the agreement, at least for now. But this is not the end of the story; thus, a follow up to
Haynes collection in highly desirable.

It might include what is missing from this collection – a chapter that specifically
focuses on the contemporary and future relationship between Moldova and Romania,
and the ethnic, cultural, and linguistic issues that continue to fuel the subdued call for
re-unification on both sides of the Prut River.

Of special note is Dennis Deletant’s authoritative and concise contribution on the
Holocaust in Transnistria. It should be required reading in Moldova and Romania
where the tendencies to deny Romanian culpability in the Holocaust have not abated
and the sentiment to honor the country’s World War II-era leader, General Ion An-
tonescu, continues to resonate.

I recommend this book as a primer on the region for graduate students, faculty,
politicians, diplomats, and business people whose work will be affected by the major
problems that will continue to plague the region for the foreseeable future.

Peter Gross
University of Oklahoma

Robert Levy, *Ana Pauker: The Rise and Fall of a Jewish Communist*. Berkeley: Uni-

Robert Levy’s treatment of Ana Pauker is the product of years of work, based on a
careful and exhaustive study of archival materials and interviews. It painstakingly at-
ttempts to ensure the authenticity of the facts surrounding the rather complex personality
of Romania’s legendary “Iron Lady,” Ana Pauker, who occupied the central posi-
tion in the power structure of Romania in the years immediately following the end of
the Second World War. Born into an orthodox Jewish family in 1893, as Ana Rabin-
sohn, her personality was moulded by the historical and economic conditions that ex-
isted in Romania at the turn of the century, especially a climate which was marked by
widespread anti-Semitism. This climate propelled Pauker, like so many other Jewish
intellectuals at the time in Eastern Europe, to become a dedicated revolutionary person-
ality. She joined the Romanian Socialist Worker’s Democratic Party in 1915, and
subsequently became associated with the maximalist Luximin faction, which was led
by her husband Marcel Pauker.

Ana Pauker was originally considered to be a dedicated and precocious Cominternist and Muscovite. She was a graduate of the Comintern Lenin School in
Moscow, where she excelled in her studies and was a friend and protégé of leading
Soviet political figures, such as Molotov. She returned to Romania in 1935, was ar-
rested, and conducted a spirited defense of herself during a tumultuous trial and was
sentenced to ten years in prison. However, Pauker returned to Moscow in 1941, saved
by a Romanian-Soviet prisoner exchange. She was sent back to Bucharest in 1944,
where she faithfully followed the Stalinist line in denouncing as premature the August
23, 1944 coup d’état, engineered by the monarch (King Michael), the communists,
and other elements, that resulted in the overthrow of the military dictatorship of An-
tonescu. In the Romanian communist power hierarchy, Pauker was always aware of
her tenuous position as a Jew and a woman, and therefore rejected the idea that she should serve as the leader of the party. Instead, she supported the selection of Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej as leader, the ethnic Romanian head of the domestic faction of the party who had spent most of the Second World War incarcerated in prison. Initially, a form of collective leadership, with Dej functioning as a kind of “front man” was created. Pauker assumed the position of Foreign Minister, and along with her allies Vasile Luca and Teohari Georgescu, functioned as a triumvirate as the real power behind the scenes. Dej, who led the home faction of the party (although the lines which separated the home and Muscovite factions of the party were not always clearly delineated) balked at this arrangement and plotted to consolidate his power by eliminating Pauker and her allies. Stalin’s subsequent desire to remove Pauker, who had lost favor with him because she was an old Cominternist and a Jewish woman, provided Dej with the opportunity that he needed. The Soviet “friends” wanted to stage-manage anti-Titoist show trials in Romania similar to the purges which were taking place elsewhere in Eastern Europe. Pauker was removed as Foreign Minister in 1952, and arrested on February 18, 1953. Weakened by a bout with cancer, she was accused of being a “bourgeois nationalist” and a “right-wing deviationist”. She was charged with allowing “careerists” and “opportunists” such as former Legionnaires, to join the party in the mass recruitment campaign after the end of the war. Pauker was also accused of “right-wing deviationism” because she had favored the construction of a government of national reconciliation that would include the historic parties, contrary to the Soviet line that the leaders of these parties should be imprisoned. Furthermore, Pauker had also alienated Dej because she tried to protect Lucretiu Patrascanu, a leading Romanian communist intellectual who was viewed by Dej as a rival for power.

Reviewing Pauker’s postwar activities, Levy argues that rather than being the architect of the terror tactics that were employed against the peasantry to promote the collectivization of agriculture and “dekulakization,” she pursued an anti-Stalinist line. At one point, she argued that collectivization should be introduced gradually, because the country had to be sufficiently mechanized first. Pauker was opposed to Dej’s policy of industrialization, which had created a vicious price scissors for the peasants who were overcharged for industrial goods and underpaid for their produce. Pauker also found herself at odds with the Stalinist line that called for the purge of the “Spaniards” or Romanians (most of whom were Jewish) who had fought with the Republican forces during the Spanish Civil War and those who fought in the resistance in France as well. The “Spaniards” included such political figures as Valter Roman, who was a protégé of Pauker’s, and ironically the father of Romania’s first post-communist Prime Minister, Petre Roman.

In 1952, Pauker’s position was further undermined as she was caught up in a broader anti-Zionist campaign that was unleashed by Stalin (witness the Doctor’s plot in the Soviet Union in 1952). She had intervened to secure the release of some imprisoned Zionists who had been arrested in 1949. She also defied the Stalinist line on restricting Jewish emigration to Israel. Furthermore, Levy convincingly argues that there was some truth to the fact that Pauker’s brother, Zalman Rabinsohn, had served as a channel of communications between the Israeli government and her. Therefore, Pauker was accused by Dej of being linked to an international Zionist conspiracy that