

Click here to view  
current issues  
on the Chicago Journals website.



---

Review

Reviewed Work(s): *Socialism in One Country, 1924-1926*. by Edward Hallet Carr

Review by: C. Jay Smith, Jr.

Source: *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 21, No. 4 (Nov., 1959), pp. 720-722

Published by: The University of Chicago Press on behalf of the Southern Political Science Association

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2126870>

Accessed: 11-02-2022 22:12 UTC

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



*The University of Chicago Press, Southern Political Science Association* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Politics*

JSTOR

archy" and the "intrigues of the cloister." And he should also decide at an early stage of his career whether he wishes to strive for the "major league" or content himself with lesser positions (though possibly more satisfying?) in the "minor league," "bush league," or Academia Siberia.

This is a most provocative book, as much for what it does not say as for what it says. The authors, pioneering research in this field (and possibly finding the book itself a step to the "major league!"), are well aware of the self-imposed limitations of their study: they analyze only 10 of the 1,852 accredited colleges and universities in the United States. Thus, they leave much room for speculation. Do the conditions in the major universities exist in the smaller private colleges? Are they better? Worse? Does the department have as much autonomy in the lesser state universities (the "minor" or the "bush"?) as at Harvard, Michigan and the University of California? And what of professorial satisfactions which cannot be measured in the marketplace? Where do they fit into the scheme for the professor who teaches at top form *in spite of* pressures to publish, "tyrannical administrators," and protests about his "manner of smoking?" In summary, however, the book points the general way toward a more rational system despite its having only scratched the surface.

Two footnotes: (1) it is hoped that the nation's other 1,842 institutions will not confuse Caplow's and McGee's norms for ideals to be emulated; (2) it is hoped that student readers will not judge all professors by those discussed here. If the latter event should occur, possibly the neglected students will band together to write *A Student Manifesto*, a document which might conclude: "Students of America, unite! The only thing you have to lose is your anonymity."

ROY P. FAIRFIELD

*Ohio University*

*Socialism In One Country, 1924-1926.* By EDWARD HALLET CARR. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958. Pp. x, 557. \$7.50.)

This book is the fourth volume to appear in Professor Carr's projected *History of Soviet Russia*, and, according to the preface, the first to bring the author to the "heart" of his subject. He re-

guards his four volumes on *The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-1923*, which appeared between 1950 and 1956, as essentially preliminary to his main purpose, which is "to write the history, not of the revolution . . . but of the political, social and economic order which emerged from it." The present volume is to be the first of three covering the years 1924-26, which were, according to Carr, the "critical turning-point, and gave to the revolutionary regime, for good and for evil, its decisive direction." Approximately one-third of this volume is devoted to a general survey of the 1924-26 period, in which the author deals with "the legacy of history;" the changing outlook on the family, the church, literature, and law; the problem of class and party; and the outstanding Soviet personalities of the period. The remainder of the book deals with the economic revival of these years. It is the author's contention that "though the rivalry between party leaders was the most conspicuous, and superficially the most dramatic, feature of these years, the forms which it took were dependent on basic economic issues."

The general view of American scholars in the field of Russian and Soviet studies on this and the preceding volumes of Professor Carr's work has been compounded in approximately equal parts of admiration, puzzlement, and irritation. If and when his project is completed, it will be not only monumental, but in many ways unique. Even one-volume histories of Soviet Russia are scarce, and when this one is complete, it will probably encompass at least twenty volumes. Dozens of hitherto neglected sources have been used, and Professor Carr has shown himself a master of the art of getting at the essence of Soviet material. Many challenging new viewpoints are offered; for example, in the present volume, the author presents convincing evidence that the breakdown of traditional family life in the Soviet Russia of the 1920's was far from having been as complete and general as has been supposed.

But the critics have, and in this reviewer's opinion, quite justly, found much that is unsatisfactory. Because of his zeal to study only what the Bolshevik Revolution produced in as objective a fashion as possible, Carr has eschewed any real attempt to consider the ultimate significance of that revolution in the context of the twentieth century world, or to assess Bolshevism save within the range of vision of the Bolsheviks themselves. If he is very far indeed from accepting the official Soviet Russian version of the events he de-

scribes, he nevertheless is inclined to give this version every benefit of the doubt. In fairness, it should be added that he is working in an area where reliable source material is still scarce and where there is a paucity of good monographic material.

This book, its predecessors, and its successors will long be indispensable to the serious, well-informed student of Soviet affairs. But even such readers, and certainly the general reader, will wonder whether Carr has not ignored the forest for the trees. Many of the trees needed badly the sort of careful scrutiny he has given them, but surely the forest is more important.

C. JAY SMITH, JR.

*University of Georgia.*

*The Development of the Soviet Budgetary System.* By R. W. DAVIES. (London: Cambridge University Press, 1958. Pp. xxi, 373. \$8.50.)

Public finance has long been one of the underdeveloped areas in Soviet studies. Except for F. D. Holzman's valuable *Soviet Taxation* (1955) and a few other scattered essays, scholarly monographs have been rare. For this reason the appearance of Dr. Davies' study of the Soviet budgetary system is an important event. It serves both to fill a serious gap in the literature and to raise many questions of general interest to economists and political scientists concerned with problems of planning in a system of the Soviet type.

Dr. Davies' book is a revised version of a Ph.D. thesis presented at the University of Birmingham in 1954. In its original form it traced the emergence and growth of the Soviet budgetary system from the 1917 revolution to the German invasion in 1941. To this he has now added a final chapter in which developments since 1941 are reviewed and some informed guesses are ventured as to future trends. This is a book which deserves to be described as "thoroughly researched." The author has scrupulously examined every available source, and he presents his findings with dispassionate objectivity. Indeed, in his effort to achieve complete detachment and to be altogether fair to the official Soviet view, he occasionally falls into the kind of judgment which T. R. Powell once described as "leaning neither toward partiality, on the one hand, nor impartiality on the other."