

## Chapter 6

---

# Soviet and Russian Research on Ethiopia and Eastern Africa: A Second Look in the Context of the Area Studies Crisis<sup>1</sup>

Colin Darch

### INTRODUCTION

Why should English-speaking *éthiopisants* and Africanists concern themselves with a body of work by scholars writing in a language that is hard to learn and mastered by few foreigners; researchers who for the most part worked in difficult material conditions, with limited access to primary materials and few opportunities to conduct fieldwork; and whose country suffered for seventy years under a totalitarian political system that punished independent thought ferociously? Is it not true that Soviet writings on Africa were mostly the tedious and conformist outpourings of Communist Party hacks parroting the latest political line? Well, yes, perhaps, up to a point. Twenty-five years ago I wrote, in response to a similar rhetorical question, that there were in fact

three main reasons for looking specifically at the Russian literature on different aspects of Ethiopian... life and culture. Firstly, foreign students of any cultures cannot afford to ignore the insights of other foreigners – from the third corner of a triangle – into those cultures.... Secondly... there has been substantial contact for many years between the diplomats, traders, scholars, adventurers and clerics of the two areas. Lastly... the study of this body of literature may lead to the discovery by some readers that Soviet scholarship is not quite so monolithic... as they may have believed.<sup>2</sup>

Do any of these arguments still hold true after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the socialist bloc in 1991 and through the much-publicized methodological and epistemological crises of the various (Western) area studies specializations in the mid-1990s?<sup>3</sup>

The elephant in the room is, of course, the cold war. Soviet studies (and to some extent Soviet African studies) received well-funded attention from

Western academicians *precisely because* their governments wanted to know what Soviet analysts wrote and thought, especially about geographic areas in which the Western and socialist political blocs were competing for political influence. This does not logically mean, however, that geostrategic interest was the only or even the originating motivation for the *emergence* of such studies. Soviet texts also received some of the same sort of attention from African scholars, either because they, as the *subjects of analysis*, wanted to know what was usefully being written about them, or because they were sympathetic to the socialist project and looked to Soviet experience as some sort of guide. But the question is still, why pay attention *nowadays*, when circumstances are completely different? Several answers are possible.

In this chapter I shall argue first that despite the apparently competing ideological foundations of Western and Soviet African studies, the two traditions share certain important common features. Not least of these is what W.G. Martin and M.O. West have termed a national "Africanist creation narration" with its roots in what is arguably an ahistorical account of the origins of "area studies" in general.<sup>4</sup> The widely shared assumption is that because area studies as a set of cross-disciplinary specializations received a major stimulus in the late 1940s and early 1950s from the onset of the cold war, little significant work could have been done in the tradition before that period. This, however, is an oversimplification, as D.C. Engerman has contended for Soviet studies and Martin and West have shown in the African studies arena.<sup>5</sup> With regard to Soviet African studies, as Peter Limb has argued,

what is sometimes not appreciated by non-specialists is that there was a 'school' (of sorts) of Africanists in the USSR developing as early as the 1930s, roughly the same time Herskovits et al. were staking their claim to be the first generation of Africanists.... That Potekhin and Ol'derogge were prominent during the Stalin period, and therefore had their careers overlaid with all manner of interference and wider calumny probably helps account, together with the Cold War, for their relative obscurity in the West and Africa.... Potekhin and Ol'derogge were certainly titans of early Soviet African Studies.<sup>6</sup>

Limb's dating of the emergence of an Africanist school to the 1930s may be conservative.<sup>7</sup> There was also at least one attempt to develop a programmatic agenda as early as the late 1920s, although it did not bear fruit.<sup>8</sup>

Second, I shall argue that the corpus of Russian and Soviet research on Ethiopia and the Horn of Africa before 1991 can be periodized, and can also be meaningfully distinguished from Soviet *Afrikanistika* (African studies) in general. This is both because it derives directly and legitimately from a preexisting and lengthy tradition of *Vostokovedenie* (Oriental studies) and also because of its sustained seriousness.<sup>9</sup> The corpus includes texts on lin-

guistics, an important travel literature going back to the nineteenth century, and seminal historical writings, on all of which more later. There is also some evidence that Russian scholars themselves, implicitly at least, recognize this distinctiveness.

Last, and in contrast, when we examine many of the Soviet publications on, for example, the neighboring region of East Africa, we can see that Soviet African studies were *generally* characterized by severe empirical weakness. In other words, they were usually more dependent on reworking evidence from published African or Western sources according to an ideologically determined program – *obobshchenie* (generalization) – than on original fieldwork.<sup>10</sup> In addition, they were typified by the use of a common paradigm – a stereotyped form of Marxism – rather than by the contending schools of thought characteristic of the Western social sciences.<sup>11</sup> Whether these characteristics *in and of themselves* constituted (or constitute) crippling deficiencies is a matter for debate. In my opinion, they do not, since one can easily imagine that works of synthesis using a Marxist problematic could and in fact sometimes do offer valuable new insights. When Soviet writing on Ethiopia or East Africa fails, it fails for deeper reasons.

### AREA STUDIES IN CRISIS? SOVIET STUDIES, AFRICAN STUDIES, AND SOVIET AFRICAN STUDIES

It seems to be generally agreed, certainly in the United States, but also elsewhere,<sup>12</sup> that area studies as a concept, as well as the various area studies specializations – Soviet studies, African studies, Asian studies, and so forth – are all in crisis. They are certainly under some kind of challenge. The crisis is partly structural in that the political imperative of superpower rivalry that to a degree underpinned area studies funding has vanished. It is epistemological insofar as the object of study – the geographic, political, or cultural area – may either also have disappeared (the Soviet Union) or else is being re-interrogated (Africa). And it is methodological, in that area studies are vulnerable to challenge from various theoretical perspectives, as Catherine Coquery-Vidrovitch has forcefully pointed out:

...most French researchers of my generation still call themselves “Africanists” in spite of the judicious case raised by Edward Said, twelve years ago against *Orientalism*... which could be easily transposed to African studies even if it occurred half a century later.... Of course, we owe a lot to the first *déficheurs* [clearers], the colonial administrators who were passionate in their field. But this leads to most of the distortions, denounced by Valentin Mudimbe, of the “colonial library” which we all find difficult to get rid of.<sup>13</sup>

In the meantime, rational choice theorists have been busy criticizing the area studies approach as “journalistic, atheoretical and generally mushy.” Political

scientists – among them the Africanist Robert Bates – have argued controversially that there is a consensus that “area studies has [sic] failed to generate scientific knowledge.”<sup>14</sup>

It is widely accepted, especially in the United States, that the emergence of area studies was fundamentally connected to the beginning of the cold war, which

exerted a powerful and lasting influence on the structure and character of America’s universities. It unleashed a flood of federal cash... perhaps the most direct impact of the Cold War on the humanities curriculum was in the funding and encouragement of ‘area studies.’ The notion of area studies arose during World War II and metastasized in the following years....<sup>15</sup>

But it is equally important to recognize that geographically defined area studies, whether of Africa or some other developing continent such as Latin America or Asia, or even of the Soviet Union, also

emerged from a re-imagining of space which took place in the middle decades of the twentieth century. A particularly important feature of this re-imagining was that it created a *common* spatial framework which could be used by a variety of different humanities and social sciences, and which therefore marked out a space for the interdisciplinary study of societies as totalities.<sup>16</sup>

In this spectrum of “area studies,” Soviet studies were an important component, and especially in the United States and for the significant period when they were among those specializations most driven by geopolitical and ideological imperatives. In fact, in recent decades, Soviet studies in the United States were “famously self-contained [and] heavily weighted with people interested in national security issues.”<sup>17</sup> But the origins of Soviet studies predated the cold war<sup>18</sup> and were a more complex ideological phenomenon than such an account suggests. For instance, we might take into account a strong and countervailing tendency that adopted what might be termed a “left critical” stance towards the USSR. The two Glasgow-based journals – *Soviet Studies*, in its early years, and *Critique: A Journal of Soviet Studies and Socialist Theory*, from the mid-1970s – were examples of this trend. *Soviet Studies* was launched in June 1949 under the editorship of two Communist academics, Jack Miller and Rudolf Schlesinger, and was designed from the start to operate “within the social sciences, not the traditional framework of language, literature and history.”<sup>19</sup> In addition, Miller and Schlesinger explicitly disavowed the idea that their journal should be “anything other than a vehicle for the purpose of publishing any reasonably serious scholar, the more empirical the better” and supported authors who had difficulty being published in the United States.<sup>20</sup> *Critique* was founded in 1973 in response to a felt need for a “forum for left-wing scholars... who find

nowhere to discuss the theoretical problems which arise.... detailed research within a broadly Marxist framework will find its home in this journal.<sup>21</sup>

Cold war area studies had two faces, of course. While Western academics looked at the socialist bloc, the socialist bloc stared back. Soviet writers often pointed to what they saw as the overtly ideological nature of Western area studies, a charge that was naturally denied in the Western academy. The reality was, as usual, complex. In the early 1950s, for example, at the height of anti-Communist hysteria in the United States, a cat *was* allowed to peek out of a bag by Dimitri von Mohrenschildt, who complained about what he termed “the over-emphasis on ‘scientific objectivity’” in Soviet studies. Indeed, he went on:

So-called objectivity, which fails to distinguish between Soviet theory and practice is, to my mind, of questionable educational value. Moreover, whether one is a humanist or a social scientist, I wonder if, at this juncture of history, one can maintain an attitude of Olympian objectivity to a régime which enslaves millions of its peoples, maintains a vicious “hate America” campaign, and deliberately perverts the basic tenets of scientific inquiry. How can we reconcile a “neutral” attitude toward Soviet Communism with our obligation as teachers to inculcate moral values?<sup>22</sup>

Naturally, not all representations of even the totalitarian model were quite so crude, and in any case other explanatory theories developed quite quickly.<sup>23</sup> But all of this also colored Western interest in and understanding of African studies as practiced in Russia. On one hand, texts about Africa could be read monolithically as evidence of revolutionary and expansionist intentions; on another, as proof of a disinterested Marxist scientific practice. By the 1960s, Soviet Africanists were representing themselves to the West in such works as *Russia and Africa* or *Des africanistes russes parlent de l'Afrique*, two works that claimed continuity from prerevolutionary times as well as special virtues for Soviet Marxist analyses of contemporary realities.<sup>24</sup>

In understanding Soviet writing on Africa, it is useful to have some sense of the periodization of the practice of social sciences and history in the USSR and of the USSR's intellectual history.<sup>25</sup> In the early 1920s, for example, when such bodies as the Institute of Red Professors or the Communist University of Toilers of the East (KUTV) flourished, it was assumed that Marxist practice could compete successfully with “bourgeois” social science. Debates were relatively open. However, this period came to an abrupt end in late 1931 with the publication of Stalin's menacing letter to *Proletarskaia Revoliutsiia*. In the context of its time, the impact of the letter has been described as “cataclysmic.” It called for what was termed a tightening of discipline among, specifically, historians, who were accused of Trotskyite tendencies. Research was halted, journals ceased publication, and people

were expelled from the Party and lost their jobs. Within a short time, it had become clear that “the theoretical front as a whole” was to be purged, and that “hardly any sphere of intellectual activity was spared.”<sup>26</sup> Throughout the Stalin period, the prevailing intellectual climate continued to be dominated by fear. But in the 1950s, under Khrushchev, and especially after the summer of 1956, limited processes of de-Stalinization allowed a generalized thaw to take place, and some things could once again be said or written.<sup>27</sup> Shortly afterwards, on 26 February 1957, Soviet Africanists led by I.I. Potekhin and D.A. Ol’derogge got together at the Ethnographic Institute in Moscow and began once again to work out plans for an institute and the coordination of research, plans that this time were destined to bear fruit.<sup>28</sup> The ride was still bumpy however; for instance, the Center of African Studies at the Academy of Sciences, known for its associations with foreigners and dissidents, got into trouble with the Party in the late 1970s and was closed down until 1984, after Brezhnev had died.<sup>29</sup>

When we look at the bibliography of Ethiopian or African studies chronologically, we can see, if not the overt marks of these events, then at least their traces. Apart from several polemical publications and Ol’derogge’s collection, published during the Italian aggression in 1936,<sup>30</sup> activity was at low ebb from the late 1920s until the mid-1950s, when Soviet Ethiopian studies underwent a marked revival.<sup>31</sup>

From the early 1960s onwards, as former African colonies achieved independence and as the Portuguese and white minority regimes in southern Africa dug in their heels, the political significance of Soviet analyses grew significantly. First and briefly, Somalia and then Ethiopia adopted overtly Marxist policies, and after 1975 both Mozambique and Angola came to independence under parties that subsequently proclaimed themselves to be vanguard and Marxist-Leninist. In the circumstances, Western geostrategists, bruised by the U.S. defeat in Vietnam, naturally tended to regard Soviet policy towards less-developed countries and Africa as “aggressive and expansionist.” Later on, more critical analysts came increasingly to believe, on the contrary, that the Soviet Union was a “beleaguered major power” that was “increasingly [seeking] relief from defense and international burdens to allow itself greater scope for development at home.”<sup>32</sup>

The third point of the triangle was, of course, Africa itself. The Soviet-Africa relationship was also an Africa-Soviet relationship – a two-way street – and the views of the Soviet Union held by Africans were not derivative of either West or East, but primary.<sup>33</sup>

### **SOVIET WRITING ON ETHIOPIA: AN EXCEPTIONAL CASE?**

The connection between Russia, broadly understood, and Ethiopia goes back much further than is generally realized, although contacts were spo-

radic and without very much political or economic significance.<sup>34</sup> Much of this early contact seems to have revolved around trading information and religious links, as Arabic literature, for example, passed through Central Asia and into the Volga region. In addition, by the fourteenth century, Ethiopian Orthodox monks had met Copts and Armenians in the religious communities of Jerusalem – indeed, the Armenians eventually took on responsibility for the maintenance of the Ethiopian community in the Holy Land. However, it is only in the nineteenth century that we can really begin to speak confidently of systematic Russian interest in the Horn of Africa, either by travelers or by students of Semitic languages.<sup>35</sup> In the space of a chapter, it would be impossible to refer to more than a few examples of Russian/Soviet writings on Ethiopia. Therefore I shall restrict myself to some references – drawn out of a hat, as it were – to a *typology* consisting of the travel literature, historical work on mediaeval Ethiopia, contemporary history, and research produced during Ethiopia's own revolutionary period.

A systematic introduction to the substantial nineteenth century Russian travel literature on Ethiopia is M.V. Rait's *Russian Expeditions to Ethiopia in the Mid-nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries and Their Ethnographic Materials*.<sup>36</sup> Over the course of some sixty pages, Rait describes and evaluates materials from eight different archives, collected by such adventurers as Arnol'di, Artamonov, Ashinov, Brovtsyn and Lebedinskii, Bulatovich, Davydov and Dragomirov, Eliseev and Leont'ev, Gudzenko, Kovalevskii, Mashkov, Shchusev, and individuals associated with the Russian Red Cross.<sup>37</sup> These names are not completely unknown in Western scholarship, of course: Based on such materials the Italian scholar Carlos Zaghi produced a two-volume monograph on Russians in Ethiopia, while the American historian P.J. Rollins wrote a doctoral dissertation on the Ashinov adventure in the late 1960s.<sup>38</sup>

Of particular interest, because they are accessible in a modern English translation, are the writings of Alexander K. Bulatovich, who was mildly disparaged during the Soviet period as an "hussar, a drifter, and a schemer."<sup>39</sup> In this respect, however, he was probably no more disreputable than any of the other European adventurers of the time. Bulatovich was a cavalryman who traveled to Ethiopia with a Russian Red Cross detachment during the Italian invasion there of 1896. At the end of the year, after the Red Cross envoys withdrew, he went to western Ethiopia on his own account. He crossed the Baro River and on his way back reached the lower stretches of the Didessa River. In September that year, he returned to Ethiopia as a member of an "extraordinary diplomatic mission" of over thirty people, dispatched by the tsar to Emperor Menelik. The mission took over four months to reach Addis Ababa, arriving only in February 1898, and several of its senior members were still there as late as 1899.

Bulatovich's observations are still of interest as primary sources on late-nineteenth century Ethiopia. They are contained in three works, namely *From Entoto to the Baro River* (1897); *Through Abyssinia across Kaffa to Lake Rudolph* (1899), and *With the Troops of Menelik II: A Diary of the Campaign from Ethiopia to Lake Rudolph* (1900). They attracted some contemporary attention and were the subject of a detailed study in Russian by L.E. Kubbel' in 1967. Most recently, they have been translated and published in English.<sup>40</sup> Richard Reid commented of the new version that it was "an exciting addition to the body of primary sources available to Western historians and anthropologists dealing with the Ethiopian region in the late nineteenth century." Reid went on

Bulatovich's narrative combines scientific clarity with obvious, but never undisciplined, passion; he has much to say about politics, religion, the army, the economy and countless other aspects of "Abyssinian" life at the end of the nineteenth century. His observations of the peoples on the receiving end of Ethiopian expansionism, especially to the west and south, are as sympathetic and as free from the prejudices of the day as one can hope to find, while his witness to the nature of that expansionism is invaluable. His attention to detail – from political relations, to personal histories, to trade and prices, to terrain – recalls that of his near-contemporary slightly further south, Emin Pasha. This is, in sum, an exciting addition to the body of primary sources available to Western historians and anthropologists dealing with the Ethiopian region in the late nineteenth century....<sup>41</sup>

Prerevolutionary travel books are not the only materials in Russian that merit attention however. The works of Iu.M. Kobishchanov represent the best traditions of Russian *vostokovedenie*, within the Soviet system. Kobishchanov was born in Khar'kov in 1934 and rose quickly through Soviet academic ranks, becoming a candidate in historical sciences at the age of twenty-eight. Kobishchanov, like Rait, attended international conferences during the Soviet years and has also contributed occasionally in English to such collections as UNESCO's *General History of Africa*.<sup>42</sup> His magnum opus on the Axumite kingdom was published in Russian in 1966.<sup>43</sup> The book is an authoritative synthesis of historical and economic knowledge about Axum from a wide range of sources, including epigraphic materials. A translation<sup>44</sup> by Lorraine Kapitanoff of this and another work by Kobishchanov, revised and updated by the author, was published in the United States in 1979, edited by Joseph Michaels.<sup>45</sup> David Killick recently commented approvingly that Kobishchanov's book is a

masterly study of records in many languages relating to the early first millennium state of Axum.... Although there has been much recent work on Axum by Munro-Hay, Phillipson, Bard and others,

Kobishchanov's work remains an essential work for research on Axum.<sup>46</sup>

Indeed, Kobishchanov has continued to be routinely cited into the late 1990s, for example by such authors as Jacke Phillips or Donald Crummey.<sup>47</sup> At the time of publication, the book was described as "the best currently available synthesis of historical knowledge" and as "an accurate, relatively up-to-date and well-organized synthesis of the present state of Axumite studies."<sup>48</sup> Kobishchanov has subsequently published other monographs, including a work that locates the Axumite polity in its regional and global context during the sixth and seventh centuries.<sup>49</sup>

After the fall of Emperor Haile Sellassie in 1975 and the advent of the *Derg* (a committee of military officers), Soviet interest in Ethiopia received an important stimulus. Not only was the country friendly and accessible to Soviet experts, but its policies and institutions had begun to be copied from Soviet models. Thus, the last decade or so of the Soviet Union, from 1975 until 1991, was one in which Ethiopian studies flourished and one in which such scholars as G.V. Tsytkin, G.L. Gal'perin, and the prolific V.S. Iag'ia published interesting economic, political, sociological, and historical monographs. Two important conferences were also held in the last period: the first, for local researchers (the All-Union Conference on Ethiopian Studies, held in Moscow in 1979); the other, the ninth in the triennial series of International Conferences of Ethiopian Studies, held in the same city in August 1986, as the epoch of *glasnost'* and *perestroika* got under way. At this latter meeting, Soviet researchers alone presented over fifty papers and the published proceedings take up six volumes.<sup>50</sup>

A certain formalism, regarding for example the objective conditions for political change, may perhaps be detected in the problematization and periodization adopted by Russian *éthiopolisants* of the late Soviet period. Iag'ia, for example, worries about whether Ethiopian absolutism was consolidated under Haile Sellassie by the adoption of the 1955 Constitution; both Gal'perin and Iag'ia are preoccupied with the date on which the 1974 revolution can be said to have begun.<sup>51</sup> Tsytkin, however, has focused in his major writings on the political and military processes by which the Ethiopian state emerged from the "scramble for Africa" as a still independent African polity in the early twentieth century. He has written three major works: a study of the centralizing tendencies of the Ethiopian state in the early 1900s, another work on Ethiopia's military resistance to European encroachment, and an ambitious 400-page synthetic history of modern Ethiopia, coauthored with Iag'ia.<sup>52</sup> The first book is an account of the processes of political unification in the Ethiopian Empire in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, processes which Tsytkin attributes mainly to an internal dynamic rather than to foreign pressures. His second work deals with the military engagements of

the feudal and absolutist Ethiopian state with various European adventures, from the Napier expedition of 1867-1868 through the period of Ethiopian expansionism to the second war against Italy in 1935, including an account of the "Patriot resistance" up to 1941. Tsyarkin uses Russian archival primary sources as well as printed traveler's accounts and thus provides a genuinely fresh perspective.

The longstanding religious and cultural links between Russia and Ethiopia furnished the documentary base of travel and military literature for Ethiopian studies to emerge in Russia; political links in the period between the overthrow of Haile Selassie in 1974 and the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 reinforced this tendency. It remains to be seen, however, whether the tradition is strong enough to sustain and reproduce itself into the future in the epoch of globalization.

### CONFORMING TO THE STEREOTYPE: SOVIET WRITING ON EAST AFRICA

In contrast to the corpus of Russian writing on Ethiopia, the available Soviet material on East Africa (taken here to mean Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda) is significantly less interesting to the Western or African reader – which is not to say, of course, that it failed in its purpose of providing information and analysis to a Russian audience. There are some interesting synthetic analyses, such as Irina Filatova's book on Kenya or Aleksandr Balezin's account of the evolution of traditional chiefdoms in Uganda during the colonial period.<sup>53</sup> But there is also dross.<sup>54</sup> In a text written nearly forty years ago, David Morison characterized Soviet African studies as

a collective undertaking, which has to be viewed as a whole before the purport of individual contributions can be appreciated.... The emphasis is not on originality, but on conformity. When Soviet Africanists disagree, it is about the correct application of Marxist-Leninist theory.... The incentive is not that of contributing original work to the whole existing corpus of African studies, but of building up a *Soviet* corpus of these studies, with its own distinctive character.<sup>55</sup>

A serious responsibility for the Soviet Africanist, Morison adds, is that of "generalization" for the wider public, and the distinction between popular and academic writing is much less sharply demarcated than would be the case in Western Europe, North America, or Africa itself. The tendency to generalize also translates into a significant number of works dealing with very broad geographical-developmental categories such as "developing countries," "black Africa," or "tropical Africa," buried within which, it is true, there may often be chapters or sections dealing with specific countries. In this context, Soviet researchers were also explicitly utilitarian in their approach to the issues:

### Soviet and Russian Research on Ethiopia and Eastern Africa

Soviet scholars consider it their duty to render aid to Africans. They want African studies to serve the progress of Africa. The USSR's attitude to the national liberation movements... has been characterized by a principled, class approach.... Soviet scholars of Africa are faced with the task of helping the African peoples to overcome economic backwardness... [and to create] social progress of the continent.<sup>56</sup>

This utilitarianism can be clearly seen in the approach to teaching African languages such as Kiswahili. In the 1960s Morison described this as being "thorough, practical and up-to-date," along with the vernacular press, required reading.<sup>57</sup> Of course, much of the quoted passage would also be perfectly acceptable as a declaration of purpose to many Western Africanists. Indeed, in one well-publicized case, a Western academic abandoned African studies precisely because of his disillusionment over the possibility of helping to achieve any of these or similar objectives.<sup>58</sup>

Naturally Tanzania, as an explicitly socialist if non-Marxist experiment, attracted early attention from Soviet analysts. At the beginning of the 1960s such commentators as G.A. Usov, V. Kuznetsov, S. Sergeev, or the ubiquitous V.Ia. Katsman were writing quite sympathetic accounts on such topics as the TANU's strained relations with the local trade union movement, or the difficulties of maintaining an independent foreign policy when relying on development aid. But much of the material on Tanzania was insipid, to the extent that it provoked protest even within the Soviet Union; in 1965, *Narody Azii i Afriki* took the unusual step of publishing a critical letter from a reader in Baku, one Iu. Karabakhly. Comrade Karabakhly felt that the articles on Tanzania in standard Russian reference works consisted mainly of truisms rather than analysis, and he deplored the near-monopoly enjoyed by the views of Dr. Katsman.<sup>59</sup>

### CONCLUSION: THE POST-SOVIET CHARACTER OF RUSSIAN AFRICAN STUDIES?

As we have seen, the demise of the Soviet Union led to the rapid collapse of Soviet area studies *in the West*. At the same time, the brutal economic "reforms" of the early Yeltsin period have caused a much more traumatic and possibly irrecoverable *material* collapse of area studies – including both the broader category of Oriental studies (*vostokovedenie*) and the narrower African studies (*afrikanistika*) – in Russia itself. One observer reported grimly, and with a touch of hyperbole, that

[t]he first casualties of the post-1991 economic reforms have been Middle East studies scholars. The conversion to a free market economy was sudden and uncontrolled, causing wages to lag far behind runaway inflation and cost of living increases. During the 1991-92 economic crisis, many Middle East experts, including the most promising of the younger generation, left Russia for better

## Africa in Russia, Russia in Africa

paying positions in universities and institutes, in Western Europe, the US and Canada.... Some scholars who did not emigrate left academe for the private sector.<sup>60</sup>

There is little doubt that the attempt to introduce a capitalist system in Russia in the 1990s resulted in the destruction of much of the institutional framework of civil life. As Boris Kagarlitsky has argued, many structures – including governmental structures at all levels – were destroyed as “relics” of the past, regardless of the fact that they had become fundamental to social and cultural activity. But nothing was put in their place.<sup>61</sup> Higher education and research institutions were simply expected to become “firms that provide educational services and research output to meet the specified demand.”

Established centers and committed individuals continue, of course, to pursue teaching and research strategies for African studies, as Vladimir Shubin has described in a fairly optimistic account written in the late 1990s. According to Shubin, himself author of a path-breaking analysis of the ANC’s relationship to the Soviet Union,<sup>62</sup> despite the collapse of the Russian economy and the undoubtedly

hard times that followed it, the IAS [Institute for African Studies], headed by Prof. Alexei Vassiliev, remains apparently the biggest center of African Studies in the world with the staff of over 180 including about 130 researchers, most of whom have Ph.D. degrees. Besides it, African research is conducted at the African Studies Center of the Institute of Universal History, Institute for Oriental Studies (mostly on Northern Africa), Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Institute of World Literature, Institute of Linguistics, Institute of State and Law (all in Moscow) as well as the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography (in St. Petersburg).<sup>63</sup>

But does size matter? A few sentences later, Shubin admits that “as [with] other fields of humanities and sciences, in general they suffered from several budget cuts during the last six years of the IMF-inspired “reforms.” The funding from the state budget to the Academy institutes is a meager 15 percent of the 1990 allocation. If in general the standard of life dropped by 50 percent, it dropped four or five times for academics.” According to Shubin, post-Soviet African studies has concentrated mainly on seven themes: theoretical studies of a sociocultural nature; economic research; history, especially military history; the preparation of reference works; international relations, especially regional conflicts; gender studies; and development studies, with a view to strengthening future Russian-African cooperation.<sup>64</sup>

Economic conditions and other circumstances conspire, by and large, to prevent large numbers of young Russian Africanists from working systematically in Africa, and so it seems improbable that a strong empirical tradition

will emerge in the near future. However, at least as far as Africa is concerned, unquestionably the most important single development for Russian researchers has been the opening of the state archives.<sup>65</sup> Indeed, in one notable case, a massive archive has actually been *discovered*. The very existence of the Center for the Preservation of a Reserve Record (*Tsentr khraneniia strakhovogo fonda*), in the small Siberian town of Ialutorovsk, was kept secret during the Soviet period.<sup>66</sup> This center is basically a backup facility for various state archives in European Russia. All these changes are opening up new vistas for our knowledge of such topics as the involvement of the Third (Communist) International in African affairs, diplomatic affairs, or the early development of African studies in the USSR.

New work that has appeared in this vein includes a general collection of documents, in Russian, on the Comintern and Africa compiled by Valentin Gorodnov, a collection on the Comintern and South Africa published in English in London, a documentary collection on relations between the Soviet Union and Africa edited by Apollon Davidson, with substantial sections on the Comintern and on relations with Ethiopia, and another fascinating collection of documents and memoirs, often in a relatively informal style, on Soviet Africanists up to the 1960s, also under the general editorship of Davidson.<sup>67</sup> These works significantly extend our knowledge of the workings of the Soviet state in this arena and of the relationship between the state and the academy.

Another category of research product that may one day emerge from the archives or libraries, and could be of considerable interest for Western and African students, is the closed Party works designated "*dlia sluzhebnogo pol'zovaniia*" or "for official use [only]." Often produced as pamphlets, collections, theses, or even monographs within such closely supervised CPSU Central Committee structures as the Academy of Social Sciences or the Institute of Social Sciences, these "closed works" seem at present to be extremely hard to identify and locate.<sup>68</sup>

Nevertheless, despite the hope for a formal survival of African studies in the statistics quoted from Vladimir Shubin earlier in this chapter, questions remain. In a recent article, Vladimir Lopatov puts the question bluntly: "Is Russia in need of Africa?"<sup>69</sup> Lopatov returned a qualified answer: There has been something of a brain drain of senior scholars, with, for example, Shubin, Davidson, and Filatova working for lengthy periods in South Africa and with some young researchers leaving for the United States.

What, then, of the future for Ethiopian and African studies in Russia? Of course, although Russia is no longer a monolithic Communist state, it is also some way from being a Western-style democratic and pluralist democracy and may indeed never become one. Ethiopia has also abandoned the revolutionary socialist path, and Ethiopian studies have been transformed

over the last thirty years or so, not the least by such phenomena as the new-found cultural and historical assertiveness of the Oromo and other subject peoples. In Russia, the economic transformation to functioning capitalism has proved much more difficult than some had supposed, and the authoritarian tendencies of the past have also proved hard to shake off.<sup>70</sup> In the academy, although researchers are now free from ideological restraint, they have not simply “joined the West” or elected to share American or Western European thematic or methodological preoccupations. Indeed, the expectation that there would be a fairly rapid convergence with Western practice in both methodology and focus in the historical and social sciences has not been fulfilled, as Boris Mironov has pointed out. Some commentators, Mironov writes, believe that

... in the pre-perestroika era, before the end of the 1980s, American and Soviet historiography shared more than they do now, in the early 21st century. In the USA, as in the USSR, one and the same problems were investigated, using similar approaches and methods, usually those associated with the *Annales* school. In the 1990s, Americans reoriented themselves to cultural history... Russians, meanwhile, made only a thematic turn, without altering their previous methodology... It is true that Russia too has a few postmodernists, but for the most part they are to be found among historians of the medieval West and among literary specialists.<sup>71</sup>

Despite the catastrophic collapse of the material conditions necessary for effective research, Russian *afrikanistika* seems as yet – and viewed of course from the outside – relatively unaffected by the soul-searching that has marked Western area studies in the 1990s. Whether that is a good thing remains to be seen. In the meantime, the body of work bequeathed to us by researchers in the Soviet period remains, by most Westerners at least, seriously underutilized.

### Notes

1. I acknowledge with thanks critical comments on a draft of this text by Gary Littlejohn.
2. Colin Darch, *A Soviet View of Africa: An Annotated Bibliography on Ethiopia, Somalia and Djibouti* (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1980), pp. xi-xii.
3. Russian Africanists have cautiously begun the process of examining their own past. Two interesting collections have been published, one the proceedings of a conference held in September 2001 *Afrikanistika XX veka: vremia, liudi, vzgliady* [20<sup>th</sup> Century African Studies: Times, People, and Perspectives] (Moscow: IVI RAN, 2002), especially pp.13-70; the other is a collection of memoirs and documents: A.B. Davidson ed., *Stanovlenie otechestvennoi afrikanistiki, 1920-e – nachalo 1960-x* [The Beginnings of Soviet African Studies, 1920s – early 1960s] (Moscow: Nauka, 2003).

4. W.G. Martin and M.O. West, "The Ascent, Triumph and Disintegration of the Africanist Enterprise, USA," in Martin and West, eds., *Out of One, Many Africas: Reconstructing the Study and Meaning of Africa* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1999), p. 86.
5. D.C. Engerman, "New Society, New Scholarship: Soviet Studies Programmes in Interwar America," *Minerva*, no. 37 (1999), pp. 25-43; Martin and West, op.cit., "The Ascent," pp. 86-89.
6. Peter Limb, "Russian Academics and Africa in 1958," *H-Africa*, 22 August 2003. Available at: [http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=hafrica&month=0308&week=d&msg=AExoMqyqRw3dVpj2NrMI3g&user=&cpw=\(10 June 2004\)](http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=hafrica&month=0308&week=d&msg=AExoMqyqRw3dVpj2NrMI3g&user=&cpw=(10 June 2004)).
7. An "African cabinet" was established at the Scientific Research Association as early as the 1920s. See Iurii Il'in et al., "African Studies in the USSR, 1960s-1970s," *Social Studies* [Moscow], no. 4 (1979), p. 65.
8. See A. Shiik [E. Sik], "K postanovke marksistskogo izucheniiia sotsial'no-ekonomicheskikh problem chernoi Afriki" [The Formulation of a Marxist Study of the Socio-economic Problems of Black Africa], *Revoliutsionnyi Vostok*, no. 8 (1930), pp. 85-199. For an English translation of this text with an introduction and commentary by C. Darch and G. Littlejohn see "Endre Sik and the Development of African Studies in the USSR: A Study Agenda from 1929," *History in Africa*, no. 10 (1983), pp. 79-108.
9. The strength of the link between *vostokovedenie* and *afrikanistika* is perhaps suggested by the absence of a specifically Africanist scholarly journal in Russian; *Narody Azii i Afriki* of course covers both fields.
10. In the mid-1980s, the *doyenne* of Soviet Africanist bibliographers, S. L. Miliavskaiia, took me mildly to task for holding this position. In a fairly generous review of *A Soviet View of Africa*, she commented ambiguously that sometimes "[...] Darch leans towards more balanced positions. For example, he notes that generalization and interpretation, rather than field research, are the strong points of Soviet African studies [... But] he finds a negative aspect, prioritizing absolutely the role of field ethnography and social anthropology. *At the same time, one must agree with the author that inadequate field research by Soviet experts in Ethiopian studies hinders the investigation of Ethiopian problems in the Soviet Union* [emphasis added]." See *Narody Azii i Afriki*, no. 3 (1983), pp. 201-202.
11. A key difference between the experimental sciences and the social sciences and humanities is that researchers in the former share an experimental paradigm, while researchers in the latter belong to contending and sometimes antagonistic schools of thought. Under the Soviet system, social science was regarded as in some sense truly scientific, and as a consequence, there was little or no opportunity for schools of thought to contend: there was a paradigm in place, which was adhered to. The result is that much of the later Soviet writing on Africa shares a viewpoint, a vocabulary and even a tone that is extremely standardized to Western ears.
12. For example: "It is evident that francophone African anthropology is in crisis," writes Catherine Coquery-Vidrovitch. See her "African Studies in France," trans. by Nicole Livar, *H-Africa*, 27 August 2001. Available at <http://www.h-net.org/~africa/africaforum/Coquery-Vidrovitch.html> [14 June 2004].
13. *Ibid.*, op.cit.

14. Christopher Shea, "Political Scientists Clash over Value of Area Studies," *Chronicle of Higher Education* (10 January 1997). See also Robert Bates, "Area Studies and Political Science: Rupture and Possible Synthesis," *Africa Today*, vol. 44, no. 2 (1997), pp. 123-132. Rational choice theory has been subjected to stinging critiques by economists and others, and is now less fashionable than it was at one time.
15. Peter Rutland, "Re-mapping the World after the Crisis in Area Studies," *Diaspora*, vol. 10, no. 1 (2001), p. 129.
16. Tessa Morris-Suzuki, "Anti-Area Studies," *Communal/Plural*, vol. 8, no. 1 (2000), p. 13.
17. Christopher Shea, "New Faces and New Methodologies Invigorate Russian Studies," *Chronicle of Higher Education* (20 February 1998).
18. The institutionalization of Soviet studies in the United States dates from the early 1940s, when the Soviet Union was a valued ally of the US and the UK. For an account of this process, see Victoria Bonnell and George Breslauer, *Soviet and Post-Soviet Area Studies* (Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1998), pp. 3-4. Cited with permission.
19. J. Miller, "The Origins of Soviet Studies: A Personal Note," *Soviet Studies*, vol. 25, no. 2 (October 1973), p. 167.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 168.
21. Editorial in *Critique*, no. 1 (Spring 1973), p. 2.
22. "Russian Area Studies and Research since World War II," *Russian Review*, vol. 12, no. 2 (April 1953), pp. 113-114.
23. For a short account of the major currents, see Bonnell and Breslauer, *Soviet and Post-Soviet*, op.cit., pp. 16-21.
24. *Russia and Africa* (Moscow: Nauka, 1966); *Des africanistes russes parlent de l'Afrique* (Paris: Présence africaine, 1966).
25. A.B. Davidson begins this task in his paper "Otechestvennaia afrikanistika: ot Kominterna do perestroiki, i posle. Popytka periodizatsii" [National African Studies from the Comintern to Perestroika: An Attempt at Periodization," in *Afrikanistika XX veka*, pp. 13-17.
26. J. Barber, "Stalin's Letter to the Editors of *Proletarskaya Revolyutsiya*," *Soviet Studies*, vol. 28, no. 1 (January 1976), pp. 22-23.
27. For an account of this period, see R.M. Cutler, "Soviet Dissent under Khrushchev: An Analytical Study," *Comparative Politics*, vol. 13, no. 1 (October 1980), pp. 15-35.
28. "Soviet Africanists' Coordinating Conference," *Africa*, vol. 28, no. 2 (April 1958), pp. 159-162.
29. A.S. Balezin, "K 30-letiiu sozdaniia Tsentra Afrikanskikh Issledovaniï v Institute Vseobshchei Istorii RAN" [The 30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Creation of the African Studies Center at the Institute of General History, RAN] in *Afrikanistika XX veka*, pp. 205-206.
30. D.A. Ol'derogge, ed., *Abissiniia (Efiopiia): sbornik statei* [Abyssinia /Ethiopia: Selected Articles] (Moscow-Leningrad, 1936).
31. For an attempt at a statistical analysis of this publishing pattern, see Darch, *A Soviet View*, pp. xv-xvi.

Soviet and Russian Research on Ethiopia and Eastern Africa

32. Robert Cassen, "Introduction," in Cassen, ed., *Soviet Interests in the Third World* (London: Sage, 1985), p. 2.
33. For a rare example of this perspective, see Jean Copans, "The USSR: Alibi or Instrument for Black African States," in Zaki Laidi, ed., *The Third World and the Soviet Union* (London: Zed Press, 1988), pp. 24-38.
34. Iu.M. Kobishchanov, "From the History of Relations between the Peoples of Russia and Ethiopia," in *Russia and Africa*, pp. 153-154.
35. For a post-Soviet assessment of the linguist B.A. Turacv (1868-1920) as the "founder of Ethiopian studies" see G.V. Tsyppkin and Anton Voitenko, "Otets otechestvennoi efipistiki" [The Father of National Ethiopian Studies], in Davidson, ed., *Stanovlenie otechestvennoi afrikanistiki*, pp. 30-46.
36. M.V. Rait, "Russkie ekspeditsii v Efiopii v seredine XIX-nachale XX vv. i ikh etnograficheskie materialy" [Russian Expeditions in Ethiopia, mid-19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> Century: Ethnographic Materials], *Afrikanskii Etnograficheskii Sbornik*, no. 1 (1956), pp. 220-281, 284-285. Rait was a very important figure and an unpublished autobiographical memoir of hers exists. See Irma Taddia, "The Maria Rait's unpu[b]lished paper 'My 50 years with Ethiopia,'" in *Afrikanistika XX veka*, pp. 49-53.
37. The coverage of Russian writings in the standard bibliography on nineteenth century travel literature is spotty. Bulatovich is there but E.P. Kovalevskii is not, nor is N. Ashinov. See R.L. Hess and D.M. Coger, *A Bibliography of Primary Sources for Nineteenth-century Tropical Africa as Recorded by Explorers, Missionaries, Traders, Travelers, Administrators, Military Men, Adventurers, and Others* (Stanford, Calif.: Hoover Institution Press, 1972).
38. C. Zaghi, *I Russi in Etiopia*, 2 vols. (Naples: Guida, 1972-1973); Patrick Rollins, "Russia's Ethiopian Adventure, 1888-1905" (Ph.D. diss., Syracuse University, 1967).
39. *Gusar, zemleprokhdets, skhimnik*. See I.S. Katsnel'son's introduction to the 1971 edition of Bulatovich's writings under the generic title *S voiskami Menelika II* [With Troops of Menelik II] (Moscow: Nauka, 1971), pp. 3-31.
40. L.F. Kubbel, "Materialy po sotsial'no-ekonomicheskim otnosheniiam u narodov Efiopii v trudakh A. K. Bulatovicha (ekspeditsiia 1896-1899 gg.)" [Materials on Socio-economic Relations among Ethiopians in the Works of K. Bulatovich, Expedition of 1896-1899], *Sovetskaia Etnografiia*, no. 3 (1967), pp. 109-112; and Bulatovich, *Ethiopia through Russian Eyes: Country in Transition*, ed. and trans. by Richard Seltzer (Lawrenceville, NJ: Red Sea Press, 2000).
41. See *Journal of African History*, vol. 43, no. 1 (2002), p. 159.
42. For a summary of his career, including a list of publications, see his entry in S.D. Miliband's *Slovar' otechestvennykh vostokovedov s 1917 g.* [The Dictionary of National Orientalists], 2nd ed. (Moscow: Nauka, 1995), p. 562-563.
43. Iu.M. Kobishchanov, *Aksum* (Moscow: Nauka, 1966).
44. It may be worth noting that the availability of a work in *Western* translation seems to function as a kind of imprimatur or guarantee of quality. For example, works on Africa by such senior figures as I.I. Potekhin and S.R. Smirnov were published in English during the 1960s and 1970s in Soviet editions, but were virtually ignored in the West, perhaps because they were political rather than historical, perhaps because they were unoriginal. See I.I. Potekhin, *African Problems* (Moscow: Nauka, 1968);

- and S.R. Smirnov, *Africa as a Soviet Scientist Sees It* (Moscow: Nauka, 1974). This latter book is mainly about Sudan. For a brief critical account of Smirnov's career, see D. Morison, op.cit., pp. 61-62.
45. See Iu.M. Kobishchanov, *Axum*, trans. by Joseph Michels (University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1979).
  46. David Killick, comment on Yuri Kobishchanov, *H-Africa* 22 August 2003. Available at: [http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=hafrica&month=0308&week=d&msg=%2byBoHGvZcVHBZjDdlYFRhQ&user=&pw=\(10 June 2004\)](http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=hafrica&month=0308&week=d&msg=%2byBoHGvZcVHBZjDdlYFRhQ&user=&pw=(10 June 2004)).
  47. See, for example, Jacke Phillips, "Punt and Aksum: Egypt and the Horn of Africa," *Journal of African History*, vol. 38, no. 3 (1997), pp. 448 and 451; and Donald Crummey, "Civilization at Aksum," *Journal of African History*, vol. 32, no. 1 (1991), p. 145.
  48. See P.L. Shinnie in the *International Journal of African Historical Studies*, vol. 15, no. 1 (1982), p. 97.
  49. *Severo-vostochnaia Afrika v rannesrednevekovom mire: VI-seredina VII v.* [North-eastern Africa in the Early Medieval World, 6<sup>th</sup> – mid-7<sup>th</sup> Century] (Moscow: Nauka, 1980).
  50. See A.A. Gromyko, ed., *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Ethiopian Studies, Moscow, 26–29 August 1986*, 6 vols. (Moscow: Nauka, 1988). I have not seen this work.
  51. V.S. Iag'ia, *Efiopiia v noveishee vremia* [Ethiopia in the Contemporary Period] (Moscow: Mysl', 1978); Georgii Gal'perin, *Efiopiia: naselenie, resursy, khoziaistvo* [Ethiopia: Its Population, Resources, and Economy] (Moscow: Nauka, 1978).
  52. G.V. Tsyppkin, *Efiopiia ot razdroblennosti k politicheskoi tsentralizatsii: vtoraiia polovina XIX-nachalo XX v.* [Ethiopia: from Feudalism to Centralization, Second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> – Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century] (Moscow: Nauka, 1980); G.V. Tsyppkin, *Efiopiia v antikolonial'nykh voinakh* [Ethiopia in the anti-Colonial Wars] (Moscow: Nauka, 1988); and G.V. Tsyppkin and V.S. Iag'ia, *Istoriia Efiopii v novoe i noveishee vremia* [The Modern and Contemporary History of Ethiopia] (Moscow: Nauka, 1989). I have not seen the last of these.
  53. Irina Filatova, *Istoriia Kenii v novoe i noveishee vremia* [A History of Kenya] (Moscow: Nauka, 1985); A.S. Balezin, *Afrikanskii praviteli i vozhdii v Ugande: evoliutsiia traditsionnykh vlastei v usloviakh kolonializma, 1862-1962* [African Rulers and Chiefs in Colonial Uganda: The Evolution of Traditional Power, 1862-1962] (Moscow: Nauka, 1986).
  54. See Darch, *Russian Writings on Tanganyika, Zanzibar and Tanzania* (Dar es Salaam: BRALUP, 1976) and Darch, *East Africana in Russian* (unpublished, 1981) for lists.
  55. David Morison, *The USSR and Africa, 1945-1963* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 59-60. This is uncontroversial: Taddia also emphasizes, for example, Rait's commitment to collective work (op.cit., pp. 51 and 53).
  56. Il'in et al., op.cit., p. 91.
  57. Morison, *The USSR and Africa*, op.cit., p. 69.
  58. Gavin Kitching, "Why I gave up African Studies," *Mots Pluriels*, no. 16 (December 2000). Available at <http://www.arts.uwa.edu.au/MotsPluriels/MP16OOgk.html> [22 June 2004].

Soviet and Russian Research on Ethiopia and Eastern Africa

59. See *Narody Azii i Afriki*, no. 6 (1965), p. 240.
60. Garay Menicucci, "The Privatization of Russian Middle East Studies," *Middle East Report*, no. 205 (October-December 1997), pp. 19-20.
61. Boris Kagarlitsky, *Restoration in Russia: Why Capitalism Failed* (London: Verso, 1995), p. 3.
62. Vladimir Shubin, *ANC: A View from Moscow* (Bellville, South Africa: Mayibuye, 1999).
63. Vladimir Shubin, "African Studies in Russia," *Africa Update*, vol. 5, no. 1 (Winter 1997-1998). Available at <http://www.ccsu.edu/Afstudy/upd5-1.html>, (7 June, 2004).
64. *Ibid.*, op.cit.
65. On the opening of archives, see James G. Hershberg, "Soviet Archives: The Opening Door," in *CWIHP Bulletin*, no. 1 (Spring 1992), pp. 1, 12-15, and 23-27; and Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, *Archives of Russia Seven Years After: Purveyors of Sensation or Shadows Cast to the Past?* 2 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Cold War International History Project, September 1998).
66. G. Alexopoulos, "Voices beyond the Urals: The Discovery of a Central State Archive," *Cahiers du Monde Russe*, vol. 40, nos.1-2 (January-June 1999), pp. 199-216.
67. A.B. Davidson et al., eds., *Komintern i Afrika: dokumenty* [The Comintern and Africa: Documents] (St. Petersburg: Aleteia, 2003); A.B. Davidson et al., eds., *South Africa and the Communist International: A Documentary History*, 2 vols. (London: Frank Cass, 2003); A.B. Davidson et al., *SSSR i Afrika, 1918-1960: dokumentirovannaia istoriia vzaimootnoshenii* [USSR and Africa: A Documented History of Relations, 1918-1960] (Moscow: IVI RAN, 2002); and Davidson's *Stanovlenie otechestvennoi afrikanistiki*.
68. I am grateful to Irina Filatova for this information.
69. V. Lopatov, "Is Russia in Need of Africa," in *African Studies in Russia 1998-2000* (Moscow: Institute for African Studies, 2002), pp. 45-53 [the original Russian text was published in *Rossiiskii Ekonomicheskii Zhurnal*, no. 9 (2000), which I have not seen].
70. See Kagarlitsky, *Restoration in Russia*, op.cit., for the argument that without a developed bourgeoisie, capitalist structures could simply not be sustained.
71. Boris Mironov, "Has Postmodernism Come to Russia? Comments on the Anthology *American Russian Studies*," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, vol. 4, no. 1 (Winter 2003), p. 214.

# **AFRICA** IN **RUSSIA** --- **RUSSIA** IN **AFRICA**

**Three Centuries of Encounters**

Edited by  
**Maxim Matusevich**

**Africa World Press, Inc.**

P.O. Box 1892  
Trenton, NJ 08607



P.O. Box 48  
Asmara, ERITREA