

chapters tell us what those principles are or what sorts of governmental responses they would authorize or prohibit. In this respect, the book seems unlikely to fill one of the charges it sets for itself: to offer guidance to newly emergent democracies in Eastern Europe about how democracies can cope with terrorism without compromising their democratic or constitutional integrity.

The concluding chapter is both a useful review of the cases and, more importantly, a thoughtful assessment of the lessons that should be drawn from them. The chapter begins with a discussion of the significant ways in which its cases differ from others, like Northern Ireland and Spain, where terrorism resonates with the agendas and goals of significant sections of the public. It is only in this chapter that we find an extended discussion of what success means. The discussion, unlike some of the case studies, emphasizes the importance of public opinion.

In sum, this is a book that occasionally falters in theoretical rigor: no discussion of success in the struggle against terrorism is likely to go far absent a careful definition of terms. Nevertheless, this is an important and seasonable study.

John E. Finn  
Wesleyan University

Gal-Or, Noemi, ed. *Tolerating Terrorism in the West: an international survey*. London: Routledge, 1991.

This slim volume consists of five essays on the domestic tolerance for terrorism in Spain, the former West Germany, Israel, Belgium and Italy. A sixth chapter, written by editor Noemi Gal-Or, who also wrote the section on Israel, attempts to interpret the disparate results.

As a basic premise, the idea of a comparative study of this kind is a good one. Unfortunately only one chapter, the first, written by Peter Waldmann on the impact of the changing role of ETA on the society and politics in the Basque region of Spain, deals with the book's purported subject matter. Had the approach and level of analysis of this piece been continued throughout the book, a valuable contribution might have been made to the study of the comparative response patterns of Western states to international terrorism. As it is, the reader is forced to wade through assorted approaches to the subject matter, uneven analytical quality, awkward translation and abysmal English.

Faced with these problems, this review will concentrate on the book's focus, the case studies chosen and the editing process. To begin with, the editor waits until almost the end of the book to state her approach. "The origin of this book," she writes on page 146, "is an attempt to understand tolerance of terrorism in principle, and the varying degrees of tolerance of terrorism within five western [sic] liberal

democracies.” On the following page she further states, “Two major questions guide our comparison: (a) What kind of attitudes have the given *polities* developed towards terrorism and terrorists? (b) What sort of attitude have the given *societies* developed towards terrorism and terrorists?” The problem here, apart from the convoluted English, is that no analytic tool is made available to calculate the degree of tolerance (or intolerance) by Western states for terrorism.

Gal-Or’s concentration of “polities” and “societies” excludes a range of casual factors and ignores established frameworks for such a study; even such an obvious conclusion that Western states tolerate a certain amount of terrorism in the hope that it might go away is beyond the scope of this study. In addition to the response of government and the reaction of its people, the way a state responds to terrorism is also affected by historic precedents, economic realities, the prevailing international climate, and the reaction of allied governments, among other things. As a framework for gauging these factors, the book’s contributors might have used Bowyer-Bell’s typology from *A Time of Terror: How Democratic Societies Respond to Revolutionary Violence* (1978), which outlines a spectrum of government responses stretching from concession and accommodation through flexibility and no compromise to retaliation.

The second problem concerns the book’s subtitle and the case studies chosen to illustrate the theme. To call this study of five states an international survey is rather stretching a point and it is even arguable, as Gal-Or herself observes in her concluding chapter, that Israel belongs not to the West but to the Middle East. Also, why study Belgian and not Dutch terrorism? Dutch problems with the South Moluccans were much more significant and longer lasting than the relatively recent difficulties with CCC fighting cells in Belgium. Why study West German and not French terrorism? After all, the French tolerated external, internal and guest terrorism for years before finally cracking down in 1986. Why not study British policy toward the IRA in Northern Ireland? Surely this is a key case study in the evaluation of societal tolerance toward terrorism. In short, how can an “international survey” on tolerating terrorism in the West fail to refer to Holland, France and the United Kingdom, not to mention the United States and, since the editor teaches at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, Canada? The inescapable conclusion is that the editor of this volume had a few manuscripts to hand and simply tried to rationalize them under the heading “tolerating terrorism.” It does not work.

By far the most irritating aspect of this collection is the impact of Gal-Or’s editing style on the material. In the acknowledgements, she states, “Brigid Bell deserves my appreciation for her outstanding editing of the manuscript, the chapters of which were all written by non-Anglophones.” Perhaps this is an attempt to shift the blame for a manuscript which bears little sign of being professionally edited. Surely any competent editor would have immediately eliminated the constant use of such archaic and superfluous phrases as “to be sure,” “interestingly,” “it is a matter of fact,” “indeed” and “in regards to” throughout the book.

The language, from beginning to end, is heavy-handed, awkward, inappropriate and at times downright incomprehensible. On page 152, Gal-Or states, “It is

expected that terrorism, the method, will expire from itself, together with the dissolution of its carriers.” Or again, on page 153, “Indifference towards terrorism, at least theoretically, means in moral terms moving away from the rejection towards the collaborative-tolerating end of the continuum. Omission still bears the responsibility for wrong-doing.” What does this mean? Such jargon would not be tolerated even in university undergraduate essays. It’s hard to believe that a publisher like Routledge would allow such a poorly-written and badly-edited book to bear its imprint.

Further, there is no description of the authors’ credentials or background beyond the mention, in the last chapter, of their disciplines. But the final indignity is that a book of 164 pages, with no appendices, can possibly sell for a total of CDN \$87.50 or US \$69.95. It is hard to know who will pay such a price.

Nevertheless, as stated earlier, the basic premise for this book, the need for comparative study of Western tolerance of terrorism, is a good one; it simply needs much better articulation. Also, Gal-Or’s chapter on Israel contains some very interesting material, but the poor conceptualization already referred to and the inappropriate use of language are the enemy of a good read.

Peter St. John  
University of Manitoba

Smist, Frank J., Jr. *Congress Oversees the United States Intelligence Community, 1947-1989*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1990.

Frank Smist’s book will prove useful to students of the American intelligence community. Carefully researched, it is enriched by numerous interviews (including, fascinatingly, one with Thomas Fox, identified as “barber, House of Representatives”). The book’s pages are a treasure trove of information and lively quotation from those who have struggled with the business of congressional oversight. For beginning students of the subject this is an excellent introduction. Everything is there, and, while Smist tends to the conventional wisdom that sees the overseers as heroes and the intelligence operatives as villains, the treatment is generally fair and balanced. It is a more satisfying account of what happened, especially in the tumultuous years of the Church Committee and the establishment of the Senate and House intelligence committees, than one finds in either of the two existing sources, Loch Johnson’s *A Season of Inquiry* or John Oseth’s *Regulating U.S. Intelligence Operations*.<sup>1</sup>

That said, it is important to note that the book began life as a doctoral dissertation in political science. It bears the marks of its origin. In good dissertation fashion the organization is chronological — one thing simply follows another — and the result is that story predominates over analysis. There are historical