

consumers, the state, and other distribution units. He argues convincingly that peasant markets currently play a declining role in the Soviet distribution system. Yet the present role is crucial. The volume and variety of products sold in the peasant market has diminished; the remaining products are perishable, costly to distribute, subject to peak-load problems and quality differentials. All of these characteristics hamper inclusion of the products in a socialized sector economic plan. Kerblay explores the possibility that vertical integration of producers and processors might break this bottleneck. In the meantime, the labor of small-scale producers, spent in marketing products, will continue to substitute for the capital goods of more modern marketing facilities.

However, the labor of small-scale producers can be subject to the behavioral (incentive) aspects of the market. Kerblay argues otherwise, that the individual Soviet producers who participate in the market as suppliers are motivated more by household needs than by market considerations. As socialized sector income has risen, the small producer has restricted market supply. The intersectoral argument is not pursued rigorously in the text, but appears as an underlying "peasant" theme. The argument is buttressed by observation (producers plant potatoes, not vegetables, despite the higher price of vegetables). Yet counterobservations appear elsewhere (producers respond to the costs of transportation). In general, Kerblay seems to espouse the implicit argument that the *market* supply curve is negatively sloped owing to the shifts in the *aggregate* agricultural sector, from traditional agriculture and peasant organization to more modern agriculture organized in socialized sectors. These behavioral relations between the producer and the market are developed less cogently than the functional relations. The decision to emphasize the peasant market as a distribution institution makes many of the implicit behavioral conclusions seem inconsistent.

Professor Kerblay has buttressed his abundant observations with a monumental bibliography. The functional role of the market is delineated clearly; the behavioral role is not.

ELIZABETH CLAYTON  
*University of Missouri, St. Louis*

ADVOKAT V GRAZHDANSKOM PROTSESSE. By *D. P. Vatman* and *V. A. Elizarov*. Edited by *I. I. Skliarsky*. Moscow: Iuridicheskaja literatura, 1969. 200 pp.

This work is a guidebook in civil litigation for advocates. The authors discuss the particularities of the representation of citizens and socialist organizations in civil courts of original jurisdiction, as well as in instances of cassation and in the review procedure of decisions already in force. The method of discharging the advocate's duties recommended by the authors is illustrated by numerous examples and court decisions. The evident scope of the book is to provide practical advice to the young advocate in respect to his behavior in the consultation office and in various courtroom situations. The work can be of aid to inexperienced members of the legal profession and to advocates-in-training.

Some of the authors' theoretical assertions, however, are at least debatable. Indeed, in discussing the legal basis of the representation of a party in a civil suit the authors state that this is a special kind of general representation provided by civil law, whereas the counsel in a criminal case is not the representative of the accused but an independent party to the trial (p. 15). That the advocate is a full-

fledged representative of his party in a civil suit, acting by virtue of a commission, is not questioned by anyone. A group of Soviet writers, headed by Professor M. S. Strogovich, admits the representative character also of counsel in a trial. Strogovich speaks of a "special kind of representation." The authors' opinion, shared by many Soviet writers, that counsel in a criminal trial has an independent role as a party to the trial is erroneous. (For a detailed discussion of this topic, see my *Organs of Soviet Administration of Justice: Their History and Operation*, Leiden, 1970, pp. 539–52.) It is peculiar that in describing the role of the lawyer in a civil suit and of counsel in a criminal trial the authors fail to mention that, in contradistinction to the lawyer, the counsel cannot abandon the defense of the accused during the trial.

SAMUEL KUCHEROV  
Washington, D.C.

RUSSIAN-ENGLISH LAW DICTIONARY. By *Nicholas P. Prischepenko*. Preface by *Miguel de Capriles*. Completed and edited by the New York University School of Law. New York, Washington, London: Praeger Publishers, 1969. vi, 146 pp. \$20.00.

The first, basic question to be asked about such a reference work is whether it contains the principal terms encountered in Russian and Soviet writings and sources on legal and governmental matters. A careful comparison of the terms in this dictionary with those in the Civil Code and the Code of Civil Procedure of the RSFSR, as well as those in the Criminal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure of the RSFSR, and those in the two-volume *Iuridicheskii slovar'* (Moscow, 1956) and the *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' pravovykh znanii (sovetskoe pravo)* (Moscow, 1965), reveals that most of the key terms in these sources may be found in the dictionary, although one might wish for more synonyms, cross references, and examples of usage in many instances. It is refreshing to discover that the Russian terms are translated into good English, without the literal translation and stilted jargon too often found in English-language works on the Soviet government and legal system published in the West. For example, *privlekat' k ugolovnoi otvetstvennosti* is quite correctly translated as "to institute criminal proceedings (against a person)" instead of the dreadful "to bring to criminal responsibility" often found in English-language books. A unique feature of the book is the inclusion of many terms relating to international law and organization, reflecting the late compiler's association with the United Nations staff as a language expert from 1946 to 1951.

Unfortunately, many terms frequently encountered in Soviet legal and governmental writings which are not to be found in any Russian-English dictionary or even in a Russian dictionary or encyclopedia, and over which this reviewer has labored many long hours in the search for a good English translation, are also absent in this dictionary. These include such terms as *pokhoziaistvennaia kniga* (household record; from article 72 of the Collective Farm Charter), *imushchestvennaia otvetstvennost'* (civil liability), *protivorechie* (contravention; the dictionary's sole translation as "contradiction" is quite inadequate), *shtatnoe raspisanie* (staffing schedule; very common in Soviet administrative law textbooks), and so forth.

Some major legal terms absent from the book include *pravovoi akt* (official act), *tuneiadstvo* (idling or parasitism), *usad'ba* (house-and-garden plot; an ex-