Other studies equal in merit to those already mentioned, and all reflecting sound scholarship, are (Part 2): Gayle Durham Hannah, "Soviet Public Communications in the Post-Stalin Period"; Edith Rogovin Frankel, "Literary Policy Under Stalin in Retrospect: A Case Study, 1952-53"; Peter Raina, "Intellectuals and the Party in Bulgaria"; and (Part 3) Stephan M. Horak, "Soviet Historiography and the New Nationalities' Policy—A Case Study: Belorussia and Ukraine." But perhaps the most interesting of all is the last study in the collection: "Modernization, Population Change and Nationality in Soviet Central Asia and Kazakhstan" by two geographers, Robert A. Lewis and Richard H. Rowland, and a political scientist, Ralph S. Clem. They point out that while the urbanization of Russians in this region is high (68.0 percent) that of Kazakhs and other indigenous nationalities is low (26.7 percent) or in some republics even less). As a result ethnic Russians dominated cities, especially the capitals of the republics: Kazakh SSR—Alma-Ata 70.3 percent; Kirgiz SSR—Frunze 66.1 percent; Uzbek SSR—Tashkent 40.8 percent. The authors conclude that "the imposition of tsarist and Soviet rule provided the Russians with an inherent advantage in competition for both preindustrial (agricultural) and modernized roles"; as a consequence, "the indigenous Central Asians and Kazakhs have been excluded to a significant degree from the advanced society in their own nationality homelands" (p. 231). Unfortunately, the implications of the very high birthrate in the indigenous communities were not considered in this study.

Even though this volume is a collaborative and loosely integrated effort, it is a significant contribution to the already voluminous literature on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Indeed, compared to the state of related research some twenty-five or thirty years ago, these studies offer an amazing quantity of useful and profound information. A further examination, however, providing a clearer view of what is more permanent and what is changing in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe would be a valuable supplement to the present volume. After all, in contrast to the evident and often beneficial changes resulting from economic progress and improvements in the fields of administrative, legal and socio-economic relations, there are some salient features of the Soviet and allied regimes which show a great degree of permanency. These are the manifest ascendancy and personalization of the paramount power of the Party's First Secretary (or General Secretary); the methods of governing through decree rather than formal statute; and the centralization of public and economic administration, although not without occasional relaxation of controls over localized—sometimes even semi-autonomous—operations.
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Do theories of political development, often criticized for their alleged Western value bias, yield any insights into the workings of Communist systems? The contributors to this symposium all agree that at least some version of the developmental paradigm can help explain the processes of political change in Eastern Europe. The volume under review is more than just another response to the long-running controversy surrounding the models associated with Almond, Huntington, et al; some of the authors demonstrate through empirical research the usefulness of the theoretical paradigm, while others offer modifications of the theory itself.

Separate sections of the book deal with ideological adaptation and conceptual change, institutional development, political participation, and external influences (both Soviet and non-Soviet). One finds both theoretical and empirical emphases, and a diversity of
topics ranging from quite specific (for example Lenard Cohen’s analysis of the 1969 elections in Yugoslavia) to quite general and abstract (as in Paul Johnson’s chapter on modernization and political change). The editors modestly admit that the volume “does not present a concept or theory of political development in Eastern Europe,” but rather it brings together “some of the main avenues of ongoing research” on the subject (p. xxiii).

In the copious literature on political development one can discern myriad approaches and definitions. Most scholars agree, however, that political development implies a tendency toward increasing political equality within society, increasing differentiation of political institutions, and an increasing capacity of the political system to control its social environment. Although all three of these processes receive some attention in the present volume, it is with respect to the third question—the efficacy of the political systems—that the most interesting discussion emerges among several authors.

Kenneth Jowitt, modifying and expanding upon a point made in an earlier article of his own, describes three core tasks of Communist regimes, each characteristic of a particular developmental stage: transformation, consolidation, and inclusion. By the mid-1960s, Jowitt argues, most East European regimes had begun to implement policies of inclusion, widening the scope of citizen participation in an attempt to “integrate” state and society. The process, however, was soon perceived by the party elites as threatening their control over the political system—as was demonstrated most spectacularly in Czechoslovakia, but also in other countries where reforms were initiated, for example Yugoslavia and Romania (as Lenard Cohen and Mary Ellen Fischer respectively show). Disillusioned by the immediate outcome of political reform, the regimes retrenched; the ruling parties pulled back from their experiments with democratized elections and radically broadened political participation in favor of controlled mobilization reminiscent of earlier policies. Nevertheless, Jowitt implies, the long-range trend is likely to be a cautious movement toward the inclusion of an increasingly broad segment of society within the decision-making institutions of the political system. Jowitt’s argument seems to be corroborated by Triska, whose analysis of studies done on political participation in Yugoslavia, Hungary, Romania, and Poland suggests that meaningful political participation takes place in these countries on a broader scale than most Western analysts are prepared to acknowledge.

Zvi Gitelman, on the other hand, implicitly disagrees with Jowitt’s argument. Gitelman contends that genuine institutional linkages between elites and masses, which he (following Huntington) sees as essential to meaningful political participation, simply have not been developed in Eastern Europe. Rather, he asserts, all institutions have tended to become instruments of elite control, like the “transmission belts” of the original Stalinist systems. Gitelman illustrates this with a case study of workers’ councils in Poland—Institutions that sprang up spontaneously but were eventually co-opted by the regime for its own purposes. Fischer’s chapter, analyzing the 1975 electoral reforms in Romania, supports the conclusion that institutional reforms, more often than not, tend to be cosmetic rather than substantive. The two case studies just mentioned do not invalidate Jowitt’s thesis, but they demonstrate that a great deal of research is needed before the argument can be considered either substantiated or without foundation.

Equally interesting, though empirically more problematical, is the question of external influences on political development. This subject has received surprisingly little attention from generalists in the field of comparative politics. Most East Europeans specialists have long considered it to be of obvious importance, but the problem has not yet been systematically analyzed. The contributions to the present volume are noteworthy but diffuse. Chapters by Kent Brown and Sarah Meiklejohn Terry offer a wealth of constructive propositions about intrabloc coalitions and outside influences (respectively), but as both authors readily admit, empirical verification is fraught with difficulties. Charles Gati argues that the political impact of the West (in contrast to its cultural and economic influence) has been minimal, due not only to the centralized control structures shielding