

VVEDENIE V PROMYSHLENNUIU SOTSIOLOGIIU (SOTSIAL'NYE PROBLEMY SOTSIALISTICHESKOGO PROMYSHLENNOGO PROIZVODSTVA). By *V. G. Podmarkov*. Moscow: "Mysl'," 1973. 318 pp. 1.26 rubles.

This book is an introduction to industrial sociology, defined (p. 15) as the study of an enterprise as a social system which interrelates different individuals and departments. A merit of the work is that Podmarkov is not as concerned with criticizing American industrial sociology as he is in reporting on writing and research in the Soviet Union. Moreover, he does not hesitate to mention problems in Soviet enterprises—for example, the case of workers in Perm who expressed open dissatisfaction with their jobs.

Several introductory chapters deal with concepts of work that industrial sociologists have applied to Soviet industry. Next there are chapters covering the structure of particular enterprises and the function of their leaders. Problems of planning are discussed and, as is traditional in Soviet research, the question of leisure time. The concluding chapters deal with sociological research and methodology. An appendix of twenty-five pages describes particular jobs and their roles in the enterprise. In most chapters the author begins with a discussion of technology (that is, machines) and then proceeds to examine economic and social considerations.

In a comparison of the United States and the USSR, the book states that the average number of employees in an American enterprise is about 50, and in the Soviet Union about 560. In 1970, it is reported, 48 percent of all employees in the Soviet Union were women. One learns that the Soviet Union starts three hundred to four hundred new production units each year (p. 91). The Soviet researchers also note that it is not an infrequent occurrence for employees to bypass an immediate supervisor to complain to a top official. When employees evaluate their positions in a factory, their answers are classified as "objective" or "subjective." It appears that the subjective variables, or reports on relations between persons, are gaining greater recognition in Soviet research.

Soviet researchers are just beginning to report on certain difficulties in their industrial organization—for example, the criteria for assigning workers to their particular duties. This problem is listed as most important by Russian employees, whereas the quality of the work produced is ranked fifth by foremen in their evaluations. Since the quality of production is apparently being stressed in the Soviet Union, the foremen can be expected to change their evaluation.

JIRI KOLAJA
West Virginia University

GOVERNING SOVIET CITIES: BUREAUCRATIC POLITICS AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT IN THE USSR. By *William Taubman*. Praeger Special Studies in International Economics and Development. New York, Washington, London: Praeger Publishers, 1973. xvii, 167 pp. \$15.00.

This slim volume, an expansion of a doctoral dissertation researched in part in the Soviet Union, focuses on Soviet city politics as bureaucratic politics, for the period 1958–69. The author draws upon the experience of a score of Soviet cities of varying size to develop the thesis, "The Soviet governmental system—in a sense a

mammoth, complex organization—is riven up and down by bureaucratic politics; . . . Soviet policies and lack of policies, foreign as well as domestic, mirror the clashes and compromises, antagonisms and alliances, of powerful bureaucratic agencies and their representatives” (p. 17). On the lower level, this is manifested by “a local conflict in which industrial interests have been as influential or even more influential than urban Party officials” (p. 5), to the extent that he concludes, “On urban and environmental issues the much-maligned Party *apparatchik* is indeed needed to rein in recalcitrant managerial specialists. Yet ironically the supposedly powerful Party secretaries are not powerful enough to dictate to influential industries whose activities adversely affect the pattern of urban development” (p. 7).

In developing his thesis the author provides new information on Soviet local politics and administration, especially on the changing role and importance of the city within the Soviet territorial-administrative hierarchy. Though at times he appears to overstate his case against the “totalitarian model,” his focus on bureaucratic politics at the local level—particularly in Soviet “company towns”—is refreshing and worth pursuing.

The book whets the reader’s appetite for a more substantial treatment of the many issues and themes discussed, particularly those dealing with the participation of the party in local decision-making. The latter, however, are not examined in enough depth and detail to justify some of the author’s statements about the surprising strength of urban industrial managers vis-à-vis party *apparatchiki*. Can the data be found for a more solid evaluation of this fundamental relationship? Probably not, though one hopes that other scholars, following the author’s lead, will make the attempt.

B. M. FROLIC
York University

SOTSIALISTICHESKAIA INTEGRATSIIA I MIROVOE KHOZIAISTVO.

By *Iu. N. Beliaev* and *L. S. Semenova*. Moscow: “Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia,” 1972. 255 pp. 96 kopeks.

This is the kind of study of economic integration in the Soviet bloc which has been appearing regularly at least once a year in the last decade or so. It is basically a compendium of standard economic data collected from various statistical yearbooks published in the Comecon countries. It is short on analysis and long on tedious description and obligatory praise of the superiority of Soviet-type economics. Anyone trying to learn something about the problems and prospects of Comecon will do much better by looking for information in the Hungarian and Polish sources.

Even though the authors devote a good deal of space to showing the economic progress achieved by the various Communist countries, they also admit that in some areas, notably intra-Comecon trade, there is considerable room for improvement, especially when compared with the performance of the Common Market. Moreover, reflecting the global concern with the energy problem, the study focuses also on the question of energy resources in Comecon, emphasizing the critical role of the Soviet Union as the chief supplier of oil and natural gas for Eastern Europe. Other than this, the study is an exercise in tedium.

ANDRZEJ KORBONSKI
University of California, Los Angeles