

In addition to listing a significant number of books which do not appear in Jones's work, Nerwood's book is more useful in that it does not restrict itself to works devoted entirely to the USSR but includes relevant chapters from books covering a broader geographical area.

Not comprehensive, yet nonselective, the usefulness of this bibliography remains limited. Given the compiler's failure to provide a statement of intent, this reviewer finds it difficult to be critical, for it is not clear what Mr. Jones tried to accomplish and for what audience the bibliography was written. By restricting himself to books, Mr. Jones has placed a somewhat artificial limitation on his criteria for inclusion. One wishes that the compiler had chosen, instead, to restrict the number of disciplines selected for inclusion and had covered each more thoroughly. Had Mr. Jones examined such standard bibliographies in the field as Paul Horecky's *Russia and the Soviet Union* (1966) and Philip Grierson's *Books on Soviet Russia 1917-1942* (1943) he would have come upon citations to a significant number of important books which are missing from his own work and a methodology and approach from which he could have learned a great deal.

ANNA K. STULIGLOWA  
Cornell University

COMPARATIVE COMMUNISM: THE SOVIET, CHINESE, AND YUGOSLAV MODELS. Edited by Gary K. Bertsch and Thomas W. Ganschow. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1976. xi, 463 pp. \$12.95, cloth. \$6.95, paper.

The big expansion over the last decade in the comparative study of Communist countries, and especially their political systems, has not yet yielded major analytical works commensurate with the promise of the pioneering studies of Eastern European politics by Brzezinski (*The Soviet Bloc: Unity and Conflict*, 1960) and Skilling (*The Governments of Communist East Europe*, 1966). In the present volume, Professors Bertsch and Ganschow set themselves the more modest task of assembling a set of relevant readings intended primarily for undergraduate study. These are arranged in nine sections covering the ideological and cultural background, historical development, the political system, the economy, and foreign relations. Each section (except the first) contains a reading on each of the three countries concerned, preceded by a five or six-page introduction and followed by a book list of about twenty-five items. The readings are taken from published books and articles and include no primary material. Thus, the first section on Marxism and Leninism comprises contributions by Peter H. Vigor and Theodore von Laue, although the editors advise students to "peruse . . . the writings of Marx, Lenin, Mao, Tito, and other Communist ideologues." In a concluding chapter Bertsch and Ganschow review the readings in the light of their understanding of Marxism.

The selection of readings is quite a good one for the compilers' purposes, though Marxists and radicals would not be happy with it. One obvious criticism is that the readings on different countries tend to diverge in the problems addressed and the level of analysis, thus hindering comparison. This defect is inherent in the nature of the exercise, however, and is rarely overcome even in symposia of commissioned papers. My chief disappointment with the selection is the lack of "hard" descriptive readings on structures and processes, which leaves the discussions of such specialized topics as leadership politics and economic performance without adequate factual underpinning. The authors' own highly compressed comments contain much good sense, but there are some misleading oversimplifications. In discussing the literature on political processes, for example, they set up a false dichotomy between adherents of a totalitarian

model "devoid of conflict" and of a "pluralist model" allowing for interest-group conflict. They then urge that "a more meaningful explanatory and descriptive model may be that of 'monism,' meaning that although many competing institutions and interests are involved, the Communist party is the dominant one." This, however, is consistent with most serious studies of Communist politics, including the classical "totalitarian" accounts of Fainsod and Schapiro, *except* that few would see the Communist Party as a single cohesive participant in the political process.

Used in conjunction with suitable primary sources and systematic structural analysis, the volume will serve well in courses on "comparative communism."

T. H. RIGBY

*Australian National University*

SOVIET POLICY TOWARDS PAKISTAN AND BANGLADESH. By J. P. Jain. New Delhi: Radiant Publishers, 1974. viii, 258 pp. Rs. 50. \$11.50.

FOUNDATIONS OF INDO-SOVIET RELATIONS: A STUDY OF NON-OFFICIAL ATTITUDES AND CONTACTS, 1917-1947. By Nirmala Joshi. Foreword by Y. B. Chavan. New Delhi: Radiant Publishers, 1975. xiv, 204 pp. Rs. 30.

The emergence of the Soviet Union as the major foreign power in the Indian subcontinent is a phenomenon of major importance. Two relatively neglected aspects of this subject are explored in J. P. Jain's *Soviet Policy Towards Pakistan and Bangladesh* and Nirmala Joshi's *The Foundations of Indo-Soviet Relations*. Although Jain states at the outset that his book concerns the "foreign policy objectives of the Soviet Union," it is rather a chronological survey of Soviet relations with Pakistan and Bangladesh, with much more attention focused on the factors shaping Pakistan's foreign policy. In part this may be attributed to the author's limited access to Russian-language sources, which are used either in translation or indirectly cited from other works. Consequently, relevant Soviet scholarly writings on Kashmir and Pakistani nationality problems (particularly Iu. V. Gankovskii's *Natsional'nyi vopros i natsional'noe dvizhenie v Pakistane*, Moscow, 1967, which was reportedly banned in Pakistan) are not examined. Nor does the author discuss I. M. Kompantsev's *Pakistan i Sovetskii Soiuz* (Moscow, 1970), a major study of the evolution of Soviet-Pakistani relations.

Jain, who is a former Indian diplomat, does, however, make good use of United Nations documents. He shows, for example, that the Soviet U.N. vetoes on India's behalf regarding the Kashmir issue were designed to prevent the stationing of United Nations forces there, and were not intended to obstruct a negotiated settlement of the dispute by the parties directly involved. Moscow viewed the plan to station U.N. forces in Kashmir as an indirect method of establishing a Western presence in an area of great strategic significance to the USSR.

In the broad perspective of the postwar era, Jain argues that Moscow has consistently sought to establish good relations with Pakistan, whose proximity to Soviet borders cannot be ignored. Soviet support for India during the December 1971 war was motivated by the circumstances surrounding the Bangladesh crisis and in view of present relations, represented only a temporary aberration from Moscow's policy. Subscribing to the widely accepted interpretation that Soviet relations with Pakistan have been mainly influenced negatively by Pakistan's alliance with the United States in the 1950s and positively by Moscow's efforts to offset Chinese influence in the 1960s, the author also reaffirms the view that the USSR is seeking to preserve stability based on the status quo in the Indian subcontinent, because this policy enables