

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: Smoloksky 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:

"Political Oppression and the Persecution of Dissidents," "The Fight Against Religion and the Suffering of the Faithful," "The Abuse of Psychiatry," and "The Oppression of Non-Russian Nationalities in the Soviet Union."

A three-page "finding" composed by a twelve-member panel that heard the testimony follows. The "finding" states that "the majority of the witnesses . . . made plausible statements of their own personal experiences during the years 1965-1975, in most cases with exact information as to the time and place of the events mentioned." The panel concludes that "on the basis of the statements made by the witnesses, the panel finds it to have been established that in the Soviet Union freedom of thought and expression is restricted, that non-conformist behavior encounters harassment in vital conditions of life, such as in the field of employment, housing and educational facilities, that freedom of movement inside the country, foreign travel as well as emigration are severely restricted, that religious freedom is substantially restricted, that the interests and aspirations of Soviet national minorities . . . are suppressed in vital respects . . . , and that in the Soviet Union there are people in prisons, camps and psychiatric wards who are deprived of their liberty, often under inhuman conditions, people who must clearly be termed political prisoners."

While much evidence can be mustered to substantiate such conclusions, the evidence in this compilation does not. The witnesses provided the panel with documentation that is not included in the book and without which the testimony amounts to no more than allegations. The panel limited each witness to ten minutes, with the result that most of them did little more than state charges. Furthermore, the testimony contains no footnotes, which poses a particular problem as regards witnesses' citations to legislative enactments.

Despite the panel's conclusion that the witnesses generally provided exact information as to time and place of events, in many instances the facts were sketchy. The book contains no indication that either the panel or the editors endeavored to verify witnesses' testimony from other sources.

The foreword states that the witnesses and panelists were chosen to assure political impartiality. Yet many of the panelists have published works containing strong indictments of Soviet human rights practices. And most of the émigré witnesses exhibit deep philosophical differences with the Soviet government. The book's endeavor to achieve impartiality is further impaired by the inclusion near the beginning of a "Declaration of the Organizers" of the hearing, which asserts that the USSR "mercilessly . . . choke[s] any form of dissent" and states in capital letters, "LET OUR PEOPLE GO."

The above criticisms notwithstanding, the book does bring to light many important and interesting allegations that warrant verification.

JOHN QUIGLEY
Ohio State University

SOVIET SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY: DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN PERSPECTIVES. Edited by *John R. Thomas* and *Ursula M. Kruse-Vaucienne*. Washington, D.C.: The National Science Foundation and The George Washington University, 1977. xlv, 455 pp.

In recent years a group of scholars has begun to focus more attention on Soviet science and technology, areas central to an understanding of the Soviet Union but previously neglected in Western scholarship. The most widely read texts on Soviet history, society, and politics still largely ignore science and technology. One positive feature of the specialist studies is that they may eventually begin to influence the textbook writers. The present volume, based on a workshop held in November 1976 and sponsored by the National Science Foundation, reflects the growth of this field,