

INKELES, A. CLYDE KLUCKHOHN'S CONTRIBUTION TO STUDIES OF RUSSIA AND THE SOVIET UNION. pdf

1: Soviet Defectors: The KGB Wanted List - Vladislav Krasnov - Google Books

The late Clyde Kluckhohn, whose work and study spanned the full range of anthropology, was one of its most gifted fieldworkers. His increasing interest in culture as the central concept of anthropology--his view that culture, not behavior, was the main concern of his discipline--prompted his greatest intellectual contributions.

In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: Richard Pipes Nikolai Nikolaevich Bolkhovitinov. These two slender volumes have one feature in common: In all other respects, they are vastly different: Its author is identified as the rector of the Smolensk Pedagogical Institute. By contrast, the work of Bolkhovitinov, a member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, is emphatically post-Soviet in its striving for objectivity and in its sympathetic understanding of the United States. The three brought out in a volume under the title *How the Soviet System Works*, which summarized the findings of the project. Given the determined effort by Moscow to prevent Westerners from gaining access to the country and the unprecedented harshness of its censorship, which imposed absolute uniformity on public opinion, it seemed essential to find [End Page] some means of penetrating the wall that Stalin had constructed around his country and learn what the regime was really like. The means chosen to answer these questions were in-depth interviews of several thousand of the , Soviet refugees stranded in the West after the war. Obviously, since they had refused repatriation, these war refugees could not be regarded as objective witnesses, and extreme care had to be taken to filter out personal grudges and prejudices. The results have well stood the test of time. Kodin is fair in presenting these results but rigidly partisan in describing the Harvard Project itself. If one is to believe him, the Cold War was started by J. They revealed that only 5 percent of the respondents wanted to overthrow the communist regime, and that a similar number, consisting mostly of apparatchiks and military, were loyal to it. The great majority accepted the regime as a given and felt pride in its great-power status. The peasants were most hostile to it, and the young most devoted. The majority of the refugees were identified as socialists: A major conclusion of the study, cited by Kodin, was thus summarized by the participants in the project: One of the things which the project staff has found most striking and challenging is the relatively low rate of active disaffection from the underlying ideas of the Soviet system as a way of organizing a society or, in more positive terms, the rather widespread acceptance of the basic principles of the authoritarian welfare You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

INKELES, A. CLYDE KLUCKHOHN'S CONTRIBUTION TO STUDIES OF RUSSIA AND THE SOVIET UNION. pdf

2: Project MUSE - Interpretations of the End of the Soviet Union: Three Paradigms

Taylor, W.W. Clyde Kluckhohn and American archaeology *Parsons, T. Clyde Kluckhohn and the integration of social science* *Inkeles, A. Clyde Kluckhohn's contribution to studies of Russia and the Soviet Union* *Adair, J. Clyde Kluckhohn and Indian administration* *Aberle, D.F. Clyde Kluckhohn's contributions to Navaho studies* *Lamphere, L. and.*

In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: Interpretations of the End of the Soviet Union: Three Paradigms David Rowley bio The dissolution of the Soviet Union and the end of communist rule in Russia might have been expected to resolve the dominant debate among scholars of Soviet history and politics during the Cold War: The totalitarian school defined the Soviet regime as an ideologically driven dictatorship that aimed at total control of the society it governed. This dramatic disappearance of the USSR in the fall of 1991 was immediately understood by those who adhered to the totalitarian model as vindication of their point of view. Martin Malia asserted, "One might think that the great crash of 1991 would have settled these questions once and for all with the conclusion that communism was irreformable, since it in fact failed to reform itself. First, the "great crash" of the Soviet Union would seem to have little in common with the collapse of other autocratic or authoritarian regimes. There was practically no violence — no anarchic riots, no massive repression, no civil war. Popular demonstrations never went beyond the realm of political behavior that is considered normal in modern democratic societies. Nor was the government "overthrown. No former leaders were executed — or even arrested! Moreover, there was hardly a change in political leadership [End Page] or administrative personnel; the post-Soviet republics are largely governed by former members of the Communist Party. Perhaps most important, there was no immediate constitutional change. No new governments were created; no new states appeared. The republics of the former Soviet Union continued for some time to operate according to the Soviet Constitution of 1977 as amended. To call this a "collapse" in the sense that France collapsed in 1793, China in 1911, or Russia in 1917 requires considerable interpretive agility. By emphasizing continuity, some former "revisionists" as we shall see continue to argue that the case for the totalitarian model has still not been proven. Second, even if one continues to conceive of the dissolution of the Soviet Union in the fall of 1991 as a "collapse" the sudden disappearance of a superpower was certainly a remarkable and unprecedented occurrence, but it is nevertheless possible to distinguish between two categorically distinct processes: To mention a few momentous changes: One could argue that by the summer of 1991 the Soviet Union had progressed far beyond the classic definition of totalitarianism. This would suggest that the logic of collapse arose not from the nature of totalitarian rule but from the nature of empires. Following this line of analysis, a third position has appeared in the debate over the nature of the Soviet regime. Though under-theorized in Anglo-American scholarship before 1991, the idea that the Soviet Union was an empire is not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

INKELES, A. CLYDE KLUCKHOHNS CONTRIBUTION TO STUDIES OF RUSSIA AND THE SOVIET UNION. pdf

3: Culture and life; essays in memory of Clyde Kluckhohn in SearchWorks catalog

Taylor, W. W. Clyde Kluckhohn and American archaeology *Parsons, T. Clyde Kluckhohn and the integration of social science* *Inkeles, A. Clyde Kluckhohn's contribution to studies of Russia and the Soviet Union* *Adair, J. Clyde Kluckhohn and Indian administration* *Aberle, D. F. Clyde Kluckhohn's contributions to Navaho studies* *Lamphere, L.*

Did Stalin Bring Back Serfdom? In addition to being an artist, I have a Ph. China had its revolution in , and many in the US saw Communism as a world-wide plague that might infect whole chunks of the globe. We went to war in Korea and Viet Nam to try to stop it. What was Soviet Communism anyway? Well, actually many Soviet peasants felt collectivization was a return to serfdom. Was collectivization part of a revolutionary new ideology, Communism? Or was it essentially a return to serfdom? The argument underlying the analogy ran as follows. They lived on the produce of their own small plots, but constantly had to struggle for enough time to work on them. As in the days of serfdom, they did not have the right to leave the village for work outside without permission. This implied that kolkhozniks belonged to a special category of second-class citizen, just like serfs. It was not unusual for local officials, kolkhoz chairmen, and brigade leaders to assume the prerogatives of estate owners and their stewards under serfdom, subjecting field peasants to beatings and insults. Sowing plans determined by the government dictated what was grown even on private plots

Fitzpatrick, p. Under state procurement regulations, first introduced in , every kolkhoz household was required to deliver a quota of meat and milk, even if it did not have pigs or sheep to slaughter or a cow to milk. This was a subject of great peasant resentment and complaint. According to one contemporary description of a large grain-growing kolkhoz in the south, villagers were awakened by a bell at 5 A. They were required to construct and maintain roads and bridges, and to supply horses and carts to transport officials, the mail, troops and prisoners. Individual entrepreneurship was not permitted outside tsarist state dominance. Ownership of horses and tractors: Tractors were owned by the state. But in fact, agriculture remained largely unmechanized for many years which is why, despite the addition of some tractors in my painting, most peasants are doing exactly the same kind of labor as in my SERFDOM painting. Who are those people, and how are they similar or different? Under Stalin, the peasant majority served as the fulcrum of modernization in what was one of the most radical transformations in modern history. Tsarism and Soviet Communism were autocratic, hierarchical structures, so the the lives of the agents in both systems were structured by their national government. Fitzpatrick weighs the rewards and risks of holding local positions of authority p. Moore wrote about one type of rural Soviet official: His role is characterized by heavy obligations and limited authority. The key decisions concerning agricultural processes, plowing, sowing, and harvesting, come to the kolkhoz from the outside. To enforce his orders he has certain powers of punishment and reward, ranging from the authority to order a piece of work done over without pay to conferring prestige and financial benefits on those who exceed the planned quota. I chose the most evocative portraits from my collection. Pathbreaking study of a serf village, by Steven L. As shown in my second painting above, the central focus of the Soviet state became modernization and industrialization. To the extent possible, tractors and combines were introduced into the countryside. Moving to urban areas: Because of the Soviet stress on industrialization, and the relatively small urban labor force, collective farm members were much more often permitted to leave the farm to become factory workers or receive training in other fields. Stratification and unequal pay: Serfdom had imposed a large degree of homogeneity on Russian peasants. The stratification, based on the type of work performed by kolkhoz members, was something new in the village. Serfdom rather served as a metaphor for evil and injustice. See also Fitzpatrick p. In what specific ways did collectivization differ from serfdom? As you weigh the similarities and differences between serfdom and collectivization, how would you characterize the historical process? Would you call it revolution or evolution? Or can you find another more accurate term? What does this say about how social change occurs? Do revolutions ever truly happen? Can you think of examples? Collective responsibility for redemption payments inhibited the departure from the village of individual

INKELES, A. CLYDE KLUCKHOHNS CONTRIBUTION TO STUDIES OF RUSSIA AND THE SOVIET UNION. pdf

peasants or households, thus perpetuating the restriction on mobility that serfdom had earlier imposed. This entry was posted on Wednesday, January 18th, at 4: You can follow any responses to this entry through the RSS 2. You can skip to the end and leave a response. Pinging is currently not allowed.

INKELES, A. CLYDE KLUCKHOHN'S CONTRIBUTION TO STUDIES OF RUSSIA AND THE SOVIET UNION. pdf

4: Clyde Kluckhohn - Wikimonde

Parsons, T., *«Clyde Kluckhohn and the integration of social science»* Inkeles, A., *«Clyde, Kluckhohn's contribution to studies of Russia and the Soviet Union»* Adair, J., *«Clyde Kluckhohn and Indian administration»*.

Private Life in a Public Space Book: Gender and Housing in Soviet Russia: Illinois State University Citation: Private Life in a Public Space, review no. The gender implications of the promises and disappointments of have not, however, been extensively detailed, particularly where a key matter of daily life is concerned: Herein lies the most compelling achievement of Gender and Housing in Soviet Russia. Enlivening a overview of housing policy from through with analysis of changing notions about the kind of dwelling that would be appropriate for a socialist society in general, and for the emancipation of women in particular, Lynne Attwood weaves together a multifaceted social history of the Soviet Union. Certainly many features of the development of Soviet housing that Attwood recounts have been detailed in previous scholarship. Committed to the mandate of simultaneously ending the existing urban housing shortage, and launching a proletarian order, already by March , the new regime declared complete the municipalisation of living space. This process entailed seizing and dividing up the spacious apartments of members of the aristocracy and bourgeoisie, and redistributing the rooms to provide a minimum of nine square meters of living space per person. By the end of the s, state determination to foster heavy industry began to take priority over the further amelioration of living conditions. The result was continued overcrowding and excessive government control over private life. By the s, factories, enterprises and city governments had become responsible for allocating housing in the service of the state. At its most egregious, supreme power over this scarce commodity enabled the Stalinist regime to use housing to punish, motivate and reward individuals. Focus on such sinister episodes obscures the ideals upon which Soviet housing was based, while preoccupation with shortcomings effaces the gender dimensions of both the housing crisis and the solutions to it that socialism offered. As Attwood demonstrates, each successive housing scheme was conflated with revolutionizing everyday life. And since Russian women were the traditional custodians of the hearth and responsible for activities connected with the home like cooking and childrearing, they featured prominently in pronouncements about the projected benefits of reorganizing daily life, and in actual efforts to improve living conditions. However, various national crises, seemingly endless shortages of capital and resources, and poor planning repeatedly thwarted the realization of the lofty goal of mass housing. Meanwhile, enduring pre-revolutionary attitudes toward women reinforced stereotypes regarding their role in the domestic sphere. The chronological approach of Gender and Housing in Soviet Russia showcases recurring problems, solutions and mindsets, leading Attwood again and again to the very conclusion with which Mayakovsky ended his life in The first eight chapters are devoted to the initial four decades of Soviet power when ideas about socialist byt were being discussed and developed, and then a chapter is allotted to each of the successive post-war regimes – the Khrushchev, Brezhnev and Gorbachev eras – and to an overview of personal accounts assembled from interviews with more than dozen individuals. Attwood largely draws upon official published sources, including popular magazines, publications for housing professionals, and newspapers. However, as an established gender scholar, she astutely reads between the lines of sometimes meticulously constructed rhetoric. Organized and financially supported by the government, such facilities would also uphold another Bolshevik aim, that of creating a collectivist society. The municipalisation of housing immediately after the Revolution signalled the inauguration of a new byt by increasing the supply of available living space and essentially decreeing that people of divergent class backgrounds cohabit. With the end of the Civil War, concerns over establishing economic stability and a new government led to a rapprochement with capitalism. To resolve problems of reconstruction like the need to accommodate more and more people as cities regenerated, the New Economic Policy NEP allowed for the partial re-privatization of housing. This process involved returning smaller apartments to their previous owners, who were allowed to rent out living space for a profit, as well as permitting individuals to join

INKELES, A. CLYDE KLUCKHOHNS CONTRIBUTION TO STUDIES OF RUSSIA AND THE SOVIET UNION. pdf

together to form housing construction cooperatives and build homes on spare plots of land. Effectively enabling the state to defer the costs of building repair and maintenance, as well as of new construction, privatization continued through . Nevertheless, as Attwood indicates, communal housing came to constitute the ideal. Providing a shared kitchen and collective childcare, this type of dwelling was seen to hold the potential to radically reconstruct bourgeois living arrangements, which, according to Bolshevik thinkers like Aleksandra Kollontai, had enslaved women. Communal housing was also perceived to be the best solution for relieving the relentless shortage of space and enforcing collectivism. By the beginning of the First Five-Year Plan in 1928, communal living was officially portrayed as the most effectual path to a new byt. The industrialization and collectivization drives, however, only put more pressure on existing housing and the resources needed to build more of it. Thus, although communal housing continued to be the ideal, factory barracks and hostels remained common forms of accommodation for urban dwellers throughout the 1920s and 1930s. The Second World War posed new challenges, particularly in urban centres where homes were destroyed by bombing raids and by individuals tearing apart wooden buildings in a desperate need for firewood. Alongside destruction, residents temporarily evacuated from cities often found their homes occupied by others upon their return, further complicating post-war relocation. By 1945, desperate need led to a law requiring local authorities to provide land to people willing to build their own houses. Construction was slow, however, and communal housing remained the norm. This commitment to single-family dwelling, which continued through the Brezhnev years, did not diminish earlier ideals about collectivism and female emancipation. Rather, the site for realizing these elements of socialist byt shifted from the shared spaces of the communal apartment to public service facilities located within new residential districts. The next noteworthy change in housing policy occurred under Gorbachev, whose privatization program overturned the state paternalism on which Soviet rule was founded. Circumstances, such as the need to quickly house the influx of soldiers returning from Soviet army bases closing down in the East Bloc, also played a role. As for privatization, the measures that the government instituted included offering loans to individuals wanting to buy their own apartments as enterprises and municipalities were relieved of their housing responsibilities, and providing legal support, financing and even technological assistance to those interested in building their own homes. Assessing the impact of these shifting policies, Attwood reveals that throughout the Soviet era, even the best intentions could hold negative, unintended consequences – ones that affected women the most. To be sure, in the years immediately following the Revolution, relocation from factory barracks and dormitories on the outskirts of cities into rooms in municipalized apartments in urban centres created new problems for male and female workers alike. These included long commutes and heating comparatively spacious, grand living spaces. Working class women, however, endured additional burdens. For example, given their greater presence in the home, it was they who were most frequently subjected to the resentment of the previous owners of flats recently seized by the state. Government provisions for housing cooperatives during the 1920s appeared to offer an alternative to this situation, as well as to overcrowded state housing. However, women tended to be in the minority, both as lessees of existing cooperatives and as shareholders of new ones being constructed. They were also underrepresented in the management of housing cooperatives. Attwood attributes this to a lack of confidence in female organizational abilities internalized by, and projected by others upon, women , a lack of free time due to family obligations , and even disinterest in part attributable to cultural preferences. The communal apartment that became the norm at the turn of the 1920s to the 1930s, meanwhile, achieved little success in securing the ideal byt it had promised to women. As Attwood shows, for example, overcrowding and gender role expectations served to situate women rarely men in shared spaces like kitchens, and, in turn, at the centre of disputes regarding their use. Communal living also subjected single women, in particular, to sexual harassment, while the broader housing shortage made it difficult for married women to leave alcoholic or abusive spouses. The ambitious one-family housing policy that Khrushchev initiated also failed to provide women a new byt. For instance, poor planning and persistent shortages resulted in families quickly outgrowing the model flat designed for a married couple and two children , sometimes forcing members of

different generations to live together. In effect then, traits of communal apartment life – from kitchen squabbles to the inability to escape an unhappy marriage – continued. Even by the final decade of the Soviet era, an unavailability of living space continued to undermine altruistic policies and laws. Among them was a housing decree containing many stipulations of potential benefit to women. For example, it provided single mothers preferential treatment for acquiring living space alongside categories of people like veterans and people with debilitating illnesses, and it stated that a woman should not have to cohabit with an abusive husband. Together with the housing shortage that made such directives unenforceable, gender stereotypes too persisted. Indeed in the final throes of the Communist era, women gained little from privatization simply because they were not treated as entrepreneurs. As Attwood demonstrates, deficiencies, stereotypes and domestic obligations also undermined the opportunities for emancipation that the reorganization of housing was supposed to advance. For instance, in combination with the shortage of communal amenities, assumptions about female inclinations meant that Soviet women were consistently designated responsibility for childcare, which in turn prevented them from taking advantage of new career prospects or advancing in their given profession. Meanwhile, in public domestic facilities, it was women who typically occupied jobs like doing laundry. Even the very goal of creating a new socialist byt was frequently relegated to women. In both the s and the post-Stalin order, it was they who were most often summoned to participate in competitions for communist living focused on ensuring household cleanliness and hygiene. In detailing these quotidian predicaments, Attwood enriches the established characterization of Soviet women as enduring the multiple burdens of participating in the paid labour force and fulfilling the majority of domestic duties. Another crucial theme of this monograph, one intimated by its subtitle *Private Life in A Public Space*, is the confluence of private and public situated at the intersection of gender and housing in Soviet society. Attwood argues that state distribution, which determined where and with whom one could live, together with overcrowding, rendered domestic space a public commodity. What is conventionally construed as private was undermined by other factors as well. For instance, since marital relations were seen to have bearing on the collective, apartment residents were encouraged to become involved in quelling spousal disputes. More generally, daily life in the communal apartment was governed by official rules for tenants, while house committees assigned to watch over neighbours attended the transition to separate apartment living. At the same time, individuals shrewdly navigated through spaces that, essentially, should have been private. Attwood reveals, for example, that residents locked up cupboards in communal flats or refused to cross the threshold of the room of another tenant even to defend a wife in distress. More generally, they tried to assume control over their housing circumstances, at times resorting to unofficial channels to exchange living space, or protesting official attempts to fill vacated spaces with new tenants. Before the collapse of the Soviet Union, Western assessments of Soviet private life had largely been restricted to the findings of policy analysts, political scientists, legal experts and sociologists intrigued by such matters as how the Soviet system works, and the impact of authoritarianism on the individual and society. Two glaring omissions, however, remain in her secondary source base. Nevertheless, some less known impressions about Soviet housing do arise here. For example, while the contributions of babushki grandmothers to Soviet childrearing are well established, the private employment of nannies in the absence of childcare institutions emerges as a fascinating avenue of inquiry. That sexual harassment might have been rampant in dwellings accommodating single women is another important issue raised in the oral accounts, as is the sense among men that it would have been inappropriate – that is, unmanly – for them to use their communal kitchen had they wanted to. In fact, throughout the book, Attwood merely skims the surface of such issues that captivate the specialist. These include the housing circumstances of destitute segments of the post-Civil War population like prostitutes and female domestic servants, or of aristocratic women who served as landladies throughout the NEP era, only to then be repressed under the auspices of class warfare during the Stalin period. Similarly intriguing is the impact on the home of state surveillance of dissidents during the s and s, a matter that Attwood hints at in a reference to postwar housing as site for extra-state activities. Admittedly, an exhaustive foray into these and various other subjects

INKELES, A. CLYDE KLUCKHOHNS CONTRIBUTION TO STUDIES OF RUSSIA AND THE SOVIET UNION. pdf

would yield a monograph several times the length most publishers would permit. As is, situated at the conjunction of several themes – Bolshevik theory, women, housing and private life – and striking for the breadth of topics it covers, *Gender and Housing* is a valuable primer for anyone interested in how Soviet housing ideology and policy were shaped by crises like those posed by the Civil War, and by ambitions like building socialism in one country under Stalin or overtaking the West in consumer satisfaction under Khrushchev. Scholars of everyday life would also find this book a stimulating read. Finally, gender specialists of different times and places might see in the experiences of Soviet women, repeatedly summoned to compensate for the shortcomings of government policy and daily life, striking parallels with their own research subjects in relation to the policies and prescriptions of their particular society. The French utopian socialist Charles Fourier asserted that the status of women reflects progress within a given society. Attwood abundantly proves that this was certainly the case where the state of Soviet housing was concerned. The following marks a transition to greater analytical emphasis on daily life in Soviet housing: *Design and Social History*, ed. William Craft Brumfield and Blair A. Ruble Cambridge, , pp. Back to 1 Attwood has contributed articles and chapters to various scholarly journals and edited collections, and most recently served as both an editor and a contributor to *Women in the Khrushchev Era*, ed. Melanie Ilic, Susan E. Reid and Lynne Attwood Basingstoke,

5: Russian Research Center Studies

Inkeles, A. Clyde Kluckhohn's contribution to studies of Russia and the Soviet Union. Adair, J. Clyde Kluckhohn and Indian administration. Aberle, D. F. Clyde Kluckhohn's contributions to Navaho studies.

6: Gender and Housing in Soviet Russia: Private Life in a Public Space | Reviews in History

Studying the Enigmas of the Soviet Union Russian Research Center Seeks Scholarly Knowledge of U.S.S.R. Alex Inkeles and Clyde Kluckhohn, the Deutscher came to the United States to study.

INKELES, A. CLYDE KLUCKHOHNS CONTRIBUTION TO STUDIES OF RUSSIA AND THE SOVIET UNION. pdf

New Bantam-Megiddo Hebrew English dictionary Aardvarks, disembark! 1992, the environmental dimension Level and precision of behavioural thermoregulation in the bearded dragon, Pogona vitticeps Decentralization and accountability in public education The addictions handbook The mortal instruments book 2 city of ashes Applications to global marketing and advertising Javascript syntax cheat sheet Feasts of other Saints. Russian short stories from pushkin to buida Comparative approach to analysis of gene essentiality Andrei L. Osterman and Svetlana Y. Gerdes. Toppling the Duke outrage on Ben Bhraggie? Pictures and pollution Construction Litigation Modern American Catholicism, 1900-1965 A room called Remember Indiana County, PA cemeteries Mystic sense of equality Interaction of proteins with nucleic acids Visual Encyclopedia of Animals Delivering Benefits to Unemployed People Part I: Life is song : the quest for music and meaning Corporate strategy and the search for ethics 7 habits stephen covey Dehydrating foods, fruits, vegetables, fish and meats Mr. William Smiths motion, to amend the Constitution of the United States. Achieving Software Quality through Teamwork Mcsa guide to microsoft sql server 2012 exam 70-462 Alma-Ata agreements State of fear Don Quixote of the Mancha Miguel de Cervantes v.15. A nations prayers Shop-Built Jigs and Fixtures (Custom Woodworking) 1000 Things You Should Know About Geography (1000 Things You Should Know About.) Amway india all product handbook 2017 Cours de piano jazz gratuit Types of factor analysis Creating a supportive environment The curious case of the imaginary tourist