

Ollman characterizes Marx's basic philosophical standpoint as a "philosophy of internal relations" which views the world more as an assemblage of relations than of discrete objects—an interpretation which certainly succeeds in clarifying many of Marx's statements. Armed with this approach, Ollman investigates (in the two major sections of his book) Marx's view of human nature and then his theory of alienation both in the productive process and in class, state, and religion. The result is a convincing demonstration of the centrality of the concept of alienation to Marx's thought, and an exposition of Marx's ideas that does credit to the subtlety of both author and subject.

It is impossible to write a book about Marx with which everyone will agree, and the present reviewer inevitably has a few criticisms: the philosophy of internal relations is so obviously a Hegelian doctrine that there could have been a little more space devoted to Marx's relation to Hegel; the identity of the views of Marx and Engels is a controversial question, and Professor Ollman would have done just as well if he had left Engels out altogether, or else justified more convincingly his inclusion; finally, Professor Ollman is obviously well aware that Marx's views underwent important changes from 1843 until the publication of *Capital*, but he does not think those changes were sufficient to alter the meanings of the basic concepts with which Marx was operating—a view which could be criticized as making Marx's thought too monolithic.

These criticisms are, however, peripheral. The thought and research that have gone into Ollman's book assure that it will be regarded as a serious and original contribution to the current debates about the interpretation of Marx.

DAVID McLELLAN  
Canterbury

**SOCIAL CHANGE IN THE SOVIET UNION: RUSSIA'S PATH TOWARD AN INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY.** Edited by *Boris Meissner*. Translated by *Donald P. Kommers*. International Studies of the Committee on International Relations. Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1972. xiv, 247 pp. \$9.95.

This volume consists of a long title essay by the editor and three much shorter essays by Karl-Heinz Ruffman ("Social Change Prior to the Revolution"), Oskar Anweiler ("Educational Policy and Social Structure"), and Karl C. Thalheim ("The Sociological Impact of Soviet Economic Policy"). Unfortunately, none of these essays makes a notable contribution to knowledge, and those by Professors Ruffman and Thalheim are uncharacteristically cursory and superficial. Professor Anweiler's essay is more nearly up to form, but it remains a summary of fairly well-known data with little, if any, fresh analysis. Only Professor Meissner attempts to break new ground, but his discussion of Soviet social structure is marred by such improbable refinements as the assignment of collective farm chairmen and cattle farm chairmen to different social classes (p. 104) as well as by his unjustified omission of any reference to the non-Russian minorities and other significant social groups.

Although the whole is sometimes greater than the sum of its parts, that is not true of this collection. The constituent essays are generally complementary, but they do not share a common theoretical framework or approach, and many

potentially interesting differences in interpretation and evaluation pass unacknowledged and unexplored. In consequence, the reader is left with only a few disjointed insights into the dynamics of Soviet society and almost no coherent guidelines for independent thinking and research. This would be lamentable under any circumstances, but it is particularly so in the case of a badly neglected field where acceptable texts are rare and works of in-depth scholarship are virtually nonexistent. One's regret is even greater because the present volume might have had the incidental but desirable effect of encouraging American scholars to pay more attention to the work of their German colleagues, many of whom have done and are currently doing outstanding research. Professors Meissner, Ruffman, Anweiler, and Thalheim all belong to this category, but *Social Change in the Soviet Union* does not present them at anything like their best.

JEREMY R. AZRAEL  
University of Chicago

THE SOVIET RUSSIAN STATE. By *Robert G. Wesson*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1972. vi, 404 pp. \$8.95.

THE SOVIET STATE: AN AGING REVOLUTION. By *Robert G. Wesson*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1972. vii, 222 pp. \$3.95, paper.

*The Soviet Russian State* is a solid textbook written for the undergraduate course on Soviet politics. (*The Soviet State* is an abridged version suitable for an introductory comparative government course.) The first third of the book (four chapters) is devoted to the historical background of the contemporary system. There follow chapters on ideology, the party, state, economy, the "psychocultural front," law, the army, nationalities, and extensions abroad of the Soviet empire. A final chapter makes a judiciously cautious attempt to weigh the future prospects of this "aging revolution." In contrast with some other recent volumes aimed at the same market, Wesson's combines balanced coverage of most aspects of the system with commendable depth. A short list of suggested readings is appended to each chapter. The unifying theme is that a strain toward autocratic structures of rule has existed in both the tsarist and Soviet periods, created by the functional need to prevent disintegration in a vast Russian-dominated multinational empire. "The multinational character of the Soviet state," Wesson asserts, "is probably the most important determinant of the peculiarity of the Russian Revolution and the Soviet system" (p. 309). The book also explores the historical tension between the need to introduce Western technology and the need to maintain political control within the empire, and the various implications of the fact that "the Soviet Union has largely outgrown or outworn the revolutionary impulses and the social transformation of its birth and has become a settled authoritarian state" (p. v).

Wesson is not impressed by recent attempts to reformulate the questions one should ask about Soviet politics. His approach is broadly historical-descriptive, stressing similarities between the Soviet and tsarist regimes, and between both and earlier "imperial orders." On this level of analysis his work ranks well above most other introductory texts. This approach, perhaps, has led him to dwell on "the Party's" monopoly of power, and to spend much time pointing out—in the traditional manner—discrepancies between mythology and political reality. The result, not surprisingly, is a relentless exposure of Soviet hypocrisy—one with