

parties belies such a distinction. And, second, the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact, and meetings of Pact foreign ministers in particular, have come to be primary means of adjusting interparty policies. It seems likely, therefore, that this exclusion derives from conceptions of the Warsaw Pact and Comecon which predate the substantial Soviet efforts to infuse those organs with more substantive policy content after 1969, and the editors would be well advised to reconsider the decision to exclude them.

Finally, given these reservations, the quality of individual articles is solid in areas where this reviewer is competent to judge. The combined efforts of R. Judson Mitchell and Robert H. Donaldson on the Soviet Union provide an intelligent guide to domestic and foreign policies. The use of central primary sources is especially noticeable and welcome, although economic policy and performance have been slighted, and treatment of dissidents might be thought relatively disproportionate by any "objective" standard of their weight in the society (but certainly that treatment is not disproportionate by standards of American interest in the subject). This essay, together with Stephen Uhalley's on China, Robert King's on Rumania, James Morrison's on Poland, Bennett Kovrig's on Hungary, and Eric Waldman's on the German Democratic Republic are the richest in detail among those examined by the reviewer. Essays by James F. Brown on Bulgaria and Zdenek L. Suda on Czechoslovakia are disappointingly thin. The essays by Milorad Popov, Eric Waldman, and D. L. Price, on the Communist parties of France, West Germany, and Great Britain respectively, all constitute useful guides to those parties' activities, but reveal one further qualification to the overall evaluation of the *YICA*. Especially in countries like these last three, where the Communists constitute a very small minority of the population and are, therefore, responsive to political conditions rather than important initiators of political developments, one would hope for more contextual description. The British Communist Party was clearly caught up in labor unrest far beyond its influence, and the German and French parties also cannot be understood without more description of the economic contexts within which they were operating. Nevertheless, these are good essays, and the decision to focus narrowly on party developments is clearly an editorial one.

All in all, the *Yearbook on International Communist Affairs, 1974* constitutes a valuable research and teaching aid. Its shortcomings are largely the product of necessary choices affecting its scope, and the strength of individual essays is often admirable.

LAWRENCE T. CALDWELL
Occidental College

CONTEMPORARY SOVIET LAW: ESSAYS IN HONOR OF JOHN N. HAZARD. Edited by *Donald D. Barry, William E. Butler, and George Ginsburgs*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974. xxvi, 242 pp. Photographs. 52.50 Dglds., paper.

This Festschrift consists of ten essays authored by leading Western scholars in Soviet law. While all are well-researched, they vary in significance. Most intriguing to this reader is the opening entry, entitled "Vignettes of Law Student Life in Moscow 1934–1937," which is a series of previously unpublished letters written by John Hazard during his student days at the Moscow Law Institute on Herzen Street. The letters vividly depict the Institute and its environs, and cover a wide

range of topics—from an account of Hazard scaring off a “besprizorni” who tried to break into his room as he slept to his description of the Soviet citizens’ sense of achievement in the accomplishments of the initial five-year plans. About the latter he wrote: “I find myself being caught up in the spirit of the country. They have something to work for and it is their ideal. Every success no matter how trivial is cause for great rejoicing, and their dreams for the future lead them on to hopes which would seem fantastic if one had not seen equally fantastic dreams take shape in concrete and steel.”

At the Institute, Hazard came into contact with the founders of Soviet jurisprudence, men who are only names to those of us who have followed Hazard in the study of Soviet law. Evgenii Korovin, the international law theoretician, gave Hazard individual tutoring sessions, which Hazard calls the highlight of his first year of study. Andrei Vyshinskii, soon to become the USSR’s leading legal ideologue, lectured on French jurisprudence and stressed the importance of studying bourgeois law, so that it could be criticized knowledgeably. I. S. Pereterskii, the leading international private law scholar, “a stocky, shaved-headed, somewhat pompous man,” digressed in his lectures on the Napoleonic, German, and tsarist codes with “witty comments on life, history, and problems in general.” Justice Commissar N. V. Krylenko, a member of the old intelligentsia, “short, oldish, but robust” and “the premier mountain climber of the USSR,” engaged in hot debate for over three hours during an end-of-the-year self-criticism session at the Institute, pacing around the platform the whole time. And Evgenii Pashukanis, the leader of early Soviet legal philosophy, who would later be purged, lectured about a recent criminal law conference in Copenhagen, complaining that Western lawyers could not intelligently discuss legal cooperation in criminal law as they “had no conception of Soviet Law.”

Then come Hazard’s exams. Each student got a different question, to be answered orally on the spot. The questions showed “a peculiarly close relationship” to periods the student had been “absent or backward in the weekly seminar work.” Hazard was asked, among other things, to contrast the basic institutions of Soviet law with those of bourgeois law. The grade he received was a “B”.

Hazard’s overall picture of the Institute is one of lively intellectual interplay. Professor Dotsenko, “a young, active, fiery communist,” regularly challenged the ideas of his colleagues on the Institute faculty as “sheer foolishness,” to the point that Hazard was “a bit surprised at these attacks in such startling unsweetened terms.” One anonymous student drew laughter from his classmates when, toward the end of a Dotsenko lecture, he passed up to the professor a written question asking, “Don’t you ever make a mistake?” From the vantage point of one who studied law in that same building on Herzen Street thirty years later, Hazard’s account evokes envy. A generation later, Soviet legal theory was far more settled and less controversial.

Hazard’s letters form only the introduction to the ten *Festschrift* essays. Four of these deserve special mention. Harold J. Berman (“The Educational Role of Soviet Criminal Law and Civil Procedure”) develops a thesis that he has previously expounded, adding interesting evidence to substantiate the educational role of law in civil cases. Peter H. Juviler (“Criminal Law and Social Control”) provides a useful outline of the changes in criminal law policy in the USSR since the mid-1950s. Zigurds Zile (“Soviet Struggle for Environmental Quality: The Limits of Environmental Law under Central Planning”) argues convincingly that environ-

mental considerations have received inadequate attention in the drafting of Soviet economic plans. George Ginsburgs ("Soviet International Trade Contracts and the Execution of Foreign Commercial Arbitral Awards") shows that the paucity of Soviet treaties on enforcement of arbitral decrees have weakened the enforceability of decisions of Soviet arbitration panels.

Other essays included are: F. J. M. Feldbrugge, "Law and Political Dissent in the Soviet Union"; Donald D. Barry and Carol Barner-Barry, "The USSR Supreme Court and Guiding Explanations on Civil Law, 1962-1971"; Dietrich A. Loeber, "Samizdat under Soviet Law"; A. K. R. Kiralfy, "Soviet Labor Law Reform since the Death of Stalin"; Peter B. Maggs, "A Computer Model of the System of Legal Regulation of the Soviet State Industrial Enterprise"; and William E. Butler, "Some Reflections on the Periodization of Soviet Approaches to International Law."

JOHN QUIGLEY
Ohio State University

EVOLUTION OF INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES.

Edited by *Harold F. Williamson*. A joint publication of the University of Delaware and the Eleutherian Mills-Hagley Foundation. Newark, Del.: University of Delaware Press, 1975. xii, 254 pp. \$20.00. Distributed by Temple University Press, Philadelphia, Pa.

This book is the report of a conference held in May 1972, the purpose of which was to examine the growth and development of large-scale enterprises in the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Japan, the USSR, and internationally—all in the light of Chandler's theme (found in his *Strategy and Structure*), that changing structure is a response to changing strategy. The papers are not original research studies carried out for the conference, but essays that can essentially be described as the work of business historians with the defects commonly found in such writing: research unguided by explicit theory, case studies in which the representativeness of the cases is left unexplored, conclusions which are either innocuous or seem unrelated to the data.

This is a pity, because the problems implicitly posed by Chandler (in his paper for the conference) are extremely interesting. Chandler starts from what amounts to an economic determinism hypothesis concerning the development of the American economy: that the size of individual companies and the structure of their management organization are both products of the external economic environment. The larger the possibility for cost-reducing economies which are external to any small firm or to a single unit within a large company, the greater will be the relative importance of multi-unit companies, and the more centralized will be the management of these companies. The more multi-unit companies direct their attention to achieving goals other than realization of cost economies external to their individual units, the less centralized will be their managements. This hypothesis is fully within the tradition of the "survivorship" argument for profit maximization.

This hypothesis could have been used for generating fascinating questions for international comparison. For example: (1) Has the growth of multi-unit firms in individual countries been more the result of market imperfections, rather than of cost-reduction factors, than was the case in the United States? If so, has this re-