

editor, a psychologist at the University of Michigan, has drawn together three useful long papers, three short commentaries, a brief introduction and conclusion, excellent bibliographies, numerous tables, and some interesting "discussion notes."

Yet for all the abundance of data and wealth of insight, the book is uneven and disappointing. The editorial responsibility for providing thematic focus and effective integration has not been fulfilled, and the reader is left to find his way through what remains essentially the transcript of a symposium, happily a stimulating one.

Field's paper "Workers (and Mothers)" introduces the Soviet woman in her various roles; Vera Dunham describes her changing image in Soviet literature; and Bronfenbrenner's focus is "The Changing Soviet Family." Among the shorter pieces, only David Heer's commentary on Soviet abortion policy is noteworthy. The remaining two are general and impressionistic and contribute little, either conceptually or empirically, to our understanding of the position of women in Soviet society.

For the most part the conceptual orientation of the symposium is sociological. A good deal of empirical data has been accumulated concerning the role and status of the Soviet woman, the family and family law, and peripherally, the socialization process and social system of the USSR. Unfortunately these clusters of concepts are never brought together and wrought into a coherent and explicit conceptual framework from which a body of testable hypotheses could have been generated. Nevertheless, this groundwork, including Field's typology (with Feldmesser's emendation) of Soviet women, in terms of their attitudes toward public participation, should greatly encourage and facilitate research on this neglected aspect of Soviet studies. In fact, the systematic analysis of the changing roles of women as reflected in family law, the press, and literature might well serve as one vehicle for comparative Communist studies. However, an adequate explanation of such role changes must eventually take into account the political context, a perspective which is notably absent in the symposium under review.

ROBERT SHARLET
Union College

ECONOMIC DEVOLUTION IN EASTERN EUROPE. By *Ljubo Sirc*. New York and Washington: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969. xii, 165 pp. \$6.50.

ECONOMIC REFORMS IN EASTERN EUROPE. By *Michael Gamarnikow*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1968. 206 pp. \$8.95.

These books share a common set of values and methodological premises, not to speak of similar prejudices. Their authors both feel passionately that centralized planning is bad and market allocation is good. And any facts, numbers, guesses, and approximations that tend to support this basic contention are grist to their mill. Sirc holds the advantage over Gamarnikow in economic sophistication—he recognizes some of the arguments of the "other side." He is also the better writer. Gamarnikow, however, holds the edge in concrete knowledge of what is going on in Eastern Europe and makes far fewer errors of fact. His book, in fact, contains a good deal of detailed material, particularly on Poland, that is not to be found elsewhere.

Both works may be cited as palpable evidence by scholars, particularly non-economists, who share their outlook. I have already seen two very favorable mentions of Gamarnikow's study by specialists in Communist affairs. Anti-Communists will be confirmed in their suspicion that Soviet-style economic management is part and parcel of the Soviet tyranny and as inefficient as it is inhumane. Those econ-

omists, especially in developing countries, who are inclined favorably toward central planning will probably not read these books, but if any of them happen to, they will not be persuaded by their arguments. Unfortunately, a more precise and better developed methodology would be required to reconcile these divergent views.

Sirc seems to believe that it is sufficient to quote repentant East European planners, many of whom are as ready to heap abuse on the old model as they were once eager to uphold it, to clinch the case for market-type decentralization. But this will not do. Beyond a certain point, neither the indiscriminate damning of the old ways nor the exuberant expectations placed in the new can make up for the lack of a balanced appraisal of the advantages and disadvantages of centrally and decentrally coordinated systems at different stages of development, in different political and social milieus, for the different goals pursued by the ultimate authorities in various societies. It may matter very much, for instance, whether resources are mobilized for growth by Soviet-style methods at an early or at a mature stage of industrialization. (To argue, as Sirc does on page 29, that Czech economists now recognize that fundamental errors were made in the allocation of resources fifteen or twenty years ago, at an earlier stage of development of their country, does not really meet the point.) This proposition should be tested statistically, not rejected a priori on the basis of casual observation. Is it likely, furthermore, that the optimal system for economies preparing for war, as the East European states were in the early 1950s, should have been as decentralized as the one that the Hungarians wish to implant today? Neither Sirc nor Gamarnikow makes a proper allowance for these extraneous factors, which cannot but influence the relation between an economy's system and the outcomes actually observed over a period of time and which must thus affect the choice of the best system under a given set of conditions. The unrigorous approach of both authors to these complex problems could perhaps be justified if the decentralized market system "dominated" all possible alternatives, that is, if it could be expected to yield the most desired outcomes for any goals and for all likely circumstances. To establish that proposition, or any one close to it in its degree of generality, Sirc and Gamarnikow would have had to be much more methodical in collecting and treating their facts. Irrespective of the outcome, they would then have written more substantial and lasting studies.

JOHN MICHAEL MONTIAS
Yale University

THE HOP INDUSTRY OF EASTERN EUROPE AND THE SOVIET UNION. By *David A. Strausz*. Pullman: Washington State University Press, 1969. 242 pp. \$8.00.

Hops are at best an unusual commodity. Though consumed indirectly by millions of beer drinkers throughout the world, their characteristics are virtually unknown to all except hop growers and dealers, brewmasters, and an occasional botanist.

It is therefore both unusual and refreshing to find in Professor Strausz's book a lucid, highly readable description of the hop crop, including its climatic and ecological requirements and growing techniques. But far more important, Strausz provides a penetrating and well-documented appraisal of the successes, failures, and prospects of this highly specialized facet of agriculture in Eastern Europe. Strausz brings to his subject not only professional competence as a geographer but also a most unusual attribute—he is an experienced and successful hop grower. Moreover, he gives firsthand observations on all the countries covered, including extensive