

they blast President Carter's human rights initiatives as a violation of Soviet sovereignty. For this and other reasons I find Professor Schwartz's criticism of Mr. Carter's human rights policy excessive, although I agree that we must avoid counter-productive tactics. I agree also that we cannot afford to be militarily weak, lest we encourage Kremlin "hawks." However, moral strength and political resolve, demonstrated by firmness of commitment to democratic values, in my opinion, are as indispensable as economic and military power. Certainly Sakharov's version of détente is more promising than the ambiguous line taken by Kremlin Americanists.

Despite such reservations, I heartily recommend *Soviet Perceptions of the United States* to seekers of solid information and informed judgment on a subject of vast importance.

FREDERICK C. BARGHOORN
Yale University

STUDIES IN SOVIET ECONOMIC PLANNING. By *Aron Katsenelinboigen*.
White Plains, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, 1978. xvi, 229 pp. \$22.50.

The author of this book received his *kandidat* and doctoral degrees in the USSR. For seven years he was head of a department at an institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and for three years he was a professor at Moscow State University. The book consists of seven essays on Soviet economics and the Soviet economy. Two of them have previously been published in English. Chapter 3 was published (in a shorter form) in the *Russian Review* and chapter 7 in *Soviet Studies* (a fact rather surprisingly not mentioned in the book). Originally written in Russian, the book has been translated into English. Unfortunately, the translation is wooden, sometimes inaccurate, and often excessively literal.

Chapter 1 basically contains two arguments. The first is a hymn of praise to the use of mathematics in economics. This was quite in place in the Soviet specialist literature of the 1960s but is now of little general interest. The second is the thesis that there are some propositions that are true for all economic systems. I am rather doubtful about this. The work of historians (such as M. Finley) and anthropologists (such as Sahlins) suggests that Marx may have been correct. There may well be a "stone age economics," an "economics of classical antiquity," and an "economics of capitalism" which differ profoundly from each other. Even in the natural sciences, the universality of the laws of physics has been challenged by modern cosmology with its "anthropic principle."

Chapter 2, dealing with Marxism and the Soviet economic system, is a low-grade repetition of ideas much better expressed long ago by Popper and the Czechoslovak reformers of the 1960s. Chapter 3, on Soviet economic thought, adds nothing to what is already well known. Chapter 4 is a methodological discussion which this reader, at any rate, found of little interest. Some remarks in it about the USSR seem patently wrong, evidently reflecting not a careful analysis of the situation but the author's subjective dislike of the USSR. For example, what evidence can be cited to support the view that after World War II "Stalin set himself the task of attaining world dominance" (p. 82)? The quoted 1946 speech is, surely, simply an indication of Stalin's aim to build up the defense potential of the USSR so as to ward off any future attackers more easily than Hitler had been warded off. Chapter 5 is basically a discussion of the economic significance of the duality theorem, which, while adding nothing to the specialist literature, displays the author's ignorance (for example, of Baumol's work on integer programming and prices). Chapter 6 on incentives also contributes nothing to the literature, at any rate, as far as I can determine.

Chapter 7, which treats the diversity of market relationships existing in the USSR, is an interesting attempt to theorize (and inform) about an important aspect of the Soviet economy. Despite Marxists' expectations, markets of various kinds continue to

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