theoretical outlook seems to be informed by a kind of dependency theory in regard to Polish economic development, and a progressivist-materialistic view of education, perspectives which elicited a number of interesting responses from his Polish colleagues. The best of the essays, from an analytical point of view, are to be found in sections I and II, especially the essays by A. Bukowski and S. Marmuszewski on grassroots democracy, G. Skapska on the paradoxes of the Polish economic transformation, and the contributions by A. Marcinkowski and J. Sobczak, J. Klich, and A. Sobczyk on issues of privatization and unemployment. These essays are informed by useful historical and regional comparisons, helping to place contemporary developments in some kind of context.

Section III on "educational transformation" is largely hortatory and theoretical. It is surely the case that Polish higher education, as that in all of Eastern Europe, faces difficult challenges in adapting to the changes brought on by marketization, not the least of which involve problems of antiquated structure, "pedagogy," and social relevance. That academics, fearful of seeing departments and faculty curtailed or eliminated in view of such challenges, or faced with factional struggles as a result, should resort to bandying about such "Dewey-eyed" slogans as "creative schools," "self-creation," and "progressive social change"—see especially the essay by B. Matwijow on "pedagogical democracy"—is perhaps understandable. The best that can be said for this section is that it represents only the ragged beginnings of a long argument about Polish education. What Poles do not need, in the eyes of this reviewer, is another kind of "captive mind" in regard to amorphous educational theories, especially those emanating from America. If Perdue really wishes to help cultivate "an authentic Polish paradigm of development" (p. 213), whatever that may be, he might be better advised to leave John Dewey and his minions at home—one cannot be sure whether Western business consultants or educational "reformers" will end up doing more damage. For all of his concern about "dependent" economic development in Poland, Perdue has constructed an oddy ironic book with regard to social and educational issues.

Keith John Lepak
Youngstown State University


Authored by a British scholar, and based mostly on English language literature and Romanian newspapers, this is a well informed discussion of some political developments in the first six years after the ousting of Ceausescu. An introductory chapter gives an adequate account of the historical background of the first half of this century. The next one, "The Legacy of Communism," is unfortunately too brief and does not really focus on the characteristics of the Romanian Communist regime as it was established under Gheorghe-Deg or as it evolved under Ceausescu. Consequently, later references to the legacy of Communism and how it affected the post-1989 developments must sound rather hollow and unexplained to an average reader.

Best are the chapters that discuss the formation and evolution of post-1990 political parties and the role played by nationalism in this process. The author correctly underscores the half-baked democratic nature of the parties and the role that President Iliescu
played in hampering and slowing down the development of democratic institutions and thinking. The author emphasizes how reluctant were the post-1989 rulers to endorse genuine pluralism. Their tactic was to practice pretended political pluralism through control and manipulation of the mass media. The author focuses on the bias of the media when covering the 1990 clashes between the Hungarians and Romanians in Transylvania. He should have pointed out that this was merely one example of a country-wide practice extending to all controversial issues. Opposition newspapers did not reach the rural and small town populations, and each of the privately owned TV and radio stations covered only a small area. Only the Iliescu controlled national radio and TV stations penetrated all the households in Romania.

However, this reviewer's basic criticism of the book is that the author vastly overemphasizes the importance of the issue of the Hungarian minority on the Romanian scene in general. At least half of the book is directly or indirectly devoted to this one problem. Consequently, Cluj, Tîrgu Mureș, and Timișoara are the centers around which most of the story revolves while Bucharest is marginalized, not to speak of, for example, Iași, a major cultural-political center, which is hardly mentioned.

Granted, the clash with the Hungarian minority has been an important problem in Romanian politics since 1990, occasionally so important as to focus the attention of the whole nation on it as it reverberates beyond Romania and even beyond Hungary. Also, it has nourished the rise of extreme nationalism with all its deleterious consequences. But it has not been and is not the issue around which the decisive developments in Romanian life—political, economic, or social—have revolved. To the masses of Romania's inhabitants, except those in Transylvania, it was essentially always a peripheral issue. After all, the Hungarians represent a minority of only about 7-8 percent of Romania's population, and emigration, as well as assimilation (through intermarriage) tend to erode further their demographic weight. Angry words have been exchanged across the Romanian-Hungarian boundary, but at no point was there the slightest chance that actions would follow words. There are today probably more Gypsies than Hungarians in Romania, and clashes with them, some of them murderous, are almost a daily occurrence, yet the author chose to ignore this problem.

Furthermore, he does not focus on the most important issue in contemporary Romania, that of economics and related transformation and disintegration of social, political and administrative institutions which is what most touches the average Romanian and what he cares most about. Witness the more recent developments. If the mayor of Cluj was re-elected, it was not because of his asinine nationalistic statements but because, all things considered, he was ultimately judged as not too bad a manager of city affairs. Also, Transylvania, where all the ruckus with the Hungarians took place, was precisely the area that decisively helped to elect a democratic president, Emil Constantinescu, who supported an alliance with the political representation of the Hungarian minority while Iliescu opposed it. On the other hand, the province of Moldova, where nationalism was not fed by any national minority issue, went all the way for Iliescu, primarily for economic reasons, while at the same time the mayor of Iași, an anti-Ilieșcu politician, was easily re-elected because he managed the city well. By contrast, the citizens of Bucharest ousted from the city hall an Iliescu man, because he was judged to be a bad mayor, and installed a Constantinescu supporter even though Iliescu was at the time still in control of the TV.