

value of quantitative data and to pass over qualitative data with disdain. Nove does not do this. Indeed he uses qualitative data—debates, literature, stories, even jokes—with rare skill and sensitivity. This allows him to cut through the fog of propaganda and some academic discussions and give his reader a balanced view of Soviet economic experience.

Quantitative data is handled indifferently, however, and that is unfortunate. Very striking is the absence of any real discussion or analysis of such data on rates of economic growth, rates of capital accumulation, levels of per capita income, income distribution, demographic changes, and so forth. A short “Note on Growth Rates” appended to the text is indicative of the author’s apparent lack of interest in quantitative analysis. Arguing that the difficulties of the index number problem are practically insoluble, we can only “agree that the U.S.S.R. did industrialize rapidly after 1928, . . . and that the word ‘rapidly’ cannot, from our present information, be given precision.” There follows a table showing the increase in physical output of selected basic commodities in six years between 1928 and 1966, which “may be a useful summary of industrial progress.” Such a descriptive, nonanalytical use of statistic data within partial indexes was a staple of economic historians in the nineteenth century. It might even still serve as the core of an author’s quantitative data. But if so, such material must be skillfully and systematically arranged and indexed, and more sophisticated measures cannot be almost totally ignored.

JOHN P. MCKAY

*University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*

SOTSIAL'NOE STRAKHOVANIE V ROSSII V 1917–1919 GODAKH (SOCIAL INSURANCE IN RUSSIA IN 1917–1919). By *S. M. Shvarts* (S. M. Schwarz). English summary by *Abraham Ascher*. New York: Russian Institute, Columbia University, 1968. ix, 202 pp. Paper.

The question of social insurance in Russia in 1917–19 has remained largely unexplored. Thus Solomon M. Schwarz’s study is particularly valuable on two grounds: it makes a substantial contribution to closing this gap, and it comes from the pen of the former head of the Department of Social Insurance in the Russian Provisional Government’s Ministry of Labor, who was the author of many legislative reforms concerning social insurance in Russia. In a sense, this book is a kind of autobiography. From 1913 Mr. Schwarz was an ardent exponent of the Menshevik position in the Russian workers’ insurance movement.

Schwarz’s detailed study will be welcomed by economists and others interested in Russian labor problems. It traces the transformation of the Russian system of social insurance from one based on the principle of social autonomy to a highly centralized operation controlled by the government. The principle of social autonomy, in which the system is partially administered by the insured themselves, was wholeheartedly supported by the Mensheviks; the centralized system came to be the Bolshevik position.

The purpose of this book is not so much to describe the administrative, technical, and financial aspects of the social insurance schemes as to analyze the competing principles from which they developed and to trace the struggle between these principles. The book succeeds admirably in its objective. As Abraham Ascher correctly notes in his English summary of the book, “In a sense, this book is a case-study of Menshevik and Bolshevik labor policy.”

The coverage is broad, as may be seen from the topics the book treats in its eight chapters. The introductory section deals with the history of social insurance in Russia before the 1917 Revolution. Then follows an analysis of the pre-1917 program of social insurance reform considered by the Provisional Government. The program of the Soviet government in regard to social insurance is presented next and is followed by a careful treatment of the development of health, accident, and unemployment insurance before 1919. Finally, Schwarz discusses how a centralized system of "social security" was promulgated by the Bolsheviks.

The student of the particular period will find accurate and detailed information that goes beyond the problem of social insurance in Russia and casts light on the social mechanics of the Russian Revolution itself. Policy and legislative problems are raised, the literature is surveyed, and, above all, the development of Menshevik and Bolshevik thought concerning social insurance in Russia is clearly stated and analyzed. This reviewer agrees with Schwarz's interpretations and believes the book will make a considerable contribution to the understanding of social insurance in Russia.

One objection to the book is that no index or bibliography is given. Otherwise it is an informative and very useful book.

LUBOMYR M. KOWAL  
*University of Michigan at Flint*

LABOUR DISPUTES IN SOVIET RUSSIA, 1957–1965. By *Mary McAuley*.  
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969. viii, 269 pp. \$6.75.

This book, which is restricted to the study of disputes at the industrial enterprise, is a revised version of a doctoral thesis submitted to Oxford University, and is based primarily on the author's research of about a year and a half in the USSR, especially in Leningrad, where she spent a year studying labor law at the University of Leningrad. Despite an extensive bibliography of seven pages (more than six of which list Russian-language publications), the author regrets the unavailability of empirical data and states that the book "is more a case-study than a complete treatment; an example of what can be done with the materials at present available."

The bulk of the book—as distinct from the historical labor and economic background—is concerned with a discussion of what, by Western standards, are minor disputes between individuals and management over the legal rights of the employee; for example, an employee may claim that he was illegally discharged, that his job should be classified in a higher wage category, that he was underpaid for overtime, or that his annual vacation should be given him in the summer. Wage rates, salaries, and hours of work are set by law and are not subject to dispute. Soviet trade unions do not call strikes, and should a "wildcat" strike occur in a state enterprise it would be considered an activity hostile to the state and severely suppressed. When a trade union local has what the author calls a "policy dispute" with the management concerning wages, conditions of work, or trade union rights, the dispute is always settled by joint consultation between the higher state-management and union bodies, where Communist Party policy is decisive.

When management refuses to grant the demands of an aggrieved employee, demands which have been presented by him directly (usually with the assistance of his trade union representative), the case may be taken to the shop or factory com-