

of the agrarian reforms which had been discussed for years in government circles. Finally, and most important, I hoped to show in this book that the agrarian problem was only one of many problems demanding the Russian government's attention during Stolypin's administration. Stolypin had to work out his relationship to Nicholas II who was his "boss"; a new parliament had been established and had to be fit into the Russian government structure; national minorities within the empire were restive; local government and the relationship between governmental and self-governmental institutions needed reworking; the central government was plagued with rivalry and friction; education and health care desperately needed to be upgraded. All these issues were as important as the agrarian question and, in my opinion, Stolypin's and the Russian government's grappling with them deserves more attention because this has been neglected. (General economic programs, aside from agrarian, also deserve attention but Stolypin was not immediately connected with them.)

Finally, I resent Ms. Kingston-Mann's implication that I relied solely on Stolypin's daughter's reminiscences and British Foreign Office reports. A review of the sources for the book would indicate that a wide range of materials was used including the records of the Council of Ministers and governmental documents.

MARY SCHAEFFER CONROY  
*University of Colorado at Denver*

Professor Kingston-Mann asks that readers refer to the original review of Professor Conroy's book.

TO THE EDITOR:

O. Anweiler's review of my book, *Contemporary Education and Moral Upbringing in the Soviet Union* (*Slavic Review*, 37, no. 2 [June 1978]: 315), is a classic example of how a review should not be written. It consists of a few generalities, which give the impression of having been very cautiously written after a hasty leafing of the book. What is the purpose of such a review? It is an offense to the author and a disservice to the reader. Writing a review is a responsible and serious assignment. It should be informative. It should give a discussion of the message of the book and its implications, it should give a fair criticism of the shortcomings, and, above all, it should be informative for the reader. No information whatsoever is given in this review. I am therefore forced to carry out the task of the reviewer and give a brief summary of the book, the topic of which is so important for our education and for our society.

The Soviet Union presents a challenge to the West not only by her growing military power and technology but also by her human resources, by the growing education of her people. This is the message of the book.

The main objective of Soviet moral education is to raise a new type of human being and create a harmonious society. This ideal has not materialized. The Soviet society is beset by the same troubles which plague all industrial societies. The book explains why.

This failure to reach the main objective is offset by undeniable successes. The Soviet schools managed to forestall the appearance of a counterculture. Juvenile delinquency exists, but it does not assume the proportions it has reached in the United States. There is no evidence of drug addiction, no vandalism, no attacks on teachers occur, nor is there a necessity of stationing guards in schools. The implications of these facts are self-evident, and our educators and society should be informed about it.

A. KREUSLER  
*Lynchburg, Virginia*