Reviews 171

method employed and the reasons why the study, published in French in 1965, is being offered in translation. The author's preface reveals that the survey is the result of a program of research undertaken in 1960 by a study committee of the European Community Institute for University Studies to determine the status of education in the "common market" countries as compared with the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Soviet Union.

The number of topics touched upon is revealed in the elaborate list of contents (making an index unnecessary) and in more than a hundred comparative tables. The footnotes, both explanatory and bibliographical, indicate the enormous scope of the research and the care with which it was carried on. However, after saying all this, one wonders about the value of the book at this time. Since the original study was published in 1965, all of the statistics on all of the countries are out of date. The latest figures used are for 1964; and some, such as the important table 64 on graduates of higher educational institutions, show 1959 data for the United States and the USSR. Some of the projections have proven far from dependable—for example, the statement on page 276 that "nearly 6,500,000 students are expected in 1970" in American colleges and universities (the actual figure for 1969-70 is 7,377,000).

Despite many faults such as these (far too many to be corrected by editorial notes), the work is notable for at least three reasons: (1) it provides much information on several countries in the period 1960–64; (2) it illustrates the emergence of a new approach—the development approach—to comparative education; and (3) it provides further documentation that the USSR is a *very* close second to the United States in quantitative educational achievement.

WILLIAM H. E. JOHNSON University of Pittsburgh

STŘEDNÍ A JIHOVÝCHODNÍ EVROPA VE VÁLCE A V REVOLUCI, 1939-1945: ČESKOSLOVENSKO, POLSKO, JUGOSLÁVIE, ALBÁNIE, RUMUNSKO, BULHARSKO, MAĎARSKO. Edited by *Jaroslav Opat*. Prague: Academia, 1969. 561 pp. Kčs. 44.

This collection of essays about Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Albania, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary during World War II is a characteristic product of Czechoslovak reform communism. The proponents of that ill-fated movement hoped to harmonize the independent development of their country under its party leadership with the power interests of the Soviet Union. In a similar vein, the seven Czech historians who contributed to the collection tried to reconcile the Soviet conquest of East Central Europe with the wartime resistance aspirations in the individual countries of the area. In their opinion, the domestic liberation efforts, allegedly dominated by the Communists and aimed at the establishment of socialistic societies, were part of the same spontaneous and irresistible historical process as the westward advance of the Red Army.

The intriguing question of the revolutionary outcome of World War II has recently aroused the interest also of radical historians in the West (e.g., Gabriel Kolko, The Politics of War). Those in Eastern Europe write with less skill but present much more primary evidence from their rich governmental and party archives. Still, they are hard-pressed to document convincingly the existence of spontaneous mass revolutionary currents there—with the familiar exceptions of Yugoslavia and perhaps Albania. All too eager to legitimize the subsequent rule

172 Slavic Review

by the Communist parties, they magnify the wartime role of the Communists way out of proportion; at the same time, they reduce the representatives of other political opinions to puppets marching to their doom with the precision of a well-oiled mechanism.

Apart from stiff determinism, hard to overcome even for enlightened Marxists, the persistence of taboos detracts considerably from the plausibility of the picture presented. Thus, for example, the omission of the Katyń massacre and of other unpleasant incidents makes the article about Poland (by J. Valenta) particularly thin. The author of the essay on Yugoslavia (J. Opat) mentions the "percentages" agreement between Churchill and Stalin, but refuses to divulge his opinion about it. In the account about Albania by P. Hradečný there are only two passing references to Enver Hoxha, one of them in a footnote.

Despite the relegation of Albania's deviationist leader to the status of a nonperson, Hradečný's essay is among the best in the collection. The ambivalent attitude of the Czechoslovak reformists to the Albanian model of communism undoubtedly facilitated an objective approach. On the other hand, their admiration for Yugoslavia influenced unfavorably the article about that country. It suffers from the uncritical acceptance of the official Titoist viewpoint characterized by overdeveloped ego and endless adulation of the partisan exploits.

The essay on wartime Czechoslovakia by O. Janeček is the most thoughtful but also the most controversial of all. Its dominant theme, implying vast Czech resistance guided by the Communists, does not lend itself easily to convincing proof; Slovakia fits this thesis better. In a final overview of the seven nations, Opat attempts to compare the incomparable. For not their similarities but rather their differences determined their respective fates in World War II, when—as so often in history—the lack of unity among the peoples of East Central Europe precipitated their misfortunes.

The initiative of the Czech historians in pioneering new interpretations of World War II had far-reaching political consequences. It contributed significantly to the avalanche which brought about the 1968 upheaval in their country. But as a fair reconstruction of the past, their achievement still falls short of the target. It demonstrates that an open-minded assessment of World War II by historians in East Central Europe is still not in sight. In the meantime the impressive documentation they amassed in this volume presents an opportunity to anyone able to take up that challenge.

Vojtech Mastny Columbia University

ESSAYS IN CZECH HISTORY. By R. R. Betts. London: The Athlone Press, University of London, 1969. x, 315 pp. \$8.75.

The essays brought together in this posthumous collection were useful when they first appeared (mostly in the 1940s and 1950s), and remain so today, as high-level popularizations of important subjects about which little has been written in English. Most of them are about political, religious, and philosophical ideas, which are not so much studied as appreciated, in the light of Betts's own understanding of life—apparently a blend of quasi-Marxism with semi-Methodism—and his ideas about what happened in the later Middle Ages. The latter center about such notions as the rising middle class, the new economy of the marketplace, the domination of governments by bankers and merchants, and so forth. These account for the doc-