

wisely relegates him, for the most part, to the footnotes. Unfortunately, this creates a false impression of Solov'ev's thought and influence—as something monolithic and constant.

Little attempt is made to assess the significance of the ideas presented, although the discussions, particularly on the functions of the society and the state, are lucidly written. One would have appreciated a fuller treatment of the church, as well as further elaboration of the difficulties with censorship and more on the intriguing bit of information Scherrer offers about the tsar possibly financing a religious society in Kiev.

Since Scherrer apparently limited her research to the obvious influences on the intelligentsia and the literary avant-garde—especially symbolism and the philosophical “turn from Marxism to idealism,” she stumbled into some factual errors. Thus, the Russian public did not have to wait until *Novyi put'* for “its first confrontations with Nietzsche” (p. 115). A decade earlier, in 1892, *Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii* had carried a series of articles on the “German thinker.” (This journal's circulation was comparable to that of the journals of the intelligentsia, and its sponsor, the Moscow Psychological Society—which Scherrer characterizes as being limited to specialists [p. 208]—performed a much broader function.)

Perhaps no single work can be expected to bring out all the interrelated strands of thought and creativity which characterize this dynamic period of Russian history. Scherrer's book is a welcome stimulant to debate on the subject.

MARTHA BOHACHEVSKY-CHOMIAK
Manhattanville College

HOW COMMUNIST STATES CHANGE THEIR RULERS. By Myron Rush.
Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974. 346 pp. \$15.00.

Succession in Communist states is an important subject, and the “comparative communist” focus of inquiry deserves endorsement. It is therefore regrettable to find the latest book by Myron Rush—whose earlier work included *Political Succession in the USSR*—something of a disappointment. This is not so much the author's fault—his scholarship is impeccable—as it is attributable to the topic. Professor Rush correctly stresses the absence of an institutionalized model for succession in Communist systems and the consequent destabilizing effects. But, as he goes on to show, changes in rulers have not generally resulted in lasting crises, and only few candidates have proved to be woefully inadequate.

In this book the Soviet Union figures only as background or paradigm. China, Albania, and Yugoslavia are discussed although they have had no succession as yet; neither have Cuba or North Korea; Mongolia and Vietnam are in effect ignored. This leaves the Soviet bloc countries of Eastern Europe for more detailed treatment, and the book does give a reliable, factual account of the successions in the six countries concerned.

Rush provides some useful classifications. While some successions have been “natural,” more often they have been politically caused by the ouster of the incumbent. He distinguishes between limited and extended succession struggles, and between those that lead to a single dominant leader and those that do not. The severity of crises, it turns out (not surprisingly), tends to be least in natural, rather than political, successions; when Moscow is in control; when there is no

strong alternative candidate; and when external pressures inhibit an internal power struggle. The outcome, Rush argues, is determined by the interaction of Soviet leadership, indigenous leadership, indigenous elites, and the "nation" at large.

It may well be that nothing more novel or exciting can be said on the subject. Students of Eastern Europe will hardly be surprised that the first secretary of the party has the inside track (but then, how did he get into *that* position in the first place?). The number of cases is still small, and as a result the patterns are often ambiguous (or all too obvious). It is hard to tell what is unique or characteristic for Communist systems and what is not. There is no apparent logic linking intervening variables and outcomes in particular cases; no clear correlation between succession types and criteria such as level of development, proximity to the USSR, political culture, or age of regime.

Actually the book has a broader scope than the title suggests. It also deals, somewhat selectively, with factional struggles, purges, and "plots against rulers." On the other hand, focusing on the succession question, the author tends to see Soviet intervention in Eastern Europe as an effort to remove individual leaders rather than to inhibit or reverse unacceptable policies.

Rush also examines the fate of potential heirs and finds them frequently in exposed positions—as Liu Shao-ch'i, Lin Piao, and Ranković, among others, had occasion to learn. It is interesting to note that all former leaders have been posthumously attacked—except for Lenin, Dimitrov, and Ho Chi Minh. Rush only alludes to the interesting problem inherent in the shift of power from a charismatic leader to a bureaucratic successor, and his sketch of typical attributes of successful, as against unsuccessful, candidates for the top position is not entirely convincing. There are also a number of apparent contradictions and truisms in the volume.

ALEXANDER DALLIN
Stanford University

THE MARKET IN A SOCIALIST ECONOMY. By *Włodzimierz Brus*. Translated from the Polish by *Angus Walker* and revised by the author. London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972. 199 pp.

THE ECONOMICS AND POLITICS OF SOCIALISM: COLLECTED ESSAYS. By *Włodzimierz Brus*. Foreword by *Maurice Dobb*. London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973. 117 pp.

Students of political economy of socialism and planning reforms should welcome the long overdue English translations of some of the writings of one of the most outstanding East European economists, Professor *Włodzimierz Brus* of Poland. Brus's writings are of considerable interest for a variety of reasons, and I can only touch on a few of them here.

Brus was among the first of East European economists to call publicly for a radical overhaul of the planning system. (Excerpts from his speech, "On the Role of the Law of Value in a Socialist Economy," delivered at the Second Congress of Polish Economists in June 1956, were translated and reprinted in *Oxford Economic Papers*, June 1957, pp. 209–21.) His courageous and outspoken stand was particularly striking in view of his high position within the citadel of orthodoxy. At that time he was much more of an insider—the party economist—than Oskar