

ship between socioeconomic development and the responsiveness of Communist elites to popular demands and pressures. In an otherwise interesting essay in which he applies certain concepts of Karl Deutsch, Lipset, Easton, Daniel Lerner, and others about elite behavior, Pirages examines the behavior of the Czech elite during a period just before the advent of the Dubček revolution, and on the basis of this analysis concludes that the Czech leadership was among the most coercively nonresponsive in Eastern Europe, along with that of East Germany. Neither conclusion was a novel discovery when the essay was written, but then miraculously and unexpectedly Novotný was displaced by Dubček, and lo and behold the Czech elite became the most responsive in the Communist world. On the basis of the evidence he had available, however (Dubček, the invisible variable, had not yet surfaced), Pirages concluded that "the empirical data indicate that the first hypothesis [i.e., "the more developed party-states should be characterized by greater citizen access to political elites and greater elite responsiveness to citizen demands" (p. 259)] . . . must be rejected for the communist system. Contrary to expectation [based on earlier studies of different systems], the party-state elites in the most socioeconomically developed countries [i.e., Czechoslovakia and East Germany] have not developed less coercive and more responsive relations with their citizens at a faster pace than the less developed countries." At this point one might ruefully ask, "Will the real Czech political elite please rise?"

This is not intended to be a criticism of Pirages as a prophet but merely to demonstrate that premature "proof" or "disproof" of a hypothesis may create false expectations and can influence and shape the direction of research and the asking of new questions, and therefore needlessly shut down old horizons in the process of creating new ones. One must wonder what Pirages's conclusion might have been if he had conducted and completed his research between fall 1967 and August 1, 1968. Would Dubček's advent have been registered as a confirmation of the hypothesis?

Among the hard questions this book raises anew, most of which cannot be explored here, are the following: (1) To what extent does the efficacy of quantitative and behavioral methods depend upon the existence of relatively stable political and ideological parameters that can allow the development of regularities and uniformities sufficient to draw definitive generalizations and conclusions? (2) To what extent are the concepts and analytical constructs of contemporary comparative politics and political science essentially generalizations based upon regularities and uniformities drawn from Western democratic and pluralistic experience? (3) To what extent, then, is contemporary comparative politics essentially a "Western area studies" methodology, euphemistically disguised as "science"? And can its methods be any more valid in their applicability to Communist systems than those of Sovietology when applied to Western systems?

VERNON V. ASPATURIAN
The Pennsylvania State University

COMMUNIST EDUCATION: ITS HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY AND POLITICS. By *Wasył Shimoniak*. Chicago, New York, San Francisco: Rand McNally, 1970. xxi, 506 pp.

The author's aim is not to analyze the process of narrow indoctrination in Communist ideology, as might be expected from the title, but rather "to present important communist educational policies and practices and to analyze their role in social change"

(p. ix). This has been done for individual countries by a host of writers, among them George S. Counts on the USSR and Stewart E. Fraser on continental China. In addition, there are works in Russian (Malkova, 1961), English (King, 1963; Roucek and Lottich, 1964; Grant, 1969), and German (Deutsches Pädagogisches Zentralinstitut, 1962; Anweiler, 1969) on educational thought and practice on a regional basis, chiefly Eastern Europe. What distinguishes the work by Dr. Shimoniak is, first of all, the fact of his birth, education, and suffering behind the Iron Curtain. The author is able to use most of the languages of the countries he writes about, and he covers fourteen Communist nations, including Albania.

As might be expected, the stress falls on the school in relation to society in the USSR. In over half the space, Shimoniak sketches the historical background of education in tsarist Russia, and then goes on to survey in historical context the aims, reforms, structure, administration, curriculum, and methodology of Soviet education. He pays particular attention to the influence of Communist policies on minority languages, chiefly in the Ukraine (where he was born) and Central Asia, the struggle of atheism versus religion in school and life, and the role of women in society. This section is highly informative and is buttressed by tables, charts, and ample bibliographical references.

There is little doubt where Shimoniak's sympathies lie—with the efforts of minority groups to maintain their cultural integrity in the face of the powerful drive toward the totalitarianization of thought and expression. He sees the culmination of Lenin's and Stalin's policies as a continuation of the tsarist tradition of Russification. The Soviet linguistic policy, for example, is "a long-range planned strategy to assimilate slowly all non-Russian nationalities . . . [under] the veneer of the proletarian culture" (p. 215). If the Communist power seems to be prevailing with respect to the language issue, it is not doing as well in the advancement of atheism. Despite more than half a century of antireligious propaganda, religious observance still holds on: "for some people religion lives in the cult of the saints, in the observance of holy days, in national traditions, and in many other ways" (p. 251).

The rest of the volume covers too much ground in too limited space. The allocation ranges from five pages (North Korea) to eighteen (Communist China). In general the material is too fragmentary and sketchy to be instructive. Even for the more substantial sections of the Soviet state there are gaps. The prerevolutionary historical account, for example, omits Vladimir Monomakh and the founding of the University of Moscow.

There are some questionable statements of fact (e.g., p. 28), misprints, and spelling inconsistencies. The well-known Soviet educational historian, for instance, appears as Medyski, Medinski, and Medynskii. Sometimes not especially familiar names are left unidentified—for example, Pnin (p. 31). And even Narkompros and Sovnarkom (p. 74) can stand precise definition. The numerous comparative tables are helpful, as are the bibliographical references in ten languages. For all the abundance, the author has not included the composite works comparable in some way to his volume.

In sum, Shimoniak has presented a creditable analysis of the Communist impact on the school, society, and the individual in the Soviet Union. With respect to the other Communist countries, he has overreached himself by trying to encompass all in the remainder of his book. What results is *parvum in parvo*.

WILLIAM W. BRICKMAN
University of Pennsylvania