

simple though systematic and thorough process yielded the conclusions mentioned above.

Unfortunately, despite the authors' inspired efforts to show that use of the *New York Times* as the sole source of data for the purposes of their study is entirely satisfactory, the outcome, in this reviewer's opinion, can only be viewed as culture-bound, American-oriented, and biased. It is not that the *New York Times* cannot be accepted as one of the finest data sources of this sort; it is simply that for an *interactional* analysis, one side's source is just not enough. An original, prestigious American source must be matched and compared with and balanced against an original, prestigious Soviet source, both for assessment of mutual actions and for measurement of their magnitude. The authors' attempt to show that a high correlation exists between the *Current Digest of the Soviet Press* translations of *Pravda* and *Izvestiia* articles and the *New York Times* articles on cold war issues, as explained in their addendum to appendix B, and that there is no need therefore for using *both* as data sources for their study, is just not persuasive. This is a real pity, because the outcome of their research would be greatly strengthened by this additional consideration, and their conclusions would be confirmed, I am fairly certain, by including the other side's data.

Still, given its major methodological thrust, this is a remarkably lucid and readable book. And given its clarity, its research strategy—with this one exception—is singularly well suited to the authors' objectives. An important book.

JAN F. TRISKA
Stanford University

STAAT ODER KOMMUNISMUS: LENINS ENTSCHEIDUNG GEGEN DIE
KOMMUNISTISCHE GESELLSCHAFT. By Günther Wagenlehner. 2nd
revised edition. Stuttgart: Seewald Verlag, 1971 [1970]. 260 pp. DM 19.80.

The great revolutions of Western history have all been made in the name of an ideology of deliverance, and thus proclaimed themselves to be the last revolution. The promises are never fully honored. All revolutions have in some sense been betrayed and given rise to new coercion, new oppression, new inequities, and a new establishment. Inevitably they are criticized from two sides: on the left are those who insist on taking the liberational ideas seriously and wish to undo their "betrayal"; on the right are those who regard the ideas in the name of which the revolution was made in the first place as folly. Both kinds of critic may make significant contributions to social philosophy. But the critic on the right places himself in an awkward position when he succumbs to the temptation of using the liberational rhetoric as a mirror in which to view and judge the postrevolutionary society. Since he does not subscribe to these ideas in the first place, his use of them makes him a hypocrite. His hypocrisy becomes more obvious when he expressly refuses to hold the same mirror up to his own society, as Mr. Wagenlehner does on page 216, because realization of the ideas just mentioned would disturb economic efficiency.

Wagenlehner argues that Marxism makes demands that cannot be realized, and that the attempt to realize them will yield an oppressive dictatorial state. He contrasts this state with the bourgeois-capitalist order described as benign and humane (*menschenwürdig*), and from which the almighty capitalist has disappeared as definitely as the propertyless proletarian (p. 215), although some reforms might still be called for.

This tired simplification is supported by summaries of Marxism and Leninism so willful that they must be described as caricatures. Marxism becomes nothing more than inverted Hegelianism, from which every subtlety has been eliminated. More important, Wagenlehner totally ignores the constant attention that Marx and Engels gave to problems of strategy, tactics, and organization, including military matters. He falsely blames them for not specifying the economic order of communism. What would have been correct to say is that they did not say much about the putative economic order in a postrevolutionary Russia.

Lenin is described as a Blanquist pure and simple, for whom the Marxist scheme of development was neither of use nor of interest, and who practically rejected the economic interpretation of history. Wagenlehner can assert this only by totally ignoring vast amounts of Lenin's writings, from early economic treatises to the works dealing with imperialism. Indeed, imperialism is not even mentioned in this book dealing with Lenin! Nor is there any treatment of the dialectics of consciousness and spontaneity and its implications for the relationship between leaders and masses. Despite this omission of themes which in my own work on Lenin I have treated as essential, I was struck by the large number of statements, including Lenin quotations, which could have been lifted straight from my *Leninism*.

Wagenlehner's summary of the history of the Soviet Union is a caricature as well. What shall we do with an account of "war communism" which mentions the Civil War only in passing, or a passage describing the elimination of the cultural influence of the old establishment as the "destruction of all moral principles" (p. 96)? I found the author's comments on the nationalization of the means of production and the discussion of Lenin's concept of "state capitalism" particularly inane. The summary ends by proving what the author set out to prove, that the Communist revolution brings about not the self-realization of man but a totally coercive state.

So what else is new?

Tracts of this kind were produced in the United States in the ten years following World War II. West Germany, which is twenty-five years behind America in the social sciences, seems to be similarly lagging in cold war rhetoric.

ALFRED G. MEYER
University of Michigan

SUR LE MODE DE PRODUCTION ASIATIQUE. By *Ferenc Tőkei*. Edited by *E. Pamlényi*. Translated by *György Bernát*. *Studia Historica, Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 58. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1966. 88 pp. \$6.00.

ZUR FRAGE DER ASIATISCHEN PRODUKTIONSWEISE. By *Ferenc Tőkei*. Edited by *Jürgen Hartmann*. Translated by *Ferenc Bródy* and *Agnes Vertes-Meller*. Neuwied and Berlin: Hermann Luchterhand Verlag, 1969. 128 pp. Paper.

Ferenc Tőkei wrote this book in 1960. Its three essays were first published as articles in the Hungarian journal *Valóság*, in 1962, 1963, and 1964 respectively, then together in book form in 1965 (*Az ázsiai termelési mód kérdéséhez*). The French edition of 1966 is a less than satisfactory translation, and some of the text and certain footnotes have been omitted. A better French translation of parts of the book was circulated in the spring of 1962, when Tőkei, then in Paris, became associated with the Centre d'Études et de Recherches Marxistes. Articles by Tőkei