

But this is a biographical problem which must be regarded as subordinate to the insights offered by Jacobsen's edition for judging in the first place the differing VDA and governmental conceptions about and attitudes toward the Germans living outside the German borders, as well as the influence of German minority problems on the internal policies of the governments concerned and on their relations to the Reich.

To Jacobsen's documentation, which is filled to the brim with fascinating details about the early years of Hitler's rule and his style of government, one can apply Klaus Urner's judgment of Peter Stahlberger's book about Emil Oprecht, *Der Zürcher Verleger Emil Oprecht und die deutsche politische Emigration, 1933-1945* (Zurich, 1970): "Although the growing distance in time diminishes the richness of the nuances determining the life of the time and leaving its stamp thereon, the retrospective view sharpens recognition of the essential by making it easier to assign to single events their proper place in the chain of historical development" (*Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, December 17, 1972).

FRITZ T. EPSTEIN

Indiana University and Freiburg im Br.

ECONOMIC REFORMS IN EASTERN EUROPE: POLITICAL BACKGROUND AND ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE. By *Radoslav Selucky*. Translated by *Zdenek Elias*. Praeger Special Studies in International Economics and Development. New York, Washington, London: Praeger Publishers, 1972. x, 179 pp. \$15.00.

Professor Selucky's book is certainly a welcome and valuable addition to the steadily growing number of analytical studies on economic reforms in Eastern Europe. Written by one of the leading Czechoslovak reformers, it gives the reader a comprehensive picture of all the complex problems involved in a switch-over from an arbitrary command economy to a more rational system geared to the market mechanism. The very fact that the author was an active participant in the seemingly unequal struggle between the would-be reformers and the entrenched party bureaucracy gives additional weight to his arguments.

Basing his analysis on the fundamental assumptions of Marxist-Leninist doctrine, Selucky—quite rightly—puts the main stress on the utter incompatibility of any genuinely market-oriented reform blueprint with the existing power structure of a Communist state. In this respect the first two chapters, "The Pre-Reform System" and "The Alternatives of Reform," should be of special interest not only to a general reader but also to more advanced students of the subject. One could only wish that Selucky had devoted more space to the highly significant changes in the political and economic thinking of the younger generation of the party oligarchy and their growing affinity with the technocrats. In the remaining six chapters of his book Selucky discusses one by one the economic reform programs worked out in the individual countries of the Soviet bloc (excluding Yugoslavia). Needless to say, the chapter dealing with Czechoslovak reforms is by far the best. It contains quite a lot of little-known factual material pertaining to the evolution of the Czechoslovak new economic model during the Prague Spring of 1968. Here one gets a good insight not only into the contemplated functional and institutional changes in the economic system but also into the intricate problems faced by the

reformers once they have wrestled political power from the orthodox ruling elite.

Naturally enough, Selucky is somewhat biased in his comparative assessment of other reform blueprints. Thus his argument that the Hungarian new economic model is a purely technocratic reform, based on a tacit acceptance of the principle of limited sovereignty, is—to say the least—debatable. Quite obviously too, Selucky is far more conversant with the East German reforms than those in Poland (especially the reform proposals of 1964/65 and the new model evolved after 1968). But these are minor weak spots in an otherwise valuable and interesting book, which no serious student of East European affairs can afford to miss.

MICHAEL GAMARNIKOW
Radio Free Europe, Munich

JAHRBUCH DER WIRTSCHAFT OSTEUROPAS. YEARBOOK OF EAST-EUROPEAN ECONOMICS, vol. 1. Edited by *Hans Raupach, Eberhard Fels,* and *Erik Boettcher*. Veröffentlichung des Osteuropa-Instituts München. Munich and Vienna: Günter Olzog Verlag, 1970. 506 pp. DM 110.

JAHRBUCH DER WIRTSCHAFT OSTEUROPAS. YEARBOOK OF EAST-EUROPEAN ECONOMICS, vol. 2. Edited by *Hans Raupach, Edward Ames, Erik Boettcher, Eberhard Fels, Hans-Werner Gottinger, T. O. M. Kronsjö,* and *Alfred Zauberman*. Veröffentlichung des Osteuropa-Instituts München. Munich and Vienna: Günter Olzog Verlag, 1971. 556 pp. DM 110.

The growing body of literature on economic planning is enhanced by the appearance of the first two volumes of this yearbook, sponsored by the Osteuropa Institute in Munich. My purpose here is strictly to call attention to the publication rather than to scrutinize the many and varied contributions. They range widely in subject matter, scope, and depth of coverage and quality. Both yearbooks are subdivided into three parts: theory of planning, application of economic policy, and valuable statistical information drawing not only on the Institute's own resources but also on information from the GDR and other East European industrial countries.

The editors should be commended for their stress on analytical methods and techniques of planning. Moreover, the stress on comparative economic planning and policy extends the very scope of the traditional approach to Soviet-type (East European) economics. Although I applaud the opinion expressed that "fruitful study of these economies should *also* include analysis of the theoretical structure of a planned economy (without reference to prevailing institutional features and characteristics), or what we may formulate as a *methodological research on economic planning*," certain reservations may be raised on the question whether a general theory of planning, independent of the institutional framework of a social system and its working arrangements for resource allocation, is conducive to understanding economic realities. The preinstitutional approach to the theory of economic growth has proved to have distinct limitations, because the institutional framework of a system is basic to its economic dynamics and, therefore, to the theory of growth (planning) relevant to that system. This raises another problem. In my view, the worthy approach taken will be even more beneficial if problems of theory and practice of planning should be related and integrated with growth processes.

If practicable, it might be a good idea to arrange for each yearbook to explore