

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).

The volume contains one hundred eighty-six footnotes, filling nine pages, which complement the monotony of the text. For example, footnotes 25–75, with three exceptions, are references to Marx and/or Engels. The book contains no index. Instead, a two-page summary in Russian is provided.

A product of “normalized” Czechoslovakia, during the 1960s, *Otázky socialistického vlastnictví* would not have been published, except in the form of a brochure for otherwise unemployable *apparatchiks*. Thoroughly without any scholarly merit, it can be recommended only to collectors of oddities.

OTTO ULČ

State University of New York at Binghamton

MAKROEKONOMICKÁ ANALÝZA A PROGNÓZA. By *Josef Goldmann*. Prague: Academia, 1975. 165 pp. Kčs. 23, paper.

This paperback presents no formal macroeconomic models, no estimates of macroeconomic parameters, and no forecasting models. The author, a leading member of the Economic Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, discusses macroeconomic analysis and forecasting only informally. To some extent, he explains his reluctance to take a quantitative approach by referring to the instability of some parameters as estimated in the West and to the “blank spots” in macroeconomic research in the East. He lists several forecasting institutes in Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries, but claims that, “for understandable reasons,” most of their findings are not being published. Furthermore, he feels that Czechoslovak research suffers from theoretical weaknesses, such as the lack of attention to the importance of monetary flows.

Goldmann agrees with some Western views that the main problem of contemporary capitalist economies is inflation rather than insufficient aggregate demand, and he considers the great discrepancy between the structure of supply and the structure of demand to be the main problem of centrally planned socialist economies (chapters 5–6). In addition, he argues that the closing of an inflationary gap in Czechoslovakia in 1970 was achieved by applying macroeconomic tools (chapter 7). This is the only instance where Czechoslovak statistics are provided (among others, data on the value of output in the service sector and on the intermediate consumption so that the official Marxian Gross National Income aggregate can be reduced to Gross National Product under the Western definition).

The author’s critique of the Czechoslovak economic prognosis for 1990 (chapter 14) is also noteworthy. He points out that the continuation of the old strategy of growth, with emphasis on metallurgy and heavy engineering, would lead to severe raw material and energy bottlenecks, accompanied by a lack of demand for engineering products. He recommends increasing the share of the service sector in national product from 25 percent to 35 percent.

The penultimate chapter, which owes much to the work of the famous Hungarian economist Kornai, discusses the interaction of the flows of goods with the system of management, the social system, and demographic and ecological variables. This chapter especially shows that the author’s interest appears to lie in a very broad, general system analysis rather than in macroeconomic forecasting based on econometrics as usually practiced in the West. Yet, his terminology bears the imprint of English and American economic literature. He uses expressions like “poznávací lag,” “komparace predikce a reality,” “interakce inertních a inovačních sil,” and so forth, although Czech equivalents exist for at least some of these terms.

JAN M. MICHAL

State University of New York at Binghamton