

(Moscow, 1968), which ably traces the demographic history of the cohort of persons born in Russia in 1906.

The present monograph is a detailed history and analysis of the population of Kharkov, intended not only to throw light on the development of the city itself but to give assistance to persons interested in "foreseeing those demographic changes which can be expected in fast growing cities of the same size and smaller." Apparently written by M. V. Kurman on the basis of a manuscript prepared in 1931-32 by I. V. Lebedinsky, the book presents a wealth of statistical data on the growth and development of the population of Kharkov from the end of the seventeenth century to January 1959, when the Soviet Union took its first post-World War II population census. A large portion of the data is for the tsarist period, and most of the remainder was derived from published results of the Soviet population censuses. Separate chapters deal with growth of the total population, natural increase, migration, age-sex structure, expansion of the boundaries and formation of the metropolitan area, nationality, educational attainment, the economically active population, and the occupational-professional structure of the population.

In a brief concluding chapter the authors claim to have demonstrated how cities grow differently under capitalism and socialism. I fail to see support for this claim, particularly in the comparisons of indicators such as the levels of morbidity, mortality, and educational attainment, which the authors make between the Kharkov of the pre-World War I years in tsarist Russia and that of the 1950s in the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, the book advances the level of demographic analysis in current Soviet publications by a marked degree. One of the authors, Lebedinsky, probably belonged to the distinguished group of Ukrainian demographers (M. V. Ptukha, P. J. Pustukhod, V. K. Vobly, etc.) who produced a number of scholarly demographic studies in the 1920s and early 1930s, and this book gives evidence of that background.

The book also presents a treasure of information on the development of the population of Kharkov. As noted above, most of it was taken from the various censuses, although much of the data on migration obviously comes from other sources. One might have hoped that the authors would have had access to, and included, the detailed demographic materials in the files of the Central Statistical Administration in Kharkov. But in any case a reader can well be content with the real merits of the book as published.

FREDERICK A. LEEDY

*U.S. Bureau of the Census*

OB OSNOVNYKH ITOGAKH IZUCHENIIA BIUDZHETA VREMENI ZHITELEI GOR. PSKOVA. Edited by *V. D. Patrushev* et al. Akademiia nauk SSSR. Sibirskoe otdelenie. Institut ekonomiki i organizatsii promyshlennogo proizvodstva. Tsentral'noe statisticheskoe upravlenie RSFSR. Novosibirsk, 1968. 84 pp. 33 kopeks, paper.

This is a Soviet report on a time distribution of urban population carried out in cooperation with nine other countries in Europe and America in the years 1965-67. Remembering S. G. Strumilin's research on time allocation before World War II, and that in the years 1958-66 the Soviets collected time budgets of 150,000 persons, one would conclude that temporal studies are relatively popular in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet research was based on responses collected in the town of Pskov in northwest Russia. American data were collected in Jackson, Michigan. This review reports only on Soviet-American differences. Soviet men and women spend the same amount of time at work as American men and women do. In Jackson people go to work by car, whereas in Pskov they walk. Americans watch television two and a half times as much as the Soviets. Russians read more. It is reported that Americans spend more time alone and that Soviet parents spend more time with their children. The Soviets take more physical exercise than Americans. American wives spend less time on the preparation of food, doing the laundry, and performing services for children, since up to 90 percent of such American services are pre-processed or automated. The labor force in Pskov was composed of 88 percent women.

Let us hope that more comparative studies, especially Soviet-American, will be undertaken in the future.

JIRI KOLAJA  
West Virginia University

MASS MEDIA IN THE SOVIET UNION. By *Mark W. Hopkins*. New York: Pegasus, 1970. xvi, 384 pp. Tables, charts, maps, and photographs. \$8.95.

Alex Inkeles wrote *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia: A Study in Mass Persuasion* at the start of the fifties. In the ensuing two decades surprisingly little has been published about the Soviet mass media. An up-to-date study of the subject was long overdue. Insofar as a descriptive work can meet this need, Mark W. Hopkins, Soviet affairs specialist for the *Milwaukee Journal*, has gone a long way toward filling the gap. His *Mass Media in the Soviet Union* is a useful survey, covering the growth of the media, their structure, controls, functions, and practices. Students setting out to deal with baffling source materials from the Soviet media will find this book a helpful introduction to their work. The solid factual data incorporated in the book gives it reference value, and the author's firsthand inquiries during his study and travels in the Soviet Union contribute much new and lively detail.

Such weaknesses as the book possesses stem from the very strengths of its conception. A broad survey ranging from Lenin's *Iskra* to today's television must inevitably slight some aspects. Much more needed to be said about the Soviet magazines, the lecture network, sociological research in the USSR in relation to the media and public opinion, and the impact of foreign broadcasting upon public and media. These topics deserved more space at the expense of some that are treated *in extenso*.

The author achieves his readable style in part by frequently finding American counterparts to Soviet practices and situations. The similarities which he notes are illuminating, but they can also be misleading. Even when he qualifies his comparison of Soviet and American practices by mentioning underlying societal dissimilarities or by pointing out that there are differences of degree (as in speaking of journalistic taboos in the two societies), he leaves an impression of greater likeness between the media of the two countries than he himself may have intended.

LEO GRULIOW, *Editor*  
*The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*  
The Ohio State University