

of the ideological bias that usually mars studies by orthodox Communist historians. But when they begin to tackle the more recent period, their slanted ideological orientation becomes all too apparent. "Victorious February 1948" is portrayed as having ushered in a bright future for the development of Czechoslovak science and the Soviet Academy of Sciences is presented as a model to be emulated: for example, in 1968 "ideologically unstable individuals began to succumb to the temptations of inimical bourgeois ideology," "bearers of right-wing opportunism and revisionist tendencies" set out to denigrate the value of the rich Soviet experience and even some members of the presidium of the academy "retreated from the positions of proletarian internationalism"; but in 1969 "discipline was fully restored" and all was well again.

Československo-sovětské vztahy is a collection of twenty-five papers which were presented at a conference of the commission of Czechoslovak and Soviet historians held in Prague in October 1973 on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the conclusion of the Czechoslovak-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance, and Postwar Cooperation. Arranged in chronological order, the papers cover various aspects of Soviet-Czechoslovak relations from the time of the October Revolution until the conclusion of the new Czechoslovak-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance in 1970. Unfortunately, the contributors merely paraphrase standard Soviet theses and interpretations relating to topics such as the October Revolution and its alleged significance for Czechoslovakia's independence; President Beneš's decision not to go to war at the time of Munich in spite of asserted Soviet willingness to help and his wartime endeavors to "isolate the Soviet Union from Europe"; the "longing" of the people of Subcarpathian Ukraine to join the Soviet Ukraine; and the fraternal "international aid of five socialist countries," given to Czechoslovakia in 1968.

Taken together, the three books constitute a telling testimony of how far the pendulum has swung from the promising days of the 1968 Czechoslovak Spring back to the stifling orthodoxy of the Stalin era. They also corroborate the assertions of the signatories of Charter 77 about the Husák regime's disregard for freedom of expression, press, and scientific research.

EDWARD TABORSKY
University of Texas, Austin

THEORETISCHE GRUNDLAGEN UND PRAKTISCHE ENTWICKLUNG
LANDWIRTSCHAFTLICHER BETRIEBSGRÖSSEN IN DER TSCHE-
CHOSLOWAKEI. By *Vladislav Bajaja*. Osteuropastudien der Hochschulen des
Landes Hessen, series 1. Giessener Abhandlungen zur Agrar- und Wirtschaftsfor-
schung des europäischen Ostens, vol. 69. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot in Kom-
mission, 1975. 324 pp. Paper.

In this very detailed and interesting book the author has tackled important theoretical and practical problems concerning optimum farm size in socialized Czechoslovak agriculture. His presentation of the complex phenomena of movements toward large-scale agriculture—coupled with horizontal and vertical integration—is both systematic and lucid.

The question of farm size in Czechoslovakia—as well as in all other East European countries and the USSR—has been a central economic and political issue since World War I, when most of the farms throughout the region were too small for mechanization or for providing their owners with even a modest livelihood. A series of agrarian reforms in Czechoslovakia and other East European countries in the interwar period attempted to increase the average size of agricultural holdings in order to improve

their viability, agricultural productivity, and the standard of living of overpopulated areas. With the political changes that followed World War II, the Communist governments saw fit to solve the problem of small farms by pressuring small farmers to join collective farms. This enabled these governments to choose, experiment, and change the size of agricultural production units as they saw fit, from one period to the other, in search of the "optimal size" for agricultural production units.

The author describes and analyzes the complex and painful process of change toward large-scale agriculture in Czechoslovakia throughout the postwar period. He draws extensively on the theoretical discussions and on evidence of the practical implications of larger farm size found in Czechoslovak economic literature. By providing various measurements of change toward large units, especially the recent concerted effort to build agro-industrial complexes on a very large scale of concentration, the author tries to assess the development of socialist agriculture critically in Czechoslovakia.

Bajaja attempts to relate the large size of farm units to agricultural productivity. His tentative finding, however, is that productivity levels of Czechoslovak farms are substantially lower than those of privately owned small-scale family farming in West European industrialized countries.

On the whole, this study provides useful information and analysis of socialization, integration, and the question of optimal size in Czechoslovak socialist agriculture. The important issues raised in this study indicate the urgent need for future research before questions of optimal size and the most efficient farm organization and ownership can be answered conclusively.

GREGOR LAZARCIK

State University of New York at Geneseo

LEOPOLD I OF AUSTRIA. By *John P. Spielman*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1977. 240 pp. + 16 pp. plates. \$14.95.

In this gracefully written little book, Spielman observes at the outset that the biography of any Habsburg emperor can be best understood within the framework of what he calls "the Habsburg dynastic enterprise." It is a thoroughly defensible premise and one that promises a great deal in any discussion of the life of Leopold I. From this stimulating beginning, however, the analysis rapidly turns into a conventional narrative in which the "life" of Leopold and his family disappears in the details of the "times." In part, this approach is unavoidable. Leopold's emperorship was taken up by some of the most dramatic moments in the history of the House of Habsburg, such as the Turkish siege of Vienna in 1683, as well as by his longstanding rivalry with Louis XIV, which gave rise to some of the most intricate diplomatic and military maneuvering of this or any other century. Nor is a straightforward description, in English, of the events of Leopold's reign without its uses. There is all too little material on the seventeenth-century Habsburg Empire available in English, and Spielman's presentation fills a genuine need. The chapters on questions of succession relate complex material with clarity and authority; those on bureaucratic infighting at the seventeenth-century Habsburg Court are interesting and necessary to explain the rule of a man so little given to personal initiative as was Leopold.

What Spielman has not done is to quarry the enormous amount of Habsburg family correspondence available in Vienna and Simancas which would have given him more of the material necessary for carrying out the dynastic study to which he refers in his introductory chapter. Leopold's handwriting has baffled even the most resourceful archivists, and one can well sympathize with an author who does not want to mire himself in such an endeavor. Nevertheless, there are five archival references in the