

Zbigniew Brzezinski, George Kennan, Richard Lowenthal, Alfred Meyer, Gordon Skilling) are listed along with such "anticommunist" organizations as NATO, USIA, Radio Free Europe, the Hudson Institute, and apparently the most notorious of all, Columbia University ("where new anticommunist theories are developed"). A large number of these specialists and organizations, in the author's view, are utilized by the United States in attempts to restore capitalism in the socialist countries. A case in point was the 1968 counterrevolution in Czechoslovakia, worked out by American anticommunist centers in conjunction with Zionists, the USIA, and organs of the press and mass media (p. 84). The book also criticizes the American war effort in Southeast Asia, Israeli aggression against the Arab states, Western notions of modernization, bourgeois economists, Trotskyists, Maoists, and the fact that there are no workers among American congressmen.

This book conforms to recent Soviet articles on anticommunism which have also attacked revisionism, convergence theory, Western concepts of "totalitarian communism," other "distortions" of Soviet democracy, and, of course, antisovietism. (See, for example, *Sovetskoe gosudarstvo i pravo*, 1972, no. 1, pp. 24–25; 1972, no. 10, pp. 56–58; 1973, no. 4, pp. 92–93; and *Partiinaiia zhizn'*, 1973, no. 12, pp. 65–67.) Unfortunately, anticommunism so broadly and so loosely described is as difficult to break down and analyze as its counterpart, the overly inclusive view of communism held by some of its most outspoken enemies. In both cases the opponent ideology appears as the source of most evils in the contemporary world. Much of anticommunism is indeed, as the author contends, in effect antisovietism. But this very identification of communism with the Soviet Union was first initiated by Soviet leaders and has since been vigorously promoted by them over quite a number of years. Inevitably, then, critics or proponents of communism have found it difficult to separate that movement from the Soviet Union itself.

RICHARD C. GRIPP

*California State University, San Diego*

SOVETSKIE ADMINISTRATIVNO-PRAVOVYE OTNOSHENIIA. By G. I. Petrov. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1972. 157 pp. 74 kopeks, paper.

Georgii Ivanovich Petrov, who holds a doctorate in law and is a member of the Leningrad University Juridical Faculty, is one of the leading specialists in Soviet administrative law, along with Iu. M. Kozlov and A. E. Lunev. Petrov's specialized monograph on the concept of the legal relationship in Soviet administrative law is organized for the first five chapters according to the standard categories of Soviet legal analysis: (1) nature, (2) subjects, (3) content, (4) objects, and (5) classification of Soviet administrative legal relationships.

This book continues a spirited debate in Soviet legal literature over the scope and nature of the concept of a legal relationship in administrative law. Lunev and Kozlov hold the standard view that only government agencies, public organizations, or public officials can be parties to an administrative legal relationship under Soviet law. (See, for example, A. E. Lunev, ed., *Administrativnoe pravo*, Moscow, 1967, pp. 32–34.) In contrast, Petrov in the book under review and in his previous writings advocates a broader concept in which two private citizens could also constitute the opposite sides of a Soviet administrative legal relationship under certain circumstances (see chap. 1, sec. 2, and chap. 2, sec. 2). Kozlov had previously

subjected this position to detailed criticism (Iu. M. Kozlov, *Predmet sovetskogo administrativnogo prava*, Moscow, 1967, pp. 104–21). In his latest book Petrov counterrebutts Kozlov, arguing among other points that the standard view represents an outgrowth of Soviet jurisprudence of the 1920s, which in turn was influenced by the “bourgeois” legal distinction between “public” and “private” law, a dichotomy which classifies the legal relationship between two private citizens exclusively under civil law. This debate, which is not untypical of theoretical differences among jurists within the Soviet legal profession, will no doubt go on.

The last two chapters of the book (chaps. 6 and 7) will probably be most interesting to the nonlegal specialist. Chapter 6 is a description of how administrative legality is secured in the Soviet Union. That is, how the Communist Party, the Supreme Soviet, and the Council of Ministers of the USSR, the procuracy, the judiciary, and the community all participate in various ways to ensure that the parties to the administrative legal relationship obey the law. Petrov concludes his book with a now familiar feature of post-Stalin jurisprudence—the projection that with the growth of legal consciousness and the decline of lawbreaking, administrative legal relationships will gradually be transformed into Communist self-administration (*samoupravlenie*) as part of the general withering away of the function of legal coercion in Soviet society. However, he adds the caveat that administrative legal relationships will continue to be necessary under “contemporary conditions of administrative and disciplinary misdemeanors” (p. 151).

ROBERT SHARLET  
*Union College*

THE ECONOMICS OF SOVIET MERCHANT-SHIPING POLICY. By  
*Robert E. Athay*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1971. xiii,  
150 pp. \$7.50.

The spectacular expansion of the Soviet merchant fleet since the mid-1950s is one of the sensational developments which have sent ripples as far as American and Australian shores. The book under review sheds a good deal of light on the motives, ways, and means underlying this development and its implications for capitalist countries. It is the first book published in English which provides a systematic analysis of the economic foundations of Soviet shipping policy. The study is based on primary sources, and although it is in a specialized field, it will have broader appeal to businessmen, economists, and political scientists interested in Soviet and East-West studies in general. Dr. Athay has carved out a niche for himself among Western specialists on Soviet economics.

As the author indicates from the start, “this study assesses the extent to which the heavy commitment of resources to the Soviet merchant fleet has been worthwhile from the standpoint of economic efficiency” (p. 3). It is shown that this expansion has been justified on economic grounds, quite apart from substantial benefits of a political and strategic nature.

The limitations of the study are set primarily by the availability of published data and the problems associated with their interpretation. The author confuses depreciation charges and capital charges, partly because he uses data of pre-1966 vintage (the year in which capital charges were introduced). Since that time some Soviet accounting practices have changed, so that his analysis is now somewhat outdated. The author has succumbed to the old temptation of describing nonsocialist