

held in high esteem; but by December 1938 Kennan had repeatedly heard such comments as, "How was it possible that any people could allow itself to be led for twenty years by such a *Sauhund* . . . as Beneš" (p. 7).

The documentary collection begins with Kennan's own historical introduction and ends with an epilogue by Professor Frederick G. Heymann that analyzes and evaluates the historical significance of the material presented. Also included are a glossary, an index, and a few maps showing the areas affected by the Munich settlement. Several photographs of the dramatic entry of the German forces into Prague on March 15, 1939, convey the atmosphere of that tragic day, which was so much like the infamous August 21, 1968, when Soviet troops occupied the country. Kennan, by shedding light on "the dilemma of limited collaboration with evil, in the interest of its ultimate mitigation, as opposed to an uncompromising, heroic but suicidal resistance to it, at the expense of the ultimate weakening of the forces capable of acting against it," helps us understand and evaluate the moral problems of the Czechs and the Slovaks today in choosing between collaboration and resistance.

Kennan's firsthand account of the first great Czechoslovak tragedy that began in 1938 makes the work mandatory reading for those who want to go beyond superficial descriptions of events written by authors who do not have the keen mind of this former diplomat and observer of international events or his willingness and ability to see things as they are and report on them accordingly.

JOSEF KALVODA  
*Saint Joseph College, West Hartford, Conn.*

FIFTY YEARS OF COMMUNISM IN RUSSIA. Edited, with an introduction, by *Milorad M. Drachkovitch*. Hoover Institution Publication, no. 77. University Park and London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1968. xi, 316 pp. \$7.50.

THE COMINTERN: HISTORICAL HIGHLIGHTS: ESSAYS, RECOLLECTIONS, DOCUMENTS. Edited by *Milorad M. Drachkovitch* and *Branko Lazitch*. Hoover Institution Publication. New York and Washington: Frederick A. Praeger. London: Pall Mall Press, 1966. xv, 430 pp. \$10.00.

FIFTY YEARS OF COMMUNISM: THEORY AND PRACTICE, 1917-1967. By *G. F. Hudson*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968. vii, 234 pp. \$5.95.

THE SOVIET UNION: A HALF-CENTURY OF COMMUNISM. Edited by *Kurt London*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1968. Published in cooperation with the Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, The George Washington University. xiv, 493 pp. \$12.00, cloth. \$2.95, paper.

RUSSIA 1917-1964: A HISTORY OF MODERN RUSSIA FROM THE 1917 REVOLUTION TO THE FALL OF KHRUSHCHEV. By *J. N. Westwood*. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1966. 208 pp. \$4.95.

Disappointment with totalitarian models for the study of Marxian socialist states is expanding in North America as authors introduce studies in "pluralism." European scholars, in contrast, still prefer to center their analyses on Russia's long history, spotted with revolutions and terror, to explain the current situation. The volumes under review, prepared in anticipation of the fiftieth anniversary of 1917,

typify the contrasting approaches. Although there are Americans like Bertram D. Wolfe, who figures in two of the books, and Europeans like Leonard Schapiro who depart from the general patterns to blur the distinctions, the volumes present considerable proof that the contrast is not overdrawn.

Westwood's historical study, tending to explain the contemporary USSR in terms of Russia's turbulent past, and Hudson's more journalistic analysis of the USSR and China in terms of the history of revolutionary ideas fit the picture, although Hudson is influenced by the psychopathological explanation of Stalinism. So also are the Europeans writing in the Comintern volume. In contrast, the Kurt London volume, with its concentration on North American authors, provides an example of the new trend with an elite study (Dan C. Jacobs), an interest-group study (H. Gordon Skilling), and an input-output analysis (Frederick C. Barghoorn).

Schapiro presents the surprise, departing in the Drachkovitch volume from his previous emphasis upon totalitarianism to give a hearing to the pluralists and rejecting his once-favored "paranoid" theory, to which he still adhered in considerable measure even when he presented orally the report from which his written contribution has been developed.

Westwood and Hudson will disappoint many North American scholars: Westwood because he tries to reach a schoolboy audience and is therefore too abbreviated, and Hudson because he is writing for a Sunday-supplement mentality. For example, Hudson gives the impression that he was in the torture chamber with Nikolaev, Kirov's assassin, in 1934 by declaring, "Nikolayev was completely recalcitrant and showed that he was fully aware that the revolver had been given him on the instructions of the secret police" (p. 119). Such dramatization without support even of a reference to a conversation with a refugee prison guard cannot but sap confidence in other revelations. Westwood's schoolboy treatment of the same event is laconic, for to him the assassination was "almost certainly with Stalin's connivance, and the key witness was killed in a staged car accident before he could be interrogated" (p. 98).

In contrast, Jacobs deals with complexity, arguing with ample documentation that the Politburo has varied greatly in function and influence over the years, depriving oversimplifiers of their often quoted cliché that "in Russia the real power is in the Politburo." Jacobs accepts the new pluralistic approach so thoroughly that he finds the Politburo now to be a "mediator of interests," retaining the power of decision but having narrow alternatives open to it, usually quite unacceptable "in the light of traditional Bolshevik values and behavioral patterns" (p. 59).

Skilling, well known for his pluralistic studies, produces a satisfying analysis suggesting that interest groups have emerged even though they are not formally organized. He sees little reason to exclude the possibility that group conflict exists in the highest level of party and state structures. Schapiro has at last acknowledged that the ruling elite in formulating policy "takes some account of the opinion of certain groups of experts," although he finds such influence "a very long way from the action of pressure groups or interest groups in our democratic societies" (p. 72).

"Convergence" has been on many lips of recent years, and some authors explore this possibility. Schapiro thinks it cannot be expected in spite of apparent similarities because of quite different premises: "the all-embracing state [of the Soviet Union] *doling out* liberties" and the Western state "increasingly *taking away* liberties" (p. 73). Sidney Hook, in closing the Drachkovitch volume, likewise

finds a divisive issue between Marxian socialist and traditional societies, namely morality, not economic or religious approaches. The issue is whether citizens may choose freely and change when they wish the economic arrangements under which they are to live.

The impact of polycentrism in communism attracts attention. The Comintern volume quite rightly indicates the centralized direction of the Communist center in Moscow during the effort to win China in the 1920s and even Yugoslavia in 1941. Drachkovitch finds the Yugoslav Communists of that time "a small but tightly knit group led by professional revolutionaries fanatically devoted to the Soviet Union and trained to implement Comintern directives" (p. 184). Branko Lazitch's account of the execution of foreign Communists during Stalin's purge in the USSR embellishes what is known of Stalin's conception of the loyalty he demanded.

The current potentialities of polycentrism as it emerged under Khrushchev are assessed for their impact on Soviet thought and on outside leftists. Ivo J. Lederer, in the Drachkovitch volume, concludes that the split between some parties is so great that "it would be foolhardy to forecast recovery and reunion" (p. 194). He expects the Soviet leadership to interpret every event today in terms of its security and not to press outward in the expansion of a doctrinal area regardless of its potential. Robert C. Tucker, in the London volume, finds that lack of Soviet pressure and centralized control of world communism will not necessarily end expansion of the concept. To him "prospects of communist revolution are not necessarily harmed by division in the communist world" (p. 37), since independence of Moscow may compel parties to stand on their own feet and thus acquire new strength.

The two fiftieth-anniversary symposium volumes provide good reading and much food for thought. They can be heartily recommended. The other three deserve less attention, although for the public for whom they were written, they may have attraction.

JOHN N. HAZARD  
*Columbia University*

CONTEMPORARY SOVIET GOVERNMENT. By *L. G. Churchward*. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Co., 1968. xxi, 366 pp. \$6.95.

POLITICAL POWER IN THE SOVIET UNION: A STUDY OF DECISION-MAKING IN STALINGRAD. By *Philip D. Stewart*. Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1968. xvii, 227 pp. \$3.95, paper.

Aside from the general area of Soviet politics these two books have little in common. Churchward's work deals with the Soviet system as a whole; Stewart's confines its attention to politics at the oblast level. Both authors claim to apply the methods of modern political science. Churchward does not really do so. Stewart is much more persistent in this respect, although the effort is not entirely successful. Indeed, methodological characteristics are perhaps the most striking features of the two books.

Churchward is a Marxist (of the Leninist persuasion). His approach to his subject promised to be rather refreshing to this reviewer. Rejecting the traditional modes of criticism of the Soviet system "from an alien standpoint of Western liberalism" (p. xvii), he proposed to analyze Soviet practice strictly in terms of Soviet political and social theory. Unfortunately, his treatment of this theory is so