

For example, unnamed store no. 3 sells books and artistic products from France; at stores nos. 97 (Raduga) and 98 (Priroda) one can purchase stenographic reports and resolutions of party congresses and plenum meetings; and store no. 160 (Poeziia) has a "Poets' Salon" where readers can hear lectures and discuss contemporary works with authors in attendance. Unfortunately no guidelines for the export of books are included. Nevertheless, this is an indispensable aid for those who wish to add to their personal libraries while in Moscow. One hopes that similar guides will be forthcoming for Leningrad and other publishing centers.

H. RAY BUCHANAN  
*Southern Methodist University*

CORRESPONDANCE. By *Karl Marx* and *Friedrich Engels*. Edited by *Gilbert Badia* and *Jean Mortier*. Vol. 1: 1835–1848. Translated by *Henri Auger* et al. Vol. 2: 1849–1851. Translated by *Gilbert Badia* et al. Paris: Éditions Sociales, 1971. Vol. 1: xx, 591 pp. Vol. 2: xx, 418 pp. Paper.

The two volumes under review here are the first two in a series planned to comprise fifteen and reproduce in French the total correspondence of Marx and Engels. The first volume covers the scattered letters of Marx's youth as a journalist and nascent socialist in Paris, his period of intellectual gestation in Brussels, and the mad year of 1848: Cologne. The second covers the first miserable years of exile in London.

For anyone interested in the biography of Marx, especially for a comprehension of the personal and intellectual background necessary to understand his writings, the Marx-Engels correspondence is essential reading. The present edition is based on the relevant volumes of the German Marx-Engels *Werke* published in East Berlin in the 1950s and 1960s. Obviously, those who read German will want to go to the original. But those who read French more easily will want to refer to these volumes—particularly since the complete English translation of the Works will not be ready for many years to come. And, of course, there are several letters of Marx's written in French for which the French edition has the original.

There is an introduction of a dozen or so pages to each volume and generous footnotes. The introduction has nothing new from the point of view of scholarship, but the footnotes are highly informative, though the editors clearly demonstrate their Communist sympathies. One clear advantage the French edition has over the German one is that the letters are printed in a strictly chronological order instead of being split up into sections. There are also letters from Marx's father and wife which were not included in the original German edition.

DAVID McLELLAN  
*University of Kent at Canterbury*

COMMUNIST PARTY MEMBERSHIP IN THE U.S.S.R., 1917–1967. By *T. H. Rigby*. Studies of the Russian Institute, Columbia University. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968. xvii, 573 pp. \$15.00.

In this book T. H. Rigby performs two important tasks. In a fifty-page introduction, he has attempted to adapt the Almond framework of analysis to make it less ethnocentric in nature, and he has examined the general role of the party in these terms.

In the rest of the book he has summarized in a most comprehensive manner all available statistical information about party membership over a fifty-year period.

The core of the book is a monumental piece of work. Ten chapters, organized chronologically, each present a detailed description of the trends in party membership within a period approximately five years in length. Five chapters, organized by category, analyze trends in party membership by age, sex, nationality, education, occupation, and region, while a sixth chapter deals with the percentage of party members among deputies of the soviets and officials of the Komsomol and the trade unions.

Professor Rigby's work is a shining example (one of the best) of a long and proud tradition in Soviet studies—a tradition that tries to overcome severe data problems by indefatigably collecting information from the widest variety of official sources and assembling these pieces into a meaningful mosaic. Several times I have had occasion to probe deeply into some specific aspect of party membership, and I have always found the data collection to be painstaking in nature and the author's ability to thread through Soviet statistical ambiguities most impressive.

Yet, for all its accomplishments, the book leaves the reader a bit unsatisfied. One problem is that it is crammed with figures from so many different times and regions that it really is more of an encyclopedia than a book to be read. It would have been extremely useful, for example, if the statistics and extrapolations had been tied together in a concluding present-tense chapter describing the Communist Party of 1967.

A second problem is that the analytical framework in the introductory chapter has relatively little connection with the substantive chapters. The basic difficulty seems to be that although the study itself is historical in nature, the framework is quite ahistorical, at least as it is applied. Thus the framework leads the author to declare in the concluding chapter that the "political functions of the CPSU membership were much the same in the 1960's as they were in the early 1920's" (p. 520), while the remainder of the chapter (like much of the book before it) carefully analyzes the different purposes and consequences of the quite different membership policies followed at different times.

To the extent that the framework has had an impact, it has been to focus the author's attention on the functions that party membership has or has not served for the regime or for specific political leaders. This focus is a useful one, but more attention might have also been given to the meaning of party membership at the individual level. For example, the fact that the proportion of party members twenty-five years of age and younger dropped from 25 percent in 1925 to 5 percent in 1967 forms the backdrop for a discussion of the increase in the level of maturity within the party and of the functions this might serve. It does not, however, lead to a substantial exploration of the changes in the criteria for party admission implied by these statistics nor in the type of personality that might meet these criteria. Yet such an exploration might have had an important bearing upon the functional analysis.

Basically, the book is limited by the classic methodology employed. The use of interview techniques (especially in dealing with party admission as perceived by the individual) and of computer analysis (especially in extrapolating more fully the degree of party saturation of various groups) would have added to the usefulness of the book. Yet, in employing the classic methodology, Professor Rigby has unquestionably produced a book that for the foreseeable future will be indispensable

to anyone interested in party membership or in the party-membership aspect of any Soviet question. As younger scholars experiment with different methodologies, one hopes that they will not forget the data problems faced by the author of this book—and most books on the Soviet Union—and that they will build upon, rather than abandon, the painstaking tradition which scholars such as Professor Rigby have developed to cope with these problems.

JERRY F. HOUGH  
Duke University

THE SOVIET PARADIGM: AN EXPERIMENT IN CREATING A MONO-HIERARCHICAL POLITY. By *Roy D. Laird*. New York: Free Press, 1970. London: Collier-Macmillan. xxviii, 272 pp. \$7.95.

Professor Laird's main purpose in setting forth a "monohierarchical paradigm" of the Soviet polity is to introduce upper-level college students to the Soviet political system as it had evolved by 1970. While this interpretive text, like others in recent years, finds the totalitarian model no longer applicable, Laird's paradigm nevertheless underscores continuing tendencies in the Soviet polity toward greater centralization and unity, such as the merger of the bureaucratic hierarchies of state and party and the "complete carrying through" of this bureaucracy into Soviet society by means of numerous "supportive adjuncts."

Beginning with a brief account of the history and physical environment that cradled the Soviet system, Laird proceeds to describe the various ideologies that have culminated in a new Soviet nationalism. "This evolving emotional cement," he says in his preface, "holds the USSR together in a way that Stalinist terror never could" (pp. xxiv-xxv). In his analysis of the state apparatus he notes especially the monolithic quality of its all-encompassing bureaucracy. The book's fourth section discusses in detail the "supportive adjuncts" to the institutions of rule, including the various "voluntary" citizen groups, unions, educational techniques, communications media, and recent social science research, stressing their influence in joining citizen and society.

Although some of the historical material is marred by inaccuracies, Laird's profound knowledge of past and present agricultural affairs provides valuable agricultural insights and leads him to emphasize the special impact of agriculture and a large rural population upon domestic politics. Agricultural institutions (for example, the MTS) are used to illustrate government operation.

In his summary evaluation, Laird concludes that current tendencies toward centralization far outweigh countertrends toward liberalization, for although terror has been abandoned as a major instrument of rule, the substitute controls of Stalin's successors appear to be "more efficient than terror and, as a result, the USSR may be a more tightly structured society than previously" (p. 208). This, briefly, is the import of Laird's paradigm.

While clearly stating his preference for an open, pluralistic society, Laird presents with great empathy and sensitivity the values of a closed, unitary system and an other-directed collectivism. Whether or not the tongue-twisting term "monohierarchical" achieves wider usage, Laird argues well for the applicability of this neutral term that abandons the aura of terror but not the exclusivist and centralist implications of "totalitarian."