

mammoth, complex organization—is riven up and down by bureaucratic politics; . . . Soviet policies and lack of policies, foreign as well as domestic, mirror the clashes and compromises, antagonisms and alliances, of powerful bureaucratic agencies and their representatives” (p. 17). On the lower level, this is manifested by “a local conflict in which industrial interests have been as influential or even more influential than urban Party officials” (p. 5), to the extent that he concludes, “On urban and environmental issues the much-maligned Party *apparatchik* is indeed needed to rein in recalcitrant managerial specialists. Yet ironically the supposedly powerful Party secretaries are not powerful enough to dictate to influential industries whose activities adversely affect the pattern of urban development” (p. 7).

In developing his thesis the author provides new information on Soviet local politics and administration, especially on the changing role and importance of the city within the Soviet territorial-administrative hierarchy. Though at times he appears to overstate his case against the “totalitarian model,” his focus on bureaucratic politics at the local level—particularly in Soviet “company towns”—is refreshing and worth pursuing.

The book whets the reader’s appetite for a more substantial treatment of the many issues and themes discussed, particularly those dealing with the participation of the party in local decision-making. The latter, however, are not examined in enough depth and detail to justify some of the author’s statements about the surprising strength of urban industrial managers vis-à-vis party *apparatchiki*. Can the data be found for a more solid evaluation of this fundamental relationship? Probably not, though one hopes that other scholars, following the author’s lead, will make the attempt.

B. M. FROLIC  
*York University*

#### SOTSIALISTICHESKAIA INTEGRATSIIA I MIROVOE KHOZIAISTVO.

By *Iu. N. Beliaev* and *L. S. Semenova*. Moscow: “Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia,” 1972. 255 pp. 96 kopeks.

This is the kind of study of economic integration in the Soviet bloc which has been appearing regularly at least once a year in the last decade or so. It is basically a compendium of standard economic data collected from various statistical yearbooks published in the Comecon countries. It is short on analysis and long on tedious description and obligatory praise of the superiority of Soviet-type economics. Anyone trying to learn something about the problems and prospects of Comecon will do much better by looking for information in the Hungarian and Polish sources.

Even though the authors devote a good deal of space to showing the economic progress achieved by the various Communist countries, they also admit that in some areas, notably intra-Comecon trade, there is considerable room for improvement, especially when compared with the performance of the Common Market. Moreover, reflecting the global concern with the energy problem, the study focuses also on the question of energy resources in Comecon, emphasizing the critical role of the Soviet Union as the chief supplier of oil and natural gas for Eastern Europe. Other than this, the study is an exercise in tedium.

ANDRZEJ KORBONSKI  
*University of California, Los Angeles*