

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,"

to the subject of Rumanian fascism. Pătrășcanu's book is mentioned only once (pp. 110–11), and then as a source for some obscure, fleetingly discussed information in the text. What this lone reference does tell us, however, is that the authors were well aware of the new Pătrășcanu edition while their work was still in manuscript.

Of interest is this work's treatment of the two major political parties of the period. The Liberals, to a much lesser degree than the National Peasants, are accused of having supported the Iron Guard. Perhaps this is because the Liberals, in contrast to the two other political movements, supported a protectionist policy favoring heavy industry, thus foreshadowing post-1958 Rumania's own policy. Significantly, the authors criticize the Guard not only for having been anti-Communist but also for having opposed sheltered industrialization and general economic autarchy—policies which they feel were indispensable for Rumania's independence (pp. 71, 73).

To Pătrășcanu, in contrast, fascism's roots ran deep and strong in both Peasantist *and* Liberal parties. In particular, he did not support the Liberals for their economic policies. On the contrary, he attacked such policies as excessively directed in favor of heavy industry. To him it was in fact the Liberals' increasing support of heavy industry at the expense of other sectors of the economy which led them eventually to espouse a rightist dictatorship. Only thus, reasoned Pătrășcanu, could they impose their allegedly unpopular economic policies on the rest of the country (see, for example, Pătrășcanu, pp. 24–37, 92–94).

The publication of *Garda de Fier* can thus be seen as an attempt to correct Pătrășcanu's interpretation.

PHILIP EIDELBERG

University of South Africa, Pretoria

ISTORIJA SRPSKE PRAVOSLAVNE CRKVE. 2 vols. By Đoko [Djoko] Slijepčević. Munich, 1962, 1966. Vol. 1: OD POKRŠTAVANJA SRBA DO KRAJA XVIII VEKA. 528 pp. Vol. 2: OD POČETKA XIX VEKA DO KRAJA DRUGOG SVETSKOG RATA. 718 pp.

SRPSKA PRAVOSLAVNA CRKVA, 1219–1969: SPOMENICA O 750-GODIŠNJICI AUTOKEFALNOSTI. Edited by Bishop *Laurentije* et al. Belgrade: Izdanje Svetog arhijerejskog sinoda Srpske pravoslavne crkve, 1969. 392 pp.

HILANDARSKI ZBORNIK. Belgrade: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 1966, 1971. Vol. 1: Edited by *Georgije Ostrogorski*. 197 pp. Vol. 2: Edited by *Svetozar Radojčić*. 201 pp.

SRPSKA PRAVOSLAVNA CRKVA, 1920–1970: SPOMENICA O 50-GODIŠNJICI VASPOSTAVLJANJA SRPSKE PATRIJARŠIJE. Edited by *Metropolitan Vladislav* et al. Belgrade: Izdanje Svetog arhijerejskog sinoda Srpske pravoslavne crkve, 1971. 539 pp.

Since the end of the eighteenth century Serbian religious and secular leaders have frequently cited the need for a written history of the Serbian Orthodox Church. The first work of this kind appeared in 1870, when Svetozar Niketić published a book entitled *Istoriški razvitak srpske crkve*, but this study only considered developments to the year 1459. A survey of the entire history of the Serbian Church did