

was becoming more institutionalized in the 1970s and gaining prominence in the UN system as a collective front in the North-South dialogue. However, the author's interpretation of the Cuban-Yugoslav conflict over Cuba's proximity to the Soviet bloc as a weakness that would further fragment the Movement could be equally seen as proof of the NAM maturing, becoming resilient and more democratic in its ability to reach compromise, respecting the views of the majority of member states as it managed to overcome the tensions that especially plagued the 1979 Havana summit (221). External challenges and actions by the great powers and China are apparent throughout the book and shed light on the fact that the NAM was seen as a threat or a potential partner at different points throughout the Cold War. China led the way to promote a "second Bandung" and undermine a more universalist non-aligned framework in-the-making, discussed at length in the third chapter, "'Afro-Asianism' vs. Non-Alignment: the 1964 Cairo Conference."

The Epilogue ambitiously covers the whole decade of the 1980s, revealing how "even the Reagan administration was not observing the NAM as a lost cause or an implacable foe any longer" (241), with the Movement having shifted its focus on economic and disarmament issues. The last Cold War summit in Belgrade (Yugoslavia) in 1989 gets less than a page, although the author underlines the "revolutionary" (249) character of the Yugoslav draft of the final document "by firmly linking economic and environmental dimensions" (249). It is therefore regrettable that this crucial decade and the state of the Movement in the 1980s is only addressed in a cursory way and the book aligns in the Epilogue with the standard teleological narrative of decline and "failure" (244). It is not clear which initiatives it refers to, but the statement that "none of the funds or centres established during the 1970s ever moved beyond the planning stage, thus marking another obvious failure of the NAM" (244) is inaccurate. There were several initiatives, such as the 1988 "Global System of Trade Preferences among Developing Countries" and the 1989 "Common Fund for Commodities" still in existence. Despite several significant omissions such as the Non-Aligned News Agencies Pool / the "New World Information and Communication Order" and a more in-depth analysis of the NAM's engagement with the Palestinian Question and Anti-Apartheid, *Non-Aligned Summits* remains an important contribution that adds nuance and complexity to our understanding of Cold War non-alignment.

LJUBICA SPASKOVSKA
University of Exeter

The Making of Mamaliga: Transimperial Recipes for a Romanian National Dish.

By Alex Drace-Francis. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2022. ix, 215 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Glossary. Index. Photographs. Figures. Tables. Maps. \$24.95, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2024.35

Alex Drace-Francis's *The Making of Mămăligă* offers a richly textured and fresh approach to the history of eighteenth–nineteenth century Romania through the lens of maize and the Romanian "national" dish mămăligă (boiled cornmeal). Much more than a food history, *The Making of Mămăligă* is a holistic commodity history that reveals the overlapping "imperial tectonics" of the three empires that dominated east central Europe—the Russian, Ottoman, Habsburg—with Romania uniquely situated at the confluence of all three. If scholars have long understood Romania to be at the "crossroads of empire," maize production, consumption, and exchange—and the multiple forms and meanings of mămăligă—offer a new way to imagine what

that meant on the ground. Namely, commodity exchange and regional food systems underpinned complex trans-imperial interactions, perhaps especially in regions (like Romania) that changed hands multiple times and had culturally connected populations on both sides of the border.

The Making of Mămăligă is a quick read, lively, readable, and rich in detail, with an impressive array of archival and print sources in Romanian, Hungarian, German, French, and more. We hear from princes, chroniclers, travelers, legislative bodies, and literary/cultural figures about the place and meaning of maize and mămăligă in Romanian history from the seventeenth-early twentieth centuries. Drace-Francis's exhaustive research reveals that maize—a New World crop—appears in the Romanian lands in the seventeenth century, becoming more prevalent in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. If seventeenth century authorities disdained or even limited its cultivation, the floodgates opened in the following centuries as boyars, monasteries, peasants, and larger estates shifted to maize cultivation as an efficient way to feed people, but also export grain for profit. Among other things, Maize played a role in the historically important peasant revolts of this period: 1821, 1888, and most notably 1907 (during which maize was often burned in protest). As Drace-Francis intriguingly argues, such uprisings were a product of the shift to “colonial” (cash crop) cereal production and export that forced peasants into almost “slave” labor conditions. This “colonial” aspect of the crop's (or in general, grain) cultivation was not simply a result of the “imperial logics” of the three empires that dominated this region. On the contrary, it was more pronounced in the period of autonomy and independence (after 1864–1878) and hence connected with enhanced capitalist relations and trade with the west.

Such arguments are compelling and raise many questions, which could benefit from more fleshing out in the text. So too, could the rich discussion of the forms and meanings of mămăligă itself, which is only developed in the rather short 7th and 8th chapters. There we begin to see the recipes, when and where mămăligă emerged and how it evolved in its various forms. We also learn of the importance of mămăligă as metaphor: that is as a marker of “Romanianness,” backwardness, or otherness in representations of European travelers or in literature from Romanian elites themselves. This section is full of rich material that could benefit from more analysis that taps into the larger questions of food history and food studies. In particular, how and when did mămăligă become coded as national, when did it become part of a Romanian national cuisine? Some of this is hinted at in the book's conclusion, which points to other work on mămăligă in the twentieth century; a period, the author notes, that would require another book. This may be true, but the reader is left wishing for at least a glimpse of what is to come. A bigger question that is felt unasked and unanswered is why did Romanians—and at least some adjacent areas—take to mămăligă or maize consumption so readily, when it was far rarer in Bulgaria and other Slavic surrounding regions. There corn tended to remain a fodder crop, as other grains, like wheat, were more central to the diet.

Still the book answers as many questions as it raises, offering a fascinating and creative approach to Romanian history. It brings Romania to the table of food history, contributing a major piece of scholarship to growing work in this field. Among other things the book develops its own tongue-twisting vocabulary for thinking about mămăligă: for example, “mămăligologist,” “mămăligological,” “mămăligolophobia,” “mămăligotopia,” and “mămăligocentric.” Indeed, Alex Drace-Francis requires us all to be a little mămăligocentric, at least while reading his book. In so doing, he invites us to rethink Romanian and east European history through a transimperial, mămăligological lens that is decidedly productive.

MARY C. NEUBURGER
University of Texas, Austin