they are in fact living up to their claims. To puncture a few gas-filled balloons is good, healthy fun.

But one must object when Nielsen enlarges his challenge to include foundations like Commonwealth and Hartford which have not made such claims and which are pursuing the greater good in ways they believe to be just as suitable as those Nielsen espouses. I wish that the author had only said somewhere, simply and forthrightly, "If I had the money I would have spent it differently." In choosing to review the activities of these large foundations with respect to race relations, he is posing his own question, not somebody else's. Many foundations believe just as strongly in the value to mankind of—say—the performing arts. And, in criticizing the way in which big foundations have dealt with the race question Nielsen is advancing the social activist approach, without evidential basis, as being more constructive than other modes of contribution to resolution of the race issue, such as social science research.

In evaluating foundations there are different levels of information that must be distinguished. At one level there are questions about specific projects: what actually happened during the course of this project or study or grant? Comparing two or more projects is a second level: is a given project more successful than another of a similar kind? Third is interprogram comparison, that is, is foundation support more effective in radio astronomy, medical education, or race relations? Fourth, how do foundations compare with each other: can it be said that one foundation is better than another? The fifth and most elevated level of information demands a comparison of the foundation goals and activities with those of other institutions, public and private, pursuing the public good. The first three of these are intrafoundation evaluations, the latter two are interinstitutional. Nielsen's evaluation goes to the fourth and fifth levels. Throughout his portraits of the large foundations, he rates and ranks them according to his implicit criteria of innovation and responsiveness in regard to his personal list of social problems. And when he evaluates the foundations versus other social institutions, whether governmental, other kinds of philanthropies, or these foundations as they might be if they were fully to reach his personal ideal for them, the criteria still are not clear and explicit. We have not found a way to bring evaluative evidence to bear on the rating of foundations, and perhaps we may not. I suppose the closest that we can come now is some kind of pooled judgment of thoughtful people, and beyond this is the expression of the public will, working through our governing system. When one man expresses his personal judgments as evaluations, he has the responsibility of making his criteria as formally explicit and understandable as he can. The author has not done this.

Having stated frequently his belief that foundations have not done as well as they could have, or perhaps as well as other institutions have, the author comes to their defense in an enviable five pages arguing the case for institutional pluralism in a deteriorating society, in which no bets should be overlooked. But it was just here that I was most disappointed in the book, because of his failure to see the implications of his own argument for the thesis of his study. The case for foundations rests on the premise of pluralism, that is, the value of diverse institutions in society. The premise of pluralism itself rests on the further premise that we do not know once and for all the path to the promised land. Institutional pluralism thus has the same roots as individual freedom in our society. Nielsen's view seems to be that these big foundations can generate pluralism in our society by being centers of social innovation and activist reform, but the very argument that he makes for foundations as a class must be made for diversity among foundations, and for precisely the same reason, namely, that none of us, including Nielsen, knows the single way to the greater good. His narrow view that foundations should be dedicated to active social change provides no room for foundations with other purposes, some to endow child development centers, some for religious training, some for archeological digs, some for strengthening the ballet as a great art form, some for advancing social science, some to create botanical gardens, and so on, through a very rich diversity of human concerns, though perhaps not Nielsen's.

A final point to note has to do with the author's recommendations on how to improve the operations and performance of the big foundations. His recommendations are familiar: diversification of boards of trustees in social and economic characteristics, better staffing, more interchange between the public constituency and foundation administrators, and similar matters. These should apply, I would say, to foundations whatever their area of activity, social activism or not. But it is here that the absence of scholarship is most evident, because Nielsen's personification of the destinies of the big foundations really tells us little about how foundations conduct their affairs, and thus he does not succeed in showing us how his proposed changes would be significant improvements.

ORVILLE G. BRIM, JR.
Old Greenwich, Connecticut

Behavior Problems, U.S.S.R.

Deviance in Soviet Society. Crime, Delinquency, and Alcoholism. WALTER D. CONNOR. Columbia University Press, New York, 1972. x, 328 pp. $12.50.

Are there alternative ways of organizing modern society and contemporary social life so that the characteristic prevalence of various social problems is lessened? Answers to such a question must largely be sought by examining the variation that exists among societies, particularly, perhaps, the "natural experiments" constituted by the modern socialist nations. Connor's study of deviance in Soviet society is one such examination, a valuable one for which American behavioral scientists should be grateful. His conclusion, to anticipate, is that "a different social system and a different mode of economic organization promise no 'total cure' for the problems of crime, alcoholism, and delinquency." On the contrary, he argues, these are major social problems in the Soviet Union.

Beyond the fact that it provides us with important, previously inaccessible information, the value of this book lies in the breadth of its objectives. Connor has not limited his concern to an attempt to appraise the prevalence of three kinds of deviance—an objective which cannot be rigorously accomplished anyway since, as with mental illness, no national Soviet statistics are available for review. He considers also such topics as the recent history of criminology in the Soviet Union, the explanations to which Soviet scholars have recourse in their at-

tempts to account for transgression, the role played by Marxist-Leninist ideology in such accounts, the relation between state and public views of the various kinds of deviance, and Soviet efforts at deviance management, that is, at punishment, correction, and rehabilitation. One gets from this book, then, a broad sense of what is, in the author's phrase, "the criminological enterprise" in Soviet society.

The book is provocative on several scores. First, there is Connor's major conclusion that, despite the inadequacies of the available Soviet data, they do point to a disproportionate contribution to rates of crime, delinquency, and alcohol abuse by members of the urban working class, those who are less educated, less skilled, lower paid, less advantaged in general. What is striking about this conclusion is its similarity to what has been drawn from the data for American society. Thus, despite radical differences in organizational premises of the two societies, in respect to deviance at this point in history similar processes may well be at work, processes dependent upon some degree of intrasocietal variation in disadvantage or in access to societal resources.

Second, Connor's discussion of Soviet theoretical perspectives on deviance reveals a continuing dialectic between a social focus (which is unable to account for individual differences in behavior in the same social context) and an individual focus (which is unable to account for different rates of deviance in different social contexts or at different historical times). In order to deal with this problem of individual differences in behavior in the same social context, renewed attention is being given by Soviet scholars to the concept of personality, but now as a social-psychological concept involving concrete social learning experience rather than, as rejected earlier, a notion derived from psychoanalysis. That the social-versus-individual dialectic should be a critical issue in relation to Marxist-Leninist ideology is not surprising; what is of interest to note is that the very same issue is currently in contention in American criminology and sociology, and there is a parallel increase here in attention to personality as a social outcome which mediates relationships between society and behavior.

Third, although Connor feels there is nothing radically innovative about the Soviet approach to corrections, the heavy emphasis on the rehabilitative function of work, the diversion of minor offenders out of the criminal justice system, the wide use of conditional early release, and the reliance on the public as informal social control agents are all of theoretical interest to the correctional field. Data on recidivism rates, which would be needed to evaluate the success of these techniques, are not available, however.

The major shortcoming of the book is that its data are sparse, pieced together from disparate sources, and uncertain as to validity; Connor has had to rely on whatever he was able to find. His handling of this difficulty is highly commendable—he is explicitly cautious, he relies on convergence from multiple sources prior to drawing conclusions, and he repeatedly warns the reader of the tenuousness of the available information. What is unfortunate, nevertheless, is that the really key questions about Soviet deviance cannot, therefore, be answered by this book. For example, is the Soviet crime rate similar to that in American society? Has the Soviet crime rate changed systematically over the last two decades? Is alcohol abuse on the decline in the Soviet Union?

Thus, the more general question with which this review began must remain unanswered; despite the substantial contribution Connor's book has made, additional and better data will be needed before the impact of an alternative social organization on deviance rates can be adequately evaluated. That the more general question continues to be a viable one is supported by the intriguing observations of recent visitors to another contemporary society—China; they report that remarkable changes in behavior seem to have occurred in a relatively short period, and they emphasize, in relation to this, the apparent pervasiveness of informal social controls in Chinese society.

For those interested in Soviet society and, especially, in cross-societal comparative work on social problems, Connor's book is well worth reading. He has made an initial step which this reviewer hopes will be the beginning of a further advance in Soviet-American cooperation in the study, and perhaps even in the amelioration, of social problems.

RICHARD JESSOR
Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, Boulder

A Crisis Dissected

Blowout. A Case Study of the Santa Barbara Oil Spill. CAROL E. STEINHART and JOHN S. STEINHART. Duxbury (Wadsworth), Belmont, Calif., 1972. xviii, 138 pp., illus. Paper, $3.

One of the few commendable side effects of wars and other calamities is that they generate interesting books. *Blowout*, a by-product of the Santa Barbara oil spill, is one of a number of antihysterical, rational commentaries on various aspects of "the environmental crisis" that have been coming to the fore in recent months. Neither a jeremiad nor a lullaby, *Blowout* occupies a critical middle ground not often found by modern environmentalists, somewhere between *The Population Bomb* and *The Doomsday Syndrome*.

By avoiding unnecessary verbiage the Steinharts have managed to cram a remarkable amount of information and commentary into their little paperback, more than in some treatises twice the size. Few scientist readers, even those knowledgeable about oil and its effects, will come away from *Blowout* without learning a great deal. Everything relevant to the Santa Barbara accident has been considered: geology, oil extraction technology, the economics of oil, the history of oil spills, marine ecology, state and federal politics and laws, regulation and enforcement, oil cleanup technology, the role of conservationists and the press, and the implications of modern patterns in the use of energy are all examined in detail.

Perhaps the greatest value of *Blowout* is heuristic. The Steinharts have clearly delineated several durable, important problems that transcend the local agonies of Santa Barbara. The one that interested me the most, although it is by no means the central issue of the book, is the emergent awareness of the existence of "natural pollution." The Santa Barbara case may provide the prototypic example of natural pollution: as early as 1776, a Franciscan monk named Father Pedro Font noted that "Much tar which the sea throws up is found on the shores. Little balls of fresh tar are also found. Perhaps there are springs of it which flow out of the sea." This and other accounts of preindustrial California documented by the Steinharts make it clear that oil is no stranger to Santa Barbaran waters, although modern technology may have increased the