

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.

Management of industry, defined by Granick to include all levels of the national managing apparatus, is analyzed in terms of managerial theory. Two assumptions form the backbone of Granick's managerial model for the CMEA countries (Rumania, East Germany, and Hungary). First, industry is "regarded as a single organization subject to common direction . . . National Communist Party and government decision makers, together with the planning committee and functional ministries as their staff support, and branch ministries as their line organs of command, can be compared to a corporate headquarters. Intermediate organizations—the *centrale* in Romania, the VVBS and *Kombinate* in East Germany, and the giant enterprises in Hungary—can be compared with divisional headquarters of a corporation; individual enterprises in Romania and the G.D.R., and factories in Hungary, can be compared with the field units of a capitalist firm" (pp. 10 and 11). Second, the managerial effectiveness of the industrial system at the level of individual branch ministries is measured by the ability to achieve objectives desired by the center. Thus, Granick's analysis "rests upon a distinction between the enterprise and the center" (p. 13) in the sense that "enterprise managers are economic men" (p. 13) who are not influenced by ideology or the public weal, while members of the center have a single-mindedness with respect to evaluation of enterprise performance (whether evaluation be objective or subjective).

Several questions immediately come to mind. Do CMEA industrial sectors actually reflect Granick's large corporate image? Granick himself notes that in "all four countries the amount of movement between the industrial hierarchy and Party or trade union bodies was negligible. Management appears to be a permanent career, rather than one interspersed with positions in the Party or trade union hierarchies" (p. 449). Another conclusion which Granick emphasizes is that "it is important to note the relative mildness of the pressures upon east European top managers to act in a fashion defined as successful by their superiors" (p. 465). Such evidence of stratification among management personnel and the absence of any clear institutional unity for the industrial sector as a whole make it difficult to understand why managers would perceive an industrial sector as a single organization with a common direction.

Is it beneficial to identify industry in each CMEA country as a large capitalist firm? The relative influence of political constraints and the relative clarity under which trade-offs are measured may differ significantly for the industry in a CMEA country versus a capitalist firm. Such significant differences might suggest a framework of analysis for CMEA countries which would focus more strongly on (1) competition for resources within the industrial sector itself, and (2) struggles for power between different functional and branch interests.

Because of the self-management ideology of Yugoslavia, Granick adopts an analytic framework which seems less controversial than the CMEA framework. In the Yugoslav case, the issue of autonomy in enterprise decision making and the issue of managerial subordination to representatives elected by employees both lead Granick to focus upon "the nature of the objective function of the individual enterprise, and the coordination of the enterprises through the market place" (p. 23).

Since limitations on space preclude even brief comment on the numerous well-reasoned hypotheses that Granick presents, a quick review of his most interesting conclusions must suffice. Granick argues that, although Rumania is considered a Soviet-type economy because of its highly centralized, mandatory planning system, the orthodox Soviet model does not explain the managerial behavior in Rumanian industrial *centrale* and enterprises. "Managerial bonuses are too low as a proportion of managerial income, changes in plans during the course of the year are too frequent, and original planning targets for production units are apparently insufficiently taut to lead to the sort of suboptimizing behavior which the orthodox model would lead us to predict" (p. 127).

With respect to East Germany, Granick again finds little use for the orthodox Soviet model. Instead, he indicates that a "satisficing" managerial approach allowed enterprise directors to fulfill plan targets and to use their resources to modernize through the development of new capital equipment products. In particular, he argues that "the East German central leadership seems to have been much more concerned with attaining such modernity than with achieving maximum rates of production growth" (p. 482).

The discussion of the Hungarian reform makes the Hungarian section the most intriguing. Granick's wide-ranging and well-written account is simply breathtaking. At times, however, his conclusions might be better considered as "reasonable but untested" hypotheses rather than proven facts. For example, in speaking of the abandonment of formal material allocations, Granick observes that: (1) stockpiling of raw materials, unfinished products, and semifabricates increased at a rate that was substantially faster than industrial output for 1968–70 (prereform stockpiling data were not available); and (2) although three of the four enterprises interviewed reported an improved maintenance situation in the 1968–70 period, the improvement "must be considered as divorced from the abolition of materials allocation" (p. 288). Then Granick goes on to conclude that "the prereform materials allocation system had in fact been a purposeless excrescence on the economy, whose removal had no apparent significance" (p. 288). Of course, disagreement over the tone of conclusions is a small price to pay for the insights yielded by, say, Granick's section on subsidies and taxes.

Eleven enterprises—nine of which are located in Slovenia—provided interview material for the Yugoslav case. Consequently, Granick admits that the book often represents a comparison of Slovenia, rather than all of Yugoslavia, with the three CMEA nations. Nevertheless, Granick is able to demonstrate that "distinctive self-management interests of the enterprise are solidly based in Yugoslav institutional reality" (p. 427) and that "the economy appears quite competitive" (p. 428).

Finally, Granick's book is mandatory reading for all who enjoy the penetrating persuasion of someone with clear vision.

MICHAEL MARRESE
Northwestern University

DEMOGRAPHIC DEVELOPMENTS IN EASTERN EUROPE. Edited by *Leszek A. Kosinski*. New York and London: Praeger Publishers, 1977. xx, 343 pp. Figures. Tables.

This is the last of the eight volumes from the 1974 Banff Conference published by Praeger, and it contains fourteen articles of considerable range and variety, grouped into the main areas of demographic data sources and availability, historical demography and the nature of the family, and finally several country studies. The editor, Leszek Kosinski, has contributed an excellent introduction, a chapter discussing sources of demographic statistics in East Central Europe, and a concluding study of postwar demographic trends in Poland. Barbara Anderson presents an inventory of Russian and Soviet demographic sources, principally the census and related surveys, divided by year of the survey, geographical coverage, and the character of the demographic information contained.

Peter Czap approaches Russian history from a demographic perspective and provides a rich and suggestive essay on unsettled questions in Russian and Soviet historical demography, suggesting grounds for literally dozens of dissertations. For both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and even earlier, there are a large number of political and economic events which depend on, or directly imply, demographic events, and, by pointing out many of these gaps, Czap delineates avenues fruitful demographic studies