NUMBER 190

CONCEPTUALIZING POLITICAL PARTICIPATION IN THE USSR TWO DECADES OF DEBATE

BY Jeffrey W. Hahn

Political Science Department
Villanova University

Short Term Visiting Grantee, 1984
Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

"Conceptualizing Political Participation in the Soviet Union: Two Decades of Debates"

One of the standard questions for measuring a sense of civic competence is whether the respondent feels that there is much they can do if an unjust law were passed by their legislative body. Those living in societies with a "civic" or participatory" political culture are more likely to respond positively than those who do not.[1] When asked to specify what they would actually do to effect such a law, students in the author's classes over the years have responded in a variety of ways. Among the most frequent is contacting their legislators (individually or through a group), either directly, or indirectly through petitions, letters, or the media. They also mention getting involved in election activities, including voting, or working for a candidate, either in a political party, or through a special interest group. Also mentioned, although less frequently, are demonstrations, peaceful or violent, or using class action suits in the courts. Probably the most extensive cross-national study of political participation to date has summarized all the various specific forms of conventional participation into four categories or "modes": voting, campaign activity, communal activity, and particularized contacts. The authors of the study defined political participation as "those legal activities by private citizens that are more or less directly aimed at influencing the selection of governmental personnel and/or the actions they take."[2]

For the sake of the present discussion, this paper will narrow these four modes down to two: electoral activity, including voting and campaign activity; and constituent contact, including communal activity and particularized contact. The term constituent contact is understood to encompass interest group activity.

It will be argued first, that constituent contact rather than electoral activity is the dominant mode of political participation in communist countries;[3] and second, that the definition of political participation offered above should be modified in the light of research about participation in communist societies. In doing so, the extensive, and occasionally bitter, debates over whether such a thing as "meaningful" political participation exists in communist countries will be reviewed. For the sake of clarity, these debates will be somewhat artificially divided into two issues: interest group pluralism and mass citizen participation.

The Debate over Interest Group Pluralism

Changes taking place in the Soviet Union following Stalin's death in 1953, combined with the emergence of comparative political systems analysis as an approach to the study of politics led to increased dissatisfaction among some specialists on the Soviet Union with the prevailing totalitarian model.[4] This model, which in origin predated de Stalinization, emphasized the highly centralized, autocratic nature of the regimes which had come to power in Eastern Europe since WW II. In this view, power was monopolized by a small elite at the head of the Communist party whose policies were more or less unquestioningly implemented by a compliant state bureaucracy and imposed on a passive population. Participation in the making of those policies by groups or individuals other than the small group at the top was out of the question. The Soviet system was seen as monolithic in the sense that one, and only one set of interests were legitimate - those of the proletariat as articulated by the Party leadership. The notion that competition between different groups for political influence or for scarce resources was not only incompatible with the totalitarian model but was rejected by the Soviets themselves.

The first major challenge to this prevailing view came from H. Gordon Skilling. As early as 1960, Skilling had advocated that the study of Soviet politics be undertaken in the context of comparative frameworks of analysis then being applied to non-communist systems.[5] One of the major functional categories used for comparing Western political systems is how interests are articulated. Applying this category to Soviet politics led Skilling to a conclusion quite different from that which the prevailing totalitarian model had implied. In an article entitled "Interest Groups and Communist Politics", published in World Politics in 1966, Skilling wrote:

> "In the absence of an effective representative body and also of independent and competing parties the single party must serve as a broker of competing group interests. In the post-Stalin era, with the circle of decision-making widening and public discussion less restricted, the Party chiefs must more and more give attention to forming a consensus among competing policy groups, specialist elites, differing viewpoints within the party, professional associations and broader amorphous social groupings."

Skilling went on to identify at least eight groups who could be said to have articulated specific interest at one time or another in recent Soviet political history: intellectuals, jurists, managers, educators, nationality groups, scientists, the military, and groups within the Party itself. Empirical evidence to substantiate his argument was forthcoming in an edited book of case studies published in 1971 and entitled, Interest Groups in Soviet Politics.

The challenge of this perspective to the totalitarian model was twofold. First, it rejected the view that Communist systems in general, and the Soviet system in particular, were unique. If the essence of politics is the resolution of competing demands, then why isn't the question of who gets what as relevant to understanding the Soviet political system as any other? Secondly, if one approaches the Soviet system in this way, the view that decision-making in the

USSR is monolithic, exclusive and unidirectional would need revision. Given competition between different groups for political influence, should it not be considered, in some degree, pluralistic? Skilling explicitly backs away from equating the growth of interest-group politics in the USSR with "genuine pluralism", preferring instead the term "imperfect monism" or a "pluralism of elites" in the spirit of Robert Dahl's concept of polyarchy.[7] Nonetheless, it is not unreasonable to infer from Skilling's argument that some sort of pluralism in Soviet politics exists.

The question of what sort of pluralism was addressed by Jerry Hough in 1972 in an article entitled "The Soviet System: Petrifaction or Pluralism". In it, Hough articulates a model of Soviet politics called "institutional pluralism" which he argues represents an intermediate stage between authoritarianism and "classical pluralism". This model shares with conventional pluralism the existence of a multiplicity of competing groups. Conflicting goals are mediated by a political elite whose decisions are influenced by those effected. Such decisions reflect a desire to accommodate as many interests as possible and are incremental rather than comprehensive in nature. The differences between this model and classical pluralism, according to Hough, "centers on the framework in which the political process takes place and on the types of political behavior that are tolerated."[9] What Hough seems to mean by this is that involvement in the political process in the USSR must be through "official channels", that is, state-approved institutions.[10] Perhaps anticipating controversy, Hough also emphasizes what he does <u>not</u> mean by institutional pluralism. He states that such a society is more oligarchic than democratic, that it represents a direction in which the USSR is heading but has not arrived at yet, and that there is nothing to exclude a reversal of this process, although he does feel that to be unlikely.

The work of Skilling and Hough stimulated a large number of works, empirical as well as theoretical, which applied their concepts of interest group pluralism to various aspects of Soviet politics.[11] But they also provoked a great deal of criticism.[12] While the attack on the concept of interest group pluralism as applied to the Soviet Union is varied and often intense, two themes seem to unite its opponents. The first of these is that the concept fails to distinguish between authoritarian and democratic regimes. This line of thinking is prominent in criticisms by Andrew Janos. Janos argues that political groups in Soviet politics described by Skilling and others fail to meet the minimal criteria of interest group pluralism. In particular, such groups lack autonomy, representativeness, and regularized access to decision-makers. Such criteria are only found in democratic societies where legitimacy comes from below and a multiplicity of private interests can contend for the satisfaction of goals which members of the group themselves have defined. In authoritarian societies the state does not exist to serve private interests, rather, private interests are defined by the state. As Janos puts it "leaders have a mandate not to obey but to command their constituents."[13] Pluralism can have meaning only in civic or democratic societies.

A second theme found in much of the criticism has to do with political culture. The point here is that the psychological prerequisites of a pluralistic society are not present in Soviet society. Traditional Russian political culture, it is argued, consists of communalist, and autocratic values rather than the individualistic, democratic, and constitutional ones found in Western society.[14] Related to this view is the rejection of any suggestion that change in a more pluralistic, or democratic direction will result from the modernization of Soviet society. As one author writes, "The pluralist thesis, like the convergence theory to which it is so closely related, is, in fact, another example of the ethnocentricism that so often prevades Western analyses of Communist states.

A variety of political forms may be compatable with advanced industrialism."[15] Pluralism will not accompany the socio-economic development in Soviet society because of the persistance of a traditional political culture which is inhospitable to it.

Both Hough and Skilling have replied in print to these criticisms, arguing essentially that they have been misrepresented.[16] In a recent symposium on this topic, Skilling undertook to set the record straight. In a response to the article by Janos cited earlier, Skilling wrote a rejoinder published in 1980 and entitled, "Pluralism in Communist Societies: Straw Men and Red Herrings." In it, he argues that centralization is indeed a key characteristic of Soviet politics and interest group activity is "marginal" to the making of policy, but he maintains that he had never argued differently. He also denies ever having said that interest-group activity in the USSR constituted "genuine" pluralism or that evolution in such a direction was an inevitable consequence of modernization. What he does insist nonetheless is that interest group activity does take place in Soviet society and is a useful category for the comparative analysis of communist as well as non-communist systems.

The current direction of the discussion of interest group participation in Soviet policy-making seems to be to disassociate empirical research on the subject of groups from the theoretical discussions of whether the Soviet polity is moving in a democratic direction. Both Skilling and Zvi Gitelman, who also commented on Janos' paper, urge the discipline to move away from debates and definitions about pluralism and into the field to do more empirical research.[17] A capsule summary of the status of the concept would probably find most students of Soviet politics agreeing that group conflict is part of Soviet political life, but wide disagreement over whether the Soviet Union is or can ever be evolving in the direction of Western-style pluralism along with a general rejection of convergence theory.[18] From the point of view of the present paper,

what the debates and the research over the past two decades have established is that political participation in the form of interest group activity does take place in the USSR. Whatever the arguments are about how "genuine" or democratic such participation is, the Soviet case may require us to modify our conception of participation. This is also true with respect to mass citizen activity in the USSR, a subject to which we turn next.

Mass Citizen Activity

Up until the middle of the nineteen-seventies, the prevailing view of mass political participation in communist countries held, with few exceptions, that such participation was little more than window-dressing used by Soviet leaders to obtain a veneer of legitimacy while enhancing their ability to mobilize citizens and check up on policy implementation. Organizations involving mass activity such as trade unions, the local soviets, the Komsomol, the people Control Committees and the like served primarily as "transmission belts" used by Party leadership to inform, direct and control the masses.[19] Not all analyses in this period, however, agreed with the prevailing view. One article argued that, within limits, the avenues open to "citizen demands" had widened, and the local deputy played a significant role in processing these demands.[20] Still another suggested that participation had increased in the post-Stalin period and that it varied inversely with the level of government.[21] A number of works dealing with the governing of Soviet cities concluded that party-state relations were more complex than previously thought, with the organs of the state playing a significant role in the formulation as well as the implementation of policy.[22] Despite these, as a recent summary of the debate puts it:

> "The functions of participation were thought to be largely limited to the socialization of the populace, the legitimation of the regime, and the mobilization of the citizenry in pursuit of goals determined by the elite. Participation, it was argued, was neither meaningful nor real, and could safely be ignored by political scientists."23

The publication of two articles, one by Jerry Hough in 1976, and one by D. Richard Little in 1976 served to stimulate new interest in the nature of political participation in communist countries.[24] Both authors noted that on the basis of quantitative analysis alone political participation in the Soviet Union was substantial, and had grown steadily in the post-Stalin period, often exceeding, in numerical terms, the standard measures of conventional participation used to describe Western democracies. As to the question of whether mass political participation had any effect on decisions, Hough's reply was that we haven't enough information to draw any conclusions about whether it does or not. As to the argument that participation in communist countries serves to mobilize and socialize citizens while providing feedback on the effectiveness of local administration, Hough answered that this is also true of the West and that we can't adopt two definitions of participation - one for the USSR, and one for the West, if we are to be truly comparative. Neither Hough nor Little deny that differences may exist. Instead, they argue that we really don't have enough empirical evidence to draw the kinds of conclusions that prevail in the literature.[25]

A virtual cottage industry of published work dealing with political participation in communist countries has emerged over the past several years since the publication of these provocative articles. Much of the reaction was critical, arguing that there were crucial distinctions to be made between "genuine" democratic participation and that which was not. Donald Barry, writing a critique of Hough's views on political participation, cites another Soviet specialist, Walter Connor, to the effect that Soviet citizens lack a participant political culture and that "the only participation worthy of the name that exists among numbers of the general populace is that practiced by the dissidents." Barry then goes on to dismiss the participation in public organizations described by Hough as "sham participation at best".[26] In a similar vein, T.H. Rigby argues that the essential difference between mass political participation in the West

and in the Soviet Union is the opportunity to organize and express, on an individual or group basis, public opposition to Soviet leaders and their policies. He specifically notes (p. 260) the importance of elections in the West as a mechanism for replacing a government when people are dissatisfied with its performance.[27] Indeed, the absence of competitive elections in the USSR is one of the most frequently articulated criticisms uniting those who reject the notion that political participation in Soviet politics is anything more than a "charade".[28]

Other scholars have argued equally vigorously on behalf of the utility of studying political participation in communist countries.[29] Nevertheless, there are still relatively few published works on the USSR which are based on empirical field research and deal with political participation as a major theoretical concern. The most extensive work to date is that of Theodore Friedgut whose book Political Participation in the USSR (1979) deals primarily with the institutions of local government. Friedgut's work is based on field research carried out while an exchange student at Moscow University in the 1969-70 academic year. During this time he interviewed deputies in the Moscow City Soviet, the Oktyabr' Urban District Soviet, and, during a week in December, 1969, members of the Kutaisi City Soviet in Georgia.[30] In addition, he has done extensive interviews with Jewish emigres to Israel.[31] His work is also based on a wide reading of Soviet source materials. After reviewing all the data available to him, Friedgut comes to the conclusion that despite considerable efforts to turn the local soviets into a vehicle for citizen participation that would generate popular support for the system, these efforts have met with, at best, limited success. "The activization of participatory institutions has not eliminated the subject element so prominent in Soviet political culture."[32] As to the thesis that successful participation will breed more participation thereby bringing systemic change, Friedgut is "doubtful".[33]

While Friedgut sees relatively little change so far, he differs from those who see the local soviets as institutions solely for the socialization and mobilization of Soviet citizens as did most of the earlier works on this subject. Instead, he points out that, to some extent, Soviet citizens can and do "fight city hall." He writes "It is a significant development in the Soviet political system that the citizen can and does elicit regime attention for his demands, for the feeling of being able to command attention from the authorities is the precondition of any civic culture".[34] Most recently he suggests that while a "civic consciousness" is not yet a dominant fact of Soviet political life, "neither is it wholly absent" and that further study of its development would "enable us to understand more of the dynamics of development of Soviet society, and the prospects for that system's future".[35]

Another study of political participation based on field research in the Soviet Union merits attention. This is the work of Ronald Hill whose book, Soviet Political Elites: The Case of Tiraspol (1977), originated as a doctoral thesis based on field research in Tiraspol, the third largest city in Moldavia. While Hill conducted some interviews with local officials, he relied heavily on local newspaper accounts. In a second book, Soviet Politics, Political Science and Reform (1980), the author, who spent May-July 1975 in Moscow, further examines the problem of political change in the course of an excellent review of what professional students of politics in the USSR are suggesting in the way of governmental reform. In certain respects, Hill's conclusions coincide with Friedgut's. Efforts to revitalize the local soviets and turn them into more participatory organs have not yet gotten very far.[36] Also like Friedgut, however, Hill maintains that local government may well become the locus of more significant changes in the future. He suggests that the emergence of a popular political culture would be facilitated by the kind of democratic reforms now being discussed.[37] Finally, again joining Friedgut, he urges further research, especially on the role of the local deputy, which he acknowledges was not a major focus on his original study.[38]

A few other recent studies deserve mention. In a recently published article based on field research in Moscow during the 1979-80 academic year, Michael Urban attempted to separate qualitative aspects of political participation from purely quantitative considerations by looking at the flow of information from administrative organs to the local soviets. He concludes that administrative bodies dominate the elected deputy by virtue of their control over the flow of information in such a way as to preclude the deputy from a participatory role in the "public sphere." Thus, "popular participation in the USSR has little to do with democracy."[39]

The growth of interest in local government in Communist countries can also be seen in the recent publication of two collections of articles. One, edited by Everett Jacobs, is entitled Soviet Local Politics and Government (1983) and provides an excellent overview of the structure and development of local government, as well as articles dealing with more specialized topics including elections (Jacobs), and participation (Churchward). The other work is entitled Local Politics in Communist Countries and was edited by Daniel Nelson (1980). One valuable article in the volume by Jan Adams examines how 36 million public inspectors and volunteers in the Soviet Union monitor the work of local administrators. The work of Nelson dealing with local politics in Romania in this book (Ch. 2), and in his Democratic Centralism in Romania (1980) also deserves special mention. On the basis of 250 interviews with Romanian representatives in four provinces Nelson tests the hypothesis that the Party's pursuit of modernization has generated demands for greater participation which, if met, will reduce the party's control over the system. In all of these works, there is a feeling that the processes of political participation in communist countries deserve more serious attention than they have previously received.

Reconceptualizing Political Participation

The foregoing review of the debates over political participation in communist countries which have taken place since the mid-sixties suggests two conclusions. First, some kind of political participation does take place in these countries. On this, even the critics would agree. Moreover, the literature would seem to have established that constituent contact, in the form of interest-group activity and mass citizen participation at the local level, does have an effect on political life in these countries. How great an effect or how "meaningful" this participation is, is a matter of considerable disagreement. On the other hand, virtually noone sees electoral activity as being an important vehicle for participation. The second conclusion is that most of the arguments against applying this concept to the politics of communist countries center on whether such participation is democratic, and on whether Soviet society can or will become more democratic. To some extent this issue is, in Skilling's words, a "red herring", since neither Skilling nor Hough have made such claims. Nevertheless, the apriori rejection of this possibility simply on the grounds that they are communist and we are not seems to move the discussion of this issue from a scholarly arena into an ideological one. One of relatively few specialists on Soviet politics willing to grasp this particular nettle is Donald Schulz who points out that "so much of the traditional literature has been marred by ideological and cultural blinders. Our conceptual frameworks have been woefully culture-bound...is it true that political participation in communist systems is fundamentally different from that found in the liberal democracies?"[40]

This quesiton presupposes a clear definition of political participation, one which would be truly cross-cultural enabling studies of politics to compare communist and non-communist systems. The call for such a reconceptualization is not new. In 1967, Robert Sharlet noted that, "Political scientists have

conceptualized political participation primarily on the basis of political behavior in democratic systems" and he urged that "a reconceptualization of this key term that takes into consideration Communist data is essential for the systematic study of comparative politics."[41] The problem with Sharlet's efforts to reconceptualize participation, as Schulz has discussed at some length, is that he uses three defining characteristics of political participation based on Western experience, (effacing, voluntarism, and responsiveness) and argues that since none of these can be found in communist societies, we need a new definition. Schulz, on the other hand, argues that all of these characteristics can be found in communist societies, but that what is different is a question of degree and mixture.[42]

The present paper finds Schulz's argument persuasive. What is needed is a conceptualization of political participation which can be applied to communist as well as non-communist systems, one which will allow us to compare these societies on the basis of degree and mix. What follows attempts such a definition. In defining what is meant by political participation, a major recent cross-cultural study by Verba, Nie and Kim chose to limit it to "those legal acts by private citizens that are more or less directly aimed at influencing the selection of governmental personnel and/or the actions that they take".[43] The present study will adopt a broader definition for three reasons. First, the emphasis on selection of personnel (primarily through elections) as a key criteria of popular involvement contains an implicit <u>apriori</u> judgement favoring developed Western democracies. In fact, elections may be the least important mode of participation in much of the rest of the world, including the communist world. This does not mean that there is no political participation in communist countries, as we have seen. Indeed, as Verba, Nie, and Kim themselves conclude with respect to Yugoslavia, while elections and campaign activities are not

considered important as a mode of participation, particularized contacts and communal activity are.[44] This is probably true also of the USSR where election activity would seem to be less important than direct contact between deputy and constituent.[45]

Secondly, the above definition stresses the importance of the input side of participation, the influencing of policy decisions, rather than the administrative or output side. It seems to this writer that this distinction is somewhat arbitrary. In my experience as an elected representative, and based on my observation of the experience of others, the administrator plays a much more interactive role in policy making. He does this by being a source of information and also by being the one who implements policy. Conversely, a major job of the representative is constituency service. From the perspective of the citizen who is often uninformed about and uninterested in most policy matters, being able to get government to take care of some particular or community concern may be their most important avenue of participation. Most are more often interested in performance than policy with their direct participation in the latter minimal.

Finally, the definition excludes the elected representative himself as participant. Restricting the definition to "private citizens" ignores the fact that public officials are also involved in the political process and that the representative is at the same time a participant. Such a definition seems excessively narrow even for non-communist countries. Therefore, this study will define political participation as the involvement of citizens in the process by which decisions affecting community life are made and implemented.

Obviously this definition is open to further modification. It would be especially interesting to find out to what degree it would be useful to analyzing participation in the less industrialized countries of the world. Nonetheless, to a modest extent, this definition hopefully will move us in the direction of developing a concept which will reflect the experience of communist as well as non-communist societies.

Footnotes

[1]Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, The Civic Culture, (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1965).

[2]Sidney Verba, Norman Nie, and Jae-On Kim, Participation and Political Equality: A Seven Nation Comparison, (Cambridge: University Press, 1978), p. 46 and pp. 53-54.

[3]While some pre-nomination competition may go on in Soviet elections, the lack of choice for the electorate means that this activity is largely ceremonial and therefore, less likely to be perceived by Soviet citizens as a way to communicate demands or preferences. See Everett M. Jacobs, "Soviet Local Elections: What They Are, and What They Are Not", Soviet Studies, V. 22, #1, (July 1970); Ronald J. Hill, Soviet Politics, Political Science and Reform (NY: M.E. Sharpo, 1980) ch. 2; and Theodore H. Friedgut, Political Participation in the USSR, (Princeton: University Press, 1979), pp. 137-146.

[4]The standard version of this model is found in Carl J. Friedrich and Zbigniew Brzezinski, Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1956).

[5]H. Gordon Skilling, "Soviet and Communist Politics: A Comparative Approach", Journal of Politics, Vol. XXII, #2, (May 1960).

[6]H. Gordon Skilling, "Interest Groups and Communist Politics", World Politics, Vol. 18, #3 (April 1966).

[7]H. Gordon Skilling and Franklyn Griffiths (eds.), Interest Groups in Soviet Politics, (Princeton: University Press, 1971).

[8]ibid., p. 17. Skilling also makes this clear in a more recent reply to his critics. H.G. Skilling, "Pluralism and Communist Societies: Straw Men and Red Herrings", Studies in Comparative Communism, Vol. 13, #1 (Spring 1980).

[9]Jerry Hough, "The Soviet System: Petrification or Pluralism", Problems of Communism, Vol. XXI, #2, (Mar-April, 1972), p. 29.

[10]Jerry Hough and Merle Fainsod, How the Soviet Union is Governed, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979), p. 547.

[11]A partial listing arranged chronologically is offered here. Joel Schwartz and William Keech, "Group Influence and the Policy Process in the Soviet Union" APSR, Vol. 62, #3 (Sept., 1968); Milton Lodge, Soviet Elite Attitudes Since Stalin, (Ohio: Merrill Pub. Co., 1969); Philip D. Stewart, "Soviet Interest Groups and the Policy Process: The Repeal of Production Education" World Politics, Vol. 22 (1969); Jerry Hough, The Soviet Prefects (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969); D. Richard Little, "Soviet Parliamentary Committees After Khrushchev", Soviet Studies, Vol. 24, #1, (July 1972): David Langsam and David Paul, "Soviet Politics and the Group Approach" Slavic Review, Vol. 31, #1 (Mar., 1962); Donald

Footnotes (cont'd.)

Kelly, "Interest Groups in the USSR: The Impact of Political Sensitivity on Group Influence," Journal of Politics, Vol. 34, #3, (Aug. 1972); William Taubman, Governing Soviet Cities (NY: Praeger, 1973), esp. pp. 112-116; Theodore Friedgut, "Interests and Groups in Soviet Policy-Making: The MTS Reforms" Soviet Studies, Vol. 28, #4 (Oct. 1976); Donald Kelley, "Environmental Policy Making in the USSR: The Role of Industrial and Environmental Interest Groups", Soviet Studies, Vol. 28, #4, (Oct. 1976); Richard Remnek, (ed.), Social Scientists and Policy-Making in the USSR (NY: Praeger, 1977); Peter Soloman, Soviet Criminalogists and Criminal Policy (London: MacMillan, 1978).

[12]A partial listing of the critics, again listing publication chronologically, is as follows: T.H. Rigby, "Crypto-Politics", Survey, Vol. 50 (1960), p. 183-194; Andrew Janos, "Group Politics in Communist Society: A Second Look at the Pluralist Approach", in Samuel Huntington and Clement Moore (eds.), Authoritarian Politics in Modern Society, (NY: Basic Books, 1970); Bohdan Harasymiw, "Application of the Concept of Pluralism to the Soviet Political System", Newsletter on the Comparative Study of Communism, Vol. 5, #1, (Nov., 1971); Joseph LaPalombara, "Monoliths or Plural Systems: Through a Conceptual Lens Darkly", Studies in Comparative Communism, Vol. 8, #3 (Autumn 1975); Wm. Odom, "A Dissenting View on the Group Approach to Soviet Politics", World Politics, Vol. 28, #4, (July 1976); Stephen White, "Communist Systems and the Iron Law of Pluralism", British Journal of Political Science, Vol. 8, #1 (Jan., 1978); Andrew Janos, "Interest Groups and the Structure of Power", Studies in Comparative Communism, Vol. 12, #1 (Spring 1979); Valerie Bunce and John Echols, III, "Soviet Politics in the Brezhnev Era: 'Pluralism' or 'Corporatism'," in Donald Kelley (ed.), Soviet Politics in the Brezhnev Era (NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980); Donald Barry and Carol Barner-Barry, Contemporary Soviet Politics, 2nd ed., (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1982) esp. pp. 240-246.

[13]Andrew Janos, "Interest Groups and the Structure of Power," op. cit., p. 20. By the same author see "Group Politics in Communist Society: A Second Look at the Pluralist Approach" op. cit.; a similar argument is made by Bohdan Harasymiw, op. cit.

[14]William Odom, "A Dissenting View on the Group Approach to Soviet Politics" op. cit. Odom also argues that group conflict is "peripheral" and centralization is critical in Soviet politics. David Langsam and David Paul, op. cit., are in agreement with the group approach but agree that Western pluralism is different because of the culture variable. Harasymiw also stresses cultural differences, as does Stephen White in his writings, notably, Political Culture and Soviet Politics, (NY: St. Martins Press, 1979).

[15]Stephen White, "Communist System and the 'Iron Law' of Pluralism," op. cit., p. 117.

[16]Hough's brief comment on the article by Odom can be found on p. 525 of Jerry Hough and Merle Fainsod, How the Soviet Union is Governed, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979).

[17]Zvi Gitelman's comments on Janos' paper "Interest Groups and the Structure of Power" may be found in Studies of Comparative Communism, Vol. 12, #1, (Spring, 1979), pp. 35-38.

Footnotes (cont'd.)

[18]A good discussion of this may be found in Daniel Nelson, "Political Convergence: An Empirical Assessment", World Politics, Vol. 30, #3 (April, 1978).

[19]S. White, 1979, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

[20]James Oliver, "Citizen Demands in the Soviet Political System" American Political Science Review (APSR), Vol. 63, #2 (June 1969).

[21]L.G. Churchward, "Soviet Local Government Today" Soviet Studies, Vol. 17, #4 (April, 1966).

[22]William Taubman, Governing Soviet Cities, (NY: Praeger, 1973), esp. pp. 111-115; B. Michael Frolic, "Decision-Making in Soviet Cities," APSR, Vol. 66, #1 (Mar. 1972), esp. pp. 50, 51; and Philip D. Stewart, Political Power in the Soviet Union (NY: Bobbs-Merrill, 1968).

[23]Donald Schulz (ed.), Political Participation in Communist Countries (Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press, 1981), p. 2.

[24]Jerry Hough, "Political Participation in the Soviet Union," Soviet Studies, Vol. 28, #1, (Jan., 1976); D. Richard Little, "Mass Political Participation in the US and USSR: A Conceptual Analysis" Comparative Political Studies, Vol. 8, #4 (Jan. 1976).

[25]See also Jerry Hough and Merle Fainsod, How the Soviet Union is Governed (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979), pp. 510-517.

[26]Barry's critique of Hough, as well as Hough's reply, may be found in Problems of Communism, Vol. 25 (Sept.-Oct., 1976), pp. 93-96.

[27]T.H. Rigby, "Hough on Political Participation in the Soviet Union", Soviet Studies, Vol. 28, #2, (April 1976).

[28]Competitive balloting is cited as a major criteria of participation in one of the earliest, as well as one of the most recent articles arguing that "meaningful" participation doesn't exist in communist countries. Howard Swearer, "Political Participation: Myths and Realities," op. cit., p. 51; R.V. Burks, Political Participation Under Socialism" Studies in Comparative Communism, Vol. 15, #1, 2, (Spring/Summer 1982), p. 147. Burks argues that in almost all cases, citizen participation in communist countries is "organized from above and involuntary in nature" (p. 142). A recent analysis by a leading French student of Soviet politics also holds this view. Helene Carriere d' Encausse, Le Pouvoir Confisque, published as Confiscated Power, (NY: Harper and Row, 1982), esp. Ch. 7.

[29]Jan Adams, Citizen Inspectors in the Soviet Union, (NY: 1977); Jan Triska, "Citizen Participation in Community Decisions in Yugoslavia, Romania, Hungary and Poland", in Triska and Paul M. Cocks, (eds.), Political Development in Eastern Europe (NY: Praeger, 1977); and Donald Schulz (ed.), op. cit.

Footnotes (cont'd.)

[30]Theodore Friedgut, "Community Structure, Political Participation, and Soviet Local Government: The Case of the Kutaisi" in Henry Morton and Rudolf Tokes (eds.), Soviet Politics and Society in the 1970's, (NY: Free Press, 1974).

[31]T.H. Friedgut, "Citizens and Soviets: Can Ivan Ivanovich Fight City Hall?" Comparative Politics, Vol. 10, #4 (July 1978); and T.H. Friedgut, "The Soviet Citizen's Perception of Local Government" in Everett M. Jacobs, 1983, op. cit.

[32]T.H. Friedgut, Political Participation in the USSR, (Princeton: University Press, 1979), p. 302.

[33]Ibid., p. 317.

[34]T.H. Friedgut (1978), op. cit., p. 469.

[35]T.H. Friedgut (1983), op. cit., p. 130.

[36]Ronald J. Hill, Soviet Political Elites: The Case of Tiraspol, (NY: St. Martins Press, 1977), p. 186. Ronald J. Hill, "The Development of Local Soviet Government Since Stalin's Death" in Everett M. Jacobs (1983), op. cit., pp. 18, 30, 33.

[37]Ronald J. Hill, Soviet Politics, Political Science, and Reform, (NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1980), pp. 175-6.

[38]R.J. Hill (1977), p. 186.

[39]Michael Urban, "Information and Participation in Soviet Local Government" Journal of Politics, Vol. 44, #1, (Feb. 1982). The distinction between quantitative and qualitative measures of political participation is a useful one. Mere volume of participation does not make for a "democratic" polity in communist or non-communist systems. The issue dealt with in the present proposal is concerned, however, not with whether the USSR is "democratic" or not, but whether the patterns of participation which do exist are considered useful to the processing of citizen demands, thereby increasing the systems legitimacy in the eyes of those who participate.

[40]Donald E. Schulz, "Political Participation in Communist Systems: The Conceptual Frontier" in Donald Schulz (ed.), op. cit., p. 7.

[41]Robert Sharlet, "Concept Formation in Political Science and Communist Studies", Canadian Slavonic Studies, Vol. I, #4, (Winter, 1967), pp. 646, 648.

[42]Donald Schulz, op. cit., pp. 7-19.

[43]Sidney Verba, Norman Nie, and Jae-on Kim, Participation and Political Equality, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), p. 1.

[44]Ibid., pp. 53-54, 323-327.

[45]Everett M. Jacobs "Soviet Elections: What They Are, and What They Are Not" Soviet Studies, Vol. 22, #1 (July, 1970), pp. 61-76.