

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-

lems of East-West relations. As the political détente progressed, the East-West juridical debate took form in that Western-sponsored pragmatic, empirical, problem-oriented, step-by-step approach that gave birth, in time, to such basic East-West international law accords as the Moscow Test Ban Treaty of 1963, the Space Treaty of 1967, and the latest nuclear nonproliferation draft treaty.

Bernard A. Ramundo is a lieutenant-colonel in the United States Army who has served with the Directorate of Foreign Military Rights Affairs in the U.S. Department of Defense, and is now a member of the Law Faculty of George Washington University. Dr. Ramundo is not a legal philosopher, and so he is rather less effective in dealing with the more speculative, philosophical aspects of the concept of peaceful coexistence than he is with its institutional and instrumental legal manifestations. In a world in which scientific observers of the Soviet legal scene tend, perhaps too easily, to be categorized as either "optimists" or "pessimists," Ramundo clearly falls into the second group and may therefore give a little more emphasis to the essentially negative or purely self-serving aspects of this special Soviet doctrine than to the areas where, as it has turned out, the doctrine has offered concrete and useful opportunities for being taken up and utilized by the West in accordance with strictly Western assessments of Western policy interests. This degree of emphasis in Dr. Ramundo's work is not, however, unpleasant or distorting, and he never in any way approaches the fiery polemics that have occasionally marred some of the lesser Soviet bloc juridical writings in the same field.

If it does not break too much new ground in surveying Soviet legal literature, Ramundo's book is at least thorough and comprehensive in the range of Soviet institutional practice covered, and it thus provides a valuable compendium of Soviet law-in-action in a still important field of applied international law.

EDWARD MCWHINNEY  
McGill University

BETWEEN HAMMER AND SICKLE. By *Arie L. Eliav*. Updated edition. New York: New American Library, 1969. 237 pp. \$1.25, paper.

The Soviet Jewish question has been the subject of several serious monographs, but a detailed analytic overview of the subject is still lacking. The lacuna is partially filled by this work by Arie L. Eliav, who served for three years as first secretary of the Israeli Embassy in Moscow. Although largely impressionistic in character, it provides invaluable insights into the deprivations suffered by the Soviet Jewish community in the ethnic-cultural, religious, and civil rights fields.

Eliav is a keen observer who has traveled widely throughout the Soviet Union and met with a great variety of Jews in all walks of public life. His two chapters on Jewish "types" and on the rarely visited Jewish communities of Lithuania, Georgia, Dagestan, Central Asia, and Birobidzhan are especially perceptive.

*Between Hammer and Sickle* highlights the extraordinary contradiction in Soviet policy: on the one hand, the authorities attempt to obliterate any sense of Jewish self-identity by depriving Jewry of the minimal communal and educational institutions which other ethnic groups have at their disposal; on the other hand, the government insists on maintaining Jewish nationality identity in the required internal passport. To the extent that such identification becomes a powerful means for discriminatory practices, whether in admission to universities or in appointment to administrative and party posts, the result can only be to increase Jewish con-