structure, reason and administration, and knowledge and ideology. In some applications of interpretive social science, the lost project defined is the recovery of a maturing individual intellect that may engage history with self-reflection and knowledge.

In less general terms, Part II offers interesting selections that demonstrate "Interpretations". C. Geertz on "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight" proceeds through "thick description" to multiple levels of meaning and social structure in an astonishing interpretive discourse in anthropology and sociology. M. Taussig writes on the culture of terror in relation to systems of meanings that become orders of torture and death, demonstrating the constitution of irrational social relations. Other studies confront the moral dilemma of conventional sexist analysis at the intersection of feminism and social science (M. Rosaldo) and the inter-subjective base of human relations "management" which turns out to be less management than social cognition (D. Schon). In an interesting and provocative refutation of artificial intelligence and the computerized decision of making of expert systems, H. Dreyfus and S. Dreyfus present convincing evidence on the limits of calculative rationality, suggesting the necessity for understanding tangible practices in the study of expert performance.

In one of the concluding selections, F. Jameson presents an overview on contemporary society with a discourse on postmodernism. For Jameson, the break-up of the modern project, resulting in fragmentation and heterogeneity, provides the basis for his interpretation of postmodernism and the political ideologies of theory. R. Bellah's essay, "The Quest for the Self: Individualism, Morality, and Politics", reflects on rampant consumerism as a kind of hidden cultural assault on the individual in mass society that may find solution in civic relations and religious (spiritual) renewal. Overall, while there are no final answers, paradigm constructions, or theoretical "takeoffs", this collection of high-level, intelligent, and knowledgeable interpretations demonstrates quite well the efforts to construct, in the words of the editors, "a more adequate understanding of the world so as to keep open the possibilities of public discussion guided by practical reason".
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The world socialist system is now experiencing a period of radical changes in all aspects of life. In some countries the changes came slower (Czechoslovakia, Romania), but some socialist countries have been on the path of reform for a long time (Hungary, Poland). Trends towards democratization in economic and social life always existed in these Soviet-type economies, but a wave of radical reforms including reforms in political structures developed to full strength only after the Soviet Union had started to implement its own version of reforms, or perestroika.

The future of all Soviet-type economies is reflected to some extent in the Hungarian model. No doubt processes of restructuring would be different in each country, but all of them began restructuring their economies in a way that resembles the Hungarian model. For instance, the 1979-82 wave of reform, especially institutional reform, was duplicated in the Soviet Union in 1982-89.
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The current condition of the Hungarian model is viewed as a logical consequence of the chain of reforms between 1950-1980. The Hungarian government proceeded from efforts to introduce certain market elements (profit, price) into the administrative model of economic structures which can be called "self-regulating economic systems." It should be stressed that all the radical reforms were preceded by a revolutionary socio-economic idea: the causes of dysfunction were not assumed to be "subjective" or lie outside the system, but to be attributable to the planned economy itself. However, it would be more exact to say "administratively commanded economy" rather than "planned economy."

The first wave of reforms was launched in 1968 under the name of the New Economic Mechanism (NEM). The NEM was influenced by and coincided in time with the economic reforms of 1964-70 in the USSR. But Hungarian reforms were more progressive when compared to those in the Soviet Union. In this country "indirect instruments of control" began appearing only in the latter years of perestroika. Richet points out precisely that the NEM was not a success because the economic structures did not match political ones. Economic democratization of a society can be viewed only as a result of political democratization. This principle point concerning negative results of implanting the NEM onto the conservative socio-economic background is absolutely right, but it should be noted that Hungary is quite restricted in natural resources. For instance, given the same NEM, the USSR would have had an enormous potential for its development before it would have been forced to restructure its economy once again in order to come to a market economy.

The reforms of 1979-82 had approximately the same result as monopolistic structures in industry which are the original cause of a distorted structure of prices. In its turn, elimination of monopolistic economic structures depends upon the existence of political pluralism in social life. At the time this book was completed, the future of political pluralism in Hungary was still vague. But after September and October, 1989, the answer to the question, "Will Kadarism survive Kadar?" set by the author in the first chapter is perfectly clear.

It is to Richet's credit that he gives a classification of centralized socialist systems. His useful description provides a reader with clear understanding of the core of a socialist economy, although the forms of Soviet-type economies may be quite different. Another contribution of this research is the concept of a transition period which inevitably takes place when the old centralized system has already broken down but the new market economy is not yet in place. The characteristic feature of this period is co-existence of some elements of market economy and instrument of a centralized planning system. The concept of a transition period may help forecast the natural development of events in Soviet-type economies; that seems indicated by the current developments of economic in Eastern Europe and the USSR.

It is interesting that the author states that "the way in which socialism directly descends from capitalism is obvious" (p. 26). It should be noted that in Lenin's opinion, socialism inherits from capitalism only the forms of organization of productive forces (cartels, monopolies—i.e., centralized forms), but the nature of the whole socialist economic base is quite different because of an absence of exploitation. In this respect, socialism is a new historical economic and social system. But it turned out not to be that in socialist countries: surplus value which was formerly taken by capitalists now is taken by the state. In this case, feedback between the separate worker or work collective and the state is quite limited and sometimes there is none of it at all (Romania). It is clear that a worker may affect an employer through a number of