the region's surge of "halal businesses" since the 2000s. Putting these trends together, future research should look at how pious business practices, in their efforts to build ethical, standards-compliant communities of trust, are themselves producing socio-economic orderings.

Because this book evokes all of the productive issues discussed above, it makes a valuable contribution to interpretive political science and to Central Asian studies regarding the nature of the region's politics. Although Spector is clear that the cases explored in the book may not be found elsewhere in their particulars, her provocative analysis of created order does raise the possibility that a broad range of human activity forging viable livelihoods may have order-producing effects on the society. This discussion has hinted at a wider landscape of political possibility in Central Asia today, where local formations of order may be more prevalent than many suppose.

Morgan Liu
The Ohio State University
liu.737@osu.edu
doi:10.1017/nps.2018.75

Crossing Borders: Modernity, Ideology, and Culture in Russia and the Soviet Union, by Michael David-Fox. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, University of Pittsburgh Press, 2015, $28.95 (paperback), ISBN 9780822963677

The idea that there is a single—most often Western—path to modernity no longer holds much water in academic circles. Challenges to this perspective come from many directions, but is most aptly captured in the "multiple modernities" approach Shmuel Eisenstadt crystallized in the early 2000s. In *Crossing Borders: Modernity, Ideology, and Culture in Russia and the Soviet Union*, Michael David-Fox invites us to engage with the multiple modernities approach focusing on the debates about "modernity" in Soviet historiography.

Like many other semi-peripheral countries that escaped foreign control, Russia had the relative freedom to negotiate modernization on its own terms. The question regarding the nature of this modernization produced a lively debate in academia that oscillated between two polls: one stressing exceptionalism and the other minimizing differences (with the West). Michael David-Fox's main argument centers on moving beyond these two views "via media or a move to the radical center" (4). This middle ground is "marked by webs of meaning, multicausal explanations, and pluralistic rather than exclusionary interpretive frameworks" (17). Taking this position allows David-Fox to recognize Russia as being distinct in some respects, but also sharing certain dynamics or institutions in relation to Western modernity. The radical move to the center serves as a linchpin keeping the disparate elements of the book together.

The book is made up of three sections addressing the themes of modernity: the early Soviet order, Stalinism, and transnational history. The first section is theoretical in nature, and explores the neo-traditionalism versus multiple modernity debate introduced at the start of the book in greater detail. Chapter 2 offers a more targeted articulation of this debate looking at the relationship between the intelligentsia, the state, and mass culture across the 1917 divide. Intelligentsia–statist form of modernity—what David-Fox defines as the marriage between the anti-capitalist commitment to enlighten masses and coercive state power—is a central concept aiming to capture the peculiarities of the Russian/Soviet engagement with modernity.

Part two moves the book into David-Fox's research based on primary material and archival research. This section concerns itself with the ideological and cultural features of Soviet

distinctiveness. Chapter 3 unpacks the distinctiveness of Soviet ideology to challenge common portrayals of ideology in Soviet studies. David-Fox makes the case that ideology is not merely a doctrine but can also act in a multitude of ways: as a worldview, historical concept, discourse, performance, and faith. Chapter 4 challenges the strong association of the Cultural Revolution with the era of the First Five-Year Plan. Chapter 5 examines the history of the Academy of Sciences and its revolutionary rival, the Socialist Academy, and how the old academy was Bolshevized and eventually merged with the party institution.

In the final section, the focus narrows down to the individual level, examining foreign visitors and their perceptions of the Soviet Union. Such perceptions were often shaped by Soviet intermediaries—as is illustrated in chapter 6 dealing with Romain Rolland and his interpreter Maria Kudasheva. This section also includes a chapter on the peculiar character of Ernst Niekisch whose political ideology swung between revolutionary left and radical right throughout his life. His life shows a representation of the cross-fertilization between the left and right during the late Weimar period, and helps demonstrate how Bolshevism could at times appeal to the radical right.

This book is a collection of fascinating stories and perspectives on Soviet modernity. It is clearly written, and presents an opportunity for even a novice of Russian/Soviet history to easily engage with the material. However, the disparate parts of the book do not quite hold up together as a consistent work examining the debates surrounding Russian modernization. The plea for Soviet/Russian studies to grapple with the concept of multiple modernities—most strongly made in the Introduction and Part I—loses its punch as David-Fox progresses through the book.

The historiographical chapters are some of the best written chapters, displaying David-Fox's aptitude for his craft. These sections implicitly invite the reader to take note of the "webs of meaning" and "multicausal explanations." Yet, even these sections lack the connections to the broader themes, leaving what these individual cases signify for the central debates up the interpretation of the reader.

Moreover, the multiple modernity perspective is supposed to "present theoretical and empirical methods for combining the investigation of particularism with the pursuit of comparability" (4). Yet, such attempts at comparison are few and far between. The few sections that do—such as the section comparing the French, Russian, and Nazi Revolution—offer glimpses of the promise of such a comparative approach.

Those looking for a collection of articles providing nuanced case studies with the backdrop of Russian/Soviet modernity might find this to be a valuable source. However, those looking for a critical examination of the multiple modernity debate in Russian historiography may find this work wanting. Regardless of which camp you side with, this is a well-researched book that should be taken note of.

D. Emre Amasyalı
McGill University
emre.amasyali@mail.mcgill.ca
doi:10.1017/nps.2018.58

Knowledge and the Ends of Empire: Kazak Intermediaries and Russian Rule on the Steppe, 1731–1917, by Ian W. Campbell, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 2017, $55.00 (hardcover), ISBN 9781501700798

Since the early 1990s, the imperial turn in Russian historiography has revolutionized our understanding of the Russian empire as a multi-ethnic colonial enterprise. This novel scholarship