

MONEY AND PLAN: FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF EAST EUROPEAN ECONOMIC REFORMS. Edited, with an introduction, by *Gregory Grossman*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968. 188 pp. \$6.00.

This collection of seven essays grew out of a Workshop on Communist Money and Finance held at Berkeley in December 1966. In the lead essay Andrzej Brzeski analyzes empirically the record of inflation in Poland. In the context of a macro-economic model of a Soviet-type economy, John Montias examines the quantitative implications of alternative monetary and fiscal policies. Interestingly, Montias explores, among other things, the relation between the budgetary surplus and real output and other variables, on the assumption that planners make quantity rather than price adjustments. Three of the essays deal with aspects of the most radical reforms (János Fekete, managing director of the National Bank of Hungary, writes on the Hungarian reform, and Boris Pesek and Václav Holešovský write on the ill-fated Czechoslovak reform). While the Fekete essay may be too sanguine in its discussion of the need for reform, the opposite could be said of the Pesek and Holešovský contributions. One wonders if and why the advantages of the standard system were inoperative in Czechoslovakia. Eugene Babitchev analyzes and describes the so-called COMECON bank, particularly the issue of multilateralism. The concluding essay by George Garvy (which incorporates comments by workshop participants other than the contributors), together with Gregory Grossman's rather extensive introduction, does much to pull together this small but somewhat unwieldy package.

This book, especially Garvy's perceptive contribution, raises fundamental and intriguing questions about money, finance, and credit in both the standard and reformed economies. What was the role of money in the standard system? If money is not necessary for exchange, can it at the same time be an effective "budget constraint" (Grossman, p. 7)? And can, as Brzeski asserts (p. 23), the Fisherian quantity approach provide a fruitful analytical framework? Was wage control ineffective? What is the "real bills" doctrine? The link between monetary and real variables? The role of the budgetary surplus? Will changes in financial flows have more than a purely accounting significance? Will the reforms usher in a "renaissance of money"? Will the central bank emerge as a key actor in a "polycentric" system of planning? And so on.

This is a valuable book.

JOHN FARRELL
Oregon State University

NATIONALISM IN EASTERN EUROPE. Edited by *Peter F. Sugar* and *Ivo J. Lederer*. Far Eastern and Russian Institute Publications on Russia and Eastern Europe, no. 1. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1969. ix, 465 pp. \$15.00.

After World War II it appeared for a time that the pressure of Stalinism would extinguish every vestige of national sentiment among the peoples of Eastern Europe. The resurgence of this sentiment since Stalin's death, however, has demonstrated that nationalism in Eastern Europe is well-nigh indestructible and that it must be regarded as one of the dominant forces in the history of the region,

capable of surviving any adversity. Nothing illustrates better the vitality of nationalism than the changing attitude of Marxist historians toward it. After 1945 in deference to Stalin the Marxists dutifully played down nationalism and, insofar as they were concerned with it, viewed it strictly through the refractory prism of ideology. Their inspiration came chiefly from the labored wisdom of Stalin; their definitions of nationalism were often lifted verbatim from Stalin's *Marxism and the National Question* (1913). The post-Stalinist ferment brought a new respect for the national past and produced a new appreciation of national movements. This process of rediscovery began in the smaller countries of the Socialist bloc (Poland, Yugoslavia) and received its official blessing when the Soviet journal *Voprosy istorii* opened (in 1966) its pages to an unprecedented discussion of nationalism. Since then the trend has continued, and as recently as September 1969 the Fifth Congress of Yugoslav Historians held in Ohrid chose as its theme the "Ethnic and National Processes in Yugoslavia." Against this background the appearance of an opus specifically devoted to East European nationalism—the first one of its kind in a Western language—will be welcomed both by specialists in East European history and by those interested in nationalism in general.

The volume concentrates on the history of nationalism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and contains separate chapters on each one of the East European countries: Albania (written by T. Zavalani), Bulgaria (Marin V. Pundeff), Czechoslovakia (Joseph F. Zacek), Greece (Stephen G. Xydis), Hungary (George Barany), Rumania (Stephen Fischer-Galati), and Yugoslavia (Ivo J. Lederer). In addition, Peter F. Sugar, a "universalist" among historians specializing in the area, supplies a comprehensive overview of "External and Domestic Roots of Eastern European Nationalism." There is no separate bibliography, but each chapter is provided with footnotes containing bibliographical information. The writing is clear and concise, the tone is moderate, the quality even.

In dealing with their respective nationalities, the authors are sympathetic without being partisan, and critical without being harsh. Of the nationalities that come within the purview of the volume, only the Macedonians do not receive an unqualified vote of confidence. Lederer's chapter on Yugoslavia does not include a discussion of Macedonian nationalism (although it recognizes the Macedonians as a distinct nationality), but is limited to the Serbian, Croatian, and Slovene movements. For a discussion of the Macedonian problem the reader should turn to the chapter on Bulgaria; its author (Pundeff) deals with the Macedonian problem with scrupulous fairness, but does not appear to recognize the Macedonians as a nationality (pp. 160–61). By contrast, the Slovaks rate, in Zacek's chapter, a full-fledged treatment as a nationality in their own right, freed from the shackling structure of "Czechoslovakism." Yet traditions die hard, and vestiges of "Czechoslovakism" linger on. Zacek devotes three pages to the Czech leader Palacký and only three sentences to the Slovak leader Štúr. He still casts Štúr exclusively in the role of language reformer and politician; there is no recognition of Štúr's philosophy of history and no mention of his work *Nárečja Slovenskuo* (*Slovak Idiom*) in which this philosophy is formulated and which also happens to be his most important work. Likewise, there is no mention of Hurban-Vajanský, the uncrowned king of the Slovak National Party in the years immediately preceding World War I.

It is only natural that in a multiauthored volume different authors accent different issues. Fischer-Galati, in refreshing disregard of the exigencies of the Cold War, points out that the Bolshevik Revolution was of great importance for the Rumanian nationalist movement, and he does not hedge his bet. The other authors

do not explore this issue, and this invites an obvious question: to what extent does Fischer-Galati's observation apply to other national movements in Eastern Europe? The distinguishing mark of Pundeff's article on Bulgaria is its awareness of historical literature published in Soviet Russia and even the Ukraine. The strident tone of Soviet historical literature makes its reading a heroic experience for the Western scholar, and this doubtless explains why other contributors desisted from this effort. The chapters on Greece and Yugoslavia are flavored by a political science expertise. It is now evident that historians will have to move closer to the domains of political science and sociology (the reverse is equally desirable) if they are to achieve a "breakthrough" in reconstructing the story of the past.

The blend of disciplines and techniques should be particularly fruitful for the study of nationalism, and Lederer offers a hint in this direction: reflecting on Yugoslavism before 1914 he is compelled to admit that historians simply do not know how much popular support the movement enjoyed at the time. His prescription: content analysis of South Slavic newspapers, schoolbooks, and so forth (p. 398). Historians have traditionally eschewed such glamourless techniques, but if they are to render more exact judgments, they will have to descend from their lofty peaks of polished discourse into the mundane world of headcounts and painstaking opinion analyses. In the field of nationalism this spells the need for serious research into the nationalist attitudes of interest groups and political parties and for a vigorous concern with the problem of the participation of popular classes in national movements. Sugar in his thoughtful essay sets the stage, so to speak, by the distinction he makes between noble, middle-class, bureaucratic, and popular nationalism (pp. 44–45). In this respect, Brock's account of Polish nationalism is outstanding, showing as it does the attitude of the leading political parties to the national question. Brock has a keen and patient eye for all the strata that made up the Polish nation, including the far-out radicals, and also for those who stood outside its pale, notably Ukrainians and Jews. A comparison between his account and the corresponding sections of the *Cambridge History of Poland* (vol. 2, 1941) reveals how much more refined the West's perception of Polish history has become in the last thirty years. There is much similarity between the pride and the heroism of Poles and Magyars, and Barany, in his account of the latter, offers a sensitive treatment of the different strains of Magyar nationalism; his characterizations of the dissident movements of the interwar period are particularly poignant.

There is little a critic needs to add beyond saying that this is a fine book written and produced with the highest degree of professionalism. It comes close to being a political history of Eastern Europe during the last two hundred years, and it is the first work of this scope to appear since Halecki's *Borderlands of Western Civilization* (1952). (The two works are of course not entirely comparable; unlike the volume under review, Halecki's book is intended to be a textbook and covers the whole span of recorded history.) However, Halecki's work is basically the product of research and outlook prevailing before World War II. By contrast, the present volume takes full account of the new historiographical trends and perceptions that emerged in the wake of World War II, and this is perhaps its greatest merit. Its publication is also something of an event for the Far Eastern and Russian Institute of the University of Washington: it is the first volume of this institute's publication series on Russia and Eastern Europe and should prove a worthy opener.

STANLEY Z. PECH
University of British Columbia