

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT AND POLITICAL CHANGE IN EASTERN EUROPE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY. By *Jan F. Triska* and *Paul M. Johnson*. Monograph Series in World Affairs, vol. 13: CHANGE AND SURVIVAL: STUDIES IN SOCIAL DYNAMICS IN EASTERN EUROPE AND THE SOVIET UNION. ESSAYS IN HONOR OF JOSEF KORBEL, Book 2. Denver: University of Denver, Graduate School of International Studies, 1975. xvi, 74 pp. Tables. Paper.

THE DYNAMICS OF SOVIET POLITICS. Edited by *Paul Cocks*, *Robert V. Daniels*, and *Nancy Whittier Heer*. Russian Research Center Studies, 76. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1976. x, 427 pp. \$17.50.

CHANGE AND ADAPTATION IN SOVIET AND EAST EUROPEAN POLITICS. Edited by *Jane P. Shapiro* and *Peter J. Potichnyj*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976. xii, 236 pp. Tables. \$18.50.

Following the "change to change" in the general field of comparative politics, much of the recent literature in Soviet and East European studies, including the three books reviewed here, has focused on change in Communist systems. The Triska-Johnson monograph and the collection edited by Cocks, Daniels, and Heer provide contrasting examples of ways in which this problem can be approached. In the Shapiro-Potichnyj book, a very eclectic collection, one finds a few fine essays, but the rest merely suggest that perhaps not everything said at the Banff conference need have been recorded for posterity.

Triska and Johnson take a "macro" approach, using aggregate data to calculate indexes of liberalization, participation, and "subsystem autonomy" in Eastern Europe. Fortunately, the authors are aware of the limitations of both their data and their method, as well as of the unquantifiable realities of East European politics. Their aim is to test the assumptions of the literature on "political development" in the East European area. They find, however, that participation, liberalization, and dependency are *not* correlated, and that "higher degrees of liberalization and Party inclusiveness" are not demonstrably "associated with higher levels of socio-economic development." The next task is then to explain why Eastern Europe is an exception to the generalizations of the developmental literature. While Triska and Johnson do not spell this out sufficiently, their findings point to the decisive function of elite choices as determinants of East European political development. They might have challenged the developmental literature as a whole, on the basis of the East European "exception," but they are content with demonstrating its limitations for Eastern Europe, thereby providing food for thought to comparativists generally as well as to East European specialists.

Following in the path of the late Merle Fainsod, to whom they dedicate their book, the authors in the Cocks-Daniels-Heer volume approach political change in the USSR by historical analysis and close, critical readings of Soviet texts. The book is framed by two "think pieces," one by Adam Ulam on the continuing need for scholarly examination of the Soviet system, and the other by Zbigniew Brzezinski, who takes up the question of the influence of Russian history and of social change on Soviet politics. Like Triska and Johnson, Brzezinski finds that political processes have a viability of their own and are not merely the resultants of other forces.

In between these stimulating essays we find articles tracing the historical evolution of concepts, fields, and policies ("peaceful coexistence," historiography, educational and agricultural policy), and a second group of essays offering close analyses of narrower aspects of Soviet policy (party membership, Virgin Lands, youth, succession and leadership, and so forth). The essays are generally of superior quality, and this anthology will be of considerable interest and use to both students and

scholars. Space does not permit discussion of all the contributions, so I shall mention only a few that especially interested me. Dina Spechler's detailed analysis of "permitted dissent" in *Novyi mir* between 1953 and 1964 is a work of the highest scholarship, meticulously describing and analyzing different types of dissent and the reactions of the regime to them, and pointing out the importance of "permitted dissent" for the later "*samizdat*" phenomenon. Spechler is perhaps overly concerned with categorization and classification, and may be attributing too much calculation, and too little bungling, to the authorities. But her essay, a model of scholarship, is important for an understanding of the differences between the Khrushchev era and that of his successors.

In one of two essays on the party, Robert Daniels shows that job slots, not individuals, determine membership in the Central Committee and that there has been a steady increase in the size of the Committee and, therefore, a "long term inflation in the status value" of the Committee. Yet, he suggests, "the network of unwritten rules and expectations about Central Committee rank and job status very narrowly restrains the options of the leadership in opening up new membership slots." This makes it hard to pack the Committee suddenly and may be "an institutional explanation of the trend to elite stability discernible under Brezhnev's leadership." The other essay on the party, by Jerry Hough, shows it to be less "elitist" than is generally supposed, with close to 30 percent of Soviet high school graduates over the age of thirty having attained membership.

Paul Cocks's essay is simultaneously a critique of the interest group approach to the study of Soviet politics, and an examination of Soviet leadership attempts to use systems methods "as a political device against a sprawling and brawling bureaucratic establishment" and as part of a "general drive to counter pluralist tendencies." Cocks concludes that PPBS cannot eliminate politics or make what used to be political decisions "objective, scientific" ones.

Gregory Massell's subject is the emerging contradiction between Soviet modernization policy and nationality policy in Central Asia, with secularized native elites—neither "fully a part of their own native milieu nor a fully integrated part of the world of their . . . Russian sponsors"—finding their way blocked by Slavic migrants.

Robert Lewis also concludes that within their republics "the indigenous nationalities [of Central Asia] are deprived relative to outsiders." Writing in the Shapiro-Potichnyj volume, Lewis brings our attention to a very important development, the possibility that the labor-short industrialized European areas of the USSR will have to import large masses of Asian workers in the 1980s. The implications of this for ethnic relations, nationality and cultural policy, and the structure of Soviet institutions are enormous.

Edith Frankel's essay in the same collection can be seen as a logical prelude to Spechler's in the other anthology, since it deals with liberalization in the literary field shortly before Stalin's death. Along with Gayle Durham Hannah's work on the "communications explosion" since 1953, this is one of the better pieces in the collection. Probably the most labor-intensive is Phillip Stewart's careful and interesting attempt to measure attitudes of regional party secretaries through content analysis. While he does find attitudes consistent with what he calls "three major images" of Soviet politicians, Stewart acknowledges that "the crucial linkage between attitudes and behavior . . . remains undemonstrated."

While none of these works can grasp the entirety of so complicated and subtle a process as political change, several of the essays do illuminate parts of it and serve as models for further study of the dynamics of Soviet and East European politics.

ZVI GITELMAN
University of Michigan