

kind of "sound fetishism" in a poet, it is hard to see how data of this sort might be meaningful, even if they were statistically respectable. The overall distribution of sounds in an author's work can at best serve only as background for the study of significant passages which, by their very nature, can never constitute a statistical sample.

D. L. PLANK

University of Colorado

THE HEIRS OF STALIN: DISSIDENCE AND THE SOVIET REGIME, 1953–1970. By *Abraham Rothberg*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1972. xii, 450 pp. \$14.50.

Abraham Rothberg has provided a far-ranging chronicle of the conflict between Soviet intellectuals and their government from the time of Stalin's death until virtually the present day. Briefly covering the relatively liberal periods of the first and second thaws, Rothberg quickly turns his attention to the 1960s and the writers and scientists whose names—at least in the Western press—are still in the headlines: Solzhenitsyn, Kuznetsov, Brodsky, Sakharov, and the Medvedev brothers, among others. For the nonspecialist the book contains a readable and comprehensive glimpse into one aspect of recent Russian history. For the specialist the book's merits are of a different nature. There is little that is actually new in what Rothberg says; the period of the thaws and the controversy surrounding Pasternak's *Doctor Zhivago* have already been covered in a number of studies, and anyone who closely follows Soviet affairs is thoroughly familiar with most of the later events as well. Yet the very inclusion of all the major and many of the minor instances of dissidence in a single volume is a service in its own right. It becomes possible not only to follow the chronological development of party policy toward intellectual mavericks but also to see connections between the various cases that are not so evident when each is viewed in isolation. Also, Rothberg does include material that occasionally sheds light on the background and the motivation of the dissidents, thereby often making them appear still more favorable. Particularly moving are the details relating to the execution of Yakir's father, Iona, a Soviet general who continued to believe in the rectitude of the party and of Stalin even as he was being executed.

The book is unfortunately marred by several errors and omissions. One hesitates to complain of lacunae in an admittedly "selected" bibliography intended for those who do not read Russian. Still, there are several works which the author considered important enough to mention in his text, but which are not included in the bibliography even though they have been translated into English. These include *Pages from Tarusa*, Fedor Abramov's *Round and About* (translated as *The New Life*), and Vasilii Aksenov's *A Ticket to the Stars*. Many readers would have also benefited from an explanation of the significance of chapter 2's title, "Engineers of the Soul." Factual errors include two references (pp. 269 and 293) to a government-sponsored celebration on Stalin's birthday in December 1969. A group of dissidents did gather that day to protest in case the rumored celebration took place, but although one of the would-be demonstrators was arrested, there was no marking of the occasion other than a quite balanced article in *Pravda*. On page 333 Rothberg utterly mangles statistics on Stalin's purges taken from Sakharov's

Progress, Coexistence, and Intellectual Freedom. In Sakharov (p. 55) we read, "In 1936–39 alone more than 1.2 million party members, half of the total membership, were arrested. Only 50,000 regained freedom; the others were tortured during interrogation or were shot (600,000) or died in camps." This comes out in Rothberg as the following: "Moreover, Stalin had in the period 1936–39 slaughtered half of the total membership of the Communist party; of the 1.2 million members, only 50,000 survived." And if Zoshchenko was "destroyed" during the Stalinist purges, it was only in a figurative sense; he was not literally killed, as were the other three persons with whom he is grouped (pp. 179–80). Finally, Rothberg repeats the widely held misconception that Zhores Medvedev's first name is a Russian form of Jaurès. I. Michael Lerner has noted in a letter to the *New York Review of Books* (March 23, 1972) that Zhores was originally called Reis and that the current form of his first name is actually an acronym.

More general objections include the occasional failure to probe beneath the surface of various issues. Sholokhov has certainly experienced a crisis in his creativity, but there have been other reasons for it besides the one mentioned in Lidiia Chukovskaia's statement (referred to twice)—that it was the price he had to pay for his political orthodoxy. Also, it would have been interesting to explore the reasons Galina Serebriakova, a woman who suffered greatly during Stalinist times, emerged as one of the leading hard-liners against the liberals. Most important, however, is the lack of discernment between the various kinds of dissent. The classification into "artistic," "political," and "scientific" dissidence which is employed to describe the situation in the 1960s does not take into account the wide range of views held by those who have expressed opposition to various aspects of the regime. On page 149 there is the comment, "Unlike most other dissidents, Volpin did not make a fetish of proclaiming his pro-Soviet loyalties." This remark, and similar ones, ignore the fact that many of those discussed *are* pro-Soviet; this point, though sometimes noted, is more often blurred. In general, there is a tendency to create a monolithic picture of today's conditions—with a small group of dissidents on the one hand and a large group of hard-line bureaucrats, fearful of exposure as the heirs of Stalin, on the other. This picture does contain a grain of truth, but the status of both camps is more complex than Rothberg would have us believe.

In sum, *The Heirs of Stalin* contains a wealth of material and information that will be of great interest to everyone who follows Soviet affairs. But it is often best to approach the author's opinions and generalizations with caution and take the time to arrive at one's own conclusions.

BARRY SCHERR
University of Washington

SOVIET PRISON CAMP SPEECH: A SURVIVOR'S GLOSSARY. Compiled by Meyer Galler and Harlan E. Marquess. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972. 216 pp. \$10.00.

Professor Marquess defines Soviet prison camp speech as "essentially Russian, but tainted by legal and administrative jargon, borrowings from non-Russian soviet nationalities, criminal argot, obscenities and frequently by elements of uneducated peasant speech," which is not altogether surprising in a microcosm of society like a