

had they only acted as loyal allies to free Russia and the world from the Bolshevik yoke"! Some participants will question whether the effort was indeed directed as much against Hitler as against Stalin.

The translation contains some regrettable errors and imprecisions.

ALEXANDER DALLIN
Stanford University

THE SOVIET UNION AND THE MIDDLE EAST: THE POST-WORLD WAR II ERA. Edited by *Ivo J. Lederer* and *Wayne S. Vucinich*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1974. xii, 302 pp. \$9.95.

Since Moscow's entry into Arab politics in 1955, the Soviet attitudes toward and relations with the states of the Middle East have attracted considerable professional attention. The quest for a better understanding of Russia's position was given additional impetus by the events preceding and following the outbreak of the June 1967 war. To shed more light on Moscow's policy, a number of scholarly conferences were held in this country and abroad. The more notable of these were the meetings at Columbia (1968), Stanford (1969), and Tel-Aviv (1971) Universities. The papers presented at Columbia and Tel-Aviv were published some time ago and reviewed in this journal. The gap left by the delay in publishing the proceedings of the Stanford conference has now been filled, and the result is a welcome addition to the literature on the subject.

In a politically volatile area such as the Middle East, the five-year delay in publishing the conference papers could have made them hopelessly out of date. However, the volume holds up remarkably well both in comparison with the two other symposia and in its own right, because of the generally high level of scholarship, sophistication, and sound judgment exhibited by the various contributors. Without denigrating the others, this reviewer found the essays by John C. Campbell, George Harris, and Nadav Safran particularly impressive.

The main criticisms which could be raised are those applicable to most symposia: the volume lacks a unifying framework, and some papers are stronger than others. As for the book's own peculiarities, the editors would probably have done better to leave the essays in their original form rather than insisting that they be brought up to date (in this instance, mid-1973). Since the contributions apparently have not been rewritten but only amended by deleting or adding sentences and paragraphs, the result is occasionally superficial updating which contributes little to the initial arguments and in some cases actually detracts from them by glossing over material that deserves more attention. In the end, as with most efforts to present "current" analyses, the volume falls short of the mark, overtaken as it has been by the war of October 1973. The only essay which the author (P. J. Vatakiotis) chose to leave unchanged appears to have gained rather than lost by his decision.

All in all, however, these are minor matters. In making the proceedings of the Stanford conference available to a wider audience, the editors have performed a valuable service to the scholarly community.

O. M. SMOLANSKY
Lehigh University