

*Politics of the Balkans*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1939, revised as *Balkan Politics: International Relations in No Man's Land*, Stanford University Press 1948, and republished by the Greenwood Press, Westport, Conn., 1971; or Roucek, Ed., *Central-Eastern Europe: Crucible of World Wars*, New York, Prentice-Hall, 1946, & republished by The Greenwood Press, Westport, Conn., 1970.

City University of New York

JOSEPH S. ROUCEK

Ivan Volgyes (Ed.), *Political Socialization in Eastern Europe: A Comparative Framework*, New York, Praeger, 1975, pp. xiv + 199.

There is no known theory of political socialization among the Eastern European authorities trying to instill «desirable attitudes» in their citizenry.

Recognizing also the lack of available research in this area, here a group of four political scientists, headed by the editor, has been trying to discern the uniqueness of the political socialization processes in Eastern Europe and has tried to compare what they know from this subdiscipline about these processes in «open societies» with those in Eastern Europe. They first attempt to develop the theory that dictates the practices of political socialization in Eastern Europe and have constructed the prevailing theories guiding value formation activities from the existing practice. Prior to undertaking a country-by-country study of the socialization processes of the area, they had attempted to construct from practice a list of desirable value objectives and certain generalizations about the relevant processes. The results of these efforts are contained in this volume, which begins with a theoretical model, a conceptual framework of political socialization activities in Eastern Europe, and proceeds to the examination of these activities in Czechoslovakia (by Otto Ulč, pp. 38-65), Eastern Germany (by Arthur M. Hanhardt, Jr., pp. 66-91), Hungary (by Ivan Volgyes, pp. 92-131), Poland (by Joseph R. Fiszman, pp. 132-146), and Romania (by Trond Gilbert, pp. 147-199).

The desire to create a «special man», «a man of special mold», «the socialist man of the future», is ably treated within the framework of the existing processes, focused mostly on the informal structures (family, peer groups and friendship circles, the churches), the formal structures (the party, youth groups, schools, trade unions, the military), and the political media (television, radio, newspapers and journals, books, films, theater, and demonstrative arts).

The long-avowed purpose of political socialization in all these countries is to create a «special man», the good communist of the future, the citizen and the revolutionary molded into one. Nevertheless, these general concepts vary in detail from one country to another. Some of the states in the continuum stage have tried to transmit goals which are widely divergent from the norms of the party leadership in another state. Thus, for instance, Hungary and Poland aim to reduce the active participation of the citizenry in political life; other states like Romania insist on a greater nationalism, rather than internationalist orientation. But in spite of these differences we may discern a pattern in the messages which contain the values to be inculcated in the polity. These messages may be divided into positive and negative themes of political socialization: 1) the positive themes are the building of socialism, socialist morality, patriotism, and love for the socialist commonwealth; 2) the negative themes include antiimperialism, antinationalism, antiindividualism, and anti-Stalinism. The intensity of emphasis and importance of each of these themes

varies not only among the communist states, but also within each country.

The details of these processes are systematically offered in each chapter (although they are somewhat of an uneven quality). Generally, the surveys and analyses are very satisfactory, supported by numerous references. In its wider implications, the study opens vistas not yet scanned.

City University of New York

JOSEPH S. ROUCEK

Peter F. Sugar and Ivo J. Lederer (Eds.), *Nationalism in Eastern Europe*, Washington D. C., University of Washington Press, 1969, pp. X + 465.

Despite many attempts of varied theoretical sophistication in the last few years to increase our understanding of the nature of nationalism as a crucial ingredient in the emergence of the modern world system, the subject still remains regrettably obscure and suprisingly devoid of significant contributions since the works of Kohn, Hayes, and Deutch appeared a number of years ago.

At the same time, while some more concerted efforts in that direction have been made with respect to defining the nature and content of nationalism in the emerging third world states, as well as, more recently, in western Europe (see the recent work edited by Charles Tilly), eastern Europe has received very little attention in this respect, other than the lip service paid to it in general treatments of the subject which view nationalism in that area as a mere reflection and mimesis of the same phenomenon in western Europe, in fact as simply the export of nationalism from western to eastern Europe in the age of «isms», after the French Revolution.

In this respect, the work under review which attempts to demonstrate the essential qualitative differences between these two kinds of nationalism constitutes a new and important contribution to our understanding of east European nationalism, and should definitely be welcomed.

The volume brings together the essays of a number of well-known and respected historians, most of whom are natives of the countries which they treat. Their command of the native languages of the countries surveyed and their knowledge of the cultures analyzed is an obvious strength of the book which, along with a rich bibliography, offers the western reader a wealth of material not otherwise easily accessible because of the language barrier. Although the book suffers, in parts, from the usual unevenness of collective works, the overall product is basically balanced and convincing in the points it treats. Of particular interest are Fischer-Galati's treatment of the antisemitic content of greater Romanian nationalism, and Lederer's analysis of the stresses and strains that went into the making of Yugoslav nationalism. Especially challenging, above all, is Sugar's introduction to the whole work which seeks to provide an overall statement on the nature of east European nationalism, to establish the essential differences which distinguish it from its western counterpart, to underline its historicist vein as a crucial ingredient that went into defining it, and, finally, to attempt to provide us with a typology of four distinct kinds of nationalism that should be seen as existing within the general phenomenon of east European nationalism. At the same time, one of the weaknesses of the volume is that the distinction between popular, bureaucratic, aristocratic and bourgeois nationalisms offered by Sugar is not pursued by the authors in their separate essays.

Ultimately, however, the greatest flaw of this volume arises precisely from its area of success: while asserting the distinctiveness of eastern European nationalism