ions of royalty, diplomats and political leaders delivered at social gatherings or for public consumption. This section is therefore less valuable to the scholar than earlier parts, although not necessarily less interesting. One learns that Frederika’s controversial children’s camps were actually started by NEF and were taken over by the future queen at Archer’s urging; that in August, 1947, American Ambassador Cannon in Belgrade urged Tito to break with Moscow and sought to tempt him with promises of economic assistance; that in the spring of 1948 the maps of the American Mission still showed half of Greece under guerrilla control. Archer also provides a bit of the lighter side of contemporary Greek history: the wife of an American official, failing to recognize King George, asked him: “Do you live in Greece, or are you a visitor too?” To which the monarch replied with a chuckle: “Well, I live here when they let me!”

Archer saw the civil war entirely from the perspective of the Greek Government, of Western diplomats and correspondents who were convinced that the insurgents were traitors to their country and blind agents of Moscow. A man who devoted so much of his life to helping homeless refugees and poor peasants and who was clearly better informed than most about social, economic, and political conditions in postwar Greece, Archer appears to be strangely insensitive to the revolutionary mood which had been spreading across the country. To attribute all that unrest to communist agitation and terror tactics is to focus on the surface evidence but fail to see the root causes of the problem. Yet this rather simplistic view of the Greek civil war and of the East-West conflict generally is perhaps one of the volume’s more significant contributions. Archer saw and interpreted those turbulent times exactly as the vast majority of Western officials did; their perceptions were honest and rational even if they were biased and narrow, and they reacted accordingly. All who seek to analyse these same events decades later would do well to try and understand the perceptions of those who lived through them.

John O. Iatrides
Southern Connecticut State College


Essentially, Professors Korbel and Wallace cover the same ground in their respective studies, but they adopt distinctly different approaches and outlooks in exploring Czechoslovakia’s modern history. This dissimilarity extends from the nature of the material presented to the authors’ individual writing styles.

Regrettably, *Twentieth-Century Czechoslovakia* is Korbel’s last book. It serves as a fitting epitaph to his long and distinguished career as a Czechoslovak diplomat and, since 1949, a recognized scholar in the field of international studies at the University of Denver. He died in July, 1977. Korbel’s commendable analysis of the meanings of Czechoslovakia’s history thus culminates a life-long love for his native land whose path through history, paved with moments of greatness but also littered with the sharp-edged and painful debris of betrayal and tragedy, has served to unify its people who, as a result, have become imbued with a keen sense of national awareness. “There is no scientific way to trace or test either the precise nature or the exact degree of the influence on a people of their history,” Korbel wrote. “Yet, there persists in history the concept of a national identity, and the transmission of that identity from generation to generation transcends even biological inheritance.”

Commencing with a summary of the nation’s heritage and a more detailed discussion of the foundations upon which it was formally established in 1918, the author turns to
the years of trial and struggle (1920-38) experienced by the young nation-state as it con-
fronted a myriad of formidable problems. In exploring this developmental period, he pays
particular attention to the Czech-Slovak dichotomy and, to a lesser extent, the German
problem. This is followed by a diagnostic look at the years of darkness (1939-45) when
Hitler dismembered the small state which, prior to the Nazi onslaught, was regarded as
an island of democracy among those European states formed following World War I.

The author then directs his attention to the brief post-World War II period of hope and
fears (1945-48) when, under Beneš's leadership and the Communist Party's rising influence,
Czechoslovakia adopted a pronounced shift toward the East. "The West was not inter-
tested in Czechoslovak democracy," the former ambassador to Yugoslavia wrote, "its fate
was left to the Communists and Soviet forces." The book's final chapters are devoted to
the Stalinist period (1948-68) during which the spark of humanity, never quite extin-
guished in the preceding maelstrom of terror and oppression, was rekindled and brought
forth the brief Prague Spring with all its bitter consequences.

Written in a lucid, flowing style, the work is devoid of minute details but complete in
unfolding the most significant events that have marked and influenced the course of
Czechoslovakia's development during this century. The author sketches meaningful por-
traits of the nation's leading statesmen, especially Masaryk and Edvard Beneš. The former
is described with obvious reverence, the latter with respect but also with an evident glim-
mer of doubt as to his resoluteness in facing crises and his ability to judge the character
of his adversaries accurately. This questioning attitude stems in part from Korbel's asso-
ciation with Beneš during the critical post-war reconstruction phase and the author's in-
volved in events that drastically altered the nation's course.

His close attachment to his native land is apparent throughout the book and distinctly
marks the interpretation of major events and issues discussed. This contrasts with Wal-
lace's approach which, while less interesting, also tends to be less subjective in interpreta-
tion and tone. Korbel's book, nonetheless, constitutes a valuable contribution and should
prove stimulating to both students just beginning their studies of Czechoslovak history
and the well-established scholars in the field.

In his work, Wallace focuses on Czechoslovakia's development from the 1848-49 revo-
lutionary period to the post-Prague Spring normalization phase. Jamming each chapter
with facts, some of which fall in the minutia category, he employs the conventional if
dull organizational method of dividing most of the chapters along demographic, economic,
social, and political lines. In contrast to Twentieth-Century Czechoslovakia, which is well
documented and includes a substantive bibliography, Wallace's book lacks source referen-
ces and the "Reading List" is compiled in a rather haphazard fashion. The former omis-
sion especially, along with unimaginative and at times cumbersome writing, tends to de-
tract from the book's substance since the accuracy of several facts presented is open to
question.

Another contrast between the two studies is the lack in Wallace's book of the emo-
tional spark which is so evident in Korbel's writing. The absence of this vitality is due,
perhaps, to a conscious effort on the part of the University of Ulster scholar to produce
a fair and objective study. The end result, however, is less interesting, for the author
seemingly fails to capture the true essence of the Czechoslovak experience.

A commendable aspect of Wallace's work is his extensive treatment of Slovakia. This
is true of the years preceding independence, the inter-war period, and the war years when
Slovakia was a separate state under a puppet regime supported by Berlin, while Bohemia
and Moravia were declared a protectorate of the Third Reich. The author details, for ex-
ample, the 1944 Slovak uprising whose ultimate failure resulted from numerous miscalcu-
lations and difficulties, not the least of which was the lack of active Soviet support at a
critical phase in the struggle.