

but I do not think that the author intended the book to be mainly a contribution to specialized literature. It is valuable as a *general* overview of this important subject. Its chief virtue is that it gives the *broad* lines of development of Soviet foreign policy. Further research on specific aspects must be promoted for a more detailed understanding of this important field.

TROND GILBERG  
*Pennsylvania State University*

WAR BETWEEN RUSSIA AND CHINA. By *Harrison E. Salisbury*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1969. 224 pp. \$4.95.

THE NEW RUSSIAN TRAGEDY. By *Anatole Shub*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1969. 128 pp. \$4.50.

RUSSIA: HOPES AND FEARS. By *Alexander Werth*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1969. 352 pp. \$6.95.

MESSAGE FROM MOSCOW. By *An Observer*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969. 288 pp. \$5.95.

A post-Khrushchevian Russia characterized by an increased repression of its educated elite, timid indecisiveness in matters of economic reform, and an uncertain aggressiveness in foreign affairs is the subject of these four firsthand accounts by foreign observers.

Salisbury's *War Between Russia and China* differs from the other three books in its concentration on Sino-Soviet relations rather than Soviet society itself. Although the book can be recommended as a useful general introduction to the topic, it suffers from serious oversimplifications. The account of the centuries-old national hatreds between Russians and Chinese is useful if exaggerated, but the suggestion that this deep-seated rivalry is inevitably escalating toward a military denouement underestimates the role that political leadership plays in deciding questions of war and peace. Nor would the author's description of China's dilemma, in view of its overpopulation and food shortage, as that of "fight or starve" appear to conceptualize adequately the range of alternatives open to Peking.

But while one may legitimately quarrel with Salisbury's journalistic penchant for using the technique of exaggeration to emphasize his points, the book is to be welcomed for the main themes it justifiably stresses: that nuclear war between the Communist giants could be disastrous not only for the participants but for the rest of the world as well, and that the United States should earnestly seek to establish some influence with Peking in an effort to avert such a conflict.

*The New Russian Tragedy* is a collection in book form of a series of newspaper articles written by Anatole Shub (son of Lenin biographer David Shub) immediately after his expulsion as *Washington Post* correspondent from Moscow in the spring of 1969. Shub's Russia is a composite of three exceedingly hostile worlds: that of the embattled foreign correspondent, hounded by the KGB and restricted to foreign compounds; that of the increasingly persecuted and martyred dissident intelligentsia—the Larisa Daniels and Andrei Amalriks—among whom Shub established some close friendships; and that of the Kremlin. Although this side of Russia needs to be reported, it is simply not correct to suggest that the same characteristics occur in all aspects of life in the Soviet Union. In Shub's book one gets no inkling that there are millions of Soviet citizens, including some

well-educated ones, who feel no fear of the regime and are intensely patriotic and immensely proud of the accomplishments of the past fifty years.

A completely different perspective is provided by the veteran journalist Alexander Werth, who died in Paris soon after completing *Russia: Hopes and Fears*. Werth writes in glowing terms about most aspects of Soviet society, regarding the extensive censorship of the arts as the only real blemish in an otherwise well-governed country. Based primarily on the author's visit to the Soviet Union during the jubilee year of 1967, the book was in press under the title *Russia at Peace* when the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia occurred. This event caused Werth to change the title and to add an epilogue in which, while roundly condemning the invasion, he reaffirmed his view that hopes for Russia's future were as justified as fears.

The book as a whole is unsatisfactory, partly because it was composed in the pre-Czechoslovakian era, partly because the author had little contact with students and younger members of the intelligentsia, and partly because his commitment and perspective tended to affect his observations. Werth's intellectual and emotional ties to Soviet Russia (as well as most of his lasting friendships among the intelligentsia) were seemingly forged during the war years—years when the Russian people suffered unimaginable hardships, some brought on by the evils of Stalinism but most imposed on them from without, and yet managed to surmount them courageously. It is from this perspective of the early forties, which he recorded so masterfully in *Russia at War*, that Werth views the Russia of the sixties. Yet such a perspective is becoming less relevant, and blinds him to many of the current pressing problems, which Salisbury, Shub, and "Observer" have described with greater depth and perception.

In *Message from Moscow*, an anonymous Western student has written the most penetrating book of its genre that this reviewer has seen. Wisely eschewing the misleading practice of presenting selected facts or statistics to demonstrate the great accomplishments (Werth) or great failures (Shub) of the Soviet economy, "Observer" concentrates on the delicate task of portraying the "mood" of the nation in the wake of the Czech invasion. The result is of necessity impressionistic, but is based on an unusually long (three-year) sojourn, and a wide range of acquaintances and friendships with Russians from all walks of life.

What gives the book its special distinction is the author's ability to show the Russian winter and traditional Russian backwardness as forces which affect attitudes, mores, and behavior much more powerfully than the incessant stream of propagandistic exhortations and official attempts at regimentation. "Observer" sees little chance that the protesting intellectuals will make much impact on Soviet development, for he regards them, like their nineteenth-century predecessors, as completely alienated from the overwhelming majority of the population. Although believing that the "neo-Stalinist" tide (which he is careful to distinguish from the mass terror of Stalin himself) may recede before long, he joins Shub in opposition to writers like Werth, who see grounds for real hope for the future. For "Observer," consolation can come only from the fact that, as he writes while describing a skiing trip in the unspoiled Russian countryside, the joys of life in Moscow are often as intense as the sorrows.

JAMES C. McCLELLAND  
Stanford University