the new social order promoted by the Chinese government and press to the outside world. One can't help but wonder what the authors thought about the contradictory material that they were getting at that time.

Although the theme of the book is largely an exposition of the procedure and effect of the various policies, it is brought out through the narration of events that took place in the village. The reader is introduced to the key players (whose names, along with that of the village itself, have been changed by the authors) in village politics. One of the most interesting features of the book is the brief look into the life histories of almost all of these characters, for it shows how the concept of class was developed and applied to the "class struggle."

The book then follows career swings of these characters through the collectivization of land, the "Big Four Cleanups," the cult of Mao, the Cultural Revolution, the Cleansing of the Class Ranks, and other campaigns. The nature of the campaigns, first made known outside China by Hinton is by now familiar to China watchers: public accusation, ridicule and castigation of cadres and other villagers judged to be "reactionary," i.e. the so-called "struggle campaigns." The reader is treated to details of how the cadre leaders of the campaigns contrived to find the most obscure reasons to attack someone. It seems that virtually anybody who took on any official responsibility would in time become a target since the most private and personal grievances were admissible as evidence of wrong doing. Indeed, the informants related how the cadres pressured and coached both accused and accusers to cloak their accusations and repentances in revolutionary rhetoric.

With the informants enjoying the relative freedom of Hong Kong, one might question the overly negative portrayal of their experience. Indeed, at various points in the narrative the villagers are described as having gotten the upper hand on their primitive technology, only to have their hopes dashed by a radically new directive. Still, during that time the village appeared to have achieved progress in developing some local industry and allowing the villagers to buy some consumer goods. The suggestion is that if the government had left things alone, the village could have done even better.

The narrative quality of the book makes for lively and interesting reading for general-interest readers. However, some of the terminology is cumbersome, perhaps because of a tendency to translate too literally. A table or diagram depicting the relationship between the various committees and teams would be helpful to readers unfamiliar with the bureaucratic hierarchy of the commune.
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It is a welcome sign of maturing American scholarship that the Korean nation can finally be approached objectively as a whole. This strategic peninsula contains some sixty million intelligent, energetic, and literate people with a sophisticated common culture and a history of well over a thousand years as a united, autonomous state. Yet its division into Communist and anti-communist halves since 1945 has until recently
been echoed by both diplomats and scholars, whose writings have generally either ignored or denigrated one side or the other. These two new books by Drs. Kihl and Koh make an important contribution by surveying the two Korean states, not on the basis of ideology, morals, or political alignment, but comparatively, as parts of a national whole, in Lasswellian terms of who, what, and how.

The two books may be a bit startling to many in this country who are accustomed to a priori downgrading or condemnation of Communism. Neither author extols or rejects the philosophy or political system of either North or South Korea on doctrinal grounds, but examines the factual evidence and undertakes to explain the behavior of each regime in terms of history, culture, internal and external environment, and foreign impact. Both books leave the reader with the message that Koreans have scored tremendous progress in industrialization and economic and social development in both North and South, but that after greater initial Northern successes (and greater Northern ruthlessness of control), the South has in recent years done better both in economic terms and—at least marginally—in moving toward a more free and open political system. Both books also underscore the strong nationalism that guides the policies of both regimes, and the deep desire of regimes and people alike for reunification, notwithstanding the antithetical proposals of the two sides to achieve it and the difficulty of the goal.

To some extent, both authors cover the same ground, although Kihl is primarily concerned with internal political dynamics, and Koh with foreign policy. Perhaps the greatest contrast in the approaches of the two is that while Kihl regards unification as an internal matter and a significant aspect of nation-building—making the Korean War a civil war—Koh considers unification as one important dimension of the foreign policies of two sovereign states.

Both books are rich in substance, carefully crafted, well organized, and well documented; they are, moreover, surprisingly up-to-date, Kihl’s book even taking note of the October 1983 Rangoon bomb murders of South Korean government officials. Thus, they are valuable resources for college courses on Korean politics and international relations. They are in use for this purpose at Georgetown University, and no doubt elsewhere.

Of course, one can always wish that excellent books were even better. In my view, both works suffer from over-preoccupation with the political models and paradigms of development theorists. Unfortunately, there is as yet no real consensus on a basic political system model which fully accommodates both political process at one point in time and change over time. If the facts of any particular case must be fitted to a particular model, the facts may suffer the fate of Procrustes’s overnight guests; and if reference is made to more than one model, the result can be distracting. At the present stage of political analysis, it may be better to draw relationships from the facts of a particular case first, and then make whatever comparisons may be appropriate with general models. In the Koh book, for example, I find his use of Triska’s “operational direction” artificial, while Kihl’s treatment of the unification problem as part of the nation-building process, to say the least, needs more justification. From a student’s point of view, moreover, Kihl’s analysis of Korean domestic politics needs to be filled out if it is to convey a full understanding of how the process works, in terms of formal institutions and informal relationships.

Although Kihl’s approach is basically analytical and objective, he does seem to make some assumptions that need more substantiation, and tosses in some troubling value words. For instance, while I do not necessarily disagree with his “set of five