47), the new economic system (1952-64), and the reform (post 1965). The book's greatest quality is that it gives the reader a real feeling for the way the system has actually worked (e.g. for the mix of rigid bureaucracy, laxness, and openness to political influence which characterized investment decisions during the administrative period), and for the pragmatism of Yugoslav economists (who yield to the «pressure of events on preconceived ideas, ...reconcile theory with changing conditions, ...political expediency»1).

In perfectly idiomatic, flowing English, Bičanič traces the development of economic ideologies, identifying the historical and fundamental roots of current economic problems (e.g. the effects of the change in market size which accompanied the formation of Yugoslavia in 1918). The primary attention of the book, however, is on events and policies; it thus complements Deborah Milenkovitch's excellent book2, which pays more attention to the history of economic thought in Yugoslavia.

Although the book is primarily concerned with Yugoslavia, it does include some discussion of the broader relevance of the Yugoslav experiment, especially with respect to planning. It is also in the discussion of planning that the book shows its greatest weakness. Bičanič does not succeed in making clear how the newest planning system is to work. He tells us that «it would be wrong to think that polycentric planning is a system where there is no central plan at all. Indeed, there are several central plans, which differ in the agents involved, their targets, their size and policy instruments in different fields... All decisions are...made consistent...by check and counterchecks»3. But the specific nature of targets and the means of reconciling conflicting plans are lost behind the somewhat vague and flowery description.

With regard to the interminable Yugoslav debate over centralization vs. decentralization, Bičanič frequently reveals his own position by adopting a mildly doctrinaire tone and implying that the proponents of greater centralization are simply power-hungry.

The final chapter of the book, written by Marijan Hanžeković after Bičanič's death in 1968, discusses the 1971 changes in Yugoslavia's economic system. Unfortunately, this chapter is considerably less clear and shows less insight than the rest of the book. It does, however prevent the book from being out of date before it is published, and does not change the overall evaluation of the book from excellent.

University of Connecticut
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This brilliant study covers the pattern of reform in Hungary in the economic, political, social and cultural spheres, which began with the Soviet installation of Imre Nagy as Hungary's Premier in June 1953 and the subsequent beginning of the «New Course». At Soviet insistence, the New Course —while bringing about certain limited changes in domestic political policy and practice— was primarily devoted to alterations to economic policy and planning targets. In fact, «it was only owing to this outside 'initiative' that Hungary embarked upon the forerunner of a series of attempts at genuine reform» (p. 3).

Consisting of two parts, the basic format is simple. Part I: «On the Road to Reform»

1. Page 41.
3. Pages 46-47.
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It should be noted that certain subjects are not covered at all (e.g. church-state relations and military affairs), while others are considered only partially and only insofar as they are relevant to the reform itself (e.g. the youth problem, research and development, and foreign policy). The basic emphasis is on the process of transition to new forms and methods; the background and roots of such development; the factors —both domestic and foreign— that have conditioned, stimulated, or retarded the process; and the significance and meaning of what appears to be a gradual qualitative change in the nature of Hungary’s society and its communist system.

As Robinson stresses, Hungary «is the first state belonging to the Soviet alliance system (and thus subject to the limits established by the Soviet Communist Party) that has undertaken, and is continuing to pursue and to expand in detail, genuine economic and substantial political reform on a society-wide basis». (p. 371). But the author leaves us in mid-air, so to speak, when he concludes his evaluation with a question: will this great process of transition...result in a sudden 'qualitative leap' forward, or in an equally sudden leap into disaster?» (pp. 371-372).

By conventional academic standards, the work is, indeed, based on wide research, as demonstrated by citing numerous Hungarian authorities, and hence it provides an illuminating prelude to any study of contemporary Hungary. One may agree or, in certain points, disagree with its interpretation, but one must also admit that this is an excellent incursion into recent history, although as a whole it is no absorbing reading.

City University of New York
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Il faut souligner dès le début la nouveauté de cet ouvrage portant sur l'un des chapitres les plus caractéristiques de la culture roumaine, dont N. Iorga avait pourtant signalé l'importance. Inédit des sources —car l'enquête est menée en mettant à profit les riches collections de manuscrits des bibliothèques roumaines— inédit de la méthode, puisque M. Duțu y applique ce comparatisme qui s'avère de plus en plus irremplaçable dans toute étude des mentalités et qui faisait défaut jusqu'ici —à quelques exceptions près— dans l'histoire de la culture