

focuses on the complex impacts produced by the collapse of the USSR, and he looks in particular into the role of historians in providing legitimacy for new state projects, arguing that their “new histories” were extremely reductionist and heavily politicized (p. 85).

The book contains many keen journalistic observations and much thoughtful reflection on the author’s own experiences (particularly concerning the bitter divisions between Armenia and Azerbaijan); there is also well-reasoned argument against those (like Svante Cornell) who link the wars with ambitions of “autonomous minorities.” Cheterian is convinced that “the use of violence by the leadership of titular nations precipitated” escalations and that the “central fact in the mechanism of starting the conflicts ... is the fact of the first use of force” (pp. 298–99). He also picks arguments with Valery Tishkov, objecting to his condemnation of self-determination (pp. 282–83), and with Ghia Nodia, asserting that the war in Abkhazia “was wrong by all possible standards” (p. 316).

Yet the volume does not quite deliver on its promise “to reconstruct a new narrative, proposing a different way of looking at the same events” (p. 4), and not only because descriptions of conflict developments inevitably follow the tracks laid by Thomas De Waal (for Nagorno Karabakh) or Anatol Lieven (for Chechnya). The analysis too often falls short of reaching real academic depth and rigor, and while the author is consciously deferential to Ronald Grigor Suny, it is a pity that he missed the interesting recent works of Christoph Zürcher (*The Post-Soviet Wars*, 2007) and Georgi Derluguian (*Bourdieu’s Secret Admirer in the Caucasus*, 2005). Cheterian’s attempt in the last chapter of the book to incorporate the impact of the oil factor and pipeline politics on the multiple sources of instability in the region is disappointingly superficial.

It is not due to lack of trying that diplomatic negotiations have failed to bring a single conflict in the Caucasus to a peace accord; regional actors refuse to compromise on their vital—and incompatible—interests. Yet, as Cheterian correctly argues, the chances that protracted stalemates will break down tend to increase with time. Only a short epilogue was added to the book after the August 2008 war between Russia and Georgia, but its main argument remains valid—the wars of the early 1990s have deformed state-building processes not only in Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia, but in Russia as well, and to such a degree that internationally unacceptable and economically unsustainable situations have become a way of life.

Pavel K. Baev, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo

Graham, Loren, and Irina Dezhina. *Science in the New Russia: Crisis, Aid, Reform*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008. xvi + 193 pp. \$22.95 (paper). ISBN 978-0-253-21988-6.

The tortured transition of Soviet science into the post-Soviet era has raised a host of questions. What happens to science when political institutions that supported it begin to crumble? How can science adapt to rapid political change and radically different economic conditions? Is foreign aid an effective solution? Is the scientific community a locomotive of change or a bastion of traditional values? *Science in the New Russia* systematically addresses such questions. This book is co-authored by the dean of historians of Russian science, Loren Graham, and the sociologist of science Irina Dezhina of the Moscow Institute of World Economy and International Relations. It supports the authors’ unmatched erudition with a wealth of statistical data and thorough research, and produces penetrating analysis and stimulating conclusions.

The book starts off with a succinct account of the Soviet system of organization of science into three “pyramids”—the network of research institutes of the Academy of Sciences, the university system, and the plethora of industrial research institutes. The key features of this system are centralized funding, the separation between teaching and research, and the fusion of honorary membership in the Academy with administrative functions. This form of organization provided some advantages for a few high-priority areas, such as nuclear physics. Yet this system ran counter to the world trends of grant-funded projects, peer-review, and integration of research with education.

Gorbachev's perestroika presented an opportunity to reform Soviet science, and the authors thoroughly examine reform efforts and the reasons for their ultimate failure. This story raises the question of whether the scientific community—in Russia or elsewhere—is truly willing to apply its fabled intellectual skepticism not only to scholarship, but to the traditional organizational principles of research as well.

The total dependence on government funding proved a major vulnerability for Russian science during the financial crisis that followed the collapse of the Soviet Union. The book documents the devastating impact of the drastic reduction of funding and subsequent brain drain on the infrastructure and personnel of Russian scientific institutions.

Instead of enacting a radical reform, however, the scientific establishment chose to preserve the existing organizational structure, equating survival with conservation. The “reform” proceeded by complementing old organizational structures, instead of directly challenging them. Nascent efforts to complement block funding of basic science with a system of individual research grants had limited effect, yet they had profound psychological significance by nurturing scholarly initiative and familiarizing the scientific community with peer-review procedures.

Among the most interesting issues addressed in the book is an assessment of the activity of foreign foundations in Russia. The very scale of foreign aid to Russian science—well over a billion dollars since the collapse of the Soviet Union—has made it a major factor of influence. Nationalist critics in Russia have often accused the foundations of pursuing hidden agendas and of biased selection procedures. The book systematically addresses such criticisms by describing in detail the operational principles of foreign foundations in Russia and the evolution of their goals from “pure philanthropy” in the early period to cooperative projects, shared funding, and selective support of young researchers, university scientists, and research centers in regional areas. The authors evaluate the results of foundations’ activity in five separate areas—philanthropy, partnerships, commercialization, security, and reform—and give a mixed review.

The book presents a nuanced picture of the post-Soviet crisis with various disciplinary, regional, funding-type, and other variations. The co-authors have conducted numerous oral interviews to complement quantitative data with a variety of personal perspectives. Their analysis would have been further strengthened by considering some cultural factors, such as the declining prestige of science. While in the Soviet Union science was a natural refuge for intelligent, creative, and entrepreneurial youth, in post-Soviet Russia they often go into politics, business, law, and journalism.

In conclusion the authors suggest specific measures to reduce brain drain and to improve the productivity of Russian science by creating better career opportunities for younger scientists, by strengthening horizontal links among research laboratories, educational institutions, and industry, and by fostering a commercial culture that supports innovation. This book would be of great interest not only to historians and sociologists of science and students of post-Soviet Russia, but also to science policy makers in many countries going through political and economic transition.

Slava Gerovitch, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Rautio, Vesa, and Markku Tykkyläinen, eds. *Russia's Northern Regions on the Edge: Communities, Industries and Populations from Murmansk to Magadan*. Helsinki: Kikimora Publications, 2008. 233 pp. €28.00 (paper). ISBN 978-952-10-4097-9.

This book looks at the socioeconomic restructuring of Russia's northwest region through an economic geography lens. It provides case studies of various regions' experiences and challenges, as well as a couple of overarching presentations addressing macrotrends that influence the new economic landscapes of the North(west). A key premise is that of spatial heterogeneity: the authors attend to how the evolution of restructuring processes is influenced by place-specific historical developments, legislative cultures, industrial legacies, and accessibility, factors that merit consideration when trying to understand differing outcomes.