trative targeting of dangerous individuals. In this, McCallum distinguishes his analysis from those, such as Kurt Danzinger, who contend that cultural conceptions of personality derive from tests administered to the "normal" public. McCallum argues instead that personality, as a concept, comes into existence "as an index of risk management" (pp. 32, 108). However, McCallum makes his case without addressing the empirical specificity of Danzinger's claims. Nor does he show how institutionally situated psychiatric ideas about personality enter public discourse. This is unfortunate because both Danzinger and McCallum make important contributions to the analysis of personality as a cultural construct. In addition, the insights of each might be fruitfully related to overlapping evocations of personality in consumer society, popular culture, the organization of business, elite and public education, and religion.

Critical scholars will find much to value in McCallum's work. Many will also be puzzled by McCallum's one-dimensional depiction of social control theory as a top-down functionalist paradigm of repressive power and self-interest. This ignores numerous more subtle studies of hegemonic control work and resistance, whose complexities belie McCallum's simplistic characterization. Nor does McCallum examine such matters as the role of pharmaceutical interventions or how gender and the racialized colonial legacy of Australia might influence judgments about dangerousness and personality. Furthermore, despite beginning with an account of the highly publicized Port Arthur killings of 1996, *Personality and Dangerousness* pays little attention to the influence of mass media in shaping perceptions of dangerousness. Nevertheless, McCallum's book provides a valuable sociological history of institutional practices leading to the managerial production of antisocial personality disorder and, as such, deserves careful reading by scholars concerned with the governance of madness, violence, and troublesome persons by modern liberal societies.

From Newspeak to Cyberspeak: A History of Soviet Cybernetics. By Slava Gerovitch. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2002. Pp. xiv+369. $37.95 (cloth); $25.95 (paper).

Christine Leuenberger
Cornell University

"We have created in our press . . . the language of a socialist citizen" (Soviet propaganda expert speaking in 1946; p. 11). The all-pervasive effect of socialist language has become a self-fulfilling prophecy and a canon of not only socialist but also Western scholarly articles about the Soviet Union. Many historians discuss Soviet scientists as being "blinded by Marxist ideology" (p. 5) and as failing to adhere to the norms of science. This is not true of Slava Gerovitch's exemplary history of cybernetics in the Soviet Union between the 1940s and 1970s. His book provides in-

depth insight into the intricate nature of Soviet science and the complex relations between science and technology, and society and politics. The development of cybernetics exemplifies how Soviet scientists, caught between often-contradictory political and economic agendas, straddled the fine line between dogma and dissent by resisting, recreating, and accommodating state-backed programs.

Cybernetics is the analysis of humans and machines using concepts of information, feedback, and control. Gerovitch traces its roots to Norbert Wiener's *Cybernetics, or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine* (MIT Press, 1948). Cybernetics was at the research frontier of Soviet science until the early 1950s. Then at the height of Stalinism and the Cold War, it became entangled with the ideological warfare against the West. In order to build "scientific Marxism," "reactionary" Western theories had to be "criticized and destroyed." This ideological warfare often served scientists' own purposes, which differed from party leaders. The rhetorical techniques of "quotation mongering" (citing Marx, Engels, Stalin, and Lenin to support an argument) and "label sticking" (discrediting an opponent's argument as politically deviant) (p. 171) turned "scholarly debates into ideological and political conflict" (p. 27). Soviet military experts, however, continued to read Western professional literature in order to "overtake and surpass" Western advances in computing and military cybernetics. Because of the Cold War and interagency competition, their efforts, however, remained a secret monopoly of the defense sector.

With the dawn of the Khrushchev era, scientists increasingly challenged the division between "socialist" and "capitalist" science. Their growing attendance at international conferences brought into relief the gaps between Soviet and Western science. Concurrently, some reform-minded scientists rehabilitated cybernetics as an objective, quantitatively precise, and exact science that could be opposed to the ideologically laden Soviet public discourse of "newspeak." The rhetorics of quantification and objectivity were to be the weapons in this fight for intellectual freedom. What started off as a dissident approach followed by a few became increasingly institutionally established. Cybernetics became legitimized as Lenin's heir and was "tamed," "domesticated" (p. 258), politicized, and ideologized to be consistent with Soviet goals and aspirations. Now "cyberspeak" started to resemble newspeak.

Scientists increasingly embraced cybernetics and computer technology as cross-disciplinary projects that could revolutionize Soviet science, technology, economics, and politics. However, ambitious plans to revolutionize everything from economic planning to transport largely faltered as cybernetic ideas encountered the practical reality of communist bureaucracy, political hierarchies, and interagency rivalries. With Brezhnev's rise to power in 1964, the drive to reform gave way to the strengthening of existing bureaucratic and hierarchical structures within which cybernetics

was accommodated. The result was a hybrid science, disowned by its original fathers but refashioned by its new masters.

No book is perfect. Certain questions remain unanswered, such as how extensive and prominent cybernetics was as a dissident and subsequently as a mainstream approach. Gerovitch argues that orthodox Pavlovians, linguists, and biologists turned to cyberspeak, but he refers to cyberneticans as "reform-minded," "unorthodox," and "liberal" throughout. Where did these categories come from? Are they the scientists' self-definitions *after* the transition from state socialism, when being dissident and unorthodox became equated with scientific integrity? Where, then, is the line between dogma and dissident? Also, Gerovitch often notes parallels between the development of cybernetics in the Soviet Union and the United States. However, at certain key junctures in Soviet science, such as in the mid-1950s when cybernetics became heralded as an exact science, Gerovitch's long view across the Atlantic diminishes. Did the Soviet love affair with quantification in the 1950s maybe mirror scientific developments in the United States? At times, also, plowing through the biographical details of various scientists can be dense and slightly repetitive. On the other hand, the attention to detail pays off when Gerovitch points to how individual personalities and their institutional positions and networks brought about scientific shifts.

Overall, Gerovitch provides an insightful, meticulously researched, and fascinating account of Soviet science. He demonstrates the coproduction of science and technology, the politics of science, and the politics of governance. Just as cybernetics itself became a cross-disciplinary project, Gerovitch's book is relevant to disciplines across academe from the social to the natural sciences.

Connecting: How We Form Social Bonds and Communities in the Internet Age. By Mary Chayko. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002. Pp. xi+239. $65.50 (cloth); $21.95 (paper).

Lori Kendall
SUNY, Purchase College

As increasing numbers of people use new communications technologies to contact and interact with others, sociologists have begun investigating crucial questions concerning the potential impact of such mediated connections on identity and community. In *Connecting*, Mary Chayko makes an important theoretical contribution to such investigations. Chayko introduces the term "sociomental connections" to refer to "connections formed with 'others' who are not physically present" (p. 187). This includes not just on-line relationships but also connections with a wide range of others such as absent relatives, famous people, and characters from television programs and books. Her most important insight concerns