form of governance in some of East Central Europe’s most consolidated democracies, he argues that what must be avoided is vesting overwhelming political power in the office of the president, such as is the case in Russia.

The volume’s final chapter returns scholars of democratization to a familiar debate. Juan Linz postulated that “habituation” to democratic norms is the end state of a consolidated democracy (“Transitions to Democracy,” Washington Quarterly 13 [1990]). Fernando Henrique Cardoso’s closing piece puts forth the common rejoinder that it is a precondition for successful democratization. While the book is an interesting read for comparativists interested in democratization theory, it is not likely to find much traction with students of postcommunist politics. For better or for worse, many no longer view the states in the region as being in transition. They are more likely to study how structures and institutions are functioning in democratic or hybrid regimes. And while many will do so comparatively with a keen eye to theory, the concern with change is not what it once was.

Terry D. Clark, Creighton University


Stephen Lovell’s Summerfolk: A History of the Dacha, 1710–2000 (2003) was the first serious attempt to write a history of the dacha and the ways of life that it engendered. Thanks to Lovell, a new area of Russian life was opened for scholarly examination. The book under review here—a collection of thirty-three articles written for a conference held in the late summer of 2006 at the dacha community of Repino—offers an opportunity to see how far “dacha studies” have come since the publication of Lovell’s book.

There are a couple of things to note about The Dacha Kingdom as a whole. Although the title is English, only eight of the thirty-three essays are in English; the rest are in Russian. Scholars from Russia, Europe, and the United States, trained in a range of disciplines—history, literature, anthropology, and cultural studies—give the book a true interdisciplinary range. Although the book is divided into four sections, the themes of the book—summer, nature, fresh air, nationality, leisure and work, cultural life, and cultural production, to mention just a few—reverberate through all of the essays.

The first section on dacha space tries to grapple with the varying meanings of the dacha experience for different groups of Russians. In this section, Lovell’s essay argues that dacha life complicates our understanding of Russian history and culture by breaking down any easy dichotomy between town and country, urban and suburban, and Patrizia Deotto analyzes the complex response children had to summers at the dacha to name only two contributions. The second section concerns itself with the dacha in literature and the arts. There are two fascinating articles by Elena Dushechkina and Valentina Gavrishina that analyze the role of dacha living in the popular press. Other contributors focus on the role of the dacha as either a place to work or as metaphor in the work of individual writers such as Konstantin Paustovskii, Aleksei Remizov, Joseph Brodsky, and Eleno Guro, among others. The third section provides case studies of dacha settlements in non-Russian areas, primarily in Estonia and Finland, providing a glimpse into the complex interactions between ethnic groups. Marina Vitukhnovsaia-Kauppala provides a fascinating account of how the Karelian Isthmus played a central role in Russian politics in the early twentieth century by providing a safe haven for revolutionaries and liberals. Rather than seeing dacha communities as isolated from the rest of society, she argues that they were sometimes at the heart of ethnic and political turmoil. In the book’s last section, scholars discuss how dacha life has begun to change in post-Soviet Russia. Inna Kopoteva suggests that in recent years dachas have been transformed from sites of economic productivity (a place to grow food) to spaces for relaxation and leisure activities. Marina Nakhsina
and Irina Razumova analyze the role of dacha living on the Kola Peninsula among descendents of peasants exiled during collectivization.

As is the case in anthologies of conference proceedings, there is a certain unevenness to the articles. Nevertheless, *The Dacha Kingdom* offers a glimpse of larger projects underway that will continue to deepen our understanding of dachas and their role in Russian life and culture. Because the essays are mostly in Russian, the book will be of interest to researchers and research libraries with substantial Russian-language holdings.

**Christine Ruane, University of Tulsa**


This is a volume of eight contributions about managers in Russia. Seven of the eight contributors are Finnish scholars; the eighth is a Russian. The introduction by Raimo Blom makes that the volume is a direct response to “the still relatively scarce” (p.7) research on Russian managers and their strategies. A special interest of the contributors is “the change in the type of managers and style of management” (p. 8). Three preoccupations underpin all eight contributions to a greater or lesser extent, serving as prisms and focal points of attention: namely, social networks, social capital, and trust. The very title of the volume, *Managers in Russia: Still So Different?* suggests that each of these factors must be understood in their Russian context, which manifestly is “different.” As we shall see, the application of ideas about social networks, social capital, and trust bears fruit, for the reader is continually treated to an unexpected insight; a ready assumption is undermined; a new vantage point is exposed. In short, this volume is a very useful appreciation of the nature of contemporary Russian management and the singular constraints that beset its status.

What the contributors make clear is that many aspects of Russian managerial experience nearly twenty years after the collapse of communism can be directly traced to Soviet experience and that the trauma is still not over. For a management scholar like myself who believes that a country’s history is a key influence on the shape and evolution of management systems, I was especially intrigued by Mikhail Chernysh’s “Social Profile of the Russian Manager.” He has done something I could not imagine: he has produced an evolutionary description of Russian management from the late Imperial period to the present day, which suggests to me that it would fully possible to write a history of twentieth-century Russia from a managerial perceptive. Perhaps Chernysh will take up the challenge.

Chernysh and the other contributors are very good on demonstrating how Russian managers, for all the legacy of the past, nevertheless operate in a different world. Two factors stand out: involvement with companies from other countries and the importance attributed to management education. Perhaps there should be a third factor, as noted by Blom in a co-authored contribution: the mobile phone which swept aside the once indispensable beepers. Indeed, Chernysh links the two former factors together: formal management education helps managers to “speak the universal language of management [and] comprehend the rules of the game in the way that is acceptable to foreign partners” (pp. 34–35). Education, “the most indisputable component of social capital” (p.76) is considered by Irina Sarno. In extensive empirical surveys of managers in St. Petersburg, she find that education does more than add knowledge and vicarious experience; it engenders innovation, not just to be understood with respect to new products and new technologies, but ”as a generator of constructive business activities that can help to overcome ... inherent inertia” (p. 105). Sarno found that the more educated they are, the more they are likely to initiate foreign business contacts. But she points out, too, that educated managers often encounter resistance to their initiatives. And where there is resistance, there is often suspicion and mistrust.

In a second contribution to the volume, again based on empirical research, Sarno notes that the level of trust of managers in actors within a social environment was *critically low* (my emphasis)