

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

provides a brief historical background, and one speculates about the future. These quantitative dimensions of the book accurately reflect its strengths and weaknesses. On the topics of history, culture, social and political institutions, and qualitative comparisons the book is sketchy and relies on rather limited source materials. Many major and standard works by Western scholars on Soviet (and American) society go unmentioned, and the Soviet primary sources used are predominantly statistical.

There is no pronounced theoretical orientation or ax-grinding observable in the author's treatment of the two societies. Perhaps because it was written by an Englishman, the book is refreshingly free of the cumbersome theoretical apparatuses, "models," and "conceptual frameworks" American social scientists are so fond of. A common-sense, descriptive approach predominates, the style is lucid and simple, and the interpretations are sensible, though sometimes oversimplified. Although he occasionally takes note of the effect of values and ideologies in the two societies (as when he observes, perceptively, that most of the economic problems of each country are exacerbated by ideology), on the whole the author is inclined to give weight to other factors, primarily those of the physical environment and economic organization. Thus the book begins, "The fundamental contrast between the two superpowers derives from the disposition of land and sea over the surface of the globe." Likewise he suggests that "Americans in their benign natural surroundings can afford many freedoms" which the Russians cannot, because they are "constantly at war" with their environment and climate (p. 98).

Other debatable aspects of the book derive from the attribution of similarities related to the industrial characteristics of both societies and the role of technical experts in both. This leads to an occasional overestimation of their power and to the underestimation of political pluralism in the United States. The political differences between the two societies cannot be reduced to one-party versus two-party system, as the author is inclined to do. Similarly questionable are the quantitative comparisons of political "participation" in the two societies which lead the author to conclude that "active participation of the ordinary citizen in government is far more widespread in the Soviet Union" (p. 264)—a proposition that takes little account of the nature of Soviet participation, more correctly labeled as pseudo participation, since it amounts to no more than carrying out at the local level policies determined by the higher authorities. There are other observations which though once valid have become dated—for instance that in the United States the "basic conceptual framework of a capitalist economy and society is seldom questioned" or that "those who control the media are also, in the main, those who control the governmental and economic structures" (p. 282). Although basically correct about the greater degree of inequality in the United States, Professor Parker seems to overestimate social equality in the Soviet Union, overlooking the extent to which status advantages are passed on from parents to children—a process much discussed by Soviet authorities and well researched by Soviet sociologists. He states that "in the USSR the top ten percent receives only between three and four times as much as the bottom ten percent" (p. 126). If this is to suggest that income differences are no more than fourfold, this surely is not the case.

Despite such criticisms (and some other disagreements of interpretation) this is an informative book. It does provide a great deal of quantitative comparative data, a thorough survey of the physical and economic aspects of the two countries, and a basically sound outline of many of their differences and similarities.

There is no bibliography but there are several charts, maps, and tables and an index (which does not include the names of authors referred to in the notes).

PAUL HOLLANDER

University of Massachusetts, Amherst

PROBLEMY IZMERENIIA ZATRAT I REZUL'TATOV PRI OPTIMAL'NOM PLANIROVANII. By *V. V. Novozhilov*. 2nd edition. Moscow: "Nauka," 1972. 434 pp. 1.87 rubles.

Victor Valentinovich Novozhilov was one of the most important Soviet economists. His great achievements were to be creative in the Soviet context, to survive as a lonely but undaunted prophet of rational thinking in economic matters all through the Stalinist period, and finally to make a major contribution to the revival of economics in the Soviet Union in the 1960s. Along with Nemchinov and Kantorovich, he succeeded in developing and winning acceptance for some simple but fundamental economic ideas that became the basis for the idea of optimal planning. Novozhilov's distinctive contribution was the idea of opportunity cost, developed and elaborated in contexts where it could not easily be rejected, and the extension of its implications from the field of investment planning, where he first applied it, to more general problems such as pricing and economic organization. This book is an elaboration of the basic ideas, and a grand summing up of their significance for the effective operation of a socialist economy. As part of that job he also refutes his critics. This second edition differs from the first (published in 1967) by the inclusion of a commentary by N. Ia. Petrakov on Novozhilov's life and contribution, and a few short pieces from the last years before his death in 1970, mostly having to do with the application of these ideas to the optimal management of the economy. Petrakov remarks that this was the first book that Novozhilov succeeded in publishing, and indeed that until the revolution in economic thought in the sixties, though he was an effective and prolific writer, he always had to publish in offbeat journals. To one familiar with his ideas, this book is rather overlong and repetitious. Its main ideas about what determines the value of a resource—how opportunity costs are measured, how prices ought to be set, and so on—are so basic to the thinking of a bourgeois economist as to seem almost banal, and hardly worth elaborating here. They are interesting reading, though, partly for their refreshing clarity against the usual Soviet discussion, and for the ingenuity he puts into making his points. The book appears to have originated basically from his lectures—there are repetitions to hammer home essential points, summaries to remind one where he has been, blackboard examples, and so on. Petrakov says that Novozhilov used his lectures (he taught at a succession of institutes in Leningrad) to develop and convey new ideas, and one wonders if there was not a considerable body of economists who had been exposed to them before they were officially accepted.

Since the real purpose of the book is to present his views in a way that they can be accepted in the Soviet context and can influence the planning system, Novozhilov is much concerned to show how they are consistent with Marxism. In addition to replying to his domestic critics, he is much concerned to refute the contentions of Gregory Grossman and the reviewer that it is difficult to square his views on value with the labor theory of value. He does so by an ingenious argument that under socialism labor is the "subject" of economic decision-making, whereas under capitalism it is the "object" thereof.