

NOTES AND REVIEWS

ROBERT L. BEISNER, *Dean Acheson. A Life in the Cold War*, Oxford University Press, 2006, 800 pp.

Dean Acheson was beyond any doubt one of the most representative figures of the early Cold War and had a great impact upon American policies vis-à-vis the Soviet Union during the late 1940s and early 1950s. Close to President Harry Truman, he was Secretary of State from 1949 to 1953, and was a key factor in applying the famous "containment" policy. Robert Beisner engaged in the very difficult work of studying all the documents, archives and bibliography regarding Acheson's personality in an attempt to reconstruct not only his biography, but also the political climate of the period which determined Dean Acheson's decisions.

Robert L. Beisner was a Professor and Chairman of the Department of History at the American University in Washington DC (currently retired). His endeavor indubitably met with great success, his book being one of the most important biographies of the Cold War age. Beisner studied a great amount of material, including state archives, personal papers, newspapers, and the entire historical bibliography, as his abundant footnotes prove. He focuses both on the politician, but also on the man Dean Acheson, trying to identify the sources of his decisions, his political mind and his diplomatic horizon, relating everything both to human and political factors of the age.

Dean Gooderham Acheson was born in the family of a protestant priest, in Connecticut, in April 1893, and attended Groton School and Yale College, later on studying law at Harvard College. Having profound Democratic convictions, Acheson joined the party and entered public service in the early 1930s, under the office of Franklyn Delano Roosevelt, who appointed him Undersecretary of Treasury in 1933. He continued to go up the social and professional ladder, proving great aptitudes in handling legal and political issues with insight. During the war, he served in the economic field, until 1945 when Harry Truman named him Undersecretary of State. He occupied this position under Secretaries of State Stettinius, Byrnes and Marshall. In 1949, Truman appointed him Secretary of State.

In this position, he was responsible for implementing the so-called Truman Doctrine and the containment policies inherited from his predecessors. Author Robert Beisner argues that, in the immediate aftermath of the World War, Acheson truly believed in conciliation with Moscow, in the possibility to work together for organizing peace. He changed his mind later and became an enthusiastic supporter of the Truman Doctrine, after acknowledging the Soviet aggressions in Central and Eastern Europe. Acheson, as Beisner depicts him, was an old-fashioned American patriot, with strong beliefs in the superiority of the American values and way of life. Therefore, his long-term cohabitation with Communism would have been unlikely, anyway. But Beisner argues that situations and circumstances played a very important role in his decision-making, rather than beliefs.

Dean Acheson supported President Truman in his efforts to uphold the independence of Greece and Turkey with large financial intervention. Acheson was apparently the writer of President Truman's speech to the Congress, where he requested approval for the financial aid plan he devised for the two countries. Also, Acheson played an important part in organizing the economic help for Western Europe, known as the "Marshall Plan." At the time of his office, Acheson was subjected to intense criticism for his attitude towards Korea. Prior to the North Korean attack on the South, Acheson had made a statement in which he said that Korea was out of what he considered the American area of security. Months later, when the North attacked the South, critics accused him of facilitating or encouraging this attack indirectly, by his indifferent attitude regarding Korea. In what concerns Asia, Acheson received more criticism regarding China, especially the "loss" of China to

Communism. Critics put a lot of the blame on Acheson for not anticipating and not taking proper measures to prevent that from happening. He himself offered more reasons for harsh criticism, during the Alfred Hiss scandal. Accused and charged with spying, Hiss was unconditionally supported by Acheson, even after his guilt had been demonstrated beyond doubt.

Going through all available materials for a comprehensive research, Beisner tries to excuse most of Acheson's controversial decisions. Nevertheless, he brings convincing arguments in favor of his standpoint. The author demonstrates that Acheson had a difficult mission, first of all domestically. The Congress was often reluctant to policies which involved spending public money abroad and international involvement, and rarely understood the subtleties of diplomacy. The Secretary of State had a hard time convincing the Congress to support Truman's foreign policies. At the same time, the American public was just as reluctant to that, due largely to its lack of interest in foreign policy. Handling such difficulties, Acheson had to confront the Soviet Union concomitantly, in one of the most heated stages of the Cold War. Two more factors influenced his policies: Europe and the rest of the world.

European countries were facing many difficulties themselves, stemming from the economic postwar crisis and the need for security. Europeans were looking at Washington as a providential friend, expecting help in all matters. Moreover, most of the European allies were colonial powers, facing more trouble in the colonial world and expecting help in those issues, as well. Acheson had to offer help in order to ensure the allies' fidelity but at the same time was pressed by colonial nations pursuing independence. Such nations requested American help, threatening to turn to the Soviets if refused. On the other hand, Beisner admits that Acheson had a superficial knowledge of Asia, Africa and the Middle East, and underestimated the importance of these areas for world politics. In a way, Acheson was a Eurocentric, with Anglophile vocation and – it could be said – with an influence of racism in his thought. He paid little attention to these nations. He even said once that he really did not understand these peoples, and it is known that he had doubts regarding their capacity to self-govern if granted independence.

Beisner stresses the fact that in Acheson's view, the most important nucleus of the Cold War was Europe and Germany. Western Europe deserved most of the American attention and help, because that was where the fate of the game was to be decided. The author considers that history has proved him right, arguing that America lost many political battles, all over the world, but not even one in Europe, considering, of course, the battles with Moscow. Moreover, Germany's unification and peaceful, constructive integration in the Western community of nations was also a proof that Acheson had a good political intuition.

Robert Beisner does not neglect Dean Acheson, the man, beyond the political figure. He describes Acheson as one of the most characteristic figures of what was usually called the old East coast aristocracy, which offered many of America's statesmen. He believed that the American public did not have any knowledge of diplomacy, but that it could be educated in that direction, as well as the press. He felt the same way about Congress, but he did despise his political adversaries, whom he sometimes called "primitives" for their lack of discernment. Otherwise, he had a rather poignant personality, charmingly combined with penetrating intelligence, complexity and pragmatism. Beisner's book is organized in seven parts and 37 chapters, having almost 800 pages. It represents Acheson's most consistent biography written until now and based on an impressive amount of documentary material. Both descriptive and analytical in nature, exhaustive by the problems discussed and the sources consulted, Robert Beisner's book is certainly a valuable contribution to understanding the Cold War and the American decision-making at the time.

Cezar Stanciu

DAN BERINDEI, *Les Roumains en Europe au XIX^e siècle. Études et essais historiques*, Edit. Academiei Române, București, 2008, 696 pp.

L'ouvrage du réputé historien Dan Berindei, membre de l'Académie Roumaine, est un événement éditorial remarquable pour au moins deux raisons. La première est le fait que cette récente apparition, qui vient s'ajouter à une longue suite de publications, livres, études et articles par le même auteur, donne la mesure de l'activité d'une vie dédiée à la recherche de l'histoire des Roumains pendant l'effervescent XIX^e siècle. La seconde raison est la manière dont l'historien fait ressortir la place des Roumains dans l'histoire de l'Europe et l'espace du sud-est de l'Europe dans une période de transformations profondes, de réveil de l'esprit national, de l'idéal de l'union et de l'indépendance. En partant d'un nombre de recherches antérieures, Dan Berindei offre aux lecteurs un ouvrage homogène, articulé, avec une riche thématique, comprenant principalement des études publiées en français, auxquelles viennent s'ajouter des études en allemand et en anglais.

Restant fidèle au credo de son illustre professeur Gheorghe Brătianu, selon lequel l'histoire d'un peuple ne peut être comprise et expliquée autrement que dans le contexte de l'histoire universelle, Dan Berindei fait ressortir le fait que chaque peuple a eu sa propre contribution au progrès de l'humanité, « même si l'apport des nations petites et moyennes n'a pas toujours été assez pris en considération ». Aussi, bien que l'histoire universelle « reste en premier lieu *le terrain de chasse* des grandes puissances », les opinions et l'argumentation d'un historien sont incomplètes si ce dernier ne prend pas en calcul la réalité toute entière (p. 9). Dans ce contexte, l'ouvrage présente des moments importants dans l'histoire des Roumains, leur réaction vis-à-vis de certains événements, les problèmes avec lesquels ils durent se confronter et leur lutte pour la reconnaissance de leur nouveau statut international.

Le volume réunit dans ses sept sections – *Locul românilor în Europa* (La place des Roumains en Europe), *Sub influența imperiilor* (Sous l'influence des empires), *Deșteptarea națională și modernizarea la români* (Le réveil national et la modernisation chez les Roumains), *Problema românilor în construcția Europei secolului al XIX-lea* (La question des Roumains dans la construction de l'Europe au XIX^e siècle), *Impactul revoluției de la 1848 asupra românilor* (L'impact de la Révolution de 1848 sur les Roumains), *Constituirea României moderne și Europa* (La création de la Roumanie moderne et l'Europe), *Drumul statului român spre independență* (Le chemin de l'Etat roumain vers l'indépendance) – des études visant la place et le rôle des Roumains dans l'histoire de l'Europe, leurs relations avec les grandes puissances, tout particulièrement avec les empires voisins, l'évolution du processus historique de la naissance de la conscience nationale et de la lutte pour l'unité et pour l'indépendance, ainsi que le chemin vers la modernisation. L'ample processus de la création de la Roumanie moderne a été étroitement lié aux déroulements enregistrés sur le continent, la question roumaine étant un des problèmes de la construction de l'Europe au XIX^e siècle, analysée par l'auteur dans le Chapitre IV. Après avoir examiné les coordonnées du nouvel ordre européen tracées après la Révolution de 1789, l'auteur se penche sur la place et le rôle attribué au sud-est de l'Europe par la diplomatie continentale et analyse les divers aspects régionaux, tels qu'ils ressortent des grands traités de paix: Vienne (1815), Paris (1856) et Berlin (1878). L'auteur montre que si au premier congrès la problématique de cet espace ne suscita pas beaucoup d'attention, aux deux congrès suivants les puissances européennes dirigèrent leurs discussions et leurs conclusions en exclusivité sur cet espace. Ainsi, l'unité, l'indépendance et la modernisation de la Roumanie, en tant que sujets des réunions internationales citées plus haut et d'autres réunions, furent les facteurs dominants de l'ample processus de transformation qui amena la création de l'Etat moderne. Ces trois facteurs n'agirent point de manière indépendante, même si chacun eut sa propre évolution, mais en corrélation étroite, avec des traits les rapprochant jusqu'à l'identification, mais aussi avec des contradictions, qui furent le résultat des divergences, ou pour mieux dire de la non-identité des intérêts des classes et catégories sociales (p. 173).

L'année révolutionnaire 1848 jouit d'une attention toute particulière (pp. 265-375), l'auteur analysant la révolution dans les Pays Roumains, la présence des Roumains dans les autres révolutions européennes et surtout l'impact de la révolution française sur le groupe de jeunes Roumains se trouvant à Paris, la sympathie pour la cause roumaine dans les milieux intellectuels français et les idées rapprochant les participants. Les trois mois de pouvoir révolutionnaire en Valachie coïncidèrent avec le début de la diplomatie moderne, concrétisée dans une manière « aisée » d'aborder les relations avec le pouvoir suzerain et les représentants des puissances européennes, ainsi qu'une attitude digne dans les relations avec la Sublime Porte.

Le moment décisif de la Révolution de 1848 marqua la naissance de la nation moderne et influença de manière directe le mouvement d'unité et de libération. L'idée d'unité prit de nouvelles dimensions, et l'idéologie et le programme de la révolution valaque furent la source d'inspiration du mouvement de libération sociale et nationale. Les frontières qui séparaient les Roumains et la domination étrangère devinrent de plus en plus contestées. L'union des deux Principautés dans le contexte de la création des Etats nationaux italien et allemand, le rôle du Congrès de Paix de Paris (1856) et le rôle de Napoléon III, la place et le rôle des Principautés Unies dans la lutte pour la libération nationale des peuples du sud-est de l'Europe, les relations des officiels roumains avec la France, surtout celles du Prince Alexandru Ioan Cuza, tout comme les démarches de ce dernier afin d'obtenir la reconnaissance de la double union par l'Empire ottoman, font l'objet de la sixième partie de l'ouvrage.

L'acheminement de l'Etat roumain vers indépendance fut marqué par le moment 1866, la Guerre franco-prussienne et, dans ce même contexte, un antagonisme plus marqué envers le Prince Carol, ainsi que par les démarches et les actions de la Roumanie dans le but d'obtenir l'indépendance économique, un pas important dans la direction de l'indépendance politique, par ses relations avec les pays d'origine latine (France, Espagne, Italie) et avec les peuples des Balkans. Chaque nation a sans doute ses propres idéaux, ses propres actions, ses propres victoires et défaites. Résultant de la volonté de toute la nation, l'unité nationale et l'indépendance avaient toutefois besoin du soutien des puissances européennes, sans lequel le nouveau statut international ne pouvait être reconnu. A noter dans ce sens les approches du gouvernement roumain en 1875-1877 auprès des représentants de l'Angleterre, de la France et de la Russie à Bucarest, dans le but d'obtenir le statut d'Etat indépendant, ainsi que les réticences et le scepticisme de ces représentants au sujet de la requête de la Roumanie. Sans jouir du support des grandes puissances et dans des circonstances délicates et compliquées, la Roumanie choisit de rester seule, et proclama son indépendance devant la nation.

Le recueil, complété par un index, est un ouvrage de référence pour l'étude de la place des Roumains en Europe et sa publication dans des langues de grande circulation facilite une meilleure connaissance de l'histoire des Roumains, ainsi qu'une compréhension correcte de leur rôle et de leur place en Europe, dans l'esprit de la vérité historique.

Daniela Bușă

GAVIN BOWD, *Memoria războiului 1941-1945* (Memory of War, 1941-1945), Edit. Pro Historia, București, 2006, 146 pp.

Gavin Bowd, a Scottish researcher with a keen interest in Romanian history during World War Two, offers the reader an approach to Romania's participation in the war based on first-hand testimonies. The morale of the troops involved in direct clashes on the battle front is depicted, together with the various attitudes adopted especially during the "eastern campaign" embarked upon by the Romanian Army after Operation Barbarossa was launched.

Bowd employs journals and memoirs already published, which he corroborates with new material – manuscripts, letters, unpublished memoirs, and postcards sent from the battle front by

military men of different ranks and arms – from the National History Archives of Romania and the Archives of the National Military Museum. The present volume is the captivating result of a research effort undertaken in Romania and Great Britain within the research program “Romanian Voices of the Second World War” which enjoyed support from the British Academy.

Testimonies include Major Gheorghe Stan’s, centered on the Battle of Stalingrad and the dramatic situation of the troops before the gory end of this formidable clash of armies. Demoralization and chaos reigned. Major Stan writes: “The atmosphere was lugubrious, as before a burial. General Tătăranu was far more overwhelmed than we would have expected. No wonder, as the general situation on the front was far more disastrous than we could imagine.” And further on, when describing the chaotic situation in terms of logistics: “We had been cut off from the units of the division ... as a matter of fact, it was useless and even impossible to put up any further resistance.” A description of the years of captivity in Soviet camps (for officers of the army) follows, with a host of details regarding everyday life.

The previously unpublished documents include Pilot Traian Gavriliiu’s journal “I Was in Stalingrad, 1942/1943,” with details concerning air operations during the battle of Stalingrad. The author was fortunate enough to break through the blockade and fly to Tatsinskaya. Back to the country, he had several jobs. He was a flight instructor, a car mechanic, a butchery worker, and a lottery agent. Quite interesting in this respect are the remarks Gavriliiu makes in the final section of the journal, in relation to the fate befalling his former flight comrades: “I sometimes happen to walk past the Military Academy, and I can see our youth there paying homage to war heroes, little knowing that we are still alive. See for instance, Deputy Pilot Țărș Leonida, who unloads freight carriages at night, at Obor railway station; Lieutenant Commander Sadu, now a watchman at Bellu Cemetery; Lieutenant Dobran and Lieutenant Vasile Gavriliiu, striving to become lathe operators at Timpuri Noi Works; Lieutenant Commander Midescu, working with submersible pumps at great depths; and, so many others, who struggle to survive.”

Quite suggestive is the manuscript left by General Constantin Vasiliu Rășcanu’s son, Colonel Iuliu Constantin Rășcanu. Written in 1979-1984, it contains episodes from the end of the war, as well as several considerations on war in general, which are in total contrast with the topics and images officially promoted in the related period (the 1980s, more exactly 40 years after the end of the war). The author concludes that “history should present the truth, and not an invention or a distortion of it.” Direct reference is made here to history during the communist regime.

No less interesting are the notes, letters, and postcards from members of the “Tudor Vladimirescu” and “Horia, Cloșca și Crișan” divisions, which render a comprehensive image of the Romanian participation in the war. Terms such as “class enemy,” “democratic army,” “worker’s emancipation,” and “our Soviet brothers” are recurrent. However, it is difficult to appreciate if they were employed in all sincerity or propagandistically, as dictated by the collaboration with the Soviet “liberators.”

Owing to the richness, variety, and often novel character of the sources employed, as well as to the rigorous interpretation, Bowd’s book is a commendable contribution to scientific research on Romania’s participation in World War Two.

Radu Tudorancea

ȘTEFAN DELUREANU, *Garibaldi între mit și istorie* (Garibaldi, Between Myth and History), Edit. Paideia, București, 2007, 216 pp.

The collection of papers on Giuseppe Garibaldi by Ștefan Delureanu, a well-known researcher of the Italian space, occurs as a natural consequence of two previous monographs dedicated to Giuseppe Mazzini, and respectively to the Italian and Romanian movements of national

revival.¹ The book is also published in a year marked by the bicentennial of the birth of the Commander of the Thousand.

The six studies deal with less known aspects of Garibaldi's relations with the European world, and especially with the Romanian world. The opening study *Garibaldi navigator pe Mediterana și Marea Neagră* (Garibaldi, a Navigator of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea) presents Garibaldi's first years on Genoese and British ships. In the exotic ports of Eastern Mediterranean and of the Pontus Euxinus, whose dangerous waters were often infested by pirates, Garibaldi was initiated not only in navigation and trade, but also in the activities of the secret Italian societies. Delureanu, who is an assiduous researcher of the Italian archives, has come upon a document attesting Garibaldi's presence in Galați. It is a letter addressed by the General to G. B. Carpenetti, and dated Caprera, 1 July 1858. The letter is included in the appendices (pp. 178-179). Several Garibaldians who sought refuge in the Danubian ports are also mentioned, which adds to the general picture of Italian immigration in the area (pp. 17-18).

The second paper presents a review of contemporary or posthumous testimonies of the collective imaginary leading to the Garibaldian myth. Several pieces of Sicilian folklore are analyzed, in which the "hero of the two worlds" has supernatural connotations and is related to the Christian and Apostolic martyrs (pp. 24-25). Garibaldi must have been the most popular Italian figure in Europe at the time. Delureanu provides in support of this a great number of press articles and literary works dedicated to Garibaldi in Great Britain, France, Spain, Austria, as well as in territories inhabited by Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, etc.

The third paper *Garibaldi în opinia și literatura română* (Garibaldi in the Romanian View and Literature) adds to the European dimension of Garibaldi, as a Romantic figure, his impact on the Romanian space. Delureanu makes a comprehensive survey of the press in the Romanian Principalities, from its beginnings in the third decade of the nineteenth century until the end of the same century. Italian publicists settled in the Romanian Principalities are also mentioned, including the charismatic Luigi Cazzavillan, a former Garibaldian and a most prominent writer and editor in Romania. Two letters by Cazzavillan to Garibaldi are published in the appendices (pp. 192-196).

The fourth paper is most inciting as it deals with the participation of the Romanians in the Expedition of the Thousand. It is based on unpublished documents from the State Archives of Turin, kept in the funds Documenti relativi ai Mille e all'Esercito Meridionale and Archivio militare di Sicilia 1860-1861. Starting out from the lack of accounts on any Romanian presence in the Garibaldian legions, Delureanu makes reference to the memoirs of participants in the Campaign of 1860 such as Cesare Giuseppe Abba and Giuseppe Bandini, and identifies with the help of documents found in the aforementioned funds a number of Romanians, most of them Transylvanian, enrolled in the Hungarian Legion. A list is given in the appendices (pp. 213-215). It is an important breakthrough for the history of Romanian-Italian relations during the Risorgimento.

The two following papers *Așteptându-l pe Garibaldi* (Waiting for Garibaldi) and *O campanie a popoarelor de la Alpi la Dunăre* (A Campaign of the Peoples from the Alps to the Danube) examine the plans of the Sabaudian monarchy interwoven with Garibaldi's and the Mazzinian initiatives to involve the Central and Eastern European peoples in the struggle against Austria. The Romanian space is seen to become especially important during the reign of Alexandru Ioan Cuza. While traveling along the path opened by Alexandru Marcu and Nicolae Corivan, Delureanu addresses these projects and adds new testimonies to their complex development by the Polish, Hungarian, Greek and Serbian leaders, and in the Romanian milieu. The presentation of the mission undertaken by the two Garibaldian emissaries Giacinto Bruzzesi and Giuseppe Guerzoni in 1863 is quite novel (pp. 142-143). Yet another piece of

¹ *Mazzini și românii în Risorgimento*, București, 2006 and *Risorgimento italiano e Risorgimento romeno*, Napoli, 2005.

novelty is Eugeniu Carada's involvement in the revolutionary plans of 1865 (pp. 164-165), established by means of the letter of the Romanian leader to Mazzini of 20 August 1864. This letter was published by Delureanu in "Bollettino della Domus Mazziniana" in 1992.

The appendices include 15 letters by Giuseppe Garibaldi, Marco Antonio Canini, Gheorghe Poenaru, Candido Augusto Vecchi, C. A. Rosetti, Hermiona Asachi Quinet, Victor Hugo, Edgar Quinet, and Titus Dunca, unpublished before. Several excerpts from the press of the time, notes, and photographs of the characters involved are also included.

Delureanu's collection of papers on Garibaldi and his relations with the Romanian world, based on unpublished documents in the Italian archives, is an important contribution to the specialized literature, and also a captivating reading owing to the distinctive style of the author.

Raluca Tomi

STEFAN IHRIG, *Wer sind die Moldawier? Rumänismus versus Moldowanismus in Historiographie und Schulbüchern der Republik Moldova, 1991-2006*, mit einem Vorwort von Holm Sundhaussen, *ibidem*-Verlag, Stuttgart, 2008, 332 pp.

As noted by historian Holm Sundhaussen in the foreword to the present volume, the particular features of the creation of the national state and the nation in the Republic of Moldova since the late eighties have made this process different from most other recent processes or actions in Europe.

Two groups are involved in the struggle for power: the "Moldovanists" and the "Romanianists." The former postulate the existence of a self-defined Moldovan "nation," non-identical to the Romanian nation, and advocate for an independent national state. Whereas the "Romanianists" see the Romanian-speaking population of Moldova as part of the Romanian nation and promote the union with the "fatherland."

In addition to this clash between Romanianism and Moldovanism, the young post-Soviet state is experiencing conflicts with separatist Transnistria and the Gagauz, both impeding a self-definition of the state and nation. The antagonism between Moldovanism and Romanianism takes various forms. It can be seen in the day-to-day policy of the political regime in Moldova and produces direct effects in all fields. Politically, Moldova has been governed since 1994 by the Moldovanists, whereas Romanianists enjoy "sovereignty" in universities and defend it in history schoolbooks.

Several attempts have been made to interpret the various conflicts in Moldova, but no thorough analysis of the political history or of the two dominant types of discourse has been undertaken so far.

Within the larger Southeast European framework, several history studies have been published, and they are known to have also approached the issue of the influence of history schoolbooks on the process of transformation in various countries.

Lying at the border between Southeast Europe and the prevailing east-Slavic area, Moldova exhibits clear differences set against all other parts of Southeast Europe. Nonetheless, similar models, already known from different contexts, can be identified here.

There is in Moldova an attempt to reconstruct history "in agreement with the truth," but history here is politically employed to stabilize power and the elites. Two post-socialist elites are struggling here for domination, and they both detain considerable power, at various stages and in various spheres, being perfectly apt to hinder one another.

Stefan Ihrig's book, which addresses especially the manifestations of what the author terms "Romanianism" and "Moldovanism" in historiography and history schoolbooks, makes an analysis of various studies belonging to both trends, and shows that the concepts developed in each

historiography contain clear indications of their direct action on the present and future of the state and nation, as well as on directions in external policy.

Although the two discourses have different definitions of the nation and goal, they appear very similar in rhetoric. There is no civic concept of nation in either "Moldovanism" or "Romanianism," but an entirely ethnicist approach to it.

This particular approach can be seen in the two stands taken in relation to ethnogenesis and the nation, national revival, the "golden era," and the "characteristics" of the nation. The concepts of nation are articulated in a primordialist, essentialist and ethnicist way. In "Romanianism," the core is considered integrally Romanian, whereas in "Moldovanism" the defining criteria are regionalist. In other words, the former trend sees in the existing state – Moldova – a hurdle in the creation of the national state and struggles for the union with Romania, whereas the later presents the Republic of Moldova as the result of a successful process of nation creation.

Both formulas leave little room if any for a civic concept of the state, or for integration of the non-Romanian population. The author believes that "Moldovanists" tend to represent more positively the place of minorities, as the concept of multi-ethnicity is eventually employed for the integration of these minorities in the projected module of integral society. He reconstructs the various changes occurring in crisis discourses since 1991 till present, at various stages.

The author concludes that in the Republic of Moldova there is a closed discourse, conversing with itself and ignoring all alternative models from within or without, be they integrative or neutralizing. The case particularity lies in the fact that "historiographical Romanianism" has been able to dominate schoolbooks despite "political Moldovanism" holding supremacy in the young republic since 1994.

The fundamental drawbacks of the dispute over the identity of the Republic of Moldova – which are reviewed – are currently in a stasis. The author notes that until now there has been no univocal or satisfactory illustration of the Romanian nation, or of the Moldavian nation, and no univocal nation in the Romanian or the Moldovan sense. Is this republic a state without a nation?

The author rates "questionable" not only the identity of the post-Soviet Republic of Moldova but also the debate on this identity: Is Moldova a country without a history? Is it a country with too many histories? Or, with a history within Romanian history, but not within the history of a new nation?

Ihrig admits to the existence of at least two histories, which he terms "Romanianist" and "Moldovanist." He also notes some Gagauz and Transnistrian "historiographical" efforts.

Attempts to narrate a "Moldovan history," and thus consolidate a Moldovan identity, have been resumed. They are in continuation of similar ones in the Soviet Union, which lay at the core of the Soviet policy in Bessarabia.

With Moldova breaking away from the Soviet Union in 1991, efforts to assert a national identity or to "create" it through historiography underwent rather significant change. However, the identity clash is not only between "Romanianists" and "Moldovanists", but also between the majority and minorities: Who would be then the carriers of the identity of the nation? The whole population of Moldova, the Romanian ethnics, or the Romanian ethnics and minorities termed historical – the Gagauz, the Bulgarians, the Ukrainians – to whom "more recent minorities" may be added, such as the Russians?

The author identifies a congenital flaw of "Moldovanism" in the fact that it relies on a state construct developed by the Soviet Union and substantiated by Soviet historiography alone. He therefore believes that a successful post-Soviet "Moldovanism" should overcome the Soviet obstacle and free itself from such a congenital "stain." However, all the hypostases of the "game of Moldovanism" closely observe the Soviet models, with very few nuances.

The "Moldovanist" case of a dogmatic historiographical concept of the "historical truth" has led to an impasse, as by its nature it has forced the introduction of a particular national-political agenda concerning the future of the state and its very existence or non-existence.

The attempt to formulate a future starting out from the past has resulted in a plurality of histories which are hindering one another. The varied political concepts employed in relation to the Republic of Moldova – and to other East and Southeast European states – have led to its perception as a failed state, a weak state, with an anemic identity, a failed authoritarian regime, or even a basic example of post-Soviet transition.

Post-Soviet transformation in the Republic of Moldova took the form of a struggle for identity. Peripheral trends, such as the Transnistrian and Gagauz ones, have called into question the common state. People who form the majority – such as Ibragimov believes – seem hesitant about what they actually are: part of the Romanian nation, or a nation proper? This has been a recurrent question since independence was achieved 15 years ago. Answers are searched for in history. And through history writing, stands taken in the argument are put forward. Historiography and education are a battle field. Teachers and students demonstrate, books are burnt, governments tremble for their fate. The issue is not solely academic. It addresses the future of the Moldovan state: the union with Romania or state independence?

The present book gives an illustration of the historiographical concepts of nation in the dispute between “Moldovanism” and “Romanianism”. It also makes an analysis of opinions and claims, as well as of the dissonance of such “productions” in a fragmented society.

The author admits he hesitated to maintain a fully deserved critical approach to the issue, which his many Moldovan friends may have perceived as offending. With friends in both camps, he regrets having had to address an issue so delicate, and hopes that he will be forgiven for a book written in the spirit of scientific debate.

In the same spirit, it may have been useful – in addition to the employment of a less euphemistic or neutral language – to retrace the *pre-history* of the issue: Moldavia as a historical province of Romania, now divided between Romania and the Republic of Moldova, sharing the same Romanian language; the destiny of her eastern part, Bessarabia, after 1812, as a Russian guberniya; the union with Romania in 1918; the creation in 1924 of an autonomous Republic of Moldova; the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact and its consequences; the Soviet Socialist Republic of Moldova; the years 1941-1944; the proclamation of independence; and the adherence to the Community of Independent States.

Reference is made additionally to the Moldovan-Romanian dictionary, and to a possible parallel between Moldova and Macedonia. A parallel between Moldova and Austria, which is alluded to, may have also proved useful. However, being less imaginative, the Austrians did not invent a “Bucovinian” language after the annexation of Bucovina in 1775, as they did not invent an Austrian language, different from the German language, when the Republic of Austria was created in 1918.

Ștefan Delureanu

ADRIAN-SILVAN IONESCU, *Mișcarea artistică oficială în România secolului al XIX-lea* (Le mouvement artistique officiel dans la Roumanie du XIX^e siècle), Noi Media Print, București, 2008, 288 pp.

Après une étude très documentée sur *l'Enseignement artistique roumain entre 1830 et 1892*, parue en 1999 aux Editions Meridiane de Bucarest, Adrian-Silvan Ionescu nous présente avec cet ouvrage un nouveau volet de la constitution du mouvement artistique roumain avec l'analyse des expositions officielles organisées à Bucarest et à Jassy entre 1864 et 1899. Tout comme l'histoire de la formation des artistes, tenue pour une part accessoire du processus créatif, celle du mouvement artistique officiel a longtemps été dédaignée par les historiens de l'art, toutes deux étant considérées comme des entraves au libre développement du génie de l'artiste. Cependant cette grille d'interprétation, résultant plutôt de la passion que de l'étude, n'a retenu du côté de la lumière que très

peu de peintres, dont l'importance est unanimement retenue par les historiens de l'art. Elle a rejeté tous les autres dans l'ombre où ils se sont trouvés confondus en une masse indistincte, recouvrant une diversité d'artistes, de courants, ou de choix plastiques pouvant aller jusqu'à l'incompatibilité totale. Cette antinomie schématique peu satisfaisante est condamnée à s'effriter progressivement grâce à la redécouverte, ou à notre meilleure connaissance, des œuvres d'artistes laissées dans l'oubli.

L'ouvrage revient dans une très riche première partie (pp. 21-67) sur la naissance du goût artistique dans les Principautés au début du XIX^e siècle grâce aux commandes de portraits, abondamment représentées par des œuvres peu connues, voire inédites, puis à partir des années 1850, sous l'influence du mouvement national, du développement de la peinture d'histoire avec Theodor Aman, Gheorghe Tattarescu ou Constantin Lecca, et dès les années 1870 des autres genres, le paysage, la scène de genre et la nature morte avec Carol Pop de Szathmari, Henri Trenk, Amedeo Preziosi, Petru Verussi, Eugen Voinescu, Nicolae Grigorescu, Ion Andreescu, Constantin Aricescu et Ștefan Luchian.

Il détaille ensuite de façon chronologique, dans des chapitres portant des titres très inspirés qui s'appuient sur les chroniques artistiques publiées dans la presse de l'époque largement citées et sur les œuvres lorsqu'elles ont pu être identifiées et localisées, le rôle singulier que les expositions ont joué dans le développement d'un goût artistique nationale, dans la formation du goût des amateurs et des commanditaires, et bien sûr dans la création des bases d'un marché d'art à Bucarest et à Jassy. Une évidence s'impose d'emblée, pour chacun des acteurs : peintre, marchand, critique ou amateur, il s'agit de livrer bataille pour imposer, faire reconnaître et faire valoir la conception de l'art qu'il fait ou qu'il a choisi de défendre. L'artiste, pour assurer son existence, n'est affranchi ni du marchand, ni de la critique, ni de la demande, ni des mécanismes publicitaires. Même s'il les récuse toujours dans ses propos, son appréciation et sa reconnaissance passent par la médiation des expositions et du marché.

La première exposition, modestement organisée en janvier 1864 dans les salles du Collège Saint-Sabba de Bucarest, fut un point de départ qui eut son importance institutionnelle, puisqu'elle institua un règlement (conçu d'après le modèle du Salon parisien, avec son système compliqué d'admission et de distinctions, qui est amplement commenté avec ses modifications successives pp. 79-81, et qui s'imposera à toutes les autres manifestations jusqu'en 1899, avec deux interruptions, pendant la Guerre d'Indépendance 1879-1880 et ensuite entre 1883 et 1894), et qu'elle constitua aussi un test de l'intérêt public pour les arts. Devenue à partir de l'année suivante « Exposition des artistes vivants », vrai Salon national qui se voulait annuel, organisé alternativement entre Bucarest et Jassy, elle provoqua vite une certaine émulation. Peu de temps après la fermeture de l'édition de 1872, elle se vit même concurrencée par les expositions suivies par des ventes et organisées par la toute nouvelle *Société des amis des Beaux-Arts* qui consacra le triomphe du jeune Nicolae Grigorescu (pp. 151-161). Plus tard en 1895, lors du premier salon où furent exposées aussi des œuvres d'artistes français comme Jean-Jacques Henner, Benjamin Constant, Carolus-Duran, Raphaël Collin, Alexandre Cabanel, acquis par l'Etat roumain pour la nouvellement créée Pinacothèque bucarestoise, se firent sentir les premières frictions entre la nouvelle génération et les organisateurs représentés par le Directeur de l'Ecole des Beaux-Arts, C.I. Stăncescu (pp. 215-225). 1896 fut l'année de la sécession et de jeunes artistes parmi lesquels Ștefan Luchian, Constantin Artachino et Nicolae Vermont ouvrirent un Salon des Indépendants qui défraya la chronique artistique grâce au soutien du collectionneur Alexandru Bogdan-Pitești, proche des Symbolistes français et du Sâr Peladan qu'il invita d'ailleurs à Bucarest en février 1898 pour un cycle de conférences. Un nouveau pas fut franchi avec l'organisation en 1898, sous la houlette du même Bogdan-Pitești, de l'unique exposition de la *Société Ileana*, précédant de deux mois l'*Exposition des artistes vivants*. L'année 1899 qui amena la démission de Stăncescu et le directorat de George Demetrescu Mirea représenta un nouveau départ dans l'organisation de cette exposition annuelle des artistes.

Pendant une assez brève période, seulement trente-cinq ans, les *Expositions des artistes vivants* et leurs pendants sécessionnistes créèrent les bases d'une vie artistique. Elles incarnèrent non seulement l'éclectisme de l'esthétique académique du milieu du XIX^e siècle mais reflétèrent aussi la variété des stratégies de carrière envisageables pour un peintre remarqué et le goût des amateurs.

L'érudition du texte qui s'appuie sur un dépouillement systématique des dossiers de l'École des Beaux-Arts se trouvant aux Archives Nationales de Roumanie à Bucarest, sur la presse d'époque et sur une très riche bibliographie, est complétée par une iconographie reproduite avec grand soin, remarquable par le grand nombre des illustrations incluant des peintures et des sculptures, mais aussi des caricatures, et portraits photographiques d'artistes, dont plusieurs inédits (Aman, p. 11 ; Petru Verussi, p. 133 ; Cladec-fils, Eliescu et un ami, p. 147).

L'annexe finale, riche de douze pièces, dont les règlements des *Expositions d'artistes vivants* et les discours d'ouverture des manifestations, contient toutes les informations souhaitables qui permettent de mieux articuler les mutations artistiques et de goût de l'art dit officiel et l'art dit indépendant, selon une lecture aussi attentive aux interactions qu'aux oppositions. L'auteur nous introduit donc dans les mécanismes de la commande et de la décision, au plus près des moyens mis en œuvre et des hommes à qui échet un rôle essentiel au cœur des arcanes de l'École des Beaux-Arts et bien sûr à son Ministère de tutelle. Pour conclure il fallait ce livre pour documenter définitivement une époque des institutions artistiques qui sort d'un long purgatoire.

Gabriel Badea-Păun

IOAN VARTA, *Bătălia pentru Bucovina în ajunul Unirii cu România (1913-1917). Documente inedite din arhivele din Federația Rusă și Republica Moldova* (The Battle for Bucovina on the Eve of the Union with Romania (1913-1917). Unpublished Documents from the Archives of the Russian Federation and the Republic of Moldova), Edit. Cartdidact, Chișinău, 2008, 208 pp.

Bucovina, the northern part of Moldavia which was annexed by Austria in 1775, resumed its place in the expansionist projects of tsarist Russia during World War One. After having consented in 1775 to the Austrian act of annexation and having annexed itself in 1812 the Moldavian territory lying between the Prut and the Dniester, Russia was now, in 1914-1917, in the camp of the Entente, alongside France and Great Britain, the irreducible enemies of the Central Powers (Germany and Austria-Hungary). Unlike before, when goals pursued had been spelled out in expansionist terms, the new clashes between the two blocs exhibited now the character of national emancipation.

Nonetheless, in this war for state and national definition spurred up by little nations, Romania included, Tsarist Russia was still consumed with expansionist ambitions, as clearly seen even before the outbreak of the war.

Romania preserved a state of neutrality until 1916, being confronted with a great dilemma: part of the Romanian nation was split between Austria-Hungary and Russia. The choice of a powerful ally was difficult to make. In the summer of 1916, owing to the fact that Transylvania had become a citadel of Romanianism claiming emancipation, the liberal government of Ion I. C. Brătianu joined the camp of France and Great Britain, and concurrently of Russia, who was ruling oppressively over Bessarabia. A written settlement of military cooperation with the government in Saint Petersburg ensued, by which Russia was acknowledging that Romania was entitled to annex Romanian territories part of Austria-Hungary.

These complex historiographical issues make the substance of the present book, *Bătălia pentru Bucovina în ajunul Unirii cu România (1913-1917)*, written by the distinguished Bessarabian historian

Ioan Varta. A number of 63 documents of great importance from the archives of the Foreign Ministry of Russia and from archives in Chişinău, in Russian and in Romanian, are provided to this purpose. It can be seen that as early as 1913 Russian diplomacy was showing a great interest in Bucovina as part of its expansionist goals. The situation remained unchanged after the signature of the cooperation agreement with Romania in the summer of 1916, by which Romania's interest in territories with Romanian population then part of Austria-Hungary was being acknowledged by virtue of the principle of nationalities. Thus, according to the documents employed by the author, Russia pursued its expansionist goals in Bucovina. An argument with Romania over the future of Bucovina was tacitly and secretly growing into shape. Who was entitled to this territory and based on which rights?

The collection of documents provided by the author shows that the action taken by Tsarist Russia was coordinated by S. Sazonov, the Minister of Foreign Affairs. After the occupation of the province by the Russian army, special agents were sent over to collect information regarding the population and the local aspirations. Higher officers of the army were commissioned to do alike. Contacts were made with the most prominent figures, especially with members of the local clergy. A propaganda campaign was launched in a discrete way, and a journal was edited in Russian. Additionally, to win over the higher officials of the Church, the Russian agents acting in Bucovina posed as defenders of Orthodoxy.

On this background of military occupation, and even after 1916 when Romania became Russia's ally, the Tsarist authorities strove to reconcile Russia's ambitions to annex the entire province of Bucovina with Romania's claims of legitimacy over this same province, broken off from its territory by Austria in 1775. Pressed by the Romanian claims of *restitutio*, the Russian officials were forced to formulate a number of "concessions," more exactly a territorial division of the province, not according to the principle of nationalities, but rather to the expansionist policy of pan-Slavism. As a result, a part of northern Bucovina with Ruthenian, Polish, and Romanian population, and with Cernăuţi as its main town, was to be incorporated into Tsarist Russia. The project was deemed of vital necessity, as it would secure a direct link with the Slavs living in Sub-Carpathian Ukraine and also help encircle Bessarabia.

The second part of this collection of documents includes an extremely conclusive statistic evaluation of the demography of Bucovina as a whole. The data were collected by the Romanian government in 1916, before the outbreak of the war against Austria-Hungary. This statistic evaluation by ethnical groups shows an overwhelming majority of Romanian ethnics on the entire territory of historical Bucovina, alongside with other smaller ethnical groups, including Germans, Jews, Ruthenians, Poles, etc. This item of information, published for the first time in its entirety, demonstrates that the Habsburg domination of Bucovina had changed nothing of the overwhelming Romanian character of the province. Hence, the expansionist decision of the Tsarist government to tear off and annex at least a part of Bucovina, despite contrary demographical data.

The chaos created by the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and the withdrawal of Russia from the war fought alongside the Entente would have enabled Romania to attach the entire historical province of Bucovina to its enlarged borders. However, reorganized under the shape of the Soviet Empire, Russia would take over the tsarist goals of annexation and partitioning of Bucovina. In 1940, according to the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, and finally in 1944, Moscow would occupy the north of Bucovina, with its main town Cernăuţi, thus tearing it away from Romania.

Apostol Stan