East European Studies in Transition
A Survey of Nine Institutes

This survey has been designed by the editors of BOI 18. The goal is to present an overview of the assessments of nine institutes involved in East European Studies:

- Centre for Russian and East European Studies (CREES) of the University of Birmingham, UK;
- Centre for Russian and East European Studies at Pittsburgh University, USA;
- Columbia University Institute for East Central Europe, New York, USA;
- Faculty of Political Sciences and Sociology, European University at St. Petersburg, Russia;
- School for Slavonic and Eastern European Studies, London,
- Finnish Centre for Russian and East European Studies, University of Helsinki, Finland;
- Davis Center for Russian Studies, Harvard University, USA;
- Institute of East European Studies, Free University, Berlin; and
- Center for Russian AND East European Studies; Stanford University, USA

We think that the answers, taken together, present an excellent picture of the development and the state of affairs of institutionalized area studies related to Eastern Europe. Comments are most welcome.

The following questions were put forward:

1. What do the collapse of the USSR; the end of the East-West conflict; and the new global environment (globalization) mean for area studies in general, and for East European studies in particular?

2. What kind of changes – if any – in your curricula, research programs and personnel policy has your institute/ department introduced since 1991 to cope with this new situation?

3. What kind of relationship – co-existence, integration, competition, other – between regional studies and disciplines is prevalent in your institute/ department?

4. How has your budget/ funding situation evolved over the last ten years? Especially regarding institutional sources and acquisition of external funds?

5. For what kind of professional career are your students being prepared? Do you know – or do you have informed guesses – where they go after university?

Please find the answers below. This survey permits an interesting comparison of recent post-cold-war developments in East European Studies. Detailed informations about the Institutes have been attached at the end of the answers.

Klaus Segbers

Responses

The Centre for Russian and East European Studies (CREES) of the University of Birmingham, UK

Philip Hanson, Director (p.hanson@bham.ac.uk)

Background. CREES is a department within the university's School of Social Sciences. It is also part of the university's new European Research Institute, officially opened in November 2001 by Prime Minister Blair. Unlike similarly-titled centres in US universities, CREES is not an umbrella organisation for teaching and research staff on the payroll of discipline departments. It is a department in its own right, with its own payroll, working alongside departments of Economics, Politics, etc. In recent years it has had a 'core' teaching staff of 10–11, whose salaries are funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) as part of the core university budget. Research fellows, paid from 'outside' (though mostly government-financed) project funds have recently been 5–7 in number. The disciplines covered are Economics, Politics, Sociology and Modern History.

In the national research assessment exercises (RAEs) that are conducted every five years, CREES has so far (most recently in 2001) received the highest possible rating. In the university's own internal financial planning, however, available funding is determined chiefly by student numbers. From that perspective CREES has been a (small) budgetary headache for the university, performing far less well than, say, Economics, for many years. That is a problem that goes back to long before the collapse of communism.

Our research and teaching have over the years been heavily weighted in favour of the USSR/Russia. Currently we have significant expertise on Ukraine, Poland, Hungary and Romania, and on EU eastwards enlargement, but Russia looms larger than any other country in our work.

Question 1

In Britain funding for Russian and East European Studies was not as closely related to security concerns before 1990-92 as it was in the US. There was a tradition of area studies that was, and in some contexts still is, considered to constitute a 'discipline' of its own. The collapse of communist rule in Europe did not therefore lead in any direct way to a reduction in public support for the field in Britain. There is however a general (global?) tendency in the academic world to treat the technical skills of individual social-science disciplines as paramount. In Britain there has also been greatly reduced university finance per student taught. These two factors, and not the collapse of communism, have recently been the most significant influences on our organization and finances. What the collapse of communist rule in Europe has done, in our neck of the woods, is primarily to alter CREES social scientists' research and teaching agendas.

Question 2

Changes in our research agenda have been massive. Even the CREES historians concerned with the Soviet period now deal with new sources and some new questions. For the social scientists concerned with the very recent past and with forward assessments, the changes are huge. For example, work on regional patterns of economic adjustment in Russia has become both feasible and of great interest. Core general questions in my own field have shifted from (for example) measuring and accounting for the slowdown in Soviet economic growth to (for example) assessing the influence of initial conditions on national outcomes in economic transformation.

Two developments identified in our field several years ago by James Millar have certainly played a part as well: the rise of the 'upstart natives' (social scientists born and bred in the countries we study and who have acquired Western technical training) and the invasion from the mainstream (social scientists who are not specialists in 'our' area but who have lately found it interesting and have moved in).

All of these developments have kept us on our toes, shaped our research agenda and been reflected in our teaching. In both research and teaching we emphasise comparative analysis, both across ex-communist countries and between ex-communist and other countries, more than before, but I believe this is more the result of developments in our disciplines than of the changes in the region studied.

In general, changes in curricula reflect our greatly changed portfolio of research topics. So far as curricula are concerned (for both undergraduates and postgraduates), we treat a grounding in the communist past as still necessary for understanding the present. We still treat language training, also, as crucial for undergraduates specializing in Russian and East European Studies, and of course for postgraduates. At the same time, the nature of 'social science Russian', specialized training in which was pioneered (at least within the English-speaking world) at CREES, has changed dramatically.

In the 1990s the core personnel of the Centre changed little in disciplinary profile but substantially in age-profile: relatively young staff now predominate. That has helped enormously in the Centre's capacity to deal with the changes in the FSU and Central-Eastern Europe. It has not come about because of those changes.

Question 3

At any British university competition between (a) budget centres and (b) departments within those budget centres that contain several departments is normally about resources. Those resources come predominantly from HEFCE and, in one form or another, even more predominantly from central government in general. Few units on any British campus are in a position where they are financially independent of central government. This fact of life hampers some sorts of inter-departmental cooperation such as sharing the teaching of large numbers of students. Given all that, we find ourselves nonetheless cooperating more closely than before with discipline departments. I attribute this to research on our part of the world becoming more exciting intellectually and more accessible than it was in communist times.

One major development at Birmingham is the creation of the new European Research Institute (ERI). It contains CREES and the Institute for German Studies (IGS) and facilitates cooperation on what might be called pan-European research and teaching among CREES, IGS, Economics, Politics and other staff.

Question 4

The stock of CREES's externally-funded research contracts being undertaken in 1990–91 (total value, not annual flow) was L743,550. In 2001–02 it was L912,490. Adjusting roughly for inflation (using the GDP deflator, which rose 37.3% from 1990 to 2001), that is a modest decline in real terms of just over 10%. CREES continues nonetheless to have much larger external research funding per head of 'core' staff than most social science or History departments in the UK.

Britain's Economic and Social Research Council continues to be the source of funding for most of our projects (which means they are 'academic' in character and gained in open competition). But we also have, for example, a UK government contract related to export controls, and in the recent past some technical assistance projects (Tacis, UK Know How Fund). A new development is a major grant application under the EU's Fifth Framework programme. Cooperation with other departments in grant applications,

though still underdeveloped, is now more seriously discussed and is more likely to happen than before.

Question 5

Our specialist undergraduates are few in number and mostly British. Some go into jobs unrelated to our region of study. One (from last year) is with strana.ru. Our Master's degree students (lately about ten a year) and doctoral students (23 currently registered) of very recent times have included people from Japan, Turkey, Russia, Bulgaria, France and Germany. Some go into back-office work in the financial sector, some into government work relating to Russia and Central-eastern Europe (e.g., the Japanese board for academic exchanges, Japanese Eximbank, German Foreign Ministry, BBC Monitoring), some into academic posts (including in the most recent cohort positions in departments of History, Sociology and Politics – NOT area studies, except for two now working as research fellows in CREES itself). Some go into the NGO sector – not necessarily working on our region.

Coda. After re-reading the text above, I fear it may seem rather complacent. I would guess that most of the countries we study will in time become more like the countries we live in than they used to be. Some may merit special study in academic settings for a long time to come; others will not. The need for economists, political scientists, sociologists and historians from countries outside our region of study to be specially trained to have a systematic knowledge of that region's languages, histories and culture may perhaps be less than it now is. For the time being, the changes under way in the region merit a lot of attention on both intellectual and policy grounds, and require special training on top of the standard discipline training. That may not be the case in twenty years' time.

Meanwhile it is worth remembering that the academic world of the social sciences has its own resource coalitions and its own fashions. These shape our activities – sometimes, it seems, regardless of all the dramatic changes going on in the world we study.

The Centre for Russian and East European Studies at Pittsburgh University, USA

Robert Hayden, Director (r.hayden@ucis.pitt.edu)

Question 1

The changes brought about by the end of the cold war and globalization, have been evolutionary rather than radical at the University of Pittsburgh. At first, enrollments in Russian language classes decreased at the undergraduate level, but not graduate, but they have since returned almost to their high point in the early 1990s. On the other hand, enrollments in non-language courses, both introductory culture classes and at the graduate level, have increased.

Pittsburgh has always maintained a balance between Russian and East European Studies. Hence, the program has a relatively large number of East European specialists, and there was an increase in course offerings and research in such areas as the impact of the expansion European Union or the conflicts in Southeastern Europe. It is important to note that many new courses and research came via expanded contacts with professional schools: a joint MBA program with the business school and new exchanges and a joint certificate program with the law school. The addition of a Byzantine Studies program, however, is based largely on the arts and sciences.

The increased flow of scholars from the area has been beneficial, and the increased opportunities to have Pittsburgh faculty from non-traditional disciplines travel to eastern Europe have created opportunities to expand the program's academic base.

Question 2

The radically changed nature of security studies since 1991 has had little impact because the courses and research at the University of Pittsburgh did not have an over-emphasis on purely military issues. However, new courses and research in the area of international crime, the environment, and above all nationalism and global economics have been developed.

There was a change in student composition in that many more students were born in the region and have native language abilities.

More graduate students are in the professional schools, particularly publicaffairs, business and law, and our Center has established joint programs with these schools. Two new programs were established with business and law, and the business school established two programs in eastern Europe. Addition faculty was appointed in the professional schools while the number of arts and sciences faculty was modestly reduced.

Question 3

Relations with departments that have been traditionally the core of the program remain strong. There has been increased activity with other area-studies centers, especially West European Studies, because of globalization, and in the case of eastern European studies, EU expansion.

Pittsburgh areas studies programs have always operated under the principle that faculty and graduate students should be BOTH area specialists and experts in their own disciplines. Thus our center offers a Certificate in Russian or East European studies, but not a degree. However, there is a discernable change in the focus of graduate student research, especially in political science and economics

towards focusing, slightly less on area studies and more on global or international issues.

Question 4

University support in areas such as small grants for research and additional faculty in professional schools has increased, but not in other areas, such as faculty support in the humanities and for instruction in the less commonly taught languages.

Government support has increased because Pittsburgh's REES program has aggressively sought and obtained grants for a variety of activities. These include undergraduate student exchanges, two programs with the law school, and other joint exchange and research activities. The program's largest single source of external support, the National Resource Center grant, is from the federal government, and it has been increased. Private support has modestly, but not significantly, increased.

Question 5

The careers of BA students are predominantly in the private sector, with pursuing further education a close second.

The vast majority of the MA students in the arts and sciences continue their education for a Ph.D.

Roughly half of the MA students in the professional schools seek employment in the private sector. This figure is much higher for the business and law schools. However, a majority of students in public affairs work for the government (US and foreign) or NGOs, which has seen a large increase since the mid-1990s. A majority of the MA students in education are employed by school districts, foreign and domestic.

The majority of the Ph.D. graduates are professors at the college level. However, a significant minority are employed by governments or research institutions.

The Columbia University Institute for East Central Europe, New York, USA

Catharine Theime Nepomnyashchy, Director (ch29@columbia.edu)

Question 1

The Harriman Institute, formerly the Russian Institute and then the W. Averell Harriman Institute for Advanced Study of the Soviet Union, merged in 1997 with Columbia University's Institute on East Central Europe. While the two institutions had cooperated closely in the past, sharing the twelfth floor of the International Affairs Building at Columbia University, this new union has further cemented that close relationship. Most recently, in 2000, we were joined on the twelfth floor by the newly founded Institute for the Study of Europe. Together we cover the expanse of Eurasia from Rejkjavik to Vladivostok, and our geographical proximity at Columbia facilitates intellectual interaction between our regions. Moreover, the flexible institutional structure which creates links between us – John Micgiel serves simultaneously as the Director of the East Central European Center, Associate Director of the Harriman Institute, Executive Director of the Institute for the Study of Europe, and Director of both federally funded East European and West European National Resource Centers – mirrors, I believe, the new flexibility for regions and subregions to interact that is already beginning to characterize the more robust and intellectually vibrant model of area studies emerging for the twenty-first century.

The collapse of the USSR, and with it of the oversimplified and therefore intellectually flimsy division of the world into a bipolar model, along with the complementary ascendency of the new global environment, demand flexibility in order to respond to the corresponding challenges these developments have posed to area studies. These challenges fall into two large categories. On the one hand, for the Harriman Institute, whose region covers the territory of the Former Soviet Union, the Eastern Bloc, and the Balkans, it becomes less and less tenable to argue that the „communist experiment" remains the defining historical experience that unites our sprawling region. Consequently, we need a more complex, but at the same time a more intellectually and practically viable understanding of the „area" in area studies.

The most striking development at the Harriman Institute has been the growth in the number of students whose primary interest is in the Balkans, East Central Europe, the Caucasus, or Central Asia. Given that the preponderance of resources in the region has traditionally gone to the training of Russianists, we currently face an extraordinary challenge in terms of being able to respond with the appropriate faculty and other resources to the expanding number of subdivisions and competing geopolitical focuses within our region. On the other hand, there is a dangerous tendency on the part of scholars and academic administrators alike to respond to this increasing regional complexity by giving in to the seduction of globally applicable theories and global studies. This is especially disturbing for us in New York City and in the United States in the wake of September 11, which has thrown into relief the desperate shortage of and need for regional specialists competent not just in the languages but in the deeper cultural and political discourses of regions that have emerged with new and dangerous prominence on the world political scene. We responded and continue to respond to the aftermath of September 11 by arranging events that bring together specialists from different regional institutes. Certainly this model of cooperation will have to become one of the defining principles of the new area studies opening up exciting new vistas for comparative area studies, which will allow us to bring together depth of

regional knowledge in two or more subregions within the territory we cover or even between regions geographically, culturally, and historically far removed from on another. As distant points on the globe are drawn closer together by media and movements, area studies will have to meet the challenge on its own terms and without sacrificing depth and specificity.

Question 2

The primary change the Harriman Institute has made has been to institute a course called the Harriman Core Colloquium, „Legacies of Empire and the Soviet Union," which all graduate students working to receive the Harriman Institute Certificate are required to take. The course is arranged topically and covers extensive weekly readings which span the range of disciplines that made up Soviet studies. The course, which was first offered in 1993, was originally conceived as an introduction to Soviet and Russian studies and their legacy in the post-Soviet period, and the reading list originally consisted of „classics" from those fields. The course has evolved as we have moved further from the Soviet experience. As scholarly publishing began to keep better pace with changes in the region, we continue to add more up to date readings to the list which seem to have more potent explanatory value for the present while removing readings that had only „historical" importance. More recently, the increasing interest among students in East Central Europe, the Balkans, the Caucasus, and Central Asia have placed a further strain on both instructors and readings. We are currently considering making a second semester of the course, devoted almost exclusively to East Central Europe, required as well. The most important function of this course, however, is to bring together a diverse group of students, including students working for the Masters of International Affairs in the School of Public Affairs and students working for the Ph.D. in disciplinary departments of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. It has been both a stimulating and at times frustrating experience for instructors and students alike as they have struggled to communicate across disciplinary boundaries. Most important, it is a defining experience in area studies for all students who graduate from the institute.

Question 3

Because of the complex structure of Columbia University, it would take much more space than I have to answer this question exhaustively. In brief, the Harriman Institute is an umbrella organization which encompasses all faculty specializing in the region at the various schools of Columbia University. Since the Harriman Institute makes no central appointments, all of our faculty are hired by disciplinary departments and therefore must answer both to their disciplines and to area studies. In some departments this balancing act is easier than in others, but it is always a balancing act. Perhaps the biggest problem in some departments comes in the tenure process, since theory tends to be valued over area studies in the evaluation of scholarly work. A related issue, one also too complicated to discuss at length here, is the relationship between disciplines and especially between the humanities and the social sciences in area studies. As more demands are placed on our time and we become increasingly specialized, despite all the trendy talk about crossing disciplinary boundaries, there is clearly a tendency for area specialists to retrench within disciplinary boundaries even at an institution like the Harriman Institute which seeks to bring scholars together by regional rather than disciplinary interests. Breaking down disciplinary boundaries is perhaps the greatest challenge facing area studies in the twenty-first century, and in the United States it is certainly related to rethinking area studies as primarily an intellectual rather than a policy directed endeavor.

Question 4

Since the Harriman Institute relies primarily on its endowment, which is held by Columbia University, we have fared relatively well in the years since the collapse of the USSR. Over the last ten years our budget has increased from approximately $ 500,000 ten years ago to $ 1.5 million today. We now have 12 named endowments and receive partial income from a thirteenth. The level of support that we receive from SIPA has remained the same over this period of time. We have also done well with support from government funds for non-Russian Slavic and East European language teaching (primarily Polish, Czech, Ukrainian, Hungarian, Romanian, and Serbo-Croatian). Nonetheless, the university administration has exhibited a disturbing lack of commitment to these languages, which would jeopardize our programs should external funding dry up. A more immediate problem is the growing need to provide instruction in the languages of Central Asia and the Caucasus (currently we offer only Uzbek). Needless to say, the university administration is even less enthusiastic about paying salaries to more language teachers to instruct relatively small classes.

Question 5

The students working for the Ph.D. in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences are being prepared for careers in academia. Many of the SIPA students working for the MIA have come back to school after working in the region in business, government, NGOs, or journalism. They come back to school to increase their professional qualifications in those areas or to gain greater regional expertise or new professional qualifications. We try to keep good track of all of our graduates to the extent that that is possible. Most do go on to interesting careers in the fields listed above.

The Faculty of Political Sciences and Sociology European University at St. Petersburg

Oleg Kharkhordin, Dean of the Department (sociopol@eu.spb.ru)

Question 1

In general, East European studies or Russian studies have been on the decline since the US administration stopped investing huge sums of money into the study of its former main opponent. The overproduction of scholars specializing in the study of these areas of the world was however so great that the effects were not immediately obvious in the early 90s – SSRC and the foundations, for example, were still investing into the development of underrepresented fields in Russian and East European studies. But with the dwindling enrollment in undergraduate classes, and the virtual absence of interest in Russia and Eastern Europe among entering graduate students (in 1999–2001 no graduate students started a PhD on Russia in the department on political science at UC Berkeley, for example), the crisis became obvious. Russia has become as interesting as any other European country, let's say – like France. Also, globalization processes there are as interesting to study there as globalization processes in the Philippines' villages, for example. A genuine framework for comparative studies has become possible.

Question 2

Basically, perestroika made possible the formation of our university, which was founded in 1994 by St. Petersburg city government and a series of institutes of the Academy of sciences. All the courses taught were hence constructed as being different from what might have been taught before 1991. Also, given that we function on the model of an Anglo-American university, we have syllabi that closely reflect a syllabus somewhere in New York, rather than a Russian class syllabus on history or political science as taught in some Russian state university in 1994. Personnel policy of the University was aimed at recruiting those Russian professors who had western PhD degrees or have had an extensive experience of doing research or teaching in the west.

Question 3

Coexistence is the name of the game, since political science and sociology at EUSP exist in the form of political and social studies of Russia. And this is repeated in other university departments as well – out of about 200 dissertations that are being written now altogether in the university, only 5–10 are not directly related to Russia.

Question 4

EUSP started with a $ 50,000 seed grant in 1994 but has evolved into a full-blown university with five departments by 1999–2000. Major sources of funding are international private corporations and a municipal budget of St. Petersburg. No major changes occurred in the last five years, since the only alternative to this scheme are state resources, but these very largely unavailable to EUSP. Russian state does not finance private universities, while cooperation with the European Commission is at the very early stage of development. Exchanges between Free University of Berlin and EUSP were covered by DAAD grants, but even this type of state support is not very stable: notwithstanding very positive responses from German students who came to study at EUSP in 1999–2001, DAAD did not allocate any money for 2002–3, for some reason.

Question 5

EUSP teaches three types of students. First, recent Russian PhD holders (main concern of the university) end up living on grants from research foundations – a major source of finance available for independent social scientists in Russia these days. Teaching was not an option for them since salaries are very low except for some select state universities, like the Higher School of Economics in Moscow (HSE): EUSP is developing now a joint project with this school that will create two departments (sociology and economics) in the St.Petersburg branch of HSE. This will create a series of decent jobs for recent EUSP graduates. Another project involves Carnegie Foundation support money that allow students from Russian regions to get back to their cities of origin, to teach what they learned during their PhD careers at EUSP.

Among foreign students who study at EUSP (there were 26 PhD and MA level students in the department of political science and sociology alone in the fall of 2001, for example), North American graduates tend to find jobs in the NGOs that work in Eastern Europe. West European students tend to choose to continue their PhDs in their home countries.

The School for Slavonic and Eastern European Studies (SSEES), London

George Kolankiewicz, Director (gkolanki@ssees.ac.uk)

Question 1

Greater diversity, complexity places a greater emphasis on specialist knowledge rather than the template approach of the Cold-War. It requires not just economic and political science expertise but also the revival of literary and cultural studies.The studies are no longer ghettoized but part of mainstream social science which is a challenge for the whole academic community.Closer co-operation with region based colleagues, recuitment of academics from the area and closer ties with the user community-business diplomacy etc.

Question 2

Most of our social science degrees have changed in form and content whereas language training is also more professional. We try to adhere to triangualtion in our recruitment and teaching policy- a knowledge of the discipline, the language and the area context (history, culture etc).

Question 3

The relationship is integral and increasingly so. We seek to forge links between language and literature, history and social sciences, which are our core provision.

Question 4

It has been assisted by the UK's recognition of the needs of the area. Our researchers have had excellent opportunities for funding from national and multilateral sources.They have good connections with scholars in the region and in some cases the demand excedes supply. Diverse sources of research and scholarship funding mean more effort has to be made however to seek the most suitable source.

Question 5

Banking, NGOs, Diplomacy, Teaching, mass media. We have regular calls for the expertise provided by our students. I'd like to ask you if you can send us some answers on that. The deadline is tight, unfortunately (feb 20), but we need altogether not more than about 2 pages. but, forst of all – are you interested at all?

The Finnish Centre for Russian and East European Studies, University of Helsinki, Finnland

Markku Kivinen, Director (markku.kivinen@helsinki.fi)

Question 1

It is obvious that the traditional area studies are in intellectual crisis. What is „East Europe" in the contemporary situation? What are the politically correct and scientifically grounded approaches to this area? Traditional ways of understanding the basic distinctions within each field are vanishing. This is typically the case with the opposition of historical versus social scientific analysis of Russia. While historians have emphasized the unique nature of Russian development social scientists have been analysing them using the same approaches as to other societies. All this underlines the need of theoretical work which would be able to link the historical processes with new theoretical concepts. This would also imply deconstructing such unspecified and all encompassing concepts as „globalization".

Question 2

Whereas elsewhere in the Westem world Russian and East European studies seemed to be d iminis hing in Finland the opposite was the case. In the middle of the 1990's the Finnish Ministry of Education started two comprehensive efforts to promote Russian and East European studies in Finland. The first initiative was to launch a comprehensive research programme for the Academy of Finland. The second initiative was to establish the Aleksanteri Institute (The Finnish Centre for Russian and East European Studies) as a special institution at the University of Helsinki. The institute is working as a nation-wide network for Russian and East European studies. In 1998 the institute started both an M.A. programme and a Ph.D. programme for the field. The networking of Finnish universities was regarded as inevitable because of the need of a division of labour and the limited resources of individual universities. Within the network each of the Finnish universities has developed a profile of its own in teaching Russian and East European issues. For example, the University of Lapland is active in arctic issues, while in the University of Joensuu, which is geographically located near the Eastern border, is concentrating on the problems of Karelia. The University of Tampere has a long and outstanding tradition in analysing the working life and social structure of Russia. Such division of labour is, of course, not determined from above, and it is about time to change according to the interests of researchers and students. In addition to the universities several research institutes are working in the field. The Bank of Finland has an internationally renowned institute for economics in transition (BOFIT).

Question 3

From the very beginning all the new Finnish efforts in the field have opted for discipline-based as opposed to area

based approach. The scholars in the research programme in the Academy of Finland were based in university departments maintaining close contacts with their disciplines. In the Ph.D. and M.A. programmes of the Aleksanteri-institute as well, students must have a disciplinary competence first, and become Russian and East European experts there-after. The programmes are based on multidisciplinary courses which are integrated within the teaching of disciplines. It is required that all new scholars in the field have a rather thorough knowledge of transition, Russian culture and history and also of Finnish-Russian political and economic relations. For each student a personal study plan is constructed with regard to this multidisciplinary part of their studies. About 50 young scholars are now enrolled in the doctoral programme of the Aleksanteri-Institute. In M.A. programme more than two hundred students are enrolled in the system.

Question 4

Funding for Russian and East European studies has grown favourably although all the time more and more of that is based on external project funding. Aleksanteri-Institute has been able to raise funding from the European Union, Finnish ministries and regional councils. The private funding is so far very modest. Also the Academy of Finland is willing to launch new programmes on these issues.

Question 5

Because the programmes in Finland are multidisciplinary there is a vast variance in the potential labour markets. So far, half of the graduated M.A .students have been recruited to the private sector. There is no unemployment in the field (99 % were immediately employed, more than 90% on a permanent basis.) The EU funding has been used for developing working life practice for the students.

The Davis Center for Russian Studies, Harvard University

Timothy J. Colton, Director (tcolton@fas.harvard.edu)

Question 1

They challenge us to situate our work in broader contexts. These include the transformed international environment, the several geographic and cultural zones in which our countries of study are located, and also the shifting academic environment, particularly in the social sciences.

Question 2

Research at my center is largely driven by the intellectual interests of its members. These have changed along with changes in the environment. The generational change in the field is now in full progress. Our master's program is now more flexible in terms of course requirements, and requires a thesis based on original research and, in most cases, summer travel, which we fund from resources we have raised.

Question 3

Not an easy question to answer. The executive committee of my center is made up of professors from all the relevant departments. These same individuals run most of our seminars. There is no competition for resources. The intellectual agenda, of course, is contested to some extent.

Question 4

Our funding base improved steadily throughout the 1990s. Government support for student-related activities has held roughly constant. From private sources, particularly for endowment, we have been able to augment our capacity a great deal.

Question 5

Our master's students go into a variety of professional slots, including business, foundations and NGO's, journalism. Ph.D. students mostly go into academic life, although there are exceptions.

The Institute of East European Studies, Free University, Berlin

Klaus Segbers, Director (segbers@zedat.fu-berlin.de)

Question 1

Structures of science dis ciplines are historically contingent. Significant changes of economic, political, social or cultural circumstances may require changes in academic departmentalization. It would be strange if such significant changes as they took place after 1985 would not affect the organization of academic inquiries.

The new configuration of time and place, structures, actors and their preferences produces no linear, clear results. Integration and fragmentation are neighbors, as are complex domestic/transnational/international shifts of demarcations. Place matters. But place is not identical with countries, nations, or macroregions. Place cannot be held constant. Places are patchworks. Places can, and have to be, constructed. They are dependent variables, shaped by influential exogeneous factors.

Globaliza tion produces homogenization as well as heterogeneous indigenization. So area-related knowledge remains important. But it must be able to make itself *communicado*. It is even responsible for its own translation into texts relevant for discipline-based questions.

This principle has serious consequences for the design and organization of teaching, of research, and also of consultations and interpretations.

Question 2

What kind of changes, if any, in your curricula, research programs and personnel policy has your institute/ department introduced since 1991 to cope with this new situation?

The integrated East European Studies curriculum – a German master program, including bachelor and master levels – will be replaced by two master programs. One will be organized at the institute (OEI), as a M.A. for East European Studies, basically in German. The other will be a distant learning M.A. course for East European Studies, in English. Both programs require a B.A.

Language training cannot be offered primarily in the institute, but there are many options in Berlin which can be used. Media oriented and Internet based teaching will be a priority for the development of new programs. Research programs will be focused more on the former USSR and the former Yugoslavia, less on East Central Europe. The organizing question for the coming years will be related to conflicts and conflict solution in these areas.

After some rounds of external evaluations, theses basic principles of the OEI are guaranteed – for the time being.

Question 3

The relation to discipline-based knowledge and to organizing questions generated in disciplines will be crucial. There is no meaningful area-related activity in terms of research other than delineated from discipline-based questions, requiring mostly comparative questions and designs.

Question 4

Nominally, there were no significant reductions. There are contracts between the universities and the Berlin government securing funding for three year periods. This gives some planning stability. But the context is messy: Berlin, as a *laender* government, is basically broke. An open discussion about future relations between the Berlin universities, about priorities and strategies is missing. The significant, dramatic changes in labor markets and their future repercussions in educational systems are not openly adressed. Berlin administrations are heavily infected by the experience of a four decade long dependency on state subsidies. The effect is a high degree of unprofessionalism; incentives are often set in a way that makes it profitable – at least acceptable – to behave in a way similar to Soviet-style mentality.

Question 5

Most *vypuskniki* find jobs in the commercial sector, in the media, NGOs, IGOs, and the academia. There are only a few who cannot find an adequate occupation. Still, the shifts mentioned above require changes in our educational system. This will be done. Also, we are preparing a more effective relationship with our alumni – something not yet common in German universities.

The Center for Russian & East European Studies, Stanford University, USA

Mary Dakin, Assistant Director (mdakin@leland.stanford.edu)

Question 1

In the US there has always been an intellectual battle in social sciences about the relevance of „area studies" to disciplines attempting to generalize on a „scientific" (large-N) level. This was articularly true for R/EE area studies. In the mid-1990s the collapse of the USSR led to a growing attitude that „the Cold War is over" – and that therefore studies of Russia and Eastern Europe were immediately irrelevant. However – following 9/11/01 there has been a resurgence of interest in language, cultural and policy studies at an area studies level. The US government and intellectual organizations came to the „sudden" realization that perhaps area-level specialization and language skills might be useful after all. In fact, the US Congress and Dept. of Defense have begun pumping money into language and area instruction in recent months, with particular emphasis in Middle Eastern studies, Russia/FSU studies, and Central Asia and the Caucasus.

Question 2

Our department was at first slow to respond, continuing with the same culture-based approach to activities that had driven programs before 1991. In recent years, however, we have tried to create programming and courses that focus specifically on contemporary policy issue; to broaden our approach to reflect themes that have more global implications (totalitarianism, dispossession, democratization, marketization and privatization) rather than country or region-specific topics; and to broaden our approach geographically – Stanford was a very Russia-centric program, by and large, and our Center is working specifically toward expanding coverage of EE and Central Asia.

Question 3

This is an interesting question – the answer is, it varies by discipline. Our Center cooperates regularly with the departments of History, Slavic Literatures, Jewish Studies, and Comparative Literatures on activities including conferences, faculty-grad seminars, student training activities, and student fellowships. With social sciences the collaborations are more limited. With Economics and Political Science they will cooperate on hiring lecturers to teach area courses (with joint funding from us), and will send their students to us for research funding, but beyond that collaboration is very limited. Collaboration with Sociology is somewhat better, but still limited. We collaborate regularly with Stanford's two think tanks, Institute for International Studies (on policy topics) and the Hoover Institution (on history topics), on research projects, public events and, in the case of IIS, student funding.

Question 4

Roughly 2/3 of our budget is from endowment funds raised in the 1970s. About 1/3 or our budget is from US Dept of Education funds for international education. Those funds were shrinking during the mid-late 1990s. The absolute number of R/EE centers funded was decreased, so competition for these funds became more fierce. We were fortunate to be refunded (3-year cycles) 3 times in the 1990s. However, the dollar amount of funding was actually shrinking, both in absolute and relative terms.

After 9/11 the amount of Dept of Ed funding available for international education has suddenly increased – particularly for Middle East and Russia/EE centers. So, our allocation for this grant cycle has been increased without our requesting it, and prospects for the future grant cycle are suddenly brighter.

Question 5

We run an interdisciplinary MA program, and students from that are pursuing successful careers in government (National Security Council, military officers, Dept of Treasury); journalism (US News and World Report, Foreign Policy, etc), NGOs involved in the region, business, and law.

We also provide curricular support and research funding that helps undergrads and PhD students – the PhD students almost universally pursue careers in the academic field.