becoming increasingly complex" obliging the discipline to set "itself ever new areas of inquiry" (p. 160).

Yu. I. Semenov's "The Theory of Socio-economic Formations and World History" translated by Ernest Gellner and commented on in his essay "A Russian Marxist Philosophy of History" will be of considerable interest to people following the discussion in the Soviet Union and elsewhere on the Asiatic mode of production as a stage in history. Maurice Godelier, who initiated a phase of the discussion in France, writes here on "The Emergence and Development of Marxism in Anthropology in France," but only those familiar with the Soviet literature would know that he and Semenov have anything in common. Meyer Fortes, in his "Introduction" alludes to the "far-reaching discussion between Semenov and Godelier on the definition and functions of relations and modes of production" (p. xix), but the reader will not find out from this book what transpired, and that must be considered a major failing on the part of Gellner and Fortes. Fortes, indeed, admits: "Semenov's grandiose scheme of social evolution in the framework of world history could not fail to win the admiration of all participants for its sweep and erudition, but I doubt if any of us was able to see how it could be applied to the humdrum tasks of empirical ethnographic research" (p. xxiii). That is a pity, because Semenov was demonstrating how the laws governing history are formulated and how they operate, and if we cannot grasp the principle, how dare we trust the conclusions of our own work, not to mention the purpose of our lives?

On the whole, though I applaud the appearance of this book, as one must applaud the shaky steps of a very small child, it would have been much better if the editor and his publishers had taken greater care with material largely unfamiliar to Western readers. Gellner's Preface and Fortes's Introduction fail to convey the excitement generated by this meeting, which was a significant dialogue. Tamara Dragadze's report of the conference, published in Current Anthropology, should have been made part of the book. The decision not to do so may have been motivated by the fact that a book of readings in Soviet ethnography, edited by Dragadze, was supposed to be in press; it has not yet appeared. More seriously though, many items cited in the Soviet papers have appeared in English translation in Soviet Anthropology and Archeology and Soviet Sociology. Bromley's discipline might have seemed less removed from everyday life even to Dragadze if he had acknowledged somehow the large body of English translations, particularly in ethnosophology in those two journals, the more so since his own work has appeared there. Of course, this criticism presupposes that the purpose of publishing the proceedings was to promote further dialogue and to attract people without a knowledge of the Russian language.

It is unfortunate that Columbia University Press has followed Bromley's and Gellner's example of not taking translations into account. The dialogue begun by Soviet and Western anthropologists will not be much advanced by this form of publication. Sovietologists in particular should take note: there are many ways to restrict the flow of information. Perhaps unintentionally, editor and publisher have produced a book which is in its own way ideologically constrictive.

Ethel Dunn  
Highgate Road Social Science Research Station, Berkeley, California


Matthew's latest monograph makes a unique contribution to an already substantial body of literature on Soviet education. Consisting of an impressive documentation and compilation of information about the various forms of schooling in the Soviet Union,
the book breaks away from the traditional pattern set by its predecessors. By charting educational legislation and the growth and demise of certain educational institutions, Matthews undertakes, with the aid of numerous statistics, to assess the performance of the educational system rather than merely describe it. Inherent in this comprehensive survey of the successes and failures of education and training in the Khrushchev and Brezhnev years, are the strengths and weaknesses typical of such an endeavor; a lot of territory is covered at the expense of depth. In his treatment Matthews reaches back to the early Stalin era and, as expected within the confines of this modest publication, is unable to delve deeply into the dynamics of education vis-à-vis other social systems. Specifically, Matthews sets out to provide an overview of policy and institutional changes from 1953 to 1979 in general and post-secondary education, describing in detail the scope, intent, and means, this is an ambitious task, and one that is ultimately disappointing. However, this does not detract from the overall impact of the work which is a tight, succinct, rich compilation of facts, policy statements, and statistics related to certain educational developments.

The author’s main concerns are accessibility to educational facilities, the manner of administration, day-to-day practices, course content, employment placement, and, to some degree, the relationship between education and certain social groups. There is no central thesis which would organize the study theoretically. Matthews categorizes educational policies according to the leader of the day, assuming a dichotomy between the policies of Khrushchev and those of Brezhnev. This approach forms the basis of the text’s organization—each aspect of education is systematically examined chronologically by association with the specific leader. This dichotomy fails to hold, and attention is directed at the nature of the policy itself, at change or continuity in educational practice. The pattern almost completely disappears as Matthews places emphasis on those periods where policy appears most significant in terms of educational development.

The first part of the book is devoted to general education under Khrushchev and Brezhnev. Theory and practice are made meaningful within a broader historical context as Matthews does not neglect developments prior to the period under scrutiny. The theme of the book, schools as training grounds for labor needs, becomes apparent in the excellent account of the polytechnization program. Using figures, Matthews describes the difficulties experienced by the curriculum and the exploitation of students for labor purposes, and identifies the causes of the program’s ultimate failure.

In the absence of a broader framework, Matthews’ description of the forms of control over institutions of higher learning omits the links between education and economic, political, and social life, leaving one to speculate on the consequences of control. Nor is there any attempt to relate the policies to the respective leaders, or to assess the effectiveness of political control over education. An interesting observation, on the other hand, is that although both Khrushchev and Brezhnev maintained and upgraded programs in the State Reserve Schools, these developments did not break down class divisions between the privileged and working classes.

An interesting chapter and an exception to the criticism about missing analysis deals with accessibility and student attitudes to higher education, drop-out rates, and job placement practice. Matthews’ figures of enrollments and limited survey data cast doubt on the Soviet’s ability to socially engineer their institutions. Higher education is not equally shared between the classes. Program and career choices are made on the basis of personal gain rather than service to the state and Communist society. Although student attitudes toward the political system are not discussed at length, Matthews’ documentation on career choice would indicate, if indirectly, that the student population is less than enthusiastic about the Communist Party and its ideology.

The conclusions Matthews draws are more speculative than well-founded. Matthews expects that one of the primary objectives will be to narrow the gap between education