BOOK REVIEW

in the end was only a very conservative goal, i.e., a stable and self-sufficient rural life oriented to simple reproduction. According to the author, the problems of political freedom and parliament were “far beyond the peasants’ understanding” (p.326). They actually had no alternative in terms of such urgent state-level problems as political power and national economy, but local and even anarchic demands like the exclusion of all non-peasant elements. From this he concludes that peasants failed to remain the subject of regional power to become rather its object soon after 1917. If this was the Siberian case, what about European Russia? Who but Bolsheviks could become the subject instead of the peasants, controlling their demands and how? This is the core of the problem. I think Sakamoto’s conclusion is very suggestive to the understanding of post-revolutionary Russia.

Though the author discusses many aspects of peasant life, an important one is regrettably absent. It is the demographic aspect. For example, the “evolution” of the commune is mainly explained in terms of population growth, yet he gives little account of its mechanism. We can find no analysis of peasants’ birth rate or mortality here. In the chapter on the peasant household, almost no reference is made to marriage and inheritance patterns. Since the study of various demographic patterns of European nations in a comparative perspective is now highly developed, the study of their counterpart, Russian peasants in Siberia, could make a solid contribution to this international scholarship. Nonetheless, this is a pioneering study to be commended to all interested in Siberian history, Russian revolutions, Russian peasants, and peasant society in general.

Shuichi KOJIMA
(Konan University)

Tsuneaki SATO, *Post-shakaishugi no Keizai Taisei* [*Economic Systems of Post-socialism*], Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo, 1997, v+303 pp.

The author has been one of the most influential researchers in Japan in the field of socialist and post-socialist economic studies for more than thirty years since the 1960s. The book is a collection of his papers published in the past ten

BOOK REVIEW

years, which are, needless to say, a most crucial period with respect to these economies. Incidentally, the author also became renowned internationally with these papers, nearly half of which were originally published in English. While the author's subject of investigation is the economic systems of post-socialism as a whole, his main interests are oriented to the economies of Central Europe, namely those of Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic.

The period of "post-socialism" began at the end of 1989 in Central and Eastern Europe, and with respect to the territories of the Soviet Union from the beginning of 1992. Their immediate targets in the early years of system transformation were as follows: liberalization of both price setting and trade, including foreign trade; encouragement of private enterprise and starting on the privatization of national assets; and a rapid stabilization of the financial system (in those countries in which they inherited extremely imbalanced national finances). In short, the targets were expressed by the following three slogans: stabilization, liberalization and privatization. However, "the shock therapy" dictated by the IMF experts just after the collapse of socialist systems was not effective enough to introduce a new growth path. As is generally known, this therapy was too much inclined toward the monetary approach and gave little consideration to the inner systemic characteristics of the formerly planned economies. Consequently, it brought forth a long-range depression as well as the extending of social differences for the "patient economies." In about 1993 and 1994 they began to take various sorts of remedies in each nation which were necessitated by the changes of government as the result of elections. At present in 1997, the author argues that the existing economies in the transition process in post-socialist nations should be called individually a "post-socialist mixed economy." The initial expanded expectation of a rapid formation of market economy of the Anglo-Saxon type in which private ownership was predominant, faded away long ago. This "post-socialist mixed economy" is singular not only in the traditional sense that a part of the national economy still remains under the public ownership, but also in that, the author stresses, a mixed ownership of a strange type (composed of state, quasi-collective and private — both domestic and foreign — ownership) is firmly built in the ownership structure of "each enterprise." (Attention! This is not a mistake of "each country," but exactly "in each enterprise." — p.200.)

The author expects that the future of Central and Eastern European nations lies in the reconstruction of "the public" which was lost in the first stage of

BOOK REVIEW

system transformation. In other words, this is nothing but creation of the “social market economy” which belongs to one of the social traditions in Western Europe after World War II. The central concept of the “social market economy,” the author thinks, is the policy systems well-constructed for social integration and the participation of citizens, and the regulation of the market from this viewpoint. The reviewer agrees with the view of the author in this point. Further, the situation in the post-socialist system is not distinct and clear at present, the author thinks. This is correct. In addition, it seems to the reviewer that the present unstable situation of the capitalist system as a whole after its development for two hundred years since the Industrial Revolution in the 18th century must inflict unfavorable influences against the efforts at reconstruction in the post-socialist countries. Anyway, the book is a valuable contribution condensed from the efforts over long years by this diligent author.

Sei FUJITA

(Osaka University of Economics and the Law)