concrete into abstract labor, his market-free economy is impossible; that if in Marx’s at-
tacks upon defenders of classless exchange economies his moral arguments are unravel-
led from his economic arguments, the latter imply that socialist economies with competi-
tive markets alone make complex classless societies viable.

Marx was not unaware of the ideological dissonance into which he had been carried
by his materialist conception of history, his commitment to communism, and his ongo-
ing rivalry with socialist adversaries. As early as 1848, Moore suggests, Marx dimly per-
ceived the feasibility of a socialist alternative to communism. In the Communist Manifes-
to he not only sketched a classless exchange economy as transitional to communism, though
a year earlier in The Poverty of Philosophy he had assailed Bray for such a proposal, but
he abandoned his original plan to include a section on communism. Since Marx remained
wedded to communism, the tension flowing from his inability to show its compatibility
with historical materialism remained. Presented with several opportunities to clarify his
views on post-capitalist economies in response to criticisms of the 1870s, Marx preferred
to evade his critics, scoffingly to dismiss or simply to misrepresent them.

Moore’s thesis that communism had become a goal which Marx was “unwilling to
abandon but unable to defend” is meticulously and adroitly argued. But while it focuses
exclusively upon Marx’s writings, it is no idle exercise in textual criticism. Its current im-
lications are far-reaching. The assertion that socialism is but a transitional (and in some
sense unstable) stage en route to a higher form of communal life provides dogmatic sanc-
tion in communist governed societies for a whole repertory of repressive attitudes and
practices. To argue that Marx’s historical materialism provides no warrant for the neces-
sity of an ultimate communist stage is to strike directly at the root of this dogma. It is
similarly to lend support to those in Eastern Europe—one thinks of Yugoslavia’s Branko
Horvat, Poland’s Jacek Kuron and Karol Modzelewski, Czechoslovakia’s Ota Sik, and
others—who have directly or indirectly questioned Marx’s views on post-capitalist eco-
nomic organization in their advocacy of a socialism more vigorous and responsive than the
bureaucratized, statized Soviet economy and those modelled on it. But from neither the
revisionists nor their opponents has a sustained critical assessment appeared of Marx’s
claims that a “higher” stage of communism would succeed a “lower” stage of socialism.
In seeking to remedy this deficiency, Moore offers not only a careful piece of scholarship,
but a contribution to an ideological arsenal.

Marx once declared his favorite motto to be De omnibus dubitandum (Bekentnisse).Moore presents a strong case that regarding the superiority and inevitability of commu-
nism, Marx chose to ignore the dictum that everything should be doubted. To those com-
mitted to defending both Marx’s communism and his scientific socialism, Moore has
posed a challenge which cannot be ignored. The responses are sure to come.

Wayne Westergard-Thorpe
University of British Columbia

Antal Matyas. History of Modern Non-Marxian Economics. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó,

A frequently employed genre in socialist economics is the “history of bourgeois eco-
nomics.” Rather similar treatments of this topic have appeared in a number of East Eu-
ropean publication lists. There will be a discussion of the law of value, pointing out the
subjective nature of bourgeois thinking on this subject and its role both as an apology for
capitalism and as a defense against Marxism. There will be a discussion of Keynesianism,
emphasizing Keynes’ interest in preserving capitalism from its own anarchy and the rise
of the organized proletariat. And there may be some discussion in a similar vein of vari-
os other aspects of Western theory. The polemical level is high, the analytical level low,
and reading them can become just a little boring.
Despite its title, the book under review bears no resemblance to the above. There is some appraisal of non-Marxian economic theory from a Marxist perspective, but this is often interesting and occupies only a tiny portion of the book. The main body of the book is devoted to a systematic, competent, and lucid survey of twentieth-century Western economic theory, with each section ending with a survey of Western criticism of the relevant theory. To my knowledge this is the best survey available in English of a most important topic.

This is not a formal history of economic theory; the aim is rather to provide the reader with a good knowledge of modern theory, using the development of the ideas more as a teaching vehicle than as the subject of historical investigation. As the author says in the preface, "He singles out from the teachings of earlier authors only those elements which are also present in a modern form in non-Marxian literature." (p. 11) The story begins, to be sure, with the rise of the subjective theory of value in the third quarter of the nineteenth century and a presentation of Jevons' theory more or less in its original form. But he quickly moves on to Marshall, to nineteenth- and early twentieth-century general equilibrium theory, and to marginal productivity. From this point on, that is, after about the first sixth of the book, discussion centers almost wholly around post-World War I economic theory, with contemporary insertions here and there, particularly in the appraisal sections. There is an extended survey of major topics in price theory and in macroeconomics, including monetary theory, Keynes' short run theory and selected post-Keynesian developments, and modern growth theory. These are all carried out at an extremely high level of competence, and are well organized and easy to follow. Less successful are sections dealing with market forms, where the treatment is substantially restricted to monopoly and monopolistic competition, and discussions of "the time factor" in economics (the cobweb theorem and a short account of the disequilibrium approach), aggregate production functions (where the basic properties of Cobb-Douglas and CES functions are laid out), the German historical school and one or two of its successors, and recent controversies over the theory of inflation.

Matyas devotes a fair amount of attention to criticisms of the received tradition in theory; indeed these are among the most interesting sections of the book. The appraisal of marginal productivity theory, the discussion of issues relating to the measurement of capital (discussed first in connection with Samuelson's factor-price frontier and later in the context of malleability and embodiment characterizations of capital in growth theory), and the criticism of theories of the firm are all both searching and constructive. Matyas is perhaps as close to a "Man from Mars" as economic theory is likely to find: his situation seems to have made him both detached from the heat of contemporary controversy and able to take seriously the genuine achievements of this body of thought. Though he does not pursue theory into the more esoteric realms that have flourished in recent years, particularly in general equilibrium theory, nor even pursue the rapidly developing literature on the economics of information uncertainty and incentives, his perspective is thoroughly modern. In fact I believe the work would make an excellent text for a first-year graduate theory course in many economics departments, including my own.

The temptation is irresistible to speculate on the motivation behind the book and its function in the curriculum at Karl-Marx University (the author describes the work as a revised version of such a textbook). I suspect that, under the guise of "know thine enemy," it is serving the function there that I have just recommended for it here. By the time a student has mastered this work he or she will not just have a good knowledge of what Western economic theory is, but also a sophisticated appreciation of the ways in which the theory serves as a tool of policy analysis, and even as a vehicle for broader social-economic interpretation. The student could not help but contrast both the technical sophistication and the quite detailed articulation of this body of thought with the thin-