

Grossman emphasizes certain moments in Kovner's life: the colorful but stifling religious education in Lithuanian *shtetels*; and the idolization of the radical critic Pisarev, whose ideology and style Kovner adopted and applied to the Jewish situation—Kovner became an atheist, materialist, and socialist, and from this position rejected the Jewish religious tradition as futile and escapist. Kovner was naturally condemned by Jews for apostasy and betrayal. In breaking with his past, however, Kovner did not join a Russian radical group. In this period of bitter reaction and persecution he chose, instead, to propagandize for equal rights for Jews. Grossman makes the strong claim that the letters this "Pisarev of the Jews" wrote to Rozanov over the years are among "the most important publicistic statements on the Jewish question in all of world literature." If so, it is unfortunate that the letters are not reproduced fully in this volume.

The book also contains an article by Grossman on "Dostoevskii and Judaism." (The verdict is complicated.) As to the book itself, explanatory notes are full and useful, although there is hardly anything on Grossman himself. The book is poorly edited, with many misspellings, some clumsy literal translations, and a few factual errors. Grossman is not alive; he died in 1965. Tsar Nicholas I died in 1855, not 1856. But these are minor points in a work of such great interest to students of Dostoevsky and Jewish culture.

NATHAN ROSEN
University of Rochester

THE INFLUENCE OF EAST EUROPE AND THE SOVIET WEST ON THE USSR. Edited by *Roman Ssporkuk*. Published in cooperation with the University of Michigan Center for Russian and East European Studies. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976. x, 260 pp. Tables. Figures. \$17.50.

The book consists of seven papers presented at a conference on the influence of Eastern European and Western areas of the USSR on Soviet society, held at the University of Michigan in 1970. The essays included are: "The Diffusion of Political Innovation: From East Europe to the Soviet Union" by Zvi Y. Gitelman, "East European Influence on Soviet Economic Thought and Reforms" by Leon Smolinski, "East Europe and Soviet Social Science: A Case Study in Stimulus Diffusion" by Zygmunt Bauman, "Czechoslovak and Polish Influences on Soviet Literature" by Deming Brown, "The Role of the Baltic Republics in Soviet Society" by V. Stanley Vardys, "The Incorporation of Western Ukraine and Its Impact on Politics and Society in Soviet Ukraine" by Yaroslav Bilinsky, and "The Moldavian Soviet Republic in Soviet Domestic and Foreign Policy" by Stephen Fischer-Galati.

The problems on which the authors focus are both interesting and important, but the title of the volume is misleading in relation to the information found in the essays. What the volume proves beyond any doubt is that, in many borderland areas and satellite countries, things are done and problems are solved in a different way than in the Soviet Union itself. The implied assumption of the organizers of this symposium (and not necessarily of the participants) seems to be that ideas of innovation and reform in the Soviet Union will come from other socialist countries rather than from some third source. Without faulting the individual scholars involved—for all of them in their respective essays exhibit full control and mastery of their subjects—this assumption does not seem to be fully warranted. Nor does the implication that the Soviet system is capable of gradual innovation, or that it is capable of any meaningful innovation at all. The Soviet dissidents have disabused many of us from these Western images of the Soviet Union, but, as this volume

indicates, some others still cling to them. Only Bilinsky detects a clear pattern of influence flowing from the Western Ukraine, acquired by the Soviets during World War II, into the Ukraine at large. But even he circumscribes the influence and limits it to the dissident movement, not extending it to official policy-makers.

In spite of these criticisms, the book can be recommended to all who are interested in East Europe and the Soviet Union. Space does not permit me to analyze the individual essays, but I do want to note that I especially enjoyed the theoretical essay on diffusion of innovations by Gitelman and the essays by Vardys and Fischer-Galati, for they brought forth information about the Soviet West, an area still largely unexplored by American scholars.

ANDREW EZERGAILIS
Ithaca College

THE INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL OF MICHAŁ KALECKI: A STUDY IN ECONOMIC THEORY AND POLICY. By *George R. Feiwel*. Foreword by *Lawrence R. Klein*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1975. xxii, 583 pp. \$22.50.

Michał Kalecki was the Continental, socialist Keynes. Embodied, so to speak, in his intellectual capital were Tugan-Baranovsky, Rosa Luxemburg, engineering, and the statistical description of the Polish economy. From Tugan he seems to have acquired a sensitivity to both the process of economic change and the role of organization in economic change; from Luxemburg he may have obtained a notion not unlike the Keynesian multiplier, combined with a theory of limited effective demand as a fundamental inhibitor of capitalist growth; from his engineering studies, a strong interest in mathematics and the preference for a succinct and logically coherent analytic approach; and from his more pragmatic work, a predilection for quantitative as opposed to qualitative analysis, combined with a recognition of the need to be *au courant* with available statistical descriptions of an economy as a prerequisite for analysis. This was a revolutionary combination, certainly for his time, and, embedded in a first-rate mind, it produced a revolutionary result. In 1933, three years before Keynes's *General Theory*, Kalecki published his *Proba teorii koniunktury*, which, along with two other papers, contains the basic analysis of Keynesian macroeconomics, but in a more coherent and, in some ways, more developed presentation than Keynes himself achieved.

Notably missing from the intellectual influences on Kalecki is the great Polish tradition, whose philosophers were instructing the world during the interwar period. Partly, this reflects Kalecki's more pragmatic education, but mostly it reflects another side of his character. Kalecki was a poor boy, who had to work at an early age and whose identification throughout his life was with society's impoverished majority. This orientation is reflected strongly in the substance of his work, if not in its form. Kalecki was strongly influenced by Marx but here, too, it was the spirit of Marxism more than the trappings which appealed to him. Unlike Keynes, his concern in developing a theory of business fluctuations was neither to save capitalism nor to bury it, but, rather, to find a way to ease the burden on that impoverished majority. He seems to have preserved a genuinely open mind as to whether capitalism or socialism could do this job, and though he never seems to have been very optimistic that capitalism *would* do it, his theory and appraisals did not exclude the possibility. His defense of Communist Poland, to which he