

of Soviet influence. Nor is it certain that "in the future Soviet policy will illustrate a greater degree of caution towards the Arab world" (p. 84). Is the Soviet Union really worried about Arab internal friction, as the author intimates (p. 100)?

WALTER LAQUEUR

Institute of Contemporary History and Wiener Library, London

SOVIET POLICY IN WEST AFRICA. By *Robert Legvold*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970. xii, 372 pp. \$13.00.

This study by Dr. Legvold, in contrast to the earlier Western studies on Soviet involvement in Africa, is intensive and comparative. It thoroughly analyzes the evolution and shifts in the USSR's relations with six West African states—Ghana, Guinea, the Ivory Coast, Mali, Nigeria, and Senegal between 1957 and 1968. During the first contact with independent Africa, according to Legvold, it was "an African nation's foreign policy, not internal development" which determined the Soviet attitude toward the country. The author points out the initial unfounded Soviet optimism about their opportunities in such "radical" states as Guinea, Ghana, and Mali. However, he notes that it was Guinea's independence and not Ghana's that "marked a turning point in Soviet relations with Black Africa."

The resultant failures in the USSR's policies in the Congo and Guinea and the movement toward a "broader African unity" among the "radical" Casablanca and the "moderate" Monrovia group of states caused a shift in the Soviet Union's policy, and it began to develop "businesslike" relations with "moderate" African states such as Senegal and Nigeria. Simultaneously, certain Soviet theorists, especially Khrushchev, began to reappraise less critically such ideological concepts as African socialism and pan-Africanism. The author notes that the Sino-Soviet competition influenced these changes in Soviet policy.

Legvold skillfully discusses the additional shifts in Soviet policy following the ouster of Khrushchev from power and after the overthrow of friendly leaders like Nkrumah and Keita. Soviet policy-makers became disillusioned with the "African revolutionary democrats," and broadened their relations with "moderate" African states such as the Ivory Coast, Nigeria, and Upper Volta. However, this reviewer has serious reservations about the impression created (pp. 325, 327, and 329) that Western powers were "neutral" in contrast to the USSR during the Nigerian Civil War. Other minor mistakes include disjointed sentences (p. 316) and a typographical error (p. 320).

In summation, the organization of the book is very good, and judicious use has been made of various Soviet, African, and Western source materials. The book deserves a wide circulation in public libraries, embassies, and among students and teachers. But it seems doubtful that Soviet authorities will permit their citizens (other than a few officials) to read this well-researched and interesting volume.

BEN C. ODUM

Eastern Washington State College

COMMUNIST PARTY-STATES: COMPARATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES. Edited by *Jan F. Triska*. Indianapolis and New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969. xxxv, 392 pp. \$9.00.

In recent years, attempts have been made by specialists in Soviet and Communist systems to break with the tradition of so-called area studies and to integrate the

study of Soviet and Communist systems into what is called the mainstream of contemporary social science. Professor Jan Triska has been among the pioneers in this notable effort to break the barriers that have developed between the study of Communist political systems and political systems in general, and this collection of articles by his colleagues and graduate students at Stanford University makes a commendable forward step in that direction.

The principal contribution of this work lies not so much in the substantive results of the authors' efforts—which are, by and large, neither novel nor breathtaking, and correspond in great measure to conclusions and observations made by other scholars using other methods—but rather in the attempt to open up new avenues to the study of Communist systems. In the process they have produced a splendid book that eloquently demonstrates the possibilities and yet implicitly concedes the limitations of the quantitative and behavioral methods they employ. They have prudently used whatever evidence was available, examined it from a variety of perspectives, and supplemented it with shrewd observations and sound judgments in an imaginative way. The overall result is a heuristic exercise in innovative application of research methods and a valuable reference book profusely endowed with documentation, descriptive data, and confirmatory analysis.

The principal theme of the work is integration and interaction among Communist states, which is also the central motif of at least six of the thirteen contributions. The use of quantitative methods to measure the degree of integration and interaction in the Communist world serves simultaneously to demonstrate both the possibilities and limitations of this approach. The book is literally immersed in quantitative data, laboriously compiled, meticulously assembled in tables and graphs, skillfully reconceptualized into mathematical models and equations, processed through computers, rotated, vectored, and even drawn and quartered, all with skill and imagination. Yet it fails to establish any causal, or even definitive, positive correlative relationship (beyond what we already know) between the data and integration. What we have instead is an avalanche of detail and minutiae which confirm "propositions" that hardly required confirmation: Yugoslavia is not completely within the system, Cuba has drawn closer to the Communist states and the Soviet Union since 1961, some Afro-Asian states have established patterns of intimate relations with the Communist countries, state relations are progressively rivaling party relations, and so forth.

Although the quality of the contributions is not even throughout, every chapter, without exception, achieves high standards of scholarship and creditable levels of excellence. While it is not possible in a short review to evaluate in detail the merits or deficiencies of each contribution in a symposium of this character, those by Jan Triska, David Finley, Bruce Sievers, Ole Holsti, Richard Brody, and John Vesecky deserve special acknowledgment.

The special hazards of using quantitative methods include not only the rapid obsolescence of the data but often the even more rapid obsolescence of the concepts formulated and the propositions verified, particularly when fast-changing political phenomena are subjected to analysis. Behavioral research tends to assume a static quality, because it must periodically stop the motion picture that is political life in order to examine carefully the individual frames. The book under review, whose contributions were written between 1963 and 1967, serves to demonstrate not only the inexorable obsolescence of statistical data but also the fragility of conceptualizations based upon them and the premature character of "verified" hypotheses.

This is painfully evident in the contribution by Dennis Pirages on the relation-

ship between socioeconomic development and the responsiveness of Communist elites to popular demands and pressures. In an otherwise interesting essay in which he applies certain concepts of Karl Deutsch, Lipset, Easton, Daniel Lerner, and others about elite behavior, Pirages examines the behavior of the Czech elite during a period just before the advent of the Dubček revolution, and on the basis of this analysis concludes that the Czech leadership was among the most coercively nonresponsive in Eastern Europe, along with that of East Germany. Neither conclusion was a novel discovery when the essay was written, but then miraculously and unexpectedly Novotný was displaced by Dubček, and lo and behold the Czech elite became the most responsive in the Communist world. On the basis of the evidence he had available, however (Dubček, the invisible variable, had not yet surfaced), Pirages concluded that "the empirical data indicate that the first hypothesis [i.e., "the more developed party-states should be characterized by greater citizen access to political elites and greater elite responsiveness to citizen demands" (p. 259)] . . . must be rejected for the communist system. Contrary to expectation [based on earlier studies of different systems], the party-state elites in the most socioeconomically developed countries [i.e., Czechoslovakia and East Germany] have not developed less coercive and more responsive relations with their citizens at a faster pace than the less developed countries." At this point one might ruefully ask, "Will the real Czech political elite please rise?"

This is not intended to be a criticism of Pirages as a prophet but merely to demonstrate that premature "proof" or "disproof" of a hypothesis may create false expectations and can influence and shape the direction of research and the asking of new questions, and therefore needlessly shut down old horizons in the process of creating new ones. One must wonder what Pirages's conclusion might have been if he had conducted and completed his research between fall 1967 and August 1, 1968. Would Dubček's advent have been registered as a confirmation of the hypothesis?

Among the hard questions this book raises anew, most of which cannot be explored here, are the following: (1) To what extent does the efficacy of quantitative and behavioral methods depend upon the existence of relatively stable political and ideological parameters that can allow the development of regularities and uniformities sufficient to draw definitive generalizations and conclusions? (2) To what extent are the concepts and analytical constructs of contemporary comparative politics and political science essentially generalizations based upon regularities and uniformities drawn from Western democratic and pluralistic experience? (3) To what extent, then, is contemporary comparative politics essentially a "Western area studies" methodology, euphemistically disguised as "science"? And can its methods be any more valid in their applicability to Communist systems than those of Sovietology when applied to Western systems?

VERNON V. ASPATURIAN
The Pennsylvania State University

COMMUNIST EDUCATION: ITS HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY AND POLITICS. By *Wasył Shimoniak*. Chicago, New York, San Francisco: Rand McNally, 1970. xxi, 506 pp.

The author's aim is not to analyze the process of narrow indoctrination in Communist ideology, as might be expected from the title, but rather "to present important communist educational policies and practices and to analyze their role in social change"