to Smith's suggestions that we "buy stability" via serious direct aid to support the living standards of the truly destitute segments of Russian society, and via aid aimed at buying off the military threat.

In sum, this work should satisfy the layreader and the trained Russian specialist alike. For the undergraduate student, this book provides very clear and concise histories of the Soviet economy and the attempts under Gorbachev to reform it, along with a non-technical discussion of the proper role and potential size of Western foreign aid. (These sections are sufficiently strong to warrant serious consideration of adopting this book as the primary text for a course on the Russian economy.) For the specialist, the work incorporates many new data series (diamond exports, arms sales, balance of payments statistics) often painstakingly developed by the author. Calling into question both the statistical and logical bases of Western assistance efforts to date, the book also deserves a wide readership throughout government and multinational institutions concerned with the fate of the former Soviet Union.

Perry L. Patterson
Wake Forest University


The Soviet environment had reached a crisis. Fallout from Chernobyl' and other environmental and health concerns generated powerful anti-government, anti-party and anti-Russian sentiments which contributed to the disintegration of the Soviet Union. What were some crucial aspects of the eco-crisis? What impact did they have on Soviet society and politics? This selection of fourteen papers, originally presented at the Fourth World Congress of Soviet and East European Studies at Harrogate, England (1990) and then skillfully edited by John Massey Stewart into a cogent presentation, provides valuable insights by both Western and Soviet scholars.

In his preface, the editor highlights three major themes: the disastrous ecological situation in the USSR and its impact on public health and the nationality problems; the effect of perestroika and glasnost' on the environmental situation; and the growth of Soviet international environmental cooperation. In the first chapter, Marshall Goldman (Harvard Russian Research Center) demonstrated how public expression of growing environmental concerns served as a catalyst for nationalist demands. He showed how glasnost' provided a political environment for public protests. Since the central government was responsible for the projects and the resultant pollution, the protests took an anti-Moscow stance. Philip Pryde (Geography, San Diego State University) provided a case study of the environmental basis for ethnic unrest in the Baltic republics. He described the evolution from the establishment of nature preserves in the pre-glasnost' era to public environmental activism, the green movement and the demand for independence. Charles Siegler (Political Science, University of Louisville) effectively linked nationalism and environmental politics in the
Soviet Union. He explained that grass-roots environmental movements, organized in the glasnost' period along republican lines, coordinated their activities with national front organizations. Victor Mote (Geography, University of Houston) documented the construction of and life on the Baikal-Amur Mainline. He demonstrated that the hostile environment of this permafrost-laden area in East Siberia and the Far East made the undertaking very costly from economic, environmental and social standpoints.

On a broader scale, Zeev Wolfson (Centre for Soviet and East European Studies, Hebrew University of Jerusalem) outlined the geographic extent of massive destabilization of ecosystems in the USSR. He discussed the types and severity of ecological degradation, concluding that the merging of two or more processes in an area may be worse than the sum of its parts. Joan DeBardelaben (Political Science, Carleton University) masterfully analyzed Soviet environmental politics. First, she identified the key institutional actors of the Brezhnev period. Then she described the changing coalitions among old and new actors during Gorbachev's glasnost'. Finally, she assessed the politics of passion, the new symbolic politics, the weakly institutionalized interest group politics, weak conflict mediation, and bureaucratic restructuring. Philip Micklin (Geography, Western Michigan University) provided an authoritative assessment of water management in Soviet Central Asia. He analyzed water usage, reviewed water management improvement measures, and then focussed on the desiccation of the Aral Sea, its environmental consequences and the proposed ameliorative measures.

How perestroika facilitated Soviet participation in international environmental cooperation was presented by Elena Nikitina (Institute of World Economy and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences). She highlighted achievements in three areas: ozone-depleting substances, carbon-dioxide emission and transboundary air pollution. Kathleen Braden (Geography, Seattle Pacific University) assessed the bilateral U.S.-Soviet environmental protection agreements. She tallied the projects according to their level of activity, regional representation, and kinds of activity over time (1973-87). Cooperation, she concluded, needed de-concentration from hard sciences in central institutions to less centralized establishments and to policy issues. Michael Congdon (U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 1987-90; Advisor to the Director, Nuclear Safety, International Atomic Energy Agency) probed U.S.-Soviet nuclear safety cooperation. He found the Soviets willing to exchange technical information on fusion, breeder reactors and high energy physics, and after the Chernobyl' disaster, on light-water reactor safety. Nevertheless, they preferred to collect the post-Chernobyl' health and environmental data themselves and then sell it to U.S. researchers.

Zhores Medvedev (National Institute for Medical Research, London) explored the Chernobyl' explosion. The American experts' computer simulations of the event, he noted, discovered construction defects and a nuclear rather than a gas explosion of the reactor. Indeed, were it not for the weak containment, the explosion would have been much more powerful. Recently published records of