

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

of Soviet sociology because this is a discipline whose existence, as the author correctly points out, is precarious. Sociology eventually becomes social criticism, and social criticism early becomes political and ideological criticism. Thus sociology, perhaps more than almost any other social science, lives under a constant sword of Damocles. As long as the regime calculates that sociological research can be useful (both at home and abroad), it will give it conditional support and legitimacy. But a hardening of the Soviet ideological line (of the type that has been building up under Brezhnev) means a tightening of controls over sociology. As the author correctly states: "Given the fact that sociology was one of the last disciplines to gain recognition . . . it would hardly be surprising if it were not one of the first to be curtailed" (p. 112).

MARK G. FIELD
Boston University

ÉDUCATION ET SOCIÉTÉ EN RUSSIE DANS LE SECOND TIERS DU XIX^e SIÈCLE. By *Alain Besançon*. École Pratique des Hautes Études, Sorbonne. Sixième Section: Sciences Économiques et Sociales. Civilisations et sociétés, 40. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1974. 168 pp. Paper.

Scholars are still grubbing at the diffuse root system of the Russian Revolution. One source of its lush violence fascinates academics in particular—the tsar's minuscule corps of university students. This French study, begun as a thesis, *Intelligentsia russe dans les années soixante*, was substantially completed in 1962. The author was allowed a few peeks at Ministry of Education and Third Section archives. In addition to standard printed sources he makes good use of memoirs written by "old grads" looking back with wonder and distortion at school days passed in the sunrise of student politics.

Martin Malia's course, removed from Berkeley to Paris in 1970, convinced Alain Besançon that the world-wide student unrest of the 1960s was conceptually linked to the empire-wide "*affaire des étudiants*" of the 1860s. Transfused by light from across the sea, the essay was published in 1974. Presumably the current generation is interested in precursors of its own malfunctions. "*Hélas*," to borrow the author's phrase, I suspect that student protest, past or present, has become one of the least important worries of the twentieth century. The audience for this graphically attractive book has shrunk to the handful of eternal students who make a living sifting the debris of the Romanov disaster.

What the professionals want to know is: Has M. Besançon found anything new; or has he at least put familiar pieces into a fresh pattern? The decade after 1962 was a boom period for English and German-language research into tsarist schools. None of this output got into Besançon's manuscript. Bibliographically, the book is out of date. Intellectually, it is very much alive. For one thing, it breathes Gallic spirit into the Miliukov-Malia judgment on tsardom's impossible marriage with German philosophy and science. Besançon generously avows his debts. But he is too modest. The man has a swift, sensitive, cultured intelligence. His language is clear, totally devoid of social science sludge. With quick grace he demolishes the Leroy-Beaulieu-Gerschenkron chestnut on radicalism and pov-