

legal enactments, was valuable enough to merit separate publication; chapter 6, on commissions of the Supreme Soviet, is thorough; chapter 8 reviews Soviet discussion of the legal standing of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and is interesting in relation to the 1977 Constitution. Criticism of other aspects of the book will not detract from the contributions of Vanneman's research.

The author's principal finding is that the Supreme Soviet is extending its influence over state and mass organs (p. 101) and power relations are shifting, which *may* signal development toward democracy and the rule of law (pp. 5, 6, 233). But the argument is flawed in several ways: (1) The author is perhaps too close to his subject; consequently, the discussion of trends in the Supreme Soviet is not balanced by consideration of other institutions (this is somewhat like projecting the course of a battleship from an intricate study of the enlisted men's mess). (2) Sources are, for the most part, Soviet publications, leading to the error of taking the printed word as description of fact. (3) An argument based on tradition is used to support the conclusion, but it actually weakens it. The Russian tradition, according to the author, is one of weak law and of extirpation of assemblies, from *veche* to *duma*; thus, to argue that the Russian tradition figures in the growth of democracy is to display both imagination and sanguineness. (4) Comparative categories are used without sufficient care; for example, soviets are called legislatures (pp. 11, 150, 204), but initiation of legislation is either weakly treated (pp. 206-7), or the party is acknowledged as initiator (pp. 131 and 187). The deputy is described as a type of ombudsman (pp. 4 and 234), and in several cases critically important distinctions are not drawn. At the same time, when Vanneman states that the party has orchestrated the growth of Supreme Soviet activity and initiates its legislation, he fails to note that his conclusions are thereby vitiated. His best case for the "burgeoning" influence of the Supreme Soviet centers on its drafting of laws. But would he then argue that the Department of Justice and the Offices of Legislative Counsel, because they do most technical drafting of laws in the United States and Canada, have acquired the functions of Congress or Parliament?

Some of the flaws may be traced to the conceptual framework used. The author says little about this, but he somewhat elliptically employs the vocabulary and approach of systems analysis, which imposes its categories on the materials under study and which requires predictions for completion of the analysis. In addition, a comparative government text by Aspaturian et al.—whose approach is that of structural-functionalism searching "scientifically" for "universal patterns" in government—is cited in seven of eleven chapters and is presumably Professor Vanneman's guide. Perhaps this is why the word "politics" is found in the title (because it is included in the definition of "system") when there is no justificatory discussion in the text; why there are references to universal patterns which do not fit Soviet institutions; and why we may infer (or predict) growth in the USSR toward a rule of law. The book suggests that such a framework may be a hindrance to understanding Soviet government.

MAX MOTE  
University of Alberta

THE SOCIALIST INDUSTRIAL STATE: TOWARDS A POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY OF STATE SOCIALISM. By *David Lane*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1976. 230 pp. Tables. \$18.50.

To say that this volume fills a serious gap in the literature on comparative communism would be a gross understatement. In fact, such literature scarcely exists, least of all in sociology, despite the considerable potential market in the form of numerous university and college programs in this important subdiscipline. Be that as it may, Lane's *Socialist Industrial State* is a remarkable contribution. The author is known to specialists

in the Soviet and East European area because of some of his earlier writings, especially his study, *The End of Inequality?* (Penguin Books, 1971), which deals with stratification problems of Communist societies. Although the present work bears the subtitle, "Towards a Political Sociology of State Socialism," the reader can find much useful information and many insightful comments on many more specific subjects. The book is subdivided into three parts and addresses four important topics of the sociology of communism: the political system and political culture; the elites of industrial Communist societies; the Soviet model and other models or, rather, "countermodels"; and the social structure. The author, respectful of the "classical" definition of political sociology, has set out to identify the social bases of Communist politics.

In Lane's analysis, as the reader might expect, a perennial difficulty comes to the fore. This is the problem connected with the notion of communism as a generalized model of a socioeconomic system: strictly speaking, there is no one model, but rather a multitude of models. The writer is aware of this, and he clearly demonstrates that the political sociology of Communist nations is a complex matter. The new term which he has coined, "state socialism," is not meant to remove the difficulty but to supply a more suitable common denominator for observed phenomena.

After perusing the book, the reader will better understand why variants of "state socialism" exhibit different political cultures. It would be misleading, however, to view this relationship as unidirectional. In the vast sociological laboratory (or laboratories?) of the Communist world, political models shape compatible management and planning systems as often as they themselves are shaped by these systems. This is especially true as a negative proposition: no type of economic organization of a Communist state is conceivable, in the long run, which would challenge or run counter to the fundamental political formula, such as the principle of the power monopoly of the party. Czechoslovakia of 1968 is a case in point.

The volume is well documented and well annotated. Perhaps the only criticism one can make is that the book is not exhaustive as far as all "social bases of communism" are concerned: a discussion of factors such as family, work experience, and effects of complex organizations would have been worthwhile, although hardly possible in some two hundred pages. But this is a minor point. The talent and expertise of the author promise that this expectation may well be met in his future scholarly exploits.

ZDENEK SUDA  
*University of Pittsburgh*

POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVOLUTION IN THE USSR. By *T. H. Rigby* and *R. F. Miller*. Department of Political Science, Research School of the Social Sciences, Australian National University, Occasional Paper no. 11. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1976. iv, 115 pp. \$4.95, paper.

The continuing development of science and technology in any society contributes to social and economic changes which can have far-reaching implications for the nature and stability of political systems. The Soviet Union is no exception. The Soviet leadership has recognized the significance of what it calls the "scientific-technical revolution," and it has taken steps to control, or at least to manipulate, that process as much as possible. This is not always successful, as Rigby and Miller aptly demonstrate. Their papers document a situation of tension and accommodation between the CPSU and the complexities of technological development.

Rigby calls our attention to the changing roles of the party in industrial administration. Unfortunately, he does not relate his analysis specifically to the scientific-