

to base some 650 aircraft in Siberia, but Moscow delayed and eventually the entire project came to naught. In the European USSR a proposal for large-scale United States and United Kingdom air deployment to the Caucasus in the fall of 1942 was eventually dropped, but substantial shuttle bombing between Italy and the Ukraine did take place in 1944–45. A total of 2,200 sorties were flown, involving 1,270 Americans at three Ukrainian bases, but overall this effort had only modest military results. (In addition, on the first major strike mission a German attack on the base at Poltava caused disastrous results—forty-three B-17's were destroyed and twenty-six damaged, and not a single attacking German aircraft was destroyed.) Nonetheless, the shuttle-bombing experience was a notable achievement in Allied cooperation.

*Eagles East* reads easily, and is recommended to those who would like to know more about this chapter in Soviet-American relations, as well as to those having a particular interest in the politico-military history of World War II.

RAYMOND L. GARTHOFF  
Washington, D.C.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SOVIET LEGAL SYSTEM. By E. L. Johnson. London: Methuen & Co., 1969. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1970. xv, 248 pp. £3.25. \$10.50.

In this brief work the late E. L. Johnson attempts to introduce Soviet law and legal institutions to the educated layman. Its title notwithstanding, the book treats the law in much greater detail than the legal system; and to the law it is indeed a valuable overview, relatively free of the specialized jargon of lawyers.

The author has devoted special attention to those legal problems thought to be of particular interest to the educated citizen, especially criminal law and procedure and domestic relations. Brief attention is also given to contract and tort, labor law, and the Soviet equivalent of corporation law. Interestingly, and unaccountably, the area of civil rights is largely ignored. For instance, statutory restrictions on assembly and demonstrations, so clearly expressed in the trials of the Pushkin Square demonstrators, are not mentioned. Nor is any note taken of the procedural and statutory bases for the current Soviet practice of remanding political oppositionists to mental institutions, thereby avoiding some of the potential embarrassment of a criminal process. Such lacunae stand as the major shortcoming of the work.

In other regards, Johnson succeeds admirably in supplying a readable and intelligible background to Soviet law for the nonspecialist. The book is notably without ideological bias, and deserves a wide readership.

RICHARD J. JOHNSON  
Glassboro State College

POLITICS AND HISTORY IN THE SOVIET UNION. By Nancy Whittier Heer. Cambridge and London: M.I.T. Press, 1971. viii, 319 pp. \$12.50.

That the Soviet historian has special political functions is well known. Specialists have also become increasingly aware that in recent years the relationship between the historian and the party has become more complex, and that at the same time more objective history is being written. The great value of Nancy Heer's study is that through painstaking research and perceptive writing she has filled in a picture which we knew only in outline.

The author has chosen to concentrate on the single most sensitive theme in Soviet historiography—the rewriting of party history since 1956—as a means of clarifying the role of history in the Soviet system. After leading the reader through the structural maze of the scholarly apparatus, she supplies fine details on cases of “horizontal spillover” which became inevitable once historians answered Khrushchev’s call to clean up Stalinist falsification. The more truthful history of Stalin entailed a more truthful history of Mensheviks, of Trotsky, of the purges and collectivization. But some historians, such as E. N. Burdzhhalov, who sought historical objectivity even at the expense of the myth of party infallibility, were soon in trouble. The party retrenched and has since tried to guide historians along a path of “contained revisionism.”

The historians have made definite gains through their troubled dialogue with the party. The author declares that Burdzhhalov’s “heretical suggestions in 1956” have become “canonized text in 1967,” and his history of the revolution is the most objective in forty years. In other cases the historians have made less progress: the Mensheviks have been transformed from traitors to misguided idealists, and Trotsky from a “nonperson” to a “semiperson.”

This study gives us the most detailed analysis to date of the complex role of the Soviet historian, who must balance scholarship with rationalizing official policies, perpetuating myths, and legitimizing political authority. It is remarkable that scholarship has made substantial gains despite the persistent political pressures.

LOWELL R. TILLET  
*Wake Forest College*

IN QUEST OF JUSTICE: PROTEST AND DISSENT IN THE SOVIET UNION TODAY. Edited by *Abraham Brumberg*. New York, Washington, London: Praeger Publishers, 1970. xiv, 477 pp. \$10.95.

This compilation preserves between hard covers material the bulk of which appeared in the magazine *Problems of Communism* in 1968. Subsequent events confirm the wisdom of the editor’s and publisher’s decision. The documents have retained their sting and their pathos, have proved to point the way to more recent manifestations of dissent in the Soviet Union, and have provided good guidance to the probable actions of the Soviet regime.

The heart of the book contains documents prepared by Soviet citizens, signed with (true) names and addresses, and usually sent to appropriate “instances” in the Soviet government or the United Nations. Most of the documents are links in the chain of repression, protest, secondary repression, secondary protest—in such areas as literature, nationalities, religion, self-expression, and intervention in Czechoslovakia. There are some records, unofficial of course, of trials and board meetings, interrogations conducted by the police or party officials, and a few Soviet news articles.

The documentary section is preceded by brief commentaries from foreign specialists and followed by a few samples of the underground literature of protest. For different reasons, both the scholar and the general reader will be grateful for the perspective contributed by the commentators but will prefer to dwell on the primary material.

A jurist must be struck by the tenacity with which the dissenters bring, now Soviet law to bear against Soviet administrative practice, now Soviet constitu-