



Soviet Social Science: The Challenge for the American Academic Community : Summary of a Meeting (1990)

Pages
41

Size
5 x 8

ISBN
0309289904

Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education; National Research Council

 [Find Similar Titles](#)

 [More Information](#)

Visit the National Academies Press online and register for...

- ✓ Instant access to free PDF downloads of titles from the
 - NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
 - NATIONAL ACADEMY OF ENGINEERING
 - INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE
 - NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL
- ✓ 10% off print titles
- ✓ Custom notification of new releases in your field of interest
- ✓ Special offers and discounts

Distribution, posting, or copying of this PDF is strictly prohibited without written permission of the National Academies Press. Unless otherwise indicated, all materials in this PDF are copyrighted by the National Academy of Sciences.

To request permission to reprint or otherwise distribute portions of this publication contact our Customer Service Department at 800-624-6242.

Copyright © National Academy of Sciences. All rights reserved.



**REFERENCE COPY
FOR LIBRARY USE ONLY**

Soviet Social Science

"

The Challenge for the American Academic Community

Summary of a Meeting

Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education
National Research Council

L1B1A11

**National Research Council
2101 Constitution Avenue N.W.
Washington D.C. 20418**

National Academy Press
Washington, D.C. 1990

**Order from
National Technical
Information Service,
Springfield, Va.
22161
Order No. _____**

82.5
.K9
57
1990
C.1

NOTICE: The project that is the subject of this report was approved by the Governing Board of the National Research Council, whose members are drawn from the councils of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine. The members of the committee responsible for the report were chosen for their special competences and with regard for appropriate balance.

This report has been reviewed by a group other than the authors according to procedures approved by a Report Review Committee consisting of members of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine.

The National Academy of Sciences is a private, nonprofit, self-perpetuating society of distinguished scholars engaged in scientific and engineering research, dedicated to the furtherance of science and technology and to their use for the general welfare. Upon the authority of the charter granted to it by the Congress in 1863, the Academy has a mandate that requires it to advise the federal government on scientific and technical matters. Dr. Frank Press is president of the National Academy of Sciences.

The National Academy of Engineering was established in 1964, under the charter of the National Academy of Sciences, as a parallel organization of outstanding engineers. It is autonomous in its administration and in the selection of its members, sharing with the National Academy of Sciences the responsibility for advising the federal government. The National Academy of Engineering also sponsors engineering programs aimed at meeting national needs, encourages education and research, and recognizes the superior achievements of engineers. Dr. Robert M. White is president of the National Academy of Engineering.

The Institute of Medicine was established in 1970 by the National Academy of Sciences to secure the services of eminent members of appropriate professions in the examination of policy matters pertaining to the health of the public. The Institute acts under the responsibility given to the National Academy of Sciences by its congressional charter to be an adviser to the federal government and, upon its own initiative, to identify issues of medical care, research, and education. Dr. Samuel O. Thier is president of the Institute of Medicine.

The National Research Council was organized by the National Academy of Sciences in 1916 to associate the broad community of science and technology with the Academy's purposes of furthering knowledge and advising the federal government. Functioning in accordance with general policies determined by the Academy, the Council has become the principal operating agency of both the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering in providing services to the government, the public, and the scientific and engineering communities. The Council is administered jointly by both Academies and the Institute of Medicine. Dr. Frank Press and Dr. Robert M. White are chairman and vice chairman, respectively, of the National Research Council.

Additional copies of this report are available from:

Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education
National Research Council
2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20418

Printed in the United States of America

**COMMISSION ON BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
AND EDUCATION**

**ROBERT McC. ADAMS (Chair), Smithsonian Institution, Washington,
D.C.**

ANN L. BROWN, School of Education, University of California, Berkeley

DAVID K. COHEN, College of Education, Michigan State University

**PHILIP E. CONVERSE, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral
Sciences, Palo Alto, Calif.**

**ARTHUR S. GOLDBERGER, Department of Economics, University of
Wisconsin**

**JOSEPH B. KADANE, Department of Statistics, Carnegie Mellon
University**

**EDWARD O. LAUMANN, Department of Sociology, University of
Chicago**

ALVIN M. LIBERMAN, Haskins Laboratories, New Haven, Conn.

**DANIEL McFADDEN, Department of Economics, University of
California, Berkeley**

STEWART MACAULAY, School of Law, University of Wisconsin

**DAVID MECHANIC, Institute for Health, Health Care Policy, and Aging
Research, Rutgers University**

ROGER G. NOLL, Department of Economics, Stanford University

**SAMUEL PRESTON, Population Studies Center, University of
Pennsylvania**

FRANKLIN D. RAINES, Lazard Freres & Co., New York

**JOHN M. ROBERTS, Department of Anthropology, University of
Pittsburgh**

ELEANOR B. SHELDON, New York, New York

**JEROME E. SINGER, Department of Medical Psychology, Uniformed
Services University of the Health Sciences**

**JOHN A. SWETS, Bolt Beranek & Newmann, Inc., Cambridge,
Massachusetts**

SIDNEY VERBA, University Library, Harvard University

Foreword

Recognition of the economic, social, and political problems facing the Soviet Union has awakened the Soviet leadership to the need for social scientific analysis to help formulate new policies. *Glasnost* and *perestroika* have also created the opportunity to reform and restructure disciplines and to build capabilities for basic research. Significant reorganization within the Soviet Academy of Sciences (ASUSSR) and other parts of the academic establishment is under way. All of these changes have made the Soviets unusually open to contacts with Western social and behavioral scientists. Dozens of new joint programs in all fields have begun or are under discussion. The opportunities are too great for any single American organization or institution to handle. Although significant roles are available for many participants, there is also the risk of duplicating effort and straining limited resources.

The Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education (CBASSE) of the National Research Council believed there was a genuine need to bring together scholars and representatives of funding organizations and professional associations to exchange information and to think strategically about how the American social science community can best respond to the opportunities. With support from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the commission sponsored a meeting on August 24-25, 1989 for these purposes. The National Research Council and the National Academy of Sciences have a long history of such agenda-setting activities and of scholarly contacts with the Soviet Union. The Academy has conducted the longest continually operating American exchange program with the Soviet Union; 1989 was its 30th anniversary. In addition, the 1988 NAS-ASUSSR protocol calls for a new cooperative program in the social sciences, prompting CBASSE's interest in exploring how it could make its most effective

contribution. In sponsoring the meeting, CBASSE thus hoped to serve its own interests as well as those of the broader social and behavioral science community. In making public this summary of the meeting, it hopes to offer interested individuals and organizations a sense of the thinking of a diverse group of informed people about the possible roles of American social and behavioral science vis-a-vis the ongoing changes in Soviet social science, as of the meeting date.

The commission wishes to express its gratitude to staff members Paul Stern and Jo Husbands for developing the concept of the meeting and producing this summary, and to Sarah Givens and Mary Thomas, who worked with them in planning and organizing the meeting. Without their efforts, the meeting would neither have occurred nor succeeded.

Robert McC. Adams, Chair
Commission on Behavioral and Social
Sciences and Education

Background

The Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education held a meeting August 24-25, 1989, bringing together interested and knowledgeable people to exchange information and to think strategically about how the American social science community can best respond to new opportunities in the Soviet Union. This summary follows the structure of that meeting: the first section provides background on the history and development of Soviet social science as well as of U.S.–Soviet scholarly exchanges. The next section focuses on current conditions and trends in Soviet social science. The next section summarizes a number of smaller group discussions on more specific topics. The final section addresses the implications of these changes and opportunities for the U.S. social science community. The agenda for the two-day meeting and a list of participants appear at the end of the summary.

THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF SOVIET SOCIAL SCIENCE

Blair Ruble, The Kennan Institute

Ruble focused on the distinguishing features of Soviet behavioral and social science in the pre-1985 period and on the changes since 1985 in the rules of the game. He identified five organizational characteristics of Soviet social science, four of which distinguished it from U.S. social science.

1. *Size of the enterprise.* Soviet science involves an enormous investment of people and money—tens of thousands of people and thousands of institutions. The data for Soviet science in 1985 showed that there were over 5,000 scientific institutions, including 20 academies, employing 1.5

million scientific workers, about a third of whom had graduate degrees. A total of 5 percent of the Soviet gross national product was spent on science. Approximately 800,000 science workers were employed in research institutions, one-fifth of them in academic institutions and the rest in other state agencies. Two-thirds of the science workers were employed in the Russian republic, which has 70 percent of the Soviet population.

In the social sciences, there were 225,000 workers (compared with 316,000 in the United States). In economics, 35 percent of these had graduate degrees; in psychology, 53 percent; in pedagogy (possibly equivalent to educational research), less than 30 percent. By comparison, half of American social science workers have graduate degrees.

2. *Hierarchical and centralized character.* The structure of Soviet social science has its roots in the 1920s and 1930s, and its development was ruled by bureaucratic logic. The Soviet Academy of Sciences established branches in the capitals of the non-Russian republics in the 1930s, which absorbed the research functions of the local universities. During the period between the 1940s and the early 1960s, these branches became republic academies, and academy branches were created in all the autonomous republics by the mid-1970s. The academic structure was thus tied to the political structure rather than to a system dictated by scientific considerations.

Higher education followed the same pattern. Central institutions established branches, which grew into universities; there are now 800 institutions of higher education. This political logic produced a number of anomalies. Prestigious scientific research centers in Leningrad were under the organizational direction of Moscow, while full branches of the Academy of Sciences existed in much smaller places, such as Ufa.

3. *Influence of extra-academic considerations.* It is well known that research and personnel decisions were strongly influenced by ideology, anti-Semitism, and conformity and that research organizations were open to KGB influence and infiltration to a degree qualitatively different from anything in the United States.

4. *Relative isolation.* Between the 1920s and 1985, virtually no Soviet social scientists were trained in foreign graduate programs, and there was almost no cross-publication or joint authorship of scientific papers between Soviet scholars and foreigners. Although this isolation has been breaking down since 1985, there are still very few opportunities for Soviet citizens to study abroad. In a dramatic break from the past, for the first time, 17 Soviets entered graduate programs in sociology in the United States in fall 1989.

5. *Uniformity of research product.* Although debates have always existed in Soviet social science, they have been conducted in obscure and

Aesopian language. Public debates were conducted within a very narrow range of acceptable disagreement.

Since 1985, the transformation of Soviet political life has been changing social science. Soviet social science is undergoing reorganization from top to bottom. Not only are the changes important in the Soviet context, but they also create opportunities for Americans.

One major source of change is self-financing in the Academy of Sciences. For example, journal editors now compete for anti-Soviet articles because these increase readership. There is also a scramble for hard currency that has led Soviets to look to U.S. foundations as potential sources of support. These pressures will probably accelerate the opening of Soviet social science to the rest of the world.

The new laws legalizing cooperative enterprises are providing a second impetus for change. Under these laws, academic entrepreneurs are organizing consulting firms to do contract research for clients that include even foreign governments.

Ruble concluded that, with the shift in emphasis from reliable government support to self-financing and entrepreneurship, the Soviet scientific behemoth has gone on a crash diet since 1985. The recent changes have created opportunities for normal international interaction between Soviet and Western scholars, although aspects of such relations, such as communication by telephone and telefax, remain very difficult. The changes have also created chaos within the Soviet system. The crumbling of the centralized system has eliminated the old rules of interaction without creating new ones. This meeting is important because of the pressing need to turn the present chaos into meaningful opportunities.

THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF U.S.-SOVIET SCHOLARLY EXCHANGES

Allen Kassof, International Research and Exchanges Board

Kassof distinguished two modes of working with the Soviets. In the anthropological model, a scholar visits a strange tribe of people who claim to be scientists but are not. Scholars may learn from studying these people but do not “do scholarship” with them. Under the “colleagueship” model, people seriously attempt to work together despite their different cultures. It has not always been clear which model applied to U.S.-Soviet scholarly exchanges—each model seemed accurate at times, depending on the Soviets involved and on the political climate. Now it appears that in many cases the natives were really scientists dancing behind masks, which they have now dropped.

Kassof identified the following historical high points in social science contacts: From the mid-1930s until the mid-1950s, the U.S.S.R. was closed to all foreigners except from Eastern Europe, which has long influenced the Soviet Union. The first group of American fellows went to the U.S.S.R. in 1956 on tourist visas. In 1958, the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants was established, and it evolved into the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX) in 1968. In the early exchanges, most of the Soviets were expert in technical subjects and almost all the Americans were in the humanities and social sciences. IREX's first Soviet partner was the ministry of higher education; its partnership with the Soviet Academy of Sciences came later. The exchanges produced an underground establishment in the Soviet Union, consisting of people in contact with the U.S. academic community. In the United States, most official and unofficial sources opposed the exchanges, with the exception of the intelligence community, which considered them useful.

The IREX Commission on the Humanities and the Social Sciences was established in the early 1970s, creating a legitimate framework for joint work. It grew quickly and eventually established subcommissions in all the participating fields. Thousands of American scholars from Soviet studies and other fields have been involved, creating networks of acquaintances across disciplines.

Soviet scholars have shown strength in international relations and security studies and in economics, in which there has been some good work despite the difficulties created by insufficient data. There has been more collegiality with the Soviets than most Americans expected. Acquaintances developed in the exchanges that have made possible quick action in the new circumstances, such as arranging for Soviet graduate students to study in the United States.

The chief problem now for IREX is funding. It cannot support all the new activities, so other approaches are needed. IREX is in good shape to help define priorities and carry out seed projects.

At present, the Soviets feel an urgency about developing the social and policy sciences. They are making a crash effort, and there is a real risk that they will overestimate what social science can accomplish. Although some areas, such as demography and opinion polling, will have immediate payoffs in terms of gathering information, the search for policy answers is not destined to be fruitful. Although anthropologists may gain understanding of ethnic relations, they will not find solutions to ethnic problems. The Soviets may be looking for answers that are not there, and Americans need to be careful in presenting what social science can do.

Americans should consider their long-term interests for the time when "Soviet chic" is behind us. Do we want data for our own research? Soviet techniques we have not yet developed? Influence in Soviet society? And

if we want influence, should we try to gain it through social science? Americans are tempted by the idea that they can train a new generation of Soviet social scientists—it is a national desire of ours to tell others (in a friendly way) how to run their lives, and the Soviets are the newest available objects of that desire. But do we want a new generation of leading Soviet thinkers to be identified with the United States?

Among the other important issues confronting us is how to make contacts more multilateral in both the West and the East. We also need to do more with the non-Russian republics, yet it is not clear how to divide our efforts among them. Finally, the question of who will pay for the exchanges will be a central problem for current and future projects.

Kassof concluded that in dealing with the Soviet Union today, we have a moving target. We need to proceed deliberately, be clear about what we want, and connect disciplinary interests with area interests.

DISCUSSION

Participants raised a number of ideas during the discussions:

- The most important American contribution is standards, because Soviet social science has lost the mechanism for evaluation. Only by establishing standards can the Soviets identify and eliminate mediocrity and lack of expertise. Many of the 250,000 Soviet social scientists are not really social scientists; they study such topics as dialectical materialism and the history of the Soviet Communist Party and are immune to interactions with the outside world.

- The most important U.S. contribution would be to teach Soviet social scientists the history of their own fields.

- One observer commented that being identified with democratization is a danger to American social scientists. Many young Soviet sociologists are interested in learning about society in order to help their country (which, for some, may be Estonia rather than the U.S.S.R.). Although teaching research methods can be democratizing, that should not be our mission.

- Funding is a great problem, particularly the problem of funding Soviet activities from U.S. sources. The issue relates to the question of whether the U.S. role should be to improve social science or to democratize the Soviet Union. The Soviets often ask the United States for all the money for a project; in one participant's opinion, we should always be asking what we gain from any activity and how it improves our understanding of human behavior.

- How multilateral should the exchanges be? What are the benefits and costs of bilateral versus multilateral approaches? In one participant's opinion, although the United States *can* conduct exchanges by itself, it

should try to attach bilateral activities to the relationships developing between Western and Eastern Europe. He noted that, until recently, the Soviets and Eastern Europeans did not want to work together, and the Soviets did not want third parties in U.S.–Soviet meetings.

Social Science in the Soviet Union: Current Conditions and Trends

Panel participants were asked to address:

- current directions of change, including how one finds Soviets interested in contacts with U.S. scholars;
- strengths, weaknesses, and needs within Soviet social and behavioral science;
- the range of U.S.–Soviet contacts in particular fields; and
- the implications of these conditions and trends for U.S. social science and scholarship.

ETHNOGRAPHY AND ETHNIC RELATIONS

Paul Goble, U.S. Department of State

Goble discussed a series of changes in Soviet ethnography that he regarded as highly significant, in particular the sense of epiphany that accompanied recent events in the Soviet Union. The appearance of new, young authors in Soviet journals and the publication of a series of conference reports in which younger Soviet scholars denounced the scholars and scholarship of the past appear especially important. Goble gained the strong impression that many Soviet scholars, especially the young, now regard scholarly life before 1985 as a vast desert in which nothing worthwhile was accomplished. He expressed considerable concern that the net result would be to forget the good work that was done in the 1960s and 1970s that can provide a solid basis for current work.

In the same vein, he cited what he viewed as an unfortunate tendency to adopt Western ideas and methods wholesale. While this is very satisfying

and self-affirming for Western scholars, it could mean the loss of much valuable work. The Gorbachev era should not be an excuse for self-congratulation among American ethnographers.

Goble also noted his concern that Western social scientists tended to use Soviet writings in ethnography only as a source of data and to believe that there are no theories and ideas from which the West could learn. He argued that, in fact, many Soviet theoretical writings are very good. Given how much is being published and how dramatic some of the individual findings are, Western scholars may forget how partial much of the information is. Goble also commented that Westerners needed to appreciate that *glasnost* has opened a door and that not all the work now coming through that door is worthwhile. He cited as an example the writings of Lev Gumulov, whose views on miscegenation would repulse most Americans.

In discussing the strengths and weaknesses of Soviet ethnography, Goble cited the intensely practical focus of its research. Although this provides Western scholars with useful clues about policy interests and directions, it seriously distorts the kinds of research that scholars can do. He also worried that the "dead hand" of Marxism-Leninism would now be replaced by the "iron hand" of the market, with different but equally pernicious effects as self-financing forces institutes and scholars to favor research ventures that are profitable.

Finally, Goble commented on the incredible proliferation of sources of information; an American scholar can no longer rely on a few journals and papers and assume that that is all the information available. For many issues, much of the information is available from sources outside Moscow, which are becoming far more accessible. As of January 1, 1990, Western scholars will be able to subscribe to all 275 regional newspapers at the *oblast* level, as well as many new journals. He argued that it is urgent for American institutions to gain some bibliographic control over this flood. INION, the ASUSSR's Institute of Scientific Information in the Social Sciences, produces as many as 20 bibliographies on ethnographic subjects a month, of which the Library of Congress receives only a quarter; few university libraries, with the exception of the University of Illinois, make any attempt to track these bibliographies. The result, he feared, will be that U.S. academics, overwhelmed with new data, will perform primarily as reporters rather than scholars.

The recent events and the new resources are very exciting, and it will be a challenge to take advantage of the opportunities.

ECONOMICS

Ed A. Hewett, The Brookings Institution

Hewett began with a benchmark, the state of the economics profession in the mid-1980s before the rise of Gorbachev. More than 4,000,000 people were listed in Soviet labor statistics as economists. By contrast, the American Economics Association has 25,000 members. Of course, Soviet "economists" include many individuals who would not be counted as such in the West, such as industrial managers. The bulk of Western-style economics is practiced in the ASUSSR research institutes and the institutes of government ministries and the party. Before Gorbachev, academic economics functioned primarily to elaborate and justify the status quo. Both the theoretical foundations and the empirical traditions of the discipline were very weak. Outright criticism was not tolerated; at most, one could suggest ways to perfect the system further. The two channels for protest were to gather and publish real data about the conditions and performance of the economy—a powerful indictment—and to do research in mathematical economics, which provided an abstract, essentially secret language political officials could not comprehend.

Today the situation is very different. Economics is an exciting discipline these days, although many of the major reform ideas are still originating in other parts of the intelligentsia. A number of fascinating policy debates are under way, for example, over the definition of *socialist property*. Hewett agreed with Goble's observation about the tendency of Soviet scholars to reject all past thinking, commenting that he worried about the current Soviet fascination with an image of the market as the answer to all economic problems.

Hewett noted that it is not possible for American scholars to take advantage of all the opportunities for contacts. Many new exchanges are springing up, often between universities and institutes, and it is difficult to keep track of the activities. This will lead to some inevitable inefficiencies as new projects reinvent the wheel, but the broadening of contacts is very positive. Hewett also noted as hopeful developments the number of younger Soviet economists taking part in exchanges and the increase in the participation of American economists who are not Soviet specialists.

Among the most encouraging signs is the new access to non-ASUSSR institutes that had previously been off limits to foreign scholars. For example, he cited a recent exchange agreement between the research institute of Gosplan and the Russian Research Center at Harvard. For policy-oriented contacts, Hewett regarded the new Commission on Economic Reform headed by Academician Leonid Abalkin as especially important.

Hewett mentioned three important needs for Soviet economics. First, there is a tremendous need for training for graduate students and young professionals in both theory and methods. He suggested that both academic economics and MBA programs could be valuable. Although Hewett does not believe that U.S. and European theory have ready answers to teach young Soviet economists, he does feel that learning how Western economists frame policy issues would be of great value. Second, on a practical level, Hewett cited the need for sheer raw computing power, which personal computers were helping to provide, and the more fundamental need for good statistics. He argued that Soviet economic statistics require a wholesale reform and cited the exchange between the U.S. Census Bureau and Gosplan on national income statistics as a good sign.

Finally, Hewett cited the need for policy advice, although he again commented that the Soviets may be too willing to listen uncritically to Western recommendations. Among the areas in which the Soviets need policy advice are monetary policy, antitrust policy, and the fostering of small businesses. In offering advice, he argued that U.S. social scientists needed to be honest brokers and to remain humble about the limits of their knowledge. The Soviets are trying to establish a socialist market economy, and, although Western economists believe they know a great deal about managing markets, they have little to offer about how to create one. There are many exciting opportunities for contacts and much interest in Western ideas, but U.S. social scientists have no magic to offer their Soviet counterparts.

SOCIOLOGY

Michael Swafford, Paragon Research International

Swafford cited Academician Tatiana Zaslavskaya's description of Soviet sociology as "sociology without sociologists" as an apt summary of the state of the discipline until very recently. Of the 8,000 members of the Soviet Sociological Association, for example, fewer than 100 actually have degrees in sociology, and until last year there were no faculties of sociology at any Soviet university. In the last year, however, vast changes have begun as the Soviet government has given high priority to the development of sociology as a genuine discipline.

Among the major changes mentioned by Swafford is a new emphasis on training. In all, 16 faculties of sociology have now been established in the Soviet Union, although this is a far more difficult effort than many Americans realize. A typical Soviet undergraduate will spend 2,000 hours in class in his or her major, approximately four times the U.S. average. The

Soviets are well aware of the problems they face and are offering supplemental courses of study for potential faculty. They are trying to translate textbooks from French and English (although the American Sociological Association has been understandably reluctant to pronounce any U.S. textbooks the "best"). Unfortunately, the Soviets are also retaining for the moment their centralized approach to textbook selection. In addition, as already mentioned, Soviet graduate students are being sent to the United States to study, and the Soviets are eager to have American lecturers in all areas of sociology.

The surge of interest in public opinion research is another positive sign, and Swafford cited in particular the range of institutions becoming involved, from the ASUSSR to private entrepreneurs. The Institute of Sociology has recently published a catalogue of 40 available data sets that, although not available for export, may be used for collaborative projects. New regulations may also permit each republic to decide whether to export survey data. Swafford regarded Zaslavskaya's new All-Union Center for Public Opinion Research on Social and Economic Problems as the most important single development; however, he pointed out the enormous challenges any attempt to develop truly national polls must face, such as the fact that 100 languages are spoken in the Soviet Union, for which Russian is not an appropriate lingua franca, and cultural problems, such as the difficulty of interviewing Moslem women. He also expressed concern that too often Western reports simply cite poll results without any comments or caveats about their probable quality.

Despite the positive trends, Swafford noted formidable problems that remain, such as the almost complete absence of pure sociology. The needs and interests of the government rather than the interests of scholars still drive the research agenda, and the sociological establishment is riven by old rivalries. Moreover, most good sociologists have found themselves drawn into the political process—Zaslavskaya is a member of the Congress of Peoples' Deputies and Mikk Titma is the ideological secretary of the Estonian Communist Party—and so they are lost to teaching and research. Swafford also expressed a more grave concern that expectations had become too great, that sociology could not possibly provide answers to Soviet problems; he feared a backlash when it "failed."

Swafford had a number of recommendations for what U.S. social science could do, such as training graduate students. He argued that this, along with support for current exchanges, will be the greatest help to the Soviets in establishing standards for their discipline. Although U.S. standards, which are based on competition, cannot be imposed on the Soviets, training and exchanges will go a long way to fostering the academic culture in which those standards develop. He also strongly advocated a summer institute in which U.S. lecturers would be sent to the Soviet Union

to conduct graduate and postgraduate seminars. Acknowledging that the proposal was controversial, he also recommended supplying as many as 150 personal computers and conducting methodological training as part of the summer institute. He did not claim that quantitative sociology held particular answers but does strongly believe that this training was an essential part of what the Soviets needed. Finally, at home, he advocated more attention to training American sociologists as specialists in the Soviet Union, noting that two major universities had been unable to fill faculty vacancies. At present there are only a handful of such specialists. He added that, as the quality of Soviet data and research improve, American sociologists' own research will benefit, so that in the long run, helping the Soviets develop their discipline will serve our own interests as well.

DISCUSSION

A number of points surfaced in the discussion:

- One participant commented that working with the Soviets lets us shape the quality of their data and gives us data to analyze, which will allow our graduate students to do genuine social science research with Soviet data. We also should try to strengthen the ability to do good research in the Soviet Union.
- We need to increase the number, now very small, of American social scientists who have, in addition to their substantive expertise, an understanding of the Soviet Union.
- Because of the move to self-financing, some of the best Soviet social scientists are going into business to raise money.
- On economics, one participant noted that the science is very weak because the linear programming approach of the 1950s, which is neither Marxist nor non-Marxist, failed to evolve into a field of scientific economics. The reason is the lack of a scientific culture. Thus, the Soviet Union needs more than long-term graduate training, in which the culture of economics is learned. The Soviets should also be advised that even though they are in a rush to solve their domestic problems, they need to invest in their people, as the Japanese have done.
- Panelists agreed that the short-term emphasis on doing research for hard currency, which is the practice of some leading scientists (while also using their institutes' facilities!) is a serious problem. As a result, leading Soviet researchers find no time to train the next generation. Swafford added that Soviet sociology, like economics, has no scientific culture. Goble noted that changing culture is slow and can have unintended consequences: if more Soviets are trained in the United States, they may use the experience mainly to gain contacts for entrepreneurial research.

- One participant noted that the role of Soviet academic institutes is changing. In 1971, the Central Economic-Mathematical Institute reported that it had no contacts with Gosplan; by 1978, it was working jointly with Gosplan; and it now reports that it has developed an alternative plan for the Soviet economy.

- One participant suggested that Americans need to think about long-term Soviet needs and that a major goal should be to encourage a movement away from monopolism in Soviet social science.

- One participant suggested that we should move from general lectures and symposia to joint research involving more junior people, including graduate students. Another commented that lectures, such as those that American sociologists recently delivered in Moscow, should be replaced by month-long training institutes.

- One participant commented that the discipline of history is in such upheaval in the Soviet Union that for now we cannot contact the leading scholars.

- One suggested increasing Soviet contact with American schools of public policy.

- It was suggested that the Americans identify promising young Soviet scholars to be invited to come here. Wesley Fisher of IREX noted the difficulty of selection. In the new program of graduate training in sociology, only 31 of 100 initial applicants were given the right to apply, and many of these were the children of important figures.

- One participant noted problems with library exchanges, even though they have been going on for over 80 years. The old books are rotting, much is uncatalogued, and journal numbers are missing. There are inequalities: the Soviets need American library science techniques, and we would like access to their material and their great bibliographic apparatus.

- One participant noted some additional problems and opportunities. One is housing: it is difficult to involve the good young researchers from outside Moscow because of the housing problem in Moscow. Another is the Soviet government agencies doing social science research that employ good researchers but do not yet have exchanges with the United States. A third is major institutional change: an article by ASUSSR President Marchuk in the new ASUSSR newspaper indicates that the whole Academy structure is in turmoil. The state statistical committee is also trying to make major changes.

Reports from Working Groups on Specific Topics

Participants divided into working groups for more detailed discussion of six specific topics. The group on "Projects to Improve Social and Behavioral Science Capabilities in the U.S.S.R." addressed issues such as disciplinary institutions and the training of students. Two subgroups discussing "U.S.–Soviet Joint Scholarly Projects" addressed a broad range of possibilities, and two subgroups discussing "U.S.–Soviet Research Collaboration" focused more narrowly on the potential for joint or parallel research with scholars in the two countries together addressing the same problem. The group on "Logistical Issues in Soviet-American Scholarly Work" focused on questions of administration, financing, and the like. The group on "Intellectual Opportunities for American Scholars" concentrated on what Americans, particularly those who do not specialize in the study of the Soviet Union, can gain from work with Soviet social scientists. And the group on "Development of Behavioral Science in the U.S.S.R." focused on developments in Soviet psychology and their implications for American psychology. Summaries of these discussions are reported in this section.

PROJECTS TO IMPROVE SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE CAPABILITIES IN THE U.S.S.R.

John Adams, chair; Marjorie Balzer, rapporteur

The group listed the following activities (from easiest to hardest to implement) as worthwhile. It was noted that each is now being done to some extent.

1. *Library exchanges* in social science (e.g., of archives and data).

2. *Professional critiques and reviews.* It is important to help raise the standards for Soviet research. Some possible means are publication of American articles, reviews, and critiques in Soviet journals; publication of the best Soviet work in the United States; and seminars presenting the best Soviet and American work together.

3. *Training of Soviet scholars* at various levels, especially the graduate level, was considered of high priority. The group discussed but did not reach consensus on important operational details, such as whether it would be better to conduct the training in the United States or the Soviet Union, how long training periods should be, and how the Soviets should be selected. For training at the postgraduate level, the group discussed such mechanisms as seminars, summer institutes, and computer training (especially for the use of local data).

4. *Collaborative conferences* on topics of common interest, especially including younger scholars to avoid elitism.

5. *Collaborative workshops* to work on data gathered in particular joint projects.

6. *Collaborative field work*, including involvement of scholars from the non-Russian republics.

U.S.–SOVIET JOINT SCHOLARLY PROJECTS

Subgroup A: Alexander Rabinowitch, chair; Jo Husbands, rapporteur

The group took a very broad approach to the definition of joint projects, which included: bilateral projects on issues of mutual interest; bilateral projects on global issues, such as environmental problems or regional conflicts, for which the opportunity to work on common problems appeared very productive; and multilateral projects on specific problems, involving more than just U.S. and Soviet participants (and which are of increasing interest to funders).

Many expressed the hope that the time has arrived for U.S. and Soviet projects to move beyond simple exchanges, moving people back and forth, to joint activities involving genuine collaboration among the participants. The group also highlighted the need to continue to press the Soviets for more open and meaningful contacts and opportunities. Available contacts are certainly far more productive than in the years of stagnation, but there are many improvements still to be made. Full and free access to data, for example, is crucial to meaningful joint work. Getting beyond Moscow, to involve scholars from other republics and institutions than those who have traditionally dominated exchanges, is very important as well. This would also help relieve the overcommitment now burdening many of the best scholars in Moscow, who have more opportunities than they can

meaningfully take advantage of, and whose participation in projects is suffering because they are stretched so thin.

The group discussed priorities among projects but arrived at no clear consensus. Instead, it identified some hard questions facing every current or potential project and for which there are no clear right answers.

1. In seeking counterparts and building networks, on whom should the project focus—graduate students, young professionals, or senior scholars?

2. Should the project seek to maximize short-term gains, to take advantage of perhaps fleeting opportunities, or choose goals regardless of how soon they may be achieved?

3. In selecting among potential projects, should the priority be those that build Soviet social science disciplines and capabilities or those with a clear policy focus?

This discussion led to some specific project ideas that particularly interested the participants. For example, journal exchanges could serve a variety of interests, such as providing access for U.S. scholars to Soviet regional journals and giving Soviet scholars outside Moscow access to major American journals. Participants strongly supported projects that would involve getting American and Soviet pieces into each other's journals. These projects also offer an important role for the social science associations. Another opportunity for social science associations lies in finding ways to bring Soviet scholars to annual meetings in the United States. Summer institutes and computer-based training also generated enthusiasm as ways to leverage resources. Several participants suggested holding such institutes in the Soviet Union in order to maximize their impact. More generally, one participant suggested that the most rewarding efforts will be those that concentrate on finding and investing in promising individuals, at whatever level is most appropriate for the particular field or issue.

Subgroup B: Jane Wales, chair; William Zimmerman, rapporteur

For the rapporteur, the most striking realization was that the discussion of opportunities and obstacles for collaboration reflected a fundamental assumption that it is now possible to do "normal" science with the Soviets.

The group spent substantial time talking about the lack of cadres, that is, the absence in the Soviet Union of trained researchers in many fields, and the fact that, for many research topics, every potential American project is seeking to collaborate with the same few Soviets. These problems are not expected to be easily resolved in the near future.

Many of the ideas for collaborative projects were noted in other groups as well; among those that stood out was the possibility of joint work

on ecology, which provides a point of entry for a number of interesting social science questions. Collaborative research on other regions, such as Latin America, and on key periods of history was also mentioned as an opportunity for promising and novel results. Of particular interest to political scientists are the topics generally known as the "civil society" and, more broadly, the opportunity to study the transformations taking place within the Soviet Union, especially the development of nascent political institutions.

The group gave considerable attention to the question of financing and generally agreed that it was not in the best interests of either side for U.S. interests to be directly subsidizing Soviet social scientists. Having said that, however, there was recognition that sophisticated calculations of short-versus long-term benefits and of trade-offs among types of contributions were absolutely necessary to assess what each side should be expected to bring to and to derive from joint projects. In discussing quick fixes for some current problems in Soviet social science, the group expressed strong interest in public policy programs as training sources, in summer institutes for crash courses in methodology and research techniques, and for "data confrontation" seminars, which would permit in-depth discussions of particular types of data or particular data bases.

U.S.-SOVIET RESEARCH COLLABORATION

Subgroup A: Philip Converse, chair; Philip Stewart, rapporteur

The group focused on a few key issues involving specific projects—notably, survey research in the Soviet Union—and spent most of its time discussing obstacles rather than opportunities. Although everyone agreed that enormous opportunities now exist for collaboration, a major question was how to take advantage of these new openings to advance both social science as an international phenomenon and Soviet capabilities in the social sciences. The group kept returning to the problem of how to create a culture of science in the Soviet Union to underlie all social science research; it agreed that, in the medium term, enhancing such values might well be the most important accomplishment of collaborative projects.

The group discussed the growth of new institutions devoted to survey research, for example the All-Union Center for Public Opinion Research on Social and Economic Problems headed by Academician Tatiana Zaslavskaya, as potential new sites for joint research. Some in the group expressed concern, however, about the adequacy of sampling frames, the level of understanding of survey methodology among the staff of these new institutes, and, given problems of resources, whether these groups had the capacity to carry out fully professional surveys even if the methodology is

understood. Others expressed strong support for the abilities of this and other new institutes.

Among the general problems discussed by the group was the lack of adequate equipment in Soviet institutions, although there was disagreement about whether U.S. research partners should become involved in supplying computers, telefax machines, and other aids, even if these would make the Americans' work easier. The group agreed that access to raw survey data was now generally much better, although some participants noted cases in which researchers could use the data only in the Soviet Union and could not take files out of the country. Another concern was what to do about the masses of Soviet survey data now being released, about whose quality little is known. The availability of qualified interviewers, their training, and the role of American scholars in that training also received considerable attention. Finally, although the group welcomed the opportunities to expand surveys to new regions, it also noted that the problems of language and methodological adequacy pose substantial barriers.

Despite these problems, the group noted a number of significant new opportunities, especially several collaborative projects involving observational techniques as well as surveys. The group felt strongly that these should be encouraged because they provide additional kinds of data that permit researchers to understand better the results of their surveys. The group also noted as another hopeful sign the opportunities that have arisen recently for collaborative projects involving longitudinal research.

Finally, the rapporteur offered his own criteria for choice among possible collaborative projects: (1) Does the project in question contribute to disciplinary research rather than to purely area studies? (2) Does it enhance the graduate training of American students in social science, using data from the Soviet Union? (3) Do the U.S. partners have substantial participation in the research design and the actual field research? (4) Is there agreement from the beginning on open and free access to the data generated by the project?

Subgroup B: Joseph Kadane, chair; Allen Lynch, rapporteur

The group concluded that the major challenge is to maintain the impressive momentum of joint research projects and to use the opportunity afforded by the current Soviet chic to build a solid infrastructure for the long-term study of the Soviet Union within the American social science community. Projects have developed most effectively when the American participants have demonstrated a consistent pattern of achievement and

reliability. Indeed, it was agreed that it is hard to embark on sound joint research projects without a previous professional and personal relationship.

Among the obstacles to research collaboration noted by the group was the problem of veto power by local institutions over their segments of multisite projects (such as those conducted across the entire Soviet Union), which inhibits prospects for international collaboration. Funding problems attracted special attention and led to the following suggestions:

1. There is a need to incorporate more hard funding sources, for example through university budgets, into Soviet-American activities, to provide the steady and consistent support that collaborative projects require.

2. Although U.S. national institutions in Soviet studies have been very dependent in the past on government funding, the group noted a promising increase in interest and support from other funding sources.

3. The Soviets generally still prefer that IREX-style exchanges fall under the umbrella of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, so that the Academy pays for them. This poses obvious problems for expanding contacts beyond the ASUSSR and beyond Moscow.

There was considerable controversy within the group over whether funding sources should consider investing in improving the Soviets' ability to communicate with American research partners, perhaps by providing computers, electronic mail, telefax, and other equipment as part of project support. Proponents argued that the Soviets' lack of adequate electronic tools seriously hampers joint research efforts. Moreover, better data from the Soviets would make for more interesting research results, which besides its intrinsic interest would make the field of Soviet studies more attractive to young American social scientists and would enhance the position of Soviet studies within U.S. universities. Others strongly objected to the idea of subsidizing the Soviets; as one of the world's largest economies, they can afford to pay, although they may certainly try to avoid it if they can. Participants did agree that arranging funding for joint projects involves time-consuming negotiations with Soviet counterparts and requires American insistence that each side pays a fair share, even if creative financing and burden-sharing arrangements may be necessary.

In conclusion, the group agreed that the guiding purposes of American efforts in promoting joint research projects with Soviet scholars should include the following dimensions:

1. Building the next American generation of Soviet specialists in the social sciences, which includes their effective integration into the social science faculties of universities;

2. Achieving significant research results that test the validity of general social science theories;

3. Engaging Soviet scholars in an effort to develop a truly international approach to the study of social phenomena and the democratic climate that is required for free scholarly inquiry to flourish.

LOGISTICAL ISSUES IN SOVIET-AMERICAN SCHOLARLY WORK

Richard Ericson, chair; Marianna Tax Choldin, rapporteur

The group identified three major sets of logistical problems for U.S.–Soviet projects. The first, *finances and equipment*, includes the nonconvertibility of the ruble. The group recommended that Americans insist on the right to spend rubles and not to finance everything in dollars (i.e., at the official rate).

One of the thorniest problems, because of the intense pressures coming from many Soviets, is the temptation to use computers as a form of financing. The group opposed this strongly, citing the clear ethical conflicts often involved, the practical problems it raised with American funding sources, and the need to ensure that the Soviets should provide some reciprocity in financing.

Trends in American funding aroused a number of concerns. For example, some participants felt that foundations preferred to support research on trendy topics, so that support for basic social science is lacking. Basic research projects now frequently suffer because they are subjected to review by foundations, rather than by scientific peers. A solution would be core funding, for example, through support from the National Science Foundation for joint basic research projects. The group also expressed concern that inadequate funding had caused IREX to drop projects for which Soviet support is in hand. It also noted that support for incidental expenses, such as housing in the Soviet Union, is needed as part of project budgets.

The second general set of logistical problems results from the *trend toward decentralized administration* on both the American and the Soviet sides. If the center once provided by IREX is eroded, it would be good to have an information clearinghouse as a source of knowledge about what projects are under way or in the planning stages. The group also expressed the need for a forum in which to meet regularly to discuss problems.

The final logistical problem is that of achieving *remote access to data*. We do not yet know if the new San Francisco-Moscow Teleport, an innovative electronic communications link, is adequate for social science needs, such as data access and transmission. The group also expressed uneasiness with the teleport because the United States pays all costs, thereby violating the principle of reciprocity.

INTELLECTUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICAN SCHOLARS

Roberta Miller, chair; Barbara Anderson, rapporteur

The group noted that there are roles for both Soviet specialists and other social scientists. Researchers should be able to state questions about the Soviet Union as general social science problems, and projects in the Soviet Union addressed to general issues in social science will need input from experts in Soviet society. The group identified four types of opportunities:

1. *Studies of social change.* The Soviet Union is undergoing rapid social change along many dimensions, including the transition from authoritarianism, the spread of a market economy, increasing federalism, change in the monetary system, increasing public participation, the development of democratic political institutions, the rapid adoption of modern information-processing systems, and rising ethnic and environmental awareness. It is ripe for research and especially interesting to Americans because these changes are occurring from a cultural and political base very different from that in other countries that have undergone similar transitions. In addition, there is very little theory to apply to some of these transitions, such as the move from state to market control in economics. *2. Special characteristics of the Soviet Union* make it an inviting site for research. The Soviet Union's great ethnic and socioeconomic diversity within a single political system makes it a natural laboratory for quasi-experimental research, such as on the effects of development and culture on policy implementation. Other special conditions include an arctic environment in which one can compare the same ethnic groups that live throughout the Arctic under different political systems. Another example is the highest female labor force participation rate in the world, which makes the Soviet Union an important outlier on the distribution of countries.

3. *New issues that can now be studied.* Openings in Soviet society now allow joint research in areas in which Soviet scholars or archives have something to teach Americans. Among these areas are medieval history, cognitive psychology, and the study of the use of time in everyday life. In addition, the Soviet system may now be developing social innovations that have not been studied before, such as new forms of federalism and the practice of voting against candidates.

4. *Policy studies.* The study of policy implementation and change can benefit from research in the Soviet Union because it has formal policies in many more areas than the United States, more centralized policies than the United States, and an instructive recent history of policy change.

The group discussed the rapidly changing funding situation for American researchers working in the Soviet Union. Although funding for area studies is decreasing as U.S.-Soviet relations improve, support for studies

of basic social science questions conducted in the Soviet Union may now become available from regular social science funders.

DEVELOPMENT OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE IN THE U.S.S.R.

Norris Minick, chair; David Johnson, rapporteur

Participants had different impressions of the state of Soviet psychology, probably because some subfields are in much better shape than others. Similarly, U.S.–Soviet collaboration is unevenly distributed across subfields. Collaboration through IREX is increasing, as is American interest, especially in Soviet work on child development. In the past, the Institute of Psychology of the Academy of Sciences made it difficult to contact scholars in the institutes of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, where much of the interesting work was taking place. Although it is now possible to make direct contact with individual Soviet scholars, the group expressed concern about the difficulty of reaching Soviet psychologists.

The group made a series of recommendations to improve U.S.–Soviet contacts in psychology and to aid the development of Soviet behavioral science. The first is to replace general conferences with in-depth meetings or research collaborations. Second, participants also recommended bringing Soviet psychologists to the United States for postdoctoral research and study. Third, the American Psychological Association (APA) should be working to develop collaborations in clinical psychology. Fourth, American psychology journals might devote a special issue to Soviet research or invite Soviet contributions to a special issue on a particular topic. Finally, the group recommended that the APA and comparable organizations might invite Soviets to submit papers for their annual conventions and subsidize travel for the authors of papers accepted.

The American Response: Ideas and Prospects

The panelists were asked to draw on the conference discussions to suggest ideas for what should be done, including specific projects and programs, organizational changes, and funding, so that the U.S. social science community can respond effectively to the new opportunities in the Soviet Union.

HERBERT SIMON, CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Simon began by commenting that, on the basis of his experience with the NAS program with China, political developments are at least as important as any particular programs. What American social scientists can accomplish is very much determined by political conditions within the Soviet Union and between that country and the rest of the world.

Simon reported that he had been impressed by the intensely applied focus of Soviet social science. It would not be an exaggeration, he argued, to say that today there is no social science in the Soviet Union, if by that we mean basic interest and curiosity about fundamental human phenomena as the driving force behind research. Although Western social science has its own strong interest in applied work, he was astounded by the degree of responsibility held and sought by Soviet social scientists in designing social reforms. This means, among other things, that any American social scientist involved in joint programs is likely to become drawn into current policy debates. Simon suggested that social scientists therefore need to be very aware and sophisticated about the roles they and their projects could play in the reform process.

Simon also noted the relevance of concerns about “science imperialism” that had been voiced in other countries—the concern of indigenous

groups with control over their own data. Americans need to be sensitive to these issues; the fact that we bring money and would like to have their data does not mean that we will always be welcome. This may become especially true as the Soviet Union opens up to more contacts and the tight central control of exchanges is lost.

On the subject of multilateral versus bilateral contacts, Simon expressed a preference for making use of multilateral settings whenever possible. He seconded the importance of getting out of Moscow and noted that this has become much easier in recent years.

One important point raised during the meeting was the role of area specialization. In the early postwar period, when many area programs were founded and supported, it was assumed that Americans should know more about other parts of the world, and that other nations would provide useful laboratories and sources of data. The ideal conception was that data from other parts of the world would feed into the testing of general social science theories about human behavior in a wide variety of cultural settings. It is no secret, Simon commented, that we have done a far better job of developing knowledge about particular areas than we have done in applying that knowledge to the development of social science. To him it therefore becomes very important to encourage the participation of nonarea specialists. He acknowledged that this is a difficult enterprise: generalists will know little about the country, and the lack of language skills will pose real problems for research.

Simon concluded by saying that everyone involved in these contacts must repeatedly ask: What is the basic goal of all these activities? For himself, and he thought perhaps for most of the participants, the fundamental purpose is to contribute to building the base of general social science knowledge and capabilities. Helping to develop Soviet competence, especially if that includes fostering an interest in basic as well as applied research, will contribute to knowledge-building as well. Simon expressed the belief that all social scientists hope to achieve normal scientific relations with the Soviet Union, so that doing science with the Soviets will be no different from working in Britain or France.

ENID C.B. SCHOETTLE, THE FORD FOUNDATION

Schoettle began by echoing calls for increasing the multilateral approach to the study of the Soviet Union, in terms of both the research teams employed and the number of countries studied. She argued that the use of comparative cases from Eastern Europe could enrich our understanding of the Soviet Union and of the broader operation of socialist societies. She also noted that Americans have a great deal to gain from

colleagues in other Western countries, whose perspectives on social science and on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe could add to our enterprise.

Schoettle listed five basic sources of funding for the field of Soviet studies and for social science activities with the Soviet Union. The two traditional sources are the U.S. government and major national foundations such as Ford and Carnegie that have a long-standing interest in these fields and whose interest shows no sign of diminishing. Philanthropy from new foundation programs and from new individual and corporate donors together constitute a third funding source. The fourth source is the regular budgets of the major scholarly associations, colleges, and universities. She noted that, although it is sometimes very difficult to get funded through these sources initially, once a project acquires the status of a regular line item, support tends to continue. The fifth source is the Soviet Union itself. Schoettle emphasized the importance of reciprocity and precedent as principles in exchange projects. She suggested that, when seeking support in the United States, Americans should always make clear what their Soviet partners are contributing, and that donors should generally expect Soviets to bear the bulk of the ruble costs of any project. She also noted that equipment costs, such as computers that U.S. participants hoped to provide to project partners, needed to be handled very carefully, despite the pressures likely to arise for shortcuts or funding sleights-of-hand.

Schoettle also noted the importance of avoiding as much as possible the cost of reinventing the wheel as new projects and institutions begin joint projects. She suggested paying attention to the importance of networking enterprises, of finding ways to spread and share information. Substantive information about what is happening is very important, and so is providing practical advice about how to design and carry out projects successfully.

Finally, Schoettle addressed herself to the question: Why do funders fund? She agreed with Simon's argument for the importance of supporting stronger social science. In response to the discussion about the most appropriate targets for training and support—graduate students, young professionals, or more established scholars—she suggested that, although all are appropriate, it is important to think about the cumulative effect of cutting in at various points in a scholar's career. Multiple strategies, which build on experiences, stand the greatest chance of success.

She also suggested that there are two other major reasons why funders support work in this area. The first is to pluralize and democratize, to encourage the forces of reform in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Schoettle argued strongly that American scholars should not shrink from this as a principal motivation for their activities. She urged projects to seek to foster pluralization within the scholarly community, by insisting on younger scholars and women as participants, by involving scholars from outside Moscow and from many disciplines, and by encouraging

the involvement of wider publics as well. The other abiding purpose is the belief that scholarly cooperation is somehow part of building broader international cooperation, of creating better relations and the capacity to address urgent common problems.

HERBERT LEVINE, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Levine focused his remarks on the question of priorities among the wide array of potentially worthwhile activities. His own highest priority would be the improvement of social science capabilities in the Soviet Union. His own discipline of economics, for example, is in dreadful shape as a science there, and he would like to see major efforts given to building its strength as a basic discipline. Such fundamental strength, he believes, would be of great value both for its eventual practical application and for the interest of the West in having Soviet economists who could appreciate and analyze world events. He believes the same benefits and priorities hold true for the social sciences.

Within this focus, he would give greatest attention to graduate training. Providing training that has a lasting effect requires careful thought and planning. In his own work over the years with younger Soviet scholars, he found that they tended to get swallowed up by the generally dismal standards and practices within the Soviet economic establishment. He therefore believes that training programs should be geared to providing a small number of competitively selected students with a complete graduate education in the West. For Levine, the key was to provide training not only in theory and methods, but also in the culture of science. This broader cultural education is an essential part of the training; it does not currently exist in the Soviet Union and therefore is best acquired abroad.

Levine suggested that the major scholarly associations should be the key vehicle for these training programs. Although IREX would be an important source of information, it should not have the primary responsibility. He argued that it would be extremely useful to persuade the Soviets to establish a new entity to manage their side of the training enterprises that could maintain connections with both the ASUSSR and the universities. He seconded Schoettle's suggestion that the Soviets should be expected to contribute to the costs of the training, if only because one tends to value something more if one has had to pay for it.

Finally, he agreed with the idea that it was important to think about what role these scholars will eventually play in their own societies. He suggested that postgraduate programs could be used to help advance their careers and reinforce the results of their training. If the purpose of the programs was to encourage the development of basic social science, then

reinforcing longer-term, cumulative effects should be part of the program design.

WILLIAM A. JAMES, U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

James commented that, from the perspective of exchanges, the U.S.–Soviet contacts were still very small and limited in scope compared with, for example, American exchanges in Eastern Europe. The U.S. Information Agency (USIA) sought, through its support of exchange programs, to expand that network with the ultimate goal of creating normal scientific relations between the two countries.

James described the range of USIA programs, emphasizing two new programs of potential interest to U.S. scholars. One provides seed money to American universities to start linkages with foreign universities, offering \$50,000 over a three-year period to help start projects, which are then expected to find other sources of support. Until last year, projects with the Soviet Union were not eligible, but that has now been changed. For next year, projects to link with the Baltic states, the Ukraine, and Byelorussia will be eligible. The second new project is the Samantha Smith program, an undergraduate and high school exchange project that can include nonacademic programs.

In discussing funding, James lamented the harsh budgetary realities—*perestroika* versus Gramm-Rudman-Hollings—that was limiting the government's ability to respond to the changes under way in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The USIA, for, example, is faced with a flat budget that remains at the level of fiscal 1985. Any expansion in programs came from diverting funds from projects that had fallen through for one reason or another. He argued that the best projects would still be able to find funding—"money chases good ideas"—and also urged scholars to look for local sources of funds.

James reviewed six program priorities for USIA funding over the coming year: expanding the English language training program, business management, American studies, environmental studies, pedagogical reform, and "constitutionality" or law and legal reform. The USIA also plans to encourage internships as part of exchanges, since practical problems of implementing reforms could be assisted by providing opportunities for direct experience. Finally, he suggested that another area of interest and concern to the scholarly community should be its contacts with the federal government, how its knowledge and insights could be made available to those charged with making and implementing policy.

FINAL REMARKS

- On integrating disciplinary researchers and Soviet area specialists, one participant remarked that it is important to bring social science methods, and not only disciplinary specialists, into Soviet studies. Another, while agreeing about the need to raise the research standards in area studies, saw the abstract methods valued in the disciplines as a barrier to entry for area specialists.

- On organizational issues, one participant raised the problem of getting outside the ASUSSR. Another noted the rising power of Soviet disciplinary associations in sociology, history, economics, and political science and suggested that Americans could now work with those groups. The associations could also sponsor individual applicants to study in the United States.

- On training Soviet scholars, one participant suggested creating a network of the 17 sociology students now in the United States, so that they will stay in contact later. A mechanism similar to the NRC's Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China might be used to supplement their fellowship money for this purpose. Another suggested bringing groups of Soviet students from the same institutions, especially outside Moscow, to build research centers. A third participant said the Soviets want to cluster their graduate students as a way to solve the problems they will face when they return to Soviet academia.

One option suggested for eliminating the reentry problem was to do the training in the Soviet Union and invite the participation of local institutions. In another participant's view, many approaches should be used. Six years of training in the United States will not often be supported because of the expense. It would be very useful and important, however, to support networks of the Soviet alumni of American training programs.

- One participant noted that the social scientists and the U.S. government may have different goals. The former want mainly to improve social science, while the latter (especially USIA) may want to emphasize citizens' groups, the Western Soviet Union, and other policy priorities.

Participants

John Adams, Department of Geography, University of Minnesota
Barbara Anderson, Population Studies Center, University of Michigan
Lance Antrim, National Research Council
Dorothy Arriola, Institute for Soviet American Relations
Deana Arsenian, Carnegie Corporation of New York
Tatiana Bachuretz, Institute for Soviet American Relations
Tom Baerwald, National Science Foundation
Paul Balaran, The Ford Foundation
Harley Balzer, Russian Area Studies, Georgetown University
Marjorie Mandelstam Balzer, Department of Sociology, Georgetown University
Joan Buchanan, American Psychological Association
Fran Burwell, School of Public Affairs, University of Maryland
William Chase, Russian & East European Studies Center, University of Pittsburgh
Marianna Tax Choldin, Russian & East European Studies Center, University of Illinois
Philip Converse, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences
William D'Antonio, American Sociological Association
Peter DeJanosi, Russell Sage Foundation
Daniel Druckman, National Research Council
Robert Edgmon, Institute of Medicine
Richard Ericson, Department of Economics, Columbia University
Murray Feshbach, Department of Demography, Georgetown University
Wesley Fisher, International Research and Exchanges Board
Samuel R. Gammon, American Historical Association
Dean Gerstein, Institute of Medicine and National Research Council

Sarah Givens, National Research Council
Paul Goble, U.S. Department of State
David Goslin, American Institutes for Research
Jeffrey Hahn, Political Science Department, Villanova University
Brett Hammond, National Research Council
Ed A. Hewett, The Brookings Institution
Robert Huber, Social Science Research Council
Jo L. Husbands, National Research Council
Michael Intriligator, Center for International & Strategic Affairs,
University of California, Los Angeles
William James, U.S. Information Agency
David Johnson, Federation of Cognitive, Behavioral and Psychological
Sciences
Joseph Kadane, Department of Statistics, Carnegie Mellon University
Cynthia Kaplan, Department of Political Science, University of California,
Santa Barbara
Allen Kassof, International Research and Exchanges Board
Melvin Kohn, Department of Sociology, Johns Hopkins University
Alan Kraut, American Psychological Society
Edward Laumann, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago
Herbert Levine, Department of Economics, University of Pennsylvania
Mary Lord, ACCESS
Gen Lovecky, Council for International Exchange of Scholars
Allen Lynch, Harriman Institute for Advanced Study of the Soviet Union,
Columbia University
Stewart Macaulay, University of Wisconsin Law School
Roberta Miller, Division of Social & Economic Science, National Science
Foundation
Norris Minick, Learning and Disability Center, Northwestern University
James M. Montgomery, East-West Forum
Brigid O'Farrell, National Research Council
Victor Rabinowitch, National Research Council
Alexander Rabinowitch, International Programs, Indiana University
Andy Riess, Council for International Exchange of Scholars
John M. Roberts, Department of Anthropology, University of Pittsburgh
John Robinson, Survey Research Center, University of Maryland
Blair Ruble, The Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies
Catherine E. Rudder, American Political Science Association
Lynn Rusten, National Academy of Sciences
Matthew Sagers, Center for International Research, U.S. Bureau of the
Census
Ann Imlah Schneider, Center for International Education, U.S.
Department of Education

Enid C.B. Schoettle, The Ford Foundation

Vladimir Shlapentokh, Community Health Science, Michigan State University

Brian Silver, Department of Political Science, Michigan State University

Herbert A. Simon, Department of Psychology, Carnegie Mellon University

Jerome E. Singer, Department of Medical Psychology, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences

Paul C. Stern, National Research Council

Eugene L. Sterud, American Anthropological Association

Philip Stewart, Department of Political Science, Ohio State University

Michael Swafford, Paragon Research International

Roman Szporluk, Center for Russian and East European Studies, University of Michigan

Charles Tilly, Center for Studies of Social Change, New School for Social Research

Jane Wales, W. Alton Jones Foundation

Mitchel Wallerstein, National Research Council

William Zimmerman, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan

**STATUS AND PROSPECTS OF SOVIET SOCIAL SCIENCE:
THE CHALLENGE FOR THE
AMERICAN SCHOLARLY COMMUNITY**

**August 24-25, 1989
National Academy of Sciences
2101 Constitution Avenue NW
Washington, DC**

AGENDA

THURSDAY, AUGUST 24

The emphasis this day is on: (1) providing and sharing information, (2) encouraging communication among participants, and (3) giving participants an opportunity to discuss issues of interest to them.

A.M.—Plenary Sessions

8:15 Registration open

8:30 Coffee, continental breakfast

9:00 Welcome—Suzanne Woolsey, Executive Director, CBASSE

9:15 Plenary Session I: Background for Our Discussions

“The History and Development of Soviet Social Science”

**Blair Ruble, Secretary, The Kennan Institute for Advanced
Russian Studies**

**“The History and Development of U.S.–Soviet Scholarly Ex-
changes”**

**Allen Kassof, Executive Director, International Research and
Exchanges Board (IREX)**

10:45 Break

**11:00 Panel I: Social Science in the Soviet Union—Current Conditions
and Trends**

Panel participants will be asked to address: (1) current direc-
tions of change, including where one finds Soviets interested
in contacts with U.S. scholars; (2) strengths, weaknesses, needs
within Soviet social and behavioral sciences; (3) U.S.–Soviet
contacts in the behavioral and social sciences in particular
fields; and (4) implications for American social science and
scholarship.

Participants:

Paul Goble, U.S. Department of State

Ed A. Hewett, The Brookings Institution
Michael Swafford, Paragon Research International

12:30 Lunch

P.M.—Working Groups

Each session will have a rapporteur, who will report back on the second day so that a collective picture can be developed for the entire group.

2:00 Working Groups

- #2a Joint U.S.–Soviet scholarly projects**
Chair: Alexander Rabinowitch, Indiana University
Rapporteur: Jo Husbands
- #3a U.S.–Soviet research collaboration**
Chair: Philip Converse, Institute for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences
Rapporteur: Philip Stewart, Ohio State University
- #4 Logistical issues in Soviet-American scholarly work**
Chair: Richard Ericson, Columbia University
Rapporteur: Marianna Tax Choldin, University of Illinois
- #5 Intellectual opportunities for American scholars**
Chair: Roberta Miller, National Science Foundation
Rapporteur: Barbara Anderson, University of Michigan

3:30 Break

4:00 Working Groups

- #1 Projects to improve social and behavioral science capabilities in the U.S.S.R.**
Chair: John Adams, University of Minnesota
Rapporteur: Marjorie Balzer, Georgetown University
- #2b Joint U.S.–Soviet scholarly projects**
Chair: Jane Wales, W. Alton Jones Foundation
Rapporteur: William Zimmerman, University of Michigan
- #3b U.S.–Soviet research collaboration**
Chair: Joseph Kadane, Carnegie Mellon University
Rapporteur: Allen Lynch, Harriman Institute, Columbia University
- #6 Development of behavioral science in the U.S.S.R.**
Chair: Norris Minick, Northwestern University
Rapporteur: David Johnson, Federation of Cognitive, Behavioral, and Psychological Sciences

5:30 Adjourn—reception follows in the Members' Room

FRIDAY, AUGUST 25

If Day 1 provides information, Day 2 addresses implications—What do these changes and opportunities mean for the U.S. social science community? How can the community best be responsive to what is happening in the U.S.S.R.? What are key issues and problems? How much communication, coordination, planning is possible, feasible, and desirable?

8:30 Coffee, continental breakfast

9:00 Plenary Session II: Reports from the Working Groups

Each rapporteur will summarize the results of the discussion in his or her group, followed by questions and general discussion.

10:45 Break

11:00 Panel II: The American Response—Ideas and Prospects

The panelists will be invited to draw on the meeting's discussion to suggest ideas for what should be done (projects, programs, organizational changes, funding, etc.) so that the U.S. social science community can respond effectively to the new opportunities in the Soviet Union.

Participants:

Herbert Simon, Carnegie Mellon University

Enid C.B. Schoettle, Ford Foundation

Herbert Levine, University of Pennsylvania

William A. James, U.S. Information Agency

1:00 Lunch

2:00 Adjourn, followed by visit to the Kennan Institute