
NEWS OF THE PROFESSION

THE CONFERENCE ON EAST-WEST ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Haus Lehrbach, near Cologne, the site of the European Academy, hosted on June 5-7, 1974, a conference of over eighty jurists, economists, and sociologists from fifteen countries, at which experts from the socialist bloc (very well represented) met with their counterparts from market economy nations. The conference was organized by the German Society for the Study of Eastern Europe and the Oostrecht Institute of the University of Cologne. The theme was intersystemic economic cooperation and ongoing integration between East and West.

In a number of meetings the participants discussed these seemingly opposed tendencies. The aim of Comecon (Council for Mutual Economic Aid) since its beginnings in 1949 has been to develop a world economic system rivaling the capitalist one, which it was eventually to replace. Currently the 1971 program adopted by the twenty-fifth session of Comecon in Bucharest is being implemented.

Comecon plans are closely paralleled by the growing integration and expansion of the Common Market and the efforts to develop and promote free trade within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Although the political integration of Europe is still a matter to be achieved in the future (if ever), the growing economic cohesion of Western Europe is a political fact. The tendency toward integration is counterbalanced, however, by efforts to expand economic cooperation with the outside world. On the Western side this effort is a part of the original plan. The Common Market, while growing more cohesive and acting increasingly as a single economic system (Common Commercial and Common Agricultural Policy), is also broadening its cooperation with other countries, with the object of lowering tariff barriers and improving the movement of goods, capital, and labor. On the Eastern side, since Stalin's death economic cooperation with the market economies has been fostered urgently, and was made a part of the general program for the integration of the socialist bloc, which needs Western know-how, patents, and industrial equipment in order to develop its industries.

The difficulty is how to mesh interests and techniques of economic operation. Western Europe expands cooperation by lowering barriers and removing obstacles. In the East, expansion of economic activity is followed by an increase in controls, though it is also true that the need to cooperate with the West has produced some new attitudes in the legal regime of some of the socialist countries. At least four socialist countries have permitted direct foreign investment in their enterprises; new patent, copyright, and conflict-of-laws legislation has been adopted; and in Bulgaria, nationality legislation has returned to the liberal idea that citizenship is a matter of individual choice rather than of government decision.

The role of the conference was therefore to take stock of the situation in both parts of the world and to discuss techniques and problems of cooperation. Though these facts were uppermost in the minds of most of the participants, there was a feeling that only a beginning was made. European security is one of the areas in which real guarantees are still awaited, particularly on the Western side. But since this was a meeting of professionals, the conference was concerned with understand-

ing the problem rather than with reaching a consensus, although at times a common ground was achieved. In retrospect, the frankness of the discussion and the absence of stereotyped phraseology were perhaps the greatest achievements of the meeting.

The Lehrbach conference was obviously only a beginning, but a happy one at that. One hopes that it will be followed by similar meetings that are as well planned and executed.

KAZIMIERZ GRZYBOWSKI
Duke University

MICHAEL CHERNIAVSKY 1922–1973

When Michael Cherniavsky, Andrew Mellon Professor of History at the University of Pittsburgh, and adjunct professor of history at Columbia University, died suddenly at his home in Pittsburgh on July 12, 1973, he was fifty years old. Born in Harbin into a family of émigrés from Russia, Cherniavsky received his early education in English-speaking establishments in China: Tientsin Grammar School and St. John's University in Shanghai. He arrived in this country in 1939 and enrolled in the University of California at Berkeley, from which he obtained all his degrees. His studies at Berkeley were interrupted by his war service with the U.S. Army Air Force Intelligence in the Southwest Pacific between 1942 and 1945, and his academic career began in 1951, the year in which he obtained his doctorate.

The two determinants of Cherniavsky's thinking, writing, and teaching were also among the determinants of his actions and his adult life-style. They were the personal and intellectual impact of Ernst Kantorowicz—first as teacher and later as life-long friend—and the passion for the Russian Revolution. It was Kantorowicz's political theology, his interest in History's great figures, and in the ruler cult, and his skillful handling of artistic sources in elucidating abstract concepts of the Middle Ages that informed Michael's work on early Russian history—his treatment of the princely saints, his preoccupation with the myth of power, the attention he paid to the Old Believers' pictorial propaganda, and his fascination with the rulers' portraits in the Annunciation Cathedral. Michael's chief contribution to scholarship lies in his application of the tenets elaborated by Kantorowicz to that segment of ancient Rus's and Muscovy's past where investigators too often wander among imaginary reconstructions of the various *izvody* of chronicle accounts, or are on obligatory, if futile, search for class struggles. The proof of Michael's passion for the Russian Revolution, its antecedents, and its aftermath is in his other writings: his book *Prologue to Revolution: Notes of A. N. Iakhontov on the Secret Meetings of the Council of Ministers, 1915* (1967), his earlier brilliant essay "Corporal Hitler, General Winter and the Russian Peasant," *Yale Review*, Summer 1962 (pp. 547–58), and his other musings on the Soviet style of war. This proof is also in the kind of basic questions Michael would raise: while Kantorowicz would discuss historical causality in general, Michael would imply the regularity of the historical process in his search for the preconditions of a revolution.

It was not a simple matter to reconcile these two determinants: the teachings of Kantorowicz, the patrician and the rifle-carrying fighter against the Spartakists in Berlin and the Räterepublik in Munich in 1919, who never made clear what kind of existence was to be attributed to the ideas whose history he pursued, and the writings of a Shaposhnikov, or the deeds of a Frunze, neither of whom should have had any doubts about the relation between the base and the superstructure. Yet