

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

the regime and from the population. In a diligent search Professor Mehnert has found some cases of sneaking sympathy for the dropouts who have decided that the world is corrupt and try to preserve their integrity by walking away from it. But Soviet readers of the mass media have had little chance to listen to the voices of the disaffected West precisely because of the fear that it might strike a responsive chord. Drug abuse, the disintegration of the family, and apathy are problems in Soviet society, too, but Soviet leaders are too uncertain and defensive to permit alienation to be discussed as a common feature of industrial society. It has to be treated as peculiar to Western society and it only makes it worse that self-styled revolutionaries attracted so much attention as examples of the phenomenon. Soviet leaders reveal their lack of confidence in their own society by the gingerly way in which they treat protest in capitalist society.

HERBERT S. DINERSTEIN
The Johns Hopkins University

A HISTORY OF MIDDLE EUROPE: FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE AGE OF THE WORLD WARS. By *Leslie C. Tihany*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1976. xvi, 289 pp. + 9 pp. maps. Tables. \$16.50.

The title of this book is misleading. By Middle Europe, one generally understands the economic and defense union of the Central Powers as envisaged by Friedrich Naumann in World War I. Dr. Tihany's ambitious enterprise represents, however, a history of the peoples between Germany and Russia from preliterary times to the end of the Second World War. It is roughly similar in scope to the late Oscar Halecki's *Borderlands of Western Civilization*.

The grandeur of the author's topic, covered in little more than 250 pages of text, leads him, particularly in the first half of the book, to the cumulative discussion of numerous ethnic groups in chapters with sweeping headings such as "The landlocked territorial imperative" and "The Drang nach Osten." This method makes it almost impossible for the layman to trace the history of any specific ethnic group. Furthermore, the arrangement is of no benefit to the expert, who will be stunned by the flood of unprovable generalizations. In his introduction the author asserts: "To be progressive as well as cumulative the presentation must include the most recent research published in non-Western languages. . . . This book has tried to keep abreast of recent research. . . ." The reader will not find confirmation of these undoubtedly sincere intentions. The sources cited in the notes are extremely limited and in the main are restricted to rather general works, most of them in English but also quite a few in Magyar and some in French and German. This in itself does not impair the value of the survey, but twenty references to one general work on Byzantine history in twenty-nine notes of chapter 3 or eighteen references to the *Cambridge History of Poland* in thirty notes of chapter 13 do seem to conflict with the author's claim. In this context the "Bibliographical Guide" is as brief as it is strange. The modern standard bibliographies on East Central Europe by Horecky, which list and annotate works in the vernacular languages as well as in English, are ignored, but the *Journal of Central European Affairs* which went out of existence many years ago is still faithfully listed.

Factual errors and misstatements may be unavoidable in a volume of this range. Only very few of the major ones can be mentioned here. Use of the term "Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation" is incorrect. So is a reference to the German Reich of 1871, with minorities less than 10 percent of its population, as a multinational empire on a par with imperial Russia and the Habsburg Empire (p. 209). It is preposterous to call Emperor Frederick II, one of the greatest minds of the High Middle Ages, a