



Center for Russian & East European Studies

Building 40, Main Quad, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-2006

NEWSLETTER

Fall/Winter 2000-2001

CREES STAFF

Director:

Nancy S. Kollmann

Assistant Director:

Mary Dakin

Academic Coordinator:

Jack Kollmann

Administrator:

Rosemary Schnoor

Newsletter Editor:

Mikhail Seregine

(650) 723-3562

mdakin@leland.stanford.edu

[http://www.stanford.edu/dept/](http://www.stanford.edu/dept/CREES/)

[CREES/](http://www.stanford.edu/dept/CREES/)

STEERING COMMITTEE

Coit Blacker (IIS)

John Dunlop (Hoover)

Terence Emmons (History)

Monica Greenleaf (Slavic)

Nancy Kollmann (History)

Karen Rondesvedt (S.U. Libraries)



A NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER

Letter from the Director

CREES has lost a dear friend and esteemed colleague in Alexander Dallin, who passed away unexpectedly in July. Over 200 people gathered on October 11 to remember and honor him at Memorial Church, and this edition of the CREES Newsletter includes remarks by several of the participants. My own remarks at the memorial service saluted Alex for his selfless service to Russian and East European Studies at Stanford and I'll summarize them here.

We should remember Alex Dallin for a side of him that is under-appreciated—understandably, given how unassuming and self-effacing he was—and that is his service to the field of Russian and East European studies at Stanford. In the 1980s and into the 1990s, he was a whirlwind of activity, bringing scholars and building programs to enrich our intellectual life. First and foremost, in my mind, is his service to CREES. Alex was on the Steering Committee in the late 1970s and early 1980s and he served as Director from 1985-1989 and 1992-1994. During his tenures as Director, Alex raised the institution that Wayne Vucinich had developed in the 1970s and took it to the next level. He put CREES on the national map, and gave it a very secure financial and institutional footing. He was an assiduous fundraiser, winning for CREES endowment grants from the Mellon Foundation and from Donald Kendall, who at that time was the head of Pepsi-Cola and a Stanford parent. And, Alex used his fund raising energies to create programs that helped students and faculty in their teaching and research, and that really added to intellectual interaction at Stanford. For example, he was the first Director of CREES who competed for the prestigious national Title VI Department of Education grant, around 1986, and we have competed successfully pretty much ever since then for Title VI funding. Those funds support graduate fellowships, visiting professors, workshops and conferences, a true enrichment of our intellectual

life at Stanford.

Alex cared a lot about supporting young scholars; as Director, he hosted evening seminars at his home for graduate students and interesting speakers. He worked hard to make connections between scholars: in the 1980s, when Russia was just opening up, he secured a private grant for scholarly exchanges between CREES and Russian institutions. Alex was committed to the life of ideas—to scholarly give-and-take. He initiated a distinguished lecture series on Soviet Studies, which we named after the donor, the Donald Kendall Lecture series on Soviet Affairs. The list of speakers ranged across disciplines and included luminaries such as Robert Legvold of Columbia, Loren Graham of MIT and Harvard, Ed Hewitt of the World Bank, Roman Szporluk of Harvard, Ronald Suny of Chicago, and Laura Engelstein of Princeton. These Kendall lectures were just what Alex wanted. Always stimulating and interpretive, they created a buzz and got people talking. From them several books were published, so the series had both short term and long-term impact.

Alex didn't build institutions and raise money for his own glory; he disdained recognition for his work. That was really clear to me in the subsequent history of the Kendall lecture series: when the Kendall Lecture fund was exhausted, Alex himself quietly donated funds for a term endowment to keep the series going. And at CREES we did that: recent speakers have been S. Frederick Starr, Jeffrey Brooks and Lilia Shevtsova. But Alex refused to take any credit for the event, he refused to let us announce that he was the donor, and he certainly wouldn't let us name the series after him. Now that he is gone, we have decided to

continued on p. 4

IN MEMORIAM: ALEXANDER DALLIN, 1924-2000



Alexander Dallin, 1924-2000

Alexander Dallin, a leading scholar in the field of Soviet and East European studies, died July 22 at Stanford Hospital at age 76. Dallin, the Raymond A. Spruance Professor of International History, Emeritus, at Stanford University, suffered a stroke on July 21.

"Dallin had a profound and beneficial influence on the field of Soviet and East European studies," said David Holloway, the current Raymond A. Spruance Professor of International History. "For him, the study of the Soviet Union was not a question of confirming an already held point of view, but rather a matter of seeking to understand a complex and changing reality."

The son of the famous Menshevik activist and scholar David Dallin, Alex Dallin was born in Berlin on May 21, 1924. The family fled from the Nazis to France, and then made their way to the United States. He earned a bachelor's degree in social science from City College of New York

in 1947 and master's and doctoral degrees in history from Columbia University in 1948 and 1953.

Dallin began his career by working after World War II on the Harvard Interview Project, which used the testimony of refugees and emigres from the Soviet Union to study the functioning of the Soviet system. He taught at Harvard, Columbia and the University of California-Berkeley before joining the faculty at Stanford in 1971.

Holloway described Dallin as "the model scholar-organizer," who applied his immense energy for the benefit of the broader community of specialists in the field. Dallin served as director of the Russian Institute at Columbia and, later, of the Center for Russian and East European Studies at Stanford.

For several decades he was a member of virtually every important committee in the field, his colleagues recall, and in 1984-85 he served as president of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies. After the fall of the Soviet Union, Dallin devoted his energy to the revival of the social sciences in the former communist world. He helped to establish the new European University in St. Petersburg and ran the New Democracy Fellows Program, which brought students from the post-communist states to Stanford to do graduate work in the social sciences.

Dallin's classic study, *German Rule in Russia, 1941-1945*, which was published in 1957

(and republished in 1981) won the Wolfson Prize for History. According to Holloway, Dallin demonstrated how a gifted mind and a talented pen could turn painstaking research in captured German archives into a fascinating and moving story of occupation and resistance.

"Dallin's scholarship had the unusual quality of being deeply researched and carefully formulated while also lively and full of ideas. These qualities are evident in the stream of books and articles he produced for over 50 years. The disciplines of history and political science mix easily in his writings, while domestic politics and foreign policy are always presented in their interconnection, and not as isolated spheres of activity. He trained generations of students, providing them with encouragement and mentorship, and gaining in the process many firm friends."

Among his later works were *Black Box* (1985), about the Soviet shootdown of Korea Air Lines Flight 007, and *The Gorbachev Era* (1986), coedited with Condoleezza Rice. His last book, coedited with the Russian scholar F. I. Firsov, was *Dimitrov and Stalin 1934-1943: Letters from the Soviet Archives*, which was published by Yale University Press earlier this year.

Dallin is survived by his wife, political scientist Gail Lapidus, with whom he frequently collaborated; by three children from a previous marriage, Linda, Natasha and Andrew; and by four grandchildren, Nicaela, Katya, Maya and Leo.

This article appeared previously in the Stanford

The following two pieces are excerpts from remarks given at the memorial service for Alexander Dallin, October 11, 2000, Memorial Church, Stanford University

The Scholarly Contributions of Alex Dallin

Alex Dallin's scholarly life spanned a period of over fifty years. His first article "America Through Soviet Eyes," was published in *Public Opinion Quarterly* in 1947. His last book, *Dimitrov and Stalin 1934-1943: Letters from the Soviet Archives*, which he co-edited with the Russian scholar Fridrikh Firsov, appeared earlier this year. Over the years he kept up a steady stream of publications devoted to the great historic events that impinged upon the fate of his parents and himself. His intellectual career can be understood as a deep reflection on the historic events that shaped his own life. That may be why, in all his writing, there is an underlying humanity, a sense of the way in which great events and movements affect the lives of individuals.

Alex's first book, *German Rule in Russia, 1941-1945*, which he published in 1957 when he was thirty-three years old, examined the policies pursued by the Nazi regime in the territories it occupied in the Soviet Union. It is a monumental work, based on captured German documents, and remains, more than forty years after its publication, the standard work on this key aspect of Nazi rule and this crucial period of Soviet history. It

displays the dominant characteristics of Alex's scholarship — a formidable mastery of sources (Alex once told me he had spent five years in a warehouse in the Navy Yard in Washington DC working with the German documents), and a questioning and probing intelligence. It is written in clear and graceful prose, which converts painstaking research into a fascinating and moving story of oppression and resistance.

Alex returned to the subject of the war throughout his life. In 1991 Norman Naimark and I worked with Alex to organize a conference to mark the fiftieth anniversary of Operation Barbarossa. Soviet writing on the war was beginning to open up under the influence of *glasnost*, and we were able to bring together a group of Soviet, German, European, and American historians to explore the new evidence and its implications for our understanding of the war. Alex's paper at the conference dealt with Stalin and the German invasion, rebutting — very effectively — the thesis, which had reemerged in the late 1980s, that the German invasion was designed to preempt a Soviet attack. He disliked this argument not only because it had been devised initially to whitewash Hitler, but because it was sloppy and not supported by the evidence.

Alex held himself to high standards of scholarship, and I am struck on rereading his work how consistently he did so. He also applied those standards to others. He could always be relied on for an honest judgment on another

person's work; and sometimes that judgment might be severe. But his judgments were also fair and shrewd, based not on the positions that people took, but on the quality of their arguments and the evidence they used to support those arguments. There was a deep integrity to his scholarship and his scholarly judgments, just as there was to him as a person. He was "all of a piece." As a colleague put it, "There was only one Alex; he didn't present different faces to different people."

The high standards to which Alex held himself and others sprang in part from his view of the subjects he wrote about. Nazi rule in the Soviet Union; World War II; the fate of the Russian Revolution and the development of the Soviet state; the Cold War — these were serious issues, not to be treated in a dilettante fashion. Historians had a responsibility to apply high standards in their attempts to make sense of these events, which had affected the lives of so many. And political scientists had a similar responsibility in making analyses and recommendations that might affect lives in the future.

All of this may make Alex sound formidable (which he was) but also unbearably high-minded (which he wasn't). He didn't put his great learning on display, nor did he trumpet his own seriousness. And he had, above all, a very dry wit — self-deprecating as well as deprecating — which enlivened every conversation with him, and is often present in his writing. His wit leavened the seriousness, but did not, I think,

make him any less serious.

In the late 1950s and 1960s he turned his attention to the study of Soviet foreign policy, publishing two books, The Soviet Union at the United Nations (1962), and The Soviet Union and Disarmament (1964). He also published widely on the international communist movement, a topic that continued to interest him until the end of his life, though he did not complete the comprehensive study that he had in mind to write.

Foreign policy and domestic politics were not isolated spheres for Alex. He wrote two widely-read pieces on the interrelationship between them, and he was very much engaged in discussion and debate about the development of the Soviet system. The study of the Soviet Union was not for him a question of confirming an already held point of view, but a matter of seeking to understand a complex and changing reality. That was what made it interesting: to see how history would unfold. And history had surprises in store. As he remarked wryly after the collapse of the Soviet Union, "Before it happened, everyone thought it was impossible; after it happened everyone said it had been inevitable." His open-mindedness made him an acute and attentive observer. He was suspicious — and critical — of intellectual schemas that tried to fit the complexities of Soviet reality onto a Procrustean bed. He liked Henry Adams's dictum that "simplicity is the most deceitful mistress that ever betrayed man."

Given his intellectual interests, Alex's joint appointment in History and Political Science made sense. His first major work was historical. But his interest in the great events and movements of the twentieth century did not stop at the point at which archives ceased to be available. He was just as interested in the contemporary development of the Soviet Union as he was in its past, and he could study that — and teach it — more easily in a Political Science department than in a History department. Unlike some of his contemporaries among historians of Russia, he did not think that it was appropriate, when analysing the present, to abandon all the standards of logic and evidence that one applied in studying the past.

The disciplines of history and political science mix easily in his work. His historical writings, though always deeply researched and carefully formulated, are lively and attentive to broad issues of political change. His political science writings, even while addressing broad questions, are always informed by a historical perspective and linked to specific events. History for him was a way to explore issues that were still alive, in one form or another. Political science, if not tempered by history and an appreciation of complexity and contingency, ran the risk of falling into dogmatic oversimplification.

Alex always prized teaching and administration as well as research, and — as others here have noted — gave generously of himself to students, colleagues, and the field as a whole. But it seems to me that for him the most important thing was scholarship, since that provided the subject-matter for teaching, and that was what administration was supposed to support and

encourage. In spite of his other responsibilities, he remained an active scholar throughout his career, and managed to keep his various roles in balance. He was, in that regard, a model scholar-organizer.

His colleagues will miss him greatly — for his immense learning; for the high quality of his work; for his wit and kindness; for his generosity of spirit; and for his integrity and humanity.

*- David Holloway, Raymond A. Spruance
Professor of History, Director, IIS*

Dallin's Early Years

As most of you know, Alex Dallin's early years were . . . eventful. For some, I suspect, the details — while interesting — are less important than the result: that Alex escaped from Nazi-occupied France; found his way to America; and lived a life of meaning, consequence and accomplishment.

To me, the details have always been important, though, and for better than 20 years I pestered Alex to share them with me. He did — reluctantly, dismissively, a piece here and a piece there — until, at last, I had assembled, to my own satisfaction at least, something approximating a coherent narrative. I believed then — as I believe now — that you cannot understand Alex Dallin the scholar, the educator, the friend, the humorist, and the humanist, without understanding Alex Dallin, the survivor.

Knowing of my interest in the circumstances of Alex's early life, Gail was kind enough to share with me a 20-page essay that Alex wrote in May of 1941 — just six months after his arrival in the United States as a stateless 16-year old. In the weeks since Alex's passing, I have read this essay — this chronicle of the German assault against France and its aftermath, this tale of chaos and paralysis, of entrapment and escape, of terror and hope — again and again — sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph.

In its depiction of those dark days between the fall of France in June 1940 and Alex's passage across the Pyrenees into Spain some three months later, the essay brings to life not only the saga of one young man's struggle against, and eventual escape from, the political equivalent of absolute evil, but also the larger story of a people, a society, a nation — and ultimately, an entire continent — caught up in a tragedy of immense proportions. No less striking than the content of the piece, though, is its underlying tone, which I can only describe as a kind of wonderment at the utter arbitrariness of it all. Alex himself is struck — again and again — by how easily his story could have had a very different ending.

If he and his mother hadn't fought their way onto that late train from Paris to Toulouse on June 10. . . If he hadn't managed to talk his way out of that internment camp in Marseilles. . . If he hadn't convinced his mother to flee, now, across the Pyrenees without waiting for that elusive French exit visa. . . And if, on their second attempt to slip from France to Spain, they hadn't

encountered an old French border guard with Popular Front sympathies, "who," Alex writes, "immediately agreed to put the seal on our passports, as to show that we were allowed to leave France." In what has to be the understatement of a lifetime, Alex exclaims, "What luck." Indeed. For Alex, of course, and for his mother and father. But also for us.

Toward the end of the essay, Alex reflects on what he and his family have experienced. He does so not to ennoble his own exploits — which he characterizes as "nothing in comparison with so many others" — but to awaken and instruct, to teach and to warn, and in the end to mobilize the complacent in preparation for what he knows will be a struggle to the death between the Nazi terror and those arrayed against it.

"And there we walked, again on the Pyrenees, then the dusty roads, leaving behind the land that had given us asylum for more than a year; the country we had fought to enter; the country we had just fought to leave.

When we arrived, we were happy. When we left, our feelings were divided. Behind us, there lay Europe — we felt it — Europe, abandoned to the invader. Would we see it ever again? We went on.

Millions were left behind; millions that had no luck; millions that must now suffer and starve in order to help beat the invader; millions that anxiously await the day when they again will live free — free from fear, free from terror, free from want."

For Alex Dallin history and politics were not abstractions. They were as vital as the blood that coursed through his veins, as vivid as the images that crowded his brain, as moving as the plight of thousands of refugees streaming south to escape the Nazi anvil — and as personal as an encounter with a sympathetic border guard.

It is this remarkable ability to live within the historical moment, and then to invest that moment with meaning, with content, and with a larger truth, that gives such power, such force, and such durability to what Alex wrote and to what he taught.

Writing of the days just before the French collapse, Alex confessed, with more than a hint of frustration, that it was easy to write one date after the other, to give one word for every event and development. But, he continued, "It is hard to transmit the spirit and the mood of those days, this electrification, this high tension of every organ — this restless, trembling feeling of uncertainty. There was no time to think. No time to dream. No time to understand. They had eyes to see — they did not see. They had ears to hear — they did not hear."

It is this determination to make us think, to help us understand, and to free us to dream — to use our eyes to see and our ears to hear — that most emphatically embodies who Alex was and what he sought to do. For me at least, this is the essential, the elemental, the enduring Alex Dallin.

So, rest assured, dear friend, we see you. We hear you. We thank you. And we miss you.

- Coit Blacker, IIS

Letter from the Director, continued from p. 1
continue the lecture series in Alex's honor and to give him some recognition. The series is now officially the "Alexander Dallin Lecture in Soviet and Post Soviet Affairs." We will continue to grow the fund that Alex himself created, and we would welcome your contributions to the Dallin Lecture Fund at CREES.

Alex took his commitment to broadening opportunities in Russian and East European Studies beyond CREES, to the broader Stanford and national community. At the same time that Alex was heading up CREES, he was also instrumental in the early 1980s, working with colleagues at Berkeley, in creating the Berkeley-Stanford Program in Soviet Studies. This was a joint program between the two campuses that trained graduate students, primarily in Political Science. The program sponsored numerous conferences and publications, but its true measure of success is probably in the generations of its Ph.D. students who have gone on to teach in major American universities, including Princeton, Harvard, Cornell, Penn, MIT, UCLA, Washington, Wellesley, Berkeley ... the list goes on. This is a lasting legacy of Alex's service.

Alex was a powerhouse at Stanford, behind the scenes, in developing our faculty. Our Political Science faculty in Russian and

East European studies is world class (David Holloway, Coit Blacker, Condoleeza Rice and Michael McFaul), and Alex was in on the ground level in making all those appointments possible. Alex never flagged in his desire to build connections between Russia and America; he worked with Condoleeza Rice in the early 1990s to create the New Democracy program, whose goal was to train young people from Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union in the social sciences so that they might return to their homelands and restore the social sciences, which had particularly suffered from ideological controls under Soviet power. Since as a scholar Alex hated cant and ideology, I can see why this project really grabbed his heart. The New Democracy Program has brought several young scholars from Russia, Poland, Romania and elsewhere to earn their Ph.Ds in Political Science, Anthropology, History and other departments.

Finally, Alex found time to serve on virtually all the major committees that shaped Russian and East European Studies throughout his career and was in on the ground level on several of them. Here are only a few of the founding institutions in American Russian and East European Studies in which he participated: the Joint Committee for Slavic Studies of the ACLS/SSRC 1963-65; National Advisory

Committee of Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants, 1960-66; Board of Trustees and first Chairman of the Board of National Council for Soviet and East European Research, 1978-83; President, American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, 1984-85; President, International Council for Soviet and East European Studies, 1985-90.

Alex's legacy lives on in many ways. Tangibly, of course, it lives on in the activities of CREES, the faculty he supported, the New Democracy Program, and in the generations of students that he advised or who graduated from programs he helped to create. And intangibly, Alex left us a legacy of graceful, selfless leadership, and I underscore the word selfless. He was not an empire builder; he was not after power, control, or prestige. He simply served; where he saw an opportunity or a need, he did what he could. I never talked with him about his philosophy of life, but I think he would have emphasized the importance of three things: to be true to yourself; to be an honest scholar; and to serve, to give back to the people and to the issues that you care about without expecting recognition. You should do it because it's right. He certainly acted that way — selflessly and professionally — and we are all in his debt.

— Nancy S. Kollmann

Stanford Presence at Annual Slavists Convention

The following CREES affiliates participated in the Annual Convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, November 9-12, 2000 in Denver

Mary Dakin, CREES, paper presenter: "Displaced Workers and Social Support: Budget Projections, Payments, and Realities in Russia," and panel discussant: Energy in the Caucasus and the Former Soviet Union.

John Dunlop, Hoover, panel chair: Solzhenitsyn after 1994: the New Publications and panel discussant: Russian National Identity after Stalin.

Terence Emmons, roundtable chair: Memoir and Epistolary Tradition in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Russia.

Stuart Finkel, History, paper presenter: "Bolsheviks and Professors: Reforms and Strikes in Russia's VUZy, 1921-1922."

Monika Greenleaf, panel chair: Literature and Philosophy: Nineteenth Century.

Allison Katsev, Humanities, paper presenter:

"Sergei Solov'ev and Monarchism on the Eve of the Great Reforms" and roundtable panelist: Memoir and Epistolary Tradition in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Russia, Dedicated to the Memory of Andrei Grigorievich Tartakovskii (1931-1999).

Nancy Kollmann, History and CREES, paper presenter: "Debates over Microhistory in the Light of a Russian Example."

Molly Malloy, Hoover Archives, roundtable chair: Resources in Russian and Ukrainian Émigré History.

Isabela Mares, Political Science, panel discussant: Transformation of Post-Communist Pension Systems.

Sara Pankenier, Slavic, paper presenter: "In Defense of Fantasy: Explaining the Impact of Astrid Lindgren's Works in Russia."

Gabriella Safran, Slavic, paper presenter: "The Education of an Ethnographer: the Russian Ansky and the Jews".

Marci Shore, History, paper presenter, "Gendered Entanglements of Marxism: Fragments from Literary Friendships."

Leonora Soroka, Hoover Archives, roundtable panelist: Research in the Russian Archives: Practical and Methodological Challenges.

Amir Weiner, History, roundtable panelist: Research in the Russian Archives: Practical and Methodological Challenges.

Glen Worthey, Green Library, paper presenter: "Minimalist Prose: Generic Antecedents of Kharm's 'Sluchai'" and panel discussant: Moralistic, Realistic, Fantastic: Russian and Soviet Literature for Children.

Bernard Black, Stanford Law School: Professor Black's recent publications include:

- Bernard Black, Reinier Kraakman & Anna Tarassova, "Russian Privatization and Corporate Governance: What Went Wrong?," *Stanford Law Review*, excerpted in *Transition* (World Bank Dec. 1999), available from SSRN at http://papers.ssrn.com/paper.taf?abstract_id=181348
- "The Legal and Institutional Preconditions for Strong Securities Markets," 48 *UCLA Law Review*, available from SSRN at http://papers.ssrn.com/paper.taf?abstract_id=182169;
- "The Core Institutions that Support Strong Securities Markets," 55 *Business*, available from SSRN at http://papers.ssrn.com/paper.taf?abstract_id=231120.

John Earle, Economics:

Professor Earle was recently awarded a Phare ACE grant from the European Union for survey research and analysis related to enterprise restructuring in Central Europe. The project, which includes partners from the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia in Central Europe, as well as Sweden, Germany, Italy and the Netherlands in the east, will complement a separate but similar project underway in Russia. Professor Earle, also a concert pianist, performed in recital at Campbell Recital Hall, Braun Music Center, Stanford, on November 12, 2000.

Lazar Fleishman, Slavic:

Professor Fleishman participated in the Seventh "International Council for Central and East European Studies" World Congress, Tampere, Finland (29 July-3 August), chairing the panel on Russian emigre journalism and presenting a paper. He is finishing the editing of a collection of articles by contributors from various countries on Boris Pasternak's novel, *Doctor Zhivago* to be published as Vol. 22 of *Stanford Slavic Studies*. Professor Fleishman is on leave for the 2000-2001 academic year, and received IREX funding to conduct research in Latvia during this sabbatical year. He will also be spending 3 months researching in Germany.

Gregory Freidin, Slavic:

Professor Freidin has published several articles recently, including a review essay, "Victor Pelevin's *Dzheneraishen*," *Foreign Policy*, Spring 2000; "Transfiguration of Kitsch: Timur Kibirov's 'Elegies for Soviet Civilization,'" in *Endquote: Sots-Art Literature and Soviet Grand Style* (Studies in Russian Literature and Theory), ed. Yevgeny Dobrenko et al., Northwestern University Press, 2000; "Putin's Dilemma: Can Bureaucrats Be Trusted?" Op-Ed, *Los Angeles Times*, Sunday, August 6, 2000; and "Police-

man Cometh: Russia's Presidential Campaign 2000," Op-Ed, *Los Angeles Times*, March 26, 2000.

David Holloway, Political Science, History, and Director, IIS:

Professor Holloway is on leave this year at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. His recent publications include:

- "Physics, the State, and Civil Society in the Soviet Union," *Historical Studies in the Physical and Biological Sciences*, vol. 31, part 1, 1999;
- "V.I. Vernadskii i atomnaia energii," in A.L. Yanshin, ed., *V.I. Vernadskii: Pro et Contra. Antologiya literaturnykh i naukovykh stadii (1898-1998)*, St. Petersburg: Izd. Russkogo Khristianskogo gumanitarnogo instituta, 2000;
- "V poiskakh Kharitona," in V.I. Goldanskii, ed., *Iulii Borisovich Khariton: Put' dlinoiu v vek*, Moscow: Editorial; URSS, 1999 (Reprinted in V.N. Mikhailov, ed., *Chelovek stoletia: Iulii Borisovich Khariton*, Moscow: Izdat, 1999).

Nancy S. Kollmann, History and Director, CREES:

Professor Kollmann's book *By Honor Bound. State And Society In Early Modern Russia* was recently published by Cornell University Press. Her recent articles include a two-part series on fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Russia: "Russia," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History. Vol. VII. c. 1415 - c. 1500* (1998): 748-70, 976-84 (bibliog) and "The Principalities of Rus' in the Fourteenth Century," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History. Vol. VI.* (2000): 764-94, 1051-58 (bibliog.); and "'What's Love Got to Do With It?': Changing Models of Masculinity in Muscovite and Petrine Russia," in *Russian Masculinities in History and Culture*, ed. Barbara Evans Clements, Rebecca Friedman and Dan Healey (London: Macmillan, forthcoming).

David Laitin, Political Science:

Professor Laitin delivered the keynote address at a symposium on "Language, Ethnicity, Cultural Diversity and Democracy" that took place at the Samarkand Institute of Foreign Languages from September 18 through September 20.

Gail Lapidus, IIS:

Professor Lapidus' article, "Russia's Second Chechen War: Ten Assumptions in Search of a Policy," was published in the journal *Central Asia And The Caucasus, Journal of Social and Political Studies*, No. 4, 2000. "Post-Communist Transitions: Magnifying Gender Asymmetries?" appeared in the volume *Making the Transition Work for Women in Europe and Central Asia*, Marnia Lazreg, ed., The World Bank, Washington D.C., 2000. "Accommodating Ethnic Differences in Post-Soviet Eurasia," will appear in Crawford Young and Mark Beissinger, eds., *Beyond State Crisis? Africa and Post-Soviet Eurasia in Comparative Perspective*, The Woodrow Wilson Center Press, forthcoming.

yond State Crisis? Africa and Post-Soviet Eurasia in Comparative Perspective, The Woodrow Wilson Center Press, forthcoming.

Michael McFaul, Political Science:

Professor McFaul is on leave at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. His recent and forthcoming publications include:

- *Russia's Troubled Transition from Communism to Democracy: Institutional Change during Revolutionary Transformations* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, June 2001);
- "Reinventing Russia's Party of Power: 'Unity and the 1999 Duma Election,'" (with Timothy Colton) *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 16:3 (Summer 2000);
- "Russia Under Putin: One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward", *Journal of Democracy*, 11:3 (July 2000);
- "Authoritarian and Democratic Responses to Financial Meltdown in Russia," *Problems of Post-Communism*, July/August 1999;
- "Lessons from Russia's Protracted Transition from Communist Rule," *Political Science Quarterly*, 114:1 (Spring 1999).

Norman Naimark, History:

Professor Naimark is in Moscow for Autumn quarter, teaching in Stanford's Overseas Studies Program. His book *Fires of Hatred: Ethnic Cleansing in Twentieth Century Europe*, will appear from Harvard University Press in January 2001.

Gabriella Safran, Slavic:

Professor Safran's article, "Ethnography, Judaism, and the Art of Nikolai Leskov" was published in *The Russian Review*, April 2000. "Dancing with Death and Salvaging Jewish Culture in *Austeria* and *The Dybbuk*" is forthcoming in *Slavic Review*. She is currently organizing a conference, "Between Two Worlds: S. Ansky at the Turn of the Century, and International Conference," for March 2001. She gave a paper, "The Education of an Ethnographer: The Russian Ansky and the Jews" at AAASS in November, and another, "Andrei Makine, Gérard de Nerval, and the Language of Exile" at AATSEEL in December. Her book, *Rewriting the Jew: Assimilation Narratives in the Russian Empire*, will be coming out in January, 2001 from Stanford University Press.

Thomas Simons, History:

A summary of Tom Simons' May 11 talk in Washington for the Kennan Institute's East European Studies Program, "The Elements of Poland's Success in its Regional Context," was published in the Program's *EES News* for October 2000, pp. 1-2, and is also available at <http://wwics.si.edu/ees/reports/2000/202sim.htm>.

NEW OPPORTUNITIES TO SUPPORT CREES

- To support at Stanford the outreach and research activities that Alex Dallin cared about, please donate to the *Alexander Dallin Fund*, jointly administered by the Institute for International Studies and CREES.
- To perpetuate the "Lecture Series in Soviet and Post-Soviet Affairs" that Alex Dallin inaugurated, please donate to the *Dallin Lecture Fund* at CREES.

Make checks payable to "Stanford University," but earmark them for the fund of your choice and mail directly to:

CREES
Bldg. 40, Main Quad
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 93305-2006.

Faculty News continued from p. 5

Amir Weiner, History:

Professor Weiner's book, *Making Sense of War: The Second World War and the Fate of the Bolshevik Revolution* (Princeton University Press) is coming out in December this year. He spent the month of June in the archives in Moscow researching for his current project, *The Last Revolution: The Sovietization of the Western Borderlands, 1939-1989*.

Steven J. Zipperstein, History and Director, Jewish Studies:

Professor Zipperstein's new book, *Imagining Russian Jewry: Memory, History, Identity* appeared last spring, published by the University of Washington Press. Zipperstein published essays recently in *Dissent Magazine*, *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and *Forward*. His article, "Zionism and the Liberal Imagination," appeared in the volume, *Zionism, Liberalism, and the Future of the Jewish State*. He was named this year to the academic board of the Center for Jewish History, in New York, and to a four-person commission established by the Israeli Ministry of Education dealing with the history of Jewish literary and cultural life in Russia and Ukraine.

Rediscovering Lev Vygotsky

Serafima Gettys, *Lecturer, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures*

Thanks to generous support from CREES, last summer I was able to join the International Vygotsky Society Summer Conference held in Russia in June 20-30, 2000, which for me, a former immigrant from Russia, was a truly unforgettable and exciting experience.

The conference was organized by the faculty of Vygotsky Institute of Psychology at Russian State University for the Humanities and started in Zvenigorod (60 miles away from Moscow) with a theoretical segment. On June 26, an overnight train took a group of participants to a little town in the south of Russia, Belaya Kalytva, where a small group of enthusiastic teachers, headed by the director of the Institute of Psychology and Vygotsky's granddaughter Elena, started a little school in which some of the tenets of Vygotsky educational theory are being translated into practice.

Lev Vygotsky, a modern myth at the time when I was a student of Leningrad Pedagogical University and often referred to as "the father of Soviet psychology" is a creator of the socio-historic theory of mind, which only recently has won full recognition in the West. Very little is known about his short life--he died at the age of 39 from tuberculosis. Guillermo Blanck writes: "Although he died more than 50 years ago, Vygotsky left an impressive body of work that, as is the case with most geniuses, becomes more modern as time goes by.... It is only now that the impact of his work is beginning to be felt in the scientific community."

Indeed, Vygotsky was endowed with all the attributes of a genius, which enabled Toumlin (1978) to say that Vygotsky had a Mozartian aura of genius. When at school he expressed great interest in all subjects and his abilities were so impressive that they made each of his professors believe that he should follow his specialty. Besides German and Russian, Vygotsky read and spoke Hebrew, French, English, learned Latin and Greek and Esperanto, had an exceptional ability of fast reading and extraordinary memory. He was able to simultaneously graduate from two universities in 1917, was an innovator in multiple fields, and wrote thousands of pages, in total 180 works. But it is in psychology, where he created his own school of socio-cultural psychological theory, that his genius realized itself fully.

The main affirmation of this socio-cultural psychological theory is the social, cultural, and historical nature of higher mental processes. The higher mental processes in humans have internalized social meanings derived from the cultural activity and mediated by signs. Central to the socio-historical theory is the idea of an instrument or tool, in accordance to which language is the key tool created by humankind for the organization of thinking.

Years ago, when I was a graduate student at A.I. Herzen University of Education in St. Petersburg, the name of Lev Vygotsky was just another name on the list of the required readings to be studied in preparation for the oral exam in Methodology of Teaching Foreign Languages. It took years of teaching, especially the last ten teaching Russian to American university students, to realize the relevance of Vygotsky's cognitive theory to my discipline. As a Soviet student I was educated in the spirit of dialectical materialism, the philosophical foundation of Marxism, which, at that time and in that country, was considered to be the only "true" theory of scholarship. Since Vygotsky was striving to be faithful to Marxism in his theoretical construct, the main tenets of his theory of language and thought were in many ways taken (by me) for granted. My encounter with a different, "Western" view on this issue led me to a reassessment of values, and helped me to better appreciate the depth and profoundness of Vygotsky's psycholinguistics and its immediate relevance to my work teaching Russian as a foreign language.

Constantine Kazarinoff 1919-2000

We at CREES are saddened by the October 12 passing of a longtime friend of the Center, Constantine Kazarinoff. A retired mathematics teacher and World War II US Navy veteran, Connie was proud of his Russian heritage and spoke Russian fluently. For years Connie was a regular at CREES public lectures and events and an enthusiastic participant in discussions. He will be missed here at Stanford.

Travels to Russia and Eastern Europe

Each year CREES invites students to apply for summer travel and research grants administered by the Center. Thirteen students received CREES research/travel grants in 2000. Here, several of them offer reflections on their experiences abroad.

Dana Sapatoru

School of Education

“Higher Education Reform in Romania”

My research trip to Bucharest, financed with the support of a research travel grant from CREES, was aimed at collecting additional information for my dissertation work, which focuses on the determinants of college choice among high school graduates in Romania. In particular, I needed additional information in three areas: the nature of the programs in private universities (especially curriculum contents and requirements); the competitiveness of admission decisions (statistics on the number of applicants, admitted students and enrollees); and the government regulation of university programs (especially accreditation procedures).

I investigated six potential sources for the information above: 1) the National Commission for Statistics; 2) the Ministry of National Education; 3) the National Commission for Academic Evaluation and Accreditation; 4) individual public and private higher education institutions; 5) independent publications; 6) and students enrolled in higher education institutions. The following paragraphs briefly describe the information available from each source and the supplementary data collected on this trip.

The National Commission of Statistics produces only aggregate statistics on enrollments by field and, more recently, by institutional form (public and private, short and long-term education) which are published in their quarterly bulletins. I obtained the most recent publication.

The Ministry of National Education (MNE), the government body responsible for the regulation of public education, is the most likely source of information on application and admission outcomes. However, there are two problems: first, while all public institutions are required to submit to

the Ministry figures on the number of seats, applicants, students admitted and enrolled each year, this is not aggregated in a useful form (and individual university data is not released); second, no information is available for private universities. The MNE does produce an internal document with time series data on several different educational indicators, such as enrollment levels by region, field, and institutional form. I obtained the latest issue of this document which includes data for the 1998/1999 academic year.

The National Commission for Academic Evaluation and Accreditation collects information from higher education institutions applying for a provisional license or for academic accreditation, and constitutes an important source of information particularly on individual private higher education institutions. Unfortunately, I was not able to establish contact with any representative of this agency or to obtain any information from them.

A large part of the information relevant for my dissertation, particularly that related to the nature of higher education programs offered, would be available solely from universities directly. However, most private institutions have poor records of compiling and reporting relevant information: only a few universities publish informative brochures describing the programs offered, websites are almost non-existent, and even telephone calls directly to the secretariat of the universities do not yield all the requested information.¹

For my dissertation I will therefore mostly rely on a small survey of 24 universities and colleges (encompassing 77 departments) I conducted in early 1999.² On this trip I updated some existing information and collected some missing data for several different institutions in my sample.

Another source of information on the official reform policies and their implementation and of aggregate statistics on the evolution of the higher education

system in Romania are several studies and articles recently published by various institutions and/or organizations. Among these are three published under the Universitas 2000 Phare Programme, including the following:

- Korka, M. (2000), *Strategy And Action In The Reform Of Education In Romania*
- Marga, A. (2000), *Education In Transition*
- Miroiu, A. and C. Bratianu (2000), *The Quality Assurance Policy In Higher Education*

In addition to investigating the sources above, I have talked informally to several students enrolled in different public and private higher education programs in various fields. They provided useful information on the intricacies of the application and admission process, including the search for the institution(s) to which they applied and the information sources available to them, the requirements of applying to a program and the differences in this regard between public and private institutions, and the admission procedure including the re-assignment of those who were not admitted to the program of their first choice in selective institutions.

To conclude, this research trip was most useful in updating my knowledge of the official policies of the Romanian government towards higher education, and it shed light on the more informal, unwritten aspects of the transition from high school to higher education.

Holly Case

Department of History

“Pre-dissertation Research in Cluj and Budapest”

My summer in Cluj and Budapest at once supplemented and supplanted all of the research I have done at Stanford on Transylvania. The fact of being there brought me to the painful realization that I did not truly have a dissertation topic and I hadn't the first clue where to begin. So I decided to begin with what I knew, taking a copy of my most recent seminar paper to a young historian in Cluj, explaining my predicament to him as best I could, and hoping

¹ It proved difficult to find university administrators or professors willing to talk about their programs as many were still on vacation at the time of my trip.

² The universities included in the sample of higher education institutions were selected based on whether

they appeared in the consideration sets of a significant number of senior high school students surveyed in May 1998 and whose college choice decisions constitute the basis of my dissertation research.

against hope that he would be as inspired as his work was inspiring. Fortunately, the man was impressed by the work I had done and made every effort to help me, typing up a list of names and phone numbers of other professors and researchers in town and sending me away with a bag full of books. During the course of my conversation with him and with others on the list, and others still whose names I got from people on the list, I realized that there are a great many people doing excellent work on interwar Transylvania, but really no one working on World War II, when Transylvania was divided in two and split between Hungary and Romania. Through some fortuitous—though embarrassingly unsystematic—preliminary archival work, I came across a number of documents dealing with this period: police reports, women’s club meeting minutes, school enrollment records, local government correspondence, etc. I had long been toying with the idea of writing the history of a single day in a single town as a means of reconstructing a picture of Transylvanian society that reflected the events of the past and foreshadowed those of the future. For logistics reasons and other technical concerns, however, I had decided against doing so earlier. After mentioning this idea to the Cluj professor, Sorin Mitu, and discussing my possibilities at length, I finally settled on a day and a town: Cluj, May 14, 1942. Instantly my research came into sharp focus. I knew where to start and what to look for and my enthusiasm for the topic grew. Since Cluj was part of Hungary in 1942, I decided to divide my time between Cluj and Budapest. Once in Budapest, I met with several graduate students, professors, archivists, even a librarian, all of whom specialized in Transylvanian, Romanian, or Hungarian history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Everyone I spoke to was intrigued by my topic and bombarded me with questions, suggestions, warnings, and lists of possible contacts. I did not have nearly enough time to follow every lead that was offered me. Nevertheless, I did manage to make a solid start, both in terms of research and plain logistics. I am eager to return to Cluj in March to pick up where I left off.

I feel inclined to mention that by way of a vacation during my stay in Europe I spent a long weekend in a village north of Cluj where some Hungarian friends of mine are doing missionary work with the Roma population. Too often in my conver-

sations with professional historians and others working in the field I am told that what relates to the Roma is not worthy of historical consideration. Though some are trying to change this trend, progress is slow and resistance is strong. In all honesty, the three days I spent with the Roma of Nadasd were among the most enlightening of my trip, both as an historian and as a human being. In them I confronted a group of people with a keener, more profound knowledge of the languages and habits of all the peoples of Transylvania than I had ever seen displayed in a book or article on nationalities relations in the region.

Inga Dorosz and Amanda Fin

Visual Arts Department

“Artists as Mediators in Poland”

We are collaborative artists in the MFA Visual Arts Department. Our work is a mixture of photography and performative events. Part of our collaborative project last year dealt with a series of performances in which the performer acted as a mediator between two spaces. We became aware and interested in the work of the Polish artist, Krzysztof Wodiczko. Wodiczko creates sculptures/apparatuses that mediate communication (experience) between an individual and society. Their function is to expose and at the same time to heal social, psychological and physical wounds. From our preliminary research in Wodiczko’s art we found conceptual links with the work of contemporary artists in Poland. Our project was to document our interviews with Polish artists.

We spent two weeks in Poland, primarily between Warsaw and Krakow. We started our research in the archives of the Centre for Contemporary Art in Warsaw (csw.art.pl/new/basis_e.html). The center curates contemporary Polish art shows with an emphasis on contemporary international art. In addition to visiting museums in Warsaw and Krakow, we spoke to gallery owners and artists. We conducted a series of interviews investigating the roles, motives and interests of contemporary Polish visual artists.

We found a number of artists dealing with problems and issues that have only recently entered the discourse, such as feminism and eco-politics. For example, Dorota Niezalska in her piece “Modus Operandi” created an installation in which women described the physical characteristics of their assailants. There is also a collective artist group which focuses on ecological issues. This collective sponsors international festivals,

inviting urban planners and artists from all over Europe to focus on local environmental problems and solutions. In addition, there is a significant amount of scholarship in Poland that is rediscovering and reanalyzing historical Polish art movements and roles of artists.

We were impressed by the diversity and insight of recent Polish art and our artwork has continued to be influenced by artists such as Wodiczko and Niezalska. This year we will complete our thesis project, which investigates artists as mediators, and use the recordings we gathered as source material for our final exhibition.

ALUMNI NEWS

Windi Blazyk (MA, REES, 2000) is working at Arraycomm in San Jose, California as Associate Recruiter.

Kathleen Collins (Ph.D., Political Science, 2000) has been appointed Assistant Professor of Politics and Government at Dartmouth College.

Andrew Curry (M.A., REES, 2000) is a Staff Writer for *US News and World Report* in Washington, DC.

Jennifer Daniell (Ph.D., Political Science, 2000) has joined Sun Microsystems as Director of Corporate Development.

Artemis Evdemon, (M.A., REES, 2000) is a Social Science Research Assistant at Stanford’s Center for International Security and Cooperation.

Amy Kovac (M.A., REES, 2000) is a Desk Officer at *The News Hour with Jim Lehrer* in Washington DC.

Alex Klaitis (M.A., REES, 1999) is Partnership and Exchange Program Manager at ISAR (Initiative for Social Action and Renewal in Eurasia) in Washington, D.C.

Christian Eversull (M.A., REES, 1998) started Stanford Medical School this fall. Prior to that, he worked at Medtronic AneuRx, a medical equipment supplier in Sunnyvale.

Rachel Farber (M.A., REES, 1997) works for the International Trade Administration in Washington, D.C., specializing in Eastern Europe and Russia. Rachel recently married Josh Turner.

Natalia Roudakova

Department of Cultural and Social
Anthropology

"Journalism in Post-Soviet Russia"

The goal for my pre-dissertation fieldwork this summer was to shape up my future dissertation project methodologically. First, I wanted to determine which professional field would be most suitable for my future study, given the goals of my dissertation project to document large-scale transformations in the practices and identities of former Soviet professionals in post-socialist Russia. Secondly, I wanted to locate my project geographically and institutionally—that is, to find particular sites in which I would be able to carry out my fieldwork. Research this summer went particularly well, was very rewarding, as I was able to achieve both goals successfully.

I decided to study post-Soviet journalism since it is probably the most telling example of a profession which is being completely redefined as Russia is making its highly contested shift away from socialism. The 1990 Law on the Press, which lifted official party censure and allowed for the privatization of media networks, has affected Soviet journalism in two important ways. First, in the 1990s newspapers have quickly grown in numbers, especially in the regions, and have diversified in form, content, and ownership structure. Secondly, the redrawing of boundaries within the post-Soviet press went hand in hand with journalists' profound reevaluation of the goals and purposes of their profession. It is extremely rare that researchers have a chance to witness a large-scale reformulation of a profession such as this one unfolding before their eyes. Hence the timeliness and the excitement of the proposed research topic.

I realized that the often taken-for-granted boundaries within Western journalism (e.g. national daily press, specialized press, partisan press, tabloid press) are currently being formulated in post-socialist Russia, emerging from the transformation of two major types of general newspapers that existed during socialism—'socio-political' (obshestvenno-politicheskaya) and youth press. Because of extremely high production costs of daily newspapers in the face of deep economic crisis, it was mainly Moscow-based editions that have found new private owners among new Russian capital. The majority of socio-political dailies in the regions have been "claimed" by various

fractions of municipal and regional governments or local senates who wrote the papers into their budgets. Editors and journalists of Communist Youth League papers, on the other hand, have been more entrepreneurial, and have established, among others, privately-owned specialized business press, digest press, and "yellow" and tabloid press.

These structural changes in the post-socialist press have resulted in a profound re-evaluation among journalists of what their profession is trying to accomplish. Older generations of Soviet journalists—committed to the ideals of public virtue and analytical, investigative journalism which became prominent following the Khrushchev "thaw"—are facing tough competition from younger journalists, many of whom believe they are producing a commodity called information that can be exchanged for higher incomes. While older generations of journalists are having a hard time reconciling themselves to the fact that their publications no longer have the power to make a difference in local communities, many younger journalists are busy figuring out how to attract advertisers and what kinds of informational products would sell best.

Methodologically, my project will differ from previous accounts in that I will seek to explain institutional transformations and changes in professional subjectivities through the daily practices of regional journalists, paying particular attention to cohort differences among them, while existing studies have limited their scope to interviewing chief editors and other media decision-makers in Russia's capital. I decided to situate my project in the city of Nizhny Novgorod, in which the transformation of media networks has been especially sharp, as the city lost its closed status associated with classified nuclear research conducted there during the Soviet times.

To investigate how journalists are reformulating their profession as they participate in the redrawing of its boundaries, I have chosen three newspapers in Nizhny Novgorod that currently stand for different types of print media in the city. These three newspapers—*Nizhegorodskie Novosti* (Nizhny Novgorod News), *Birzha* (Stock Exchange) and *Novoe Delo* (New Cause) are connected through editors and journalists who used to work for the same youth paper *Leninskaya Smena* (Lenin's New Generation) during the socialist years. They are also similar in that their staffs include between 15 and 20 journalists. Finally, all three papers were founded by editors from

Leninskaya Smena in 1990, soon after the Law on the Press allowing for private ownership of the media was passed. However, these papers are sharply dissimilar in their ownership structures, readership orientation, and professional ethos. These similarities and differences are very important for my project, as they will allow me to trace why people who used to share the same work environment have gone in such different directions once the Law was passed.

The first newspaper in my sample, *Nizhegorodskije Novosti* (Nizhny Novgorod News), with a circulation of about 10,000 copies, is a daily newspaper which continues the tradition of 'socio-political' press of late socialism with its emphasis on public virtue and investigative journalism that combines disinterested analysis with passionate engagement in the social life of the community. This paper is geared toward intelligentsia and, among other topics, investigates energy crises, non-payment of wages to state employees, problems in local educational system, and maintains columns like "Person and Society," "State and Politics," and "Events and Opinions." This paper was founded by a joint initiative of the Nizhny Novgorod regional Duma (Senate) and a number of journalists in their 40s and early 50s from *Leninskaya Smena* and *Nizhegorodskii Rabochii* (Nizhny Novgorod Worker) in opposition to "dry" party press, namely the Nizhny Novgorod version of *Pravda*. Due to the extremely high production costs of daily press, the paper has been continuously funded by the local Duma, although the subsidies allotted for journalists barely meet the minimum living standards. Because of low salaries, there has been a high turnover of personnel in this newspaper; yet several of the editors have remained there throughout the last decade. These editors believe that they need government subsidies to survive and maintain their voices on the market among their more aggressive competitors, who seem to be concerned less with public virtue and more with making profit off of the commodity called 'information'. Professionalism, these editors argue, does not mean "singing to the tunes of whoever pays for the music," but rather being able to maintain their voices no matter what economic or political cataclysms may come.

The second newspaper in my sample is *Birzha* (Stock Exchange), which is a business weekly with a circulation of 30,000 copies. It was founded by a former editor-in-chief of *Leninskaya Smena* who was in his

late 30s in 1990. *Birzha* identifies itself as a newspaper of Nizhny Novgorod entrepreneurs, although its editors and journalists come from intelligentsia circles, similarly to those in *Nizhegorodskie Novosti*. In contrast to government-supported papers, *Birzha* journalists say they have re-oriented themselves from universal writers to producers of specialized information for the community of entrepreneurs. *Birzha* both continues and strays from the ideals of 'socio-political' press of the Soviet times. It maintains the concern for the well-being of the community of entrepreneurs—periodically the paper publishes optimistic human interest stories about former teachers, doctors, engineers etc. who, despite the continuing economic crisis, have been able to start and maintain a successful business. Yet the paper also publishes business and stock exchange news, juridical and accounting information for entrepreneurs, and relies heavily on advertisement, therefore making a sharp turn away from the late socialist model of investigative journalism with its emphasis on deep social analysis and interpretation. The ownership structure of *Birzha* is also radically different from that of *Nizhegorodskije Novosti*. *Birzha* became self-supporting soon after its founding, and its journalists have consequently enjoyed much higher incomes compared to those in government-supported papers. Consistent with the paper's philosophy of entrepreneurship, *Birzha* supports the private owner and does not hide that one of its goals is to continue making money in newspaper business.

The third paper in my sample, *Novoe Delo* (New Cause), is also a privately-owned weekly with a circulation of 40,000 copies, founded in 1990 by a managing editor of *Leninskaya Smena* who was in his early 30s. *Novoe Delo* represents yet another type of press in Nizhny Novgorod today. Similar to *Birzha*, *Novoe Delo* both continues and strays from the ideals of socio-political press of the Soviet times, but it does so in a markedly different way. *Novoe Delo* remains a general newspaper that covers a wide range of topics including regional political and social issues, yet it also writes about scandals and crimes in the city, as well as gives advice in matters of sex. The banner headings of *Novoe Delo* are often shocking, and overall the style of presentation is highly emotionally charged. Editors and journalists at *Novoe Delo* explain this as a continuation of the "passionate engagement" style of journalism characteristic of late socialism, which

2001-2002 ACADEMIC YEAR
Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS)
FELLOWSHIPS IN THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

FLAS Fellowships provide tuition and stipend to graduate students for the study of Russian language in combination with either area studies, international studies, or international aspects of professional studies. Czech and Polish languages may also be eligible.

DEADLINE: JANUARY 12, 2001

Applications are now available from the CREES website
 (<http://www.stanford.edu/dept/CREES/grants.html>),
 directly from CREES, Building 40, Main Quad,
 or by contacting CREES at (650) 723-3562 or rosemary.schnoor@stanford.edu

they practice out of respect for the reader, who might not be tuned to the "convoluted" language of analyses present in other dailies and weeklies. At the same time, *Novoe Delo* editors do not hide that for them journalism became a business in which this kind of "emotionally charged" journalism is able to generate high revenues.

Given the timeframe of this project, a sample of three papers that I selected will be small enough to permit intensive interaction for one researcher, but broad enough to examine journalistic communities with competing understandings of professionalism in their close institutional settings. I hypothesize that this tension between diverging notions of professionalism outlined above, stemming from different property regimes in media enterprises, is, in fact, what drives the current reshaping of the profession. In order to test that, I will closely observe and interact with editors and rank-and-file journalists working for all three newspapers in Nizhnii Novgorod during the year of my fieldwork, 2001-2002. I will pay particular attention to four aspects of journalists' daily practices—maintenance of professional networks, relations to sources, relations to audiences, and to journalists' social circles.

My study will differ from existing accounts of the transformations in post-socialist media in a number of ways. Theoretically, most such accounts have been influenced by a libertarian theory of the press, which draws a sharp distinction between Leninist propaganda model and a liberal democratic model of the press espoused in mainstream Anglo-American journalism. In their attempts to document the shift from the former model to the latter,

researchers have focused on "whether the Russian state is still pressuring the media." In my project, though, I will aim to locate the origins of transformations in post-socialist media not in the macro worlds of "civil society" and "public sphere," but the micro-worlds of journalists' everyday encounters and practices, which are themselves historically, socially, and culturally produced. It is these micro-worlds that I believe are going to give shape to the future of Russian journalism. Such an ethnographic approach will not only make the necessary link between the changing institutional structures, professional identities of journalists, and their social agency, but may also bring a critical eye to liberal Western theories which have been inspiring research on post-socialist media thus far.

Malgorzata Fidelis
Department of History
"Summer Research in Poland"

Between June and September I was in Poland researching documents on women workers in early communist Poland. During that time I was supported by a CREES Summer Research Grant. This trip took place after I finished my first year in the Ph.D. program in the Department of History, during which my dissertation topic began to take shape. I decided to study how the radical social upheavals of postwar reconstruction and socialism building affected Polish women. I had many ideas, but no access to primary sources on the subject, since most of the materials on economic and social issues were located in

Poland. The major aim of my trip, therefore, was to do a reconnaissance: identify archives that would be most useful for my research; identify factories/industrial centers, which could be used for case studies, and meet with scholars, who work on social history under communism in Poland. I have accomplished all of these goals and now have a rich background on the problems I would like to discuss in my dissertation.

While in Poland I visited three archives and two libraries that proved extremely useful for my research. In the Archive of New Documents (Archiwum Akt Nowych), the main archive to hold any institutional documents in Poland since 1918, I worked mostly with the materials of the Polish United Workers' Party, the ruling party in communist Poland between 1949 and 1989. I looked at the documentation of the party's Women's Division, the Ministry of Work and Welfare responsible for shaping protective legislation, and the ministries of various branches of industry (for example, the textile industry, in which the majority of workers were women). I also found the documents of the Women's Divisions within the Polish Socialist Party and the Polish Workers' Party, the two most influential parties between 1945 and 1949, prior to the establishment of the one-party system in Poland.

In the Archive of Labor Unions (Archiwum Ruchu Zawodowego), I found sources on the Women's Chapter within the official labor union as well as documentation on the protective legislation regarding women. Some of the most interesting documents were the complaints written by women

workers to the labor unions; these letters provided insights into everyday factory life and identified bases of gender discrimination. In the State Archive of the City of Warsaw, I found documents from local factories. Textile factories, in particular, revealed abundant material on women workers' organization and activity.

I used two main libraries in Warsaw – the Library of the Warsaw University and the National Library. I studied books, periodicals, and newspapers of the 1940s and 1950s, many of which proved to be indispensable sources on women and labor in early communist Poland. I was also able to identify a significant source of women workers' memoirs. Beginning in 1949, the Association of the Friends of Memoirs began to organize periodical competitions for the memoirs of workers and peasants. This Association is still active and its archive holds a sizable collection of women workers' memoirs.

Consultations with Polish scholars and community leaders proved to be extremely helpful as well. In Warsaw, I met with Professor Andrzej Paczkowski of the Political Institute of the Polish Academy of Science, who is a recognized specialist on the history of communism in Poland. I talked with Professor Anna Zarnowska of the University of Warsaw, who is a specialist in both labor history and women's history. I also met with Dariusz Jarosz of the Historical Institute of the Polish Academy of Science, who writes on social history under communism. In Cracow, I interviewed Ms. Barbara Krupa, who in the 1960s was the head of the League of Women (the official

women's organization in communist Poland) in an industrial city of Nowa Huta near Cracow. She shared with me women workers' memoirs submitted to her organization for a memoir contest about constructing Nowa Huta in the late 1940s and early 1950s.

Martin Dimitrov

Department of Political Science
"Intellectual Property Rights in Russia"

I went to Moscow this summer with a puzzle: while Russia has intellectual property laws on the books, they are not systematically enforced. As a result, Russia has one of the highest levels of piracy of intellectual property in the world. Going into the field I had several hypotheses that I needed to test out. One possible explanation was that the Russian government had no interest in enforcing the laws, which was due partly to lack of foreign pressure and partly to insufficient domestic pressure from rights holders associations. Another possibility was that Russian lawyers, judges and law enforcement officers were not well versed in the intricacies of intellectual property law and thus had no understanding of the importance of enforcing it. It was also possible that the high levels of piracy were explained by consumer demand. Finally, it was possible that enforcement differs across the country, and what I would see in Moscow would not be representative of the whole country.

EDUCATOR OUTREACH NEWS

VIDEO LENDING LIBRARY

CREES is pleased to announce a new Documentary Film Lending Library for educators. These documentary videos, on contemporary and historical topics in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, can be borrowed at no cost for classroom or research purposes. We ask only that the borrower cover the cost of return postage and postal insurance. For a list of available titles and descriptions of the films, please see our website at <http://www.stanford.edu/dept/CREES/videolib.html>.

We recommend advance reservation of requested titles; you may make a reservation through our web site, by email (mdakin@stanford.edu), or by phoning the Center. Please feel free to contact us with any questions, or to reserve a title.

2001 TEACHER WORKSHOP SERIES

The Center for Russian & East European Studies and the Bay Area Global Education Program are pleased to offer this year's teacher workshop series: "Why Bosnia? Why Kosovo? The U.S., the U.N. and the Balkan Wars." Bert Patenaude of the Hoover Institution is director of this year's series. Guest lecturers will include Stanford Professors Norman Naimark and Stephen Stedman.

The workshop will consist of four Saturday morning sessions:

January 27, "Balkan Monsters or Balkan Ghosts: Who is to Blame for the Death of Yugoslavia?"

February 10, "The US and the Balkan Wars;"

February 24, "Bosnia and the Tragic Failure of UN Peacekeeping," and

March 10, "Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing in Modern Europe."

Session One on January 27 will include an afternoon session on Teaching Resources and the New Balkan Wars. **Pre-registration is required** for all sessions of the workshop.

For further information on the workshop sessions, please see our web site: <http://www.stanford.edu/dept/CREES/workshop2001.html>. To preregister, contact Mary Dakin (mdakin@stanford.edu) or Tuckie Yirchott (tuckie@stanford.edu). The workshop web site also includes a comprehensive list of useful links regarding the Balkan conflicts and teaching.

Government Incentives to Enforce Intellectual Property Laws

The experience of other transitional economies has shown that US pressure serves as a very effective tool to induce governments to step up the enforcement of intellectual property laws. Thus far, the US has not applied Special 301 sanctions against Russia. I visited the US Embassy hoping to get a sense of the official US policy towards piracy of intellectual property in Russia. My meetings with two intellectual property experts at the US Embassy (David Knuty and Douglas Kramer) proved disappointing. I was left with the sense that there is no coherent US strategy on how to limit IP piracy in Russia. A meeting with Meredith Singer at the American Chamber of Commerce was similarly disappointing: although the Chamber had identified counteracting IP piracy as a priority area, there was no action plan how to do it. Overall, I got the feeling that the US diplomats simply reacted after the fact and had no understanding of the necessity of a proactive policy on the issue. IP piracy was not a priority area for them, claims to the contrary notwithstanding.

Given the lack of US pressure, it was not surprising to find top Russian bureaucrats entrusted with IP protection rather apathetic. I met with Sergey Kotov, a highly placed official at the Unfair Competition and Antimonopoly Ministry. He was a quintessential Soviet era bureaucrat, who gave evasive answers to my questions about the role of his ministry in curbing piracy. I also had a meeting with a representative of the Russian Chamber of Commerce, Vladimir Kismereshkin, who supposedly specialized in unfair competition, yet he was singularly unwilling to talk about the nature of his work. After my meetings I was convinced that although the government had created a number of agencies entrusted with fighting piracy, their activity was not coordinated, and thus was ineffective.

My meetings with representatives of the different rightsholders associations proved much more stimulating. Given that the rightsholders have a direct stake in ensuring that intellectual property rights are enforced, they represent a dynamic, proactive group of knowledgeable experts. My meeting with Ekaterina Ananjeva at the Russian Authors Society (RAO) revealed how difficult it is for an enormous state-created agency to adopt the dynamic workstyle of its efficient private counterparts. The difference between the Russian

collecting society and the branch offices of well-established Western anti-piracy alliances such as RAPO (Russian Anti-Piracy Association, funded by MPI), ABKP (Association for Combating Computer Piracy, funded by SONY), IFPI (International Federation of Phonographic Industry) was stark. Western organizations operated out of plush offices and had impressive contacts with the police authorities, which insured that the raids they performed were successful. The problem with these associations is that they are usually very small (at most 20 people), which makes it impossible for them to have any impact on the enforcement of intellectual property laws outside of Moscow. I also had a very useful meeting with Sergey Lipatnikov, a private investigator for the Armor Group. He explained to me the different schemes used for smuggling pirated intellectual property in Russia, and made it clear that the expense of prosecuting counterfeiters is prohibitive for many owners of intellectual property, who prefer to suffer losses rather than to hire expensive private investigators with the necessary connections to ensure the compliance of the police authorities. However, the rightsholders associations had elected not to put pressure on the government, but to use their previous links with the police and the secret service (a lot of the people now working for the rightsholders associations were previously employed by the KGB). As a result, gains made in the enforcement of IP laws were highly specific to the collaboration of the police authorities with the rightsholders associations. There was no coherent government policy on the enforcement of IP laws.

Judges, Lawyers, and Other Law Professionals

How can a country that has no conception of the importance of intellectual property laws learn to respect them? One avenue is to increase the awareness of its legal professionals of the importance of intellectual property. Much to my dismay, I discovered that there are only a dozen law school professors in Russia who are knowledgeable about issues concerning intellectual property. My interviews with professors Edward Gavrylov and Viktor Dozortsev, the doyens of IP law in Russia, revealed that no undergraduate courses on intellectual property (it is taught as part of civil law) and only a few graduate level courses on the subject exist. Thus, most law students graduate from law school without

BOOK NEWS

New from HOOVER INSTITUTION PRESS:

CNN's Cold War Documentary: Issues and Controversy, ed. by Arnold Beichman, ISBN: 0-8179-9742-3, \$17.95 paper, April 2000, 173 pages.

Peter Duignan, *NATO: A History*, ISBN: 9782-2 \$16.95, paper, March 2000, 96 pages.

The Collapse of Communism, ed. by Lee Edwards, ISBN: 9812-8 \$18.95, paper, January 2000, 207 pages.

Charles King, *The Moldovans: Romania, Russia, and the Politics of Culture*, ISBN: 9792-X \$24.95, paper ISBN: 9791-1 \$39.95, cloth, January, 2000, 303 pages.

The Fall of the Berlin Wall: Reassessing the Causes and Consequences of the End of the Cold War, ed. by Peter Schweizer

Roman Szporluk, *Russia, Ukraine, and the Breakup of the Soviet Union*, ISBN: 9542-0 \$24.95, paper, March 2000, 440 pages.

For more information contact:

Hoover Institution Press
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-6010
<http://www-hoover.stanford.edu/>
Telephone: 800-935-2882 or 650-723-3373
Fax: 650-723-8626

New from STANFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS:

Abraham Ascher, *P. A. Stolypin: The Search for Stability in Late Imperial Russia*. Forthcoming, ISBN: 0-8047-3977-3, cloth, \$55.00, 488 pages.

Hermann Field and Kate Field, *Trapped in the Cold War: The Ordeal of an American Family*, Afterword by Norman Naimark. ISBN: 0-8047-3590-5, cloth, \$45.00, 486 pages.

The New Russia: Transition Gone Awry, Edited by Lawrence R. Klein and Marshall Pomer, Foreword by Mikhail Gorbachev, Preface by Joseph Stiglitz. Forthcoming, ISBN: 0-8047-4165-4, paper, \$24.95; ISBN: 0-8047-4127-1, cloth, \$60.00, 496 pages.

Gabriella Safran, *Rewriting the Jew: Assimilation Narratives in the Russian Empire*. Forthcoming, ISBN: 0-8047-3830-0, cloth, \$45.00 296 pages.

For further information contact:

Stanford University Press
521 Lomita Mall
Stanford, CA 94305-2235
Telephone: (650) 723-9434
Fax: (650) 725-3457

<http://www.sup.org/>

an awareness of the intricacies of IP law.

Not surprisingly, judges also have a low level of understanding of intellectual property law. There are no specialized intellectual property courts in Moscow, let alone in the regions. My interviews with the Chief Judge of the Moscow Court of Appeals Alla Bolshova and the head of the Special IP Team Larina revealed that even the special IP team does not deal exclusively with intellectual property. The number of IP cases heard at the Moscow Court of Appeals was surprisingly small: 97 for all of 1999. In the absence of specialized courts dealing exclusively with IP, it is exceedingly difficult to build a corpus of lawyers with expertise in the area.

My meetings with lawyers were more encouraging. My interviews at Baker & McKenzie (Paul Melling), Gowlings (Monique Couture), Latham & Watkins (Any Goldin), and McGuire Woods Battle & Boothe (Alexander Christophoroff) revealed a group of young and energetic, Western-educated lawyers who were working vigorously to protect the interests of their Western clients in Russia. Most of these lawyers worked on trademark protection. However, my meetings with two patent attorneys, Valery Guerman (president of the Association of the Russian Patent Attorneys) and Alexander Isaev demonstrated that Russia had not made great strides in improving patent protection. An interview with Alexander Korchagin, the head of the Russian Patent Office (Rospatent) strengthened my conviction that Russia's patent system requires a major overhaul.

Thus, my second hypothesis was mostly confirmed: the legal professionals Russia had were few, underqualified, and largely resistant to change. Most well-qualified Russian lawyers were working for Western companies, and their efforts were usually perceived to be at odds with the interests of the Russian consumers

Consumer Power

Given the short duration of my stay in Russia, I had no opportunity to conduct a comprehensive survey on the attitudes of ordinary citizens towards the IP protection. Most of my evidence is therefore anecdotal. I made an effort to find legal CD and CD-ROMs on the market, but I was not successful. Copies of the latest versions of Western-produced software sold for only a few dollars. Granted, the software came without user manuals and customer support, but consumers were happy to buy it and often said that the pirates were doing a service to

STUDENT NEWS

WELCOME NEW REES M.A. STUDENTS!

Brian Fonville

Brian is pursuing both a JD at Stanford Law School and the CREES MA degree. He holds BA (with highest distinction) in French Language and Literature from University of North Carolina. His interests are Eastern Europe, especially the Czech Republic, and international law. Brian is in Prague for the autumn quarter on an internship program in the office of President Havel.

Emily Johnson

Emily is a co-term student at Stanford. Her undergraduate major was Geological and Environmental Sciences. Since coming to Stanford, Emily has studied at Stanford's Moscow campus (Autumn, 1997), Oxford campus (Winter, 2000) and Berlin campus (Spring, 2000), and remained in Berlin this past summer on an internship. Emily has been granted a FLAS Fellowship in Russian for the 2000-2001 academic year.

Maria Kiehn

Maria holds a BA (magna cum laude) in Russian Language and Literature from Georgetown University. Since graduating from Georgetown she has studied in St. Petersburg, spent a year teaching English in Belarus, worked at the National Foreign Language Center in Washington DC, and most recently served as Administrator in Stanford's Slavic Department. Maria has been granted a FLAS Fellowship in Russian for the 2000-2001 academic year.

Vera Trappmann

Vera, a sociologist, comes to us from Germany, where she has studied at Ruhr University, Bochum; Free University in Berlin; and the University of Bielefeld, where she received a graduate degree in sociology. Vera has been a Visiting Scholar at European University in St. Petersburg, and most recently worked on a European Union-sponsored research project regarding restructuring of the steel industry in Russia. This year Vera is the recipient of a one-year fellowship from the German National Scholarship Foundation and the German Ministry of Trade and Commerce.

CREES welcomes back continuing students in our MA program:

Major Blaise Liess (US Army)

Major Martin Ryan (US Army)

Ji Hyun Yoon

OTHER STUDENT NEWS:

Dusan Djordjevic

(PhD Candidate, History) Dusan Djordjevic worked on his dissertation on interwar Yugoslavia in 1999-2000 as a MacArthur Foundation scholar at the Center for International Security and Cooperation. In May he presented a paper at a conference on "Ideology and Historiography: The Making of Yugoslav Identity" at the European

University Institute in Florence. In August he attended the Junior Scholars' Training Seminar in Wye Woods, Maryland, organized by the program for Woodrow Wilson Center.

Andrew Jenks

(Ph.D. Candidate, History) Andrew's paper "A Metro on the Mount: the Underground as a Church of Soviet Civilization," has been published in the October issue of *Technology and Culture*. The article also features photographs of the Moscow metro taken by CREES Academic Coordinator **Jack Kollmann**.

Jocelyn Loftus-Williams

(Junior, Slavic Languages and Literatures, and CREES Office Assistant) was an Open Source Officer in the Foreign Broadcast Information Service at CIA this past summer.

Caitlin Murdock

(Ph.D. Candidate, History) continues her dissertation research year on fellowship from the German Marshall Fund. Her project is on the Bohemian-Saxon border region 1871- 1938.

Paul Stronski

(Ph.D. Candidate, History) is conducting field research for his dissertation project "Forging a Soviet City: World War II and the Sovietization of Tashkent." He received two grants in support of this project: the ACTR/ACCELS Research Scholar Exchange Program grant for his current research in Tashkent, and a Stanford GRO grant for research in Moscow this spring.

Ann Livshitz

(Ph.D. Candidate, History) is conducting her dissertation research this year on Soviet childhood in the Stalin era. She received a fellowship from IREX for this project.

Marci Shore

(Ph.D. Candidate, History) recently returned from a year in Warsaw on an IREX/Fulbright-Hays grant, conducting research for her dissertation tentatively titled: "Vagaries of Marxism and Modernity: The Fin-de-siecle Generation of Angst and Revolution in Poland, 1918-1968." She gave a paper, "Variations on Marxism and Modernity: Samokrytyka, Confession and Denunciation in Stalinist Poland," at the VI World Congress of the International Council for Central and East European Studies in Tampere, Finland. Her translation from Polish of an excerpt from a memoir (*Czarne Sezony, The Black Seasons*) will be published this fall in *The Chicago Review*.

Valery Yakubovich

(Ph.D. Candidate, Sociology) has received a Littlefield Fellowship from the Stanford Institute for International Studies. His paper "The Changing Significance of Ties: An Exploration of the Hiring Channels in the Russian Transitional Labor Market," co-authored with Irina Kozina, has been published in the September issue of *International Sociology*.

UPCOMING CONFERENCES

XXV ANNUAL Berkeley-Stanford Conference

Friday, March 9, 2001
Alumni House, University of California - Berkeley

"MEMORIES, GENERATIONS AND LIFE HISTORIES IN THE MAKING OF POST-COMMUNISM"

*Presented by the Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian
Studies, UC Berkeley and the Center for Russian and East European
Studies, Stanford University*

For more information, please contact ISEES at (510) 642-3230

"Between Two Worlds: S. Ansky at the Turn of the Century" an International Conference

March 17 - 19, 2001
Stanford University

S. Ansky was a populist activist and an author of fiction,
poetry, and drama in Yiddish and Russian

For more information, please contact Sue Dambrau at
dambrau@stanford.edu or browse to
<http://www.stanford.edu/group/Ansky/ansky.html>

society by providing software so cheaply. This feeling has permeated even the legal community. A highly placed lawyer gave me advice on how to obtain a pirated copy of a legal database for a fraction of its official price. An employee of a rightsholders association entrusted with fighting piracy offered me a stack of CDs seized during raids, which I could take as presents for friends back in the US. Thus, I was left with the feeling that neither ordinary Russians nor those engaged with copyright protection truly understood how important secure intellectual property rights are for the development of a Russian high-tech industry.

The Center versus the Regions

The protection of IPR in Moscow is not representative of the entire country. Moscow has made some steps to limit piracy and has created important institutions that are engaged in IP protection. The infrastructure necessary to limit piracy exists: the courts are functioning, the police force is

large, the IP lawyers are aggressive about pursuing the interests of their foreign clients. Other large cities with significant levels of foreign investment (St. Petersburg, Ekaterinburg) also enjoy piracy levels lower than the national average. However, the further one moves from Moscow the higher the piracy rate. In the faraway regions, whole towns are dominated by mafia groups who make it impossible for the police to monitor the movement of pirated intellectual property and to conduct raids efficiently. Cities of special interest for future visits are Rostov, Kaliningrad, and Sochi.

Conclusion

My trip gave me a snapshot view of the difficulties of IP protection in Moscow. Corruption, inadequate awareness of the importance of IP, and poor training of the lawyers and judges all serve as important obstacles in the face of establishing secure intellectual property rights. However, the capital boasts a small group of elite IP

lawyers, who effectively protect the interests of the major US companies. These lawyers have made a contribution to the lower piracy rate that Moscow enjoys in comparison with the regions. The lower piracy rate in Moscow is not surprising: most foreign investment is channeled through the capital, which creates an incentive for the municipal and the federal governments to make sure that the foreigners don't leave due to the lack of IP protection. At the other extreme, the regions are locked into a vicious circle: the lack of foreign investment accounts for the high levels of IP piracy and the absence of government interest in enforcing IP laws. Yet, given the abysmal state of IP protection, foreign companies are even less likely to invest in the regions in the future. My research leaves me pessimistic about the prospects of the regions, and gives me some moderate optimism about the ability of the center to succeed in the creation of a vibrant regime for the protection of intellectual property.

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

Return Service Requested

Non-Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Palo Alto, CA
Permit No. 28