

ization, but the way they have framed the argument is anything but persuasive. They say that Communist controls over agriculture were "enormously successful in fulfilling Stalin's main purposes" (p. 39) but have proved unable in the long run to provide satisfactory yields, largely because farm size and structure inhibit efficient decision-making. The first point is conventional wisdom that may not be true: even Soviet scholars have begun to hint over the last decade that collectivization as implemented was unnecessarily (and enormously?) costly in terms of economic efficiency as well as human suffering; and it is not obvious that the marketings, manpower, and savings required for industrialization could not have been mustered by other means more effective in the short as well as the long run. The Lairds cannot be blamed for accepting the economic rationale that numerous Western students (including this reviewer) have advanced in the past, with varying degrees of caution, for the system that emerged in the 1930s. It is unfortunate, however, that an interim judgment based on incomplete evidence should be reiterated in its least cautious form at a time when economists have begun to re-evaluate the evidence now available, and to have second thoughts.

That Soviet yields of food products today are less than they might be is true, but farm size is not the heart of the problem. The formidable difficulties reside in the unsatisfactory incentives at every level, and not only within agriculture. The Lairds assume that manufacturing is a less delicate child than farming, that "there seems to be no fundamental reason why communist urban production cannot be run as efficiently as any Western corporation" (p. 70), and that the industrial reforms introduced since 1965 have basically altered enterprise motivation: "Profit is supplanting plan fulfillment as the prime measure of industrial success" (p. 84). If they suppose that Soviet enterprises are now energetically competing (like Western enterprises) to provide new and more productive inputs to farms and more appealing goods for farmers to buy, they are mistaken. There is a profit plan too, which may be an even greater deterrent to the kind of support industry should give agriculture than the old indicators were.

Come to think of it, maybe the best way to dissuade urban bureaucrats and intellectuals from following the Soviet example in farming is to remind them of the problems plaguing Soviet industry. No one has ever wanted to socialize agriculture by itself.

NANCY NIMITZ
RAND Corporation

LES MARCHÉS PAYSANS EN U.R.S.S. By *Basile H. Kerblay*. *École Pratique des Hautes Études, Sorbonne, sixième section: Sciences économiques et sociales. Études sur l'histoire, l'économie et la sociologie des pays slaves*, 10. Paris and The Hague: Mouton, 1968. 517 pp. 82 F.

The conglomerate of institutions known as a market is viewed ambivalently by economists. On the one hand, the market is an impersonal behavioral mechanism which induces predictable responses from consumer-demanders and producer-suppliers; on the other hand, the market is a functional economic entity which distributes goods from producer to consumer and which may itself respond as a producer-supplier of a service. Professor Kerblay notes the ambiguity concerning markets at the beginning of his rich and colorful book. He chooses to emphasize the distribution (functional) aspects of the Soviet peasant market and its changing role during the course of Soviet economic development vis-à-vis producers,

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-