importance of revolutions and popular rebellions as indicators of the extent to which capitalism was a transformation of feudalism instead of the realization of "a long-deferred opportunity" (p. 7).

Wood has two outstanding chapters which devastate the neocconservative arguments of J. C. Clark and Alan Macfarlane. Clark contends that Britain was noncapitalist until at least 1832, since it was ruled by an aristocracy; Macfarlane believes that England never had a peasantry and never was feudal, since land had always been privately held. Wood points out that the British aristocracy became capitalist in the seventeenth century, so that its rule was a sign of capitalist dominance in a way that the rule of a very different state-based French aristocracy was not. As for Macfarlane, Wood shows that his model ignores that, before the sixteenth century, cultivators "owned" tenancies on manors rather than land. The English Revolution and Civil War, no matter what the participants in those events thought they were about, had the effect of ratifying true ownership of land and thereby ensuring the proletarianization of a majority of English peasants. Thus, the English Revolution was modern and procapitalist in a way which the French Revolution, which was mainly about bourgeois access to state privileges, was not.

Wood's contrast of the two revolutions is enough to dispose of Clark and Macfarlane on one side and Naim and Anderson on the other. However, her essay does not identify the mechanism by which long-standing favorable conditions for capitalism became combined with other, unmentioned factors to produce a revolutionary transformation in Britain in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Wood's study is perhaps most valuable for the implications she draws from her argument for contemporary capitalist crises. If Britain was peculiarly capitalist rather than just peculiar, then the current tendencies in Britain (and, she adds, in the United States) are paradigmatic of capitalism. Left on their own, capitalists invest for profit, not to foster production. State intervention, as in Japan, may be necessary to extend productive investment. Limits on capitalists' economic freedoms more often have had a militaristic than democratic basis. Capitalism does not necessarily foster democracy, thus working-class mobilization is necessary if democracy is to extend into the workplace and other realms from which it has been excluded by capitalists. Wood's analysis allows us to recognize that such a project would be as revolutionary as was the transformation of feudalism into capitalism.


Dmitri N. Shalin
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The collapse of communism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe caught everybody by surprise, including experts in the West, who are being forced to take a fresh look at their theories and reassess the future possibilities. Why did the socialist systems disintegrate? Why so suddenly? Why now? What are the prospects for rebuilding a civil society and market economy in ex-communist countries? Constructing Capitalism is the latest addition to the growing body of literature that grapples with the changes in the communist world. The book grew from an International Political Economy Colloquium at the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, University of Washington. Among the contributors are well-known social scientists, such as Leszek Kolakowski, Janos Kornai, J. van Brabant, Kazimierz Poznanski, and others, who draw on the developments in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and to a lesser extent in Romania and the Soviet Union in an attempt to figure out the forces which brought down "the house that Stalin built."

An issue that engenders the liveliest controversy in this collection is the relative role that ideology and economics have played in recent developments. According to one view, laid down forcefully by Valerie Bunce, the internal logic of the Stalinist system spells its inevitable demise. Central planning runs afool of an industrial economy which Stalinism helped bring to Russia and Eastern Europe. As the Stalinist system grows increasingly complex, it creates new layers of
is necessary if democracy is to become the workplace and other institutions. His analysis allows us to see that a project would be as simple as the transformation of industrialism.


Lincoln, Las Vegas

Kazimierz Poznanski, who points out that economically inefficient regimes show no apparent tendency to self-destruct. Even extreme economic deprivations, such as unleashed by the forced collectivization in the Soviet Union, failed to cause popular uprisings. True, material hardships undermined the system's ideological underpinnings, but "an ideology of apathy and despair, designed to rob people of the will to resist" thwarted concerted action; rather, it is the gradual "erosion of Communism as a living faith" in the post-Stalinist era that made possible the sudden collapse of communist regimes (pp. 13-15). Searching for deeper roots of the current ideological crisis in the communist world, Kolakowski concludes that "the powerful need to be free is perhaps more than a contingent product of peculiar historical circumstances, that it is, so to say, anthropologically rooted, that it belongs to the permanent spiritual condition of humanity" (p. 19).

The debate about the primacy of ideological over economic factors in social evolution is, of course, an old one. Each mode of reasoning has its merit, each produced valuable research, and each stands to learn from its antithesis. The line separating ideology from economics is never hard and fast. This is particularly evident in the communist systems where ideology goes to the heart of economic decision making and economics serve to foster an ideological agenda. The debate under review does not settle the issue of economics over ideology, but it sets the problem in the present and suggests a fresh look at the interplay between the structural/economic and ideological/communicative underpinnings of social life.

A few other points raised in this slender, informative volume are likely to attract the attention of social scientists. Several authors make a forceful argument that transferring ownership rights to private owners does not guarantee a more efficient use of economic assets. An interim strategy for building markets is needed, one that focuses on the right of use first and settles the thornier issue of legal ownership later. Also, one finds in this collection an instructive discussion about the fate of civil society under communism and the problems that reformers are facing in their efforts to revitalize civic culture in postcommunist polities. Finally, the reader will benefit from the debate about the central, if not always benign, role that nationalism plays in the postcommunist world.

I would like to make one final remark about the volume. It is no secret that today's publishers are hesitant to take on edited collections from conferences, colloquia, and so on. Too often such undertakings lose money. Westview Press is among the handful of publishers willing to take on such risky projects and able to make them financially viable. I am not sure what the publisher's secret is, but good planning, strong editorial control, and the willingness of the participants to follow a common blueprint no doubt have something to do with it.


Richard Bensel
Department of Political Science
New School for Social Research

Sklar's United States as a Developing Country is a collection of seven essays written and, in some cases, published over the last thirty-five years. This collection follows his Corporate Reconstruction of American Capitalism and can be read, in part, as an expansion on the major themes in that book. Describing himself as a student of Frederick Jackson Turner, John Stuart Mill, and Karl Marx, Sklar also invites the reader to see this collection as (an apparently comprehensive) sampling of his scholarly work and, thus, to view these articles as illustrating the evolution of his thinking on these topics.

By development, Sklar means at least two things: linear change from one complex of class relations and modes of production to another and the programs and responsibilities to be attended to by government as nations undergo modernizing transitions (p. 19). In