

formation, as well as numerous directives, reports, and speeches concerning fulfillment of the Third Five-Year Plan. The second main section contains considerable information pertaining to the size, educational attainments, industrial distribution, and productivity of the industrial labor force, as well as many previously unpublished circulars, directives, and announcements concerning "socialist competition" and the Stakhanovite movement. Appendixes also provide, in addition to footnotes, a chronology of party and government directives on industrialization issues, a very helpful list of abbreviations, an unusual directory of industrial establishments, and a bibliography of sources consulted.

The most important question is, of course, whether the collection provides anything new and interesting—beyond merely organizing and presenting existing source materials in a useful way. The answer is a slightly qualified "yes." Previously unpublished archival materials are included, as are published data of very limited circulation. There is, naturally, a degree of overlap between this volume and the standard handbooks such as *Resheniia partii i pravitel'stva po khoziaistvennym voprosam* (vol. 2) and *KPSS v rezoliutsiakh i resheniakh s'ezdov, konferentsii i plenumov TsK* (vol. 5), although the editor has sought to minimize unnecessary duplication. Similarly, there is some overlap between the data presented in this volume and that given in the standard *Narodnoe khoziaistvo v SSSR* handbooks (especially 1956 and 1958) and certain other well-known statistical handbooks. This is particularly so for the year 1940, because, as the last complete prewar year, 1940 is a standard base-year in most Soviet statistical presentations. Even so, careful examination of selected sections of the new collection indicates that there is new material not only for 1938 and 1939 but also for 1940 (and, to a degree, for 1941). State budget sources and uses of funds statements, for example, are more complete in *Industrializatsiia SSSR* than elsewhere, including Plotnikov's *Ocherki istorii biudzheta . . .* (1953). (For example, the expenditure of the NKVD is separately identified here and rose from 2.8 percent of the 1937 state budget to 3.7 percent of the half-again larger 1939 budget.) One may also trace the impact of preparation for war upon the whole pattern of economic activity.

Available space does not permit elaboration of the value of this new reference work, but much could be said about the interagency communications that are included and about the data that are presented according to *narodnye komissariaty*, just to mention two potentially important aspects. This is, then, a useful and promising reference work. It is a scholarly compilation as well. Omissions, deletions, and dating problems are all dutifully noted. The series as a whole must now be considered *the* place "to begin" any examination of Soviet industrialization.

JAMES R. MILLAR

*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*

KARL MARX: HIS LIFE AND THOUGHT. By *David McLellan*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973. xii, 498 pp. \$12.50.

The book under review is the latest in a series of works on or by Marx that David McLellan has either written or edited in recent years, and it is undoubtedly meant to be the crowning achievement of his labors. It is not, as McLellan claims, the only "full-scale biography of Marx in English covering all aspects of his life since that of Mehring, first published in the original German in 1918," and, unfortunately, the

only advantage of this and the other biographies of Marx that have appeared in English since Mehring's is that they are fuller. McLellan states at the outset that his book "is intended for the general reader" and that in it he attempts to cover fully "the three main facets of Marx's life—personal, political and intellectual." But it is precisely for the general reader that this book is most undesirable, because although McLellan's treatment of Marx's personal and political life is for the most part adequate, his treatment of Marx's intellectual life is either vague, misleading, or a travesty. In general, his discussion of Marx's individual works is descriptive rather than analytical, and the weight he gives to each reflects current trends mainly (but not exclusively) among English and American writers. Specifically, I refer to the overemphasis on the importance of Marx's 1844 Manuscripts (the "Paris Manuscripts") and the *Grundrisse* (1857–58). For example, McLellan devotes only two pages to *The Holy Family* but twenty-four pages to the "Paris Manuscripts." His treatment of the *Grundrisse* is relatively less disproportionate in length, but more disproportionate in emphasis.

McLellan treats both the "Paris Manuscripts" and the *Grundrisse* like secular Dead Sea Scrolls on the basis of which we are obliged to reinterpret the entire corpus of scholarship on Marx. There is no question that they are important for a fuller understanding of the development of Marx's thought; but Marx did not die believing that the main outlines of his thought were not clear in his published writings and could only be explained by two of his writings that he never had any intention of publishing. But it is primarily in the sections of his book on the "Paris Manuscripts" and the *Grundrisse* that McLellan attempts to analyze rather than merely describe the content of Marx's thought. Concerning the *Grundrisse*, he writes, "there is in both thought and style a continuity with the 1844 Manuscripts most noticeable in the influence of Hegel on both writings" (p. 295). In this view, the *Grundrisse* is reputed to be "as 'Hegelian' as the '1844 Manuscripts'" (p. 304). To add to the absurdity, the notion of "the 'universal' individual" in the *Grundrisse* is said to be "at the center of his vision of utopia" (p. 300).

In his desire to establish a "continuity" in Marx's thought, McLellan is either unwilling or unable to analyze and determine the stages in the *development* of Marx's thought. The fact that Marx continued to recognize the heuristic influence of Hegel upon his thought does not mean that the *Grundrisse* is Hegelian in the same sense that the "Paris Manuscripts" are. It is not! McLellan fails to recognize that the "Theses on Feuerbach," written shortly after the "Paris Manuscripts," marked the beginning of an epistemological and ontological break away from the position Marx had arrived at in 1844, a break that was fully realized in the Feuerbach section of *The German Ideology*, written in 1845–46. Here Marx outlined the "materialist conception of history" that he later realized in *Capital*.

And it is in the Feuerbach section of *The German Ideology* that Marx outspokenly appropriated those elements of positivism that were so essential for what he called the "science of history." According to McLellan, "Towards the end of his life Marx moved nearer to the positivism then so fashionable in intellectual circles. This tendency, begun in *Anti-Dühring* and continued by Engels in his *Ludwig Feuerbach and Dialectics of Nature*, reached its apogee in Soviet textbooks on dialectical materialism. It was this trend which presented Marxism as a philosophical world-view or *Weltanschauung* consisting of objective laws and particularly laws of the dialectical movement of matter taken in a metaphysical sense as the

basic constituent of reality" (p. 423). This statement betrays a basic misunderstanding of the relation between Marxism and positivism. It was precisely the obscuring (although not the abandoning) of the "scientific" view, particularly in Engels's last books, that allowed Soviet ideologists to reduce the fundamental Marxist theory of historical materialism to an appendage of the philosophy of dialectical materialism. Soviet Marxism could not tolerate a science of society and history such as Marx had formulated and advanced throughout his life.

Also indicative of McLellan's innocence regarding the major outlines of Marx's thought is his complete disregard of the significance of Marx's discovery of the "Asiatic mode of production" in 1853. He writes: "In Marx's view, Asia had no history of its own. The reason for this lay in a mode of production different to that of the West" (p. 289). Given the enormous importance of Marx's views on Asia and other areas of the Third World, to say nothing of the world-wide debate on the "Asiatic mode of production" that has been in progress since 1962, this omission in a contemporary study of Marx's life and thought is almost inconceivable. The same is true of his offhand and totally misleading comments on Marx's views on Russia. The only remark he has to make about Marx's most important analysis of Russian society, *The Secret History of the Eighteenth Century*, is, "His almost pathological hatred of Russia led him to his bizarre view of Palmerston as a tool of Russian diplomacy" (p. 288). Other examples could be mentioned, such as McLellan's innocuous treatment of Marx's relation to Lewis Henry Morgan, to suggest that although McLellan is cognizant of the new documentation and literature on Marx's thought, he does not know what to do with it. And if Marx's intellectual life remains a conundrum in McLellan's book, his personal and political life must remain of only incidental interest to the "general reader."

G. L. ULMEN  
New York

MARX'S THEORY OF EXCHANGE, ALIENATION AND CRISIS. By Paul Craig Roberts and Matthew A. Stephenson. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1973. xi, 127 pp. \$5.50.

In view of the enormous volume of literature which Marx has inspired in the last hundred years, one would be a little surprised if there were anything new to say about him. Nevertheless, the authors of this concise and elegant little essay have pointed out certain consistencies in the Marxian writings which at least have not been so well expounded before, and present a picture of Marxian thought which is more consistent, though perhaps less agreeable, than certain commonly received interpretations. Their main thesis is that Marx's basic attack is on exchange as a social organizer, not merely on private property, that his denunciations of capitalism come from his deep hatred of exchange as a social relationship and the recognition that capitalism, of all forms of social organization, rests on free exchange as a determinant of the survival of organizations, the division of labor, and the structure of output. He hates exchange, because it destroys the "convivial" relationship and the emphasis on production for use. The commodity, because it participates in exchange, is in Marx's eyes an abstract monster eating up human life and use values. Marx therefore visualizes socialism as the return to a nonexploitative form of pre-exchange society rather like the feudal manor, but with the state as lord, in