

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

Empire in 1812, and the evolution of the Russo-Romanian relations down to 1918, when that province rejoined the unified Romanian national state. The interwar period is examined in greater details pointing out that the turning point in the Soviet-Romanian relations came in the summer of 1940 when the Soviet Union, acting in accordance with the Soviet-Nazi Non-Aggression Pact of 1939, sent an ultimatum to the Romanian government demanding the evacuation of the two provinces within four days, and subsequently Russian troops moved in and occupied them. Following the end of World War II, the Soviet Union annexed these territories and created the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The communist government, installed in Bucharest by the Russians in 1944 and totally subservient to them, tacitly acquiesced the seizure and reintegration of the two provinces into the Soviet Union. But in the 1960's, the Romanian Communist Party revived the question of Bessarabia and Bukovina once more, and a serious Soviet-Romanian territorial dispute ensued. The crisis came to an open in the mid-1970s when the Romanian government openly challenged the legitimacy of Soviet domination of these two Romanian provinces. The government in Bucharest claimed its rights on Soviet Moldavia (Bessarabia) on historical and geographical grounds, ethnic identity (the Moldavians are in fact Romanians and constitute the majority of the population in the Soviet Moldavian republic), and cultural, and linguistic affinity with the Romanians. Historians, scholars, and intellectuals began an extensive publicity to prove the Romanianism (*Romanitatea*) of the two lost territories to the Russians. Although the controversy quelled in the last years, the study suggests that the issue of Bessarabia and Bukovina still remains an open one.

Based on this assessment, the author attempts to show that despite the far-reaching transformations that have been wrought about by the Soviet Union during the last decades in the disputed area, the Romanian character of Soviet Moldavia has not been substantially changed: the population of Soviet Moldavia remains still predominantly Romanian; the overwhelming majority of the Soviet Moldavians still speaks the Moldavian (Romanian) language; that Moscow's systematic policy of de-nationalization, Russification, and Russification of the Moldavians has not been successful, particularly in the rural areas; that the efforts of the Russians to integrate as fully and as completely the whole socioeconomic, political, and cultural institutions of Moldavia into the Soviet system have not succeeded; that the process of submerging the Moldavian population into the institutional structure of the Soviet Union has not been achieved; that the Russians failed to convince the Moldavians that they constitute a separate nationality, apart from the Romanians, and thus creating a new Moldavian nationality; and that, finally, the Russians failed to suppress or eradicate the ethnic nationalism of the Moldavians and to break away from the Romanian past history and tradition.

The author arrived at these points by a careful and systematic analysis, comparison, evaluation, and use of statistical data, which he provides throughout his study, as well as by personal information, and first-hand knowledge of the region, its people, and history. Some of his arguments, however, would indicate that the nationality problem has become, as he points out, an important issue in the Soviet Union. He further contends that non-Russian nationalities are definitely on their path to claiming greater autonomy and rights and that such a process cannot be halted, that the future of Soviet nationalities is not yet decided, nor do the Soviet leaders know what will happen to the Soviet Union in the coming years; that ethno-demographic changes of the Soviet industrial complex in the last decades produced a growing concern in Moscow; and that the domination of the Soviet realm by the

Russians might be challenged from within by the increasing numbers of Soviet non-Russian nationalities.

It is obvious that, in multinational countries such as the Soviet Union, the existence of considerable national diversity poses the spectre of lack of internal unity, particularly during a period of crisis. But the Russian leaders have been able to check national aspirations and to suppress "bourgeois nationalism", "Chauvinism", and "ethnic bigotry". The tightly controlled centralized soviet political system, government, and party apparatus, have so far ensured a remarkable measure of internal cohesion. Despite some isolated cases of dissatisfaction, and divided loyalties, the Soviet Moldavians, and the Soviet population as a whole, identify and support their political system. It is a chimera to believe that Soviet collapse from within, often forecasted by Western observers, would be possible in the nondistant future. The grip of the Russians over their non-Russian nationalities is too heavy, the policy of integration and Sovietization of the Moldavians will continue, and the prospects of solving the Romanian-Soviet territory dispute, would not be achieved until and unless the Soviet *empire* collapses and the international boundaries are readjusted. Dima's work on Bessarabia and Bukovina, however, is a valuable contribution to the understanding of the nationality question of Soviet Moldavia and of the causes which led to the territorial dispute between the two communist governments—Soviet and Romanian.

University of South Carolina—
Coastal Carolina College

DEMETRIOS J. FARSOLAS

Andreas Geiger, *Herkunftsbedingungen der türkischen Arbeiter in der Bundesrepublik und ihr gewerkschaftliches Verhalten*. Express Edition; Berlin 1982; 229 S.

Geigers Buch befaßt sich in erster Linie mit dem Herkunftsland der größten Ausländergruppe in der B. R. Deutschland, der Türken, von denen zur Zeit mehr als 1,6 Millionen hier leben. Geiger stellt zunächst die Entwicklung der Türkei von der Endphase des Osmanischen Reiches an bis hin zur Gegenwart kurz dar. Parteien, Gewerkschaften, Lokalpolitiker und Arbeitgeberverbände sowie ihre Bedeutung für die Ursachen der Migration werden kurz umrissen.

Im zweiten Teil versucht Geiger ein landeskundliches Bild der Türkei aufzuzeigen. Dabei liefert er jedoch—ebenso wie im ersten Teil—lediglich ein oberflächliches Informationsbündel, da er sich bemüht, möglichst viele Informationen zu verarbeiten, ohne diese jedoch zu vertiefen.

Im dritten Teil befaßt sich der Autor von S. 166 bis S. 195 mit dem Stellenwert der deutschen Gewerkschaften für die türkischen Arbeitnehmer. Eine Dokumentation über die türkischen Fordarbeiter während des Fordstreikes im Jahre 1973, ein Anhang über Parteien und Gewerkschaften und eine Zeittafel der Türkei bilden den letzten Teil des Buches.

Insgesamt bemüht sich der Autor, möglichst viele Informationen über die Türkei zu vermitteln, was ihm wegen des breiten Spektrums an Daten jedoch nicht gut gelingt. Diejenigen Leser, die sich über die Türkei und die türkische Migration auskennen, werden in Geigers Buch tiefgehende Analysen und Informationen vermissen.