

progress of the non-Russians. Regrettably, on those topics Sokolov only expresses his disapproval of Pokrovsky but does not clarify the writer's position.

The chapter on Pokrovsky's "struggle against noble-bourgeois historiography" fails to indicate that after 1917 one of his principal concerns as a critic was to expose the nationalist, Great Power interpretation of Russian history, and that he feared a revival of Russian nationalism in historical ideas. Pokrovsky warned especially against those "bourgeois" ideas (justifying tsarist Russia's foreign policies and its treatment of non-Russian nationalities, for example) which were disguised in Marxist language.

ROMAN SZPORLUK  
*University of Michigan*

THE DESPISED AND THE DAMNED: THE RUSSIAN PEASANT THROUGH THE AGES. By *Jules Koslow*. Russia Old and New Series. New York: Macmillan, 1972. 174 pp. \$5.95.

This book contains twenty-one chapters, ranging from "The Early Years" (thirteenth century) to "The New Soviet Peasant." It is interestingly illustrated and has a two-page map showing the union republics, some major cities, and a few rivers. The bibliography contains a short list of books in English on the Russian peasant (the most recent source was published in 1968). Since the book is undocumented, it is difficult to tell whether Koslow has based it on any Soviet work.

To whom can the book be recommended? To high school students, perhaps, but very cautiously. The quotations from Russian literature and from Donald Mackenzie Wallace's work might stimulate a young mind to further reading, but the teacher assigning the book would do well to point out that Koslow has organized his material in a rather strange fashion: past and present are all mixed up, as if the peasant had made no progress through the ages, and as if the Russian Revolution had happened so recently that thirty-seven pages and ten photographs were adequate coverage of the present. Some of those photographs are oddly placed: "Collective farm workers attend a literacy class" is the caption of one (p. 159), just below a paragraph pointing out that the literacy rate in the USSR is 95 percent. In fact, in 1970, 99.7 percent of Soviet citizens between the ages of nine and forty-nine were literate, with men having a very slight edge over women.

A number of Koslow's statements about the history of the Russian peasantry seem questionable to me, but since I consider myself a cultural anthropologist rather than a historian, I will point out only the following: the collective farmer's garden plot cannot have been as large as five acres (p. 143), since Iu. V. Arutiunian (*Sotsial'naiia struktura sel'skogo naseleniia SSR*, Moscow, 1971, p. 130, notes 1 and 2) points out that the maximum size was set by the Kolkhoz Charter of 1935 at 0.5 hectare (one hectare = 2.47 acres); in 1938 it was actually 0.49 hectare on an average, although in the Northern Caucasus kolkhozniks were given 0.68 hectare; and in 1967 it was 0.31 hectare. It also seems wrong to suggest (p. 146) that state-farm workers are much like factory workers. It is true that, unlike collective farmers, state-farm peasants were paid wages, but the data of Arutiunian and others amply demonstrate that even state farm peasants were and remain disadvantaged compared with factory workers. Nor is it correct to say that the "MTS have been largely superseded by farms that own their own equipment" (p. 143). The MTS is defunct, and has been for more than a decade.

The book can also be read by specialists as a horrible object lesson. Even granted that Russia's last seventy-three years do not outweigh the importance of other centuries, it is unfortunate that Koslow's view of the peasantry appears to have been influenced by a conclusion in *The Peasants of Central Russia* by Stephen P. Dunn and myself (p. 155). Basing our opinion on pre-1965 data, we wrote that fifty-some years after the Revolution the peasant remained a man in transition. I would not make such a categorical statement today, mostly because I have more data at my disposal—some of which were surely available to Koslow, too, if he made a conscientious effort to produce a book to be read in the 1970s.

Unfortunately, this book seems aimed at a passive mass market, and specialists have every reason to be ashamed of the slowness with which current data filter out to the lay public.

ETHEL DUNN

*Highgate Road Social Science Research Station, Berkeley*

THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN SOVIET AGRICULTURE. By *Karl-Eugen Wädekin*. Edited by *George Karcz*. Translated by *Keith Bush*. 2nd rev. and enl. ed. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1973. xviii, 407 pp. \$17.50.

This volume is a considerably revised and enlarged English translation of the author's *Privatproduzenten in der sowjetischen Landwirtschaft* (Cologne, 1967). Three chapters have been added which bring the historical account of Soviet policy toward "private" agriculture down to 1971. To make room for the new material, some of the appendixes in the original German edition have been omitted.

The book represents a monumental task carried through with Wädekin's usual high competence and thoroughness. If it receives the attention it deserves, it will lift the discussion of Soviet agriculture among Western scholars to a new level and make obsolete the assumptions which have been common up to now. The first three relatively brief chapters set forth the "ground rules" under which the private sector operates in the Soviet agricultural economy. The next four chapters assess the performance of Soviet private agriculture and explain its connection with the rest of the economy. These are followed by a historical survey of policy toward the private sector from the death of Stalin to 1971 and a chapter of summary entitled "Conflict and Uneasy Coexistence."

The reviewer's first and most important task in this instance is to urge his readers to study Wädekin's work with due care and attention as soon as possible, learn from it, and then build further on what the author has accomplished. Having said this much, however, I must add that I have some reservations about Wädekin's theoretical stance and general approach. To begin with (although this seems an odd comment to make on such a massive and detailed work), it seems to me that Wädekin takes too restricted a view of his subject. The performance of the Soviet "private agricultural economy" is assessed almost entirely in straight economic terms; except for a perfunctory nod or two in the direction of my own work, the social aspect of the matter is neglected. The new section, carrying the historical account from Stalin's death down through 1971, is written throughout in terms of policy rather than its consequences, which may lead unwary readers to assume (consciously or otherwise) that the Soviet regime, unlike others, is omnipotent, and that its intentions are always flawlessly implemented. Finally, even within the limits of the discussion of economic matters and of government policy in regard to