

modify a treaty norm. "In principle, it is possible to change a customary norm by means of treaty and a treaty norm by means of a custom" (p. 142).

Fourth, the creation and the subsequent consolidation of the socialist commonwealth of nations led to the quest for a new reality in the legal regulation of interstate relations. Having found that the law of peaceful coexistence is essentially designed to regulate relations between socialist and capitalist states, and since general international law does not preclude the establishment of a localized international legal system, the socialist states have consequently created a new type of international law—socialist international law—which is founded upon the principle of socialist internationalism. The principles of socialist international law are not only of a higher type, but go further than the principles of general international law in ensuring friendly relations among states (p. 445).

This book will surely remain the most reliable restatement of the Soviet doctrine of international law for many years, and we are all indebted to Dr. Butler for making it available in the English language. For anyone who is not already familiar with Soviet doctrine and its terminology, the nine-page introduction by the translator will prove most helpful in bridging the gap between the Western and Soviet theories of international law.

CHRIS OSAKWE  
*Tulane University*

SOVIET AGRICULTURAL POLICY: TOWARD THE ABOLITION OF COLLECTIVE FARMS. By *Stephen Osofsky*. Praeger Special Studies in International Economics and Development. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974. xi, 300 pp. \$20.00.

The purpose of this book is "to probe for the major problem areas in the kolkhoz" and to do so largely in terms of political analysis. The book is divided into three major sections: the first deals with policies and problems of the immediate post-Khrushchev era; the second deals with present-day Soviet agriculture, especially the prospects for reform; and finally, section 3 provides conclusions and an update through 1973.

The author covers a wide range of problems such as labor force utilization, organizational issues (especially the "link"), the private sector, farm size, party influence, land rent, cost/price issues, and so on. Soviet policies are interpreted mainly in terms of the writings of Soviet and Western observers, rather than from the views of upper level policy makers in the state and party apparatus. Although substantial documentation is used to present varying views on each issue, weighing the alternate views to arrive at some (if any) consensus is a difficult task. In several instances, unfortunately, available data, which might have been used to strengthen the conclusions, were omitted. For example, the discussion of seasonality in labor utilization (pp. 118–23, 233) concludes that little improvement has been made in recent years. While not challenging the conclusion, it should be noted that an examination of monthly labor force data, available for most of the last twenty years, would have strengthened the author's argument. A similar case can be made for the discussion of managerial skill levels (p. 118), the whole matter of party influence in increasingly large farms (pp. 76–79), and cost/price analysis (chapter 11).

Regrettably, poor editorial control mars the book. For example, subheadings in chapters begin with chapter 5. Terminology is sometimes uneven—the term *dvor* is first used on page 151 and frequently thereafter, but it is not in the list of abbreviations and no definition is offered until page 161; the MTS are Machine Tractor Stations (p. xi) and Motor Tractor Stations (p. 16); the late Professor Jerzy Karcz is Jerry (p. 118) and Jarzy (p. 172). In some cases, sentences are difficult to follow—optimal farm size is described in terms of “hectares of plow farm” (p. 173)—and sources are miscited—Professor Wädekin’s Descriptive Stratification Analysis is cited as a “Descriptive Analysis” (p. 293), and M. Lewin is “Lewis” (p. 260).

In spite of shortcomings, however, the author does survey a substantial body of literature of interest to the observer of Soviet agricultural affairs and gives considerable attention to the legal basis of Soviet policy making, a viewpoint frequently neglected in the West. The author’s recommendations are familiar—less control from above and more incentives from below.

ROBERT C. STUART  
*Rutgers University*

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIOLOGY IN THE SOVIET UNION. By *Elizabeth Ann Weinberg*. International Library of Sociology. London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974. xv, 173 pp. \$14.00.

Perhaps one of the more intellectually intriguing aspects of the post-Stalin era was the rebirth of sociology in the Soviet Union. True sociology had existed before the revolution and for a while afterward. It then disappeared as a discipline for about a quarter of a century, to be formally resurrected in the wake of the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956. This useful book attempts to give a bird’s-eye view of contemporary sociology in the USSR. After briefly reviewing the historical background, it examines the Soviet view of “bourgeois” sociology, it reviews who the sociologists are, where they are (or were) trained, their participation at the Sixth World Congress of Sociology, and where their research findings are published. The author then examines the major substantive areas of sociological research. The book also offers a very small glossary of Russian terms (not primarily sociological) and two appendixes, one on questions from a time-budget research study, the other culled from *Komsomol’skaia pravda* public opinion polls. Particularly useful is a bibliography that contains, I presume, most of the sociological references the author was able to locate. Some of the information, unfortunately, is already dated or incomplete: although there is reference to the Sixth World Congress of Sociology (1966), there is none about the Seventh (1970) held at Varna, Bulgaria, where the Soviet contingent was very much in evidence; since the book was published, a journal exclusively devoted to sociological articles has appeared; and in the last few years the sociological establishment has come under strong ideological attack, and new personalities have emerged to direct it.

This book is not a “sociology of Soviet sociology.” It strikes me as largely descriptive rather than analytic, and it lacks (though the author can hardly be faulted for this) the kind of insight into what it means to be a sociologist in a Soviet-type society that can be found, for example, in the detailed paper by Alexander Matejko, “Sociologists in Between” in *Studies of Comparative Communism* (1972). The book can be recommended, however, as a useful inventory