

ment of it. The author exhibits the same careful research and often brilliant analysis as in the first study, and gains the same reward, the satisfaction of shedding new light on the past. The case is especially interesting in that Indonesia, unlike Egypt, had a large and strong Communist party whose revolutionary possibilities were ignored by Khrushchev, and this at a time before the PKI had so clearly lined up with the Chinese. Both studies are most helpful in increasing our knowledge of what really happened at this time of a major shift in Soviet policy toward the third world.

JOHN C. CAMPBELL
Council on Foreign Relations

SURVEY OF THE SINO-SOVIET DISPUTE: A COMMENTARY AND EXTRACTS FROM THE RECENT POLEMICS, 1963–1967. By *John Gittings*. London, New York, and Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1968. Issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. xxix, 410 pp. \$11.75.

This book is different from all other documentary collections on the extensive Sino-Soviet polemic in its organization of extracts according to significant subject matter. Instead of compiling editorials and official statements chronologically, Mr. Gittings has carefully culled the extensive Russian and Chinese materials for 1963–67, grouping explicit references under thirty categories, such as “The Korean War,” “The Sino-Indian Border Dispute, 1959,” “The Sino-Soviet Border, 1962–4,” and “Nuclear Weapons and Defense, 1958–9.” Because these documents as issued contained a hodgepodge of current and retrospective charges and counter-charges, this reordering is particularly helpful for quick reference and will be of use to the undergraduate reader and paper writer.

Gittings prefaces each grouping with a cogent analysis of the larger relevance of the excerpts, integrating where possible more recent Russian and Chinese materials. He wisely eschews assessing the merits of particular accusations or the reliability of alleged revelations, maintaining careful objectivity throughout. Especially valuable is his twenty-seven page introduction, which offers a genuinely fresh overview of Sino-Soviet relations with particular emphasis on elements of strain manifest between the two parties prior to 1949. Here as elsewhere in the volume Gittings proves himself no less a scholar through his illuminating research among original sources than the more established experts in Sino-Soviet affairs to whom he pays homage in his helpful footnotes. Moreover, his British perspective makes possible a thoughtful critique of fallacies and assumptions underlying American policy in this earlier period.

An appendix contains another twenty “major historical documents” from the years 1950–62, but here excerpts do only a partial service, and the selectivity over so long a period is inevitably contentious. Finally, the author includes a list of all relevant items issued by either side in 1963–67, going well beyond those selected for the main portion of this collection. The full span of materials indicated in his list, together with their eventual decline in quality and authoritativeness as compared with the exchange of letters between the Russian and Chinese parties in 1963–65, underscores Gittings’s justification in extracting the few kernels of historical relevance from the vast chaff of propaganda verbiage spewed out in Moscow and Peking. Since the true scholar will inevitably examine full texts in their original

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