

Yiddish-speaking community of workers and intellectuals in America. (That the traditionally religious and Zionist Jews receive relatively scant attention is another matter.) A Slavic scholar will be struck by the huge amount of evidence which indicates that this world was also in many respects an offshoot of the political and cultural Russia of the turn of the century. Thus, in 1883 a group of Jewish immigrants from Russia founded the Tolstoyan settlement of New Odessa in the distant reaches of Oregon. (Curiously, in recent years the same state attracted groups of peripatetic Old Believers.) Modern American trade unionism owes much to the early Yiddish-speaking unions which, in turn, were closely modeled after those of tsarist Russia to which many of their members and leaders had belonged. And Yiddish theater, which was once probably the best theater this country had, was all too transparently an offspring of the Russian. Thus, "when Adler was doing [in Yiddish] Tolstoy's *Living Corpse*, John Barrymore came frequently to admire and study his performance." When Maurice Schwartz took a Yiddish adaptation of Leonid Andreyev's *The Seven Who Were Hanged* to London, James Agate, a leading critic, wrote that "the performance of these Yiddish players contains more great acting than I have ever seen on any stage in any place." Indeed, the native language of the Yiddish theater's leading playwright, Jacob Gordin, was Russian (he was brought to the Yiddish theater by a producer who was "always in awe of intellectuals who spoke Russian fluently"). It was, no doubt, Turgenev's example that encouraged Gordin to create *The Jewish King Lear*. And a half a century before the launching of America's first graduate program in Russian literature, the name of Boris Tomashevsky was famous in this country. The literary scholar's namesake was a matinée idol of New York's Yiddish theater.

MAURICE FRIEDBERG

*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*

COMPARATIVE SOCIALIST SYSTEMS: ESSAYS ON POLITICS AND ECONOMICS. Edited by *Carmelo Mesa-Lago* and *Carl Beck*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Center for International Studies, 1975. xvi, 450 pp. Figures. Tables. Paper.

COMPARATIVE ECONOMIC SYSTEMS: A DECISION-MAKING APPROACH. By *Egon Neuberger* and *William J. Duffy* et al. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976. vi, 378 pp.

Comparing socialist systems is difficult at best and the state of that art is rudimentary. Data are fragmentary, methodology is underdeveloped, and too many disciplines and skills are required. The authors of these volumes have transcended the varied difficulties by coauthorship and extensive scholarly labor. Both volumes contribute generously to the field.

In the Mesa-Lago/Beck volume, the editors have merged work from two disciplines, economics and political science; in a summary conclusion, a sociologist (Paul Hollander) suggests possible extensions in the comparison of socialist systems for the future. The volume begins with careful but varied definitions of socialism. Paul Shoup, John Michael Montias, William A. Welsh, and Dr. Mesa-Lago guide the reader through the intricate paths of statism, bureaucracy, decentralization, and centralization. Political structures are compared by Dr. Beck, William Dunn, Andrzej Korboniski, Paul Cocks, Jan Triska and Paul Johnson, and Frederic Fleron, Jr. Economic structure is analyzed in articles by Stanislaw Gomulka and Peter J. F. Wiles, Richard Carson, Frederic Pryor, Paul Marer, and Jozef Wilczynski. Their work is frankly empirical and refreshingly nonideological. The conclusions are fresh and deep; the quality is high. Authors truly compare different socialist systems, and add China and

Cuba to the more familiar USSR-East European group. (Unfortunately, Albania, Mongolia, North Korea, and North Vietnam are excluded; the editors note the gap with regret.) The volume might be used profitably as a readings book for scholars and advanced students.

In the Neuberger/Duffy volume, socialist systems also are compared, but to an economic model. The authors develop a highly original paradigm for the comparison, the DIM system. (The DIM acronym is unfortunate in my judgment.) The system of comparison divides economic structure into three basic functions: for Decision-making, for Information, and for Motivation. Again, the work is nonideological and empirical. Roughly a third of the book is devoted to developing the DIM paradigm; the remainder studies eight economic systems according to the paradigm: the United States, the Soviet Union, China, France, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Sweden, and Japan. As no pair of authors could have detailed knowledge of so many economic systems, these two wisely called on Alan Brown and Joseph Licari for the chapter on Hungary and on F. Reed Johnson for the chapter on Sweden. The authors assume extensive and intensive familiarity with economic terms, and the book would be a suitable text only at an advanced level.

The DIM paradigm, however, should be studied by any serious scholar of comparative economic systems. More traditional texts study outcomes of economic growth and of efficiency, but this text analyzes the processes by which those outcomes were achieved. In doing so, the authors utilize recent developments in economic theory of information and decision making, and add work on motivation. Ideology is assumed to be exogenous to the economic systems. The resulting paradigm reorders our knowledge and methodology in comparing economic systems. For example, it distinguishes between a planning system which limits the choices or decisions of a lower echelon unit (administrative decentralization) and one which manipulates the consequences of a decision by that unit (manipulative decentralization), while granting it the freedom to choose. The first is closer to a traditional planned system, the second to a market. In another example, coercion becomes a motivation system, costly in its use of scarce resources, which can occur in any society.

Both books approach inquiry concerning socialist systems with a positive spirit lacking in normative, or "ideological," bias. Paul Hollander (in Mesa-Lago/Beck) terms this the "optimistic-evolutionary" perspective. He hypothesizes that technocrats, who are by definition rational and apolitical, create such an environment. Although the positive environment itself is salutary, it disguises questions answered by ideology. One is the question of legitimacy or the ideological support for a social system. Neuberger/Duffy include legitimacy as motivation by "solidarity," where an individual subverts a personal objective to group goals, thus acknowledging their superior legitimacy. To generalize this principle would be an accomplishment indeed. The books, together and singly, are full of such challenges.

ELIZABETH CLAYTON  
*University of Missouri, St. Louis*

ON THE EVE OF POLTAVA: THE LETTERS OF IVAN MAZEPA TO ADAM SIENIAWSKI, 1704–1708. Edited, annotated, and with an introduction by *Orest Subtelny*. Preface by *Oleksander Ohloblyn*. New York: The Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States, 1975. 159 pp.

Much has been written about the reign of Peter I and the Northern War (1700–1721), and one might think that the history of Russia, Sweden, and Poland for this period would hardly be in need of rewriting as a result of the discovery of previously