

En annan typ av reform är när en demokratisk författning ändras. Då handlar det om reformer inom systemets ram. Här kan man skilja mellan totala reformer (som den svenska) och partiella. Vad gäller de senare kan man särskilja ett par återkommande typer av reformer. Den ena gäller valsystemen och förändringar av dem (som Frankrike vid två tillfällen under senare år). Den andra gäller avvägningen av decentraliseringsgraden i systemet, konflikten mellan centrum och periferi, så dominerande i federala stater och i stater med starka etniska och regionala spänningar.

Arbetet med att utmejsla oberoende och beroende variabler bör naturligtvis på sikt leda fram till formulering av testbara hypoteser. Låt mig avslutningsvis skissera en sådan hypotes. Legitimiteten och livslängden hos en ny författning ökar, om enigheten vid beslutstillfället var stor. Detta gäller särskilt författningsreformer som påtagligt berör de inblandade aktörernas relativa makt; förändringar av valsystem är, som ju Björn von Sydow framhåller, tex av den karaktären. Det franska valsystemet erbjuder ett exempel, Sri Lanka ett annat med mer drastiska konsekvenser (Phadnis 1989).

Sedan detta skrevs, har jag i det senaste numret av *Politologen* (nr 1 1989) kunnat läsa Axel Hadenius' inlägg om försummade områden inom jämförande politik. Han vill där "hävda tesen att svagheten i den jämförande forskningen främst ligger i en alltför lättvindig behandling av den beroende variabeln". I det omdömet instämmer jag gärna.

Anders Sannerstedt

Anmälda arbeten

Karl-Göran Algotsson: *Medborgarrätten och regeringsformen. Debatten om grundläggande medborgerliga fri- och rättigheter i regeringsformen under 1970-talet*. Stockholm 1987: Norstedt.

Keith G Banting & Richard Simeon, ed: *The Politics of Constitutional Change in Industrial Nations. Redesigning the State*. London 1985: Macmillan.

Vernon Bogdanor, ed: *Constitutions in Democratic Politics*. Aldershot 1987: Gower.

Björn von Sydow: *Vägen till enkammarriksdagen. Demokratisk författningspolitik i Sverige 1944-1968*. Stockholm 1989: Tiden.

Referenser

Axel Hadenius: Försummade områden inom jämförande politik. *Politologen* 1989:1 s 93-99.

Urmila Phadnis: Sri Lanka: Crises of Legitimacy and Integration, s 143-186 i Larry Diamond, Juan Linz, Seymour M Lipset, eds, *Democracy in Developing Co-*

untries, Vol 3 Asia. Boulder, Col: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Nils Stjernquist: Statsvetenskaplig forskning kring den nya grundlagen. *Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift* årg 79 (1976) nr 1 s 58-69.

Saadia Touval: Multilateral Negotiations: An Analytical Approach. *Negotiation Journal* 1989 s 159-173.

Report on the appointment to the Chair of East European Studies at the Faculty of Social Sciences Uppsala University

I

The University of Uppsala advertised early March 1988 the post of Chair for East European Studies. The terms of reference for the appointment are formulated in the advertised vacancy as follows: "East European Studies is an interdisciplinary subject, studying the Soviet and East European societies with reference to social and legal structure, economy, administration, politics, culture and ideology." The general requirements in respect of the holder of the chair are laid down in Sections 21, 30, 31 of the Higher Education Ordinance.

On account of these rules the appointed experts, nominated by the Faculty of Social Sciences, assume the following criteria to be decisive for the selection and nomination of the applicants:

1) The most important criterion is the scientific qualification, which is expressed in the quality, quantity and thematic scope of publications.

2) Apart from that experience in academic teaching, in organisation of research and international scientific contacts as well as all other experience useful to the job of carrying out the tasks in connection with the Chair, are important criteria.

3) As to the professional and regional orientation of the applicants the terms of reference offer a wide scope. The subject the applicant has specialized in is not a deciding factor per se, provided it falls under the headings of sociology, law, economics, administrative science, political science, culture or philosophy. What must be insisted upon, however, is that the applicant's scientific work transgresses the narrow confines of his own discipline so as to demonstrate his inter-disciplinary social science approach to research into the complexities of East European societies. In regional terms the applicant will not be expected to be equally conversant with conditions in the Soviet Union and all East European countries. His scientific work might well pick out cer-

tain regional focal points. One requirement is, however, that the Soviet Union is taken into account in some of the scientific works of the applicant.

II

16 candidates have applied for the Chair

1) Anders Åslund (1952)

Nationality: Swedish

Profession: Economist

Academic degrees:

– Fil. kand. History, Russian, Polish, political science. Universities of Gothenburg, Uppsala and Stockholm (1976)

– Business economics exam. Stockholm School of Economics (1976)

– Dr.Phil. University of Oxford, St. Anthony's College (1982)

Dissertation: *The Non-Agricultural Private Sector in the East European Economy: The Case of Poland and the GDR 1945–1980*

Present status: Diplomatic service (1st secretary).

2) Deilef Brandes (1941)

Nationality: German

Profession: Historian

Academic degrees:

– Dr. phil. East European history, Modern times and Slav culture (further studies: Germanistics, political science). University of Munich (1970). Dissertation: *Occupation politics, collaboration, and resistance in the Bohemia-Moravia Protectorate till Heydrich's death (1939–1942)*.

– "Habilitation"-thesis on East European History. Free University of Berlin (1984). Thesis: *Great Britain and the governments in exile of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia from start of war to the Teheran Conference*

Present status: free-lance scientist.

3) Marek Ciesielczyk (1957)

Nationality: Polish; has been living in the Federal Republic of Germany since 1982.

Profession: Historian (modern times)

Academic degrees:

– M.A. philosophy. University of Krakow (1981)

– Dr phil. Political science. Philosophy and East European history. University of Munich (1988). Dissertation: *The Immutability of the Communist System* (German original title not reported)

Present status: free-lance publicist.

4) Jan Åke Dellenbrant (1946)

Nationality: Swedish

Profession: Political scientist

Academic degrees:

– Fil kand. Russian, Political science and Economics (1968)

– Fil mag. Russian, Political sciences, Economics with subsequent exam in Economics and history. University of Uppsala (1970)

– Fil lic. Political science. University of Uppsala (1971)
Work: "Politics and Economy in the debate on Soviet society"

– Fil. Dr. Political Science. University of Uppsala (1972)

Dissertation: *Reformists and Traditionalists. A study of Soviet Discussions about Economic Reform 1960–1965*

– Reader in political science, especially East European research. University of Uppsala (1978)

Readership General Political science

University of Helsinki (1987)

Present status: Acting professorship at the University of Uppsala.

5) Anders Fogelklou (1943)

Nationality: Swedish

Profession: Lawyer

Academic degrees:

– Fil kand. Russian, Literary history and political science. University of Stockholm (1967)

– Jur kand. University of Stockholm (1968)

– Jur Dr. University of Uppsala (1978). Dissertation: *The unjust law*

– Readership in general legal theory. University of Uppsala (1982)

Present status: Acting professorship at the University of Uppsala.

6) Albert P van Goudoever (1944)

Nationality: Dutch

Profession: Historian

Academic degrees:

– Fil. kand. History. University of Utrecht (1967)

– Dr. phil. History, specializing in economic and social, modern and East European history. University of Utrecht (1969)

Doctorate. University of Utrecht (1983). Dissertation: *Angst voor het verleden. Politieke rehabilitaties in den Sovjet Unie na 1953*

Associate Professor University of Utrecht (1987)

Present status: Professor by special appointment in East European history at the University of Utrecht.

7 *Stefan Hedlund* (1953)

Nationality: Swedish

Profession: Economist

Academic degrees:

- Fil. kand. Economics. University of Lund (1976)
- M.A. Economics. University of California at Santa Barbara (1977)
- Fil. Dr. Economics. University of Lund (1983). Dissertation: *Crisis in Soviet Agriculture?*

Present status: Researcher at the Institute of Economics at the University of Lund.

8 *Horst Herlemann* (1941)

Nationality: German

Profession: Political scientist

Academic degrees:

- M.A. Political science, East European history and Slav Culture. University of Bochum (1975)
- Dr. rer. soc. University of Bochum (1979). Dissertation: *Decisions in Soviet Farming Policy 1940-1960*

Present status: free-lance scientist.

9 *Marvin R. Jackson* (1932)

Nationality: American

Profession: Economist

Academic degrees:

- B.S. Business Administration. University of Colorado (1954)
- M.A. University of Colorado (1960)
- Ph.D. Economics. University of California, Berkeley (1962)

Dissertation: *Soviet Project and Design Organizations: A Case Study of Investment Decision-Making in a Command System*

Present status: Full professor of Economics at Arizona State University, Tempe.

10 *Jiri T. Kolaja* (1919)

Nationality: American of Czech origin

Profession: Sociologist

Academic degrees:

- Dr. phil. Sociology, University of Brno, Czecho-Slovakia (1947)
- M.A. Sociology. University of Chicago (1951)
- Ph.D. Industrial Sociologist, Cornell University (1959)

Present status: Full professor of Sociology at West Virginia University, Morgantown.

11 *Kjell Magnusson* (1945)

Nationality: Swedish

Profession: Sociologist (and Slav culture)

Academic degrees:

- Fil. Kand. Russian, Serbo-Croat, religious history and psychology with subsequent exam in religious history and -philosophy, Serbo-Croat and sociology. University of Uppsala (1967, 1974)

- Fil. Dr. Sociologist, University of Uppsala (1986)

Dissertation: *Yugoslavs in Sweden. Immigrants and Identity in a cultural-sociological perspective*

Present status: Researcher at the University of Uppsala.

12 *Mihajlo Mihajlov* (1934)

Nationality: Yugoslav of Russian origin; has lived in USA since 1978

Academic degrees:

- B.A. Comparative literary history. University of Zagreb (1959)

- M.A. University of Zagreb (1961)

- Thesis for doctorate on "System of Motivations in Dostojevskij's novels", completed, but this promotion to doctor was not implemented for political reasons

Present status: Commentator on Intellectual and Ideological Affairs at Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Washington DC.

13 *Bronislaw Misztal* (1946)

Nationality: Polish; has lived in Australia since 1986

Profession: Sociologist

Academic degrees:

- M.A. Sociology. University of Warsaw (1970)
 - Science candidate. Institute of Philosophy and Sociology at the Polish Academy of Sciences (1973)
 - Doctor of Science (Dr. habil). Institute of Philosophy and Sociology at the Polish Academy of Sciences (1977)
- Present status: Lecturer and Project Director at the Griffith University of Brisbane, Australia.

14. *Daniel N. Nelson* (1948)

Nationality: American

Profession: Political scientist

Academic degrees:

- B.A. Political science and History. University of Minnesota (1970)
- M.A. Political science. The Johns Hopkins University (1972)
- Ph.D. Political science. The Johns Hopkins University (1975)

Present status: Full professor of Political Science at the University of Kentucky, Lexington/Ken.

15 *Lars Ohlsson* (1942)

Nationality: Swedish

Profession: Political scientist

Academic degrees:

– Fil.kand. Russian and Political Science. University of Uppsala (1966)
 – Fil.Dr. Slav culture. University of Uppsala (1979)
 Dissertation: *Local government in the Soviet Union. The soviets: Vision and reality*
 Present status: Director of undergraduate studies at the Department of Soviet and East European Studies at Uppsala university.

16 *Michal Sicinski* (1948)

Nationality: Polish; has lived in Norway since 1987 (?)

Profession: Philosopher

Academic degrees:

– M.Sc. Physics. University of Wrocław (1970)

– M.A. Philosophy. University of Wrocław (1973)

– Dr.phil. Philosophy. University of Krakow (1979).

The subject of the dissertation derives from the field of epistemology

Present status: free-lance scientist.

III

In the view of the experts there are *ten candidates* who do not for various reasons *fulfil* the requirements for the future holder of the Chair for East European studies.

There is no doubt about the scientific qualifications of *Brandes*. His scientific oeuvre comprises two, respectively three monographs, namely *The Czechs under the German Protectorate*, 2 volumes, Munich 1969 and 1975 (Vol. 1 (1939–1942) = Dissertation; Vol. 2 = Continuation of the doctoral thesis on the period 1942–1945) and *Great Britain and her East European allies 1939–1943*, Munich 1988 (= "Habilitation"/doctorate paper) as well as 15 papers in German scientific journals and composite works. These works are substantial and to some extent fundamental to history and the study of the epoch, and they focus on the East European, particularly the Czecho-Slovakian history on the one hand, on the other East European politics in world war II in the international context. Moreover, Brandes has dealt with the history – and to a lesser extent – the present situation of the ethnic Germans in Eastern Europe and the non-Russian colonial settlements in Russia. USSR's own problems only receive marginal mention, however, in the total scientific work. In terms of the academic subject and methodology the works clearly belong to the discipline of history and despite focussing on contemporary history they can hardly be said to cover the interdisciplinary social science aspects called for. In other words the works are somewhat on the periphery of the scope of the chair, both in regional and disciplinary terms. Supposing it was a chair for contemporary East European history (excluding the Soviet Union), then Brandes would certainly be on the shortlist with reason-

able prospects of being appointed. But his scientific qualifications hardly live up to the scientific profile of the chair with which we are concerned here.

The young *Ciesielczyk*, who did not complete his studies until 1988 with his degree at the University of Munich, is without any doubt not sufficiently qualified for the Chair. Apart from the dissertation – which in fact has not been submitted, there are only a number of minor articles in German popular science magazines and Polish emigree publications that – taken together – come into the category of high-level journalism.

It is impossible to judge *Goudoever's* scientific qualification since he has not submitted his publications, which to an appreciable extent are written in Dutch and, therefore, could not be read by the members of the expert committee. Not that the list of publications and his academic career would necessarily preclude him from being sufficiently qualified, but *Goudoever's* works on contemporary East European and Soviet history do tend to give the impression that they fall under the heading of history. Any bent for interdisciplinary sociology can probably be ruled out.

Herlemann's politico-scientific works deal without exception with the Soviet Union, the subject being the agricultural policy, the bureaucratic problems, the political participation, quality of life and the political culture in a well balanced combination of empiricism and theory. Even though the themes of his scientific works lie well within the scope of the Chair, the totality of his work does not live up to what will be expected of the appointee to the Chair. Of monographic work there is but one dissertation *Zu Entscheidungen der sowjetischen Agrarpolitik 1940–1960*, Berlin 1980, which essentially devotes itself to list the agricultural policy, decisions of the party- and central government according to formalized criteria and to relate their number of certain indicators of the actual position of the Soviet agriculture. The problems of substance inherent in the agricultural policy are not discussed. Herlemann has furthermore edited four books (three as co-editor), published about 8 papers and articles as well as about 15 reviews, all of them definitely high level material. In scholarly terms, most innovated are his investigations of Soviet quality of life, on the very subject of which Herlemann organized a conference in USA and edited the omnibus volume, *Quality of Life in the Soviet Union*, Boulder/Co. 1987. Seen as a whole the publications are qualitatively close to qualifying him for the Chair, quantitatively they are below the mark. Herlemann has not got his Habilitation-degree, although he for some time has been working on an "habilitation"-work. Considering his not insignificant age of 48 the total scientific work – bearing

in mind all the individually positive points – is, all things considered, not so impressive as to shortlist him as a prospective nominee.

Kolaja has not submitted his publications, so that an assessment of his scientific qualifications, if this was at all possible in professional terms – is out of the question. After his extensive publications of a scientific nature, his academic career and his many years as Full Professor at American universities there can be no doubt whatsoever about his scientific qualifications – albeit that his publications concentrate on the areas of general and industrial sociology as well as town planning, which have little in common with the tasks confronting the Chair. *Kolaja* is no doubt an internationally respected sociologist, but in this particular instance it is not a question of a chair in (East European) sociology. Irrespective of that, on grounds of age alone – he is 70 years old – *Kolaja* can hardly be considered.

Magnusson is principally a specialist on Yugoslavia concentrating on religious, ethnic and socio-cultural aspects, who has published two books. The first deals with the nationality problem in Kosovo (*Nationality problem in Yugoslavia: the crisis in Kosovo*, 1981); the second is his thesis and is concerned with the identity problems of Yugoslav immigrants in Sweden (*Yugoslavs in Sweden. Immigrants and identity in a socio-cultural perspective*, Uppsala 1986). A bigger and as yet unpublished manuscript is devoted to theoretical problems of the Yugoslav religious sociology. Another 10 or so papers and contributions to Swedish publications exist. *Magnusson* no doubt has intimate knowledge of the complex socio-cultural conditions in Yugoslavia and has contributed appreciably to a better understanding of them through his works. Taking into account his age, 44, the extent of his scientific work is admittedly close to the minimum required from a holder of a chair. In the case of this particular chair it should be borne in mind that *Magnusson* is pronounced Yugoslavia-specialist, who has no in-depth knowledge of either the USSR or other East European countries. Because of these reasons he is not sufficiently qualified for this Chair.

Mihajlov is an intellectual of world class, who in the sixties and seventies was one of the leading lights in the non-conformist intelligentsia in Yugoslavia and because of that was politically persecuted having to spend all of seven years in prison. He arrived in USA in 1976 where he taught at several universities as a guest lecturer ending up as a commentator on the intellectual and ideological development in Eastern Europe with Radio

Free Europe/Radio Liberty. *Mihajlov* has published a great many studies, articles and essays in all the world languages in magazines and newspapers of the Western world, which have demonstrated his intimate knowledge of Russian literature and philosophy of the 19th and 20th century and singled him out as a fertile thinker and inspiring observer of the communist power scene. Evaluating his intellectual qualities it stands out: that *Mihajlov* first and foremost is a writer and publicist and not a scientist in the strictly academic sense of the word. His works on Russian literature may have a scientific quality, which, however, is outside the work parameter of the vacant Chair.

Misztal, who did not come out from Poland to the West until 1986, has not submitted his publications, so that an assessment of his scientific qualifications is impossible. Nevertheless, going by the list of publications and his academic career it can be assumed that *Misztal* is a scientifically qualified and internationally reputable sociologist in his discipline, which mainly takes in urban sociology, the social movements (particularly students movements) and general sociological theory. What is relevant to the work sphere of the vacant Chair are the studies concerned with the socio-political evolution in Poland in the eighties. Irrespective of the scientific qualifications in abstract terms it is apparent from the available papers, that the scientific works have a definite specialist sociological character and are at the periphery of the field of work for which the Chair was really designed. On these grounds, *Misztal* is not to be considered for the appointment in the opinion of the expert commission.

Ohlsson has, considering his age of 47, published little: a monograph, a paper (based on the subject of the monograph) and three book reviews. The monograph is his thesis and deals with local government in the Soviet Union (*Lokal förvaltning i Sovjetunionen*, Stockholm 1979), as well as the system of soviets historically and contemporarily, in which theoretical and practical viewpoints alike are being aired. This work hardly adds anything to what is already known within the relevant research in the West. This apart there are five unpublished manuscripts written by *Ohlsson*. They amount to: two reports and a pre-study, produced within the framework of a research project (theories of the West regarding the soviet system of power; Soviet co-operatives); a brief guideline for teaching purposes about Soviet Marxism-Leninism; a topical contribution on the concepts of glasnost and perestroika. All these works are certainly weighty, but do not excel in originality. Altogether the performance to date does not come up to

what is demanded, quantitatively and qualitatively, from a candidate by way of scientific accomplishment.

No assessment can be made about *Sicinski*, who presumably did not leave Poland until 1987, as he has submitted neither publications nor catalogue. From the papers at hand it can only be presumed, that the relatively few publications probably are in Polish dealing with problems of abstract philosophy and scientific theory, thus outside the mandated scope of the Chair.

IV

The experts are of the opinion that six applicants meet the requirements for the chair, though to differing degrees.

The less qualified group comprises Fogelklou, Jackson and Nelson (in alphabetical order).

Fogelklou is a lawyer with definite politico-scientific interests. His scientific oeuvre comprises a monograph – his dissertation – on Soviet-marxist legal theory (*The unjust law. A study of Hegel's justification and the criticism by marxism of the modern legal system*, Stockholm 1988), about 15 papers and contributions as well as 12 reviews mostly in Scandinavian publications and composite works, but also in publications of the reputable Dutch Documentation Office for East European Law of the University of Leiden (*Encyclopedia of Soviet Law; Review of Socialist Law*). In terms of content the entire work is centered around three focal points, which admittedly cannot be grouped in well defined areas: 1. Marxist and Soviet state- and legal theory. This area is represented by the somewhat oddly structured dissertation that the chapters proceed in this order: Pasuhanis, tradition of legal nihilism in Russia, Lenin, Hegel, Marx. The dissertation attempts to give a differentiated reply to the question, whether the suppression in the post-capitalist society was inevitably intended by the marxist concept of law. In subsequent articles Fogelklou has followed up the development of the more recent Soviet law concept and has in his work concentrated on the question whether traces of an incipient philosophy of the natural right concept are noticeable. Also worthy of note is the paper on the function of Soviet law as a symbol stabilizing social order and the power system (1987). 2. The political system in the Soviet Union. Fogelklou has addressed the subject of continuity and change in the Soviet system in a number of papers, in which the analysis of the concrete processes of change and their theoretical classification are combined in a well balanced manner. Especially worthy of mention are the piece on the Western conception for interpretation of the Soviet system (1983), a contribution on the

problem of succession in the Soviet leadership taking the example of the transition from Brezhnev to Andropov and again to Chernenko (1984) as well as an analysis of the political changes under Gorbachev (1988). The politico-scientific component has been visibly strengthening over the latter years. 3. Problems of East European. Hereunder come general questions like functions and technical deficiencies in the Soviet legislation and special subjects like the law of personal property in Soviet civil law (1971), the Chinese constitution of 1975 (1977 – unpublished manuscript) and the internal legal structure of Soviet enterprise in connection with Andropov's "Laws governing work collectives" of 1983 (1986). The regional focal point is indisputably the Soviet Union, but the other countries under communist rule are considered, as shown by the frequent comparative comments. One particular work dealing specifically with a non-Soviet subject is worth mentioning, quite apart from the said analysis of the Chinese constitution of 1975, namely a short contribution on the development in Poland during the years 1980–82 (1982). The scientific quality of the works is considerable throughout and proves Fogelklou to be an expert of the Soviet legal and political system. Fogelklou is well conversant with the latest advances of research in the West into both law and political science, which is very evident from the full use he has made of the English and German-language material. He is also capable of subjecting the Soviet system to a both inter- and intra-systematic comparison. The works are rich in thoughts and inspiring, although it is not always easy for the reader to follow his line of thought. As regards quantity all his work is for a 46 year old scientist not especially impressive.

Apart from his thesis his publications do not really take off until the early eighties. On account of the comparatively modest number of publications there is obviously a limit to the thematic scope.

Fogelklou has carried out teaching activities at the University of Uppsala since the early 70'ties, changing between general legal theory, Soviet law and -politics and also Swedish constitutional law. Some particularly valuable and enduring experiences were gained during his time as temporary professor for East European research in 1985–86 and public law in 1986–88. During this period he was also involved in various research projects and so could learn relevant organisational skills. Fogelklou is well known in the international world of Eastbloc-lawresearchers and has extensive international contacts. Numerous study- and research visits to Germany (Institute of Eastbloc-law at the University of Cologne 1972 and 1988, Max-Planck-Institute of Law history and international civil law in Frankfurt and Ham-

burg 1973), USA (Columbia University, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Minnesota Law School 1983), the Netherlands (Documentation Office for East European Law at the University of Leiden 1979, 1982, 1984), Norway, Finland and Japan as well as several study-trips to Moscow for research purposes (1971, 1979, 1982, 1987) have expanded his knowledge of scientific work abroad. All his experience should stand Fogelklou in good stead in connection with exercising the functions of the Chair, for which he is scientifically qualified, though to a lesser extent than the listed candidates.

Marvin R Jackson (b. 1932) received his Ph. D. degree in 1967 at the University of California, Berkeley, under the supervision of Grossman, a member of the present experts' committee. Earlier academic degrees in business administration and economics were obtained at the University of Colorado. Currently, he is full professor of economics at Arizona State University.

The dissertation examined the role and significance of organization (in this case, engineering-bureaus) in Soviet decisions regarding investment choice. It remained unpublished as such, but its salient content is summarized in the article entitled "Information and Incentives in Planning . . ." (*Sov. Studies*, 1971), while its echoes can be detected as well in two other articles, both jointly with Jos. Brada and both on the role of organization in foreign-trade decision-making (in *The Journal of Comparative Economics*, 1978, and in *Co-existence*, 1981).

Almost immediately after completing the dissertation Jackson turned his research interests toward Southeastern Europe. Our knowledge of Jackson's work comes almost entirely from publications.

Jackson's publication record is extensive and varied, even taking account of his relatively more advanced age. Apart from the unpublished dissertation and the three articles just mentioned, Jackson's writing falls into two main areas, both dealing with Southeastern Europe (mostly Romania and Bulgaria). By far the larger volume of publication relates, first and foremost, to the region's or the two countries' economic and demographic history from the late nineteenth century to the post-1945 period; and second, to what is expressed by the German word *Gegenwartskunde*, including the attempts at economic reform in the two countries. In his letter to Uppsala, dated 8 March 1988, Jackson states being engaged in completing "a first draft of a monograph on industrialization patterns under communist rule" (which may represent a geographic broadening of his research), and expecting to prepare two papers: the impact of industrialization on society in the Balkans"

and "on problems of measuring the GNP of Southeastern European countries in the interwar period". In the same letter he mentions being engaged in "collecting a large cross-national data base that focuses on the Soviet Union and seven smaller East European countries and has comparative observations on some 40-45 other countries". In the past, Jackson prepared a number of studies of the economics of the State of Arizona.

There is no question that Jackson is a mature, solid, able, and productive scholar, enjoying full recognition and high reputation as a leading Western economic specialist within the study of Southeastern Europe. The thematic range of his research within this area is wide, as is his choice of methodological approaches (historiographic, comparative-institutional, quantitative). He is basically a historian and institutionalist with an adequate command of theory and quantitative techniques, not an advanced theorist as such or a skilled econometrician.

The fact that he has hardly any monographs to his sole credit is only in line with contemporary practice in American economics to emphasize the publication of articles (or even working papers) rather than full-scale books. In the major book-sized opus that bears his name, *Balkan Economic History* co-authored with Lampe, Jackson's contribution is the smaller one in length. The book has received good reviews (with some exceptions).

Nothing that Jackson has taught at the university level for about twenty years, unfortunately we dispose of no significant information about the quality of his teaching - nor on his experience in supervising or coordinating research.

As noted, he is a fine scholar, enjoys wide recognition, has spent much time in both parts of Europe, and seemingly has developed good contacts and connections with scholars and institutions in both West and East. He is a close student of current developments as well as of (recent) economic history. Thus, Jackson might well rank within the top three candidates for the Uppsala chair, were it not for the fact that, after his dissertation of over twenty years ago, he has devoted little attention to countries of the East outside the Balkans, and particularly to the USSR (although may be doing so currently in the above-mentioned projects).

Daniel N Nelson is a political scientist whose main interest lies in the use and construction of models of explanation, and of theories. His scholarly activity and production is comprehensive. He has published four monographs, edited eight books and about forty articles in American and international scholarly journals and collective works. His productivity is further document-

ed by the fact that he has several articles and books in preparation.

Nelson's main scholarly areas are the following: 1) The political system (conceived in a broad sense) of Romania. 2) Comparative studies of Communist one-party systems (political participation, problems of legitimation and stability on the background of these regimes' policy of modernization, and local policy). 3) The Warsaw Pact (burden sharing, problems of loyalty, and alliance behaviour).

The regional emphasis in Nelson's production is on Romania and, to a lesser degree, Poland in his comparative studies and elsewhere, however, Nelson also treats other Communist states. The Soviet Union clearly belongs to the periphery of his scholarly interest, and his knowledge and/or use of Soviet sources is very sparse. His knowledge of Soviet scholarly literature also seems to be very modest.

Nelson's scholarly universe is predominantly American or Anglo-American. He is not well versed in the Continental-European scholarly literature on Communist systems.

The applicant's pedagogical experience is broad. Since 1977 he has taught political science at the University of Kentucky, first as an Assistant Professor 1977-1980, then as an Associate Professor 1980-1984, and since 1985 as a Full Professor. Among the themes of his teaching have been comparative politics with special emphasis on Eastern Europe, comparative communism, authoritarian political systems, political violence, East Asian politics, and Soviet foreign policy.

The applicant has also broad experiences in research and organizing research. Apart from his own monographs and articles he has organized symposiums and been in charge of editing and publishing several collective works with contributions from conferences and symposiums. In 1985-1986 Nelson was a Project Director at the US Information Agency. He has done many research trips to and done research in countries in Eastern and western Europe and in Asia. He has further been engaged as a consultant of American government agencies.

A characteristic feature of Nelson's work is an often extensive presentation of hypothetical-theoretical reasonings and considerations whereas the empirical base to support the theories often is rather weak. The exposition of the hypotheses, theories and models is at times very detailed and written in a rather heavy and complicated language. The same holds true for his presentation of the often rather trite results of his research.

Thus it is difficult to accept that his study *Citizen Participation in Romania* (1980) – as claimed by the author – is important for an understanding of changes in a

Communist political system in "the empirical portrait" of political apathy in a Communist state including a preliminary model of explanation published in "Apathy in a Communist State". In "The Political Behavior of Futility" (unpublished manuscript) the choice of Poland is methodologically dubious. His argument for the choice rests on the fact that material on public debate is most voluminous – but by this very fact the argument is spurious and rather points to Poland as a special case.

Nelson has more and more concentrated his scholarly efforts on comparative studies of domestic politics in Communist Europe. His aim has been to establish and test generalizable hypotheses about domestic Communist politics. He is very critical towards those who are preoccupied with the study of central party and government organs. He strongly argues for the point of view that a deeper understanding of the Communist systems demands more attention to the base. He himself identifies the relationship between people and party as the political nexus of Communist party rule.

It is the ambition of Nelson to develop bases for gauging change in such a relationship. In one of his later work consisting of both earlier and hitherto not published articles (*Elite-Mass Relations in Communist Systems*, 1988), he concludes that the Communist party's vertical control breaks down on the local level, and that the results of his research suggest a dynamic political environment which is far away from what he calls the traditional totalitarian image.

Daniel Nelson has made valuable contributions to the study of Communist states and no doubt has the necessary qualifications for the chair of East European Studies, but to a lesser degree than the applicants on the top list of priority.

The three top candidates are the following ones: Anders Åslund, Jan-Åke Dellenbrant och Stefan Hedlund.

Anders Åslund (b. 1952, Swedish, economist)

Academic attainments:

– Fil. Kand. History, Russian, Polish, political science. Universities of Göteborg, Uppsala and Stockholm (1976) Economics. Stockholm School of Economics (1976)

– Ph. D. St. Antony's College, Oxford University.

"The Non-agricultural Private Sector in the East European Economy: The Case of Poland and the GDR 1945-1980". Supervisor: W. Brus.

Readers: M. Kaser, M. Nuti.

Publications: One book (at time of application; another since) – *Private Enterprise in Eastern Europe: The Non-agricultural Private Sector in Poland and the GDR 1945-*

1980, London, 1985 (dissertation). About 10 articles in professional journals and collective volumes. Three major unpublished manuscripts on computation of Soviet GNP (taking issue with CIA estimates) and (since published) on economic reforms and political development under Gorbachev, discussed below.

Emphasis on contemporary economics and politics of the Soviet Union.

Research management and supervision: seemingly no experience. (We understand that Åslund has been recently appointed director of the newly-established institute for East European research in Stockholm.)

Teaching: no notable experience.

Other: Diplomatic service in Poland (1979–80), Moscow (1984–87), and elsewhere (from 1977). Study at Oxford (1978–82); Fellow at the Wilson Center (Washington, DC, 1987–88).

Åslund is an uncommon candidate for a major university chair in at least two senses. He comes from the foreign service rather than an academic ladder, and has done most if not all of his scholarly work while on duty with or on leave from the foreign service. The second sense in which he is an uncommon candidate is perhaps more significant – he has very quickly made a mark in international sovietological circles.

Nearly all of Åslunds's major published or to-be-published work falls into three parts:

1. A book (also the doctoral dissertation) on *Private Enterprise in Eastern Europe; The Non-agricultural Private Sector in Poland and the GDR, 1945–83*, and a number of articles on this general theme anticipating and following the book's publication.

2. A book entitled *Gorbachev's Struggle for Economic Reform* and the related article on "Gorbachev's Economic Advisors". (This book was published in 1989 does not appear as such in Åslund's list of publications submitted with application for the Uppsala chair. However, the list (Bilaga 4) mentions several parts of the manuscript for the book being ready. At least one member of the experts committee is in possession of both the full manuscript (undated) and of the published book; the two are essentially identical. Hence, we take the liberty of placing this book in evidence.)

3. An unpublished manuscript on the way to publication in a collective volume, originally a paper for a conference in March 1988, entitled "How Small is the Soviet National Income".

We proceed in this order.

1. The book on *Private Enterprise* is a first-rate achievement in the investigation of a theme in Eastern political economy. It brings together a vast amount of factual material for the two countries, and organizes and analyzes them with great skill; traces the complex

interplay between economic, political, social, and ideological forces; displays good sensitivity and insightfulness; and convincingly contrasts the position of private firms and private businessmen in Poland and the GDR (a major thesis of the work). It is without doubt the best monograph on legal private enterprise in an Eastern country.

2. The book on Gorbachev's reform – to be more accurate, on the history of its initial years – is basically similar in approach and methodology, and displays the same positive qualities as does the first. It, too, brings together a vast number of discrete facts into a single mosaic, and does so with sensitivity and insight. (Although, by the nature of the matter, many of the insights and conclusions remain to be tested by the passage of time.) It is also marked by the author's remarkable success, while stationed at the Swedish embassy in Moscow, to seek out and interview a very large number of significant Soviet persons. The work certainly rates with the very best Western books on perestroika to have yet appeared.

3. The manuscript on "How small is Soviet National Income" forcefully and imaginatively advances thesis that the US CIA's estimates of the relative size and rate of growth of the Soviet economy are much too high, to which end a large number of discrete figures and facts are imaginatively brought together and distilled into the final result.

Even long before its publication, the paper has received considerable attention among sovietological economists, especially in the United States. The reason is not so much that the CIA's findings in regard to the growth and size of the Soviet economy have not been previously challenged – this much has been continuously done by American and other Western economists for many years, as Åslund indeed notes – but rather because of the smallness of the alternative figures advanced (note the title of the paper) and the force of the argument.

The author's case rests largely on the low accuracy of Soviet statistics (to put it mildly), a fact of which the CIA's experts are not unaware, and on intuitive conclusions regarding the poverty of the Soviet Union based on personal observation. In the process the author displays a high degree of sensitivity to numbers and good intuition into their meaning. So far so good. He may be right in his numerical conclusions, too, but we cannot know this without an attempt at alternative computations by means of standard index-number techniques, or without full appreciation of the high sensitivity of any index-number result to the formula employed.

To sum up: Åslund has produced two first-rate books. He is a political economist with a strong empir-

ical and pragmatic bent who asks important questions and goes after the answers in a determined and effective way. He clearly has uncommon energy, stamina, insightfulness, ability to collect and correlate information of various types.

On the other hand, in his work he has not had the occasion to display his knowledge of more theoretical and technical economics or of advanced quantitative methods.

Åslund may well be an effective and inspiring teacher, judging by his conference participation, though we have no direct evidence of that. Of his ability to supervise and coordinate research we know nothing. He has a wide and close acquaintance with the East and with very many persons there, as well as a broad view of the world in general. And he now has many contacts in the world of Western sovietology. His promise is clearly high. All in all, and despite some of the remarks above, he is surely a prime candidate for the Uppsala chair.

We place him in the top three candidates for the Uppsala chair.

Jan Åke Dellenbrant (1946, Swedish, political scientist)
Academic attainments:

– Fil. Kand. Russian, political science, Uppsala University (1967)

– Fil. Mag. Russian, political science, economics, with supplementary examination in economics and history, Uppsala University (1968, 1970)

– Fil. Lic. Political science. "Politik och ekonomi i sovjetisk samhällsdebatt". Supervisor: L Lewin, Uppsala University (1972)

– Fil. Dr. Political science. *Reformists and Traditionalists: A Study of Soviet Discussions about Economic Reform 1960–1965*.

Supervisor: L. Lewin, Uppsala University (1972)

Docent in political science, esp. East European Study. Uppsala University (1978)

Docent in general government studies. Helsinki University (1987)

Current position: Acting Professor at Uppsala University.

Publications: Four books – *Reformists and Traditionalists: A Study of Soviet Discussions about Economic Reform, 1960–1965*, Stockholm, 1972 (doctoral dissertation); *Soviet Regional Policy: A Quantitative Inquiry into the Social and Political Development of the Soviet Republics*, Stockholm, 1980; *Kooperation och samverkan*, Stockholm, 1985; *The Soviet Regional Dilemma: Planning, People and Natural Resources*, New York, 1986. Also a basic textbook with M. Baeck: *Politik i Sovjetunionen*, Malmö, 1971, 2nd ed. 1982. Three edited books. Ca. 20 pieces and 12 reviews in Scandina-

vian, English, French, German, and American professional journals. Some six large unpublished (duplicated) studies.

Areas of emphasis: Several areas of concentration within political science (broadly defined) can be distinguished:

1. Soviet Regionalism and individual regions. In this subject area, to which two of his books and numerous shorter pieces are devoted, Dellenbrant has made a distinctive contribution to East European studies by bringing attention to, among other things, the significance of the phenomenon of Soviet regionalism. Various pieces deal with individual regions – Siberia, Central Asia, The Baltic. Particularly noteworthy is the demonstration in *The Soviet Quest for Regional Security*, 1986, that the union-republic Party leaders have shown increasing interest from the standpoint of their own republics in those questions of foreign and security policy that concern their respective republics (e. g. invasion of Afganistan, the Polish crisis).

2. Soviet Economic Policy: In addition to the dissertation, a number of Dellenbrant's works deal with economic reform, the new cooperatives, technological progress, and energy policy.

3. Theoretical questions of mode-building and of the political decision-making process.

4. The cooperative movement, esp. in Sweden, and

5. Party regionalism in Sweden.

Research management: For about 15 years Dellenbrant has been continuously engaged in research and teaching, the more so in his present professorial position. In the course of many research projects he has surely acquired great experience in supervising researchers and in cooperating and planning research with other scholars. As Secretary of the Nordic Committee for Soviet and East European Studies during 1975–82, he must have acquired broad experience of an organizational and editorial nature. Altogether, he is closely familiar with all aspects of the research process.

Teaching: Dellenbrant has taught at Uppsala University since 1973 (with some interruptions), and occasionally abroad, particularly at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey (CA, USA) in 1985/86 and at Helsinki University in 1988. He has also lectured extensively at various educational institutions.

Other activities: Well-known and recognized in the international community of specialists, Dellenbrant has made numerous visits for study and research to the United States, England, and West Germany, as well as to the USSR, Poland, and Hungary.

Dellenbrant is a political scientist with a very large and widely ranging publication record, mostly in sovietology (much of that on economic or political-economic

themes), but also heavily on the theory and practice of cooperatives (non-Soviet) and Swedish party regionalism.

Dellenbrant has contributed to the study of Swedish cooperative movement. The book *Kooperation och samverkan* (Stockholm 1985) is a presentation of various research projects done by Dellenbrant and others about 1) the relationship between management and members in the cooperative movement; 2) the relationship between members and their organizations on one side and employees on the other; 3) the relationship between cooperative movement and the trade union movement. The book contains a historical background and a contemporary analysis of Swedish cooperative movement's problems and future perspectives. Among other things it points to different interests between management, members and employees. Dellenbrant is also a co-editor of the report *Svensk partiregionalism* (St., 1986). Dellenbrant has contributed with some reflections on the so-called innovation and diffusion theories and their explanatory value regarding the study of the spread of ideas of the Swedish workers movement. According to (him) the empirical testing of these theories has not given any definite results as to the explanatory value of the diffusion theory. He thinks, however, that the theory may contribute to a better understanding of the spreading of ideas.

Dellenbrant's sovietological work is so varied and wide-ranging that it is difficult to evaluate it in brief compass. Geographical emphasis is clearly on the USSR proper. He is clearly thoroughly conversant with the sources, both Western and Eastern. The significance of his work on regionalism and individual regions has already been mentioned. Of his two major books that fall under this rubric, in the first (1980) – using quantitative methods and relying on the concept of modernization – he examines socio-economic data for the 15 Soviet union republics to ascertain that, during 1956–1973, interregional differences remained substantially unchanged, despite over-all growth. The work displays all the strengths and weaknesses that might be expected of a largely quantitative method. Moreover, the quantitative work itself would have gained from a more thorough and critical discussion of the differences between – adjusted – economic magnitudes, (which are particularly sensitive to inadequacies in the data), the choice of particular statistical techniques, and other technical decisions. In consequence, the reader is not fully satisfied, even if many of the findings are intuitively known or acceptable to him.

The second book on regionalism (1986) carries the theme forward in time and broadens it in qualitative terms – placing less reliance on a rather mechanical

quantitative approach – while analyzing the content of regional policy and its place in the decision-making process (e. g., BAM, diversion of Siberian rivers). It is also much more policy-oriented than the first (notwithstanding the first's title). Thus, it is more satisfying to the social scientist than the first book, although the political scientist may desire a more explicit statement of the theoretical premises of the analysis, and the economist – a more critical discussion of the official data in the numerous tables. Dellenbrant's shorter pieces on individual large regions (Siberia, Central Asia), and those dealing with the interplay of domestic regional problems and foreign policy, seem to come off more vividly and convincingly (cf., "The Central Asian Challenge", *Jour. of Communist Studies*, 1988:1). But in general, as one of our committee has put it: Occasionally one has the impression that Soviet reality tends to slip out of the field of vision behind the quantitative data and the official literature.

Dellenbrant places squarely among the top three candidates for the Uppsala chair.

Stefan Hedlund (b. 1953, Swedish, economist)

Academic attainments:

- Fil. Kand. Economics. Lund University (1976)
- M.A. Economics. University of California at Santa Barbara (1977)
- Fil. Dr. Economics. *Crisis in Soviet Agriculture?* Supervisor: M. Lundahl. Lund (1983)

Current position: Researcher at the Institute of Economics, Lund University;

Publications: Books: *Crisis in Soviet Agriculture*, London, 1984 (doctoral dissertation); co-authored with M. Lundahl, *Beredskap eller protektionism?* Stockholm, 1985 (see below); a textbook on East European economic systems, *Östekonomi*, Bjarnum, 1986; and an edited book. Ca. 40 pieces in Scandinavian professional journals. Two large, as yet unpublished, manuscripts (with K. Gerner, *A Legacy for Gorbachev: on Ideology and Rationality in the Soviet Version*; and *Private plots: A Soviet Agricultural Anomaly*). Numerous articles in leading Swedish newspapers, esp. Svenska Dagbladet. Reviews.

Areas of emphasis: His works in East European studies fall into three areas of emphasis: 1. The Soviet economy, esp. agricultural history and policy; 2. The application to Soviet economy and politics of the Exit-Voice-Loyalty (EVL) concept, put forward by Albert Hirschman in 1970; 3. Investigation of individual topics, e. g. Hungarian economic reforms or latest political developments in Poland. Outside of East European studies; 4. Socialist/collectivist economic reforms in Tanzania and Israel (the kibbutz); 5. Swedish agrarian policy and

social policy (health care).

Research management: having yet held no leading academic position, Hedlund could not have yet had experience in managing research projects, but in the course of his ten years at universities he surely must have become familiar with the specificities of organized research. He has had much experience as an equal partner in joint research, as well as in organizing conferences and putting out conference volumes thanks to the Arne-Ryde Symposia (1979 and 1985, the latter leading to the publication of *Incentives and Economic Systems*, London, 1987).

Teaching: Since 1978 Hedlund has continuously taught at the university level such subjects as the economics, history, and politics of the USSR, and general economics. His teaching experience has taken place at Lund, as well as at Glasgow (1981) and Uppsala (1984/86). His textbook came out in 1986.

As mentioned, Hedlund's dissertation and first book-length publication is *Crisis in Soviet Agriculture* (1984). A fine work, intended in style and language for the general reader as well as for the specialist, it can be fully appreciated by the latter for the scholarship it represents and the balanced judgement it offers. Methodologically eclectic, the work draws on a very wide literature on Soviet agriculture in primary and secondary sources, and makes judicious use of general economic theory. (The dissertation itself, published in English as Lund Economic Series No. 28, contains some more technical passages and diagrams omitted from the trade-book version). The last chapter (Future Prospects, etc.) is commendably prescient. If not path-breaking in itself, the book contains areas of originality of analysis. Thanks to its serious scholarship combined with readability, it is one of the finest general books on the economics of Soviet agriculture in recent decades.

The book manuscript "Private Plots: A Soviet Agricultural Anomaly" carries the same general approach and scholarship to a more specific aspect of Soviet Agriculture, and in this way is also a more distinctive product. It promises to be the best work on private plots since Waedekin's classic on this subject over 15 years ago. Here he displays good knowledge of the primary as well as secondary Soviet sources and of the relevant Western literature. Emphasis is on the complexities of interaction between the private and official sectors on economic, political, and other levels. Several of Hedlund's conference papers are offshoots from this work. The manuscript is particularly original and distinctive in its ample use of the Hirschmanian Exit-Voice-Loyalty (EVL) schema, which has conceptually inspired much of Hedlund's work (on a variety of topics) in the last several years. (E.g., the publications Nos. 40, 57-63.)

Although, thanks to its essential simplicity and plasticity, the EVL schema would seem to have considerable analytical potential in social science, it has so far been employed very little by economists and particularly in the analysis of economic systems and institutions (even if it has been around for some time and its originator is a distinguished economist himself), probably because it lends itself poorly to quantification, let alone mathematical manipulation. Nor has it found much employment in sovietological work, where it would seem to be logically indicated. Hedlund deserves credit for pioneering such application of the EVL schema, which he carries out rather imaginatively.

The manuscript "A Legacy for Gorbachev: On Ideology and Rationality in the Soviet Model" is joint with K. Gerner; it is difficult to ascertain the precise extent of Hedlund's own contribution to it. It does, however, demonstrate – as, indeed, does his whole and rather numerous set of publications, an impressive breadth of intellectual concerns and ideas, ranging into several sides of sovietology, but also into to study of Sweden's och Europe's agriculture, economic reforms in the smaller East European countries, and a series of brief pieces on Tanganyika and the Israeli kibbutz. Clearly, he is able to see Soviet agriculture in a strong comparative context.

In the book *Beredskap eller protektionism? En studie av beredskapsmålet i svensk jordbrukspolitik* (Stockholm 1985) – written in cooperation with Mats Lundahl – Stefan Hedlund takes a critical look at Swedish agricultural policy since World War Two. The main thesis of the book is that considerations of emergency measures in case of war and the possible breakdown of international trade have been used by Swedish politicians to keep up an over-dimensional agricultural sector in Sweden. Because of the crucial position of the Center Party in the Swedish political system, and because of this party's deference to agricultural interests, the agricultural policy of Sweden is never questioned.

In sum (at least in regard to that part of his work that is linguistically accessible to this committee) Hedlund is a very competent economist (in the technical sense), a knowledgeable sovietologist, a political economist, balanced and judicious in his analysis and conclusions, articulate, and productive. Still relatively young, he has a large and broad publication record of high quality and appreciable economic profession. Those of us who have observed his presentations at conferences suppose that he is an effective teacher. We place him in the top three candidates for the Uppsala chair.

Evaluation

We select as the three top candidates for the Uppsala chair (alphabetically for now) Dellenbrant, Hedlund, Åslund.

The three scholars have a good deal in common. All fall within the mandated scope of the chair's requirements. All three have impressive records of publication or prospective publication, in both quantity and quality, account being taken of age (and, in Åslund's case, presuming that diplomatic service requires a certain amount of internal unpublished writing of intellectual quality). In the case of all three the regional emphasis lies with the USSR proper, and the temporal emphasis is on contemporary or recent problems and trends. All three have broad thematic interests and competence within Soviet studies.

At the same time all have paid substantial attention and have published on the countries of Eastern Europe (i.e., outside USSR) – Åslund impressively so and considerably more than the other two. Furthermore, all have, or have had, interests and publications outside Soviet/EE studies, whether geographically (Tanzania, Israeli kibbutz (Hedlund), a number of countries by virtue of diplomatic service (Åslund), Swedish party system (Dellenbrant), the economics and politics of Cooperation (Dellenbrant). We judge these parallel interests and accomplishments to be of appreciable significance in this instance.

All seem to have more than adequate foreign language ability. As it happens, all three are Swedish by nationality, though, as instructed, we did not consider this fact as major requirement for filling the chair. All three are seemingly well versed in the relevant bodies of world literature and well connected in major scholarly circles abroad, where they enjoy academic standing on an international scale.

Now as to differences between them. All three can be said to be political economists and institutional comparativists in their research orientations, and all have little hesitation to step outside their formal disciplines or venture into multi-disciplinary efforts (which in principle is good in this instance).

Åslund and Hedlund were trained as economists; neither exhibits any predominant theoretical or mathematical orientation in his publications. However, Hedlund seems to use formal economic theory more readily than Åslund, and will experiment with new conceptual directions, as shown by his strong interest in and application of Hirschman's EVL schema. Åslund, in fact, shows little concern with the more formal economic theory. However, both Åslund and Hedlund display very good practical economist's sense (i.e., an intuitive understanding of how things do not – repeat, not – work). Åslund also shows strong intuitive numerical sense (by which we do not mean to say that Hedlund does not).

Dellenbrant has wide interest in and acquaintance with formal models and political science-theories, which he relates to his empirical research and institutional analysis. His use of modeling mathematical-statistical techniques has already been commented on above; we do not see the results as being exceptionally fruitful in understanding Soviet reality. His institutional analysis and policy inquiries are wide-ranging and frequently more convincing.

In terms of years and breadth of management and leadership of research, Dellenbrant is by far the most experienced of the three, with Hedlund second. The same ranking holds for teaching experience (though we do not rank the three candidates for quality of teaching for lack of evidence).

When we add to these findings such additional considerations as the incisiveness of questions raised and investigated, originality, imagination, resourcefulness in own research, intellectual independence, and the intrinsic importance of issues addressed, Åslund comes out with a distinct edge in our opinion.

We therefore arrive at the following ranking

1. Åslund
2. Hedlund
3. Dellenbrant

Georg Brunner Gregory Grossman Bent Jensen