

relationships than socialist planners are—after all, the former have a real stake in future outcomes.

Despite these objections to the fundamental idea of the book, I found in it many ideas and propositions with which to agree, and many that provoke a questioning and a rethinking of some position previously held.

ROBERT W. CAMPBELL  
*Indiana University*

AN ANALYSIS OF SOVIET VIEWS ON JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES. By  
*Carl B. Turner*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1969. vii, 183 pp. \$6.50.

In this work Professor Turner summarizes the views of Soviet economists on John Maynard Keynes. The book presents these views by historical periods beginning with the time prior to the publication of the *General Theory* and concluding with the Khrushchev era. This historical method of presentation allows the reader to trace the evolution of the Soviet attitude toward Keynes from one of tolerance during the 1920s to one of extreme hostility during the Cold War, and finally back to an attitude which displayed a more dispassionate form of criticism during the late 1950s and 1960s. Turner makes extensive use of quotations in his illustration of Soviet views.

The method of presentation by historical periods rather than by themes of criticism results in a great deal of repetition, since various authors sharing common opinions are quoted for each period. I think the book would have profited from a tighter form of organization that would have included for the noneconomist reader a brief summary of Keynes's major contributions to economic theory. It would also have been helpful if Turner had summarized in his introduction the recurring themes of criticism that appear in the Soviet works on Keynes.

On balance the book is a useful and interesting work for the historian or political scientist as well as for the economist because it allows the reader to correlate changing Soviet attitudes toward an important segment of Western economic theory with the shifting political situation. One is struck by the lack of in-depth economic analysis of the Soviet economists' critiques of Keynes's *General Theory*. The quotations selected certainly indicate that they were more interested in discrediting him as an apologist of capitalism than in investigating his contribution to economic theory.

JOYCE PICKERSGILL  
*California State College, Fullerton*

SOVIET TRANSPORT EXPERIENCE: ITS LESSONS FOR OTHER COUNTRIES. By *Holland Hunter*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, Transport Research Program, 1968. xiii, 194 pp. \$6.00.

In this work Professor Hunter continues his investigation of problems first explored in his previous monograph, *Soviet Transportation Policy* (1957). Although specialists on the Soviet economy will probably find the earlier book more comprehensive, and therefore more useful, many scholars will welcome this new study as one that better meets their needs. Besides presenting an excellent chapter and two appendixes on the commanding place of railroads in Soviet transportation, which is an admirable compression and updating of his earlier work, the author gives fine

summaries of both the place of trucks in freight transport and the growth of passenger traffic, as Soviet planners, reluctantly but decisively, enter the automobile age.

There is also an attempt to place the Soviet experience in transportation in a world context and to draw lessons for other countries—underdeveloped countries in particular. This aspect of the book may have little appeal to scholars who do not take a comparative or developmental approach. And some economists and students of transportation, for whom this discussion is primarily intended, may find these “lessons” insufficiently rigorous and therefore superficial. In my opinion, however, the author has succeeded in presenting some stimulating thoughts on world transportation possibilities as seen in the light of Soviet practice.

Three related conclusions are particularly important, and are indicative of the book’s method and purpose: (1) Soviet planners have consistently allotted minimal investment to transportation in order to save funds for investment elsewhere, mainly in heavy industry; (2) Soviet railroaders have nonetheless performed very well, because they have learned to make intensive use of the thin railroad system inherited from prerevolutionary days; and (3) many developing countries can conceivably follow this pattern, up to a point. They can minimize expensive transportation projects and use existing facilities, mainly railroads, more intensively.

In short, this book presents an excellent, concise survey that should be of interest to scholars and students in various fields.

JOHN P. MCKAY  
*University of Illinois*

THE CONSUMER IN THE SOVIET ECONOMY. By *Philip Hanson*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1968. ix, 249 pp. \$7.50.

Philip Hanson in this volume sets out on one of the most difficult tasks confronting economists who study the Soviet Union. He seeks to measure and compare Soviet consumption with consumption in other countries, especially the United Kingdom. Others, particularly Janet Chapman, have tried before him and have encountered similar difficulties. Both Hanson and Chapman acknowledge the hazards of comparing particular “bundles of goods” that are common in one country but not in another and therefore more expensive in that second country. Still, as long as there are those who insist on asking for such questionable measurements, someone will have to supply the figures, and we are fortunate that specialists like Hanson and Chapman have set themselves to the thankless task rather than others who would too easily claim confidence in their figures regardless of their fragile nature.

Nonetheless, the willingness to make comparisons based on spot observations of the prices and quantities of such commodities as “potatoes (old)” and “lipstick (cheap)” conveys a false sense of thoroughness despite all disclaimers. The fact remains that not only are the theoretical concepts unsatisfactory but the empirical material is equally cumbersome or simply not available. This is true not only of Soviet data but of American and English material as well. The lack of precision in the calculations is acknowledged by Hanson on page 63, when after a series of calculations he confesses, “It is doubtful whether this exercise is any more enlightening than merely knocking an intuitive 10 per cent off the real income estimates straight away.” Notwithstanding the pitfalls and shortcomings, Hanson has written what appears to be the most sophisticated and thorough attempt to apply economic