

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