Southern Political Science Association

The Politics of the European Communist States. by Ghita Ionescu

Review by: Edward Taborsky

The Journal of Politics, Vol. 30, No. 3 (Aug., 1968), pp. 852-854

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of the [Southern Political Science Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2128818>

Accessed: 04/02/2014 13:22

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Cambridge University Press and Southern Political Science Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Politics*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

questions, not always successfully but as well as anyone could, even in the inner circles of the JCP. Today there are at least three wings of the Japanese Communist movement: the main neutral wing ("We are all revisionists now" as Scalapino notes on p. 353 to show how the JCP development parallels that in other Communist parties toward national independence); a noisy and violent left wing often supporting Peking; and a smaller right wing loyal to Moscow. This reviewer found pp. 195-213, based on an article in the January 1964 issue of the *Annals*, a remarkably well-written summary of the JCP dilemma posed by the Sino-Soviet rupture.

The final two chapters bring the story up to date on the present status and future potential of the JCP, including 21 tables on the party's membership, electoral record, and finances. A good bibliography and an unusually detailed (43 pp.) index enhance the value of the volume. Even though the JCP is a weak party, unlikely to attain power on its own or through its Socialist-controlled "united front," this account of its weaknesses and ineptitude is of great value to Far Eastern specialists. The case study of the JCP provided here, however, is even more enlightening to anyone concerned with the world Communist movement.

DOUGLAS H. MENDEL, JR.

University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee

The Politics of the European Communist States. By GHITA IONESCU. (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967. Pp. viii, 303. \$6.75.)

The mighty upsurge of revisionism, pluralism and polycentrism in communist East Europe in the early and middle sixties has greatly enhanced the interest of Western political scientists in the area's political developments. Convention programs, symposia, and the growing number of monographs and books—including this one—all attest to this increasing interest.

Mr. Ionescu, of the London School of Economics, devotes his book to a searching analysis of the pluralistic forces and tendencies that are at work in the communist-controlled "apparatus states" of Eastern Europe. (He covers all of them, except Albania.) Believing that studies of communist politics have too

long been "focused more on how power is produced and administered by the state, than on how power can be and is encroached upon, limited and ultimately deflected by the necessary checks and dissent of the other forces of society," he tries to correct this imbalance by focusing his attention precisely on "this permanent, although unrehearsed, and inevitable, although hidden, relation of conflict between these particularly ambitious states and these particularly resilient societies."

Rejecting "the Stalinist assumption that the [Party] Apparatus alone can conduct all the principal activities of the state," the author contends that even in communist systems the power holders must necessarily seek and institutionalize "bargains" with those who can provide or withhold contributions indispensable to the functioning of society. Thus various checks develop that limit the rulers and constitute a sort of opposition. Mr. Ionescu divides these "plural checks" into three main categories: 1. the "apparatus" other than the Party, such as the Army, the Security Police, the Trade Unions, and the State and Local Administration, all of which are, to some extent, "the administrative rivals of the main [i.e. Party] apparatus;" 2. the social-economic classes and groups, such as the peasants, the workers, and the intelligentsia, which have at their disposal "massive means of bargaining as producers;" 3. the "constitutional and cultural bodies" which tend to develop "an institutional consciousness of their own" in spite of Party efforts to control them, and which are now in the process of "active reinstitutionalization."

Having identified the various "plural checks," Mr. Ionescu proceeds to explore the "manifestation of dissent," its basic political, economic, national, and spiritual causes, its main locales and "aggregation centers", its overall impact. He concludes by singling out, in a predictive vein, two "irreversible trends": first that "the pluralization and the reinstitutionalization which follows from it will continue to lead to the dissolution of the Apparatus;" and second, that "the European communist States will in the future become more European than Communist,"—whatever he may mean by that. (Earlier in his book, on p. 165, he mentions yet another "irreversible trend," namely, that "the party politician will give more and more recognition and scope to the intelligentsia and the élites.")

Mr. Ionescu's study is well written and his arguments and conclusions, optimistic as they are, are supported with plenty of convincing evidence. The only criticism this reviewer has concerns Part I of the book in which the author promises to expound "a brief general theory of power in the European communist states." This part lumps together all sorts of things, pertinent or not, ranging from sovereignty to *nomenklatura*, the Soviet Census of white-collar workers, and even "Frederick William, the Great Elector." The promised general theory gets rather lost in the process.

EDWARD TABORSKY

The University of Texas at Austin

Politics and the Military in Modern Spain. By STANLEY G. PAYNE. (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1967. Pp. xiii, 574. \$12.50.)

The neglect of modern Spanish history is nowhere better revealed than in the absence, until last year, of serious studies on the role of the military since soldiers first emerged as a political force in the aftermath of the Napoleonic wars. With the publication of this book there is no longer any excuse for historians to ignore or oversimplify the military dimension of Spanish politics. It is essentially an examination of the military in the twentieth century; only one-sixth of the book is devoted to the period before 1898. For the origins of military involvement one must turn to Christiansen's *The Origins of Military Power in Spain, 1800-1854* (1967), and for the mechanics of the nineteenth-century *pronunciamiento* and the military's political theory, to Carr's *Spain, 1808-1939* (1966) (neither of which is included here in an otherwise admirable bibliography).

If there is a theme in Professor Payne's book, which covers all the political aspects of the military problem, it is the failure of the professionalization of the Spanish army which was reflected in its extraordinary lack of homogeneity even in times of crisis, as in 1936 when "Franco insisted that the initiative (for declaring martial law) lay with the government and that the Army could take no responsibility alone as it lacked 'moral unity'." (p. 312) The case of the two professional elite corps, the artillery and the