

the period 1953–66 from the death of Stalin to the Siniavsky-Daniel trial: the awakened hopes for reform especially after Khrushchev's 1956 denunciation of Stalin; the pursuit of wider freedoms by writers and artists through a period of thaws and repressions; and, finally, the Siniavsky-Daniel trial, which signaled an end to de-Stalinization on the part of the new regime and constituted a severe warning to cultural nonconformists of the party's intention to restore discipline with any means at its disposal, short of a return to Stalinist terror. It is Miss Gerstenmaier's thesis that this action produced the opposite effect from what the party had hoped, that a political polarization occurred, and that the movement for cultural freedom became a movement for the defense of human and civil rights, the "Democratic Movement" which is the subject of part 2. Part 3 is an appendix of sixty-eight documents ranging from the "classics" of Soviet dissent, such as the Sakharov-Turchin-Medvedev letter, to the letter of an anonymous student.

The revelations herein of widespread bullying tactics and violations of the law by the Soviet government may come as a rude shock to those who presuppose a steady liberalization in the Soviet Union. Unfortunately the Hecker translation contains so many painful errors, transliteration discrepancies, half- or untranslated terms, and vapid paraphrases that it renders the English version intolerably misleading to the layman and obnoxious to the specialist, who might, however, read it for such howlers as "Aleksandr Radischev, the first important writer to be critical of Soviet society" (p. 111), "liberating oneself from lies, fear, and sepsis" (p. 113), "The famous poem 'The Citizen' by Grazdanin" (p. 145), and so on.

TED CRUMP
Bryn Mawr College

SOVIET POLITICAL INDOCTRINATION: DEVELOPMENTS IN MASS MEDIA AND PROPAGANDA SINCE STALIN. By *Gayle Durham Hollander*. Praeger Special Studies in International Politics and Public Affairs. New York, Washington, London: Praeger Publishers, 1972. xviii, 244 pp. \$15.00.

This is an ambitious but disappointing book. Professor Hollander undertakes the important task of analyzing post-Stalin developments in Soviet journalism, book publishing, radio, television, cinema, and the "agitation-propaganda apparatus." Specifically, she attempts to relate these developments to broader questions about Soviet political socialization, to analyze reciprocal influences among the various media, to assess the likely impact of recent technological innovations, and to formulate generalizations about adult political socialization in the USSR (pp. xvii–xviii).

The chief virtue of this book lies in its descriptive reporting and synthesis of Soviet research on audience behavior. Soviet social scientists and party officials have conducted an increasing number of public opinion studies since the 1960s. Few of the findings about the "effectiveness" of ideological work have been published, but some interesting results have been printed about the characteristics, habits, and preferences of Soviet radio listeners, television viewers, filmgoers, and newspaper, magazine, and book readers. Mrs. Hollander summarizes these studies and identifies factors (such as age, occupation, and education) that seem to correlate with specific types of audience behavior.

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