

model "devoid of conflict" and of a "pluralist model" allowing for interest-group conflict. They then urge that "a more meaningful explanatory and descriptive model may be that of 'monism,' meaning that although many competing institutions and interests are involved, the Communist party is the dominant one." This, however, is consistent with most serious studies of Communist politics, including the classical "totalitarian" accounts of Fainsod and Schapiro, *except* that few would see the Communist Party as a single cohesive participant in the political process.

Used in conjunction with suitable primary sources and systematic structural analysis, the volume will serve well in courses on "comparative communism."

T. H. RIGBY

Australian National University

SOVIET POLICY TOWARDS PAKISTAN AND BANGLADESH. By J. P. Jain. New Delhi: Radiant Publishers, 1974. viii, 258 pp. Rs. 50. \$11.50.

FOUNDATIONS OF INDO-SOVIET RELATIONS: A STUDY OF NON-OFFICIAL ATTITUDES AND CONTACTS, 1917-1947. By Nirmala Joshi. Foreword by Y. B. Chavan. New Delhi: Radiant Publishers, 1975. xiv, 204 pp. Rs. 30.

The emergence of the Soviet Union as the major foreign power in the Indian subcontinent is a phenomenon of major importance. Two relatively neglected aspects of this subject are explored in J. P. Jain's *Soviet Policy Towards Pakistan and Bangladesh* and Nirmala Joshi's *The Foundations of Indo-Soviet Relations*. Although Jain states at the outset that his book concerns the "foreign policy objectives of the Soviet Union," it is rather a chronological survey of Soviet relations with Pakistan and Bangladesh, with much more attention focused on the factors shaping Pakistan's foreign policy. In part this may be attributed to the author's limited access to Russian-language sources, which are used either in translation or indirectly cited from other works. Consequently, relevant Soviet scholarly writings on Kashmir and Pakistani nationality problems (particularly Iu. V. Gankovskii's *Natsional'nyi vopros i natsional'noe dvizhenie v Pakistane*, Moscow, 1967, which was reportedly banned in Pakistan) are not examined. Nor does the author discuss I. M. Kompantsev's *Pakistan i Sovetskii Soiuz* (Moscow, 1970), a major study of the evolution of Soviet-Pakistani relations.

Jain, who is a former Indian diplomat, does, however, make good use of United Nations documents. He shows, for example, that the Soviet U.N. vetoes on India's behalf regarding the Kashmir issue were designed to prevent the stationing of United Nations forces there, and were not intended to obstruct a negotiated settlement of the dispute by the parties directly involved. Moscow viewed the plan to station U.N. forces in Kashmir as an indirect method of establishing a Western presence in an area of great strategic significance to the USSR.

In the broad perspective of the postwar era, Jain argues that Moscow has consistently sought to establish good relations with Pakistan, whose proximity to Soviet borders cannot be ignored. Soviet support for India during the December 1971 war was motivated by the circumstances surrounding the Bangladesh crisis and in view of present relations, represented only a temporary aberration from Moscow's policy. Subscribing to the widely accepted interpretation that Soviet relations with Pakistan have been mainly influenced negatively by Pakistan's alliance with the United States in the 1950s and positively by Moscow's efforts to offset Chinese influence in the 1960s, the author also reaffirms the view that the USSR is seeking to preserve stability based on the status quo in the Indian subcontinent, because this policy enables

the USSR to preserve its dominant external position there. In general, the book fails to offer major new interpretations and insights into Soviet relations with Pakistan and Bangladesh. It, consequently, does not represent a significant scholarly achievement.

Of much greater interest is Nirmala Joshi's study which purports to examine, as a background to understanding their postindependence policies toward each other, the mutual perceptions of Soviet and Indian political figures in the pre-1947 period. The author succeeds better in elucidating Indian views toward Russia than the Soviet perception of India, not only because of the nature of Soviet published writings (which are an extension of official policy), but also because of her superficial examination of the Soviet materials. By abstracting only those articles that illuminate Soviet policy toward the Indian nationalist movement, a policy which was itself determined by Moscow's changing relations with Great Britain, the author presents a unidimensional image which neither assesses the level of sophistication of Soviet analyses of India nor discusses important Soviet writings on Indian nationality and communal problems during the 1940s. Admittedly, the author was denied access to Soviet archives during her two years of research in the USSR, but it is still disappointing that the book shows scant trace of any benefit from this visit. It is all the more surprising that the author evidently did not contact other Soviet scholars, such as M. A. Persitz, who had begun to publish articles directly pertinent to her subject, which were based on archival sources, during her visit (1969-71).

The main value of the work then lies in the exposition of the generally positive appraisal of Russia by Indian nationalist leaders. The "Russian menace" was never taken very seriously by Indian nationalists who viewed it as a British ploy to preserve hegemony in India. The October Revolution drew considerable interest because Indian leaders saw Russia as a kindred agrarian, underdeveloped country. Revolutionary Russia was seen not only as a bulwark against imperialism but also as a development model with impressive achievements in industrialization, education, health, and so forth, that were worthy of emulation. The Indian image of the Soviet Union was not, however, entirely an uncritical one. The major leaders of the Indian left were democrats who were repelled by the suppression of civil liberties, and they became progressively disillusioned with Soviet foreign policy after the signing of the 1939 Nazi-Soviet pact. It is interesting, however, that Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of India's foreign policy, in spite of Stalin's postwar policies, continued to believe that the USSR did not pose a threat to India and looked forward to close ties with India's powerful neighbor to the north after independence. That such ties were not established at the inception of Indian statehood must be attributed to Stalin's retrenchment of Soviet policy in the late 1940s.

Overall the author has done well in illuminating the wellsprings of the official Indian approach to the Soviet Union.

RICHARD B. REMNEK
Memphis State University

ECONOMIC ESSAYS ON VALUE, COMPETITION AND UTILITY. By V. K. Dmitriev. Edited and with an introduction by D. M. Nuti. Translated by D. Fry. New York and London: Cambridge University Press, 1974. 231 pp. \$18.50.

V. K. Dmitriev (1868-1913) was a Russian economist who worked with sources from Western Europe and extended their concepts by formulating his own. This book collects three major essays in which he attempted "an organic synthesis of the labor theory of value and of the theory of marginal utility." The first essay is an exposition