

they are about differences in policy objectives, and because Soviet authors frequently must be elliptical in order to publish at all. A Western study may place some Soviet economic controversy into a general Soviet intellectual context, or it may regard the controversy as a stage in the history of Soviet economics, or it may analyze the controversy in terms of Soviet economic policy or modern economics. These approaches will endear the author, respectively, to historians of Soviet intellectual thought, historians of Soviet economics, historians of Soviet economic policy, and analytical economists.

Felker's discussion will interest historians of Soviet economics a good deal, historians of Soviet intellectual life and economic policies somewhat, and analytical economists not at all. It is essentially an account of events along the frontier separating the policy-oriented wing of Soviet academic economics and the intellectually oriented wing of the Soviet economic administration. A corresponding controversy in the United States would involve, say, academic economists like Ackley, Friedman, Heller, and Musgrave on the one hand, and government economists of the Federal Reserve Board and the Executive Branch on the other.

The analytical economist, reading of a policy controversy, would be interested in "where the truth of the matter lay"; he would want to know the circumstances in which each of the arguments might be valid. Consequently, he would be disappointed in Felker's discussion. It deals with several proposed redefinitions of the objectives to be pursued by Soviet managers (and of the basis for cash rewards to managers). The author could have analyzed the consequences of each set of objectives and evaluated the validity of positions of the contestants. Such analysis would have added to our understanding of economic systems and would have interested a group of economists broader than the Sovietologists. This group would like to know the consequences of new forms of economic organizations and is reluctant to accept obiter dicta, whether of Soviet or Western origin.

EDWARD AMES

State University of New York, Stony Brook

OPYT SOTSIOLOGICHESKOGO IZUCHENIIA SELA. By *Iu. V. Arutiunian*.

Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1968. 104 pp. 42 kopeks, paper.

This book reports and interprets the results of a sociological study conducted in the large Ukrainian village of Terpene, Melitopol Raion, Zaporozhe Oblast, and in certain outlying settlements. The population studied included kolkhozniks, sovkhoz workers, blue-collar industrial workers (chiefly employed in a lime works), and white-collar workers employed in various government agencies and in the trade and cultural spheres. The study concentrated on economic matters—income, consumption, the size and role of the "personal" economy among various groups in the population. Indirectly the study deals with such touchy and (for Soviet social science) unusual topics as social stratification and the pathways and limitations of social mobility. The population is divided not—as has been customary in Soviet social science writing—according to "relationship to the means of production" (i.e., workers versus kolkhozniks), but according to the character of labor. Labor is divided as follows: (1) skilled mental, usually requiring higher education; (2) unskilled mental (white-collar); (3) skilled physical; (4) unskilled physical. The reporting and interpretation of data is preceded by a section which reviews critically the history of Russian and Soviet "rural sociology" and rejects much of it. The

author also is critical of the current Soviet ethnographic method of choosing the object of study (pp. 30–32), remarking, “To be interested only in advanced farms means essentially to bypass real problems which, naturally, are more acute on ordinary farms” (p. 31). We find this remark fascinating in the light of Lawrence Krader’s review of our *The Peasants of Central Russia* in *American Anthropologist* (70, no. 3 [1968]: 592–93), which suggested that we somehow neglected to say how typical our sources were. We had, of course, no basis for doing so. When one realizes that Arutiunian, a historian turned sociologist, is one of the first to raise this issue in the Soviet Union, Soviet reaction to our treatment of their work takes on added piquancy (see *Sovetskaia etnografiia*, 1969, no. 1, pp. 164–72).

Arutiunian’s study has a theoretical and historical importance far beyond its relatively modest scope. It represents a fairly rigorous scientific test of a basic Marxist postulate in regard to social structure—something which some Western Sovietologists still consider impossible (for example, H. Kent Geiger, *The Family in Soviet Russia*, Cambridge, Mass., 1968, pp. 6–7). Furthermore, this test yields a negative result. Arutiunian shows convincingly that the basic “stratifying factors” in the population are not class differences—that is, differences in the relationships of individuals to property—even though such differences do exist, but differences in the character of labor and the degree of training. In accordance with the requirements of Marxism, he calls them “intraclass” differences, but this does not obscure the thrust of his argument.

Arutiunian’s observations on the “personal economy” are also original and somewhat startling. The presence of the household plot has been considered by many Soviet social scientists and some Western ones (including the present reviewers) as one of the major traits distinguishing the kolkhoz peasantry from the rest of the population. Arutiunian’s data suggest strongly that this is not so; rather, the difference in the character and dimensions of the personal economy is not between kolkhozniks and others but between rural and urban residents: “It is certainly not by virtue of their high degree of consciousness that workers in the city do not raise cabbages on asphalt” (p. 55). Arutiunian also gives short shrift to those Soviet economists who hold that the personal economy is a brake on the development of communism and therefore generally undesirable: he demonstrates that the personal economy uses primarily and rather efficiently the surplus labor of “non-able-bodied” persons—adolescents, old people, housewives burdened with large families. He also points out that even during the period when abuses of the personal economy were most widespread, the household plot never reached (over the Soviet Union as a whole) the maximum dimensions envisaged in the model charter.

Arutiunian’s excellent summary of the state of the field (in his introductory section) has one flaw: the question of religiosity has had much wider discussion than his remarks (pp. 26–27) would suggest, and one would expect him to be aware of certain new directions in the burgeoning field of sociology of religion (reflected in some articles in *Chelovek, obshchestvo, religiia*, Moscow, 1968, and *Konkretnye issledovaniia sovremennykh religioznykh verovaniï*, Moscow, 1967, for example). Perhaps, however, what he is really saying is that some of the Soviet social scientist’s most firmly held assumptions need rethinking, if not replacement.

The first printing of this book (3,200 copies) was obviously inadequate, which is not surprising considering the author’s candor and the forcefulness of his expression. The boldness of certain recent publications in social science contrasts sharply with the widely publicized repression of “creative writers” and intellectuals.

It would be interesting to know whether the text of Arutiunian's book has been modified (by addition, subtraction, or replacement) for the second printing (1969). A translation of this book is scheduled for serial publication in *Soviet Sociology* at the earliest possible date.

STEPHEN P. DUNN AND ETHEL DUNN
Berkeley, California

ETHNIC MINORITIES IN THE SOVIET UNION. Edited by *Erich Goldhagen*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968. Published for the Institute of East European Jewish Studies of the Philip W. Lown School of Near Eastern and Judaic Studies, Brandeis University. xiv, 351 pp. \$8.75.

This collection of diverse papers is the result of a symposium held at Brandeis University in October 1965. While most of the contributions deal with specific nationalities, three papers and the editor's introduction are of a general nature. John Armstrong provides a highly useful overview of the problem based on comparative quantitative data; he also offers an imaginative typology of the non-Russian nationalities which conveys their diversity despite a certain degree of arbitrariness in categorizing them. Vsevolod Holubnychy's paper on the economic aspects of relations between the Soviet republics is most provocative. Holubnychy advances the hypothesis that the economic development of the Russian SFSR has generally proceeded at a more rapid rate than that of the non-Russian republics. He cites data regarding per capita allocation of investments, per capita savings in banks, allocation of durable consumer goods in relation to population, per capita personal disposable income, and urban housing that tend to support this hypothesis. Soviet language policy is discussed by Jacob Ornstein in terms of some of its contradictory aspects but with emphasis on the regime's efforts to promote the use of Russian.

The papers devoted to specific nationalities deal with the Ukrainians, Armenians, Belorussians, the Baltic and Turkic peoples, and the Jews. Yaroslav Bilinsky discusses and exhaustively documents the nature of the rather fierce cultural "war" that is occurring in the Ukrainian Republic for Ukrainian ethnic assertiveness. Mary Matossian's briefer paper on cultural patterns in Soviet Armenia conveys the notion that the Armenians are probably faring better than certain of the other nationalities under Soviet rule. Jaan Pennar's concise essay on the Baltic peoples illustrates the crosscurrents of Soviet policy and the national resistance of the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. Nicholas Vakar offers a somber account of the plight of the Belorussians. An exclusively historical paper by Edward Allworth traces the development of the "nationality" idea in tsarist Central Asia and differs markedly from the other contributions. Garip Sultan's paper on demographic and cultural trends among the Turkic peoples contains much important data. The volume concludes with two papers dealing with the Jewish minority. The one by Joseph and Abraham Brumberg is based on a detailed analysis of the contents of the Yiddish-language periodical *Sovetish Heimland*. William Korey explores the legal position of the Soviet Jewish community and the pressures to which it has been subjected.

Although the papers vary in format and in scope and emphasis and some offer more statistical data than others, the volume provides a wealth of evidence on this complex problem. However, it is unfortunate that papers on the Georgian, Tadzhik, and Moldavian republics were not included. The data and the many statistical