

is that it does not go far enough in answering the political, organizational, and regional questions it raises.

Oakland University

ELEFThERIOS N. BOTSAS

REFERENCES

Bombulles, Joseph T. *Economic Development of Communist Yugoslavia*.

Stanford, Calif.: Hoover Institution Press, 1968.

Ward, Benjamin. "Workers' Management in Yugoslavia," *Journal of Political Economy* 65(1957): 373-86.

Slobodan Stanković, *The End of the Tito Era: Yugoslavia's Dilemmas*, Stanford, Hoover Institution Press, 1981, pp. 154.

Slobodan Stanković's short book may well be the last of what has become a thriving cottage industry of political and historical analysis, the what-will-happen-after-Tito book. Even though Stanković published his book shortly after Tito's death, its substance still revolves around the famous question.

The fundamental Yugoslav dilemma to which Stanković's title refers is the tension between democratic method and hierarchical control that has marked Yugoslav politics for the past thirty years. This tension has been expressed most notably in the contradiction between self-management and one-party control, but its influence in Yugoslav public life is pervasive. Edvard Kardelj proposed a theoretical solution to the contradiction, which he called the pluralism of self-management interests. According to Kardelj, in Yugoslavia the single party itself is the institution that insures the vitality of self-managing socialist democracy. Stanković finds it difficult to imagine the practical steps to which Kardelj's notion would lead, and notes that after the Slovene's death in 1979 his theoretical views have fallen into desuetude.

If Kardelj's theories do not resolve Yugoslavia's dilemmas, perhaps the army might. It is the only institution in Yugoslavia that remains overtly hierarchical, even though it is bound to respect the individual rights of its members. Stanković sees the army as playing an important role after Tito's departure, particularly in maintaining order in the face of ethnic problems, but since the army is not equipped to deal with the complex Yugoslav economy, he does not believe it can provide long term solutions.

Yugoslav foreign relations reflect the same basic dilemmas as her internal problems. Relations with the Russians are more or less cordial, but the debate over Stalinism lies close beneath the surface. Yugoslavia has supported Eurocommunism against Russian attacks, but on the other hand does not accept it for herself or advocate it for other East European communist states. And in pursuing a basic policy of non-alignment Yugoslavs are torn between wanting to encourage, even lead, a powerful group pursuing socialist goals and their aversion to the imposition of a uniform model of socialist behavior.

Until recently, when tensions over these issues reached a peak it was Tito who provided the solutions. This singular fact of recent Yugoslav history impells Stanković to discuss, as have so many, who will take Tito's place, particularly in the party which, he covers more thoroughly than the state apparatus. Stanković does not explicitly say that collective leadership can not work, but he seems to assume it, emphasizing that when a country is governed by a single powerful person as long as Yugoslavia was by Tito, a style of "leaderism" develops that is hard to eradicate.

Stanković believes Yugoslavia will survive as an integral state, despite the apparent impossibility of resolving her fundamental dilemma without a strong leader. He expects ethnic problems to be severe, and the strong foreign policy of the Tito era to be continued, rather than softened in an effort to solve internal economic problems.

Stanković's conclusion is curious. Instead of summarizing his basic points, which are themselves not as clearly made as they could be, he finishes with a discussion of seven proposed amendments to the constitution, and eight preliminary changes to the party statutes. Brief biographies of thirty prominent Yugoslav politicians are appended. This non-conclusion reinforces the legalistic tone of the book. Perhaps such is the fate of analysts who follow Yugoslav public life, which itself on occasion achieves a similar formal quality.

Rice University

GALE STOKES

Fahir Köker, *Herausbildung der strukturellen Heterogenität in einer unterentwickelten Gesellschaftsformation am Beispiel der Türkei*, Rita Fischer Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, 1980, 190 Seiten.

Das Buch von Köker hat — ausgehend von der Tatsache, daß es keine allgemein anerkannte Theorie der Unterentwicklung gibt-zum Ziel, einen Ansatz zu entwickeln, mit dem die 'Peripherisierung' und 'Spätkapitalisierung' der vorkapitalistischen Gesellschaftsformationen in ihrer Geschichte analysiert werden können. Als Ursache dieser Prozesse wird hier die strukturelle Heterogenität in kapitalistischen Peripherien für die Türkei diskutiert. Die Konzepte der strukturellen Heterogenität der unterentwickelten Gesellschaftsformationen und des peripheren Kapitalismus sind die Kernbegriffe einer neueren entwicklungs-politischen Diskussion, die in den letzten Jahren erhebliche Bedeutung für die Entwicklungsprobleme der Länder der Dritten Welt insgesamt gewonnen hat.

Der Verfasser gliedert seine Arbeit in eine theoretische Einleitung und zwei Kurzabschnitte über 'die Türkei als peripheres Land' und die Schlußfolgerungen, im wesentlichen jedoch in drei Hauptabschnitte.

Nach einer wohl gelungenen Einleitung untersucht der Verfasser anhand eines Metropol-Peripherie-Modells, ob die Türkei eine kapitalistische Peripherie ist. Die periphere Situation der Türkei innerhalb des kapitalistischen Weltmarktes wird durch die vielfältigen Abhängigkeitsmechanismen durchaus belegt. Im ersten Hauptabschnitt (Kapitel III) werden die historischen und geographischen Bedingungen unterschiedlicher Produktionsverhältnisse der heutigen türkischen Gesellschafts-