nis, Detailgenauigkeit und Empathie – eine gelungene Gratwanderung also, die die Filmreihe nicht nur zu einem persönlichen Gewinn macht, sondern auch ihre vielseitige Einsetzbarkeit garantiert.

Zitierte Literatur

White, Isobel M.
1975 Sexual Conquest and Submission in the Myths of Central Australia. In: L. R. Hiatt (ed.), Australian Aboriginal Mythology. Essays in Honour of W. E. H. Stanner; pp. 123–142. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. (Social Anthropology Series, 9; Australian Aboriginal Studies, 50)

Engelhard, Jutta Beate, und **Burkhard Fenner**
1996 Wer hat die Kokosnuß ...? Die Kokospalme – Baum der tausend Möglichkeiten. (Katalog einer Ausstellung des Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museums für Völkerkunde der Stadt Köln vom 26. April 1996 bis 26. Januar 1997.) Köln: Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum. (ETHNOLOGICA, Neue Folge, 21)

Fig. 1: Alexander N. Krasnikov (1949–2009)

The Methodology of Classical Religious Studies

A. N. Krasnikov's Evaluation

Henryk Hoffmann

Contemporary Russian religious studies (*Religionswissenschaft*) has been, for some years, undergoing significant transformations. With the fall of communism and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the all-powerful Marxist ideology reigning there until the 1990s lost its support from the state. Until recently, Russian (Soviet) religious studies – initially known as the "history of religion and atheism" (*istoria religii i ateizma*), and later "religious studies" (*religioviedenie*) – was linked to "scientific atheism" (*naučnyi ateizm*) and as such, with its ideological slant, it did not win recognition among the religious studies scholars worldwide. The objectives of Marxist religious studies, as an integral part of "scientific atheism," have been clearly spelled out by D. M. Ugrinovič in his book *Vviedenie v teoretičeskoie religioviedenie* (Introduction to Theoretical Religious Studies; 1973). Ugrinovič stated that the aim of "scientific atheism" (including religious studies as part of it) was to overcome religious relics of the past, and this endeavor was seen as a one of the nationwide tasks undertaken in then Soviet Union.

The purpose of this review article is to introduce a book by the late Alexandr Nikolayevič Krasnikov, *Metodologičeskye problemy religioviedenia* (Methodological Problems of Religious Studies; 2007).[1] In this highly interesting and informative book the author postulates a thorough revision of the existing Marxist literature on religious studies. Krasnikov states that, "in the 1990s, Russian science and education moved from 'scientific atheism' to religious studies, from an ideologically biased critique of religion to its scholarly and philosophical understanding" (4).

The new *Religionswissenschaft* or religious studies in Russia is now closer to the Western-European understanding of its subject matter, and have now for some time been pursued by religion scholars, chiefly from the universities of Moscow and St. Petersburg but also from the Amur State University in Siberia. The scholars are grouped around the Blagoveščensk and Moscow quarterly *Religiovedenie. Naučno-teoretičeskiy zurnal* (Study of Religion. Scientific and Theoretical Journal), which is an official magazine of the Russian Association of Researchers of Religion, and A. N. Krasnikov was the editor-in-chief of this quality quarterly.

Alexandr Nikolayevič Krasnikov († 2009) was a noted Russian religious studies scholar and philosopher of religion. He was also a professor in the Chair of Philosophy of Religion and Religious Studies, Faculty of Philosophy, M. W. Lomonosov

1 Krasnikov, Alexandr Nikolayevič: Metodologičeskye problemy religioviedenia. Moscow: Akademičeskiy Proiekt, 2007. 239 pp. ISBN 978-5-8291-0856-4.

University in Moscow, where he had worked since 1983. His scholarly interests included Catholic theology, especially the methodology of contemporary neo-Thomism. Of his particular interests were history, theory, and methodology of religious studies as knowledge of the world's religions (meta-religious studies). Among his many publications, major relevant works include *Islam* (1993); *Antropoligičeskye spory o suščnosti religii* (Anthropological Disputes over the Essence of Religion; 1997); *Ekologia religii* (Ecology of religion; 1999a); *Sovremiennaya fenomenologya religii* (Contemporary Phenomenology of Religion; 1999b; *Proiskhoždenie religii* (The Origin of Religion; 2000); *Religiovedčeskiy slovar* (Dictionary of Religious Studies; 2007); *Teoretičeskye i empiričeskye predpasylki religioviedenia* [Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Religious Studies; 2001); *Problema proishoždienia religii. Rannye formy vierovanii i kulta* (Problems of the Origin of Religion. Early Forms of Belief and Worship; 2002); *Metodologia klasičeskovo religioviedenia* (Methodology of Classical Religious Studies; 2004).

The reviewed book consists of a foreword (3–8), three parts, each with an itemized summary, and a conclusion (231–232). Part I: "The Source of Religious Studies. Forming a Religious Paradigm" (9–67) is divided into two sections: "The Basis of Scholarly Study of Religion" (9–31) and "Religious Studies Methodology in the Second Half of the 19th to the Early 20th Centuries" (31–65).

Part II, "Review of Early Religious Studies Methods of the First Half of the 20th Century" (68–149) consists of three sections: 1. "From Evolutionism to Diffusionism and the Theory of Primeval Monotheism" (68–95); 2. "The Methodology of Classical Phenomenology of Religion" (96–125); 3. "The Rise of the Hermeneutical Approach to Studying Religion" (125–147).

Part III, "Religious Studies in the Second Half of the 20th Century. In Search of a New Paradigm" (150–230), includes five sections: 1. "Trends in Religious Studies in the Second Half of the 20th Century" (150–165); 2. "The Crisis of Classical Phenomenology or Religion. Neophenomenology of Religion" (165–179); 3. "Methodological Problems in the History of Religion" (179–198); 4. "Structuralism in Religious Studies" (198–215); and 5. "The Ecology of Religion" (215–228).

In his book Krasnikov draws largely, among others, on known works of such authors as J. Waardenburg (1973–1974) and F. Whaling (1984–1985). Krasnikov's book is interesting, for he also refers to the valuable works on religion by Russian scholars, such as M. A. Pylayev (2000), A. P. Zabiyako (1998), J. A. Kimielyev (1998), and the collective work "Klassiki mirovovo religioviedienia" (Classics of the World Religion Studies; Krasnikov 1996).

In discussing the methodology of religious studies, A. N. Krasnikov distinguishes its three formative periods. The first period lasted from the second half of the 19th century to the early 20th century; the second and third, respectively, cover the first and second halves of the 20th century. Thus the author dates contemporary religious studies from the late 1950s until the present.

Describing in part 1 the early period of religious studies becoming emancipated as a field of study, the author asserts that:

1) Religious studies as a branch of knowledge began in the 1860s in Western Europe and North America. At that time, university chairs of religion began to be formed as did publications, symposia, etc., all conducive to a new paradigm being created in the study of world religions.

2) The rise of religious studies was supported by an accumulation of empirical and theoretical material concerning religion of various human groups, resulting in the emancipation of many disciplines and approaches in studies on religion, such as sociology of religion, psychology of religion, anthropological and ethnological analysis of religious phenomena, etc.

3) Religious studies, created at an intersection of various sciences, did not stop at the achieved ideas but went on to develop their own theories and research methods. In accordance with the then accepted research standards, religious studies, at its point of departure in research procedures, referred to empirical data and their rational interpretations and generalizations, permitting a formulation of generalized laws of the development and functioning of religion.

4) An analysis of early religious studies' methodology permits the conclusion that at that time the understanding of scholarly inquiry into religion was based on such tenets as comparatism, classification, objectivism, evolutionism, historism, reductionism, aposteriorism, and causality.

5) The rise of studies of religion met with a negative response from most Christian theologians. As a principal objection, they questioned the possibility of learning about an irrational phenomenon like religion via rational methods. Moreover, they feared that a comparative study of religious phenomena might result in a relativism and blurring of the Christian truths, and consequently in collapse of morality.

6) In its pioneering period, religious studies were formed in the atmosphere of never-ending polemic with theology and was openly in opposition to it. To a greater or lesser degree, all significant works in religious studies at that time, emphasized differences in the theological study of religion and that of other secular sciences.

7) Many similarities existed between religious studies and liberal Protestant theology. This is especially apparent in works of those liberal Protestant theologians who employed scholarly methods of inquiry. Religious studies were taking shape by distinguishing itself from Christian theology, and this was most visible in the sphere of methodology (65–67).

As he examines in part 2 the developmental stage of religious studies in the first half of the 20th century, A. N. Krasnikov concludes:

1) The chief effect of religious studies developing in the first half of the 20th century was to invalidate the then existing paradigm under which it was pursued. What remained untouched was the method of comparative study of religion. All other methods of early religious studies underwent dramatic modification. Revision extended to many theoretical statements widely accepted in religious studies in the latter half of the 19th and early 20th centuries.

2) The critique of the previous paradigm was the result of new information becoming available about beliefs of primitive peoples, in that it could not be made fit in with the evolutionist patterns of the mid-19th and early 20th centuries. Evolutionist views began to be superseded by diffusionist concepts and the theory of cultural circles leading to the theory of "primeval monotheism." Its unpopularity in academic circles led to the question of origins of religion and its early forms being relegated to a periphery of religious inquiry.

3) The fall of the previous paradigm in religious studies was helped by changes in the spiritual life of the West, especially in philosophy. Trends like "philosophy of life," hermeneutics, and phenomenology gained currency, resulting in serious shifts in religious studies. While previously the study of religion developed along the lines of philosophical rationalism, often of materialistic or positivist provenance, the first half of the 20th century saw many religious scholars leaning instead toward philosophical idealism, subjectivism, and irrationalism. It was this shift in religious studies' underlying philosophy that brought about a revision of preexisting methods and theoretical constructs.

4) The prevailing paradigm in religious studies was exploded from within by so-called "Christian religious scholars." Realizing that theologians' open fight against religious studies (an attitude characteristic for theologians in the late 19th and early 20th centuries) was ineffective, religious philosophers and theologians adopted a different tactic and actively began to introduce theological ideas to the academic study of religion. Using recent philosophical thought, Protestant and Catholic thinkers proposed to capitalize on scholarly research of religion to serve Christianity. They began to treat religious studies as an introduction to Christian theology. While this approach benefited theology, it greatly hampered religious studies.

5) In the first half of the 20th century, many religious scholars preferred a scientific approach to studying religion. Research methods of early religious studies were used to a greater or lesser extent by outstanding historians, anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists, and philosophers of religion. But it was not they who set the pace in Western religious studies at the time. Having demolished the previous paradigm in religious studies, diffusionists, phenomenologists, and hermeneutists were still unable to propose a new approach to religious inquiry. Their unquestionable contribution was in amassing a great amount of empirical data and creating the various classifications and typologies of religious phenomena. Yet many scholars, including contemporary phenomenologists of religion, point to the methodological contradictions and theoretical helplessness of early 20th-century religious studies. It became obvious then that the scholarly treatment of religion was in deep crisis. Solutions to the problem were sought in the second half of the same century (147–149).

In Part 3 of his book, A. N. Krasnikov tries to show that contemporary (beginning from the mid-20th century) religious studies, without disowning its previous attainments, were attempting to find a new paradigm for its inquiry. To prove his point, Krasnikov analyzes the views of the chief personae and world centers of religious studies, also considering the current state of research in Russia. He concludes as follows:

1) The search for a paradigm in religious studies in the second half of the 20th century was not successful. This is made evident by aggravating methodological pluralism, use of not well-defined categorization, absence of generally recognized findings. Needless to say, respective empirical facts, when carefully verified, can be recognized by a

majority of religious scholars, but serious controversies arise in interpretation. Debates about the fundamental concepts like religion, study, religious study, myth, history, hermeneutics, phenomenology, religious experience, religious faith, etc. have not led to any binding agreements. Some religious scholars (U. King, E. J. Sharpe) have accepted that at the present state of development of the world's religions, methodological and terminological pluralism is not only inevitable, but also desirable. Others (R. J. Zwi Werblowsky) have postulated to adopt a "basic minimum assumptions" for a study of religion, but their efforts failed to win general approval in the community.

2) Despite the existence of the International Association for the History of Religions (IAHR) and other regional and national scholarly organizations, religious studies has never been monolithic. The respective schools and trends concentrated on their own chosen research areas and did not form a coherent whole. Nor did they attempt to overcome divisions between them. What united the religious studies community was a desire by most of its members to distance themselves from theology and philosophy of religion. That, however, has proved insufficient. In some IAHR conferences and congresses, participants could not find a common language. The many discussions about current problems in religious studies failed to produce expected results and their participants, often after sharp disputes, remained unaffected, leaving such gatherings none the better off. The lack of a single common paradigm led to the absence of unity in the religious studies community, confirming T. S. Kuhn's correlation of "paradigm" and "scholarly community."

3) The desire of most religious scholars to distance themselves from theology and philosophy of religion has caused a marginalization of those methodological orientations which referred in their theoretical constructs to the understanding and terms of Christian (Protestant, less often Catholic) theology and idealistic philosophy. This applies especially to classical phenomenology of religion and traditional hermeneutics. Phenomenology of religion was blamed for its unspecified subject of inquiry, theological slant, subjectivism, empirical groundlessness, and also for methodological contradictions. As to hermeneutics, while its importance to religious studies was not dismissed, it was often required free itself from theological influences.

4) The crisis in phenomenology of religion and traditional hermeneutics coincided with rationalist efforts in religious studies. That this is true is suggested by the development of history of religion, the wide dissemination of the idea of structuralism in religious studies, and the rise of a new discipline in religious studies called ecology of religion. In the second half of the 20th century, history of religion tried to rid itself of theological and philosophical influences in order to join ranks with other rapidly developing humanities. Structuralism in anthropology always aspired to be proper science, while philosophical structuralism emphasized its own rationality. Ecology of religion saw a revival, on a new level, of those ideas and methods which had helped create and foster religious studies as an academic discipline. Recognizing the relevance of the methodological principles of evolutionism, causal analysis, and reductionism seems not as a retrograde step but as a new stage in the development of the study of religions. Knowledge may also progress through use of older ideas when they are updated and complemented with new meanings.

5) The second half of the 20th century saw a realization of the necessity to develop a new paradigm of religious studies. Many empirical-driven scholars felt a need to develop a new general theory to include the various research findings and create an adequate interpretation of the factual material gathered. Desires to obtain such a theory involved a rejection of philosophical speculations in scholarly study of religion. This rejection is entirely understandable. To understand the fears of religious scholars, suffice it to mention the processes at work in Western philosophy, including in the philosophy of science in the latter half of the 20th century. Gnoseological anarchism, poststructuralism, or postmodernism could not be allies in scholarly inquiry into religion. A new paradigm in religious studies would be developed in metareligious studies which deal not with religious phenomena or with religion as such but with the history, theory, and methodology of religious studies (228–230).

While reviewing Krasnikov's book one must note that his proposed periodization in the history of religious studies and his choice of schools and research trends for analysis arouse some serious objections. To begin with, the author all to readily contrasts diffusionism with evolutionism, forgetting that the latter was a highly vigorous school of thought and itself, incidentally, subject to evolution. Apart from its classical stage (1860s–1880s: H. Spencer, E. B. Tylor, J. G. Frazer, L. H. Morgan) and its critical stage (from the end of 1880s until World War II: R. R. Marett, A. Lang), which the author discusses faithfully and accessibly, after the war it also had a phase called neoevolutionism (L. A. White), entirely ignored by the author,

even though neoevolutionists greatly contributed to a contemporary revival of certain achievements of evolutionism. Moreover, in discussing diffusionism as a response to evolutionism, Krasnikov fails to notice that in fact the cultural-historical school (W. Schmidt in particular) inquired into the origin and early forms of religion, as did evolutionists (the evolutionist-anthropological school). Such was the purpose of the proposed "monotheism of primeval culture" – the wording W. Schmidt used – commonly called primeval monotheism (*Urmonotheismus*), as was that of *Uroffenbarung* or "early revelation" as its source. It is difficult to guess why the author omitted to mention what role in resolving this dispute was played by functionalism (B. Malinowski and A. R. Radcliffe-Brown). Could it be that functionalism is not part of classical religious studies? However, to combine functionalism with structuralism, as Krasnikov does, is a gross oversimplification. It is only regrettable that he is silent about other distinguished representatives of the cultural-historical school like W. Koppers, M. Gusinde, or P. Schebesta. Nor does he note that they expressed their views (from 1906) in the *Anthropos* journal and congregated around the (still existing, since 1931) Anthropos Institute. Another surprising omission within classical religious studies is that of the Myth and Ritual School (S. H. Hooke, E. O. James), which began in 1933, and which could provide a good illustration of the author's point about the discipline's confessional (in this case Anglican) entanglements in apologetics. It is all the more strange as the first two Religion Congresses (Amsterdam 1950 and Rome 1955) were dominated by issues of interest to its supporters.

In discussing the phenomenological current in religious studies, the author faithfully follows J. Waardenburg's views and assertions. This unquestionable leader in neophenomenology of religion greatly expands the circle of phenomenologists of religion. In our opinion, Krasnikov's placing R. Otto among phenomenologists should be annotated with a comment that in *Das Heilige* (1917) Otto never referred to works by E. Husserl or M. Scheler, or by the Dutch (proto)phenomenologist of religion P. D. Chantepie de la Saussaye. More interestingly, when he wrote that book, he placed it not in *Religionsphilosophie* (such a term not even appears in it) but in *Religionsgeschichte* (the common name then given to religious studies) or *Religionsforschung*.

Counting (again after Waardenburg) R. Pettazzoni as a phenomenologist of religion also calls for a commentary. First, Pettazzoni (a leading proponent of the Italian historical school) largely shared the historiosophic views of the neo-Hegelian B. Croce and was a consistent advocate of historism in religious studies and of scholarship free from confessional influences. Accordingly, he often opposed both phenomenology of religion (e.g., G. van der Leeuw) and W. Schmidt's concepts. According to Pettazzoni, "Religious phenomenology and history are not two sciences but are two complementary aspects of the integral science of religion" (1959: 66). Its task was also to collect and order empirical evidence, not just in a historical (diachronic/dynamic) arrangement but also according to a logical pattern (synchronic/static).

When the phenomenological current in religious studies is discussed, a conspicuous absence is felt of the important current called G. Mensching's "comprehensible religious studies" (*verstehende Religionswissenschaft*) originating from the work of R. Otto and the philosophy of W. Dilthey, and especially from his ideas of *Verstehen* and *Einfühlung*.

Despite these shortcomings, the Russian scholar's work deserves appreciating reception, although assessment of respective currents in religious studies is still an open case. Particularly valuable (although necessarily synthetic) are sections describing the views of A. Lang, N. Söderblom, phenomenology of religion, hermeneutics, structuralism, etc.

Several errors and faults have found their way into the book. The names are misspelled of A. Dieterich (not Dietrich, p. 45) and Reinhard Pummer (not Pammer, p. 181). The list of important literature on p. 46 is not arranged chronologically (if the book is to be used by students, the ordering should be by publication date). Concerning the concept of *mana* (p. 74), it was known long before 1891, having been propagated by F. M. Müller himself (in his 1878 publication of R. H. Codrington's letter). The listing of various encyclopedic publications in religious studies (154) ignores RGG (Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart) which had as many as three editions. While it is true (164) that the *Temenos. Nordic Journal of Comparative Religion* is published by The Finnish Society for the Study of Religion, its subtitle clearly suggests that it is a joint Finnish, Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish project. In Poland, the *Euhemer. Przegląd Religioznawczy* quarterly has since 1992 (for 17 years now) appeared under the new title of *Przegląd Religioznawczy* and is now an official publication of the Polish Society for the Study of Religions. In addition, the main publication of Poland's only Institute of Religious Studies, Jagiellonian University, is the *Studia Religiologica*, appearing annually since 1979. Such defects do not detract from the

generally favorable picture of the book in question, although they stand to be emended in subsequent editions. There is no doubt that Krasnikov's book clearly marks out a qualitatively new period in Russian religious research, which, now free from ideological shackles, joins the worlds' mainstream study of religions.

References Cited

Kimielyev, Yurij Anatolewič
1998 Filosofia religii [Philosophy of Religion]. Moscow: Nota bene.

Krasnikov, Alexandr Nikolayevič
1993 Islam. In: I. N. Yablokov (ed.), Lektsii k' kursu "Osnovy religioviedenia" [Lectures in the "Introduction to Religious Studies"]; pp. 126–143. Novosibirsk: Kontinent S.
1997 Antropoligičeskye spory o suščnosti religii [Anthropological Disputes over the Essence of Religion]. In: I. N. Yablokov (ed.), Lektsii po religioviedeniu [Lectures in Religious Studies]; pp. 9–25. Moscow: Izdatielstvo Moskowskovo Uniwersitieta, ČeRo.
1999a Ekologia religii [Ecology of Religion]. *Vestnik Moscovskovo universiteta (Seria Filosofia)* 1: 63–73.
1999b Sovremiennaya fenomenologya religii [Contemporary Phenomenology of Religion]. *Vestnik Moscovskovo universiteta (Seria Filosofia)* 6: 36–47.
2000 Proiskhoždenie religii [The Origin of Religion]. In: I. N. Yablokov (ed.), Osnovy religioviedenia [Introduction to Religious Studies]; pp. 87–94. Moscow: Vysšaya škola.
2001 Teoretičeskye i empiričeskye predpasylki religioviedenia [Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Religious Studies]. In: I. N. Yablokov (ed.), Vviedenie v obščeye religiovedenie [Introduction to General Religious Studies]; pp. 14–26. Moscow: Universitiet.
2002 Problema proishoždienia religii. Rannye formy vierovanii i kulta [Problems of the Origin of Religion. Early Forms of Belief and Worship]. In: I. N. Yablokov (ed.), Istoria religii [History of Religion]. Vol. 1; pp. 48–57. Moscow: Vysšaya škola.
2004 Metodologia klasičeskovo religioviedenia [Methodology of Classical Religious Studies]. Blagowieščensk: Izdaniye Amurskovo gosudarstviennovo univiersitieta.
2007 Metodologičeskye problemy religioviedenia [Methodological Problems of Religious Studies]. Moscow: Akademičeskiy Proiekt.

Krasnikov, Alexandr Nikolayevič (ed.)
1996 Klassiki mirovovo religioviedenia. Moscow: Kanon+.

Krasnikov, Alexandr Nikolayevič, Zabiyako, Andrey Pavlovič, and **Elbakyan, Ekaterina Sergeyevna** (eds.)
2007 Religiovedčeskiy slovar [Dictionary of Religious Studies]. Moscow: Izdatielstvo Akademičeskiy Proiekt.

Otto, Rudolf
1917 Das Heilige. Über das Irrationale in der Idee des Göttlichen und sein Verhältnis zum Rationalen. Breslau: Trewendt und Granier.

Pettazzoni, Raffaele
1959 The Supreme Being; Phenomenological Structure and Historical Development; pp. 59–66. In: Mircea Eliade and Joseph Kitagawa (eds.), The History of Religions. Essays in Methodology. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Pylayev, Maxim Alexandrowič
2000 Fenomenologya religii Rudolfa Otto [The Phenomenology of Religion of Rudolf Otto]. Moscow: Izdatielstvo Moskovskovo kulturologièeskovo liceya 1310.

Ugrinovič, Dymitriy Modestowič
1973 Vviedenie v teoretičeskoye religioviedenie [Introduction to Theoretical Religious Studies]. Moscow: Mysl.

Waardenburg, Jacques
1973–74 Classical Approaches to the Study of Religion. Aims, Methods, and Theories of Research. Vol. 1: Introduction and Anthology. Vol. 2: Bibliography. The Hague: Mouton. (Religion and Reason, 3 + 4)

Whaling, Frank (ed.)
1984–85 Contemporary Approaches to the Study of Religion in 2 Volumes. Vol. 1: The Humanities. Vol. 2: The Social Sciences. Berlin: Mouton. (Religion and Reason, 27 + 28)

Zabiyako, Andrey Pavlovič
2000 Kategoria sviatosti. Sravnitielnoye issliedovanie lingvoreligioznych tradicii [The Category of Holiness. A Comparative Study of Linguistic-Religious Traditions]. Moscow: Moskowskiy učebnik.

Minikulti in Davos

Über den "Kampf" der Kulturen, kosmopolitische Eliten und einen ganz neuen Kulturbegriff

Thomas Bargatzky

Die Kampfhandlungen zwischen der georgischen Armee und südossetischen Milizverbänden begannen im Juli 2008. In der Nacht zum 8. August 2008 gingen georgische Einheiten in die Offensive zur Rückgewinnung der Kontrolle über das abtrünnige Gebiet. Daraufhin griffen russische Truppen vom Nordkaukasus her ein und drängten die georgische Armee zurück. Der Krieg endete bekanntlich mit der Niederlage Georgiens. Nicht lange danach – im Herbst desselben Jahres – kam es zum großen Bankenzusammenbruch, zum "Platzen der Finanzblase", zum Ende des "Casino-Kapitalismus", wie die Ereignisse in den Medien auch genannt wurden.

Wenn nun gerade in diesem selben Jahr ein Buch erscheint, das unverdrossen behauptet, dass Kulturen nicht zusammenprallen, und dass uns die Wirtschaft die Lösung für unsere Probleme zeigt, so könnte man die Sache auf sich beruhen lassen. Das