

ing finding himself in the category of Mensheviks, whom he denounced as "pseudo-Marxist lackeys of the bourgeoisie" for their belief that it was too early to establish socialism in Russia.

Sometime between 1917 and 1922 the suspicion might have dawned on Lenin that the effort to establish a noncommodity form of economic organization was utopian, with or without a transitional period. This has indeed dawned on many present-day economists in the Soviet Union, but orthodox Marxists continue to define socialism or communism as a noncommodity form of production. The conflict (in economics) between the modern-day revisionist and orthodox Marxists can be understood in these terms. Revisionists realize that it is impossible (in a modern economic context) to organize production in a noncommodity form and that efforts to do so are at the expense of economic rationality, yet they cannot say Marx was utopian and still hope to be recognized as Marxists. Therefore, they attempt to revise Marx and identify markets or commodity production with socialism.

The programmatic content of Marxian socialism calls for the replacement of a commodity with a noncommodity form of production. In my article my purpose was to show that the policies of "war communism" were an effort to establish socialism. After decades of a reign of mythology, I looked at the evidence provided by Lenin. That evidence is unequivocal. I suspect that resistance to the evidence is basically a matter of reluctance to acknowledge the power of ideology to introduce and maintain folly as a force in Soviet economic history.

TO THE EDITOR:

I am seeking information about a Russian writer named Sergei Gussiev Orenburgsky, born in the later 1860s, author of two novels, *Land of the Fathers* and *Land of the Children*. The latter was published in English translation by Longmans, Green in 1928 (the translator was Nina Nikolaevna Selivanova). It is thought that he came to the United States in the 1920s and lived for some years in New York City. It would be much appreciated if anyone possessing such information could write me at the address shown.

MRS. GRACE CALÍ
Buzon 466, Quebrada Vuelta
Fajardo, Puerto Rico 00648

TO THE EDITOR:

Like one of your correspondents (March 1971 issue), I am beginning to become disenchanted with the contents of the *Slavic Review*, but for a different reason. Whereas Mr. Lupinin says that the *Slavic Review* is not historical enough, in my mind it is now too historical, and what is more, far too literary. When I first subscribed to the *Slavic Review* eight years ago, there seemed to be a much larger proportion of articles dealing with contemporary Soviet affairs, particularly Soviet politics, than now. I regret the shift in content. Perhaps articles of the previous kind are just not being written these days; I do not know. At any rate, while the *Slavic Review* has maintained its usual high standards, I find that it is moving far enough away from my interests to encourage me to read it in the Library rather

than to subscribe to it. This is not a complaint, rather a cry from the heart, and I hope it is understood as such.

EVERETT JACOBS
University of Sheffield

TO THE EDITOR:

I can only say "Amen" to the letter of Mr. Nicholas Lupinin in the recent number of the *Review* with regard to the direction taken by Slavic studies in the United States in recent years. It was natural that there should be an outpouring of studies on the Russian revolution, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of that event, but actually the trend had been evident long before that.

It must be admitted that the Russian revolution is perhaps the most important event of the twentieth century so far. But to treat it as a turning point to be accepted on its own valuation without reference to the past which is to be ignored as utterly irrelevant is the height of absurdity. Nor will its study prove fruitful in the long run if pursued along these lines.

STUART R. TOMPKINS
Victoria, British Columbia

NEW FROM YALE

Plan and Market in Yugoslav Economic Thought

by Deborah D. Milenkovitch

Can a socialist state decentralize and still remain socialist? This is a real question in Yugoslavia, which started to reform its centrally planned model fifteen years earlier than other East European countries and has gone further in expanding the scope of market relations than other socialist countries have even contemplated. In Yugoslavia the progression has been from soviet-type planning to decentralization of current production decisions to decentralization of investment decisions to privatization of social property. The decision to establish workers' councils as the vehicle of decentralization has been of central importance.

Mrs. Milenkovitch analyzes the Yugoslav experience carefully and raises the intriguing question whether the changes are specific to Yugoslavia or whether there are common forces that will compel other socialist countries to abandon central planning of production and investment and ultimately induce them to reestablish ownership over productive factors. Though the book focuses on Yugoslavia, many of the economic problems discussed are common to other socialist nations and of keen interest to Western economists watching the socialist states experiment with new ways of meeting national economic needs.

"A very interesting combination of three different approaches . . . history of economic doctrines, economic history (nonquantitative), and comparative economic systems. There does not exist any treatment of Yugoslavia that attempts to do what she has done successfully."—Egon Neuberger

\$10.00



Yale University Press New Haven and London
in Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press