

The weaknesses of Mrs. Hollander's book are not insignificant: many topics are discussed, but none in sufficient detail to interest the specialist. Many important questions are raised, but none is analyzed in any depth (for example, pp. 191–96). Many facts are assembled, but not always for purposes that are clear to the reader. Much of the writing is dry and sometimes repetitious, which reduces the popular appeal of the book.

The difficulties of the author's undertaking must not be minimized. But she has by no means exhausted the available written Soviet sources (for example, only two of eleven volumes of *Spravochnik partiinogo rabotnika*, 1957–71, are cited in the bibliography; the journal *Politicheskoe samoobrazovanie* is virtually untapped; many pertinent books, such as the five-volume series *Voprosy teorii i praktiki massovykh sredstv propagandy* [now *Voprosy teorii i metodov ideologicheskoi raboty*], 1968–72, are not cited). Nor does Mrs. Hollander seem to have been as successful as Mark Hopkins (see his *Mass Media in the Soviet Union*) in obtaining interviews with Soviet journalists and media officials.

Most important, the author has not placed her personal stamp on the materials gathered. Her book is largely a pastiche of Soviet and Western research findings and assertions—some of them very closely paraphrased or quoted at length—with little original or imaginative interpretation. To be sure, one discerns a persistent emphasis on the role of the Soviet mass media as agents of “political control”—an approach that has both strengths and weaknesses. But Mrs. Hollander makes virtually no effort to analyze the various *purposes* of Soviet ideological work, though occasional judgments about its *effectiveness* are cautiously tendered. Implicit is a rather static view of the political and ideological goals of Soviet leaders—a view that one might choose to defend, though it should not ignore (as Mrs. Hollander does) the striking contrast between Khrushchev's emphasis on “production propaganda” and the present stress on “political propaganda” (political education that has merely an “indirect” effect on the economy), and, most important, the increasingly wide-ranging debates on significant policy issues that have become the hallmark of the Soviet press today.

In sum, Professor Hollander's study contains only a few of the ingredients of a first-rate sequel to Alex Inkeles's *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia*.

ERIK P. HOFFMANN

State University of New York at Albany

DEVIANCE IN SOVIET SOCIETY: CRIME, DELINQUENCY, AND ALCOHOLISM. By *Walter D. Connor*. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1972. ix, 327 pp. \$12.50.

For all that has been written about modern Soviet society, there remain many areas of inquiry where it is still not at all certain what the Soviet experience has to say to non-Communist industrial societies. Unfortunately there are still serious limitations on the kind of knowledge available to us. Part of this is owing to large gaps in published Soviet data, and to the difficulty of obtaining interviews and firsthand information. The emphases of Soviet sociology, and the kind of data gathered in Soviet survey research, leave further gaps.

The present volume remains well within these familiar limitations. But where other American investigators have at least been able to make “spot checks” in certain areas of deviance control (for example, Urie Bronfenbrenner), Connor's

work is built almost wholly on published sources. Consequently it is strongest in analyzing the content of discussions in professional journals and the press, and in describing the formal mechanisms that have been set up to control deviance of different kinds. The most interesting and useful part of the book, therefore, is its exposition of public Soviet discussions of the causes of deviance and their remedies.

The discussion of theories of causation is the only one in which the author has attempted to bring in a comparative perspective. From a limited sample of Western social investigators, he separates the possible causes of deviance into several theoretical emphases: determinist, interactionist, neofunctionalist, and voluntarist. He concludes that Soviet theory as a whole can be described as social-determinist, though the brand of determinism is "soft" enough to permit the individual deviant to be dealt with from a voluntarist point of view. Social determinism has meant, for Soviet criminologists and others, building a picture of present-day Soviet society which pinpoints systemic shortcomings; here, one gathers from Connor's materials, they have struck a delicate and shifting balance.

Even with its stress on theories, published discussions, and formal structures, several accessible fields of inquiry are lacking in this investigation. The author has paid scant attention to Soviet psychology, including significant Western writings in this field. As to Soviet Marxism, although he was right in not cluttering the text with Marxist quotations, there is too little reference to the specific impact of ideology on Soviet thinking about these problems. Next, even though our knowledge of social mores and political culture in the Soviet Union is fragmentary at best, it is surprising to find almost no reference to the possible areas of incongruity between official thinking and unofficial social standards. Finally, since deviance must be defined with regard to given norms, it would have been interesting to see an attempt to sketch in at least some of the important differences between Soviet norms (for example, the definition of economic crimes) and those in the non-Communist industrial nations. All things considered, this study is useful and readable, but incomplete in its selection of relevant questions.

ROBERT J. OSBORN
Temple University

THE SUPERPOWERS: THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION COMPARED. By *W. H. Parker*. New York: Halsted Press Division, John Wiley & Sons, 1972. xii, 347 pp. \$14.95.

A one-volume study of the "superpowers" is a bold venture. The topic is vast, the information uneven (that is, many statistics for the USSR are not available), and the mere task of deciding what to include in the comparison is quite formidable. Nor is there a scholarly tradition of such comparisons to draw on, as far as these two societies are concerned.

Wisely the author chose to limit himself largely to his field of scholarly specialization (geography) and adjacent areas, which also happen to be the most bountifully documented: natural resources, production, economic organization, and the like. Of the nineteen chapters eleven deal with such matters (geography, climate, resources, agriculture, transportation, economic organization, and so forth). Two chapters are addressed to sociological topics ("Society," "Standard of Living and Way of Life"), two to domestic politics, two to international relations, one