

party, the power base established in local assemblies and the reputation for achievement on the local level." The analysis of the Chilean party's policy, which was intended to be very realistic, gradualist, and moderate, is skillfully nuanced.

In general the work has the merit of not minimizing the gains made by the Communist parties in several sectors and the strengthening of Moscow's authority over almost all of the parties which, even when they have reservations about the Soviet Union's domestic policy, support its foreign policy. The reinforcement of Moscow's influence might appear surprising if one considers that on the level of ideology the Soviet Communist Party seems to be executing an about-face. However, for a long time the fate of the various Communist parties has been settled not on the level of ideology but rather on the level of organization, in accord with the political realities of the country concerned.

FRANÇOIS FEJTÖ
Paris

THE POLITICAL SYSTEM OF COMMUNISM. By *Richard C. Gripp*. New York and Toronto: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1973. xi, 209 pp. Paper.

Professor Gripp compares political structures and processes of fourteen Communist states, employing five hypotheses as organizing principles: intent to institute a Communist society, domination of the Communist Party, introduction of public-socialist ownership, provision for popular participation, and establishment of foreign policies supporting Communist states and revolutionary movements and opposing capitalist governments. Employing these five touchstones, he attempts to gauge the degree to which there exists a common core of Communist political systems and to discern divergences from the generalized model.

The eight concluding pages sketch a common pattern of evolution of Communist systems and rank the fourteen states accordingly. Within this broad framework the volume is predominantly descriptive, drawing somewhat eclectically on a variety of sources to survey thematically the nature of the Communist states. This is a formidable task, and it is only partially successful. The volume does provide a kind of introductory overview to Communist political institutions and practices, and Gripp has sought to think broadly about the essence of Communist regimes. But the brush strokes are necessarily very broad, especially in a book of this size and character. Much of the dynamics, cause-and-effect relationships, and richness of the mosaic are obscured, and there is necessarily a mechanical quality about the comparisons and contrasts.

HOWARD R. SWEARER
Carleton College

SOVREMENNYI ANTIKOMMUNIZM: KRITICHESKIE OCHERKI. By *E. D. Modrzhinskaia*. Moscow: "Pedagogika," 1972. 256 pp. 47 kopeks.

What is the stuff that anticommunism is made of? It includes, according to the broad definition of this book's author, active opposition to Marxism-Leninism, to socialist nations, to the international worker's movement, to national liberation movements, to humanism, and to the Soviet Union. Anticommunism as practiced in the West, and especially in the United States, promotes imperialism, Zionism, counterrevolution, the doctrine of convergence, and Western pluralist democracy.

Many names of Western "anticommunists" (for example, Raymond Aron,

Zbigniew Brzezinski, George Kennan, Richard Lowenthal, Alfred Meyer, Gordon Skilling) are listed along with such "anticommunist" organizations as NATO, USIA, Radio Free Europe, the Hudson Institute, and apparently the most notorious of all, Columbia University ("where new anticommunist theories are developed"). A large number of these specialists and organizations, in the author's view, are utilized by the United States in attempts to restore capitalism in the socialist countries. A case in point was the 1968 counterrevolution in Czechoslovakia, worked out by American anticommunist centers in conjunction with Zionists, the USIA, and organs of the press and mass media (p. 84). The book also criticizes the American war effort in Southeast Asia, Israeli aggression against the Arab states, Western notions of modernization, bourgeois economists, Trotskyists, Maoists, and the fact that there are no workers among American congressmen.

This book conforms to recent Soviet articles on anticommunism which have also attacked revisionism, convergence theory, Western concepts of "totalitarian communism," other "distortions" of Soviet democracy, and, of course, antisovietism. (See, for example, *Sovetskoe gosudarstvo i pravo*, 1972, no. 1, pp. 24–25; 1972, no. 10, pp. 56–58; 1973, no. 4, pp. 92–93; and *Partiinaiia zhizn'*, 1973, no. 12, pp. 65–67.) Unfortunately, anticommunism so broadly and so loosely described is as difficult to break down and analyze as its counterpart, the overly inclusive view of communism held by some of its most outspoken enemies. In both cases the opponent ideology appears as the source of most evils in the contemporary world. Much of anticommunism is indeed, as the author contends, in effect antisovietism. But this very identification of communism with the Soviet Union was first initiated by Soviet leaders and has since been vigorously promoted by them over quite a number of years. Inevitably, then, critics or proponents of communism have found it difficult to separate that movement from the Soviet Union itself.

RICHARD C. GRIPP

California State University, San Diego

SOVETSKIE ADMINISTRATIVNO-PRAVOVYE OTNOSHENIIA. By G. I. Petrov. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1972. 157 pp. 74 kopeks, paper.

Georgii Ivanovich Petrov, who holds a doctorate in law and is a member of the Leningrad University Juridical Faculty, is one of the leading specialists in Soviet administrative law, along with Iu. M. Kozlov and A. E. Lunev. Petrov's specialized monograph on the concept of the legal relationship in Soviet administrative law is organized for the first five chapters according to the standard categories of Soviet legal analysis: (1) nature, (2) subjects, (3) content, (4) objects, and (5) classification of Soviet administrative legal relationships.

This book continues a spirited debate in Soviet legal literature over the scope and nature of the concept of a legal relationship in administrative law. Lunev and Kozlov hold the standard view that only government agencies, public organizations, or public officials can be parties to an administrative legal relationship under Soviet law. (See, for example, A. E. Lunev, ed., *Administrativnoe pravo*, Moscow, 1967, pp. 32–34.) In contrast, Petrov in the book under review and in his previous writings advocates a broader concept in which two private citizens could also constitute the opposite sides of a Soviet administrative legal relationship under certain circumstances (see chap. 1, sec. 2, and chap. 2, sec. 2). Kozlov had previously