

The present volume, published on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the war, contains selected Greek documents and dispatches covering the period between the 28th October 1940 and the 27th April 1941, the eve of the entry of German troops in Athens.

Much has been written on this critical period by Greek and foreign authors, mainly on the basis of foreign official sources and personal experiences. The present volume aims at covering the official Greek angle of this tumultuous period of World War II, when the British Empire was at its lowest and Greece her only ally still fighting on her own soil.

This volume corroborates, on the basis of Greek official documents, several historical facts of that period, some of which are little known:

1. As early as the 15th January 1941, the Greek Prime Minister declared to Field Marshall Wavell that "in the case of a German attack, Greece, even if left to her own resources, will not conclude a separate peace, but will fight back against the invader, for Greece is not fighting for victory but for honour".

2. British difficulties in supplying war material to embattled Greece.

3. Greek anxiety for nothing to be done—including the premature landing of British troops in Greece—which could give grounds to accelerating the German invasion of Greece.

4. The day to day wavering of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Turkey, under German pressure, to come to the aid of Greece, with the final well known consequences of the occupation of Yugoslavia, the adherence of Bulgaria to the Axis and the neutrality of Turkey.

5. Complications to the planning of the defence of Greece, due to the indecisiveness of Yugoslavia and Turkey.

6. Turkish-Soviet relations during this difficult period.

7. Soviet displeasure at the German infiltration of the Balkans.

8. The first premonitions of the pending German invasion of the USSR.

9. British plans for the invasion of the Dodecanese as early as 1940. Greek proposals to participate in the operation.

10. Greek-British preparations for the evacuation of troops, the Royal Family and the Government from the Greek mainland to Crete. Discussion of Cyprus as a possible site for the Greek Government in exile.

The detailed catalogue of the documents published in this volume, as well as a second catalogue of the personae dramatis, will prove very useful in future historical research.

D. L. CHRISANTHOPOULOS

Robert R. King, *A History of the Romanian Communist Party* (Histories of Ruling Communist Parties). Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press, 1980, pp. xvi + 190. *Romania in the 1980s*, edited by Daniel N. Nelson (Westview Special Studies on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe). Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1981. pp. xiii + 313.

As an East Bloc country whose relations with the Soviet Union have been less than amicable, Romania has become a subject of great interest to American scholars in recent years. Daniel Nelson writes in his preface: "Among communist states, Romania is, in several respects, a unique case. Romania has been the only Warsaw Pact member to deviate consistently from Soviet foreign policy norms....The leadership...has, meanwhile, governed

through a studious commitment to socio-economic centralization and control often reminiscent of Stalinist orthodoxy”.

Also significantly, Romania's foreign policy “independence” includes favorable contact with the U.S., à la Yugoslavia and China. For this reason Romania, Yugoslavia, and China are in the popular misconception more moderate or tolerable “Communist” countries—an amelioration not granted, for example, to Albania, the country whose relations with the Soviet Union are worst of all, but whose relations with the U.S. are almost as bad. The popular view is that the closer a country stands in its foreign policy to Moscow and away from the U.S., the harsher the life for the citizens of that land. It is rather confusing and therefore interesting to learn that traditional Western freedoms (and material items as well!) are more plentiful in dutiful East Bloc states such as Bulgaria and Hungary than in Romania. It is no wonder, therefore, that this anomaly becomes the central problem of each of these books. Their major weakness is the inability of the authors to recognize the fact that there is no connection between foreign policy and “Stalinist orthodoxy” in socialist states.

In fact both books are really descriptions based on excellent scholarship of the Romanian state and society today, where it may be heading, and a little bit of how it got there. King's *History* is one in the Hoover Institution's series on the Histories of Ruling Communist Parties. Nelson's *Romania* is a collection of essays, chiefly by political scientists, on different aspects of Romanian society and government with prognoses of what lies in the future. There can be no argument that both books are professionally competent and will serve academic readers and advanced students as invaluable reference and text material.

After two brief chapters on the party after 1919 and its establishment of power, King's study of the RCP's history concentrates on the development of institutions, the party elite, attitudes of nationalism, and social structure under Romanian socialist development since World War II. There is also a chapter on the party's role in Romanian foreign relations, particularly after the advent of Ceausescu. He pictures the party as the demesne of the single leader, at first Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, and now Ceausescu. Gheorghiu-Dej was not the opponent of Stalin as Fischer-Galati has described elsewhere, but his strong supporter as Kenneth Jowitt portrayed. King believes Ceausescu is an opponent of Moscow, but just as strong a dictator. The institutions of socialism are weak and oppressive when they follow Soviet models; they are more acceptable when they encourage Romanian nationalism and follow traditional bourgeois models.

Nelson in *Romania in the 1980s* brings together a group of young and old scholars, including Stephen Fischer-Galati, Paul Shapiro, John Cole, Mary Ellen Fischer, Walter Bacon, and Marvin Jackson, all among the leaders in American Romanian studies and with recent experience in the country. The articles are not presented in isolation, but with references to each other, although sometimes in a rather forced manner. The anthology starts with an overview, the historian Fischer-Galati's “Romania's Development as a Communist State” and a statistical analysis of interwar Romanian politics by Paul Shapiro. The remainder of the book is divided into two parts—“Leaders and Citizens in Romanian Politics” and “Foreign and Economic Policies” with a final concluding chapter by editor Nelson. The “Leaders and Citizens” section includes an excellent chapter by John Cole describing the effect of socialism on a peasant society. His presentation stems from the realistic observation that socialism is a fact of Romanian life and conclusions must be based on that fact. There are also articles on the role of Ceausescu (Fischer) and the workers in Romania (Nelson).

Since the individual articles are by and large strong analyses of present Romanian condi-

tions, it is rather disappointing that *Romania in the 1980s*, which I find to be the superior of the two works, comes to the same tired conclusion as the *History of the Romanian Communist Party*—that Romania's future will be dim to the degree its leaders adhere to the Marxist-Leninist ideology and strong to the degree they emphasize the country's nationalist past. This conclusion is based on the naive and historically disproven formula that ideology determines policy, and imperfections in society reflect mistaken ideology. In analyses of Eastern Europe, American scholars have for too long, hiding behind the mask of "objectivity", supported the anti-Marxism and anti-Sovietism of their society's leadership by attributing the region's woes to socialism, Moscow, and desertion of the bankrupt Wilsonian-Clemenceau nation-state system set up after World War I. A conscious application of ideology does *not* determine social structure. Economic, sociological and political conditions from both the past and present, from both outside and inside the society create social structures. Political leaders then use ideology to explain and justify those structures to the inhabitants of the society. Nelson's conclusion that nationalism is a key to Romania's viability and welfare is unsupported by the facts presented in the writings of his own authors. The nation-state system over the past century has proven an unequivocal disaster for Eastern Europe. The inability of the nations of Eastern Europe to live in harmony after 1919 under the patronage of "bourgeois" Western Europe and America is the major reason that the discredited Russian Empire in its "socialist" guise has reappeared as the primary factor in the region. This is the reality of Eastern Europe. Romania's present and future is and will be determined by its past and the past of its neighbors. Nelson would have been better advised to draw his conclusions from his own contributor Cole. Romanian socialism is a fact of life for the rest of this century and well into the next. The nation-state system which prevailed in Eastern Europe before World War II will not be restored. It may be true that Romanian politicians are corrupt, that the Romanian people believe themselves to be economically exploited and frustrated by their inability to participate in the decisions which effect their lives, that they believe that their leaders do not always have their best interests at heart, but these are phenomena of a world-wide malaise and not factors brought about by Marxist ideology.

Indiana University Northwest

FREDERICK B. CHARY

Nicholas Dima, *Bessarabia and Bukovina: The Soviet-Romanian Territorial Dispute* (East European Monographs/Columbia University Press, 1983), p. 159.

This monograph is concise and penetrating analysis of the social, political, economic, ethnodemographic, cultural, and linguistic changes, with particular attention to developments since 1945, of one of the Soviet republics—Moldavia (historically known as Bessarabia), and to a lesser extent, the region of Bukovina (currently part of the Ukraine)—two Romanian territories which have been forcibly reannexed by the Soviet Union at the beginning of World War II and subsequently incorporated into its realm.

The study begins with a brief historical background of Russia's involvement in the Romanian Principalities, beginning with Peter the Great, the first annexation of the Eastern half of the Principality of Moldavia, known historically as Bessarabia, into the Russian