

proto-Nazi (p. 50). This kind of judgment may, of course, be attributable to the author's curious semantics. In the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78 he refers to the Russians as "victorious but diarrheic" while the Turks are just "bloody but unbowed" (p. 180). As to other points: Jean Baptiste Colbert held several important positions but never that of "foreign minister" (p. 123). The statement that the Socialist deputies in the Vienna parliament voted for war credits in August 1914 is incomprehensible, because, in fact, the Austrian parliament was adjourned from March 1914 to May 1917 (p. 207).

A certain fluency and skill in the narration should not be denied. Also some colorful details including gory samples of medieval cruelties may interest the reader. Beyond this, the layman who peruses the volume will gain insight into the difficulties of the author's task and the commendable efforts to overcome them. And one certainly must not forget a main asset of the volume, the thoughtful though all too brief foreword by John Campbell. All this helps to justify the production of the book. But why it had to be undertaken by a university press in these days of crisis for scholarly publications is another matter.

ROBERT A. KANN
University of Vienna

THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF EASTERN EUROPE: TRANSITION AND PROCESS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA, HUNGARY, POLAND, ROMANIA, AND YUGOSLAVIA. Edited by *Bernard Lewis Faber*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976. xvi, 419 pp. \$25.00.

Professor Faber has produced a solid and useful volume on the sociology of Eastern Europe, which quite properly relies heavily on contributions from East European sociologists. The volume is of broader interest in that it demonstrates the range of work being done by East European sociologists and calls attention to some of the contributions by their North American colleagues working in the same field. The material in the book goes well beyond its title, for it includes contributions on the family, urban life, and factory organization.

The strongest contributions are by the East Europeans, particularly the excellent and succinct summary by W. Wesolowski ("The Notions of Strata and Class in Socialist Society"), which attempts to make operational, in a solid and undogmatic way, the two concepts as they are used in social science research in Poland. In practice, it is extraordinarily difficult to make the notion of class operational in research in any society since it contains both objective indicators of location in the productive process and subjective indicators on the level of class consciousness of a given group. Work of contemporary sociologists in this field increasingly stresses the fact that class consciousness can only be adequately measured in periods of mobilization and conflict, and since no systematic study of the recent strike wave in Poland is likely to be produced in the near future, we are left with the more passive studies reflecting workers' consciousness in periods of relative peace and stability.

The section on Poland is generally outstanding. It includes a major contribution by Zygmunt Bauman ("Social Dissent in the East European Political System"), and excellent chapters by Zagorski on "Social Mobility in Poland," and by Fishman from Oregon on "Education and Social Mobility in People's Poland." The section on Yugoslavia is somewhat disappointing and surprisingly so in view of the contributions made by Yugoslav sociologists in the past decade. The problem is in large part ex-

plained by the fact that all of the contributions in this case are by outside scholars, two of whom are anthropologists with a somewhat more limited and specialized focus. Professor Rawin's contribution, "Management and Autonomy in Socialist Industry—the Yugoslav Experience," is quite dated, for it is based on research conducted over a decade ago, before major new reforms in the system were made. Frank Parkin's article, "Market Socialism and Class Structure: Some Aspects of Social Stratification in Yugoslavia," is, in contrast, a solid contribution of a type appropriate to an outside researcher because it combines an analysis of Yugoslav data with a more general theme where a degree of social distance for the observer is useful.

This points up a problem with specialists on Eastern Europe. It is rarely the case that an outside sociologist can do a descriptive study which is superior to that done by resident sociologists. But outside sociologists are particularly useful in adding a comparative dimension in the instances when the particularist focus of the East Europeans gives their work a parochial narrowness often of interest only to specialists.

Taken as a whole, this book is of interest to political scientists, sociologists, and area specialists, and Professor Faber and the Praeger Special Studies series are to be thanked for a contribution to a field which is grossly underrepresented in the publications on Eastern Europe. More such collaborative efforts should be encouraged.

BOGDAN DENITCH
Graduate Center, CUNY

SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF MODERNIZATION IN COMMUNIST SOCIETIES. Edited by *Mark G. Field*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976. x, 277 pp. \$14.50.

A compelling need exists for an upsurge in scholarship which shares the objectives of this book: to compare basic features of social change in Communist-led societies; to analyze the consequences of selected modernization strategies for contemporary China, the Soviet Union, and other socialist countries; and to examine the issue of convergence with particular attention to the similarities and differences among these cases, Japan, the United States, and other Western examples. To recognize the importance of each of these objectives cannot, however, be equated with taking appropriate action toward realizing any of them. The time has passed when we should be lulled by excuses "that this volume has only scratched the surface" due to such factors as the enormity of the task and the dearth of trained sociologists.

Instead, it behooves us to acknowledge that even given the resources on hand, this volume, when judged as a single entity, has failed to provide a proper format for proceeding toward these objectives. The approach from paper to paper lacks consistency. The choice of countries, time periods, and topics appears chaotic. In brief, a weakly coordinated collection of conference papers means that the whole does not equal the sum of its parts.

The ten articles selected for this book vary considerably. The most promising contributions among them are left hanging for want of proper follow-up. For instance, where are the parallel studies to the useful overview and thoughtful reinterpretation of China's recent modernization strategy provided by Ezra Vogel's "The Chinese Model of Development"? Where are the statistically based comparisons between socialist countries to complement Walter Connor's "Deviance, Stress and Modernization in Eastern Europe"?

From other articles the payoff is simply too small. Despite its interesting documentation of reasons behind the lack of innovation in Soviet research and development, why is a work as heavily footnoted as Peter Solomon's "Technological Innovation and Soviet Industrialization," which establishes only one major point, included in this