

programs, and correspondence courses; problematic secondary education (pp. 64–79); and the time lag between the demands for new industrial techniques and the adaptation of curricula to meet those demands (p. 91).

This book does not, however, successfully bridge the gap between earlier works on tsarist education and recent studies on Soviet education. Moreover, one-third of the book consists of tables, lists, and charts that are not related adequately to the text. Some tables are mislabeled (pp. 7, 9, 65); others are given numbers that do not correspond to the text (pp. 159, 161, 185, 197, 201). The writing is broken up by long lists of governmental ministries, population data by republic, and nineteenth-century educators. In view of the author's own warnings regarding the pitfalls in comparing Soviet and U.S. statistics (pp. 158–63), the vast number of unintegrated charts, maps, and tables in the appendixes (pp. 181–224) may confuse those he is seeking to enlighten.

Kitty D. Weaver has undertaken the more limited task of explaining the nature of the Soviet system of nursery schools and kindergartens. Mrs. Weaver became interested in the Soviet preschool as a result of her firsthand observation of Lenin-grad toddlers in 1963. Subsequently she made three additional trips to the Soviet Union, visiting eleven of the Soviet republics and observing, by her own estimate, about two thousand children under seven years of age. The author is well versed in socialist pedagogical theory; she is as conversant with the theories of Krupskaja, A. S. Makarenko, and N. A. Vetlugina as she is with those of Maria Montessori, Jean Piaget, and Benjamin Spock. Mrs. Weaver has a good eye for significant detail. The book also contains forty-eight photographs, taken by her husband, which are skillfully integrated with the text.

Though Mrs. Weaver has no children of her own, she has, at sixty, a grandmotherly passion for the subject of her book. A self-admitted enthusiast (p. 22), she is sometimes carried away by her admiration for Russians and for the Soviet preschool system, and the book is somewhat repetitive on those points that deeply impressed her (for example, the good posture of all preschoolers and the orderly seating arrangements). Moreover, the book contains erroneous and awkward translations and numerous inconsistent transliterations. But these are minor annoyances for the reader to suffer in return for a lively account of how the Soviet preschool actually works.

WILLIAM L. MATHES
Seton Hall University

A RUSSIAN-CHINESE-ENGLISH GLOSSARY OF EDUCATION. Translated by C. T. Hu and Beatrice Beach. Publications of the Center for Education in Asia, Institute of International Studies, Teachers College, Columbia University. New York: Teachers College Press, 1970. x, 117 pp. \$6.95, cloth. \$4.50, paper.

C. T. Hu, director of the Center for Education in Asia at Columbia University, has reissued the *Glossary of Pedagogical Terms in Russian and Chinese* (Peking: People's Education Publishing House, 1955) with two significant additions: a glossary of English equivalents for the Chinese and Russian terms, and an introductory essay surveying Sino-Soviet collaboration in education in the early 1950s. Professor Hu's aim is to make readily available "a highly useful research tool" for the study of that phase of Chinese education. The value of his *Glossary* is based on

two assumptions: (1) the future of China will be shaped in large part by those Chinese who received their education when it was inspired by the Soviet model, and (2) normalization of relations between the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union is inevitable.

Hu's large claims for his *Glossary*, however, are compromised by major deficiencies in the organization and preparation of the book. The translations from Russian or Chinese into English are often inaccurate, incomplete, or painfully literal—as if they were done by a computer: for instance, we find “female graduate student” for *aspirantura* (graduate work), “geographic” for *geologicheskii* (geological), “democratic” for *demonstratsionnyi* (demonstration), “education” for *vospitatel'* (educator), and “educational studies” for *poseshcheniia zaniatii* (attendance)—to list only a few.

There are, moreover, few notes or comments on the pedagogical terms and institutions that have no exact equivalents in English. Also omitted is a bibliography on the subject. Although Hu's introduction does place the original *Glossary* in historical perspective, it skirts the crucial issue that the book raised—namely, what do these word lists tell us about the extent of Soviet influence on the Chinese educational system by 1955? Lacking a critical analysis and grouping of related terms and concepts, the present book remains a mere listing, in three columns, of raw, undifferentiated data. The next step would be to determine the principle of selection by which terms such as *detstvo*, *ideia*, and *priroda* become integral parts of a distinctive educational system.

In short, this book is a paradigm of a familiar academic “genre”—the nonbook which draws no conclusions because it asks no real questions.

ALBERT LEONG
University of Oregon

SOVIET WORKS ON SOUTHEAST ASIA: A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF NON-PERIODICAL LITERATURE, 1946–1965. By *Peter Berton* and *Alvin Z. Rubinstein*, with a contribution by *Anna Allott*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1967. 201 pp. \$4.50, paper.

The title of this work is misleading, for the book is more than a bibliography: nearly half is interpretive material on Soviet research and publishing on Southeast Asia. This material includes a twenty-two-page retrospective analysis of Soviet scholarship on Southeast Asia; a thirteen-page report entitled “Soviet Southeast Asian Studies, Language and Literature” by Anna Allott of the University of London School of Oriental and African Studies, based on her two-week visit to the Soviet Union in October 1966; and a thirty-page section on the categories of works excluded from the bibliography and the various aspects of Soviet publishing on Southeast Asia, such as translations and the relation between Soviet publishing and official Soviet attitudes toward Southeast Asia. Also provided are lists and descriptions of Soviet periodical publications on Asia and Africa, Soviet publishing houses that feature material on Asia, and general bibliographical tools. Accompanying the discussion are six tables which statistically support portions of the analysis.

The introduction presents an explanation of the scope and organization of the bibliography. It must be read, for it explains the more detailed coverage subsumed under the broad subject divisions, as well as the arrangement and content of the