

as Morris makes clear, a coherent Soviet naval policy did not emerge quickly, even under the Bolsheviks. Though it is also available elsewhere, the reader will find a useful summary of Soviet naval policy through the end of the Great Patriotic War. The development of the contemporary Soviet navy is described in a less disciplined, but quite readable manner.

There are two errors commonly made by commentators on the Soviet navy: First, the historic limitations upon tsarist naval power, to the extent that they still apply to the nuclear-age Soviet navy, are frequently not recognized. Second, Western analysts seldom arrive at any coherent description—or “model”—of Soviet naval power, often leading to lapses in analysis where it is assumed that nothing prevents the USSR from developing a traditional type of navy.

The book under review avoids the first pitfall. It is sprinkled with common-sense judgments about limitations on the contemporary Soviet navy, especially about geographic, economic, and mission-related constraints. However, even though Morris is surely aware of basic asymmetries between Russian and Western sea power, his failure to deal with them in terms of a vigorous analytical framework sometimes leaves the reader with the impression that the Soviet navy suffers no inherent, long-term limitations. This is the case, for example, when the Kiev class aircraft carrier is discussed in terms of “global maritime power.”

The Soviet Navy: Myth and Reality is more of an essay than a vigorous, well-documented work. It provides little new information and no new approaches, but it does present useful background and reasonable argumentation. Though the book will benefit the generalist more than the specialist on Soviet military matters, both should read it.

STEVE F. KIME
National War College

THE SOVIET UNION AND SOCIAL SCIENCE THEORY. By *Jerry F. Hough*. Russian Research Center Studies, 77. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1977. xviii, 275 pp. \$16.50.

Any book by Jerry Hough—one of the most knowledgeable, industrious, and original students of Soviet politics today—is bound to arouse high expectations. His readers should not be disappointed, although some will find much to argue with: indeed, this is clearly part of the author’s intention, since the book is essentially a barrage of argument and evidence designed to provoke critical reexamination by Sovietologists of the assumptions and methods of their research. Judging by the preface, the author evidently hopes to exert a wider influence, encouraging more realistic understanding of the Soviet Union and thereby more appropriate American policies toward that country.

The book consists of an introduction and eleven essays, five of them originally published between 1971 and 1976. It has two distinct but interrelated themes: the first is that the study of Soviet politics and social (including political) science have much to learn from each other, and the second is that faulty assumptions and methodology have led to a serious underestimate of the degree of pluralism and participation in the Soviet system. Hough is not content, however, with merely commenting on others’ work. He supports his arguments with much new research of his own, which would make rewarding reading even if one could not agree with a single one of the author’s major conclusions.

The advantages of applying what has been learned from the study of large-scale organizations in the West to better understand the nature of Soviet politics and society is the subject of chapter 2, “The Bureaucratic Model and the Nature of the Soviet System.”

Here, as elsewhere in the book, Hough's major target is the "directed society model" of the USSR, that is, the view that what people do can be understood simply in terms of commands passed down from the center. If we accept that the Soviet Union is "a corporation writ large," he argues, then we must realize that, like other large corporations, it consists of a great variety of officials and specialists, pursuing multifarious and often conflicting objectives, which influence not only the implementation of centrally prescribed goals but also their determination. Here Hough might be accused of beating a dead horse, because, during the 1970s, several scholars (including this reviewer) have published studies whose approach to the USSR as a bureaucratic system has had much in common with the one proposed here, and, indeed, a reflection of this might have been expected in a book intended largely as a critical review of "the state of the art." However, simplistic "directed society" views are still widespread, especially among nonspecialists, and Hough's essay is the most systematic critique of these views, in the light of a very wide range of Western organization theory and research.

Hough's second theme finds its purest expression in chapter 4, "Political Participation in the Soviet Union," which I have discussed at length elsewhere (*Soviet Studies*, April 1976). In this chapter, the author adduces considerable evidence of more extensive participation since Khrushchev and for the view that at least some of this participation affects decisions and is not just an inflation of "paper activists." Hough then discusses political participation in the United States, drawing largely on Robert Dahl's study of New Haven, and concludes that "we do not really know" whether "the frequency and significance of the impact on decisions in the Soviet Union is less than in the West." This is a thought-provoking essay, although one of the thoughts it provokes is that "participation" may be too vague a concept to be useful in comparative analysis.

The two major themes of the book become interwoven in several of the essays, particularly in chapter 1, which reproduces (with updated data) Hough's well-known *Problems of Communism* article, "Petrification or Pluralism?" Discussing three competing models of the Soviet Union since Khrushchev, as "a directed society," as "oligarchic petrification," and as "institutional pluralism," Hough invites us to consider the evidence for the third, but urges an open mind and suggests that "if we are to judge by the evidence of both Soviet and Western experience, the Soviet future will be far more inconsistent than any theory suggests."

In the remaining chapters in part 1, Hough demonstrates the value of various concepts and methods of analysis—developed for the study of Western societies—for examining important aspects of the Soviet system. In the essay, "The Party Apparatchiki and Interest Group Theory," the concepts (mainly those of Arthur Bentley) sit lightly, but nonetheless help the author to illuminate a number of points. The chapters, "Party Saturation" and "Women and the Women's Issue in Soviet Policy Debates," make ingenious use of fairly simple statistical techniques to produce interesting new information and raise important questions. More recondite statistical methods are employed in the chapter, "Centralization and Decentralization in the Soviet Administrative System," in which regional variations in the provision of hospital beds are used to explore the degree of decentralization in the administration of health-care policies.

In part 2 attention shifts to the light which the study of Soviet politics may throw on a number of problems and concepts prominent in recent American political science literature: the relationship between "demand inputs" and governmental "outputs" (and societal outcomes generally), the measurement of relative power, the comparison of political systems, and so forth. These chapters will undoubtedly receive the close consideration they deserve in specialized political science journals, and here some general remarks must suffice. First, in case after case, Hough shows how Western scholars tend to shift their standards and modify their concepts when their attention moves from their own to the Soviet system, and he points out the ideological bias reflected

in the questions we ask and those we ignore. Second, he indicates in several contexts how a fuller understanding of the Soviet system might relieve the ethnocentricity of American comparativists, most of whom, incidentally, preserve remarkably primitive notions of Soviet political realities. Third, he poses, on a theoretical level, several of the questions earlier raised in the more empirically oriented essays of part 1: on kinds of political participation, the distribution of capacity to influence policy, the direction of political change in the USSR, and so forth. Finally, he tenders some wise and sensible advice on research strategy in the study of Soviet politics, which should be taken to heart by all graduate students and their advisers.

There are a few minor criticisms that might be made of the organization and presentation of this book. There is some repetitiveness (one table even appears twice) and the volume would have benefited from more cross references and a fuller index. More seriously, although Hough is more concerned here with raising questions than providing answers, many of the issues discussed might have appeared in fuller perspective if Hough had developed his insights into the *differences* between the Soviet and Western systems. What's sauce for the goose may be sauce for the gander, but there are certain things the goose can do that the gander cannot, and vice versa. If Soviet society is essentially "a corporation writ large," and Western capitalist democracies are not, what difference does this make to the nature of participation, pluralism, and so forth, in the two systems? There are few scholars with a greater capacity to throw light on this fundamental question than Hough.

T. H. RIGBY

The Australian National University

POLITICS AND THE SOVIET UNION. By *Mary McAuley*. Harmondsworth, England and New York: Penguin Books, 1977. 352 pp. £1.50. \$3.95, paper.

This book differs markedly in style and approach from the general run of recent textbooks on Soviet politics. Most obvious is the absence of social science jargon, apparently due not to ignorance or rejection of the concepts involved but to an unusual capacity to render the concepts into ordinary English. In addition, there is the large weight given to historical narrative and analysis. Parts 1 and 2 (totaling half of the book) trace the evolution of the system to the late Stalin era, and even part 3, which is devoted to description and analysis of the contemporary political system, conveys a picture both of the flow of major events and the broad changes in the system over the last quarter-century. At each stage, the reader is invited to consider the central issues confronting the Soviet leadership, the alternatives available and visible to them, and the reasons for and consequences of their decisions, including those consequences that generate new problems while constraining their resolution. Dr. McAuley has a sense of the contingent and the unplanned—Brezhnev's regime did not flow with some inexorable logic from Lenin's *What is to be Done?*—and also a sense of the tragic in this story, which comes through despite her no-nonsense style. She sees the present ruling group as "caught in a trap. Its search for support produces conflict, because to meet the demands or satisfy the grievances of one group or section of the community is to provoke opposition from another. To contain the conflict it must use the existing political structures to suppress or deny the aspirations of the different groups . . . The political structures may make opposition difficult but they simultaneously deny the ruling group a social base" (p. 322).

A further feature of Dr. McAuley's approach is that she continually presents and critically evaluates alternative explanations of aspects of the system, including explana-