

SOVIET INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN HECKSCHER-OHLIN PERSPECTIVE: AN INPUT-OUTPUT STUDY. By *Steven Rosefielde*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, D. C. Heath, 1973. xxv, 175 pp. \$13.50.

The Heckscher-Ohlin theorem states that if a competitive market economy has plentiful labor and scarce capital, it will export labor-intensive goods and import capital-intensive goods. The Leontief paradox notes that the United States, generally considered labor-scarce and capital plentiful, exports labor-intensive goods and imports capital-intensive goods, contrary to the theorem. There is no reason why the theorem should hold for the USSR, which is not a competitive market economy. But Rosefielde argues clearly and persuasively that if one uses traditional measures, then Soviet foreign trade follows the Heckscher-Ohlin prediction even if U.S. trade does not.

This book, then, makes a bad situation worse for international economists. Part of the difficulty must lie in a misstatement of the problem. Economic historians have been working on an analogous problem in the history of technology, and have some evidence that plentiful natural resources ("land") may replace both labor and capital in production processes. Students of the Leontief paradox (cited in this book) have thought that something akin might be at work in determining trade patterns. Rosefielde attempts to investigate this matter, with inconclusive results. But his lack of success may stem from his basic statement of Heckscher-Ohlin and his formulation of the Leontief Statistic (his numerical measure). These are based on a labor-capital production process, and not on a land-labor-capital production process. Moreover, input-output analysis is ill-equipped to study replacement of one input by others, since by assumption all inputs are used in fixed proportions. Rosefielde has presented the standard two-factor approach so well that its weaknesses, as well as its strengths, are at once apparent. His book is a welcome addition to the list of works seeking to analyze the Soviet economy at the technical level that is applied to other economies.

EDWARD AMES

State University of New York at Stony Brook

CONSERVATION IN THE SOVIET UNION. By *Philip R. Pryde*. New York and London: Cambridge University Press, 1972. xv, 301 pp. \$12.50.

This study has two stated objectives: (1) to review the major features of natural-resource management and conservation in the USSR and identify major problems resulting from Soviet approaches to resource management, and (2) to examine these approaches "with the goal of acquiring insight into the contemporary Soviet perception of what constitutes proper natural resource conservation." These are ambitious goals; Pryde has succeeded reasonably well in meeting the first but has faltered on the second.

Two useful introductory chapters on the Soviet concept of conservation and its historical and institutional framework are followed by six chapters dealing with management of land and soil resources, nature preserves, fish and wildlife conservation, timber and mineral resources, water resources, and environmental pollution and quality. A summary chapter treats attitudes, problems, and trends.

What emerges is a picture of a multitude of bureaucratic organizations at various political levels competing for resources and often working at cross-purposes while striving to fulfill economic plans. Although ecological research has shown