

science policies. Especially critical of Khrushchev, Medvedev suggests that, in each period of Soviet history, political constraints damaged the quality of scientific research. Yet, he concludes on an optimistic note, firm in his belief that Soviet scientists will continue to work in the best traditions of Russian and world science.

The book is a study of the impact of national and international politics on the Soviet scientific community. But it is also an appeal by the author to protect science from further abuse. Medvedev's aim is to publicize the plight of Soviet scientists, whom he shows to be remarkably flexible, courageous, and tenacious, despite all the obstacles placed before them. While it is easy to agree with his plea for the integrity of science and for the importance of open communication in the international scientific community, it is difficult to accept his idealized view of science as "the most rational force in today's world" (p. 217). The nexus of politics and science is far more complex than that which is portrayed in *Soviet Science*. Heroes and villains are not so easily cast.

Not intended as a detailed history of Soviet scientific development, Medvedev's narrative style and commentary will appeal to a wide audience. It is informative and well written. Nonetheless, the lack of extensive documentation will be missed by the scholarly reader.

LINDA L. LUBRANO
American University

PRINTSIPY I TENDENTSII RAZVITIIA PREDSTAVITEL'NOGO SO-STAVA MESTNYKH SOVETOV (SOTSIOLOGICHESKOE ISSLEDO-VANIE). By *B. K. Alekseev* and *M. N. Perfil'ev*. Leningrad: Lenizdat, 1976. 304 pp. 90 kopecks.

This careful sociological investigation by two Soviet scholars presents one hundred forty-two pages of statistical information, much of it new, about deputies to local soviets in the USSR. Some data were drawn from census reports, deputy registration forms, and biennial election figures, but most of the information comes from questionnaires distributed in 1969 and 1971 to the five hundred deputies of the Vasileostrovskii and Moskovskii district soviets of Leningrad. The one hundred fifteen tables contain information about each deputy's social position, social origin, party or Komsomol membership, length of party service, length of employment at current job, education, age, sex, salary, amount of free time, and attitudes toward labor. They also provide answers to such questions as how much time the deputy spends working for the soviet; how he or she spends "leisure" hours, including time devoted to household chores and child care; how the deputy participates in the work of the soviet (as member or chairman of an executive committee, standing commission, or deputy group); and what kinds of difficulties and satisfactions deputy work entails.

A major purpose of the study is an examination of these data for evidence of "basic tendencies" in the historical development of Soviet society over a fifty-year period. In the recent period, the characteristics of deputies are shown to reflect the present stage of a fully developed socialist society. The investigation is clearly intended to aid the party in shaping the composition of future soviets according to Lenin's precepts.

Important questions are asked, such as those concerning adequacy of preparation and capabilities of deputies to carry out their assignments. Yet the authors stop short of investigation sufficient to find real answers to such questions as how the deputy characterizes his relations with his executive committee and its departments, or why deputies do not fully exploit the statutory powers given them. Nevertheless, the book is a notable advance in the field of Soviet sociology. Western scholars of Soviet local government will find it of great interest.

JAN S. ADAMS
Ohio State University