



THE UNIVERSITY OF
MELBOURNE

**CERC WORKING
PAPERS SERIES**

No. 1 / 2004

Richard Sakwa

**THE
AUSTRALASIAN
CONTRIBUTION
TO SOVIET, EAST
EUROPEAN AND
RUSSIAN
STUDIES**

CERC WORKING PAPERS SERIES INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

Philomena Murray (CERC Director)
Leslie Holmes (CERC Deputy Director)
Peter Shearman (CERC Principal Fellow) (**Editors**)

Wladimir Andreff (University Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne)
Michael Bradshaw (University of Leicester / University of Birmingham)
Renaud Dehousse (Institute of Political Science, Paris / European University Institute, Florence)
Maurizio Ferrera (University of Pavia / Università Bocconi)
Stephen Fortescue (University of New South Wales)
Graeme Gill (University of Sydney)
Paul Hainsworth (University of Ulster)
Simon Hix (London School of Economics)
Robert Horvath (University of Melbourne)
Elizabeth Meehan (Queen's University of Belfast)
Andrew Moravcsik (Harvard University)
Kirill Nourzhanov (Australian National University)
Marko Pavlyshyn (Monash University)
William Tompson (University of London)
J. H. H. Weiler (New York University)
Stephen Wheatcroft (University of Melbourne)

The Contemporary Europe Research Centre (CERC) was established in 1997 as an interdisciplinary centre located within the University of Melbourne's Faculty of Arts. The Centre draws upon a broad pool of expertise from the University of Melbourne and beyond, bringing together specialists on all aspects of contemporary Europe, east, central and west. The Centre produces and coordinates quality academic and applied research, with a particular focus on interdisciplinary, comparative and transnational projects.

The CERC Working Papers Series is peer-reviewed.

Copyright © 2004 by the Contemporary Europe Research Centre

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission from the Contemporary Europe Research Centre, Level 2, 234 Queensberry Street, The University of Melbourne, Victoria 3010, Australia.

ISSN 1447-0071

Published by the Contemporary Europe Research Centre in December 2004.

The Australasian contribution to Soviet and Russian studies is a broad and diverse subject, and one that can hardly be described comprehensively in a short paper.¹ It may, in addition, be thought more appropriate for someone from the region to undertake this difficult endeavour.² Nevertheless, a view from the outside may help place the achievement in perspective, and it is in this spirit that I undertook this brief survey of the field, first presented to the Fiftieth Anniversary Conference of the Australasian Political Studies Association (APSA), held at the Australian National University (ANU), Canberra, 2-4 October 2002.

Introductory comments

Before going into details, I will make a few observations. For me it was a strange sensation; examining the work of various scholars from the angle of their Australasianness or connections with the region of whatever sort, rather than other substantive scholarly criteria. It soon became clear that the Australasian scholarly field of Soviet and post-Soviet studies is far deeper and extensive than one may have initially thought. The more one follows the ins and outs of the subject, the greater the range and depth of the scholarship found. Indeed, the more one worked on the area it seemed that almost everyone working in the field could claim some connection with Australasia! Who would have guessed, for example, that Alex Pravda was born in Melbourne. Indeed, it is still difficult for me to stop seeing the world through the prism of the antipodes and people's connection with the region!

¹ It gives me great pleasure to thank Professor Joan Rydon, the doyenne of political studies in Australia, for her generous funding of my trip to Australia in connection with the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Australasian Political Studies Association.

² The difficult task was made somewhat easier by helpful comments on various drafts of the paper from Stephen Fortescue, Graeme Gill, Leslie Holmes, Peter Shearman, Aleksandar Pavković and Stephen Wheatcroft. The responsibility for errors, omissions and lapses of judgement, of course, remains mine.

The second observation is the obverse of the first. If categorising scholars by their Australasian connections meant the seeking out of particularity, the universality of the work done by Australasian scholars is impressive. There is nothing insular about this aspect of the discipline of political studies in the region. The works of the authors discussed below have been firmly part of a global scholarly discourse. More than this, in a sense it could be argued that political studies were in the vanguard of the opening up of Australia from the relative insularity that characterised the society up to the late 1960s. Australasian scholars are now firmly part of the global study of Russian and East European studies. But can we identify something that could be labelled the 'Australasian school' of Communist and Russian studies. This paper suggests that while this could be argued it would be a bit of a red herring and pointless quest: the origin of the various scholars is not what makes their work important.

When talking of Australasian Soviet and Russian studies, I will be taking a 'civic' rather than an 'ethnic' approach'. I will not restrict myself to those who were or are, for example, Australasian by birth, or to Australians or New Zealanders working in the region. In preparing this paper, I have been struck by the large number of incomers who have made an important contribution to the field; and at the same time, the large number of Australians who work outside Australia. The question then arises: is there anything specifically Australasian about the study of Soviet and post-Soviet affairs? The answer to this question will emerge perhaps in the course of the analysis. Ultimately, the significance of the work coming out of the region and of its exemplars elsewhere is its universality rather than its local particularity.

Another feature that is marked is the way that disciplinary boundaries are increasingly blurred. Soviet and East European studies are far from hermetically sealed from broader aspects of political studies, especially political theory. Increasingly area studies has become part of comparative politics, a process accelerated since the fall of communism. At the same time, we should not forget that Soviet and East European specialists have a number of specialist skills, above all knowledge of languages, literature and culture, that cannot simply be subsumed into the field of politics. As Mao Zedong used to say, it is best to walk on two legs. He had in mind industry and agriculture, but we say comparative politics and area studies need to find a way of complementing each other. Younger scholars in particular are characterised by a healthy foot in both camps, and indeed by a relative fluidity in a disciplinary sense in which their skills are displayed.

A final comment must be one in the spirit of the Trade Descriptions Act: in a brief analysis it is impossible to do justice to the richness of the contribution made by Australasian scholars to this field, and it would be unrealistic to try to do so. The comments below are intended to be no more than a modest impressionistic snapshot of some of the characteristics of the field and a presentation of the works of some representatives in the field. The focus, moreover, will be on political and historical studies, broadly defined, as warranted by the initial brief to present the survey to the APSA. Apologies in advance to those who are not mentioned: this paper makes no claim to be a comprehensive survey of what I have come to realise is an enormously rich and diverse field.

Scope and characteristics of the field

Work by scholars from this region has been characterised by a robust independence, and thus it is impossible to categorise it as either belonging to the 'totalitarian' school or to the 'revisionist' camp. In the field of Soviet politics and government, for example, we have a number of specialists on the Communist Party and the state (e.g. T. Harry Rigby, Lloyd Churchward, Graeme Gill, Stephen Fortescue, John Miller) whose work resists easy categorisation. Some have continued their work to cover the post-Soviet period and have become renowned specialists on post-communist Russian politics (Graeme Gill, Peter Lentini) or analysts of comparative communism and post-communism (Graeme Gill, Leslie Holmes, R. F. Miller and T. H. Rigby). There has also been a diversification, with important specialists on Soviet and Russian foreign policy: Peter Shearman, Bobo Lo and more broadly in the study of international relations, Stephanie Lawson, formerly at ANU and now at the University of East Anglia (UEA). A particular strength has always been historical research, exemplified by the work of Stephen Wheatcroft, David Christian and Roger Markwick. It should also be noted that Sheila Fitzpatrick began her career in Australia before moving on to the US. An interesting feature is the strength of political philosophy, with David Lovell for example providing a fascinating study of the responsibility of Marx for Soviet authoritarianism.³ The journal *Thesis 11* has for a generation provided a forum for some of the best analysis of the USSR and post-communist political dilemmas. We can also be confident that the potential is far from exhausted, with a number of younger specialists already making their mark so that we can be assured that the baton is being passed to a new generation. It should not be

³ David W. Lovell, *From Marx to Lenin: An Evaluation of Marx's Responsibility for Soviet Authoritarianism* (Cambridge University Press, 1984).

forgotten that at a crucial moment in the transcendence of the communist order Australia played host to a number of scholars from Eastern Europe. Representatives of the so-called 'Budapest school', drawing on the ideas of Georg Lukacs, found respite for a time here, notably Ferenc Fehér, Agnes Heller and György Márkus.

'Honorary' Australians

Let us begin by the looking briefly at the work of some of these scholars, whom we can designate 'honorary' Australians, those who came to Australia and produced important work before moving on but whose work lives on in the thinking of other regional scholars. We can note here the openness of the country that provided shelter for these scholars from Eastern Europe in difficult times, and provided a haven for them to work. The outstanding book in this respect is *Dictatorship over Needs*.⁴ Published in the last period before the onset of *perestroika*, the work builds on Heller's earlier analysis of the theory of need in Marx.⁵ The analysis of Soviet societies in *Dictatorship over Needs* remains one of the best of late communism. Written from the perspective of a broadly conceived Marxist framework in applying the concept of 'dictatorship over needs', the book takes a socialist but anti-Leninist approach in discussing ways of transcending bureaucratic state socialism. It does not necessarily advocate fully-fledged capitalism as the sole alternative. How distant this dream of renewed socialism looks from the perspective of today!

The authors of this book, written in Melbourne and Sydney, could not conceive of socialism without democracy, but in a strange

⁴ Ferenc Fehér, Agnes Heller and György Márkus, *Dictatorship over Needs: An Analysis of Soviet Societies* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1983).

⁵ Agnes Heller, *The Theory of Need in Marx* (London, Allison & Busby, 1976).

augur of Gorbachev's *perestroika*, they insisted that 'the world needs more, not less socialism than it has today'.⁶ This was to be a socialism purged not only of Leninist-Stalinist accretions but also of Trotskyist revolutionism, since its argument about the need for individual democratic rights under socialism harked back to Karl Kautsky's critique of the nascent Leninist system in the months following the October revolution. This deontological Kantian approach was one aired from a very early stage in the outstanding Australian journal of political science and political theory, *Thesis 11*. As the authors of *Dictatorship over Needs* point out, dissidents in Eastern Europe found on their own skin that 'the lack of these rights or their effective institutionalization not only leaves the individual completely helpless against the virtually arbitrary power of the state, but at the same time makes collective control over its activity impossible...'.⁷ This was an attempt to carve out a Kantian democratic (deontological) imperative out of the Hegelian shell of state socialism.

Having sought refuge in Australia from the cloying suffocation and contradictions of Kadar's 'goulash communism' in Hungary, these authors moved on both in physical and intellectual terms, beyond a 'Budapest school' approach to political theory. Their work provided a distinctive critique not only of the contradictions and inadequacies of state socialism, but also of the western left (above all so-called Eurocommunists). Of course, faced with the collapse in 1989 not only of state socialism but also of illusions of socialist renewal of these systems, Agnes Heller in particular, who moved on from Australia soon after the completing this book to take up the post of Professor of Sociology at the New School for Social Research

⁶ Fehér et al, *Dictatorship over Needs*, p. xiii.

⁷ Fehér et al, *Dictatorship over Needs*, p. xiii

in New York,⁸ has continued fundamental research into ways of renewing political life in late capitalist societies.⁹ She has focused on the problems of 'agonistic' liberalism; a liberalism that can generate an awareness of its own shortcoming while sustaining an agenda for social amelioration. She seeks to ground a politics of social renewal on an ethic of individual freedom and responsibility. György Márkus remained and continues to work in Australia.

Many other well-known scholars in the field of Russian and East European studies have passed some time in Australia. The political philosopher Andrzej Walicki spent some time at ANU in the early 1980s. The sociologist Ivan Szelenyi worked five years in the country, working as a statistician in marked contrast to the Lukacsianism of the Budapest school, before going on to the United States. Other East Europeans who spent time in the region include Janina Frentzel-Zagorska, who spent ten years at ANU working on political trends in Poland and Hungary. At ANU she was accompanied by her partner Krzysztof Zagorski, who is now head of Poland's premier survey organisation, CBOS. Israel Getzler and Lewis Siegelbaum spent fruitful periods of work in the region.

The Australian study of state socialism

If the representatives of the 'Budapest school' took a radical approach to the Soviet order, Australia was rich in careful scholarly studies of these systems. The name of Lloyd Churchward is inextricably bound up with the development of Russian studies in the region, being the first to offer a course in Soviet politics (at the University of Melbourne). He was the author of a classical work on

⁸ Ferenc Fehér at this time became Lecturer in Sociology at the New School.

the Soviet system.¹⁰ First published in 1968, his book *Contemporary Soviet Government* is still an interesting read because of its broad sweep, its insistence on taking the institutions of Soviet governance and participation seriously, and its methodology, such as the use of citizens' letters, to illustrate his arguments. The word 'government' in the title was meant as a rebuke to Merle Fainsod's classic work on how Russia is 'ruled'.¹¹ While noting at various points the restrictions on the type of democracy that the Soviet system espoused, let alone 'bourgeois' democracy, Churchward's analysis is nevertheless imbued by an attempt to understand real processes, rather than imposing a predetermined ideological schema. Although Churchward remained a member of the Australian Communist Party from 1944 until its dissolution in 1990, he was doubly careful to ensure that his work strove for academic balance. This did not mean, however, that his work was impartial in analysing the burning issues of the day. In a world torn apart by the Cold War his work, which in Markwick's words 'was a marriage of Marxism and Western political science',¹² achieved a delicate balance between commitment and detachment.

Churchward's book on *The Soviet Intelligentsia* identified the important phenomenon that even within the staid framework of Soviet politics there were numerous avenues for members of the intelligentsia to exert their influence on the political process.¹³ Although taking a somewhat mechanical Soviet-style definition of

⁹ Agnes Heller and Ferenc Fehér, *The Grandeur and Twilight of Radical Universalism* (New York, Transaction Books, 1991); Agnes Heller, *An Ethics of Personality* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1996); Agnes Heller, *A Theory of Modernity* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1999).

¹⁰ Lloyd Churchward, *Contemporary Soviet Government*, second edn (London & Boston, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975).

¹¹ Merle Fainsod, *How Russia is Ruled* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1963).

¹² Roger D. Markwick, 'Activist Academic: Lloyd Churchward as a Labour Intellectual', *Labour History Review*, No. 77, November 1999, p. 34.

the intelligentsia, he nevertheless was correct in identifying this social group as a latent alternative to *apparatchik*-dominated bureaucratic state socialism. For him this would be 'within-system' reform, and thus he paid little attention to what he considered the marginal phenomenon of dissent.

The core of Churchward's work, however, was the study of labour history. His collection of essays on *Soviet Socialism* provides a nuanced appreciation of the realities of the late Soviet years.¹⁴ At one point he asks: 'Are Soviet workers exploited?' His answer is clearly yes, but he notes that workers enjoy strong employment security, with collective dismissals illegal and individual ones closely monitored by the trade unions.¹⁵ If there is a single key theme to Churchward's work, underlying his essays, his work on the intelligentsia and his general analysis of the Soviet system, it is that participation in the Soviet system was not meaningless. This meant, therefore, that he rejected the totalitarian model and demonstrated many formal and informal flows of power, influence and authority. In short, his work represents one of the most perceptive attempts to come to terms with the Soviet experience. His work has provided a rich resource for later scholars.¹⁶ For example, the question of legitimacy was explored in a volume edited by Rigby and Fehér, a work that examined the debate over

¹³ Lloyd Churchward, *The Soviet Intelligentsia: An Essay on the Social Structure and Roles of Soviet Intellectuals in the 1960s* (London & Boston, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973), in particular pp. 111-23.

¹⁴ Lloyd Churchward, *Soviet Socialism: Social and Political Essays* (London & Boston, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987).

¹⁵ Churchward, *Soviet Socialism*, p. 23.

¹⁶ For an appreciation of Churchward's work, see the special issue of *Labour History Review* (No. 77, November 1999) devoted to him. In particular, see the already cited work, Roger Markwick's, 'Activist Academic: Lloyd Churchward as a Labour Intellectual', *Labour History Review*, No. 77, November 1999, pp. 27-43.

legitimation in Soviet-type systems,¹⁷ a theme that is still running strongly, notably in the work of Leslie Holmes.

As one reads Churchward's works, the strengths and shortcomings of the Soviet system spring to life, and demonstrate how far off the mark are the Martin Malia type criticisms of the Sovietological profession. Committed socialists could in many ways understand the inner dynamics and failings of the USSR better than those on the outside of the movement that the country claimed to represent. Although Churchward presented a somewhat idealised view of the participatory characteristics of the Soviet system, he nevertheless saw in them the potential for further democratic development, a view that once Gorbachev's *perestroika* got off the ground proved not too far off the mark. The later 'failure' of these reforms does not vitiate the view of Churchward (and Gorbachev) that the system had the potential for evolutionary democratic development.

The name of T. H. Rigby needs no introduction. Professor of Political Science at the Research School of Social Sciences of the Australian National University, he is the author of a number of important works. His book on Communist Party membership was invaluable to me when writing my own thesis on the Communist Party in Moscow during the Civil War, and it remains the single best work on the subject.¹⁸ It is a pity that it has not been updated to take the story up to the end in 1991! He also wrote a notable work on the Council of People's Commissars (Sovnarkom) under Lenin,¹⁹ where the relationship between institutions and personal leadership

¹⁷ T. H. Rigby and F. Feher (eds), *Political Legitimation in Communist Systems* (London, Macmillan, 1982).

¹⁸ T. H. Rigby, *Communist Party Membership in the USSR, 1917-1967* (Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1968).

¹⁹ T. H. Rigby, *Lenin's Government* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1979).

is explored. He has also studied political elites in the USSR.²⁰ However, the contribution for which he will no doubt be remembered for is his concept of Soviet-type socialism as a mono-organisational society.²¹ A collection of essays published in 1990 explored the idea from a number of angles.²² Through the prism of the concept of the USSR as a mono-organisational society, Rigby provided a novel approach to the application of notions of bureaucracy, leadership and organisation theory, while introducing the notion of crypto-politics. Rigby describes crypto-politics as

not overt and channelled through specialized "political" institutions, but covert, masquerading as the faithful performance of assigned organizational roles. It involves competition between constituent organizations and their formal subdivisions, biased reporting of information relevant to the formation or vetting of policy, informal networks or cliques, the use of personal powers to reward friends and punish enemies, and bias in the execution of policy so as to facilitate or prejudice its success or to favor certain affected interests rather than others.²³

Sounds rather like the situation in many post-Soviet states! Indeed, the concept is useful in studies of contemporary Russian politics.

²⁰ For a collection of his essays on the subject, see T. H. Rigby, *Political Elites in the USSR: Central Leaders and Local Cadres from Lenin to Gorbachev* (Aldershot, Edward Elgar, 1990). See also T. H. Rigby and B. Harasymiw (eds), *Leadership Selection and Patron-Client Relations in the USSR and Yugoslavia* (London, Allen & Unwin, 1983).

²¹ The core essay outlining the notion is T. H. Rigby, 'Stalinism and the Mono-organisational Society', in Robert C. Tucker (ed.), *Stalinism: Essays in Historical Interpretation* (New York, Norton, 1977), pp. 53-76.

²² T. H. Rigby, *The Changing Soviet System: Mono-organisational Socialism from its Origins to Gorbachev's Restructuring* (Aldershot, Edward Elgar, 1990).

²³ Rigby, 'Stalinism and the Mono-organisational Society', pp. 58-9.

Stephen Fortescue, at the University of New South Wales but also closely associated with the Centre for Russian and East European Studies (CREES) at the University of Birmingham, now part of the European Research Institute there, has focused on science policy in the Soviet Union and in recent years on enterprise restructuring.²⁴ His work on what there was of an industrial policy in the 1990s remains a triumph of detailed research and the painstaking attempt to follow through the tangled web of policy evolution.²⁵ He is now working on the Russian mining and metals industry.

R. F. Miller, a long-time scholar at ANU, has produced many significant works on a range of topics, including publications on Polish agriculture, Gorbachev's changes and Russian foreign policy.²⁶ Elected repeatedly president of the Australasian Association for Communist and Post-Communist Studies (AACPCS), Miller is currently Visiting Fellow in the Transformation of Communist Systems Project of the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies at the Australian National University. Fluent in a number of languages, including Russian, Serbo-Croat and Polish, he has conducted field research in numerous countries, including Yugoslavia, USSR, Poland, Bulgaria and Romania. His numerous monographs include works on Soviet agriculture,²⁷ a comparative study of Soviet and Yugoslav agricultural co-operation,²⁸

²⁴ Stephen Fortescue, *The Communist Party and Soviet Science* (London, Macmillan, 1986); *Science Policy in the Soviet Union* (London, Routledge, 1990).

²⁵ Stephen Fortescue, *Policy-Making for Russian Industry* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1997).

²⁶ See, for example, R. F. Miller, J. H. Miller and T. H. Rigby (eds), *Gorbachev at the Helm: A New Era in Soviet Politics* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987).

²⁷ R. F. Miller, *One Hundred Thousand Tractors: the MTS and the Development of Controls in Soviet Agriculture* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1970).

²⁸ R. F. Miller, *Socialism and Agricultural Cooperation: The Soviet and Yugoslav Cases* (Canberra, Department of Political Science, Institute of Advanced Studies, ANU Occasional Papers, 1974).

a study (with T. H. Rigby) of technological development in the USSR,²⁹ some important studies of Yugoslav socialism under Tito,³⁰ an edited book with Ferenc Fehér on Khrushchev,³¹ a work on Poland in the 1980s,³² and a number of works on the Gorbachev period and the development of post-communist Russia.³³ He has in addition contributed chapters to nearly two dozen books, written dozens of articles, including latterly on developments in the former Yugoslavia,³⁴ and he is frequently asked to comment for the media and government for briefings and commentary.

The name of Leslie Holmes needs no introduction. An early escapee from Thatcherite Britain, he left the University of Kent at Canterbury in 1983 and has been at the Department of Political Science at the University of Melbourne ever since. While at Kent he edited one of the most interesting studies of the relationship between state and party in communist societies.³⁵ He is currently president of the International Council for Central and East European Studies

²⁹ R. F. Miller and T. H. Rigby, *Political and Administrative Aspects of the Scientific and Technical Revolution in the USSR* (Canberra, Department of Political Science, Institute of Advanced Studies, ANU Occasional Papers, 1976).

³⁰ R. F. Miller, *Tito as Political Leader and External Factors in Yugoslav Political Development* (Canberra, Department of Political Science, Institute of Advanced Studies, ANU Occasional Papers, 1977); idem., *Federalism as a Safety-Valve: The Yugoslav Case* (Canberra, Centre for Research on Federal Financial Relations, Australian National University, Occasional Paper 16, 1981).

³¹ R. F. Miller and Ferenc Fehér (eds), *Khrushchev and the Communist World* (London, Croom Helm, 1984).

³² R. F. Miller (ed.), *Poland in the Eighties: Social Revolution Against 'Real Socialism'* (Canberra: Department of Political Science, Institute of Advanced Studies, ANU Occasional Papers, 1984).

³³ R. F. Miller with J. H. Miller and T. H. Rigby (eds), *Gorbachev at the Helm: A New Era in Soviet Politics?* (London and Sydney, Croom Helm, 1987); R. F. Miller, *Soviet Foreign Policy Today: Gorbachev and the 'New Political Thinking'* (Sydney, Allen & Unwin, 1991); R. F. Miller (ed.), *The Developments of Civil Society in Communist Systems* (Sydney, Allen & Unwin, 1992).

³⁴ For example, R. F. Miller, 'Tudjman's Victory: Croatia, the U.N., NATO and the U.S.' *Nationalities Papers*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (September 1997), pp. 501-514; idem., 'Dealing with the Communist Past: The Special Case of Yugoslavia', *The South Slav Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 1-2 (87-88), Spring-Summer 2002, pp. 3-27.

³⁵ Leslie Holmes (ed.), *The Withering Away of the State? Party and State Under Communism* (London and Beverly Hills, Sage Modern Politics Series, Volume 6, 1981).

(ICCEES) and responsible for preparations for its quinquennial conference in July 2005. Following an early study of the policy process in communist states³⁶ he produced one of the most thorough comparative analyses of the world communist systems in 1986³⁷ - just in time to see the systems collapse soon after. His study of the collapse brought together a number of innovative approaches, including developing the notion of eudaemonic legitimation to make it a more central part of the scholarly lexicon and pointing out the central role of corruption in loosening the bonds that held the communist regimes together.³⁸ Holmes's study of post-communism was one of the first to bring to fruition the scholarly transition from comparative communism to comparative post-communism.³⁹

The list could go on and this discussion, as suggested earlier, would require a much larger work than this to do full justice to all who have worked in the field. Two more important contributions, however, can be mentioned at this point. John Besemeres's important work on population politics was one of the first to identify demography as one of the time bombs ticking away ready to blow away the foundations of the Soviet system.⁴⁰ He later shifted from academia towards hands-on engagement as a practitioner in government, providing excellent analysis of Soviet, East European and post-Soviet events. A similar path was followed by Paul Dibb, author of *The Soviet Union: The Incomplete Superpower*, another of those books that presciently identified the shortcomings of the Soviet system, this time in its pretensions as a superpower.⁴¹ More recently he has returned to

³⁶ Leslie Holmes, *The Policy Process in Communist States* (London, Sage Publications, 1981).

³⁷ Leslie Holmes, *Politics in the Communist World* (Oxford, Clarendon, 1986).

³⁸ Leslie Holmes, *The End of Communist Power: Anti-Corruption Campaigns and Legitimation Crisis* (Cambridge, Polity Press, 1993).

³⁹ Leslie Holmes, *Post-Communism: An Introduction* (Cambridge, Polity Press, 1997).

⁴⁰ John Besemeres, *Socialist Population Politics: The Political Implications of Demographic Trends in the USSR and Eastern Europe* (New York, M. E. Sharpe, 1980).

⁴¹ Paul Dibb, *The Soviet Union: The Incomplete Superpower* (London, Macmillan, 1986).

academia at the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre of the ANU. Both these authors put a lie to the stale (and meaningless) canard that 'Sovietologists' had failed to predict the demise of the Soviet Union. In fact, almost all had identified the structural flaws in the system and thus were able to anticipate later problems. The job of prediction, of course, is for astrologists and not social scientists.

The transition to and from socialism

The high hopes raised by Gorbachev's accession to power was reflected in John Miller's wide-ranging study of Gorbachev's leadership.⁴² Full of detailed and perceptive analysis, the book remains a useful resource for studying the Gorbachev period, in particular the broad-ranging attempt to place *perestroika* in historical perspective, including reaching back to different conceptions of change (reform versus revolution) advanced by the Decembrists.

While Agnes Heller and her colleagues may have discussed the way that dissidents had shifted away from attempts to influence the party and sections of public opinion towards a strategy of creating an independent public opinion as a way of exerting pressure on the apparatus,⁴³ the concept of civil society barely figures in their work. The issue, however, is at the heart of a collection edited by scholars at the time working in the Department of Politics, University College, University of New South Wales.⁴⁴ Bringing together a range of classical and contemporary works,

⁴² John Miller, *Mikhail Gorbachev and the End of Soviet Power* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1993).

⁴³ Fehér et al, *Dictatorship over Needs*, p. 7.

⁴⁴ Chandran Kukathas, David W. Lovell, William Maley (eds), *The Transition from Socialism: State and Civil Society in the USSR* (Melbourne, Longman Cheshire, 1991).

including the famous essay by Leszek Kolakowski,⁴⁵ the book argued that the distinction between state and civil society was crucial for understanding the breakdown of the state socialist order. One of the contributors, David W. Lovell, had already produced (as noted earlier) an outstanding work examining the question of continuity between Marx and Lenin. In other works he has examined Trotsky's views on Soviet bureaucratisation⁴⁶ and Marx's creation of the myth of the proletariat.⁴⁷ Together with Chandran Kukathas and William Maley, Lovell also produced an analysis of an Australian theory of politics.⁴⁸ I leave it to others to evaluate how convincing this was. Another of the contributors, Eugene Kamenka (Professor of the History of Ideas, ANU), brought his distinguished record of research on Marxism, Feuerbach and bureaucracy to bear on Soviet problems.⁴⁹

In a recent edited work Lovell returns to earlier themes to evaluate the achievements, and indeed the meaning of, 'the transition'.⁵⁰ The book examines the main problems in the attempt to introduce representative democracy and the market in the former communist states. His current work focuses on the problem of trust in post-communist societies. He argues that these societies have relatively low levels of trust in their political institutions, and that to be able to consolidate the moves toward democracy and the

⁴⁵ Leszek Kolakowski, 'The Myth of Human Self-Identity: Unity of Civil and Political Society in Socialist Thought', first published in Leszek Kolakowski and Stuart Hampshire (eds), *The Socialist Idea: A Reappraisal* (London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1974), pp. 18-35.

⁴⁶ David W. Lovell, *Trotsky's Analysis of Soviet Bureaucratisation: A Critical Essay* (London, Croom Helm, 1985).

⁴⁷ David W. Lovell, *Marx's Proletariat: The Making of a Myth* (London, Routledge, 1988).

⁴⁸ Chandran Kukathas, David W. Lovell, William Maley (eds), *The Theory of Politics: An Australian Perspective* (Melbourne, Longman Cheshire, 1990).

⁴⁹ Eugene Kamenka, *The Ethical Foundations of Marxism* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962/1972); *Marxism and Ethics* (London, Macmillan, 1969); *The Philosophy of Ludwig Feuerbach* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970); *Bureaucracy* (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1989).

⁵⁰ David W. Lovell, (ed.), *The Transition: Evaluating the Postcommunist Experience* (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2002).

development of civil society levels of trust have to be enhanced, something that can only be done by political elites setting an example of open, pluralistic and honest governance.⁵¹

Another study published at this time again encompassed a range of state socialist systems. The volume edited by Robert F. Miller reflected the distinctive moment of hope and idealism as the old system collapsed and representations of the new remained coloured by the emancipatory prospect of the triumph of civil society.⁵² The tone is captured by Harry Rigby's essay, 'The USSR: End of a Long, Dark Night?' (pp. 11-23), while Les Holmes introduces a theme that has been extensively studied by Claus Offe, namely the search for autonomous patterns of development in the GDR.⁵³ Martin Krygier, professor of law at the University of New South Wales, has also written extensively on post-communist legal, political and social developments. In a recent provocative analysis he unsparingly dissects the hopes, illusions and realities of post-communist subjectivity.⁵⁴

A sophisticated attempt to penetrate to the very roots of the Soviet system and its subsequent demise is provided by Johann Arnason of La Trobe University.⁵⁵ From the perspective of historical sociology, he examines the pattern of pre-revolutionary state formation and its legacy on the Soviet state-building enterprise. The

⁵¹ David W. Lovell, 'Trust and the Politics of Postcommunism', *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, Vol. 34, Issue 1, March 2001, pp. 27-38.

⁵² Robert F. Miller (ed.), *The Developments of Civil Society in Communist Systems* (Sydney, Allen & Unwin, 1992). See also his edited volume covering the early *perestroika* period, R. F. Miller, et al (eds), *Gorbachev at the Helm: A New Era in Soviet Politics* (London, Croom Helm, 1987).

⁵³ Leslie T. Holmes, 'The GDR: The Search for Autonomous Patterns of Development', in Robert F. Miller (ed.), *The Developments of Civil Society in Communist Systems* (Sydney, Allen & Unwin, 1992), pp. 65-83.

⁵⁴ Martin Krygier, 'Parables of Hope and Disappointment', *East European Constitutional Review*, Vol. 11, No. 3, Summer 2002, pp. 62-5.

work represents a brave attempt to provide a sophisticated rendition of totalitarian theory tied to a reworking of the concept of modernisation, and ultimately suggests that the Soviet Union represented a distinctive pattern of modernity – and thus placed in question some accepted views about the very nature of modernity itself. He has developed a wide range of sophisticated approaches as editor of *Thesis 11*, and encouraged others to use the journal as the forum for debates about problems of contemporary politics and political philosophy.

Post-communist politics

If the Australian study of the fall of communism reflected a wave of global optimism at that time, then it, too, has shared the subsequent disillusion. The volume edited by Saikal and Maley (dedicated to the memory of Eugene Kamenka, 1928-1994) was clearly influenced by the unexpected success of Vladimir Zhirinovskii in the elections of December 1993. The work was based on papers presented to a conference at ANU held in that month and subsequently updated, and included papers by Russian and British contributors.⁵⁶

Like many of today's most prominent political scientists, Graeme Gill's first work was on a historical topic,⁵⁷ while his second was an important and very successful interpretation of patterns of

⁵⁵ Johann P. Arnason, *The Future that Failed: Origins and Destinies of the Soviet Model* (London and New York, Routledge, 1993).

⁵⁶ Amin Saikal and William Maley (eds), *Russia in Search of its Future* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995). Contributors included A. V. Obolonsky from Moscow and Archie Brown from Oxford. Australian contributors included R. F. Miller, Stephen Fortescue, Leslie Holmes, John Miller and T. H. Rigby.

⁵⁷ Graeme Gill, *Peasants and Government in the Russian Revolution* (London, Macmillan and New York, Barnes & Noble, 1979).

power in twentieth century Russia.⁵⁸ Based in the Department of Government at the University of Sydney, Gill's publishing career reflects the vicissitudes of the subject itself. His next work provided a detailed study of the rules of the CPSU,⁵⁹ after which his attention turned to the phenomenon of Stalinism, about which he wrote two important books.⁶⁰

With the fall of the Soviet system Gill's attention turned to contemporary issues, producing a number of works dealing the reasons for the fall and problems of transition.⁶¹ A number of books then focused on problems of Russia's transition, the first of which provided a detailed cross-country analysis of democratisation processes;⁶² while the second took a broad comparative view of the problems of post-communism.⁶³ A considered review of the achievements, or rather failings, of Russian post-communist democratic development is provided in the book by Gill and Roger Markwick.⁶⁴ The book examines the gap between the democratic ideal and the alleged rather sordid results evident in post-communist Russia. The problem for them is the stymied development of civil society. Gill's latest work combined historical

⁵⁸ Graeme Gill, *Twentieth Century Russia. The Search for Power and Authority* (Melbourne, Nelson, 1987, repr. 1988, 1989 & 1991; second fully revised edition 1994).

⁵⁹ Graeme Gill, *The Rules of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (London, Macmillan 1988). Another book (with Roderic Pitty) a little later again examined the structure of communist power: *Power in the Party: The Organization of Power and Central-Republican Relations in the CPSU* (London, Macmillan, 1997).

⁶⁰ Graeme Gill, *Stalinism* (London, Macmillan, 1990, second fully revised edition 1998); *The Origins of the Stalinist Political System* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990, p/b ed. 2002).

⁶¹ *The Politics of Transition: Shaping a Post-Soviet Future* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993) with Stephen White and Darrell Slider; *The Collapse of a Single-Party System: the Disintegration of the CPSU* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994); (ed.), *Elites and Leadership in Russian Politics* (London, Macmillan, 1998).

⁶² Graeme Gill, *The Dynamics of Democratization: Elites, Civil Society and the Transition Process* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 2000).

⁶³ *Democracy and Post-Communism: Political Change in the Post-Communist World* (London, Routledge, 2002).

⁶⁴ Graeme Gill and Roger D. Markwick, *Russia's Stillborn Democracy? From Gorbachev to Yeltsin* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000).

and political studies to provide a magisterial analysis of the development and characteristics of the modern state.⁶⁵

Aleksandar Pavković from the Department of Politics and International Relations at Macquarie University in Sydney has studied the post-communist transition and the state fragmentation in one area - that of former Yugoslavia. His main interest is in the revival of nationalist ideologies, in particular the Serb nationalist ideologies, and their role in the break-up of the multinational Yugoslav federation.⁶⁶ The Australian scholars' essays concerning the impact of nationalism on the post-communist transition in East Europe and USSR were edited by him and his colleagues at Macquarie's Centre for Slavonic and East European Studies.⁶⁷ He has also explored the impact of recursive secessions from the Yugoslav state on contemporary normative theories of secession and has proposed a liberal approach to secession, which, while responding to the demands of nationalism, strives to minimise the violence usually associated with secession.⁶⁸

A recent comparative study of post-communist democratisation is the work co-authored by John Dryzek (ANU) and Leslie Holmes.⁶⁹ The book is a good example of the way that disciplinary boundaries are being blurred, bringing together an area

⁶⁵ Graeme Gill, *The Nature and Development of the Modern State* (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2003).

⁶⁶ Aleksandar Pavković, *The Fragmentation of Yugoslavia: Nationalism and War in the Balkans*, 2nd revised edition (London, Macmillan and New York, St. Martin's Press, 2000); idem., 'From Yugoslavism to Serbism: the Serb National Idea, 1986-1996', *Nations and Nationalism*, Vol. 4, 1998, pp. 511-28.

⁶⁷ A. Pavković, H. Koscharsky and A. Czarnota (eds), *Nationalism and Postcommunism: A Collection of Essays* (Aldershot and Brookfield, Vermont, Dartmouth Publishing, 1995).

⁶⁸ Aleksandar Pavković, 'Recursive Secessions in Former Yugoslavia: Too Hard a Case for Theories of Secession?', *Political Studies*, Vol. 48, 2000, pp. 485-502; idem., 'Secession as Defense of a Liberty: a Liberal Answer to a Nationalist Demand', *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, forthcoming.

⁶⁹ John S. Dryzek and Leslie Holmes (eds), *Post-Communist Democratization: Political Discourses across Thirteen Countries* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002).

studies specialist (although with strong expertise in comparative politics) with a political theorist. The book tries to go beyond the institutional façade of democratic transition to assess the quality of democracy in thirteen post-communist countries, reflecting above all the views of the inhabitants of the countries themselves. Applying a sophisticated methodology of discourse analysis, the work puts a final nail in the coffin of earlier teleological representations of the transition as some sort of inevitable move towards Western-style democracy. Les Holmes himself has continued work on the phenomenon of corruption, and is completing a book called *Rotten States*, a systematic analysis of the problem.

History

History has traditionally been a particularly well-developed field in Australasia. Ric Zuckerman at Adelaide, for example, has written on the Tsarist secret police, while Labelot Owen, the author of *The Russian Peasant Movement, 1906-1917* (1937) was an Australian. This traditional strength remains in full flood. In a recent masterful study of the rewriting of history in Soviet Russia Roger Markwick does for historians in the late Soviet era what Douglas Weiner had earlier done for natural scientists:⁷⁰ namely, demonstrated that beneath the officially imposed conformity in the Soviet Union there ran deep currents of autonomy and professional integrity.⁷¹ Based on his doctoral research at the University of Sydney, the book reflects years of thought, interviews and research. The focus is on the development of history in the years following Stalin's death up to 1974, with a relatively brief analysis of later developments up to

⁷⁰ Douglas R. Weiner, *Models of Nature: Ecology, Conservation, and Cultural revolution in Soviet Russia* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1988); Douglas R. Weiner, *A Little Corner of Freedom: Russian Nature Protection from Stalin to Gorbachev* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1999).

⁷¹ Roger D. Markwick, *Rewriting History in Soviet Russia* (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2001).

the full-scale triumph of revisionism in the Gorbachev years. The approach is a fruitful blend of history and political science. The work deservedly was awarded the Alec Nove prize for the best book in the field at the British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies (BASEES) annual conference in April 2003.

Markwick draws on Kuhn's concept of a paradigm shift to argue that the shaping of a revisionist approach to questions of Soviet history in the early post-Stalin period laid the basis for the re-emergence of a traditional role for the Russian intelligentsia in the 1960s and later. The influence of Churchward is possibly at work here. The intelligentsia has acted as the conscience of the nation; in this case it acted as the guardian of the well-springs not only of the truth about the Soviet past, but also of an approach to science in which truth is separated from the imperatives of the power system. This dual rejection of orthodox Soviet practices laid the basis for a vigorous revisionist school of historiography from the 1950s that blossomed into a full-scale rejection of the distortions of the 'Stalinist school of falsification' during the period of *glasnost*. Markwick uses the term 'revisionism' not in its traditional Marxist-Leninist sense of opportunistic deviations from the one true path, but to denote intellectual challenges to orthodoxy. From this perspective, he demonstrates the limits of narrow totalitarian approaches to Soviet reality. Above all, he convincingly shows that an excessive focus on a relatively small number of 'dissidents' has obscured profound currents of autonomy that gathered pace within the system itself, above all within its intellectual heartlands.

The focus of this book is the work of the Academy of Science's Institute of History in Moscow, but the resonance of this study is much wider. It joins a growing literature demonstrating the complex currents flowing beneath the placid surface of Soviet life, but it also

demonstrates the devastating impact of Brezhnev's stagnation. Instead of allowing this revisionist current to inform and enrich Soviet socialism, it was harried and marginalised. By the time Gorbachev was ready to draw on the *intelligent* tradition the reserves of loyalty to the system had been much weakened and were quickly exhausted. Markwick has written a classic that describes this process and thus is more than a history of historians in the late Soviet period, but itself makes a major contribution to the history of the USSR and its fall. He is now researching state and society in the USSR during the Second World War.

Stephen Wheatcroft was one of the most active Australian academics in putting Melbourne on the map in establishing the original Centre for Russian and East European Studies in the 1980s. It was officially opened by Nikolai Ryzhkov, Gorbachev's prime minister, in 1989 and hosted a number of top Soviet and then Russian politicians, scholars and officials. The Centre acted as a magnet for Russian scholars, and many of these immigrant academics have remained in the country. His work has focused on mortality statistics in Russian and the Soviet Union. In a well-known series of exchanges in *Europe-Asia Studies* he has debated the excess mortality caused by Stalin's purges. He has also developed the field of 'comparative famines'. His collaboration with members of his former alma mater, the Centre for Russian and East European Studies at the University of Birmingham has been particularly fruitful.⁷² In a recent edited book he has brought together an impressive range of contributors to question accepted versions of Russian history.⁷³ Wheatcroft's successor as director of the Centre,

⁷² For example, R. W. Davies, Mark Harrison and Stephen Wheatcroft (eds), *The Economic Transformation of the Soviet Union, 1913-1945* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994).

⁷³ Stephen Wheatcroft (ed.), *Challenging Traditional Views of Russian History* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

Vladimir Tikhomirov, edited a number of particularly impressive volumes that brought together Australian scholars in the field, expatriate Russians and other academics.⁷⁴ Tikhomirov later returned to Moscow to enter the world of business. David Christian, now at the University of California, San Diego, wrote an early work on vodka in Russian history. In his *Power and Privilege* he brought in the steppe people to develop a history of Russia since neolithic times, an approach that clearly builds on the Australian aboriginal experience.⁷⁵ His work in the area of 'world history' take a broad view of historical processes.⁷⁶

Foreign policy: culture and context

There is a long tradition of the Australasian study of foreign policy. Amin Saikal and William Maley co-edited a fine work examining the issues associated with the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan,⁷⁷ a book that has taken on renewed relevance in the light of recent events. Peter Shearman's work on the Soviet relationship with Cuba remains one of the best studies of the question.⁷⁸ His sceptical view of Gorbachev's foreign policy is reflected in a review essay published soon after the fall of the Soviet system.⁷⁹ An edited collection in the 1990s provided an early overview of Russian

⁷⁴ Vladimir Tikhomirov (ed.), *Russia After Yeltsin* (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2001). His earlier volumes were Vladimir Tikhomirov, *The Political Economy of Post-Soviet Russia* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 2000), and Vladimir Tikhomirov, (ed.), *Anatomy of the 1998 Russian Crisis* (University of Melbourne, Contemporary Europe Research Centre, 1999).

⁷⁵ David Christian, *Imperial and Soviet Russia: Power, Privilege and the Challenge of Modernity* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1986/1994/1997).

⁷⁶ David Christian, 'Inner Eurasia as a Unit of World History', *Journal of World History*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 1994, pp. 173-84; idem, 'Silk Roads or Steppe Roads? The Silk Roads in World History', *Journal of World History*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 2000, pp. 1-26.

⁷⁷ Amin Saikal and William Maley (eds), *The Soviet Withdrawal from Afghanistan* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989).

⁷⁸ Peter Shearman, *The Soviet Union and Cuba* (London, Chatham House Papers No. 38, 1987).

⁷⁹ Peter Shearman, 'New Political Thinking Reassessed', *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 2, 1993, pp. 139-58.

foreign policy, covering its various geographical spheres of interest.⁸⁰ He now has a book coming out on European security since 9/11, edited with his former PhD student Matt Sussex.⁸¹ They are currently working together on the security aspects of the Chechen war through the prism of Mary Kaldor's thesis of new wars, a thesis she based on the experience of the Bosnian conflict. Robert G. Patman began his work with a study of Soviet involvement in the Horn of Africa.⁸² Now at the Otago Foreign Policy School, he has edited volumes on post-Cold War security⁸³ and on the question of universal human rights. His focus at present is on how Reagan's first administration energised the reformers, and in general is working on the question of the Russian-US relationship seen through Russian eyes.

Although Bobo Lo is now primarily known for his work on Yeltsin's and Putin's foreign policy, his first work (based on a doctoral dissertation written at Melbourne University) is a study of Soviet labour ideology, focusing in particular on the Gorbachev period although referring back to Andropov and Chernenko.⁸⁴ Lo's book on Yeltsin's foreign policy is one of the most sustained single-authored works on the subject.⁸⁵ Focusing on the major ideological currents that framed policy debates in Russia in the 1990s, while aware of the institutional constraints that helped shape policy, Lo challenges many a facile assumption about the foreign policy of the Yeltsin era. Lo's recent study of Putin's foreign policy takes a

⁸⁰ Peter Shearman (ed.), *Russian Foreign Policy Since 1990* (Boulder, Westview Press, 1995).

⁸¹ Peter Shearman and Matthew Sussex (eds), *European Security after 9/11, 2001* (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2004).

⁸² Robert G. Patman, *The Soviet Union in the Horn of Africa* (London, Croom Helm, 1986).

⁸³ Robert G. Patman (ed.), *Security in a Post-Cold War World* (Otago, University of Otago, 1999).

⁸⁴ Bobo Lo, *Soviet Labour Ideology and the Collapse of the State* (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2000).

⁸⁵ Bobo Lo, *Russian Foreign Policy in the Post-Soviet Era: Reality, Illusion and Mythmaking* (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2002).

thematic approach, dealing with the policy-making environment, the economic agenda, security and geopolitics, identity, values and civilisation, and end with a contemplation of the impact of 11 September on Russian foreign policy and Russia's place in the world.⁸⁶

Quite apart from his scholarly work, Lo is interesting for a number of reasons. His background, with a Chinese father and French mother, reflects Australian multiculturalism. His decision to use the forename 'Bobo', when he has perfectly serviceable French (François) and Chinese forenames, suggests a robust independence of mind. Above all, his decision not to enter directly into academic life was in part determined by the extraordinary devaluation that the academy has suffered in late capitalist society. In Australia we all know about the sustained financial pressures imposed on the sector, whereas in Britain the auditing culture imposed on universities by successive Conservative governments, out of the sheer pleasure of reducing scholarly life to the hand-maiden of a particularly narrow version of capitalist reproduction was continued, and indeed intensified, by new Labour (late Thatcherism!) out of a sense of duty. Lo wisely entered the diplomatic service and spent some time as a Counsellor at the Australian embassy in Moscow. He is now an independent scholar working closely with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London, having enjoyed a fellowship in Oxford and at the Carnegie Moscow Centre.

The cultural angle is taken up by Stephanie Lawson, Professor of International Relations and Director of European and International and Social Studies at UEA. In a number of important works she has examined issues associated with culture, democracy,

⁸⁶ Bobo Lo, *Vladimir Putin and the Evolution of Russian Foreign Policy* (Blackwell, Royal Institute for International Affairs, 2003).

nationalism and ethnicity in Asia-Pacific as well as normative international theory. She has examined the 'Asian values' debate and tried to unpack not only 'orientalism' (to use Edward Said's term) but also the cultural basis and international relations implications of 'occidentalism'. These issues were taken up in her edited book on *The New Agenda for International Relations*.⁸⁷ More specifically, her work on the cultural sources of foreign policy has important implications for the way that we study Russian foreign policy. Central Asia has now become part of Russian foreign policy, and Amin Saikal's Centre for Arab and Islamic Studies at the ANU provides a focus for much of this work and the framework for the research of notable scholars such as Kirill Nourzhanov.

In the latest collection edited by Lawson,⁸⁸ David Lockwood's chapter on the Russian Far East takes up some of the questions already addressed some years ago by Carlyle A. Thayer in his work on the USSR's role as an Asian power.⁸⁹ Lockwood is a specialist in Soviet history and the political economy of contemporary Russia, focusing in particular on the role of the state in economic development and the transition from state-run to market economies, and the impact of globalisation on national states. The latter was an issue he took up in his controversial work on the impact of globalisation on the fall of the USSR.⁹⁰ In his essay in Lawson's collection Lockwood examines the identity crisis in the Russian Far East, focusing in particular on settler states and the

⁸⁷ Stephanie Lawson (ed.), *The New Agenda for International Relations: From Polarization to Globalization in World Politics* (Cambridge, Polity, 2002). See also *The New Agenda for Global Security: Cooperating for Peace and Beyond* (London, Allen & Unwin, 1996).

⁸⁸ Stephanie Lawson (ed.), *Europe and the Asia-Pacific: Culture, Identity and Representations of Region* (London, RoutledgeCurzon, 2003).

⁸⁹ Carlyle A. Thayer, *The Soviet Union as an Asian Pacific Power* (Boulder, CO, Westview Press, 1987).

⁹⁰ David Lockwood, *The Destruction of the Soviet Union: A Study in Globalization* (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2000).

border mentality.⁹¹ He discusses the impact of marketisation on representations of the border, while never losing sight of the facticity of territorial division, a theme he took up in a Contemporary Europe Research Centre (CERC) working paper.⁹² Lockwood's achievement is to problematise the 'borderness' of states by providing historical and theoretical contextualisation. His work thus complements that of the great Finnish scholars in the field of psychological geography, above all Anssi Paasi.⁹³

The European challenge to political studies has been taken up in the work of Philomena Murray, currently director of CERC at the University of Melbourne, under whose auspices this work is being published. Educated at the College of Europe, Bruges, University College Dublin and the European University Institute, Florence, she then in the 1980s entered the diplomatic service before taking up lecturing in Australia. She is the President of the Contemporary European Studies association of Australia and between 1996-98 was joint editor of *The Australian Journal of Political Science*. With Leslie Holmes she edited *Europe – Rethinking the Boundaries*,⁹⁴ and also with him edited *Citizenship and Identity in Europe*.⁹⁵

⁹¹ David Lockwood, 'Europe in the Asia-Pacific: The Russian Far East faces its Future', in Stephanie Lawson (ed.), *Europe and the Asia-Pacific: Culture, Identity and Representations of Region* (forthcoming).

⁹² David Lockwood, *Border Economics Versus Border Mentality: The Politics of Russia/China Border Trade*, The University of Melbourne, CERC Working Paper Series No. 2, 2001.

⁹³ Anssi Paasi, *Territories, Boundaries and Consciousness: The Changing Geographies of the Finnish-Russian Border* (Chichester, John Wiley & Sons, 1996).

⁹⁴ Philomena Murray and Leslie Holmes (eds), *Europe – Rethinking the Boundaries* (Aldershot, Ashgate, 1998)

⁹⁵ Leslie Holmes and Philomena Murray (eds), *Citizenship and Identity in Europe* (Aldershot, Ashgate, 1999).

Other

This paper has made no claim to provide an exhaustive study of Australasian scholarship on Soviet and East European affairs. There is plenty of work in addition to that mentioned above. For example, the sociologist Jan Pakulski in Tasmania has published much important work on legitimacy in communist states, and is an example of a Pole who moved from being an 'honorary Australian' to becoming part of what makes Australia such a vibrant intellectual community. There is much research in the sphere of language and literature studies, as well as on gender issues. The whole sphere of Soviet and post-Soviet legal studies is well-represented in the profession. Born in Poland, Adam Czarnota's work has focused on the sociology of law, legal theory, the philosophy of law and the history of ideas. Together with Martin Krygier he edited an important study of the development of law in post-communist societies.⁹⁶ As for the work of economists, I am ill-equipped to judge. One work which provides an excellent overview of post-communist economic developments is that by Richard Pomfret, professor of Economics at the University of Adelaide.⁹⁷ His work, like many others today, stresses the importance of governance and institutions in the transition; to a degree, the choice between gradualist or so-called shock therapies is less important than state capacity.

Towards the future

There are many younger scholars now working on Soviet, East European and Russian affairs. Let me note the work of only a few.

⁹⁶ Adam Czarnota and Martin Krygier (eds), *The Rule of Law After Communism: Problems and Prospects in East-Central Europe* (Aldershot, Ashgate, 1999).

Emma Gilligan, of the University of Melbourne, has provided a fascinating study of Sergei Kovalyov.⁹⁸ The work presents a challenging and balanced assessment both of the man (and his personal failings) and his work, effectively inter-weaving accounts of Kovalyov's personal development and public life. Zoe Knox's study of the Russian Orthodox Church (ROC) argues that its role has been much enhanced in post-communist Russia but that ROC's relationship with the development of civil society has at best been ambiguous, a problem that is examined through the prism of developments in three spheres: social, political and religious.⁹⁹ The analysis is rooted in a sound discussion of theoretical problems of the meaning of civil society and of Orthodox traditions and concepts of *symphonia* and *sobornost*. One of the themes of the book is that the ROC has changed in the transition from communism from oppressed to suppresser.

In a recent book Jason Sharman, a lecturer in government at the University of Sydney, examines how governments can stay in power without the consent of the governed. On the basis of case studies of Soviet collectivisation, the Hungarian uprising of 1956 and the rise of Solidarity in Poland, he examines how communist systems stymied the ability of popular grievances to be transformed into collective action and thus allowed the state to lord over society.¹⁰⁰ Clearly, there are many other talented young scholars preparing or having recently completed their PhDs. Examples include Robert Horvath, Stefan Auer, Matt Sussex, Don Bowser,

⁹⁷ Richard Pomfret, *Constructing a Market Economy: Diverse Paths from Central Planning in Asia and Europe* (Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 2002).

⁹⁸ Emma Gilligan, *Sergei Kovalyov and the Defense of Human Rights in Russia*, PhD thesis, University of Melbourne, October 2001; to be published by RoutledgeCurzon.

⁹⁹ Zoe Knox, *The Struggle for Religious Pluralism: Russian Orthodoxy and Civil Society in Post-Soviet Russia*, PhD Thesis, Centre for European Studies, Monash University, March 2002; to be published by RoutledgeCurzon.

¹⁰⁰ Jason Sharman, *Repression and Resistance in Communist Europe* (London and New York, RoutledgeCurzon, 2003).

Julie Elkner, Michelle Dixon, John Brookfield and Carol Strong. All are developing interesting research and publication profiles. A case in point is the work of Robert Horvath, who provided a stimulating essay in the already-mentioned volume edited by Stephen Wheatcroft.¹⁰¹

Conclusion

By the nature of such a paper, there can be no conclusion. A few comments however may be appropriate. Let us return to the question posed at the beginning: is there an Australasian school of Communist and East European studies? We have identified a large number of Australians who have made a significant contribution to the field, working both in Australia and abroad. We have also suggested that this work is impossible to categorise into any of the existing schools: totalitarian, revisionist or something in between. It is characterised by detailed research, archival, interviews and other primary and secondary sources.

Clearly, the higher education sector in Australia is facing particularly harsh challenges. The organisational framework for study in the field reveals elements of continuity and change. The Australia and New Zealand Slavists Association (ANZSA) has a long tradition in area studies, helping focus work in the area of language and literary studies (although it is not closed to others working in the field) through its Twentieth Century Group conferences and the publication of the journal *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies* (formerly *Melbourne Slavonic Papers*). The AACPCS, formed in the early 1990s, is oriented towards the social sciences, although

¹⁰¹ Robert Horvath, 'The Dissident Roots of Glasnost', in Stephen Wheatcroft (ed.), *Challenging Traditional Roots of Russian History* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), p. 173-202.

again ensures the permeability of disciplinary boundaries and includes all communist and post-communist societies, most notably China, in its purview.

The fall of communism has removed one of the major incentives to invest and support work in the field of Soviet studies. Research into East Asia has clearly risen to greater prominence as part of Australia repositioning itself as an East Asian power. The way that the field is institutionalised has changed markedly in response to new scholarly and political agendas, notably the rise of pan-European studies. The subsuming of the former dedicated Centre for Russian and East European Studies at the University of Melbourne into the broader Contemporary Europe Research Centre is part of a wider trend. The National Europe Centre in Canberra is now far more prominent than the old East European studies focus at ANU. In general there has been a shift of resources from Soviet and East European studies to allow a greater focus on the Asian and European contexts. This shift of scholarly emphasis since the fall of communism is appropriate, but is in danger of being taken too far.

The Slavic and Eurasian region remains an important field in its own right, and Australian scholars continue to make an important contribution. With the onset of globalisation, cheaper air travel and the internet, Australia is becoming ever more integrated into a single global scholarly community. At the same time, however, access to *Pravda* and some other basic Soviet sources is no longer enough on which to make judgements. The premium is now on field visits, interviews and archival research in Russia and other post-communist states, and this in itself poses problems for scholars burdened by teaching, administrative and other commitments. Distances have shrunk in one sense, but globalisation has certainly not negated location. In a scholarly

sense, however, Australia has always been a vibrant part of the Soviet, East European and Russian studies field – and long may it continue.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arnason, Johann P.; *The Future that Failed: Origins and Destinies of the Soviet Model* (London and New York, Routledge, 1993).

Besemeres, John; *Socialist Population Politics: The Political Implications of Demographic Trends in the USSR and Eastern Europe* (New York, M. E. Sharpe, 1980).

Christian, David, *Imperial and Soviet Russia: Power, Privilege and the Challenge of Modernity* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1986/1994/1997).

Christian, David, 'Inner Eurasia as a Unit of World History', *Journal of World History*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 1994, pp. 173-84; idem, 'Silk Roads or Steppe Roads? The Silk Roads in World History', *Journal of World History*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 2000, pp. 1-26.

Churchward, Lloyd; *The Soviet Intelligentsia: An Essay on the Social Structure and Roles of Soviet Intellectuals in the 1960s* (London & Boston, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973).

Churchward, Lloyd; *Contemporary Soviet Government*, second edn (London & Boston, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975).

Churchward, Lloyd; *Soviet Socialism: Social and Political Essays* (London & Boston, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987).

Czarnota, Adam and Krygier, Martin (eds), *The Rule of Law After Communism: Problems and Prospects in East-Central Europe* (Aldershot, Ashgate, 1999).

Davies, R. W., Mark Harrison and Stephen Wheatcroft (eds), *The Economic Transformation of the Soviet Union, 1913-1945* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Democracy and Post-Communism: Political Change in the Post-Communist World (London, Routledge, 2002).

Dibb, Paul; *The Soviet Union: The Incomplete Superpower* (London, Macmillan, 1986).

Dryzek, John S., and Leslie Holmes (eds), *Post-Communist Democratization: Political Discourses across Thirteen Countries* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Fainsod, Merle; *How Russia is Ruled* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1963).

Fehér et al, *Dictatorship over Needs*, p. xiii.

Ferenc Fehér, Agnes Heller and György Márkus, *Dictatorship over Needs: An Analysis of Soviet Societies* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1983).

Fortescue, Stephen, *The Communist Party and Soviet Science* (London, Macmillan, 1986); *Science Policy in the Soviet Union* (London, Routledge, 1990).

Fortescue, Stephen, *Policy-Making for Russian Industry* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1997).

Gill, Graeme; *Peasants and Government in the Russian Revolution* (London, Macmillan and New York, Barnes & Noble, 1979).

Gill, Graeme; *The Rules of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (London, Macmillan 1988).

Gill, Graeme; *The Collapse of a Single-Party System: the Disintegration of the CPSU* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Gill, Graeme, *Twentieth Century Russia. The Search for Power and Authority* (Melbourne, Nelson, 1987, repr. 1988, 1989 & 1991; second fully revised edition 1994).

Gill, Graeme and Roderick Pitty; *Power in the Party: The Organization of Power and Central-Republican Relations in the CPSU* (London, Macmillan, 1997).

Gill, Graeme (ed.), *Elites and Leadership in Russian Politics* (London, Macmillan, 1998).

Gill, Graeme; *The Dynamics of Democratization: Elites, Civil Society and the Transition Process* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 2000).

Gill, Graeme, and Roger D. Markwick, *Russia's Stillborn Democracy? From Gorbachev to Yeltsin* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000).

Gill, Graeme; *Stalinism* (London, Macmillan, 1990).

Gill, Graeme; *The Origins of the Stalinist Political System* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990).

Gill, Graeme; *Stalinism* (2nd ed.) (London, Macmillan, 1998).

Gill, Graeme; *The Nature and Development of the Modern State* (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2003).

Gilligan, Emma; *Sergei Kovalyov and the Defense of Human Rights in Russia*, PhD thesis, University of Melbourne, October 2001; to be published by RoutledgeCurzon.

Heller, Agnes; *The Theory of Need in Marx* (London, Allison & Busby, 1976).

Heller, Agnes and Ferenc Fehér, *The Grandeur and Twilight of Radical Universalism* (New York, Transaction Books, 1991);

Heller, Agnes; *An Ethics of Personality* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1996);

Heller, Agnes; *A Theory of Modernity* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1999).

Holmes, Leslie (ed.), *The Withering Away of the State? Party and State Under Communism* (London and Beverly Hills, Sage Modern Politics Series, Volume 6, 1981).

Holmes, Leslie and Philomena Murray (eds), *Citizenship and Identity in Europe* (Aldershot, Ashgate, 1999).

Holmes, Leslie T.; 'The GDR: The Search for Autonomous Patterns of Development', in Robert F. Miller (ed.), *The Developments of Civil Society in Communist Systems* (Sydney, Allen & Unwin, 1992), pp. 65-83.

Holmes, Leslie, *Politics in the Communist World* (Oxford, Clarendon, 1986).

Holmes, Leslie, *Post-Communism: An Introduction* (Cambridge, Polity Press, 1997).

Holmes, Leslie, *The End of Communist Power: Anti-Corruption Campaigns and Legitimation Crisis* (Cambridge, Polity Press, 1993).

Holmes, Leslie, *The Policy Process in Communist States* (London, Sage Publications, 1981).

Horvath, Robert, 'The Dissident Roots of Glasnost', in Stephen Wheatcroft (ed.), *Challenging Traditional Roots of Russian History* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

Kamenka, Eugene, *The Ethical Foundations of Marxism* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962/1972).

Kamenka, Eugene; *Marxism and Ethics* (London, Macmillan, 1969).

Kamenka, Eugene; *The Philosophy of Ludwig Feuerbach* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970);

Kamenka, Eugene; *Bureaucracy* (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1989).

Knox, Zoe, *The Struggle for Religious Pluralism: Russian Orthodoxy and Civil Society in Post-Soviet Russia*, PhD Thesis, Centre for European Studies, Monash University, March 2002; to be published by RoutledgeCurzon.

Kolakowski, Leszek and Stuart Hampshire (eds), *The Socialist Idea: A Reappraisal* (London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1974), pp. 18-35.

Krygier, Martin; 'Parables of Hope and Disappointment', *East European Constitutional Review*, Vol. 11, No. 3, Summer 2002, pp. 62-5.

Kukathas, Chandran; David W. Lovell, William Maley (eds), *The Theory of Politics: An Australian Perspective* (Melbourne, Longman Cheshire, 1990).

Kukathas, Chandran; David W. Lovell, William Maley (eds), *The Transition from Socialism: State and Civil Society in the USSR* (Melbourne, Longman Cheshire, 1991).

Lawson, Stephanie (ed.), *The New Agenda for Global Security: Cooperating for Peace and Beyond* (London, Allen & Unwin, 1996).

Lawson, Stephanie (ed.), *The New Agenda for International Relations: From Polarization to Globalization in World Politics* (Cambridge, Polity, 2002).

Lawson, Stephanie (ed.), *Europe and the Asia-Pacific: Culture, Identity and Representations of Region* (London, RoutledgeCurzon, 2003).

Lo, Bobo; *Soviet Labour Ideology and the Collapse of the State* (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2000).

Lo, Bobo; *Russian Foreign Policy in the Post-Soviet Era: Reality, Illusion and Mythmaking* (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2002).

Lo, Bobo; *Vladimir Putin and the Evolution of Russian Foreign Policy* (Blackwell, Royal Institute for International Affairs, 2003).

Lockwood, David; *The Destruction of the Soviet Union: A Study in Globalization* (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2000).

Lockwood, David; *Border Economics Versus Border Mentality: The Politics of Russia/China Border Trade*, The University of Melbourne, CERC Working Paper Series No. 2, 2001.

Lockwood, David; 'Europe in the Asia-Pacific: The Russian Far East faces its Future', in Stephanie Lawson (ed.), *Europe and the Asia-Pacific: Culture, Identity and Representations of Region* (forthcoming).

Lovell, David W.; *From Marx to Lenin: An Evaluation of Marx's Responsibility for Soviet Authoritarianism* (Cambridge University Press, 1984).

Lovell, David W.; *Trotsky's Analysis of Soviet Bureaucratisation: A Critical Essay* (London, Croom Helm, 1985).

Lovell, David W.; *Marx's Proletariat: The Making of a Myth* (London, Routledge, 1988).

Lovell, David W.; 'Trust and the Politics of Postcommunism', *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, Vol. 34, Issue 1, March 2001, pp. 27-38.

Lovell, David W., (ed.), *The Transition: Evaluating the Postcommunist Experience* (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2002).

Markwick, Roger; 'Activist Academic: Lloyd Churchward as a Labour Intellectual', *Labour History Review*, No. 77, November 1999, pp. 27-43.

Markwick, Roger D.; *Rewriting History in Soviet Russia* (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2001).

Miller, John; *Mikhail Gorbachev and the End of Soviet Power* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1993).

Miller, R. F., *One Hundred Thousand Tractors: the MTS and the Development of Controls in Soviet Agriculture* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1970).

Miller, R. F., *Socialism and Agricultural Cooperation: The Soviet and Yugoslav Cases* (Canberra, Department of Political Science, Institute of Advanced Studies, ANU Occasional Papers, 1974).

Miller, R. F., and T. H. Rigby, *Political and Administrative Aspects of the Scientific and Technical Revolution in the USSR* (Canberra,

Department of Political Science, Institute of Advanced Studies, ANU Occasional Papers, 1976).

Miller, R. F., *Tito as Political Leader and External Factors in Yugoslav Political Development* (Canberra, Department of Political Science, Institute of Advanced Studies, ANU Occasional Papers, 1977).

Miller, R. F.; *Federalism as a Safety-Valve: The Yugoslav Case* (Canberra, Centre for Research on Federal Financial Relations, Australian National University, Occasional Paper 16, 1981).

Miller, R. F. (ed.), *Poland in the Eighties: Social Revolution Against 'Real Socialism'* (Canberra: Department of Political Science, Institute of Advanced Studies, ANU Occasional Papers, 1984).

Miller, R. F., and Ferenc Fehér (eds), *Khrushchev and the Communist World* (London, Croom Helm, 1984).

Miller, R. F with J. H. Miller and T. H. Rigby (eds), *Gorbachev at the Helm: A New Era in Soviet Politics?* (London and Sydney, Croom Helm, 1987).

Miller, R. F.; J. H. Miller and T. H. Rigby (eds), *Gorbachev at the Helm: A New Era in Soviet Politics* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987).

Miller, R. F. *et al* (eds), *Gorbachev at the Helm: A New Era in Soviet Politics* (London, Croom Helm, 1987).

Miller, R. F.; *Soviet Foreign Policy Today: Gorbachev and the 'New Political Thinking'* (Sydney, Allen & Unwin, 1991).

Miller, R. F. (ed.), *The Developments of Civil Society in Communist Systems* (Sydney, Allen & Unwin, 1992).

Miller, R. F.; 'Tudjman's Victory: Croatia, the U.N., NATO and the U.S.' *Nationalities Papers*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (September 1997), pp. 501-514.

Miller, R. F.; 'Dealing with the Communist Past: The Special Case of Yugoslavia', *The South Slav Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 1-2 (87-88), Spring-Summer 2002, pp. 3-27.

Miller, Robert F. (ed.), *The Developments of Civil Society in Communist Systems* (Sydney, Allen & Unwin, 1992).

Murray, Philomena and Leslie Holmes (eds), *Europe – Rethinking the Boundaries* (Aldershot, Ashgate, 1998)

Paasi, Anssi; *Territories, Boundaries and Consciousness: The Changing Geographies of the Finnish-Russian Border* (Chichester, John Wiley & Sons, 1996).

Patman, Robert G., *The Soviet Union in the Horn of Africa* (London, Croom Helm, 1986).

Patman, Robert G., (ed.), *Security in a Post-Cold War World* (Otago, University of Otago, 1999).

Pavković, A., H. Koscharsky and A.Czarnota (eds), *Nationalism and Postcommunism: A Collection of Essays* (Aldershot and Brookfield, Vermont, Dartmouth Publishing, 1995).

Pavković, Aleksandar, 'From Yugoslavism to Serbism: the Serb National Idea, 1986-1996', *Nations and Nationalism*, Vol. 4, 1998.

Pavković, Aleksandar, 'Recursive Secessions in Former Yugoslavia: Too Hard a Case for Theories of Secession?', *Political Studies*, Vol. 48, 2000, pp. 485-502.

Pavković, Aleksandar, *The Fragmentation of Yugoslavia: Nationalism and War in the Balkans*, 2nd revised edition (London, Macmillan and New York, St. Martin's Press, 2000).

Pavković, Aleksandar, 'Secession as Defense of a Liberty: a Liberal Answer to a Nationalist Demand', *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, forthcoming.

Pomfret, Richard, *Constructing a Market Economy: Diverse Paths from Central Planning in Asia and Europe* (Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 2002).

Rigby, 'Stalinism and the Mono-organisational Society', pp. 58-9.

Saikal, Amin and William Maley (eds), *The Soviet Withdrawal from Afghanistan* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989).

Saikal, Amin, and William Maley (eds), *Russia in Search of its Future* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Sharman, Jason, *Repression and Resistance in Communist Europe* (London and New York, RoutledgeCurzon, 2003).

Shearman, Peter, *The Soviet Union and Cuba* (London, Chatham House Papers No. 38, 1987).

Shearman, Peter, 'New Political Thinking Reassessed', *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 2, 1993, pp. 139-58.

Shearman, Peter (ed.), *Russian Foreign Policy Since 1990* (Boulder, Westview Press, 1995).

Shearman, Peter and Matthew Sussex (eds), *European Security after 9/11, 2001* (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2004).

Rigby, T. H.; *Communist Party Membership in the USSR, 1917-1967* (Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1968).

Rigby, T. H.; 'Stalinism and the Mono-organisational Society', in Robert C. Tucker (ed.), *Stalinism: Essays in Historical Interpretation* (New York, Norton, 1977), pp. 53-76.

Rigby, T. H.; *Lenin's Government* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1979).

Rigby, T. H. and F. Feher (eds), *Political Legitimation in Communist Systems* (London, Macmillan, 1982).

Rigby, T. H. and B. Harasymiw (eds), *Leadership Selection and Patron-Client Relations in the USSR and Yugoslavia* (London, Allen & Unwin, 1983).

Rigby, T. H.; *Political Elites in the USSR: Central Leaders and Local Cadres from Lenin to Gorbachev* (Aldershot, Edward Elgar, 1990).

Rigby, T. H.; *The Changing Soviet System: Mono-organisational Socialism from its Origins to Gorbachev's Restructuring* (Aldershot, Edward Elgar, 1990).

Thayer, Carlyle A., *The Soviet Union as an Asian Pacific Power* (Boulder, CO, Westview Press, 1987).

White, Stephen; *The Politics of Transition: Shaping a Post-Soviet Future* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993).

Tikhomirov, Vladimir (ed.), *Anatomy of the 1998 Russian Crisis* (University of Melbourne, Contemporary Europe Research Centre, 1999).

Tikhomirov, Vladimir (ed.), *Russia After Yeltsin* (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2001). His earlier volumes were Vladimir Tikhomirov, *The Political Economy of Post-Soviet Russia* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 2000).

Weiner, Douglas R., *Models of Nature: Ecology, Conservation, and Cultural revolution in Soviet Russia* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1988);

Weiner, Douglas R.; *A Little Corner of Freedom: Russian Nature Protection from Stalin to Gorbachev* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1999).

Wheatcroft, Stephen (ed.), *Challenging Traditional Views of Russian History* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

CERC PUBLICATIONS

	Price	+ postage within Australia	International orders (includes airmail postage)
A. Elijah, P. Murray and C. O'Brien, <i>Australia-EU Relations</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> \$10.00	<input type="checkbox"/> \$11.50	<input type="checkbox"/> \$13.00
R. Abazov, <i>Foreign Policy Formation in Central Asia</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> \$10.00	<input type="checkbox"/> \$11.50	<input type="checkbox"/> \$13.00
V. Tikhomirov, ed., <i>Anatomy of the 1998 Russian Crisis</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> \$27.45	<input type="checkbox"/> \$31.45	<input type="checkbox"/> \$39.00
R. Dossi, <i>Italy's Invisible Government</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> \$10.00	<input type="checkbox"/> \$11.50	<input type="checkbox"/> \$13.00
D. Lockwood, <i>Politics of Russia/China Border Trade</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> \$10.00	<input type="checkbox"/> \$11.50	<input type="checkbox"/> \$13.00
M. Longo, <i>The EU's Search for a Constitutional Future</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> \$10.00	<input type="checkbox"/> \$11.50	<input type="checkbox"/> \$13.00
J. Teorell, <i>Political Culture and Democracy in Russia</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> \$10.00	<input type="checkbox"/> \$11.50	<input type="checkbox"/> \$13.00
G. Burgess, <i>Human Rights Dilemma in Anti-Nazi Protest</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> \$10.00	<input type="checkbox"/> \$11.50	<input type="checkbox"/> \$13.00
A. Hadenius, <i>Development of Parties: Russia in Perspective</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> \$10.00	<input type="checkbox"/> \$11.50	<input type="checkbox"/> \$13.00
Z. Knox, <i>Russian Orthodoxy and Religious Pluralism</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> \$10.00	<input type="checkbox"/> \$11.50	<input type="checkbox"/> \$13.00
R. Sakwa, <i>The Australasian Contribution to Soviet, East European and Russian Studies</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> \$10.00	<input type="checkbox"/> \$11.50	<input type="checkbox"/> \$13.00
N. Chaban and J. Bain, <i>Peripheral and Invisible? The European Union in the New Zealand Media 2000 - 2002</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> \$10.00	<input type="checkbox"/> \$11.50	<input type="checkbox"/> \$13.00

* All prices are in Australian dollars and are GST-inclusive.

PERSONAL DETAILS:

Title: _____ Name: _____

Company/Institution: _____

Postal address: _____

Telephone: _____ Email: _____

PAYMENT DETAILS:

I enclose a cheque for \$ _____ made payable to 'The University of Melbourne'.

Please invoice me/my company/institution

Please charge \$ _____ to my credit card.

Type (Visa/Mastercard/Bankcard only): _____

Account No _____

Exp: _____

Signature: _____

CERC Working Papers Series

The CERC Working Papers Series aims to provide a forum for the publication of high quality original research, based on work in progress, on issues relating to Europe. The Series is fully refereed.

Guidelines for contributors

1. Papers should be approximately 8,000 - 12,000 words long.
2. Papers should be typed and double-spaced on A4.
3. Endnotes rather than footnotes should be used.
4. Authors' names and affiliations should appear only on the cover of the manuscript.
5. Each manuscript should be accompanied by an abstract of 150-200 words.
6. Endnotes should be kept to a minimum.
7. Please indicate word length and inclusion of any diagrams or tables.
8. All references should be listed alphabetically at the end of the paper.
9. For journal articles, the volume and issue number, and month and year of publication should be provided.
10. Please submit 3 copies of your paper with a disk in Word or convertible format.
11. The Working Paper may be work in progress, which you are considering submitting elsewhere at a later stage (though you should refer to this earlier version in your finalised paper).
12. All papers will be evaluated by two anonymous referees. The Editors act on the basis of the referees' reports, but retain final discretion in the decision to publish.
13. Authors receive 4 free copies of the Working Paper. Further copies may be purchased by authors for half price.

For more information, please contact the Editors:

A/Prof. Philomena Murray

Director
Contemporary Europe Research Centre
The University of Melbourne
Victoria 3010, Australia
Tel: (61-3) 8344 5151
Fax: (61-3) 8344 9507
e-mail: pbmurray@unimelb.edu.au

Prof. Leslie Holmes

Deputy Director
Contemporary Europe Research Centre
University of Melbourne
Victoria 3010, Australia
Tel: (61-3) 8344 7293
Fax: (61-3) 8344 9507
e-mail: leslieth@unimelb.edu.au

A/Prof. Peter Shearman

Department of Political Science
The University of Melbourne
Victoria 3010, Australia
Tel: (61-3) 8344 6559
Fax: (61-3) 8344 7906
e-mail: shearman@unimelb.edu.au

Contemporary Europe Research Centre
The University of Melbourne
Level 2, 234 Queensberry Street
The University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, Australia
tel: (61 3) 8344 9502
fax: (61 3) 8344 9507
e-mail: cerc@cerc.unimelb.edu.au
website: <http://www.cerc.unimelb.edu.au>