



STANFORD UNIVERSITY

## Center for Russian & East European Studies

Encina Hall, Room 200, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-6055

### NEWSLETTER

Spring 1991

#### CREES STAFF 1990-91

Director:

Norman Naimark (History)

Assistant Director:

Irina Barnes

Masters Program Coordinator:

Jack Kollmann

Administrative Assistants:

Rosemary Schnoor

Charlotte Sullivan

Newsletter Editor:

Kathy Vitz

Student Assistant:

Saya Okimoto

#### STEERING COMMITTEE

Terence Emmons (History)

Lazar Fleishman (Slavic)

John Litwack (Economics)

Nancy Okimoto, Ex Officio (IIS)

## Welcome Back, Professor Rice

*Condoleezza Rice is Associate Professor of Political Science at Stanford University. She recently returned to Stanford after serving a two-year appointment to the National Security Council in Washington, D.C.*

*Dave Stewart and Amy Weisman are CREES MA students.*

Q: Dr. Rice, could you tell us about what you did in the Bush Administration and what responsibilities that entailed?

A: I was special assistant to the president for national security affairs and senior director for Soviet Affairs. That position is one of the senior positions on the National Security Council staff, so my immediate boss was Brent Scowcroft.

The NSC staff has three functions. The first is to coordinate US government policy while a policy is being considered. I managed relations at the assistant secretary or undersecretary level. The second function is to staff Brent Scowcroft. When we had requests for, say, the Prime Minister of Russia to come to the White House, we recommended to Brent whether or not to see them. We went to the meetings, and I would write a paper for him suggesting issues he might want to raise. If an issue couldn't be settled at my level and it had to go to the Scowcroft, Baker, Cheney, Powell level, then it was my responsibility to make sure Brent was prepared. The third function is being the president's personal foreign policy staff. When he goes to a meeting with Gorbachev, the NSC staff writes his briefing papers and cards with

things he might want to raise, while bringing issues to him that need to be raised at the head of state level.

Q: Which did you consider the most challenging or fulfilling?

A: It varied at any given time. During a crisis period, such as the two or three Baltic crises, I think the most challenging thing was trying to get the US government to respond and making sure that all the pieces were in place. The operational side of it, for me, was probably the most fun. The most personally satisfying was working with Brent Scowcroft.

Q: How did your experiences here at Stanford help you in your job with the NSC?

A: It would have helped a lot more had all of our assumptions about the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe not been blown away in the first six weeks. You go in and you really don't have a lot of time to learn anything new. It's very much a response job. I think that you have to go in with considerable intellectual capital about the place that you're dealing with. Also, academics juggle a lot more than most people realize; juggling responsibilities to committees and to students and to teaching and to research, and this job was the ultimate juggling job—I had several balls in the air at once.

Q: What do you hope to bring back from your experience in the NSC?

*Continued on page two*

## Entertaining Shevardnadze

Eduard Shevardnadze swung by California on his U.S. tour in mid-May to see his good friends Ronald Reagan and Stanford professor George Shultz.

At a speech in San Francisco on May 17, the two diplomats credited their wives—"the gals"—with helping to usher in warm Soviet-American relations. According to Shultz, people in White House and Kremlin circles used to "joke that they could solve problems." Implicit in this enthusiasm for feminine comradeship may have been a reference to Raisa and Nancy, who had a reputation for not getting along.

Giving a speech in the old Politburo style (no time restrictions), Shevardnadze discussed, among other things, "the new world order," and the importance of the UN in the future of international relations. Audience members sighed with relief when he announced that he no longer saw a dictatorship looming in the Soviet Union.

The next day at a Hoover Institution luncheon Shevardnadze repeated his speech, but Shultz threw in a huge party favor to spice things up. He sang "Georgia on My Mind," in honor of Shevardnadze, who is from Soviet Georgia. George Alexander, not to be confused with Stanford professor Alexander George, accompanied Shultz on guitar and also performed several solos. Alexander's Georgian drinking song had guests cheering and clapping.

Amy Gillett, CREES MA student

## Interview with Condoleezza Rice, Continued

*Continued from front page*

A: I've always tried to teach some of the decision-making aspects of politics. I think I have a better sense for that now. It's important to understand what people were really thinking. I feel lucky that I was in the White House at this historical juncture and I think I can bring some perspective on what it was like to go through those events from that vantage point.

Q: What led to your decision to return to Stanford and give up that exciting lifestyle?

A: It wasn't an easy decision. I felt that it's hard to keep an academic career intact if you don't come back in about two years.

Q: Is academics more your goal than public or civil service?

A: We're fortunate in the U.S. that we can go in and out. But I think of myself as an academic first. That means that you want to keep some coherence and integrity in your career. Graduate students have effectively no access to you for a couple of years. I tried to keep up with my graduate students but it was hard. You can't be away from that for too long.

You start to think differently when you're in the government. When the time came and I was asked to stay, I thought if I stayed, I should stay to the end of the term and I didn't think I was prepared to do that. I was getting tired—it is a very demanding job. The real stress of White House jobs is that it's a really small staff—40 people in the whole NSC staff. It's a burn-out job.

Q: Why did you decide to enter the Soviet military realm of education?

A: I started out as a music major [at the University of Denver], can you believe that? About half way through I decided it just wasn't going to work and I started looking for an interesting area to study and international relations attracted me. It is really a story of just continuing to follow the next interesting thing. First it was international relations, then the Soviet Union, and then

the Soviet military came out of that. I don't know why the Soviet Union has kept my attention better than anything else.

Q: What are some of the obstacles you've faced, if any, in this particular field as a woman and a minority?

A: It's funny. I don't think I ever focus on it very much. I didn't choose to do this because it was different. I chose to do it because it was interesting. I really did wake up one day and think, well, I guess this is an odd thing for a black female to do, but it wasn't conscious on any level until quite late in the game. So when I walk into a room, I tend to discount that.

Now sometimes there are reactions that you can't discount. I gave a talk in Moscow in Russian. At the end of this talk I handled lots of questions. The Moscow News article appears the next day and it says, "She should have been home cooking, or driving admirers mad, but instead she was juggling names of generals," and it was honestly meant as a compliment. I think if you're too conscious of it, then it gets in the way.

Q: Do you see perestroika, glasnost', and the early Gorbachev phenomenon as reversible?

A: I don't think that it is possible to reverse course. The illegitimacy of the symbols, the institutions, the history, is too much to overcome. That doesn't mean that they couldn't go to something awful. But I think it would be something new and awful. It might be authoritarian, it might be totalitarian, it might have communist overtones. It could be a reversal from democratic principles and more openness and all that, but I don't think you could revert.

Q: Do you see the possibility of a right-wing coalition of conservatives, the military leadership and the KGB "capturing" Gorbachev at this point?

*Continued on page five*

## Catching Up With the MA Program Students

One of the CREES MA students graduated at the end of winter quarter 1991. **Jenny Schmitz** completed her degree, and is now in Poland with the Stanford-in-Krakow program as a teaching assistant. This summer she will be teaching English in Prague.

Most of the CREES MA students will be graduating this June. **Heidi Hillis**, who has been hard at work on the second issue of the journal *Montage* and preparing a translation of the last chapter of Ivan Bunin's *Life of Arsenev* for publication, is hoping to go to the Soviet Union this summer. Afterwards, Heidi will return to the Bay Area and look for employment with non-profit organizations dealing with the Soviet Union in such fields as the environment or health. **Ryuichi Hirano** just returned from Washington, D.C., where he took a Russian exam at the Japanese embassy. This summer he will take the intensive Russian language program at Norwich University, after which he will travel around the United States before going to the USSR for a year to study Russian at Moscow State University. Ryuichi will be a diplomat for Japan in the Soviet Union after he completes his training.

The sport of fencing has been keeping two of our students busy. **Elisabeth Spilman** is also working as a research assistant for sociology professor Szonja Szelenyi. After graduation, she plans to keep fencing, work, and maybe go to Hungary next year. **Tom Thliveris** is going to fence at the U.S. Olympic Festival in July, and will train in Australia in August and September. He will continue to train for the 1992 Olympics, and after he completes his military career, Tom hopes to work in foreign and security policy for the U.S. government.

In addition to editing the CREES Newsletter, **Kathy Vitz** is doing research on the

Soviet perspective on the INF Treaty, and job hunting. This summer she will go to Estonia and Leningrad to visit friends and relatives, and look for work in the Soviet Union with a joint venture or teaching English. Besides researching Khrushchev's motivations during the Cuban Missile Crisis and Jewish Bolshevik revolutionaries, **Amy Weisman** is also actively job searching. After graduation, Amy has plans on some "rest and relaxation" for a while before taking on a job in Soviet studies.

Several MA students are returning next fall and will continue in the program. **Mei Fen Chen** is currently doing research on the diplomatic history between the Soviet Union and China after the October Revolution. She will attend summer school before finishing her degree in the fall. **Amy Gillett**, who joined CREES in winter quarter as a co-terminal student in Slavic languages and literatures, will spend two months in Prague teaching English with the Stanford Students for East European Democracy (SEED). She will then go to Novosibirsk with the Stanford-Soviet Exchange Project (SSEP) for three weeks of "winning and dining (vodka and black bread)," before returning to Stanford to finish her MA in December. U.S. Army Captain **Dave Stewart** is having too much fun to graduate. To supplement his research in military-related subjects in past and contemporary Russian and Soviet history, he will attend the Norwich University summer Russian language program. After some scuba diving at Monterey, Dave will return to Stanford and hopes to complete his MA after winter quarter.

**Per Birk Monsted**, a Fulbright scholar who has been doing research at Stanford under CREES auspices, will return to his native Denmark this summer, with stops in China and Moscow. He will write his dissertation at the University of Aarhus, and may pursue a career in Danish diplomacy.

## Thank You Co-Sponsors

We wish to acknowledge the cooperation and co-sponsorship of many Stanford organizations which have helped bring a rich and varied program to our campus. Among them were:

Berkeley-Stanford Program in Soviet Studies  
Center for East Asian Studies  
Center for European Studies  
Center for International Security and Arms Control  
Center for Latin American Studies  
Department of Art  
Department of Comparative Literature  
Department of Drama  
Department of Economics  
Department of German Studies  
Department of History  
Department of Music  
Department of Political Science  
Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures  
Department of Sociology  
Graduate School of Business  
Hoover Institution  
Institute for International Studies  
International Relations Program  
Medieval Studies Program  
Northeast Asia-U.S. Forum  
Overseas Studies Program

---

### Additional program support provided by:

Goethe Institute  
Rockefeller Foundation  
Fritz Thyssen Stiftung



# Summary of CREES-Sponsored Events in 1990-91

## Lectures and Seminars

Calin Anastasiu, *Romania: Ten Months After*. 10/23/90  
Barbara A. Anderson and Brian Silver, *Ethnic and Regional Aspects of Population Change in the Soviet Union*. 4/16/91  
Evgenii Anisimov, *Istoriia i Traditsiia Politicheskogo Prestupleniia v Rossii: Obshchestvo, Donos i Sysk*. 4/12/91  
Robert Argenbright, *Soviet State Territoriality and the Control of the Railroad System*. 5/6/91  
Eniko Ballabas, *Feminism and Democracy in Hungary*. 11/1/90  
Ivo Banac, *Contemporary Yugoslavia*. 3/12/91  
Brian Boyd, *Nabokov's Onegin: Indispensible or Unreadable*. 10/23/90  
Kazimierz Braun, *Polish Theater in the Post-Communist Era*. 1/10/91  
Archie Brown, *Gorbachev and the Crisis of Perestroika*. 5/7/91  
Jane Burbank, *Legal Consciousness in Russia 1905-25*. 4/23/91  
Jane Burbank, *Struggle for Legality: Moscow 1991*. 4/10/91  
Ivan Denes, *Search for Identity: Hungary, a Case Study*. 2/5/91  
Robin Feuer-Miller, *Unsealing the Generic Envelope: Dostoevsky, Dickens and "The Dream of a Ridiculous Man."* 3/5/91  
Karl H. Fink, *Western Employees and Western Economic Policy in Eastern Europe*. 2/1/91  
Nicola Gheorghe, *The Gypsies: Politics of Ethnicity in Romania*. 11/29/90  
Abbott Gleason, *What Has Happened to the Communist World?* 1/16/91  
Leonid Gordon, *The Emergence of an Independent Labor Movement*. 10/4/90  
Oleg I. Gubin, *Democratic Opposition in Russia: From Disagreement to Unity*. 4/17/91  
Jeffrey W. Hahn, *Continuity and Change in Russian Political Culture*. 5/1/91  
Natalia Ivanova, *Nationalism in Literature and Politics*. 11/8/90  
Janis Jurkans, *The Baltics Today*. 4/2/91  
Tamara Kabochkina, *Issledovatelskaia baza istoricheskoi nauki v SSSR*. 12/3/90  
Alexander Kalinin, *The Soviet Environmental and Energy Policy*. 2/14/91  
Mikhail M. Kolesnikov, *Constructivist Theater and Ballet as Laboratories for the New Man*. 11/19/90  
Sergei Kuleshov, *Lenin and Gorbachev*. 4/22/91  
Roman Laba, *The End of the Soviet Union: An Illustrated Lecture*. 2/7/91  
Peter Mateju, *Stratification and Inequality in the Period of Transition from a Redistributive to a Market Economy: The Case of Czechoslovakia*. 12/5/90  
Jan Nattier, *Buddhism in Central Asia (Soviet and Chinese):*

*The State of the Field*. 1/17/91  
Vida Ognjenovic, *A National Theater in a Multi-National State*. 2/11/91  
Daniel Okimoto, Moderator, Round Table Discussion with David Holloway, Alexander Skorodumov, and Shigeo Natsui, *Implications of Gorbachev's Tokyo Summit*. 5/15/91  
Krustyo Petkov, *Current State of Bulgaria*. 10/12/90  
Sergei Romaniuk, *The Preservation of Historical Monuments in Moscow*. 11/27/90  
Stefen Rybar, *Polarization of Political and Social Forces: The Economic Climate of Today's Czechoslovakia*. 1/31/91  
Lev Shilov, *Russian Literature in Authorial Performance*. 9/27/90  
Iuri Solov'ev and Victor Volkonskii, *The Current Soviet Economic Debate: Participants' Report*. 10/26/90  
Jadwiga Staniszkis, *Dilemma of Transition in Eastern Europe*. 3/18/91  
David Stark, *Democratization and Privatization in Eastern Europe*. 3/8/91  
Stefan Stoyanov, *The New Bulgaria*. 11/9/90  
Peter Steiner, *Ironies of History: The Joke of Milan Kundera*. 4/8/91  
Sergei V. Tagor, *Implications for Perestroika on Soviet-Latin American Relations*. 10/11/90  
Valeri Tishkov, *National Ethnic Conflict and the New Political Structure in the Soviet Union*. 12/7/90  
Nina Ulff-Moller, *Nature and Structure of Russian Chant: Tradition and Change in 1,000 Years*. 10/30/90  
Piotr S. Wandycz, *First Annual Antonia and Konstanty Stys Lecture on Polish History and Culture: Poland's Return to Europe*. 3/14/91  
Dimitri Yurasov, *Historical Memory in Soviet Politics*. 11/14/90  
Vladislav Zubok, *The Turn to the Right and Foreign Policy in Moscow*. 2/22/91

## Annual Donald M. Kendall Lectures on Soviet Affairs

Ronald G. Suny, *Revenge of the Past: The Nationalities Problem in the Soviet Union*.  
*Class, Nationality and Revolution*. 2/25/91  
*State Building and Nation Making*. 2/26/91  
*Nationalism and the Nation State*. 2/27/91

## Conferences

The Bellagio International Conference, *June 1941: Fifty Years Later*. 6/10-12/91  
The Berkeley-Stanford Annual Conference, *Beyond Leninism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union*. 3/15/91  
The Boris Pasternak International Conference, 10/16-20/90

## Symposium

*The New Germany and the New Europe*. 11/16/90

## Interview with Condoleezza Rice, Continued

*Continued from page two*

A: I feel slightly vindicated by recent events. I thought all along that Gorbachev is a very tactical man. He is looking for something that works, *anything* that works. For a long time he thought those answers were on the left. Then the left couldn't answer the questions: can there be a Union and a democracy? The right seemed to have an easy answer to that—there can at least be a Union. We saw him swing rightward.

I don't think he's ever really been of either group. I see him as a figure who swings in between, as almost personally the center of Soviet politics. I think he is tacking left again, having seen that the right coalition is incapable of keeping miners out of the streets. He went from the left-center to the right-center, and now he swinging back to the left-center.

That's not ideal, but I do think that that means that captivity probably isn't the right word. He is tactful and in search of methods that work and will try to find them wherever he can. He does have certain principles that are very important to him: the Union has to stay together, and I think he has terrible difficulty with the notion of private property. It's when certain core values like the Union are threatened that he starts shifting.

Q: Do you think that policy will hurt him? He has no backers of his own to speak of—sometimes it's the right, sometimes it's the left, but there's really no Gorbachev coalition.

A: I think that what Soviet politics needs most right now, is not to polarize into hard left and hard right. Somebody who's tacking right and left is more likely to keep people involved in the political process. Whereas eight weeks ago the left thought that Gorbachev was dead for them and the right thought he was their hero, I think today you have a reversal of that.

Q: Do you see the possibility of the military stepping in and attempting a coup?

A: I'm more uncomfortable with the role of the Soviet military than I've ever been, specifically with the role of the high command. The rules of the political game used to be very clear—no one criticized the government, especially military officers. Now, everybody criticizes the government, and it hasn't occurred to military leaders that they should not do so.

I do think that you can discount, to some degree, the agitation caused by such people as Alksnis and Petrosenko [members of the so-called "Black Colonels" and "Soyuz"] and even those in the high command, like [Defense Minister]

Yazov and [Chief of the general Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces] Moiseyev, when they get up and say horrible things about the Soviet president, because things are very fluid.

Below the top level, the Soviet military is not very coherent and there are a lot of different voices being heard, so it would be risky for the Soviet military to insert itself into politics in any major way. If there is a danger, it would probably come from a coalition between the KGB, the MVD, and maybe elements of the military, allied with elements of the apparatchiki. That would be much more dangerous than any military attempt in the classic sense of a coup.

Q: With the growing discontent among the leadership levels of the military, do you see a threat to the cohesion of the military itself?

A: I do not believe it is possible for any country to go through what the Soviet Union is going through now and have any social institution remained untouched, including the military. Nothing is settled—the political, economic and social rules of the game are all in a state of flux, and that is going to have an effect on military cohesion.

Q: Do you perceive the possibility of a Western underestimation of Soviet military capability in the future?

A: There is probably a lot of soul-searching going on in the Soviet research and development sector right now. Their mobilization strategy of trying to do a few things well is no longer viable on the modern battlefield. Now the entire spectrum of the economy, from microelectronics to computing to optics, is engaged in creating battlefield systems, which they are incapable of doing—the technology is not there. I think we will be seeing a quest for a new approach to R&D, to bring the technology needed to the battlefield.

Q: Do you see the current military reforms and peace initiatives as indicative of a genuine approach to world stability?

A: I think that there were those in the Soviet Union who, even as late as 1987, thought they were engaging in a tactical retreat. They are actually engaged in a full-scale strategic retreat that has all the indications of a strategic defeat. It's one thing to give a little ground on nuclear weapons or to withdraw from Afghanistan; it's an entirely different matter to dissolve the Warsaw Pact, leave Eastern Europe, and allow Germany to reunify. We are speaking here of another order of magnitude.

Those who were actually trying to reorient Soviet foreign and domestic policy are now coming under attack, which is

*Continued on back page*



## Bellagio Conference

On the fiftieth anniversary of the German invasion of the Soviet Union, there will be an international conference on "June 22, 1941: Fifty Years Later." This groundbreaking conference will be held June 10-14 at the Rockefeller Foundation's Bellagio Study and Conference Center in northern Italy.

Scholars in various disciplines from the United States, the Soviet Union, Germany, and Britain will discuss the early stages of the German-Soviet war in the light of newly-opened archives and information.

The organizers of the conference, Stanford professors Alexander Dallin, David Holloway, and Norman Naimark, have invited 19 other outstanding scholars to participate, including Dr. John Barber (Cambridge), Dr. Olaf Groehler (Militaerische Akademie, Potsdam), Dr. Jonathan Haslam (Cambridge), Dr. Viktor Israelian (Diplomatic Academy, Moscow), Dr. Jacob Kipp (Ft. Leavenworth, KS), Major General Y. Y. Kirshin (Institute of International Relations, Moscow), Prof. G. A. Kumanev (Institute of History of the USSR), Dr. Manfred Messerschmidt (MGFA, Freiburg), Aleksandr Nekrich (Russian Research Center, Harvard), Prof. Nina Tumarkin (Wellesley), Dr. D. F. Volkogonov (Institute of Military History, Moscow), Prof. Mark Von Hagen (Columbia), and Prof. Gerhard Weinberg (University of North Carolina).

## The Japanese-Soviet Territorial Dispute

The Japanese-Soviet summit talks have ended, and the outcome appears to be a standoff. Gorbachev could not elicit economic cooperation from the Japanese, and Prime Minister Kaifu could not discover any significant changes in the Soviet attitude toward the territorial dispute.

During Gorbachev's visit to Japan, I studied articles on Japanese-Soviet relations in American newspapers much more closely than before. I was happy that more people here in America became familiar with the subject, including the territorial dispute. But I also saw in those articles some ideas which could be embarrassing to the Japanese.

First of all, Japan does not officially consider that the disputed islands are included in the Kuril islands as referred to in the American press. In official treaties between Japan and other countries, the name "the Kuril islands" has been used to refer to those islands north of the disputed islands, which are called "the Northern Territories."

Japan was not "buying" the islands from the Soviet Union. In Japan, neither politicians nor the press use the word "buy" in referring to Japanese initiatives in the territorial dispute. A few politicians did explore the idea literally to "buy" the islands, but naturally they did not get support from the Japanese public or from the government.

We are claiming the four islands not because we need more space to live. The territorial issue is significant for us because it is symbolic of the unfair relations between Japan and the Soviet Union. We are claiming these islands because we believe that they have been Japanese territories

since the beginning of Russo-Japanese relations, and that there are no grounds for their occupation by the Soviets.

In 1855, Japan and Russia established the border between them for the first time. At that time, the four islands called the "Northern Territories" were included in Japanese territory. Before that agreement, the border between Russia and Japan was not defined. So we consider these islands inherent Japanese territory because they had never belonged to another country before 1855.

Japan surrendered at the end of World War II in 1945 according to the Potsdam Declaration of the Allies. That declaration indicated that the Allies would not take Japanese inherent territories in order to expand their own territories. In accordance with this declaration, the Soviet Union could not annex the Northern Territories. Japan renounced all claims to "the Kuril Islands" in the 1951 San Francisco Peace Treaty.

In any case, the geographical limits of the Kuril Islands were not defined in the Peace Treaty. Moreover, the Soviet Union did not sign the Peace Treaty in San Francisco. Thus, the long territorial dispute began.

The territorial dispute between the two countries is not an obstacle intentionally erected by the Japanese in order to obstruct the improvement of Japanese-Soviet relations as stated in some Soviet newspapers. We want to construct good relations with the Soviet Union, one of our nearest neighbors, and work toward a solution to this dispute.

*Ryuichi Hirano, CREES MA student*

# Departmental Updates

## History Department

Steven Zipperstein is a visiting associate professor for spring quarter, and is teaching a seminar on "Russian and Soviet Jewish History." He is a fellow at the Stanford Humanities Center.

The graduate students in the Department of History have been rapidly accumulating frequent flyer mileage. Lauri Koloski-Kister is also in Poland with Overseas Studies as one of the graduate student teaching assistants for the Krakow program. Delano Dugarm is spending the academic year in Moscow on an IREX fellowship for dissertation research. Kristin Edwards, her husband, and her child spent fall quarter and part of winter quarter in Novosibirsk so that she could do research for her dissertation. Unfortunately, Sue Rupp's trip to Moscow as one of the CREES exchangees at the Moscow State Historical Archival Institute was cut short for health reasons.

## Political Science Department

The big news in the Department of Political Science is the return to Stanford of Professor Condoleezza Rice [see interview beginning on page 1]. She is currently a Senior Fellow at the Center for International Security and Arms Control, and will resume her teaching duties in the fall.

Professor David Holloway has been named co-director of CISAC. Elemer Hankiss will come to Stanford as a visiting professor in the fall. His responsibilities as the head of Hungarian television prevented his visit scheduled for earlier this year.

As for the graduate students, Steve Fish, who was awarded a dissertation fellowship from the Berkeley-Stanford Program in Soviet Studies, is in Moscow at the Plekhanov Institute for the academic year, studying the emergence of informal organizations in Soviet society. Eva Busza will be going to the USSR this summer, and Ian Bremmer will be at Middlebury College for their intensive Russian summer program.

## Slavic Department

Professor Joseph Frank published *The Idea of Spatial Form* (Rutgers University Press) at the beginning of the year. The book is an anthology of Professor Frank's essays on comparative literature written over a thirty-year span.

Julie Cassidy was awarded a two-year Social Science Research Council Graduate Training Fellowship. She will be affiliated with the Gorky Institute of World Literature in Moscow while she examines elements of drama in early Soviet show trials. Sally Kux will be in Moscow this summer, and then she will go to Finland for a year on a Fulbright fellowship while she does her dissertation research.

The Center for Russian and East European Studies gratefully acknowledges the support of:

Donald M. Kendall Fund

Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

Steve P. Rados Fund

Konstanty and Antonina Stys Fund

Mara Tomashevich Karabas Fund

Sara Stys Vucinich Fund

Wayne S. Vucinich Fund

We are very grateful to the many individuals who generously support CREES with annual contributions to its operating and special interest funds.

Would you like to be on our mailing list and participate in CREES activities?

Please fill in your name and address, and return to the CREES office, Encina Hall, Room 200, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-6055.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Address

\_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone

\_\_\_\_\_  
Affiliation

Areas of Interest:     USSR                       Language and Literature             History             Economics  
                                  Eastern Europe             Political Science                       Sociology             International Relations  
                                  Other \_\_\_\_\_

## Interview With Condoleezza Rice, Continued

*Continued from page five*  
one of the reasons Shevardnadze resigned. It would be extremely difficult to expect no friction between the opposing camps.

As far as the changes we have recently seen in foreign policy, Gorbachev and those around him were reacting to the failure of the previous Soviet foreign policy. In the West we saw a Soviet Union on the march, while those in the Soviet Union who looked at it realistically saw an expansion and simultaneous weakening of the center. The changes we are seeing in foreign policy are indicative of a true shift in intention from the Soviet Union toward better world relations.

**Q:** How do you foresee the Soviet Union in the year 2001?

**A:** Don't write the Soviet Union off. It will still be two to three times larger than any other country in the world, and it will be militarily powerful, with an army of at least two million men. I think it may be a volunteer force, and that deep down the Soviet General Staff have also reached that conclusion. Because it will be volunteer, it will need to pay better, and so it will be more expensive. I think the country will have an economy somewhere between those of Spain and Italy. Therefore, its strength in the international system will be disproportionate to its size.

The Baltics may get away from the country. I also see a very loose confederation, at least for a while. People will find that in a loose confederation, not all republics are created equal. Russia will still dominate, as it does today, by sheer size and resources. Some of the centralism will go away and the republics will have more authority. The less optimistic picture is that the country will not be able to make it under the new systems, and then you will probably see a very strong impoverished Slavic core, with the other regions still trying to break away.

**Q:** What advice would you give to someone contemplating entering your career field?

**A:** Don't panic! People ask me, "Well, what are you going to do now?" as if it's all over. The Soviet Union is still going to be there. It's not like studying the Ottoman Empire—the Soviet Union is going to be around for a long time to come, and experts are going to be needed for just as long.

Pursue what interests you. Take advantage of the new openness to find out what you can, and become expert in some aspect of the Soviet Union. Right now we need Soviet specialists who know economics and computers. But whatever your particular field of expertise, you will have subject matter available for years to come.

## AAASS National Convention

The American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS) will hold its twenty-third annual national convention in Miami on November 22–25, 1991. This year's convention features a particular emphasis on Latin American relations with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Pre-registration for the conference ends on October 15, 1991. For more information on the convention, contact AAASS at 128 Encina Commons, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-6029, or call (415) 723-9668.

---

Center for Russian and East European Studies  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305-6055

Non-Profit Organization  
U.S. Postage  
Paid  
Permit No. 28