

in the socialist system. But Sutton's study overlooks the widespread importance of Western technology in the pre-1917 Russian economy. In contrast with Sutton's view, an alternative hypothesis worthy of investigation is that the large Soviet program to utilize Western technology in the 1920s reflected the capability of a relatively backward socialist economy to accelerate the transfer and assimilation of advanced technology.

Sutton's analysis of the sectoral impact of Western technology has several shortcomings. Although Western aid was undoubtedly widespread throughout the economy, the conclusion that it was used in 90 to 98 percent of the economy is highly dependent on the sectoral classification system used and, in this case, implies a much greater effect on output and investment than would be the case if the estimate were based on some more relevant measure, such as value of output or investment produced with some form of Western aid. Although no sectoral or aggregate estimates of Soviet expenditure on Western technical assistance are made, Sutton's data suggest that, on the basis of output and capital investment, Soviet heavy industry (mining, metallurgy, metalworking, etc.) most likely spent a disproportionately large portion of these funds compared to the consumer goods industries and agriculture.

The study shows that Soviet concessions involving foreign equity capital usually ended in expropriation or other failure for reasons often not spelled out by Sutton. Sutton asserts that this fate of foreign capital in the USSR was largely the result of bad faith on the part of the Soviet government. This hypothesis needs more documentation. A systematic review of the operation and termination of Soviet concessions might provide some insights into the causes of mutual disillusionment about the concessions policy and into the problems of private foreign enterprises operating in a socialist and increasingly centralized economy.

It is to be hoped that in the two future volumes promised by Sutton some of these issues will be dealt with. Despite the criticisms above, Sutton's book is of value to students of the Soviet economy and of technological innovation in economic development, for the study contains a great deal of interesting data and provides several insights into Soviet growth and the process of technological transfer.

MICHAEL R. DOHAN
California Institute of Technology

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF SOVIET INDUSTRIAL MANPOWER:
1940–1960. By *Emilo J. Stanley*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968. xxv,
209 pp. \$15.00.

An outgrowth of a doctoral dissertation in the geography department at the University of Michigan, this book is basically designed to analyze the regional distribution of Soviet industry through the study of employment data. The focus is on graphic presentation in the form of maps and tables. On the basis of data for the years 1940 and 1960, industrial workers are categorized both by major economic regions and by industrial sectors: energy and fuel, heavy industry (iron and steel), machinery, chemicals, building materials, forest products, apparel, and food processing. Tables break down regional employment by sectors of industry; maps are used to show the distribution of a particular sector by regions. Data were derived from national and regional statistical handbooks published in the Soviet Union in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

To anyone familiar with the general pattern of distribution of Soviet industry, the results of this mapping of employment data are fairly predictable. The author, now a project director of the Computer-Assisted Education Curriculum Program at the University of California, Irvine, traces industrial employment from its prewar concentration in the European USSR, particularly the Central Region and the Ukraine (Donbas), through the wartime eastward movement, to the continuing concentration in the west after the war. To readers less familiar with the situation the multiplicity of maps and tables and the style of textual discussion may prove confusing. A sentence, taken at random, goes: "There are still eight *sovmarkhozy* with lower ratios surrounding Moscow (4 per cent or less, the median ratio in 1955 being 6 per cent), while all of Kazakhstan and Central Asia have the ratios below the median" (p. 82). One comes away with the impression of a statistical exercise in the tabular and cartographic presentation of percentage changes of employment indicators.

Stanley points out that employment in machine manufacturing alone, which he uses as a case study, correlates well with the general pattern of industrialization. It can be inferred that a study limited to this branch of industry might have yielded a clearer picture of the general distribution of Soviet industry than the painstaking sector-by-sector analysis.

For his areal units the author uses both the *sovmarkhozy* (or regional industrial management areas) of 1957–65 and the system of fourteen major economic regions that was abandoned by Soviet planners in 1961. Of course, any regional pattern for which data were available is justified as a framework of presentation. But the reader should have been clearly alerted that the *sovmarkhozy* no longer exist and that the old system of economic regions has been overhauled. Only in one of the appendixes is casual mention made of a "1963 division into seventeen major economic regions" without indication that this system officially replaced the network of fourteen regions used in the study.

Chapter 10, "Communist Doctrine and Economic Geography," seems oddly out of step with the rest of the book, as if it had been added as an afterthought. In it, Stanley polemicizes with Soviet scholars, particularly Iu. G. Saushkin, a Moscow University economic geographer, on the grounds that they still engage in sloganeering ("the future belongs to socialism") and thus give "little hope that a basic change in their thinking has occurred in the post-Stalin era." The literature would, on the contrary, suggest that the thinking of Soviet economic geographers has undergone a marked change indeed, especially when it comes to analysis of the constraints imposed on economic development by a harsh environment, as in Siberia. Ample evidence of this trend could have been gleaned from the journal *Soviet Geography: Review and Translation*, from which some material for the study was derived.

THEODORE SHABAD
American Geographical Society
and the *New York Times*

SOVIET ECONOMIC CONTROVERSIES: THE EMERGING MARKETING CONCEPT AND CHANGES IN PLANNING, 1960–1965. By *Jere L. Felker*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: M.I.T. Press, 1966. xi, 172 pp. \$5.95.

Soviet economic controversies puzzle Western economists because an alien technical jargon is used, because it is hard to determine when issues are analytical and when