

sions of key figures: for example, Fidel Castro represents Latin America to the exclusion of Luis Carlos Prestes, Vittorio Codovilla, and others with whom the Latin American Communist movement has been identified. But this merely calls attention to the need for a more complete biographical dictionary. The twenty-five contributors to the volume have generally treated their subjects with appropriate sympathetic detachment. A notable exception is the biography of Gus Hall, which reveals little about him or communism in the United States.

BERNARD S. MORRIS  
Indiana University

THE GRUNDRISSE. By *Karl Marx*. Edited and translated by *David McLellan*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971. ix, 156 pp. \$5.95.

Marx's *Grundrisse* was written in 1857–58 while he was also preparing the *Critique of Political Economy* (1859). The introduction to the *Grundrisse* appeared in N. I. Stone's translation of the *Critique of Political Economy* in 1904, but the text as a whole was not published until 1939–41 in Moscow. The 1953 East German edition contains over a thousand large pages. About forty pages of this were translated by Jack Cohen and published with an introduction by E. J. Hobsbawm in 1964, with the title *Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations*. It is rumored that more than one translator is now working on the whole volume.

David McLellan, the author of a number of books on the early development of Marx's thought, has now dipped more extensively into the *Grundrisse* and brought out a volume of translated extracts with an introduction. He wisely refrains from including passages already translated by Cohen, interesting and important as they are, but endeavors to give English readers a glimpse of Marx's economic-ethical views as a whole. The main thesis of McLellan's introduction is that the *Grundrisse* is "the centrepiece of Marx's thought." The extracts reproduced, especially number 8, show that the theory of alienation given under the influence of Hegel's *Phenomenology* in the *Paris Manuscripts* of 1844, was, with an additional impulse from Hegel's *Logic*, vital to Marx's analysis in 1857–58 and indeed in *Das Kapital* as well. It follows that those who, like Althusser, think that Marx's early ethical criticism of capitalism was replaced by a radically different "scientific" criticism are mistaken. The text of the *Grundrisse* fully substantiates this. McLellan, however, does not in this book try to interpret what Marx says or to discuss his views, and perhaps it is this lack of philosophical content which leads him to exaggerate the novelty of his conclusions. It was in 1947, probably without help from the *Grundrisse*, that Jean Hyppolite wrote: "To recognize the influence of Hegel's *Logic*, it is enough to read *Das Kapital*."

H. B. ACTON  
University of Edinburgh

CAPITALISM AND MODERN SOCIAL THEORY: AN ANALYSIS OF THE WRITINGS OF MARX, DURKHEIM AND MAX WEBER. By *Anthony Giddens*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1971. xvii, 261 pp. \$11.00.

In their varying ways the writings of Marx, Weber, and Durkheim have a common characteristic; they "fuse together an analysis and a moral critique of modern

society." Giddens strives to bring out the common and divergent points of this analysis and critique, particularly the conception of the evolution of human society and an interpretation of the social differentiation which this evolution entails. The comparative discussion is organized around the questions of rationality in history, interplay of ideology and social infrastructure, and interaction of man and society.

Like Marx, Weber admits the significance of class conflicts in history but rejects the interpretation of its development as a rational scheme involving "ultimate ends." Durkheim recognizes a definite overall pattern in the "stages" of the development of society, but he rejects the significance of "revolutionary dynamism" and stresses instead the decisive role of cumulative change. From these diverging positions, "idea-systems" and the interplay of ideology and social life appear to Marx as uniquely determined by the economic infrastructure, to Weber as "irrational" in terms of connections between, say, the pre-existing social order and the innovations of "charismatic" leaderships, and to Durkheim as determined by an infrastructural set different from the one suggested by Marx. At this point the book's comparative approach loses substantially in momentum as the views involved grow increasingly divergent. But the discussion picks up again in interest as attention is drawn toward a critique of modern society.

Marx's concept of "alienation" and Durkheim's "anomie" are presented as the key elements of their respective analyses of the "crisis" of society and of the modes of solving it. For Marx, the answer lies in the *dissolution* of the division of labor which capitalism entails; contrariwise, for Durkheim, the answer lies in the moral *integration* of the worker in the society's collective endeavors. Durkheim suggests that the worker's "dehumanization" (i.e., his "anomic" position) arises from his lack of understanding of the "organic solidarity" which binds him to society's productive efforts. Once such "moral awareness" is instilled, the problem disappears. In contrast to both Marx and Durkheim, Weber stresses that what determines alienation is the institutional context in which bureaucratic specialization develops—whether under capitalism or socialism, the fragmentation of the soul is unavoidable, the "Faustian universal man" is irremediably condemned, and the "specialists without spirit, sensualists without heart" are bound to replace him.

The complex ramifications of these interesting comparisons are unfortunately treated too summarily in the last third of the book. The first two-thirds, devoted to separate studies of the three authors considered, labors strenuously over a terrain already well plowed.

NICOLAS SPULBER  
Indiana University

HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN NON-MARXIAN SOCIAL-ECONOMIC  
THOUGHT. By Boris Ischboldin. New Delhi: New Book Society of India,  
1971. 328 pp. \$7.00.

Before presenting their own viewpoints, Soviet economic historians must attack four groups of enemies: Russian "bourgeois" economic historians, Menshevik writers, "deviationists" of all stripes, and Soviet scholars who, inadvertently or not, offer "incorrect" and ideologically "distorted" explanations. Apparently these enemies share in the "cosmopolitan" belief that much of Russian economic thought was acquired from abroad through "borrowing and importation." This contention is dismissed as a "slandorous fabrication" by A. I. Pashkov, editor of an official *Istoriia*