
This book by John Dunn, Fellow of King’s College and Professor of Political Theory at the University of Cambridge, is the second edition of a work that was first published in 1972. Although many questions regarding his study could be considered here, only three will be discussed. These are: is this volume worth the attention of the reader?; what is the most likely audience for it?; and, is there a good reason for the book to have been published in a second edition? Without further preliminary comments, let us begin.

First, is the book worthy of the interest of many readers? Yes, indeed it is. In his study Dunn succeeds admirably in calling attention to a number of issues about revolutions, such as how they most usefully can be conceptualized and how the participants, direct observers, and victims have thought and felt about them. His approach, as he readily states in his preface to the first edition, is that of a political theorist whose chief purpose is to ask thought-provoking questions about an important, large-scale social phenomenon. Anyone who wishes to think seriously about revolutions and their multiple meanings will be challenged and stimulated by this book.

It is the author’s primary stated purpose to raise questions, not to answer them. The book’s subtitle is taken literally and although Dunn provides answers to many questions, he views them, at least in part, as extensions of his questions and not as providing any intellectual or empirical closure to his questions. Readers who seek firm, reliable answers rather than an adventure in thought will properly shun this book.

The majority of Dunn’s questions are found in the eight analyses of revolutions that form the largest portion of his book. The revolutions studied are those of Russia, Mexico, China, Yugoslavia, Vietnam, Algeria, Turkey, and Cuba. Each analysis is approximately 20-25 pages in length and collectively they are well done as the author skillfully shows how the revolutions resemble and differ from each other. In short, this book has several distinctive strengths.

Second, what is the likely audience for this study? The book will be almost completely ignored by government officials and military officers. Apart from its failure to provide any policy guidance, its approach and pace will be distasteful to persons who must cope with the daily tyranny of the “in” box. Equally, this book probably will hold little appeal for a general audience (and this includes most undergraduates) because the author not only desires his readers to mentally extend themselves in what presumably will be a leisurely manner but his use of language in the two prefaces virtually ensures that many who begin his study will never get as far as the work’s text; only highly educated and motivated readers will understand and appreciate his prefaces and proceed further. Now, having effectively turned away a goodly part of the book’s potential audience, who remains? Actually, its readers will pretty much be limited to professors and their graduate students. This is unfortunate because the
work deserves a larger audience than it is likely to receive. Nevertheless, at its core, this is a book by a scholar for other scholars.

Third, was there a good reason for the book to be published in a second edition? The question is difficult to answer. The second edition adds little of consequence to what appeared in the first edition. Only the second preface and a supplementary reading guide, 1971-88, are new and neither is unusually important. Furthermore, Dunn has not revised his eight analyses using the relevant material published since the first appearance of his book. They could have been strengthened had this been done. And apart from matters of scholarship, revising the analyses also was desirable in order to remove a number of statements that read today are curious, to say the least. For example, this reviewer had a strange sense of time displacement when he found Dunn speculating about Mao's future policy shifts and was informed that Portugal remained committed to its armed struggle to retain its African colonies. Naturally, if this work was a genuine classic, it would be folly to tamper with it but that is not the case. These analyses could and should have been moderately revised for the new edition. As things stand, they are a mixture of the highly insightful and the obviously out-of-date in the second edition.

It also should be noted that the author has largely ignored those revolutions that have occurred since his book was first published as well as the general studies of revolution that have appeared since 1972. In regard to the former, he mentions the revolutions in Ethiopia, Kampuchea, and Iran but confines his thoughts about them to a single paragraph. And as for comparing his work with more recent studies or even discussing them, he writes little apart from devoting a page of his second preface to favorable comments about Theda Skocpal's *State and Social Revolutions*. This has the effect of reinforcing the impression that the book is intended just for fellow scholars because most readers, unfamiliar with the extensive literature on revolutions, will find it impossible to place Dunn's book in the context of other studies on the subject.

In conclusion, although this is an admirable book in several respects, the new edition adds little of value to the original. Thus, persons who have access to the first edition can safely ignore the second. But regardless of which edition is available, anyone who believes it is important to think intelligently about revolutions should make an effort to read this book.
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It has become fashionable among American commentators to decry the role of law in combatting international terrorism.1 Viewed in this light, Professor Murphy's book is a welcome antidote, as he explores the extensive code of