

DIE SOWJETISCHE BILDUNGSPOLITIK VON 1958 BIS 1973: DOKUMENTE UND TEXTE. Edited by *Oskar Anweiler, Friedrich Kuebart, and Klaus Meyer*. Osteuropa-Institut an der Freien Universität Berlin, Erziehungswissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen, vol. 9. Berlin and Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer Verlag in Kommission, 1976. xvi, 407 pp. Paper.

This volume continues the method and the message of an earlier volume published in 1961 which covered the politics of Soviet education since 1917. The method is the same: a generous selection (eighty-three) of documents and texts covering official pronouncements on all aspects of the massive and complex Soviet educational enterprise. The documents are introduced, as in the earlier volume, by an incisive and balanced assessment of the problems facing the political leaders of Soviet schools. The message is a bit different, however. Between 1958 and 1973 fundamental changes occurred in Soviet education and in the West's view of it, and these changes are clearly and authoritatively defined.

In the firm, unimaginative hands of Khrushchev's heirs, Soviet education has settled down. It has given up revolutionary flamboyance for steady, practical support of the supreme goals of the regime: Communist Party mastery at home, economic development of Siberia and Central Asia, and military power second to none. The Soviet Union is a country where the aging adults in power put it squarely to the young: there is only one way you can share in the modestly good life we have prepared for you—hard work, discipline, loyalty, and waiting in line. The well-regulated school will prepare you for the well-regulated life. Keep your nose clean and you will enjoy a level of security and comfort unknown to your fathers and grandfathers. The message of the leaders is clear. What is not so clear is how the young are adapting this straightforward doctrine to their private dreams. I suspect that most of them are accepting the standardized model and quietly adapting it to individual needs.

The West's view of Soviet education has also changed since 1958. The mystery is gone. Gone too is any semblance of desire for emulation: we do not need Soviet guidance to strangle ourselves in innovative and creative regulations.

PAT ALSTON

*Bowling Green State University*

STUDIES IN SOVIET INPUT-OUTPUT ANALYSIS. Edited by *Vladimir G. Treml*. Foreword by *Wassily Leontief*. New York and London: Praeger Publishers, 1977. xx, 446 pp. Tables. Figures.

This collection is a product of the well-known research project on Soviet input-output data and analyses which has long been in progress at Duke University. Chapter 1 is a revised and updated version of work that has been published previously. Chapters 2-7 are revised, updated versions of mimeographed occasional papers of the Duke University project. The entire project is concerned primarily with the use that can be made of Soviet input-output data by U.S. researchers, rather than with the role of input-output in Soviet planning. Hence, the book contains a chapter on the role of input-output in SOVMOD, but absolutely nothing on the role of input-output in the OGAS. The reader interested in the use of input-output in the USSR must supplement this book with the paper by Tretyakova and Birman in *Soviet Studies* (April 1976) and with sources on the use of input-output in the OGAS.

Chapter 1 is the latest in a series of writings in which the authors reconstruct the 1966 USSR ex post input-output table. It provides a mass of valuable data for researchers interested in the structure of the Soviet economy in the 1960s. Chapter

2, a useful development of an earlier work by Montias, considers one way to minimize plan inconsistencies caused by failure to take account of the structural interdependence of current production—and that is, to take advantage of the triangular hierarchy of the input-output table. Chapter 3 is an attempt to assess the importance of economies of scale in Soviet industry. This is useful because of the assumption of constant returns to scale implicit in conventional input-output studies. The author is commendably honest in pointing to the limitations of his own study. (Such academic modesty is a valuable and commendable feature of the whole book.) Chapter 4 considers Soviet transportation in an input-output framework. Chapter 5 is concerned with converting the 1966 USSR input-output table into 1970 prices, in order to make it comparable to subsequent Soviet tables. (Perhaps experience with this kind of work will make Western specialists on the Soviet economy more sympathetic to Soviet planners' preference for stable prices.) Chapter 6 is a useful, up-to-date, brief survey of Soviet work on regional input-output. The authors correctly note that "major advances are being made in the Soviet Union in the theoretical study of regional input-output models and in the gathering of data for regional input-output accounts. In fact, this Soviet research is probably the most advanced of its type in the world" (p. 282). Chapter 7, a detailed study of input-output in one Soviet republic, Latvia, contains a mass of detailed information about the construction of the Latvian tables, which is helpful for obtaining a firm grasp of the meaning of Soviet input-output data. Chapter 8 deals with the use of input-output data for comparisons of the structure of U.S. and Soviet economies. For this purpose, the U.S. data were adjusted to correspond to the Soviet data, and six statistical tests of the relationship between Soviet and U.S. input coefficients were conducted. Because of data limitations, the paper is mainly of methodological rather than substantive interest. Chapter 9 considers the use of input-output data in the SRI-WEFA econometric model of the USSR.

This book is not a comprehensive survey of Soviet work on input-output. For example, it contains virtually nothing on Soviet labor and physical input-output tables or on the capital stock matrices. Nor does it have much on the usefulness, or otherwise, of input-output in Soviet planning. Nevertheless, the book is a valuable source of data on, and a competent analysis of, Soviet input-output work. It will be very useful for those needing a complete version of the input-output table in value units for the USSR in 1966 and for those requiring detailed information about, and analysis of, Soviet work in the input-output area.

MICHAEL ELLMAN  
*Amsterdam University*

THE YOUNG HEGEL: STUDIES IN THE RELATIONS BETWEEN DIALECTICS AND ECONOMICS. By *Georg Lukács*. Translated by *Rodney Livingstone*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1976 [1966, 1975]. xxx, 576 pp. \$24.95.

Georg Lukács spent 1933–45 in exile in the Soviet Union, where he worked as a research associate of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences in Moscow. For the first few years he wrote primarily on aesthetics. But when his criticism of socialist art brought him into conflict with his Soviet colleagues, he turned back to his earlier philosophical concerns and wrote *The Young Hegel*, which he completed in 1938. When it was finally published in Vienna in 1948, he had thoroughly revised the text. He again revised it for the 1954 East Berlin edition, from which this not completely satisfactory translation has been made.