

THE BEHAVIORAL REVOLUTION AND COMMUNIST STUDIES:
APPLICATIONS OF BEHAVIORALLY ORIENTED POLITICAL
RESEARCH ON THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE.
Edited by *Roger E. Kanet*. New York: Free Press, 1971. xv, 376 pp. \$9.95.

This collection of essays, drawn from various scholarly journals and unpublished manuscripts, is a pioneering effort to apply to the field of Slavic area studies the concepts increasingly applied in behavioral political science. The thirteen papers, for the most part by young scholars in political science and history, deserve serious attention both for the wide range of theories they represent and for the quantitative techniques they employ. As innovating first steps they also deserve the most critical evaluation, so that future adherents to the methods and theories may build upon a firm and rigorous foundation.

The positive results of these first steps are many. First, the willingness of the scholars to turn to other disciplines for theories upon which to base hypotheses results in a creative enrichment of the field. For example, P. Terrence Hopmann applies to international relations models drawn from social psychology; Erik Hoffmann applies role theory to a study of propaganda workers; and Don Karl Rowney applies organization theory to a research design for analysis of the imperial Russian Ministry of Internal Affairs. Second, there are many examples of the use of recently developed quantitative techniques. Perhaps most interesting, in this respect, is the major content analysis project described by Hopmann. Here, one sees something of the expense and time required for a careful study using content analysis. Carl Beck, Gerard A. Johnson, and J. Thomas McKechnie use quantitative techniques to discover career patterns among the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and to relate these patterns to a major turnover of personnel in 1962. This focus on career structure of opportunities seems a particularly useful approach, and one that is used with promising results in the study of American politics. Third, the reliance on new theories and techniques prompts several of the authors to search for new indicators of political processes. Thus Dan C. Heldman, in his study of Soviet relations with twenty-five African states, has developed a scale of bilateral relations which includes data on trade, diplomatic contacts, economic and military relations, and an index of the level of activity of local Communist and socialist-oriented groups.

Critical reading of these varied essays, however, must also point to some areas in which future investigations will have to proceed with caution. First, there is the problem of missing data. The number of cases from which an author generalizes is apt to be so small that generalization is unfounded or of little utility. Studies of elite personnel particularly suffer from this defect. Another result of missing data is the possibility of bias. There may be some pattern or characteristic among those about whom there is no information that would severely skew the results. Thus Michael P. Gehlen and Michael McBride, in their study of the Soviet Central Committee, point to a "sharp increase" in apparatus assignment from one time period to the next, but we see later that part of that "increase" reflects only a later classification of personnel about whom there had previously been no information but who were undoubtedly *apparatchiki* in the previous time period as well. Second, there is an understandable problem in creating a bridge between the general theories used and the available data from the Communist system investigated. This leads, in some cases, to assumptions which future students of the system

might wish to investigate further: for example, it would be useful to test Frederic J. Fléron's assumption that seven years marks the watershed between professional and party socialization, or Milton Lodge's assumption that authors of articles in Soviet journals represent different functional elites rather than a communications specialty, or Hopmann's assumption that the Communist states (without Yugoslavia and Cuba) do, in fact, form a system.

These far-reaching assumptions and questions may now be examined with the new techniques and theories, and we should be grateful to Roger Kanet for bringing these provocative and innovating essays to our attention.

ELLEN MICKIEWICZ
Michigan State University

SOVIET JEWRY TODAY AND TOMORROW. By *Boris Smolar*. New York: Macmillan, 1971. x, 228 pp. \$5.95.

The plight of Jews in the Soviet Union has received such attention of late that books on the subject threaten to take on the magnitude of a new academic and journalistic genre. Yet our level of understanding by no means equals the level of available information. Just as Wiesel's eloquence, unique in this literature, contributes notably to understanding, so too do the wide experience and historical awareness of a skilled journalist such as Boris Smolar.

Born in Russia and well acquainted with earlier phases of the Soviet period, Smolar is able to connect the current problems of Russian Jewry with both pre- and postrevolutionary experience. Although a glance at the table of contents suggests the usual touching-of-all-the-bases, the text discloses a tissue of historical connections that lend vital perspective to the inevitable and, for the purposes of this book, essential array of personal observation and anecdote. Though this feature of the book seems to me more important than sheer informational content, I would not want to intimate that the latter is deficient. Even close observers of the Jewish situation in the Soviet Union may be intrigued, as I was, by the account of Hebrew studies in Leningrad and the state of the famous Genizah collection of ancient Hebrew documents in the Saltykov-Shchedrin Library. Almost equally fascinating, by way of counterpoint, is Smolar's description of his encounter with Arab students in Moscow.

Although much of the rest may already be familiar to the specialist, the reader wishing an informed and perceptive introduction to the subject could go much further and do a whole lot worse than to start with this survey. My only serious disagreement, purely in the realm of opinion, has to do with Smolar's expectation that Jewish identity may disappear in the Soviet Union. Disabilities seem generally to have had an opposite effect on both religious and ethnic identity.

LYMAN H. LECTERS
University of Washington