

ground in none of the senses applied to its European forebears. While the book may be weak in providing general explanations of political phenomena it nevertheless is a good addition to our knowledge of some specific forms of organization.

JOSEPH A. SCHLESINGER
Michigan State University

THE SOVIET WEST: INTERPLAY BETWEEN NATIONALITY AND SOCIAL ORGANIZATION. Edited by *Ralph S. Clem*. Foreword by *Edward Allworth*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975. xvi, 161 pp. \$15.00.

Soviet nationality policy, while permitting some forms of national expression, uses socioeconomic and political pressures to encourage national groups to integrate with the Soviet polity. The Soviet West, which includes the republics of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Belorussia, the Ukraine, and Moldavia, is an area of major political and economic importance to the Soviet Union, as well as an area with traditional ties to Europe and with a record of national dissent. Thus, it is an area of special interest for examining the effectiveness of Soviet nationality policy.

This collection of articles focuses on the interaction between the efforts of national groups to preserve their identities and the pressures for integration from the Party, the press, the schools, and the economy. Each author, drawing extensively from a review of the local Soviet press, examines one aspect of this interaction in one republic and seeks to discover a pattern of development common to the Soviet West as a whole. The various studies reveal both indifference and resistance to campaigns and policies aimed at promoting integration. The general picture which emerges is that, despite pressures for integration, national identity remains strong, has in some cases increased during the Soviet period, and remains a potentially disruptive force throughout the Soviet West.

These papers grew out of the graduate seminar in Soviet nationality problems at Columbia University and are published as part of the Praeger Special Studies program. They are of interest mainly to the specialist. As with any collection the quality of the writing and analysis is uneven. Some of the contributions are poorly organized and some of the authors draw rather broad conclusions from little evidence. However, as a whole, the work offers much new and revealing information, and thus contributes to a better understanding of the Soviet nationality problem.

CATHARINE V. EWING
Phillips University

REHUMANIZATION OR DEHUMANIZATION?: PHILOSOPHICAL ESSAYS ON CURRENT ISSUES OF MARXIST HUMANISM. By *Pavel Kovaly*. Boston: Branden Press, 1974. 153 pp. \$8.75.

The five essays which make up this volume were previously published in *Studies in Soviet Thought* from April 1971 to June 1973. To these have been added a brief introduction, a two-page postscript, and a brief bibliography on Solzhenitsyn. Four of the essays deal with Arnost Kolman, György Lukács, Adam Schaff, and Alexander Solzhenitsyn respectively. The fifth addresses the question "Is It Possible to Humanize Marxism?" The main thesis, which is suggested rather

than defended, is that "Marxist philosophy as a whole cannot transcend itself toward its own humanization, unless it changes its own fundamental presuppositions and thus stops being Marxist" (p. 31).

Except for a few minor errors (for example, Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* appeared in 1909, not in 1913), the essays are informative and were originally worth publishing. The studies of Kolman, Lukács, and Schaff show how each of these prominent Marxists tried unsuccessfully to humanize Marxism. The essay on Solzhenitsyn contrasts his humanism with Stalinist anti-humanism.

The scholarly reason for reprinting the five essays in this volume, however, remains obscure. The essays, which were independently written, do not form a tightly knit whole. With the exception of the piece on Schaff which was turned from a book review into an article, the essays were not revised. The repetitions have not been removed. Pertinent materials which have appeared since the essays were written—for example, Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago*—were not considered. The author's observation, that "all attempts to humanize Marxism will be always threatened by the orthodox Stalinist ideologists and politicians" (p. 34), could probably have been cogently argued by going beyond the three instances covered in his previously published essays. He chose not to do this.

Reprinting one's articles in book form may be appropriate where the demand for them considerably exceeds their accessibility or where a position is coherently developed in successive essays. Unfortunately, neither justification is apparent in this case.

RICHARD T. DE GEORGE
University of Kansas

EAST CENTRAL EUROPE BETWEEN THE TWO WORLD WARS. By *Joseph Rothschild*. A History of East Central Europe, vol. 9, edited by *Peter F. Sugar* and *Donald W. Treadgold*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1974. xvii, 420 pp. \$14.95, cloth. \$7.95, paper.

The introductory college course, variously known as World History or History of Western Civilization, does not include Europe's East Central or Eastern part even though a good portion of the material is devoted to Western Europe. More specialized history courses, covering select periods of European history, also seem not to treat the lands east of Germany as an integral part of Europe. The average college teacher in charge of such courses either claims that he does not know enough about the east or argues that the east is so different from the west as to be unsuited for treatment in a single course. One suspects that one of the reasons for which Professors Sugar and Treadgold launched this multivolume project was to help change the prevailing campus practice and to promote integration of teaching on East Central Europe within a European context.

East Central Europe between the Two World Wars, the first in a series, covers ten countries in eight chapters: Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, and the Baltic states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. There is also an introduction and a separate "survey of culture." Of these ten countries, the last three named had previously been under the Russian Empire; Bulgaria and Albania had been under the Ottomans in the more distant past (as had the politically important parts of interwar Yugoslavia and Rumania); and five