

2, a useful development of an earlier work by Montias, considers one way to minimize plan inconsistencies caused by failure to take account of the structural interdependence of current production—and that is, to take advantage of the triangular hierarchy of the input-output table. Chapter 3 is an attempt to assess the importance of economies of scale in Soviet industry. This is useful because of the assumption of constant returns to scale implicit in conventional input-output studies. The author is commendably honest in pointing to the limitations of his own study. (Such academic modesty is a valuable and commendable feature of the whole book.) Chapter 4 considers Soviet transportation in an input-output framework. Chapter 5 is concerned with converting the 1966 USSR input-output table into 1970 prices, in order to make it comparable to subsequent Soviet tables. (Perhaps experience with this kind of work will make Western specialists on the Soviet economy more sympathetic to Soviet planners' preference for stable prices.) Chapter 6 is a useful, up-to-date, brief survey of Soviet work on regional input-output. The authors correctly note that "major advances are being made in the Soviet Union in the theoretical study of regional input-output models and in the gathering of data for regional input-output accounts. In fact, this Soviet research is probably the most advanced of its type in the world" (p. 282). Chapter 7, a detailed study of input-output in one Soviet republic, Latvia, contains a mass of detailed information about the construction of the Latvian tables, which is helpful for obtaining a firm grasp of the meaning of Soviet input-output data. Chapter 8 deals with the use of input-output data for comparisons of the structure of U.S. and Soviet economies. For this purpose, the U.S. data were adjusted to correspond to the Soviet data, and six statistical tests of the relationship between Soviet and U.S. input coefficients were conducted. Because of data limitations, the paper is mainly of methodological rather than substantive interest. Chapter 9 considers the use of input-output data in the SRI-WEFA econometric model of the USSR.

This book is not a comprehensive survey of Soviet work on input-output. For example, it contains virtually nothing on Soviet labor and physical input-output tables or on the capital stock matrices. Nor does it have much on the usefulness, or otherwise, of input-output in Soviet planning. Nevertheless, the book is a valuable source of data on, and a competent analysis of, Soviet input-output work. It will be very useful for those needing a complete version of the input-output table in value units for the USSR in 1966 and for those requiring detailed information about, and analysis of, Soviet work in the input-output area.

MICHAEL ELLMAN
Amsterdam University

THE YOUNG HEGEL: STUDIES IN THE RELATIONS BETWEEN DIALECTICS AND ECONOMICS. By *Georg Lukács*. Translated by *Rodney Livingstone*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1976 [1966, 1975]. xxx, 576 pp. \$24.95.

Georg Lukács spent 1933–45 in exile in the Soviet Union, where he worked as a research associate of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences in Moscow. For the first few years he wrote primarily on aesthetics. But when his criticism of socialist art brought him into conflict with his Soviet colleagues, he turned back to his earlier philosophical concerns and wrote *The Young Hegel*, which he completed in 1938. When it was finally published in Vienna in 1948, he had thoroughly revised the text. He again revised it for the 1954 East Berlin edition, from which this not completely satisfactory translation has been made.

Lukács's concentration on the *young* Hegel was totally consistent with his concentration on the *young* Marx. In *History and Class Consciousness*, Lukács, together with Karl Korsch (whose *Marxism and Philosophy* was also published in 1923), had initiated the "Marxist renaissance" of the 1920s, which was associated with the "rediscovery" of the relationship between Hegel and Marx, and later also with the "discovery" of Marx's *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts* of 1844. Lukács's book was immediately denounced by Soviet Marxists and their adherents as "ultra-leftism," and was perceived as an attempt to create a "Western Marxism" in contradistinction to Soviet Marxism. This caused Lukács to repudiate his book and turn back to writing predominantly on aesthetics. After Lenin's death in 1924, however, he published a small book, *Lenin: A Study of the Cohesion of His Thought*, which was at once an act of defiance and of affirmation showing that, in spite of the attacks on him, he was both a better Marxist and a better Leninist than his critics were. He wrote *The Young Hegel* in the same spirit.

The starting point of *The Young Hegel* was an article Lukács wrote in 1931 for a protest volume against the keynote of the University of Berlin congress commemorating the centenary of Hegel's death, which was: "In Germany today the problem of Hegel is primarily a problem of Kant." Because of Moscow's antagonism toward Lukács and the other contributors' refusal to participate without him, the volume was never published. In his 1954 preface to *The Young Hegel* Lukács wrote that "the imminent outbreak of the war" delayed its publication "for many years"; but he never had any idea that it would appear in the Soviet Union. He was not only turning back to Hegel; he wrote that "this interpretation of Hegelian philosophy is no more or less than the attempt to apply to his early development the brilliant insights formulated by Marx in his *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts* of 1844."

Lukács's Neo-Hegelian Marxism was an overreaction to the Neo-Kantian agnosticism of his youth. During the "Marxist renaissance" of the 1920s in Germany, the problem of Neo-Hegelianism was primarily a problem of Neo-Kantianism, and Lukács was never able to escape the epistemological and ontological trap of the latter. Theoretically, Lukács never went beyond Marx's "Theses on Feuerbach," which constituted a midpoint in Marx's development from a humanist philosopher in the 1844 manuscripts to a materialist social scientist in the 1845–46 Feuerbach section of *The German Ideology* (in which the epistemological and ontological divides separating the *young* Marx and the *mature* Marx are manifest and the foundations of historical materialism are laid). In *The Young Hegel*, Lukács ignores the mediating role of Feuerbach in Marx's development, contending instead that Marx's critique of Feuerbach gave an impetus "to the direction of dialectical materialism." Lukács's main concerns remained the same as Marx's concerns in the 1844 manuscripts—the relations between "economics and philosophy" and "economics and dialectics."

Lukács's "Western Marxism" of the early 1920s foreshadowed the transformation of Soviet Marxism in the early 1930s, by which time they had become epistemologically and ontologically related. On the surface, this statement appears suspect, because even after recanting his subjectivistic attitude (found in *History and Class Consciousness*) and later seeking refuge in the Soviet Union, Lukács was never accepted as a doctrinal authority by Soviet Marxists. Quite the contrary! But, as Lukács later wrote, "only the atypical can be truly representative." The Hegel-Marx relation, as expounded by Soviet Marxists at the 1931 memorial meeting in Moscow on "Hegel and Dialectical Materialism," was based on a calculated disregard of the Feuerbach problem.

Lukács and the Soviet Marxists obscured those aspects of Marx's relation to Feuerbach which revealed the transition through Hegel from social philosophy to social science. Like Lukács, the Soviet Marxists' major concerns since 1931 have been the relations between "economics and philosophy" and "economics and dialectics."

Soviet Marxism has conformed to Lukács's 1923 credo: "The watchword that Marx states in his Feuerbach Theses is the transformation of philosophy into practice." It can be traced to Lenin's theoretically most problematic book, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, which opened the door to those propositions that became dominant in the 1930s. Already in 1908, Lenin's epistemology and ontology were obscured by his "reflection theory" of knowledge and the emasculation of historical materialism in his philosophization of dialectics.

When Lukács took refuge in the Soviet Union in 1933, he rested his case on *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. The case, to be sure, was shaky because Lenin, despite his philosophical deviations, never abandoned Marx's scientific materialist approach. But Lenin's *Philosophical Notebooks* guided Lukács in writing *The Young Hegel* and there is an inherent relation between *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* and the *Philosophical Notebooks*. In the latter, Lenin's "Surveys of Hegel's Works," in particular *The Science of Logic*, occupy a central position. Lenin criticized Hegel's idealism from the standpoint of "dialectical materialism," and, in conceptualizing the fundamental laws and categories of dialectics, he underlined the specifics of their reflection in thought, and especially the relation between dialectics, logic, and epistemology. In analyzing "the emergence of the Hegelian dialectic," Lukács concentrates on Hegel's *Phenomenology*—the key work in Marx's 1844 manuscripts—and on Hegel's *Logic*, and thereby attempts to get at the very core "of the interaction between the categories of philosophy and economics" where "the dialectical categories of the social sciences appear as intellectual reflections of the dialectical process being enacted objectively in the lives of men, but independently of their will and knowledge."

Hegel is at the heart of Western Marxism crossing the "institutional divide" into what Marx called "semi-Asiatic" Russia and Lenin called the *Aziatchina*. Philosophy is at the heart of Soviet Marxism crossing the ideological divide into the subjectivistic realm of "dialectical materialism." Looking east and west, Lukács stood at the brink of these divides. *The Young Hegel* is essential for an understanding of Lukács's philosophical purpose and political predicament, for the critical situation of Western Marxism, for the illumination of Leninism, and for the transformation of Soviet Marxism. Both Hegel and Marx grew up; they *matured* out of philosophy and into history. But neither Lukács nor Soviet Marxists could face the political conclusions of historical materialism applied to the east or the west, to the past or the present. Lukács never went beyond the *young* Hegel because he never went beyond the *young* Marx.

G. L. ULMEN
New York City

ENTERPRISE GUIDANCE IN EASTERN EUROPE: A COMPARISON OF FOUR SOCIALIST ECONOMIES. By *David Granick*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975. xvi, 505 pp. \$27.50, cloth. \$9.75, paper.

Granick expertly blends managerial interviews, a thorough knowledge of the relevant literature, empirical investigation, and carefully enunciated reasoning into an intriguing comparative study of contemporary industrial management in Rumania, East Germany, Hungary, and Yugoslavia. Granick certainly deserves high praise for his extensive field work, brilliant insights, and persuasive style. Yet this reviewer was impressed not only by Granick's in-depth analysis, but also by his strong and controversial judgments. The importance of the book, therefore, rests on its descriptive-empirical content as well as on its presentation of clearly stated judgments.