



Title	<REVIEW>SOREN KEIZAI NO SAISEISAN KOZO : SONO TOKEITEKI KENKYU [THE REPRODUCTIVE STRUCTURE OF THE SOVIET ECONOMY : A STATISTICAL STUDY], By Kiichi Mochizuki, Tokyo : Taga Shuppan, 1984., 475pp., 6,800
Author(s)	KUBONIWA, Masaaki
Citation	Acta Slavica Iaponica, 5, 128-129
Issue Date	1987
Doc URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2115/7971
Type	bulletin (article)
File Information	KJ00000034128.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

problems of labor relations, including *arteli* and real wages during this period. We are now provided with reliable information on these subjects.

Kenji UCHIDA
Iwate University

SOREN KEIZAI NO SAISEISAN KŌZŌ : SONO TŌKEITEKI KENKYŪ [THE REPRODUCTIVE STRUCTURE OF THE SOVIET ECONOMY: A STATISTICAL STUDY]. By *Kiichi Mochizuki*. Tokyo: Taiga Shuppan, 1984. 475pp. ¥6,800.

The direct source of the statistical information on Soviet economy is limited to the statistical Yearbook published by the Soviet Central Statistical Administration (TsSU). The Yearbook has been published yearly from 1956, following the post-Stalin era. The Yearbook contains some widely known defects; namely, it is based on exaggerated performance results, while negative economic performance is not included. It also contains many inconsistencies in nominal and real statistical terms. These characteristic features of the Yearbook result in the creation of unreliable forecasts and concepts.

In his book Mochizuki has attempted to compensate for these deficiencies by developing his own estimates and by using other reliable, politically non-biased sources for statistical information, provided by American and Soviet scholars.

By using this methodology, Mochizuki seeks to describe an overall picture of the reproductive structure and national income flow structure of the Soviet economy. The methodology employed, and the results obtained, are unique and thought-provoking. If Mochizuki's efforts were limited simply to a description of a macro-empirical analysis, it would be a scholarly accomplishment. In addition Mochizuki also provides the reader with a description of Soviet input-output analysis, as well as his own estimates of Soviet military expenditures, which are related to the most important issue of contemporary politics; namely U. S.-Soviet military competition.

The book, which includes over 150 statistical figures and tables, can be divided into four primary areas. The first area is concerned with the theoretical framework on which Mochizuki bases his statistical estimates. (Chapters 1, 4 and 5.) This framework is based on the Belkin Income-Commodity Model, which connects the standard input-output table with the income distribution table. The author introduces and explains this new system of accounts and presents comparisons with the United Nations SNA. He also attempts to convert the SNA into the Belkin System of Accounts. It may be the first time that this has been attempted. It will be apparent to the informed reader that the author has based his research on "Measurement With Theory."

The second area is concerned with statistical estimates of income-commodity models from 1970 to 1975 (Chapter 4), and the reconsideration of the Soviet investment-related statistics employing the Kazantsev Macro-Economic Model. It should be noted that the author's estimations are based on the controlled totals which are found in the

Yearbook. Further, he presents macro 1972 income-commodity tables by integrating the Sverdlik Money Circulation Table and his own estimates of Soviet input-output tables (Chapter 8). This second area constitutes the key section of the book. However, some inconsistencies are apparent. For example, two sets of data, the author's data and data based on other sources, are presented. It is not clear to the reader which source should be taken as accurate, since the data are contradictory. At times, the author appears to ignore published data and presents less-than-useful estimates; for example, kolkhoz estimates of inventory changes. In addition, some serious miscalculations can be found in the basic tables.

The third area is concerned with input-output analysis. The author introduces the Soviet input-output tables estimated by Soviet economist Sverdlik and estimates provided by Treml and his associates. Employing Sverdlik's nine-sector tables, Mochizuki performs conventional input-output impact analysis and presents a comparison of the Japanese and Soviet economies, the first time that this type of comparison has been made in Japan. However, a series of inputting errors make the final results suspect.

The fourth area deals with three important, but difficult to understand, Soviet statistics; namely, foreign trade, agricultural subsidies and military expenditures (Chapter 9). With regard to the former two statistics, the author bases his consideration entirely on the Treml estimates. For the military estimates, the author presents his own estimates.

The key points of the author's estimation of Soviet military expenditures are as follows:

1. Estimation of "unfinished investment change" and "inventory change."
2. Estimation of the "state stock" by subtracting unfinished investment change and inventory change from "material inventory and stock change" data appearing in the Statistical Yearbook.

It is not clear just how the share of military expenditure in the estimated state stock is determined. However, the author's attempt to estimate Soviet military expenditure and present the results for scholarly rather than political consideration, is commendable.

Masaaki KUBONIWA
Hitotsubashi University

SUTĀRIN TAISE-KA NO HŌ TO KENRYOKU : SHAKAISHUGITEKIGŌHŌSEI GEN-RI NO KEISEI KATEI [THE POLITICAL POWER AND THE LAW UNDER THE GOVERNMENT OF STARIN : THE FORMATIVE PROCESS OF THE SOCIALIST LEGALITY]. By *Hiroshi Oda*, Tokyo : Iwanami Shoten, 1986. 357 pp. ¥7,400
SOBIETO HANZAIGAKUSHI KENKYU [A STUDY OF THE HISTORY OF SOVIET CRIMINOLOGY]. By *Kan Ueda*. Tokyo : Seibundo, 1985. 265 pp. ¥4,500

These two books under review have one thing in common : they represent a new trend of Japanese scholarship of Soviet law, which is characterized by detached objectivity. But they approach the subject from the completely opposite direction.