EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES: TOWARDS A MAP OF THE FIELD AND ITS NEEDS

by

RONALD H. LINDEN

Ronald H. Linden is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science of the University of Pittsburgh. He is the author of Bear and Foxes: The International Relations of the East European States, 1965-1969 and the editor of The Foreign Policies of East Europe: New Approaches.

THE CARL BECK PAPERS IN RUSSIAN AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES
Ronald H. Linden, Editor
4E-23 Forbes Quadrangle
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA
15260

PREFACE

With this paper the Carl Beck Papers in Russian and East European Studies are launched. Though modest in conception, form, and certainly budget, this series is quite immodest in its goals: to find and distribute in the most effective and timely way possible high quality scholarly papers on topics relating to the Soviet Union and East Europe, drawn from the entire range of the humanities and social science disciplines. The Russian and East European Studies Committee of the University of Pittsburgh's Center for International Studies, in recognizing the need for such a series, also recognized the tasks such a project would entail and did not shrink from them. They therefore deserve a prompt expression of appreciation from the editor as well as the promise that their commitment will be consistently tested in the future. Even this first paper, much less the projected four-per-year, would not have appeared without the resolute efforts, careful attention and staunch support offered by Bob Donnorummo and Rose Krasnopoler of REES and by Burkart Holzner, Director of the University Center for International Studies.

As for this first paper itself, the boldness of an editor leading with his own paper is hopefully mitigated by the appropriateness and origins of the paper's subject. In 1979 Carl Beck asked me to "take a look at" the existing scholarship on East Europe and prepare a report on the field's development, its gaps and areas where further research might be needed and fruitful. Suggested in his usual casual way, the job quickly took on the characteristics of a typical Carl Beck task: formidable but inviting in the suggestion; labyrinthine, exhausting but rewarding in the execution. Sadly, unlike so many others he spawned, this work comes to fruition after its mentor can no longer profit from it. Knowing that, of course, would not have changed Carl's mind about the need to do it. His desire was for a guide or map for those working in this field, to act as a possible stimulus to others interested in filling in the gaps in existing research. In that way, too, it was a typical Carl Beck task, and presenting the answer to one of Carl Beck's last ambitious questions seems an entirely appropriate way to begin a series that bears his name.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years East European studies has enjoyed something of a boomlet. While outlets for scholarly research and the institutions that support it are enduring hard times at present, research questions relating to the countries in the Soviet alliance system, to Yugoslavia and even Albania are still attracting healthy interest. Three national publishers presently produce volumes or series dealing with contemporary East Europe (Praeger, Westview, Pergamon) while several others regularly publish work on the area (e.g. St. Martin's, Columbia University Press, Johns Hopkins University Press, Indiana University Press, the Hoover Institution). The range of journals which publish work on this region is impressive even if the distribution within this range is hardly uniform.[1] And while funding for work on the area is suffering the same pangs of constriction and retrenchment as in other fields, some counter indications are present. Two new sources of funds have appeard since 1978,[2] a number of non-area specific courses have shown a willingness to support work in this area,[3] and international exchange programs with countries in the region have so far managed to survive the vicissitudes of domestic and international politics and economics.[4]

The reasons for the steady growth of interest in East Europe are certainly various and complex, and though not strictly the focus of this review, deserve some recapitulation. To begin with, there was the well-known and well-discussed recognition of the weakness of the totalitarian model for the study of the post-Stalin Soviet Union and its derivative allies. (Fleron, 1969a; Skilling, 1969, Tucker, 1971b, pp. 20-46; Ionescu, 1972). Though there were attempts by some to fight a rear guard action and save what they could of this model (Kassof, 1969; Dallin and Breslauer, 1970; Friedrich, 1972; Schapiro, 1972a), the presence of a rude reality which included not only a differentiated complex, less ideological and less terrorized Soviet Union, but also an increasingly fragment communist world, was too difficult to ignore. Also impossible to

ignore were the enormous changes which were taking place within the communist societies of the Soviet Union, China and East Europe; hence the recognition of the need to consider the effect of these changes on the political systems existing there, i.e. to ask what exactly is a communist state.

Acceptance of this need, plus the concomitant recognition of the need to move Soviet studies closer to the social science disciplines, led to the evolution of the field of comparative communist studies.[5] But the growth of interest in developing a generalizable comparative model of communist states and their societies did not spur a substantial amount of work on East Europe, at least at first.[6] Evidently that had to await the recognition of two additional phenomena: 1) the increasing distinctiveness of the communist systems in East Europe from that of the Soviet Union; and 2) the increasing diversity within East Europe itself. The presence of such differences seemed to offer for the first time the promise of an intellectual return for the considerable effort needed for studying these states in depth. Awareness of these differences further eroded the attractiveness of the Soviet model for studying this group of states. Still it was not until the beginning and even middle of the seventies taht some of the alternative models and approaches to communist politics began to be applied to the states of East Europe (Gati, 1974; Mesa-Lago and Beck, 1975; Janos, 1976; Triska and Cocks, 1977). The fact that this coincided with the flowering of detente, the success of ostpolitik, and increasing interest in and availability of data from "the other Europe," all improved the prospects for empirical work on these countries. Now, as both the decade and detente have waned, it seems appropriate to take stock of scholarly work on East Europe; to offer a rough map of what might be called East European studies; and to suggest gaps which further research might fill. The present review is focussed primarily though not exclusively on conceptual, theoretical and empircal work which utilizes the states of East Europe

(including Yugoslavia and Albania) at its exemplary or empirical field. The discussion embraces more recent work, i.e. that published during the mid-to-late 1970's, and is based on a survey of books and articles in the fields of political science, sociology and, to a lesser extent, economics. An eye is particularly cast for studies which have aimed toward comparison or which suggest themselves as being useful for comparative inquiry. The review itself is divided into a section devoted to domestic politics and one focusing on international relations and foreign policy.

It is typical at this point in a review to remind the reader that "no attempt was made to be exhaustive." The present reviewer, however, did so attempt. That he failed is both a testament to his own hubris and, more to the point, an indication of the remarkable growth in the field of East European studies in the last five years.[7]

DOMESTIC POLITICS

The Search for New Approaches

With most studies of the field acknowledging the limits of the totalitarian model for allowing full comprehension of the dynamics of modern communist states, the search began for approaches or models to replace it. Two main currents of thought seemed promising. The "interest group" or "conflict" school of politics took its inspiration from models of politics based on pluralist systems (Skilling and Griffiths, 1971, pp. 3-45) and was applied for the most part to the Soviet Union (Skilling and Griffiths, 1971; Ploss, 1971). The second major stream took its inspiration from various schools interested in development and/or modernization, all of which shared a common concern with the phenomenon of change (Korbonski, 1977). Not surprisingly the recognition that the world's communist states were no longer what they once were stimulated attempts to discover how they came to be what they now were, i.e. what were the indigenous and exogenous sources of change, where

was the resistance to change, where was it leading, and how was change different in communist states than in others, if indeed it was (Johnson, 1970; Kautsky, 1973; Gati, 1974; Janos, 1976a).

The great bulk of recent studies on East Europe, as a subset of broader communist studies, take as their starting point a concern with change. Both in studies which aspire to be comparative, as well as the more frequent idiographic work, change itself has been conceived of and examined in a variety of ways and for a number of effects. The conception of communism as a "mobilization regime", or one directing change in accordance with its prescriptive ideology, was developed by several scholars (Johnson, 1970; Tucker 1971b, pp. 3-19; Jowitt, 1977) in order to examine the effects of the mobilization and "post-mobilization" stage on communist politics and economies. Others, still concerned with change, chose to focus on the phenomenon of modernization, itself conceived of in several ways, and explored the effects of rapid industrialization on communist states and societies (Gati, 1974; Johnson, 1977). Still others attempted to refine the maddeningly ambiguous notion of political development in order to examine the dynamics of that process in East Europe (Gitelman, 1970, Triska and Johnson, 1975; Triska and Cocks, 1977).

The use of such notions as mobilization, development and modernization has had the benefit of bringing to communist studies perspectives derived from studying other societies and systems (Aspaturian, 1974a; Black, 1974; Korbonski, 1977) and these perspectives are strong where the totalitarian model is weakest, in working change in as an expected aspect of the functioning system rather than an unexpected and dysfunctional aberration. But they have also tended to spawn idiosyncratic and not necessarily cumulative empirical results (Johnson, 1970; Gati, 1974; Triska and Cocks, 1977). Moreover a plethora of new and often hybrid categories of political and economic systems have emerged, none

of which seemed virile enough to act as a replacement paradigm for the totalitarian mode (see e.g. Montias, 1975; Janos, 1976b). Still, the attempt to reform our conception of communist politics did focus attention on the increasingly complex and differentiated dynamics of these systems and if no one model could be agreed upon, most analyses did seem to accept as a starting point the notion of a dynamic system, one in which change is becoming more the norm than the exception. And some of these approaches proved attractive enough to actually spur some empirical work (!) examining the nature, dynamics and effects of change in East Europe. Much of this work is explicitly comparative (Korbonski, 1975b; Shoup, 1975; Triska and Johnson, 1975; Welsh, 1975; Nelson, 1978b), while others offer the possibility of comparison (Gati, 1974, Part II; Cohen, 1977; Gitelman, 1977). Explicit foci for studies of the effect of change in East Europe have been: the party and its relationship to society (Gitelman, 1970, 1977; Pienkos, 1975; Brown, 1976; Croan, 1976; Shoup, 1976; Jowitt, 1977); policy and planning (Cocks, 1977); bureaucracy and elites (Ludz, 1972; Baylis, 1974; Cohen, 1974; Farkas, 1975; Kanet, 1978, Fischer, 1979; Cohen, 1979); participation and dissent (Jancar, 1974; Triska and Cocks, 1977, Part III; Bertsch, 1979); liberalization (Korbonski, 1975b; Triska and Johnson, 1975); society and social change (Gilberg, 1975;, Part II; Matejko, 1976; Social Forces, 1978, Part I; Whitaker, 1979); political culture and ideology (Lowenthal, 1970; Baylis, 1971; Bertsch, 1974; Clark and Johnson, 1976; Brown and Gray, 1979); economic reform (Burks, 1970; Dunn, 1975; Korbonski, 1975a; Wadekin, 1978). Finally, there has been some focus on the process of change itself in East Europe, both its sources (Burks, 1970; Aspaturian, 1974b; Gati, 1974, Part II; Lodgaard, 1974; Kanet, 1976; Korbonski, 1976a; Johnson, 1977; Abonyi, 1978a; Starrels, 1978; Urban, 1978; Abonyi and

Sylvan, 1979), and on East Europe as a source of change (Gitelman, 1972, 1974; Kanet, 1974a; Bertsch, 1978). In addition, of course, a variety of historical or descriptive works on particular East European states perforce tell a story of change, though they typically leave theoretical insights about the effects of change on communist political systems for the reader to glean (Fejto, 1971; Wallace, 1976; Dziewanowski, 1977; Prifti, 1978). In fact overall there is something of a disjunction between those works which characterize or describe the expected effects of change on communist systems (e.g. those in Johnson, 1970 or in Janos, 1976b) and those, more recent, which document specific changes (e.g. Fischer, 1979).

Probably the weakest link between theoretical expectations and empirical "events" is that bridging the undeniable social and economic effects of rapid modernization and development with the political system (see e.g. Gilberg, 1975b, pp. 241-51; Jambrek, 1975; Toma and Volgyes, 1977). Surprisingly few works have tried to leap the chasm between the sources and impact of economic change and the political stimulants or impediments to such changes (Volgyes, 1974a; Farkas,1975; Korbonski, 1975a; Johnson, 1977; Bertsch, 1979). This is especially true within discrete policy areas where approaches from policy sciences have been insuffiently mined (Welsh, 1978). Thus for example there is little work on the effects of change on the policy and programs which emerge from the political system. With the exception of Yugoslavia, most of the policy debates, evolutions and processes in East Europe remain unstudied through either a longitudinal or comparative framework. And very little has been done on the effect of domestic change and economic development on foreign policy (Linden, 1979; Marsh, 1979).

The study of change, like the broader body of scholarly work on East Europe, is skewed by country. Yugoslavia has attracted the most attention,

which is not surprising considering that few would argue with Gary Bertsch's conclusion that "unlike the leaders of most Communist party systems, the Yugoslavs have shown a willingness to implement political changes to keep abreast of their changing society. Showing less conservatism than their Soviet and East European counterparts, the Yugoslavs have experimented with reforms that have made Yugoslavia the most innovative of all Communist systems." (1979, p. 119). The country next most studied with respect to change would probably be Czechoslovakia, again a clear function of exciting events stimulating excited research.[8] This means also that relatively little work has been done on the effects of change in (in roughly descending order) Poland, Hungary, the GDR, Romania, Bulgaria and Albania. Moreover, in terms of both specific countries and for the region in general, several specific interesting research questions remain, related to our understanding of the process of change. Just to offer one example: what is the effect of modernization on political values, not only of the population, insofar as it can be assessed (see e.g. Brown and Gray, 1979; Bertsch, 1974; Bertsch and Zaninovich, 1974), but of the party itself, i.e. what is their reaction to change? This question has been examined to some extent for the Soviet Union (see e.g. Cocks, 1970; Lowenthal, 1970; Rigby, 1976; on Soviet reaction to international change, see Clemens, 1978) but very little in East Europe.

Investigating this question draws one almost inevitably toward the other, still embryonic, school of post-totalitarian communist studies, the interest group or conflict approach. Again with the exception of Yugoslavia, few scholars have attempted to combine the insights of the conflict school and the modernization/development school for studying the East European states. For example one result of modernization, writes Ivan Volgyes, is that "within

the Party elite the process of interest group articulation and demand aggregation gives rise to the emergence of leaders who are associated with different interests. In short, a pluralization of functions can be observed." (1974a, p. 336). Yet for East Europe relatively little observation has taken place, either from the starting point of the effects of modernization or development (see Burks, 1970; Starrels and Mallinckrodt, 1975, pp. 109-66), or the relation of such groups to change (Skilling, 1970; Korbonski, 1974; Kanet, 1978). An immense amount of work remains to be done, to ferret out the existence of various "interest groups" and relate their existence to policy, to process, and to the ways they effect and are affected by change. What is the stake of the party in promoting or preventing change? How does its stake compare or come into conflict with that of the armed forces? The industrial managers? Who has access and what is the aiming point of that access? Even relatively simple questions, such as whether the institution-equals-interest relationship holds up in East Europe, has elicited little investigative inquiry. For example, surprisingly little scholarly attention has been devoted to the communist parties of East Europe (Cocks, 1975; Pravda, 1975; Rusinow, 1976; see also the discussion below pp. 12-14).

Of the groups which have been studied in Eastern Europe the greatest amount of attention has been focused on the military (Stavrou, 1975; Dean, 1976; Herspring and Volgyes, 1978). Not all these, however, approach the military as an interest group (Stavrou, 1975; Alexiev, 1977; Bacon, 1978; Remington, 1978) and even fewer are comparative (Herspring, 1978b), though some attempt has been made to mine the pioneering work of Kolkowicz on the Soviet Union for its uses in East Europe (Herspring and Volgyes, 1978, Part I). Investigation of workers' groups, e.g. workers' councils, is, not surprisingly, heavily skewed toward Yugoslavia (see e.g. Woodward, 1977; Obradovic and Dunn, 1978), though once again the remarkable 1968 period in Czechoslovakia

did provide enough grist for significant study (Fisera, 1978). On the other hand, studies of other trade unions--one on Poland (Ludlow, 1975) and one on East Germany (Scharf, 1976a)--show that one need not have a Prague spring to allow for interesting investigations and unexpected findings. In fact, as events have all too often demonstrated, investigations into what may not presently appear to be dynamic groups or phenomena can enable us to be better informed should that situation change. It might, for example, be worthwhile to examine what might be called "embryonic interest groups," i.e. groups which at present do not or can not act as expected in western pluralist models, but who do function, nevertheless as interest articulators sotto voce or who are ready to do so more boldly should greater "subsystem autonomy" (Triska and Johnson, 1975) break out (see e.g. Terry, 1979). If questions of what are called in the west "public policy" are to become increasingly articulated, struggled over and responded to in East Europe, then work on both institutions and interest groups in these states is likely to be an exceedingly useful basis for understanding how this process works in these states.[9]

If the interest group approach has proven procrustean when applied to the Soviet Union, for whatever reason,[10] this does not necessarily mean it will be useless in studying states whose political processes are the product of domestic and international influences quite different from those in the Soviet Union. Are there no interest groups in Hungary? Who is telling Kania what in Poland? (see Terry, 1979) Where did that near-coup come from in Bulgaria in 1965? Andrzej Korbonski's comment in 1977 that the interest group "box... remained largely empty" is still valid, (p. 12; cf. Gitelman, 1979). It is, however, only partly true, as Korbonski suggests, that this

is due to "a curious inertia if not inherent conservatism of the East European specialists." (p. 12) It is also partly a result of the fact that we are dealing with secretive systems which offer at best limited access to information. It is also partly due to the poor reputation the interest group approach earned, undeservedly, in studying Soviet politics. Perhaps with improved data and information sources and ambitious new attempts to use the approach on the Soviet Union such as that of Clemens (1978) and Valenta (1979), the box can begin to be filled. Finally, the approach has also been underutilized in East Europe undoubtedly because research on such groups in western societies has been closely related to the study of institutions, and the study of intra- or inter-institutional dynamics in East Europe has clearly been relegated to the dustbin of scholarly investigation.(Brown, 1978)

If notions of change and these states' attempts to stimulate or prevent it are going to guide research on the region, then further work is needed as well on the relationship of this change (or its absence, a "change from change") to: the state-society relationship (see e.g. Gitelman, 1970; Jowitt, 1977); the cross-sectoral effects of change, i.e. both within the political system and from it to the economic and social milieu; perceptions of change, i.e. the attitude of party elites and others toward the phenomena. This last would include for example investigations into the visions of the future held by those both in power and out. (See e.g. Zaninovich, 1970.) In terms of sources of change, relatively less attention has been devoted to international--especially noncommunist-sources (Aspaturian, 1974b; Kanet, 1974a, 1976; Korbinski, 1976a; Terry, 1977; Zimmerman, 1977; Brown et al., 1978; Starrels, 1978; Abonyi and Sylvan, 1979) and this work has until now made little use of existing frameworks for the study of domestic-international linkages (Rosenau, 1969, 1970, 1973; one example would be Clark, 1980). This is an especially important gap to fill since it is certainly arguable that the greatest change in the sources of change in recent times has been in the international environment.

Structures: From the Top Down

If change has been the process attracting most attention in studies of the region, what aspect of the existing systems and societies have drawn the analyses of recent scholarship and where is there room for further work?

Leaders and Elites

Some of the earliest work in "data making" and utilization in East European studies was accomplished in the area of elite recruitment, advancement and turnover (Beck, 1970; 1973; Farrell, 1970a; Beck, Johnson and McKechnie, 1971; Zaninovich, 1973); these both allowed for and built upon suggestive analytical frameworks (Welsh, 1973). However, work on elites in the region has focused almost entirely on the elite as a dependent variable, i.e. on what the characteristics and career patterns of the elites of different communist states have been, and how these have been affected by change (see the discussion in Korbonski, 1976b; Welsh, 1979, Ch. 7; recent examples include Pienkos, 1975; Scharf, 1976b; Bielaslak, 1978; Cohen, 1979; Fischer, 1979). This focus reflects the preferences of the investigators, obviously, data availability, and the field's close association with work done on elites in the Soviet Union (see e.g. Farrell, 1970b, Beck et al, 1973). In addition it reflects the pull of that most fascinating question related to elites, the question of succession. This is correctly seen as an important political process in itself, the causes and patterns of which are deserving of inquiry (Rush, 1974; Beck, Jarzabek and Ernandez, 1976; Studies in Comparative Communism, 1976; Journal of International Affairs, 1978).

But while the phenomenon of rule-bound systems changing their most important rulers without rules or even useful precedents is indeed exquisite in its irony and a compelling topic for inquiry, there has been too little work like that of Bunce (1976) which asks, essentially, what does it matter? How does it affect policy? Or the policy system? While some work has been

done on this in the Soviet Union (see the literature cited in Bunce, 1976) there has been precious little systematic questioning of the effect of leadership change in East Europe (see, e.g. Jowitt, 1974; Zimmerman, 1976). Nor should the question of leaders and elites continue to be considered in isolation from our understanding of other aspects of these regimes, e.g. group conflict and external-internal linkages (see e.g. Clark, 1980).[11] Here too a gap alluded to by Korbonski (1976b) remains unfilled.

As to the elites of specific East European countries, again it is Yugoslavia which has claimed most of the attention of recent scholarly work (see e.g. Barton, Denitch and Kadushin, 1973; Zaninovich, 1973; Cohen, 1974; Zimmerman, 1976), though the pathbreaking work of Peter Ludz on the GDR (1972) remains a standard for inquiry on this subject (cf. Baylis, 1974). As for other countries and other leaders, Scharf's call (1976b) for more longitudinal studies could certainly be responded to fruitfully for studying elites from Warsaw to Bucharest. And political biographers who seek to emulate, say, Stephen Cohen's achievement in his study of Bukharin (1973) have the careers of almost every present and past East European leader as fallow, but hopefully not arid, fields of investigation.[12]

The Party

Conceptual work on the various communist parties, while not vast, has produced some of the most suggestive results, largely because it has been specifically cast in contexts which are inherently comparative. Thus Cocks (1970), Gitelman (1970), Baumann (1976b), Janos (1976), Rigby (1976) and Jowitt (1977) have explicitly addressed themselves to the question of the party's role and rule in a rapidly changing society and have pointedly tried to improve upon or create de novo models for understanding the

functions of and effects on the party of this changing situation. Most of this work however draws upon the Soviet experience and the amount of empirical testing of the models in the East European context is small. The communist parties of the states of East Europe, for all their similarity in terms of leading role to those of the Soviet Union or China, are in a fundamentally different position. They rule different societies with different histories, ethnic mixtures, religious attitudes, orientations toward communism, and exposures to the west, to mention only a few parameters. Moreover, communist party rule in East Europe must make itself effective in an environment which is, in one crucial aspect at least, fundamentally different from that of the Soviet Union: they must govern with their continuation in office hostage, ultimately, to outside major-power interference. To put it simply, the CPSU does not have to worry about the Soviet Union intervening to "help" them destroy "anti-socialist forces." This means that certain actions which the party might want or need to take in response to the changing dynamics of their country are not possible; some options are excluded explicitly or preemptively by fear of external reaction. Thus it is surprising and unfortunate that there are so few studies of these parties and the way they have chosen to negotiate their particular difficult paths. Areas where some individual-country, and even a few comparative studies have been made include: the party-society interface (Pravda, 1975; Brown, 1976; Croan, 1976; Shoup, 1976); intraparty conflict (Skilling, 1974; Rusinow, 1976); party reform (Pravda, 1975) and ideology (King, 1978). Once again, the most fluid of the situations e.g. Czechoslovakia, 1968 and Yugoslavia have attracted the most attention, while semmingly more "stable" environments, i.e. those in Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania and even Poland, have received little attention.

Potential students of this subject have not had much in the way of contemporary histories of these parties to draw on, even for Yugoslavia. Typically the most one can hope for is a chapter in a volume devoted to the whole country (e.g. Prifti, 1978) or an edited volume dealing with the whole region (Rakowska-Harmstone and Gyorgy, 1979; Fischer-Galati, 1979). While recently histories of the Polish (Dziewanowski, 1976; Weydenthal, 1978), Hungarian (Molnar, 1978; Kovrig, 1979) and East German (McCauley, 1979) parties have been published, only McCauley is likely to be of use as a source for more concentrated contemporary analysis. Still, students of these parties at least will be one up on their colleagues doing work on the Romanian, Bulgarian, Albanian or Yugoslav parties.[13]

Sub-national politics

Work on government and politics below the national level is even more scarce. In this realm it is one of the most restrictive of the East European states, Romania, which accompanies Yugoslavia as the most studied case. This is due in large part to Daniel Nelson's persistent survey work in Romania (1976, 1977a) and the work of Nelson (1978a) and Trond Gilberg (1975a) on elite characteristics at the local level. Of course it is Yugoslavia's extraordinary mixture of regional, ethnic, linguistic and religious groups which dominates the sub-national literature (see e.g. Lang, 1975; Rusinow, 1975, 1980; Frey, 1976; Bertsch, 1976, 1977; Ludany, 1979). Some of this work has sought to offer comparative insights from their cases (Bertsch, 1974; Klein, 1975) and others have been presented as potentially generalizable (Denich, 1976). Still, with a few exceptions (Nolting, 1975; Piekalkiewicz, 1975; Tarkowski, 1978) it is not political scientists but economists and, interestingly, geographers, who have done the most complete groundwork in the area of regional and local

developments in East Europe (Hoffman, 1971, 1972; Turnock, 1974, 1976, 1978; Burghardt, 1975; Enyedi, 1976).[14] Time is certainly ripe for examining the political impact of regional ethnic and cultural disparities in Romania, Poland, Czechoslovakia and, dare one hope, between Geg and Tosk in Albania!

Which brings us to one of the most puzzling gaps in the field of East European studies, research on minorities. While minorities are recognized by virtually everyone who barely touches the area in an undergraduate course as a crucial variable in understanding the politics and policies of most of these states, vigorous systematic examinations of the politics of minorities in the region are exeptionally hard to find, especially those which might offer broader clues about the minority-majority political process in general. While interest in ethnic diversity in the Soviet Union seems to be undergoing something of a revival, for East Europe few have chosen to build on the insights offered by Shoup (1972), King (1973) or Bertsch (1974) for the study of East Europe (see e.g. Dyker, 1979). Though useful individual case studies exist (e.g. Gilberg, 1974, 1976) as well as narratives of the ups and downs of nationalities and minorities (Fischer, 1977b; Mackenzie, 1977) much of this information remains intertwined in contemporary histories of the region (Lendvai, 1963; Fejto, 1971; Wolff, 1974; Korbel, 1977, ch. 5 and 6). Thus, unlike the situation with regard to communist party studies, in the area of minorities, there are histories and, with some exceptions, a good deal of data, allowing for longitudinal or comparative inquiry. What is lacking is an effective investigative framework or conceptual scheme which would facilitate investigation of the role of minorities in the political system and stimulate the growth of a cumulative body of knowledge on subnational groups in these states. It may be that the study of minorities and nationalities has been too long associated with advocacy or cold-war policies. For whatever reason a crucial part of the field has been too long neglected.

East European Societies

The data expansion of the last decade has probably been most successfully utilized in studying the changing societies of the East European states. Recent studies, most of which have been sociological, include both comprehensive and explicitly comparative work like that of Connor (1979; cf. Ranki, 1974) and idiographic examinations of certain social dynamics such as stratification and mobility (Faber, 1976, Part I). In addition there has been an increasing focus on specific groups such as intellectuals (Gomori, 1976; Raina, 1976; Hancock, 1978) or women (Sokolowska, 1975; Volgyes and Volgyes, 1977; Jancar, 1978; Moskoff, 1978; Achberger, 1979; Wolchik, 1979). Much of this work overlaps with that focusing on modernization in terms of interest in the effects of modernization on society and in its emphasis on change. Like the modernization approach, most of the sociological work, addressed as it is to questions of society and not polity, tend to ignore or deal only lightly with the impact of the political system on society or conversely the effect on the political system of that changing society.[15] Typically the question is posed, as in Connor (1979), as follows: What has been the effect of socialism on, in this case, social equality and intergenerational mobility? Or, in the studies on women, how has the role and status of women changed in the transition from pre-socialist to socialist system (Sokolowska, 1975; Wolchik, 1979). In other words, the general condition of socialism or communism is taken as given, but the connection between the state's political system and its policies and the social results are not explicated, though some mention of ideology is usually made. So while specific aspects of these societies, e.g. status, mobility, etc. are being described in greater and greater detail, we have little information on the political context of the issues. What are the stakes, the perceptions of threat, or in some cases opportunity, held by

those involved in social policy? And a crucial question, how is the solution of these issues related to other aspects of the political system? For example, Jancar (1978) addresses the questions of whether there are "built-in biases in the Communist system /that/ have prompted the depoliticization of women to the degree that female political apathy has become a fundamental characteristic of the system." (p. 114) She concludes that such biases do exist and include: the command nature of the communist sytem; the failure to teach women political skills; the ruthlessness of the power struggles in communist systems; and the nature of party work (pp. 112-18). Whether or not Jancar is correct, at least the question of context and impact is addressed and the links sketched out. To investigate such links to social policy is clearly a complex and difficult task, even in more open societies, much less when one has to deal with making sense of a mass of often non-comparable, incomplete, mis-representative "quasi-imaginary" data (Connor, 1979, p. 5). Still the appearance of various sociological works such as that of Connor (1979) which have made strides in making sense of this data, has smoothed part of the path for those interested in pursuing the "political connection." In additiona number of East European scholars, in and out of favor, have addressed such questions themselves (Ferge, 1979; Konrad and Szeleny, 1979) and greater use could be made of indigenous scholarship. (See further discussion below.)

With this particular gauntlet comes another already alluded to, that of bringing the analysis full circle by asking what is the effect on the political system of these well-documented changes? Is the persistent (and evidently increasing) social stratification in East Europe providing the bases for interest groups? Will such groups utilize existing but discredited institutions as their vehicles for interest aggregation and articulation, or will their

impact be intra-institutional, e.g. within the party? Or will their effect be extra-institutional, stimulating action on the fringes or between the seams of political systems fearful of autonomous centers of political power? How will one-party but not one-interest states react? Finally, a particularly important question in the East European context: what transnational factors are present which either stimulate or retard such effects? Will links grow between like-minded groups across states, and with what effect? As noted above, the modernization approach has yielded only tentative investigations of such questions in East Europe.[16] One study of the region which has addressed in a systematic manner questions of the political impact of social and economic development (Nelson, 1977b) found "no strong support... for the hypothesis that relationships exist between political variables and socio-economic levels and/or rates of socio-economic change in communist states." (p. 384) With such a result, flying as it does in the face of most expectations regarding this relationship, further work certainly seems in order.[17] We have models aplenty and now we also have a good deal of the necessary data to accomplish such investigations.

Greater data has also become available in the last decade to allow fuller examinations, in at least some of these states, of existing political cultures. Since first discussed as a useful way to look at communist states (Tucker, 1971a) the political culture approach has elicited much promise for work in East Europe and a rather mixed bag of hard evidence (Bertsch, 1974, 1976; Bertsch and Zaninovich, 1974; Schweigler, 1975; Starrels and Mallinckrodt, 1975, ch. 2; Clark and Jonson, 1976; Bowers, 1979; Paul, 1979). Though the region's rich mixture of traditional, historical culture, and communist "goal" and "transfer" cultures would seem to make it the ideal testing ground for both longitudinal and comparative study, existing studies are confined mostly to the GDR and, as usual, Yugoslavia. This may be due to problems with the concept or its opera-

tionalization (see the discussions in Paul, 1976; Brown, 1979) or, just as likely, problems of data, both behavioral and attitudinal.

At least in the latter case, somewhat more grist for milling is now available in the form of public opinion surveys. While certainly not of the Civic Culture variety, these can be mined for insights about the political culture of the individuals in these states (Piekalkiewicz, 1972; Schweigler, 1975; Clark and Johnson, 1976; Brown and Wightman, 1979; Radio Free Europe, 1979). Clearly survey data has to be approached with caution and even skepticism, and needs to be supplemented with other measures, for example, participation (Triska and Cocks, Part III; Baylis, 1978; Pravda, 1978) and with less systematic, "softer" measures (see e.g. Kolankiewicz and Taras, 1979; Schopflin, 1979). It may be that such studies, especially those based on surveys, are most useful for what they tell us about the political systems within which they operate. Thus the presence or absence of independent public opinion, and the range of allowed expression as political phenomena themselves, tell us a good deal about how these states are responding to change and modernization at the interface between state and society (Connor and Gitelman, 1977; Goldfarb, 1978). More broadly, this work can and should be related to the process of socialization in East Europe. Here an excellent beginning has been made with the development of a comparative framework and its preliminary application to five of the East European states (Volgyes, 1975; cf. Volgyes, 1977; Georgeoff, 1977).[18]

The "political connection" referred to above as needing further explication, is probably clearest in the case of those who have not been "properly" socialized, i.e. opponents of the regime. Most of what is published in this area has been confined to documents and commentary (e.g. Pelikan, 1976; Riese, 1978) or simply the samizdat, essays and monographs of various dissenters (e.g. Bahro, 1978). But some countries, notably Czechoslovakia,

Poland and Yugoslavia, have also been the subject of some excellent in-depth examinations; some from the perspective of the relation of dissent to Marxism (Sher, 1977; Kahrs, 1979; Szeleny, 1979); some its relation to the political system in which it was spawned (Triska, 1975, 1979; Bromke, 1978; Kusin, 1978; Raina, 1978); and others its relation to society in general (Jancar, 1974; Baumann, 1976; Shapiro, 1978). Recently the first moves toward comparative analysis were evident as several broader treatments of dissent in East Europe have emerged (Szulz, 1978; Tokes, 1979; Connor, 1980). Whether enough is known about dissent in East Europe--as opposed to that in the Soviet Union--to make generalizable treatments possible remains to be seen. So far, the studies of samizdat and its authors are as uneven and skewed as is the "independent" literature itself. Still, the mere appearance of a volume such as that of Tokes (1979) indicates a level of interest in East European dissent and, along with theoretical suggestions such as those of Shapiro (1978) Baumann (1976) and Jancar (1974), are likely to advance our understanding of the appearance, function and dynamics of opposition in these states. Given the nature of the subject, of course, hard information is often exceptionally difficult to obtain, but dissent in a variety of manifestations is present virtually throughout East Europe and, relative to that of the USSR, is quite understudied. Especially worthy of examination are questions of: the range of dissenting views; relationship of dissenters to their society, i.e. are they intellectuals, workers, peasants (see e.g. Lewis, 1979); and reactions of the various regimes. It is not at all clear for example that dissent and opposition are necessarily dysfunctional to the ruling party and its goals. Assuming that achieving greater autonomy vis a vis the Soviet Union is one goal of a regime, could not a clever use of one's domestic opponents or their aims advance that goal e.g. by securing substantial economic aid from the USSR?

Another question begging investigation is the significance of transnational communication in either the stimulation or limiting of dissent. As with so many of the questions needing study in East Europe investigation and understanding may well be enhanced by comparing certain phenomena in the East European communist states with the situation in non-communist countries (see the discussion below).

FOREIGN POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

In a recent review of several volumes devoted to East Europe, Voytech Mastny called foreign policy "potentially the most consequential of the neglected topics of inquiry" (1979a, p. 63). Indeed, Roger Kanet's view, that "Western scholarship has not always kept pace with developments either within East Europe itself or in the relations of the states of the region with the outside world" is probably a generous understatement, as Kanet's own review articles in the field have demonstrated (1974b, 1980). The "why's" of this particular neglect are very likely also familiar to students of East Europe. Evidently convinced that the East European states' foreign policies were products of puppet strings held in Moscow and that therefore the foreign policy to be studied was that of the Soviet Union, students of East European politics have instead focused their attention predominantly on intra-polity developments. This seemed all the more appropriate since postwar experience in the region suggested that the Soviet Union, the most salient and threatening state from the standpoint of the United States, perceived the greatest danger to its own security and international position as emanating from domestic instability in East Europe and the possible alteration or dismantling of the regimes installed there. Thus the substantial obstacles to exhaustive inquiry into these states' foreign policies, plus the necessity of mastering

new languages, cultures, and histories made more attractive those areas where significant payoffs seemed most probable. And of course the region remained caught in an image which assumed, if not total bloc unity, at least minimum and inconsequential foreign policy differences. The public explosion of the Sino-Soviet dispute and its spillover into East Europe, along with other equally public differences, such as those between Bucharest and Moscow, did finally erode this image, and put in its place a notion of communist "polycentrism" (Laquer and Labedz, 1962; Survey, 1966; Bromke, 1972). Still, foreign policy remained relegated to a residual category of analysis. Not even the stir caused by the "comparative communism" revolution, could stimulate such work on the foreign policies of these states.[19]

It was nearly a decade after the emergence of the Sino-Soviet break before recognition of the greater diversity of the East European states stimulated calls for investigations into their foreign policies which would bring to bear the concepts, methods or approaches of international relations or comparative foreign policy (Studies in Comparative Communism, 1975a; Gitelman, 1976; Kuhlman, 1976). The impact of this recognition can be measured in the growth of the number of studies devoted to mapping the diversity of foreign policy actions and attitudes in the region. (Hughes and Volgy, 1970; Kintner and Klaiber, 1971; Harle, 1971; Laux, 1975; Tucker, 1975; Clark and Farlow, 1976; Simon, 1977; Potter, 1978; Linden, 1979). But, as Roger Kanet (1975) has noted, much less attention has been given to examining the causation behind these differences. This is true because, with the limited exception of Yugoslavia, the causes of these states' foreign policies in general have been largely unexamined either on an individial or region-wide, comparative basis. Thus both differences from andadherence to Soviet foreign policy has been left to conventional wisdom or seemingly "obvious" factors such as geography to

explain. Only the most notorious cases of foreign policy divergence, that of Romania and - in the other direction - the GDR, have received any significant treatment (On Romania see Brown, 1963; Floyd, 1965; Dziewanowski, 1969; Jowitt, 1970, 1971; Farlow, 1971, 1978; King, 1974; Gill, 1975, Socor, 1976; Braun, 1978; Linden, 1979, ch. 5. On the GDR see Sinanian, Deak and Ludz, 1972, ch. 9; Merkl, 1974; Bowers, 1976, 1979; Bryson, 1976; Croan, 1979; Ludz, 1976; Dorpalen, 1977; Moreton, 1978; Olsewski, 1978; Glass, 1980; Krisch, 1979).[20] And if one were looking for comprehensive, analytic treatments of the postwar foreign policies of virtually any of the East European states, one would search in vain.[21] Instead one typically finds foreign policy touched on as sort of an afterthought in volumes devoted to the country as a whole (see, for example Prifti, 1978, 242-56; Kusin, 1978, 258-72; Blazynski, 1979, 210-30).

Comparative analytical work touching on all or even some of these states is similarly in short supply. Apart from the overall mapping of divergent foreign policies, probably the subject most studied in a comparative mode is East Europe's response to ostpolitik (Dean, 1974; Nelson, 1975; Griffith, 1978; Potter, 1980). Thus it would appear that Gitelman's (1976) call for more comparative work has been heeded as part of a larger literature on ostpolitik itself (Whetten, 1971; Sinanian, Deak and Ludz, 1972, ch. 8; Birnbaum, 1973, Mensonides, 1974; Gyorgy, 1976).[22]

This also points to what is the most common approach to the study of the international relations of these states, the foreign-policy-target approach. That is, the states relations are conceived of and examined as the targets of international initiatives, with consideration mostly devoted to examining the impact on the region of the policies of other states, e.g. West Germany. The bulk of such works are devoted to Soviet-East European relations and are concerned primarily with East Europe as it relates to the U.S.S.R.'s: needs

and goals (Brown, 1975; Jamgotch, 1975; Aspaturian, 1976; A. Johnson, 1976; Marer, 1976b; Jones, 1977; Rubinstein, 1977; Kalvoda, 1978; Rakowska-Harmstone, 1976; Korbonski, 1980; Dunn, n.d.)instrumentalities (Kanet and Bahry, 1975; Korbonski, 1978; Staar, 1978; Petersen, n.d., Clayton, n.d., Klein, n.d.); or decision-making (Paul, 1971; Valenta, 1979). Work on the region as a foreign policy target of the United States is much less differentiated, apart from the continuing stream of studies of the origins of the cold war (of which the most interesting is undoubtedly Mastny, 1979b). Most discussions of American policy toward the region are either brief descriptive contemporary histories (Gyorgy, 1973; Byrnes, 1975; Kovrig, 1976; Rachwald, 1978; Farlow, n.d.), often combined with policy recommendations; or simply straight advocacy (Gati, 1975; Licklider, 1976/77; Ploughman, 1976/77; Lieber, 1977; Silberman, 1977; U.S.H. of Rep., 1978). There exist a few studies of particular episodes in the recent history of relations between the US and certain countries in East Europe, (Lillich, 1975; Kaplan, 1975; Urban, 1978) and exactly two studies covering part of the post-war course of relations between the US and one East European country (Larson, 1979; Wandycz, 1980). There exists no comprehensive study examining the perceptions, decisions and factors underlying the postwar course of US policy toward either particular East European countries or the region as a whole, an astonishing gap and a testament in the centrality and dominance of the Soviet Union in our scholarship.[23] If one can roughly break down U.S.--East European relations since the war into periods of containment, cold war, bridge-building, detente with Sonnenfeelers, and decoupling, then of these only the first two have received substantial treatments, from the US perspective, and virtually all need examination from the East European viewpoint.[24]

Other actors whose involvement in East Europe has received some (too little attention--again largely from the standpoint of the outside actor -- are: China (Remington, 1976; Morris, 1978; Szuprowicz, 1978); Canada (Sharp, 1972); the Papacy (Dunn, 1979); and West Europe, especially the EEC (Ransom, 1973; Vayrynen, 1974, Mahoney, 1978; Shlaim and Yannopoulous, 1978). A great number of the East-West studies focus on the economic issues between the two regions of Europe, e.g. trade, finance, debt, industrial cooperation, and to a lesser extent between the US and East Europe (US. Congress, 1974, part III; 1977, esp. part III; Friesen, 1976; Garland, 1976; Hayden, 1976; Portes, 1977; Brada and Somanath, 1978; Levcik and Stanasky, 1979). These works are usually aimed at an economic assessment, but they do provide a valuable resource base with which to consider political questions, especially those relating to the effects of international economic relations on East European domestic and foreign policy (Kanet, 1976; Korbonski, 1976c; Bahry and Clark, 1980).

The East Europe-as-target approach also embraces works that focus on the putative effects of Eurocommunism on the region. While some argue that these effects will--or at least might--be of significance in East Europe (Gati, 1977; Valenta, 1978) others are doubtful (Tokes, 1978a). The nearest thing to a systematic study of the possible effects suggests only a limited impact to date (Machala, 1978). In any case, detailed case studies or further comparative work would certainly be timely and useful.

Recent work on Eurocommunism and East-West relations in general are most often cast against a background of detente (see e.g. Korbonski, 1976c; Machala, 1978; Tokes, 1978b). This is representaive of a second type of study of the region's international relations, the international milieu approach. In this mode, a derivative, really, of the East Europe-as-target school, analysts have addressed themselves to the question of how a certain international environ-

ment or aspect of the environment affects the East European states. In addition to detente, there has been some attention devoted to the "world communist" milieu of these states, i.e. their role and actions within the context of the world communist movement (Devlin, 1975; Seton-Watson, 1978). A large number of studies of this genre focus on the effects of the continuing Sino-Soviet dispute on the East European countries (King, 1972; A. Johnson; 1974; Remington, 1976), though in this area the most effective work remains that done on the early period of the dispute (e.g. Griffith, 1963; Levesque, 1970). Recently the changing international economic milieu, and especially the change in East European interactions with it, has begun to be investigated (Fallenbuchl, Neuberger and Tyson, 1977: Hewett, 1977: US Congress, 1977, part III; Nayyar, 1978; Neuberger and Tyson, 1980; Terry, 1980), in particular, the impact of changing energy regimes on the region (Lee, 1974; Goldman, 1975; Kramer, 1975, 1979; Joyner, 1976; Haberstroh, 1977). In this area the need seems to be less for new region-wide studies and more for examination of particular cases, along the lines of Terry's study of Poland (1980), with an eye toward elucidating the possible political impact of the dislocations in the international economic environment. As regards both case and comparative studies with the international milieu perspective, much could be gained from--and given to-- the broader study of international relations and foreign policy by placing work into frameworks which are potentially more generalizable. There have been a few attempts to do so. Modelski's (1960) suggestion of a form of "communist international system" and Zimmerman's (1972a) postulation of a "hierarchical regional state system," were designed to both explore and suggest propositions relating more generally to interstate relations.

The benefits of approaching the study of these states with such an orientation are several. First, such work can bring to bear what conceptual refinements, analytic rigor and substantive findings have been produced in these broader fields. At the same time, rigourous, conceptually-guided empirical work in East Europe can make a real contribution to the study of international relations and foreign policies outside the region. The international relations of the East European states are conducted under certain circumstances which are relatively clear, but certainly not unique. Indeed some students of the subject have been willing to consider these states' relations as exemplifying particular instances of larger phenomena such as imperialism (Marer, 1974) or dependency (Bahry and Clark, 1976; Jowitt, 1978; Clark and Bahry, 1979; Zimmerman, 1980; see further discussion below). The states themselves are of a certain similar size, development and political system. Because of their similarities, the states of East Europe are particularly useful for the development and testing of more generalizable ideas about foreign policy. Some factors, in the words of experimental science, would be automatically held "constant" (Rosenau, 1975). Yet their differences in both domestic and international politics are significant enough and appear with enough regularity to make investigation challenging, fruitful and, not the least, suggestive of further inquiry. In undertaking this inquiry, might there not be something to be gained from sifting through the results of broader foreign policy studies to consider their possible relevance for East Europe? Even more likely, might not one of the various analytic frameworks or conceptual schemes be adopted and adapted for the study of this region? The expectation here is that these would not only act as guides to inquiry, but would be improved by whatever modification would be derived from work in this region (see e.g. Hughes, 1971; Hopmann and Hughes, 1975; Linden, 1979, ch. 6; Terry, 1980).

Nor is selecting such guides or tools from the existing general literature as formidable an undertaking as it might seem. Much of it would be inappropriate for use in East Europe for one or another reason. Much, for example, has focused on states with fundamentally different characteristics, thus failing on grounds of prima facie isomorphism. Kean and McGowan (1973), for example, suggest that, "although most theorizing in international relations and in the comparative study of foreign policy purports to be general, and therefore applicable to all states, it is implicitly modeled on the behavior of 'great' powers" (1973, p. 246). This has, in addition, rendered much of the empirical work less transferable to states which do not fall into this category.[25] The states of East Europe would certainly fall in the non-superpower category as would virtually every other state by definition. Thus results which emerged from a study of East Europe would seem to have potentially a wide impact, especially in areas such as great power -- small power relations.

A good deal of international relations research has produced results which are inconclusive, insufficiently suggestive or mindlessly inductive. But John Vasquez' (1976) depressing conclusion that almost 93% of all "correlational-explanatory" research conducted before 1970 produced weak or statistically insignificant results should serve not to prevent a mining of this field for use in East Europe, but to push us toward those results which do seem suggestive. For example, Vasquez suggests that of the independent variables used in international relations research, strategies "focusing solely on subnational actors are the most successful in predicting behavior and the least employed" (p. 191). Such a focus would seem to be particularly relevant in understanding the foreign policies of the East European states, especially given the rather constricted international parameters within which they operate. Furthermore, it seems likely that research on East Europe could make a contri-

bution toward filling gaps in dependent variable studied. Vasquez notes, for example, that ". . . not much research effort has been concentrated on trying to explain the political characteristics of the international system" (p. 193). Examining international alliance patterns in East Europe, especially as they reflect or impact upon the global system can certainly offer useful evidence bearing on questions such as this (Modeslski, 1960; Zimmerman, 1972b). In addition, some of the globally aggregated results--or non-results--do yield certain positive, i.e. non-null, findings for certain subsets or types of nations. Thus, for example, Wilkenfeld (1968) found a relation between some types of domestic conflict and foreign conflict behavior for nations with a "centrist" governmental structure, though the globally aggregated findings of both Rummel (1963, 1967, 1968) and Tanter (1966) had suggested a nonexistent, or at best quite weak, relationship.[26]

Certain approaches drawn from comparative foreign policy or international relations would seem implausible a priori in some configurations, but more likely to yield useful insights in other forms. For example, the "societal" approach to foreign policy, i.e. looking for factors explaining foreign policy within a state's societal structure, e.g. public opinion, would likely be of little value in East Europe if one were searching for evidence that these states are sensitiveto public views or preferences in foreign relations. Indeed searching for such preferences or public views would likely be a frustrating and uncertain business. Even in the western liberal democracies results establishing a relation between public opinion and foreign policy are scant and weak. (Abravanel and Hughes, 1973; Merritt, 1973). But the impact of other societal factors, such as level and scope of modernization, or role and position of ethnic groups, might indeed be significant and research in this area has yet to begin.[27]

Some approaches which seem promising--even greatly so--may have to wait until greater data availability and system openness makes their use possible. For example, the bureaucratic politics approach so productive in studying United States foreign policy (see e.g. Allison, 1971) -- though not without its critics, (Krasner, 1973; Perlmutter, 1974) -- has shown itself to have an even higher ratio of framework-to-payoffs in studying the Soviet Union (Simes, 1975; Valenta, 1979). Still, Weil's (1975) study of the bureaucratic politics of North Vietnamese foreign policy demonstrates that such work can be productive in studying the small communist states as well.

Finally, some approaches have already been tried in studies of East Europe and have yielded disappointing results; for example, regional integration. In this particular case this has been the result of a focus on institutions seemingly analogous to those in western regions, especially Comecon, but in fact non-isomorphic, and not fruitful arenas in which to learn about international integration in East Europe. The result of borrowing a focus more appropriate for West Europe has been, as Cal Clark (1975) says, to miss "where the action is" in the region's integration (1975).[28]

But even to have recognized all of these obstacles and problems of non-productivity or nonisomorphism is still to leave much of the work in international relations, both theoretical and empirical, available and usable for work in East Europe. For example, a great deal of discussion has been generated recently by the notion of an "international regime". Most often a regime is conceived of as some set of governing rules or arrangements, agreed to by the actors (typically nation-states), for whom these act as norms of behavior (Keohane and Nye, 1977; Haas, 1980; Young, 1980). An example would be the creation of a regime for the use and exploitation of the world's oceans (International Organization, 1977). Despite widespread recognition of the significance of non-formalized rules, most studies of regimes have nevertheless tended to focus on specific sets of rules, organizations, and procedures more formal than informal.[29] But the international (and domestic) relations of the East European states often respond

to international regimes with less formal procedures and rules, with less explicit international agreements, but with no less effective creation of norms. Moreover their peculiar regimes vary with issue area and over time and cover virtually the entire spectrum of their behavior. Investigation of these "regimes" and their operation could not only further explicate the causes and courses of the East European states' international behavior, but could offer to the general study of world politics a broader conceptualization of the notion of regime. Addressing, for example, the question of European security from the standpoint of discovering "the sets of governing arrangements that affect relationships of interdependence" (Keohane and Nye, 1977, p. 19) might clarify our view of security in the East European context, and broaden the current narrow focus of research on essentially military questions (Bender, 1972; King and Dean, 1974; Bertram, 1979) or the politics and dynamics of particular negotiating mechanisms, e.g. MFR and CSCE (Davy, 1972; Klaiber et al, 1973; Laux, 1975; Caldwell, 1976; Russell, 1976; Coffey, 1977; Hopmann, 1978; Miko, 1980).[30] These form only a part of the European security regime and broader questions might profitably be examined as they related to security, e.g. East-West economic relations, leaders' perceptions of threat. We could thus return the conceptual loan to the field of international relations with interest.

Or consider systems theory, an approach which has stimulated little empirical investigation compared, say, to an approach based on nation-state attributes, and which seems at first glance not particularly appropriate for studying East Europe. For one thing, it is cast at the global level of analysis, whereas our desired focus is regional; and in virtually all its formulations, the systems approach brings with it a host of theoretical and empirical problems (Waltz, 1979, pp. 38-193). Still, the systems approach does provoke at least one fascinating question which, when adapted for investigation in East Europe, poses a significant research problem; What is the

regional (or subsystem) effect of a decided shift in the global system, say from bipolarity to multipolarity? Further, what impact does the direction, speed and scope of this shift have on the nations making up the system? Does the regional subsystem mute or reinforce such an impact? What kind of global system is more advantageous for weaker states in the subsystem? That such an approach can be the catalyst for interesting questions and answers has already been demonstrated by William Zimmerman's (1972a) examination of the effect of an existing bipolary system with low expectations of violence on a regional hierarchical (sub)system. Given the present disintegration or transformation of that system, questions such as those above might usefully and profitably be addressed, with the results benefiting both East European studies and general international relations theory.

It is unlikely of course that any one approach borrowed from the comparative study of foreign policy or international relations would fit perfectly into the field of East European studies. What is more likely is that certain broader concepts or frameworks would shed light on the shadowy and understudied field of East European foreign policies and, in return, improve our understanding of the overall phenomenon of interstate relations.

To what kinds of questions might such approaches be addressed? If we want to move beyond situational description, in what direction might we travel? The need for studies--especially comparative studies--of causation has already been noted. Of the particular questions which wait to be addressed, one of the most provocative is the same one which has received such attention in shaping domestic politics, the response of these states to change. Despite the fact that these states' international environment--and their relationship to it--has been changing along with the domestic situation, concepts of modernization and development have been utilized largely for understanding the various states' reactions only to these domestic changes. We can not expect to compre-

hend the relationship to external ecological change simply by extrapolating from the states' domestic experience. To begin with, the nature and number of operative factors involved is different, and includes inter alia the reactions of other states, international economic and ideological aspects, leadership perceptions, and transnational effects. Second, the degree of exposure to such changes varies from state to state and thus we should expect that the diversity we have learned to observe in domestic politics will be similarly, if not equally, represented in international politics (see e.g. Potter, 1978, 1980). Third, these states' degree of external dependence upon the Soviet Union varies by level, degree and type (see Bahry and Clark, 1976, 1980; Clark and Bahry, 1979). Thus their freedom to react to change is presumably enhanced or restricted variously, though here we should avoid accepting a priori a one-to-one relationship between Soviet desires and East European responses to change (Potter, 1980). And finally, there is of course the fundamental difference which all governments face, that between domestic and foreign policies; in particular the fact that so much of what goes on outside their boundaries is beyond their control, though it affects them nevertheless (Rosenau, 1967, pp. 11-50). Hence we should expect rather than be surprised that the rate, form and direction of these states' reactions to international change may be quite different from their reaction to domestic change. To wit, Romania's rigid neo-Stalinism at home (complete with personality cult) contrasted with its flexible, innovative foreign policy. Compared to the relatively more malleable domestic milieu of the East European states, problematic enough, in the world beyond the river's edge, the unknowns are greater, the insecurities more heightened, and for us who study them, the range of responses less well understood.

Thus we should be asking ourselves, for example, how have--and how will--these states react to their changing international environment? How do such changes affect them and to what degree can they manipulate such changes to their advantage?[31] What factors explain their particular reactions? If, of course, we simply consider it axiomatic that they will react as mimics of the Soviet Union, or that they will all react alike, we need not address such questions. If, on the other hand, we cannot accept such fiats, we must take care to build change into our investigations of these states' foreign relations, (see e.g. Potter, 1978; Bahry and Clark, 1980; Clark, 1980; Korbonski, 1980), and conversely, to insure that foreign policy is one of those phenomena examined when we investigate change (or modernization, or development) in East Europe (as an example, see Jowitt, 1971).

Among the phenomena currently undergoing rapid change and receiving extraordinary attention in the study of other states, is international interdependence. Though there is some debate among students of the subject as to whether or not worldwide interdependence is presently greater or less intense and extensive than previously (Waltz, 1970, 1979; Morse, 1972; Katzenstein, 1975; Rosecrance et al., 1977), for East Europe there can be little doubt of its substantial interdependence with the external world and especially of the increase in its ties with the noncommunist world, developed and developing, in the last twenty years. The challenging question for us is how have and how will these states react to such interdependence and its consequences? And how will they do so? What mixture of economic, political, cultural, ideological and individual factors will produce the particular reaction each state demonstrates in the face of ties which both bind and benefit? As interdependencies grow and fluctuate with noncommunist states, it will certainly not be enough to generalize from the region's earlier and continuing experience with Soviet dominance and dependence. It is quite unlikely that these new

interdependencies will duplicate that relationship. Nor for that matter has that relationship remained static in either form, function or affect (Marer, 1976b; Korbonski, 1980). Instead of using the automatic assumption of a mimicked past and overdetermined future, our assumption as to the future of such interdependencies will need a sounder empirical and theoretical base. (As examples, see Bahry and Clark, 1980; Terry, 1980.)

Of course some may argue that while the relations of the East European states with those of the west or the third world are examples of interdependence, their relationship with the Soviet Union is, as it ever was, one of profound dependence. That this is true of course can hardly be argued and has been empirically demonstrated (Marer, 1974, 1976b; Zimmerman, 1980). However as both Marer (1976b) and Korbonski (1980) demonstrate, this relationship is multi-faceted and includes significant losses to the dominating side (the USSR) as well as gains. But we could still include it under the rubric of interdependence, conceiving of dependence as simply an assymetrical form of inter (or mutual) dependence (Caporaso, 1974, p. 91; cf. Keohane and Nye, 1977, pp. 8-11). Alternatively, following most dependencia theorists, we could view it as a fundamentally different phenomenon, characterized by a fixed structural relationship between states, and producing, in the dependent ones, internal economic political and social "distortions" (Duvall, 1978). As Bahry and Clark (1980), following Richardson (1978); point out, the presence of some proven costs to the dominant state in this case would not remove it from consideration as a case of dependent relations (cf. Hirschman, 1978, pp. 45-50). As these authors (along with Zimmerman, 1980) see it, there exists no a priori reason why these states' relations with the Soviet Union could not be cast in the framework of (ahem) dependentsia. Doing so not only suggests new dimensions and dynamics for study in the empirical field, but

also offers improvements in the notion itself as an analytic concept (see also Jowitt, 1978). Moreover, what empirical work has been done on such relationships suggests the need for further refinement and qualification of the concept and further investigations of other regions and even subregions (Kaufman, Chernotsky and Geller, 1975; McGowan and Smith, 1978). Combining the ideas of dependence and interdependence would suggest a picture of states' relations which are dependent vis a vis some state(s) and interdependent vis a vis others. What theoretical and empirical possibilities are suggested either by this or by keeping the two notions separate remain to be explored.

Even were the relationship to and increasing importance of change and interdependence not a key question, even were we to posit a world of unyielding isolation and sameness in which to observe our "subjects," we would still want to know why they did what they did. There would still remain a host of unexplored pathways toward a more complete understanding of the causes and courses of these states' foreign policies. There remains open a broad area for investigation into what Rosenau called "linkages" between domestic and international politics (1969, 1973; for one such study using East Europe, see Clark, 1980).

This is true for both the international -- national direction (Korbonski, 1976a; Terry, 1977) and especially the national -- international direction. Could not attention be profitably directed, for example, toward discovering the significance and impact on foreign relations of intragovernmental bargaining and interest groups, societal subgroups, economic factors such as level of development, decision-making, individual personality factors and perceptions? Who supports what kind of foreign policies in Poland and why? What influence do "attentive publics" have on Romania's external relations? Does it matter what the "cognitive map" of a Party leader is (say, Ulbricht compared to Honeker)?

In our mental matrix of East European studies, the cell is smallest which would include foreign policy investigations which are conceptually guided or based. If work on this region is ever to move beyond--and at the same time make proper use of--the body of descriptive, narrative, and somewhat incomplete, literature which exists at present, it would seem imperative that we both bring to the field and from it some gains relevant to the broader study of international relations and foreign policy.

OTHER PATHS LESS TRAVELED

Two other impressions emerge from this review which, however, do not apply equally to studies of domestic and foreign policies. First, there has been too little recognition of the possible advantages of comparing communist states with noncommunist ones; and second, too little exploitation of East European academic work.

Comparing the domestic political system of communist states with that of noncommunist states actually has a stronger conceptual base than the empirical results would suggest. That is, attempts to develop effective models for understanding the dynamics of communist states have taken their inspiration from studies of noncommunist states. The comparative communist approach, as is well-known, took at a minimum the Weltanschauung of comparative politics and at a maximum specific models for application to communist systems, e.g. political development (Triska and Cocks, 1977), political culture (Starrels and Mallinckrodt, 1975). The political culture approach, elite studies, the interest group approach, studies based on organization theory, to name only a few, all sought to apply a general model, with greater or fewer modifications, to the particularities of communist states. In addition, the search for a proper replacement for the leaky totalitarian model often brought experts on

quite different countries or regions together to try to develop or apply rubrics which could serve them all (Huntington and Moore, 1970; Schapiro, 1972b). The application of these models and schemes to the Soviet Union and East Europe (or other communist states) forms a continuous theme throughout the literature and has undoubtedly contributed not only to improving the comparative and longitudinal analyses of communist states, but also to the growth and breadth of comparative politics.

What it has not done, however, is stimulated much empirical comparative work across systems, i.e. between non-communist and communist states, especially those of East Europe.[32] Judging from the smattering of work of this type that does exist, there seems to be two proto-approaches, one deductive and the other inductive. The first, posits the communist-noncommunist distinction as a given and then explores the differences between such states along certain dimensions. This is the approach utilized, for example, by Connor (1979) and Meyer et al (1979) in studying social mobility; by Lindbergh (1977) for energy policy, Edelstein (1974) on metropolitan decision-making and, less convincingly, Burling, (1974) on leadership succession. As is evident from this list (which excludes works employing the Soviet Union and/or China as the sole representatives of communist systems, e.g. Brzezinski and Huntington, 1964; Martin, 1977) cross-system studies involving East Europe are in short supply. Moreover, as noted above, searching for the reasons for cross systems differences does not represent the major investigative focus of such studies, leaving such conclusions, evidently, to the reader.

The other approach, typified by the study of John Echols (1975), is to posit the communist-noncommunist difference not as a given "but rather as an empirical question in need of evidence." (p. 259). Echols, for example, assessed the level of regional equality within eight communist and noncommunist countries, including the Soviet Union and Poland, and concluded that other

characteristics of states, in this case the unitary-vs-federal nature of government structure or the goals-vs-capacities equation, may be a more significant determinant of differences in regional equality than the presence or absence of a ruling communisty party.[33] Echols' approach points back to the search for broader based comparative models useful for the study of communist states, but at least it moves us toward a resolution of the "comparative vs. communist" dilemma based on evidence as much as on theory.[34] Of course approaching the question inductively does not relieve the investigator of the responsibility for addressing the question of the impact of an effect on the political system of differences, when they are found, or the reasons for the insignificance of system type when few such differences are found.[35]

Unlike studies of domestic differences, communist-noncommunist empirical work in foreign policy studies has gone further than model development. Comparative cross-system studies have been made of alliance cohesion (Hopmann and Hughes, (1975), power and alliance relations (Taylor and Salmon, 1974; Clemens, 1976; Kaufman, 1976; Gochman and Ray, 1979), and levels and dimension of dependency (Zimmerman, 1980). In most of these, causal relations are more suggested than developed. Still if the suggestions are as bold as that of Zimmerman (1980) then both our understanding of the politics of the region and our conceptual models for broader study are improved by this cross system comparison.

He concludes that

> [a]n examination of Soviet-East European relations and a comparison of Soviet-East European relations with United States-Latin American relations, against a backdrop of the four concepts central to dependency theory, do not lend credence to dependency theorists' focus on the causal role of capitalism. To the extent that conditions which dependency theorists have ascribed to relationships between developed and less-developed capitalist states are actually observed, this preliminary inquiry suggests that they are to be found as often, or to an even greater degree, in the Soviet-East European regional system as in asymmetrically figured systems of capitalist states. (p. 180)

A second source of insight and data so far utilized only lightly has been the work of East Europeans themselves. This is not surprising considering the constraints under which the social sciences generally operate in these countries. Still, some research more in accordance with western canons of scholarship has developed in some East European states, e.g. sociology in Poland, economics in Hungary, international relations in Yugoslavia, and the product of this research can be used profitably if carefully by western scholars. (See e.g. Volgyes, 1978). In addition, much of this work brings a different and needed perspective to the study of these states, not to mention familiarity with context, which can greatly improve the content validity of our data (though of course it may also do the opposite). Examples of the kind of indigenous work which could be exploited are: that of the Budapest school on economics (Hegedus, 1976, 1977; Hegedus et al, 1976); Ferge (1979) on social policy; Konrad and Szelenyi (1979) on elites; Lekovic and Bjelica (1976) on socialization; and Mates (1972) on nonalignment; to mention a few in English. East European sources might also be exploited (carefully) for material with which to fill the first gap mentioned in this section, cross system comparisons (see e.g. Allardt and Wesolowski, 1978). Finally, judging the worth of this work has in some cases been made easier by studies of certain academic disciplines themselves in East Europe (Bebler, 1976; Dorpalen, 1976; Markus and Hegedus, 1976; Cohen, 1978; Denitch, 1978; Pastusiak, 1978; Patterson, 1980).

IN LIEU OF A CONCLUSION

It is likely that even as this review surfaces, many of the gaps noted, as well as others which have been missed (the gap in gaps), are being filled. This is due in part to the changing nature of work which is emerging and to the limitations of the present review itself. We have, for example, not

touched upon three vehicles of research presentation which probably escape too many of us: 1) foreign language material, especially German; greatly underutilized by the field as a whole;[36] 2) dissertations; and 3) the sprawling body of conference papers, perhaps the most fugitive of all scientific literature.[37] Though many of the above do surface ultimately as articles or chapters in edited volumes, we can be certain (especially those of us with rejection letters) that a good deal of exciting work at the very forefront of our field is seen by too few of us. This is especially true in East European studies where for example, scholarly papers can be presented appropriately in at least half a dozen national and regional conferences across several different disciplines. This is of course a sign of life, an indication of the size of the field which studies of East Europe must cover. The mere fact that the above map is so full--even if in places it is only with signposts--is reason to be encouraged by the state of interest in the "other Europe." It is also an indication of challenge, of the complexities of the task, and of the need to continue to draw to these tasks the best in scholarly tools, personnel and resources.

1. According to the files of United States Political Science Documents, from 1975 to 1978 articles on contemporary East Europe were published in the following distribution:

Ten or more: Studies in Comparative Communism (17)
East European Quarterly (14)
Problems of Communism (11)

Five or more: Current History (8)*

Four: Armed Forces and Society
East Central Europe
International Studies Quarterly
Journal of Social and Political Studies
Orbis
Social Forces**
World Politics

Three: Foreign Affairs
Foreign Policy
International Security
Polish Review
Political Science Quarterly
Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science**
Slavic Review

Two: American Journal of International Law
American Journal of Sociology
Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science
Law and Society Review
Publius
Western Political Quarterly
Wilson Quarterly

One: Administration and Society
Asian Survey
Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists
Comparative Studies in Society and History
Comparative Urban Research
Journal of Political Economy
Journal of Politics
Journal of Social Issues
Politics and Society
Polity
Slavonic and East European Review
Social Science Quarterly
Studies in Comparative International Development
Urban Affairs Quarterly

*Seven articles in one special issue
**All articles in one special issue

2. The National Council for Soviet and East European Research (Washington, D.C.) has awarded contracts for more than two million dollars since 1978, of which just under $478,000, or 22.9%, was for projects dealing with East Europe or with the Soviet Union and East Europe together. The Ford Foundation (New York) has held three rounds of competition for its new program combining international security/arms control studies with Soviet/East European area studies.

3. These would include, for example, the International Affairs Fellowships of the Council on Foreign Relations (New York); the Rockefeller Foundation (New York), and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (Washington), as well as the more familiar sources for support, The American Council of Learned Socities (New York) and the Fulbright-Hays Programs of the U.S. Government (Washington).

4. These include the International Research and Exchanges Board, the National Academy of Sciences, the Council for International Exchange of Scholars, the Institute of International Education and the Fulbright-Hays Program.

5. In addition to the volumes of Fleron (1969b) and Kanet (1971), see Johnson (1970), Mesa-Lago and Beck (1975), Janos (1976b), Studies in Comparative Communism (1971, 1975b), and the Newsletter on Comparative Studies of Communism (1968-1973).

6. The seminal volumes of this genre contained the following number of articles on East Europe: Fleron (1969), one; Johnson (1970), three; Kanet (1971), two; Beck et al (1973), two.

7. The reviewer thus apologizes in advance to those scholars whose work he slights by omission.

8. Studies of the 1968 period set in a larger framework and aimed at explicating some of the aspects of change in communist systems are Gitelman (1972),

Bertsch (1974), Ulc (1974), Croan (1976), Paul (1976). For a bibliography of studies of this period see Hejzlar and Kusin (1975).

9. On this point see also Brown (1978). For a study focusing profitably on institutions, among other things, see Gitelman (1977). Examples of studies which could reasonably be categorized under the rubric "public policy" are Volgyes (1974b), Kaser (1976), Bunce and Echols (1978), Seroka (1978).

10. For a discussion see Janos (1970), McGrath and McInnes (1976), Odom (1976), Studies in Comparative Communism (1979).

11. For a nontheoretical but classic study of such a link see Skilling (1964).

12. Political biographies exist for Alexander Dubcek and Janos Kadar, both by journalist William Shawcross (1971 and 1974 respectively).

13. There are histories of the Bulgarian and Yugoslav parties, covering through the end of World War II; see Oren (1971) and Avakumovic (1964), respectively. In addition the Hoover Institution series had just added histories of the Romanian (King, 1980) and Czechoslovak (Suda, 1980) parties to this list.

14. In addition a spate of demographic research has added grist for political studies with information about population patterns and movements in the region; see Fuchs and Demko (1977), Kosinski (1977), and Kostanik (1977).

15. Contrast this with the various theoretical attempts to deal with this question with regard to the Soviet Union, described in Lane (1978). An exception would be Jancar (1978) and those studies which have focused on dissent as a social phenomenon, for example Jancar (1974), Bauman (1976a), and Shapiro (1978).

16. See Gati (1974), part II. The transnational spread of ideas is discussed in Gati (1974), part III, and also in some of the literature on Eurocommunism's possible effects on East Europe; see e.g. Tokes (1978a), Valenta (1978).

17. Nelson agrees and casts his conclusions in a very tentative light, due largely to problems of data and measurement validity; see pp. 384, 386.

18. There are also useful studies of some of the various agents of socialization, e.g. education (Thomas, 1969; Fiszman, 1973; Connor, 1976; Szaz, 1977); the media (Paulu, 1974; Harasymiw, 1976; Robinson, 1977; Sussman, 1979); and religion (Bociurkiw and Strong, 1975; Heneghan, 1977; Kovats, 1977).

19. Examples of comparative work which did appear during this period are Hopmann (1967) and Triska (1969).

20. For an excellent discussion of existing studies of Romanian foreign policy see Laux (1979); on the GDR, see Marsh (1979) and Starrels (1980).

21. Of those listed above on the GDR and Romania, for example, only Moreton (1978) would qualify among recent works. Despite its title, Braun (1978) is not a comprehensive work on Romanian foreign policy but an analysis of the limitations and defenses operating in the Romanian-Soviet dyad.

22. The example Gitelman (1976) used to illustrate the usefulness of comparative work was also ostpolitik. For further discussion of the usefullness of comparative study of the foreign policies of communist states, see Studies in Comparative Communism (1975a), and Adomeit and Boardman (1979a). For a critique of a specific study--that of Hughes and Volgy (1970)--see Hempel (1973) and also Hughes and Volgy's reply (1973).

23. There does exist one study of the impact of East European ethnic groups on U.S. foreign policy (Garrett, 1978) which the author concludes is limited; and two on particular aspects of U.S. policy; Hewett (1978) on MFN, and Birnbaum (1977) on human rights.

24. Studies of the effects of detente on East Europe which touch on relations with the United States are Gripp (1976), Klein (1976) and Fascell (1979). Attempts to measure the presence or absence of detente, in terms of levels of interbloc tension and conflict are included in Hopmann (1967), Goldmann (1973) and Kegley (1974).

25. Indeed, McGowan and Kean (1973) found that size and modernization were powerful, if indirect, factors explaining the variance in foreign policy participation across 114 states. But, as the authors themselves recognize, their results were much weaker for small states (57 of the 114) and less modern states (also 57). For similar conclusions about the necessity of disaggregating global results according to nation genotype, see East and Hermann (1974); Harf, Hoovler, and James (1974); and Moore, (1974).

26. For a critical view of these studies, see Mack, (1975). Of the globally aggregated studies, Mack states, ". . . there is absolutely no reason to assume that the relationships that have been investigated should apply to the total sample of nations, and very good reasons why they should not" (p. 610).

27. For a preliminary discussion, see Denitch, (1976).

28. See also the discussion in Kanet (1974b and Abonyi (1978b); for an alternative approach to regional integration see Linden, (1979). The above point does not, of course, gainsay the value of such studies for learning about the institution itself. Recent works on Comecon include Hewett (1974), Wilczynski (1974), Holzman (1976); Korbonski (1976c), Marer (1976a), NATO (1977), Beloff (1978).

The institutional focus has not provoked much work on the East European states' activites in other, i.e. noncommunist, international organizations, however; see e.g. Weiner (1973, 1980) and Baumer and Jacobsen (1978).

29. A useful exception would be Hopkins and Puchala's (1978) discussion of an international food regime. One study of an environmental regime which includes part of East Europe is Boczek (1978).

30. For elaboration on the notion of security in East Europe see Linden (1980b).

31. Conceptual frameworks for studying such questions are suggested bu Rosenau (1970) and Hanrieder (1971). Of particular interest for the study of East Europe is the modification of Rosenau's work for the situation of small states offered by McGowan and Gottwald (1975).

32. There have been studies of East Europe included in edited works, with the comparison implicit between this region and others; see, e.g. Holloway (1975), Pravda (1978), Tarkowski (1978). An important exception to this trend would be works on East Germany, many of which have been explicitly cast in a comparative structure with West Germany; see, e.g. Schnitzer (1972), Merkl (1974), Schweigler (1975), Bleek (1976); cf. the discussion in Starrels and Mallinckrodt (1975). A study comparing Poland to Finland published in Warsaw is Allardt and Wesolowski (1978).

33. Holloway (1975) also discusses system capacity, and its relationship to economic reform in East Europe. As noted (fn. 32) Holloway's study, though it focuses on East Europe alone, is included in an edited volume dealing with failures of state capacities in Europe, thus the comparison remains implicit.

34. Mezey's (1979) cross-system study of legislatures is also representative of the inductive approach, as he allows the differences in legislative form and behavior--rather than its nominal political system--to determine its place in his categorization scheme. For his characterization of the Polish sejm as a "minimal" legislature, see pp. 132-41, passim. For an earlier study comparing the East European experience with that of Mexico see Croan (1970).

35. See also Echols (1975) comment to this effect, p. 260. The strongest statement to the effect that such differences are unlikely to be significant analytically is found in Kautsky (1973).

36. Two reviews of foreign policy studies which do mention many works in German are Kanet (1980) and Starrels (1980).

37. The U.S. State Department's publication "Foreign Affairs Research Available", Office of External Research, Bureau of Intelligence and Research is an useful comprehensive guide to such papers.

REFERENCES

Abonyi, Arpad. 1978a. "Internationally Diffused Innovation and Conditions of Change in Eastern Europe," in Andrew Gyorgy and James A. Kuhlman (eds.), Innovation in Communist Systems. Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 163-78.

_____. 1978b. "General Approaches to International Integration: the study of Socialist Interstate Relations in the CMEA," in Simon McInnes, William McGrath and Peter Potichnyj (eds.), The Soviet Union and East Europe Into the 1980s. Oakville, Ont.: Mosaic Press, pp. 245-76.

_____ and Ivan J. Sylvain. 1979. "The Impact of CMEA Integration on Social Change in Eastern Europe: The Case of Hungary's 'New Economic Mechanism'," in Teresa Rakowska-Harmstone (ed.), Perspectives for Change in Communist Societies. Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 81-118.

Abravanel, Martin and Barry Hughes. 1973. "The Relationship Between Public Opinion and Governmental Foreign Policy: A Cross-National Study," in Patrick J. McGowan (ed.), SAGE International Yearbook of Foreign Policy Studies, Vol. 1. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE, pp. 107-34.

Achberger, Karen R. 1979. "GDR Women's Fiction of the 1970s: The Emergence of Feminism within Socialism," East Central Europe, 6, pt. 2, pp. 217-31.

Adomeit, Hannes and Robert Boardman. 1979a. "The comparative study of communist foreign policy," in Hannes Adomeit and Robert Boardman (eds.), Foreign Policy Making in Communist Countries. New York: Praeger, pp. 1-15.

_____, 1979b. Foreign Policy Making in Communist Countries. New York: Praeger.

Alexiev, Alexander. 1977. Party-Military Relations in Romania. Santa Monica, CA: Rand (#P-6059).

Allardt, Erik and Wlodzimierz Wesolowski (eds.), 1978. Social Structure and Change: Finland and Poland Comparative Perspective. Warsaw: Polish Scientific Publishers.

Allison, Graham T. 1971. Essence of Decision. Boston: Little, Brown.

Aspaturian, Vernon V. 1974a. "Marxism and the Meaning of Modernization," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The Politics of Modernization in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 3-21.

_____, 1974b. "The Soviet Impact on Development and Modernization in Eastern Europe," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The Politics of Modernization in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 205-55.

_____, 1976. "Has Eastern Europe Become a Liability to the Soviet Union? The Political-Ideological Aspects," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The International Politics of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 17-36.

Association of Polish Students and Graduates in Exile. 1977. Dissent in Poland: Reports and Documents in Translation. London: Veritas Foundation Press.

Avakumovic, Ivan. 1964. History of the Communist party of Yugoslavia. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

Bacon, Walter M., Jr. 1978. "The Military and the Party in Romania," in Dale R. Herspring and Ivan Volgyes (eds.), Civil-Military Relations in Communist Systems. Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 165-80.

Bahro, Rudolf. 1978. The Alternative in Eastern Europe. London: New Left Books.

Bahry, Donna and Cal Clark. 1976. "A Dependence Theory of Soviet-East European Relations: Theory and Empirical Testing." Paper for Conference on Integration in Eastern Europe and East-West Trade. Bloomington, Indiana, October 28-31.

_____. 1980. "Political Conformity and Economic Dependence in East Europe: The Impact of Trade With the West," in Ronald H. Linden (ed.), The Foreign Policies of East Europe: New Approaches. New York: Praeger, pp. 135-58.

Barton, Allen, Bogdan Denitch and Charles Kadushin (eds.), 1973. Opinion-Making Elites in Yugoslavia. New York: Praeger.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1976a."Social Dissent in the East European Political System," in Bernard L. Faber (ed.), The Social Structure of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 115-42.

_____, 1976b. "The Party in the System-Management Phase: Change and Continuity," in Andrew C. Janos (ed.), Authoritarian Politics in Communist Europe. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California, pp. 81-108.

Baumer, Max and Hanns-Dieter Jacobsen. 1978. "International organizations and East-West economic relations," in Avi Shlaim and G. N Yannopoulos (eds.), The EEC and Eastern Europe. London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 227-45.

Baylis, Thomas A. 1971. "Economic Reform as Ideology: East Germany's New Economic System," Comparative Politics, 3, No. 2, January, pp. 211-229.

_____. 1974. The Technical Intelligentsia and the East German Elite. Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____. 1978. "Participation and Ideology," in Lyman H. Legters (ed.), The German Democratic Republic. Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 85-102.

Bebler, Anton, 1976. "The Development of Sociology of Militaria in Yugoslavia," Armed Forces and Society, 3, No. 1, Fall, pp. 59-68.

Beck, Carl. 1970. "Career Characteristics of East European Leadership," in R. Barry Farrell (ed.), Political Leadership in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, Chicago: Aldine, pp. 157-94.

_____. 1973. "Leadership Attributes in Eastern Europe: The Effect of Country and Time," in Carl Beck et al., Comparative Communist Political Leadership. New York: David McKay, pp. 86-153.

_____. Gerard A. Johnson and J. Thomas McKechnie. 1971. "Party Careers: A Case Study of Bulgarian Central Committee Members, 1962," in Roger E. Kanet (ed.), The Behavioral Revolution and Communist Studies. New York: The Free Press, pp. 187-203.

_____ et al. 1973. Comparative Communist Political Leadership. New York: David McKay.

_____. William A. Jarzabek and Paul H. Ernandez. 1976. Political Succession in Eastern Europe: Fourteen Case Studies. Pittsburgh, PA: University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh.

Beloff, Nora. 1978. "COMECON Blues," Foreign Policy, 31, Summer, pp. 159-79.

Bender, Peter. 1972. East Europe in Search of Security. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bertram, Christoph (ed.). 1979. New Conventional Weapons and East-West Security. New York: Praeger.

Bertsch, Gary K. 1974. Value Change and Political Community: The Multinational Czechoslovak Soviet, and Yugoslav Cases. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE (#01-050).

_____. 1976. Values and Community in Multi-National Yugoslavia. Boulder, CO: East European Quarterly & Columbia University Press.

_____. 1977. "Ethnicity and Politics in Socialist Yugoslavia," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 433, September, pp. 88-99.

_____. 1978. "Yugoslav Self-Management and Its Influence on Other Socialist States," in Andrew Gyorgy and James A. Kuhlman (eds.), Innovation in Communist Systems. Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 75-98.

_____. 1979. "Participation, Change and Stability: Yugoslavia in Comparative Perspective," in Teresa Rakowska-Harmstone (ed.), Perspectives for Change in Communist Societies. Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 119-46.

_____. and M. George Zaninovich. 1974. "A Factor-Analytic Method of Identifying Different Political Cultures: The Multinational Yugoslav Case," Comparative Politics, 6, No. 2, January, pp. 219-44.

Bielasiak, Jack. 1978. "Lateral and Vertical Elite Differentiation in European Communist States," Studies in Comparative Communism, 11, No. 1/2, Spring/Summer, pp. 121-41.

Birnbuam, Karl. 1973. East and West Germany: A Modus Vivendi. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

_____. 1977. "Human Rights and East-West Relations," Foreign Affairs, 55, No. 4, July, pp. 783-99.

Black, Cyril. 1974. "Eastern Europe in the Context of Comparative Modernization," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The Politics of Modernization in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 22-39.

Blazynski, George. 1979. Flashpoint Poland. New York: Pergamon Press.

Bleek, Wilhelm. 1976. "From Cold War to Ostpolitik: Two Germanies in Search of Separate Identities," World Politics, 29, No. 1 October, pp. 114-30.

Boczek, Bolesaw A. 1978. "International Protection of the Baltic Sea Environment Against Pollution," American Journal of International Law, 72, No. 4, October, pp. 782-814.

Bowers, Stephen R. 1976. "Contrast and Continuity: Honceker's Policy Toward the Federal Republic and West Berlin," World Affairs, 138, No. 4, Spring, pp. 309-35.

_____. 1979. "East German National Consciousness: Domestic and Foreign Policy Considerations," East European Quarterly, 13, No. 3, Summer, pp. 145-83.

Bociurkiw, Bohdan and John W. Strong. 1975. Religion and Atheism in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Brada, Josef C. and V. S. Somanath. 1978. East-West Trade: Theory and Evidence. Bloomington: International Development Institute, Indiana University.

Braun, Aurel. 1978. Romanian Foreign Policy Since 1965. New York: Praeger.

Bromke, Adam. 1972. "Polycentrism in Eastern Europe," in Adam Bromke and Teresa Rakowska-Harmstone (eds.), The Communist States in Disarray 1965-1971. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 3-20.

_____. 1978. "The Opposition in Poland," Problems of Communism, 27, No. 5, September/October, pp. 37-51.

Brown, Alan A., Zbigniew Fallenbuchl, Joseph A. Kitacari and Egon Neuberger. 1978. "The Impact of International Stagflation on Systemic and Policy Changes in East Europe: Theoretical Reflections," in Simon McInnes, William McGrath and Peter Potichnyj (eds.), The Soviet Union and East Europe into the 1980s. Oakville, Ont.: Mosaic Press, pp. 309-23.

Brown, Archie. 1978. "Policymaking in Communist States," Studies in Comparative Communism, 11, No. 4, Winter, pp. 424-36.

_____. 1979. "Introduction," in Archie Brown and Jack Gray (eds.), Political Culture and Political Change in Communist States. New York: Holmes & Meier, pp. 1-24.

_____ and Jack Gray (eds.). 1979. Political Culture and Political Change in Communist States. New York: Holmes & Meier.

_____ and Gordon Wightman. 1979. "Czechoslovakia: Revival and Retreat," in Archie Brown and Jack Gray (eds.), Political Culture and Political Change in Communist States. New York: Holmes & Meier, pp. 159-96.

Brown, J. F. 1963. "Romania Steps Out of Line," Survey, 49, October, pp. 19-34.

_____. 1975. Relations Between the Soviet Union and Its Eastern European Allies: A Survey. Santa Monica, CA: Rand (#R-1742-PR).

_____. 1976. "The Interaction Between Party and Society in Hungary and Bulgaria," in Andrew C. Janos (ed.), Authoritarian Politics in Communist Europe. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California, pp. 109-26.

Bryson, Phillip J. 1976. "The Red Miracle in the International Arena: Economic Foundations of East German Foreign Policy," East Central Europe, 3, No. 1, pp. 84-96.

Brzezinski, Zbigniew and Samuel P. Huntington. 1964. Political Power: USA/USSR. New York: Viking.

Bunce, Valerie. 1976. "Elite Succession, Petrification, and Policy Innovation in Communist Systems," Comparative Political Studies, 9, No. 1, April, pp. 3-42.

_____ and John M. Echols III. 1978. "Power and Policy in Communist Systems: The Problems of 'Incrementalism'," Journal of Politics, 40, No. 4, November, pp. 911-32.

Burghardt, Andrew F. 1975. Development Regions in the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and Canada. New York: Praeger.

Burks, R. V. 1970. "Technology and Political Change in Eastern Europe," in Chalmers Johnson (ed.), Change in Communist Systems. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 265-311.

Burling, Robbins. 1974. The Passage of Power: Studies in Political Succession. New York: Academic Press.

Byrnes, Robert F. 1975. "United States Policy Towards Eastern Europe: Before and After Helsinki", Review of Politics, 37, No. 4, October, pp. 435-63.

Caldwell, Lawrence T. 1975. "The Warsaw Pact: Directions of Change," Problems of Communism, 24, September/October, pp. 1-19.

_____. 1976. "CSCE, MFR, and Eastern," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The International Politics of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 173-91.

Caporaso, James. 1974. "Methodological Issues in the Measurement of Inequality, Dependence, and Exploitation," in James Kurth and Steven Rosen (eds.), Testing Theories of Economic Imperialism. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, pp. 87-114.

Clark, Cal. 1975. "The Study of East European Integration: A Political Perspective," East Central Europe, 2, 2, pp. 133-51.

_____. 1980. "Balkan Communist Foreign Policies: A Linkage Perspective," in Ronald H. Linden (ed.), The Foreign Policies of East Europe: New Approaches. New York: Praeger, pp. 17-45.

_____ and Robert L. Farlow. 1976. Comparative Patterns of Foreign Policy and Trade. Bloomington: International Development Research Center, Indiana University.

_____ and Karl F. Johnson. 1976. Development's Influence on Yugoslav Political Values. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE (#01-058).

_____ and Donna Bahry. 1979. "Dependency in the Soviet Bloc: A Reversal of the Economic-Political Nexus." Paper for the International Studies Association Meeting, Toronto, March 20-24.

Clayton, Elizabeth. n.d. "Economic Intervention as a Solution to Soviet Political Problems in the Balkans," in Phillip A. Petersen (ed.), Soviet Policy in the Post-Tito Balkans. United States Air Force. Studies in Communist Affairs (Vol. 4), pp. 119-32.

Clemens, Walter C., Jr. 1976. "The European Alliance Systems: Exploitation or Mutual Aid?" in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The International Politics of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 217-38.

_____. 1978. The U.S.S.R. and Global Interdependence. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute.

Cocks, Paul. 1970. "The Rationalization of Party Control," in Chalmers Johnson (ed.), Change in Communist Systems. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 153-90.

_____. 1975. "Bureaucracy and Party Control," in Carmelo Mesa-Lago and Carl Beck (eds.), Comparative Socialist Systems: Essays on Politics and Economics. Pittsburgh, PA: University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh, pp. 215-48.

_____. 1977. "Retooling the Directed Society: Administrative Modernization and Developed Socialism,: in Jan F. Triska and Paul Cocks (eds.), Political Development in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 53-92.

Coffey, Joseph I. 1977. Arms Control and European Security. New York: Praeger.

Cohen, Lennard J. 1974. "Yugoslavia: The Political Role of the Administrative Elite," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The Politics of Modernization in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 160-99.

_____. 1977. "Political Participation, Competition, and Dissent in Yugoslavia: A Report on Research on Electoral Behavior," in Jan F. Triska and Paul Cocks (eds.), Political Development in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 178-216.

_____. 1978. "Political Science in Socialist Yugoslavia: The Regime-Management and the Self-Management of a Discipline," in Simon McInnes, William McGrath and Peter Potichnyj (eds.), The Soviet Union and East Europe Into the 1980s. Oakville, Ont.: Mosaic Press, pp. 59-98.

_____. 1979. "Partisans, Professionals and Proletarians: Elite Change in Yugoslavia, 1952-78", Canadian Slavonic Papers, 21, No. 4, December, pp. 446-78.

Cohen, Stephen F. 1973. Bukharin and the Bolshevik Revolution. New York: A. A. Knopf.

Connor, Walter D. 1975. "Education and National Development in the European Socialist States: A Model for the Third World?" Comparative Studies in Society and History, 17, No. 3, July, pp. 326-48.

_____. 1979. Socialism, Politics, and Equality, Hierarchy and Change in Eastern Europe and the USSR. New York: Columbia University Press.

_____. 1980. "Dissent in Eastern Europe: A New Coalition?" Problems of Communism, 29, January/February, pp. 1-17.

_____ and Zvi Y. Gitelman. 1977. Public Opinion in European Socialist Systems. New York: Praeger.

Croan, Melvin. 1970. "Is Mexico the Future of East Europe: Institutional Adaptability and Political Change in Comparative Perspective," in Samuel P. Huntington and Clement H. Moore (eds.), Authoritarian Politics in Modern Society. New York: Basic Books, pp. 451-83.

_____. 1976. "The Leading Role of the Party: Concepts and Contexts," in Andrew C. Janos (ed.), Authoritarian Politics in Communist Europe. Berkeley, CA: Institute of International Studies, University of California, pp. 151-75.

_____. 1979. "Regime, Society, and Nation: The GDR after Thirty Years," East Central Europe, 6, 2, pp. 137-51.

Dallin, Alexander and George W. Breslauer. 1970. Political Terror in Communist Systems. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Davy, Richard. 1972. "The ESC and the Politics of Eastern Europe," World Today, 28, No. 7, July, pp. 289-95.

Dean, Robert W. 1974. West German Trade with the East: The Political Dimension. New York: Praeger.

_____. 1976. "Civil-Military Relations in Yugoslavia, 1971-1975", Armed Forces and Society, 3, No. 1, Fall, pp. 17-58.

Denich, Bette S. 1976. "Sources of Leadership in the Yugoslav Revolution: A Local-level Study", Comparative Studies in Society and History, 18, No. 1, January, pp. 64-84.

Denitch, Bogdan. 1976. "The Domestic Roots of Foreign Policy in Eastern Europe", in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The International Politics of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 239-52.

_____. 1978. "The Use of Specialists in Policymaking in Yugoslavia." Studies in Comparative International Development, 13, No. 2, Summer, pp. 77-87.
Devlin, Kevin. 1975. "The Interparty Drama," Problems of Communism, 29, No. 4, July/August, pp. 18-34.
Dorpalen, Andreas. 1976. "The Role of History in the DDR," East Central Europe, 3, No. 1, pp. 58-68.
_____. 1977. "Marxism and National Unity: The Case of Germany," Review of Politics, 39, No. 4, October, pp. 505-20.
Dunn, Dennis J. 1979. Detente and Papal-Communist Relations, 1962-1978. Boulder, CO: Westview.
Dunn, Keith A. n.d. "The History and Context of Soviet Difficulties with Socialist Romania, Yugoslavia, and Albania," in Phillip A. Petersen (ed.), Soviet Policy in the Post-Tito Balkans. United States Air Force, Studies in Communist Affairs (Vol. 4), pp. 1-28.
Dunn, William N. 1975. "Revolution and Modernization in Economic Organizations," in Carmelo Mesa-Lago and Carl Beck (eds.), Comparative Socialist Systems: Essays on Politics and Economics. Pittsburgh, PA: University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh, pp. 147-91.
Duvall, Raymond D. 1978. "Dependence and dependencia theory: notes toward precision of concept and argument," International Organization, 32, No. 1, Winter, pp. 51-78.
Dyker, David A. 1979. "Yugoslavia: Unity Out of Diversity?" in Archie Brown and Jack Gray (eds), Political Culture and Political Change in Communist States. New York: Holmes & Meier, pp. 66-100.
Dziewanowski, M. K. 1969. "The Pattern of Romanian Independence," East Europe, 18, No. 6, June, pp. 8-12.
_____. 1976. The Communist Party of Poland. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
_____. 1977. Poland in the Twentieth Century. New York: Columbia University Press.

East, Maurice A. and Charles F. Hermann. 1974. "Do Nation-Types Account for Foreign Policy Behavior?" in James N. Rosenau (ed.), Comparing Foreign Policies, Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE, pp. 269-304.
Echols, John M. III. 1975. "Politics, Budgets, and Regional Equality in Communist and Capitalist Systems," Comparative Political Studies, 8, No. 3, October, pp. 259-92.
Edelstein, Alex S. 1974. The Uses of Communication in Decision-Making: A Comparative Study of Yugoslavia and the United States. New York: Praeger.
Enyedi, Gyorgy. 1976. Hungary: An Economic Geography. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Faber, Bernard L. (ed.). 1976. The Social Structure of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger.
Fallenbuchl, Zbigniew M., Egon Neuberger and Laura D'Andrea Tyson. 1977. "East European Reactions to International Commodity Inflation," in U.S. Congress, East European Economies Post-Helsinki. Joint Economic Committee, 95th Congress, 1st sess., pp. 54-101.
Farkas, Richard. 1975. Yugoslav Economic Development and Political Change: The Relationship Between Economic Managers and Policy-Making Elites. New York: Praeger.
Farlow, Robert L. 1971. "Romanian Foreign Policy: A Case of Partial Alignment," Problems of Communism, 20, November/December, pp. 54-63.
_____. 1978. "Romania: The Politics of Autonomy," Current History, 74, No. 436, April, pp. 168-71, 185-86.

_____. n.d. "U.S. Interests and Policy Options in the Balkans," in Phillip A. Petersen (ed.), Soviet Policy in the Post-Tito Balkans. United States Air Force, Studies in Communist Affairs (Vol. 4), pp. 29-44.

Farrell, R. Barry. 1970a. "Top Political Leadership in Eastern Europe," in R. Barry Farrell (ed.), Political Leadership in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Chicago: Aldine, pp. 88-107.

_____. 1970b. Political Leadership in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Chicago: Aldine.

Fascell, Dante B. 1979. "The Helsinki Accord: A Case Study," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 442, March, pp. 69-76.

Fejto, Francois. 1971. A History of the People's Democracies. New York: Praeger.

Ferge, Zsuza. 1979. A Society in the Making: Hungarian Social and Societal Policy 1945-75. White Plains, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Fischer, Mary Ellen. 1977a. "Participatory Reforms and Political Development in Romania," in Jan F. Triska and Paul Cocks (eds.), Political Development in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 217-37.

_____. 1977b. "Nationand Nationality in Romania," in George W. Simmonds (ed.), Nationalism in the USSR & Eastern Europe in the Era of Brezhnev & Kosygin. Detroit, MI: University of Detroit Press, pp. 504-21.

_____. 1979. "The Romanian Communist Party and Its Central Committee: Patterns of Growth and Change," Southeastern Europe, 6, pt. 1, pp. 1-28.

Fischer-Galati, Stephen. 1979. The Communist Parties of Eastern Europe. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fisera, Vladimir. 1978. Workers' Councils in Czechoslovakia 1968-69. New York: St. Martin's.

Fiszman, Joseph R. 1973. Revolution and Tradition in People's Poland. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fleron, Frederic J., Jr. 1969a. "Soviet Area Studies and the Social Sciences: Some Methodological Problems in Communist Studies," in Frederic J. Fleron, Jr. (ed.), Communist Studies and the Social Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally, pp. 1-33.

_____. 1969b. Communist Studies and the Social Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Floyd, David. 1965. Romania: Russia's Dissident Ally. New York: Praeger.

Frey, Cynthia W. 1976. "Yugoslav Nationalism and the Doctrine of Limited Sovereignty," East European Quarterly, 10, No. 4, Winter, pp. 427-57.

Friedrich, Carl F. 1972. "In Defense of a Concept," in Leonard Schapiro (ed.), Political Opposition in One-Party States. London: Macmillan, pp. 249-55.

Friesen, Connie M. 1976. The Political Economy of East-West Trade. New York: Praeger.

Fuchs, Roland J. and George J. Demko. 1977. "Spatial Population Policies in the Socialist Countries of Eastern Europe," Social Science Quarterly, 58, No. 1, June, pp. 60-71.

Garland, John S. 1976. Financing Foreign Trade in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger.

Garrett, Stephen. 1978. "Eastern European Ethnic Groups and American Foreign Policy," Political Science Quarterly, 93, No. 2, Summer, pp. 301-23.

Gati, Charles F. (ed.), 1974. The Politics of Modernization in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger.

_____. 1975. "The Forgotten Region," Foreign Policy, 19, Summer, pp. 135-45.

_____. (ed.) 1976 The International Politics of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger.

_____. 1977. "The 'Europeanization' of Communism? Foreign Affairs, 55, No. 3, April, pp. 539-553.

Georgeoff, John. 1977. "Goals of Citizenship Training: A Bulgarian Perspective," Studies in Comparative Communism, 10, No. 3, Autumn, pp. 309-14.

Gilberg, Trond. 1974. "Romania: Problems of the Multilaterally Developed Society," in Charles F. Gati, (ed.), The Politics of Modernization in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 117-59.

_____. 1975a. "Political Leadership at the Regional Level in Romania: The Case of the Judet Party, 1968-1973," East European Quarterly, 9, No. 1, Spring, pp. 97-118.

_____. 1975b. Modernization in Romania Since World War II. New York: Praeger.

_____. 1976. "Ethnic Minorities in Romania Under Socialism," in Bernard L. Faber (ed.), The Social Structure of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, 195-224.

Gill, Graeme. 1975. "Romania: Background to Autonomy," Survey, 21, No. 2, Summer, pp. 94-113.

Gitelman, Zvi Y. 1970. "Power and Authority in Eastern Europe," in Chalmers Johnson (ed.), Change in Communist Systems. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 235-64.

_____. 1972. The Diffusion of Political Innovation: From Eastern Europe to the Soviet Union. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE (#01-927).

_____. 1974. "The Impact on the Soviet Union of the East European Experience in Modernization," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The Politics of Modernization in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 256-74.

_____. 1976. "Toward a Comparative Foreign Policy of Eastern Europe," in Peter J. Potichnyj and Jane P. Shapiro (eds.), From the Cold War to Detente. New York: Praeger, pp. 144-65.

_____. 1977. "Development, Institutionalization, and Elite-Mass Relations in Poland," in Jan F. Triska and Paul Cocks (eds.), Political Development in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 119-43.

_____. 1979. "Comment" Studies in Comparative Communism, 12, No. 1, Spring, pp. 35-38 (on Andrew C. Janos, "Interest Groups and the Structure of Power: Critique and Comparisons," Idem., pp. 6-20).

Glass, George A. 1980. "East Germany in Black Africa: a new special role?" The World Today, August, pp. 305-12.

Gochman, Charles S. and James Lee Ray. 1979. "Structural Disparities in Latin America and Eastern Europe, 1950-1970," Journal of Peace Research, 16, No. 3, pp. 231-54.

Goldfarb, Jeffrey C. 1978. "Social Bases of Independent Public Expression in Communist Societies," American Journal of Sociology, 83, No. 4, January, pp. 920-39.

Goldman, Marshall I. 1975. "The Oil Crisis in Perspective: The Soviet Union," Daedalus, 104, No. 4, Fall, pp. 129-43.

Goldmann, Kjell. 1973. "East-West Tension in Europe, 1946-1970: A Conceptual Analysis and a Quantitative Description," World Politics, 26, No. 1, October, pp. 106-25.

Gomori, George. 1976. "The Cultural Intelligentsia in Poland: The Writers," in Bernard L. Faber (ed.), The Social Structure of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 167-94.

Griffith, William E. 1963. Albania and the Sino-Soviet Rift. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

_____. 1978. The Ostpolitik of the Federal Republic of Germany. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Gripp, Richard C. 1976. "Hungary's Role in Detente," in Peter J. Potichnyj and Jane P. Shapiro (eds.), From the Cold War to Detente. New York: Praeger, pp. 199-213.

Gyorgy, Andrew. 1973. "Some Signposts in United States-Eastern European Relations: 1963-1973," GPSA Journal, 1, No. 1, Fall, pp. 2-16.
_____. 1976. "Ostpolitik and Eastern Europe," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The International Politics of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 154-72.
_____ and James A. Kuhlman (eds.), 1978. Innovation in Communist Systems. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Haas, Ernst B. 1980. "Why Collaborate? Issue-Linkage and International Regimes," World Politics, 32, No. 3, April, pp. 357-405.
Haberstroh, John R. 1977. "Eastern Europe: Growing Energy Problems," in U.S. Congress, Eastern European Economies Post-Helsinki. Joint Economic Committee, 95th Congress, 1st session, pp. 379-95.
Hancock, M. Donald. 1978. "Intellectuals and System Change," in Lyman H. Legters (ed.), The German Democratic Republic, Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 133-54.
Hanrieder, Wolfram F. 1971. "Compatibility and Consensus: A Proposal for the Conceptual Linkage of External and Internal Dimensions of Foreign Policy," in Wolfram F. Hanrieder (ed.), Comparative Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays. New York: David McKay, pp. 242-64.
Harf, James E., David G. Hoovler and Thomas E. James, Jr. 1974. "Systemic and External Attributes in Foreign Policy Analysis," in James N. Rosenau (ed.), Comparing Foreign Policies. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE, pp. 235-50.
Harle, Vilho. 1971. "Actional Distance Between the Socialist Countries in the 1960s," Cooperation and Conflict 14, No. 3-4, pp. 201-22.
Harasymiw, Bohdan (ed.), Education and the Mass Media in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger.
Hayden, Eric. 1976. Technology Transfer to East Europe. New York: Praeger.
Hegedus, Andras. 1976. Socialism and Bureaucracy. New York: St. Martin's.
_____. 1977. The Structure of Socialist Society. New York: St. Martin's.
_____. et al. 1976. The Humanisation of Socialism; writings of the Budapest school. London: Allison & Busby.
Hejzlar, Zdenek and Vladimir V. Kusin. 1975. Czechoslovakia 1968-1969: Chronology, Bibliography, Annotation. New York: Garland.
Hempel, Kenneth S. 1973. "Comparative Research on Eastern Europe: A Critique of Hughes and Volgy's 'Distance in Foreign Policy Behavior'," American Journal of Political Science, 17, No. 2, May, pp. 367-93.
Heneghan, Thomas E. 1977. "The Loyal Opposition: Party Programs and Church Response in Poland," in Robert R. King and James F. Brown (eds.), Eastern Europe's Uncertain Future. New York: Praeger, pp. 286-300.
Herspring, Dale R. 1978a. "Detente and the Military," in Lyman H. Legters (ed.), The German Democratic Republic. Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 199-216.
_____. 1978b. "Technology and Civil-Military Relations: The Polish and East German Cases," in Dale R. Herspring and Ivan Volgyes (eds.), Civil-Military in Communist Systems. Boulder, CO: Westview.
Hewett, Edward A. 1974. Foreign Trade Prices in the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. New York: Cambridge University Press.
_____. 1977. "Recent Developments in East-West European Economic Relations and Their Implications for U.S.-East European Economic Relations," in U.S. Congress, East European Economies Post-Helsinki. Joint Economic Committee, 95th Congress, 1st session, pp. 174-98.
_____. 1978. "Most-Favored Nation Treatment in Trade Under Central Planning," Slavic Review, 37, No. 1, March, pp. 25-39.

Hirschman, Albert O. 1978. "Beyond asymmetry: critical notes on myself as a young man and on some other old friends," International Organization, 32, No. 1, Winter, pp. 45-50.

Hoffman, George W. (ed.), 1971. Eastern Europe: Essays in Geographical Problems, London: Methuen.

_____. 1972. Regional Development Strategy in Southeast Europe. New York: Praeger.

Holloway, David. 1975. "Models of Reform in Eastern Europe," in James Cornford (ed.), The Failure of the State. London: Croom Helm, pp. 141-73.

Holzman, Franklyn D. 1976. International Trade Under Communism. New York: Basic Books.

Hopkins, Raymond F. and Donald J. Puchala. 1978. "Perspectives on the international relations of food," International Organization, 32, No. 3, Summer, pp. 581-616.

Hopmann, P. Terrence. 1967. "International Conflict and Cohesion in the Communist System," International Studies Quarterly, 11, No. 3, September, pp. 212-36.

_____. 1978. "Asymmetrical bargaining in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe," International Organization, 32, No. 1, Winter, pp. 141-78.

_____ and Barry Hughes. 1975. "The Use of Events Data for the Measurement of Cohesion in International Political Coalitions: A Validity Study," in Edward E. Azar and Joseph Ben-Dak (eds.), Theory and Practice of Events Research. London and New York: Gordon and Breach, pp. 81-95.

Hughes, Barry. 1971. "Transaction Analysis: the Impact of Operationalization," International Organization, 25, No. 1, Winter, pp. 132-45.

_____ and Thomas Volgy. 1970. "Distance in Foreign Policy Behavior: A Comparative Study of Eastern Europe," Midwest Journal of Political Science, 16, No. 3, August, pp. 459-92.

_____. 1973. "On the Difficult Business of Conducting Empirical Research in a Data-Poor Area," American Journal of Political Science, 17, No. 2, May, pp. 394-406.

Huntington, Samuel P. and Clement H. Moore (eds.), 1970. Authoritarian Politics in Modern Society. New York: Basic Books.

International Organization. 1977. "Restructuring ocean regimes: Implications of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea," 31, No. 2, Spring, entire issue.

Ionescu, Ghita. 1972. Comparative Communist Politics. London: Macmillan.

Jambrek, Peter. 1975. Development and Social Change in Yugoslavia. Westmead, Eng.: D. C. Heath.

Jamgotch, Nish, Jr. 1975. "Alliance Management in Eastern Europe (The New Type of International Relations)," World Politics, 27, No. 3, April, pp. 405-29.

Jancar, Barbara W. 1974. "Modernity and the Character of Dissent," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The Politics of Modernization in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 338-57.

_____. 1978. Women Under Communism. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

Janos, Andrew C. 1970. "Group Politics in Communist Society: A Second Look at the Pluralist Model," in Samuel P. Huntington and Clement H. Moore (eds.), Authoritarian Politics in Modern Society. New York: Basic Books, pp. 437-50.

_____. 1976a. "Systemic Models and the Theory of Change in the Comparative Study of Communist Politics," in Andrew C. Janos (ed.), Authoritarian Politics in Communist Europe. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California, pp. 1-30.

_____ (ed.). 1976b. Authoritarian Politics in Communist Europe. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California (#28).

Johnson, A. Ross. 1974. "Yugoslavia and the Sino-Soviet Conflict: The Shifting Triangle," Studies in Comparative Communism, 7, No. 2, Spring/Summer, pp. 184-203.

_____. 1976. "Has Eastern Europe Become a Liability to the Soviet Union? The Military Aspect," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The International Politics of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 37-58.

Johnson, Chalmers (ed.). 1970. Change in Communist Systems. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Johnson, Paul M. 1977. "Modernization as an Explanation of Political Change in East European States," in Jan F. Triska and Paul Cocks (eds.), Political Development in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 30-50.

Jones, Christopher D. 1977. "Soviet Hegemony in Eastern Europe: the Dynamics of Political Autonomy and Military Intervention," World Politics, 29, No. 2, January, pp. 216-41.

Journal of International Affairs. 1978. "Leadership Succession in Communist States," 32, No. 2, Fall/Winter, entire issue.

Jowitt, Kenneth. 1970. "The Romanian Communist Party and the World Socialist System: A Redefinition of Unity," World Politics, 23, No. 1, October, pp. 38-60.

_____. 1971. Revolutionary Breakthroughs and National Development, The Case of Romania, 1944-65. Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____. 1974. "Political Innovation in Romania," Survey, 20, No. 4, Autumn, pp. 132-51.

_____. 1977. "Inclusion and Mobilization in European Leninist Regimes," in Jan F. Triska and Paul Cocks (eds.), Political Development in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 93-118.

_____. 1978. The Leninist Response to National Dependence. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California (#37).

Joyner, Christopher. 1976. "The Energy Situation in Eastern Europe: Problems and Prospects," East European Quarterly, 10, No. 4, Winter, pp. 495-516.

Kahrs, Karl H. 1979. "The Theoretical Position of the Intra-Marxist Opposition in the GDR," East Central Europe, 6, pt. 2, pp. 250-65.

Kalvoda, Josef. 1978. Czechoslovakia's Role in Soviet Strategy. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

Kanet, Roger E. (ed.). 1971. The Behavioral Revolution and Communist Studies. New York: The Free Press.

_____. 1974a. "Modernization Interaction Within Eastern Europe," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The Politics of Modernization in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 275-303.

_____. 1974b. "Integration Theory and the Study of Eastern Europe," International Studies Quarterly, 18, No. 18, September, pp. 368-92.

_____. 1975. "Is Comparison Useful or Possible?" Studies in Comparative Communism, 8, No. 1/2, Spring/Summer, pp. 20-27.

_____. 1976. "East-West Trade and the Limits of Western Influence," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The International Politics of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, 192-213

_____. 1978. "Political Groupings and Their Role in the Process of Change in Eastern Europe," in Andrew Gyorgy and James A. Kuhlman (eds.), Innovation in Communist Systems. Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 41-58.

_____. 1980. "Research on East European Foreign Policy: Other Needs, Other Areas, New Directions," in Ronald H. Linden (ed.), The Foreign Policies of East Europe: New Approaches. New York: Praeger, pp. 311-19.

_____ and Donna Bahry. 1975. "Soviet Policy in East Europe," Current History, 69, No. 409, October, pp. 126-28, 154.

Kaplan, Stephan S. 1975. "United States Aid to Poland, 1957-64: Concerns, Objectives, and Obstacles," Western Political Quarterly, 28, No. 1, March, pp. 147-66.

Kaser, Michael. 1976. Health Care in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Kassof, Allen. 1969. "The Administered Society: Totalitarianism without Terror," in Frederic J. Fleron, Jr. (ed.), Communist Studies and the Social Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally, pp. 153-69.

Katzenstein, Peter J. 1975. "International interdependence: Some long-term trends and recent changes," International Organization, 29, No. 4, Autumn, pp. 1021-34.

Kaufman, Edy. 1976. The Superpowers and Their Spheres of Influence: The United States and the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe and Latin America. New York: St. Martin's.

Kaufman, Robert R., Henry I. Chernotsky and Daniel S. Geller, 1975. "A Preliminary Test of the Theory of Dependency," Comparative Politics, 7, No. 3, April, pp. 303-30.

Kautsky, John H. 1973. "Communism and Modernization," Studies in Comparative Communism, 6, No. 1/2, Spring/Summer, pp. 135-70.

Kean, James G. and Patrick J. McGowan, 1973. "National Attributes and Foreign Policy Participation: A Path Analysis," in Patrick J. McGowan (ed.), SAGE International Yearbook of Foreign Policy Studies, Vol. 1. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE, pp. 219-52.

Kegley, Charles W., Jr. 1974. "The Transformation of Inter-Bloc Relations: Approaches to Analysis and Measurement," in Louis J. Mensonides and James A. Kuhlman (eds.), The Future of Inter-Bloc Relations in Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 3-27.

Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye. 1977. Power and Interdependence. Boston: Little, Brown.

King, Robert R. 1972. "Romania and the Sino-Soviet Conflict," Studies in Comparative Communism, 4, No. 4, Winter, pp. 373-412.

_____. 1974. "Romania: The Difficulty of Maintaining an Autonomous Foreign Policy," in Robert R. King and Robert W. Dean (eds.), East European Perspectives on European Security and Cooperation. New York: Praeger, pp. 168-90.

_____. 1978. "The Blending of Party and State in Romania," East European Quarterly, 12, No. 4, Winter, pp. 489-500.

_____. 1980. A History of the Romanian Communist Party. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

_____ and Robert W. Dean (eds.). 1974. East European Perspectives on European Security and Cooperation. New York: Praeger.

Kintner, William R. and Wolfgang Klaiber. 1971. Eastern Europe and European Security.

Klaiber, Wolfgang et al. 1973. Era of Negotiations. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Klein, George. 1975. "The Role of Ethnic Politics in the Czechoslovak Crisis of 1968 and the Yugoslav Crisis of 1971," Studies in Comparative Communism, 8, No. 4, Winter, pp. 339-69.

_____. 1976. "Detente and Czechoslovakia," in Peter J. Potichnyj and Jane P. Shapiro (eds.), From the Cold War to Detente. New York: Praeger, pp. 181-98.

_____. n.d. "Soviet Foreign Policy Options in the Contemporary Balkans," in Phillip A. Petersen (ed.), Soviet Policy in the Post-Tito Balkans. United States Air Force, Studies in Communist Affairs (Vol. 4), pp. 133-53.

Kolankiewicz, George and Ray Tarns. 1979. "Poland: Socialism for Everyman?" in Archie Brown and Jack Gray (eds.), Political Culture and Political Change in Communist States. New York: Holmes & Meier, pp. 101-31.

Konrad, George and Ivan Szeleny. 1979. The Intellectuals on the Road to Class Power. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Korbel, Josef. 1977. Twentieth-Century Czechoslovakia: The Meanings of Its History. New York: Columbia University Press.

Korbonski, Andrzej. 1974. "Bureaucracy and Interest Groups in Communist Societies: The Case of Czechoslovakia," in Lenard J. Cohen and Jane P. Shapiro (eds.), Communist Systems in Comparative Perspective. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/ Doubleday, pp. 358-78.

_____. 1975a. "Political Aspects of Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe," in Zbigniew M. Fallenbuchl (ed.), Economic Development in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, Vol. 1. New York: Praeger, pp. 8-41.

_____. 1975b. "The Pattern and Method of Liberalization," in Carmelo Mesa-Lago and Carl Beck (eds.), Comparative Socialist Systems: Essays on Politics and Economics. Pittsburgh, PA: University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh, pp. 192-214.

_____. 1976a. "External Influences on Eastern Europe," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The International Politics of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 253-74.

_____. 1976b. "Leadership Succession and Political Change in Eastern Europe," Studies in Comparative Communism, 9, No. 1/2, Spring/Summer, pp. 3-22.

_____. 1976c. "Detente, East-West Trade and the Future of Economic Integration in Eastern Europe," World Politics, 28, No. 4, July, pp. 568-89.

_____. 1977. "The 'Change to Change' in Eastern Europe," in Jan F. Triska and Paul M. Cocks (eds.), Political Development in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 3-29.

_____. 1978. "Eastern Europe and the Soviet Threat," Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science, 33, No. 1, pp. 66-76.

_____. 1980. "East Europe: Soviet Asset or Burden? The Political Dimension," in Ronald H. Linden (ed.), The Foreign Policies of East Europe: New Approaches.

Kosinski, Leszek A. (ed.). 1977. Demographic Developments in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger.

Kostanick, Huey L. (ed.). 1977. Population and Migration Trends in Eastern Europe. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Kovats, Charles E. 1977. "The Path of Church-State Reconciliation in Hungary." in Robert R. King and James F. Brown (eds.), Eastern Europe's Uncertain Future. New York: Praeger, pp. 301-11.

Kovrig, Bennet. 1976. "The United States: 'Peaceful Engagement' Revisited," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The International Politics of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 131-53.

_____. 1979. Comunism in Hungary: From Kun to Kadar. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

Kramer, John M. 1975. "The Energy Gap in Eastern Europe," Survey, 21, Winter/Spring, pp. 65-78.

_____. 1979. "Betweeen Scylla and Charybdis: The Politics of Eastern Europe's Energy Problem," Orbis, 22, No. 4, Winter, pp. 929-50.

Krasner, Steven. 1972. "Are Bureaucracies Important?" Foreign Policy, 7, Summer, pp. 159-79.

Krisch, Henry. 1979. "Soviet-GDR Relations in the Honecker Era," East Central Europe, 6, pt. 2, pp. 152-72.

Kuhlman, James A. 1976. "A Framework for Viewing Domestic and Foreign Policy Patterns," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The International Politics of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 275-91.

Kusin, Vladimir, V. 1978. From Dubeck to Charter 77: A Study of 'Normalization' in Czechoslovakia, 1968-78. New York: St. Martin's.

Lane, David. 1978. "Towards a Sociological Model of State Socialist Society," in Simon McInnes, William McGrath and Peter J. Potichnyj (eds.), The Soviet Union and East Europe Into the 1980s. Oakville, Ont.: Mosaic, pp. 27-58.

Lang, Nicholas R. 1975. "The Dialectics of Decentralization: Economic Reform and Regional Inequality in Yugoslavia," World Politics, 27, No. 3, April, pp. 309-36.

Laquer, Walter and Leopold Labedz (eds.). 1962. Polycentrism: The New Factor in International Communism. New York: Praeger.

Larson, David L. 1979. United States Foreign Policy Toward Yugoslavia, 1943-63. Washington: University Press of America.

Laux, Jeanne K. 1975. "Intra-Alliance Politics and European Detente: The Case of Poland and Romania," Studies in Comparative Communism, 8, No. 1/2, Spring/ Summer, pp. 98-122.

_____. 1979. "Socialism, nationalism and underdevelopment: research on Romanian foreign policy making," in Hannes Adomeit and Robert Boardman (eds.), Foreign Policy Making in Communist Countries. New York: Praeger, pp. 49-78.

Lee, J. Richard. 1974. "Petroleum Supply Problems in Eastern Europe," in U.S. Congress, Reorientation and Commercial Relations of the Economies of Eastern Europe. Joint Economic Committee, 93rd Congress, 2d Sess., pp. 406-20.

Lekovic, Zdravko and Mihalo Bjelica. 1976. Communication Policies in Yugoslavia. Paris: UNESCO.

Lendvai, Paul. 1969. Eagles in Cobwebs: Nationalism and Communism in the Balkans. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Levcik, Friedrich and Jan Stankovsky. 1979. Industrial Cooperation Between East and West. White Plains, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Levesque, Jacques. 1970. Le Conflict sino-sovietique et l'Europe de l'Est. Montreal: Les Presses de l'Universite de Montreal.

Lewis, Paul G. 1979. "Potential Sources of Opposition in the East European Peasantry," in Rudolf L. Tokes (ed.), Opposition in Eastern Europe. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 263-91.

Licklider, Roy E. 1976/1977. "Soviet Control of Eastern Europe: Morality versus American National Interest," Political Science Quarterly, 91, No. 4, Winter, pp. 619-24.

Lieber, Robert J. 1977. "The Pendulum Swings to Europe," Foreign Policy, 26, Spring, pp. 43-56.

Lillich, Richard B. 1975. "The United States-Hungarian Claims Agreement of 1973," American Journal of International Law, 69, No. 3, July, pp. 534-59.

Lindberg, Leon N. 1977. "Energy Policy and the Politics of Economic Development," Comparative Political Studies, 10, No. 3, October, pp. 355-82.

Linden, Ronald H. 1979. Bear and Foxes: The International Relations of the East European States, 1965-1969. Boulder, CO: East European Quarterly and Columbia University Press.

_____ (ed.). 1980a. The Foreign Policies of East Europe: New Approaches. New York: Praeger.

_____. 1980b. The Security Bind in East Europe. Pittsburgh, PA: University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh.

Lodgaard, Sverre. 1974. "On the Relationship between East-West Economic Cooperation and Political Change in Eastern Europe," Journal of Peace Research, 11, No. 4, pp. 325-40.

Lowenthal, Richard. 1970. "Development vs. Utopia in Communist Policy," in Chalmers Johnson (ed.), Change in Communist Systems. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 33-116

Ludanyi, Andrew. 1979. "Titoist Integration of Yugoslavia: The Partisan Myth and the Hungarians of the Vojvodina 1945-1975," Polity, 12, No. 2, Winter, pp. 225-52.

Ludlow, Howard T. 1975. "The Role of Trade Unions in Poland," Political Science Quarterly, 90, No. 2, Summer, pp. 315-24.

Ludz, Peter C. 1972. The Changing Party Elite in East Germany. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

_____. 1976. "Actual Problems of Political Relations Between the USSR and the GDR," in Peter J. Potichnyj and Jane P. Shapiro (eds.), From the Cold War to Detente. New York: Praeger, pp. 166-80.

McCauley, Martin. 1979. Marxism-Leninism in the German Democratic Republic. New York: Harper & Row.

McGowan, Patrick J. and Klaus-Peter Cottwald. 1975. "Small State Foreign Policies," International Studies Quarterly, 19, No. 4, pp. 469-500.

_____. and Dale L. Smith. 1978. "Economic dependence in black Africa: an analysis of competing theories," International Organization, 32, No. 1, Winter, pp. 179-236.

McGrath, Bill and Simon McInnes. 1976. "'Better Fewer but Better': On Approaches to the Study of Soviet and East European Politics," Canadian Slavonic Papers, 18, No. 3, September, pp. 327-37.

McInnes, Simon, William McGrath and Peter J. Potichnyj (eds.). 1978. The Soviet Union and East Europe Into the 1980s: Multidisciplinary Perspectives. Oakville, Ont.: Mosaic Press.

Machala, Pavel. 1978. "Eastern Europe, Eurocommunism and the Problems of Detente," in Morton A. Kaplan (ed.), The Many Faces of Communism. New York: The Free Press, pp. 228-65.

Mack, Andrew. 1975. "Numbers are Not Enough," Comparative Politics, 7, No. 4, July, pp. 597-618.

MacKenzie, David. 1977. "The Background: Yugoslavia Since 1964," in George W. Simmonds (ed.), Nationalism in the USSR & Eastern Europe in the era of Brezhnev & Kosygin. Detroit, MI: University of Detroit Press, pp. 46-56.

Mahoney, Robert B., Jr. 1978. "Assessing One Psychological Dimension of East-West Competition in Europe." CarlisleBarracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.

Marer, Paul. 1974. "The Political Economy of Soviet Relations with Eastern Europe," in James Kurth and Steven Rosen (eds.), Testing Theories of Economic Imperialism. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath, pp. 231-60.

_____. 1976a. "Prospects for Integration in the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA)," International Organization, 30, No. 4, Autumn, pp. 631-48.

_____. 1976b. "Has Eastern Europe Become a Liability to the Soviet Union? The Economic Aspect," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The International Politics of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 59-81.

Markus, Maria and Andras Hegedus. 1976. "Tendencies of Marxist Sociology in the Socialist Countries," in Andras Hegedus et al., The Humanisation of Socialism. London: Allison and Busby, pp. 124-39.

Marsh, Peter. 1979. "Foreign policy making in the German Democratic Republic: the interplay of internal pressures and external dependence," in Hannes Adomeit and Robert Boardman (eds.), Foreign Policy Making in Communist Countries. New York: Praeger, pp. 79-111.

Martin, Andrew. 1977. "Political Constraints on Economic Strategies in Advanced Industrial Societies," Comparative Political Studies, 10, No. 3, October, pp. 323-54.

Mastny, Vojtech. 1979a. "East European Studies at a Crossroads," Problems of Communism, 28, No. 3, May-June, pp. 60-64.

_____. 1979b. Russia's Road to the Cold War. New York: Columbia University Press.

Matejko, Alexander. 1976. "Structural Change Under State Socialism: The Polish Case," in Jane P. Shapiro and Peter J. Potichnyj (eds.), Change and Adaptation in Soviet and East European Politics. New York: Praeger, pp. 40-57.

Mates, Leo. 1972. Nonalignment: Theory and Current Policy. Dobbs Ferry, NY: Oceania.

Mensonides, Louis J. 1974. "European Realpolitic II: Bonn's Ostpolitik," in Louis J. Mensonides and James A. Kuhlman (eds.), The Future of Inter-Bloc Relations in Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 162-80.

Merkl, Peter H. 1974. German Foreign Policies, West and East. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC Clio.

Merritt, Richard L. 1973. "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy in West Germany," in Patrick J. McGowan (ed.), SAGE International Yearbook of Foreign Policy Studies, Vol. 1. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE, pp. 255-74.

Mesa-Lago, Carmela and Carl Beck (eds.). 1975. Comparative Socialist Systems: Essays on Politics and Economics. Pittsburgh, PA: University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh.

Meyer, John W. et al. 1979. "Education and Occupational Mobility: A Comparison of Polish and American Men," American Journal of Sociology, 84, No. 4, January, pp. 978-86.

Mezey, Michael L. 1979. Comparative Legislatures. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Michnik, Adam. 1976. "The New Evolutionism," Survey, 22, No. 3-4, Summer-Autumn, pp. 267-77.

Miko, Francis T. 1980. "East European Views of SALT." Paper for International Studies Association Meeting, Los Angeles, CA March 19.

Modelski, George. 1960. The Communist International System. Princeton, NJ: Center for International Studies, Princeton University.

Molnar, Miklos. 1978. A Short History of the Hungarian Communist Party. Boulder, CO: Westview

Montias, John M. 1975. "A Classification of Communist Economic Systems," in Carmelo Mesa-Lago and Carl Beck (eds.), Comparative Socialist Systems: Essays on Politics and Economics. Pittsburgh, PA: University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh, pp. 39-51.

Moore, David W. 1974. "National Attributes and Nation Typologies: A Look at the Rosenau Genotypes," in Janes N. Rosenau (ed.), Comparing Foreign Policies. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE, pp. 251-68.

Moreton, N. Edwina. 1978. East Germany and the Warsaw Alliance. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Morse, Edward. 1972. "Transnational Economic Processes," in Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye (eds.), Transnational Relations and World Politics. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 23-47.

Moskoff, William. 1978. "Sex Discrimination, Commuting, and the Role of Women in Romanian Development," Slavic Review, 37, No. 3, September, pp. 440-56.

Nayyar, Deepak (ed.). 1978. Economic Relations Between Socialist Countries and the Third World. Montclair, NJ: Allanheld, Osmun.

Nelson, Daniel. 1975. "The Early Success of Ostpolitik: An Eastern European Perspective," World Affairs, 138, No. 1, Summer, pp. 32-50.

_____. 1976. "Sub-National Political Elites in a Communist System: Contrasts and Conflicts in Romania," East European Quarterly, 10, No. 4, pp. 459-94.

_____. 1977a. "Issues in Local Communist Politics: The Romanian Case," Western Political Quarterly, 30, No. 3, September, pp. 384-96.

_____. 1977b. "Socioeconomic and Political Change in Communist Europe," International Studies Quarterly, 21, No. 2, June, pp. 359-88.

_____. 1978a. "Background Characteristics of Local Communist Elites: Change vs. Continuity in the Romanian Case," Polity, 3, Spring, pp. 398-415.

_____. 1978b. "Political Convergence: An Empirical Assessment," World Politics, 30, No. 3, April, pp. 411-32.

Neuberger, Egon and Laura D'Andrea Tyson (eds.). 1979. The Impact of International Economic Disturbances on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. New York: Pergamon.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 1977. Comecon: Progress and Prospects. Brussels: NATO-Directorate of Economic Affairs (series No. 6).

Nolting, Orin. 1975. "Local Government Administration in Romania," Planning and Administration, 2, No. 2, Autumn, pp. 33-51.

Obradovic, Josip and Willian H. Dunn (eds.). 1978. Workers' Self-Management and Organizational Power. Pittsburgh, PA: University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh.

Odom, William E. 1976. "A Dissenting View on the Group Approach to Soviet Politics," World Politics, 28, No. 4, July, pp. 542-67.

Olszewski, Michael W. 1978. "The Framework of Foreign Policy," in Lyman H. Legters (ed.), The German Democratic Republic. Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 179-98.

Oren, Nissan. 1971. Bulgarian Communism: The Road to Power, 1934-1944. New York: Columbia University Press.

Pastusiak, Longin. 1978. "International Relations Studies in Poland," International Studies Quarterly, 22, No. 2, June, pp. 299-318.

Patterson, G. James. 1980. "National Styles in the Development and Profession of Anthropology: The Case of Romania," East European Quarterly, 15, No. 2, Summer, pp. 207-18.

Paul, David W. 1971. "Soviet Foreign Policy and the Invasion of Czechoslovakia: A Theory and a Case Study," International Studies Quarterly, 15, No. 2, June, pp. 159-202.

_____. 1976. "Political Culture and the Socialist Purpose," in Jane P. Shapiro and Peter J. Potichnyj (eds.), Change and Adaptation in Soviet and East European Politics. New York: Praeger, pp. 3-17.

_____. 1979. The Cultural Limits of Revolutionary Politics: Change and Continuity in Socialist Czechoslovakia. Boulder, CO: East European Quarterly and Columbia University Press.

Paulu, Burton. 1974. Radio and Television Broadcasting in Eastern Europe. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Pelikan, Jiri. 1976. Socialist Opposition in Eastern Europe: The Czechoslovak Example. New York: St. Martin's.

Perlmutter, Amos. 1974. "The Presidential Political Center and Foreign Policy," World Politics, 28, No. 1, pp. 87-106.

Petersen, Phillip A. n.d. "Military Intervention as a Solution to Soviet Problems in the Balkans," in Phillip A. Petersen (ed.), Soviet Policy in the Post-Tito Balkans. United States Air Force, Studies in Communist Affairs (Vol. 4) pp. 93-118.

Piekalkiewicz, Jaroslaw A. 1972. Public Opinion Polling in Czechoslovakia, 1968-69. New York: Praeger.

_____. 1975. Communist Local Government: A Study of Poland. Athens: Ohio University Press.

Pienkos, Donald. 1975. "Party Elites and Society: the Shape of the Polish Central Committee C.P.C.C. Since 1945," Polish Review, 20, No. 4, pp. 27-42.

Ploss, Sidney I. (ed.). 1971. The Soviet Political Process. Waltham, MA: Ginn and Co.

Ploughman, Piers (pseud.).1976/77. "Advancing American Interests Through Soviet Control, a Modest Proposal," Political Science Quarterly, 91, No. 4, Winter, pp. 625-28.

Polach, J.G. 1970. "The Development of Energy in Eastern Europe," in U.S. Congress, Economic Development in the Countries of Eastern Europe. Joint Economic Committee, 91st Cong., 2d Sess., pp. 348-434.

Portes, Richard. 1977. "East Europe's Debt to the West: Interdependence is a Two-Way Street," Foreign Affairs, 55, No. 4, July, pp. 751-82.

Potter, William C. 1978. "Innovation in East European Foreign Policies," in James A. Kuhlman (ed.), The Foreign Policies of Eastern Europe: Domestic and International Determinants. Leyden, The Netherlands: A. W. Sijthoff, pp. 253-302.

_____. 1980. "External Demands and East Europe's Westpolitik," in Ronald H. Linden (ed.), The Foreign Policies of East Europe: New Approaches. New York: Praeger, pp. 96-134.

Pravda, Alex. 1975. Reform and Change in the Czechoslovak Political System: January-August 1968. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE (#90-020).

_____. 1978. "Elections in Communist Party States," in Guy Hermet, Richard Rose and Alain Rouquie (eds.), Elections Without Choice. New York: John Wiley, pp. 169-95.

Prifti, Peter R. 1978. Socialist Albania Since 1944: Domestic and Foreign Developments. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT press.

Rachwald, Arthur R. 1978. "United States Policy in East Europe," Current History, 74, No. 436, April, pp. 150-53, 185.

Radio Free Europe-Radio Liberty. 1979. "Three Measurements of East European Attitudes to the Helsinki Conference," RFE-RL, East European Area, Audience and Opinion Research.

Raina, Peter. 1976. "Intellectuals and the Party in Bulgaria," in Jane P. Shapiro and Peter J. Potichnyj (eds.), Change and Adaptation in Soviet and East European Politics. New York: Praeger, pp. 179-97.

_____. 1978. Political Opposition in Poland 1954-1977. London: Poets' and Painters' Press.

Rakovski, Marc. 1978. Towards an East European Marxism. New York: St. Martin's

Rakowska-Harmstone, Teresa. 1976. "'Socialist Internationalism' and Eastern Europe --A New Stage," Survey, 22, No. 1, Winter, pp. 38-54, and No. 2, Spring, pp. 81-86.

_____(ed). 1979. Perspectives for Change in Communist Societies. Boulder, CO: Westview.

_____ and Andrew Gyorgy. (eds.) 1979. Communism in Eastern Europe. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Ranki, George. 1974. "Has Modernity Made a Difference?" in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The Politics of Modernization in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 310-27.

Ransom, Charles. 1973. The European Community and Eastern Europe. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.

Remington, Robin. 1976. "China's Emerging Role in Eastern Europe," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The International Politics of Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 82-102.

_____. 1978. "The Military as an Interest Group in Yugoslav Politics," in Dale R. Herspring and Ivan Volgyes (eds.), Civil-Military Relations in Communist Systems. Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 181-200.

Richardson, Neil R. 1978. Foreign Policy and Economic Dependency. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Riese, Hans-Peter (ed.). 1978. Since the Prague Spring. Charter '77 and the Struggle for Human Rights in Czechoslovakia. New York: Random House.

Rigby, T. H. 1976. "Politics in the Mono-Organizational Society," in Andrew C. Janos (ed.), Authoritarian Politics in Communist Europe. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California.

Robinson, Gertrude Joch. 1977. Tito's Maverick Media: The Politics of Mass Communications in Yugoslavia. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Rosecrance, Richard et al. 1977. "Whither interdependence?" International Organization, 31, No. 3, Summer, pp. 425-72.

Rosenau, James N. 1967. "Foreign Policy as an Issue-Area," in James N. Rosenau (ed.), Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy. New York: The Free Press, pp. 11-50.

_____. 1969. "Toward the Study of National-International Linkages," in James N. Rosenau (ed.), Linkage Politics. New York: The Free Press, pp. 44-63.

_____. 1970. "Foreign Policy as Adaptive Behavior: Some Preliminary Notes for a Theoretical Model," Comparative Politics, 2, No. 3, April, pp. 365-88.

_____. 1973. "Theorizing Across Systems: Linkage Politics Revisited," in Jonathan Wilkenfeld (ed.), Conflict Behavior and Linkage Politics. New York: David McKay, pp. 25-56.

_____. 1975. "Comparison as a State of Mind," Studies in Comparative Communism, 8, No. 1/2 Spring/Summer, pp. 57-61.

Rubinstein, Alvin Z. 1977. "Soviet Policy in Europe," Current History, 72, No. 430, October, pp. 105-108, 132.

Rummel, Rudolph. 1963. "Dimensions of Conflict Behavior Within and Between Nations," General Systems Yearbook, 8, pp. 1-50.

_____. 1967. "Some Attributes and Behavioral Patterns of Nations," Journal of Peace Research, 4, pp. 196-206.

_____. 1968. "The Relationship Between National Attributes and Foreign Conflict Behavior," in J. D. Singer (ed.), Quantitative International Politics. New York: The Free Press, pp. 187-214.

Rush, Myron. 1974. How Communist States Change Their Rulers. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Rusinow, Dennison I. 1975. "Slovenia: Modernization Without Urbanization?" Common Ground, 1, No. 2, April, pp. 57-70.

_____. 1976. "Yugoslavia: The Price of Pluralism Reassessed," Common Ground, 2, No. 2, April, pp. 69-76.

_____. 1980. The Other Albania: Kosovo 1979, Parts I and II. Hanover, NH: American Universities Field Staff (Reports 1980/5 & 6, Europe).

Russell, Harold S. 1976. "The Helsinki Declaration: Brobdingnag or Lilliput?" American Journal of International Law, 70, No. 2, April, pp. 242-72.

Scharf, C. Bradley. 1976a. "East Germany's Approach to Industrial Democracy," East Central Europe, 3, No. 1, pp. 44-57.

_____. 1976b. "Environmental Determinism and Communist Behavior," Studies in Comparative Communism, 9, No. 1/2, Spring/Summer, pp. 152-61.

Schapiro, Leonard. 1972a. "Totalitarianism in the Doghouse," in Leonard Schapiro (ed.), Political Opposition in One-Party States. London: Macmillan, pp. 268-76.

_____. (ed.). 1972b. Political Opposition in One-Party States. London: Macmillan.

Schnitzer, Martin. 1972. East and West Germany: A Comparative Economic Analysis. New York: Praeger.

Schopflin, George. 1979. "Hungary" An Uneasy Stability," in Archie Brown and Jack Gray (eds.), Political Culture and Political Change in Communist States. New York: Holmes & Meier, pp. 131-58.

Schweigler, Gebhard L. 1975. National Consciousness in Divided Germany. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.

Seroka, James H. 1978. "Changes in Public Policy Decision-making Processes: The Case of the Yugoslav Commune," East European Quarterly, 12, No. 4, Winter, pp. 443-59.

Seton-Watson, Hugh. 1978. The Imperialist Revolutionaries. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

Shapiro, Paul A. 1978. "Social Deviance in Eastern Europe: On Understanding the Problem," in Ivan Volgyes (ed.), Social Deviance in Eastern Europe, Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 1-22.

Sharp, M. 1972. "Canada in the World Community," Atlantic Community Quarterly, 10, No. 1, Spring, pp. 66-70.

Shawcross, William. 1971. Dubcek. New York: Simon and Schuster.

_____. 1974. Crime and Compromise: Janos Kadar and the Politics of Hungary. New York: Dutton.

Sher, Gerson S. 1977. Praxis: Marxist Criticism and Dissent in Socialist Yugoslavia. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

_____. (ed.). 1978. Marxist Humanism and Praxis. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Shlaim, Avi and G. N. Yannopoulous (eds.). 1978. The EEC and Eastern Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shoup, Paul. 1972. "The National Question and the Political Systems of Eastern Europe," in Sylva Sinanian, Istvan Deak and Peter C. Ludz (eds.), Eastern Europe in the 1970s. New York: Praeger, pp. 121-70.

_____.1975. "Indicators of Socio-Politico-Economic Development," in Carmelo Mesa-Lago and Carl Beck (eds.), Comparative Socialist Systems: Essays on Politics and Economics. Pittsburgh, PA: University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh, pp. 3-38.

_____. 1976. "The Limits of Party Control: The Yugoslav Case," in Andrew C. Janos (ed.), Authoritarian Politics in Communist Europe. Berkeley, CA: Institute of International Studies, University of California, pp. 176-96.

Silberman, Laurence. 1977. "Yugoslavia's 'Old' Communism: Europe's Fiddler on the Roof," Foreign Policy, 26, Spring, pp. 3-27.

Simes, Dimitri K. 1975. "The Soviet Invasion of Czechoslovakia and the Limits of Kremlinology," Studies in Comparative Communism, 8, No. 1/2, Spring/Summer, pp. 174-80.

Simon, Jeffrey. 1977. Comparative Communist Foreign Policy, 1965-1976. Santa Monica, CA: Rand (#P-6067.)

Sinanian, Sylva, Istvan Deak and Peter C. Ludz (eds.). 1972. Eastern Europe in the 1970s. New York: Praeger.

Skilling, H. Gordon. 1964. Communism National and International. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

_____.1969. "Interest Groups and Communist Politics," in Frederic J. Fleron, Jr. (ed.), Communist Studies and the Social Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally, pp. 281-97.

_____. 1970. "Group Conflict and Political Change," in Chalmers Johnson (ed.), Change in Communist Systems. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 215-34.

_____. 1974. "The Fall of Novotny in Czechoslovakia," in Lenard J. Cohen and Jane P. Shapiro (eds.). Communist Systems in Comparative Perspective. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, pp. 129-44.

_____ and Franklyn Griffiths (eds.). 1971. Interest Groups in Soviet Politics. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Social Forces. 1978. "Social Change in Socialist Societies," 57, No. 2, December, Part I.

Socor, Vladimir. 1976. "The Limits of National Independence in the Soviet Bloc: Rumania's Foreign Policy Reconsidered," Orbis, 20, No. 3, Fall, pp. 701-32.

Sokolowska, Magdalena. 1975. "The Role and Status of Women in Poland," Studies in Comparative International Development, 10, No. 3, Fall, pp. 71-87.

Staar, Richard F. 1978. "Soviet Relations with East Europe," Current History, 74, No. 436, April, pp. 145-49, 184-85.

Starrels, John M. 1978. "Two Germanies and the Transformation of Europe," in Andrew Gyorgy and James A. Kuhlman (eds.), Innovation in Communist Systems. Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 105-14.

_____. 1980. "GDR Foreign Policy," Problems of Communism, 29, No. 2, March-April, pp. 72-79.

_____ and Anita M. Mallinckrodt. 1975. Politics in the German Democratic Republic. New York: Praeger.

Stavrou, Nikolaos A. 1975. "The Political Role of the Albanian Military," Intellect, 104, No. 2367, July/August, pp. 18-21.

Studies in Comparative Communism, 1971. "On Comparing East European Political Systems," 4, No. 2, April, pp. 30-78.

_____. 1975a. "Symposium on the Comparative Study of Communist Foreign Policies," 1/2, Spring/Summer, pp. 5-65.

_____. 1975b. "The Science of Communist Politics," 8, No. 3, Autumn, special issue.

_____. 1976. "Leadership and Political Succession," 9, 1/2, Spring/Summer, special issue.

_____. 1979. "Pluralism in Communist Societies: Is the Emperor Naked," 12, No. 1, Spring, pp. 3-38.

Suda, Zdenek. 1980. Zealots and Rebels: A History of the Ruling Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

Survey. 1966. "Foreign Policy in a Polycentric World," No. 58, January, special issue.

Sussman, Leonard R. 1979. "Mass Media: Opportunities and Threats," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 442, March, pp. 77-84.

Szaz, Z. Michael. 1977. "Contemporary Educational Policies in Transylvania," East European Quarterly, 11, No. 4, Winter, pp. 493-501.

Szelenyi, Ivan. 1979. "Socialist Opposition in Eastern Europe: Dilemmas and Prospects," in Rudolf L. Tokes (ed.), Opposition in Eastern Europe. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 187-208

Szulc, Tad. 1978. "Living with Dissent," Foreign Policy, 31, Summer, pp. 180-91.

Szuprowicz, Bohdan. 1978. "The Sino-COMECON Connection," Contemporary China, 2, No. 3, Fall, pp. 30-63.

Tanter, Raymond. 1966. "Dimensions of Conflict Behavior Within and Between Nations, 1958-60." Journal of Conflict Resolution, 10, No. 1, pp. 41-64.

Tarkowski, Jacek. 1978. "Local Influences in a Centralized System: Resources, Local Leadership and Horizontal Integration in Poland," in Sidney Tarrow, Peter J. Katzenstein and Luigi Graziano (eds.), Territorial Politics in Industrial Nations. New York: Praeger, pp. 213-44.

Taylor, Charles L. and Jack D. Salmon. 1974. "A Comparison of the Blocs," in Louis J. Mensonides and James A. Kuhlman (eds.), The Future of Inter-Bloc Relations in Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 28-45.

Terry, Sarah. 1977. "External Influences on Political Change in Eastern Europe: A Framework for Analysis," in Jan F. Triska and Paul M. Cocks (eds.), Political Development in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 277-314.

_____. 1979. "The Case for a Group Approach to Polish Politics: Comment," Studies in Comparative Communism, 12, No. 1, Spring, pp. 28-34 (on Andrew C. Janos, "Interest Groups and the Structure of Power: Critique and Comparisons," Idem. pp. 6-10).

_____. 1980. "The Implications of Interdependence for Soviet-East European Relations: A Preliminary Analysis of the Polish Case," in Ronald H. Linden (ed.), The Foreign Policies of East Europe: New Approaches. New York: Praeger, pp. 186-266.

Thomas, John I. 1969. School and State in the People's Republic of Albania. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

Tokes, Rudolf L. 1978a. "Eastern Europe in the 1970s: Detente, Dissent, and Eurocommunism," in Rudolf L. Tokes (ed.), Eurocommunism and Detente. New York: New York University Press, pp. 437-511.

_____. 1978b. Eurocommunism and Detente. New York: New York University Press.

_____. (ed.). 1979. Opposition in Eastern Europe. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Toma, Peter A. and Ivan Volgyes. 1977. Politics in Hungary. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.

Triska, Jan F. (ed.). 1969. Communist Party States. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

_____. 1975. "Messages from Czechoslovakia," Problems of Communism, 24, No. 6, November/December, pp. 26-42.

_____. 1979. "Czechoslovakia: The Politics of Dependency," in Hans Brisch and Ivan Volgyes (eds.), Czechoslovakia: The Heritage of Ages Past. Boulder, CO: East European Quarterly and Columbia University Press, pp. 171-200.

_____. 1977. "Citizen Participation in Community Decisions in Yugoslavia, Romania,Hungary, and Poland," in Jan F. Triska and Paul M. Cocks (eds.), Political Development in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 147-77.

_____. and Paul M. Johnson (eds.). 1975. Political Development and Political Change in Eastern Europe. Denver, CO: University of Denver. (Monograph Series, Vol. 13, Bk. 2)

_____. and Paul M. Cocks (eds.). 1977. Political Development in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger.

Tucker, Harvey J. 1975. "Measuring Cohesion in the International Communist Movement," Political Methodology, 2, No. 1, pp. 83-112.

Tucker, Robert C. 1971a. "Culture, Political Culture, Communism." Paper for Conference on Political Culture and Communist Studies, Arden House, November 19-21.

_____. 1971b. The Soviet Poltitcal Mind. New York: W.W. Norton.

Turnock, David. 1974. An Economic Geography of Romania. London: Bell.

_____. 1976. "Restructuring of Rural Settlement in Romania," Slavonic and East European Review, 54, No. 1, January, pp. 83-102.

_____. 1978. Eastern Europe. Folkstone, Eng. and Boulder, CO: Dawson and Westview.

Ulc, Otto. 1974. "Czechoslovakia: The Great Leap Backward," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The Politics of Modernization in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 89-116.

United States Congress, 1974. Reorientation and Commercial Relations of the Economies of Eastern Europe. A Compendium of Papers Submitted to the Joint Economic Committee, 93rd Congress, 2nd Sess.

_____. 1977. East European Economies Post-Helsinki. A Compendium of Papers Submitted to the Joint Economic Committee, 95th Congress, 1st Sess.

United States House of Representatives. 1978. U.S. Policy Toward Eastern Europe. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East of the Committee on International Relations, 95th Congress, 2d Sess.

Urban, George. 197. "The Invasion of Czechoslovakia, 1968: The View from Washington, a conversation with Eugene V. Rostow," Washington Quarterly, 2, No. 1, Winter, pp. 106-20.

Urban, Joan B. 1978. "The Impact of Eurocommunism on the Socialist Community," in Andrew Gyorgy and James A. Kuhlman (eds.), Innovation in Communist Systems. Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 115-40.

Valenta, Jiri. 1978. "Eurocommunism and Eastern Europe," Problems of Communism, 27, No. 2, March/April, pp. 41-54.

_____.1979. Soviet Intervention in Czechoslovakia, 1968: Anatomy of a Decision. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Vasquez, John A. 1976. "Statistical Findings in International Politics," International Studies Quarterly, 20, No. 2, June, pp. 171-218.

Vayrynen, R. 1974. "ESC and EEC: The Incompatibles?" Instant Research on Peace and Violence, 3, pp. 113-27.

Volgyes, Ivan, 1974a. "The Impact of Modernization on Political Development," in Charles F. Gati (ed.), The Politics of Modernization in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 328-37.

_____ (ed.). 1974b. Environmental Deterioration in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger.

_____ (ed.). 1975. Political Socialization in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger.

_____. 1977. "Goals of Citizenship Training: A Hungarian Perspective," Studies in Comparative Communism, 10, No. 3, Autumn, pp. 289-309.

_____. 1978. "Modernization, Stratification and Elite Development in Hungary," Social Forces, 57, No. 2, December, pp. 500-21.

_____ and Nancy Volgyes. 1977. The Liberated Female. Life Work and Sex in Socialist Hungary. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Wadekin, Karl-Eugen. 1978. "Economic Reform and Social Change in Soviet and East European Agriculture," in Simon McInnes, William McGrath, and Peter J. Potichnyj (eds.), The Soviet Union and East Europe Into the 1980s. Oakville, Ont.: Mosaic Press, pp. 203-29.

Wallace, William V. 1976. Czechoslovakia. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Waltz, Kenneth. 1970. "The Myth of Interdependence," in Charles Kindleberger (ed.), The International Corporation. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 205-23.

_____. 1979. Theory of International Politics. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Wandycz, Piotr. S. 1980. The United States and Poland. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Weil, Herman W. 1975. "Can Bureaucracies be Rational Actors? Foreign Policy Decision-Making in North Vietnam," International Studies Quarterly, 19, No. 4, December, pp. 432-68.

Weiner, Robert. 1973. "Albanian and Romanian Deviance in the United Nations," East European Quarterly, 7, No. 1, Spring, pp. 65-90.

_____. 1980. "The Communist Balkans at the United Nations," in Ronald H. Linden (ed.), The Foreign Policies of East Europe: New Approaches. New York: Praeger, pp. 267-88.

Welsh, William S. 1973. "Introduction: The Comparative Study of Political Leadership in Communist Systems," in Carl Beck et al., Comparative Communist Political Leadership. New York: David McKay, pp. 1-42.

_____. 1975. "Towards an Empirical Typology of Socialist Systems," in Carmela Mesa-Lago and Carl Beck (eds.), Comparative Socialist Systems: Essays on Politics and Economics. Pittsburgh, PA: University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh, pp. 52-91.

_____. 1978. "Policy Science as an Innovative Area in Socialist Systems," in Andrew Gyorgy and James A. Kuhlman (eds.), Innovation in Communist Systems. Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 13-40.

_____. 1979. Leaders and Elites. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Weydenthal, Jan de. 1978. The Communists of Poland. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

Whetten, Lawrence L. 1971. Germany's Ospolitik: Relations Between the Federal Republic and the Warsaw Pact Countries. London: Oxford University Press.

Whitaker, Roger. 1979. "Continuity and Change in Two Bulgarian Communities: A Sociological Profile," Slavic Review, 38, No. 2, June, pp. 259-71.

Wilczynski, J. 1974. Technology in Comecon: Acceleration of Technological Progress Through Economic Planning and the Market. New York: Praeger.

Wilkenfeld, Jonathan. 1968. "Domestic and Foreign Conflict Behavior of Nations," Journal of Peace Research, 1, pp. 56-9.

Wolchik, Sharon L. 1979. "The Status of Women in a Socialist Order: Czechoslovakia, 1948-1978," Slavic Review, 38, N . 4, December, pp. 583-602.

Wolff, Robert L. 1974. The Balkans in Our Time. New York: W. W. Norton.

Woodward, Susan L. 1977. "'The Freedom of the People is in its Private Life' The Unrevolutionary Implications of Industrial Democracy," American Behavioral Scientist, 20, No. 4, March/April, pp. 579-96.

Young, Oran R. 1980. "International Regimes: Problems of Concept Formation," World Politics, 32, No. 3, April, pp. 331-56.

Zaninovich, M. George. 1970. "Party and Non-Party Attitudes on Social Change," in R. Barry Farrell (ed.), Political Leadership in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Chicago: Aldine, pp. 294-334.

_____. 1973. "Elites and Citizenry in Yugoslav Society: A Study of Value Differentiation," in Carl Beck et al., Comparative Communist Political Leadership. New York: David McKay, pp. 226-97.

Zimmerman, William. 1972a. "Hierarchical Regional Systems and the Politics of System Boundaries," International Organization, 26, No. 1, Winter, pp. 18-36.

_____. 1972b. "The Transformation of the Modern Multistate System: The Exhaustion of Communist Alternatives," Journal of Conflict Resolution, 16, No. 3, September, pp. 303-17.

_____. 1976. "The Tito Succession and the Evolution of Yugoslav Politics," Studies in Comparative Communism, 9, No. 1/2, Spring/Summer, pp. 62-79.

_____. 1977. "National-International Linkages in Yugoslavia: The Political Consequences of Openness," in Jan F. Triska and Paul M. Cocks (eds.), Political Development in Eastern Europe. New York: Praeger, pp. 334-64.

_____. 1980. "Dependency Theory and the Soviet-East European Hierarchical Regional System: Initial Tests," in Ronald H. Linden (ed.), The Foreign Policies of East Europe: New Approaches. New York: Praeger, pp. 159-85.

THE CARL BECK PAPERS IN RUSSIAN AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

Papers Available:

No. 101. Ronald H. Linden, East European Studies: Towards a Map of the Field and Its Needs, pp. 68, $4.00.

No. 102. Charles E. Ziegler, Policy Alternatives in Soviet Environmental Protection, pp. 28, $3.00.

No. 103. Michael Sozan, Food Deprivation and Social Stratification in Prewar Hungary, pp. 19, $3.00

No. 104 Stephen Scherer, England and the Northern War in Soviet Historiography: 1935-1950, pp. 18, $3.00

No. 101. Ronald H. Linden, East European Studies: Towards a Map of the Field and its Needs, pp. 68, $4.00

No. 102. Charles E. Ziegler, Policy Alternatives in Soviet Environmental Protection, pp. 28, $3.00

No. 103 Michael Sozan, Food Deprivation and Social Stratification in Prewar Hungary, pp. 20, $3.00

Ronald H. Linden is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science of the University of Pittsburgh. He is the author of Bear and Foxes: The International Relations of the East European States, 1965-1969 and the editor of The Foreign Policies of East Europe: New Approaches.

V
251
1

Paper No. 101