

ceedingly important term in the Collective Farm Charter), *podsobnoe domashnee khoziaistvo* (household subsidiary plot; from article 10 of the Constitution of the USSR), and *raionirovanie* (zoning). For comprehensive coverage, this reviewer still prefers *A Russian-English Dictionary of Social Science Terms*, compiled by R. E. F. Smith (London: Butterworths, 1962). Also, one may eagerly anticipate the forthcoming *Encyclopedia of Soviet Law*, being compiled and edited by the Documentation Office for East European Law of the University of Leiden, for expansion and explanation of the terms contained in the Prischepenko work, along with many other words and phrases not included therein.

In this reviewer's opinion, a "law dictionary" should serve as a useful source of specialized terms encountered in writings on law and government. Hence ordinary terms included in any Russian-English dictionary should presumably be omitted, and only technical terms not found elsewhere would be included. However, a substantial flaw of this dictionary, particularly in view of its high price for so few pages, is that it includes many terms easily found in, for example, Smirnitsky. These range from "organize," "understand," and "interview" to "stepmother," "bachelor," "duel," and "guillotine"—although, strangely, "revolution" and its associated words (e.g., *revoliutsionnye tribunaly*) are omitted!

The principal complaint this reviewer has about the dictionary is the same one he has about S. N. Andrianov and A. S. Nikiforov, *Anglo-russkii iuridicheskii slovar'* (Moscow, 1964)—namely, there are so many British legal and governmental terms translated into Russian. This raises the perplexing question of just when one would ever need to translate them from Russian into English, except perhaps in Russian historical writings concerning English law. Thus in a Russian-English law dictionary one would expect to find primarily words and phrases concerned with the law and government of Russia and of the Soviet Union. In all fairness, it must be said that a number of terms associated with the historical development of Russian law and its codification are indeed included, the only significant omission being that of the *Russkaia Pravda*, a collection of laws allegedly compiled under Iaroslav the Wise (1015–54). To be sure, *zemstvo* is to be found only under *volostnoe zemstvo*, with no cross reference, and *duma* appears only as *gosudarstvennaia дума*, likewise without any cross referencing. However, these strictly Russian terms are overwhelmed by the large number of English terms translated into Russian, including crown prince, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, manor, thane, shire, Lord High Chancellor, Lord Mayor, Court of Exchequer, Court of the King's or Queen's Bench, scutage, seizin, sheriff, and Privy Councilor. In view of the price of the book, together with the omission of various Soviet legal terms, the inclusion of these English terms seems a puzzling, expensive, and unnecessary luxury.

GLENN G. MORGAN  
San Jose State College

EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN WESTERN EUROPE, THE UNITED STATES, AND THE U.S.S.R.: A COMPARATIVE STUDY.  
By *Raymond Poignant*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1969. xxx, 329 pp. \$9.95.

This fact-filled volume is the eighth in the series of Comparative Education Studies published by the Teachers College of Columbia University. A brief but enlightening foreword by the editor of the series, Professor George Z. F. Bereday, explains the

method employed and the reasons why the study, published in French in 1965, is being offered in translation. The author's preface reveals that the survey is the result of a program of research undertaken in 1960 by a study committee of the European Community Institute for University Studies to determine the status of education in the "common market" countries as compared with the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Soviet Union.

The number of topics touched upon is revealed in the elaborate list of contents (making an index unnecessary) and in more than a hundred comparative tables. The footnotes, both explanatory and bibliographical, indicate the enormous scope of the research and the care with which it was carried on. However, after saying all this, one wonders about the value of the book at this time. Since the original study was published in 1965, *all* of the statistics on *all* of the countries are out of date. The latest figures used are for 1964; and some, such as the important table 64 on graduates of higher educational institutions, show 1959 data for the United States and the USSR. Some of the projections have proven far from dependable—for example, the statement on page 276 that "nearly 6,500,000 students are expected in 1970" in American colleges and universities (the actual figure for 1969-70 is 7,377,000).

Despite many faults such as these (far too many to be corrected by editorial notes), the work is notable for at least three reasons: (1) it provides much information on several countries in the period 1960-64; (2) it illustrates the emergence of a new approach—the development approach—to comparative education; and (3) it provides further documentation that the USSR is a *very* close second to the United States in quantitative educational achievement.

WILLIAM H. E. JOHNSON  
*University of Pittsburgh*

STŘEDNÍ A JIHOVÝCHODNÍ EVROPA VE VÁLCE A V REVOLUCI,  
1939-1945: ČESKOSLOVENSKO, POLSKO, JUGOSLÁVIE, ALBÁNIE,  
RUMUNSKO, BULHARSKO, MAĎARSKO. Edited by *Jaroslav Opat*.  
Prague: Academia, 1969. 561 pp. Kčs. 44.

This collection of essays about Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Albania, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary during World War II is a characteristic product of Czechoslovak reform communism. The proponents of that ill-fated movement hoped to harmonize the independent development of their country under its party leadership with the power interests of the Soviet Union. In a similar vein, the seven Czech historians who contributed to the collection tried to reconcile the Soviet conquest of East Central Europe with the wartime resistance aspirations in the individual countries of the area. In their opinion, the domestic liberation efforts, allegedly dominated by the Communists and aimed at the establishment of socialistic societies, were part of the same spontaneous and irresistible historical process as the westward advance of the Red Army.

The intriguing question of the revolutionary outcome of World War II has recently aroused the interest also of radical historians in the West (e.g., Gabriel Kolko, *The Politics of War*). Those in Eastern Europe write with less skill but present much more primary evidence from their rich governmental and party archives. Still, they are hard-pressed to document convincingly the existence of spontaneous mass revolutionary currents there—with the familiar exceptions of Yugoslavia and perhaps Albania. All too eager to legitimize the subsequent rule