

administration appears purposive, rational, and reasonably well-coordinated in contrast to the "intrigues and enmities that riddled the leadership of the Third Reich" (p. 245). In the Third Reich the assessment of public opinion generally resulted in self-deception, while in the USSR the leadership is more likely to obtain a realistic image. Soviet politics is the politics of productive work, while National-Socialist politics was politics as a staged show. Many other differences are made clear in the book: the most glaring difference between the NSDAP and the CPSU is, perhaps, the care with which the NSDAP refrained from encompassing business and industry in its organization. Significant differences in the composition of the membership are also noted, although much more could have been added, especially concerning the differences between rank-and-file members and party professionals. Unger himself points out that rank-and-file membership in the NSDAP was encouraged for its demonstration effect, while in the CPSU it entails genuine leadership functions. The list of significant differences could be lengthened at will.

As a result, this book should be welcomed for the rich information it provides to readers unfamiliar with the German and Russian sources; but, as a contribution to the theory of one-party systems, it fails.

ALFRED G. MEYER  
*University of Michigan*

YEARBOOK ON INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST AFFAIRS, 1974. Edited by *Richard F. Staar*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1974. xix, 648 pp. \$25.00.

A colleague of mine thinks that to undertake any review demonstrates a lack of professional good judgment. He may be right. Certainly a single scholar who undertakes to review a *Yearbook on International Communist Affairs* reveals hopeless pretension, unsound judgment, or very limited objectives. My plan is to place this review squarely in the latter category.

The review concerns itself with only two questions: how does this volume of the *YICA* succeed as a yearbook, and what uses does the 1974 edition have for Communist studies? With respect to the second question, my competence to judge the scholarly quality of the individual pieces which make up the *YICA* is limited to essays on the Soviet Union, with some additional, although uneven, interest in and competence to judge the chapters on East and West Europe.

The scope of the *YICA* requires the above disclaimers. It devotes approximately 100 of its 648 pages to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, another 100 pages to Western Europe, and then includes sections on the Middle East and Africa, the Americas, Asia and the Pacific, and finally, a section on International Communist Front Organizations. Within these geographical divisions, individual countries are described according to a general, but apparently flexible pattern—some history, data on the composition of individual Communist parties and their elites, and description of the basic developments in domestic and foreign policies. It is apparent that the editor (Richard Staar) and the publisher (the Hoover Institution Press of Stanford University) have permitted the individual authors considerable latitude of style and judgment within this general framework, and this sensible decision also explains the principal virtue of the *YICA*—that it appears at all, that it has done so through eight successive editions, and that it appears soon enough to be of use to students of Communist affairs with an interest in contemporary developments.

The appearance of this volume covering the calendar year 1973 during the following year is an achievement of no small significance. It might well be argued that this brisk schedule of publication is the ultimate justification for the whole enterprise, for the utility of pulling together descriptions of contemporary events depends on wedging these essays chronologically between the cycle of analysis that appears in journals and the schedule of publication for book length studies.

In the judgment of this reviewer, the effort also provides an important service to scholars in the field. One of the irreducible dilemmas facing any scholar dealing with contemporary affairs is the problem of scope. What we lack in access to definitive archival material must be compensated for, in part, by extensive search for corroborating or negating evidence. For example, evaluation of Soviet foreign policy toward Western Europe could be facilitated by the collection of this data on Asian, Middle Eastern, Latin American, and African parties into easily accessible form. It will not settle the debate in the West over the meaning of *détente* in Soviet policy, but participants in that debate have in the *YICA* a convenient means for subjecting their conclusions to the additional test of comparison with the activities of such pro-Soviet parties as the Chilean Communist Party and the Brazilian Communist Party. Those activities reveal the effects of Soviet foreign policy under very different conditions and are described in efficient essays by William E. Ratliff and Rollie E. Poppino, respectively. Thus, the *YICA* provides a convenient tool by which scholars working on Communist affairs may enrich their own work through reference to the experiences of Communist parties outside their individual competences.

This scholarly utility of the *YICA* combines with the standard uses of such materials in teaching. It is an obvious starting place for any student trying to write on the policies of Communist parties under the press of academic deadlines. These two uses of the *YICA* make it an essential reference work for every library supporting academic work on Communist or international affairs.

This recommendation does not imply that the 1974 *YICA* is without shortcomings. There are the inevitable problems of multiple authorship. Individual essays vary both in quality and in length, although the latter variance is not always explicable by any obvious standard. Singapore is allocated eight pages, and North Vietnam nine, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea six pages and Nepal nine, the Australian Communist Party commands ten pages and Cambodia seven—this in 1973! One suspects that editorial guidelines get stretched in the wrong places, or that the editor could find authors with more to say on ruling parties and on those parties which operate in situations of potentially serious consequences to the international environment.

Readers who have more concern than this reviewer for the "political complexion" of the Hoover Institution will find some evidence of bias. But the fault, if it is one, is reasonably straightforward and can be determined by an examination of the list of authors. It does not, in the opinion of the reviewer, vitiate the data presented, rather, it probably affects more its selection and its various emphases.

One more substantive objection might be raised to *YICA*. It is difficult to understand the inclusion of thirty-five pages on "international communist front organizations" and the exclusion of any systematic treatment of Communist interstate relations, such as the Warsaw Pact and Council of Mutual Economic Assistance. The possible explanation—that the focus of the *YICA* is on party as opposed to state affairs—fails for two reasons. First, the content of every article on ruling

parties belies such a distinction. And, second, the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact, and meetings of Pact foreign ministers in particular, have come to be primary means of adjusting interparty policies. It seems likely, therefore, that this exclusion derives from conceptions of the Warsaw Pact and Comecon which predate the substantial Soviet efforts to infuse those organs with more substantive policy content after 1969, and the editors would be well advised to reconsider the decision to exclude them.

Finally, given these reservations, the quality of individual articles is solid in areas where this reviewer is competent to judge. The combined efforts of R. Judson Mitchell and Robert H. Donaldson on the Soviet Union provide an intelligent guide to domestic and foreign policies. The use of central primary sources is especially noticeable and welcome, although economic policy and performance have been slighted, and treatment of dissidents might be thought relatively disproportionate by any "objective" standard of their weight in the society (but certainly that treatment is not disproportionate by standards of American interest in the subject). This essay, together with Stephen Uhalley's on China, Robert King's on Rumania, James Morrison's on Poland, Bennett Kovrig's on Hungary, and Eric Waldman's on the German Democratic Republic are the richest in detail among those examined by the reviewer. Essays by James F. Brown on Bulgaria and Zdenek L. Suda on Czechoslovakia are disappointingly thin. The essays by Milorad Popov, Eric Waldman, and D. L. Price, on the Communist parties of France, West Germany, and Great Britain respectively, all constitute useful guides to those parties' activities, but reveal one further qualification to the overall evaluation of the *YICA*. Especially in countries like these last three, where the Communists constitute a very small minority of the population and are, therefore, responsive to political conditions rather than important initiators of political developments, one would hope for more contextual description. The British Communist Party was clearly caught up in labor unrest far beyond its influence, and the German and French parties also cannot be understood without more description of the economic contexts within which they were operating. Nevertheless, these are good essays, and the decision to focus narrowly on party developments is clearly an editorial one.

All in all, the *Yearbook on International Communist Affairs, 1974* constitutes a valuable research and teaching aid. Its shortcomings are largely the product of necessary choices affecting its scope, and the strength of individual essays is often admirable.

LAWRENCE T. CALDWELL  
*Occidental College*

CONTEMPORARY SOVIET LAW: ESSAYS IN HONOR OF JOHN N. HAZARD. Edited by *Donald D. Barry, William E. Butler, and George Ginsburgs*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974. xxvi, 242 pp. Photographs. 52.50 Dglds., paper.

This Festschrift consists of ten essays authored by leading Western scholars in Soviet law. While all are well-researched, they vary in significance. Most intriguing to this reader is the opening entry, entitled "Vignettes of Law Student Life in Moscow 1934–1937," which is a series of previously unpublished letters written by John Hazard during his student days at the Moscow Law Institute on Herzen Street. The letters vividly depict the Institute and its environs, and cover a wide