

On that, Worth argues that “‘Market Socialism’ . . . was initiated in Tito’s Yugoslavia, before spreading to Czechoslovakia and China. . . . This ultimately led to the reforms adopted by Gorbachev” which “closed the ideological chapter of Marxist-Leninism” (72). Why market reform should have been initiated (when it clearly represented a potential danger to the regimes concerned) is not explained, except that “this came from a belief that an economic market could promote . . . socialism on a more efficient level” (72). Again, the emphasis is on the power of ideas, this time the ideas of Josip Broz Tito, Alexander Dubček, Deng Xiaoping, and Mikhail Gorbachev. What brought this most unlikely group together was the fact that globalization was forcing market reforms upon them (whatever their subjective ideas and desires might have been), if they were not to face accelerating economic decline and consequent military weakness as well.

Of course, one’s opinion of this book in the end rests on one’s attitude toward its theoretical premises. In all fairness, I should say that it demonstrates a command of the literature and offers a fairly clear argument. Those more in sympathy with the neo-Gramscian argument will probably enjoy it, although they will probably be as irritated as this reader was by the many printing errors.

DAVID LOCKWOOD

Flinders University, South Australia

New Directions in Russian International Studies. Ed. Andrei P. Tsygankov and Pavel A. Tsygankov. Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society, no. 6. Stuttgart: Ibidem-Verlag, 2005. 196 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Tables. €22.00, paper.

Originally published as a special issue of *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* (March 2004), all the essays in this volume were specifically prepared for non-Russian academics in order to give them an encompassing picture of what has happened to international studies in Russia since the collapse of the Soviet Union.

The volume starts with the editors’ article in which they identify all the major trends in Russian international studies as an academic discipline. These new trends—they call them “directions”—are pluralization, westernization, and isolationism. In addition, there are different approaches to the study of international relations, approaches that are basically the same as in the west, especially in the United States. The editors call these approaches “schools”: realist, liberal, geopolitical, international political economy, ethnic issues, globalization issues, and even the study of negotiations. Combining these approaches and trends gives the reader a rich picture of Russian academic discipline as a whole. The authors then try to position Russian scholars within these schools and to connect them to the study of international relations. From my point of view neither aspect is very convincing. First, because there are disagreements even among the authors of this volume about where some scholars belong; second, because at least some scholars simultaneously use different approaches according to this classification; third, because some schools and especially the scholars belonging to certain schools do not address international relations directly as is the case with ethnic issues and negotiation issues.

As mentioned above, new trends in Russian research—pluralization, westernization, and isolationism—began with the advent of perestroika and penetrated all aspects of Russian academic life. With the new conditions of openness and then the refutation of a single ideology of Marxism-Leninism, all scholars (not only those in the area of international relations) were forced to reconsider their ideological position, their attitudes toward the west, as well as the multitudes of theories they could use to formulate the new international realities and Russian international policies, in particular.

The realist school and the liberal one would, probably, be the most familiar to a western scholar because these same approaches are the most widespread in the United States. More difficult to grasp is the question of the precise difference between the Russian and western approaches. Of course, there are obvious differences such as the point of view of the scholar (whether one sees the world through a Russian or a U.S. prism) and a different assessment of the world situation. But we are talking about an academic discipline and,

SLAVIC REVIEW
VOL. 65 NO. 3
FALL 2006

consequently, about ideas. Here the difference in approach is not at all obvious. According to Tatyana A. Shakleyina and Alexei D. Bogaturov, authors of the article on the realist school, this is at least partly because "Realism in Russia does not represent a single direction or unified methodological approach. Disagreements inside realism 'school' relate to various spheres and are rather deep. However, it is possible to identify six methodological traditions which emerged in post-Soviet Russia" (62). Listing these six traditions provides a better sense of the fuzzy classifications we are dealing with: historical systemic approaches, structuralist school, geopolitics and geoeconomics, political philosophy and sociology, political psychology, and political economy. Yet, in the introductory article by the editors, as well as in other articles, geopolitics, international political economy, studies on globalization and equity, and political psychology are considered separate schools in international relation studies. Does this really matter, one may reasonably ask. My answer would be "essentially no." The problem is that this overlap will leave many readers feeling bewildered. We would like to anchor ourselves to familiar ground, and we would like to understand the difference between that particular field in my country and in Russia. Did they make any progress in my field, did they advance any new and interesting arguments or ideas? It is very difficult to get answers to these or similar questions.

In the entire volume, there are few comparisons (except sporadic ones) between the western field and the Russian one under discussion. Perhaps the authors were given too little space. But a more realistic explanation is given in Mikhail V. Il'yin's "Studies of Globalization and Equity in Post-Soviet Russia." Having mentioned the importance of the Russian Academy Institute of Scientific Information on Social Sciences, Il'yin continues: "This [dissemination of information from foreign sources by the institute] is of particular importance since most of Russian political scientists are not versed in foreign languages. . . . According to estimates of the late 90s' only 2-5% of Russian political scientists actually read papers of their foreign colleagues in the original . . . the majority of Russian political scientists badly rely on translations, summaries and reviews of literature in other languages" (115). By the way, this is evident from the bibliographies each author provides; they are almost exclusively Russian sources. But it is not only the lack of language knowledge that debilitates the Russian scholar; it is also the lack of foreign materials (journals and books, especially outside Moscow) and the training that most scholars received during the Soviet period.

One other criticism seems appropriate. All the authors take up considerable space describing political, ideological, and other causes that would explain this or that trend or "school." In my view, this approach is effective only when readers understand the substantive issues and are familiar with the difference between the Soviet/Russian approach and the approach taken by the scholars of other countries.

Despite these criticisms, this rich volume and the high professionalism of the authors makes clear to a western academic audience in the field of international relations what their Russian colleagues are struggling with. One can hope that this volume will also help some of us to make direct contact with our colleagues and clarify some of the issues that to date remain unclear.

EDWARD BELIAEV
Columbia University

Economic Development in Tatarstan: Global Markets and a Russian Region. By Leo McCann. RoutledgeCurzon Contemporary Russia and Eastern Europe Series. London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2005. xii, 205 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Figures. Tables. \$115.00, hard bound.

Leo McCann's book reports on interview-based research conducted in Tatarstan from 1999 to 2001. Originally a doctoral dissertation at the University of Kent, England, the book critiques alternative theories of globalization, showing their inapplicability to this region of the former Soviet Union. The methodology involves semi-structured interviews with forty-four people from the government, state enterprises, the private sector, and