LETTER FROM THE DIRECTOR

We have finished another busy year at CREEES, with a bang. We are very proud to announce that CREEES has received, yet again, substantial Federal funding from the Department of Education (Title VI). We have been named one of about 16 National Resource Centers in Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies and we have received fellowship funds for graduate study and program funds worth over $1.600,000 over the four year grant cycle. CREEES has received Title VI grants for the last several grant cycles, and we are gratified at this national recognition of the strength of our programs. With Title VI funds we will be able to enrich the training and activities in our field at Stanford in many ways. With fellowship funds we will support students in our interdisciplinary M.A. program and send graduate students to intensive summer language study program in languages of our area. With curricular development funds we will supplement our curriculum with new courses by visiting professors in geographical areas and disciplines that are underrepresented and we will support the teaching of “less commonly taught languages” (a Federal priority), which in our area include Ukrainian, Hungarian, Uzbek, Polish and Czech. Responding to another government priority, we will also use our grant to provide teacher training for high school teachers and support the writing of curricular units in our field. It is a great opportunity, as well as a great honor.

The list of exciting activities that we “will do” with our Title VI funds also replicates many of the activities that we are already doing with our current Title VI funding and other support, such as income from the Wayne S. and Sally Stys-Vucinich Endowment Fund. We just graduated seven students in our MA program, most of whom were supported by FLAS grants. You will read about them elsewhere in this issue. In May, CREEES and CDDRL co-sponsored a two-day scholarly workshop “Waves and Troughs of Post Communist Transitions: What Role for External vs Domestic Variables” again using Title VI NRC funds. (See page 8 for details.)

You will see in this issue a summary of our activities for the year. Some highlights: a very active faculty/grad student workshop on “Borderlands” that brought a distinguished list of visiting speakers from around the world -- this was co-sponsored with the Stanford Humanities Center; another active faculty/grad student workshop on Russian Orthodoxy, culminating in a one-day conference on “Orthodoxy and Literature,” the annual Alexander Dallin Lecture in Post-Soviet Studies, featuring the distinguished British political scientist, Archie Brown; six lectures in our annual series devoted to Ukraine; and the annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference, reflecting on Glasnost’ 20 years later.

It was also a year of transition for CREEES. Associate Director Mary Dakin moved on to an excellent new job in the Office of the Dean of Humanities and Sciences; her (continued on page 2)
replacement as of this writing is not yet selected, but candidates are strong and we expect a smooth transition. Nonetheless, Mary is irreplaceable (see the story in this issue for details!), but of course we wish her well in her new role. Last July, we welcomed Van-Anh Nguyen as Administrator and are delighted at her able "taking of the reins" of our financial records. Rounding out our staff are Sue Purdy Pelosi as Events Coordinator extraordinaire and Jack Kollmann as our ultra-dedicated Academic Coordinator. All our staff merit extra thanks for their superb work as we navigated staff transitions amid a very busy year! I also want to give thanks publicly to our marvelous CREEES-affiliated faculty – as we move through the process of selecting a new Associate Director, I realize how I value the advice, support and time that our faculty colleagues contribute to CREEES. Some serve on the Steering Committee, some take the lead in organizing conferences and workshops, some come to us with fantastic ideas for lectures and activities. It is their energy and commitment to expanding the intellectual life of CREEES that often goes unsung. Thanks to you all!

We also bid goodbye to two visiting scholars who made energetic contributions throughout the year to our intellectual life. Iryna Lukyanenko was our annual Chopivsky Post-Doctoral Scholar from the Department of Finance of Kiev Mohyla Academy; Alexei Timofeychek from Kaliningrad carried out research on a Carnegie Research Fellowship. We look forward next year to another busy round of visiting scholars, new courses and talented MA students. As always, we welcome your comments and suggestions.

Nancy S. Kollmann
William H. Bonsall Professor in History
Director, Center for Russian, East European & Eurasian Studies

FAREWELL TO MARY DAKIN

This spring CREEES congratulated our Associate Director, Mary Dakin, on her new position – Mary is moving on to work in the Office of the Dean of Humanities and Sciences as Senior Planning Associate, working with the Vice Dean and the Executive Dean. Although we will miss her immensely at CREEES, we know that this is a great career step for her and we are proud of her achievements. This job will take advantage of her superb management skills, her financial planning know-how and general great savvy about university administration.

Mary served as Associate Director of CREEES for seven years, joining us in the summer of 1999. Mary earned a Ph.D. in Political Science from Indiana University, focusing on post-Soviet social welfare issues in Russia and Ukraine; she taught and worked in university administration at the University of Puget Sound and the University of Washington before coming to Stanford. When she arrived in July 1999, she was immediately and unceremoniously plunged into one of the most complex tasks we do at CREEES, our once-every-three-year grant proposal to the Department of Education for funding as a National Resource Center (NRC) in Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies (known locally as the "Title VI" grant). This was surely trial by fire – side by side with Director Nancy Kollmann, Mary got a crash course in "Stanford" as we assembled all possible information and statistics about our CREEES faculty, students, alumni, courses, library and archives, public programs, overseas studies, you name it. She compiled appendices, wrote sections of the report, polished prose and kept us to the mandated page limit – all in a brief month or two lead-time. She performed like such a trooper that we knew we had found a real gem.

In her seven years at CREEES, Mary over and over again exemplified the skills and talents that our first Title VI application showed forth. She went on to take the lead in two more Title VI proposals (we have a 100% success rate in Mary’s tenure, by the way), and to shape CREEES in exciting directions. One of our mandates as a NRC, for example, is to offer training for teachers K-14 in our field. Mary created a very dynamic and fruitful model for our teacher training, which we focus at the high school level. Each year she was responsible for designing, with Stanford faculty, a day-long seminar on a topic that high school teachers can then integrate into their teaching, complete with web-based resources and activities. She also built strong relations with the Stanford Program in International and Cross Cultural Education (SPICE), a respected organization in the Institute of International Studies that produces school curricular units (continues on page 15)

CREEES is designated a National Resource Center for the study of Russia, Eastern Europe and Eurasia 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 CREEES at Stanford is available at http://creees.stanford.edu
"Gorbachev Revisited" - The 2006 Alexander Dallin Lecture on Soviet and Post Soviet Affairs

By Archie Brown, Emeritus Professor of Politics at Oxford University and Emeritus Fellow of St Antony’s College, Oxford

On Tuesday, April 18, 2006 Professor Emeritus of Politics, Oxford University, Archie Brown delivered an address entitled: Gorbachev Revisited. Following is a summary of his presentation:

“First of all, let me say that it is a great honour and special pleasure to be giving a lecture which is in memory of Alex Dallin. My own memories of Alex are of a superb scholar of great perception and fine judgement and of a warm-hearted, hugely impressive human being. The first of three visits I have made to Stanford (though the last one was fifteen years ago) was at the invitation of Alex Dallin. He wrote to me on November 20th 1987 to say that the Center for Russian and East European Studies had inaugurated an annual lecture series on Soviet affairs and that the first series had been given by Alex Nove. I was not surprised to hear that it had continued, as Alex reported, ‘a great success’. Alex asked me if I would be willing to give the second series of lectures. The subject would be up to me, but he hoped that Gorbachev would fit somewhere within the definition, given your recent work.

That is how I came to give four lectures at Stanford exactly eighteen years ago. The first, entitled "The Making of a Reformist General Secretary", was delivered on April 18th 1988. The overall title of the series was “The Gorbachev Factor in Soviet Politics” and these lectures were the origins of my book, “The Gorbachev Factor”, although what I thought would be a short book turned out to be 230,000 words and it was 1995 before I finished it for publication by Oxford University Press ten years ago. However, a lot more sources on the politics of the perestroika period became available in the 1990s, so the delay had some advantages. No theme was suggested to me for the Dallin Memorial Lecture this evening, but given the origins – thanks to Alex Dallin – of my first acquaintance with Stanford, it seemed appropriate to call my lecture ‘Gorbachev Revisited’. The other good reason for doing so is that, after writing quite a bit on post-Soviet Russian politics, I have lately been working once again on the perestroika period.”

Professor Brown went on to divide his lecture into four parts – first, providing context for the reforms which produced such dramatic change in the Soviet Union in the second half of the 1980s, leading ultimately to the demise of the Communist system and the Soviet state, and then addressing the following questions: (1) Would the Soviet system and the Soviet Union have disappeared at much the same time as they did if someone other than Gorbachev had become leader in 1985? (2) What was Gorbachev’s mindset when he became Soviet leader and how did his views evolve; and (3) Was Gorbachev a success or failure as political leader?

Archie Brown stressed at the outset that he was not arguing for a “Great Man” interpretation of history whereby it is the unique charisma of an individual that is all-important. Gorbachev was not lacking in charisma as a politician, but the push he gave to reform within the highest echelons of the Soviet system, and his incautious manoeuvring, were more important in getting liberalization and democratization underway than his popular appeal (even though, contrary to widespread myth, he was a popular leader during the greater part of his time at the top of the Soviet political hierarchy).

In terms of getting the reforms off the ground, Brown stressed a factor which has been accorded little attention – a phenomenon labelled “institutional ambivalence” by X.L. Ding in the context of studying change in Chinese politics. As Ding had put it: “An institution can be used for purposes contrary to those it is supposed to fulfill, and the same institution can simultaneously serve conflicting purposes”. That was true of many of the policy-oriented institutes which came under the supervision not only of the Academy of Sciences but also of departments of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Perhaps the most surprising example of institutional ambivalence was none other than the International Department of the Central Committee. Gorbachev took a lot of his better aids and advisers from there – people who contributed significantly to what became known as the “New Thinking” – of whom the best example was his principal foreign policy aide, Anatoly Chernyaev, a long-standing deputy head of the International Department.

Before answering the first of his three questions – how much it mattered that Gorbachev, rather than someone else, became General Secretary in 1985 – Brown noted that “if a political system is highly authoritarian, with great power vested in the holder of the top political office, the personality, values and policy preferences of that officeholder are liable to make a bigger difference than the personality, values and preferences of the head of government within a democracy”. He went on, however, to modify that generalization by pointing out that if the authoritarian system is (a) highly institutionalized and (b) highly ideologized, then there may be quite serious constraints upon the scope for innovation of even the topmost leader.

Answering his first question, Brown said: “In fact, we know the views of the aging members of the Politburo who were still extant when Chernenko died. We hardly need to speculate about whether any possible successor – and the long short-list could be no longer than the ten full members of the Politburo – would have pursued transformative change, as Gorbachev did. They have all made their views known, whether in interviews or memoirs, and it is clear that they would not have made these radical changes. Viktor Grishin, the most plausible short-term successor to Chernenko, is among those who published memoirs in which he utterly condemned the policies Gorbachev pursued.”

Professor Brown noted that some Realist international relations scholars had cited statements by conservative Communists saying, retrospectively, that in 1989 they would not have used force either to prevent the East European countries becoming independent, and they have interpreted this to mean that neither ideas nor the personality of the Soviet leader were decisively important. What mattered was the changing ratio of material resources between the Soviet Union and the West, particularly those of the United States.

“That”, the speaker continued, “is open to at least two objections. The first is that the policies pursued by Gorbachev had changed the whole climate both of Soviet politics and of international politics. The norms of Soviet politics had been altered fundamentally by Gorbachev’s endorsement of glasnost and a whole range of freedoms. At least as crucial, the expectations of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe had been raised by the change in Soviet foreign policy and in Soviet ideology. Especially important in that respect was Gorbachev’s statement at the Nineteenth Party Conference in the summer of 1988, repeated in his December 1988 United Nations speech, that in every country people had a right to choose their own form of government.” No other leader from the ranks of the Soviet Politburo in 1985 would have allowed those expectations to be raised in the
first place, and they would have been fully backed in their caution by the conservative majority within the Communist Party apparatus, the military-industrial complex and the KGB.

Second, those who took at face value what conservative Communists said retrospectively were guilty of failing to take due account of what those whom Gorbachev had displaced (and many of those who remained in place) were saying in private at the time of the transformation of the political landscape of Central and Eastern Europe. Andrei Gromyko’s son, Anatoly, quotes his father expressing astonishment at Gorbachev’s unwillingness “to use force and pressure to defend state interests”.

On the second question – what was Gorbachev’s mindset when he became General Secretary and how did his views evolve – Archie Brown began by saying: “I have been looking at a lot of unpublished documents from the perestroika period over the past eighteen months – transcripts of Gorbachev’s meetings with his advisers and transcripts of Politburo meetings. I was surprised by how often Gorbachev cited Lenin.” Moreover, he did not believe that Gorbachev was doing this purely for tactical reasons. “Even”, he continued, “if most of us here take an extremely negative view of Lenin (as I certainly do), it is important to note that an idealization of Lenin and the belief that Stalin was the evil genius who had distorted purer Leninist norms was one of the strands of thought important to the emergence of perestroika and important, certainly, in Gorbachev’s worldview at that time”.

Nevertheless, Gorbachev retained a respect for the historic figure of Lenin while becoming less and less of a Leninist even while he still held the office of General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party. Professor Brown elaborated on the changing meanings of perestroika, glasnost and democratization between 1985 and 1988 in respect both of Gorbachev’s understanding of those concepts and in Soviet political discourse more generally. In a one-to-one meeting with his aide, Georgiy Shakhnazarov in June 1988, Gorbachev mentioned that the leader of the West German Social Democratic Party, Fogel, had told him that what he (Gorbachev) was saying about international relations had “much in common” with social democracy. Gorbachev said to Shakhnazarov: “I didn’t raise an objection”. By 1989 Gorbachev was telling Shakhnazarov that he felt close to social democracy. He could only, however, “come out” as a social democrat after he had ceased to be General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party.

Addressing his final question – was Gorbachev a success or a failure? – Archie Brown said that the answer obviously depended on one’s criteria for evaluation and partly on one’s own values. In a book published last year, Perestroika dissidents let spasya, a wide variety of different judgements appeared. Aleksandr Dugin, a Russian nationalist, attacked Gorbachev severely as a Westernizer. What was needed, he said, was “modernization without Westernization”. What was required also was will and harshness. Never in history, Dugin maintained, had reforms been carried out without bloodshed, force and excesses. The morality of an ordinary person was different from the morality of a ruler. Gorbachev, Dugin insisted, had no historic right to allow the abolition of the Warsaw Pact and he should have destroyed Yeltsin.

Somewhat similar views were expressed by another Russian nationalist writer, Aleksandr Prokhanov, when he was asked to evaluate Gorbachev in connection with the latter’s seventy-fifth birthday on March 2nd this year. Prokhanov said: “He is guilty of smashing to smithereens a great, weary, still developing state which required treatment and rebirth, not death. Gorbachev is the assassin of the Soviet state”.

The range of opinion on Gorbachev is remarkably wide. Two very different Russian writers gave their views of Gorbachev to the same issue of the newspaper, Nezavisimaya gazeta, as had Prokhanov. Vasily Aksenov concluded his highly positive assessment by saying: “In short ... I consider that there was no greater person in the history of the Soviet Union than Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev”. And Vladimir Vovnyovich wrote: “Gorbachev is a historic individual. He played an enormous role. It is said that he destroyed the Soviet Union. For that I am personally prepared to put up a statue to him”.

In Gorbachev’s own terms, Archie Brown noted, the breakup of the Soviet Union was a failure. The transformation of the Soviet system was intentional from 1988, but the dissolution of the Union was something that Gorbachev strove to the end to avoid. His other great failure was with the economy. Gorbachev was as unlucky as Putin has been lucky with the price of oil. The price was falling during the second half of the 1980s, sharply contrasting with what has happened so far this decade. But that was a relatively small part of the problem. Much more fundamentally, there was a contradiction and tension between trying to get the existing economic system to work better and moving to a system based on different operating principles.

Elaborating on Gorbachev’s substantive successes, Professor Brown noted:

- the release of dissidents from prison and the resumption of rehabilitations of those unjustly repressed in the past
- the introduction of glasnost and its development into freedom of speech and publication
- freedom of religious observance
- freedom to travel
- the introduction of competitive elections for a legislature with real power
- the development of civil society – a result of perestroika, not a precursor of it
- progress toward a rule of law, subjecting the Communist Party to the law and moving supreme power from party to state institutions
- allowing the East European countries to become independent and non-Communist
- playing a more decisive role than any other individual on either side in ending the Cold War

There was even a success amidst a failure: the dissolution of the state at the end of the perestroika period was not accompanied by civil war as in Yugoslavia. Gorbachev refused to use the force that would have been necessary to restore the kind of ‘order’ that was being urged by many in the party hierarchy, the military and the KGB.

The case of Gorbachev suggests it is wrong to think that politicians, even major power-holders, are all in the business of power-maximization. If Gorbachev had wished to maximize his power, he had no need to change the system. As the youngest member of the Politburo he could gradually have placed within it people of his own choosing, and, given the norms of the system, would have increased still further his power and authority over time. The Soviet Union would doubtless have continued its relative decline vis-à-vis the West, but its sophisticated control mechanisms – from party discipline to censorship to the KGB, and its pattern of rewards for conformist behaviour and hierarchy of sanctions for nonconformism – would have kept things ticking along. Professor Brown added: “After all, in the hybrid regime of Yeltsin’s Russia there was a lower GNP in the 1990s than in the last years of the Soviet Union. Even today, just as in...”
Soviet times, Russia relies overwhelmingly on the export of natural resources, especially oil and gas. Yet Putin's position seems secure enough, although he has nothing like the formidable defences of it that the General Secretary in the unreformed Soviet system could command.”

A lot didn't work out the way Gorbachev intended, though the evolution of his views was such that it is inadequate and misleading to evaluate his achievements and failures, taking as a base-line his aspirations when he took office in 1985 or, for that matter, the ideas set out in his book, Perestroika, in 1987. The turning-point in Gorbachev's own political evolution came in 1988. Even the late Aleksandr Yakovlev, with all his ambivalence towards Gorbachev over the last fifteen years of his life, concluded: “I consider Gorbachev to be the greatest reformer of the century, the more so because he tried to do this in Russia where from time immemorial the fate of reformers has been

Alexey Timofeychev, 2006 CREEES Visiting Scholar and Sociology, Warsaw. My dissertation research is on elite politics in Russia's region. From January 15 until May 10 2006, I worked as a visiting researcher at the Center for Russian, Eastern European & Eurasian Studies (CREEES) at Stanford University. It was a part of the Carnegie Research Fellowship Program that was organized by National Council for Eurasian and East European Research and American Councils for International Education (ACTR/ACCELS).

During this period of time I have been working in the libraries of the Stanford University expanding my knowledge on the part of theoretical and methodological dimensions of my PhD project. This work greatly facilitated my research, strengthening both the theoretical and methodological basis of it. In what concerns theory I mainly concentrated on the elucidating of the applicability of a cognitive branch of the new institutionalism approach. I have traced its roots in terms of both rational choice and sociological institutionalisms. I have also considerably moved forward in what regards the operationalization of the main categories used in my research project. I also extensively examined literature on elites and approaches used in elite studies. I got familiar with extensive foreign literature on Russian regionalism.

I attended multiple workshops, seminars and conferences on related topics in CREEES, Political Science Department, Freeman Spogli Institute of International Relations at Stanford and the Institute of Slavic Studies at Berkeley. I met a number of scholars interested in the study of contemporary Russia and discussed with them different aspects of my research project.

Nina Polishchuk, Senior Research Fellow at the H. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy, National Academy of Ukraine, spent 2005-06 at Stanford as a Fulbright Scholar. She presented information to CREEES about new publications in the field of philosophy from her Institute, and donated these books to CREEES. These are some of the important titles that she reported on.
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The March 2006 parliamentary elections in Ukraine were a major step in that country's transition to Western-style democracy. I was fortunate enough to be in Ukraine during the elections, serving as an international observer with the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America's election mission. As an observer, I was stationed in Simferopol, the capital of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea.

Predictably, Crimea voted overwhelmingly for Viktor Yanukovych's pro-Russian Party of Regions in the elections (58.01%). After the Party of Regions, the most popular parties were Our Ukraine (7.62% of the vote), the Bloc of Yulia Tymoshenko (6.54%), and the "National Opposition" Bloc of Natalia Vitrenko (6.18%). Focusing on the election results, however, does not tell the whole story. The conduct of the 2006 elections -- the first since the Orange Revolution forced the corrupt politicians of the Kuchma era out of power -- served as a litmus test for Ukraine's progress towards liberal constitutionalism.

In Crimea, as in the rest of Ukraine, citizens took active parts in both the campaigns and the elections themselves, not only as voters, but also as the administrators of local polling stations and as party representatives sent to monitor the voting. Whereas Crimea is recognized as one of Ukraine's most politically assertive regions, the 2006 elections proved peaceful and -- most importantly -- free and fair.

For many Ukrainians, Crimea is a paradox: it is at once familiar and foreign, considered an exotic frontier region and an integral part of Ukraine. As an orientalized "near abroad," it has captured both the Ukrainian and the Russian imagination for hundreds of years, although it was only incorporated into the Russian Empire under Catherine II and wasn't transferred to the Ukrainian SSR until 1954.

But Crimea today is vastly different from the Crimea of the tsarist period. The native Crimean Tatars were expelled by Stalin in 1944 and have only begun to return since the breakup of the Soviet Union. Today, the population of Crimea is largely Russian; in 1991, 67% of Crimeans were ethnic Russians and 81% were Russophone. Russian is not only the dominant language in daily life, but it is also the language used by the media and the government. In the early 1990s, when Crimean secessionism was considered a possibility, the corollary of Crimean independence was the pursuit of closer ties between Crimea and the Russian Federation.

Throughout Simferopol, walls are still marked with graffiti that proclaims "Krym -- Rossiya," a reminder of the region's close psychological ties to Russia.

Nonetheless, the secessionist impulse in Crimea has died down. Between 1996 and 1997, the major issues dividing Crimea from the rest of Ukraine were defused. The region attained the status of Autonomous Republic (a unique case for Ukraine), the secessionist president was removed and the parliament was empowered, a Crimean constitution was passed, and an agreement was reached between Ukraine and Russia over the troublesome question of the Black Sea Fleet. Today, in many public buildings, the flag of the Crimean Autonomous Republic hangs alongside the Ukrainian flag. Even if the relationship is occasionally awkward, Crimean distinctiveness and Ukrainian civic identity now exist side-by-side with each other.

The state of affairs in Crimea today is a strong rebuttal to the argument that Ukraine is deeply and fatally divided. Throughout the 1990s, the prospect of Ukraine splitting along religious or ethnolinguistic lines was a popular doomsday scenario, just like the fear that radical ethnonationalists would come to power or that a nuclear confrontation between Ukraine and Russia was possible. Even today, most scholarly works on Ukraine draw attention to deep and allegedly irreconcilable divisions in Ukrainian society. Unfortunately, this emphasis on regional differences tends to overshadow the growth of a single civic Ukrainian identity, supported by a burgeoning civil society.

Most recently, the specter of secessionism was conjured by Yanukovych and his allies during the 2004 Orange Revolution. Yanukovych's scare tactics triggered talk of regional turmoil or a "Ukrainian civil war" in the West. Such a scenario was extremely unlikely, however. Yanukovych and his pro-Russian campaign promises enjoyed popular support in eastern and southern Ukraine, but secessionism did not. In eastern Ukraine, the calls for federalization and secession were expressly the work of pro-Yanukovych elites. Furthermore, the region of Ukraine with the largest claim for sovereignty -- Crimea -- was peaceful.

What I observed during the 2006 parliamen-

tary elections seemed to confirm the reality of Ukraine's transition to liberal constitutionalism. Despite massive support for the Party of Regions and despite the deep ethnolinguistic ties to Russia, Crimeans never stepped outside the legal and political framework of the Ukrainian state. I saw no protests, no boycotts, and no intimidation; rather, I saw Crimeans peacefully taking part in the same electoral process as the rest of Ukraine.

What is more, participation in the electoral process was not limited to casting votes. Each polling station was run by a voting commission composed of local volunteers and their work was monitored by a contingent of election observers sent by the parties. After polls closed and once votes began to be counted -- an inhumanly long and taxing process -- it was the members of the voting commissions and the party observers who ensured that the election results were tallied accurately. Without these volunteers, free and fair elections would not have been possible. The struggle to implement a democratic system takes place at this grassroots level, and it is these volunteers who are driving the transition.

Civil society and civic nationalism are still developing in Crimea, just as in other regions of eastern and southern Ukraine. Nonetheless, they are developing. Since independence, Ukraine has experienced neither a bloody revolution nor a civil war. There has been no armed conflict with Russia. Extremism has not taken root. Rather, Ukraine is squarely on the path toward a modern, liberal state with respect for the rule of law. The 2006 elections, like the Orange Revolution, marked another milestone along that path; both proved that not only was liberalization real, but that it was the choice of the people.

Footnotes:
CONGRATULATIONS 2006 CREEES GRADUATES!

Kathryn Blair completed her undergraduate degree in history with high honors last year here at Stanford. This year she was an Academic Theme Associate at Slavianska Dom (Stanford's Slavic theme dorm) and an active member of the Stanford Equestrian Team. She also continued to pursue her primary academic interest: 20th century Russian history. Although her future plans are still somewhat tentative, she will most likely be taking a job as a bioinformatics software engineer in her home state of Utah. She hopes to return to the world of academia and Slavic studies and eventually pursue a PhD in Russian history.

Elizabeth Engraf graduated from the University of Notre Dame in 2003 with a B.A. in history and pre-professional studies. After receiving her undergraduate degree, she researched privatization and property restitution in Poland funded by a Fulbright Fellowship. She also spent a year teaching English in Poznan, Poland. At Stanford, Elizabeth has focused her studies on East Central Europe and more specifically on Poland and her neighbors. Upon completion of this MA program, she hopes to find employment as a consultant or analyst and later to return to academics either as a student or as a teacher.

Mattias Eriksson comes from Lund, Sweden where he earned a BA in East and Central European Studies and a MS in Industrial Management and Engineering from Lund University. Before coming to Stanford, Mattias had studied and worked in Russia, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, among other countries. While in the AMREES program, he took courses mainly within political science and history focusing especially on contemporary Russia and Central Asia. In the future, Mattias hopes to be working for the Swedish Trade Council in Russia.

Mark Romaniw graduated from Georgetown University in May 2005, majoring in International Politics with a Certificate in Russian and East European Studies. At CREEES, he concentrated on twentieth-century Soviet and East European history as well as questions of identity in post-Soviet Russia and Eastern Europe. In March 2006, he was an international observer for the Ukrainian parliamentary elections, stationed in Simferopol, Crimea. His article about the experience is on page 6 of this issue. He plans to work in the Washington, DC area next year and in the long-term he plans to apply to PhD programs in either Political Science or Government.

Lucy Stringer After graduating from Duke University with honors in Russian and English History, Lucy completed a Middlebury College intensive Russian language course and was awarded the Edward H. Benenson Prize to spend a year in Moscow researching the influences of Chekhov and Levitan on contemporary Russian intellectual culture. On her return to the US, and before entering the CREEES master's program, she worked as an analyst for Borealis Ventures in Hanover, NH. At Stanford, Lucy has studied the theory and practice of democratization from political science, historical, and economic perspectives and has completed coursework in Russian, East European and Central Asian history. She has also continued to practice and develop her Russian language skills, and has served as the Editor-in-Chief of Zhe, Stanford's Student Journal of Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies. Next year, Lucy will be in Washington, DC, where she will work in the fields of democracy-building and development, with a focus on the re-emerging economies of Russia and the former Soviet Union.

Maria Taylor Before arriving at CREEES, Maria Taylor completed an AB in Mathematics and in the Growth & Structure of Cities at Bryn Mawr College. She has lived in Budapest and St. Petersburg, and traveled in Russia and Central Europe. While at CREEES, Maria studied history, Russian language and culture, anthropology, and political science. Her future plans include a Masters of Landscape Architecture degree from the University of Washington in Seattle, in keeping with her larger interests in urbanism and the built environment. This summer Maria is participating in an urban planning project in St. Petersburg, Russia, and plans to travel to Kazakhstan.

2006 AMREES graduates: Academic Coordinator Jack Kollmann, Lucy Stringer, Kathryn Blair, Elizabeth Engraf, Mattias Eriksson, Mark Romaniw, Director Nancy Kollmann & Associate Director Mary Dakin (Maria Taylor was in Moscow).
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Zhe promotes university-wide recognition of Stanford students' commitment to scholarship in Russia, Eastern Europe and Eurasia. The journal features work by students sharing their research and fostering an interest among other students for further academic engagement in these regions. Please pick up a copy of the journal at the CREEES office, or visit us at zhe.stanford.edu.
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CONFERENCEs
Glasnost’ Evaluated: 1986-2006
30th Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference
Friday, March 3, 2006
Panel I: Glasnost’ in Scholarship and Culture
Panel II: Openness and Transparency in 21st Century Russia
Panel III: Conceptualizing Glasnost and Its Consequences

Eastern Orthodoxy and Literature Conference
March 4, 2006
This conference explored the place and use of Orthodoxy in literary studies and related fields. Presented by the Orthodoxy Reading Group, CREEES, and the Research Unit of the Division of Literatures, Languages and Cultures at Stanford

Opening Remarks - Gabriella Safran Stanford University
Orthodoxy and Philosophy - Steven Cassidy UC San Diego “How Russian Orthodox Got Turned into Something It Was Probably Never Meant To Be.”
Judith Kornblatt University of Wisconsin, Madison “Solovev’s Re-Vision of Divine Wisdom”
Bissera Pentcheva Stanford University “The Performance of Relics: The Mandylion in Constantinople”

Orthodoxy and Narrative - Chair: Sarah Pratt USC
Robert Bird University of Chicago “Narrative and Image in the Sergeiev School (Vasili Rozanov, Pavel Florenski, Vladimir Favorsky, Mikhail Prishvin)”
Tom Roberts Stanford University “Narrative Strategy and Religious Discourse in Leskov’s The Enchanted Wanderer”
Kate Holland Yale University “The Novel and Legend: Religious Narrative and The Brothers Karamazov”

Orthodoxy and Pedagogy - Chair: Gabriella Safran Stanford; Jack Kollmann Stanford University; Bob Gregg Stanford University

Orthodoxy and Theology - Chair: Nancy Kollmann Stanford University; Nikolai Kotrelev Moscow Academy of Sciences; Vladimir Solovev: Between Catholicism and Orthodoxy; Martha Kelly Stanford University; “The Lenten Subtext in Akhmatova’s Late Poetry”
Eugenii Bershtein Reed College; “Sex in Russian Modernist Theology: Father Sergii Bulgakov and Others”

Closing Remarks - Chair: Laura Wittman Stanford University; Viktor Zhivot University of California, Berkeley

Waves and T roughs of Post Communist Transitions: What Role for External vs Domestic Variables?
April 28 & 29, 2006
Sponsored by the Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law and CREEES
Valerie Bunce (Cornell) “The Diffusion Effect on Post Communist Transitions”
Michael McFaul (CDDRL) “The Missing Variable: The International System as the Link between Third and Fourth Wave Models of Democratization”

Panel II: The Second Wave and the EU Effect
Milada Vachudova (UNC Chapel Hill) “Democratization in Post Communist Europe: Illiberal Regimes and the Leverage of the European Union”
Alina Mungui-Pippidi (Romanian National School of Government and Administration) “Europeanization without Decomunization: A Case of Elite Conversion?”
Tsveta Petrova (Cornell) “Differential Impact of EU Enlargement on First and Second Wave Applicants: Europeanizing Political Parties in Poland and Bulgaria”

Panel III: The Third Wave: Electoral Breakthroughs (or not)
1998-2005
Sharon Wolchik (George Washington University) & Valerie Bunce
“Defining and Domesticating the Electoral Model of Democratization: A Comparison of Slovakia and Serbia”
Cory Welt (CSIS) “Regime Strength and Color Revolution in the Caucasus”
Mike McFaul “The Orange Revolution: External versus Internal Dimensions”
Eric McGlinchey (George Mason University) “Regeneration of Degeneration: Youth Mobilization and the Future of Uzbeck Politics”

Panel IV: Troughs of Reform: Russia, Belarus and Authoritative Resilience
Kathryn Stoner-Weiss (CDDRL) “When the Wave Hits a Shoal: Russia’s Back Slide Away from Democracy”
Vitali Sliatski (CDDRL and Belarus) “Another Contagion: Preemptive Authoritarianism in the Former Soviet Union Following the Colored Revolutions”

2005-06 ALEXANDER DALLIN LECTURE IN SOVIET AND POST-SOVIET AFFAIRS
Gorbachev Revisited
Archie Brown, Emeritus Professor of Politics at Oxford University and Emeritus Fellow of St Antony’s College, Oxford
Tuesday, April 18, 2006

SUMMER 2006 ISSUE
PUBLIC LECTURES

Traian Basescu, President of Romania
Achieving Democracy from the Black Sea to the Middle East and Beyond
September 15, 2005

Marketa Trimble Landova, PhD, SPIEL Fellow, Stanford Law School
(Non)Reform of Public Service in the Czech Republic after 1989
October 4, 2005

Izolya Zemtsova, Visiting Professor of Music, Stanford University
What Georgia Sings to the World: Contemporary Musical Life in Georgia
October 18, 2005

David Holloway, Professor of Political Science, Raymond A. Spruance Professor of International History, Stanford University
Reflections on the 2005 Vailal Conference
October 28, 2005

Pavel Podvig, Research Fellow, CISAC, Stanford
The KGB, Secrecy & Spymania vs Science in Today’s Russia
November 1, 2005

William Craft Brumfield, Professor of Slavic Studies, Tulane University
The Revival of Russia’s Spiritual Heritage: The Tikhvin-Dormition Monastery and the Return of the Tikhvin Icon
November 1, 2005

Panel Discussion featuring Professors Steve Zipperstein, Gabriella Safran, Oleg Budnitsky, and other distinguished faculty
Rethinking Jews, Communism, Russia and the Last Century
November 7, 2005

Steven Fish, Assoc Prof Political Science, UC Berkeley
Why Democracy Failed in Russia
November 30, 2005

Masha Lipman, Editor, Pro et Contra, Research Affiliate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
Democracy Twice Removed: Kremlin Control and Manipulation of Russian Political Life
January 10, 2006

Gavhar Dzhrayeva, Director, NGO “Immigration and Rights,” Moscow
Migrant Workers in Russia: Prospects & Dangers
January 11, 2006

Andrei Tsypynkov, Associate Professor International Relations / Political Science, San Francisco State University
Regime Changes in the Post-Soviet World: Putin’s Response
January 17, 2006

Svetlana Adonyeva, Professor, Faculty of the Humanities, St Petersburg State University
A Destined Fiance – A Figure in Disguise – Animus
January 18, 2006

Elena Kiladze, 2005 - 06 Fulbright Scholar, Yale School of Architecture; Assoc. Prof, Institute of Architecture, Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia
Utopia and Reality in Soviet Architecture
January 26, 2006

Julia Verkholantsev, Assistant Professor, University of Pennsylvania
St. Jerome, the Gligoile: A Mythology of the Sacred Origin of Slavic Letters
January 25, 2006

Viktor Shireman, Chief Researcher, Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, Moscow; Visiting Researcher, Wilson Center, Washington DC; Author of Intellectuals and Politics in the Northern Caucasus in the 20th Century
The Politics of Name in the Northern Caucasus
February 7, 2006

Andras Simonyi, Ambassador of Hungary to the United States
Hungary Two Years after EU Membership
February 7, 2006

Mary Warlick, Director, Russia Office, Bureau of European & Asia Affairs, US Department of State
Briefing and Q&A on US Russia Relations
February 10, 2006

Andrey Kurov, Vice President, US-Russia Technology Symposium; Senior Economist, Open Economy Institute, Moscow; Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science, Stanford University
Limits of Democracy and Russia: Can the Poor Be Free?
February 28, 2006

Olena Nikolayenko, Ph.D Candidate, Political Science, University of Toronto; Visiting Researcher, Stanford Center on Adolescence
DisTrust in Political Institutions among Adolescents in Russia and Ukraine
March 7, 2006

Jonathan Moore, Foreign Service Officer, US Dept. of State, Minsk; National Security Affairs Fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University
Belarus on the Eve of Elections
March 10, 2006

Jochen Helfbeck, Professor of History, Rutgers University
Revolution on My Mind: Writing a Diary under Stalin
March 13, 2006

Mykola Sorochinsky, Former Section Head of the Legal Dept., Central Election Committee, Ukraine; Muskie Fellow, University of Notre Dame Law School
March 14, 2006

Sergey Ivanov, Senior Research Assoc, Institute of Slavic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
Holy Fools in Byzantium & Beyond
April 10, 2006

Wolfgang Eichwede, Director, Institute for the Study of Eastern Europe, University of Bremen
The Historical Role of the Dissident Movement and Samizdat Culture in Eastern Europe
April 11, 2006

Marketa Trimble Landova, SPIEL Fellow, Stanford Law School
Legal Landscape in a ‘Legislative Hurricane’ Impact of the 2004 European Union Enlargement on Czech Legislative Process
April 20, 2006

Myroslav Marynowych, Senior Vice Rector, Ukrainian Catholic Univ, Ukraine
The Ecumenical Challenge of the Church of Kyiv
Tuesday, April 25, 2006

Leonid Livak, Associate Professor of the University of Toronto
Of Garlic, Gese, and Gogol: New Analytical Approaches to ‘the Jews’ of Russian Literature
April 26, 2006

David R. Stone, Associate Professor of History, Kansas State University; 2005 - 06 Fellow, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences
The Comecon’s International Investment Bank and the Crisis of Developed Socialism
May 2, 2006

Col. Tucker B. Mangaser, Commandant of the Defense Language Institute and Commander of the Presidio of Monterey and Ord Military Community
Area Studies in Uniform: One Soldier’s Story
May 5, 2006

Elise Wirtzchaffner, Professor, History Department, California State Polytechnical University, Pomona
The Orthodox Heritage of Eighteenth-Century Russian Intellectuals
May 8, 2006

Luka Babka, Director of the Slavonic Library, Prague
The Soviet gulag and the Czechoslovak Experience (1918-1989)
May 10, 2006

Seth B. Graham, Humanities Fellow and Lecturer, Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures, Stanford University
The Irony Curtain: Everyday Satirical Performance in Soviet Russia
May 16, 2006

Michael Beizer, Hebrew University
A Jewish Postal Romance: Secret Aid of American Jews to Soviet Jewry after World War II
May 25, 2006

Jonathan Moore, Foreign Service Officer, US Dept. of State, Minsk; National Security Affairs Fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University
The State Department as an Institution and as a Career
May 26, 2006

Oleh Shamshur, Ambassador of Ukraine to the United States
Maturing Democracy: Ukraine after the Orange Revolution
Presentation of a Medal of Honor on behalf of the President of Ukraine to Robert Conquest, Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution
June 15, 2006
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CENTRAL ASIA EVENTS

Edige Magauin, Radio Free Europe; Osher Fellow, Hoover Institution
Islamic Identity in Central Asia
September 27, 2005

Abdul Ghaffer Mughal, Lecturer; Department of Economics, California State University, Hayward; CREEES Visiting Scholar
Motivations to Remit and the Consequences for the Country of Origin: Evidence from Tajikistan
October 25, 2005

Farah Hivward, Broadcaster; Radio Free Afghanistan, RFE/RL, 2005 Osher Fellow, Hoover Institution
Afghan Women -- Still Victims of Warlords
November 8, 2005

SILK ROAD LECTURE SERIES

Sponsored by the Silk Road Foundation and co-sponsored by CREEES and CEAS

Roderick Whitfield, Professor Emeritus, School of Oriental and Africa Studies, University of London
Portraits of Horses and Lions at the Ming Court
November 3, 2005

Gene Richards, Major, US Army, China FAO Masters Student CEAS
China: Central Asia's Next Hegemon?
January 19, 2006

AI Dien, Professor Emeritus, Asian Languages CEAS
Sogdians Are Everywhere: Recent Archaeological Discoveries
February 16, 2006

Greg Mortensen, Author; Director, Central Asia Institute
Three Cups of Tea: One Man's Mission to Fight Terrorism and Build Nations... One School at a Time
March 21, 2006

Datsheveg Tumen, Dept of Anthropology & Archaeology, Natl University of Mongolia, Ulaanbaatar

Archaeology of Xiongnu and Mongolian Period
April 4, 2006

Eugene Wang, Abby Aldrich Rockefeller Professor of Asian Art, Harvard University
Why Do Caves Need Murals? Symbolic Cosmos in Cave Shrines at Dunhuang
May 4, 2006

Piotr Monczarz, Ph.D. P.E., Corporate VP, Exponent Oil and Gas, World Energy Stability, and the Silk Road World
May 11, 2006

LECTURES ON ART AND ARCHITECTURE IN EARLY RUSSIA

Presented by Jack Kollmann, Lecturer in History and Academic Coordinator, CREEES, given as part of History 120A "Early Modern Russia"

Early Russian Art, 11th-16th Centuries
October 11, 2005

A Century of Change: Russian Art and Architecture in the 17th Century
November 14, 2005

Peter the Great and the Founding of Sanktpeterburg
November 16, 2005

18th-Century St. Petersburg: Art and Architecture in the Imperial Capital
November 30, 2005

CENTRAL EUROPEAN FILM SERIES

WINTER 2006: 1918-1968
Shown in conjunction with COMPLIT 244: Central European Literature & Film: 1918-1968; all films introduced by Instructor Jessie Labov

SPRING 2006: 1968 - Present

April 11, 2006
Camera Politica: Dusan Makavejev
Lecture: Dusan Makavejev

April 19, 2006
Witness (A Tanu)
Directed by Peter Basco, Hungary, 1968

April 26, 2006
The Ear (Ucho)
Directed by Karel Kachyra, Czechoslovakia, 1970

May 3, 2006
Camera Buff (Amator)
Directed by Krzysztof Kielowski, Poland, 1979

May 10, 2006
Time Stands Still (Megall az ido)
Directed by Peter Gother, Hungary, 1982

May 17, 2006
Pigs (Psy)
Directed by Wladyslaw Pasikowski, Poland, 1992

May 24, 2006
Fighter
Directed by Amir Bar-Lev, USA, 2000

May 31, 2006
Wounds (Ran)
Directed by Srdjan Dragojevic, Serbia, 2000

June 7, 2006
Kontroll
Directed by Nimrod Antal, Hungary, 2003

EIGHTH ANNUAL UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION FILM FESTIVAL

"A Statement of Hope and Courage"
October 19-23, 2005
http://www.UNAFF.org

Art and Architecture of Early Russia: Early Russian Art, 11th-16th Centuries
October 4, 2005

http://creees.stanford.edu
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CREEES/STANFORD
HUMANITIES CENTER
WORKSHOP

BORDERLANDS: ETHNICITY, IDENTITY
AND VIOLENCE IN THE SHATTER ZONE
OF EMPIRES: The Eurasian Space

CREEES received Mellon Foundation funds from the Stanford Humanities Center to run this research seminar for faculty and graduate students as a Stanford Humanities Center Workshop in the 2005-06 academic year.

Mike Reynolds, Research Fellow, John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies, Harvard University
Russia and the Ottoman Kurs in 1908 to 1914
October 21, 2004

Michael Kemper, Associate Professor of History, St. Lawrence University
Islamic Law and Customary Law in Nineteenth-Century Daghestan
October 17, 2005

Sabine Dullin, Research Fellow, Russian Center, École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales. Paris

The Collapse of Communist Globalization: Ideological Border and National Spaces in the Soviet Union
November 10, 2005

Istvan Deak, Professor Emeritus of History, Columbia University
Jews and Other Nations in Multinational Modern Eastern Europe
December 6, 2005

Edward W. Walker, Executive Director, Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies, University of California at Berkeley
Ethnic War, Holy War, Western War? Does the Adjective Matter in Explaining Collective Political Violence?
January 30, 2006

Anu-Mai Koll, Professor Studia Baltica, Historiska Institutionen, Stockholm University
Participation and Perpetrators: the Campaign Against the Kalaks in the Estonian SSR 1947-49
February 9, 2006

Mark von Hagen, Professor of History and Director of the Harriman Institute, Columbia University
Occupations in Borderlands: the German and Russian Experience in Ukraine, 1914-1918
February 17, 2006

Pieter Judson, Professor, Swarthmore College
Language Frontiers of the Hapsburg Monarchy
March 6, 2006

Stephan H. Astourian, Executive Director, Armenian Studies Program, University of California at Berkeley
Armenian-Tatar War (1905-06)
April 5, 2006

Stephen Kockin, Professor of History, Princeton University
Transcania: The Problem of Governance in Eurasia
April 10, 2006

John LeDonne, Harvard University
Ethnicity, Identity, and Violence in Russia's Borderlands: The Eighteenth Century
April 24, 2006

Michael Khodarkovsky, Professor of History, Loyola University of Chicago
Was 18th Century Russia a Colonial Empire?
May 11, 2006

Erika Monahan, Ph.D. Candidate in History, Stanford University
Sinews of Capital: Elite Merchant Dealings on the Seventeenth Century Siberian Frontier
May 18, 2006

ORTHODOXY READING GROUP

Discussion of chapters from Christine Worobec, Possessed: Women, Witches, andDemons in Imperial Russia
Gabriella Safran, Stanford University
October 10, 2005

A Conversation with Laura Engelstein, Yale University
November 8, 2005

Discussion of chapters from Chris Chulos, Converging Worlds: Religion and Community in

Peasant Russia, 1861-1917
Jack Zolli, Stanford University
November 14, 2005

Scott Kenworthy, Miami University of Ohio
Defining Russian Religious Identity in the 19th Century: The Case of Mohila and Paisius
February 6, 2006

Conference: Eastern Orthodoxy and Literature
March 4, 2006

Robert Nelson, Yale University
The West Makes the East: On the Interpretation of Visual Signs in Eastern and Western Medieval Art
March 10, 2006

Elise Wirtschafter, California State Polytechnic University
Roundtable on the Orthodox Heritage of 18th-century Russian Intellectuals
May 8, 2006

UKRAINE EVENTS AT STANFORD UNIVERSITY 2005-2006

Journey Beyond Words: Mapping Out Ukrainian Identity
Volodymyr Dibrova, Novelist: Preceptor Slavic Languages, Harvard University; Prof Kyiv Mohyla Academy
October 27, 2005

Ethnicity and Reporting of Mass Murder
Krajivski, the NKVD Massacres in 1941, and the Winnicki Exhumation
John-Paul Himka, Professor, History and Classics, University of Alberta
December 1, 2005

Does Ukraine Have a History? Ten Years Later
Mark von Hagen, Boris Bakhmeroff Professor of Russian & East European Studies, Columbia Univ. past president, International Assoc for Ukrainian Studies
February 16, 2006

Post-Orange Revolution Media and the Parliamentary Election 2006
Marta Dyczok, Professor of Political Science & History, University of Western Ontario
March 9, 2006

The Role of Judiciary in Ukraine's Political Process
Mykola Sorochnsky, Former Section Head of the Legal Dept., Central Election Committee, Ukraine; Muskie Fellow, University of Notre Dame Law School
March 14, 2006

Volodymyr Kulyk, Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies, Kyiv; Visiting Faculty, Political Science, Stanford University
March 17, 2006

Evangelical Movements in Late Soviet/Post Soviet Ukraine
Catherine Wanner, Assistant Professor of Eastern European History and Religious Studies, Pennsylvania State University
April 6, 2006

The Ecumenical Challenge of the Church of Kyiv
Myroslav Marynovych, Senior Vice Rector, Ukrainian Catholic University, Lviv, Ukraine
April 25, 2006

Foiled Authoritarianism in Ukraine: The Sources of the Orange Revolution
Lucan Way, Assistant Professor of History, Temple University
April 27, 2006
Q. How do you estimate the role of Orange Revolution in Ukraine?

A. The stirring and exulting “orange days” in the Ukraine have already become a part of history. I think the Orange revolution was a real phenomenon in Ukrainian history, a unique historical event for Ukraine and for the Ukrainian people. It was a revolution in our spirit. The most important result of the Orange Revolution is that it gave the feeling of dignity to our people. They also realized that democracy should not be taken for granted, it is necessary to fight for it.

Q. What was the role of “Kyiv-Mohyla” Academy in the Orange Revolution?

A. I want to say that I am really proud to work at the University of “Kyiv-Mohyla Academy”. Our University has a long history based on the respect of democratic traditions. It was the first University that supported the Civic Protest Movement and went on a political strike. Also we declared the “WE ARE MARCHING” campaign. Lead by the president of our University Vyacheslav Bryukhovetsky, all students, faculty and staff marched to the offices of governmental institutions, where the people’s voice had not been heard yet. We published a special book We Are Marching that included the best photos, open letters to top officials and other interest chronicles of those historic days.

Q. Could you say some words about the history of your University?

A. The National University “Kyiv-Mohyla Academy” is one of the oldest universities in Eastern Europe. It starts its glorious history from the Kyiv Brotherhood School opened in 1615. The school got College Status in 1632, exactly the same year Harvard University was founded. In 1658 it was granted the status of Academy. Following the death of its first rector and patron Petro Mohyla, the Kyiv Academy became the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (KMA). Until the Slavico-Byzantine Latin Academy was opened in Moscow in 1701, the KMA was the only Eastern Orthodox School of advanced education. In the year 1817, KMA was closed down by the order of the Russian tsar. In September 1991 the Academy was reopened - now as the National University “Kyiv-Mohyla Academy” (NaUKMA). NaUKMA is an internationally-oriented school which has bilateral agreements with more than 50 educational institutions abroad. It is built on the principles of liberal arts education and has Ukrainian and English languages as its official languages.

Q. What are you currently working on at Stanford?

A. I am working on my book Communist Leadership in Ukraine. I have finished the student guide The Diagnostic Tests for Econometrics Models. At the same time I am doing library research for the two new MA courses in “Financial Management” and “Financial Econometrics”. Also, I am continuing work on a research project that I started with my colleagues concerning the examination of the border effect in Ukraine. It is an interesting economic and political issue - especially after the last presidential elections of 2004 - that can give answer to the question “How far is the East from the West?” As a professional educator I am also interested in advancing university teaching methods. In this respect I am really impressed by the activities of the Center for Teaching and Learning at Stanford, its goals and accomplishments. After returning to Ukraine, I will finish my research work and the new courses using the material that I have collected at Stanford.

At the end I would like to express my special gratitude to the Chopivsky family Foundation who provided me and other Ukrainian scientists with such a great opportunity to work at the one of the most prestigious university in the world such as Stanford. It is great to have access to Stanford's famous libraries and information, to have a wonderful chance for professional advancement. Also I am very impressed by the activities of the Center for Russian, East European & Eurasian Studies (CREEES) and its important role played in the understanding of culture, history, politics and everyday life of post-Soviet countries. I am also impressed by the activities of its Ukrainian Studies subdivision and the huge interest that the American people express in Ukraine. I am happy to meet here remarkable scientists and leaders of the CREEES such as Professor Nancy S. Kollmann, Dr. Mary Dakin, Dr. Lessia Jarboe as well as its other faculty and staff.
**UKRAINIAN STUDIES NEWS**

**Director's Note:**
**Ukrainian Studies Fund Puts Stanford Over the Top to Credit Union.** All of these grants were matched by a local anonymous friend of Ukrainian Studies at Stanford, with the result that we can now create a special fund for an endowment.

Why an endowment? What is the difference between the "Ukrainian Studies Fund" to which people have been contributing and the new endowment? The difference is in the long-term promise of funds. We have been raising, up to this point, term funds, that we have gratefully expended for lectures, new courses and other activities. But endowment funds cannot be spent down; only their income comes to the program. Thus, it's a long-term challenge to build up enough endowment so that the income is substantial enough. That is our future challenge.

An Endowment Fund is a long run guarantee that there will always be activities devoted to Ukrainian Studies at Stanford. With such funds we can ensure that Ukrainian language, history, culture or politics is taught, or support graduate students, or host post-doctoral scholars. Ultimately, of course, everyone dreams of founding a Chair in Ukrainian Studies at Stanford – a huge, but worthy goal for us all.

We will continue to raise money both for our short-term programming and for endowment. Should you want to contribute to Ukrainian Studies, you can choose your format. Should you want to support specific programs in the near future, write your check to "Stanford University" and put in the note "Ukrainian Studies Fund." Should you want to support the long-term goal of building our Endowment, simply put in the note "Endowment for Ukrainian Studies." We are grateful for your support!

*—Nancy Kollmann*

**Stanford Welcomes Kateryna Yushchenko and Honors Robert Conquest**

The Program in Ukrainian Studies at Stanford University completed a successful year with two festive events in June. On June 1, Stanford hosted Mrs. Kateryna Yushchenko during her tour of the U.S. Mrs. Yushchenko met with Stanford faculty for lunch and toured the campus with Professor Nancy Kollmann.

On June 15, Ambassador of Ukraine Oleh Shamshur traveled to Stanford to award the Medal of Iaroslav Mudryi, one of Ukraine's highest honors, to Professor Robert Conquest, Senior Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University. John Dunlop, Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution skillfully moderated the event that included public policy discussion and a very emotional ceremony. Mr. Shamshur addressed a very enthusiastic crowd of about 120 people from Stanford and the Ukrainian community with a short lecture entitled: "Maturing Democracy: Ukraine after the Orange Revolution" and then graciously participated in a very lively question and answer period.

There was a great deal of interest in the Ambassador's thoughts on the Orange Revolution. He said: "The post-Soviet period of the Ukraine is over..." and is convinced that parliamentary elections in March 2006 which were "the last test of Ukraine on the road to democracy," demonstrated the support of Ukraine's voters for the political leaders and parties that worked together during the Orange Revolution. Dr. Shamshur emphasized that the government needs the time to put into operation legislative and other reforms to improve standards of living as well as to increase foreign investment.

![Ambassador Shamshur, John Dunlop and Robert Conquest](image)

Commenting on the relationship between Ukraine and US Ambassador Shamshur said that the two countries are working together on the war on terror and promoting human rights, fighting organized crime, human trafficking and stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The true highlight of the event was the presentation of the Ukraine Presidential Medal of Iaroslav Mudryi, named for the Kievan prince known as a lawmaker and patron of the church and the arts (early 1000s) to Dr. Robert Conquest Senior Fellow, Hoover Institution in recognition of his groundbreaking scholarship on the Ukrainian famine of 1932-1933 in *Harvest of Sorrow* (1986). Ambassador Shamshur extolled Dr. Conquest's lifelong commitment to scholarly focus on this long-ignored subject.

"For a new democratic Ukraine, you are a real national hero... You have done a real outstanding feat for Ukraine. You have done a service to humanity... Ukraine needs to know and understand its history in order to be able to make the right decisions for the future, and this is why the groundbreaking books of Dr. Conquest are so important for the developing Ukrainian democracy and its current and future generations of historians."

At the end of the medal presentation, the crowd spontaneously sang "(God Grant You) Many Years" a Ukrainian ballad often sung in churches and on special occasions. Dr. Conquest expressed very deep thanks for the honor, which is rarely presented outside of Ukraine.

*A brief biography of Robert Conquest can be found at: http://www-hoover.stanford.edu/bios/conquest.html*
Lauren C. Allan-Vail completed her MA in Slavic Languages and Literatures. She is working at GCEP on campus.

Emily Greble Balic (Ph.D. Candidate History) For 2007, Emily Greble Balic will be a pre-doctoral fellow at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s JFK School of Government. She has a joint appointment in the programs on International Security and Intrastate Conflict.


Andrew Chen completed his BS and co-terminal MS in Aeronautics and Astronautics. He participated in the 2005 Stanford in Moscow Program, as well as a Stanford OSP Summer Seminar in St. Petersburg.

German Dziebel completed his Ph.D. in Cultural and Social Anthropology. His dissertation was on “Playing and Nothing: European Appropriations of Native American Cultures in the Late 20th Century.”

Irina Erman completed her MA in Slavic Languages and Literatures. She continues her studies at Stanford toward the Ph.D.

Rebecca Fogel completed her BA in Slavic Languages and Literatures with a double major in Urban Studies. She participated in the 2005 Stanford in Moscow program.

Melissa Fusco graduates with a double major in Philosophy and Slavic Languages and Literatures. She received the Galina Leytes Prize for her honors thesis “Quine and the Bilingual Mind.” In the fall, she will pursue philosophy graduate studies at UC Berkeley.

Liubov Golbert (Ph.D. Comparative Literature 2006) accepted a position as Assistant Professor in the Slavic Languages and Literatures Department at UC Berkeley. She will begin teaching 19th-century Russian literature in the Fall.

Ilya Gruen completed his MA in Slavic Languages and Literatures. He continues his studies at Stanford toward the Ph.D.

Tetiana B. Hryny’ova completed her Ph.D. in Physics, with a dissertation on “Study of B Meson Decays to pseud Final States.” Tetiana was president of the Ukrainian Students Association at Stanford for several years.

Ben Knelman completed a BA with a double major in Russian Language, Culture and History and in Economics. He received Honors from the Interdisciplinary Honors Program in Environmental Science, Technology and Policy. Ben has been accepted into the CREEES MA program for the fall.

Martha McCrummen Fraser Kelly is completing her Ph.D. in Slavic Languages & Literature, her dissertation title is “(Un)Orthodox Beauty: The Uses of Orthodox Ritual in Russian Modernist Literature and Culture (1895-1965).” She will be an IHum Teaching Fellow this academic year.

Zhanara Nauruzbayeva received her MA in Cultural and Social Anthropology; she continues her studies at Stanford toward the Ph.D.

Rebecca Osakwe completed her BA in Economics. Rebecca authored “PEM Fuel Cells and Russia’s Supply of Plutonium: Tracing One Bottleneck for Another?” for the 2nd edition of Zhe, Stanford’s Student Journal of Russian, East European & Eurasian Studies.

Heili Pals completed her Ph.D. in Sociology. Her dissertation is entitled “The Varying Impact of Adolescent Nonconformity on Career Path in Transitional Societies.” She will be a post doc in Texas A&M working with Prof. Howard Kaplan. Heili is co-author with D. Sunshine Hillygus, Norman H. Nie, and Kenneth Prewitt of The Hard Count: The Political and Social Challenges of Census Mobilization. In the spring she received two awards: The James W. Lyons Award for Service and The Graduate Service Recognition Award.

Sara Pankenier completed her Ph.D. in Slavic Languages & Literatures. Her dissertation was entitled “The Infantilist Aesthetic of the Russian Avant-Garde.” Sara will be a visiting lecturer in Russian Literature at Dartmouth College next year.

Carleen Pino completed her BA in Slavic Languages and Literatures. Carleen works at Genetech in Palo Alto.

Tom Roberts completed his MA in Slavic Languages and Literatures. He continues his studies at Stanford toward the Ph.D.

Matthew Rojansky (J.D. 2006) was a 2005-06 FLAS Fellow in Russian and a predoctoral fellow at CISAC at SFI. In April he delivered the paper “Network Attribution Theory: A New Approach to Internationally Wrongful Acts” for the Social Science Seminar series. Next year he will serve as Clerk for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.

Maria Sidorakina completed a BA in Comparative Literature and a BS in Economics with departmental honors, with distinction.

Carolyn Sinsky graduates with a BA in Slavic Languages and Literatures. She received the Galina Leytes Prize for her honors thesis: “The Woman Reader in Eugene Onegin.” Carolyn will pursue a Ph.D. in Slavic Literature at Harvard University this fall.

Augustin Stoica completed his Ph.D. in Sociology in September, 2005. His dissertation was entitled “From Good Communists to Even Better Capitalists? Entrepreneurship in Post-Socialist Romania.” He has returned to Romania where he teaches at a university in Bucarest.

ALUMNI - What’s your news?

Share your recent activities with us by calling 650.723.3562 or email creesesinfo@stanford.edu

Please include your full name, class year, department and updated contact information.
FACULTY NEWS

Maya Arad (Drama) published Roots and Patterns: Hebrew Morpho-Syntax (Dordrecht: Springer, 2005) and The Righteous Foraken (Achuzat Bait, Tel Aviv).

Robert Crews (History) published For Prophet and Tsar: Islam and Empire in Russia and Central Asia (Harvard Univ. Press, 2006).


Maria Gough (Art History), authored The Artist as Producer: Russian Constructivism in Revolution (Berkeley: UC Press, 2005).

Bert Patenaude (History) published A Wealth of Ideas: Revelations from the Hoover Institution Archives (Stanford University Press, 2006), and developed a related exhibit that ran from January to May at the Hoover Exhibit Pavilion. Bert helped plan the subject and delivered two lectures for the CREEES/BAGEP 2006 Teacher Training Workshop "Russia and America: From Rasputin to Putin" in March. He continues to teach in the IR program and for Continuing Studies.


Wojciech Zalewski (Slavic Curator Emeritus; Religious Studies Curator, Green Library) published Religia w Slezbie Zycia, Eseje Humanistyczne (Bydgoszcz: Galeria Autorska, 2005).

ALUMNI NEWS

Stuart Finkel (PhD History 2002) accepted a position as Assistant Professor of History at University of Florida in Fall 2006.

Veronika Frenkel (A.B. English, 2004) is pursuing a MA in Library Science at San Jose State University. Veronika and Andy Chen (Aero/Astro 2006) were married in June. Congratulations, Veronika and Andy!!!

Amelia Glaser (Ph.D. Comparative Literature 2004) accepted a position as Assistant Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures at UC San Diego in Fall 2006.

Andrew Jenks (Ph.D. History 2003) accepted a position as Assistant Professor of History at UC San Diego.

Fritz Kaege (MBA 2001, FLAS Fellow), is an analyst at Columbia Water Asset Management, L.P. in Chicago, managing Russian and Central Asia investments for mutual funds. Fritz married Rebecca Williams in May, 2006 — they met at a Russian language table potluck run by the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations (he brought khachapuri, she brought plov).

Jackie Kerr (AMREES 2004, BA Slavic and Mathematics 2003) is a graduate student in the Ph.D. program in Government at Georgetown University.

Amy Kovac (AMREES 2000) has taken a position with The Roanoke Times as staff correspondent for higher education. She lives in Blacksburg, Virginia.

Mikolaj Kunicki (Ph.D. History 2004) accepted a position as Assistant Professor of History at University of Notre Dame to begin Fall 2006.

Ashlee Rosenthal (BA Political Science 2005) completed a MA in Russian Studies at European University of St. Petersburg this June.

Vera Trappmann (AMREES 2001) has been European Fellow at the European University Viadrina in Frankfurt Oder for two years. She is in writing stage of her Ph.D. dissertation.

and disseminates them nationwide. Under her guidance CREEES sponsored SPICE's production of several units, including "Mapping Russia: Geographic and Cultural Diversity," "Inside the Kremlin: Soviet and Russian Leaders from Lenin to Putin," and "Democracy-Building in Afghanistan." She also developed the CREEES Video Lending Library, which loans documentary films on CREEES topics to teachers and interested public.

In addition to her outreach to the community, Mary energized CREEES activities on campus in many ways. She expanded our activities in the social science fields, organizing lectures and conferences. Working with Stanford faculty, she organized conferences on the Taliban in Afghanistan, on environmental degradation in the former Soviet bloc and Soviet Union, and on current dilemmas of post-Soviet political transition, and other topics. She worked side by side with Director Nancy Kollmann to shape CREEES's intellectual agenda — selecting visiting lecturers for our endowed series, designing weekly “brown bag” lunch lecture series, making policy for our M.A. program, and collaborating with our fellow Area Studies Centers and IIS in joint seminars and projects.

Mary was unfailingly dedicated to CREEES — in between these formal tasks, she was always there on the go, always engaged — mentoring students, introducing speakers at lunchtime talks, greeting visitors and introducing them around, networking with colleagues across campus, making things happen. She was a wonderful manager in our small and comradely office. When our Administrator Rosemary Schnoor was suffering from severe illness in her last months on the job, Mary was unfailingly kind and thoughtful to Rosemary. Mary, for example, cajoled Rosemary into letting us give her a retirement dinner, and Mary designed a quite lovely dinner and assembled a momento photo album for Rosemary. She has always put her all into serving CREEES. We will miss her energy and presence, her hearty laugh, her “can-do” attitude. We wish her the best in her new job!

Mary Dokin

http://creees.stanford.edu
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CREEES/Mellon Graduate Research Travel Grants

Daniel Perez (History) for research in Albania
Anat Plocker (History) for research in Poland
Natalie Rouland (Slavic) for research in Russia
Kathryn Ward (History) for research in Ukraine
Iga Zelazny (Art History) for research in Russia

Foreign Language & Area Studies (FLAS) Fellowships for Graduate Intensive Language Study

Megan Dean (History) studying Turkish at Bogazici University (Istanbul, Turkey)
Benjamin Knelman (Economics) studying Russian at Moscow State University (Moscow, Russia)
Kylea Liese (Anthropological Science) studying Tajik language at Indiana University
Edward "Jed" Stiglitz (Political Science) studying Russian at Monterey Institute of International Studies

CREEES/DLCL Undergraduate Language Grants for Summer Intensive Language Study

Richard Barbour (Linguistics) studying Tajik at Indiana University
Mark Harrold (Undeclared) studying Russian at Nevsky Institute of Language and Culture
Katrina Lewin (Slavic Language & Literature) studying Russian at Middlebury Language School
Wilson Velasco (Slavic Language & Literature) studying Russian at Bard College

Center for Russian, East European & Eurasian Studies
Bldg. 40, Main Quad
Stanford University,
Stanford, CA 94305-2006

RETURN SERVICE REQUIRED