

THE USSR. By *John C. Dewdney*. Studies in Industrial Geography, vol. 3. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1976. xvi, 262 pp. Tables. Figures. \$19.50.

In this introductory textbook on the current industrial geography of the USSR, John Dewdney has provided a useful review of the development and distribution of the leading sectors of the Soviet industrial economy. The book is divided into three sections. The first of these encompasses the environmental, resource, transport, and population factors related to industrialization in the USSR. The remainder of the book examines specific industrial sectors and regional contrasts in Soviet industry.

The text contains a substantial amount of factual information about Soviet industry which is presented in an encyclopedic manner, along the lines used by Theodore Shabad in his inventories of Soviet industrial resources. Thus, on the positive side, the text is a useful reference for up-to-date locational and production data of industrial sectors and regions. In addition, the chapter on regionalization is a useful survey of an important theme.

A negative consequence of this industrial-inventory approach is an unparalleled degree of dullness resulting from the stupefying citation of hundreds of place names, technological processes, and industrial products. These factual data are difficult to evaluate because they are either unrelated or only linked in a cursory manner to broader policy issues of development, location theory, and the planning process. Moreover, they usually do not contain any reference to comparative costs. The most critical need is for unifying concepts, problems, and methodologies, or, in other words, valid criteria for the inclusion of information. The goal of providing a reliable survey of the thousands of industrial activities in the USSR and their diverse technologies is a fruitless scholarly endeavor. An additional difficulty which is apparent in this text is the undesirability of isolating industrial development from such related activities as agriculture or urbanization.

In summary, this text is a convenient source for selected industrial data but is seriously marred by the author's apparent incognizance of the conceptual and methodological growth of modern geography.

ROBERT N. TAAFFE
Indiana University

THE THIRD WAY: MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY AND MODERN INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY. By *Ota Šik*. Translated by *Marian Sling*. White Plains, N.Y. and London: International Arts and Sciences Press and Wildwood House, 1976. 431 pp. \$25.00.

With the volume under review, Professor Šik has joined the growing effort to liberate Marx from Soviet captivity and claim him for the forces of political as well as social and economic emancipation. The author does not see the task of dissociating Marxian thought from Soviet realities and ideology as "a return to the origins," pure, authentic, and unadulterated, but as a liberation from dogmatic attitudes altogether. Hence, whenever Šik confronts "official Marxism" with Marx, he makes a point of confronting Marx with newer insights and contemporary facts as he sees them. At the same time, Šik keeps his distance from Western economic theoreticians, whom he likes to correct with the help of Marx wherever he considers Marx superior. He manages in this way to strike the likable posture of an independent maverick, rather than of some sort of convert.

To place emphasis on the political significance of Šik's contribution is to express the opinion that the strictly economic portions of the work, which take up a good deal of space, are not always entirely successful. Viewed through the eyes of mainstream Western economists, the examination of contemporary capitalism, especially

the sections on monopoly, macroeconomic instability, stabilization, and growth, lack the analytic rigor customarily expected in the profession. There is a certain amount of misunderstanding of the relationship between purely theoretical models and the empirical behavior of real economies, which leads to some unwarranted criticism of the models by reference to unruly historical facts. (In fairness, it should be noted that the author left Czechoslovakia in 1969, where "his" economic reform was brought to a sad end, and the German original of the book appeared in 1972; thus, he hardly had enough time to become thoroughly acquainted with Western modes of economic discourse.) On the other hand, Šik's personal reading of Marxian theories bears some residual traces of old conventions: for example, the distinction, invalid on Marx's own terms, between a "productive" material-output sector and "nonproductive" services; some confusion about the definition of global aggregates; and various imprecisions of minor importance.

Having mentioned these reservations, I hasten to say that Professor Šik is successful in getting across his principal message, one that is sometimes lost on nonpractical practitioners of rigorous theorizing. Traumatic experience with Soviet-type command planning prompts him to issue repeated warnings: "Let us remember that the road from a defective monopoly market to absolute state monopoly leads from *partial* to *complete* dictatorship of producers over consumers" (p. 199, italics in the original). "Socialist" is consistently written in quotation marks whenever the reference is to Soviet-type systems, to mark the error of identifying "socialization" with "state ownership" (p. 354), and to caution against the dangerous implications of shallow analyses, which he sees typified in the writings of J. K. Galbraith.

Professor Šik's positive recommendations—the "third way"—point to some system of market-oriented autonomous enterprises under collective capital ownership, which would awaken the interest of workers in enterprise efficiency and operate in a framework of democratic macroeconomic planning. Free of central bureaucratic authority, the system should thrive on a "genuine, living confrontation of interests" (p. 386). This valuable formula, which might have been accorded greater elaboration, is the author's answer to Lenin's authoritarian view of the role of the state, copied from capitalist wartime controls under suspension of the market mechanism. Lenin's conception emerges from Professor Šik's calm and even-tempered criticism as the most unfortunate instance of revisionism in the history of Marxist movements.

VÁCLAV HOLEŠOVSKÝ

University of Massachusetts, Amherst

MOSCOW AND THE NEW LEFT. By *Klaus Mehnert*. Translated from the German by *Helmut Fischer*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975. xii, 275 pp. \$12.50.

In his short but valuable study of the new leftists of the sixties, Professor Mehnert examines an interesting episode. The Soviet leaders disowned widespread protest against capitalist society because of echoes in its own. The Soviet leaders, who can ignore the doctrinal heresies of a Castro, a Berlinguer, or a Castillo as long as they do not reject the CPSU as irrelevant or anti-Marxist, vilified Herbert Marcuse and Daniel Cohn-Bendit because they questioned the revolutionary character of the Soviet Union, thus striking at the very legitimacy of the system.

In one of its most troubled periods, American society came to accept (in part) the protest against the war in Vietnam and the charge that man was fouling his own nest by destroying the environment. The common sight of a beard under the hard hat of a young construction worker symbolizes the incorporation of some of the values of the disaffected. In the Soviet Union, dissidents have evoked much less sympathy from