

of the world heritage," ready to seal the fate of the free world at Moscow's command (pages 13-14). One rubs one's eyes and reads again. Has nothing happened since Stalin's time except more Stalinism? There is but an occasional and skeptical hint of it here.

Those who say the East European states are no longer satellites may be no more right than Dr. Roucek and Dr. Lottich, who call them "less than satellites," mere "colonial outposts." There are, clearly, strong centripetal as well as centrifugal forces. But let us at least start with the facts at hand, find out what we can of the present relationships between governments and between Communist parties, and let the judgments and sweeping definitions follow later. We do need to know all we can about Eastern Europe, including the state of education there, as the authors say in their opening chapter. Unfortunately, few readers are likely to find that fighting their way through these more than six hundred pages brings much enlightenment on the subject.

Council on Foreign Relations

JOHN C. CAMPBELL

LETTERS

TO THE EDITOR:

If I may make a small contribution to the current discussion of the nature and content of Soviet sociology (George Fischer's *Science and Politics*, Robert A. Feldmesser's review of this in *Slavic Review* for March 1965, and Fischer's reply in the September issue), it seems to me that both authors have missed the point somewhat. I believe that a review of the files of *Soviet Sociology* (a translation journal published by International Arts and Sciences Press, White Plains, New York) would show that the sociological field in the Soviet Union is somewhat broader than either Fischer or Feldmesser indicates. I'm speaking now in terms of substance; it is true that not all the materials which go into the journal are specifically tagged as sociology by the Soviet authors. The journal includes such categories as "social theory and sociological research," "sociology of labor," "demography, ethnogeography, and social statistics," "computer and statistical methodology," and several others.

It is also my impression that the more technical aspects of sociology as now practiced in the Soviet Union (computer programing, the use of mathematical models, and so forth) are beginning to generate their own dynamism, just as the similar aspects of economics have done in the past. The distinctions drawn by Professor Fischer in his reply between economics and sociology in the Soviet context are valid enough as far as they go, but I don't think they tell the whole story. In point of methodology the field has already advanced far beyond the primitive "Confessions of a Generation" study carried out by Grushin and Chikin in 1962. For a highly ideological but nevertheless revealing report by the same authors on another

public opinion poll, see "Problems of the Movement for Communist Labor in the USSR," *Soviet Sociology*, Vol. I, No. 4 (1963).

With regard to "theoretical conferences" or "mass interviews," I wish to draw attention to a remarkable transcript of such a meeting which appeared recently in *Komsomol'skaia Pravda* under the title "The Arithmetic of Socialism on the Land: A Leninist Class Session" and which is scheduled for publication in translated form in *Soviet Sociology*. This session was participated in by social scientists from the central institutions, kolkhoz chairmen, and other officials, agronomists, and a good many rank-and-file kolkhozniks. The speakers raised questions concerning the effectiveness and morality of various methods of payment on kolkhozes, the nature of material incentive, and what actually constitutes socialism in this respect, which I have never seen discussed in any Soviet document up to now. If this beginning is followed up, it could provide an avenue of escape for Soviet sociology from the cul-de-sac in which Professor Fischer finds it imprisoned.

December 7, 1965

STEPHEN P. DUNN
Editor, *Soviet Sociology*

RUSSIA AND THE BALKAN ALLIANCE OF 1912 *Edward C. Thaden*



THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



The first new answers to the "Eastern Question" in over thirty years, based on previously unused Soviet sources.

In 1912, the Christian states of the Balkans formed an alliance, and drove the Turks almost completely out of Europe. Obviously Russia had encouraged the alliance, and, according to the traditional view, she sought warm-water ports and possession of Constantinople. In reality, pressed by internal problems, she sought to prevent war while maintaining her Balkan influence.

192 pages, \$7.50

University Press Building
University Park, Penn. 16802