

their living quarters and other party privileges. His private papers demonstrate his desire for Soviet Russia's industrial competitiveness in a world economy and administrative efficiency. Like Stalin, Trotsky supported state economic planning, but through the use of less violent and more democratic methods. Plagued by periodic bouts of illness, Trotsky remained a revolutionary writer rather than a politician.

He was expelled from the USSR and sent to Turkey in 1929 for forming an anti-Soviet party and inciting counter-revolution. There he observed dramatic transformations in the Russian and international economies. The USSR had doubled its industrial output by 1932 and the stock market crash heightened his hopes for a socialist order. Stalin viewed Trotsky's political aim to restore Leninism as a conspiracy and wanted him dead. He and his family lived as run-aways abroad and eventually settled in Mexico, ensconced in a villa that acted as a fortress. There his devotion to his wife Natalia survived an extra-marital liaison with Frida Kahlo, which caused considerable tensions between him and Diego Rivera. Alarms and Mexican police protection did not deter Roman Mercador from infiltrating Avenida Vienna and assassinating him in 1940.

Service has written a factual biography, but his goal for a dispassionate analysis mitigates his incisive political and personal interpretation. His concluding statements argue that Trotsky's contradictory ideas endured and that he was a complex human being. Surely such a complicated figure merits more profound observations.

Kathleen Lord  
Mount Allison University

**Sharon A. Kowalsky, *Deviant Women: Female Crime and Criminology in Revolutionary Russia, 1880-1920* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2009).**

*Deviant Women* is one of a growing number of studies to situate intellectual and cultural developments in Russia within a larger European context. Kowalsky's discussion of the impact of Cesare Lombroso's theories of criminal types, among other things, demonstrates how Russian criminology was in direct dialogue with the rest of the field in Europe. She also charts the rise of other schools of thought less interested in identifying inborn criminal traits than in emphasizing the role of socioeconomic conditions in causing crime. With the establishment of the Soviet state, criminology became a state-supported scientific discipline, although one that never became dominated by a single approach. The 1920s saw increasing state concern over crime rates, driven by the assumption that crime was supposed to disappear the closer the country came to achieving socialism. Hence, crime statistics were used to chart the country's progress

towards that goal as well as the supposed level of consciousness of the population. The same statistics demonstrate what criminologists thought should be tracked and labelled as a crime. While most criminologists were, to use Bolshevik terminology, “bourgeois specialists,” they were still driven by a desire to radically change society. So they chose to work with the new regime. Kowalsky’s discussion of their activities sheds light on how people negotiated what it meant to be Soviet in this era when identities and social categories were so in flux. In her words,

The course criminology took highlights the temporary compatibility of the Russian intellectual ethos with early Soviet interests, the willingness of professionals to work within the limits set by the Soviet state, the arenas of independence professionals found for themselves and their research within this framework, and the constraints the state placed on public, autonomous activity. (54)

When it comes specifically to the question of female crime, Kowalsky demonstrates that Lombroso’s 1893 work *The Female Offender* (co-written with Guglielmo Ferraro) was seminal. The work established certain notions that wound up influencing all schools of criminology in Russia until the end of the 1920s. Lombroso and Ferraro stressed the “primitiveness” of women; argued that female criminals were driven by deviant sexuality; and suggested that women could more easily be influenced to commit crimes by others than men. At the basis of their analysis was a deterministic assumption about the role of female reproductive physiology in criminality.

The persistence of these ideas is the main focus of the book. Kowalsky devotes entire chapters to attitudes towards sexuality and female deviance; the connection of female crime with the perceived “backwardness” of the countryside; and the problem of infanticide. On the basis of pre-revolutionary studies, criminologists assumed that women’s reproductive systems made them more susceptible to certain types of crime (abortion, spouse murder, and infanticide). Yet, they also believed that female crime rates would go up as more women left the domestic sphere since their isolation there was to blame for their relative “backwardness.” Hence, early Soviet investigators searched for evidence that women were committing a broader array of crimes in an effort to prove that women were now more equal in society and the country was on track towards socialism. Instead, they found that women were still committing “female” crimes, just in greater numbers. This pattern led to disturbing conclusions: was the revolution somehow incomplete or were women merely unwilling to embrace the new social order?

Some of the same questions were raised when criminologists considered the geography of crime. Relying on Bolshevik notions that assumed urban life to be more modern than, and culturally superior, to its rural counterpart, criminologists posited that urban crimes were more professional and less violent

than rural crimes. However, they connected female crime with peasant crime. In this way, according to Kowalsky, "social class and gender became markers of urban and rural, and thus of progress and backwardness." (118) Her case study of infanticide underscores this point. Soviet criminologists tended to accept pre-revolutionary views about infanticide, believing it to be a sign of cultural backwardness. It was thought the crime was committed by single women out of shame or fear. Bolshevik social and legal policies that allowed abortions and provide financial support for single mothers were supposed to eliminate the reasons behind infanticide. So when infanticide rates continued to rise in the 1920s, criminologists scrambled to explain the situation. For instance, a sudden upsurge in the number of urban infanticide cases was linked to the migration of peasant women to the cities, because it was assumed they brought their "backwardness" with them. "By incorporating physiological factors into their explanations of infanticide," Kowalsky writes, "criminologists highlighted both the 'naturalness' of the crime and the fundamental 'primitiveness' of women." She goes on to argue that, "In so doing, they unconsciously cast doubt on the ability of the socialist project to eliminate conditions that contributed to criminal activity, implying that women's crime was natural, rooted in biology, and thus immutable." (165-66)

In sum, this well-written and convincingly argued book will appeal to a number of audiences. By stressing Russia's connection to intellectual trends in Europe, *Deviant Women*, offers new insights to any Europeanist interested in criminology as well as intellectual and cultural history more generally. For Russian specialists, the book provides further evidence of the deep continuities that existed between the late imperial and early Soviet eras. It also raises disturbing questions about Soviet policies vis-à-vis women and sheds new light on Bolshevik efforts to transform society in the 1920s.

Alison Rowley  
Concordia University

**Thomas Wheatland, *The Frankfurt School in Exile* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2009).**

Since Martin Jay, Rolf Wiggershaus, and Douglas Kellner's classic accounts, there have been few full-length historical accounts of the famed German-Jewish émigrés known collectively as the Frankfurt School. Given such a strong pedigree, the first thing that comes to mind as one sets out to read Thomas Wheatland's new book *The Frankfurt School in Exile* is what is left to say? Wheatland quickly takes up this concern in his introduction where he makes the claim that many of the traditional accounts of the Institut für Sozialforschung (Institute for Social Research) and their period of exile in the United States fail to adequately explore