

Nations General Assembly of a Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in December 1966. The Paris Peace Conference of 1919 met some demands for self-determination and added a short-lived international protection of minorities limited to about a dozen "new" states.

Lenin used the slogan of self-determination as a vehicle for imposing on many national minorities in Russia a tie with the Soviet "federation" before the "union" status of 1924 was established. Stalin repeated this in 1940 with the Baltic states. After World War II, when Soviet influence was dominant in Eastern Europe, only Tito adopted the Soviet model. The other Communist-ruled countries limited protection of minority rights to short stipulations in their constitutions and issued internal legislation providing minority rights in cultural matters. So, for example, the DDR issued several laws and decrees securing special rights for the small group of Lusatian Sorbs. Czechoslovakia, where the separatist demands of the Slovaks have a sad history, solved this matter only after the pertinent article was written. Mao Tse-tung, also, did not follow the Soviet model despite the fact that some of the thirty-five million non-Chinese form a definite majority in large areas. Limited territorial autonomy is all that they received from the central government.

The volume, edited by the well-known authority on Soviet and East European law and government, Professor Boris Meissner, deals very thoroughly with the subject. It concludes with a name index.

WITOLD S. SWORAKOWSKI
Hoover Institution

PROSPECTS FOR SOVIET SOCIETY. Edited by *Allen Kassof*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger. A publication of the Council on Foreign Relations. x, 582 pp. \$3.95, paper.

THE SOVIET PEOPLE AND THEIR SOCIETY: FROM 1917 TO THE PRESENT. By *Pierre Sorlin*. Translated by *Daniel Weissbord*. New York, Washington, and London: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969. x, 293 pp. \$7.00.

THE ROADS TO RUSSIA: UNITED STATES LEND-LEASE TO THE SOVIET UNION. By *Robert Huhn Jones*. Foreword by *Edgar L. Erickson*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969. xix, 326 pp. \$6.95.

The eighteen essays in *Prospects for Soviet Society* provide an extremely useful stocktaking of current Soviet reality, seen in historical perspective. They will enable scholars to obtain reliable judgments in areas bordering their own. As an authoritative review, the book seems sure to figure in many reading lists for a variety of courses. The analysis is on a high level, strewn with thoughtful insights and set forth with graceful precision. The papers were first written in 1965, revised in 1966, and put in final form by July 1967. They address themselves in part to prospects for the next decade or so, from the vantage point of the mid-1960s.

The volume is a substantial and well-organized whole, complete with solid footnotes and a thorough index. The two essays in part 1 ("Soviet Society After Fifty Years") are "Persistence and Change" by Allen Kassof and "Soviet Society: A Comparative View" by Cyril E. Black. Part 2 takes up the "Formation and Control of Policy": "The Party and Society" by Jeremy R. Azrael, "Interest Groups" by Sidney I. Ploss, "Law and Society" by Leon Lipson, "The Military" by Thomas W. Wolfe, and "The Non-Russian Nationalities" by Vernon V.

Aspaturian. Part 3 deals with "Resources and Their Management" in five essays: "Population Changes" by Warren W. Eason, "Education" by William K. Medlin, "Agriculture" by Arcadius Kahan, "Industry" by Herbert S. Levine, and "Science" by Alexander Vucinich. The four essays of part 4 discuss "Changing Aspects of Social Structure" as follows: "Stratification and Communism" by Robert A. Feldmesser, "The Family and Social Problems" by Mark G. Field and David E. Anderson, "Leisure: The Unity of Pleasure and Purpose" by Paul Hollander, and "The Intellectuals" by James H. Billington. Finally, an essay by John C. Campbell on "The Soviet Union in the International Environment" and one by the editor, Allen Kassof, on "The Future of Soviet Society" provide a summary review of Soviet prospects.

The papers were originally prepared as a joint enterprise sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations and later carried on by the American Council of Learned Societies. Authors saw each other's drafts, and, presumably as a result, the whole collection hangs together well, for which we no doubt owe thanks in addition to the editor. Readers may find dull stretches in fields far from their interests, but this seems an inevitable price to pay for careful treatment of intricate matters. Most of the discussion is reasonably sprightly.

Developments in the two years since these essays were completed appear to have made the outlook somewhat darker. The rate of change in Soviet society has slowed down. Though economic progress continues, the domestic social and political atmosphere has become more bleak. Readers of this book will not find the recent trends surprising. They will, however, have a good basis for assessing the forces that, sooner or later, seem bound to reassert the forward momentum that prevailed during 1954–64.

The book by French sociologist Pierre Sorlin is a warmhearted account of Soviet experience from a French point of view. He seeks to make vividly human the difficulties that Russians have suffered in the painful course of their modernization during the last half century. Though based on wide reading in Russian sources, his survey is a rather sweeping and popular history evidently intended more as an introductory textbook than as a scholarly analysis.

The author personalizes the country, the party, and various categories of the people, attributing to them purposes, capacities, and reactions that often strike this reviewer as puzzling or unpersuasive. He is also awed by the large size and rapid growth of the Soviet population as it has absorbed and recuperated from devastating blows. One is given the sense of a vast drama played out somewhat abstractly, with large social groups as the actors.

Professor Sorlin gives welcome attention to regional diversity in the Soviet record and takes pains to discuss rural as well as urban developments. Some twenty-two simple sketch maps and graphs illustrate the narrative, and an appendix gives summary annual economic data. The bibliography lists somewhat random Soviet sources, not linked to the text in footnotes, together with a representative and up-to-date list of suggestions for reading drawn from standard United States sources. The English of the translation is lucid and well phrased.

The book may prove effective with some young students whose teachers want to offer a humane introduction. Beyond this, one glimpses distinctive views that might enrich Soviet studies if Sorlin were to advance them, in detailed and substantiated form, in a different book.

Official Soviet denigration of United States aid to the USSR in World War II led the Lilly Endowment, Inc., to support the project of the Freedom Study Com-

mittee of the University of Illinois, which commissioned Professor Jones to prepare a documented, objective account of United States lend-lease to Russia. The study uses U.S. presidential papers, government reports, memoirs, and press accounts, with occasional references to a few standard official Soviet sources, to compile an admiring and somewhat heavy-breathing narrative of United States efforts to aid a suspicious and ungrateful ally. A scholar seeking to evaluate the contribution of lend-lease supplies to the war and postwar Soviet economy would have to go beyond this United States-focused study to the increasingly rich Soviet sources that have become available in the last decade.

HOLLAND HUNTER
Haverford College

THE SOVIET SYSTEM AND MODERN SOCIETY. By *George Fischer*.
New York: Atherton Press, 1968. A Joint Project of the Bureau of Applied
Social Research and the Russian Institute of Columbia University. xiii, 199 pp.
\$7.50.

George Fischer's latest book is innovative in method, provocative in thesis and assertion, and somewhat inconclusive and speculative in logic and theory. On balance, it constitutes in this reviewer's opinion a significant and valuable addition to the growing body of scholarly literature on Communist systems that seeks to apply advanced methods of analysis to the very poor data available and to substitute reasoned discussion for moralistic polemic. Unfortunately, Fischer at times departs from sober quantitative analysis for cloudy realms of confusing speculation about such abstractions as "monism" and "Capitalist Democracy," but for the most part he sticks to the scholarly business at hand.

Both in his useful data assembly and tabular analysis and in his much less successful effort at grand theory construction Fischer makes an interesting contribution to the rapidly burgeoning literature on the sources of stability and survival power of the Soviet system. The data and arguments he adduces in support of his thesis that the Soviet system is a stable and adaptive polity are impressive. They serve as a salutary corrective to the views of some scholars who seem to think that contemporary Soviet Russia has entered a state of advanced political decay. However, as will be indicated subsequently, this reviewer feels that Fischer's arguments against the prophets of Soviet doom are stronger than his case for the continued success of a relatively changeless Soviet system.

The heart of Fischer's study is a quantitative analysis of the composition, in terms of past work experience, of a sample of 306 incumbents, in 1958, 1958-62, and 1962, of six categories of leadership posts at the all-union, republic, and oblast levels of the CPSU. Fischer breaks his sample down into four categories: Dual Executives, "who as a rule did extensive work of two kinds within the economy, technical work and party work, prior to getting a top party post"; Technicians, "who did extensive technical work, but not extensive party work, within the economy"; Hybrid Executives, "who received technical training but had no extensive work in the economy"; and Officials, with "neither technical training nor extensive work in the economy." Using more than sixty statistical tables, Fischer argues that there is a trend toward more top posts being held by men of Dual Executive career experience. It should be noted that only 16 percent of the total sample of 306 falls within this category, although the figure increased from 10