

Gregor names as belonging to the same category, whether or not it be labeled fascism. And indeed by glossing over rather lightly essential differences in aims, methods, social base, and political system (including foreign policies), Gregor strains his thesis, making his book an interesting tour de force. The same strain shows also in his treatment of Mussolini himself, where he stresses the periods before 1926 and after 1943, dismissing the years of Mussolini's accommodation with capitalism, private property, and the monarchy, as a tactic forced upon him by circumstances. An even more serious flaw may be Gregor's inability to fit the Third Reich into his scheme. For many scholars, National Socialism was the paradigm of fascism; for Gregor it was an aberration. Missing, too, from his account, are many movements usually described as of the "far right" in contemporary Western Europe and North America. At the same time, Gregor is careful to point out that he is writing specifically about ideologies, and not about political systems.

Still, this is a tour de force. Occasionally my eyebrows went up when I read a particularly bold statement. But Gregor, on the whole, presents an impressive amount of knowledge in highly provocative fashion. The book is an important contribution to our understanding of contemporary political ideologies and trends.

ALFRED G. MEYER

University of Michigan

L'ÉVOLUTION DU MARXISME SOVIÉTIQUE: THÉORIE ÉCONOMIQUE ET DROIT. By *Henri Chambre*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1974. 476 pp. Paper.

From the hand of a master who has access to all the relevant sources, this work asks what happened to economic and legal theory in the Soviet Union between the Twentieth and Twenty-fourth Congresses of the CPSU. In other words, what was the net effect of de-Stalinization in terms of economic and legal theory? Divided into two almost equal parts, the book offers the hurried reader the advantage of a short but precise introduction and accurate conclusion to each part—as well as a very informative, synthetic transition between the two.

In the section on economic theory (pp. 41–222), Professor Chambre limits himself to three problems: the "law of value," the "price of production," and profit. He finds that in the period under consideration the Soviets have had to extend the law of value beyond the limits formerly considered acceptable. They also moved to consider—in line with the third volume of *Capital*—the "price of production" as ultimately determining value. Profit—which had existed in the Soviet realm since the time of Lenin—is undergoing more critical analysis in terms of the real role it can play as indicator. Finally, the author points out that the Soviets have come around to more extensive use of mathematical modeling, with all the theoretical adjustments that this implies.

The section on theory of law (pp. 225–450) deals *in extenso* with the four areas of civil law, work law, law of marriage and family, and criminal law. The author finds that in all of these there has been evolution in the sense of "more rationality," including adjustments for changes in life-style. However, just as the results of the rediscovery of the "price of production" in the third volume of *Capital* were neutralized by the eternal dogmas previously derived from the first volume of *Capital* (the famous "iron laws"), so in the case of progressive adjustments of

laws; one finds that they remain vaguely expressed and open to abuse. Such is the effect of an "education tax" to prevent Jewish emigration, and which results in an "internal immigration."

Thus Chambre's general conclusion is that during the period of de-Stalinization increased rationality has been evidenced both in economic theory and in the formulation of laws. But he hastens to note that "rationality" here does not mean what Weber et al. meant by it. It means "conforming to the vision of the new Soviet man as presented by the party."

In concluding, Chambre points out that whereas Marx had undertaken a thorough critique of the Hegelian state, Lenin did no such thing for later bourgeois states—thus leaving the Soviets unable to resolve difficulties such as the following one: "If the system of laws is nothing but a social superstructure, the authority of which is based on an infrastructure which is an economic structure considered to be sound—i.e., a system where all the means of production are collectivized and put to work for the benefit of all of society—every element of discrimination has to have been eliminated, even if at one time it may have seemed necessary to discriminate" (p. 468).

This book must be considered the best commentary on developments in Soviet theory during the period in question—proving that sometimes the least obviously political study of Soviet events can have the greatest explanatory power for these same events.

T. J. BLAKELEY
Boston College

L'ISBA D'HIER ET D'AUJOURD'HUI: L'ÉVOLUTION DE L'HABITATION RURALE EN U.R.S.S. By *Basile H. Kerblay*. Lausanne: Éditions l'Age d'Homme, 1973. 247 pp. Paper.

This volume, by a distinguished French Slavist who is currently professor of Russian and Soviet civilization at the Sorbonne, has a scope considerably beyond its modest title. Professor Kerblay has in fact analyzed the entire rural housing situation in the Soviet Union, both in its historical-ethnographic aspect and in its current sociological one. He has done a first-rate job. I have seen nothing in English to equal it in ethnographic insight or historical grasp, and although some of the author's judgments on current matters are controversial, they are always sober and carefully documented.

The book is divided into an introduction, a relatively brief section on the traditional peasant dwelling (pp. 25–93), and an extended discussion of post-revolutionary rural housing conditions (pp. 94–202). A short historiographic appendix entitled "The State of Studies of the Russian Peasant Wooden Dwelling" and an extensive bibliography complete the book.

I have no criticisms of substance to offer. The author handles his sources, including the Soviet press and literary works on public affairs, with admirable care and restraint. As one who has been raked over the coals by his Soviet colleagues for using this kind of source, I wish Kerblay luck. I do not see how a better job could be done by a Western researcher in the absence of actual field work in the Soviet Union, which unfortunately does not seem to be in prospect.

STEPHEN P. DUNN
Highgate Road Social Science Research Station, Berkeley