

In this section he establishes the inheritance that has shaped the postwar development of the country, including the legacies of foreign domination and exploitation as well as the impact of Soviet ideology. One of his interesting conclusions is that although the Soviet model created a proclivity for emphasizing so-called heavy industry, this emphasis happily coincided with the developmental potential of Yugoslavia in the early postwar period.

Parts 2 and 3 of the book contain a careful analysis of the economic policy and development of Yugoslavia since 1945. The various sectors of the economy are minutely described, full attention being given both to actual developments and to potentials for development. The material is treated in a way that makes clear the relations between such factors as resources, population, transportation facilities, and industrial and agricultural progress.

The Yugoslav economy, though it has achieved quite respectable rates of growth in national income and in industrial and agricultural output, has been plagued by serious problems arising from an imbalance in the economy—chronic balance of payments problems, inflation, and low capital and labor productivity. These problems have many causes, but the cause that Hamilton is most concerned with is that of the spatial distribution of economic activity. His first-rate analysis of this matter sheds a good deal of light on both the achievements and the failures of the Yugoslav experiment with a fairly decentralized socialist system. Resource misallocations arising from decentralization are clearly defined, as is the failure of the government's policy to close the gap between the advanced and the backward regions of the country. But these issues are treated in the context of the feasibility of better performance, given the potentials that exist. One can only hope that Hamilton's work receives wide circulation among those interested in questions of economic development and economic planning, and among Yugoslav policy-makers in particular.

W. MICHAEL RABBITT  
*Franklin and Marshall College*

THE ORIGINS OF SOCIALISM. By *George Lichtheim*. New York and Washington: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969. xii, 302 pp. \$6.95, cloth. \$2.95, paper.

NATIONALISM & SOCIALISM: MARXIST AND LABOR THEORIES OF NATIONALISM TO 1917. By *Horace B. Davis*. New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1967. xiv, 258 pp. \$7.50.

A century of disputation and exegesis has not exhausted the fascination of the socialist tradition for scholars and revolutionary activists alike. Thanks to the existence of powerful governments espousing Marxism-Leninism (in one form or another) as their official faith, the meaning of Marxist theory in particular remains a lively question for historical and philosophical judgment. Nevertheless, the actual relevance of socialist theory to the present Communist regimes has not been satisfactorily settled.

One great myth is only now being erased inadvertently by the New Left—the conviction that the industrial working class is the principal natural vehicle for the socialist reconstruction of society. Lenin was right about the workers—left to themselves they can rise only to trade-union consciousness. In *Marxism: An Historical and Critical Study* (1961) George Lichtheim recounted Marx's quest for a revolutionary social force to implement his ideal, and the theory of inevitable

proletarian revolution that followed upon his discovery of the workers. Now we can see that the basis for a faith in the proletariat was almost as shaky as Marx's transitory belief in German democratic nationalism. Lenin sensed this, without admitting it, when he resurrected the Russian conspiratorial tradition and put his chips on the organization of déclassé professional revolutionaries.

In some circumstances, nationalism, like organization, may be a much stronger radicalizing force than class. This is made very clear by Jens Christophersen in "The World Revolution That Got Lost" (*Verdensrevolusjonen som ble vekk*, Oslo, 1968), a ground-breaking essay that ought to be translated. Christophersen points out that in small oppressed countries the Left tends naturally to be nationalistic, and only in successful great powers is it antinationalistic. As to class, in the actual regimes of Marxian socialism the social elements which have built and benefited most from the system are not the workers but the managers, whether of the party or industrial variety. Marx, in retrospect, was more utopian than the Utopians: the real prophet of Soviet society was not Marx but Saint-Simon.

The imaginative contributions of the great French and English utopian socialists to the evolution of the human conscience are brought back into focus in the first two sections of Lichtheim's new book (actually a prelude to the earlier volume, which is to be followed by a third on the Socialist movement since Marx). A section on early German socialism and the "Marxian syntheses" (of socialist protest and industrial reality) rounds out the book. Lichtheim's command of intellectual history is impressive and exciting, although there is not actually much in the present volume which is not already familiar to readers of G. D. H. Cole or of Lichtheim's own earlier work, and Slavists will be disappointed at the lack of attention to developments outside the West European mainstream. From the standpoint of Anglo-American empiricism (which Lichtheim lightly disparages) he is perhaps too much the Central European Hegelian, according ideas a virtual life of their own as they pass from writer to writer. On Hegel specifically, however, Lichtheim has shifted his emphasis since his *Marxism* to deny that Marx "applied" Hegel but instead had to struggle to transcend him.

*Nationalism and Socialism* by Horace Davis will prove a disappointment to readers seeking new light on the troublesome relationship of these two political categories. Davis's book is an unabashed apology for Lenin and the Leninist emendation of Marxism on the national question, stopping, unfortunately, before Lenin's theory had to meet the test of power, and making no reference whatsoever to the problems of nationalism in the international Communist movement since 1917. The major recent scholarship on the question (e.g., Richard Pipes, Alfred Meyer, Bertram Wolfe) is not even listed in the bibliography.

Davis, an economist by profession, does present a fair treatment of Marx's racism and the inconsistency of some of his nationality views with his class theory. Bakunin comes in for a brief, familiar critique as a Russian nationalist. Otherwise the Russian nationality problem (even the crisis of the Bund and the Social Democrats) does not appear until Lenin comes up with the theory of self-determination. While the German and Austrian Social Democratic theorists are briefly summarized and criticized, the Menshevik view is not explained and the left-wing opposition to self-determination is represented only by Rosa Luxemburg. Davis does not go beyond nationalism as a theoretical problem for the Marxists, and attempts no insight into it as a revolutionary force in its own right.

ROBERT V. DANIELS  
*University of Vermont*