

The unresolved dilemma of socialist societies is "whether it is possible to establish the political conditions for egalitarianism while also guaranteeing civil rights to all citizens within the system of 'socialist legality'" (p. 184). "Egalitarianism seems to require a political system in which the state is able continually to hold in check those social and occupational groups which, by virtue of their skills or education or personal attributes, might otherwise attempt to stake claims to a disproportionate share of society's rewards. The most effective way of holding such groups in check is by denying them the right to organize politically, or in other ways, to undermine social equality" (p. 183). In capitalist societies ruled by Social Democrats there is class inequality and really no political equality, since the latter "presupposes sufficient social and material equality to enable contending groups to utilize formal political rights in roughly the same degree" (p. 185). In socialist countries there is a synchronic but not a diachronic class system, and there is political coercion intended to keep potential reward claimants in check. If Parkin is right, the absence of social stratification can be achieved only if the state continually deprives some occupational and social groups of their civil rights, which does not signify to the author any abuse of the ideal of political equality. Perhaps a little tolerable imperfection in class and political equality is the most humane solution, although not the most visionary.

The book is conjectural, thinly documented (United Nations tables notwithstanding), often sweeping, at other times too restrictive: the U.S. experience, for example, refuses to fit into Parkin's two-class model, despite occasional references to "aspirational values." In the preface the author states that his aim was "to write about only those issues which interested me most and to forget the rest." It shows.

JAN S. PRYBYLA
Pennsylvania State University

THE SOVIET RURAL COMMUNITY: A SYMPOSIUM. Edited by *James R. Millar*. Urbana, Chicago, London: University of Illinois Press, 1971. xv, 420 pp. \$12.50.

This is a "must" for students of Soviet agriculture. The general standard is high, there is relatively little repetition, there are many valuable and clear statistical tables, and altogether this is a volume which no one interested in the Soviet rural sector should be without. All of the fifteen contributions have merit, and in a short review it is not possible even to mention them all, let alone to praise them individually. George L. Yaney explores in an original way the special role of the agricultural specialists; after the flight of the gentry and the destruction of the *zemstvos* they were an essential link between the (Soviet) administration and rural areas. The specialist strove for the consolidation of strips, and also supported the looser forms of cooperation. Yaney is right to remind us that most of the so-called *kolkhozes* in existence in mid-1929 were of the small "TOZ" type, in which peasants were still largely individual producers. When in 1929 the party launched its new and drastic policy, the specialists would not carry it out, and the party had to "improvise" a crude and inexperienced rural administration out of virtually nothing. The resulting excesses and disruption—given also the instructions received from the center—were scarcely surprising.

There is much to learn from Robert F. Miller's careful survey of agricultural

administration in more recent years, especially the causes and consequences of Khrushchev's ill-fated reorganizations of 1961–62. As always, Jerry Hough's insights are valuable and helpful, in this instance on the subject of the career patterns and backgrounds of kolkhoz chairmen. Karl-Eugen Wädekin reminds us of the growing importance of that segment of the rural population which is not engaged in agriculture. The quality of the agricultural labor force is another matter worthy of special attention, and Norton T. Dodge most usefully analyzes information about education, sex composition, and age, not forgetting the effect of the generally negative attitudes of peasant youth toward agricultural work, nor yet the fact that this kind of problem exists in non-Communist countries also.

Jerzy Karcz's untimely death has removed a major scholar, who contributed to this volume an excellent historical survey. Particular importance must be attached to his analysis of the consequences of collectivization. Drawing on work by the Soviet scholar Barsov, he shows that the total value of agricultural marketed output actually increased insignificantly (if at all) in 1932 as compared with 1928, while inputs (i.e., industrial goods purchased by agriculture) rose. This could hardly have been part of the original intentions of the collectives. But Karcz was surely wrong in asserting that in 1950 the kolkhoz household obtained only 45.3 percent of its cash income from the private plot. Total sales in the kolkhoz markets in that year were four times as great as the total cash distribution to kolkhoz peasants, and it is reasonable to suppose that roughly two-thirds of sales in the market must be attributed to these peasants.

On this same point of relative income from private plots, it seems to me a little misleading for David W. Bronson and Constance B. Krueger, in an otherwise excellent survey, to say that an average day's pay for collective work was a mere 54 percent of the "pay per day's work on private plots," as late as 1967. Private-plot incomes here include consumption in kind of private produce, as well as market sales. But the word "pay" is not only linguistically incorrect: it suggests that if the worker did an extra day's private work, he would be "paid" more, in roughly these proportions. But this is plainly not so. It makes little sense to milk the same cow yet again, to slaughter a piglet twice over, or once more to dig up the same small potato patch.

The editor himself contributes a thoroughly documented survey of kolkhoz finance, with particular attention to the financing of investments. His many tables will be very helpful to students of the subject.

The book ends with some interesting contributions on what the editor calls the "texture of rural life," including the role of religion and the family, drawing both on literature and on Soviet sociological and ethnographic work. One must disagree with Gleb Zekulin's assertion that the words "sdano v nabor" occur today only on the last page of *Novyi mir*. My copy of *Voprosy ekonomiki*, among other journals, still bears this useful indication of the date on which it was presented to the censors. But it would be all wrong to end the review with carping criticism. This contribution, along with the others, is of a high standard; and the editor is to be congratulated.

ALEC NOVE
University of Glasgow