

elementary technologies can strip away their "capitalist" (read elements of hierarchical organization, specialization, and technical rationality) overlay. Given this framework, the current scientific and technological revolution becomes, in the hands of Soviet theorists, "a conservative doctrine that describes (and rationalizes) what has in fact been Soviet practice since 1917 . . ." (p. 484).

Taken as a whole, this is an extremely important work for students of comparative communism and modernization. Its principal weaknesses are inherent in its breadth of coverage. The greatest problem has already been noted by many of the authors: the ambiguity of the "goal culture-transfer culture" distinction, and, in particular, the difficulty in demonstrating their relationship. The most enlightening chapters are those which focus explicitly on concrete technologies or transfer situations, the least successful are those which heap theoretical convolutions upon an admittedly shaky foundation. Greater attention should perhaps have been given to the question of the level of technological sophistication as an important factor, although some contributors do suggest that certain primitive technologies have proven more amenable to adaptation to a Communist goal culture. The importance of what has been termed "the second industrial revolution" has all but been ignored, however, except by a few authors who deal with the theory of the scientific and technological revolution.

DONALD R. KELLEY

*Mississippi State University*

ECONOMIE POLITIQUE DE LA PLANIFICATION EN SYSTÈME SOCIALISTE. Edited by *Marie Lavigne*. Recherches Panthéon-Sorbonne Université de Paris, no. 1. Paris: Économica (49, rue Héricart), 1978. 328 pp. Paper.

This volume was written by a group of French political economists engaged in research on the theory of socialist economies. Its primary purpose is to analyze problems of planning in socialist economies of the Soviet type. The study is focused on the following questions: Does socialist planning follow a logic specific to all socialist countries of this type? Can one determine a social optimum and attain it through the efforts of the planners? How did the "law" of priority of heavy industry modify the strategy of socialist growth? What mechanisms of political economy determine prices, revenues, monetary flows, and external exchange in the socialist countries which have abandoned the most imperative and centralized planning system? And what conclusions can be drawn from the debates on self-management in Soviet-type socioeconomic systems?

The book is divided into three parts: (1) optimum growth in a socialist system, (2) regulation in a socialist system—interaction of plan and the political economy, and (3) the socialist economic system. The authors prefer analytical tools of political economy to conventional economic analysis.

In the first part of the book, articles by Seurot and Després deal with different aspects of optimality. Seurot states that the major problem of a socialist economy in attaining optimality lies in reconciling utility functions of individual citizens with the dominant values of the social system. Després stresses "workable" optimality which bypasses the question of social preferences and their reconciliation. Tartarin challenges Stalin's dogma of growth priority of heavy industry as nonscientific and based on an unverified hypothesis supported neither by Marx nor by Lenin. Duchêne examines the most recent contributions of Soviet economists to the intersectoral dynamic equilibrium and the choice of the rate of growth.

In the second part, Richet interprets the historical development of central planning in Hungary and provides a theoretical interpretation of the New Economic Mechanism developed in 1968. In the next two chapters, Asselain and Boncoeur deal

with a specific aspect of economic reform in Hungary—determination of prices. Their special interest is in the “double channel price,” which incorporates taxes on wages and investment in the cost of production. Mescheriakoff deals with monetary policy in the Soviet system—monetary intervention administered to ensure the fulfillment of the plan—and Rogulska investigates the existence of an income policy in Poland. According to her, remuneration for labor, as in capitalist countries, is based on labor productivity and not on need. Szymkiewicz uncovers some paradoxical relationships between the international exchange and internal planning in Poland.

The third part of the volume consists of three essays by Andreff, Djurjevac, and Lavigne, dealing with some recent debates which revive certain controversies inherent in contemporary socialist systems.

The twelve contributors, who have extended the theories of planned economies by suggesting new approaches and interpretations, do not claim to cover the area, because it is too large for any research group. A great deal remains to be done. Yet, the book represents a valuable addition to presently existing literature on socialist planning in Soviet-type economies.

OLEG ZINAM

*University of Cincinnati*

NATIONALISM IN THE USSR AND EASTERN EUROPE IN THE ERA OF BREZHNEV AND KOSYGIN. Edited by *George W. Simmonds*. Detroit: University of Detroit Press, 1977. 534 pp. \$12.00, cloth. \$6.95, paper.

The noted sociologist Nathan Glazer has remarked that the problem of ethnicity ought now to be placed “at the very center of our concern for the human condition.” Much the same thought seems to have inspired the organizers of a symposium, held at the University of Detroit, the papers and proceedings of which are reproduced in the present volume. It comprises more than three dozen contributions, covering most of the major national minorities in the Soviet Union, four nationalities of Eastern Europe (Poles, Hungarians, Albanians, and Rumanians), and two national minority groups (Slovaks and Croatsians). According to the volume’s editor, all the contributors believe that “nationalism has reemerged as one of the major forces in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.” Of course, ethnicity, ethnic consciousness, and nationalism need not be synonymous terms, a fact recognized by most, but by no means all, of the contributors. In a symposium of this scope and coverage, unevenness of quality seems inevitable.

Although many of the papers are informative, only a few excel in the quality of their analysis. The latter include Tõnu Parming’s dispassionate dissection of the “collaborative response pattern” characteristic of the Estonian experience, Vahakn Dadrian’s functional analysis of religion in conjunction with his use of sociopsychological models to elucidate Armenian “ethnocentrism,” Teresa Rakowska-Harmstone’s insightful treatment of Soviet policies in Central Asia working at “cross-purposes” and, in a separate paper, her suggestive approaches to “the study of ethnic politics in the USSR,” and Zvi Gitelman’s discriminating account of “the Jewish question in the USSR since 1964.” In contrast to these contributions, a number of the other papers are largely descriptive, sometimes sketchily so, or else, in one or two cases, more partisan than scholarly in character. Several of the papers do not even purport to come to grips with the basic issues of ethnicity and nationalism. These include the papers on Poland, as well as the two contributions on Albania, which constitute exercises in “Tiranology” with respect to Albanian elite politics. While tantalizing in their own right, they do not pertain to the symposium as a whole.

Considered in its entirety, the volume fails to develop or explore theoretical approaches that would transcend particular case studies. With the partial exception