

second chapter, Juviler reviews the early attitudes and policies toward crime, criminology, and punishment and, in chapters 3 and 4, he traces them through their various phases to the present. Chapter 5 is devoted to those who study the phenomenon of crime, and chapter 6 to the ways in which these "experts" have sought and now seek to explain its existence and to advise on how to deal with it. The final chapter is given over to general conclusions. A selective bibliography is also included.

On the whole, the study is written with restraint and good sense. Juviler avoids the mire of criminal statistics, he uses data from the 1920s effectively, without indulging in endless speculative extrapolations about subsequent eras, simultaneously showing an awareness of the changing definitions of crime and probable patterns of criminality and their relationship to political, economic, and social change. His classification of "liberal" and "conservative" trends in criminal policy is plausible, though debatable, and should stimulate further reflection. The chapters on the role of the criminologist as an expert whose findings may influence legal and social policy complement other research being done in Soviet studies of this nature and are of great interest and importance. Analogies between certain facets of Soviet and American experience are well chosen, when used, and provide a welcome sense of balance all too often absent in discussions of this subject. In fact, the book is not well served by its dust jacket, for Juviler has not undertaken to write an exposé, but has produced a solid reflective exploration of a highly pertinent facet of Soviet life and experience.

W. E. BUTLER
University College London

SOVIET CRIMINOLOGISTS AND CRIMINAL POLICY: SPECIALISTS IN POLICY-MAKING. By *Peter H. Solomon, Jr.* Studies of the Russian Institute, Columbia University. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978. x, 253 pp. \$15.00.

In Professor Solomon's words, his book aims "to assess the increase in specialist or expert participation in Soviet policy-making that occurred in the past two decades" (p. ix). More specifically, it seeks "to address some of the questions raised by Western scholarship about Soviet policy-making by examining in detail the nature and impact of one set of specialists (criminologists) in one policy realm (criminal policy)" (p. 4). Had the author strictly adhered only to the first of his objectives, this reviewer would have been even more generous with his praise. There is no question that Professor Solomon has conducted an impressive search for data; his description and analysis of the Soviet scene are soundly organized and well written. Over all, the book is a fine addition to the growing body of recent high quality English-language literature on Soviet criminal law and policy (such as some of the writings by Berman, Feldbrugge, Connor, Conquest, Juviler, and Chalidze).

The first substantive chapter outlines the development of criminologists' participation from 1938 to 1963. We learn, for example, that it is necessary to revise the conventional image of a "narrow and restricted political process under Stalin," to temper it with a realization that it was "not so narrow as to exclude direct participation by specialists in some fields at some times" (p. 32). (But compare the amazing span of Stalin's direct control as reported in *Khrushchev Remembers* [Boston and Toronto, 1970], pp. 62-63.) The next two chapters discuss the early post-Stalin years when "the quality of criminal law scholars' participation was good" and, although one could not make "broad conclusions . . . about the scholars' influence on policy" (p. 49), they played "a prominent part in policy development" (p. 51).

Three case studies from the 1960s follow. The final three chapters—"The Nature of Participation," "The Effects of Participation," and "Specialist Participation Reconsidered"—supply the promised integrated assessment.

This reviewer is somewhat concerned about Professor Solomon's generalizations about Soviet policy making from a few episodes in the development of Soviet criminal policy alone and, even more so, about his attempt at a cross-systemic comparison. In choosing a policy area for study, Professor Solomon first "tried to find a policy area which would typify a broad range of Soviet policy-making"; and second, he "sought a realm in which the relevant specialists were likely to have participated to some extent in the formation of public policy" (p. 8). It was most fortunate that criminal policy was the typical area. This find neatly dovetailed with Sir Radzino-wicz's urging that the author study Soviet criminology (p. ix). And research on specialist participation in an area where there was none would have been a most unrewarding enterprise. If the participation and influence of criminologists was typical, the author muses at the end of the book, "one could generalize from their experience about the role of specialists in Soviet policy-making as a whole" (p. 160). He then cites several reasons why it might be so. The discovery that, in the few criminal policy decisions studied, the top law enforcement officials played a more active part than did the relevant Central Committee staff is cited to contradict Brzezinski, Huntington, and Avtorkhanov, who held that Central Committee *apparatchiki* usually were the principal source in Soviet policy making (p. 111). On page 152, Professor Solomon states emphatically: "*Soviet criminologists seemed to have had about as much influence on criminal policy as did their counterparts in at least two major western states [the United States and England].*" This reviewer is still at a loss as to what is being compared. The author himself allows that participation is not confined to formal service on blue-ribbon committees or commissioned research reports. In fact, it may go on in many virtually undetectable ways. In a Western-type polity, it might be expressed in the education of future policymakers by specialists and in what the popular press writes under the influence of specialists of varied and warring viewpoints. What, then, exactly are the earmarks of a "specialist"? And was Vyshinskii a specialist?

The very last pages of the book take cognizance of problems of this nature. But under this light of awareness the pearls of science quickly turn into glass beads.

ZIGURDS L. ZILE

University of Wisconsin, Madison

ZAPADNIA: CHELOVEK I SOTSIALIZM. By *A. Fedoseev*. Frankfurt/Main: Possev-Verlag, 1976. 373 pp. DM 21.80, paper.

Some potential readers may be put off by the polemical title of this book, which might lead them to assume that the contents of the book are predictable and not very interesting. That would be unfortunate. In fact, this account of one man's career in Soviet science, and his decisions to abandon it, is well worth reading.

The strongest feature of the book is not Fedoseev's analysis of socialism but his own personal story, a very unusual story indeed. The author made headlines in 1971 after his spectacular defection while in Paris as a member of a high-level Soviet delegation. That occurred in May; in April, only a month before his break with the USSR, he had received the highest award bestowed by his country—the title "Hero of Socialist Labor."

Until May Day of 1971 his life can be considered an illustration of the indisputable achievements of the Russian Revolution—the swift transformation of Russian science and technology which enabled the Soviets in some areas to match the most