

NATSIONAL'NYE OTNOSHENIIA V SSSR I TENDENTSII IKH RAZ-VITIIA. By *M. I. Kulichenko*. Moscow: "Mysl'," 1972. 564 pp. 2.23 rubles.

The author, Professor Mikhailo Ivanovich Kulichenko, is a researcher of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the Central Committee of the CPSU, and in the same year that his own book was published he helped the Institute's director, Academician Petr F. Fedoseev, to edit a collectively written monograph entitled *Leninism i natsional'nyi vopros v sovremennykh usloviakh* (Moscow, 1972). This work was issued under the label of the Institute and represents the latest Marxist-Leninist word on nationality theory and policy on a global basis. Kulichenko's own book, needless to say, emanates from the same institutional source and should be regarded as no less authoritative. In addition, it is more instructive, because even though confined to Soviet problems it not only attempts to formulate a systematic sociology of nationality but also appraises Soviet research in this field, and by so doing reveals the range of discussion from which input into formulation of Soviet policy is made. Discussions of nationality theory in the Soviet Union were very lively for some four to five years after the overthrow of Khrushchev.

As a theorist, Kulichenko is systematic but limited, with only occasional glimpses of revelation and insight. He accepts the official view that theory must serve revolutionary politics (p. 28) and that the nationality development must be guided by the party. He relies on official, "classical" Marxist sources and thus ends up with Friedrich Engels as the only—besides Lenin—sociologist of nationality. Kulichenko deplors the fact that nationality studies are not interdisciplinary but uses very little of Soviet empirical work, especially in ethnography and linguistics; this work might not provide sufficient evidence to support his claim that the "objective" tendency of historical progress is assimilation (p. 360). The newly propagandized creation of the "Soviet people" is regarded as substantiation of this tendency. Kulichenko and others claim for it a superiority and uniqueness over the national Soviet communities. Smaller Soviet nationalities and their statehood, Kulichenko says, will have to disappear relatively soon, though the others will perhaps enter into the global stage of communism in a partly assimilated shape. Generally, however, the author toes the current party line of moderate and "voluntary" assimilation, criticizing those Soviet writers who consider that this assimilation will come only *ad kalendas Graecas* as well as those others who see the need for its immediate materialization. At the same time he polemizes with some Western writers who see nationalism as a social force of world dimensions, and furthermore he tries to "defend" Lenin from the Western interpretation that Lenin was a pragmatist on the national question. Much of these polemics are artificial; Kulichenko cannot marshal evidence from Soviet sources, and on the question of Lenin's pragmatism, the more he quotes Lenin to disprove either Pipes or Dmytryshyn, the more the Western historians emerge as correct analysts.

However, if Kulichenko offered only these observations, his book would be disappointing. Fortunately, it is not so. The author reviews scores of Soviet monographs, thus giving us information about nationality research in the Soviet Union, and furthermore revealing a certain diversity of views, however limited this diversity appears to be. Kulichenko does not shy away from sensitive subjects—for example, he criticizes Stalin not only as a nationality politician who was responsible for deportations of Crimean Tatars, among others, but also as a theoretician, and especially as a man who stifled research on the nationality question. The author also

denounces Ivan Dziuba, the nonperson of nationality dissent in the Ukraine, but suggests that the late Mykola Skrypnyk had some "interesting thoughts" to offer (p. 519). The very mention of these names shows an improved climate of inquiry. In short, Kulichenko reveals certain stirrings in the nationality section of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism which this reviewer prefers to take as a sign of active and concerned intellectual communication.

V. STANLEY VARDYS
University of Oklahoma

VAD HÄNDER I BALTIKUM? By *Andres Küng*. Stockholm: Aldus/Bonniers, 1973. 274 pp.

In spite of the recent growth of scholarly interest in Soviet nationality questions, many of the non-Russian areas of the USSR remain understudied. The Baltic republics fall into this category. The uneven collection of articles by Vardys, *Lithuania Under the Soviets*, focuses on only one of the Baltic republics and is by now nearly a decade old. There is nothing which could serve as a continuation of the 1938 (reprinted in 1970) survey of the Royal Institute of Foreign Affairs on the Baltic states in general. In such a situation Andres Küng's popular work acquires value for the scholar as well as for the general reader at whom it is aimed.

Küng succeeds in presenting in a very effective way a large body of diverse information about three different countries. The reader is introduced to the most Western, the most economically developed, and in some senses the most restless region of the USSR. This restlessness, the pervasive aura of instability, which seems to permeate the current Baltic scene, forms a leitmotif for the work. The question of nationalism which manifests itself in various subtle ways on an everyday basis, such as the frequently noted Estonian reluctance publicly to demonstrate any knowledge of Russian, and in occasional dramatic outbursts, such as the Kaunas riots in the summer of 1972, is pervasive. In addition, a picture is presented of the problems attending rapid economic growth and of the relations between local authorities and the central government in Moscow.

Implicitly the author seems to doubt any possibility of a gradual resolution of the current tensions within a Soviet framework. He makes few attempts to determine the eventual outcome of the current state of affairs. However, he does feel that their perceived cultural superiority vis-à-vis the dominant nationality in the USSR will ensure a successful resistance to Russification among the indigenous Balts (p. 189).

Occasional factual errors appear both in the presentation of the historical background and in the description of more recent events. For instance, the postwar Lithuanian guerrilla resistance is presented as having ended in 1953 (p. 55). This reviewer has seen a typewritten resistance prayerbook dated 1956 on display at the Vilnius Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism.

Analyses of official explanations could have strengthened the presentation. Although occasionally one or another Soviet explanation for a topic under consideration is presented, as in the discussion of the Letter of the Seventeen Latvian Communists, more often than not the Soviet view is ignored. The relative sparsity of documentation is another major flaw. Some incidents posited in demonstration of trends remain undocumented, giving the impression of a possibility of confusion of hearsay with fact. It would have been worthwhile to mention the source for news