

The publication of some of Alexander Dubček's statements on the path of socialism in Czechoslovakia prior to the Warsaw invasion is a significant event. Paul Ello has chosen his four texts not only for their importance as historical documents. He insists that they provide a "blueprint for the further development of a Socialist political order" (p. vii). The translations themselves are adequate, preserving something of the original style, which is difficult, often obtuse, and replete with the jargon one has come to expect of the public pronouncements of East European political figures.

Ello provides each document with an introduction and an analysis based on the speech itself. His central idea is that relations among the nations of the Communist bloc have been guided by the principle of change and accommodation since the death of Stalin. Not all scholars will agree with this, but the failure of the reform government in Prague was certainly indicative of the opposition to change on the part of the Brezhnev regime.

With the resignation of Oldřich Černík in January 1970 and his replacement by Lubomir Strougal, the reform "action programme" has become a thing of the past. Ello's statement that the documents he has published "provide some indication of the direction [in] which Communist Party State Systems will have to move if they are to survive" is probably a more dubious hypothesis now than it was in September 1968, when the book was first published.

JACK V. HANEY
University of Washington

COMMUNIST STUDIES AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES: ESSAYS ON
METHODOLOGY AND EMPIRICAL THEORY. Edited by *Frederic J.
Fleron, Jr.* Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1969. xiii, 481 pp. \$5.95, paper.

Perhaps this collection of studies, assembled by Professor Fleron from widely scattered—although exclusively English-language—sources, should be reviewed by a committee. Certainly few scholars would feel confident of their capacity to evaluate such a wide range of methodologies, theoretical approaches, and analytical—including mathematical and statistical—techniques as are represented. However, the difficulties confronting the reviewer of this volume may be a measure both of its merits and of the complexity and variety of emerging trends in scholarship that it exemplifies. It should perhaps be added that since even the most recent of the articles included were published, many new projects, especially quantitative ones, have been begun.

This reviewer is favorably disposed to what he takes to be the editor's objective, namely, the fostering of rigorously professional and "scientific" modes of scholarly inquiry in the description and analysis of "Communist" political systems and movements. He has for some time recommended to his undergraduate and graduate students the reading of such components of the present symposium as Fleron's introductory article, "Soviet Area Studies and the Social Sciences: Some Methodological Problems in Communist Studies," as well as Milton Lodge's statistical study of "elite" attitudes, and the writings of Skilling, Tucker, Shoup, and other contributors to this symposium. However, the reviewer would like to offer some observations and, it is hoped, constructive criticisms.

The first relates to the criteria of selection and organization of this collection, and, more fundamentally, to the question of what purpose is served by reprinting excellent but highly disparate articles, assuming that Professor Fleron's objective

was the reinforcement of what has already become, perhaps, the dominant trend in Communist studies. Would it not have been much more useful if Fleron had applied his considerable talents to the production of an original monograph—or had at least produced a work of greater synthetic power? In such a study he could have dealt with fundamental problems of issues, values, and the mysteries of scholarly creativity. Of course, any of us might quail before the wide-ranging, perhaps impossible task of producing a work such as is, half seriously, suggested here—but in the absence of such efforts we may be condemned to methodological confusion or to reliance on intuition.

Although this collection as it stands is a very useful, indeed often fascinating reference tool, it is, like all symposia, more mosaic than matrix, more stew than clear soup. There is a great deal of overlap in the content of many of the articles, and some readers will be puzzled about the validity of a classification scheme that categorizes as “methodological” T. H. Rigby’s “Crypto-Politics,” while assigning Lodge’s “groupism” study to the rubric of “conceptualization,” and Erik Hoffman’s piece on communication theory and William Welsh’s ambitious, impressive but extremely speculative, and perhaps somewhat pretentious, efforts at prescription for improved elite analysis, and the application of game theory to the 1956 Hungarian crisis, to that of “social science theory.” Incidentally, Welsh’s article on the 1956 situation is really a contribution to international relations theory rather than to “Communist” studies. Although his article on comparative elite studies is impressive, one wonders if Professor Welsh is fully aware of the costs, financial and in terms of manpower, of the elaborate types of study he suggests. With regard to some of the technical aspects of Welsh’s articles—and of some others in the collection—readers might be more favorably impressed if they were not asked to accept statements regarding philosophy and mathematics made by nonphilosophers and nonmathematicians.

Second, although Fleron strikes a modest note in his preface, there seems to be a tendency in some of the articles in this book to assume, or at least create the impression, that established scholarship is so defective as to be almost useless, while the “new” methods and approaches promise to drastically improve, indeed to revolutionize, political and social analysis. Ironically, most of the contributions by the Young Turk contributors to this volume constitute discussions of what might, hopefully, be accomplished by using new approaches and concepts, rather than actual contributions to knowledge. It is not unfair, perhaps, to point out that only a handful of publications, exclusively or almost exclusively produced by older scholars, some of whom are represented here, have actually made any substantive contribution to, for example, the “comparative” study of Communist states, parties, or movements. This observation leads, perhaps, to a rather general question. Is it not better—as Abraham Kaplan suggests—to start with problems or with unresolved contradictions or gaps in our knowledge and then look for concepts, methods, and techniques that may help in finding solutions or answers, rather than to begin with methods and then search for projects to which to apply them? However, if one follows this procedure one may never acquaint oneself with new approaches, as perhaps Professor Fleron and some of his collaborators might argue.

Incidentally, some of the contributions to this collection, like much other recent writing on comparative communism, seem to this author to be somewhat naïve or confused. Some discussion of this fashionable topic seems to be devoted—in part—to the enunciation either of truisms or of dangerous oversimplifications. It would seem obvious that all conceptualization involves comparison. The isolation and full

description of any phenomenon requires—as numerous textbooks on modern logic, such as those of Langer, Leonard, and Quine, spell out—the placing of the object under study within a context, or “universe of discourse.” It is hence not necessary, in order to proceed “comparatively,” to describe explicitly each and every element belonging to a set of more or less similar elements—but of course one must first sort out a set of objects from other, presumably dissimilar ones! In any case, more is made in some assertively “comparative” political studies of the claim that two or more “whole systems” are allegedly “systematically” compared than is justifiable.

The reviewer would like to make another point in connection with comparative studies, which, incidentally, he strongly approves and advocates, especially along the lines suggested by Professors Tucker, Skilling, Welsh, Shoup, and others. It is to be hoped that comparative studies, whether of “whole systems” or “parts” of systems, will not cause us to lose sight of the enormous importance of individual states, such as the USSR or China. To what extent, indeed, can the European Communist states now in the Warsaw Treaty Organization develop new political systems without fundamental change in the USSR?

The tendency should be noted of some of the contributors, including Professor Fleron in his article on the “logic of inquiry,” to assume, perhaps too self-confidently, that they have selected from available conceptual schemes the “right” ones for use in sociopolitical analysis. Certainly some of the leading philosophers of science are skeptical of sweeping claims for particular methodologies, or even of methodology in general. As Karl Popper has written, “profound truths are not to be expected of methodology.” Also, as is well known, at least to some of us, the writings of Abraham Kaplan and Bertrand Russell, to mention only two other not insignificant philosophers and theorists of method, are replete with ironic reminders of the virtues of modesty, tolerance, and pluralism in matters methodological and epistemological.

Finally, the reader of this valuable symposium is likely to feel that it omits, or at any rate largely neglects, some important approaches. For example, little is said, at least by the younger contributors, of such aspects of training and preparation for scholarship as deep knowledge of languages, literature, and history, extensive experience in “Communist” countries, or “practical” experience in government and politics. Not only are these considerations ignored in large part, but anthropological, psychological, “psychocultural,” and other methods are not discussed. There is a tendency, somewhat disturbing to this reviewer, to assume that “systematic” knowledge of methods and techniques, largely derived from philosophy of sciences and mathematics, can lead to a level of understanding of the immensely complex phenomena and problems of politics and society—somewhat similar to the kind of knowledge of nature achieved by “hard” scientists. Somehow neither history nor common sense seems to support such a view.

However, in conclusion it should be stressed that Fleron’s study is a very useful, and unique, contribution to scholarly literature. It will make more “visible” hitherto obscure studies, some either unpublished or inaccessible. It should be useful reading for all scholars in our field who have not taken the trouble to “retool” and bring their knowledge of the philosophical, methodological, and technical context of their research up to a reasonable level. Also, in an era when rigor and logic in scholarship are once again threatened, perhaps, by an antirational and antiscientific “counterrevolution,” it is good to be reminded that so many scholars, both newcomers to the field of Communist studies and established veterans, are in their daily work in an extraordinarily difficult field attempting to contribute to what

David Easton, in his presidential address to the 1969 convention of the American Political Science Association, referred to as “reliable understanding.”

FREDERICK C. BARGHOORN
Yale University

THE YOUNG HEGELIANS AND KARL MARX. By *David McLellan*. New York and Washington: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969. ix, 170 pp. \$8.50.

Most studies on the relationship of Marx's thought to the “Young Hegelians” have tended to read the doctrines of Marx's early associates through his writings. As a consequence, the Young Hegelians themselves have generally been relegated to the level of minor players in the drama of Marx's intellectual development, and, worse, have been interpreted not in their own right but according to Marx's criticisms of them, an approach which prevents accurate appreciation of their influence on him. Professor McLellan's study takes a different focus: while keeping Marx at or near center stage as the title suggests, it simultaneously rehabilitates the Young Hegelians as thinkers interesting in their own right, not adequately understood if seen through the sole medium of Marx's criticisms, and more subtly present in his doctrines than is often supposed.

McLellan, who lectures in politics and government at the University of Kent at Canterbury, divides his work into two parts. The first and shorter part is an introductory essay (pp. 1–47) that treats the history of the Young Hegelian movement from Hegel's death (1831) to the end of 1844, by which time the last organ of the movement in Germany, the Bauer brothers' *Allgemeine Literatur Zeitung*, had ceased to function and Marx's political journalism in France (the *Deutsch-französische Jahrbücher* and *Vorwärts*) had come to a disappointing end. The second part (pp. 48–160) is a series of biographical and doctrinal studies of the movement's principal figures apart from Marx: Bruno Bauer, Ludwig Feuerbach, Max Stirner, and Moses Hess. McLellan thus combines the approaches used in the earlier studies on the subject available in English, Karl Löwith's *From Hegel to Nietzsche* and Sidney Hook's *From Hegel to Marx*. McLellan's historical account is more effective than Löwith's, mainly because it is less ambitious in scope and consequently less diffuse in organization and development; and his treatment of the individual figures improves on Hook's, mainly by attending carefully to the doctrinal evolution of the men in question in the context of the historical background—a feature especially evident in the case of Bruno Bauer, a fascinating figure until now relatively neglected by English-writing commentators. In general, the historical essay provides a well-proportioned and helpful background to the individual studies of the men in question, each of which is itself a small gem of intellectual biography. Throughout, it is evident that McLellan has both gone directly to the primary sources and also benefited from the best secondary scholarship (he provides a valuable select bibliography), and that he has mastered the art of turning scholarly research into lean and clear exposition. The book should be required reading for every student of Marxism and of German intellectual history of the 1840s.

JOSEPH J. O'MALLEY
Marquette University