

language, the author's innovative compilation provides a useful service which teachers and students should appreciate.

ALLEN S. WHITING  
*University of Michigan*

YEARBOOK ON INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST AFFAIRS, 1968. Edited by *Richard V. Allen*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1969. xvii, 1,165 pp. \$25.00.

This volume of the *Yearbook*, covering the calendar year 1967, merits the accolades conferred on the first volume published in 1967 (covering 1966) under the editorship of Dr. Milorad M. Drachkovitch. The format has been somewhat revised, presumably in the interests of standardization, and in spite of certain deletions the 1968 yearbook runs to four hundred pages more than the pilot volume. The introductory essay, an analysis of the activities of the international Communist movement, which appeared in the first volume, has been dropped. The useful sections on the Fourth International and on biographies of prominent Communists have been omitted, perhaps because they do not warrant annual updating. Profiles of the individual Communist parties, now arranged alphabetically rather than geographically, constitute the largest section (roughly seven hundred pages). For those who are not familiar with the yearbook, the profiles furnish statistical data, information on party organization, program, and personalities, a review of activities, international alignments, competing Communist groups, and more. Additional sections are devoted to international Communist front organizations, international Communist conferences and events, almost three hundred pages of documents, a chronology, a bibliography of books published during the year, and an index, now in two parts, of persons and subjects.

The yearbook, a rich resource for data on communism, invites comparison with *World Strength of the Communist Party Organizations*, an annual report of more limited scope. Published for over two decades by the Department of State—and perhaps an inspiration for the yearbook—*World Strength* was initially conceived as an “in-house” text on Communist parliamentary and party strength. It received favorable notice and was subsequently issued as a public document. A nuclear staff organized as the Committee on World Communism produced the report, drawing on the resources of Washington at large. Since the committee's charge was “in-depth” research on international communism, *World Strength* became in effect a statistical companion piece to more ambitious, analytical annual reviews of international communism. In addition, the committee published a serial journal and a wide range of ad hoc reports. Most of the output bore a security classification, which it has long outlived—if it ever warranted one. Scholars who are interested in research and analysis of international communism within the government, or in the general problem of the connection—or disjunction—between research and policy, or in early attempts at comparative analysis, would surely profit from a foray into these archives, if ever they are opened.

There are nagging problems with certain of the data presented in both *World Strength* and the yearbook. The reliability of membership data, for example, has always been in question, whether the figures are taken from party publications or estimated by the analyst. A more significant qualitative point is the question of what constitutes membership. I would suspect that the pattern ranges widely from token

or purely nominal membership on up. Distinction is also necessary between membership in ruling and nonruling parties (and in different geographic areas) where motivation and obligation differ. It is, in short, useful to have the statistics, but their significance is a matter of interpretation, as is the bulk of material compiled by the yearbook.

One problem that did not face the analyst until the 1960s was the constitution of the international Communist movement. The parties that belonged to the Comintern were the orthodox parties, and even after its dissolution there was no problem in identifying members of the "Stalinist international." Within the last decade, however, the scene has been confused by the appearance of Marxist-oriented guerrilla and "New Leftist" movements which also might be designated "Communist." The editors of the yearbook have coped with this development by treating as Communist parties only those that describe themselves as Marxist-Leninist and are so recognized by authoritative Communist publications, such as the *World Marxist Review*. This is not a bad solution for identification of "orthodox" Communist parties. What the editors do not face up to, however, is the concept of the "international Communist movement," which has undergone a major transformation since the days of the Comintern. What does this monumental compendium add up to in terms of communism as an international movement or an international "system"? The editors can plausibly claim that the question is outside the scope of their terms of reference. But a staff fully occupied with the compilation of this yearbook is in a unique position—and indeed, in my view, has the obligation—to provide an interpretation of the data, including an analysis of communism as an international movement in its time of troubles. This seems to have been the purpose of the introductory essay, inexplicably omitted from the 1968 yearbook.

BERNARD S. MORRIS  
*Indiana University*

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE: INTERNATIONAL LAW IN THE BUILDING OF COMMUNISM. By *Bernard A. Ramundo*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1967. Published in cooperation with the Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University. x, 262 pp. \$6.95.

Though Soviet authors prefer to ascribe the philosophic origins of the concept of "peaceful coexistence" to Lenin himself, the fact is that the term entered into popular currency as the leitmotiv of the Khrushchev-era Soviet foreign policy and of the consequent Soviet search for limited tactical accommodations on specific tension-issues of East-West relations and ultimately for some more general détente with the West. In its reformulation as a talking point for Soviet policy-makers in the Khrushchev era, "peaceful coexistence" was enunciated at such a high level of generality and abstraction as to seem to Western policy-makers to be something in the nature of a Trojan horse device for lulling Western suspicions while the Soviet Union proceeded, in another of Premier Khrushchev's colorful phrases, quietly to prepare to "bury the West." The give-and-take of Soviet-Western confrontation and debate in political arenas like the U.N. General Assembly and its Sixth (Legal) Committee, and in scientific legal bodies like the Institut de Droit International and professional groups like the International Law Association, tended to produce a much greater refinement of the concept and more concrete secondary principles that could be operationally useful in resolving specific prob-