

SCARCITY AND CONTROL IN SOCIALISM: ESSAYS ON EAST EUROPEAN PLANNING. By *Phillip J. Bryson*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, D. C. Heath, 1976. xiv, 202 pp. Figures. Tables. \$16.50.

Phillip Bryson's *Scarcity and Control in Socialism* is a slender volume best described as a cross between a textbook and a scholarly monograph. Like a text, it is organized topically, each section dealing with a different aspect of planning and control. Themes such as the nature of centralist administration under socialism, decentralization, information theory, pricing, investment criteria, and CMEA integration are discussed separately in individual chapters which set forth the issues, survey the literature, embellish key arguments, and culminate with a few broad, but carefully hedged, conclusions.

Like a monograph, the embellishments introduced in each chapter are intended as serious contributions to the pertinent literature. An input-output approach to information theory is advanced, the typical method is contrasted with Fisher's concept of rate of return over cost (after the manner of Alchian), an optimum foreign trade decentralization scheme is suggested which invokes Kuhn-Tucker, and the CMEA independent price basis problem is given a tentative solution through the application of the Baumol-Bradford theorem. In and of themselves, many of the ideas put forward by Bryson are potentially meritorious. Unfortunately, having chosen the hybrid textbook-monograph format, he is unable to develop his ideas with sufficient detail and rigor to ever be really persuasive. For example, while a "quasi-optimal" independent pricing scheme is recommended, no thought is given to the pure theoretical problem of whether an independent price basis is preferable to employing world prices. Equally telling is the fact that nowhere in the book is any empirical attempt made to validate the relevance of various hypotheses.

In summary then, *Scarcity and Control in Socialism* is neither a textbook nor a scholarly monograph. It fills a useful niche between the two for those desiring to explore certain fundamental problems of socialist economics without committing themselves to a thorough and comprehensive exploration of particular scientific problems. This surely is a valid function, but it is still disappointing that none of the scholarly problems raised by Bryson receive the comprehensive analysis they warrant.

STEVEN ROSEFELDE
University of North Carolina

FIGHTING AUSCHWITZ: THE RESISTANCE MOVEMENT IN THE CONCENTRATION CAMP. By *Józef Garliński*. London: Julian Friedmann Publishers, 1975. xii, 327 pp. Photographs. \$12.50. Distributed by Holmes & Meier Publishers, New York.

The concentration camp in Auschwitz was not only a place of inhuman crimes. Struggle and charity became the fulfillment of life for many of the camp's inmates, those who conquered fear and then offered resistance. There are various publications (for example, B. Baum's *Widerstand in Auschwitz*) which describe resistance in the camp, but Garliński's book is unsurpassed in its presentation of one resistance organization, founded by a man who purposely accepted arrest and deportation to Auschwitz. This man was Witold Pilecki. Acting in conjunction with the Polish underground Home Army, he established a secret organization in the camp, which assisted the inmates and directed the fight against the Nazis.

Pilecki subsequently escaped and tried, unsuccessfully, to organize the liberation of the camp by the Home Army. He then fought in the Warsaw Uprising and was taken prisoner of war; after liberation, he joined the Polish Army in the West. When he returned to Poland, he was accused of joining the resistance movement against the Communists. Sentenced to death in a secret trial, Pilecki was executed in 1948.

The book is carefully written and documented, and includes an extensive bibliography, indexes, appendixes, and illustrations. It is generally a factual account, but the statement that there were no deportations from the General Government (pp. 171–72) is not accurate. This may, however, only have been an error in proofreading.

WACLAW W. SOROKA

University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point

PROTI OKUPANTŮM: STRANA A LID V BOJI PROTI NACISTŮM
(ČERVEN 1941–LEDEN 1943). By *Jaroslav Žižka*. Prague: Svoboda, 1975.
231 pp. + 24 pp. photographs. Tables. Kčs. 20.

Žižka, a specialist on the Czech anti-Nazi resistance, has produced a compact overview of oppositional movements in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia during the eighteen months after Germany's attack on the USSR. His main attention is not on Moscow or London, although these capitals are discussed in relative proportion to their importance, but on parachutist agents flown from England and their fates, on the rationale and implementation of the policies of Reich Protector Reinhard Heydrich, and on transformations in the resistance groups under the impact of Nazi countermeasures. By using records of the Extraordinary People's Courts and various central and provincial archives, Žižka endows a semipopular work with enduring value.

Like others who have studied the resistance, Žižka credits Heydrich's tactic of threats, brutality, and selective concessions with devastating results, but he further suggests that it threatened the political, physical, and moral survival of the Czech nation. Thus he concludes that Heydrich's liquidation was a horrible necessity although the actual event was executed in an irresponsible, narrowly conceived manner that brought only negative consequences. Looking somewhat beyond the gruesome events of the *Heydrichiáda* the author detects in the countryside and small towns new currents that were to revive the resistance, but he provides few data here or on the "psychosis of terror" which he claims then gripped the Czech masses. Although rich in detail, the book lacks a bibliography and at critical points omits reference notes. For example, Žižka writes that the London-based Czechoslovak government-in-exile, headed by former president Eduard Beneš, plotted Heydrich's assassination in order to bolster its standing with the Allies. He bases this conclusion on "an analysis of all the available documents" (p. 126) but he cites no supporting document whatsoever.

STANLEY B. WINTERS

New Jersey Institute of Technology