porting the Malthusian view. Similarly, while asserting that ethnocentrism and political and economic biases have dominated the Malthusian perspective, the author seems unaware that these same charges can be leveled against its criticism. Neither this nor the following comment is intended to be negative but rather to define the work's focus and the intensity of the author's pursuit of it.

While Kleinman points out very well the logical and empirical problems of the Malthusian perspective, he offers no real integrated and general alternative to it. What I found particularly frustrating is that, in a number of places, the alternatives he suggests (but never develops) are, within the isolated context in which he offers them, quite naive. For example, in chapter 10, where he examines current fertility declines in nonindustrial societies, he mentions that 14 countries had fertility rates that were below 30 per 1,000 in 1975. After briefly reviewing some factors usually thought to influence fertility declines, Kleinman concludes these countries ". . . vary considerably in per capita income and types of prevailing economies though, in general, their populations are fairly literate and may be characterized as more modern than other developing countries. However, the same could be said of some countries where birth rates were not falling so rapidly . . ." (p. 92). Kleinman suggests that population pressure that has caused fertility to be controlled could be responsible for motivating the fertility decline. This is deduced from the observation that the countries mentioned are relatively small, and many of them are islands. Given the structure of the arguments against the Malthusian approach, he never asks the logical questions. Why should population pressure lead to the use of fertility control? Are there small countries where fertility has not declined?

In short, as long as the reader is aware that Kleinman offers no clearly developed alternative to what he destroys, this is a worthwhile book. On the other hand, the work fails to offer a well-integrated and analytical alternative to the Malthusian perspective.

Internal Migration during Modernization in Late Nineteenth-Century Russia. By Barbara A. Anderson. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1980. Pp. xxv + 222. $18.00.

Henry S. Shryock, Jr.
Georgetown University

Internal Migration during Modernization in Late Nineteenth-Century Russia is a revision of the author's 1974 Princeton dissertation. Barbara

Anderson feels that an understanding of internal migration in late 19th-century Russia has relevance to understanding that phenomenon in contemporary developing countries. During the period discussed the Russian Empire had a well-developed statistical system. Here the author uses the statistics on place of birth in the 1897 census and supplements them with annual registrations of migrants from European to Asiatic Russia collected at key destinations.

The first chapter summarizes the hypotheses to be examined, the last summarizes how they work. Anderson divides migration during modernization into two main types: (1) to urban, industrial centers, and (2) to a sparsely settled frontier area. (What proportion of contemporary countries in the process of modernization have frontiers like those of Asiatic Russia or the American West?)

Given the presumed necessity to use official statistics for provinces and cities, the analysis is essentially ecological in nature, using in- and out-migration rates, for example, the number born in Province A living elsewhere in Russia in 1897 per 1,000 of the total born in Province A and surviving within Russia in 1897. Rather than using ecological characteristics as mere surrogates for the characteristics of individual migrants, Anderson regards the area of origin as forming the environment in which persons are socialized and in which attitudes, including willingness to migrate, develop. An illiterate living in a province with relatively high literacy is thought to have more and better information about potential destinations and to be more receptive to new ideas than illiterates living elsewhere. The evidence is indirect. J. da Vanzo, on the other hand, found that origin employment rates in the United States affect out-migration but only for the unemployed (*Why Families Move* [Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand, 1976, p. vi]). Elsewhere the author draws conclusions about the migratory behavior of Jews on the basis of rates for provinces that contain high proportions of Jews, a practice that is admittedly paralleled by the use of election statistics for areas to draw conclusions about the voting behavior of various socioeconomic groups.

A rather "parsimonious" set of explanatory variables is used throughout most of the regression analysis. These are: soil fertility level, proportion of males with primary occupation in agriculture who had an auxiliary occupation, percentage of military recruits who were literate, workers in industry per 1,000 of the population (not the population of working age), number of workers in secondary industry per 1,000 of the population, natural increase rate, population growth rate, and population density, as well as a distance-type variable for migration streams. Some of these variables are examined for more than one period prior to 1897, with consideration given to the likely lags in their effects. The multiple and

partial regression analysis, use of both stepwise and nonstepwise regression, use of standardized ("normalized") and nonstandardized coefficients, tests of statistical significance, and multicollinearity are all clearly discussed.

Kingsley Davis's modification of demographic transition theory wherein another response to transitional growth is out-migration from the high-growth area (rather than reduced fertility) is tested. Anderson chooses to measure population pressure by the natural increase rate instead of by population density. She found, however, that the origin area's rate of natural increase was not a significantly positive determinant of migration to modernized destinations but relevant only to Asiatic Russia in the later part of the 19th century.

Other important findings were: Within a settled area, migration rates are positively related to the cultural modernization and, to a lesser extent, to the industrialization of the origin, but negatively related to the importance of traditional agriculture. Migration rates to a frontier area are negatively related to cultural modernization of the place of origin. To a lesser extent, they are negatively related to industrial modernization of the place of origin. Migration rates to a frontier area are positively related to the importance of traditional agriculture at the place of origin.

Thus, some findings for migration within a settled area and to a frontier area were in opposition. In both situations, however, migration to a specific destination tends to decrease with increasing difficulty of reaching the destination—partly a function of distance.

Destinations like the Urals or Donbass, or even Odessa and Kiev, that were intermediate in modernity between St. Petersburg and Moscow, on the one hand, and Siberia, on the other, tended to draw from origins that were also intermediate in modernity.

It may seem surprising that literacy was higher and population pressure less in areas of lower soil fertility, but it was in these areas that industrialization had proceeded further. Thus, out-migration rates by provinces were positively correlated with their soil fertility.

The inclusion of definitions for such commonplace terms as mean, standard deviation, crude birthrate, and net migration makes one wonder about the intended readership. The cautious editor who required these would have been better employed in correcting several persistent grammatical errors, such as using a plural verb with two singular nouns connected by "or." Tables are well designed, but the photo-offset reduction and faint print sometimes affect legibility. There is an excellent bibliography.

All in all, the book is a real contribution to our knowledge of internal migration. We can see how the state of the art has improved since E. G. Ravenstein included Russia in his classic 1889 article.