

flourish and play an important role in the USSR. This is an insufficiently known fact and one that has previously received little attention. In my opinion, this is the best chapter in the book.

Katsenelinboigen's book contains a number of valid observations about Soviet economic thought and the Soviet economy which may be novel and of interest to non-specialists. On the whole, however, it is disappointing, for the author has not yet learned how to address the Western reader.

MICHAEL ELLMAN  
Amsterdam University

ZUR MARXISTISCHEN GESCHICHTSTHEORIE, 3 vols. By *Ferenc Tökei*.  
Beiträge zu Interpretationsproblemen Marxscher Formulierungen. Budapest:  
Akadémiai Kiadó, 1977 [1968, 1969, 1971]. Vol. 1: ZUR THEORIE DER  
GESELLSCHAFTSFORMEN. 150 pp. \$9.50. Vol. 2: ANTIKE UND FEUD-  
ALISMUS. 197 pp. \$12.50. Vol. 3: ZUR DIALEKTIK DES SOZIALISMUS.  
128 pp. \$8.00.

The publication of Ferenc Tökei's collected essays in German in the three volumes under review is justified by the importance of the unifying theme of the volumes: the attempted reinterpretation of Marx's theory of history and the reconstruction of Marx's theory of socioeconomic forms. The essays, written and published in Hungary between 1967 and 1973, are a continuation of the author's pioneering work on the "Asiatic Mode of Production" (AMP), through which he entered the world of international scholarship.

Part of the unfinished business of Marx and Engels is that of the theory of social evolution of precapitalist societies. In his preface to the *Critique of Political Economy* (1859), a remarkable compression of the Marxist "structuralist" view of society, Marx sketched the stages of socioeconomic evolution as "Asiatic, ancient, feudal and modern bourgeois modes of production . . . as progressive epochs in the economic formation of society." During the rest of his active scholarly life, Marx concentrated all of his efforts on analyzing the last of the stages—capitalist-bourgeois society. With the shift of the revolutionary movement to backward Russia, the problem of precapitalist societies had been widely discussed in the Soviet Union in the 1920s in the wake of Lenin's interest in what is known today as the Third World, but the ambitious beginnings were laid to rest and replaced by simplistic and dogmatic pronouncements during the subsequent quarter of a century of the Stalinist era. The problem was also neglected by Western scholarship until recently, albeit for very different reasons. Three events brought about a turning point for Marxist scholarship in general and for the study of the AMP in particular: Stalin's death in 1953, the publication of Marx's *Grundrisse* in East Berlin the very same year, which made the earlier Moscow "rare book" edition available to a larger scholarly audience, and the publication of Karl August Wittfogel's *Oriental Despotism* in 1957.

Marxist scholars in the East and West began work with the intention of "taking back" (*repandre*) AMP from Wittfogel. In the West, the problem was taken up mostly by French and British scholars following Eric Hobsbawm's pioneering endeavor. The task is, to be sure, not an easy one. It requires interdisciplinary efforts, and consequently, archaeologists, anthropologists, economic historians, Sinologists, and Africanists have been laboring over the problem ever since. Soviet and East European research into this area was slowly and cautiously reopened at the urging of academician Eugene Varga, among others. Ferenc Tökei's early studies in Hungary had earned him well-deserved international recognition already in the 1960s. He began his scholarly work in the 1950s and today he is a member of the prestigious Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the supreme scientific body of his native land. As a young man, Tökei learned Chinese and published extensively on problems of Chinese

literature and culture—a preoccupation that came in very handy when dealing with the problem of AMP as part of Marxist theory of socioeconomic forms.

In the three volumes under review, Tőkei employs the method of philosophical-textual exegesis. He eschews direct confrontation with, and evaluation of, the voluminous literature dealing with the subject. The textual interpretation begins with Marx's early methodological writings, such as the Proudhon critique (in a letter to Annenkov) and continues with the "Preface" (1859), the latter being significant in that it led to many misunderstandings and misinterpretations and was turned into dogma by Stalin in his famous passage "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism" in the *History of the CPSU(b)* (1938). In this instance, Tőkei departs from his declared stance not to confront or evaluate secondary literature, and he undertakes a detailed, though somewhat belated, criticism of the one-time "Supreme Theoretician." The introduction to the *Grundrisse*, a more detailed, though basically fragmentary theoretical-methodological writing of Marx is also analyzed. Tőkei asserts that the problem of the Asiatic Mode of Production is the dividing line between the genuine dialectical and the dogmatic Marxist theory of history, a bold statement with which some would not agree. Tőkei's reconstruction of Marx's theory of history and social forms is accomplished vis-à-vis both dogmatic distortions and "subjectivist-revisionist" Marxologists. The latter usually contrast the young Marx with the later Marx. Tőkei emphasizes the unity and continuity in the work of Marx by extensively analyzing the connecting pieces of the *oeuvre*: *The German Ideology* and the *Grundrisse*. In Tőkei's opinion, Marx's *Das Kapital* is no substitute for the *Grundrisse* or vice versa. He also calls special attention to the Feuerbach essay in *The German Ideology*.

As regards methodological legacy, the history of Marxism after Marx revolves around the issue of Marx's relationship to Hegel, and consequently it can be written in terms of "re-Hegelizing" or "de-Hegelizing" Marx. The debate around this issue reaches from Georg Lukács to the Frankfurt School and from the Second International to Louis Althusser and his followers, respectively. Tőkei, following his great countryman Lukács, belongs to the re-Hegelizing camp. Tőkei also takes as a point of departure the later Lenin's cryptic remark that "it is impossible completely to understand Marx's *Das Kapital* . . . without having thoroughly studied and understood the whole of Hegel's logic." Tőkei's attempts to re-Hegelize Marx consequently head in that direction and by no means represent a step forward for the use of Marxist methods in modern empirical social sciences. Tőkei analyzes precapitalist socioeconomic forms by using the "individual-community-means of production" conceptualization, the usefulness of which was questioned by his critics, because of its resemblance to an oversimplified cabalistic number mysticism.

In sum, the German-language publication of the three-volume collection of essays by the Hungarian academician, Ferenc Tőkei, is a welcome event. To be sure, many problems remain unresolved and some of Tőkei's conclusions can and will be widely argued. By making his work accessible to a larger audience, however, the publication of these three volumes represents a valuable contribution to the ongoing debate over many key issues of Marx's writings. An index would have made the publication even more useful.

ZOLTÁN TAR

*New School for Social Research*

THE INTERNATIONAL SAKHAROV HEARING. Edited by *Marta Harasowska* and *Orest Olhovych*. Baltimore: Smoloskyp Publishers, 1977. 335 pp. \$8.95.

The Common Committee of East Exiles in Denmark sponsored a public hearing in Copenhagen in October 1975 on human rights in the USSR. The oral testimony of twenty-four Soviet émigrés who testified at that hearing is reproduced in this volume. The testimony focuses on the period 1965–75. It is grouped under four headings: