conclusions is again open to question. He attributes the relatively rapid pace of technical progress in Soviet industry to its comparatively low level of technological development. Being relatively backward gives it a larger fund of already developed technology and existing technological knowledge, which it can borrow from abroad as part of the process of "catching up." He also finds the ranking of industries by returns to scale and by rate of technological progress to be nearly the same in the USSR as in the United States. Thus, he concludes (p. 159): "... the rate of technical progress and the degree of returns to scale in the branch of industry are mainly independent of prevailing economic system and chiefly determined by the technological condition of production" (author's emphasis), including the characteristics of the particular branch and the stage of economic development of the country under consideration.

Are Gorbachev and other socialist leaders then wasting their time with reform and with altering the structure of industrial output in favor of light industry (which Bairam believes will reduce Soviet industrial growth, if not offset by such measures as greater investment in research and development)? Worse, are they imposing adjustment costs on their countries with little prospect of resulting benefits down the road, save possibly those arising from detente and greater foreign investment from developed market economies? Bairam suggests in the last two paragraphs of the book that he favors perestroika, but this sits ill at ease with the thrust of the conclusions above, particularly since reform has been pursued (and ignored) in socialist countries at widely varying levels of development. (This makes it harder to argue that desirability of reform itself depends on stage of development.) Aside from foreign investment and technology transfer, the main potential benefit of reform may be greater orientation of production to demand. But this again raises the issue of what growth rates mean when output is measured in prices that often bear little relation to marginal values of goods to users.

Any effort to estimate basic measures such as technological progress, returns to scale, and substitution elasticities for the USSR or Eastern Europe faces statistical problems that are not fully surmountable. Despite these, this reviewer believes that Bairam's work bears comparison with some of the best that has been done (by such authors as Weitzman, Desai, Gomulka, Cameron, Rosefield and Lovell, and others). It will be essential reading for any scholar interested in this kind of estimation.

Richard L. Carson
Carleton University


One of the conventional ways in which book reviewers try to grab the attention of their audience is by telling them that the book under review is an "important book." The nature of the research project which gave rise to this book demands the attention of the entire community of scholars interested in the Soviet Union. This collection of eleven essays emerged from the Soviet Interview Project (SIP), a multi-million dollar survey of about 2,600 emigres from the Soviet Union funded by the U.S. intelligence community with monies channeled through the National Council for Soviet and East European Research. The interviews, done in 1983 and 1984, were with members of the so-called "third wave" of emigration, most of whom had come to the United States in 1978 and 1979 and virtually all of whom were Jewish, urban, disproportionately well-educated ... and had already voted with their feet.
There can be no doubt that the emigres are an important source of information. This project, like the famous Inkeles and Bauer Harvard Research Project of the 1950s, has the potential to teach us a great deal. The limits of a censored scholarship and press and our inability to do survey research within the USSR make the emigre population a compelling resource.

There are three interrelated issues which have to be faced by anyone dealing with this material. First, are the results biased because this is a disaffected population? Second, to what extent can we generalize to the Soviet population as a whole? Third, are we willing to accept the results which fly in the face of our conventional wisdom about the Soviet Union. If the results are the same as what we already know, why was so much money spent to reinvent the wheel. In other words, we have to worry about whether what was learned was new or true.

So what have we learned from this survey? There are two major themes that emerge in these essays. First, there are significant differences in the world views of different generations of Soviet citizens. For example, the generation that grew up under Stalin is much more critical of those years and much more tolerant of existing difficulties than the generation they spawned. Those in the latter group see the Brezhnev years as the worst period and demonstrate little tolerance for the shortcomings of the Soviet Union. In Essence, they are unappreciative of the progress that has been made since the Stalin years. The second major finding is that there is a strong inverse relationship between the level of educational attainment and the degree to which people support the Soviet system. As education increases, support for the regime diminishes. Finally, and this should be music to the ears of those trying to reform the economy, support for the Soviet system appears to rise with increasing income, at all levels of education.

The book is divided into four major sections. In the first section, which introduces the book, the crucial issues of bias are confronted by James Millar, who was the national director of SIP. In a second essay, he and Elizabeth Clayton provide an excellent overview of quality of life measures. The degree of confidence in the results is enhanced by the fact that it is clear that those who left are not necessarily in opposition to all aspects of Soviet life. Emigres are able to make distinctions in their feelings about various features of the world they left behind. There then follow three sections variously labelled "Politics," "Work," and "Life." In the first section, two articles by Donna Bahry and Brian Silver on the generation issue and the sources of regime support are quite rich, but the third article, by Linda Lubrano on citizen attitudes towards science and technology, seems out of place in this book. It is never made clear why it is important for us to know what people's attitudes are in this area. This is the weakest contribution to the collection.

The section on "work" probably contains the strongest set of essays, although I admit to an economist's bias. Aaron Vinocur and Gur Ofer write on the distribution of earnings, household income, and wealth. Their major finding is that, even after taking account of the level of economic development, the distribution of income earned in the public sector is more equal than income distribution in the West, although when privately earned income is incorporated, the income distribution moves closer to what one would find in Western nations. The essay by Barbara Anderson, "The Life Course of Soviet Women Born 1905-1960," is a major addition to our knowledge of Soviet women. She has been able to give us insights into the decision making of Soviet women with respect to when they finished their education, took a first job, and began to have children. Paul Gregory's essay, "Productivity, Slack, and Time Theft in the Soviet Economy," is important because it examines some critical questions about worker and enterprise performance, although using workers as the witnesses i.e., non-experts, rather than managers' perceptions. There are some arresting results, such as the workers' view that supply uncertainty appears to be less of a problem.