

ARI Research Note 90-99

DTIC FILE COPY

①

Social Science Research and Literature on the Contemporary Military in Socialist States

Anton Bebler

Edvard Kardelj University

AD-A226 925

Basic Research
Michael Kaplan, Director

August 1990

DTIC
ELECTE
SEP 28 1990
S B D



**United States Army
Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences**

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

90 00 27 011

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

**A Field Operating Agency Under the Jurisdiction
of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel**

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

JON W. BLADES
COL, IN
Commanding

Research accomplished under contract
for the Department of the Army

Edvard Kardelj University

Technical review by

Michael Kaplan

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: This report has been cleared for release to the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) to comply with regulatory requirements. It has been given no primary distribution other than to DTIC and will be available only through DTIC or the National Technical Information Service (NTIS).

FINAL DISPOSITION: This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE: The views, opinions, and findings in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS --	
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY --		3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.	
2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE --		5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) ARI Research Note 90-99	
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) --		7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army Research Institute	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Edvard Kardelj University	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) --	7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 5100 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5600	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 61000 Ljubljana, Yugoslavia Kardeljeva Ploscad 5		8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences	
8b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5600		3b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) PERI-BR	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER DAJA45-88-M-0231
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Social Science Research and Literature on the Contemporary Military in Socialist States		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 61102B	PROJECT NO. 74F
		TASK NO. N/A	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO. N/A
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Bebler, Anton			
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Final	13b. TIME COVERED FROM 88/05 TO 88/07	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1990, August	15. PAGE COUNT 23
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Contracting Officer's Representative, Michael Kaplan			
17. COSATI CODES		18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) ► A number of problems exist with the body of social science literature and research on the contemporary military in socialist/communist states. Much of this research is nonscientific in nature, and what is of interest is often unavailable to even social scientists. Organizational differences set aside communist from western militaries in the areas of social science research and publication. Many social science research institutions in the East are institutes of military history. There is a strict separation of civilian social scientists from military personnel involved in social science research. Practically the entire production of social science work comes from military institutions and authors. Only a fraction of this goes unclassified. The share of scientific content in this literature varies widely--from zero to, exceptionally, above half. (14) (—)			
20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT. ☐ DTIC USERS		21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Michael Kaplan		22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (202) 274-8722	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL PERI-BR

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH LITERATURE
ON THE CONTEMPORARY MILITARY IN SOCIALIST STATES IN EUROPE

There exists a very considerable body of social science literature and research on the contemporary military in the USSR and in eight European socialist/communist states. This body has been accumulated in the last seventy years. The oldest and the largest part of it comes from the USSR and since 1945 also from younger socialist states. But there is a number of problems with this literature. What could be called social science proper constitutes only a small fraction of the totality of written sources on the contemporary communist military. The rest is non-science literature, para-science or quisi-science literature - from fiction, journalism, propaganda, memoirs, going all the way to more serious non-fiction with some elements of social science analysis.

Secondly, the most interesting products of social science research are not available, not only to foreigners but also to domestic social scientists, civilians and even those in military uniforms. Military secrets is only one reason for this effective blockage. In his latest book The Soldier and the Nation. The Role of the Military in Polish Politics, 1918-1985, 1988: Westview the best-known East European social scientist of the military Jerzy Wiatr listed several dozen empirical sociological and social psychological studies produces in the last twenty years in Polish military institutions. These studies, M.A. and Ph.D. theses etc., are not secret, yet usually they can not be obtained outside the institutions of origin. Still more titles could be found in small-circulation and theoretically open journals published by, for example, military-political schools or academies (such as Zeszyty Naukowe, Wojskowa Akademia Politiczna im. F. Dzierzynskiego, Warszawa or Zbornik Radova, Visoka vojnopoliticka skola JNA, Beograd). However these editions are not for sale and very carefully distributed.

There is a number of organizational features that set the communist militaries aside from the West also in the area of social science research and publication. The largest known social science research institutions in the East are institutes of military history. In several European socialist countries these are only publically listed military social science research institutions at all (for instance, in Romania, Bulgaria and Albania). Other social science research takes place as subsidiary activities at high military schools and academies in function of military education. Thirdly, main political departments usually organize some applied and directly action-oriented research, mostly based on in-the-house public opinion surveys. Other offices and military institutions involved in social science research activities are medical and personnel selection outfits. The study of foreign hostile militaries and some strategic studies take place in civilian institutions,

either autonomous or integrated with academies of science or universities.

In the East there are no known social science research institutions similar in size, mission or structure to the US Army Research Institute or the RAND Corporation. There is a much stricter separation of civilian social sciences from the military personnel involved in social science research. With very few exceptions civilians do not participate and are barred from in social science research on the domestic or friendly military. Such work is performed by military officers with additional social science training (in history, philosophy, sociology, social psychology etc.), in the line of duty and usually without and communication with universities or other civilian social science institutions.

Poland has the longest tradition of regular public opinion research in military-related questions, is the only European socialist country with a known military Institute of Social Science Research (within the Military Political Academy) and has a Center for Social Opinion Research at the Council of Ministers, headed by Col. Stanislaw Kwiatkowski.

More developed than elsewhere the Polish system of social science research by and for the military indicates the main directions of these activities in the more developed European communist militaries. The Institute Badan Spolecznych Wojskowej Akademii Politycznej (IBS) was established in 1970 and started operating in 1971. Its basic tasks were set up as follows: sociological analysis of moral-political situation in the ranks; soldiers' opinions on domestic and foreign political developments as well as on conditions in the armed forces; analysis of social precesses affecting defense needs and the party's political activities in the ranks; the development of military law; cooperation with corresponding institutions at home and in other WTO states; information gathering and dissemination.

Accordingly the Institute used to have four divisions-analysis of social problems, research on problems of ideological-up-bringing work, public opinion research and military and war law. The IBS has been headed by Col. Dr. E. Olczyk (1971-1982) and by Brig. Gen. Prof. Dr. Leslaw Wojtasik. From 1971 till 1986 the IBS carried out 382 projects, on the average 25-30 annually, from 1981 till 1985 effected 154 projects and 163 reports. Among its topics these were- sociological and psychological research on propaganda; longitudinal public opinion research on evaluation of the Second world war and of Polish military tradition; attitudes of the world war and of Polish military traditions; attitudes of the military youth; analysis of defense problems; military service and societal change; value change among recruits; cultural work among the troops; relations among the officers and NCOs; military family; military education; effectiveness of training of reserve officers; functioning of honour panels, control mechanisms and councils among officers and professional



or	
☒	☐
n	
/	
y Codes	
and/or	
Dist	Special
A-1	

NCOs; disciplinary and legal problems; social pathology in the ranks (suicides, alcohol abuse, grave disciplinary transgressions); public opinion research on attitudes toward military, universal service and patriotism.

Among the going research topics for the present five-year plan there are: value integration in the ranks; political attitudes of the officers in the 80s; social and material position of retired professional military; military family; attractiveness of military occupations for the youth; social and political attitudes of recruits; value change during the universal service; the feelings of insecurity, anti-socialist phenomena and interpersonal relations in the ranks; the monitoring of attitudes in the ranks; the state of military discipline. (Zestyty Naukowe, no. 4, 1987, pp. 103-109)

There are no recent public Soviet accounts on social science research carried out in the Ministry of Defense (particularly by and mostly for the main Political Department), in the Military Political Academy, in the Institute of Military History etc. However and approximate, although already dated, indication of the main concerns and of the level of sophistication could be gained from the standard text-books for military colleges and academies. Like W. Shelyag et. al. Military Psychology, 1972 (translated by the US Air Force) and A.M. Danchenko et. al. Military Pedagogy, 1973. These sources point out to the regular areas of operational research in the Soviet Armed Forces on the social psychological side testing and evaluation of knowledge, skills and abilities of recruits at induction and at the end of the tour of duty, effectiveness of various methods of training and upbringing, change in values and psyche of soldiers, small group dynamics, cohesion, stress, fear etc.

Common features of most sources on the contemporary military

First in the USSR and later in other socialist states the military and other related social phenomena have been the subjects of study for social, military and social-cum-military scientists.

In addition to and often in conjunction with scientific endeavors the same phenomena have been extensively treated in mass (civilian and military) media, in political propaganda and literature. In fact the quantitatively largest part of the sum total written and published on the military has appeared in the latter two categories of sources and not in scientific publications. This specific feature of socialist states should be borne in mind for at least three reasons.

Following Marxist-Leninist precepts it became customary in these states to officially deny the autonomy of science (even more vigorously of social sciences) vis-a-vis political ideology.

Hence many, if not a majority of social science or social-cum-military science practitioners with academic degrees and titles are required by their superiors or party organs in these states to act very often or even most of the time as official ideologists, political propagandists and party workers. Many among them see nothing wrong in fusing ideology, political propaganda and social science and consider the autonomy of science a sheer bourgeois hypocrisy and a tool of Western ideological subversion.

Secondly, following the Soviet Russian political norms any public treatment of real problems related to the domestic or politically friendly military has been severely restricted or almost entirely eliminated (prohibited) in all socialist states. The room for even "in-the-house" social science inquiry into contemporary domestic military problems has been very much restrained and seems even non-existent in a number of socialist states, particularly in Asia. Therefore the non-scientific treatment of the military is often the only outlet available of known to the outside world, being at best a substitute for scientific enquiry.

Thirdly, in most socialist states many social science sub-disciplines dealing with the military have not been internally officially recognized. Historically much of these activities have evolved from the ideological-cum-multidisciplinary social science conglomerate officially called "Marxism-Leninism", "Scientific Socialism", "Scientific Communism" and the like. This conglomerate presumably provides the key to the revelation of the ultimate truth and is thus above all social sciences. In all socialist states but in Poland and Yugoslavia there has been no official recognition of any separateness of such sub-disciplines as military sociology or political science of the military.

Soviet Sources

Undoubtedly by far the quantitatively largest body of para-social science literature on the military has been produced over the last six plus decades in the Soviet Union. Starting with the official political literature, which in the USSR is always arranged and presented according with hierarchical position and current political status of authors, one should mention names of all past and present Soviet leaders from V.I. Ulyanov-Lenin, J.V. Dzhugashvili-Stalin to K. Cerneko, in the next category all past commissars and ministers of defense, deputy ministers, chiefs of staff, heads of the Main Political Administration of the Soviet Army and Fleet etc. Of these the still most interesting today are military writings from the twenties by two former political opponents - L. Broshtein-Trotsky and M. Frunze.

Skipping other, evidently non-scientific sources one arrives at a very large body of works written by Soviet military historians. These works, particularly those dealing with hostile and foreign armies, quite often contain serious, well-documented although

never unbiased analysis of at least some aspects of institutional dynamics, social composition of the military, their political role, civil-military relations etc. in the recent past. This is particularly true of the Soviet historical literature on the Second world war, on the Wehrmacht, SS Waffen, Abwehr and other military or paramilitary institutions in the Nazi Germany. On the other hand works by Soviet military historians on their own post-revolutionary armed forces are largely hagiographic, descriptive and one-sided. They very carefully avoid discussing or even mentioning most real problems and politically sensitive issues in their own armed forces and societies. A similar approach is routinely taken by them when dealing with friendly socialist armed forces. With minimal variations the same rule applies to those works written by either military officers or by civilian social scientists in which military-related phenomena are treated predominantly from the angles of economics or international law. Coming closer to sociology and political science of the military one should mention rather numerous books and artikler in the field of military psychology.

Several varieties of Soviet social science works dealing with war and military organizations seem to be unknown in non-socialist states. One is exemplified by the work of Col. Professor M.P. Skirido Ph.d in philosophy, and entitled The People, The Army, The Commandant. It presents a curious amalgam of philosophy, history, politics and ethics of war, theory of international regulations, political and ethics of military organization, psychology of management and of commanding etc. Another variety is represented by (then) Col. Professor A.S. Milovido, PhD in Philosophy, Communist Morality and Soldier's Duty. This one combines ethics and esthetics in military profession, moral and legal norms in military organizations, discourses on the communist morality and on military-technological aspects in contemporary military organizations. These and other Soviet varieties resulted both from the defined needs of military academies' curricula, and also from long-standing limitations affecting sociology and political science of the military in the USSR.

Both sociology and political science were quite undeveloped in Russia at the time the Tsarist regime collapsed while best individual scholars in these fields (like Pitirim Sorokin who dealt also with war) went to the West. The new regime treated for several decades sociology as an antithesis of Marxism and as a tool of bourgeois ideology, while political science as an Anglo-Saxon bourgeois invention. These prejudices, although softened by time, still persist. The ideological preponderance of Marxism-Leninism (officially treated as supra-science) and the deeply entrenched academic positions of traditional social sciences (history, philosophy, law et al.) result in a situation where de facto predominantly political science and sociology works are internally presented under these covers, while their empiricism remains highly suspect and thoroughly controlled.

Sociology and political science of the military have not been so far officially recognized in the USSR as academic disciplines both in civilian and in military institutions. The Soviets use these designations for external consumption when dealing with non-socialist states, social scientists from them and with international organizations based in them. For historical reasons the military sociology line in international communications of Soviet scholars has been monopolized by a group of military officers with academic degrees in History and "Philosophy" (in fact mostly in "Marxism-Leninism") and headed by Generals P.A. Zhilin (previously) and S.A. Tiushkevich (presently), both from the Institute of Military History of the Ministry of Defense. Most members of this group are former political officers and now teachers of Marxism-Leninism in leading military academies in Moscow. By their previous training, personal inclinations and professional contacts they have little in common both with Soviet and with international sociology. Their main motivation in international communications was aptly summed up by Gen. S. Tiushkevich himself when he entitled his latest article in the monthly The Communist of the Armed Forces "Ideological struggle on problems of war and peace".

The prime product of this group of Soviet officers is the collective work War and the Army, no doubt authorized by the Main Political Administration of the Soviet Army and the Fleet. The book reflects the structure of military academies courses dealing with both phenomena. The part one treats war as a social phenomenon (history of thought on war up to Lenin, the origins of war, war and other forms of armed violence, typologies and the social character of contemporary wars, war and revolution, war and social progress etc.). The part two covers material and non-material factors in contemporary wars (regularities in wars, military might, material factors, science-technological progress and its influence on war, military science, spiritual factor in war, the role of ideology, the role of masses and of individuals in war). On four hundred plus printed pages of this standard military academy textbook on war the reader, for example, will find neither the authors' own definition of war nor a presentation of and/or a discussion on numerous other definitions of war in the scientific literature. This predominantly ideological scripture reflects well the inability of officially-sponsored Soviet social science: to develop on the basis of Marxist methodology an up-to-date scientific theory of war; to develop its own empirical research; to absorb from the entire world literature scientifically valid results; to disentangle social science from the position of a humble maid to current policies and politicians; to operate without "taboo" topics imposed by omnipresent party and security watchdogs etc. Similarly as War and the Army, other Soviet works on war have also appeared in connection with teaching in military academies. Of these still the best, in my view, are works by Col. E.I. Rybkin.

The latest addition to this steadily growing but largely stereotyped literature was fathered by T.P.Kondratkov. Like other recent Soviet works on the subject Kondratkov's also contains liturgic quotations from K. Chernenko. It then presents a review of the development of social and political thought on war from Sun Tsu to Clausewitz (politically the safest subject) and an exposition of the Marxist-Leninist theory of war. The work is heavy on history of social and political thought and on quotations from Marx, Engels and Lenin. The author's main endeavor is however to belittle about 150 "anti-Marxist" authors who published in English, German and French. It harshly treats contemporary anti-Marxists - on the basis of very sparse quotations from works practically unattainable to Soviet readers. It is also extremely thin on the empirical side of contemporary wars, eschewing entirely the empirically oriented Western social science literature on war. The author's theoretical level is reflected in his apparently not distinguishing between ius ad bellum and ius in bello when presenting Lenin's typology of just and unjust wars (p.143). Treating the Second World War Kondratkov still repeats the old Komintern (and Stalin's) evaluation of its first phase as imperialist and unjust on both sides (the sole exception is presumably Poland, with all other minor victims of German and Italian aggressions including Ethiopia, Denmark, Norway, Belgium, the Netherlands, Yugoslavia, Greece et al. ignored). According to Kondratkov the Second World War was transformed into a just-unjust war only on June 22, 1941, after the German attack on the USSR. From the totality of empirical facts relevant to his discussion Kondratkov fails even to mention the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact and the consequent Soviet military actions and extortion with the threat to use force (in 1939-1941) against six smaller and weaker neighboring states. The practice of omitting (and/or denying altogether) politically inconvenient historical facts, twisting and falsifying them - practice wide-spread in the Soviet social literature generally - constitutes, of course, a gross violation of scientific norms and also of the requirements of Marxist methodology.

Concerning contemporary wars Soviet authors still insist on the orthodox Marxist position according to which the root causes of all wars lie in class exploitation, class oppression and class struggle, with still the only culprit world-wide being imperialism. The officially approved typology of contemporary wars treats its quantitatively largest sub-class (wars between and within Third world states) as an aberration and as a result of imperialist influence, interference, intrigues, provocations etc. (i.e. as a derivative of imperialist wars). Until very recently it not only refused to admit the occurrence of wars between socialist and non-socialist Third world states, as well as between socialist states themselves, but even denied the theoretical possibility of such wars, all empirical evidence to

the contrary notwithstanding.

Looking at the side of military organization one finds a quantitatively large class of popular history, public relations and political propaganda books, brochures and articles extolling the Soviet Army and the Fleet, the Border and Internal Troops (belonging to the KGB and to the Ministry of Interior) and their exploits, particularly in the Civil War and during the Second World War. The persistent efforts to sell somewhat modified and translated versions of these texts as social science works have been politely ignored or rebuffed by most Western scholars as decidedly sub-standard. Such texts written by P.A. Zhilin and by other Soviet officers are sometimes included into international compendia but for reasons other than their scientific quality.

A more serious and one of the few internally allowed angles in discussing the Soviet military deals with parapolitical, educational, social service and several other secondary activities of Soviet Armed Forces. Thus in civilian academic publications one occasionally finds articles written probably by high military political officers like the two recent ones with very similar titles: Y.I. Deriugin, N.N. Efimov the Upbringing role of the Soviet Armed Forces and B.P. Utkin the Upbringing (vospitatel naia) role of the Soviet Armed Forces under the conditions of a developed socialism. Deriugin and Efimov operate with some empirical data from 1919, 1929 and the late seventies. They refer to several unidentified internal surveys, on political and general information exposure of military cadets' parents toward the profession of officer (86 percent fathers and 82 percent mothers responding favorably); on the rising general educational level of conscripts; on their previous occupation (about 60 percent in industry, construction and transportation, about 30 percent in agriculture); on the conscripts level of "political consciousness"; on their "understanding well the social value and necessity of military service" (about 90 percent); on conscripts estimation of the future value of their present military service in enhancing their education, skills, physical fitness etc.

Positive answers to these questions are then compared with answers to different questions in very different societal and organizational settings and drawn from a West German (K. Roghmann) and from an American (C. Moskos) studies. From these comparisons a conclusion is drawn, naturally unfavorable for bourgeois armies and favorable of the Soviet Army, concerning the possibilities for the development of conscript's personality, of patriotism, of spiritual as opposed to materialistic values, of antimilitarism etc. But even in this, by Soviet standards substantive social science work, one would vainly look for a discussion on or for a clarification of key concepts used, hypotheses proposed, existing world-wide theoretical and

empirical literature, sources utilized (there is of course a quotation from the current party leader), at least a hint that there might be some minor problems in implementing the Soviet Army's upbringing role etc.

However Soviet scholars are allowed to do much of it when they deal with hostile or potentially hostile "bourgeois" armed forces and somewhat less so with Third world militaries. For a number of years they could do it also with the Chinese military. Practically the entire open production on foreign militaries comes from civilian research institutes of the Academy of Sciences - the Institute for the World Economy and International Relations, of State and Law, for the USA and Canada, for Africa, for Latin America, for Oriental Studies, for the Economics of the World Socialist System et.al. One example of these institutes works is provided by a chapter on the Japanese self-defense forces in a collective volume Japanese Militarism .

From the considerable Soviet literature devoted to the military in developing countries one should mention works of the most productive Soviet author (and a Professor at the IMEMO) G.I. Mirski. He himself presented his book The Army and Politics in Asian and African countries in the following manner: "On the basis of an analysis of social structures in Asian and African countries the author investigates the causes for a relatively autonomous political role played by armed forces, presents officers' social origin, ideological build-up, armies' role and place in developing societies..." Mirski's book is a comparative study with most empirical data drawn from Egypt, Syria, Burma, Iraq, Thailand, Indonesia, Ghana and Nigeria. In his second book The Third World: Society, Power, Army, G. Mirski treated in a comparative manner (mainly on data from Asia and Africa) preconditions for the military entering the political arena, causes of coups, aims of the military, the military while in power, the relationship between the army and revolutionary democracy. Many of Mirski's topics were covered also by P.E. Sevortian in his The Army in political regimes of the contemporary East. Sevortian's style is less flowery, his sample of countries is somewhat different (primarily Pakistan, Indonesia and Egypt) and his approach slightly more sociological than that of Mirski.

The most recent collection of articles under the overly ambitious title Armed Forces in the Political System was prepared by a group of scholars in and around the Institute of State and Law of the Academy of Sciences. The collection written by 11 authors devotes most its attention to armies and paramilitary formations in "the developing countries of socialist orientation" (Algeria, Ethiopia, Angola, Benin, Mozambique, South Yemen, Afganistan, Tanzania, Burma, Madagaskar et.al.), but deals also with armies in Pakistan, Thailand, Mexico, Panama, with the Indian police and

with the ideology of capitalist-oriented military regimes. Written mostly by jurists on the basis of dated secondary sources and without field work the collection's major flaw lies in pronounced normativism and legalism.

East European sources

The situation in East European socialist states varies from one state to another and in all differs somewhat or distinctly from the Soviet situation. In all of them the total volume of literature is much smaller than in the USSR. The Albanian situation is very like that in Asian socialist states. Bulgarian and Rumanian social science on the military is mostly represented by works of military historians or civilian historians treating Military-related phenomena (mostly wars) in the past. Bulgarian historians are most interested in the Russian-Turkish war (from which Bulgarian independence resulted), in the two Balkan wars and in the final stage of the Second world war (with the obvious tendency to whitewash the role of the Bulgarian army in the entire Second world war). There are also a few Bulgarian works treating the Third world militaries ideologically along the Soviet lines.

The Rumanians stress their glorious military past from the Dacians on, using military history to buttress the present defense doctrine. Marxist vocabulary is combined in Rumanian works with claims that the present (post-1968) doctrine is a direct linear descendant from defense strategies used by princedoms of Walachia, Moldavia and Transylvania in the Middle Ages as well as from the pre-revolutionary military doctrine in the twenties and thirties.

The GDR production, again for reasons of external and internal politics, is oriented toward digging up "progressive tendencies" in the past of the Prussian and German military (from the Peasants' war and the Prussian-Russian alliance against Napoleon on). Their research specialty within the Warsaw pact is German militarism of the past, (only) West German militarism of the present, the Bundeswehr, the Bundeswehr-related problems in the NATO and the West German "military-industrial complex"

In the German Democratic Republic there are several centers of social science or social science-related activities on the military. The single most important one is the Military Academy "Friedrich Engels". In connection with teaching on war and military organization several Professors - Lt.Colonels or Colonels - Doctors have produced works with elements of sociology and political science of war (along with the predominant ideological component). Particularly two authors stand out-

Wolfgang Scheler and Gottfried Kissling. Unlike Soviet academy textbooks the East German ones contain bits and pieces of original empirical quantitative research on contemporary wars, as well as attempts to introduce and use objective and operational criteria for political classifications of wars. The Scheler-Kiessling book Just and unjust wars of our time (1982) contains computations on civil and, the like wars in 1945-1979, their time series, frequencies, a classification by duration, computations of all wars and war-like conflicts in the same period, computations by the degree of success in national liberation wars etc. The Kiessling book War and Peace in our time (1977) presents still more computations of wars, war-like events, armed uprisings and military coups by decades (1945-1955-1965-1975), by regions and by a degree of success (the latter is calculated for "the most important colonialist and neocolonialist wars"). However the methodology used in these studies remained unclarified and might will be questionable. The politically more important and therefore ideologically more deformed line of research and publications pursued in the same academy has to do with older German, GDR and, negatively of course, West German military traditions, ideology and militarism.

Other centers in GDR include the High Military-political School "Wilhelm Pieck" where capitalist and particularly the Third world militaries are studied. The Institute of Military History is involved, apart from the obvious, in research on the USA and FRG military policies. Internal empirical classified sociological and political science research is conducted by a section in the Ministry of Defense, while foreign military-related international problems (particularly disarmament and the "military-industrial complex" in developed capitalist states) are dealt with at the civilian Institute for International Relations in Potsdam-Babelsberg, closely associated with the GDR Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Among individual civilian scholars one should mention Professor Manfred Kossok of the University of Leipzig who worked in the past on the military in Latin America, and later moved to the comparative study of revolutions. Activities similar to GDR, with particular attention to (West) German militarism and revanchism, to some NATO-related topics and the Third world military have taken place in military and civilian institutions in Czechoslovakia. The organizational set-up also used to be similar - with the political - military establishment of the Czechoslovak People's Army and its outfits on the military side and regional or topic oriented research institutes of the Academy of Science on the civilian side. Up to the Warsaw pact invasion in August, 1968 the single most important center for the development of sociology and political science of the military had been the Military Political Academy "Klement Gottwald" in Prague. Its teachers and researchers, usually Lt. Col. or Col., Prof., Doctors-Jaromir Cvrcek, Karel Rychtarik, Jaromir Dedek, Zdenek Novak and others made considerable strides in the development of empirically oriented and ideologically less rigid studies on the Czechoslovak military's social mobility, on social consequences

of the military-technological revolution in socialist armies, on military youth and youth motivation for entering the military profession, on soldiers' leisure time and life style etc. However for its active participation in the reformist movement of the "Prague spring" the academy was punished in the ensuing "counter-reformation" by a total overhaul and transfer to Bratislava, while its teachers, as far as is known, by involuntary retirement.

Among Hungarian social scientists known abroad two stand out - Col. Dr. Emil Nagy from the unit for applied research of the Hungarian People's Army (on the side of military organization) and the civilian Professor of the Karl Marx University in Budapest (and a former diplomat) Istvan Kende. Col. E. Nagy and his group presented at the ISA congress in Uppsala (1978) a study entitled Way of life of today's soldiers in the Hungarian People's Army. Theoretically the work presents no interest. More attractive are (obviously heavily filtered) results of empirical research stated in 1976. Data was drawn and reprocessed from earlier opinion survey of 3000 ex-privates (1970), from files on 400 professional officers and NCOs (1971), from a family survey of 2000 active officers and NCOs (1973) and from an unspecified number of results of soldiers' examinations. In his study Nagy used a methodology derived from Janowitz, Moskos, Raven, Skawran, Brengelman and several other Western social scientists. Apart from document analysis, survey research and IQ tests the authors also used participant observation of ten platoons in four battalions (with the total number of 250 soldiers). Their particular interest was centered on personality and activity trends, on small group dynamics, soldiers' preferences for activities and for leisure time, the soldiers' time budget, organization of everyday life etc. It follows from the presented data that general training and general duties take only 4.66 percent of the soldiers' total time; various chores (cleaning barracks etc.) - 8.63 percent; mass communication - 7.58 percent; leisure, amusement, sports - 9.18 percent; sleeping, washing, eating, dressing - 38.57 percent; political education - 9.9 percent. When asked about their satisfaction with these activities soldiers expressed their preferences, firstly, for leisure time and rest, secondly, substantially lower for specialized military training, thirdly, still less for general training and regular duties, etc. These data were interpreted by the authors as showing a high degree of Hungarian soldiers' inculturation into the socialist way of life(!)

Professor I. Kende has been involved for already about fifteen years in the empirically oriented, largely quantitative research on local wars since 1945. Among scholars from socialist states he is unique in combining a Marxist perspective with solid empirical foundations and methodology of quantitative research of war similar to G. Bouthoul's, D. Singers's and M. Small's. Apart from Hungary I. Kende carried out research at the

International Peace Research Institute in Oslo (1968, 1977) and at the Hamburg University (1982).

Of all socialist states sociology and political science of the military are academically recognized and most developed in Poland and Yugoslavia. This is due to stronger than in Russia traditions in pre-revolutionary sociology, which somehow survived the upheaval of the Second world war, the first post-revolutionary years and domestic Stalinism; to lesser cultural and scientific isolation from the West; to less pronounced (but still existing) prejudices among some politicians against both disciplines; to less stringent ideological controls; to lesser obstacles to intellectual cooperation of the military with civilian universities; to less stringent prohibitions and limitation of empirical work on domestic and foreign militaries. Ideological relaxation and the abandonment in organizational terms of the academic monopoly of Marxism-Leninism occurred in both states after 1953 - in Yugoslavia with the collapse of the Cominform blockade (once Stalin died) and in Poland after the glorious Polish October 1956 and the removal of the most obnoxious signs of foreign political and military domination. This relaxation led to a recognized or tolerated by officials pluralism in social sciences, to the development of empirically oriented social sciences and various amalgams between Marxism and non-Marxian (could not read rest of sentence).

In Poland these developments were strong in civilian universities but in the late fifties they were allowed to enter also the Military Political Academy F.Dzierzynski in Warsaw. In 1957-1958 a department of sociology was formed there, according to its head for many years Jerzy Wiatr, the first such department not only in socialist states, but in the entire world. J. Wiatr as a civilian teacher taught at this department a course "The Army and Society" for almost ten years, until a new wave of political conservatism in 1967-1968 forced him to transfer to the civilian University of Warsaw.

The outgrowth of his lectures was the first and still the best in socialist states textbook on military sociology and political science of the military. Its first edition was entitled The Army and Society. An Introduction to military sociology. The second edition appeared in 1964 and the third was prepared about twenty years after the first, just before the imposition of martial law and military rule in Poland in December 1981, and was published in 1982. In this revised and enlarged third edition entitled Military sociology the author incorporated pieces from his numerous works-several books and more numerous articles-published in Poland and in the West. Wiatr's Military sociology treats predominantly armed forces and their social and political role, but contains also a subchapter on war and a large part on great ideologies (including Marxism) in their relation to the social role of the military. Apart from a chapter on the subject and

methodology of military sociology the two key parts of the book elaborate the role of the military in capitalist states, in anti-imperialist revolutions and in the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, as well as in socialist states. The last part is no doubt the most interesting to international audience. On about 90 book pages of medium size J. Wiatr writes on the socio-political character and functions of a socialist army (chapter X), on the Polish People's Army in the light of sociological research (chapter XI) and on the perception and evaluation of the armed forces and on military traditions in Polish society (chapter XII). This part constitutes the most comprehensive, theoretically and empirically the best-founded text on socialist militaries published in socialist countries today. Its value is enhanced by extensive bibliographical notes of Polish and other authors as well as by international comparisons drawn from similar studies on the officer's social prestige in Danemark, FR of Germany, Indonesia, Pakistan, the Philippines, Poland and the USA.

J. Wiatr incorporated into his book his earlier valuable paper Military professionalism and the transformation of military structures in Poland. It contained a discussion on the formation of Polish military officers' corps, its pre-war social Composition, educational background, previous experience and lifestyle. All this was set against the backdrop of deep social changes in the post-war Poland with vastly increased egalitarianism; a considerable reduction in pay-scale differences with white and blue-collar workers; with officers' different social origin (ex-workers - 48.6%, expeasants 33.3%, ex-inteligentzia - 11.3%), and marriage patterns; increased social mobility via the military etc. Democratization of the social origin and rapid industrialization brought about also a relative lowering of the military officer's social standing and a growing disparity between it and a high standing of the army as national institution. Unpublished public opinion surveys in the summer 1981 showed a high degree of public confidence into the army (in the range of 70%), about six times surpassing that of the ruling party and trailing only behind the Catholic church and the Solidarity (in the 90-80% ranges).

Two other Polish social scientists known abroad are both active colonels, teachers - researchers at the F. Dzierzynski Academy, pupils and successors of J. Wiatr in this institution. Of the two, Col. Jozef Graczyk is closer by his inclination and works to military sociology, while the other Maj. Gen. Mieczyslaw Michalik took a line in philosophy and ethics of the military occupation. Graczyk's most important work Sociological problems of the Polish Peoples' Army (1972) treats, first, functions performed by military sociology in society and in armed forces and then the social functions of armed forces themselves. Graczyk draws heavily in his work from internal opinion surveys, mostly among postgraduate officer-students in Polish military academies. From these data personal motivations of Polish officers are gauged,

the degree of their satisfaction with advanced academy studies, their life aspirations and values, their sons' preferred occupations (very few following their fathers), internal relations in the profession, etc. The author treats also the questions of professional ethics, discipline, etiquette, relations with subordinates etc.

The development of the military-related social sciences in Yugoslavia bore numerous similarities with those in other European socialist states, but also showed some noticeable differences from all the rest and also from Poland (with which it has the most in common). As in other states there exists a large para-scientific and non-scientific literature treating domestic and foreign armed forces. The official political literature on military matters includes writings and speeches of leading politicians, generals, secretaries of defense, their deputies, chiefs of staff, military theoreticians in the general and high office ranks etc. - the late. President Tito's Military Works, the ex-Defense Secretary Army Gen. N. Ljubicic's All People's Defense - - a doctrine of peace, (1976) Col. Gen. V. Bubanj's The Doctrine of Victory (1973), Col. Gen. R. Tanaskovic The Factors in Building and Organization of Armed Forces (1970) and many others. Of all these one work by the leading Yugoslav ideologist (late) E. Kardelj stands out - Socialism and War (1960, 1973). It was hailed by the official Yugoslav press as scientific work of world-wide importance, while scourged by the Soviet, Chinese and all other communist press as entirely unscientific diatribe of no consequence (to put it very mildly). The truth lied somewhere in between.

As in other socialist states a very large part of the Yugoslav literature was produced by military historians, associated with the Institute of Military History in Belgrade, with high military schools, with departments in the Federal Secretariat of Defense, some written by retired military officers and civilian historians. The biggest part of this history production has been devoted for several decades to the National Liberation War: to the Communist party in the war, to individual partisan units, services, the system of command etc., as well as to other theaters in the Second World War, particularly those that affected the war in Yugoslavia. Some works from this extensive literature contain sociological and political science analysis of individual partisan brigades and divisions, of the partisan units by regions, of the chain of command etc.

Numerous studies of the Third world militaries in politics have been produced since the sixties by civilian social scientists associated with the Institute for International Politics and Economy and the Institute for International Laborer Movement in Belgrade, the Institute for Developing Countries in Zagreb, Center for Cooperation with Developing Countries in Ljubljana,

Faculties for Political Science in Belgrade, Zacreb and Ljubljana.

Yugoslav sociology and political science of the military are in some respects complimentary with those in Poland. They lack good sociological works on the Yugoslav military and in this variety are certainly below the level of Wiatr's and Graczyk's works. This is primarily due to official prohibitions and/or severe limitations (officially justified by security precautions) imposed on empirical research within and on the armed forces. Historically it came about from the copying the Soviet practices (originally transposed Russian Tsarist system of civil-military relations) of banning any public diffusion of relevant data on the military, prohibiting a public debate on defense and security, issues etc. These restrictions have become ingrained in the inertia of relations and remained largely intact despite considerable liberalization and democratization of Yugoslav politics since 1950 - 52 and even after the introduction in 1968-1969 of a new military doctrine of "all people's defense," the abolition of the federal standing army's monopoly in defense matters and the ensuing considerable decentralization of defense activities in the seventies. (Although the continuing branding of most defense security data as "military secrets" is inconsistent with democratic politics in general and with conscious mass participation of population in defense in particular). However the rigidity of implementation of the above mentioned prohibitions slackened since the early seventies. Foreign empirical data on the Yugoslav military were allowed to be published, some fragmentary data from official Yugoslav sources were used public high military officers for public relations purposes (e.g. on the Yugoslav trade statistics in weapons and military equivalent), publication in civilian press of some officially confidential figures went unpersecuted etc.

For several years since 1968 and till its disbandment most empirical sociological research in the Yugoslav armed forces has been conducted by the Center for Andragogical, Psychological and Sociological Research, Federal Secretariat of National Defense. The center prepared thirty-eight larger studies, carried out fifty-five public opinion surveys and published twenty-six monographs, textbooks and manuals. Into the first category fall studies on officers' general educational and cultural levels, on young soldiers adaptability to military life, on recruits' value orientations, on social relations in the military organization, and on the AWOL problems. Public opinion surveys within the armed forces have covered, often regularly, the perception of social and legal positions of professional soldiers, the recruits' position in the military organization, views on pending legislation concerning the armed forces, on some aspects of the official military doctrine, on social and economic reforms in society at large, on the armed forces modernization, on the role of LCY organizations in the armed forces, on international relations and the country's geopolitical position, on the

functioning of the sociopolitical system, on the importation of foreign capital, on soldiers religiosity, on the utilization of leisure time and on the use of national languages in the YPA.

The results of one of the largest research projects.

Investigation on Relations between Nations and Nationalities in the YPA (started in 1966), were circulated outside the armed forces in 1970-1971 and were partly published in the weekly "NIN" in the summer 1972. The research team, headed by Col. Dr. Ilija Mrmak, used four types of questionnaires, with twenty-seven questions for military academy cadets and twenty-two questions for NCO cadets. The questionnaires permitted five Likert-type scaled anonymous answers ranging from "fully agree" to "fully disagree". The team used three samples of rank and file recruits from the twenty-eight garrisons (which were designed to give the time dimensions, too), two samples of NCO cadets from twelve schools, two samples of cadets from eight military academies, one sample of active officers (including reserve officers on active duty). All samples were predesigned, nonrandom representative samples. The total population included 7,663 soldiers, 4,951 cadets, and 2,738 offices.

Another interesting piece of research, which was given a limited circulation in civilian institutions, dealt with the performance of Yugoslav soldiers in UN peace keeping forces - Col. A. Logic et. al. The Detachment of YPA on the Sinai during the Israeli-Egyptian conflict in 1967. On the basis of an ex post facto survey of 229 members of the last detachment (45 officers and NCOs and 184 soldiers) out of the total 260 members, as well as of a study of related written documentation the researchers enquired into the degree and motivation for satisfaction with the Sinai service, the level of soldiers' information, relations between rank and file, NCOs and officers, the privates' evaluation of their superiors, the functioning of the unit under war-like conditions of stress, the incidence of courage and fear (by age, social origin, marital status, rank etc.), the manifestations of fear and courage, attitudes toward the war and evaluation of previous training and preparations in the light of the actual performance etc. Some of the findings (for example, on the incidence of fear and the rural-urban dichotomy) ran parallel to those of the Stouffer's classic study "The American Soldier".

Yugoslav authors have accumulated a considerable literature in substance close to political science of the military and military-related phenomena. It includes books written by teachers in military academies, military schools of advanced learning and civilian university faculties on legal, philosophical, ethical and other aspects of war, on the Yugoslav defense doctrine and defence system, on political and social thought, particularly Marxist thought, related to the idea of "people in arms" and to militia armies, on defense and security aspects of non-alignment, on disarmament and pacifism etc. There have been also civilian longitudinal studies based on public opinion surveys on social standing of military occupations, on

defense-related values among general population etc. One interesting story entitled Militarism (Rad, Beograd, 1977) was produced by (then) Maj. Dr. Ejub Kucuk. Kucuk is very rare among Marxist social scientists in giving a value-neutral definition of Militarism.

Finally I would like to mention two open empirical studies on military-related topics: M. Milosavljevic The Social Position of Veterans of the National Liberation War in Yugoslavia and Social Welfare Policies and D. Pajevic's Motivational Factors in Choosing Military Occupations. In the first a thorough sociological investigation of Yugoslav veterans' social position and a comparative study of social welfare policies affecting veterans in five major states are presented, supported by solid and up-to-date empirical evidence. The second study inquires into Yugoslav youth's (in some respects inadequate) interest for military occupations. It surveys the existing (mostly western) literature and theories and then on the basis of a representative random sample of high school seniors throughout Yugoslavia attempts to single out and to evaluate the most important psychological and societal variables affecting their decisions for or against entering military occupations.

In these and in some other areas Yugoslav social scientists seem to be ahead of the Poles, at least, as far as could be ascertained from publicly available materials.

Finally, several words should be said about contacts and cooperation between social scientists working on the military in socialist states. Some of these activities exist in the framework of military-political cooperation among the Warsaw Pact militaries. This is particularly true of military academies and political organs' cooperation, with most initiatives (for political reasons) coming from Moscow. Within this framework there was a limited number of joint publications, often exercises in military ideology. So far there have been no known joint sociological comparative studies of serious scientific value coming from socialist states.

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS AND GENERAL DISCUSSION

By far the largest part of the military-related literature in the socialist states has been generated by political-ideological (including propaganda) and by educational needs of communist parties and armed forces. The share of scientific content in this literature varies widely - zero to, exceptionally, above a half.

In all socialist states there exists a clear division of labour between civilian institutions and civilian social scientists and military institutions and military officers. With the partial exception of Yugoslavia (where five university departments of

national defense studies were established in 1975) civilian universities are everywhere excluded from teaching and the related research on the contemporary military. Typically, civilian social scientists are prohibited, by various means (including the threat of criminal prosecution) incapacitated to study contemporary armed forces of their own or of allied states. They are allowed to study, on the basis of foreign sources and to publish on foreign hostile or potentially hostile bourgeois, socialist and unallied Third World armed forces. But this activity as a rule does not take place at universities but at research institutes (usually associated with academies of science). A similar situation exists with regard to international military-related problems (disarmament, international humanitarian law, strategic studies). Civilian social scientists are given free hand in critically examining policies and practices of politically opposite states, but not those of their own or of allied socialist states. In this respect Yugoslavia is again an exception, to a degree.

Practically the entire production of social science works on the domestic (or allied) contemporary military and on domestic military-related problems comes from military institutions and authors in military uniforms. Only a fraction of this production goes unclassified, mostly in such areas as sociology, politics and ethics of war, military ideology, party work within the military, methodology, military andragogy and ethics. Even internally and in classified works military officers are much constrained in using and discussing empirical social science data on their own or on allied armed forces. Diffusion within the military of results of contemporary social science research is either altogether prohibited or strictly circumscribed at all levels but at the highest. This is due to the delicacy of possible impacts of this research on power position of key generals.

The single most important obstacle to the development of social studies on the development of contemporary domestic military in socialist states are authoritarian (in some states and periods outright dictatorial) methods and practices of military (defense) politics. The most influential and the oldest Soviet model of civil-military relations has developed in a society lacking democratic traditions of civilian control over the military, of parliamentary control over the executive, of public debate on defense policy and military issues etc. Mainly for these reasons in all socialist states today practically all empirical data on their own and allied armed forces are classified. These include the size of armed forces and of their components, composition by age, sex, social, regional, nationality, language, etc. origin, systems of recruitment and remuneration, social status, arms and equipment, real material outlays and their subdivisions, defense production, research and development policies etc. etc. Workers and peasants in today's socialist states know and could lawfully know far less on their armed forces than the counterparts in Western ("bourgeois-democratic") states could know, if their

care, on armed forces of their own or of socialist states. Under these conditions, obviously, there could be no meaningful public debate on the military, with corresponding highly debilitating effects on military related social sciences. Several methods are used by social scientists to avoid these difficulties: (1) do not treat these questions at all, at least field work, corresponding training, contacts with foreign researchers etc. Partly for these reasons, partly due to strong legalist traditions most works on foreign militaries by authors from socialist states are of inferior quality, suffering from normativism, internal ideological "mores", one-sidedness, use of secondary and tertiary, often outdated sources, journalism etc.

Apart from the above mentioned formidable internal obstacles to the study of the contemporary domestic military, social scientist in socialist states are to a significant extent theoretically incapacitated by the failure or by outright official prohibition to update Marxism, to absorb the immense treasure of social science knowledge accumulated since the days of Marx, Engels and Lenin, to revise those positions of classical Marxism which were shown to be of limited use, Europocentric, unconfirmed by subsequent research and events or outright erroneous. It is a historical irony that such trade-marks of Marxism as the insistence on economic interests as the basic motivation in human behavior, the stress on the class-suppression function of armed forces in all class-divided states are the least appropriate for the study of armed forces in states governed by Marxist parties. And in fact social scientists in these states when dealing with their own armed forces stay away from the categories of class struggle of state as primarily a mechanism for class oppression etc., and use the non-Marxian notions of social integration, of class harmony, class cooperation etc., in the stead. The latter categories however were never used by the classics of Marxism when they wrote about armed forces (plus police, courts, prosecutors, jails and other tools of oppression) in class-divided societies. Hence much in the contemporary social science production in socialist states have no foundation in classical Marxism, contrary to orthodox ideological claims. F. Engels wrote in 1865 that the decisive advantage of socialists (as compared to bourgeois thinkers and politicians) in studying military questions stems from their not publicly; (2) treat the deep past of your own armed forces; (3) treat hostile foreign forces; (4) stay on the level of ideologism and verbalism; (5) use formalism and legalism only etc. These methods are however not unique for socialist states.

Terminology used in socialist states is mostly of classical Marxist derivation with some older, originally non-Marxist concepts (militarism, just war) and newer non-Marxist concepts (military-industrial complex) having been assimilated. The infusion of concepts, social science methodology and terminology from Western non-Marxist literature is most evident in works of Polish, Yugoslav, Hungarian as well as civilian Soviet authors. No internationally influential conceptual and terminological

innovations have been noticed.

An important common feature of all social sciences in all socialist states is Marxism in nationally-state colored variations, as the dominant and in some the only allowed political ideology. Both the ideological and scientific contents of Marxism have significantly affected military-related social sciences, even more so because the officially sponsored state variations of Marxism are the only ones tolerated in the military establishments themselves. The scientific component of Marxism could theoretically give social scientists from socialist states some advantages over some social scientists from non-socialist states, because (a) it provides a coherent and universal theoretical framework and methodology and (b) it systematically stresses conflict, which is appropriate for the study of many (but not all) military-related social science topics. Furthermore social scientists from socialist states could have a far better access to the "armed forces of a new type". However these theoretical and practical advantages have been either squandered or lay unused. The least internally constrained to make good use of Marxism are civilian social scientists working on hostile or not too friendly foreign armed forces. However they lack direct access and possibilities for empirical (socialists) social and political disinterest and impartiality as far as the object was concerned. This impartiality was considered by Engels to be the necessary precondition for scientific objectivity. This precondition does not exist in today's socialist states, where cautiously selected and politically convenient quotations from the classics are most often used to justify regimes past or current policies, contrary to the original intellectual mission of Marxism.

Apart from theoretical problems social science studies on the domestic contemporary military are handicapped by several practices. These studies are allowed to military officers only, in their mid-career-plus age, without previous social science training, most often without knowledge of foreign languages, not infrequently without particular personal motivation, interest of intellectual qualities. This negative internal selection is then coupled with heavily restricted access to international organizations, international gatherings, and, to a lesser extent, also to foreign publications. Being a sinecure and a highly valued bonus foreign travel to international meetings has been monopolized in the USSR by small but strategically located groups of military-cum-social scientists (ISA) and of civilian social scientists (IPSA). International participation from Poland, Yugoslavia and Hungary has been irregular, while from the rest of sixteen socialist states very rare or non-existent. As the Soviet participation is not based on science merits, the outside picture created by papers, frequently of dismal scientific quality sorely under-represents the true state of affairs.