

the Soviet bloc. He regrets that his interviews with city officials, who tended to repeat the clichés of legal definition, were not very productive. One wonders whether a less direct approach, focusing on some specific policy (perhaps something like the *sovnarkhoz*, discredited shortly before his visit), might not have elicited more cogent information than overt interrogation concerning party and state organizational processes. Nevertheless, Hill acquired (perhaps more than he realizes) an intangible grasp of the personality of Soviet officials and a feel for the Tiraspol environment which would have been hard to achieve without the benefit of his extended visit.

The chief merit of Hill's book consists of the skillful and infinitely painstaking way in which he utilizes his data. Merely reading the local press would have availed him little; his basic approach consists of elaborate recombination of scattered evidence on local administrative elites. By constructing patterns of career advancement and of participation in formal sessions (of the *gorsovet*, the *gorkom*, and occasionally their executive bodies), Hill is able to detect a second more profound level of patterns, namely, the organizational behavior characteristics of officials. He generously acknowledges models provided by earlier students of regional and local elites, notably this reviewer's. Hence, I am embarrassed to quibble over his truncated quotation (p. 107) of my general position (in *Ideology, Politics and Government in the Soviet Union*) on Soviet-party relations: "The Soviet state is . . . a facade behind which the real power of Communist control is exercised." Hill might have recalled the old adage of readers of *Pravda* editorials: always pay attention to what follows *odnako*, for I add, "but it is a facade that is not wholly devoid of functional significance." I believe, however, that Hill and I agree on basic issues, such as the high degree of career interchangeability between state and party officials below the top levels. Where we appear to differ, as in the notably higher role he ascribes to local Komsomol organizations, his more recent, precise data are frequently persuasive.

Like all case studies, Hill's provides a mine of evidence. The book is, however, much more than that. Its clear, admirably concise style and excellent use of statistical tables, charts, and maps are useful examples for anyone. Above all, the extraordinarily skillful combination of conceptual frameworks, general data concerning the Soviet system, and rich new material make the book a model which should inspire a new generation of intensive analyses.

JOHN A. ARMSTRONG  
*University of Wisconsin, Madison*

REVOLUTIONARY LAW AND ORDER: POLITICS AND SOCIAL CHANGE  
IN THE USSR. By *Peter H. Juviler*. New York and London: The Free Press  
and Collier Macmillan, 1976. xiv, 274 pp. \$13.95.

In this wide-ranging review of Russian and Soviet responses to the phenomenon of crime from 1864 to the present day, Professor Juviler seeks to identify the basic patterns of and trends in criminal policy, with emphasis upon the post-Stalin era. He brings to his study some two decades of research and reflection, including a number of visits to the Soviet Union. He is sensitive to the various approaches of Soviet policymakers and crime experts in their efforts to diagnose and resolve the root causes of criminal behavior, often lacing his observations with perceptive analogies to American experience.

The study comprises seven chapters. A succinct introduction sets the framework for an examination of the social changes which have occurred in the USSR (and the tsarist background to these changes) and of the efforts by the Soviet leadership to pursue various aspects of the revolution while responding to the consequences of both political upheaval and the impact of industrialization and collectivization. In the

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).