

DIE KOMMUNISTISCHE ANERKENNUNGSLEHRE: DIE ANERKENNUNG VON STAATEN IN DER OSTEUROPAISCHEN VÖLKERRECHTSTHEORIE. By *Dietrich Frenzke*. Abhandlungen des Bundesinstituts für ostwissenschaftliche und internationale Studien, vol. 26. Cologne: Verlag Wissenschaft und Politik, 1972. 382 pp. DM 42.

It is not uncommon for Western observers of Eastern Europe in their oversimplifications of intellectual and institutional patterns under Communist regimes to end up in the curious and doubtless unintended position of fostering notions of uniformity that those regimes would like the outside world to accept. Whether this error stems from a too easy acceptance of official postures or from insufficient examination of varied evidence from the East European states, the irony is not lessened by the fact that the mistake is often perpetrated precisely by those Western observers most anxious to discredit the claims of the Communist regimes.

Apparently international law is no exception to this pattern of fallacy, for a significant part of Frenzke's motivation for undertaking his detailed study of East European approaches to recognition was the Western supposition that they constitute a unified conceptual and theoretical picture. He notes that certain East Central European issues in particular, such as the division of Germany, have stimulated a vigorous debate about the meaning of recognition in the West, but that little attention has been paid to corresponding discussion in Eastern Europe, the result being an unwitting assumption of ideological uniformity when in fact the range of disagreement may be as wide in the East as it is in the West.

Treating his subject according to the conventional legal subheadings of diplomatic recognition, the author scrutinizes a large body of international legal literature (notably the studies of D. I. Feldman in the USSR, V. Paul in Czechoslovakia, K. Nágý in Hungary, and J. Symonides in Poland) to establish through comparison that there is no unanimity among Soviet and East European legal scholars about the nature of or bases for the recognition of states. Although much of the book is quite technical, it contains material of interest and importance to many kinds of students of East European affairs, not the least of its contributions being a bibliography rich in citations from Soviet and other East European legal sources.

And some of Frenzke's conclusions are of more general import. Not only does he show the inadequacy of Western knowledge of East European legal scholarship, he also demonstrates the inappropriateness of Communist claims to the effect that "bourgeois" disputation over recognition represents an imperialist instrument for intervention in the affairs of other states, inasmuch as the same level of disagreement prevails in the socialist states. He further shows that, apart from the conspicuous but essentially cosmetic presence of Marxian terminology, there is no distinctive theory of the recognition of states derived from and coherent with Marxian theory in general or even with Marxist-Leninist ideology. On the contrary, and to no one's great surprise I would suppose, the differences in East European concepts of recognition tend to match up roughly with the status and interests of the individual states, the contrast being sharpest perhaps between Soviet and Yugoslav viewpoints.

LYMAN H. LECTERS
University of Washington