

Die längst widerlegte Behauptung, der von der KPTsch propagierte „Zentrale National-Revolutionäre Ausschuß“ habe existiert, wird von Seeber wieder aufgetischt (S. 84). Sie bildet aus Hodža, Osuský und Hácha eine Reihe von „Kollaborationspolitikern“ (S. 318). Obwohl Seeber Polen und die Tschechoslowakei vergleicht, ist ihr der Zusammenhang nicht aufgefallen, daß die sowjetischen Noten zum Abbruch der diplomatischen Beziehungen zu Polen und das Angebot eines Separatvertrages mit der Tschechoslowakei am selben Tage überreicht wurden (S. 134). Nicht obwohl (S. 147), sondern wegen ihres Eintretens für ein allgemeines Sicherheitssystem sprachen sich die britische und besonders die US-Regierung gegen den bilateralen Vertrag aus.

Dem offiziellen Charakter der Arbeit entspricht ein schwerfälliger, substantivischer Verlautbarungsstil. Mit den Übersetzungen aus Fremdsprachen hat Seeber auch Schwierigkeiten. Dazu kommen mehrere Dutzend Fehler bei der Schreibung polnischer, tschechoslowakischer und sogar russischer Namen und Ungenauigkeiten bei der Bezeichnung von Institutionen. Anscheinend hat sie auch nicht bemerkt, daß es sich bei Tatiszczewo und Tatiščevo um denselben Ort handelt (S. 99, S. 101). Das Central Department des Foreign Office wird bei ihr zur „Osteuropa-Abteilung“, die „Division of European Affairs“ zur „Abteilung für osteuropäische Fragen“. In Seton H. Watson (sic!) sieht sie einen „Hauptberater der britischen Regierung“ (S. 71) und in Isaac Deutscher einen „bürgerlichen Politologen“ (S. 41).

Mit einem Satz: Auf die Lektüre von Seebers Buch kann man ohne weiteres verzichten.

Berlin

Detlef Brandes

*Habel, Fritz Peter (Hrsg.): Dokumente zur Sudetenfrage.*

4. Aufl., R. Oldenbourg, München-Wien 1984, 503 S.

This volume represents an exhaustive collection of documents, judiciously edited, bearing primarily, as the title suggests, on the Sudeten problem in its entire historical dimension. It is the fourth edition of a book last brought out by the same editor in 1962 and already out of print in 1965. (The first two editions, properly speaking, were not officially in print, but were hectographed). This edition represents an extensive expansion and updating of the documentation and brings the chronology of the Sudeten question down to 1984. It thus represents the most up-to-date collection we have and will remain a standard reference work on the Sudeten question for the foreseeable future.

The core of the book is represented by several sections which detail the emergence of the Sudeten question in its historical dimension. "National Problems in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia" examines the long-term historical genesis of the Sudeten problem from Duke Sobieslav I's patent of freedom for the Germans in c. 1175 to the introduction of historian Boháč's book on the Czech people of 1916. A section on the years 1918–1920 details the emergence of Czechoslovakia and the Sudeten problem as a part of that emergence. Yet another section deals with the first Czechoslovak Republic

from 1921 to 1938, focussing primarily on the fateful years which immediately preceded the Munich Agreement. A quite short segment covers the years of World War Two and a following, considerably lengthier one, the expulsion after the war and the activities of Sudeten leaders in West Germany during the 1950s. Two final "historical" sections present a documentation which underlies the discussions surrounding the Prague Treaty (1973) and bring the Sudeten question down to the mid-1980s with declarations by Kohl, Genscher and Zimmermann.

But there are other segments of the volume which make it more than just a documentary collection bearing on the Sudeten question. Extensive sections at the beginning and end of the book attempt to put the Sudeten documentation into a much larger context. At the outset, the editor introduces a series of documents under the rubric of general questions of law and treaties, addressing such interrelated problems as human rights, expulsion of peoples, national self-determination etc. These include the Magna Carta, the Atlantic Charter and Lenin's declaration on Peace. Toward the end of the volume another series of documents is introduced the purpose of which is apparently to demonstrate that several current world problems are analogous to the historical Sudeten one. Here for the most part United Nations resolutions and declarations, as well as political speeches dating from 1948 to 1982, shed light on Gibraltar, Northern Japan, the Falkland Islands and, most important, Palestine, indicating that a variety of peoples in the world today are attempting to exercise a perceived right to reoccupy a historical Heimat.

I have no quarrel with the addition of these "extra-Sudeten" documents in the volume; they many well be of interest to scholars of international law, although one must always be very careful of historical analogies widely separate ethnically and geographically. However, the reader should be aware that their inclusion makes the book more than just a documentation of a particular *historical* problem; rather it puts the book into a *political* dimension by suggesting implicitly that that historic problem has not yet seen its final resolution. Moreover, if one examines carefully the selection of documents, one notes that their thrust is ultimately to support at least tacitly a German claim, if only within the framework of a free, united Europa, to Heimatrecht. Indeed, the very selection of the theme for this book – the "Sudeten question" rather than, say, the "Czech-German question" – does the same thing. If one understands this, then the book can be of great use to the scholar, because no other book brings together such a wealth of documentation between two covers.

One must also applaud the format of the book, which makes it very easy to use. The Table of Contents is set up to show, in parallel columns, the date, author, nature (speech, law, letter, etc.) and, in two to five word indicators, the substance of each document. Moreover, an extensive name and institutional index at the rear makes it easy to find relevant people and organizations in the text. The documents are precisely cited and a modest number of footnotes explains what may be archaic or unclear references in the body of the documents.