politically, a disastrous error, few Westerners have devoted any attention to peasant social structure in cultural perspective. Lewin is even of the opinion that before collectivization no one was leading the peasantry. However, if one accepts the view of some Soviet historians, notably A. I. Klibanov, that among the peasants, political protest was in religious guise, it is nearly impossible to accept Lewin's view. Arutiunian's book is silent on this point, and since he is statistically meticulous in all other matters, one is tempted to take this blank spot as tacit admission that kulaks and religious leaders were not synonymous. But this is not to say that Arutiunian does not consider religion. He does, in an offhand way, correlating it with age, sex, and low-status occupations, as well as with conservative views. He tends to dismiss it as *statistically* relatively unimportant. He is content that he has been able to demonstrate the existence of four distinct strata among peasant populations, in addition to the fact that there are material differences between kolkhozniks and sovkhoz workers (the strata persist across this division, and material status varies from region to region, which may be one reason he de-emphasizes the differences). It is not, he says, access to the means of production but access to education and the content of labor which determine social status. What is important for him is that it cannot be demonstrated that anyone but the party is leading the peasants at the present time. Is the party doing it well or poorly? Arutiunian does not look at the problem in that way, although there can be little doubt that he has attempted to amass as much data as possible for the party to answer the question itself. It is not without significance that in discussing the migration of rural residents to the city he says that efforts should be made not so much to stop the flow of young people to the cities as to induce the return of the adult population (those who have finished their studies or have families) (p. 265). On August 22, 1973, *Izvestiia* announced that monetary subsidies, freedom from taxes for eight years, and other financial inducements would be extended to families settling in certain agricultural regions of the USSR, thus indicating that the Council of Ministers of the USSR has decided that rural areas are at least as difficult to live in as regions of the Far North. It was also announced that these families would be provided with adequate housing or building materials, child-care facilities, and hospitals—items concerning which Arutiunian found considerable dissatisfaction. To correct the deficiencies will be a tall order, but not impossible.

One other aspect of Arutiunian's book deserves mention: he has, in effect, extended a controversy of the 1920s to the present day, operating as a principled social scientist. He shows no desire to return to the 1920s, unlike some Soviet cultural dissidents. It is unfortunate that, perhaps for this reason, Soviet social science gets less attention in the West.

ETHEL DUNN
Highgate Road Social Science Research Station, Berkeley

THE SERVICE SECTOR IN SOVIET ECONOMIC GROWTH: A COMPARATIVE STUDY. By *Gur Ofer*. Harvard Economic Studies, vol. 141. Russian Research Center, no. 71. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973. xi, 202 pp. $10.00.

In this slim, tightly written volume, Dr. Ofer has set himself the task of explaining why the Soviet Union has reached a relatively advanced stage of economic development but yet retains an industrial structure resembling those of considerably less

developed economies. In particular, he asks, why is the share of the civilian labor force employed in services so low relative to comparable industrialized countries?

After adjusting for a variety of differences between the statistics of the USSR and those of the countries with which it is compared, Ofer considers the systemic and developmental characteristics of the USSR as explanatory factors. It is not surprising that he should see in the "socialist economic system" a common denominator of the various factors explaining the relatively low level of service employment in the USSR (and in most of socialist Eastern Europe as well). Industrial structure is a function of economic policy, particularly of the components affecting the rate of investment, the degree of urbanization, and rates of labor force participation. Soviet economic policy has kept a tight rein on the process of urbanization, has prohibited most private enterprise, and has constrained increases in disposable personal income. This has tended to constrict the sphere of services—a result obtained by direct limitation as well. But Ofer's analysis carries considerably further: to demonstrate and explain the relatively lower administration share of employment in the USSR; to distinguish between the peculiar industrial structure of the USSR viewed statically and the changes in structure taking place according to the general developmental model; to discuss the relation between growth strategy, ideology, and institutional structure and operation as explanatory factors; and to consider the degree to which the peculiar industrial structure will change in the future.

The theoretical and statistical apparatus of this book is wielded deftly. The noneconomist, nonstatistician who finds some of that material rough going will nevertheless be amply rewarded for patience in making his way. It would have eased his task of absorbing the large number of tables had they featured more effective separation of subtotals from components. A review for this journal must also note that the transliteration of Russian titles is often sloppy. But these are only minor blemishes on an expert performance.

ABRAHAM S. BECKER
The RAND Corporation

RECENZIJA: A REVIEW OF SOVIET UKRAINIAN SCHOLARLY PUBLICATIONS. Published semiannually by the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies at Harvard University. Vol. 1, no. 1 (Fall 1970) to vol. 4, no. 1 (Fall-Winter 1973). 48, 80, 81, 93, 72, 61, 70 pp. Subscriptions (one year): $5.00, libraries and institutions. $4.00, private subscribers. Single copies: $3.00.

The publication of *Recenzija* marks another significant success of the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and fills a need in providing detailed review articles of Soviet Ukrainian works that are not being reviewed adequately in the standard scholarly journals. Each issue contains five or six review articles, a number of which are more than five thousand words in length. Contributors include such scholars as Professors George Shevelov, Horace Lunt, Assya Humesky, Henning Andersen, Patricia Grimsted, Max Okenfuss, Omry Ronen, Roman Serbyn, and Roman Solchanyk as well as *Recenzija*'s faculty adviser, Professor Omeljan Pritsak. However, approximately half of the reviews have been prepared by advanced graduate students at Harvard, who have acquitted themselves in a highly creditable manner.

The first seven issues offer a fairly wide range of reviewed works. These