

Liberalism, Constitutional Nationalism, and Minorities: The Making of Romanian Citizenship, c. 1750–1918. By Constantin Iordachi. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2019. xxii, 682 pp. Appendix. Notes, Bibliography. Index. Tables. Illustrations. Figures. Maps. \$199.00 hardbound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2020.168

This book is a sophisticated exploration of the creation of Romania during the long nineteenth century, examined from the perspective of the development and evolution of citizenship in the Romanian lands from Prince Mavrocordat (1711–1769) to the creation of Greater Romania following World War I. The making of the modern Romanian state has been the focus of numerous studies in the past, but these have been from traditional diplomatic and political development angles. The author deliberately follows another path, which leads him to concentrate on 1) what he terms “constitutional nationalism”; 2) the making and evolution of modern citizenship in the Romanian principalities; and 3) the histories of marginalized groups and influences (Jews, Greeks, Roma, peasants, women, and the inhabitants of the Dobrogea) in what became the unitary Romanian national state in 1918.

The study also proves to be a persuasive vehicle for the integration of Professor Constantine Iordachi’s diverse research interests and publications, which range from citizenship studies to the interplay of nationalism and liberalism in the Romanian context to the darker side of nationalism manifested in Romanian xenophobia, antisemitism, and fascism. Appearing during the events celebrating the centennial of the formation of United Romania, the study has wider relevance in showing how Romanians dealt with historic legacies from Byzantine, Ottoman, Russian, and westernizing influences, and in illustrating the difficulties involved in the development and evolution of citizenship in southeastern Europe.

Iordachi’s methodology is generally historical, but at the same time interdisciplinary in a sane and useful fashion. His focus is primarily on what he calls “liberalism with a twist” or “constitutional nationalism” (4). This involves tracing the history of the Romanian state from the eighteenth century pre-modern Ancien Régime to 1918 while examining the struggle of regional and national elites with competing and contested views of development, citizenship, and legal status. In the end, what was important in this socio-intellectual history was the transfer and adaptation of western (mostly French) liberal conceptions of citizenship to Romania, where it emerged as the principal weapon in the struggle for power by local Romanian elites against “alien minorities.” After 1848, this led to frequent confrontations between Romanian authorities and western powers, especially over the “Eastern Question” and the “Jewish Question,” and created inherent flaws in the structure of Romanian civil society and politics, including the emergence—following Charles Tilley’s definition of citizenship—of a fluid and transactional view of citizenship.

The author’s deep immersion and expertise in the Romanian context, unusually, does not cause him to see Romanian experience as exceptional, nor does it cause him to lose sight of the comparative context of southeastern Europe or nineteenth-century Europe. This transnational approach is successful in bringing new perspectives to bear on what could have been just another rehashing of the making of Romania. At the same time, the thickness of his historical descriptions do not taper off into confusing rabbit trails or irrelevant observation.

The book has three chronological sections: pre-modern Moldova and Muntenia from 1750 to 1858; the “emergence of Romanians from peasants” (to borrow a phrase from Eugen Weber) between 1859 and 1866; and, finally, the development of constitutional nationalism between 1866 and 1918 with a stress on minorities rights issues. The book ends with an outline of the principal aspects

of the Romanian citizenship model as well as an application of this exploration to modern citizenship studies.

The most significant contributions of Iordachi's work are two-fold: firstly, the demonstration that in the second period, 1859–1866, the Francophile liberal assimilationist model transitioned into a decidedly un-liberal ethno-national or constitutional nationalist model that prevailed in Romania thereafter; and, secondly, the provision of three case studies in the final section which deal with the Jewish Question, the status of women, and the issues involved in the integration of Dobrogea into the Romanian Kingdom just prior to World War I (foreshadowing integration issues that would face Greater Romania after 1918). These case studies are nicely set in context instead of being discussed in isolation from the bigger picture.

The book is impeccably edited and handsomely produced. The scholarly base is sound, except for a few minor quibbles over resources (perhaps a churlish comment about a book with a sixty+-page bibliography in half a dozen languages).

This study makes a definite contribution to the analysis of the formation of the modern Romanian state without reploughing old ground. The author judges the activity of Romania's nineteenth century liberal political entrepreneurs to be on the whole remarkably successful despite their long run failures in creating a civil society. He is also hopeful that current Romanian elites will benefit from critically examining past successes and failures.

PAUL E. MICHELSON
Huntington University

Planning Labour: Time and the Foundations of Industrial Socialism in Romania.

By Alina-Sandra Cucu. New York: Berghahn Books, 2019. xiv, 246 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Tables. \$90.00, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2020.169

This is an excellent book. *Planning Labour* constitutes a major contribution to the study of labor and class in the early years of socialism in Romania, and by extension, to our understanding of the first decades of east European socialist regimes more generally. It is theoretically ambitious and ethnographically rich, a well-written and engaging narrative. Alina-Sandra Cucu's analysis situates the transition to socialist state planning and factory production within a larger social framework of neighborhoods, suburbs, and rural communities that fed and sustained the new socialist enterprise, specifically in and surrounding Cluj/Kolozsvár. Based on extensive archival research and interviews, as well as a masterly command of an extensive secondary literature, Cucu illustrates how core principles of the socialist project—socialist accumulation and centralized state control—clashed with the challenges the country faced in modernizing the economy and transforming its inhabitants into well-disciplined socialist citizens. Drawing on Ernst Bloch's notion of nonsynchronicity, Cucu argues that Romanians were having to reconcile a future-oriented vision of socialist society promoted by the new Communist Party regime with the vagaries of everyday subsistence one faces in a poorly-developed national economy, the social conditions of which are strongly mired in the historical constraints of previous decades. In short, she insists that the local, everyday practices of the people in Cluj and its environs were just as crucial to the history of socialist transformation as the political projects devised by new elites.

Cucu makes important interventions in several theoretical debates, notably questions of ethnicity versus class in Romania and the nature of state power in