Professor Kozlov probably overstates his case when he says that the "ethnic problem left by tsarist Russia has been substantively resolved during the years of Soviet rule." (p. 216) Admitting that there are still issues and problems, he strongly expresses the need for a better understanding of ethnic relations, an immensely complex and difficult study, often without adequate statistics or other reliable information.

It is stated in the conclusion to this study that there is a slow, very slow, transformation going on in the Soviet Union. The people are uniting into an entity that can be called the "Soviet people." Whether this idea was advanced because it fits official views is difficult to tell. In the first chapter he also presents "official" views, but the main body of the work is straightforward and sound. Occasionally a rather surprising statement is presented in a bland manner. He also blandly presents the Great Russian viewpoint, which in these times is insensitive.

This small volume is a valuable work, and the information is well-presented and argued, leaving aside the items of Marxist-Leninist cant (Changes seem to be coming so fast that if he were to revise the volume today, he might leave out some of that.) The migratory patterns from village to city and from one region of the country to another are well-noted, as are the processes of linguistic change and intermarriage between ethnic groups. I wish the book had been longer and could have provided more explanation. It is not for the casual reader. Unless some previous knowledge is brought to the work, its virtues are difficult to appreciate.

In this edition the work has a number of minor flaws. Professor Shanin of the University of Manchester, the power behind a series of translations on the Second World, of which this is one, states that the aim is to present "satisfactory standards of translating and editing." I suppose this volume meets that criterion. My criticisms are minor, but someone should have gone over the typescript or printout carefully. Occasionally, the sentences do not emerge entirely out of the Russian; some do not make much sense. Fortunately this is rare. It may be just a prejudice on my part, but I would prefer to see the names of the people conform to commonly accepted spellings. This is not possible always because no agreed on spelling is in current use. May I give some examples, Azerbaijani; not Azerbaidzhan; Tuvan, not Tuva; Kabardian, not Kabardins. There are others. Also, the western region of China is Xinjiang; the transliteration from Russian, Sintszyan, is not good form in English.

Alton S. Donnelly  
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This small volume is most timely. Stephen Kux's consideration of possibilities for new formal Soviet federal arrangements is being impacted almost daily by new crises. In late summer 1991, the form which the association of Soviet republics would take in the future, and indeed, which republics would be included in any new union ceased to be a matter mostly
of academic speculation but became front-page news. After the collapse of the brief anti-Gorbachev coup, it became imperative to create some kind of new federal or quasi-federal mechanisms to hold at least a majority of the fifteen constituent republics together within some sort of bonds, however loose. Whatever arrangements would be worked out remained extremely uncertain, however, in the confusing days which followed Gorbachev's restoration to power and the decision on September 5, 1991, to institute new, transitional associational arrangements.

In the development of his monograph, the author demonstrates an adequate knowledge of the main corpus of historically significant federalism literature and an above average comprehension of current Soviet sources. The large number of annotated footnotes shows convincingly that the author has exhaustively researched his subject. A few rather obvious misinterpretations or outright errors are made, however, including the author's erroneous attribution to Western federations, presumably including the United States, of "the explicit, unambiguous enumeration of powers assigned to the federal authorities and the member-states respectively." (p. 40)

As the author interpreted the situation he confronted when he wrote this study prior to the virtual collapse of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), in the summer of 1991, "despite its federal claims, the Soviet Union [was historically] a highly centralized, unitary state with [only] a measure of administrative devolution." (p. 2) Federalism, in contrast, was a way to accommodate demands for greater autonomy within a large, demographically heterogeneous territory. In the opinion of this reviewer, what the author did not take sufficient account of is that USSR constituent republic demands, increasingly strident as this book came from the publisher, reflected an already existing natural federalism.

The author correctly asserts that federalism is exceeding difficult given "the heterogeneous, multiethnic nature of the USSR." (p. 3) However, these are precisely the attributes which show that a spontaneous federalism already prevailed. It did not have to be invented. In some respects the USSR was always more federal than the supposedly more usual archetype, the United States, since more "social, economic, environmental and political issues [had been] 'ethnicized'" and territorial boundaries frequently corresponded with ethnic divisions. (p. 4)

The author was very much aware at the time he was writing that the "degradation of the economy, the environment and the social sphere [were] exacerbat[ing] centrifugal tendencies." (p. 59) But, again, these centrifugal tendencies exhibited natural federalism. Kux furnishes ample evidence that the USSR was "too complex and too heterogeneous and its republics too diverse [all cognate with what we are here identifying as natural federalism] to be managed through a uniform, monolithic approach." (p. 59) This fact demonstrates that there always had been more federalism and less unitarism than has been supposed in the USSR.

Also showing the presence of a spontaneous federalism is the fact that, at the time Kux was writing and continuing to the present time, the "periphery [was] set[ting] the agenda in the national question." (p. 110) It was noteworthy that, "[p]ressure from below [was] overtaking [i.e., was more important than] the managed reforms from above" (p. 115), which were