

Székely villages of the early nineteenth century, so the everyday life of a Székely at that time, despite the deep-seated community traditions, was hardly an easy one. There are some slight attempts on Imreh's part to "Marxist-Leninize" his introductory study by looking for supporting data of an alleged continuous "class struggle" in the land of the Székelys, but he has little success. Otherwise the book is readable and nicely printed, the notes are precisely presented, and the Hungarian-Hungarian dictionary at the end, which links nineteenth-century Hungarian to the present language, deserves acknowledgment. The book will be interesting reading for students of Transylvanian history, and it also illustrates the value of this kind of research using village community documents.

ANDRÁS H. FOGÁNY
Seton Hall University

THE GREAT RUMANIAN PEASANT REVOLT OF 1907: ORIGINS OF A MODERN JACQUERIE. By *Philip Gabriel Eidelberg*. Studies of the Institute on East Central Europe, Columbia University. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974. xii, 259 pp. 64 Dglds.

Systematic historical analyses of major peasant revolts are still comparatively rare in non-Communist literature, especially in the field of East Central European studies. For this reason, Professor Eidelberg's work is most welcome and breaks much new ground in the study of the long-range and immediate causes of the Rumanian peasant revolt of 1907. In a broader sense, his monograph is a major contribution to the field of East European social and agrarian history from the mid-nineteenth century to the First World War. The relevance of this study to comparative agrarian history is emphasized by an appendix entitled "Rumania and Russia (1861-1921)." The author also takes a brief look ahead to place in historical perspective the present Communist system of collectivization.

Until now it has generally been held that the revolt could be traced directly to the Land Reform of 1864, which created the machinery for a system of agricultural contracts that became increasingly onerous for the peasant. Eidelberg's original contribution, however, is to show that a more important cause, both of the worsening position of the Rumanian peasant and of the revolt itself, was the precipitate fall in world grain prices in 1875. The decline in agricultural profits encouraged the great landlords to recoup their losses by raising their peasants' rents. This long-term decline also stimulated, for the first time, a major trend toward sheltered industrialization and away from extensive agriculture. Such a policy was favored by the Liberal Party, representing many small landlords who could not adapt to the post-1875 agricultural situation.

Eidelberg meshes the immediate causes of the revolt into these long-range trends in a detailed analysis of the issue of agricultural reform (1903-7). This discussion forms the heart of his book. Existing accounts agree that the peasants were encouraged to revolt by outside influences, variously attributed to the "village bourgeoisie," the "urban bourgeoisie," or the "political radicals." The exact nature of this influence, however, had never been described in detail, much less satisfactorily explained. Eidelberg explains and documents this influence.

According to his argument, the Liberal Party, in order to create an internal market for its sheltered industrialization program, began to press for the creation of village land-renting cooperatives, whose purpose was to transfer control of the

great private estates to a minority of well-to-do peasants (similar to Stolypin's "wager on the sturdy and the strong"). This program, however, aroused among the peasants expectations which could not be satisfied, owing to landlord resistance. It also inspired a competing program of reform, promoted by the anti-industrialist camp (supported to some degree by elements of the Conservative Party) to transfer a substantial portion of the same land to the broad masses of the peasant poor. This second conception of reform was, in effect, a "wager on the weak," aimed at hindering the growth of an internal market, and enabling a modified estate system to endure. Thus "the industrialization controversy became the great issue of dissension among the landlord classes, and eventually each side appealed to the peasants for support" (pp. 231-33). The revolt broke out, Eidelberg argues, when the peasants decided to take the law into their own hands, convinced that they had considerable support within the landed establishment.

The author is skeptical toward liberal or populist attempts to introduce into the Rumanian countryside an open, pluralistic society. He believes that in both Rumania and Russia the average peasant was so poor, unskilled, and inefficient that he could only survive in a closed society which guaranteed him permanent employment. The peasant feared that an open society would give his more dynamic and enterprising peasant neighbor the chance to prosper and eventually push him off the land. Such a prospect justified the continued existence of the estate system and its eventual successor, the Communist collective farm. In Rumania both have served to keep the more dynamic peasant minority under control. Eidelberg argues that in 1907, and again after 1918, the peasant did not wish to destroy the estate system, only to modify it. Because he so desperately needed landlord support, he tended to be a follower, not a leader, in agrarian reform.

GLENN E. TORREY

Emporia Kansas State College

GARDA DE FIER: ORGANIZAȚIE TERORISTĂ DE TIP FASCIST. By Mihai Fătu and Ion Spălățelu. Bucharest: Editura Politică, 1971. 430 pp. Lei 8.25, paper.

This book merits attention if only because it is the first serious monograph on the Iron Guard to be published by the Rumanian Communists since Lucretiu Pătrășcanu's classic, *Sub trei dictaturi*, first appeared in 1944. *Sub trei dictaturi* was itself reprinted a year earlier (1970), and by the same publishers as *Garda de fier*. This reprint, the first in twenty-four years, was part of the political rehabilitation of a man who had been one of the most prominent Rumanian Communists before 1944. The subsequent appearance of *Garda de fier*, however, reveals that although Pătrășcanu's views have been reprinted, they have by no means always been endorsed.

A hint of this in fact had already been suggested in the preface of the 1970 edition of *Sub trei dictaturi*, in which the publishers stated that the reader could find in Pătrășcanu's work a wealth of information but added that this information had been "presented within the framework of a historical-materialist analysis at the level of comprehension of the period in which it had [originally] been conceived." The book's subject matter, added the publishers, remained an open field for historical investigation. Moreover, *Garda de fier*, in its own introduction, never acknowledges Pătrășcanu, but refers to itself as "a beginning, a first contribution,"