

as they do, the impact of Eurocommunism on Eastern Europe, and ultimately on the Soviet Union itself. To the extent that West European Communist parties feel compelled to assert their independence from Moscow, criticize Soviet imperial behavior in Eastern Europe, and dissociate themselves from some of the harshest features of Soviet-style dictatorial rule, they do present an intrasystem alternative to the Soviet pattern, one that can be skillfully used by East European revisionists. While Eurocommunist ideals will not push the Soviet Union out of Eastern Europe or lead to the introduction of Western-style democracy in that region, they can reinforce already existing tendencies toward semiautonomy and encourage more moderate tendencies in the political and economic realms.

CHARLES GATI
Union College

POLITICAL CULTURE AND POLITICAL CHANGE IN COMMUNIST STATES. Edited by *Archie Brown* and *Jack Gray*. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1977. xiv, 286 pp. \$24.00.

This is a book about the intriguing question of why nations respond differently to similar challenges, in this case, the Communist effort to create societies that conform to the presumed Marxist-Leninist ideal. The extremely uneven results of the bold experiment in social engineering are the problem to be analyzed and interpreted.

In trying to devise an appropriate methodology, the authors acknowledge the merits and limitations of socioeconomic explanations, but focus on the examination of those aspects of political culture that are not readily susceptible to such explanations. In his sound, thorough, and difficult theoretical introduction, Archie Brown distinguishes between "official" and "dominant" political cultures. The paradigm, referring to the crucial difference between values that are promoted and those that are actually internalized, makes it possible to analyze the interaction between the two political cultures, as well as between political culture and political change.

Inevitably, the selection of countries to be examined presents difficulties. One may question the merit of including China and Cuba in the otherwise all-European sample. It is much more justifiable to include an essay on Russian-Soviet political culture, but the essay, though well written, offers little that is not already familiar to specialists, for whom the book is intended. The main thrust of the volume is found in the chapters on Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, for which the authors have assembled an impressive array of pertinent empirical data. Although the data for Poland are the most copious, they are more successfully used by David Dyker in his essay on Yugoslavia, aptly subtitled "Unity out of Diversity." In assessing the record, Dyker does not find much substance in the overadvertised self-management formula, a key concept of the official political culture. He does demonstrate, however, that, of all Communist countries, Yugoslavia shows the narrowest gap between the regime's performance and popular aspirations—a hopeful sign for the survival of its peculiar system of "institutionalized conflict."

Archie Brown and Gordon Wightman concentrate on the 1968 reform movement in Czechoslovakia as a classic example of political culture fostering political change. By effectively using contemporary surveys of Czechs' and Slovaks' views of their national past, they pinpoint the preeminent role of historical consciousness in the reform movement. They also offer some fascinating examples of how political change influenced political culture. According to a survey conducted shortly after the Soviet invasion, for example, more Czechs and Slovaks felt affinity with the Germans and Austrians than with the Russians; so much for presumed persistence of Germanophobia in that part of Eastern Europe! The gaping abyss between official and domi-

nant political cultures makes post-1968 Czechoslovakia appear to be at the opposite end of the spectrum from Yugoslavia—the nation which, in the same survey, emerged as the most congenial to the citizens of Czechoslovakia.

The subtitles, “Socialism for Everyman?” in the article about Poland and “An Uneasy Stability” in the one about Hungary, suggest the authors’ difficulty in conveying the salient features that distinguish the political cultures of the two most “historic” nations of Eastern Europe. In fact, the characterizations could just as easily be reversed or applied to other countries. Does a consensus about the merits of a strictly limited partnership with the Russians provide the vital common base that unifies the official and dominant political cultures in Poland, the most important member of the Soviet bloc? Or does that distinction belong to perhaps the least important member of the bloc, Hungary, where George Schöpflin has discovered a remarkable revival of forms reminiscent of the time Francis Joseph wore the crown of Saint Stephen?

Although all of the contributors modestly stress the exploratory nature of their work and the provisional character of their findings, those findings—summed up in a brilliant final essay by Jack Gray—carry considerable weight. To the central question of how successful the strenuous Communist effort to mold a new “socialist man” has been, Gray answers that, in Eastern Europe, the experiment has been a failure, while in Cuba and China its results remain uncertain. His conclusion is as unassailable as it is devastating from the Communist point of view: whatever the changes in traditional political cultures, they have been directed more toward liberal democracy than toward the totalitarian Communist model, because “experience of Communist government has not weakened but actually strengthened the conviction among the population that political freedom brings both greater justice and greater efficiency.”

VOJTECH MASTNY

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

AUTHORITARIAN POLITICS IN COMMUNIST EUROPE: UNIFORMITY AND DIVERSITY IN ONE-PARTY STATES. Edited by *Andrew C. Janos*. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1976. xii, 196 pp. \$3.75, paper.

This volume of seven essays—three general papers and four dealing with particular groups of countries—is the fruit of a colloquium organized by Andrew C. Janos in 1973 on the “politics of change” in Communist-ruled Eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union. The essays stress the factors of continuity as well as of change. The general papers, in particular, are characterized by an effort to introduce concepts that bring the discussion of Communist-governed societies closer to the general methods of social science. This effort has met with uneven success in the different contributions. Because of space constraints, my comments will be confined to the general papers.

Mr. Janos’s opening essay, “Systemic Models and the Theory of Change,” offers an ambitious matrix of different types of authoritarian regimes, but the extent to which later concepts overlap, or form subgroups of, the former is not always clear. An unfortunate example is his use of the terms “millenarian” and “chiliastic”—derived from Latin and Greek terms which refer to an identical religious or quasi-religious outlook—to denote completely different and, in fact, largely contrasting types of systems. Nevertheless, most of the distinctions thus introduced prove to be useful tools for a description of different stages in the development of different societies under Communist rule, and give rise to many sound and valuable observations. I especially appreciate Janos’s critique of the widespread notion of Stalinism as a regime of