

#241

**Sovietology: From Stagnation to *Perestroika*?**

**A Decade of Doctoral Research in Soviet Politics**

**by Peter Rutland**

Dr. Peter Rutland is Assistant Professor of Government at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut.

Copyright October 1990 by the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars  
Edited by Peggy McNerny

**The Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies  
The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars**

The Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies is a division of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Through its program of fellowships, meetings, and publications, the Institute encourages scholarship on Russia and the Soviet Union, embracing a broad range of fields in the social sciences and the humanities. The Kennan Institute is supported by contributions from foundations, corporations, individuals, and the United States Government.

**Kennan Institute Occasional Papers**

The Kennan Institute makes Occasional Papers available to all those interested in Russian and Soviet Studies. Occasional Papers are submitted by Kennan Institute scholars and visiting speakers, particularly those who wish to receive timely feedback on their work. Copies of Occasional Papers and a list of papers currently available can be obtained free of charge by contacting:

**Occasional Papers  
Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies  
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, Suite 704  
Washington, D.C. 20024-2518  
(202) 287-3400**

This Occasional Paper has been produced with support provided by the U.S. Department of State under the Soviet and East European Research and Training Act of 1983 (Title VIII) and by the Smith-Richardson Foundation. We are most grateful to these sponsors.

The views expressed in Kennan Institute Occasional Papers are those of the authors.

**Sovietology: From Stagnation to *Perestroika*?**

**A Decade of Doctoral Research in Soviet Politics**

**by Peter Rutland**

## Acknowledgements

This study was financed by a summer research award from the Policy Research Institute, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin, with additional assistance from the Slavic Department and the Perry-Castaneda Library at the University of Texas.

Dr. Rutland presented this paper to the Kennan Institute on October 9, 1990, as part of the Kennan Institute's continuing series of noon discussions.

## Introduction

The transformation of the Soviet political system since 1985 has profound implications for the way Soviet politics is studied in the West. Scholars of Soviet affairs now face an avalanche of new information about the past and a bewildering series of events and institutional developments which portend a major transformation of the Soviet political system.

In order to judge whether the profession of Sovietology will rise to the challenge which it now faces, it is important to have a clear idea of the scholarship which was produced over the preceding decade. There has been a relative dearth of writing on the state of the discipline since A.H. Brown's pioneering work *Soviet Politics and Political Science*, published in 1974.<sup>1</sup> As a first step towards updating Brown's study, the author reviewed all doctoral dissertations on Soviet domestic politics completed in the U.S. and Canada between 1976 and 1987.

Doctoral dissertations were chosen in order to investigate the sort of skills and knowledge which young scholars are bringing with them as they enter the field. Presumably, individuals who completed a doctorate in the last dozen years will be leading the pack of researchers gathering information on contemporary developments in Soviet politics and will be influential in developing new analytical categories with which to understand and explain these events.

Dissertations also account for a significant proportion of the original research published on Soviet politics in the U.S. and Canada. There are relatively few established academics in the Soviet field continuing to publish numerous research monographs beyond their dissertation. (Instead, they seem to concentrate their energies

---

1. A.H. Brown, *Soviet Politics and Political Science* (London: Macmillan, 1974).

on publishing articles, edited collections, and books for general and student audiences.) Also, 24 of the 87 dissertations in the sample subsequently appeared as books. Bearing in mind that the average lag between the award of the dissertation and publication of the book was 3-4 years, one may assume that another half dozen dissertations will be appearing as books in due course. Thesis-derived publications thus represent a substantial contribution to original research in this field.

This study is confined to an examination of the subject matter and research methodology of theses on Soviet domestic politics. The author obtained and read 87 theses written on this subject between 1976 and 1987;<sup>2</sup> these dissertations are listed in Appendix E.<sup>3</sup> To keep the project manageable, theses which were defended in politics departments, but which focused on historical events prior to 1941, were excluded (see Appendix F). If one's definition of contemporary Soviet politics were broadened to include the pre-war period, there would be no rationale for excluding theses written in history departments. However, it would seem more appropriate to judge political science theses on pre-war subjects alongside history dissertations, rather than alongside studies of contemporary politics.

Although general data on theses pertaining to Soviet foreign policy and international relations are presented in the appendices, such theses were not read for this study; these theses more properly belong to the separate sub-discipline of international relations. Moreover, the dissertation abstracts of theses on Soviet foreign policy suggest that such dissertations rarely use Russian-language sources or involve any original research into Soviet domestic policy processes. Half a dozen theses recorded

---

2. In most cases where a book was published, the book was read in place of the thesis.

3. A handful of the theses were not available through University Microfilms at the time of writing. These are included in the Appendix E listing, but were not individually read.

under the "International Relations" rubric in the American Political Science Association listing (see Appendix A) were examined for their domestic politics content, and three of them were included in the sample. Similarly, dissertations on East European politics and Soviet and East European economics defended during the 1967-1987 period were counted for comparative purposes, but were not read as part of this study.

### **The Quantitative Picture**

In 1988, Dorothy Atkinson carried out a review of graduate work in the Slavic field for the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies.<sup>4</sup> She concluded that Soviet and East European studies fell on hard times in the late 1970s, but have started to revive since 1983. My own more detailed study of Soviet domestic politics confirms these findings.

The total number of Ph.D.s written in the field in North America from 1976 to 1987 are grouped along the following lines: Soviet domestic politics, 87; Soviet foreign policy, 121; East European politics, 145. These numbers do not strike the author as particularly impressive. An average of 8 dissertations per year on Soviet domestic politics seems far from enough to replenish the institutional demands for Soviet specialists in academia and government. Appendix A shows that theses on Soviet topics amount to a mere 4 percent of the total number of theses written on comparative politics during that period -- and comparative politics itself was hardly in a robust state of health. The number of theses reaches a low point of three per year in 1980 and 1982, but then recovers.

---

4. D. Atkinson, "Soviet and East European Studies in the United States," *Slavic Review*, Vol. 47, no. 3 (Fall, 1988): 397-413. See also the report of her talk at the Kennan Institute, 24 February 1988.

East European politics seemed to do slightly better than Soviet politics -- particularly Poland and Yugoslavia, with 45 and 27 theses respectively (see Appendix C). This presumably reflects the greater accessibility of Eastern Europe, easier availability of research materials and contacts with academics, and the fact that these countries enjoyed (or suffered) more tumultuous politics than the USSR in the pre-1985 period.

Soviet/East European economics does not, however, seem to be in a healthier state (see Appendix D). The total number of theses awarded over 11 years was 59, with the bulk of these devoted to international trade, rather than to the internal functioning of socialist economies.

The breakdown of universities (see Appendix B) shows a dichotomy between a small number of institutions producing a steady flow of theses, and a large number of schools producing theses on an erratic basis. Only eight schools averaged more than *one* thesis per year in Soviet domestic, Soviet foreign and East European politics combined, and those eight accounted for 33 percent of all theses. The remaining two thirds of the theses written in the three fields were spread among 73 different universities.

Looking specifically at Soviet domestic politics, we find 97 theses (including 10 on historical topics) produced over 11 years in 38 different universities: an average of less than one thesis per university every three years. Even the top 5 schools, in terms of theses awarded in domestic politics, averaged only 6.6 theses each during 11 years. This skewed distribution implies that most students writing dissertations on Soviet politics work without the benefit of direct interaction with others doing doctoral work in the same field. Thus our picture of the sub-discipline of Soviet domestic politics amply confirms Atkinson's broader picture of Slavic studies as a field in decline since the 1960s.



More important than the perceived crisis in the number of specialists, however, is the question of the intellectual health of the discipline. How did the field cope with the dearth of information during the Brezhnev era? How did it respond to the intellectual trends which swept the social sciences in the 1960s and 1970s -- the rise of quantitative methods, the collapse of Marxism, the search for new theories?

### Sources and Methods

#### 1. Russian Language

The level of rigor displayed in the selection and utilization of sources varied widely among the 87 theses on Soviet domestic politics, as is shown below in Table One.

**Table 1. Use of Russian\* Language Sources.**  
(N=87)

Type of Source	Quantity Used					
	50 plus	20-50	10-20	≥ 10	≥ 5	None
Books	23	16	13	8	2	25
Journals	< 13	>	15	20	16	23
Articles	23	23	11	4	3	23
Dissertations	-	-	2	1	4	80

(\* In 6 cases non-Russian native languages were used.)

Broadly speaking, the theses fell into two groups: those which made comprehensive use of Soviet sources and those which used only a small number. Among the latter group, 18 theses apparently used no Russian-language sources at all, and a further five used only Soviet statistical sources. Very few made use of Soviet dissertations.

Most disturbing of all, it appears that only 17 of the 87 thesis authors conducted any research in the Soviet Union itself. This implies that for all the efforts of IREX and other bodies sending researchers to the USSR, in an average year only one or two students were working in the USSR who would produce a dissertation on Soviet politics. Those who *were* in the USSR typically relied upon library/archival work and interviews with academics; only a handful were able to conduct anything resembling fieldwork in the conventional sense (e.g., interviewing officials).<sup>5</sup> A further six worked with *samizdat* archives in the West (e.g., at Radio Liberty in Munich), and five interviewed emigrés.

There are two types of approaches to comparative politics: the broad and the narrow. The broad comparativists look at a range of countries by examining specific institutions in each country or by analyzing cross-national social and political data. In contrast, the traditional area specialists immerse themselves in the culture of a given region. Ninety percent of the theses in this sample fall squarely into the area studies category, only 10 attempted international comparisons on a systematic basis.<sup>6</sup> However, it is difficult to see how most of the authors can claim expertise as area specialists, when three quarters of them do not seem to have spent any length of time in the Soviet Union.

## 2. Use of Quantitative Methods

Sixteen theses made some use of quantitative techniques apart from merely presenting tables. In a couple of cases this was very fruitful, but often the theses ended

---

5. BALZER, BARBER, HAUSLOHNER, RUBLE, URBAN.

6. BARBER (U.S.), BUNCE (multiple), DEBARDELEBEN (GDR), DOBSON (multiple), ECHOLS (multiple), EVANGELISTA (U.S.), FISHER (U.S.), PALTIEL (China), RUESCHEMEYER (GDR, U.S.), URBAN (U.S.).

up manipulating data which most Soviet area specialists would regard as lacking in significance or reliability. A good example of such techniques is KERNEN's econometric investigation of the relative weight of climate versus poor management in explaining variations in Soviet agricultural performance. KERNEN had the advantage of using data which was directly related to what he wanted to study: weather conditions and harvests in different regions. He came up with the interesting conclusion that weather alone did not account for the notorious cycle of good and bad harvests in the USSR. Instead, most of the variance seems to be due to organizational factors, such as changes in farm structure, transport breakdowns, and interruptions in supplies of fuel, fertilizers and manpower (ch. 9).

ECHOLS's thesis looked at regional inequalities in the provision of health care and education, pulling together a vast range of data from ten countries. He concluded that a wide range of factors generate inequality and that the centralization and nominal commitment to redistribution of socialist public policy does not consistently result in greater equity in welfare provision.

In many cases, however, researchers had considerable problems gathering meaningful data and seem to have been tempted to over-interpret the significance of their results. GREEN, for example, did a frequency count of political items listed in the table of contents of 162 Soviet journals, and then strained to find ways to relate this material to his purported goal of testing which model of the Soviet political system -- totalitarian versus interest group theory -- was more appropriate.

RHODES's study of readers' letters to the Soviet press is more substantial. He analyzed a sample of 6,000 letters published in four papers over a 20 year period in terms of ideological content, purpose (complaint or suggestion), writer's occupation, etc. He concluded that there were more critical letters in the national press (*Pravda* and

*Izvestiia*) than in the republican press (*Bakinskii rabochii* and *Pravda Ukrainy*); and that there was considerable continuity in the subject matter of the letters between 1952 and 1972 (p. 177).

Several theses were devoted to trying to tease out significant findings from the sparse biographical data available on the top few hundred officials of the state and Party bureaucracies. WILLERTON scoured the biographies of 1,800 officials and inferred the existence of a patron-client relationship from the mere fact that two individual's careers overlapped in a given region. DiEUGENIO offered an elite analysis in the tradition of Fleron and Hough, looking for signs of "interest group pluralism" (p. 5) in the Central Committee of the CPSU from 1952 to 1976. It proved difficult to test the theory that the elite was increasingly reliant on experts co-opted from state bureaucracies, since there was much overlap between party and state careers and, besides, "experience in the party's territorial apparatus continues to be the predominant career path to Central Committee status" (p. 147). An almost identical exercise was carried out by KING, who also failed to clearly establish whether or not technocracy was spreading through the elite during the Brezhnev years. SIEGLER, too, offered a "techno-bureaucratic co-optation model" (p. 16), largely on the basis of data concerning the educational background of deputies in the standing commissions of the Supreme Soviet. However, there is little in his account to suggest that these bodies wielded any real decision-making power, and such claims ring rather hollow now that we can see a real (quasi-) parliament in action in the USSR.

Among the more sophisticated projects were the studies of budgetary spending by BUNCE and BAHRY. BAHRY's study faced the problem that more than half of all social spending flows through the industrial ministries, and thus lies outside of the republican budgets she was examining. It is not clear from her evidence that there has

been an upsurge in provincial decision-making and influence amounting to a "local revolution" (p.1) since Stalin's death. Nor does her evidence bear out the argument that "politics matters" (p. 127), since the budgetary process seems to be decided according to central rules that are subject only to incremental change.

BUNCE's study of the impact of leadership succession on state spending was even more ambitious, comparing the USSR with 13 other industrial countries. The conventional wisdom is that Soviet leaders build up power and authority over time. In contrast, BUNCE argues that general secretaries, like elected leaders in the West, enjoy an initial "honeymoon" period during which they introduce policy innovations and jack up social spending to curry support. However, her data are presented rather hastily, with little explanation, and do not seem robust enough to sustain the claims made on their behalf.

Many of the theses rely at some point or other on a close reading of speeches by key political leaders -- Politburo members, regional Party secretaries, etc. About a dozen went one stage further, and tried to rigorously code speeches in order to generate data which could then be statistically manipulated. The most thorough example is perhaps BLOUGH's work, which came out of the large Soviet Elite Perceptions Project at Ohio State University in the 1970s. BLOUGH attempts to model the decision-making of the Brezhnev leadership by coding 500 speeches and articles by Politburo members. One wonders how meaningful such speeches really are, given that Romanov and Kunaev, usually regarded as highly conservative Party leaders, emerge (pp. 91, 249) as the most ardent advocates of reform and discipline. In the end, BLOUGH identifies no less than five factions among the 11 senior Politburo members, but is unable to place any of the five junior members in these factions (p. 225).

## **The Intellectual Framework**

What of the intellectual approaches adopted in these theses? It is difficult to make general statements about the methodological approaches followed in 87 different dissertations, but straightforward historical narrative seems to have been the most common framework in all subject areas. Even theses which began with a theoretical argument typically reverted to a chronological approach for the bulk of the study.

Certainly it is important to keep contemporary politics in their historical context. However, this strong historical bent tends to exaggerate the uniqueness of Soviet politics. It discourages attempts to relate the material under examination to the categories of Western political science and leaves little opportunity to draw comparisons with other countries. The historical emphasis leaves one with the impression that Soviet politics (and Sovietology) is still living in the shadow of Stalin; politics in the post-Stalin era is dominated by the struggle to create a "normal" political system. Perhaps, after all, the theses give an accurate picture of the essence of Soviet politics -- a picture which gives one little idea of what is in fact the "normal" functioning of the Soviet political system.

Few of the theses tried to use theory in a rigorous or creative manner. The only thesis that displayed any real theoretical depth was PALTIEL's comparison of the personality cults of Stalin and Mao, in which he presents a lively and perceptive discussion of the internal dynamics of the Leninist "combat party." His thesis is less optimistic than most in its assessment of the extent to which the CPSU has achieved successful institutionalization of power (in the S. Huntington sense) since Stalin.

The generally barren nature of the theses from a theoretical point of view, and the paucity of references to other works in comparative politics, was perhaps one of the

most disturbing findings of the study. Most theses confined themselves to an introductory chapter reviewing the Sovietological literature in the chosen field, with Hough and Breslauer among the most frequently cited authors.<sup>7</sup>

Relatively few chose an interest group or policy process approach, although these were generally regarded as producing the most stimulating work on Soviet politics in the 1960s and 1970s.<sup>8</sup> Virtually none of the theses tried to apply concepts such as corporatism or state formation, which were in vogue in comparative politics in the earlier and later phases of the period in question. A surprisingly large number took as their starting point -- at least nominally -- the Brzezinski and Huntington textbook from 1964, *Political Power: USA/USSR*.<sup>9</sup> This book has not been widely cited in published literature on Soviet politics of the last decade and is usually regarded as an excellent summary of the way the Soviet system worked as of 1964, rather than as an important, original study.

Those starting with Brzezinski and Huntington usually adopted a policy process approach. Typically, they embarked on a meticulous categorization of stages in the decision-making process (germination, initiation, persuasion, decision, implementation, etc.), but rarely managed to break out of a chronological framework. Some theses in this group focused on one or two case studies, for example, CHOTINER on the 1962 party reform; or BRUCE on the Virgin Lands campaign and the 1958 education reform; others looked at a specific policy area.

---

7. J.F. Hough, *The Soviet Prefects* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969); G.W. Breslauer, *Khrushchev and Brezhnev as Leaders* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1982).

8. As represented, for example, by H.G. Skilling and F. Griffiths *Interest Groups in Soviet Politics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971); T. Gustafson, *Reform in Soviet Politics: Lessons of Recent Policies on Land and Water* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

9. Z.K. Brzezinski and S.P. Huntington, *Political Power: USA/USSR* (New York: Viking Press, 1964).

The policy process approach can produce illuminating research. BARBER compared the provision of vocational services for the disabled in the USSR and the U.S., showing how both countries have failed to develop an effective network of implementation bodies. EVANGELISTA used a policy process framework to compare weapons acquisition in the U.S. and the USSR and concluded that the procedures are more "top down" in the USSR than in the U.S. The "top down" procedures tend to stifle initiative in the early stages, but make it easier to move into mass production. In the U.S. the process gets bogged down after the initiation stage, as elaborate political deals have to be cut in order to get a weapon into production.

It is of particular interest that several authors concluded that the decision-making model that they had outlined at the start of the thesis failed to fit their chosen subject. ALMQUIST tried to identify the input of the "military industrial complex" in the policy process by reading articles by managers of defense plants. He found their concerns and views to be indistinguishable from those of civilian industrialists and concluded that the defense industry is a relatively passive instrument of national military policy, not an active lobby (as it is in the U.S.).

KNARR examined population policy by looking at the role of academic specialists in the field. Interestingly, he concluded that they accepted the official pronatalist outlook and failed to develop any original policy positions, and thus did not serve as an example of specialists with an independent input in the policy process.

In view of the paucity of empirical material, there was a strong tendency for people to retreat to the realm of theory. Given the apparent difficulty in finding Western concepts to fit Soviet reality, many sought to fill the theoretical vacuum by taking on Soviet theory lock, stock and barrel. It is a natural tendency for scholarship to



be shaped by its subject matter, but Soviet political theory is neither so theoretically rich, nor so closely tied to political practice, that it merits such lavish attention.

Twenty-five percent of the theses began with a discussion of the thoughts of Marx, Engels, and Lenin on the subject matter of their dissertation (nationalism, environmental problems, etc.). It is not at all clear that these classical works really shed much light on contemporary Soviet behavior in the area in question. Thus, for example, DE BARDELEBEN carefully dissects the place of ecological issues in Marxist-Leninist theory in the USSR and the German Democratic Republic, but concludes that such disputes are merely an exercise in ex-post legitimation and do not really drive environmental policy.

The prominence accorded to Marx and Lenin is presumably the result of a tendency to approach the USSR in ideological terms and to see the country as, in some sense, the product of classical socialist theory. Most of the authors who used Marxist-Leninist concepts do not seem to have believed that these concepts had any universal significance and thus used them in a routine manner. One felt the authors would not be inclined to employ such concepts when analyzing, say, American society. This makes their use of Marxism even more puzzling. Another possible explanation is that those who spent time in the USSR may have been persuaded by their Soviet academic advisors to adopt such an approach. Those who did not study in the USSR, but did use Soviet literature, may have been influenced by the Soviet convention of starting every publication with a ritual introductory section citing the founding fathers of socialism on the subject. (This is ironic, since nowadays many Soviet authors confess in private conversation that they only wrote such theoretical passages under duress.)

More important still than this ritual invocation of Marxism was a widespread tendency for theses to adopt the conceptual categories developed by Soviet scholars in

the field. For example, BUCKLEY's thesis on Soviet women is built around 16 interviews with Soviet specialists who discuss how they conceptualize the women's question. The thesis contains much interesting material, shows clearly that gender issues have been kept off political and academic agendas, and demonstrates that there was no space within the dead rhetoric of "developed socialism" to broach this crucial social question (p. 254). But one cannot help wishing that there had been more theses directly investigating the position of women in Soviet society, instead of analyzing how scholars analyze the role of women.

Parallel examples are provided by RUBLE and HAUSLOHNER, who were among the few scholars who managed to interview Soviet officials: in both cases, trade union administrators. Without having access to workers or managers, it is difficult for them to judge how much credence can be attached to the claims their interviewees make for the role of unions. URBAN explicitly discusses what can be achieved using the interview method and uses his interviews with city managers to offer a subtle analysis of Soviet administrative ideology. He explores its illusory self-image, whereby it presents itself as a humane and participatory bureaucracy. URBAN does not, however, seek to investigate exactly how these values affect the way the bureaucracies work in practice.

### **Coverage of Subjects**

Apart from the question of intellectual approach, it is illuminating to look at the theses in terms of their subject matter, as summarized in Table Two on the following page.

**Table 2. Subject Matter.**  
(N=87)

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Number of Theses</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Number of Theses</u>
ideology/media	10	economic policy	9
management theory	7	Politburo/Central Comm.	7
social issues	6	government	6
regional politics	6	policy process	6
ethnicity	6	history, 1941-64	5
military	4	agricultural policy	4
Ukrainian dissent	4	dissent	4
women	2		

(Each thesis was only counted once, although some clearly straddled several fields.)

Five main groupings emerge for the purposes of our discussion:

- 1) Ideology and administrative theory, which consists mainly of an exegesis of Soviet concepts (17 theses).
- 2) Detailed case studies of given policy areas: the policy process, economics, and agriculture (19 theses).
- 3) The interlocking themes of ethnicity, regional politics, and dissent (20 theses).
- 4) Political institutions (Politburo, Central Committee, the Communist Party, the military, law), plus those on post-1941 historical topics (23 theses).
- 5) Social questions and women (8 theses).

## 1. Ideology

Some theses take ideology almost at face value, seeing it as the vehicle for policy debates, as a legitimation device (domestic and international), and possibly as a source of insights into the "operational code" of Soviet leaders. LONGO carries out a content analysis of 1,180 articles and speeches from journals such as World Marxist Review in an

attempt to establish whether Soviet leaders try to use the concept of "developed socialism" to legitimize Soviet relations with Eastern Europe. Similarly, THOMPSON treats us to an exhaustive analysis of developed socialism, including chapters on the concept of "the Soviet people," moral vs. material incentives, the leading role of the Party, and the withering away of the state. COX tries to measure the Soviet posture towards the outside world in terms of an "ideological assertion quotient" derived from a content analysis of speeches at Party congresses. (It went up from 67 to 74 percent between 1952 and 1976! p. 83).

ROCCA reviews the history of "futurology" and social forecasting in the USSR, seeing it as yet another manifestation of the intelligentsia seeking a role for itself as the nation's "spiritual elite" (p. 302). One cannot help feeling that the ambitious cybernetic visions of the 1960s (peddled by Abel Aganbegyan among others) now seem almost ludicrously out of touch with the real problems facing the USSR. URBAN accurately calls them "a resounding flop" (p. 58).

The theses on Soviet ideology tend to stay on the level of political rhetoric and do not use ideology to open up a discussion of real social processes. One wonders just how much meaning can be attached to the official ideological debates of the Brezhnev era. A worrisome fact to emerge from these studies is that several of the original architects of the concept of "developed socialism," such as F. Burlatskii and A. Butenko, are still in business among the high priests of *perestroika*.

Among the theses which relied most heavily on Soviet political and academic concepts are those relating to management science and administrative theory (BEISSINGER, BOVA, COAN, STEVENSON-SANJIAN, URBAN, VIDMER, ZUBEK). These theses are sophisticated and informative pieces of work, but one regrets that their authors did not spend more time studying how actual decisions are

made in Soviet industry, and less exploring the conceptual categories Soviet theorists themselves use to model decision-making processes.

BEISSINGER and VIDMER trace the impact of Western ideas on Soviet management science. This has the advantage of getting beyond the dead categories of Soviet Marxism and allows the analyst to use Western organization theory to get some purchase on Soviet reality. However, the assumption seems to be that Soviet administrative practices are converging on the Western model and that the "Americanizers" represent the wave of the future. The Soviets have evidently tried to achieve modernization without market reform by introducing selected elements of Western management practice, such as using business games to train managers. Both authors conclude that this movement has thus far failed to make any significant inroads into Soviet managerial culture. Even if the Americanizers prevail in the long run, focusing on this issue has the effect of steering research even further into the realm of theory, and away from the current practices of Soviet managers.

COAN points out that a fundamental weakness in trying to apply concepts from Western organization theory to the USSR is a failure to appreciate the problem of *scale*. Western theory is designed to explain how organizations survive within a complex, competitive system. In the Soviet case, the organizations are all locked into a unitary structure of political and economic institutions which stands or falls as a single entity (p. 76). He nevertheless concludes that a Western-derived bureaucratic politics model can shed light on Soviet administrative behavior, using as a case study the way in which self-interested ministries blocked the 1965 economic reform.

Of course Western scholars need to arrive at an understanding of Soviet academic writing in their chosen field of study, but one must approach this theory in a critical manner. After all, much of it is of very poor quality -- as Soviet scholars

(publicly since 1985, and privately before 1985) are the first to admit. And a mastery of Soviet political theory can be no substitute for Western comparative political analysis.

## 2. The Policy Process

In the whole period there are remarkably few theses that look at resource allocation processes in specific policy areas. The exceptions are mainly in the areas of environmental policy, labor policy and agriculture.

Environmental policy is usually seen as one of the areas where pluralistic elements have made their greatest inroads into the Soviet political system. ZIEGLER, however, concludes his study of environmental policy-making by rejecting bureaucratic or interest group approaches in favor of a "corporatist" model, on the grounds that the system still has a "fundamentally authoritarian character," with policy discussion initiated and channeled from above (pp. 163, 54). DREIFELDS's study of environmental policy in Latvia shows that, to a surprising extent, many of the themes in the contemporary debate were already present in the 1960s and 1970s (and even the 1950s): popular concern, prominent media coverage, administrative confusion, and numerous but ineffective laws.

Rather surprisingly, the theses on agricultural policy-making outnumber those on industrial policy-making. COFFMAN begins his comprehensive study of agriculture in the Brezhnev period with Huntington's notion of the "adaptation" of a political system over time (p. 12). He also utilizes Hough's notion of the party as a "goal rational" institution, going beyond Max Weber's vision of "instrumental" bureaucracy (p. 399). The leadership faced the problem of how to give more structure to the "shapeless" agricultural administration which it inherited from Stalin. The picture that emerges is a familiar one: Brezhnev avoids decentralization by throwing money at the problem,

although COFFMAN offers a more rosy portrayal of Brezhnev as a reformer than has been common since 1985. VAN ATTA traces the successive waves of experimentation with independent work teams on farms from the 1930s to the 1980s. In addition to detailing policy shifts, he shows how the issue was tied into factional politics at the Politburo level.

Moving on to labor policy, HAUSLOHNER sees the "policy immobility" of the Brezhnev period as a conscious choice -- a sort of social contract -- rather than evidence of structural decay (ch. 8). While HAUSLOHNER focuses on the center, SLIDER looks at local initiatives in labor planning. He shows convincingly that there was room for experimentation in the Brezhnev period, although in the final analysis none of the experiments actually worked. A third thesis on labor policy is RUBLE's history of Soviet trade unions, which he portrays as trapped uneasily in the dual role of servants of management and defenders of worker's interests.

HEDGES and BELANGER also provide policy case studies. HEDGES' thesis on the oil industry focuses almost exclusively on technological and organizational factors and downplays the role of political manoeuvring. BELANGER looks at the generation of foreign trade policy. He perceives an opening of the Soviet economy to the West in the 1970s which resulted in a "significant shaping of political change in the USSR" (p. 301), but he presents little evidence or argument to sustain this view.

Only two dissertations during the period address the question of law in the USSR. One of the most striking findings to emerge from ARMSTRONG's study of Soviet property law is that many post-1985 controversies have a pre-history going back to the Stalin years. Issues such as the limits on private artisan activity, the right of state enterprises to sell surplus equipment, or the ability of plan orders to override contracts, have been on and off the Soviet agenda since the 1930s. MARTENS's study of

invention law (mostly in the pre-war period) shows the naiveté of Marx's vision of mass creativity and the automatic spread of new technology in the absence of an incentive structure.

### 3. Nationalism and Dissent

Predictably enough, questions of nationality and dissent, two inextricably linked categories, generated a sizeable proportion of the theses written in the past decade. However, the geographic coverage of such theses was distinctly uneven. A great deal of attention was focused on Ukraine and Uzbekistan; nothing at all on the Baltics, the Caucasus, Belorussia, or Moldavia; and very little on the Russian provinces. (An exception would be FITZGERALD's demographically focused study of the development of Siberia.)

In the 1970s political dissent was largely pushed underground, and the theses examining oppositional activity mainly looked at ethnic-related unrest. CORCORAN took a broad brush approach, searching for patterns across the entire range of organized dissent. He points out that the only extensive movements to emerge were ethnic-based: Jews, Germans, Crimean Tatars, Meskhetians, and Lithuanians. He sees the political system as still essentially authoritarian in nature and argues, surprisingly, that dissent slowed down political change by making it more difficult for the regime to open up discussion of, say, economic decentralization, for fear of fueling nationalism (p. 413). In CORCORAN's work, written in 1977, one finds many harbingers of the ethnic explosions of 1988.

KOWALESKI analyzed 427 protest events from 1967 to 1977 in terms of location, size, theme, symbols utilized, and the response of the authorities. He finds, for example, that 62 percent were nationality-related; 46 percent took place outside the courts; the average size was 75 (with 10 percent over 1,000); and only 25 percent were not harassed by the authorities. Adopting a semiological approach, he tries to test to what extent the



adoption of symbols was a useful tactic for dissenters. He concludes that symbols may have been effective when used to mobilize support for an indirect mass protest, but not as part of a direct appeal to the authorities. PARCHOMENKO also investigates the imagery of dissent, mainly through the interpretation of the case studies of two dissidents. On the basis of interviews with 104 Jewish emigrés, GREENFIELD charts the domain of private information networks within the USSR. His material presages several of the findings of the subsequent large-scale Soviet Interview Project led by Professor James R. Millar.

Most of the theses on ethnicity zeroed in on an individual nation, but three essayed a general analysis, using aggregate data on language use, etc. EWING's thesis tests the impact of modernization on ethnicity. She concludes that urbanization and industrial development from 1959 to 1970 led to an increased Russian presence in the non-Russian regions, but did not correlate this increase with any diminution in ethnic identity. ROCKETT contrasts this pattern with American experience, where modernization has typically been seen as promoting ethnic assimilation (p. 51). RAPPOPORT similarly tests for "national integration" across the various republics by looking at every available data set from the republican statistical handbooks (air travel, inter-marriage, migration, budgetary policy, party membership, etc.). Unfortunately, many of the differences between ethnic groups are to be found *within* republics, and these are lost when aggregate data is presented, particularly when such data is normalized to allow for size differences.

Turning now to the four theses on Ukraine, FARMER offers a fairly sophisticated analysis of the symbolic politics of Ukrainian nationalism. He points out that the search for "authenticity" involved not only a drive for independence, as articulated by V. Moroz, but also a search for change within the system, as articulated by Dzuba (p. 210). BILOCERKOWYCZ covers much of the same territory, constructing a demographic profile of 210 dissidents and presenting 8 case studies. OLIVER's thesis similarly analyzes 440

biographies of nationalist leaders as well as looking at the composition of the republic's Party leadership. She finds this leadership to be heavily Ukrainianized and suggests a possible "Titoist" future for Ukraine, although this has not yet materialized (p. 277).

MOTYL draws most of his empirical material from Ukraine, but also devotes a great deal of attention to discussing the most suitable conceptual framework for exploring the dynamics of national identity in the USSR. He sees ethnic identity as something deeply rooted, not simply a response to competitive social processes triggered by modernization (p. 134).

ZIMMER and GLEASON both study the cotton empire created in Soviet Uzbekistan, which accounts for some 70 percent of the republic's GNP (GLEASON, p. 90). They conclude that the Uzbek elite basically accepted the single crop development path foisted on them by Moscow and that the ethnic mobilization predicted by "internal colonialism" models has failed to materialize. ZIMMER devotes the bulk of her thesis to a sophisticated analysis of the debate waged among the region's economists over the relative merits of monoculture versus diversification in agriculture.

SELNICK's mainly factual study looks at an aspect of Uzbek politics not closely covered in GLEASON or ZIMMER -- the ethnic composition of the republican elite. The pattern which emerges is that of an overwhelmingly indigenous political elite, with non-Uzbeks monopolizing the key *obkom* second secretary positions (ch. 7). Similarly, OLCOTT's study of the creation of modern Kazakhstan has an almost exclusively economic approach, tracing the development of agriculture in the region from nomadism to the arrival of the *kolkhozy*. The original thesis did not take the story beyond the 1930s; the book adds a chapter on the Virgin Lands campaign and subsequent developments. She shows, for example, how the Party apparatus in the republic was steadily nativized in the Brezhnev years, with the number of Slavic *obkom* first secretaries falling from 10 out of 15 to only

4 out of the same number (p. 242). However, she does not explore the cultural dynamics of Kazakh identity.

The only thesis to adopt an explicitly anthropological approach was BALZER's study of the small Khanty tribe of northern Siberia. She spent a month interviewing villagers in the field. BALZER is keen to show how the Khanty have struggled to preserve their identity through burial rituals and the like, as well as through syncretic adaptation to Russian culture. However, this reader came away with an overall impression of the tremendous impact of Russian/Soviet culture on the tribe, from forced collectivization and the persecution of shamans to weekly discos on the town square.

No theses at all seem to have been written on post-war politics in Moldavia, Belorussia, the Caucasus, or the Baltics -- a stunning gap in the light of recent developments. WILLERTON's thesis includes case studies of Lithuania and Azerbaijan, but he focuses exclusively on patronage networks and does not consider the ethnic agenda in those republics.

#### 4. Political Institutions

Remarkably few theses looked at the core institutions which form the sinews of political power in the USSR. The Party itself attracted surprisingly little attention, given its dominant role in the political system. There were also very few studies which shed light on the decision-making process in ministries and state committees.

Half a dozen theses on political institutions focused on succession issues at the apex of the political system -- the Politburo and the Central Committee. The section on quantitative methods above outlined some of the drawbacks in creating ambitious models with which to interpret the sparse data available on these institutions. These theses typically saw top Party institutions as an unstable oligarchy in which hostile factions

manoeuvre for power, using policy issues as weapons in their factional struggles. Generally speaking, these works add little information to our understanding, such as it is, of Kremlin politics.

On the other hand, there were a number of theses offering case studies of specific political institutions: WILLIAM JONES on the militia, SIEGLER on the Supreme Soviet, ZAMOSTNY on local soviets, CHOTINER's case study of the bifurcation of the Party in 1962, KAPLAN on the Party in agricultural management, and HA on the Party and economic reform.

ZAMOSTNY systematically describes the powers of local soviets and concludes that they are most effective in supervising the implementation of policy, rather than in, say, raising revenue or deliberating policy (p. 102). He accepts Hough's tentative model of "institutional pluralism"<sup>10</sup> (p. 160), but the illuminating comparisons he draws with U.S. local councils seem to indicate that local autonomy in the USSR is not as extensive as he claims.

KAPLAN's study of the role of the Party in agriculture builds upon Hough's work on regional party organs. In agriculture, unlike industry, there was no new technical elite to oversee the post-war recovery, so local Party organs found themselves drawn into a dominant role. KAPLAN'S evidence is mostly drawn from the 1946-63 period, supplemented by some general data on the educational level of key personnel in subsequent decades.

YONG CHOOL HA took the methodology used by Breslauer in his study of Brezhnev and Khrushchev and applied it to regional party officials. He read articles by *obkom* first secretaries to ascertain their attitudes toward economic reform in 1957, 1965,

---

10. J.F. Hough and M. Fainsod, *How the Soviet Union is Governed* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979), p. 526. Hough himself has stepped back from this model.

and 1973. His analysis shows the advantages of a careful qualitative reading as compared to a crude attempt to quantify articles and speeches by Soviet officials. HA shows the complexity of the issues -- Party secretaries must juggle conflicting responsibilities (political fealty, plan fulfillment, and the articulation of local interests) and voice a range of differing opinions as to the ideal type of Party intervention. The regional Party elite, therefore, was not a monolith during the Brezhnev era.

Several theses explored Soviet military policy. To some extent, the theses by NELSON and CURRIE exhibit a tendency toward over-reliance on Soviet and Marxist categories, as discussed above. CURRIE's thesis on the General Staff applies Soviet concepts of "military doctrine," "professionalism," and the interpenetration of the Party and the army (chs. 2, 4). NELSON focuses on what he sees as the constant stream of Pavlovian Marxist propaganda to which Soviet soldiers are subjected. In contrast, LATHROP tries to utilize the conceptual framework of Western military sociology (i.e., the garrison state, praetorianism, the nation-in-arms). Because he relied mainly on secondary sources, however, he fails to come up with any strikingly original arguments as to the dynamics of civil-military relations in the USSR.

## 5. Social Issues

There were remarkably few dissertations on sociological themes during the period under review. As far as this author is aware, no doctoral research was conducted on some of the most basic groups which make up Soviet society: the workers, peasants and intelligentsia! Nevertheless, a few highly informative theses were presented in the sociological field.

JONGENEL-PETERS's thoughtful study of social welfare in the USSR shows that while the system is heavily influenced by collectivist values, economic considerations have

outweighed political and cultural factors in determining the pattern of welfare provision (p. 151). There is little evidence in her thesis to support many of the common interpretations of the Soviet welfare system found in Western writing -- theories of convergence, social control, or social contract (ch. 7).

ECHOLS' thorough investigation of inequality in the provision of social services in 10 different countries shows that inequality has many diverse causes. In practice, the communist states' centralized policy-making and ideological commitment to equality do not prevail over the ethnic diversity and uneven economic development which several of these states face within their borders.

Also in the sociological field, THOMAS JONES's study of the higher education system examines such topics as student selection, the social composition of different colleges (*VUZy*), and the low importance attached to socio-political activism. He shows that the key role played by education in social stratification in the USSR has had, ironically, a negative impact on the educational system itself. Students are so keen to enter *VUZy* that they end up studying subjects they hate, while *blat* and grade inflation eat into the integrity of the system (pp. 512-15). DOBSON's thesis studied similar topics with extensive international comparisons, showing that in the 1960s the access of working class children to higher education nearly doubled in the West, while in the USSR it stayed the same or declined.

ELIZABETH KING's thesis looks at political socialization in the USSR. Of note is her reminder that courses in social science, "scientific communism," and so forth were introduced in schools and *VUZy* only after Stalin's death (pp. 86-93). Before that, classes presumably had to make do with Lenin, Stalin, and the *Short Course*. She compares Soviet and U.S. text books, finding that U.S. books emphasize problem-solving skills, while their Soviet counterparts emphasize emotional development. U.S. texts depict a pluralistic society while avoiding discussion of social conflicts; Soviet texts project a monolithic image

of their society while avoiding the sensitive question of the ethnic diversity of the USSR. CUSHMAN, too, explores the pattern of political socialization, using an original interpretation of the nature of youth involvement in political ritual.

MILLS, a former Moscow correspondent, offers an analysis of journalists as a professional group on the basis of a thorough reading of the trade monthly *Zhurnalist*. She argues that, although journalists were generally supine during the Brezhnev era, they were able to carve out various roles for themselves, such as ideological warrior, literary critic, publicist, and, to a lesser extent, investigative reporter, citizen's friend, and collective cheerleader.

Apart from BUCKLEY's work, discussed in the section "Sources and Methods," three other theses were devoted to a more empirical investigation of gender. FISHER's interesting study relies mainly on statistical argument to examine whether or not Western rational choice models apply to the Soviet "marriage market." He concludes that the pattern is "essentially similar" to that pertaining in the U.S. (p. 261): "money" triumphs over "love" when it comes to deciding who to marry. RUESCHEMEYER reaches similar conclusions about marriage patterns in the U.S., East Germany, and the USSR, on the basis of 45 interviews with emigrés from the latter two countries. The limitations of the sample make it only a study of professionals' attitudes towards marriage; the awkward situation of emigrés being asked to assess their former private and professional lives raises some doubts as to whether the responses can be generalized.

Finally, ROSENBAUM makes a careful study of gender stereotyping in children's readers in the USSR. This author found her conclusions surprising and disheartening. Texts from both the 1920s and 1970s had very rigid stereotypes of male and female characters. Occupational stereotypes were more polarized in the 1970s than in the 1920s (ch. 7). For example, 63 percent of female characters were identified in the text as

mothers, but only 15 percent of men were shown as fathers (p. 494). Her thesis is evidence of the absence of any deliberate policy to promote gender equality in USSR; the main didactic purpose of the readers was to promote a sense of moral responsibility and patriotism.

Other theses in the social arena included PETTAVINO's comparative study of the organization of sports in Cuba and the USSR. There were also many theses written in education departments on various aspects of the Soviet education system, but these were not reviewed for this article.

### **Conclusions**

The initial reaction to this study must be that the collective results of a decade of graduate work do not come close to providing us with a full understanding of how the Soviet political system worked during the Brezhnev years. There are simply too few studies based on substantial research in original sources, and too many "blank spots" in terms of subject areas left uncovered, to provide a balanced picture of Soviet political processes. There were surprising few theses on domestic politics, and most of these were written by students in graduate programs producing less than one thesis a year on Soviet affairs. On the positive side, several theses contained material worthy of publication that has not yet reached a broader audience. (For example, the theses by ALMQUIST, HA, KOWALESKI, KERNEN, ROSENBAUM, and ZIMMER.)

Safeguarding the future health of Soviet area studies is not simply a matter of enticing more warm bodies into M.A. and Ph.D. programs. The slump into which the study of Soviet politics has fallen is arguably more a matter of quality than quantity. There is a need to begin a conscious and explicit debate about the state of the discipline, with a



view towards developing a consensus on required theoretical and methodological approaches and promoting awareness of the need for cross-fertilization with scholars engaged in comparative politics. This need grows ever more acute as the Soviet system lurches in new directions.

There are crucial gaps in our knowledge of how specific Soviet institutions work, of the recent political history of whole regions of the USSR, and of the social structure of this huge and diverse nation. How can isolated scholars embark upon studies of the new parliamentary system or informal groups without prior studies of the social and political environment within which these institutions operate? Such reference points may simply not be available in Sovietological literature and cannot be conjured up overnight. In this case, the Soviet field will have to look for assistance by bringing in ideas, and perhaps scholars, from other fields of comparative politics on a more systematic basis.

Above all, future doctoral students should be encouraged to choose topics that are considered important for the functioning of the Soviet system, rather than subjects that look easily "doable" because sources are available. In the past these sources included emigré interviews, biographical data on leaders, and content analysis of leaders' speeches. Much of the research of the past decade is regrettably akin to the man who looks for his lost keys under the street light because he cannot see the pavement back down the road where he dropped them.

As for the substantive content of the theses, the overall impression, curiously, is that there were fairly lively political processes within the Brezhnevite bureaucracies. This contradicts the new conventional wisdom emanating from Moscow since 1985, which portrays the Brezhnev era as an ice-age in which nothing happened except the enrichment of a corrupt elite. Unfortunately, there is as yet insufficient research available to judge which interpretation of the "era of stagnation" is closer to the truth.

Appendix A. Theses on Comparative Politics.

---

Number of Ph.D.s submitted each year on the domestic politics of the following countries, as reported each year in the spring issue of the American Political Science Association journal, PS.

<u>Country</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
All countries	238	233	167	153	161	117	87	106	102	119	114
USSR	7	11	6	3	4	3	5	5	7	9	4
China	17	12	6	10	8	7	3	9	4	15	11
Italy	5	1	1	0	2	1	2	2	3	2	2
Brazil	4	4	6	4	4	0	2	0	5	7	7

TOTALS: USSR, 64; China, 102; Italy, 21; Brazil, 43; all countries, 1,597.

Soviet theses as a proportion of total theses: 4 percent.

---

**Appendix B. Theses on Soviet/East European Politics.**

The total number of Ph.D.s awarded in the fields of Soviet and East European politics in the US and Canada during the period 1976-1987 were:

Soviet domestic politics - 97  
Soviet foreign policy - 121  
East European politics - 145.

Tables A and B of this Appendix show the distribution among universities of this total number of theses: Table A lists the universities which awarded only one Ph.D. in any of the fields of Soviet domestic politics, Soviet foreign policy, and East European politics; Table B lists the universities which awarded more than one Ph.D. in any of the three selected fields combined.

The comprehensive list was compiled from the general listings in the annual spring issue of the American Political Science Association journal *PS* and from the articles listing dissertations in the Slavic field published annually by Jesse J. Dossick in the *Slavic Review*. (Incidentally, the *Slavic Review* listing was usually much more complete than the APSA listing, even for political science theses.) "Politics" was taken to include sociology (typically producing only 1-2 theses per year), but to exclude demography, economics, geography, and education.

It is entirely possible that not *all* theses were reported in these two sources. However, there is no reason to believe that a substantial number of theses failed to be recorded in either of these sources.

**Appendix B - Table A**  
**Political Science Theses Awarded by University: 1976-1987**  
**(Universities Awarding only one Ph.D.)**

---

The following universities awarded only one Ph.D. in any of the three fields over the course of the decade:

**Universities with one Ph.D. awarded in Soviet domestic politics:**

Brandeis; Bryn Mawr; California, Davis; Miami, Ohio; Missouri, Columbia; Texas, Austin.

**Universities with one Ph.D. awarded in Soviet foreign policy:**

Ball State; Cincinnati; Connecticut; Georgia; Hawaii; Kent State; Montana; New Orleans; Rand; SUNY Binghamton.

**Universities with one Ph.D. awarded in East European politics:**

Arizona; Brown; California, Irvine; Carnegie Mellon; Catholic; Colorado State; Kentucky; Mississippi State; Nebraska; New Hampshire; Oregon; Rice; Rutgers; Temple; Washington University, St. Louis.

---

**Appendix B - Table B**  
**Political Science Theses Awarded by University: 1976-1987**  
**(Universities Awarding More than 1 Ph.D.)**

UNIVERSITY:	FIELD:			Total
	USSR/Domestic	USSR/Foreign	East Europe	
Columbia	8	13	8	29
Georgetown	9	7	2	18
Harvard	5	6	7	18
Michigan	4	5	5	14
George Washington	6	3	4	13
Virginia	1	5	6	12
California, Berkeley	3	3	5	11
Wisconsin, Madison	3	1	7	11
Massachusetts	0	3	7	10
American	1	5	3	9
Indiana	3	1	5	9
Kansas	3	1	5	9
MIT	2	5	2	9
Tufts	1	7	1	9
Southern California	0	7	1	8
Miami (Florida)	0	7	0	7
Ohio State	3	2	2	7
Pennsylvania	1	3	3	7
Yale	3	1	3	7
Chicago	2	2	2	6
Illinois	3	2	1	6
Johns Hopkins	1	4	1	6
New School	0	1	4	5
North Carolina	1	0	4	5
Pennsylvania State	0	2	3	5
South Carolina	0	1	4	5
Stanford	1	1	3	5
SUNY Buffalo	3	0	2	5
Claremont	1	3	0	4
Iowa	0	0	4	4
New York University	0	0	4	4
Northwestern	0	0	4	4
Notre Dame	3	0	1	4
Pittsburgh	0	2	2	4
Princeton	3	0	1	4
Boston	0	0	3	3
Cornell	1	1	1	3
Toronto	2	0	1	3
UCLA	0	0	3	3
California, San Diego	0	0	2	2
Colorado	2	0	0	2
CUNY	0	2	0	2
Denver	1	0	1	2
Duke	0	1	1	2
Florida State	0	2	0	2
Howard	0	2	0	2
Michigan State	2	0	0	2
Oklahoma	2	0	0	2
Vanderbilt	2	0	0	2
Washington, Seattle	0	0	2	2

Appendix C.

**Theses on East European Politics by Subject and Country, 1976-1987**

---

	<u>military/foreign policy</u>	<u>social/political</u>	<u>economic policy</u>	<u>total</u>
<b>Bulgaria</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Czechoslovakia</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>East Germany</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Hungary</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Poland</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Romania</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Yugoslavia</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Eastern Europe as a whole</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b><u>15</u></b>
			<b>Total:</b>	<b>145</b>

---

Source: Same as for Appendix B.

**Appendix D.**

**Theses On Soviet/East European Economics**

---

**(N=87)**

**The number of theses awarded in the field of Soviet/East European economics, as recorded in annual articles by Jesse J. Dossick in the Slavic Review, 1976-1987:**

**Universities awarding 5 Ph.D.s: Columbia; Duke; California, Berkeley.**

**Universities awarding 4 Ph.D.s: Washington, Seattle.**

**Universities awarding 3 Ph.D.s: Indiana; North Carolina; Michigan.**

**Universities awarding 2 Ph.D.s: Georgetown; Houston; Illinois; Kent State; Ohio State; Pennsylvania; Tufts.**

**Universities awarding one Ph.D.: American; Arizona; Boston; Boston College; Calgary; Chicago; Harvard; Johns Hopkins; Michigan State; Minnesota; Missouri; MIT; New School; Northwestern; Rand; Toronto; George Washington.**

---

### Appendix E. Bibliography of Theses Read by Author.

N=87. All theses were defended in politics or political science departments, unless otherwise stated. Of the 87 theses, 23 were written by women.

Almquist, Peter B. "Organization and Influence of Soviet Military Industry, 1965-82," Ph.D. diss., MIT, 1987.

Armstrong, George M. "The Right to Control Property and the Construction of Communism: Property in the USSR," Ph.D. diss., Princeton, 1982. Subsequent publication: *The Soviet Law of Property* (London: M. Nijhoff, 1983).

Asptore, Jilleen. "Military-Patriotic Themes in Soviet Textbooks and Children's Literature," Ph.D. diss., Georgetown, 1986.

Azarenko, Jury. "The Russian Liberation Movement During World War II: Historical Accounts," Ph.D. diss., Georgetown, (Russian), 1984.

Balzer, Marjorie M. "Strategies of Ethnic Survival: Interaction of Russians and Khanty (Ostiaks) in Twentieth Century Siberia," Bryn Mawr, 1978.

Bahry, Donna L. "Republic Politics and Federal Budget Policy in the USSR," Ph.D. diss., Illinois, 1977. Subsequent publication: *Outside Moscow* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987).

Barber, James P. "The Delivery of Soviet and American Vocational Services: Policy, Implementation, Outcomes," Ph.D. diss., MIT, 1978.

Beissinger, Mark R. "The Politics of Convergence: The Diffusion of Western Management Ideas in the Soviet Union," Ph.D. diss., Harvard, 1982. Subsequent publication: *Scientific Management, Socialist Discipline and Soviet Power* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988).

Belanger, William. J. "The Offshore Experiment: Foreign Economic Relations and Political Change in the USSR, 1969-83," Ph.D. diss., Stanford, 1986.

Betit, Eugene de Friest. "The Committee of People's Control: The Soviet Road to Communism," Ph.D. diss., Georgetown, 1977.

Bilocerkowycz, Jaroslaw M. "Soviet Ukrainian Dissent: A Study of Political Alienation," Ph.D. diss., University of Washington, Seattle, 1983. Subsequent publication: *Soviet Ukrainian Dissent* (Boulder, Co.: Westview Press, 1988).

Blough, Roger. A. "The Politburo and the Making of Soviet Economic Policy," Ph.D. diss., Ohio State, 1984.

Bough, B. Edward. "The Problem of Djugashvili: The Stalin Issue in Soviet Politics," Ph.D. diss., George Washington, 1977.

Bruce, James B. "The Politics of Soviet Policy Formation," Ph.D. diss., University of Denver, 1976.

Bova, Russell. "Collectivism in the Workplace," Ph.D. diss., Indiana, 1985.

Buckley, Mary. "Ideology and Soviet Women," Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt, 1981. Subsequent publication: *Woman and Ideology in the Soviet Union* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1989).

Bunce, Valerie J. "Elite Succession and Policy Change in Communist and Democratic Systems," Ph.D. diss., Michigan, 1976. Subsequent publication: *Do New Leaders Make a Difference? Executive Succession and Public Policy under Capitalism and Socialism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981).

- Chotiner, Barbara A. "The 1962 Reorganization of the CPSU," Ph.D. diss., Columbia, 1977. Subsequent publication: *Khrushchev's Party Reform: Coalition Building and Institutional Innovation* (Westport, CT.: Greenwood Press, 1984).
- Coan, Ronald W. "Bureaucratic Politics and Administrative Reorganization: Three Models of Soviet Political Development," Ph.D. diss., Miami University, Ohio, 1977.
- Coffman, Richard W. "The Grand Design: Agricultural Development and Political Change During the Brezhnev Era," Ph.D. diss., Columbia, 1984.
- Corcoran, Edward A. "Dissent in the Soviet Union: The Group Basis and Dynamics of Internal Opposition," Ph. diss., Columbia, 1977.
- Cox, Channing H. "Legitimacy and the Soviet International Perspective," Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1979.
- Currie, Kenneth M. "The Soviet General Staff," Ph. diss., George Washington, 1987.
- Cushman, Thomas O. "Ritual and the Sacralization of the Secular: Social Sources of Conformity and Order in Soviet Society," Ph.D. diss., Virginia, (Sociology), 1987.
- de Bardeleben, Joan. "Theoretical and Ideological Discussion of Environmental Problems in the Soviet Union and East Germany," Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1979.
- DiEugonio, Richard D. "An Analysis of the Central Committee CPSU 1952-76: A Perspective on the Correlates of Power," Ph.D. diss., Georgetown, 1978.
- Dobson, Richard B. "Social Influences on Educational Attainment in Soviet Russia," Ph.D. diss., Harvard, (Sociology), 1977.
- Dreifelds, Juris. "Policy Making and Participation in Environmental Policy in Latvia," Ph.D. diss., Toronto, 1978.
- Echols, John M. "Politics, Policy and Equality under Communism and Democracy," Ph.D. diss., Michigan, 1976.
- Evangelista, Matthew. "Technological Innovation and the Arms Race: A Comparative Study of Soviet and American Decisions on Tactical Nuclear Weapons," Ph.D. diss., Michigan, 1986. Subsequent publication: *Innovation and the Arms Race: How the US and Soviet Union Develop New Military Technologies* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988).
- Evanson, Robert K. "Political Terror in Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union: A Study in Comparative Communism," Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1979.
- Ewing, Catherine V. "Socio-Economic Modernization and the Unification of Linguistic Minorities in the USSR," Ph.D. diss., Oklahoma, 1977.
- Farmer, Kenneth C. "Ukrainian Nationalism and Soviet Nationalities Policy 1952-72," Ph.D. diss., Wisconsin, Madison, 1977. Subsequent publication: *Ukrainian Nationalism in the Post-Stalin Era: Myths, Symbols and Ideology in Soviet Nationalities Policy* (London: M. Nijhoff, 1980).
- Fisher, Wesley A. "The Soviet Marriage Market: Marriage Patterns in the USSR since World War Two," Ph.D. diss., Columbia (Sociology), 1976. Subsequent publication: *The Soviet Marriage Market: Mate Selection in Russia and the USSR* (New York: Praeger, 1980).
- Fitzgerald, John F. "The Interaction of Demographic Trends in Siberia and Developmental Policy as a Problem for the Soviet Government 1959-75," Ph.D. diss., Notre Dame, (Sociology), 1977.



- Gleason, Gregory W. "Between Moscow and Tashkent: The Politics of the Uzbek Cotton Production Complex," Ph.D. diss., University of California, Davis, 1984. Subsequent publication: *National Federalism in the USSR* (Boulder, Co.: Westview Press, 1988).
- Green, Steven J. "Political Communication in the Soviet Media," Ph.D. diss., Michigan State, 1986.
- Greenfield, Mark J. "The Private Zone: A Development in Soviet Political Communication since Stalin," Ph.D. diss., Oklahoma, 1981.
- Ha, Yong Chool. "The Party and Economic Reform," Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1985.
- Hauslohner, Peter A. "Managing the Soviet Labor Market: Politics and Policymaking under Brezhnev," Ph.D. diss., Michigan, 1984.
- Hedges, Lawrence R. "Politics and Technology in the Soviet Petroleum Industry: The Record of the Seventies and the Challenge of the Eighties," Ph.D. diss., American University (International Relations), 1982.
- Jones, William M. "Maintaining Order in the Soviet Union: The Militia and the MVD in the Post-Khrushchev Era," Ph.D. diss., Duke, 1976.
- Jones, Thomas A. "Higher Education and Social Stratification in the Soviet Union," Ph.D. diss., Princeton (Sociology), 1977.
- Jongeneel-Peters, Susan E. "Social Welfare in the USSR," Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt (Sociology), 1986.
- Kaplan, Cynthia S. "The Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the Implementation of Industrial and Agricultural Policy: Leningrad, 1946-53," Ph.D. diss., Columbia, 1981. Subsequent publication: *The Party and Agricultural Crisis Management in the USSR* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987).
- Kernen, Beat R. "Soviet Agricultural Output: A Descriptive and Analytical Examination of Geographical, Technological and Socio-Political Determinants, with Special Reference to Crops," Ph.D. diss., Kansas, 1986.
- King, Elizabeth. "The Teaching of Social Science as a Tool of Political Socialization in the USSR," Ph.D. diss., University of Missouri, Columbia, 1978.
- King, Marshall R. "Political Recruitment in a Mono-Organizational Setting: The Soviet Central Party Leadership in the Post-Stalin Period," Ph.D. diss., SUNY, Buffalo, 1980.
- Knarr, John R. "Population Politics and the Soviet Polity," Ph.D. diss., UCLA, 1977.
- Kowaleski, David A. "The Protest Uses of Symbolic Politics: The Functions of Symbolic Resources for Protest Groups in the Soviet Union," Ph.D. diss., Kansas, 1978.
- Lathrop, Gregory L. "Soviet Civil-Military Relations: Integration on the Mass Level," Ph.D. diss., Notre Dame, 1979.
- Longo, Maria L. "Developed Socialism: A Framework for Soviet Bloc Relations?," Ph.D. diss., George Washington, 1981.
- Lork, A. Wayne. "Foreign Policy and the Struggle for Power in the USSR, 1953-56," Ph.D. diss., Georgetown (History), 1978.
- Martens, John A. "Development of the Soviet Law on Inventions, 1919-59," Ph.D. diss., Notre Dame, 1977.
- McCain, Morris A. "The Changing Soviet Polity: Specialist Elites in Legal Reform," Ph.D. diss., Yale, 1979.

- Mills, Rilla Dean. "The Soviet Journalist: A Cultural Analysis," Ph.D. diss., Illinois (Communications), 1981.
- Motyl, Alexander J. "The Ethnic Stability of the Soviet Multinational State," Ph.D. diss., Columbia, 1984.  
Subsequent publication: *Will the Non-Russians Rebel?* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987).
- Nelson, Gail H. "Ideological Constraints on Soviet Decision-Making for Defense," Ph.D. diss., University of Colorado, Boulder, 1979.
- Olcott, Martha B. "Socio-Economic Changes and Political Development in Soviet Central Asia," Ph.D. diss., Chicago, 1978. Subsequent publication: *The Kazakhs* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1987).
- Oliver, Linda K. "Ukrainian Nationalism in the 1970s," Ph.D. diss., Indiana (History), 1981.
- Paltiel, Jeremy J. "De-Stalinization and De-Maoization: Leadership in the Institutionalizing Leninist Regime," Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1984.
- Parchomenko, Walter. "Soviet Official Images of Dissidents and Nonconformists," Ph.D. diss., Georgetown, 1984.
- Pettavino, Paula J. "The Politics of Sport under Communism: A Comparative Study of Competitive Athletics in the Soviet Union and Cuba," Ph.D. diss., Notre Dame, 1982.
- Ra'anana, Gavriel D. "Factions and Their "Debates" over International Policy during the Zhdanovschina Ramifications for Ruling and Non-ruling Communist Parties," Ph.D. diss., Tufts, 1980. Subsequent publication: *International Policy Formation in the USSR: Factional Debates During the "Zhdanovshchina"* (Hamden, CT.: Archon Books, 1983).
- Rappoport, Ann L. "Soviet Policies Towards its Union Republics: A Compositional Analysis of "National Integration," " Ph.D. diss., Ohio State, 1978.
- Rhodes, Mark S. "Letters to the Editor in the USSR: A Study of Letters, Authors and Potential Uses," Ph.D. diss., Michigan State, 1977.
- Richmond, Nathaniel I. "Cyclical, Linear and Dialectical Models of Soviet Leadership Politics: The Brezhnev Period," Ph.D. diss., George Washington, 1986.
- Rocca, Gordon L. "Policy Sciences in the USSR: The Case of Soviet Social Prognostics," Ph.D. diss., George Washington, 1978.
- Rockett, Rocky L. "Ethnic Nationalities in the Soviet Union: Sociological Perspectives on an Historical Problem," Ph.D. diss., University of Texas, Austin (Sociology), 1979.
- Rosenbaum, Mollie Schwarz. "Women's Place and Cultural Values in Soviet Children's Readers: An Historical Analysis of the Maintenance of Role Division by Gender in the 1920s and 1970s," Ph.D. diss., Pennsylvania (History), 1981.
- Ruble, Blair A. "Soviet Trade Unions: Changing Balances in their Functions," Ph.D. diss., Toronto, 1977.  
Subsequent publication: *Soviet Trade Unions: Their Development in the 1980s* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981).
- Rueschemeyer, Marilyn R. "Personal Life and the Demands of Work: An Exploratory Study of Professional Men and Women in the US and Two Socialist Societies," Ph.D. diss., Brandeis, 1978. Subsequent publication: *Professional Work and Marriage: An East-West Comparison* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981).
- Samadani, Seyyed-Abolghassem. "The Federalism of the Soviet Union," Ph.D. diss., Claremont, 1979.

- Sanjian, Andrea Stevenson. "The Development of Administrative Science in the USSR," Ph.D. diss., Indiana, 1983.
- Sawyer, Thomas E. "The Jewish Minority in the Soviet Union: A Critical Study," Ph.D. diss., Georgetown, 1978. Subsequent publication: *The Jewish Minority in the Soviet Union* (Boulder, Co.: Westview Press, 1979).
- Selnick, Irwin S. "The Ethnic and Political Determinants of Elite Recruitment in the Soviet National Republics: The Uzbek Soviet Elite 1952-81," Ph.D. diss., Columbia, 1984.
- Siegler, Robert W. "The Standing Commission System of the Supreme Soviet: An Analysis of Adaptation to Changes in the Governmental Sector of the USSR's Cooptative Technobureaucracy," Ph.D. diss., SUNY, Buffalo, 1981. Subsequent publication: *The Standing Commissions of the Supreme Soviet: Effective Cooptation* (New York: Praeger, 1982).
- Slider, Darrell L. "Social Experiments and Soviet Policy Making," Ph.D. diss., Yale, 1981.
- Thompson, Terry L. "Developed Socialism: Soviet Politics and Ideology under Brezhnev," Ph.D. diss., Georgetown, 1985. Subsequent publication: *Soviet Ideology from Khrushchev to Gorbachev: Developed Socialism Under Brezhnev* (Boulder, Co.: Westview Press, 1988).
- Urban, Michael E. "Ideology and Administration in the US and Soviet Union," Ph.D. diss., Kansas 1976. Subsequent publication: *The Ideology of Administration: Soviet and American Cases* (New York: SUNY Press, 1982).
- Van Atta, Donald A. "Transmission Failure: Campaigns to Reorganize Agricultural Production Brigades in the Soviet Union," Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1984.
- Vidmer, Richard F. "The Science of Management in the USSR: Emulation and the Role of Americanizers," Ph.D. diss., Michigan, 1978. Subsequent publication (with James C. Thompson): *Administrative Science and Politics in the USSR and US: Soviet Responses to American Management Techniques* (New York: Praeger, 1983).
- Willerton, John P. "Patronage and Politics in the Soviet Union," Ph.D. diss., Michigan, 1985.
- Zamostny, Thomas J. "Legislative Authority in Soviet Local Government: Soviets and their Standing Commissions," Ph.D. diss., Ohio State, 1978.
- Ziegler, Charles E. "Disaggregated Pluralism in a Socialist System: Environmental Policy in the USSR," Ph.D. diss., Illinois, 1979. Subsequent publication: *Environmental Policy in the USSR* (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987).
- Zimmer, Terese S. "The Politics of Regional Development in the USSR: The Case of Uzbekistan," Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins, 1983.
- Zubek, Wojtek. "Soviet Industrial Theory," Ph.D. diss., SUNY, Buffalo, 1983. Subsequent publication: *Soviet Industrial Theory* (New York: P. Lang, 1984).

#### Appendix F. Political Science Theses on Historical Topics.

N=10. The following theses were defended in political science departments, but were not read for this article because their subject matter was primarily historical (pre-1941).

Cook, Linda J. "Political Mobilization Strategies in the Stalinist "Revolution from Above"," Ph.D. diss., Columbia, 1985.

Fierman, William. "Nationalism, Language Planning and Development in Soviet Uzbekistan," Ph.D. diss., Harvard, 1979.

Patrick Flaherty, A. "Lenin, Bolshevism and the Origins of Stalinism," Ph.D. diss., Harvard, 1984.

Josephson, Paul R. "The Leningrad Physico-Technical Institute and the Birth of Russian Physics," Ph.D. diss., MIT, 1987.

Kim, Boo Ki. "Stalin's Idea of the New Forms of a Bond," Ph.D. diss., Columbia, 1986.

Lih, Lars T. "Bread and Authority in Russia: Food Supply and Revolutionary Politics 1914-21," Ph.D. diss., Princeton, 1983. Subsequent publication: *Bread and Authority in Russia, 1914-21* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990).

Remington, Thomas F. "Democracy and Development in Bolshevik Socialism, 1917-21," Ph.D. diss., Yale, 1978. Subsequent publication: *Building Socialism in Bolshevik Russia: Ideology and Industrial Organization, 1917-21* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1984).

Sochor, Zenovia A. "Modernization and Socialist Transformation: Leninist and Bogdanovist Alternatives of the Cultural Revolution," Ph.D. diss., Columbia, 1977. Subsequent publication: *Revolution and Culture: The Lenin-Bogdanov Controversy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986).

Stetten, Nancy. "The National Question and the Russian Civil War," Ph.D. diss., Chicago, 1977.

Tsyarkin, Mikail. "The Origins of the Soviet Military Research and Development System 1917-41," Ph.D. diss., Harvard, 1985.