

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE REVOLUTIONARY STATE: A CASE STUDY OF THE SOVIET UNION AND CUSTOMARY INTERNATIONAL LAW. By *Richard J. Erickson*. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, 1972. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff. xiii, 254 pp. \$15.00.

In a closely reasoned crisp study Dr. Erickson catalogues Soviet international law practice, focusing on its reliance on custom as a source. He concludes that, in the main, Soviet foreign policy relies heavily on established custom to implement its policy, and to some extent seeks to create new custom to foster what remain of its original revolutionary aims. To Erickson, the old is more prominent than the new, since Soviet leadership currently evaluates stable world order more highly than revolution. He finds that Soviet policy has taken this turn in realization that the USSR has a stake in the contemporary international system and needs to protect its interests through reciprocal recognition of custom.

Erickson believes that too many Western diplomats and scholars have concentrated attention on the revolutionary (or what he calls the "provocative") aspect of Soviet use of custom with the result that they have overlooked the conservative trends in Soviet diplomacy. His case is well documented in many fields of international relations.

Not everyone will be willing to accept this focus—especially those who have been in or near the heated struggle to preserve valuable fundamental principles of international law (minus those relics of the past related to colonialism) from erosion under expansion of the concept of the doctrine of "peaceful coexistence," espousal of new concepts of *jus cogens* and of the right of all states to participate in general multipartite conventions, support for insurgents under a doctrine of "just war" that goes beyond anticolonial struggle, and rejection of some economic aid treaties as "unequal" when unrelated to victories in warfare. Erickson's emphasis on conservatism seems strong in the light of these Soviet maneuvers.

Erickson's research is thorough—Soviet texts, United Nations documentation, International Court of Justice decisions, International Law Commission reports, and draft conventions. He has provided no exhaustive digest, but he has covered enough to give a sense that no surprises would lie in what is not touched. He has added a unique and useful listing of Soviet specialists participating in various international bodies, and a good who's who of the major actors. Regrettably, he does not always indicate when some of them have died, such as Durdenevsky and Golunsky. Also some of his bibliographical titles are erroneous in detail, and some important texts are omitted. Nevertheless, this is a valuable guide to Soviet practice, and is thought-provoking on the question of what balance is today maintained between conserving the status quo and fostering revolutionary transformation in the Soviet image. Foreign Offices and specialists will want it on their shelves.

JOHN N. HAZARD
Columbia University

INDUSTRIAL'NAIA SOTSIOLOGIIA V SShA. By *S. I. Epshtein*. Moscow: Politizdat, 1972. 232 pp. 35 kopeks.

The only interest that such a book holds for the American (or Western) reader is that it gives a Soviet account and interpretation of American sociology, specifically industrial sociology. It could be titled "Industrial Sociology in the USA: Through a Glass—Very Darkly." There is some narcissistic fascination for the

Western reader to be derived from such a completely ideological interpretation of a major disciplinary interest. Once the Soviet approach is grasped, then the interpretation flows naturally and logically.

The book's basic point of departure is that the United States is a capitalistic-bourgeois society. The owners of capital have but one and only one overriding concern: to increase profits by exploiting the proletariat and expropriating the surplus value that can be squeezed from the workers. Industrial sociology is just one (and often more subtle) tool in the capitalistic armamentarium to generate more profits, and sociologists have sold out to the capitalists. Their efforts, however, have been only partly successful, thanks to the workers' ability to see through some of these tricks and to resist this exploitation. The condition of the American working class will not be improved until capitalism is eliminated. What industrial sociologists attempt to do is to fool the working class so that it will reconcile itself to exploitation.

The book then reviews the major developments of industrial sociology in the United States, starting with the Hawthorne Experiment and Elton Mayo—although Taylor is mentioned as a precursor of Mayo, and the major differences between the two are pointed out. Industrial sociology is labeled the "new paternalism" among which "social or human relations" occupies an important position, followed by "psychosociology," "participation," "games theory," "communications theory," "workers' participation," and so on. The author's conclusion is that industrial sociology in the United States consists of a multiplicity of measures to heighten the exploitation of the workers, to mask the true nature of capitalist society, to deny the essentially irreconcilable clash of interests between workers and capitalists, to splinter the working class into antagonistic groups and thus reduce its strength, and to use every possible means of manipulation, deception, bribery, and corruption.

In the West this book will appeal to a limited audience. As such its contribution, it seems, would be more to the sociology of knowledge than to industrial sociology. The Soviet reader will, on the other hand, garner a rapid overview of the field of American industrial sociology—seen, of course, through a Soviet ideological screen.

MARK G. FIELD
Boston University

AN ELBE UND ODER UM DAS JAHR 1000: SKIZZEN ZUR POLITIK DES OTTONENREICHES UND DER SLAVISCHEN MÄCHTE IN MITTELEUROPA. By *Herbert Ludat*. Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1971. x, 210 pp. DM 52.

This volume contains five "sketches" by a recent laureate of the Palacký Medal, who has both produced and edited important publications on the medieval settlement and the social as well as political structure of the Slavic-German borderlands. The studies are assembled here not so much as final statements but rather as summaries of recent research and points of departure for new discussions.

The introductory essay sets the stage. It is the author's contention that the widespread rebellion of the Slavs in the Lutetian (sometimes called Veletian) confederation in 983 caused a major break in the "progress of Christianization of Europe." This rift was about to be healed by the concerted efforts of Ottonian