what was the mechanism that ensured such coordination? Were all the Securitate's bureaus equally important for imposing compliance toward the regime? What was the relationship between the ruling family, the Communist Party, the Securitate and the Army? How much independence did the Securitate enjoy relative to other apparatuses of the regime? Was the security police a monolithic organization unconditionally devoted to the Party and the leader? Were there any dissenting groups? How was dissent within the Securitate appeased? When the security police reprimanded dissenters such as Gheorghe Ursu, at what level was the decision to kill him taken?

Deletant's book is an attempt to write a history of the Communist Romania rather than to give a precise account of the interplay between Ceausescu and the Securitate. Therefore, a better title would have probably been Romania: A History, 1945-1989. The Securitate and its relationship with the most recent Romanian dictator will continue to retain their mythical aura until the Romanian archives are indeed made available to interested researchers.

Lavinia Stan


This is yet another of the books on the Polish movement Solidarity, which started the slide down the slope that eventually led to the collapse of the Communist political system, not only in Poland, but in all of the Soviet bloc, including the Soviet Union itself. The book differs from most other studies in that it is profoundly theoretical. Herein lies its major strength and, simultaneously, its weakness. The difficulty rests, as the author himself admits, with the theory of sociology developed in the West, so strongly influenced by the Marxian concept of classes as to be useless for an analysis of Solidarity. Even the more flexible concept of "new social movements" promoted by Jurgen Habermas fails as an analytical tool here because the "movements" of his theory are the result of the crisis of legitimacy in a post-industrial society. Solidarity rose and fell in circumstances much more akin to those existing at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. The author of the book finds the work of Alain Touraine the best suited for his purpose because "he and his co-workers make clear their break with the traditional varieties of Marxism and functionalism while embracing the imagery of emancipatory struggle against the forces of domination..." (p. 7) While no doubt this is true, in our opinion Touraine's theory at times obstructs the analysis of Solidarity rather than illuminates it, perhaps a result of its relative vagueness.

The problem with the author's application of the theoretical scheme is that he cannot quite make up his mind whether Solidarity was a labor or a national movement. He illustrates quite convincingly the connection of Solidarity to the other workers' protests...
in Communist Poland: the 1956 Poznan uprising; the 1970 coastal cities revolt, and the 1976 Radom and Ursus upheaval. And even to the prewar tradition of labor struggle in Poland, where the sit-down strike made its debut in 1931—a method that "had a domino effect on workers in other countries" (p. 33), especially France, where it was called the "Polish strike," and the United States in the "Great Sit-Down" of 1936. The author provides solid evidence that in all these events in Poland, as in Solidarity, the leadership and the participants were genuine worker-s. The intellectuals joined later, often after the movement was solidified under its own leadership and after the workers themselves faced, alone, the initial brutal suppression or its dangers. The intellectual served as advisors and sometimes, when the original workers' protest exploded into a nationwide movement, as its leaders. Even the ideology of Solidarity, as the author discusses with considerable knowledge, perception and originality, started with the workers and for a large part remained their own creation. How was it then that Solidarity eventually inspired the whole nation and its ranks grew to over nine million people from all walks of life, including members of the Communist Party? The answer is: "Solidarity was a trade union movement, but it was more than this, because it appealed in Gramscian fashion to others among the disaffected in Polish society. On the side of political culture, workers, peasants, and intellectuals were united by a nationalism born of historical domination and internal betrayal." (p. 52)

This is very true, but despite his relatively good knowledge of Polish history and a fine understanding of Polish political culture, the author fails to connect the above statement to the long historical tradition of the Polish labor movement, which, since the beginning of industrialization in the 1830s, was always connected to the nationalist cause. Polish workers fought foreign factory owners backed by foreign forces of occupation, and their economic demands were closely linked to demands for the restoration of independent Poland. In that sense Solidarity was nothing new but a continuation of Polish history. Clearer understanding of this would have added weight to the author's correct argument that Solidarity's success in capturing the national imagination was also its undoing. The Communist government could have tolerated "The Independent Trade Union-Solidarity," however painful it would have been in view of its ideological foundations. But when Solidarity became the movement of the whole nation and called into question the existing Communist political system, it invited its suppression by the military. The author rightly points out that while the military coup ended, at least for a while, the legal existence of Solidarity, it also finished once and for all the hegemony of the Communist Party. That, in fact, meant the end to the Communist system and inevitably had to lead to the attempted compromise between the military and Solidarity in the talks of the "round table," which eventually had to result in the complete victory of the anti-Communist forces.

The last part of the book changes gears. It employs modernization theory to explain the demise of Solidarity after its original victory at the polls. This is only partially effective because the focus on economic reforms and their lack of concern for social justice, misses the point that once Solidarity became a national movement it lost its workers' core and the unity of interest of its members. It became an organization of opposition but not of reform. Its victory had to bring its political death since its different components envisioned a different future for Poland. The victory of "old communists-new