

strongly object. In anticipation of the 100-year state jubilee (2018), the presentation of Latvian history as a perpetual march of the people's will throughout the centuries to found the Latvian state (as witnessed, for example, in the recent introduction to the Latvian Constitution of 2013), has enshrined a new period of nationalistic romanticism. That is why the style and tone of the research—a theoretical approach of constructionism (also called modernism) dealing with nationalism and national collective memories—should be praised as an antidote to the growing self-centered historiography of national essentialism among Latvian historians.

The important issue raised by the study is the presence, or rather the absence, of the political will to create a common, inclusive space for contemporary Latvians of various ethnic origins. The study presents the chronology of attempts to define the place and meaning of minorities after a long and traumatic second Soviet occupation, which lasted for almost 50 years. Wezel has created a truly wide landscape of various case studies that show the spectrum and diversity of exclusive discourses of political parties and civil society. At the same time, various trends to self-isolation and ethnically-centered mythology and collective prejudices from the side of so-called Russian-speaking minorities have been critically revisited. A wide spectrum of sources in both Latvian and Russian have been included in the study, thus adding to the diversity of public positions and collective imagery of the Other. In some ways, the study resembles the analytical chronicles of interpreting the past in a society that is learning to accept the Other after the breakdown of the Soviet ethnic politics, which, as we remember Rogers Brubaker stating, helped to create anxieties among both ethnic minorities and majorities in the republics of the former USSR. Ethnicity and its cultural products are still viewed as the basis of Latvian identity and state policy towards minorities, as Wezel has clearly identified, still linked to the notion of a nervous, uncertain, and frustrated majority shaped in its collective attitudes by the experience of the 1940s. In this atmosphere, the critical distance from one's own traumas is hard to maintain, while issues such as the participation of Latvians in the Holocaust (1941–44), although accepted and analyzed by Latvian academic elites, has not gained a foothold in popular collective memory. The study is certainly most enjoyable reading for those who value uneasy questions from the past.

DENISS HANOVŠ

Rīga Stradins University

Latvia—A Work in Progress? 100 Years of State- and Nation-Building. Ed. David J. Smith. Stuttgart: ibidem Verlag, 2017. xvi, 320 pp. Notes. Index. Tables. \$48.00, paper.

What is Citizenship for? Citizenship and Naturalization in Latvia. By Susanne Tönsmann. The Baltic Sea Region: Northern Dimensions—European Perspectives, no. 16. Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2017. 217 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Tables. €44.00, paper.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.232

Any author of a book on a small country has to confront the problem of a limited number of interested readers, but tiny Latvia offers a compelling drama for anyone interested in the history of Europe. The Latvian case study illustrates the process of nation-formation and the dilemma of national survival, the panorama of revolution and war, and the diplomatic efforts to find security in a geopolitical environment that includes powerful neighbors such as Germany and Russia. Furthermore, Latvian

history shines a light on the human dramas of resistance, dissidence, exile, and migration. In the post-Soviet era, Latvia has dealt with problems of historic justice, the “triple transition” of post-communism, problems of ethnic and social integration, and the quest for membership in NATO and the European Union.

This year marks the 100th anniversary of Latvia’s Declaration of Independence, and there will be much taking stock of what has been achieved since Latvia acquired sovereignty and began to control its own destiny. *Latvia—A Work in Progress?*, an edited volume with sixteen contributors, takes a broad view and provides readers with a solid foundation for understanding many of the key issues in Latvian history, especially the ever-evolving relationship between state and nation. This book contains several chapters on the interwar Republic of Latvia and the reader gains an appreciation for the contingent nature of the emergence of the first Latvian state in the midst of World War I and the Russian Revolution. The eminent historian Andrejs Plakans explains the difficulty of forging a “master narrative” that can tell *the* story of Latvia’s historical development as a state because of the frequent upheavals of borders and regimes on this small piece of territory. War and migration patterns have also drastically altered the country’s ethnic composition.

Several authors in this collection show their admiration for the civic elements of Latvian nationhood during the period of 1922–34, when the Latvian nation was envisioned as a multi-ethnic society (1922 was the year that the Constitution was adopted and 1934 was the year that Kārlis Ulmanis staged a coup and established a more nationalist authoritarian regime). Marina Germane points out that the 1919 Citizenship Law offered citizenship to all those who were permanent residents in Latvia prior to the start of the War in 1914, thereby initially granting citizenship to 94% of the population. David J. Smith contributes a chapter on the under-appreciated life and work of Paul Schiemann, a Baltic German who served in the Latvian *Saeima* and was an early defender of minority rights and European integration. Not surprisingly, the interwar Republic is generally viewed as a “golden age” in the eyes of those who grew up under Soviet rule. Significantly, as Irena Saleniece reports, this is also true for non-Latvians who have a memory of pre-Soviet Latvia as a time when many ethnic minorities benefited from land reform and religious freedom.

Ethnic relations have become a dominant theme in any work on contemporary Latvia, and the contentious issue of citizenship is a point of overlap in the two volumes under review. Based on the non-recognition policy of the western powers following the annexation of the Baltic Republics by the USSR in 1940, leaders of Latvia’s independence movement claimed that they were *restoring* sovereignty rather than creating a new state. Ultimately this led to the adoption of a controversial approach to citizenship that restored it to the citizens of the interwar Republic of Latvia and their descendants, while hundreds of thousands of Russian-speakers who came to Latvia during the Soviet period would have to apply for naturalization. While this policy meant that nearly 40% of Latvia’s Russians were included in the restored citizenry, the fact remained that those excluded were primarily Russians and other Russian-speaking minorities. Although it did not prevent Latvia from meeting the democratic conditions of NATO and EU membership, this policy has received a great deal of criticism, especially from Russia. It also meant that Latvia’s democratic consolidation would depend upon the social integration of non-Latvian minorities into a shared Latvian identity.

Since the process of naturalization began, over 145,000 people have received Latvian citizenship, but Susanne Tönsmann is more interested in the puzzle of why 230,000 people have chosen to remain non-citizens. Among the reasons identified by Tönsmann is that many object to the fact that they have to go through the “humiliating” process of naturalization at all. Others remain content with the positive rights bestowed on non-citizens (a status that differs from statelessness). Tönsmann’s

account differs from most treatments of the subject by taking seriously the *duties* of citizenship and the goals of the state in constructing its citizenship policy. Her book is thorough, well-balanced, and deserves a wide readership. She has an uncanny ability to summarize complex issues in concise sentences. For example, “The fulfillment of duties makes people citizens, rather than have citizenship,” and “Duties are nothing less than reflections of the state trying to know who it is as a state” (Tönsmann, 142–43).

Finally, many authors in the volume edited by Smith shift attention to the geopolitical context of the renewal of statehood in 1991 and the processes of transition and democratic consolidation that followed. Una Bergmane contributes a detailed examination of the French government’s decision to eventually grant diplomatic recognition to the Baltic states in 1991, while Li Bennich-Björkman and Alfs Vanags discuss the impact of western multilateral institutions on Latvia’s post-Soviet development. While the European context has undoubtedly been a positive factor in Latvia’s post-communist transition, a more assertive Russian foreign policy is once again creating a sense of vulnerability in Latvia. Geoffrey Pridham concludes by noting that “. . . now the crisis over Ukraine and Russian ambitions to restore the Soviet Union have driven a wedge between the ethnic political communities in Latvia, raising in a more painful way than before the question of loyalty towards the Latvian state,” (Smith, 193).

MARK A. JUBULIS
Gannon University

The Romanian Orthodox Church and the Holocaust. By Ion Popa. Studies in Antisemitism. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2017. xiv, 238 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. \$50.00, hard bound, \$49.00, e-book.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.233

Riddled with antisemitism during the 1930s, the Romanian Orthodox Church energetically supported the Romanian state in the murder of at least 250,000 Jews and roughly 20,000 Roma during the Holocaust. Priests and theologians played an active role in fascist parties before the war, including in the National Christian Defense League, the National Christian Party, and the Legion of the Archangel Michael. The Patriarch Miron Cristea introduced antisemitic legislation during his term as Prime Minister, which was unprecedented in its cruelty toward Jews, and hundreds of clergy travelled to Transnistria as “missionaries” to establish a new metropolitanate there. These priests and bishops witnessed and gave their blessing to the murder of Jews and Roma in ghettos, concentration camps, and massacres in Transnistria. The story of the Romanian Orthodox Church’s involvement in the Holocaust has already been outlined and documented by Jean Ancel, and this book adds only minor details to a story that still awaits a comprehensive treatment. Ion Popa elaborates on the rhetoric that accompanied the Church’s involvement in Transnistria, and proves that attempts to distance the Church from the Holocaust are disingenuous. The book’s real achievement is the way it unpacks the significance of the Holocaust for subsequent Church history.

Writing about the Romanian Orthodox Church is difficult because church archives remain closed, and most of the book is based on the archives of the former secret police, Holocaust-era archives held at the US Holocaust Memorial Museum, and Church newspapers, magazines, and books. Despite the fact that so much of the book is based on published sources, this is a story that the Church has successfully denied