Letter from the Director

Things will never be quite the same after September 11. Here at CReES, our programs and activities go on much as before, and yet this time of national concern has prompted us all to reassess. Here at Stanford and at CReES we responded to the terrorist attacks with both short and long term strategies. In the short run, we are offering a series of three public round table presentations exploring the causes and impacts of the attacks on geopolitical relations with Russia and the former Soviet Union. The first of the series was held November 7, 2001, entitled "September 11: Turning Point for Russian Foreign Policy?", and featured panelists John Dunlop, Gail Lapidus and Michael McFaul. A second panel, "Afghanistan: War & Beyond," which featured Thomas Simons, Terence White, Stephen Stedman and Jenik Radon, was held January 23, 2002. A third panel on new security issues in Central Asia is placed for March. We are also devoting this year's joint conference with the Institute for Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies at Berkeley to the theme of "Political Violence in Russia and Eastern Europe," which will examine the historical role of terrorism in Russia, Stalinist state violence and contemporary perspectives. In the long run, we are expanding our curricular offerings and public programs to direct more attention to Central Asia and Afghanistan, and are working with other Stanford departments and programs to develop new faculty positions in the crucial field of Islamic studies.

Meanwhile, we have launched this year with an exciting array of programs, visitors and new students. On November 2 we hosted Andrew Sorokowski for a lecture on religion in Ukraine, following up on Pope John Paul II's trip to Kiev and Lviv; he spoke on "Kievan Churches: Reflections on John Paul II's Visit to Ukraine." On November 29 we honored the memory of our colleague Alexander Dallin with the second Alexander Dallin Lecture in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies. Robert Legvold of Columbia University presented a stimulating lecture on "Russia and the World after America's Autumn of Tears" to a large audience of faculty, students and visitors. We continue our three-year series of faculty-graduate student workshops sponsored with the other area studies Centers at Stanford (African, Latin American and East Asian Studies) on the theme of "Local Conflicts, Global Implications." This year's theme is "Diaspora and Homeland," and speakers have included Stanford Professors Richard Roberts, Renato Rosaldo, David Palumbo-Liu and Ronald G. Suny of the University of Chicago, Fellow this year at the Center for the Advanced Study of the Behavioral Sciences. We also continue to co-sponsor with the History Department a reading group (fondly called the "kruzhek") on Russian and East European speakers; so far we have heard presentations by Stanford graduate students and visitors Mikhail Krom, European University of St. Petersburg and David Frick, University of California, Berkeley, who presented papers, respectively, on the theory and practice of microhistory as historical method.

Work is progressing on the transfer of Russian and East European materials from the Hoover Institution Library to Stanford's Green Library. All current collecting of monographs and serials, with relevant budget, has been transferred to Green and is being done by Slavic (Continued on Page 3)
Coit Blacker (IIS) was awarded the 2001 Laurance and Naomi Carpenter Hoagland Prize for Undergraduate Teaching here at Stanford.


Russia and Poland for the Blackwell Companion to Gender History.

David Laitin (Political Science) authored “Secessionist Rebellion in the Former Soviet Union,” published in the September 2001 issue of Comparative Political Studies.

Gregory Freidin (Slavic) enjoyed a brief leave of absence this fall following completion of his six-year term as Chair of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures. His chronology of Babel’s works and days was published as part of the W.W. Norton’s Complete Works of Isaac Babel (NY, 2001).


Gabriella Safran (Slavic) has been awarded both the Aldo and Jeanne Scaglione Prize for Studies in Slavic Languages and Literatures from the Modern Language Association of America, and the National Jewish Book Award (East European Studies Division), for her book Rewriting the Jew: Assimilation Narratives in the Russian Empire (Stanford University Press, 2000).

Nancy Tuma (Sociology) and Mikl Titma have received a three-year grant from the National Science Foundation for their project “Paths of a Generation: From Socialist Up-Bringing to Post-Socialist Adulthood.”
curator Karen Rondestvedt and her staff. Hoover and Green
library staff and faculty are collaborating on planning the
division of the library materials currently at Hoover (items
designated as "special collections" because of their rarity,
condition, academic importance or other considerations
will be kept by the Hoover), but no physical transfer of
materials will take place until room is cleared in Green.
Curators Joe Dwyer and Maciej Siekierski continue to
develop the Hoover archival collection, which will of course
remain at Hoover. The Hoover Library is open for business
as always, and we look forward to greeting the stream of
visitors who regularly travel to use our Hoover and
Stanford collections.

We welcome to our community this year many visitors and
guest professors. Six new MA candidates join us, bringing
backgrounds as varied as experience with the Peace Corps
in Primorskii Krai, and as researcher with the UN Tribunal
in the Hague. You will find profiles of our new students on
page four. We have welcomed so far this year two visiting
scholars: Azer Ibadzade of Azerbaijan State Economics
Institute, who is working on trade policy issues in
Azerbaijan, and Bat Batjargal, a sociologist currently teach-
ing entrepreneurship and management at Beijing
University School of Business, who specializes in
entrepreneurial networks in Russia and China. Stanford is
hosting many visiting scholars of Russia and Eastern
Europe this year; many of them are profiled on page four-
teen.

We welcome your comments on our activities; you can
reach me by e-mail at kollmann@stanford.edu. Our website
will keep you current on what's going on at CRees; we look
forward to seeing you, and wish you all the best in the com-
ing year.

2001~02 CRees Sponsored Courses

The following courses were sponsored or co-sponsored by
CRees, in some cases using Title VI funds provided by the
U.S. Department of Education.

Maxim Bratersky, Director, Stanford in Moscow, will
teach a course on "Post-Soviet Foreign Policy Dilemmas" in
the International Relations program this coming spring.

Oksana Bulgakova, Visiting Professor in the Department
of Slavic Languages and Literatures, taught "Gender
Images in Film" and "Sergei Eisenstein and Film" this fall.
This spring she will teach "Models of Film Analysis".

David Frick, Professor of Slavic Literature at the U.C.
Berkeley, taught "20th Century Polish Literature and
History" in the Slavic Department here at Stanford this fall.

Roy Gardner, Chancellor's Professor of Economics at
Indiana University, will teach "Transition in Post-
Communist Economies" this winter in the Department of
Economics.

Jana Grittersova, Visiting Lecturer in Political Science,
taught "Political Economy of East Central Europe" in the
Political Science Department this fall quarter.

Dietmar Hochmuth, Filmmaker and Visiting Lecturer,
taught "Divided Heaven, Divided Screen: Cultural
Identities in Reunifying Germany in the Mirror of
Documentaries from East and West" for CRees and
German Studies this fall.

Jack Kollmann, Lecturer and CRees Academic
Coordinator, taught "Introduction to Russian Orthodox
Christianity and Iconography" in the fall quarter for the Art
and Art History and Religious Studies departments.

Michael McFaul, Associate Professor of Political Science,
will teach a graduate seminar on "US-Russian Relations in
the 1990s" this spring quarter.

CRees is designated a National Resource Center for the study of Russia, East Europe and the former USSR by
the U.S. Department of Education, and receives Title VI funds for educational and outreach activities. The center is a
Degree-granting program within the School of Humanities and Sciences at Stanford University. Further information
about CRees at Stanford is available at www.stanford.edu/dept/CRees
New REES MA Students

Sarah Cameron is a Stanford alumna with a B.A. in History (1999, with honors) and a Minor in IR. She served in the Peace Corps 1999-2001, teaching English in a village in Primorskii Krai. She is recipient of a FLAS fellowship for the 2001-02 academic year.

James Earl holds a B.S.F.S. in International Politics with a Certificate in REES from Georgetown University (1998). His most recent position was as Program Associate for the International Technical Legal Assistance Program of the American Bar Association Central and East European Law Initiative. He is recipient of a FLAS fellowship for the 2001-02 academic year.

Brian Fonville earned B.A. in French (1996, with Highest Distinction) from the University of North Carolina. He is near completion of a J.D. at Stanford Law School. Brian interned this past summer at European Bank for Reconstruction and Development in London, and last autumn in Prague in President Havel's office.

Jeannette Leeney earned her B.S. (1999, cum laude) in Spanish, with Minors in Russian and Business at Georgetown University. Jeannette has studied abroad in St. Petersburg and in Santiago, Chile. She worked for two years as Legal Assistant for International Trade at Dewey Ballantine, LLP, Washington D.C. For the first half of 2001 she taught English in a Moscow school. Jeannette is recipient of a CREEES fellowship for the 2001-02 year.

Eric Leyde is a Captain in the US Army in the Foreign Area Officer training program. He holds a B.A. in Russian Language & Literature and in International Studies (REES) from the University of Washington, Seattle (1991, Distinguished Military Graduate). He has also studied at the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies, Garmisch, Germany and at the Defense Language Institute (DLI), Monterey. Since 1999 he has had postings in Kyiv, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Tbilisi.

Ivo Lupis holds a B.A. in Russian & International Relations with a Minor in History (1992) from the University of Southern California. From 1993-97 he worked in the former Yugoslavia as a researcher for Human Rights Watch, and as a political analyst for International Crisis Group. From 1998-2001 he was a researcher at the UN International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) in the Hague. Ivo has published numerous reports and articles on human rights issues in the former Yugoslavia. He is recipient of a CREEES fellowship for the 2001-02 academic year.

Contributing to CREEES

Financial contributions in support of CREEES programs and activities are always welcome and greatly appreciated. Please make checks payable to Stanford University and send them directly to CREEES at Building 40, Main Quad, Stanford, CA 94305-2006. For further information about the Wayne and Sara Stys Vucinich Fund and other special funds associated with CREEES, please contact us at (650) 723-3562.

Recent contributors to the Wayne and Sara Stys Vucinich Fund:
Barbara Broadus
William Danoff
Eric Johnson
Andrew W. Nussbaum
Mary Ann Millias St. Peter
James & Carol Toney
Wayne S. Vucinich
Darien D. & Douglas R. Walker
Brothels in Turn of the Century Russia

Anne Eakin Moss
Ph.D. Student, Slavic Languages and Literatures

My dissertation, "Communities of Women: Russian Realism and the Limits of the Social Imagination, 1860s-1930s," investigates portrayals of women's communities – utopian communes, sentimental friendships, brothels, women's prisons, and girls' institutes – in Russian literature, film and other cultural texts. In Nikolai Chernyshevsky's critically condemned but wildly popular novel, What Is to Be Done? (1863), the heroine creates a women's sewing commune and dreams that she has joined a sisterhood of goddesses leading humanity to an ideal communal future. As a result of this novel, which was widely popular in its day and later became the inspiration for Lenin's political treatise of the same name, the image of female community became a central allegory for the ideal possibilities of Russian society. My dissertation shows how this allegory consistently articulated the point of intersection between Russian literary and social transformation over three generations. I examine how the theme of women's communities functioned in Realist literature in the 1860s, how it was reconfigured by new discourses about sexuality and attitudes toward literature at the turn of the century, and how it was transformed by Socialist Realism and put into the service of Soviet cultural policy.

This summer I was able to complete my research in Ukraine and Russia thanks to a CREEES Research and Travel Grant. I focused my research on questions about context and reception during the turn of the century period. Part two of my dissertation, "Finding Russia in the Brothel: Women's Communities and the Struggle with Modernity at the Turn of the Century," shows how idealized female communities encountered in the literature of the 1860s were replaced by communities of women figuring as signs of disease and the degradation of authority. In the parlors of brothels described by Maxim Gorky, Anton Chekhov, and Alexander Kuprin, communities of women served as an allegory for a country suffering from the pressures of modernization and class confusion. In order to make broader claims about the relationship between culture and society, I also look at how these literary images were generated by and, at the same time, influenced social policy and other public discourse about women.

My primary text for this period is the novel The Pit, by Kuprin, which is set in a Kiev brothel. In the Kiev libraries and archives, I investigated Kuprin's journalistic and literary career in the city, public debates about prostitution at that time, city records about brothels, and, as a postscript, local policy toward prostitution in the Soviet period as it was worked out by the Zhenotdel. I worked in the National Library in the name of V. I. Vernadsky (a great convenience because the Lenin Library in Moscow has been closed all year), the newspaper and manuscript archives at the Vernadsky library, the Central State Archives of Civic Society of Ukraine and of the Higher Governmental Bodies and Administration of Ukraine, and at the Kiev Municipal Archive. In this last archive, I found a brothel rule book and register, of the sort from which Kuprin actually quotes in his novel!

In Moscow, I worked at the Historical Library, the Russian State Archive for Literature and the Arts, the State Archive of the Russian Federation and the Moscow Municipal Archive. In the library, I continued my work with journals and newspapers unavailable or hard-to-find in the U.S., including the short-lived journal Questions of Sex, with which Kuprin was affiliated. I worked with the Literary Archive's collection of memoirs and diaries and the Kuprin collection, which contains his unpublished letters, his collection of reviews of his works, and memoirs documenting his return to the Soviet Union in 1937. These last materials offer a telling picture of the Soviet reconstruction of the literary canon. In the historical archives, I collected material complementary to my Kiev research, which will enrich the picture my dissertation will draw of public discourse about the brothel at the turn of the century.
Filming Abkhazian Independence

Thomas Burns
M.A. Student, Communication

I received a joint summer grant from CREES and IIS to conduct pre-production research for a film about the contested region of Abkhazia in the South Caucasus. Once considered the Riviera of the Soviet Union, Abkhazia declared its independence from Georgia following a violent ethnic conflict in 1992-93. Recognized by no government in the world, Abkhazia struggles to reinvent itself despite ongoing hostilities with Georgia and crippling economic blockades. The film explores life in post-war Abkhazia and the effects of ongoing ethnic conflict through testimonies from people on both sides of the border, and I conducted my research primarily in the Black Sea town of Sukhumi, Abkhazia, as well as in Tbilisi, Georgia. Now in its fundraising stage, this film is expected to enter production in the fall of 2002.

The political details of the Georgian-Abkhaz conflict are extremely complicated. Thankfully, this film is intended to explore the conflict not through direct exposition of the war, its roots, actors, and events, but rather by examining the current state of Abkhaz culture and society in the post-war environment—an environment whose development, unlike that of modern-day Georgia, is inextricably tied to the war and its enduring legacies. One goal of my research was generation of a detailed film treatment that will act as a key fundraising instrument and, more importantly, as a road map for the film’s production.

I found my research returning time and again to a small group of issues that together comprise the film’s core themes: Abkhazia’s independence from Georgia, won and maintained at a tremendous cost to the local population, is recognized by no government in the world. This irony underlies the current condition of Abkhazia’s post-war development: unwilling to risk compromising its sovereignty in a negotiated agreement with Georgia, Abkhazia remains subject to debilitating Russian and Georgian blockades and is unable to represent itself to the international community. Abkhazia’s commitment to its own independence begs fundamental questions about the processes of war and nation-building: Is Abkhazia’s independence, unrecognized and confined by a blockade, worth the cost? Who are the war’s real victors? Can unresolved conflicts eventually fade into a state of mutual complacency, or will Abkhazia always remain invisible to the world? Is international recognition of Abkhazia ultimately inevitable?

Both sides of the conflict look to the past to justify their respective claims to the territory of Abkhazia, and each side has its own version of the region’s history. While the written history of the region generally supports Georgian claims, the Abkhaz believe it to be a fabrication of the Soviet apparatus under the leadership of Stalin and Beria (both Georgians). There is little doubt that histories were altered during the Soviet period, but is historical invention in part to blame for this conflict? How does the question of historical rights to the territory of Abkhazia—a question that can never be answered—affect the potential resolution of the conflict? Assuming that the Abkhaz version is credible, can simple historical revision erase the past of an entire people?

Ethnicity is in the eye of the beholder. Or is it? The question of ethnogenesis informs every facet of domestic and foreign policy-making in Abkhazia, including the question of international recognition: Abkhaz leadership refuses to negotiate the return of Georgian
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refugees/internally displaced persons until Georgia officially acknowledges Abkhazia as ethnically, geographically, and historically independent. Abkhazia struggles to reinvent its ethnic identity in the wake of war and Soviet collapse, but, after what many see as eighty years of Georgian colonization, (re)constructing a national identity is all but an easy task. Public debates held throughout the summer regarding the adoption of Abkhazian as the official state language highlight the diverse ethnic composition of the local population, of which ethnic Abkhaz constitute slightly more than half, and the predominance of Russian as the lingua franca. Unable to risk alienating its own population, how will the Abkhaz incorporate the presence of other ethnic groups into a national identity? How does the process of ethnic reinvention include these groups in the wake of what is in essence an ethnic conflict? Who are the Abkhaz?

I have already encountered obstacles to the making of this film: making a film about Abkhazia and Abkhazians requires the support of not only local leadership, but also of the local population. Foreigners are generally viewed with extreme suspicion, and gaining local confidences proved a long and arduous process. I realized immediately upon arrival that any travel to Tbilisi would interfere with my local relationships and consequently chose to conduct the Georgia component of my research at the end of the summer. I also chose for similar reasons to limit my contact with the United Nations mission in Sukhumi, as it is generally viewed with hostility as a pro-Georgian entity (UNOMIG stands for "The United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia").

Another set of obstacles involved archival material and shooting. Acquiring footage from the Abkhaz television archive was complicated, though ultimately negotiable for a price. Under the tight scrutiny of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Abkhaz TV is naturally suspicious of foreigners requesting footage from the war. In addition to prohibitions regarding what footage may and may not be distributed by the station, the entire pre-war TV archive in Sukhumi was destroyed during the war. Georgian television stations, in contrast, were generally quite accommodating in granting access to their film and video archives, and I was able to copy both historical footage and footage shot during the war for use in my own film.

In general, my pre-production research was successful. I established valuable contacts, negotiated logistical concerns regarding production, and collected, organized, and reconstituted sufficient material into a cinematic form to move the film forward to the stage of fundraising. This film comes at a fascinating time in the region’s history: Marred by war, economic collapse, and intense nationalism, Abkhazia is faced with difficult issues whose outcome will profoundly affect its future for generations to come. These issues, like the film itself, all address the fundamental question of how nations are born.

Women Workers Under Communism in Poland

Malgorzata Fidelis
Ph.D. Student, History

The goal of my summer research trip to Poland was to identify archival collections for my dissertation research, a continuation of the process started in the summer of 2000. My study focuses on Polish women, mostly of peasant background, who between 1945 and 1956 migrated to the cities en masse and took jobs in the expanding network of factories. The aim of my work is twofold. First, I intend to look at the experiences of women in the context of postwar reconstruction and Stalinist rapid industrialization. Secondly, I seek to examine the state’s cultural construction of “women workers” as a salient part of the socialist “proletariat.”

I spent four weeks at the Archive of Modern Documents (Archiwum Akt Nowych) in Warsaw searching through the documents of the United Polish Workers’ Party (the ruling party in Communist Poland after 1948) and of the Ministry of Labor and Social Welfare. Among the most interesting documents I found were the reports and protocols of the women’s chapters in the Polish Worker’s Party (1945-1948), the Polish Socialist Party (1945-1948), and the Polish United Workers’ Party (1948-1956). In them, female Communist activists discussed organizing and educating working-class women in an effort to mold them into ideologically conscious citizens. Their methods to convert lower class women to Communism, for example, included surprising plans for penetration of these women’s environment through joining the Catholic Church organizations and convincing women that religion and communist ideology were not incongruent.

In my dissertation, I intend to provide case studies of women workers in several industrial centers in different parts of Poland. One such place is a coal-mining region of Upper Silesia in southern Poland. An important part of the Stalinist concept of female emancipation was to encourage women to enter jobs traditionally dominated by men. The coal mines and metal plants of Upper Silesia provided employment for women as miners and metallurgical workers. This summer I visited Katowice, the main city in that region, to locate materials on women miners. Between 1951 and 1957, around 800 women in Poland worked underground. I found their names in the documents and next year I plan to talk to those women miners who are still alive. While in Katowice I was lucky to meet several miners’ families, who were very hospitable and helpful in providing information on Silesian traditions and work in the mines.
Inter-ethnic Reconciliation in Schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Jonathan Morgenstein
M.A. Student, International Policy Studies

My CRES grant allowed me to travel to Bosnia this summer in order to examine schools’ influence on students, with regard to the building or undermining of inter-ethnic reconciliation.

My research plan was to ascertain the level of inter-ethnic tolerance of the school environments, then the level of tolerance among the students. Then, using the media and community tolerance levels as controls, I would determine if the schools were attempting to influence the students with regard to inter-ethnic tolerance and if they were successful in this endeavor. I visited secondary and primary schools in four separate cities. In Mostar, I visited a primary and secondary school in both sides of the divided city: the side dominated by Bosniaks (Bosnian Muslims) and the side dominated by Croats (Catholics). I also conducted my study in: Zivinice, a multi-ethnic, Bosniak dominated suburb of Tuzla; Pale, the exclusively Serb (Eastern Orthodox Christian) suburb of Sarajevo that served as the capital of the Bosnian Serb Republic (known as “Republika Srpska”—RS) during the war; and Banja Luka, the almost exclusively Serb current capital of the RS. I also conducted my study—only at the secondary level—in Sarajevo, the multi-ethnic capital of the country.

In order to measure the level of community tolerance—external to the schools—as a control on the influence on the students, I acquired polling-site by polling-site voting records for the past three years. I also found refugee repatriation rates relative to return applications, as well as statistics on inter-ethnic violence for each municipality in Bosnia. To measure the media influence, the students wrote in their surveys the major media sources they follow. I have been assisted by international workers in Bosnia in measuring the level of nationalist sentiment expressed by each cited media source.

I spent my initial two weeks before Bosnia’s classes began visiting school sites, meeting education ministers and principals, and setting up the future school visits for when students would have returned. Despite the nominal status of two federated entities within Bosnia, subordinated to a unified central government, there is effectively no national Ministry of Education whatsoever. Ostensibly, a unified “Bosniak-Croat Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina” (“the Federation”) runs the rest of Bosnia. Nevertheless, this sub-national state is again broken down into a number of almost fully autonomous Cantons, necessitating the acquisition of approval on the Cantonal, not Federation level, to enter the schools. However, even beyond this Cantonal system, within the most ethnically polarized Federation Cantons, a de facto system is set up so that within each ministry the Minister is either Bosniak or Croat and the Deputy Minister is of the other ethnic group. For example, the Minister of Education for the Canton that runs Mostar is Croat and her Deputy Minister is Bosniak. Essentially, the Minister runs the Croat-dominant municipalities and neighborhoods and the Deputy Minister runs the Bosniak dominated municipalities and neighborhoods. While there is coordination and cooperation at times, they are operated more or less separately and independently, despite ongoing attempts by UNMIBH to unify the authority structure. It should be noted that while the overwhelming majority of given officials for the Bosniak controlled entities are indeed Bosnian Muslims, a number of such officials are actually ethnic Serbs, Croats or of mixed ethnicity, who align themselves with the Bosniak-dominated government.

At each school I distributed surveys to three full classes (between 25 and 35 students in each class) plus between five and fifteen teachers. I tried to conduct interviews with teachers and principals and students at the secondary school level. I furthermore collected textbook samples of Balkan history and literature in use by all three ethnic groups. I returned with approximately 1,100 surveys that I must translate and enter into a database before fully analyzing. Nevertheless, I can make certain preliminary assessments based on interviews, casual conversations, and observations.

In general, the atmosphere both of the community and the schools of Banja Luka, were the most nationalistic of the cities I visited. In both primary and secondary schools, the trappings of Serb nationalism were pervasive. A giant Serbian flag hung in the main hall at the front of the primary school. Many classrooms in the secondary school had the Serbian eagle with the Serbian cross and four “C’s” hanging from the walls. While many Serbs view this cross and “C’s” as a benign symbol of national pride, many Croats and Bosniaks see it as symbols of Serbian oppression. Meanwhile, not one Bosnian national flag was seen anywhere at either school of Banja Luka, indicating a distinct lack of recognition of the national government’s sovereignty.

The statements of the students I had interviewed in Banja Luka reflected hostility towards other groups, especially Muslims. “Why should they build mosques here in Banja Luka?” one student asked, “They don’t belong here, churches belong here and mosques in Sarajevo!” Since she was only about 8 when the war started, I suspect she does not realize that about 40% of Banja Luka’s pre-war population was Muslim. I don’t want to give the impression that I only found the trappings of nationalism in Banja Luka’s schools, it was simply most prevalent there. Surprisingly in Pale, the famously nationalistic Sarajevo suburb and war-time capital of the Bosnian Serb Republic, the disdain for other ethnic groups was not as
omnipresent as in Banja Luka. Nevertheless, the Pale students could recognize that my translator was Bosniak by her name. One student pointedly asked her—in English while I was standing next to her—if he could write “Chetnik” instead of circling “Serb” for his ethnicity on the survey.

Of course, the nationalist sentiment—even if was much more evident among the Serbs — was not exclusively their domain. In Croat Mostar, the public high school’s principal had large pictures of the Pope and the Virgin Mary on her walls. The Croat nationalist checkerboard shield was hanging in practically every classroom as well, similar to the Serb cross in Banja Luka and Pale. Furthermore, the Croat Minister of Education in Mostar had her office not in any official government building, but instead in the official party headquarters of the HDZ, the Croat ultra-nationalist party. Even the apparently much less nationalistic Bosniaks were not completely immune from the bug of ethno-centrism. A literature teacher in Bosniak Mostar had hung the photos of what she described to me as the four most important writers in Bosnia’s history. I ask their ethnicities, pointing out that Ivo Andric, a Bosnian Croat and Bosnia’s only Nobel Prize winning author was not among the four. She said that it was not her choosing, that these four were objectively Bosnia’s greatest authors, and Andric was not among them.

I did encounter students and teachers throughout who did express a desire for a return to peace. Many expressed a belief that after all the destruction of the war, full re-integration was a bad idea. Not because they personally hated other groups, but believed peaceful coexistence in divided communities but a unified state was the best situation. I also do not want to minimize the sentiment that was especially strong in the Bosniak dominated areas for a desire to return to a unified, integrated, multi-ethnic state—even if many thought such an ideal was unlikely or impossible.

So if the school and the students and the media and rest of the community all appear to be held by the sway of nationalism, can I deduce anything about the influence, specifically, of the school? Perhaps. Firstly, I can examine in more detail the survey responses. Maybe it was only the most nationalist personalities who felt secure enough to speak out loud, but a significant percentage of students and teachers may be actually more tolerant. Therefore I must reserve my full judgment until I have all the data properly measured. Furthermore, even if all four components turn out to be equally nationalist, I have at least then produced evidence showing that the schools are playing no serious role in increasing tolerance. Such evidence can still be useful for the basis of further study and policy considerations.

East European Jewish Culture and Intelligentsia — Ukrainian Archival Resources

Kenneth Moss
Ph.D. Student, History

My dissertation, entitled “A Time for Tearing Down and a Time for Building Up: Recasting Jewish Culture in Eastern Europe, 1914-1921,” is a history of the East European Jewish intelligentsia’s attempt to realize competing programs of ideological and aesthetic revolution in Jewish cultural life at this critical juncture in European politics and culture. Ukraine was one of the key centers of Jewish cultural life in this era, both because Ukraine was one of the demographic centers of East European Jewry and because the substantial national autonomy extended to Ukrainian Jewry as Ukraine moved toward independence in late 1917 drew many Jewish nationalist intellectuals eager to take part in this (tragically short-lived) experiment. Kiev in particular became the site of a vibrant Jewish cultural sphere characterized by feverish modernist experimentation, far-reaching plans for the complete transformation of Jewish culture and consciousness, and, not least, intensifying ideological and institutional conflict among competing cultural camps.

It might therefore seem natural that I should look to archival sources in Ukraine. In fact, however, it was long believed in the West and even in the Soviet Union that virtually all archival sources bearing on Jewish life in the Tsarist Empire and the Soviet Union had been destroyed by order of the Soviet authorities, presumably during the suppression of the last remnants of Jewish cultural life in the 1930s and the “anti-Zionist campaign” of the post-war era. Certainly, there was no sign or mention in any Soviet archive of the sorts of materials relevant to my dissertation: the writings of Jewish nationalists and autonomists, Yiddishists and Hebraists, were utterly anathematized.

It was therefore with tremendous surprise and excitement that both Western scholars and scholars in the former Soviet Union learned of the existence of massive amounts of material long believed destroyed: the records of Jewish parties and civic organizations,
Language and Educational Reform in Post - Communist Baltic States

Sandra Staklis
Ph.D. Student, Education

I was awarded a CREES Research Grant to do pre-dissertation fieldwork on changes in the Estonian and Latvian higher education systems since the end of communism. At the outset, I was particularly concerned with determining the feasibility of studying how different ethnic groups negotiate the new educational environment. Since the language of instruction in state-supported institutions of higher education changed in the early 1990s from a mix of Russian and Estonian and Latvian to the exclusive use of the titular languages, I wished to investigate how the educational opportunities for Russian-speakers in both countries were affected. This plan involved both gathering information on the education systems of the region (unavailable in the US) and conducting interviews more specifically on language use and students in the institutions. Due to the short duration of my trip, I focused mainly on Latvia. Consequently, my initial research plan was to visit a mix of private and public institutions of higher education that offered instruction in Latvian, Russian, and English. Visiting these institutions allowed me to speak with students, instructors, and administrators about language issues in higher education.

My work was roughly divided into two parts: first, gathering published information and statistics about the local educational systems, and secondly, conducting interviews with policy makers, educators, and students at institutions of higher education. Shortly after my arrival in Riga, I traveled to Tallinn, Estonia and was able to collect information on how higher educational institutions have changed during the past ten years. Additionally, I received census data from the Statistical Office of Estonia. I gathered similar information in Latvia. My first interviews in Latvia were with Dr. Nils Muiznieks and Dr. Artis Pabriks at the Center for Human Rights and Ethnic Studies, and soon after I interviewed Dr. Indra Dedze and Dr. Guntis Catlaks who work on bilingual and higher education issues at the Soros Foundation. Each of them was invaluable in providing me with an overview of both the current debates in education and language policies in the Baltics and the state of local educational research. It was encouraging to learn that no one has as yet investigated the impact of language changes at the tertiary level, but discouraging to discover how little information and research is currently available on tertiary education in general. These interviews helped shaped my subsequent activities: I had to first focus on gathering basic information about the higher education system before I could hope to focus on language issues.

Before the school year began in September, I also interviewed student administrators at several institutions of higher education. The most elite institutions in Latvia are the internationally funded Stockholm School of Economics in Riga (SSE-Riga) and the Graduate School of Law, both of which offer instruction in English. At these institutions I interviewed Diane Paune and Linda Freimane, Deans of Student Services, about the schools’ students and study programs. I interviewed similar administrators at the Baltic Russian Institute, a private institution with instruction in Russian; Turiba, a private institution with Latvian instruction; the University of Latvia, the largest and most elite state-supported institution; and Vidzemes University College, a 4-year old state-supported institution with instruction in Latvian and English located outside of Riga. From these interviews, I gained an overview of how tertiary education is funded and organized in Latvia, and insights into the types of students they typically attract. It
became apparent, however, that investigating the ethnic mix of students attending these schools would be possible at only the smaller institutions. At the large, state-supported institutions such as the University of Latvia, little information on the background of students is collected, and administrators are reluctant to offer such statistics to researchers in part because it is so politically sensitive.

Once classes began in September, I conducted 80 semi-structured interviews using a simple survey with students at all of the institutions noted above, except for the Baltic-Russian Institute. I administered the surveys personally in order to test the clarity of the questions and follow up on any answers that were unusual or led to further questions. Most of my interviews were with students in programs of business, economics, and tourism. These subjects are the most popular university majors in Latvia and are offered by most schools, public and private and therefore allow comparisons across institutions. The students came from both Latvian and Russian speaking families and were at various stages in their undergraduate careers. The questions they answered pertained to their socioeconomic background, language abilities, secondary education, and their hopes for the future.

The above outline highlights my main activities in Latvia; I also spent considerable time doing popular press searches and collecting information from both governmental and non-governmental offices. Much of the information will be utilized in the dissertation proposal I am preparing this quarter. My work both sharpened and changed my research plans in several ways. Most importantly perhaps, I am now prepared to do further survey research for my dissertation on my own, which I was initially reluctant to do. As far as the tertiary education is concerned, the most important innovations are not found in the reform programs in the universities that were established during Soviet times or earlier, but in the new public and private institutions that have appeared since 1991. While the existing institutions have been slow to respond to the new socioeconomic environment, new institutions have led the way in introducing new study programs, pedagogical methods, and international contacts to the region. I now hope to focus my dissertation work on how these new institutions are accommodating and adapting to the multi-ethnic environment in Latvia, and how they may impact the opportunities for both Latvians and Russian-speakers in the future.

Gardzienice —
Theatre of Sources in Poland

Kris Salata
Ph.D. Student, Drama

I wish to sincerely thank CREES for making my summer research in Poland possible. Thanks to your support I was able to acquire the most important experience directing me through my dissertation research. In addition, I have collected material for teaching an original course titled Theatre of Sources (offered next quarter). Thirdly, I will be able to utilize my summer research in my third-year theatrical production. My project crosses boundaries between fields of knowledge, engaging not simply across cultures, but across academic disciplines, including anthropology, ethnography, archeology, cultural history of ancient Greece, and engaging the arts — music, dance, and drama.

The starting point is, of course, theatre. I attended a two-week international consortium held in a remote village of Gardzienice, in the eastern part of Poland. There, a theatre group (of the same name as the village) has been settled for the last 25 years, devoting its work to researching and cultivating the oral cultural traditions in eastern, southern and central Europe. Besides documenting their anthropological /ethnographical expeditions on film and on paper, the group physically learns the singing and dancing techniques from the original performers, thus providing the most direct medium of preservation of the performed forms. Our workshop included watching the researched material on film as well as learning the songs in their original language and delivery version.

For the last few years the group has been working on the project of ancient Greek drama, to which the key was reconstructing the original music and dance. Gardzienice found its knowledge of folklore essential, as the approach to the reconstruction included usage of existing oral cultures as examples of rhythms and vocal techniques. This method is by no means new. In the 1930's Milman Parry, and in the 1950's Albert B.Lord theorized on Homer's epic poems basing their findings on a close study of the epic singing from the Balkans. Gardzienice was able to follow the same path and, using the preserved fragments of musical notation, reconstructed several ancient songs creatively applying the folk source. These songs, the product of both research and artistic interpretation, became the core of their current work on the Greeks. Again, the workshop included both theoretical and practical study on the subject. I was able to closely look at the choices made, and understand the reasoning behind them. Before my trip to Poland I was already working on the musical aspects of the Greek drama. Gardzienice's workshop has tremendously contributed to my research.

I have convinced the Department of Drama to initiate a project to bring the Gardzienice group to Stanford next year, organizing a workshop dedicated to the subject of the music of the ancient Greek drama. Co-sponsoring departments will include CREES, Classics, and the Humanities Center.
Russian Modernist Poets and Autobiography

Marilena Ruscica
Ph.D. Student, Slavic Languages and Literatures

Thanks to a generous CREEES Research and Travel Grant, I was able to spend September 2001 in Moscow, where I conducted research for my dissertation. The topic of my dissertation is Russian modernist poetical autobiography. In particular I look at the works of Andrey Bely, Boris Pasternak and Marina Tsvetaeva. During the month I spent in Moscow, I looked for letters, notes, reviews, unpublished or published material unavailable at Stanford. In one word, I looked for anything that would shed new light on my reception of the way these authors understood the autobiographical discourse and, consequently, the way they put it into specific modes of narrative. After a first general survey of the places where I would have conducted my work — both main libraries and archives, I decided to focus mostly on a research of material regarding Andrey Bely, who is the less investigated among my authors, and Marina Tsvetaeva. Both their archives can be found at RGALI, or Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva, which became my main place of work. My efforts resulted in satisfying and successful findings.

Andrey Bely’s personal archive is unequally divided among three main institutions: the Dom muzei Andreia Belogo na Arbate, the Lenin Library and RGALI. This last one owns currently the largest section of the archive and most of the original documents, so it was at RGALI that I conducted the most significant part of my research. In Bely’s files I found unpublished letters addressed to the editor of the journal Russkie vedomosti by readers who react to the first publication of Bely’s autobiographical and antroposophial 1917 novel Kotik Letaev. These are letters written by angry readers, offended by the incomprehensible novelty of what today is considered a prose masterpiece that continued and yet brought a revolution into the Russian tradition of childhood narrative.

My most important findings at RGALI were a small “official” autobiography Bely wrote in 1932 upon the request of the publishing house “Federatsia,” that had planned a never realized publication of a book called “Sto portretov sovetskikh pisatelei” (this document is in the personal archive of D. M. Pines), and a whole work Bely wrote on A. S. Pushkin, which had somehow remained in the shade. Bely’s reading of the autobiographical relationship of Pushkin to Onegin was illuminating to understand his own relationship with the multiple fictional selves that inhabit his narratives. It also connects very interestingly to Pasternak’s belief into what he called a “subjective biographical realism” a principle that lies behind his attitude towards autobiographical content in fiction.

Library News

Karen Rondestvedt, Slavic Curator

CREES graduate Maria Kiehn has organized the part of the Yevtushenko archive that will be of most interest to scholars: correspondence, manuscripts, documents, photographs, and audio-visual material. Her finding aid is on the web at http://www.oac.cdlib.org/dynaweb/ead/stanford/mss/m1088/. The material is housed in Special Collections in Green Library.


Everyday Stalinism: Large microfiche set containing data (mostly statistical) on living standards, cultural interests, etc., of various groups in the Soviet Union in the 1920’s and 1930’s. In Green Library Media-Microtext.

A collection of approximately 30 rare music scores of Russian songs popular in the 1930s. For Special Collections, Green Library. Not yet cataloged.


Library of the late Prof. Jozo Tomasevich. Over 2000 books and journal issues, mostly in Serbian and Croatian, on the subject of Yugoslav 20th century political history. Collection currently being processed.
Forms of Capital and Post-Socialist Entrepreneurship: Preliminary Evidence from the Romanian Case

Augustin Stoica
Ph.D. Student, Sociology

Against the background of the current global spread of markets, my dissertation addresses the paradox of “making capitalism without capitalists” in East Central Europe. How is it possible to build capitalism in the absence of a capitalist class? Who are the new capitalists in the region and from where do they come? The aim of my project is to investigate the social origins of the emerging post-socialist entrepreneurial classes and the institutional conditions that shape their contours. I intend to highlight the similarities and differences between Romania—a case discussed less frequently—and other post-socialist countries of East Central Europe (Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic).

It is against a complex theoretical background that I began my pre-dissertation research in Romania. Assuming that there is such a thing as a “successful transition to a market economy” (which I doubt there is), Romania, by all accounts, is not that “thing”. Most Romanian medium size and large enterprises are still owned by the state, and the several attempts at mass privatization have been unsuccessful. These facts led the World Bank to evaluate Romania’s economic reforms and performance as “limited to none”. By the mid 1990s, the private sector share of GDP was 40% in Romania, as compared to 65% in the Czech Republic, and 60% in both Hungary and Poland. In 1995, Romania had the lowest Gross National Product per capita in a list of countries that included the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Bulgaria. By the end of the 1990s, Romania still lagged behind the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland in terms of its private sector share of GDP, and GNP per capita.

A possible explanation for this poor economic performance lies in the outcomes of the first competitive elections. In contrast to Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic, in Romania the former communists—less committed to radical reforms—won not only the first but also the second free elections, staying in power from 1990 to 1996. Moreover, the former communists won again the last general elections of November 2000. Hence, one would expect that the political capitalism thesis would cut more ice in Romania than it does in Hungary or Poland, and that an individual’s political resources would be an important, if not the most important, form of capital for entrepreneurship, especially for big businesses. The information I collected tends to support this thesis, but the story is more complex.

To begin with, the importance of various forms of capital in different entrepreneurial strategies varies by business type and size. In the case of individual farmers, the picture is quite dramatic. While the Law of Agricultural Resources of 1991 returned a significant proportion of land to peasants, many of them face huge difficulties to secure adequate financial means to operate as individual agricultural producers. One group seemingly attracted by a career in private farming consists of those who retired or lost their jobs after 1990. The word “attraction”, however, should not be taken literally. These individual farmers are the former peasants-workers of state socialism: employed as industrial workers in the nearby cities, these peasants-workers were also involved in farming activities, cultivating their small plots of land for consumption and sometimes for the market. Whereas the post-socialist political decisions made these peasant-workers...
proud landowners, the economic restructuring and recession put them in the embarrassing situation of being jobless, and the only alternative they had was private farming. The new, full-time individual farmers I talked to find it very difficult to cope with rising production costs, poor technical infrastructure, and lack of credit from financial institutions. Those who seem to do fairly well in the Romanian private agriculture are the former heads of and especially specialists employed by the former collective farms. Using the connections or social ties they formed under state socialism, these local bosses are able to secure the financial and other material resources to successfully run medium size agricultural enterprises.

In the case of small business operators, including self-employed individuals, the story is different. Becoming a small business operator does not require significant resources in terms of human and/or financial capital. Usually, a prospective small-business operator relies on his/her family or close friends to secure the start-up capital. Having network resources or social capital is not a necessary condition to become self-employed or a small business operator. However, cultivating relations with various individuals is important for staying in business, and it often implies “to give a ‘small attention’” or “to be nice” with suppliers, “beat cops”, city hall employees, and representatives of other local bodies, from “health and safety” inspectors to officers of the Financial Guard (the equivalent of the IRS).

The particular institutional configurations of post-socialist societies may nurture particular – if not mutant – capitalist strategies, such as described in Burawoy and Krotov’s 1992 study of merchant capitalism in Russia or Stark’s 1996 study of recombinant property in Hungary. In a similar vein, in the Romanian case I have often encountered a hybrid entrepreneurial form, part-time entrepreneurship. By part-time entrepreneurs, I refer to individuals who, besides their main job or occupation, legally run private businesses. In Romania (among others), some part-time entrepreneurs – taking advantage of widespread corruption, and the lack of the rule of law – keep their main jobs in the state sector to siphon off state resources to use them in their private businesses. The entrepreneurial inclinations of some of my part-time entrepreneurs seem to become manifest only so long as they can transfer to the state the liabilities resulting from their economic transactions. The real problems occur when state officials massively adopt such a strategy. In this case, we are dealing with phenomenon of “predatory state bureaucracy”, which has negative consequences for the development of the domestic entrepreneurial classes and economic growth. From my discussions with some “insiders”, this strategy is quite common among incumbents in state bureaucracy.

Although most of the findings I presented above have pessimistic tones, one should not interpret them as an attempt to “exoticize” the Romanian case, because historical evidence shows that this story of entrepreneurship is by no means unique. In my future research I attempt to investigate more closely the similarities and differences between entrepreneurial paths in various post-socialist countries, as well as the relations between such strategies and larger institutional configurations.

---

**Visiting Scholars**

**Innokenty Alekseev** is a 2001-02 Fellow at the Stanford Program in International Legal Studies at Stanford Law School. Mr. Alekseev is an attorney at the Moscow office of Debevoise and Plimpton, and a doctoral candidate at Moscow State Institute for International Relations.

**Bat Batjargal**, Lecturer in Entrepreneurship at London Business School and Visiting Assistant Professor of Strategy at Peking University School of Management, is Visiting Scholar at CREEES from November 2001 – April 2002. Dr. Batjargal holds a doctorate in sociology from Oxford, and his research focuses on entrepreneurship and social capital in Russia and China.

**Eunsook Chung**, a Senior Research Fellow at the Sejong Institute, Korea, is a 2001 Hoover Institution Visiting Fellow. Dr. Chung works on human rights issues and the war in Chechnya.

**Sheila Gwaltney**, U.S. Foreign Service Officer, is the 2001-02 National Security Affairs Fellow at the Hoover Institution. Ms. Gwaltney has served extensively in the FSU, most recently in Bishkek.

**Astrid Hedin**, Assistant Professor of Political Science from Lund University, Sweden, is a post-doctoral scholar at the Scandinavian Consortium for Organization Research at Stanford from
July 2001 – July 2002. She is the recipient of a fellowship from the Swedish Foundation for International Cooperation in Research and Higher Education. Dr. Hedin’s research interests include organizational studies and social networks; her dissertation was “The Politics of Social Networks: Interpersonal Trust and Institutional Change in Post-Communist East Germany.”

Azer Ibadzade, a doctoral candidate in Economics at Azerbaijan State Economics Institute, was a Visiting Scholar at CREES from August – December 2001, as a fellow on the State Department’s Regional Scholar Exchange Program. His dissertation project is “Optimization of Foreign Trade Relations of the Azerbaijan Republic.”

Juliet Johnson, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Loyola University of Chicago, is a W. Glenn Campbell and Rita Ricardo-Campbell National Fellow at the Hoover Institution. Her research is on creation of independent national banks in post-communist states.

Yuriy Kapitsa is a Fulbright Scholar at Stanford Law School through September 2002. Dr. Kapitsa is Director of the Centre of Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer in Kyiv, Ukraine and Associate Professor of International Relations at Taras Shevchenko University, Kyiv. His research project is “Combating Piracy in Audio-Visual, Computer and Other Spheres.”

Timur Kadyshev of the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology is a 2001-02 Visiting Fellow at the Center for International Security and Cooperation. His research topic is “National Security and Strategic Nuclear Balance after START II.”

Yanni Kotsonis, Associate Professor of History, New York University, is a W. Glenn Campbell and Rita Ricardo-Campbell National Fellow at the Hoover Institution. His research is on taxation in Russian history.

Sergey Kuznetsov, a contributing editor at Lenta.ru, is a 2001-02 John S. Knight Fellow in the Department of Communications.

Pavel Oleinikov of the Snezhinsk City Administration and the CNS NIS Nonproliferation Project Core Group is a 2001-02 Visiting Fellow at the Center for International Security and Cooperation. His research is on “Salvaging the US-Russian Nonproliferation Programs.”

Kevin Platt, Associate Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures at Pomona College, is a 2001-02 Fellow at the Stanford Humanities Center. His project is “The Imaginary Past: Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great in Russian Nationalist Historical Mythology.”

Yuri Slezkine, Professor of History at the University of California at Berkeley, is a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.

Ronald Suny, Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago, is a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.

Serif Turgut is a correspondent with ATV Televison, Istanbul, Turkey, and has spent the last 8 years in former Yugoslavia. Ms. Turgut is a 2001-02 John S. Knight Fellow in the Department of Communications.

Martina Winkler of Universitat Leipzig will be Visiting Scholar at CREES for the year 2002. Dr. Winkler is the recipient of the Feodor Lynen Fellowship from the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung. Her research is on legal history in Russia.
Czech Prime Minister Speaks at Stanford

Lisa Trei,
Stanford News Service

Drawing on the experience of his own country with Adolf Hitler in the period leading up to World War II, Czech Prime Minister Milos Zeman warned against any future tendency to negotiate with terrorists in a public appearance at Stanford on Monday, November 5.

"There is no problem to fight [back] in the present situation while there is still shock" following the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, he told an audience gathered at the Hoover Institution. But Zeman predicted that a time will come when people will start to hesitate and talk about the need "to negotiate, if not with Osama [bin Laden, the suspected mastermind behind the terrorist attacks], then with his successors," he said. "People will say, 'They are pleasant fellows, they believe in God and might be good partners for business.'" But, the prime minister warned, "If the free world stops the bombardment [in Afghanistan], it will only open the opportunity for the preparation of new terrorist attacks by new terrorists."

Zeman said there were many opportunities to thwart the rise of Hitler in Germany during the 1930s, but British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain's policy of appeasement prevailed. Consequently, he said, the German Nazi army occupied parts of Czechoslovakia in 1938. A year later, World War II broke out.

The Center for Russian and East European Studies sponsored the prime minister's talk, which was titled "Czech Republic and United Europe in the Globalized World." His visit was the first leg of a weeklong trip to the United States aimed to attract economic investment and foster political and military relations. Zeman visited Austin, Texas, before heading to Washington to meet with Vice President Richard Cheney and Secretary of State Colin Powell. The trip ended with a visit to New York City's "Ground Zero," to pay respects to victims of the Sept. 11 attacks.

Zeman said it is important to do more than just offer "warm phrases" of solidarity with the United States. Consequently, the Czech Republic, as a member of NATO, has offered use of an anti-chemical military unit, two airplanes and other support.

According to Zeman, terrorism represents an attack on freedom of choice. While he expressed his personal dis-

Robert Legvold Delivers Annual Alexander Dallin Lecture

Lisa Trei

For the first time since June 1941, the United States and Russia face a common enemy: the threat of global terrorism, Columbia University's Robert Legvold said Nov. 29. The Sept. 11 terrorist attacks have created a watershed with possibly dramatic implications for U.S.-Russian relations, he said.

Legvold, a political science professor, discussed the former superpower's changing foreign relations in "Russia and the World After America's Autumn of Tears" at the 2001-02 Alexander Dallin Lecture in Soviet and Post-Soviet Affairs.

The series, hosted by the Center for Russian & Eastern European Studies, is named in honor of Dallin, the Raymond A. Spruance Professor of International History, Emeritus, and a leading scholar in Soviet and East European studies, who died last year.

According to Legvold, the biggest failing of the post-Cold War period is what he called the "great power irresponsibility." The first George Bush administration referred to the creation of a "New World Order" and almost every Western leader talked about a "Europe whole from the Atlantic to the Urals, and at peace for the first time in 300 years."
But no one, he said, did anything to reinforce the new status quo.

The recent terrorist attacks have given the West, and especially Russian President Vladimir Putin, a second chance, Legvold said. Before Sept. 11, Legvold characterized Russia’s foreign policy as ungrounded and unformed. Although Putin was trying to push economics to the top of his agenda, at a very basic level Russians were asking, “What is Russia? Where does it belong? And Does Russia matter?” he said. During Putin’s first 18 months in office, Legvold said, he tried to be “all things to all people,” which precluded creating a foundation for taking bold action.

The terrorist attacks gave Russia not only an “imperative but an opportunity” to act, Legvold said. “I think that, instinctively or accidentally, Putin realized that moving boldly and decisively would substantially increase Russia’s diplomatic-political cachet in all directions,” he said. Russia could have responded as China did, acting supportively and cooperatively but without siding decisively with the United States.

According to Legvold, enormous possibilities accompany Putin’s decision to support the United States. “They are truly historic in terms of the way we have understood history since 1985,” he said, referring to the beginning of former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev’s policy of perestroika that ultimately ended with the collapse of the superpower.

The possibilities include a chance to avert Russia’s being alienated from the West and to avoid the emergence of a strategic East-West rivalry within the post-Soviet region. Legvold argued that Russia was in no position to be a global rival with the United States or to contest U.S. policy seriously in most parts of the world except within the former Soviet republics. However, with the development of key bilateral relations with Ukraine, for example, “there was a tendency on the part of Russians to assume the U.S. was engaged in a coherent policy of rolling back and displacing Russia’s influence and putting itself in the catbird seat” in this region, Legvold said. “Now we have a chance, depending on how we behave, to avert that danger.”

Legvold contended that Russia likely will pursue policies that parallel Western interests, “unless the West gives it reason not to.” But, he added, it will not be easy to decide what it means to integrate Russia with but not into the West. However, putting Russia in league with the West will create two positive synergies, he said: It will encourage democracy in Russia and the evolution of a policy of reassurance within the post-Soviet space.

“I believe that this process of integrating Russia with the West is likely to push Russia away from harsh carrot-and-stick policy to a policy of reassurance in dealing with its neighborhood,” Legvold said. “That is critical to stability in the post-Soviet space.”

Legvold admitted that his assessments could be flawed and that the process toward making Russia an equal player with the West has barely begun. At a fundamental level, he said, the nation still must resolve the issue of self-identity. “There is a direct relationship between democracy and the durability of alliances with the West,” he said. “Western alliances depend on membership being democratic in the long run.”

At this point, however, Legvold is cautiously optimistic. “Putin, I believe, is giving Russia and the rest of us another crack at it,” he said. “I think the signs are that the European leadership and the Bush administration are responsive. The real question is whether [they] know how to capitalize on the opportunity.”

This article appeared originally in Stanford Report, December 5, 2001

---

**A l u m n i  N e w s**

**Azer Askarov** (AMREES, 2000) recently entered the Ph.D. program in the Department of History at the University of Maryland.

**Andrew Blake** (1994) is Group Manager, Strategic Infrastructure at Capital One (one of the top ten Visa/Mastercard issuers), based in Richmond, VA.

**Andrew Curry** (AMREES, 2000) has been promoted to Associate Editor at US News and World Report magazine.

**Ji Hi Jung** (AMREES, 1997) started Law School this fall at Georgetown University. In recent years she was pursuing a diplomatic career, working in the Korean Foreign Service, and most recently at the United Nations.

**Maria Kiehn** (AMREES, 2001) has been working as research assistant on the Yevtushenko Papers at Stanford’s Green Library.

**Amy Kovac** (AMREES, 2000) has been promoted to Copy Editor at the journal Foreign Policy.

**Michael Kuchkovsky** (1994) recently completed a Masters of Architecture degree from Rice University.

**Major Brendan McAloon** (1996) is in Moldova as the Defense Attache, with Michele, Aidan and Duncan (their newest addition—3 years old).

**Major Tucker Mananger** (1996) serves as the Assistant Army Attache in Warsaw. He and Stacy have 3 girls.

**Lou O’Neill** (1992) is General Counsel for The Falconwood Corporation in New York (a privately held merchant bank/venture capital firm).

**Mark Wohlforth** (1994) is currently an Associate with Mercer Management Consulting in Boston.
The following CREES affiliates and graduate students participated in the 2001 Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies:

**Steven A. Barnes** (History) presented “Soviet Society Confined: The Gulag in the Karaganda Oblast of Kazakhstan.”

**Catalin Cosovanu** (Political Science/Law) chaired the roundtable *Post-Socialist Lawyering in Eastern Europe.*

**Mary Dakin** (CREES) was a presenter for the roundtable *Successful Outreach Programs of Russian and East European Centers* and chaired the panel *Gender, Violence, and Representation in Russia.*

**Dusan J. Djordjevich** (History) presented “The Emergence of the Serbian Question in Inter-War Yugoslavia.”

**John Dunlop** (Hoover) was Discussant for the panel *Chechnya Reconsidered,* and chaired the panel *The Russian National Unity Party in Post-Soviet Politics: Analysis and Evaluation.*

**Gregory Freidin** (Slavic) chaired the panel *Russian Culture and the Classical World.*

**Andrew L. Jenks** (History) presented “Stalin in a Box: The Icon Painters of Palekh and the Cult of Personality.”

**Nancy Kollmann** (History/CREES) was a presenter for the roundtable *Adventures in Russian Historical Research.* She also chaired a panel on “The Minority of Ivan the Terrible.”

**Gail Lapidus** (IIS) was a presenter for the *Ed Hewett Memorial Roundtable Russia.*

**Michael McFaul** (Political Science/Hoover) was a presenter for the roundtable *Putin’s Russia: Reform or Retrenchment?*

**Anne Q. Eakin Moss** (Slavic) presented “Finding Russia in the Brothel: Women’s Communities and the Struggle with Modernity in Gorky and Kuprin.”

**Amir Weiner** (History) presented “To the Gulag and Back: Social Engineering in Pre-War and Post-War Western Borderlands.”

---

**Teacher Workshop Series**

**World War II: The Soviet Perspective**

The Center for Russian and Eastern European Studies (CREES) and the Bay Area Global Education Program (BAGEP) are pleased to present this five-part workshop series for teachers. These five Saturday workshop events include guest lectures, curricular activities and materials. Material covered addresses California State History and Social Science Standards 10.7, 10.8, 10.9 and 11.7.

**Session One: January 12**

“Fighting, Surviving, and Remembering Wartime Soviet Union.”

CERAS Room 204

9:00 a.m. Lecture: **Amir Weiner**, Assistant Professor, Department of History 

12:30 p.m. Curriculum workshop (Teachers only)

**Session Two: January 26**

“Wartime Foreign Policy: The Soviet Union and the Grand Alliance”

CERAS Room 304

9:00 a.m. Lecture: **Norman Naimark**, Robert and Florence McDonnell 

Professor of East European History, and Director of International Relations and International Policy Studies 

12:30 p.m. Curriculum workshop (Teachers only)

**Session Three: February 9**

“Stalin as War Leader”

CERAS Room 204

9:00 a.m. Lecture: **David Holloway**, Raymond A. Spruance Professor in International History, Professor of Political Science, and Director of the Institute for International Studies 

12:00 p.m. Curriculum workshop (Teachers only)

**Session Four: February 23**

“When Soviets Met Nazis”

CERAS Room 204

9:00 a.m. Lecture: **Amir Weiner**, Assistant Professor, Department of History 

12:30 p.m. Curriculum workshop (Teachers only)

**Session Five: March 9**

“The Great Patriotic War in Soviet Film”

CERAS Room 204 

9:00 a.m. Lecture: **Oksana Bulgakowa**, Visiting Professor, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures 

12:30 p.m. Curriculum workshop (Teachers only)


**PRE-REGISTRATION REQUIRED**

To register, or for further information, please contact: 

**Mary Dakin**, Assistant Director, CREES 723-3562 mdakin@stanford.edu

**Terry Haugen**, Co-Director, BAGEP (415)-293-4641 thaugen@wacsf.org

Continuing Education Credit: Continuing Education Credit (1-4 quarter units) is available for a $60 per unit.
CREES was visited October 9, 2001 by Viktor I. Ishaev, Governor of Khabarovskii Krai in the Russian Far East. Ishaev left is pictured here with CREES MA student Sarah Cameron and Former San Francisco Consul General of the Russian Federation Vladimir Kuznetsov. He was first appointed governor in 1991, then re-elected to the position in 1996 and 2000. A Doctor of Economics, Ishaev recently headed a presidential committee on strategic planning for Russian economic development. He presented at Stanford on "The Russian State: Strategic Development through 2010."

Educator Outreach News

Stanford Area Studies Centers Collaborate

The Center for Russian and East European Studies, in collaboration with the Centers for African Studies, East Asian Studies and Latin American Studies, hosted a daylong symposium on June 2, 2001 on "Refugees and Dispossession in Global Perspective." This successful event attracted over 100 people from the public and Stanford communities. Issues of international concern were addressed by speakers who presented on ethnic cleansing in Eastern Europe (Norman Naimark, History), refugees and statelessness in Palestine (Joel Beinin), treatment of refugees in Columbia and El Salvador (Terry Karl, Political Science), rural migration in China (Li Zhang, UC Davis), and ongoing refugee issues in Rwanda (Steven Stedman, IIS). The Stanford Program on International Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE), directed by Gary Mukai, organized a special teacher outreach workshop in the afternoon, presenting "Curricular Applications on Human Rights and Child Labor" for secondary school teachers. The four area centers have jointly contributed toward production of a SPICE curricular unit on human rights, listed below.

New SPICE Curricular Units

Since 1976 the Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education (SPICE) has supported efforts to internationalize elementary and secondary school curricula by linking the research and teaching at Stanford University to schools through the production of high-quality curriculum materials on international and cross-cultural topics. Housed in the Institute for International Studies at Stanford University, SPICE has produced over 100 supplementary curriculum units on international history, the global environment, and international political economy. SPICE draws upon the diverse faculty and programmatic interests of Stanford University to link knowledge, inquiry, and practice in exemplary curriculum materials.

CREES Video Lending Library

Materials from the CREES documentary video lending library are available for two-week checkout by instructors in the US and Canada for classroom use and curriculum development. Borrowers are responsible for paying postage and postal insurance for the return of the video. For a full list of available videos, please check our website at http://www.stanford.edu/dept/CREES/ videolib.html or contact Mary Dakin, CREES Assistant Director, at (650) 723-3562 or mdakin@stanford.edu, for a brochure.

CREES is proud to support the outstanding work of SPICE in collaborative efforts funded by US Department of Education Title VI funds. CREES and SPICE are pleased to announce a new curriculum unit published this fall, Mapping Russia: Geographic and Cultural Diversity. Written by Stanford Political Science Ph.D. Arthur Khachikian, this unit introduces students to the geographic, political and cultural diversity of the peoples and territory of the Russian Federation through regionally-based lessons focusing on themes such as federalism, ethnicity, and environment. Another new publication by SPICE, Examining Human Rights in a Global Context, was co-sponsored by CREES and Stanford’s Centers for East Asian, African and Latin American Studies. The lessons in this unit focus on both theoretical and legal issues, and include contemporary case studies on Chechnya, Rwanda and Colombia. For further information and a current catalog, please call (650) 723-1114 or (800) 578-1114, or visit SPICE on the web at http://spice.stanford.edu/.
Upcoming Conference
XXVI Annual Stanford-Berkeley Conference

"Political Violence in Russia and Eastern Europe"

Friday, April 26, 2002
Hartley Conference Center,
Mitchell Earth Sciences Building,
Stanford University

Presented by the Center for Russian and East European Studies, Stanford University
and the Institute of Slavic, East European and Eurasian Studies, University of California at Berkeley.
For more information see http://www.stanford.edu/dept/CREES/events.html or call (650) 723-3562

Center for Russian and East European Studies
Building 40, Main Quad
Stanford University
Stanford CA 94305-2006