

"The Rumanian Socialists and the Hungarian Soviet Republic" says much that is new about the Rumanian response to the Hungarian Commune, especially to Béla Kun's nationality policies, his essay is curiously unhelpful in shedding light on the personal and political tensions that had characterized Hungarian-Rumanian socialist (i.e., prior to 1918) and Communist (within the Federation of Foreign Groups in Russia during 1918) relations. The Kun-Rakovsky feud would have deserved a few words—in fact, probably more, in view of Kun's subsequent Comintern role and his sinister interference in Rumanian Communist affairs.

William B. Slottman's "Austria's Geistaristokraten and the Hungarian Revolution of 1919" is something of a *non sequitur* to the rest of the volume: it proves—if this sort of thing needed proof—that the Hungarian sociopolitical upheaval left the Viennese intellectuals quite cold in a "The Hungarians are revolting! Aren't they?" fashion. Richard Lowenthal's concluding piece, "The Hungarian Soviet and International Communism," is a distinct disappointment to anyone expecting anything beyond meaningless trivia from this distinguished authority on international Communist history. It is most regrettable to see the author of the brilliant St. Antony's study on the Spartacus League deliver himself of a few hasty remarks on such an interesting subject as the international impact of the Hungarian Commune.

This volume and the rest of the recent literature notwithstanding, the Hungarian Soviet Republic's full story is yet to be written. Interested historians and students of social, cultural, and political change in Central Europe have much unexploited and generally accessible research material on the Commune at their disposal—over one hundred books and thousands of articles on subjects ranging from preschool educational reforms to military history have been published in the last ten years in Hungary alone—to develop monographic and comparative studies on the Hungarian Soviet Republic, its social and cultural policies, its revolutionary literature, and so on. The present volume—apart from the notable exception of Janos's excellent study and William McCagg's "Hungary's Jewish Ministers and Commissars," which regrettably was excluded from the published proceedings of the Berkeley conference on which this collection is based—fails to take up this challenge. Perhaps another conference, say, on the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Soviet Republic, will do justice to these matters. Until then, some collective soul-searching by all "Commune specialists" seems to be in order.

RUDOLF L. TÖKÉS
University of Connecticut

NEMZETKÖZI JOG. By György Haraszti, Géza Herczegh, and Károly Nagy.
Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1971. 371 pp. 27 Ft.

In the less oppressive political and economic atmosphere of the late sixties, international law in Hungary remained basically conservative and showed only limited progress. It lags behind other academic fields in adapting to the changing circumstances of the postrevolutionary era. However, this new official university textbook, introduced in the fall semester of 1971, is a welcome change from the earlier text (with the same title) written by Gyula Hajdu and László Buza (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1954; reprinted most recently in 1968). The new book is shorter and the discussion more scholarly, but the authors make it clear that their approach is Marxist-Leninist and their views strongly reflect Soviet doctrines. It is an asset

that the ideological sections have been reduced, but the complete lack of references and an index is a serious deficiency.

The authors cover the traditional areas of international law. The analysis of international treaties is thorough and perhaps the best part of the book. The discussion of international organizations (chap. 9) is considerably longer than in the earlier text. The presentation of Western theories and the views of non-Soviet writers, who are referred to only in a critical way, is painfully inadequate. In general there is no important difference between Hungarian and Soviet theory. Although the dependence on Soviet doctrine is frequently so overwhelming that it raises the question of originality, the sources are not cited. But readers familiar with the Soviet literature will easily recognize that the main theoretical influence is the work of the most influential writer in the Soviet Union, Grigorii I. Tunkin, *Voprosy teorii mezhdunarodnogo prava (A nemzetközi jog elméletének kérdései, Budapest, 1963)*.

The book does not include even the most outstanding cases in international law. However, the amount of political propaganda has been significantly reduced, which is a great improvement. For example, the entire section dealing with the question of just and unjust war is completely omitted, although the problems of national self-determination and liberation movements are still covered, though more briefly.

In the Hungarian literature on international law a wider and more diversified selection of topics has led to a greater number of publications and some valuable contributions in recent years. This book is an expression of that new vitality. The authors have made a belated attempt to implement the de-Stalinization of international law, and their efforts demonstrate that the discipline shows some scholarly growth but there is still no meaningful separation from Soviet influence.

BARNABAS A. RACZ
Eastern Michigan University

DIVANUL. By *Dimitrie Cantemir*. Edited with an introductory study by *Virgil Căndea*. Bucharest: Editura pentru literatură, 1969. cx, 566 pp. Lei 26.

This edition of Dimitrie Cantemir's bilingual work *Divanul sau Gîlceava Înțeleptului cu Lumea sau Giudețul Sufletului cu Trupul* is the first to appear since 1878, when G. Sion published an unreliable Latinized text. Consequently, Virgil Căndea has taken pains to ensure that the transliteration of the Rumanian version (originally printed in the Cyrillic alphabet) is both accurate and consistent. He also includes a modern Rumanian translation of the Greek version (which he ascribes to Ieremia Cacavela), and this should prove of considerable help to readers unaccustomed to Cantemir's ornate baroque style. Clearly, such an arrangement is hardly designed to appeal to the specialist, who must still consult existing copies of the 1698 Jassy edition for research purposes; but the assumption that few present-day students of Rumanian literature possess sufficient linguistic preparation to read with any ease the original Rumanian text—let alone the Greek version—is probably correct.

A man of many accomplishments—aptly compared by the critic George Călinescu to Lorenzo de' Medici—Dimitrie Cantemir is the most representative figure of a late-flowering Renaissance in Rumania. His first work, the tripartite