

DIE ÄRA BACH IN BÖHMEN: SOZIALGESCHICHTLICHE STUDIEN ZUM NEOABSOLUTISMUS, 1849–1859. By *Christoph Stölzl*. Veröffentlichungen des Collegium Carolinum, vol. 26. Munich and Vienna: R. Oldenbourg, 1971. 360 pp. DM 38.

The history of Bohemia, after 1860, is the history of a growing Czech nationalist movement and of the conflict of that movement with the "ruling" Germans. Explanations for the vigorous progress of the Czechs have generally been sought in the demographic and political changes that took place after the year 1860, the year of the opening of the constitutional regime in the Habsburg Monarchy. Christoph Stölzl has little patience with such an approach and contends that the decisive period for what happened after 1860 is the decade that preceded it: the neoabsolutist period of the 1850s associated with the name of Minister Bach. According to the author, that decade brought a basic shift toward industrialization and saw the emergence of models of social and political behavior that determined the main lines of Bohemia's history in the next half-century. He shows how the Czech-speaking peasants, artisans, and workers began, in the fifties, to shed their ethnic neutralism and identify themselves with the Czech nationalist movement. Each class did so for its own reasons and looked for its own specific social and organizational supports. The case of the workers was particularly interesting. Bach's bureaucrats failed to solve the "social question," and this drove the Czech-speaking workers, hitherto uncommitted on the national question, into the arms of the Czech nationalists. The German-speaking workers had no comparable place of refuge; they were unable to identify with the German-oriented administrative elite which had let them down, and failed to establish a rapport with the "Bohemian German nation." As a result, the Bohemian Germans proved in the future no match for the vigorous nationalism of the Bohemian Czechs.

Stölzl's account is documented from police and administrative records of Bach's officials, and the amount of labor invested in it is prodigious. Its great merit is that it seeks to understand nationalist problems by reaching beyond the realm of nationalism into the realm of social policy and behavior. It shows how and why each social group was drawn into the Czech nationalist movement and describes the institutional means through which this was accomplished. It is a study of social mobilization and the concomitant growth of national consciousness. With his "social history" approach, Stölzl follows the course earlier charted for nineteenth-century Bohemian history by his mentor Friedrich Prinz, and it all adds up to a promising trend in West German historiography. Stölzl's case is convincingly presented. The approach is imaginative. The perspectives are tempting.

STANLEY Z. PECH
University of British Columbia

KAPITALISTICKÁ INDUSTRIALIZACE A STŘEDOEVROPSKÁ SPOLEČNOST: PŘÍSPĚVEK KE STUDIU FORMOVÁNÍ TZV. PRŮMYŠLOVÉ SPOLEČNOSTI. By *Pavla Horská-Vrbová*. Prague: Academia, 1970. 223 pp. Kčs. 22.

This recent work by one of Czechoslovakia's leading economic historians is both exciting and disappointing. It is exciting because it brings to general scholarship

on industrialization a discussion of rarely emphasized areas of Central and Eastern Europe, and because it presents information on economic-demographic-social interaction, a subject that has become the focus of extremely fruitful work in the West in the past decade. The disappointment does not flow from the level of scholarship but from the fact that when this work, and other recent studies from Czechoslovakia, are compared with newer Western work, the Czech publications seem to reveal a lack of awareness of questions, approaches, and techniques of most modern economic and social history. Although there is some evidence of familiarity with the *Annales* school (there are references to several articles published in the mid-sixties), most of the Western works cited or listed are very old indeed, and the obviously superb scholarship and quality of mind of the author cannot overcome this gap.

The main purpose of the work is to examine the nature of the industrialization process in Central Europe and to discuss and account for differential levels of economic and social development in the principal regions: the major German states and the Bohemian crownlands. (An excellent summary of some of the central arguments of the book is given in a French résumé.) Although admittedly only a "contribution" to such ends, the book does provide the reader with much of value. Chiefly, it discusses the location, timing, and nature of the coming of industry and an industrial society in the area and offers the student a thorough tour of the archival and statistical sources. Also, in part relying on the excellent work of the late demographer Ludmila Kárníková, the author writes suggestively about the relation between demographic factors and social stability and change.

In depicting the nature of economic change, the author reinforces the more recent ideas of other economic historians that industrialization was an extremely gradual process. Such is the picture that is emerging concerning France, the United States, and even Japan and Russia, and such is the description furnished by Dr. Horská-Vrbová concerning Central Europe. First came an upsurge in textile production—linens, then woolens and cottons—beginning with domestic production and small firms in the latter part of the eighteenth century and developing on a factory scale in the early nineteenth century. Also in the early nineteenth century the mining and metallurgical firms developed, growing gradually from very small to very large enterprises. In this connection, the book supports studies by Franklin Mendels, Rudolf Braun, Lutz Berkner, and others concerning "proto-industrialization" in other areas: this is a period in which a symbiotic relationship between preindustrial handicraft production and agriculture encourages relatively large upsurges in population, even before the so-called industrial revolutions. It is in this area of demographic and social interaction that the book is most suggestive. Although unfortunately the ideas are not pursued as far as one might wish, the study discusses a number of possibilities concerning the relation between average age levels and degree of stability (via groups with higher marriage and fertility rates) and social action. It is most interesting to note, for example, that the small owners of handicraft production or manufacturing firms marry much younger than workers do, and display higher rates of fertility as well. If the work is to be faulted, it would be for the lack of an analytical framework. Individual branches of industry in various areas are discussed, as are particular periods, but the reader lacks a sense of perspective on the interconnection and relative importance of various branches of the economy; and a dynamic picture of economic or demographic change from one period to the next is often lacking. On the whole, how-

ever, the work is extremely rewarding and indeed vital to students of economic and social change in the region.

RICHARD L. RUDOLPH
University of Minnesota

POLITICAL GROUPING IN THE CZECHOSLOVAK REFORM MOVEMENT. By *Vladimir V. Kusin*. Political and Social Processes in Eastern Europe Series. New York: Columbia University Press, 1972. xii, 224 pp. \$11.00.

PUBLIC OPINION POLLING IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA, 1968-69: RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF SURVEYS CONDUCTED DURING THE DUBCEK ERA. By *Jaroslav A. Piekalkiewicz*. Foreword by *Barry Bede*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972. xxix, 357 pp. \$18.50.

SOCIAL CHANGE AND STRATIFICATION IN POSTWAR CZECHOSLOVAKIA. By *Jaroslav Krejčí*. Political and Social Processes in Eastern Europe Series. New York: Columbia University Press, 1972. xvi, 207 pp. \$11.00.

The Czechoslovak effort during 1968 to introduce and implement reform while retaining a socialist system has been of particular interest to social scientists in the West. Who were the initiators and proponents of reform within the Czechoslovak political system? What role did the Czechoslovak Communist Party (KSČ) play in the reform movement? To what extent was it pushed toward reform by societal forces? To what extent did it have the support of organized groups and the public at large? Was it compelled to introduce reforms too precipitously and against its more measured judgment?

Kusin's *Political Grouping in the Czechoslovak Reform Movement* and Piekalkiewicz's *Public Opinion Polling in Czechoslovakia, 1968-69* provide some answers to these questions, based on public opinion surveys and on a close reading of the Czechoslovak press. Krejčí's *Social Change and Stratification in Postwar Czechoslovakia* presents some very useful data and interpretation of radical social reform under Communist rule, but unfortunately does not link up this discussion to the 1968 events very successfully.

Kusin, presently at the University of Glasgow, offers a survey of seven major nongovernmental political interest groups, their internal development during 1968 (including recognition of shared attitudes and concerns), and the influence each seems to have had on the 1968 KSČ-led reform movement. He argues from the outset that interest groups do exist in Communist-ruled states. Their cohesion and unity of opinion may vary greatly, however, and are different from those which typically characterize groups in Western-type democratic societies. He focuses most fully on the intelligentsia (defined by Czechoslovak writers as inclusive of white collar and professional workers, and comprising about 25 percent of the working population in 1968) and concludes that though it was not tightly organized, it seems to have had the greatest impact on the reform movement. The students, considered separately, do not rate particularly high on his scale of influence and involvement in the reform, perhaps because they concentrated on bringing about some sort of joint action with industrial workers (such as was effected quite