

Germany; and that Hungary's leaders tried to cope with these pressures, but failed almost completely.

MARIO D. FENYO
Portland State University

ARROW-CROSS MEN, NATIONAL SOCIALISTS: 1935-1944. By *M. Lackó*.
Studia Historica, Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, 61. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1969. 112 pp. \$6.00.

This volume is an abridged and inferior version of the original (*Nyilasok, nemzetiszocialisták, 1935-1944*, Budapest, 1966). Missing are, among other things, the fine analysis of the 1939 secret parliamentary elections and the biography of Ferenc Szálasi, the Arrow-Cross leader. One is not even told of Szálasi's Army General Staff background. Still, even the English version is valuable as the only study on the Hungarian far right based on archival sources. The author argues correctly that interwar politics, both popular and high level, were dominated by counterrevolutionary ideologies; that a sharp distinction must be made between Horthy's own conservative camp and the more dynamic rightist opposition; that a further distinction must be drawn, within the far right, between the "gentlemanly" National Socialists and the more plebeian Arrow-Cross movement; and that, finally, within the Arrow-Cross a distinction must be made between the middle-class opportunists and the anarchistic, social revolutionary extremists. The rapid growth of the Arrow-Cross between 1937 and 1940 and its equally rapid decline thereafter is well illustrated, destroying the widely held belief that Szálasi's assumption of power on October 15, 1944, was the culmination of a long development and not the result of a last-ditch German maneuver. The author, a Marxist, freely admits that the Arrow-Cross had a wide mass base, even among workers, and that at one point the Arrow-Cross miners almost brought the Hungarian economy to a standstill while vainly hoping for a German invasion of their country. On the other hand, the book swarms with unsupported statements on the collective behavior of such groups as "the upper strata of the medium landowners" or "the antipopular and anti-progressive, uneducated, low-minded stratum of the officers." Every representative of the old order is mercilessly criticized, and there is no end to the author's righteous indignation.

ISTVÁN DEÁK
Columbia University

IDEOLOGIA GENERAȚIEI ROMÂNE DE LA 1848 DIN TRANSILVANIA.
By *George Em. Marica, Iosif Hajós, Călina Mare, and Constantin Rusu*. Bucharest: Editura politică, 1968. 334 pp. Lei 9.75.

In the past twenty years Rumanian scholars have published a large number of monographs, shorter studies, and collections of documents dealing with the revolution of 1848 and its antecedents in Transylvania, but the present work is the first systematic analysis of the thought and preoccupations of those who provided the Rumanian national movement with its ideological basis. The authors have used the writings of twenty-two persons whom they consider most representative of the period as their primary source and have produced a lucid, scholarly introduc-

tion to the intellectual history of the Rumanians of Transylvania between 1820 and 1850.

The generation of 1848 is portrayed as mainly concerned with the material world, as encyclopedic but not always profound or original in its intellectual interests, and as men of action rather than scholars. The major figures of this generation were influenced by three great currents of Western thought—the Enlightenment, romanticism, and liberalism. The Enlightenment had lost little of its attraction, because, according to the authors, the generation of 1848 faced the same social problems as its predecessor; the writings of both generations are, in fact, suffused with the spirit of reformism and the belief that education was the principal means to progress. The influence of romanticism was also considerable, and the passion and idealism of the national movement cannot be explained without reference to it. The influence of Western Europe is here duly noted, but nowhere is it more evident than in the economic and political thought of the 1840s. What strikes one particularly is the appeal to English experience. A constitutional monarchy and the untrammelled development of capitalism were almost unanimously equated with human progress. The authors make clear, however, that the generation of 1848 was aware of Rumanian realities and applied Western theory accordingly. They also emphasize that the strivings for political liberty and economic and social progress were inseparable from the goal of national emancipation.

These as well as other themes are treated in sections dealing with the contributions of the generation of 1848 to various branches of learning and to the creation of a Rumanian-language newspaper press. The authors conclude that little original work was done in any field except linguistics. Here the impetus came largely from a desire to defend the national interest, for by the 1840s language had become the focus of national antagonisms in Transylvania. History, on the other hand, once the chief weapon in the debate among Rumanians, Magyars, and Saxons over their respective rights, suffered a decline, owing, it seems, to the fact that arguments in defense of nationality were now being drawn mainly from philosophy. Many Rumanian intellectuals considered natural law to be superior to historical right as an argument in favor of national equality.

The authors regard the founding of Rumanian-language newspapers as the most important cultural achievement of the generation of 1848. The comprehensive survey of the ten newspapers published between 1821 and 1849 is the work of Professor George Em. Marica and is one of the chief merits of the present volume. The importance of the subject can hardly be overestimated, for the press was the chief outlet for the ideas and programs of Rumanian intellectuals and was the principal means by which they were able to mold public opinion. The most important newspapers—*Gazeta Transilvaniei* and *Foaia pentru minte, inimă și literatură*—are given their due, but what is particularly precious is the analysis of several short-lived but important publications like *Organul Luminării* and *Democratia*, which have until now received little attention.

The volume ends with a discussion of the main currents of economic and political thought and a short presentation of the programs drawn up by Rumanian intellectuals during the revolution of 1848.

The authors have placed the generation of 1848 well within the context of the intellectual development of the Rumanians of Transylvania except in one important respect—the church. Although the intellectuals were indeed little concerned with theology, religious thought itself remained influential. The prevalence of a sort of Christian humanism and the extraordinary popularity of the teachings of Lamennais

are otherwise inexplicable. The authors could have enhanced the significance of what preoccupied Rumanian intellectuals if they had placed them in the broader context of the *European* generation of 1848. As it is, comparisons have been limited mainly to eighteenth-century Transylvania. These objections notwithstanding, the work remains a significant contribution to the elucidation of the revolution of 1848 in Central Europe.

KEITH HITCHINS

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

TWENTIETH CENTURY RUMANIA. By *Stephen Fischer-Galați*. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1970. x, 248 pp. \$7.95.

The author has chosen historical change and continuity as his main theme. His purpose is to examine the validity of the present regime's claim that the Socialist Republic of Rumania represents the fulfillment of the Rumanian people's age-old aspirations. Three chapters deal with the period before 1944 and six with the installation and evolution of the Communist system. Throughout, the author confines himself mainly to political history.

Perhaps the most important single ingredient in the Rumanian historical tradition is nationalism—specifically, the idea of the essential oneness of the Rumanian people. Although the author rightly criticizes the extreme nationalist interpretation of the Rumanians' struggle for political unity before 1918, he does not fully appreciate the mutual concern which Rumanians on both sides of the Carpathians had for one another. The newspapers and private correspondence of the time clearly reveal the strength of national feeling. It seems to me that the author misjudges the attitude of the Rumanians of Transylvania toward both the Habsburg emperor and the Old Kingdom. Contrary to his views, loyalty to the first was fragile after the Compromise of 1867, and it was not "opposition to socio-economic and political modernization" in Rumania that prevented the Transylvanian Rumanians from accepting the political leadership of Bucharest but rather their repugnance toward the political system there and its failure to bring about meaningful social reform.

As far as the interwar period is concerned, the author gives Ion I. C. Brătianu, King Carol II, and Marshal Antonescu their due. He is a little hard on Iuliu Maniu, who emerges as a prude and a shallow democrat. The Jewish question and the nationality problem, both continuing themes in late nineteenth and twentieth-century Rumanian history, are quickly passed over. The Iron Guard and fascism are treated at some length, but other ideologies and intellectual currents are largely ignored. The literature of the period is mentioned briefly in a later chapter. Its representatives are inaccurately characterized as "less distinguished" than the writers of the nineteenth century, and Victor Eftimiu and Cezar Petrescu are cited along with Mihail Sadoveanu as major figures. In fact, the twenties and thirties witnessed brilliant innovation and productivity and the maturing of modern Rumanian literature; and Eftimiu and Petrescu, though popular, belong to the second rank.

In describing Rumania's development under communism, the author gives particular attention to the national current in the Rumanian Communist movement and demonstrates that the policies pursued by Gheorghiu-Dej and Ceaușescu in the sixties had their origins in the preceding decade. The struggle between the "Muscovites" and the "Rumanians" within the Rumanian Communist Party and the con-