

on assumptions about available technical capability and the selection of criteria for determining exploitable deposits. In this respect the Soviet primary energy reserves may be overstated as compared to those of the West, where the role of market forces may prevent resources in faraway locations or lying at great depth from being included in the reserves category. With this reservation in mind, it should, however, be acknowledged that both volumes represent first-class work, rich in quantitative data, and offering a penetrating analysis of the scope and structure of the Soviet energy resource basis. Both volumes deserve to be translated in their entirety.

JAROSLAV G. POLACH
Resources for the Future, Inc., Washington, D.C.

DIE LANDWIRTSCHAFTLICHEN BETRIEBSGRÖSSEN IN DER SOWJETUNION IN STATISTIK UND THEORIE. By *Ivan Lončarević*. Osteuropastudien der Hochschulen des Landes Hessen Reihe I, Giessener Abhandlungen zur Agrar- und Wirtschaftsforschung des Europäischen Ostens, vol. 45. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1969. 184 pp. DM 26, paper.

A decade ago the late Lazar Volin observed that throughout the collectivization of Russian agriculture there had been no studies of the optimum size of farm. This can no longer be said. After the resurrection of the All-Union Institute of Agricultural Economics in 1955 (Stalin closed its predecessor in 1935), numerous Soviet studies have dealt with the size-of-farm problem.

The size peak was reached for state farms in 1962; since that date there has been a 32 percent decline in average sown area per state farm, to 6,900 hectares in 1967. Sown area per collective farm has remained virtually unchanged since 1962, at about 2,800 hectares. Paralleling this stabilization or reduction in farm size, the Soviet professional literature reflects an increasing concern with size problems. The concern is less with overall size, which remains a highly charged political question, than with optimum size for managerial subunits: "departments" for state farms and "complex brigades" for collective farms.

Lončarević describes in detail the procedures by which Soviet agricultural economists build their concept of optimum size. The outcome is closely related to the optimal size (and number) of worker settlements per farm. This in turn is a function of economies in supplying social and cultural services, and diseconomies resulting from increased internal transport costs as settlement size increases.

A major limitation on Soviet calculations of optimum farm size is the absence of an interfarm market for livestock feed. Each unit must rely primarily on its own feed supply. Given administered prices and state procurement contracts, any feed available "above the plan" can be sold for premium prices. This discourages interfarm sales and retards specialization. If a market structure of farm-level prices ever emerges in the Soviet Union, the question of optimum size of farm will appear in a different light.

Lončarević's survey of the literature through 1967 is the best available appraisal in a non-Russian language of current Soviet thought on this topic.

PHILIP M. RAUP
University of Minnesota