

social sciences in the two societies. The Soviet selections will be particularly interesting, I believe, to Western audiences because of their heavy style, the reiteration of the belief in Marxism-Leninism as the ultimate key to all questions, and the emphasis on *protivizm* ("againstism"—a compulsive need to attack capitalistic or "bourgeois" societies and institutions). The American selections run the gamut from Parsons to C. W. Mills and are relatively free of this need to assert the superiority of their own system—in fact, very often they do the opposite.

This reader might serve as collateral reading for a course on comparative modern society or a course on the Soviet Union.

MARK G. FIELD
Boston University

ANNUAIRE DE L'U.R.S.S.: DROIT, ÉCONOMIE, SOCIOLOGIE, POLITIQUE, CULTURE, 1968. Edited by *Pierre Lavigne*. Centre de Recherches sur l'U.R.S.S. et les Pays de l'Est. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1969. 961 pp. 105 F.

In 1962 the first of a series of annual volumes on the USSR, prepared under the overall sponsorship of the French National Scientific Research Center (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique), was issued. The first two volumes (1962 and 1964—none was issued for 1963) were edited by Michel Mouskhely of the Law Faculty, University of Strasbourg. After Professor Mouskhely's death in July 1964, Pierre Lavigne, then a professor of law at the University of Strasbourg, now of the University of Paris, assumed the editorship. Under his aegis four volumes have been issued and two more are scheduled before the series is terminated with the issue for 1970. The original concept of Mouskhely was that of a compendium composed entirely of articles. Lavigne's approach has been to devote approximately two-thirds of a volume to articles and one-third to a chronology of events during the year, selected statistical materials, and a special section on miscellaneous topics. The special sections of the 1966 and 1967 volumes, for example, contain, respectively, a historical essay on economic regionalization and a "Panorama of Social Sciences in the USSR," which is a bibliographical essay on such topics as the origins of Soviet constitutional law, problems of political economy, and Marxist social psychology. The 1968 issue contains a continuation of the bibliographical essay on the origins of Soviet constitutional law, collective farm law, and the early history of Soviet sociology.

The majority of the articles in each issue are invited, although some are contributed and some are translations of important articles appearing in the Soviet press. This issue includes translations of three Soviet articles on law and two on the economy. Three original articles by members of the Faculty of Law at Poznan (Poland) deal with Soviet bilateral treaties, Comecon, and the role of the state. (At least one article from Poland and two from the Soviet Union have been included in each of these yearbooks.) Rudolf Schlesinger, now deceased, is the only non-Frenchman to have contributed to every *Annuaire*, and Kazimierz Grzybowski, of Duke University, is the only regular American contributor. Regular French participants include Basile Kerblay, Pierre Naville, Robert Triomphe, and, in the last three years, Alexandre Bourmeyster. Two research specialists at the Strasbourg Research Center on the USSR and Countries of the East, Inna Kniazeff and Zygmunt Jedryka, also contribute each year. As expected, Pierre and (his wife) Marie Lavigne have

made significant contributions in law and economics, respectively, from the beginning of the series.

Part 1 of the 1968 *Annuaire*, which is concerned with Soviet society, contains a mixture of items with heavy stress on sociological aspects. Francis Cohen, in an article on "Social Classes in the USSR," uses basic Soviet sources by Arutiunian, Shubkin, Kugel, Rutkevich, and Shkaratan to analyze class differences. In addition, Cohen makes extensive use of Seniavsky's excellent history on labor supply. Gabrielle Froment-Meurice, in "Soviet Women Between Work and Family," uses a variety of measures of work, leisure, household tasks, and so forth. Dominique de Lapparent looks at "Soviet Youth" through the responses to opinion surveys conducted by and published in *Komsomol'skaia pravda*. Michael Kaser's article on "Salient Features of State Boarding Schools" can be placed within the rubric of both sociology and economics, and Alexandre Bourmeyster's article on "The Problem of Man and the Critique of Existentialism" in the Soviet Union draws from the fields of both sociology and philosophy.

Among the articles on law in the USSR, Pierre Lavigne's article on workers' protection in cases of enterprise reduction in size or closing is the most interesting. He examines both the (outdated) regulations in force and their interpretation by the courts.

Articles on Soviet economics include a translation from the Russian of an article by G. A. Ivanov on "Central Planning Agencies," which is a continuation of his earlier piece in the *Annuaire* for 1965 and part of a book coauthored with A. Pribluda, *Planovye organy v SSSR* (Moscow, 1967). Bernard Lion's article, "The Balance of the National Economy," reviews the history, background, and structure of each of the tables of the balance. Georges Lasserre, on the basis of two months' research in the Soviet Union during the fall of 1966, writes about "Consumer Cooperatives in the USSR." His article would have benefited from more research in Soviet literature, particularly the two statistical handbooks on Soviet trade (1956 and 1964). Marie Lavigne contributes a fifty-page substantive and thoughtful article on "Planning and Monetary Policy in the Soviet Economy," concluding that Soviet "monetary planning is incomplete, insufficient, and incoherent." Guy Caire writes about the "Choice of Criteria for Foreign Trade in Comecon."

The foreign affairs section of this *Annuaire* opens with a review of events in 1967, particularly as seen in Soviet newspapers. In addition to two articles in English (by R. Schlesinger, "The Soviet Interpretation of International Relations," and K. Grzybowski, "Soviet Law of Diplomacy"), there are two articles by professors of the Faculty of Law at Poznan on "Bilateral Treaties in the Soviet Union" and "The USSR and Comecon."

The next section of the yearbook contains a detailed chronology of events in 1967, a selection of contemporary documents such as new decrees of the Supreme Soviet modifying the constitution or decisions of the Council of Ministers, results of the 1967 economic plan, and a long statistical section, which with only a minor exception is based on various issues of *Vestnik statistiki*. Following this is a very useful, extensive review of organizations and work in the social sciences and humanities during the year. The yearbook concludes with a potpourri of items in a special section under the general heading "Historical and Comparative Studies," the contents of which have been described above.

The gap created by the regrettable disappearance of the *Annuaire* after the 1970 issue will in part be filled by a new quarterly journal on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe entitled *Revue de l'Est*, the first issue of which was published in Paris

in July 1970. The journal is edited by Professors Eugène Zaleski and Michel Lesage. French work has long been neglected in the United States, partly owing to a cultural lag, but also to a domination of research and publication, particularly in the 1950s, by doctrinaire people. At present there is much fine research being conducted on many subjects, in research bodies such as the C.N.R.S. referred to above, the government (as in the G.E.P.E.I.—Groupe d'Études Prospectives sur les Échanges Internationaux), and in the universities (in the provinces, as well as in Paris).

MURRAY FESHBACH
U.S. Bureau of the Census

AN ECONOMIC HISTORY OF THE U.S.S.R. By *Alec Nove*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1969. 416 pp. \$10.00.

This is a valuable book. In my opinion it now stands as the best comprehensive economic history of the entire Soviet period, and it will no doubt be a highly useful synthesis and reference tool for a number of years. Among recent treatments it is vastly superior to Anatole Mazour's *Soviet Economic Development*, for example. It also surpasses somewhat older major studies—Baykov (1946), Dobb (first and basic edition, 1948), and Jasny (1961)—since it provides detailed coverage of both the preplan and postwar eras and incorporates important recent monographs by Levin, Malafeev, Moshkov, and others. Yet for various reasons, of which the two most important are discussed below, I do not think it will come to rank as one of the truly outstanding general studies in the broad field of economic history.

To begin with, this is an extremely *political* economic history. After quoting Lenin in the preface to the effect that politics have dominance over economics, Professor Nove agrees that this has undeniably been the case in the Soviet Union. And if the politicians doubled as "the board of directors of the great firm U.S.S.R. Ltd.," and therefore had to respond to economic conditions as well as impose their will upon them, these "super-managers" are still the economic historian's proper focus. Thus the author feels justified in choosing to "concentrate on economic policies, decisions, events, organizations, and conditions" chiefly as they relate to the men, or man, at the top. This leads him to organize his study mainly around the specific pattern of events in time, as opposed to analytical or topical subdivisions.

This chronological political approach has real merits. We see, for example, that Lenin was still backing war communism as late as February 1921, and that NEP was under serious attack from 1925 on. Consistently we find a clear narrative of what leaders were thinking and doing on economic matters. There is a delightful absence of the chronological confusion or deception found not only in an authority like Dobb but in many builders of "Soviet economic models." But there are obvious shortcomings to what might be called the "super-manager view of economic history," as there was in the old "great man" view of political history. We are offered insights into certain decisions, such as NEP, collectivization, and liberalization, but our understanding of the underlying problem—the tempo and process of Soviet economic development—is advanced very modestly. The findings are incomplete, as is the analysis.

A related problem concerns the use of qualitative and quantitative material. There is currently a tendency among some economic historians to overestimate the