ISSN 1536-4003

University of California, Berkeley

Newsletter of the Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies

Fall 2011
Volume 28, Number 2

In this issue:

Newsletter of the Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies
University of California, Berkeley
Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies
260 Stephens Hall # 2304
Berkeley, CA 94720-2304
iseees@berkeley.edu
http://iseees.berkeley.edu

Editors: Andrei Dubinsky and Jeff Pennington.

Submit suggestions, corrections, or inquiries to the above address or call (510) 642-3230.

The ISEEES Newsletter is published twice a year, in the Spring and Fall semesters.

Notes from the Director

A Happy New Year to everyone!

2011 was a difficult year. We lost one of the oldest and most distinguished members of our community, Nicholas V. Riasanovsky. Two of our staff members, Libby Coyne and Rebecca Richards, have left us in order to pursue other careers, and so, to varying degrees, have the State of California and the U.S. Department of Education.

We have not been deterred, however.

First, I am very happy to announce the arrival of two new colleagues. Professor Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann, an expert on Central European History (and a native of East Germany) will be joining the History Department. Dr. Malgorzata Mazurek, a sociologist working on Poland, is a Marie Curie Fellow in the Gerda Henkel Foundation's M4 HUMAN program.

Meanwhile, the ISEEES executive director, Jeff Pennington, in partnership with the Institute of European Studies, was successful in renewing a three-year, €300,000 grant from the European Commission to continue the work of the European Union Center of Excellence at UC Berkeley. Funded by the Delegation of the European Union in Washington, DC, ours is one of only ten such centers in the United States. This three-year project will fund lectures, conferences, and research grants for students and faculty on a wide variety of EU-related topics. These days, every topic is, one way or another, EU-related.

The BPS executive director, Ned Walker, all by himself, negotiated a renewal of the two-year Carnegie Corporation grant that brings to Berkeley young social science faculty from the Caucasus, and now also Belarus, Moldova, and Ukraine. This project teams fellows from the region with UC Berkeley faculty mentors and doctoral students, who help them develop new courses to be offered at their home institutions. In fall 2011, BPS hosted four fellows: Ludmila Cojocari, associate professor of history at Moldova State University in Chişinău; Vahram Danielyan, lecturer in Armenian philology at Yerevan State University; Elene Kvanchilashvili, assistant professor of psychology at Tbilisi State University; and Siarhei Liubimau, lecturer in sociology at the European Humanities University in Vilnius.

This has been a busy fall semester at ISEEES. On September 20, ISEEES held its annual fall reception. The conversation was worthy of the tasty Russian treats Katya provided. A month later, on October 20, Professor Vladimir Mau, rector of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, spoke on Russian economic policy.

In mid-November, ISEEES co-sponsored a student-organized conference on Romani studies. Over a dozen speakers from throughout the United States and Europe focused on the history of Roma and their situation in Europe today. In early December 2011, Ambassador Joanna Kozińska-Frybes, consul general of the Republic of Poland in Los Angeles, spoke about the Polish presidency of the European Union and the European financial crisis. On December 5, Mr. Fyodor Lukyanov, editor-in-chief of the journal Russia in Global Affairs, delivered the annual Colin Miller Memorial Lecture. His talk, titled “Russia in a Changing World: Unpredictable Challenges Ahead,” is now available as a podcast on the ISEEES website.

ISEEES welcomed a number of new visiting scholars this semester. Berkeley alumna Laura Henry (Political Science), associate professor in the Department of Government and Legal Studies at Bowdoin College, spent her fall sabbatical with us as she researched Russia’s changing environmental policy. Professor Lee Suhyoun, research professor at Chungbuk National University in Korea, is spending her sabbatical year at Berkeley. Her research focuses on typologies of nominal constructions in the Russian language. Dr. Zarina Molochieva is a post-doctoral scholar working with Professor Johanna Nichols on an NSF project focusing on varieties of highland Chechen. She holds a Ph.D. in linguistics from the University of Leipzig, and most recently worked as a researcher in the Department of Linguistics of the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig. Professor Anna Novakov teaches art history at St. Mary’s University of California in Moraga. Her research focuses on the history of the East European avant-garde from 1920 to 1940 and its impact on women artists and architects in Serbia. Dr. Tatiana Voronina, associate research scholar at the European University of St. Petersburg, is a Fulbright visiting scholar working on the memory of the Leningrad blockade during the perestroika era.

Finally, ISEEES will be moving to a primarily electronic version of its newsletter. Last April, the U.S. Congress cut $50 million from the U.S. DoEd's international and foreign language education budget. This translated into a drastic 46% reduction in Federal funds which ISEEES receives through the DoEd Title VI National Resource Center program—funds which are used for public outreach, library acquisitions, and the teaching of Armenian, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Bulgarian, Czech, Hungarian, Polish, and Romanian. With continuing cuts to state funding, and now with cuts to Federal funding, ISEEES is forced to rely more and more on our own discretionary funds, much of which come from gifts and endowments made by friends and colleagues. Even modest gifts make a difference in enabling us to maintain superior programming, research, and academic support.

Mark your calendar for the 2012 Berkeley-Stanford Conference, to be held on Friday, March 2 at Stanford University. The conference, titled “From Prague Spring to American Spring,” will look at global and comparative perspectives on protest and revolution between 1968 and 2012. We look forward to seeing you throughout 2012. Be sure to check our website, http://iseees.berkeley.edu/, for upcoming events and updates to the calendar.

Happy New Year!

Yuri Slezkine

ISEEES Director

Jane K. Sather Professor of History

Save The Date

The 36th Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference on Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies

From Prague Spring to American Spring:
Global and Comparative Perspectives on Protest and Revolution, 1968-2012

Date: March 2, 2012 | Place: Stanford University

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

Troika Undergraduate Journal

Troika is an undergraduate journal in Eastern European, Eurasian, and Slavic Studies at the University of California, Berkeley. Founded in 2010 as an ASUC sponsored organization, the first issue was published in Spring 2011. The journal features outstanding undergraduate work from universities worldwide, including academic research papers, memoirs, creative writing, translations, and photography.

On **Thursday, January 26, 2012**, *Troika* will celebrate the release of the Spring 2011 issue at The Magnes, 2121 Allston Way, Berkeley, 6:30 - 8:30 p.m. The campus community and the public are invited to attend.

This publication is made possible by support from the Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies at UC Berkeley, with funding from the U.S. Department of Education Title VI National Resource Centers program.

East Central European Archives: A Review

Mark Keck-Szajbel

Mark Keck-Szajbel is a Ph.D. Candidate in the Department of History, UC Berkeley

For nearly a decade, I have been pursuing research across East Central Europe and America. In visiting collections, large and small, the researcher sometimes feels like a space voyager, traveling to different, unknown worlds. Despite the historian's conviction that the archive is his/her realm, each one is in fact a different planet, with exotic specimens, unusual climates, and strange inhabitants. This article intends to provide a brief assessment of collections across East Central Europe: a hitchhiker's guide, so to speak, to two-dozen "worlds" of archives.

Since my project analyses various layers of society in late state socialism—from the central committee to the local consumer—I have been researching not only state-run national archives, but also miniscule archives of private collectors. At the outset, I would like to make two general assertions. First, the transition from "communist Europe" to "new Europe" has varied depending not only on country but also on locality. Getting by in English is not nearly as difficult as it was twenty years ago, and one no longer has to use order slips as toilet paper. The archive's physical environment reflects how transition is a process, as best revealed in Prague, where the *Archiv bezpečnostních složek*, or Archive of Secret Services, is located in one of the few unrenovated buildings in the city center, whereas the national archives are in a modern, towering building resembling a monument to Hundertwasser. Second, beyond collections' physical structures, the passage of time is reflected differently in terms of accessibility, breadth, and willingness to accommodate the researcher. Counter-intuitively—and in contrast to former Soviet republics—one can say that breadth does not come at the cost of accessibility: large archives in East Central Europe are not arbitrarily restrictive when it comes to accessing documents. Accessibility is reliant on accommodation, however, and the size of the archival collection does not correspond with the archive's physical size. As such, accommodation frequently dictates accessibility.

As a historian returning from years of archival research, I feel that better preparation might have helped me in my search for the materials I needed to complete my dissertation. It was not the fault of advisors, since it is not their responsibility to ensure comfort in the confines of archives. But there were numerous obvious and, in retrospect, typical problems I feel novice historians can anticipate before entering a new archive. The following essay is a written extension of what is detailed in the charts and graphs below. For obvious reasons, there are numerous gaps in the number of archives presented: I have not included national libraries (which host a wealth of sources), nor have I included university libraries (with their numerous archival collections). Hopefully, the fact that there are numerous exceptions to common practice in each archive justifies this essay.

"When did you write to us?"

One day in February, when I thought I was planning *well ahead* for a trip to Germany, I called the *Bundesbeauftrafte für die Unterlagen des Staatsicherheitsdienstes der ehemaligen Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, or the archive of the East German secret police. My trip from Hungary to Germany was already planned for late March; hence, I was certain that over a month of advance notice would suffice. *Leider nicht*. On this occasion, the BStU informed me that advance notice is required to go into the archives. One should send a request more than six weeks in advance.

That is one of the longest delays I had in entering an archive, and it illustrates why it is important to notify archives well in advance of arrival (especially on the first visit). At the *Instytut Pamięci Narodowej*, or Institute of National Memory, I was required to pre-register well in advance (I wrote them in late January and received approval in late March). I had indicated my city of residence in Poland, and they allowed me to visit their branch office there. The IPN is notoriously closed to the general public: their digitized catalogues are available only in person at the archive. Two weeks after I had ordered a dozen boxes, the IPN informed me that they were delivered. Ironically, however, since they knew I was a foreigner, they assumed I would be traveling to Warsaw (the IPN has offices in most major cities in Poland). Since I did not make it clear that I was intending to visit the IPN in a city outside of Warsaw, the process was delayed yet again. I viewed what boxes I could in May, in Warsaw, nearly five months after I had submitted a letter of interest.

I am reminded of eighteenth century scholars who traveled with letters so as to study with professors in distant cities; while the tradition of carrying letters has largely been eliminated in the past generation, formal notification of arrival is not only polite but also necessary. That said, the vast majority of archives I have visited are welcoming, even without a formal letter of introduction, and even without notification. Assume, however, that archives with personal material about everyday citizens are more rigid than others.

"You're the American?"

Most young scholars pursuing advanced degrees in European history will be virtually fluent in a second language, but that does not make navigating the state archive simpler. The fact that digital search machines have, in my personal experience, yet to fully impress upon visitors the size of the box, the nature of the material, or the structure of collections, a novice can hardly enter the archive with thorough understanding of what to ask for or the highly coded language within an archive. Explaining to an archivist what one is looking for is difficult enough; to do that in a foreign language makes matters all the more difficult.

Counterintuitively, limited language capabilities can help a novice get to the documents faster and explore the archive in ways novice researchers would often like. On my first visit to the *Magyar Országos Levéltár*, or Hungarian National Archives—which has very limited digital search engines—I gave a general description of my project. The archivists placed me with toms of indexes to help me look for exactly what I wanted. Perhaps that was discourteous, but it helped me find files and papers I would never have found had my language capabilities been more precise about what exactly I wanted to find.

I have tried to become more sociable with archivists. During my stay in the *Bundesarchiv*, or the Federal Archives in Berlin, I grew accustomed to chat, highlight funny anecdotes found in the documents, and (most importantly) inquire about ambiguous language, thereby gaining both a native speaker's understanding of what the language is supposed to mean (or distort), as well as greater insight as to what the archivist "sees" in a document which historians frequently do not. As goes without saying, the archivist has to have the right working conditions and be willing to chat in order for that to work.

"Didn't you check the catalogue?"

It always seemed ironic to me that the graduate student is expected to know about his/her dissertation topic before starting grad school. How can one know what one wants to write about if one has had limited exposure to the field one intends to study? The situation is the same when it comes to archives. Before one enters the archive, it is difficult to know what is available online, what is available digitally on-site, and what restrictions there are on the documents.

In my case, that problem was compounded, since I was looking for transnational perspectives. How does one find a documentation of the same meeting between ministers in two different countries? Even if governments in the Eastern bloc did take notes from Moscow, ministerial organization differed and different archives organize documents differently today. If I am looking for a specific cooperative project between a Polish state film production company with Czechoslovak filmmakers, the availability of documentation in each country is highly questionable; both the communist and the post-communist regime have set different standards on what to archive, where to place the materials, and how to allow access to researchers.

As a rule of thumb, I have found that small, (semi-) private archives and collections are the most accessible to the researcher and are the most forthcoming in terms of assistance and aid. The *Deutsches Polen-Institut* (German Poland-Institute), the Open Society Archive, the *Magyar Kereskedelmi és Vendéglátóipari Múzeum* (Hungarian Trade and Tourism Museum) – almost all of these private institutions went out of their way to provide me with materials pertinent to my research. Individuals at these small collections were especially helpful in allowing me to recreate the structure of each state.

For that reason, it is crucial to inform archives about the scholars with whom one intends to speak and the documents one would like to find. At the *Instytut Zachodni* (West Institute), the archivists were helpful and the catalogue incredible (although largely not digitized for documents dating before 1990). Alas, more than a quarter of the (admittedly obscure) manuscripts and books I was looking for were missing, and the professor I had tried to contact numerous times was not present. It is usually better to call, well in advance.

"Can you find that?"

There are always great stories from elder colleagues and advisors about the stubborn, East European archivist, who hoards her (since she is usually female) materials and knowledge about the collection, fearful, perhaps, that the young historian would make her job obsolete once he/she published the findings. I have had contact with several dozen archivists. With one possible exception, I have never had the experience where the archivist is intentionally unhelpful.[1]

But my experience at the *Instytut Zachodni* was typical of several archives, most notably the *Národní archiv*. In both cases it was not likely that they actually lost documents. Rather, due to relocation into modern, high tech and attractive buildings, or to statutory limitations on the release of documents, it was very difficult to find materials necessary for my dissertation.

There is good news. The notable exception to this rule is the *Bundesarchiv*, where everything in the archive is catalogued. At the *Instytut Pamięc Narodowej* and at the *Archiv bezpečnostních složek*, archivists are willing to send either digital copies or originals across the country to another research branch. But in the case of the former, the process can take an exorbitant amount of time (between one week and one month). In the latter, much of the materials housed outside of Prague are not inventoried. In my case, I

1. The one exception was in a local, East German archive. Ironically, it seems that after their absorption into the Federal Republic (where it was mythologized that D-Marks flooded libraries and state-of-the-art museums, and where *Ordnung muß sein*), East German municipal collections lost a great deal of their funding. There is always a skeleton crew of librarians and/or archivists, but they seem protective of their collections.

traveled to Brno from Prague (a three hour train ride) every day and took as many images as possible.

Fostering a professional relationship often helps in gaining access to materials. I do not disparage my archivists' attempts to find and deliver materials to my research table in Prague, Budapest, or Poznań, but I was usually unsuccessful in gaining access to materials unlisted in digital catalogues. One can only hope that with the growing interest in late state socialism, more documents will become available. In this case, funding is a crucial element. I understand that many archivists are overworked and underfunded.

"Can I copy that?"

Many of us are envious of other scholars who can write significant sections of their dissertations in the comfort of their homes. Archives in East Central Europe are not anywhere near full digitization, although there are hopeful signs of improvement in many archives. The *Bundesarchiv* increasingly releases collections online. Elsewhere, technology is allowing private individuals to quickly reproduce documents.

That the *Bundesarchiv* releases some collections is ironic, since it seems to be the most prohibitive when it comes to digital reproduction and copying. One has to formally file a request to copy. That form goes to a private company that makes the copy for the archive. Then, after two to six weeks, the researcher gets the copy delivered by mail. That would not be so bad, were it not for the fact that copies are exorbitantly expensive (more than 50 cents per copy, plus labor costs). Fortunately, bureaucracy is not as stringent in East Germany.

In Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary, advancements in digital photography have outpaced many archives' ability to control reproduction. In 2004, when I first visited a small collection in Poznań, I remember the archivists' surprise at an individual with a digital camera intending to make readable copies of materials. Since there was no regulation *against* the use of digital photography at the time, I was allowed to make copies without formalities. Archives and collections have now bridged the digital divide, and most have policies on digital reproductions. Usually that merely means signing a form and indicating which files one photographed. In the *Magyar Országos Levéltár*, the archive charges roughly five dollars for a "half-day" to photograph. Otherwise, photography is free of charge in most archives.

"Can I write that?"

With few exceptions, each archive I visited has legal restrictions. (UC Berkeley also restricts the use of human subjects in research. See: http://cphs.berkeley.edu/.) Depending on the archive, national regulations and bilateral agreements with the United States, restrictions range from a researcher's self-censorship of personal information found in documents to the meticulous blacking-out of names and private data by the archive. Still, certain archives—usually private or semi-private archives with limited collections of state documents—are fully open and impose next to no restrictions on citing sections and publishing information (including names and personal details) found in their papers.

A good colleague of mine is currently writing about name changes: how Poles, Russians, or Yugoslavs were forced or chose to alter their birth name when immigrating to Germany. In most cases, he has to write aliases for the individuals in his documents, since their personal information is protected by the 60-year rule. But how can he write about Piotr Dąbowski changing his name to Peter Eich if the name has to be altered in publications?

Restrictions are not surprising, and researchers in East Central European archives generally have to admit that things are not nearly as bad as in other formerly communist states. Here, too, it is worthwhile to speak with an informed archivist about regulations. At the *Archiwum Akt Nowych*, I sat down with an archivist in order to fully understand the extent of protection afforded to individuals listed in documents. I was especially interested in contacting individuals who had crossed the border illegally. According to the archivist, private personal data are off-limits for publication. But, in this case, printing the names and the reason why police were investigating the individual was legal, as was contacting individuals to interview. In other words, not everything is prohibited, and there are surprising gray areas.

The same can be said of reprinting images found in archives. I recently went through the arduous rite of passage for every scholar intent on publishing images in his/her work. It is a learning process but one that is very instructive for any individual working in an open archive with a digital camera. Both images I needed were contributions to collected volumes from common publishers. In past days, historians would not only need to attain permission from the archive, the journal, and/or the owner of the print but also to procure high-quality copies of the image. With digital photography, this has largely been alleviated, although there are still many hurdles when it comes to quality. One of the obvious problems publishers have with authors is that they provide images of poor quality. A rule for publishers is 300dpi, usually higher quality than most cameras can produce. But in several archives, they allow researchers to use scanners. And where that is not available, common programs such as Adobe Photoshop can change the resolution of images. Provided the original is large enough, reducing to 300dpi will only shrink the size of the image, and the researcher will no longer have to pay for archivists to scan high resolution prints.

"Pardon"

One learns the local etiquette of archives and collections relatively quickly, even when language skills limit formality. In some of the most impersonal archives, I quickly learned with whom to speak to get more files per day, when to arrive at the archive, and even how to get around strict document restrictions, even when my knowledge of the language was limited. Foreign practices can be quirky—I think of walking through the metal detectors in Warsaw and Prague to access some collections, or being given the keys to a wonderfully-restored fin de siècle villa where an institute kept some of its collection with no security—but following them is crucial in establishing a positive working relationship.

Space for the researcher is not a given. One of the reasons for pre-registering at archives is to ensure availability. Especially in archives with larger collections, the volume of visitors on any day is unpredictable. Depending on the archive—such as the *Politisches Archiv des auswärtigen Amtes*, or Political Archive of the Foreign Office—space is reserved to ensure that the researcher has an entire table and/or microfiche machine available. At the *Archiwum Akt Nowych*, especially on days of high traffic, one is lucky to receive half a table; one has to fight to ensure a comfortable workspace. Making reservations for space is frequently inconvenient and redundant, but to travel in a full, hot tram only to return home after encountering a crowded archive feels like a tragedy.

At the end of any archival visit—even in large archives where one feels anonymous—it still made a world of difference when I stopped and expressed my gratitude for the archivists' time and expertise. Even if I never return to the archive, or if the chances of the archivist remembering me are slim, I try to impress upon them how much historians value them. On more than one occasion, the archivist has broken away from his/her work schedule to inquire about my research and what I was not able to find. I am convinced that these personal contacts—albeit brief—have aided me in discovering otherwise untouched papers.

"I love that place"

I was amused by American colleagues in Europe. Without wanting to stereotype, it was amazing how, for example, the location of a good cafeteria was one of their first questions to friends and research colleagues (for the record, the national archives in Prague and Berlin are the best). Beyond culinary questions, there are many miscellaneous concerns when doing research in collections: how is the lighting in the archives, where is the location in the city, or what are the hours of operation? Does the collection close for a month or six weeks during the summer? Complicating the matter is the fact that each researcher has different preferences.

Morning hours are rarely a problem in any archive, but afternoon hours are often problematic. The Czech Republic was the most restrictive when it came to afternoon working hours—especially on Fridays and in the summer. That said, archives in Prague have coordinated summer closures so that the researcher is never forced to spend his/her coveted research money at his hotel; archives usually alternate closures to ensure access. In Poland, on the other hand, one can expect most archives, national and university libraries to be closed for three weeks in August. Germany has the most holidays, but archives are usually open year-round, albeit with occasional, amended open hours.

When it comes to the surroundings, the national archive in Prague, once again, is the most comfortable: it has *free* wifi available for researchers (as opposed to the *Bundesarchiv*, which has a private operator charging fee-for-use), large reading rooms, and plenty of natural light. The Open Society Archive was the most forthcoming when it came to using their equipment to make digital copies and speaking with archivists. The *Magyar Kereskedelmi és Vendéglátóipari Múzeum* was interesting, since it is located in a large museum. In order to access the archive, it was necessary to go through several exhibits. To get to the *Archiv bezpečnostních složek, Brno-Kanice*, I had to take a train to Brno, then take a bus outside of the city, and then walk a mile through a dense forest, which formerly housed border guards. While inconveniently far from civilization, it was refreshing to have a long walk through the forest to get to the secluded archive.

"Don't tell anyone I gave you this." Final assessments

George Soros recently explained in the *New York Review of Books* how he intends to make the Open Society Archive survive him.[2] He urges transparency at the governmental level, and dynamism at the archival level. One can see how his vision of transparency has been realized in Budapest, where the OSA is incredibly forthcoming and willing to circulate their archival materials. But archival material is increasingly distributed outside the realms of reading rooms as scholars, institutes, and websites work to make more information available away from the archive. Now it is completely natural to ask where a colleague looked for material and see if he/she has any copied files. Is this dissemination good for the archive or the scholar?

The Parallel Archive is a good case in point: scholars are encouraged to place their digital copies of archival materials online. The intention is to make material available to scholars where archives—most notably in Russia—have closed for political or physical reasons. But what protection does the scholar have against prosecution for publishing archival material on the Internet? How extensive is the material? Is it representative of material in the archive itself? There are so many questions about an archive with no administrative structure, but I do think that virtual archives are the wave of the future, especially considering the huge costs of housing and preserving materials.

The astute will notice that I have included two libraries in my assessment of East Central European archives. In the case of the of the *Wojewódzka i Miejska Biblioteka*

2. George Soros, "My Philanthropy," in: New York Review of Books, June 23, 2011.

Publiczna w Zielonej Górze, it was merely due to their willingness to help me find little-known magazines and journals otherwise unavailable in other national libraries. The second library I have included in my assessment of archives deserves attention since it has increasingly made rare materials—which account for so much of our archival research—available to the public online. The Národní knihovna in Prague has made a wide variety of obscure and less-obscure materials publicly available online through their website. In so doing, it is promoting the type of projects recently detailed by Robert Darnton in the *New York Review of Books*.[3] It is bypassing Google books but also ensuring the accuracy Parallel Archive is, as of yet, unable to provide.

One thing is certain—East Central European archives are patently not Russian, Ukrainian, or Byelorussian. With only the exception of Hungary, where recent legislation has opened the possibility of archival destruction, archives are in no foreseeable danger of becoming more restrictive. The real question is to what degree East Central European archives are willing to liberate their documents from the physical space of the archive. In light of the cost of maintaining physical archives, it would be cost-effective to increase an online presence, especially given cuts in state funding.

List of archives/collections reviewed:

Czech Republic:

1. ABS-Brno, Archiv bezpečnostních složek (Brno-Kanice), www.abscr.cz

2. ABS-Praha, Archiv bezpečnostních složek (Prague), www.abscr.cz

3. AMZV, Archiv ministerstva zahraničních věcí České republiky (Prague), www.mzv.cz

4. NA, Národní archiv (Prague), www.nacr.cz

5. NKCR, Národní knihovna České republiky (Prague), www.nkp.cz

6. SOAL, Státní okresní archiv Liberec (Liberec), www.soalitomerice.cz

Germany

7. BArch Berlin, Bundesarchiv (Berlin), www.bundesarchiv.de

8. BStU, Bundesbeauftrafte für die Unterlagen des Staatsicherheitsdienstes der ehemaligen Deutschen Demokratischen Republik (Berlin), www.bstu.bund.de

9. DPI, Deutsches Polen-Institut (Darmstadt), www.deutsches-polen-institut.de

10. DokuDDR, Dokumentationszentrum Alltagskultur der DDR (Eisenhüttenstadt), www.alltagskultur-ddr.de/pages/home.html

11. Herder Institut (Marburg), www.herder-institut.de

12. Institut für Osteuropäische Geschichte und Landeskunde (Tübingen), www.osteuropa.uni-tuebingen.de

13. MfAA, Politisches Archiv des auswärtigen Amtes, http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/DE/AAmt/Politisch-esArchiv/Uebersicht_node.html

14. Stadtarchiv Frankfurt (Oder), www.stadtarchiv-ffo.de

15. Stadtarchiv (Zittau), www.zittau.de/2_rathaus/stadtver-waltung/struktur/archiv.html

Hungary

16. MKVM, Magyar Kereskedelmi és Vendéglátóipari Múzeum (Budapest), www.mkvm.hu

17. MOL, Magyar Országos Levéltár (Budapest), www.mol.gov.hu

18. OSA, Open Society Archives (Budapest), www.osaarchivum.org

19. Parallel Archive, www.parallelarchive.org

Poland

20. AAN, Archiwum Akt Nowych (Warsaw), www.aan.gov.pl

21. APP, Archiwum Państwowe w Poznaniu (Poznan), www.poznan.ap.gov.pl

22. APWr, Archiwum Państwowe we Wrocławiu (Wrocław), www.ap.wroc.pl

23. APZG, Archiwum Państwowe w Zielonej Górze (Zielona Góra), www.archiwum.zgora.pl

24. IPN, Instytut Pamięci Narodowej (Warsaw), www.ipn.gov.pl

25. IZ, Instytut Zachodni w Poznaniu (Poznan), www.iz.poznan.pl

26. Wojewódzka i Miejska Biblioteka Publiczna w Zielonej Górze (Zielona Góra), www.wimbp.zgora.pl

USA

27. Hoover Institute Library and Archives (Stanford), www.hoover.org/library-and-archives

3. Robert Darnton, "Google's Loss, the Public Gain," in: New York Review of Books, April 28, 2011.

Assessment of Archives (Overview)

N/A not applicable - small; restrictive; limited O normal; open; accessible + exceptional Y/N required/not required	Size, breadth, of collection	Accessibility to collection	Registration payment required	Accessibility of materials	Availability of materials	Availability of archivist(s)	Summertime availability	Open hours	Computerized search-engines	Copying and digital imagery	Scholarships available	Scholar privacy	No document restrictions	Number of documents/day
Czech Republic														
Arch. bezpečnostních složek, Brno-Kanice	O	+	N	+	O	+	+	-	O	+	N	+	O	+
Arch. bezpečnostních složek, Praha	O	+	N	+	O	O	O	O	O	+	N	O	O	+
Arch. min. *zahraničních věcí*	O	+	N	+	+	+	O	-	O	+	N	O	+	O
Národní archive	+	+	N	O	O	O	-	+	O	+	N	+	O	+
Národní knihovna České republiky	+	+	Y	+	O	-	-	+	+	+	N	O	+	+
Státní okresní archiv Liberec	-	+	N	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	N	+	+	+
Germany														
Bundesarchiv	+	+	N	+	O	O	+	O	+	-	N	O	-	+
BStU	+	-	N	-	+	+	O	O	-	-	N	+	-	O
Deutsches Polen Institut	-	+	N	+	+	+	+	+	O	+	Y	+	+	+
Doku-zentrum Alltagskultur	-	O	N	-	-	-	O	O	-	-	N	n/a	-	
Herder Institut	O	+	N	+	+	+	+	O	+	+	Y	+	+	+
Inst. für Osteuro. Geschichte	-	+	N	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	N	+	+	+
Politisches Arch. des Auswärtigen Amts	+	+	N	+	O	+	O	O	O	+	N	+	O	+
Stadtarch. Frankfurt (Oder)	-	-	Y	-	O	O	-	-	-	-	N	O	-	-
Stadtarchiv Zittau	-	+	Y	+	+	+	O	-	-	n/a	N	O	+	+
Hungary														
MKVM	-	+	N	+	+	+	O	O	-	+	N	+	+	+
Magyar Országos Levéltár	+	O	N	O	O	+	O	+	O	O	N	O	O	O
Open Society Archives	O	+	N	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Y	+	+	+
Parallel Archive	-	+	N	+	+	-	n/a		+	+	N	+	+	+
Poland														
Archiwum Akt Nowych	+	+	N	+	+	+	-	O	-	O	N	-	O	O

Arch. Państwowe w Poznaniu	O	+	N	O	+	O	-	-	N	-	N	+	+	+
Arch. Państwowe *we Wrocławiu*	O	+	N	+	O	O	-	O	O	-	N	+	+	O
Arch. Państwowe w *Zielonej Górze*	-	+	N	+	+	+	-	-	N	N	N	+	+	+
Instytut Pamięci Narodowej	+	-	N	-	+	O	-	-	O	-	N	+	-	O
Instytut Zachodni w Poznaniu	-	+	N	-	+	O	-	-	O	+	N	+	+	+
Woj. i Miej. Bib. Publ. w Ziel. Górze	-	+	Y	+	O	O	+	+	O	+	N	+	+	+
USA														
Hoover Institute Library and Archives	O	+	N	O	+	+	O	O	+	-	Y	+	+	+

The Hertelendy Graduate Fellowship in Hungarian Studies

Daniel Viragh, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History, received the Hertelendy Graduate Fellowship in Hungarian Studies for the 2011-2012 academic year, allowing him to conduct research in Budapest during the year. He is undertaking extensive archival research for his dissertation on "Modern Jewish Identities in the Kingdom of Hungary, 1867-1914."

The Peter N. Kujachich Endowment in Serbian and Montenegrin Studies

Sarah Garding, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Political Science, received funding for her project titled "From 'Stepmother' to Loving Fatherland: Serbian State-Diaspora Ties Since 1990." These funds supported extended field research among the Serbian diaspora communities of North America.

Mujeeb Khan, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Political Science, received a Summer Language Training Fellowship for study of Serbian Language during summer 2011.

Andrej Milivojevic, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History, received a fellowship that enabled him to do research for his dissertation during summer 2011.

Additionally, funds from the endowment are used to support the teaching of Serbian (Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian) language during the 2011-2012 academic year. Funds were also used for subscription fees for the use of Central and East European Online Library, which contains a number of Serbian and Montenegrin titles of use to faculty and students pursuing research in the area. Lastly, funds were used to support Troika, UC Berkeley's undergraduate journal in Eastern European, Eurasian, and Slavic Studies.

Peter Kujachich honored by Cal

On Oct. 4, Peter Kujachich received the Berkeley Foundation's *Builders of Berkeley* designation. He was honored for three endowments to the university. His name was engraved on the wall outside Doe Library on campus. Mr. Kujachich's contributions fund various academic projects on campus dealing with Serbia and Montenegro. The Kujachich endowment also funds an annual lecture in Serbian and Montenegrin Studies. ISEEES students and faculty doing research on Serbia and Montenegro have greatly benefited from Mr. Kujachich's philanthropy, and we are very happy to see him honored by UC Berkeley for his generosity and his contributions to Serbian and Montenegrin studies at Cal.

Peter Kujachich (center) at the ceremony.

Faculty and Student News

Boris Barkanov, Ph.D. in political science, UC Berkeley, has accepted a postdoctoral fellowship at the Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies at Harvard University.

Monica Eppinger, Ph.D. in anthropology, has accepted an Assistant Professor of Law position at St. Louis University. She is on the Advisory Board for Russian and Eastern European Studies and is also a member of the core faculty of the Intercultural Studies Center at St. Louis University.

Eleonory Gilburd, Ph.D. in history, UC Berkeley, and assistant professor of modern Russian and Soviet history at New York University, is the recipient of the Robert C. Tucker/Stephen F. Cohen Dissertation prize for an outstanding doctoral dissertation, "To See Paris and Die: Western Culture in the Soviet Union, 1950s and 1960s."

Eric Johnson, Ph.D. candidate in history, published a BPS working paper titled "The Commune On Znamenskaia Street: Or What Happens When An Actor Makes Tea" in the summer 2011 BPS Working Paper Series.

Matthew J. Jackson, Ph.D. in art history, UC Berkeley, and associate professor of art history at the University of Chicago, is the recipient of the Wayne S. Vucinich Book prize for the most important contribution to Russian, Eurasian, and East European studies in any discipline of the humanities or the social sciences. His book *The Experimental Group: Ilya Kabakov, Moscow Conceptualism, Soviet Avant-Gardes* is based on his 2003 Berkeley dissertation.

Mujeeb R. Khan, Ph.D. candidate in political science, plans to continue his dissertation fieldwork on the causes of the Bosnian genocide in former Yugoslavia. His research is funded by Berkeley's BPS Committee and FLAS.

Andrew Kornbluth, Ph.D. candidate in history, received the ACLS Dissertation Fellowship for Eastern Europe for the 2011-2012 academic year. He plans to conduct research in Poland during this time.

Jody La Porte and **Danielle N. Lussier**, Ph.D. candidates in political science, co-authored an article titled "What is the Leninist Legacy? Assessing Twenty Years of Scholarship" in the Fall 2011 issue of The Slavic Review. The article critically examines the "legacies" paradigm dominating post-communist scholarship in the social sciences.

Tony H. Lin, Ph.D candidate in Slavic languages and literatures, participated in the ACTR Summer Russian Teachers Program at the Moscow State University for six weeks, which was funded by the U.S. Department of Education. He also received a Critical Language Scholarship Alumni Development Grant.

Julia McAnallen received her Ph.D. in Slavic languages and literatures in May 2011 and is currently a UC International Postdoctoral Teaching Fellow at the Instituto de Empresa University, Segovia and Madrid, Spain. She has recently published an article titled "Predicative Possession in the Old Church Slavic Bible Translations" in OSLa, volume 3(3), 2011: *Indo-European Syntax and Pragmatics: Contrastive Approaches*.

Marcy E. McCullaugh, Ph.D. candidate in political science, recently returned to UC Berkeley after conducting dissertation field research in Almaty and Astana, Kazakhstan, Baku, Azerbaijan, and Moscow, Russia for a year. Her research was supported by an International Dissertation Research Fellowship (IDRF) from the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) and a Fullbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad (DDRA) Fellowship.

Johanna Nichols, professor emerita of Slavic languages and literatures and affiliate professor of linguistics, has published a book titled *Ingush Grammar* in August 2011, University of California Publications in Linguistics.

Harsha Ram, associate professor of Slavic languages and literatures, UC Berkeley, has recently contributed the chapter "Russian Modernism" to *The Cambridge Companion to European Modernism*. He has presented various lectures and roundtables including: "The Georgian Intelligentsia Between Nation and Empire" at *Imperial Nation Workshop: Tsarist Russia and the Peoples of Empire* in Ann Arbor Michigan; "Hidden Georgian Histories in Russian Culture and Thought" at the annual conference of the Association for the Study of Nationalities in New York; "Georgian Modernisms, Georgian Modernities" at the *Modernism in Georgia: Redrawing the Boundaries* conference at Columbia University; "Narrating Russian Modernism" at the Department of Russian and Slavic Studies at New York University; "Crossroads Modernity: Aesthetic Modernism and the Russian-Georgian Encounter" at the *Caucasus: Zones of Contestation* conference at Princeton University.

Gergő Tóth, lecturer in Hungarian and German, has completed an Oral Proficiency Interview Assessment workshop at Middlebury College in July. He is also working as the Technical Editor for the online journal of American Hungarian Educators' Association.

Allan Urbanic, librarian for Slavic and East European Collections, has been selected by the Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies (ASEEES) Committee for Library and Information Resources (CLIR) as the 2011 recipient of the ASEEES CLIR Distinguished Service Award. The award recognizes his lifelong dedication and service to the field of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian studies librarianship.

Zhivka Valiavicharska received her Ph.D. in rhetoric in August 2011 with a dissertation titled "Spectral Socialisms: Marxism-Leninism and the Future of Marxist Thought in Post-Socialist Bulgaria." She is currently a Harper and Schmidt postdoctoral fellow in the Social Sciences at the University of Chicago's Society of Fellows.

Barbara Voytek, Ph.D., anthropology, and former Executive Director of ISEEES, is one of the Senior Researchers on a three-year grant from the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA) that has been awarded to Ferenc Horváth (Móra Ferenc Museum of Szeged and Jószef Attila University Szeged) for analysis of archaeological materials from the Neolithic tell site, Hódmezővásárhely-Gorzsa. She, together with an Italian colleague, is studying the chipped stone tools from the site, which dates to ca 4,000 BC and represents one of the most systematically excavated Tisza culture settlements.

Campus Visitors

Professor Laura Henry is a visiting scholar with ISEEES during the fall semester. A UC Berkeley alumna, she is currently an Associate Professor in the Department of Government and Legal Studies at Bowdoin College. Her research project is titled "National Interests and Transnational Governance: the case of Russia's Changing Environmental Policy."

Elira Karaja is a visiting student researcher with ISEEES and the Berkeley Economic History Lab. She is a Ph.D. candidate in economics at the Institute for Advanced Studies IMT in Lucca, Italy. She is conducting research for her Ph.D. thesis at UC Berkeley under the supervision of professor Gérard Roland. Her research focuses on the impact of institutions, reforms, and historical legacies for transition (emerging) economies in Eastern Europe and Former Soviet Union.

Kim Jung Il is a visiting scholar with ISEEES during 2011. He is Assistant Professor at the Department of Russian Language and Literature, Kyungpook National University, Korea. His visit is sponsored by his university. While in Berkeley, he will be doing research on the keywords of Russian culture from a comparative cultural viewpoint

Lee Suhyeon is spending her sabbatical year with us at ISEEES. She holds a Ph.D. in Russian linguistics from the Russian State University for the Humanities, and she is currently a research professor at Chungbuk National University in Korea. Her research focuses on types of nominal constructions in the Russian language.

Zarina Molochieva is a post-doctoral scholar working with Professor Johanna Nichols on an NSF project focusing on the varieties of highland Chechen. Zarina holds a Ph.D. in linguistics from the University of Leipzig, and most recently worked as a researcher at in the Department of Linguistics of the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig, Germany.

Professor Anna Novakov comes to us this semester from St. Mary's University of California in Moraga, where she teaches art history. She holds a doctorate from New York University in the History of Art and Art Education and her research is currently dedicated to the history of the East European avant-garde (from 1920-1940) and its impact on women artists and architects in Serbia.

Professor Park Jeong-O joins us from Hankuk University of Foreign Studies in South Korea, where he teaches Romanian language and literature. He is spending a sabbatical year at UC Berkeley, conducting research on contemporary Romanian culture and literature, especially within the field of world comparative literature.

Svetlana Roberman is a visiting Fulbright post-doctoral scholar at ISEEES during the 2011 calendar year. She holds a Ph.D. in social anthropology from Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Israel. Her research is on post-Soviet Jewish diaspora in Germany and Israel.

Tatiana Voronina is a visiting Fulbright post-doctoral scholar at ISEEES from October 2011 to April 2012. She is currently an Associate Research Scholar at the Oral History Center at the European University of St. Petersburg. She holds a Ph.D. in history from the Russian Academy of Science, Institute of Russian History. Her current research project deals with memories from the blockade of St. Petersburg. She will spend her time in Berkeley doing research for a book on this topic.

Make a Gift to ISEEES!

The loyal support of private donors like you supplements the funding we receive from other sources and enables us to meet the standards of excellence required of us by the University of California, Berkeley as an organized research unit and by the U.S. Department of Education as a Title VI National Resource Center. Your support helps to expand and sustain a robust area-specific international education for our students, furthers research opportunities for faculty focusing on our region, and allows us to respond to new programming opportunities and to expand public outreach.

Our Federal and state funding have faced continued reductions, compelling us to draw more and more on our modest endowments to maintain the superior programming and research and academic support our student, faculty, and public constituents have come to expect. As a result, we have expanded opportunities for more targeted giving in order to encompass a variety of ISEEES programs. Contributions of any size are appreciated and contribute directly to ISEEES's continued accomplishments. We would be very happy to discuss details of these funds or other giving opportunities. Jeff Pennington, executive director of ISEEES, can be reached at jpennington@berkeley.edu or (510) 643-6736.

GIVING OPPORTUNITIES

ISEEES General Support Fund
The ISEEES General Support Fund is an unrestricted fund that is used to: provide travel grants to affiliated graduate and undergraduate students for the purpose of presenting papers at academic conferences; provide research assistance to affiliated faculty members; convene conferences, open to the public, that examine current topics in Slavic, East European, and Eurasian studies; host an annual reception to foster community building among faculty, students, and the public; and augment the state and grant funds that provide minimal support for ISEEES operations.

ISEEES Graduate Student Support Fund
The ISEEES Graduate Student Support Fund is a new UCB Foundation endowment that was established by a generous gift from an anonymous donor. When fully funded, the ISEEES Graduate Student Support Fund will be used to support graduate students in the field of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies. The endowment was launched by the initial gift and matching funds from the Graduate Division. Additional gifts to the Fund are encouraged and gratefully accepted.

Colin and Elsa Miller Endowment Fund
The Annual Colin Miller Memorial Lecture honors the memory of a journalist and radio and TV producer who was devoted to the Center for Slavic and East European Studies (as ISEEES was called before the year 2000). The endowment funds an annual lecture given by a respected scholar in the field of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies.

Hungarian Studies Fund
This fund promotes the teaching of the Hungarian language at UC Berkeley, provides research assistance to faculty and students studying Hungarian topics, and supports lectures, workshops, and conferences devoted to Hungarian studies.

Fund for Romanian Studies
This fund promotes the teaching of the Romanian language at UC Berkeley; supports lectures, workshops, and conferences devoted to Romanian topics; and provides research assistance to faculty and students pursuing Romanian studies.

Support Our Institute!

Associates of the Slavic Center

ISEEES acknowledges with sincere appreciation the following individuals who made their annual contribution to ISEEES between June and December, 2011.

CENTER CIRCLE
Paul Hertelendy*

BENEFACTORS
Frank Fletcher*

SPONSORS
Katalin Voros*
Margaret and Peter Edgelow*
Thomas Potworowski*
Kathleen E. Smith*
Carol Santos*
Michael P. Richards*

MEMBERS
Bonnie Hamlin*
George and Guyla Ponomareff*
Sue C Schiffer*
Anonymous*
Eric and Paula Gillett*
Elena Sokol
Deborah Pearl*
Roberta Shaw*

* gift of continuing membership

Your gift will qualify you for membership on our annual giving program: Associates of the Slavic Center. Descriptions of membership benefits by level are included below. Thank you for your continued support.

Members (Gifts under $100). Members are notified in writing about major upcoming ISEEES events.

Sponsors (Gifts of $100—$499). ASC Sponsors receive a specially designed gift that bears the ISEEES logo, promoting Slavic and East European Studies at Berkeley.

Benefactors (Gifts of $500—$999). ASC Benefactors receive a complimentary copy of a book authored by ISEEES faculty.

Center Circle (Gifts of $1,000 and above). Members of the Center Circle will qualify for the Charter Hill Society at UC Berkeley. The Charter Hill Society is Berkeley's new program designed to recognize donors' annual giving to the campus. Benefits of this program include a subscription to *Berkeley Promise Magazine* and an invitation to *Discover Cal* lecture.

It is a policy of the University of California and the Berkeley Foundation that a portion of the gifts and/or income therefrom is used to defray the costs of raising and administering the funds. Donations are tax-deductible to the extent allowed by law.

You can contribute online by visiting the ISEEES website http://iseees.berkeley.edu, clicking on the "Contributing to the Institute" link, and selecting the ISEEES fund which you would like to support.

Or send a check, payable to UC Regents, to:

Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies
University of California, Berkeley
260 Stephens Hall #2304
Berkeley CA 94720-2304

Name(s)____
Address ____
____
City ____________________State________ Zip ______
Home Phone__________________ Business Phone________________
If your employer has a matching gift program, please print name of corporation below:
____
____ I have made a contribution but wish to remain anonymous.

Energy Restructuring and Social Distribution in Transition: The Model of East Germany and Poland*

Theocharis N. Grigoriadis

Theocharis Grigoriadis is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Political Science, UC Berkeley

Introduction

The Oder-Neiße borderline between the German Democratic Republic and Poland did not only signal Germany's defeat in the Second War and the end of Prussia as a formative component of German political and economic development.[1] It also hallmarked the restructuring of highly differentiated patterns of enterprise in the transition period following the dissolution of the USSR and led both communist economies to divergent sets of institutional arrangements. The purpose of this article is to unfold the mechanisms that led to differentiated corporate structures in the energy sectors of East Germany and Poland. In its next stage, the article treats these structures as fixed and analyzes their role as social distribution mechanisms. Why the energy sector? I contend that the increased dimension of public interest in the continuity and diversity of energy production combined with the cross-nationally observed inclination of the socialist and post-socialist state to exercise direct or indirect control over their natural resources justifies this choice. Furthermore, the significant share of energy companies in the industrial GDP of Eastern Germany and Poland as well as the social cleavages arising in the aftermath of restructuring implementation in both countries form the basis for a second question;[2] what were the distributive effects of energy restructuring, and how can they be incorporated into the ex novo formation of socio-economic strata in East German and Polish societies?

There is a clear distinction between restructuring and privatization. Restructuring can occur before or after privatization, but unlike privatization it does not touch ownership relations inside an enterprise;[3] the latter can be either a State-Owned Enterprise (SOE) or a private corporation. Hence, corporate restructuring focuses on debt reduction, attraction of state aid and foreign direct investment, boost of labor productivity, employment adjustment, corporate governance reform, increase of exports and profitability, and new marketing strategies. Nevertheless, the time differential between restructuring and privatization can be so small that the boundaries between these two phases in market transition are non-existent.[4] The East German and Polish energy sectors are interesting cases, given their common state origins and their distinct structural features. The Polish energy sector has had a higher degree of diversity in resources: oil, gas, electricity and coal (lignite) have been the main market fields, open to structural reform.[5] On the other hand, the East German energy sector was defined by coal (lignite) and electricity production, while natural gas has only had a marginal role in domestic growth, as the GDR never enjoyed natural gas reserves.[6]

This plurality in Polish energy resources does not change the fact that Poland has been one of the most coal-dependent countries in the world (US Department of Energy Overview). Coal dependence has been the main common energy industry feature across the Oder-Neiße borderline. However, what I observe in East Germany and Poland is the distinction between *procedural* and *regulatory energy restructuring*.

I define procedural restructuring as organizational reform of SOEs with the imminent purpose of privatization. There is practically no difference between the time point of privatization and the time point of restructuring. The direct involvement of *Treuhand* as the institutional intermediary between the East German government and West German energy corporations indicates a multiplicity of actors that participated in the restructuring and privatization processes.[7] There is also a critical distinction between *horizontal and vertical (hierarchical) energy restructuring*; horizontal energy restructuring is linked to the implementation of energy reform plans by institutional coalitions that do not belong to the same administrative or hierarchical line. Polish energy restructuring is regulatory and vertical (hierarchical).[8] Regulatory restructuring is implemented by administrative acts. Its purpose is not imminent privatization, but the preservation of state control and the maintenance of lower subsidized energy prices for both social and electoral reasons. Hierarchical restructuring is the top-down implementation of organizational reform at the enterprise level. The government alone is the common denominator of all restructuring efforts; foreign investors and international organizations are complementary rather than central in the reform process. East Germany's energy restructuring was designed as a consequence of the abolition of the country's sovereignty;[9] in Poland, energy restructuring was connected to a transition to a new form of government within set geographical boundaries, but with diversified economic foundations.

In the aftermath of these parallel reform processes, the distributive role of companies derived in both countries is evaluated in terms of employment, income, education, pensions, and labor representation. More specifically, I

* An earlier version of this article has been published as "Energy Restructuring and Social Distribution in the Transition Economies of East Germany and Poland," Journal of Siberian Federal University, Series: Humanities and Social Sciences, 3 (2011 4): 410-425.

intend to analyze the impact of energy restructuring in East Germany and Poland in terms of equality rather than liberty. The underlying normative principle of economic liberalization in Eastern Europe is reversed; if the purpose of the state is to advance individual liberties constrained by social deliberations, then this article provides an explanation that reverses the roles of liberty and equality. Now equality is the objective principle and liberty forms the constraint. Social distribution is used as a proxy for equality to the same extent that privatization is used as a proxy for liberty.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 1, an ideal type of energy restructuring is proposed, and then the politics of energy restructuring in East Germany and Poland are compared. In Section 2, energy firms are treated as social distribution mechanisms through the lens of the public ownership. Section 3 proposes a two-dimensional map of the interaction between energy restructuring and social distribution. Moreover, it stresses the derived observation that the existence of distributive energy firms in post-socialism implies the existence of distributive energy bureaucracies. Section 4 concludes that the treatment of energy as a public rather than private good is critical in that respect.

I. Models of Energy Transition in East Germany and Poland

The actors of my ideal type of energy restructuring include the state, which is the owner of any given enterprise and represents the people's interests, and institutional intermediaries that assist the state in restructuring implementation such as banks, independent agencies, international organizations and private advisors. The organizational division of the firm into smaller corporate units, which become financially viable with state subsidies, FDI and bank loans, is considered to be the first step toward efficient restructuring.[10] Furthermore, the substitution of public managers with skilled personnel that have signed short-term service contracts with the government and the ability of the government to block any major decision taken by the board of directors, constitute the second step in the restructuring process.

Profitability and therefore liquidity is the key proxy used to evaluate the success of the restructuring phase.[11] Increased market value is linked to higher state revenues, increased job security for the currently employed, and sustainable economic growth. Export growth, increased labor productivity, cash flow, and total factor productivity are treated as functions of profitability. The term organizational restructuring encompasses both what the literature calls organizational and financial restructuring.[12] The institutional map of privatization does not have the state as its main point of reference, as is the case in restructuring.[13] On the contrary, it entails a significant bargaining role for entrepreneurs who are willing to acquire governmental shares in state corporations.[14] It also includes supporting institutions, which can be either financial (banks), international (The World Bank and IMF), or administrative (agencies) with a broader and more independent statutory mandate.[15] Because the goal of privatization should be a contract where economic efficiency and social justice meet, I argue that the government has to preserve a package of *vetoing minority shares* in the post-privatization period. This should be particularly the case for sectors of reinforced public interest such as energy, infrastructure, and telecommunications.[16] I treat this package of shares as a *public ownership minimum* that affects the management's decisions regarding employment relations when both phases of industrial transformation are over.[17] My transition theory of corporate governance necessitates an alliance between the unions and the government. The imposition of the *public ownership minimum* protracts the privatization process and increases the number of private contenders.[18] Thus, the bargaining position of the private investor is restrained but not to such an extent that he or she opts to exit the transaction. In this approach, minority state ownership does not have a positive but a normative component (Meyer 2002: 269-274).[19] The government does not care about maximizing the value of its stocks but rather about its reelection. By blocking decisions against labor interests, it indirectly implements social policy.

This two-stage model of energy transition is applicable in the cases of East German and Polish energy restructuring. When the Berlin Wall fell, East Germany's energy industry consisted of the electrical power industry and lignite (brown coal) mining operations in Lusatia and Middle Germany.[20] The Electricity Treaty (*Stromvertrag*) signed among the *Treuhand* (East Germany's privatization agency), the GDR government, and seven West German firms on August 22 of 1990 led to the creation of the Unified Energy Plants as a joint-stock corporation (*Vereinte Energiewerke AG*); this company included the East German lignite power plants, which had been already restructured by the *Treuhand* for that purpose.[21] *Treuhand* was not as efficient in selling the lignite mines per se; Middle German mining operations were finally bought by PowerGen plc, Morrison Knudsen Corporation and NRG Energy Inc., which formed the Middle German Lignite Corporation (*MIBRAG BV*).[22] Nevertheless, it was able to sell the Lusatia mines to a business consortium formed by RWE AG and Viag/Veba (*Lausitzer Braunkohle AG*).[23]

Treuhand functioned as a *quasi* East German government, whose mandate and legitimacy was derived from its institutional linkage to West Germany's political and economic system.[24] The immediate transition from restructuring to privatization resulted in the rapid generation of property rights; the source of these property rights was not the East German government but the *Treuhand*.[25] This was the first time in the history of democratization and industrial transformation that an administrative agency was subjected to the laws of a foreign country (West Germany) and then privatized that country's energy infrastructure, despite the obvious welfare consequences for the populous

East German working class. Communist economies are two or three times more energy intensive than capitalist ones; this feature is likely to endure in early transition.[26] An economic report on the East German energy sector in 1990 shows the following: while the energy sector did not occupy a leading position in the share of industrial employment, it accurately reflected changes in labor relations and employment during the post-reunification period.[27] The negative slope of the East German energy intensity curve between 1990 and 1994 implies a parallel decrease in both energy consumption and production and indicates *Treuhand's* objective to fully change the sectoral distribution of East Germany's industrial GDP.[28] This strategic decision was not supported with a sustainability plan for power plants or mining operations; on the contrary, it linked them to the corporate interests of West German multinationals without taking into account the input from either East German state governments or trade unions.[29] The procedural and horizontal nature of East German energy restructuring now becomes obvious.[30] I argue that restructuring exclusively catered to the interests of West German energy oligopolies.[31] Not only did it increase energy market concentration and therefore violated even more antitrust law in New Germany, but it also facilitated an unprecedented bargaining between energy multinationals and an administrative agency, which was certainly not a legitimate representative of the East German people.[32] Energy restructuring in East Germany should be seen as a seminal paradigm of an ethnically-driven FDI externalization. *Treuhand's* failure to generate a surplus between restructuring revenues and expenditures undermined the infrastructural modernization of East German energy companies and had an adverse effect on the overall competitiveness of the German economy.[33] Particularly in the energy sector, the rapid transfer of privatization costs from producers to consumers constitutes the most ample manifestation of *Treuhand's* politically conservative bias and pro-business orientation.[34]

In Poland, on the contrary, the state remained as the main source of energy transition (hierarchical and regulatory). Energy restructuring was defined not only in terms of privatization, but also in terms of energy law reform, commercialization of energy enterprises, energy pricing and policy-relevant issues for each subsector.[35] The World Bank's seminal proposal on Polish energy restructuring outlined the reform steps that were actually implemented in this sector; privatization of infrastructure was designed and implemented under the regulatory supervision of five different ministries.

Pricing – while still subsidized – was cost-reflective and in many cases state management was accountable to workers councils.[36] The Polish Oil and Gas Company (PGNG) – the most important corporate actor in the oil and gas sectors – was owned by the state; nevertheless, Poland's limited gas and broad oil dependence on Russia render the politics of oil and gas industry transformation less interesting.[37] What matters most is electricity restructuring and the regulation of the Upper Silesian lignite mines that have been continuously serving as a major component of electricity production.[38] The government maintained direct control over PSE SA, the Polish National Grid, as well as over the generation and distribution companies, until the mid-1990s; the state began to partially privatize its energy assets only when the Energy Act entered into force and adjustment to the European *acquis* became a serious incentive for energy restructuring.[39]

The Polish transition to a market economy is considered to be a success story for shock therapy privatization proponents. In the case of energy restructuring, however, rapid privatization was certainly not the case. Unlike East German restructuring, where the boundaries between restructuring and privatization were substantially blurred, Polish energy industry was transformed under the aforementioned *public ownership minimum.* Differentials in profit and time are large enough to make a clear distinction between restructuring and privatization. The latter stage was largely concluded upon Polish accession to the European Union. It is reasonable to hypothesize that the government in Warsaw has been reluctant in the public offerings of its energy assets. The scope of Polish mass privatization programs was not as wide as it was initially expected and occurred in sectors where extensive privatization was due to the impact of foreign experts rather than administrative pressures.[40] Hence, energy restructuring is one of these policy initiatives where the government decided to defend its ownership shares; minority state ownership in the energy sector was seen as a method of offsetting the negative welfare effects of employment decline.[41] Contrary to Russian privatization schemes, direct rather than indirect bureaucratic intervention in the restructuring and privatization of energy SOEs preserved a minimum equality threshold in Poland necessary for social solidarity.[42]

II. Energy Firms as Distributive Mechanisms: The Oder-Neiße Dichotomy

Social distribution is inherently connected to the idea of the allocation of public resources by the government.[43] Here, I do not intend to focus only on the political mechanisms of energy restructuring and privatization. I assume that restructuring and privatization as a two-stage process provides the firm with a series of property assets that are taxable by the government. In that respect, I suggest that the public ownership minimum determines the distributive power of the firm both toward its employees and the citizens. The same set of incentives that prevent the government from fully privatizing the energy sector is also valid for the explanation of energy firms as social distribution mechanisms; thus, state ownership, unemployment benefits, and taxation may be considered as forms of social insurance that bridge corporate restructuring with inequality alleviation.[44]

When the transition to a market economy occurs, the government is not likely to treat the energy sector as a first priority privatization area, because this would radically increase energy prices, inflation and unemployment rates. This would result in a severe social crisis that no government wants to face. Energy restructuring and privatization may be seen as a more powerful but indirect way of social distribution; firms that receive less subsidies and pay more in social services and compensation for their employees are "rewarded" with lower taxes, and vice versa. The existence of the public ownership minimum defines my theory of energy firms as social distribution mechanisms in post-communist East Germany and Poland.

In the former German Democratic Republic, distributive energy restructuring did not occur due to biased and unilaterally inspired macroeconomic and political planning. Lignite industry production and employment data in the 1990s amplify a radical decrease in energy significance for East Germany, which becomes broader as the time distance from 1990 increases; the lignite employment/lignite production ratio also becomes exponentially smaller.[45] Schleiniger has argued that the exemption of energy-intensive export sector from environmental-friendly taxation can increase energy use because energy-intensive commodities are cheaper and therefore substitute for labor-intensive commodities.[46] Taxation of energy companies does not distribute per capita income for the benefit of lower-class people, unless it discourages producers from shifting the additional cost of taxation to consumers without the provision of any additional public goods or social services. The goal of a tripartite social contract becomes critical here. Because antagonistic relations among capital, labor and the government are constrained by minority state ownership and public interest, the establishment of a social contract can only occur under conditions of stringent labor and corporate tax regulation with distributive effects. The energy sector is the main industry from which the distributive intentions of any government can be clearly inferred.[47]

The maintenance of powerful regulatory mechanisms in the Polish energy sector prevented the adjustment of energy prices to efficient levels.[48] The prospect of upward mobility (POUM) motivates lower and middle-income citizens to support the public ownership minimum in the energy sector given the limited price elasticity (in comparison with mature market economies) and the strong income elasticity of energy consumption.[49] The Polish Ministry of Privatization chose to sell state-owned energy enterprises only if it was able to substantially support the state budget; thus, complete corporate restructuring has been treated as a prerequisite of privatization due to the distributive considerations of the government.[50] The energy administration in Warsaw opted for negative rather than positive distribution by continuing to subsidize electricity prices, while maintaining variable but significant control over domestic energy firms.[51]

III. Analytical Framework

The aforementioned arguments are equivalent to the following propositions:

Proposition 1: *The public ownership minimum rather than full privatization guarantees the survival of energy firms and the maintenance of social peace.*

Proposition 2: *Hierarchical rather than horizontal energy restructuring leads to socially distributive subsidies and prices.*

Proposition 3: *Procedural rather than regulatory energy restructuring is likely to benefit producers at the expense of consumers.*

Proposition 4: *Institutional and political legitimacy of the regulatory authority are prerequisites for effective energy restructuring.*

Corollary 1: *The Treuhand was the institutional sponsor for an ethnically-driven transfer of the East German energy sector to a set of subsidiaries of West German corporations.*

Corollary 2: *The Polish Ministry of Privatization preferred to adopt the public ownership minimum rather than regulate its energy policy preferences through the private sector.*

Moene and Wallerstein argue that higher degrees of inequality do not automatically generate support publicly financed insurance; this is the case only when public distribution is targeted toward lower-income people that already have a job rather than to unemployed people or pensioners.[52] To provide a primary analytical design on the interaction between energy restructuring and social distribution, I suggest a two-by-two matrix, where energy restructuring forms the first axis of analysis and sectoral workforce the second axis of analysis (see Matrix 1). I classify energy restructuring into two categories based privatization sequencing. A high value is assigned when privatization follows restructuring, whereas a low value is assigned when privatization precedes restructuring. The sectoral workforce is treated on the basis of its vocational training; the government can restructure its own energy assets considering the welfare of either high- or low-skilled energy workers.

In Matrix 1, when energy restructuring benefits the interests of a high-skilled workforce and energy

Matrix 1

Energy Restructuring → **Sectoral Workforce ↓**	Privatization Ex Post → Hierarchical Restructuring (High)	Privatization Ex Ante → Procedural Restructuring (Low)
High-Skilled Workforce (High)	*Social Mobility*	*Intersectoral Transfers*
Low-Skilled Workforce (Low)	*Labor Peace*	*Disruptive Unemployment*

privatization follows restructuring, then social mobility occurs **(High, High)**; hierarchical restructuring makes the government in charge of the industrial transformation process. The public provision of a resource-based insurance to the qualified middle class generates sufficient levels of occupational mobility. In the lower left entry of the matrix **(Low, High)** the government supports its low-skilled workforce; due to their limited skills in the phase anteceding restructuring, they can only use public insurance in a non-positive way, i.e. to reduce their unemployment risk, but not to find a more qualified job. That is why labor peace is achieved.

In the upper right entry **(Low, High)** I interact procedural restructuring with the interests of high-skilled workers. The immediate transfer of state-owned energy assets to private investors reduces the volume of energy rents that the government can distribute. High-skilled employees are incentivized to change their occupational status; however, this change is constrained by the limited quantity of the public insurance provided. This is why it is more likely to observe horizontal (intersectoral) rather than vertical labor transfers. The lower right entry **(Low, Low)** implies limited public insurance for low-skilled workers. Socially disruptive unemployment is the occuring policy outcome, because the latter are not any more protected by the public ownership minimum.

Distributive energy firms imply the existence of distributive energy bureaucracies; since the fall of centrally planned economies, culture and the "symbolic-ideological control" of resources have been in decline in Eastern Europe.[53] The level of adherence to the political legacies of socialism defines the distributive role of bureaucracy in the transition period. The appropriation of the East German government by *Treuhand* and the centralized authority of the Polish Ministry of Privatization constituted two corner equilibria phenomena in the energy transition map of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union in the 1990s. Unlike the institutionally supported oil privatization in Russia and the successful implementation of shock therapy policies in the Czech Republic and Slovakia, Poland suggested a case where energy bureaucracies maintained the majority of their regulatory privileges. At the same time, they ceased to exist in East Germany.

I define social distribution as the set of those expenditure-minimizing policies that maintain a minimum of social welfare for all citizens.[54] Because there is no objective definition of equity, social distribution can never be value-free or impartial.[55] As Nee points out, the transition from socialism to capitalism entails the transfer of resources from hierarchies to markets; nevertheless, gradual reforms can preserve the social stratification observed under socialism and maintain the significance of bureaucracy in the market allocation of resources.[56] To examine the impact of energy bureaucracies on centralized and decentralized marketplaces, I propose another two-by-two matrix, where energy bureaucracy constitutes the first dimension and economic organization the second (see Matrix 2).

I divide energy bureaucracy according to its regulatory capacity; when the public ownership minimum is preserved, then I assign a high value. The opposite holds when the energy sector is fully privatized. Economic organization is explained in terms of centralized vs. decentralized markets; centralized marketplaces imply interventionist governments with sufficient ownership shares in the economy. On the other hand, in decentralized markets, the state plays an intermediary role in the regulation and allocation of resources.

When energy bureaucracy maintains an ownership minimum in centralized market systems, then social distribution is feasible **(High, High)**; the government is able to subsidize energy prices at a low cost and thus ensure a minimum of energy consumption for all citizens. This is the entry where I locate the Polish energy sector. When the government maintains an ownership minimum in decentralized marketplaces, then union corporatism is the political equilibrium; advanced rather than transition European economies could qualify for that entry, where public ownership meets labor co-determination and tripartite negotiations **(Low, High)**.

Nevertheless, when energy bureaucrats give up their distributive potential and approve full-scale privatization policies, while economic organization is still defined by a centralized marketplace, then the formation of patronage networks between business and government is observed; the cases of energy privatization in Azerbaijan, Ukraine, and other post-Soviet states are indicative in that respect **(High, Low)**. In the lower right entry **(Low, Low)**, the privatization of energy firms in decentralized markets leads to elite contracts between the government and corporate investors. After the contracts are concluded, the government ceases to control its energy assets. This was the case for the East German electricity sector whose privatization followed German reunification.

Matrix 2

Energy Bureaucracy → **Economic Organization ↓**	Public Ownership Minimum (High)	Full Privatization (Low)
Centralized Markets (High)	*Social Distribution*	*Patronage Networks*
Decentralized Markets (Low)	*Union Corporatism*	*Elite Contracts*

IV. Conclusions

The multidimensional map of the Oder-Neiße dichotomy indicates that the public ownership minimum rather than the withering of public regulation is the most effective basis for collective welfare and the increase of public revenues through privatization. The thesis of this article is influenced by the normative foundation of equity rather than liberty. The role of two administrative bodies, the Polish Ministry of Privatization and the *Treuhand*, has been instrumental in that direction. Because the energy sector has been the epicenter of industrial transition from socialism to capitalism, its ownership transformation has had a critical impact on the status of the middle class and thus the *ex novo* class formation, which was observed in Eastern Europe in the 1990s.

V. References

Aghion Philippe and Olivier J. Blanchard. "On privatization methods in Eastern Europe and their implications." *Economics* of *Transition,* Volume 6 (I), 1998: 87-99.

Barrel Ray and Dawn Holland. "Foreign Direct Investment and Enterprise Restructuring in Central Europe." *Economics of Transition*, Vol. 8 (2) 2000: 477-504.

Benabou Roland and Efe A. Ok. "Social Mobility and the Demand for Distribution: The POUM Hypothesis." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* May 2001: 447-487.

Bispinck Reinhard. "Collective Bargaining in East Germany: Between Economic Constraints and Political Regulations." *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 1993, 17: 309-331.

Blaszczyk Barbara. "Privatization and Company Restructuring in Poland." *Working Paper No. 18*, CASE Reports, Center for Economic and Social Research, March 1999.

Bolton Patrick, Gerard Roland, John Vickers, Michael Burda. "Privatization Policies in Central and Eastern Europe," *Economic Policy* Vol. 7, No. 15, (Oct., 1992): 275-309.

Bonin John P. and Bozena Leven. (2001). "Can State-owned Banks Promote Enterprise Restructuring? Evidence from One Polish Bank's Experience," *Post-Communist Economies,* 13:4, 431-443.

Brada Josef C. "Privatization is Transition--Or is it?" *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 10, No. 2, (Spring 1996): 67-86.

Brezinski Horst. "Privatization in East Germany," *Moct-Most,* N. 1, 1992.

Carlin Wendy, Colin Mayer, Hans-Werner Sinn, and Vittorio Grilli. "Restructuring Enterprises in Eastern Europe," *Economic Policy*, Vol. 7, No. 15, (October 1992): 312-352.

Craig Gordon. "The End of Prussia." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 124, No. 2, (Apr. 29, 1980): 97-99.

Cremer Helmuth and Pierre Pestieu. "Distributive Taxation and Social Insurance." *International Tax and Public Finance*, 3:281-295 (1996).

Dale Gareth "More shock than therapy: Why there has been no 'miracle' in Eastern Germany," *Socialism and Democracy*, (2002): 93-136.

Debande Olivier and Guido Friebel. "A positive theory of give-away privatization," *International Journal of Industrial Organization* 22 (2004): 1309– 1325.

Economic Report. "The East German Industrial Sector in 1990." 1991: 10-13.

Estrin Saul. "Competition and Corporate Governance in Transition," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 16, No. 1, winter 2002: 101-124.

Falkinger Josef. "Social Instability and Distribution of Income." *European Journal of Political Economy,* Vol. 15 (1999): 35–51.

Franz Wolfgang and Viktor Steiner. "Wages in the East German Transition Process: Facts and Explanations." *German Economic Review* 1 (3): 241-269.

Freund Caroline and Christine Wallich. "Public-Sector Price Reforms in Transition Economies: Who Gains? Who Loses? The Case of Household Energy Prices in Poland." *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 1997: 35-59, University of Chicago Press.

Gray Cheryl W. "In search of owners: Privatization and corporate governance in transition economies," *The World Sank Research Observer*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (August 1996): 179-97.

Hall John and Udo Ludwig. "German unification and the market adoption hypothesis," *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 1995, 19, 491-507.

Hansen Ulf. "Restructuring the East German energy system." *Energy Policy* Vol. 24. No. 6: 553-562. 1996.

Headey Bruce, Peter Krause, and Roland Habich. "East Germany: Rising Incomes, Unchanged Inequality and the Impact of Distributive Government 1990-92." The British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 46, No. 2, (June 1995): 225-243.

Horst Siebert. "The integration of Germany: Real economic adjustment." *European Economic Review* 35 (1991): 591-602.

Hughes Gordon. "The Energy Sector and Problems of Energy Policy in Eastern Europe," *Oxford Review for Economic Policy Vol. 7, No. 2.*

Joint UNDP/World Bank Energy Sector Management Assistance Program. "Poland: Energy Sector Restructuring Program, Volume I," *Report No. 153/93*.

Kaminski Jacek. *Energy sector overview in Poland*. Mineral and Energy Economy Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences.

Kaufmann D., Kraay A., & Zoido-Lobaton P. (1999). *Aggregating governance indicators* (Policy Research Working Paper No. 2195). Washington, DC: World Bank.

Kenway Peter. "The role of the state in privatization in Poland and Czechoslovakia," *Moct-Most,* N. 2, 1993.

Kettler Hannah E. (1997). "The Emergence of Concentrated Ownership Structures in East Germany: the implications for enterprise restructuring." *Review of Political Economy* 9 (2): 117-149.

Kitson Michael, Ron Martin and Frank Wilkinson. “Labor Markets, Social Justice and Economic Efficiency.” *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 2000, 24, 631-641.

Kočenda Evžen and Štěpán Čábelka. “Liberalization in the Energy Sector: Transition and Growth,” *Manuscript 1998.*

Lehmbruch Gerhard (1994). “The process of regime change in East Germany: An institutionalist scenario for German unification,” *Journal of European Public Policy* 1:1, 115-141.

Lill Bruno. *Energy Sector in Poland*. Center for Markets in Transition, HSE, October 2001.

Mantorski Zbigniew. “Polish electric energy sector just before accessing European Union,” *Int. J. Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management,* Vol. 6, Nos. 1/2, 2006.

McMillan John and Christopher Woodruff. “The Central Role of Entrepreneurs in Transition Economies.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives,* Volume 16, No. 3 (Summer 2002): 153–170.

Menz Georg. “Old bottles - new wine: The new dynamics of industrial relations.” *German Politics*, (2005) 14:2, 196-207.

Meyer Klaus E. “Management challenges in privatization acquisitions in transition economies.” *Journal of World Business,* 37 (2002): 266-276.

Michel Jeffrey H. “Status and Impacts of the German Lignite Industry,” *Air Pollution and Climate Series 18*, The Swedish NGO Secretariat on Acid Rain.

Milewski Roman. “The Effects of Privatization of SOEs in Poland and East Germany.” *Research Support Scheme* Open Society Institute, May 1999.

Ministerstwo Gospodarki. “The Citizen, Market and Competition: Organisational, Structural and Structure of Ownership Transformations in the Fuel and Energy Sector,” *Appendix 3.*

Minogue Martin. “Apples and Oranges: Problems in the Analysis of Comparative Regulatory Governance.” *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* Vol. 45 (2005): 195-214.

Moene Karl Ove and Michael Wallerstein. “Inequality, Social Insurance and Distribution.” *American Political Science Review* Vol. 95, No. 4 (December 2001): 860-874.

Naimski Petr. “Energy diversification strategy for Poland,” Columbia University*,* September 17th 2007.

Nee Victor. “A Theory of Market Transition: From Distribution to Markets in State Socialism,” *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 54, No. 5, (October 1989): 663-689.

Pohl Gerhard et al. “Privatization and Restructuring in Central and Eastern Europe: Evidence and Policy Options,” *World Bank Technical Paper No. 368,* 1997.

Priewe Jan. “Privatization of the industrial sector: the function and activities of the *Treuhandanstalt,*” *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 1993, 17: 333-348.

Rapaczynski Andrzej. “The Roles of the State and the Market in Establishing Property Rights,” *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 10, No. 2, (Spring 1996): 87-103.

Rittel Horst W. J. and Melvin M. Webber. “Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning,” *Policy Sciences*, Vol. 4, 1973: 155-169.

Roesler Jorg. “Privatization in Eastern Germany. Experience with the Treuhand,” *Europe-Asia Studies* Vol. 46, No. 3, (1994): 505-517.

Rondinelli Dennis and Jay Yurkiewicz. “Privatization And Economic Restructuring in Poland: An Assessment of Transition Policies,” *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* Vol. 55, No. 2 (April, 1996): 145-160.

Schleiniger Reto. “Energy tax reform with exceptions for the energy-intensive export sector.” *Working Paper No. 73*, Institute of Empirical Economics, University of Zurich, February 2001.

Schütte Tjark (1993). “Bad debt problems and enterprise restructuring in Eastern Germany,” *Post-Communist Economies*, 5 (2): 161-185.

Sinn Hans-Werner and Alfons J. Weichenrieder. “Foreign Direct Investment, Political Resentment, and the Privatization Process in Eastern Europe,” *Economic Policy*, 1997: 179-209.

Solga Heike and Martin Diewald. “The East German Labor Market After German Unification: A Study of Structural Change and Occupational Matching,” *Work, Employment & Society,* Vol. 15, No. 1: 95–126.

Squires Meaney Constance. “Foreign Experts, Capitalists, and Competing Agendas: Privatization in Poland, Czech Republic and Hungary.” *Comparative Political Studies* 1995, 28; 275.

Statistik der Kohlenwirtschaft EV. *Dateien.* Essen und Koeln, Januar 2009.

Statistik der Kohlenwirtschaft EV. *Der Kohlenbergbau in der Energiewirtschaft der Bundesrepublik Deutschland im Jahre 2006.* Essen und Koeln, November 2007.

Titmuss Richard. “The Role of Distribution in Social Policy,” *Social Security Bulletin*, Vol. 28, No. 20, 1965: 14-20.

Uerge-Vorsatz Diana, Gergana Miladinova, and Laszlo Paizs. “Energy in transition: From the iron curtain to the European Union,” *Energy Policy* 34 (2006): 2279–2297.

US Department of Energy. “An Energy Overview of the Republic of Poland.” *Fossil Energy International, Society*, Electronic Resource.

Verdery Katherine. “A Prologue to the *Transition,*” *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 18, No. 3, Representations of Europe; Transforming State, Society and Identity, (August 1991): 419-439.

Webber Douglas. “The decline and resurgence of the German model’: The Treuhandanstalt and Privatization politics in East Germany,” *Journal of European Public Policy* 1:2, 1994, 151-175.

Yandle Traci J. “The Impact of Governing and Economic Institutions on Energy Systems Development: A Case Study of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic,” *Journal of Energy and Development*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 1999, Accepted Manuscript.

Endnotes

1. Craig Gordon. "The End of Prussia." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 124, No. 2, (Apr. 29, 1980): 97-99.

2. Falkinger Josef. "Social Instability and Distribution of Income." *European Journal of Political Economy,* Vol. 15 (1999): 35–51.

3. Carlin Wendy, Colin Mayer, Hans-Werner Sinn, and Vittorio Grilli. "Restructuring Enterprises in Eastern Europe," *Economic Policy*, Vol. 7, No. 15, (October 1992): 312-352, at 314-318.

4. Ibid, at 317-321.

5. Lill Bruno. *Energy Sector in Poland*. Center for Markets in Transition, HSE, October 2001.

6. Yandle Traci J. "The Impact of Governing and Economic Institutions on Energy Systems Development: A Case Study of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic," *Journal of Energy and Development*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 1999, Accepted Manuscript.

7. Webber Douglas. "The decline and resurgence of the German model: The Treuhandanstalt and Privatization politics in East Germany," *Journal of European Public Policy* 1:2, 1994, 151-175, at 151-155.

8. For an overview of the restructuring and privatization of SOEs in Poland see Rondinelli Dennis and Jay Yurkiewicz. "Privatization And Economic Restructuring in Poland: An Assessment of Transition Policies," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* Vol. 55, No. 2 (April, 1996): 148-152.

9. Horst Siebert. "The integration of Germany: Real economic adjustment." *European Economic Review* 35 (1991): 591-602, at 600-602; Hall John and Udo Ludwig. "German unification and the market adoption hypothesis." *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 1995, 19, 491-507, at 492-492 and 504-505.

10. Barrel Ray and Dawn Holland. "Foreign Direct Investment and Enterprise Restructuring in Central Europe." *Economics of Transition*, Vol. 8 (2) 2000: 477-504, at 500-501.

11. Blaszczyk Barbara. "Privatization and Company Restructuring in Poland." *Working Paper No. 18*, CASE Reports, Center for Economic and Social Research, March 1999, at 23-26.

12. Pohl Gerhard et al. "Privatization and Restructuring in Central and Eastern Europe: Evidence and Policy Options," *World Bank Technical Paper No. 368,* 1997: 12-19.

13. Gray Cheryl W. "In search of owners: Privatization and corporate governance in transition economies," *The World Sank Research Observer*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (August 1996): 179-97, at 190-192.

14. McMillan John and Christopher Woodruff. "The Central Role of Entrepreneurs in Transition Economies." *Journal of Economic Perspectives,* Volume 16, No. 3 (Summer 2002): 153–170, at 156-159.

15. See the legal foundations of East German and Polish corporate privatization in Bolton Patrick, Gerard Roland, John Vickers, and Michael Burda. "Privatization Policies in Central and Eastern Europe," *Economic Policy* Vol. 7, No. 15, (October 1992): 275-309.

16. For a good account of the reasons why privatization and industrial transition may not conincide see Brada Josef C. "Privatization is Transition--Or is it?" *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* Vol. 10, No. 2, (Spring 1996): 67-86.

17. Debande Olivier and Guido Friebel. "A positive theory of give-away privatization," *International Journal of Industrial Organization* 22 (2004): 1309– 1325, at 1321-1323.

18. Meyer Klaus E. "Management challenges in privatization acquisitions in transition economies." *Journal of World Business,* 37 (2002): 266-276, at 267-268.

19. Ibid, at 269-274.

20. Michel Jeffrey H. "Status and Impacts of the German Lignite Industry," *Air Pollution and Climate Series 18*, The Swedish NGO Secretariat on Acid Rain, at 10.

21. Ibid, at 34.

22. Ibid, at 35-36; Hansen Ulf. "Restructuring the East German energy system." *Energy Policy* Vol. 24. No. 6: 553-562. 1996, at 556.

23. Michel Jeffrey H. "Status and Impacts of the German Lignite Industry," *Air Pollution and Climate Series 18*, The Swedish NGO Secretariat on Acid Rain, at 38.

24. Lehmbruch Gerhard (1994). "The process of regime change in East Germany: An institutionalist scenario for German unification," *Journal of European Public Policy* 1:1, 115-141, at 138-139.

25. For a thorough account on the creation and enforcement of property rights in post-socialism, see Rapaczynski Andrzej. "The Roles of the State and the Market in Establishing Property Rights," *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 10, No. 2, (Spring 1996): 87-103.

26. Hughes Gordon. "The Energy Sector and Problems of Energy Policy in Eastern Europe," *Oxford Review for Economic Policy Vol. 7, No. 2,* at 78-81.

27. Economic Report. "The East German Industrial Sector in 1990." 1991: 10-13.

28. Hansen Ulf. "Restructuring the East German energy system." *Energy Policy* Vol. 24. No. 6: 553-562. 1996, at 553-556; See also Statistik der Kohlenwirtschaft EV. *Dateien.* Essen und Koeln, Januar 2009, Arbeitsgemeinschaft Energiebilanzen.

29. Webber Douglas. "The decline and resurgence of the German model': The Treuhandanstalt and Privatization politics in East Germany," *Journal of European Public Policy* 1:2, 1994, 151-175, at 154-160.

30. Estrin Saul. “Competition and Corporate Governance in Transition,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 16, No. 1, winter 2002: 101-124, at 108-110.

31. In Kettler Hannah E. (1997). “The Emergence of Concentrated Ownership Structures in East Germany: the implications for enterprise restructuring.” *Review of Political Economy* 9 (2): 139-142 I find a useful analysis of the reasoning behind the takeover of East German corporate entities by leading West German firms.

32. An interesting theoretical approach on Treuhand’s failure to boost sustainable competition combined with a minor application in the energy sector is also offered by Dale Gareth “More shock than therapy: Why there has been no “miracle” in Eastern Germany,” Socialism and Democracy, (2002): 108-115 and 121; For a more moderate evaluation of Treuhand’s politics see Priewe Jan. “Privatisation of the industrial sector: the function and activities of the *Treuhandanstalt*,” *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 1993, 17: 333-348.

33. Roesler Jorg. “Privatisation in Eastern Germany. Experience with the Treuhand,” *Europe-Asia Studies* Vol. 46, No. 3, (1994): 505-517, at 508.

34. Brezinski Horst. “Privatization in East Germany,” *Moct-Most*, N. 1, 1992: 11 and 18.

35. Joint UNDP/World Bank Energy Sector Management Assistance Program. “Poland: Energy Sector Restructuring Program, Volume I,” *Report No. 153/93*: Annex 1.

36. Joint UNDP/World Bank Energy Sector Management Assistance Program. “Poland: Energy Sector Restructuring Program, Volume I,” *Report No. 153/93*: Main Report; The Polish administrative bodies involved in the energy restructuring process were the Ministries of Industry and Trade, Environment and Natural Resources, Finance, Local Government, and Privatization.

37. Naimski Petr. “Energy diversification strategy for Poland,” Columbia University, September 17th 2007, at 4-7.

38. Kaminski Jacek. *Energy sector overview in Poland*. Mineral and Energy Economy Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences.

39. Mantorski Zbigniew. “Polish electric energy sector just before accessing European Union,” *Int. J. Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management,* Vol. 6, Nos. 1/2, 2006, at 53-57; See also Ministerstwo Gospodarki. “The Citizen, Market and Competition: Organisational, Structural and Structure of Ownership Transformations in the Fuel and Energy Sector,” *Appendix 3.*

40. Blaszczyk Barbara. “Privatization and Company Restructuring in Poland.” *Working Paper No. 18*, CASE Reports, Center for Economic and Social Research, March 1999, at 11-15 and 45-46.

41. Ibid, at 23.

42. Kenway Peter. “The role of the state in privatization in Poland and Czechoslovakia,” *Moct-Most*, N. 2, 1993, at 67-69.

43. Kitson Michael, Ron Martin and Frank Wilkinson. “Labor Markets, Social Justice and Economic Efficiency.” *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 2000, 24, 631-641.

44. Cremer Helmuth and Pierre Pestieu. “Distributive Taxation and Social Insurance.” *International Tax and Public Finance*, 3:281-295 (1996), at 292-293.

45. Statistik der Kohlenwirtschaft EV. Der Kohlenbergbau in der Energiewirtschaft der Bundesrepublik Deutschland im Jahre 2006. Essen und Koeln, November 2007.

46. Schleiniger Reto. “Energy tax reform with exceptions for the energy-intensive export sector.” *Working Paper No. 73*, Institute of Empirical Economics, University of Zurich, February 2001, at 10-15.

47. For an interesting take on the interaction between market regulation and social distribution in East Germany see Solga Heike and Martin Diewald. “The East German Labor Market After German Unification: A Study of Structural Change and Occupational Matching,” *Work, Employment & Society,* Vol. 15, No. 1: 95–126.

48. Freund Caroline and Christine Wallich. “Public-Sector Price Reforms in Transition Economies: Who Gains? Who Loses? The Case of Household Energy Prices in Poland.” *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 1997: 35-59, University of Chicago Press, at 46-47 and 52-55.

49. Benabou Roland and Efe A. Ok. “Social Mobility and the Demand for Distribution: The POUM Hypothesis.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* May 2001: 447-487, at 447-453.

50. Milewski Roman. “The Effects of Privatization of SOEs in Poland and East Germany.” *Research Support Scheme* Open Society Institute, May 1999, at 18-19.

51. Falkinger Josef. “Social Instability and Distribution of Income.” *European Journal of Political Economy,* Vol. 15 (1999): 35–51, at 49-50.

52. Moene Karl Ove and Michael Wallerstein. “Inequality, Social Insurance and Distribution.” *American Political Science Review* Vol. 95, No. 4 (December 2001): 860-874, at 863-865.

53. Verdery Katherine. “A Prologue to the *Transition*,” *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 18, No. 3, Representations of Europe; Transforming State, Society and Identity, (August 1991): 419-439, at 434.

54. Titmuss Richard. “The Role of Distribution in Social Policy,” *Social Security Bulletin*, Vol. 28, No. 20, 1965: 14-20, at 14-15.

55. Rittel Horst W. J. and Melvin M. Webber. “Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning,” *Policy Sciences*, Vol. 4, 1973: 155-169, at 167-169.

56. Nee Victor. “A Theory of Market Transition: From Distribution to Markets in State Socialism,” *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 54, No. 5, (October 1989): 663-689, at 678-679.

FLAS Fellowship Awards

Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) fellowships enable US citizens and permanent residents to acquire a high level of competency in modern foreign languages. FLAS funding for Russian and East European languages comes to UC Berkeley through a Title VI grant from the US Department of Education to ISEEES. Applications are accepted through the Graduate Fellowship Office.

Awards for AY 2011-2012

Maya Garcia, Department of Comparative Literature, received a fellowship to study Russian at St. Petersburg State University in Russia.

Lauren Hill, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, received a fellowship to study Russian at UC Berkeley.

Mark Keck-Szajbel, Department of History, received a fellowship to study Hungarian at UC Berkeley.

Kevin Kenjar, Anthropology Department, received a fellowship to study Bosnian at UC Berkeley.

David Marcus, Anthropology Department, received a fellowship to study Russian at UC Berkeley.

Katherine Marple-Cantrell, Department of City and Regional Planning, received a fellowship to study Serbian at UC Berkeley.

Marica Petrey, Department of Literature, received a fellowship to study Russian at UC Berkeley.

Elizabeth Purdy, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, received a fellowship to study Serbian at UC Berkeley.

Mary Renolds, Department of Comparative Literature, received a fellowship to study Russian at UC Berkeley.

Mariko Sweetnam, School of Public Health, received a fellowship to study Romanian at UC Berkeley.

Peter Woods, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, received a fellowship to study Slovenian at the Centre for Slovene in Ljubljana, Slovenia.

Awards for Summer 2011

Sarah Cramsey, Department of History, received funding to study Yiddish at Bard College YIVO.

Katherine Eady, Department of History, received funding to study Russian at the School of Russian and Asian Studies of the London School in Bishek, Kyrgyzstan.

Elise Herrala, Department of Sociology, received funding to study Russian at Moscow State University in Russia.

Marianne Kaletzky, Department of Comparative Literature, received funding to study Russian at St. Petersburg State University in Russia.

Irina Kogel, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, received funding to study Polish at the School of Polish Language and Culture in Lublin, Poland.

Michelle McCoy, History of Art Department, received funding for independent Russian study in St. Petersburg, Russia.

Elizabeth Purdy, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, received funding to study Serbian at the Serbian Language and Culture Workshop in Valjevo, Serbia.

Malgorzata Szajbel-Keck, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, received funding to study Czech at the Summer Prague University of Charles University in Prague.

BPS Fellowships

Nicole Eaton, Ph.D. candidate in history (Academic Year Fellowship).

Boris Barkanov, Ph.D. candidate in political science (Summer Fellowship).

Alexandre Beliaev, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology (Summer Fellowship).

Erin Coyne, Ph.D. candidate in Slavic languages and literatures (Summer Fellowship).

Theocharis Grigoriadis, Ph.D. candidate in political science (Summer Fellowship).

Mujeeb Khan, Ph.D. candidate in political science (Summer Fellowship).

Larisa Kurtovic, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology (Summer Fellowship).

David Marcus, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology (Summer Fellowship).

Jason Morton, Ph.D. candidate in history (Summer Fellowship).

Alina Polyakova, Ph.D. candidate in sociology (Summer Fellowship).

Zhivka Valiavicharska, Ph.D. candidate in rhetoric (Summer Fellowship).

UC Berkeley CASE-CRRC Project

The Berkeley Program in Eurasian and East European Studies is pleased to report on its latest group of Carnegie Fellows who came to Berkeley from Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, and Moldova in October 2011 for a two-week workshop. Their visit was sponsored by a generous grant from the Carnegie Foundation to ISEEES. We had four Carnegie fellows this semester.

Ludmila Cojocari is Associate Professor at the Institute of Social History "ProMemoria," and a faculty member of history and philosophy at Moldova State University in Moldova. She currently teaches courses in Romanian history, ethnography, cultural anthropology, and political semiotics. During the workshop, her main goal was to devise and elaborate on a new course, "Politics and Practices of Memory: Dealing with the Legacy of a Totalitarian Past."

Vahram Danielyan is a Lecturer in the Faculty of Armenian Philology at Yerevan State University in Armenia. His teaching experience includes courses on Armenian Diaspora Literature, Literature of Early 20th Century Armenia, Modern Armenian Literature, Armenian Literature in the Post-Independence Period, and Contemporary Armenian Prose. Dr. Danielyan hopes this workshop will bring him a step closer to realizing his goal of publishing his research findings in an academic book.

Elene Kvanchilashvili is Assistant Professor at Tbilisi State University and the Georgian Institute of Public Affairs. She teaches a wide range of subjects, including Social Psychology, Political Psychology, Cross-Cultural Psychology, Mass Communication and Communication Skills Training. Dr. Kvanchilashvili's goal for this workshop was to design a teaching course on the interdependency of nationalism and ethnic conflicts in the era of globalization in contemporary Georgia.

Siarhei Liubimau is a Lecturer at the European Humanities University in Minsk, Belarus – Vilnius, Lithuania. Dr. Liubimau has had experience teaching courses in the Sociology of Culture, the Phenomenon of Tourism in the Context of Critical Social Theory, Research Methods, and Critical Urbanism. He utilized his experience at the Carnegie workshop to develop a new syllabus.