

The N. N. Kolosovskii article on territorial-production combinations, though translated and published elsewhere in English, is indispensable, and it is well supported by V. G. Varlamov's essay on interregional ties between these combinations or complexes. It is surprising that the section on population geography does not include a major reference to the geography of labor supply, although Zaienchkovskaia and Perevedentsev's article on migration and territorial redistribution of population is useful.

One of the greatest disappointments of this impressive volume is the lack of supporting map materials. There are many graphs, tables, and diagrams, but the lack of maps (there are only two in the entire volume) makes the sections on economic and agricultural regionalization, for example, difficult to follow, even for the specialist. The few minor lapses in transliteration in the footnotes do not detract from the otherwise high quality of the product.

W. A. DOUGLAS JACKSON
University of Washington

SOVIET POLITICS AND SOCIETY IN THE 1970'S. Edited by *Henry W. Morton* and *Rudolf L. Tökés*. Studies of the Russian Institute, Columbia University. New York: The Free Press, 1974. xxvi, 401 pp. \$12.95.

The typical Festschrift, like the typical conference book, is a disaster. In either case, the end product all too often lacks a unifying theme, and is made up of chapters that are little more than hasty rehashes of more careful and extended exercises published elsewhere. Inasmuch as *Soviet Politics and Society in the 1970's*, edited by Henry W. Morton and Rudolf L. Tökés, is both a conference book and a Festschrift in honor of John Hazard, I approached it with some misgivings. Readers of this journal will be pleased to learn that my fears were largely unwarranted. While the quality of the pieces varies, and some lack of focus does exist, the authors *kollektiv* headed by Messrs. Morton and Tökés has, in fact, produced a book with a central theme—the overall responsiveness and adaptiveness of the Soviet political system when confronted with social change. The book contains contributions which are addressed to politics and social change, including Tökés on dissent, Grey Hodnett on cotton politics in Soviet Central Asia, and Barbara Jancar on women in Soviet politics. There are articles on social welfare policies: Morton on the Soviet housing crisis, Peter Juviler on crime, David Cattell on welfare planning, and Theodore Friedgut on political participation in local soviets. And, finally, the generalizability of the Soviet model is discussed: David Albright on the USSR and the third world, Paul Shoup on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and William Taubman on the Soviet Union and the literature on political development.

Moreover, it is a book which lies in the mainstream of contemporary political science. Several of the articles are of interest to social scientists who have only a marginal interest in the USSR per se. This is an important point, because prospective readers with social science interests should be urged to disregard both Professor Tökés's observation in the introduction that "the editors and the contributors have, on the whole, been rather underwhelmed by the results and remain somewhat skeptical about the so-called 'behavioral revolution' in political science," and his criticism of "semantic, culture bound neologisms and intellectually barren

model building exercises." I doubt if one will find any enthusiasm for "culture bound neologisms and intellectually barren model building exercises," even among those who might be willing to depict themselves as behavioral zealots.

It is necessary to stress this point because, in the opinion of this reviewer, the most interesting articles are precisely those which display a familiarity with broader social science literature. It will probably suffice here to identify three especially noteworthy chapters, those by Friedgut, Tőkés, and Hodnett, although Shoup's and Taubman's essays could also be singled out. Professor Friedgut, emulating Robert Dahl, asks "who governs" in Kutaisi (the second city of [Soviet] Georgia), and provides us with one of the few "community power" studies of a Soviet city. Using interviews conducted both in Georgia and in Israel (to which several of the residents of Kutaisi migrated), he finds, not surprisingly, that there is a power structure in Kutaisi, dominated by members of the party apparatus and the directors of the city's largest plant, the Kutaisi Truck Factory. He shows that local notables—the most prominent being the truck factory director and *not* the *gorkom* first secretary—wield considerable power in Kutaisi, and that the city is somewhat isolated from Georgian and Soviet high politics. Even more interesting outgrowths of Friedgut's study are possible. He could have drawn further on Dahl's work by attempting to ascertain whether issues influence the composition of the elite in Kutaisi, and he could have made his study more explicitly comparative. We may yet see the day when politics in the cities of both Georgias—theirs and ours—are compared.

The essay on dissent by Tőkés is similarly stimulating and informed by insights gleaned from such social scientists as Dahl, John Harsanyi, Yezekeiel Dror, and Ted Robert Gurr. The study of dissent in the USSR has become a small industry in the West, and Professor Tőkés is one of its most industrious practitioners. Readers will find his essay especially rewarding because of its attempt to relate dissent to the larger picture, namely, systemic evolution. Tőkés states that "the emergence of public contestation and unorthodox interest articulation have been unintended but inevitable by-products of a planned process of liberalization of 'postmobilization decompression' that developed a momentum of its own" (p. 39).

Finally, mention should be made of Grey Hodnett's "Technology and Social Change in Soviet Central Asia: the Politics of Cotton Growing." It is, to use a hackneyed phrase, a seminal article. It sets out to ask an exceedingly important question about center-periphery relations within the Soviet Union: to what extent do Soviet Central Asian cotton pickers operate in an economy and/or a society which is similar to that conjured up by the image of the plantation in the American South or in the West Indies? Drawing on the model made explicit by George Beckford's study of Western plantations, Hodnett carefully concludes that the features most associated with a Western plantation economy do fit rather well with Soviet Central Asian reality, while the plantation society attributes are less discernible. In short, Hodnett's study is a model of what is to be done in Soviet studies: detailed study of Soviet reality, rendered comparable by explicit comparison to non-Soviet experience or to social science models which have been formulated without knowledge of, or reference to, the Soviet experience.

WILLIAM ZIMMERMAN
University of Michigan