
available in English. His translator, George Schwab, in an introduction to this 1932 work, tries (in vain) to dispel its ideological taint. Schmitt's discussion of the "friend-or-foe" distinction in politics has little to offer us theoretically, but between the lines he does reveal the inner conflicts and sensibilities typical of those German conservatives who ended up on the Nazi side of the fence.

**PERCEPTION AND MIS-
PERCEPTION IN INTER-
NATIONAL POLITICS**

By Robert Jervis
Princeton, 1976, 445 pp.
\$22.50, cloth, \$11.50, paper
L of C 76-3259
ISBN 0-691-05656-0

Drawing examples from a wide range of historical literature, UCLA political scientist Robert Jervis analyzes how decision-makers in international affairs perceive new information, relate it to recent events and beliefs, and derive lessons from history. In applying social psychology to dozens of situations as diverse as the origins of World War I and the Gulf of Tonkin incident (1964), Jervis examines common misperceptions, e.g., exaggerating the unity and prescience of one's opponents and overestimating the importance of one's own nation as target or protagonist. Psychologists might ask for the use of more current research from their field of study; historians might prefer to see Jervis's psychological concepts applied in greater depth to fewer historical cases. But such flaws are minor in an innovative book.

**CHINA AS A MODEL OF
DEVELOPMENT**

By Al Imfeld
Orbis, 1976, 159 pp. \$5.95
L of C 76-4827
ISBN 0-88344-053-9

The People's Republic of China as "a model, a plan, a point of departure, not always a reality" is the subject of this lucid development study by a Swiss priest with degrees in theology, sociology, and journalism. For the rest of the world, he believes, the Chinese model should stimulate "an examination of conscience." Comparing China to India exaggerates the Chinese success; comparing it to Japan minimizes it. Comparisons among the three countries show that varying levels of ethnic uniformity, indigenous political continuity, and cohesive yet flexible ideologies have helped to place Japan first, China second, and India third in development in Asia since the late 1940s.