stalin and ultimately led to Skrypnyk's suicide on July 7, 1933.

Despite Skrypnyk's official rehabilitation after de-Stalinization, very little has been written about him in the Soviet press, apart from a few occasional articles and a slim and rather biased biography by Babko and Bilokobyl's'kyi, published in Kiev in 1967. Skrypnyk's life is more fully described by Mr. Koszeliwiec in his work Mykola Skrypnyk ("Suchasnist,'" 1972), and this sequel, containing Skrypnyk's speeches and writings, provides a well-balanced selection of thirty articles dealing primarily with the nationality question. Hopefully, this is only a beginning, and others will follow Koszeliwiec's lead in preparing a more comprehensive study of this colorful figure of Ukrainian Marxism. A great deal remains to be done in deepening our political and historical understanding of the Skrypnyk years within the broader dimensions of Soviet history and politics.

Bohdan S. Wynar
Ukrainian Research Foundation


This is a competent and faithful English translation of combined issue 7 and 8 of the Soviet Ukrainian samvydav journal Ukrain's'kyi visnyk (The Ukrainian Herald). All other issues, except no. 5 (which never reached the West), have been published by Smoloskyp in Ukrainian. The present issue, along with no. 6, has been translated into English.

Modeled on the Moscow-based Chronicle of Current Events, the first six issues of Ukrain's'kyi visnyk had a strong human rights and nationalist orientation, and, probably because of the editorship of Viacheslav Chornovil, provided a relatively dispassionate chronicle of arrests and extrajudicial persecutions, as well as memoirs and analytic essays on Russification, nationality policy, and civil rights.

Issue 7-8 appeared after the 1972 wave of KGB arrests of intellectuals and dissidents, thought to have been aimed at silencing the Visnyk. The issue differs dramatically in terms of style and content from all pre-1972 Ukrainian samvydav literature: instead of objective reporting of events, petitions, and appeals to Soviet authorities to observe their own legal norms, this issue shows a virulent separatism that is reminiscent of an earlier era of Ukrainian nationalism. The first article, written by the issue's editor, Maksym Sahaydak (presumably a pseudonym), chides the West for its naivete, warns of the dangers of détente in terms evocative of Solzhenitsyn, and forthrightly labels the Soviet Union a "fascist empire" (p. 21). The major article in the issue, which provides the title, consists of two parts. The first part is a convoluted statistical