

analysis to the economics of consumption and light industry in the USSR. That he is not entirely successful only illustrates how difficult such a project is.

But Hanson is to be commended for more than his willingness to try. For example, on page 237 he reproduces some turnover tax rates which I frankly did not know were available in the West. Then again on page 24, when discussing the burdens of industrialization under both the tsars and the Soviets, he says, "the Russian people have suffered from non-communist industrialising autocrats, as well as communist ones."

Marring Hanson's work, however, are many oversights and mistakes, which come as something of a surprise considering the overall sophistication of his analysis. Thus while his research is otherwise impressive, a good portion of his analysis of the accumulation of savings and inventory formation has been anticipated in an article in the *Journal of Political Economy* of August 1965, which Hanson seems to have overlooked. Also, Hanson's analysis on pages 60–61 seems incomplete; he suggests that the share of food in total retail sales increased from 54.9 percent in 1955 to 58.3 percent in 1964 and ascribes this increase to the shift from paying peasants in kind to a new system of paying them with money. An equally likely explanation could be that the poor harvest and the rise in food prices caused a poor-man's-good or an "Irish potato" effect—to satisfy his consumption needs amid higher prices the Russian consumer was forced to divert more of his resources to food.

At times there seems to be some confusion over the concept of disposable income. On pages 174–75 Hanson suggests that the rapid rise in excess inventory accumulation and personal savings indicates involuntary savings. Certainly some of the saving that takes place is involuntary; but one has to consider, among other things, that there are also persons who save for a rainy day or for cooperative apartments, facts that Hanson omits to mention in this context, although he does talk about such costs earlier, on page 78.

Hanson also neglects some important aspects of the economic reforms introduced in 1965. On page 177 he states that the introduction of profit as a success indicator was impossible for many enterprises because they were operating at a loss. Of course there was a major price reform in July 1967, which probably occurred while the manuscript was in the proof stages, but even unprofitable firms have been able to use profit as an indicator. Firms operating at a loss were simply judged by how much they reduced their losses. Similarly, he neglects to mention the role that interest charges and rate of return play in the reform. He also neglects to mention the tendency for the factory manager to raise prices while ostensibly making some improvements in the product, whereas the change that takes place is actually a minor one. Such shortcomings mar an otherwise interesting study.

MARSHALL I. GOLDMAN
Wellesley College

THE ROLE AND STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE SOVIET UNION. Edited by Donald R. Brown. New York: Teachers College Press, 1968. xii, 139 pp. \$6.25.

This thin volume grew out of a "symposium on Russian women" held at Bryn Mawr College and attended by a distinguished interdisciplinary group of scholars including Urie Bronfenbrenner, Vera Dunham, Mark Field, Nicholas DeWitt, Norton Dodge, and Kent Geiger, to mention those whose previous work seems to have the most bearing on the topic. From this impressive array of specialists and others, the

editor, a psychologist at the University of Michigan, has drawn together three useful long papers, three short commentaries, a brief introduction and conclusion, excellent bibliographies, numerous tables, and some interesting "discussion notes."

Yet for all the abundance of data and wealth of insight, the book is uneven and disappointing. The editorial responsibility for providing thematic focus and effective integration has not been fulfilled, and the reader is left to find his way through what remains essentially the transcript of a symposium, happily a stimulating one.

Field's paper "Workers (and Mothers)" introduces the Soviet woman in her various roles; Vera Dunham describes her changing image in Soviet literature; and Bronfenbrenner's focus is "The Changing Soviet Family." Among the shorter pieces, only David Heer's commentary on Soviet abortion policy is noteworthy. The remaining two are general and impressionistic and contribute little, either conceptually or empirically, to our understanding of the position of women in Soviet society.

For the most part the conceptual orientation of the symposium is sociological. A good deal of empirical data has been accumulated concerning the role and status of the Soviet woman, the family and family law, and peripherally, the socialization process and social system of the USSR. Unfortunately these clusters of concepts are never brought together and wrought into a coherent and explicit conceptual framework from which a body of testable hypotheses could have been generated. Nevertheless, this groundwork, including Field's typology (with Feldmesser's emendation) of Soviet women, in terms of their attitudes toward public participation, should greatly encourage and facilitate research on this neglected aspect of Soviet studies. In fact, the systematic analysis of the changing roles of women as reflected in family law, the press, and literature might well serve as one vehicle for comparative Communist studies. However, an adequate explanation of such role changes must eventually take into account the political context, a perspective which is notably absent in the symposium under review.

ROBERT SHARLET
Union College

ECONOMIC DEVOLUTION IN EASTERN EUROPE. By *Ljubo Sirc*. New York and Washington: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969. xii, 165 pp. \$6.50.

ECONOMIC REFORMS IN EASTERN EUROPE. By *Michael Gamarnikow*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1968. 206 pp. \$8.95.

These books share a common set of values and methodological premises, not to speak of similar prejudices. Their authors both feel passionately that centralized planning is bad and market allocation is good. And any facts, numbers, guesses, and approximations that tend to support this basic contention are grist to their mill. Sirc holds the advantage over Gamarnikow in economic sophistication—he recognizes some of the arguments of the "other side." He is also the better writer. Gamarnikow, however, holds the edge in concrete knowledge of what is going on in Eastern Europe and makes far fewer errors of fact. His book, in fact, contains a good deal of detailed material, particularly on Poland, that is not to be found elsewhere.

Both works may be cited as palpable evidence by scholars, particularly non-economists, who share their outlook. I have already seen two very favorable mentions of Gamarnikow's study by specialists in Communist affairs. Anti-Communists will be confirmed in their suspicion that Soviet-style economic management is part and parcel of the Soviet tyranny and as inefficient as it is inhumane. Those econ-