

trade at various periods. The chapters that deal with trade policies and practices present only sketches of the facts and issues: Soviet trade with Comecon is discussed in fifteen pages, and trade with China in four.

The author draws extensively on both Russian and English-language sources, but his bibliography ignores many of the major scholarly works on the subject. The discussion of Comecon takes no note of Michael Kaser's work, and the subject of Western trade restrictions is treated without reference to Adler-Karlsson's provocative study.

The most valuable portion of the book for social scientists is the detailed description of the historical changes in the organizations involved in foreign trade. The scholarly reader, however, will find that the book does not break new ground, nor does it provide a significant restatement of old ground. The limited usefulness of the book for scholarly purposes is not in criticism of the book itself, which was written not for scholars but for businessmen. From that perspective the book is to be compared with Samuel Pizar's *Coexistence and Commerce*, which unfortunately is not mentioned in the bibliography but which continues to be the most important book on commercial trade with the USSR.

JOSEPH S. BERLINER

*Brandeis University and Russian Research Center*

SOVIET AND EAST EUROPEAN FOREIGN TRADE, 1946-1969: STATISTICAL COMPENDIUM AND GUIDE. By *Paul Marer*. Computer programs by *Gary J. Eubanks*. International Development Research Center Studies in Development, no. 4. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1972. xviii, 408 pp. \$15.00.

The main bugbear haunting Western researchers working in the field of socialist foreign trade has been the absence of complete and standardized statistics and of information on the methodologies used in the socialist countries in presenting their data. The volume being reviewed here, published under the wing of the International Development Research Center of the Indiana University, represents a long-awaited and courageous effort to overcome these difficulties. Nine countries are individually covered in the study—the USSR, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Albania.

The book embodies a description and some rigorous analysis of the methods and practices underlying the organization and presentation of foreign trade statistics in the socialist countries. On the basis of these considerations, meaningful to Western readers, systematized tables have been prepared (expressed in current dollars), reconciled with United Nations classifications ("Standard International Trade Classification" and "Broad Economic Categories"). Statistical tables constitute four-fifths of the volume.

The book is divided into four parts. Part 1, "Introduction and Summary," provides a guide to the data presented in part 2, "Statistical Series." The methodology used in constructing the tables considered in part 3, "Notes and Documentation." Many specialists in the field will find part 4 most useful of all. It consists of seven appendixes, dealing with the United Nations and Comecon trade classifications, the problems of reconciliation, valuation, definitions, and unspecified Soviet exports; the last two appendixes contain standardized statistics on trade with the

United States, Canada, Japan, and Australia, and a description of the Soviet and East European Foreign Trade Data Bank developed at the International Development Research Center.

The user must realize that although the socialist data have been standardized, they still basically suffer from their original sin—price distortions in respect of structure, direction, and domestic relations. The degree of these distortions varied in different years. The standardized data are not disaggregated and complete enough to enable a settlement of the old problem—the extent of exploitation (if any) in intra-Comecon and East-West trade. The observation that intra-Comecon trade has been growing fastest in manufactures (p. 345) is not necessarily valid in application to the 1960s (especially between the USSR and several East European countries). However, bearing these and some other minor limitations in mind, the book will be a valuable reference for many years to come, and it should contribute to a higher standard of discussion on socialist foreign trade.

JOZEF WILCZYNSKI  
*Royal Military College of Australia*

**SOVIET PLANNING AND SPATIAL EFFICIENCY: THE PREWAR CEMENT INDUSTRY.** By *Alan Abouchar*. Russian and East European Series, no. 39. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, for the International Affairs Center, 1971. x, 134 pp. \$5.50, paper.

This modest monograph is concerned with two problems in the regional planning of the cement industry of the Soviet Union during the 1930s. The first is the economic rationality of the location of cement factories. Abouchar gives Soviet planners very low grades in this regard, finding that, as of 1940, alternative locations for these producing plants would have satisfied the existing market at one-third lower social cost. The second problem is the degree to which cement from existing factories was rationally distributed to consumers in order to avoid waste of transport. Although it was precisely this issue which most exercised the Soviet critics of the industry at the time, Abouchar finds that the waste of transport was minimal—only 7 percent during the first half of 1936 as judged by a linear programming transport model using twenty-eight regions. It is the second result, rather than the first, which surprises both Abouchar and his reader.

Judging solely by the internal evidence of the book, Abouchar's treatment of his twin problems seems excellent. He makes a strong case for the Soviet cement industry of his period being one that is peculiarly amenable to his methods of analysis. His attempt to convert the rates charged for shipping into social cost of transport is, inevitably, rather arbitrary; but he both makes a reasonable case for his approach and indicates his assumptions clearly. His treatment is careful and well argued throughout.

However, the results of a Soviet study covering 1964 cast considerable doubt on Abouchar's conclusion about the high static efficiency of cement distribution in 1936. The 1964 study shows a transport waste of 30 percent compared with Abouchar's figure of 7 percent. (See Z. I. Loginov and L. Iu. Astansky, "Skhema optimal'nogo razmeshcheniia tsementnoi promyshlennosti," in *Primenenie matematicheskikh metodov v razmeshchenii proizvodstva*, Moscow, 1968, esp. p. 15. See also Michael Ellman, *Soviet Planning Today*, Cambridge, 1971, pp. 171–78.)