

industrial geography of Eastern Europe lies another book waiting to be written, which would treat thematically various questions raised but incompletely dealt with in the present book—questions such as whether or not a distinctive socialist geography is being created in Eastern Europe, the attention given to equity versus efficiency in industrial location and other economic decisions, and whether the imposition of communism has actually stimulated or hindered the economic progress of Eastern Europe. A work of this nature would no doubt interest a broader audience than the one interested in industrial geography per se. I, for one, hope the author chooses to write this less orthodox book, for he is unusually qualified to do so.

ROLAND J. FUCHS
University of Hawaii, Manoa

EASTERN EUROPE'S UNCERTAIN FUTURE: A SELECTION OF RADIO FREE EUROPE RESEARCH REPORTS. Edited by *Robert R. King* and *James F. Brown*. New York and London: Praeger Publishers, 1977. xxii, 360 pp. Tables.

This volume is a collection of revised Radio Free Europe background reports written originally for the RFE research series in 1976 and 1977 by the RFE Research and Analysis Department and the Department of Policy and Research. Because "the entire Research and Analysis Department of RFE contributed" to this volume (p. ix), it is a company book. The volume is a plus for RFE's public relations and rightly so: RFE research deservedly enjoys an excellent reputation, and publication of some of it in book form widens the audience. But is the volume also a plus as a book on the "uncertain future" of Eastern Europe?

The compilation consists of five parts: external influences, foreign economic relations, domestic economies, political and social developments, and church and state relations. Within each part, eighteen individual chapters conform, more or less, to the section headings. Introductions to the respective parts by the editors are supposed to integrate the chapters into the larger themes.

The result is uneven. Although the eighteen chapters range from excellent to good (I consider only three contributions mediocre), together they do not make up an integrated whole. In the well-written preface, the editors explain the volume's lack of cohesion by pointing out that the individual chapters "are not intended to give a complete picture of the individual countries, but taken together, they do provide a *mosaic* of the problems facing both Eastern Europe as a whole and the individual states in the region" (p. ix, italics added).

I beg to disagree. A mosaic is a design where small pieces form patterns or figures. The editors may have had a mosaic in mind when they started to discuss the idea of the volume. If so, they failed to execute it. A potpourri or a *mélange* would be a better description. A mosaic demands more time, thought, energy, and effort on the part of the editors, and even then, neat packaging of various research papers—the sole common frame of which is time and space—is difficult. Such editing is a major job shunned by most editors. It would be much easier to analyze the several problems in an essay based on the research papers than to reproduce the papers, however edited, separately. The editors chose the eighteen papers (I assume from a larger selection), edited them minimally, listed them under five separate headings, and, on the basis of the papers included, wrote their brief introductions. William Robinson, an employee of RFE, provided selected statistical data, and the editors put together the preface. Thus, alas, a book was produced.

The "uncertain future" part of the title is justified as long as it is understood that assessment of the future depends on assessment of the present. This is not stated

in the book, but this is what the editors must have had in mind, since the chapters deal with the present and the past. Besides, what future is ever certain?

RFE research on Eastern Europe is most valuable. Those of us who follow it closely would be lost without it. Publishing some of the research in book form makes for an interesting experiment. It will be intriguing to learn how well the book sells, because, in addition to libraries and institutional subscribers, the majority of sales will probably go to new readers, to whom, I take it, the symposium is addressed in the first place.

JAN F. TRISKA
Stanford University

OTÁZKY SOCIALISTICKÉHO VLASTNICTVÍ. By *Zdeněk Hába* et al. Prague: Academia, 1976. 233 pp. Kčs. 31, paper.

In 1974, a symposium was held on the grounds (*na půdě*) of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the Economic Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences—these grounds being presumably identical or at least interchangeable. The symposium dealt with “questions of socialist ownership,” and the volume under review, an offset paperback with a printing of sixteen hundred copies, is its product. Twenty-two authors—economists, lawyers, and sociologists—with academic titles before and after their names contributed to what the publisher claims to be a “theoretically demanding and stimulating opus.” According to the authors themselves, this is not a “collection of an ordinary type but a systematic analysis of the most fundamental and most up-to-date questions of socialist ownership.”

Except for a list of contributors, the authors are not identified individually in the text. They refer to their work as a “collective monography”—somewhat reminiscent of Chinese symphonies composed by a committee—but they acknowledge a certain diversity in style. This reviewer did not detect any such diversity, however. The contributions are written in the same ponderous, long-winded monologue of ideological tracts, authoritative declarations of faith, and condemnation of heretics, vintage early 1950s.

The volume consists of four parts: (1) methodological approach to the issue; (2) questions of a general theory of ownership and rejection of false views, especially misinterpretation of the young Marx; (3) socialist ownership in a socialist economy (this constitutes the longest part [pp. 85–177], containing information, for example, about the effectiveness of dairy production and the disagreements among theoreticians concerning the fine points of the socioeconomic status of cooperative ownership); and (4) focus on the monopoly ownership in advanced capitalist countries and the rejection of bourgeois and revisionist concepts and interpretations of “socialist property.”

The individual chapters within each part are rather short. For example, the chapter “The Problematics of Economic Interests In Socialism” consists of five pages (pp. 118–22) recounting what the Soviet authors in the collection (I. Proshliakova, N. Gusev, B. Babaev, V. Kulikov, P. E. Ekhim, M. Mikhailov, M. Motylev, A. G. Zdravomyslov, and others) say and how they say it. Western authors, such as R. Aron and J. K. Galbraith, are attacked in the text but are omitted both in the footnotes and the bibliography. The two-page bibliography consists of fifty-two titles, of which only six are from the West. The most recent Western work listed is that by E. Zaleski, *Planning Reforms in the Soviet Union* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1967). However, the paucity of non-Communist sources does not prevent the authors from engaging in a sweeping criticism of the “most recent bourgeois literature” (p. 208).