him to make very clear suggestions that certainly left him wide open to such charges.

Rutherford attempts to soften the harsh impact of Mitrinovic's analysis of Jews, non-Whites, Moslems, and women: "... he regarded it as being of the greatest importance that each organ of the human whole, each nation, race or sex, should be true to its own character and perform that function which at any time was proper to it." (p. 62) For many readers today, however, this explanation does little to mollify the unsettling character of Mitrinovic's Europe-centered discourse. No matter how we attempt to explain the subtle context of his argument, it is impossible to shut our eyes to the heart of his message: "Europe anthropologically, historically, culturally, by religion and by geography, appears to have been destined to play the leading role in the functional organization of the world.... Enshrined in the trinity of Aryan morality, Christian metaphysics and Social ... service, they [European values] constitute, without doubt ... the highest and most synthetic ideals of conduct ever formulated by men. ..." (pp. 75, 87-88) Mitrinovic's perspective makes intercultural sensitivity rather difficult.

Rutherford concludes this collection with three articles, originally published in Purpose magazine in 1929 and compiled from notes of lectures given by Mitrinovic, and a selection of Mitrinovic's editorials and other writings from New Britain Quarterly, The New Atlantis, New Europe, and The Eleventh Hour.

In all of his works Mitrinovic exhibits a difficult and often perplexing style and language which were constructed to mirror his utopian view of the world. Apparently radical solutions could not be achieved by plain language and clear analysis. Rutherford has edited some of the language for us, but enough remains to remind us of the frustration and confusion many of his original readers felt.

As fascinating as he was in his time, Dimitirije Mitrinovic is not well-known today. It is unlikely that we will ever experience a renaissance of interest in him. Nevertheless, he is a fascinating character. Studied together with Rigby's Imitation and Initiative, Rutherford's collection offers us an important introduction to the bizarre mind of this Balkan eccentric.

Thomas A. Emmert

Gustavus Adolphus College


Josef Kalvoda adopts a detailed and innovative approach in his analysis of the origins of the state of the Czechs and Slovaks, and of the independence movements, both at home and abroad, which culminated in the
founding of the republic during the Versailles Conference. To accomplish the task, he draws on a wide array of sources, including private papers (released prior to 1948) and published as well as archival materials.

In introducing the general topic of Czechoslovakia's genesis, the author suggests that historians and other writers have advanced basically three theories about the struggle for independence. "The first credits the émigrés, notably [Tomáš G.] Masaryk, for winning independence," according to Kalvoda; "the second claims that it was the consequences of the Bolshevik revolution in Russia; and the third emphasizes the work of the registers at home, and their assumption of power on October 28, 1918, as the decisive factor."

Kalvoda essentially challenges the first theory by arguing that its adherents tend to downplay the fact that the plans originally conceived by Masaryk and others were subjected to considerable changes. The author also points to the change of attitudes by the major powers, The United States, Great Britain and France, toward the independence movement to coincide with their own plans for the organization of Central Europe following the cessation of hostilities. Furthermore, he suggests that the thesis also diminishes both the importance of the movement at home, led primarily by prewar political leaders, Dr. Karel Kramár and Dr. Alois Rašín, and the decisive action taken by the so-called "men of the 28th of October," who proclaimed Czechoslovakia's independence and seized political power on that day in 1918. (Until the Communist takeover, October 28 was officially observed as Czechoslovakia's independence day.)

Kalvoda challenges the Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the country's independence as being a direct consequence of the Bolshevik Revolution by maintaining that this theory is based on the premise, as commonly referred to by Czech, Slovak and other Communist historians, that the notion of independence was initiated by Lenin's followers. This implies that no such independence movement had existed prior to November 7, 1917, or that no programs for an independent Czechoslovakia had ever been formulated before that date. The revolution was undoubtedly a contributing factor, but the movement for independence had been launched before that event.

In light of the above arguments, it is Kalvoda's contention that political leaders inside the future state, led largely by Dr. Kramár, deserve the real credit for being the thinkers and planners who brought Czechoslovakia into being. They had remained at home, as opposed to the exiles Masaryk, Eduard Beneš and Milan R. Štefánik, hoping to be liberated by Russia. Their hopes were not to be realized.

In taking this stand, however, Kalvoda apparently feels compelled to justify praising Kramár by criticizing Masaryk and, to a lesser degree, Beneš and Štefánik. He does so at one point by comparing Kramár with Masaryk: "Kramár was an honest man who made no charges [referring to Masaryk's ties to British intelligence] he could not prove; Beneš and Masaryk, who had no moral scruples whenever their own political interests