The Bergson legacy may be measured by the students he trained, his published works and the Bergson modal -- the standard of scientific inquiry and discourse he established as his legacy to the profession. Bergson is considered the intellectual father of Soviet economics.

He played the major role in founding the U.S. tradition of description and analysis of Soviet economic institutions, measurement of Soviet growth, and evaluation of that growth. … He had earlier made a major contribution in the development of welfare economics.²

His teachings put Soviet economic studies on the academic curricula and his research established a new sub-field in mainstream economic analysis. From 1949 to the 1990's six generations of Soviet economic specialists were influenced by Bergson’s teaching.³ Bergson’s publications from 1937 to the turn of the century informed the burgeoning cadre of Soviet economists, Soviet area specialists and mainstream economists.⁴ Bergson’s modal brought rigor, objectivity, professionalism, and a broad approach to Soviet economic studies.⁵ This legacy will not expire with his passing, but will continue to influence future generations.

¹The views expressed are the author’s and not necessarily those of Congressional Research Service.


⁴Abram Bergson, 1937-2003: Selected Writings, November 2003, Appendix B.

⁵The specific examples are drawn from my personal experience. My first class with Bergson was in 1948 and I received my PhD from Columbia in 1955. I also viewed the impact of Bergson’s legacy from the perspective of editor of, and contributor to, over forty volumes on the Soviet and Russian economy. The Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress released these volumes from 1959 thru 2001.
**Bergson as a teacher.** Bergson’s role was unique in 1947 as both a professor of economics and a senior economic specialist in the nascent Russian Institute area program at Columbia University. He later joined the faculty of economics at Harvard University after two terms as Director of the Russian Research Center, 1964-68, 1969-70.

Bergson made a major contribution to 20th-century economics by establishing a school of economists who transformed the study of the Soviet economy, hitherto a reserve of partisan emigres and committed writers, into a field of sober academic inquiry... They had an enormous influence on the development of U.S. economic Sovietology and established themselves as the dominant paradigm in that field. 6

Bergson’s teaching career initially defined the field and then changed with it. Even when the Soviet government published meager data, he provided his students with a comparative theoretical framework for understanding the Soviet economy. As the Soviet authorities provided more useful economic statistics, Bergson was able to develop an analytic framework for Soviet national income estimates using primary data. When both theoretical and empirical models of the Soviet economy were possible, Bergson’s teachings contributed to and adjusted to this development. Throughout his long teaching career, he provided insights from theoretical assessments of the command economy to empirical assessments of Soviet economic development and stimulated informed discourse on the broader issues of the field. Bergson stressed to his students the importance of understanding the debate on central planning between Lange-Lerner and Von Mises. Bergson, as an area specialist, encouraged students to place the Soviet command economy in the context of Russian culture and socialist economic theory. Area study students specializing in political science and history such as Marshall Shulman, Alex Dallin, Jack Matlock, and Ralph Fisher developed an appreciation of the role of economics in Soviet development from Professor Bergson.

**Bergson as a scholar.** Bergson’s extensive collected works span over 60 years. He started as a mainstream economist with important contributions to the development of welfare economic theory. In welfare economics Bergson is famous for his concept of an individualistic social welfare function. This concept was subsequently utilized and further developed by Professor Samuelson, who described

6”Abram Bergson,” Michael Ellman, op.cit.
Bergson’s contribution as “a flash of lightening after which all was light in the hitherto extraordinarily confused subject of welfare economics.”  

John Hicks and Maurice Dodd expressed different views on the significance of Bergson’s contribution to developing a social welfare function. Bergson encouraged the debate on his concept by inviting Professor Hicks to lecture at Columbia.

Bergson’s interest in welfare economics may have peaked his interest in the Soviet economy and led to his research trip to the Soviet Union in 1937. He gained further insights on the functioning of the Soviet economy as the chief of the Russian economics subsection in the Russian Division of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) during World War II. Abram Bergson joined Columbia’s Russian Institute at its outset in 1946 as a professor of economics and as a member of the Institute faculty. Bergson was intellectually active with his colleagues at Columbia. He gained insight on national income accounting from Professor Carl Shoup, and other quantitative methodologies from contact with the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) staff, particularly from Professors Frederick Mills and Arthur Burns. Theoretical insights were stimulated by J. M. Clark, George Stigler and William Vickery. During his Columbia stay, he became a special consultant for Rand Corporation where he developed a cadre for constructing measures of Soviet economic growth.

Bergson’s main contribution to economic Sovietology concerns the measurement of Soviet economic growth... Bergson developed a method which enables internationally comparable national income statistics and growth rates to be calculated for the USSR and applied to the USSR for 1928-55... The development of this method and its application to the USSR for the period 1928-55 was an enormous achievement. They clearly indicated that assessment of socialist economy did not have to remain at the level of ideological confrontation but was amenable to rational discourse and scientific inquiry.

----------

7Ibid.


9On advice of Professor Bergson, I took one or two courses from each of these Columbia professors.

10Ellman, op.cit.
Alexander Gershenkron, at Harvard, proposed physical indicator methods for generating internationally comparable data.\textsuperscript{11} Bergson encouraged the physical indicator method as a check on his methodology for assessing Soviet economic growth. He facilitated development of Soviet input/output analyses by Vladimir Treml as a supplement to his national income calculations. Likewise, Murray Feshbach was inspired by Abram Bergson’s work to initiate Soviet demographic studies. Publications on the measurement and understanding of Soviet economic performance and theoretical discussions on the Soviet command economy in the context of western economic theory were thus central to Abram Bergson’s publications throughout his academic career.

**Bergson’s modal.** Bergson had strong views on how teaching and research on the Soviet economy should be conducted. “His works on the Soviet economy are marked by the combination of encyclopaedic knowledge of Soviet statistics, theoretical analysis and immense industry.”\textsuperscript{12} The “sober academic inquiry” he brought to the field emphasized rigor, objectivity, professionalism, and a broad view of Soviet economic developments. Many of Bergson’s betes noires relied on less demanding analyses in their assessments. **Rigor.** Bergson called for a rigorous approach, comparable to the modal of mainstream economists. He insisted on full documentation of analyses. **Objectivity.** He brought no animus to his teachings and research. Bergson wanted to understand Soviet economic development, not judge it. He would often caution students and colleagues, “We must have further research on this subject.” **Professionalism.** Bergson felt a strong professional obligation to his students and his profession. He was accessible to students and demanded a great deal of them. He felt students had a strong responsibility for independent research and practical experience. His candidates for PhD in economics were expected to be conversant with history, political science, and law in the Soviet Union. In recommendations, he was particularly careful not to overstate the student’s qualifications. **Broad View of Soviet Economic Development.** Bergson expected others to be as intellectually curious as he was. He wanted to know more about Soviet and Russian culture, Marxist and socialist teachings, and performance of other Communist countries in their transition periods. Bergson invited Herbert Marcuse


\textsuperscript{12}Ibid.
to give a series of lectures on Marxism for the students and faculty at the Russian Institute at Columbia. Bergson headed a comparative team of Soviet and Chinese specialists for an extensive fact-finding trip through China in 1983.

**Bergson’s legacy to future generations.** Bergson’s thinking and analyses of our times may continue to influence future generations of post-Soviet economic studies. Soviet economic studies founded and developed by Bergson may be disappearing as a unique sub-field in mainstream economics in the view of James Millar.\(^\text{13}\)

My best guess is that comparative economic systems will be a victim of the collapse of Soviet socialism. The new paradigm for this region of the world is almost certainly going to be economic development, with an appropriate emphasis upon institution building for formerly centrally planned economies. This approach is suitably theoretical and prescriptive and thus compatible with mainstream economics.

Whatever the redefinition of Soviet economic studies may be, Bergson’s legacy, his teachings, publications and modal may continue to be relevant and influential. Bergson’s modal was to approach Soviet economic studies with the discipline of a mainstream economist. Bergson’s legacy may already be influencing a new generation of Russian economists as they “replace the Marxist economic paradigm and the way economics was taught by the old regime, with modern western economics.”\(^\text{14}\)

---

\(^\text{13}\)James Millar, op.cit.

Appendix A

Western Soviet Economists, 
Generations I, II, III, IV, V, and VI

*Generation I: Before 1949*

Wassily Leontief (USSR)  
Alexander Gerschenkron (Austria)  
Naum Jasny (USSR)  
Calvin Hoover (Wisconsin, 1925)  
Peter Swanish (Chicago, 1930)  
Lazar Volin (Michigan, 1931)  
Arthur Z. Arnold (Columbia, 1937)  
Abram Bergson (Harvard, 1940)  
Harry Schwartz (Columbia, 1943)  
D. Gale Johnson (Iowa State, 1945)  
Joseph Kershaw (Columbia, 1948)  
Chee Hsein Wu (Harvard, 1948)

*Generation II: 1949-1958*

Holland Hunter (Harvard, 1949)  
M. Gardener Clark (Harvard, 1950)  
Edward Ames (Harvard, 1952)

*Bergson*

David Granick (Columbia, 1951)  
Henry H. Ware (Columbia, 1951)  
Edward Janssens (Columbia, 1951)  
John P. Hardt (Columbia, 1955)  
Richard Moorstein (Columbia, 1956)  
John M. Montias (Columbia, 1958)  
Egon Neuberger (Harvard, 1958)

*Gerschenkron*

Donald R. Hodgman (Harvard, 1951)  
James F. Coogan (Harvard, 1952)  
Franklyn D. Holzman (Harvard, 1953)  
Gregory Grossman (Harvard, 1953)

*Other*

Mikhail V. Condoide (Ohio State, 1949)  
Chris D. Calsoyas (Berkeley, 1949)  
Phillip M. Raup (Wisconsin, 1950)  
Vladimir Katkoff (Ohio State, 1950)  
Robert A. Johnston (Northwestern, 1951)  
John M. Letiche (Chicago, 1952)  
Stanley H. Cohn (Chicago, 1952)  
Robert Holloway (Stanford, 1952)  
Nicholas Spulber (New School, 1952)  
Morris Bornstein (Michigan, 1952)  
Rush Greenslade (Chicago, 1953)  
Raymond P. Powell (Berkeley, 1952)  
Gertrude Schroeder (John Hopkins, 1953)  
George Murphy (Washington, 1957)  
Ted Osgood (Yale, 1957)  
Benjamin Ward (Berkeley, 1958)
Generation III: 1959-1968

Bergson


Other

John S. Hoyt (American, 1959)  Alan Abouchar (Berkeley, 1965)
Arkadius Kahan (Rutgers, 1959)  Carl B. Turner (Duke, 1965)
Glen A. Smith (Stanford, 1959)  Francis M. Watters (Berkeley, 1966)
Vladimir G. Treml (North Carolina, 1963)  Martin Weitzman (MIT, 1967)
Andrzej Brzeski (Berkeley, 1964)    Curtis H. Knight (Indiana, 1968)
James R. Millar (Cornell, 1965)

Generation IV: 1969-1978

Terence E. Byrne (Brown, 1969)    Norman Kaplan (Chicago, 1970)
Phillip M. Weitzman (Michigan, 1969)  Ralph A. Fulchino (Georgetown, 1971)
George Gorelik (Berkeley, 1970)    Murray Feshbach (American, 1974)
Stephen Sacks (Berkeley, 1971)    John P. Lewis (Ohio State, 1974)
Martin C. Spechler (Harvard, 1971)  Joseph Senkiew (Virginia, 1974)
Andrew Feltenstein (Yale, 1976)    Laurie R. Kurtzweg (Duke, 1975)
Donald W. Green (Berkeley, 1972)    Leo Yong-Gol Kim (George Washington, 1972)
Craig L. Moser (Ohio State, 1974)    Robert Dalton III (Missouri, Columbia, 1972)
Corinne A. Guntzel (Illinois, 1972)    Volkmar Liesbcher (Southern Illinois, 1972)
**Generation IV: 1969-1978 (continued)**

- Kenneth R. Gray (Wisconsin, 1976)
- James P. Murray (New York, 1976)
- Steven Rosefielde (Harvard, 1972)
- Darius J. Conger (Oklahoma, 1974)
- Christine Wollan (Illinois, 1972)
- Scott Boaz (Arkansas, 1973)
- John P. Bonin (Rochester, 1973)
- Antonio M. Costa (Berkeley, 1973)
- John C. Evans (Tufts, 1973)
- John Farrell (Wisconsin, 1973)
- Alice C. Gorlin (Michigan, 1973)
- Peter J. Grandstaff (Duke, 1973)
- James W. Gillula (Duke, 1978)
- David P. Levine (Yale, 1973)
- George C. Logusch (New York, 1973)
- Andris Trapans (Berkeley, 1978)
- Jeffrey Miller (Pennsylvania, 1976)
- Carl H. McMillan (Johns Hopkins, 1972)
- Peter Murrell (Pennsylvania, 1976)
- Joseph Pelzman (Boston College, 1976)
- Shannon R. Brown (Berkeley, 1974)
- James A. Younker III (Northwestern, 1972)
- William N. Turpin (George Washington, 1976)
- Michael Marrese (Pennsylvania, 1977)
- Sheldon T. Rabin (Johns Hopkins, 1977)
- Marc Rubin (Pennsylvania, 1977)
- Clark J. Chandler (Michigan, 1978)
- Harold S. Gardner (Berkeley, 1978)
- Michael D. Harsh (Washington, 1978)

**Generation V: 1979-1988**

- Daniel Bond (North Carolina, 1979)
- Richard E. Ericson (Berkeley, 1979)
- Gene D. Gill (Duke, 1979)
- Lyle D. Israelson (MIT, 1979)
- Silvana Malle (Berkeley, 1979)
- Poong Rhee (Illinois, 1979)
- Merle W. Shoemaker (Syracuse, 1979)
- Jeffrey Summers (Purdue, 1979)
- Lenore S. Taga (Berkeley, 1979)
- Bruce M. Everett (Tufts, 1980)
- Susan G. Jacobs (Duke, 1982)
- Wolfram Schrettl (Boston, 1982)
- Keith W. Crane (Indiana, 1983)
- Yoo Soo Hong (Northwestern, 1983)
- Blaine E. McCants (Duke, 1983)
- Judith A.R. McKinney (Indiana, 1983)
- Ebrahim Sheibang (Indiana, 1983)
- Robert S. Whitesell (North Carolina, 1983)
- Voytek Zubek (SUNY, Buffalo, 1983)
- Michael Aleexev (Duke, 1984)
- Pedro F. Pellet (University of Miami, 1986)
- Paul A. Goldberg (Columbia, 1984)
- Barry W. Ickes (Berkeley, 1984)
- John Parsons (Northwestern, 1984)
- Jeanine D. Braithwaite (Duke, 1988)
- Michael Hemeseth (Harvard, 1988)
- Huizhong Zhou (Northwestern, 1984)
- Stuart S. Brown (Columbia, 1985)
- Vladimir Kontorovich (Pennsylvania, 1985)
- Robert B. Koopman (Boston College, 1985)
- Michael A. Murphy (Northwestern, 1988)
- Yassaman Saadatmand (New Hampshire, 1988)
- Heidi A. Kroll (Berkeley, 1985)
- Daniel M. Kemme (Ohio State, 1980)
- Susan Linz (Illinois, 1980)
- John S. Pitzer (American, 1980)
- Matthew J. Sagers (Ohio State, 1980)
- Anna S. Kuniansky (Houston, 1981)
- James B. Streets (Michigan, 1981)
- Karen M. Brooks (Chicago, 1982)
- Lorrie Jo Brown (Washington, 1982)
- Richard C. Harmstone (Columbia, 1982)
- Robert A. Walker (Southern California, 1979)
- Michael L. Wyzan (North Carolina, 1979)
- Victor Kamedrowsky (North Carolina, 1982)
- Kent H. Osband (Berkeley, 1985)
- Helen T. Otto (Houston, 1985)
- Steven Popper (Berkeley, 1985)
- Lung-Fai Wong (Minnesota, 1985)
- William Liefert (Michigan, 1986)
- Elisa B. Miller (Washington, 1986)
- Janet Mitchell (Northwestern, 1986)
- Perry L. Patterson (Northwestern, 1986)
- David P. Apgar (Rand Graduate Institute, 1984)
- Barry Kotlove (Davis, 1987)
- Mark A. Prell (MIT, 1987)
- Daniel Berkowitz (Columbia, 1988)
- Ernest Raiklin (New School for Social Research, 1984)
- Nicholas Kozlov (New Hampshire, 1988)
- John Litwack (Pennsylvania, 1988)
- Michael A. Murphy (Northwestern, 1988)
Generation VI: 1989-1992 (incomplete)

Greg Brock (Ohio State, 1989)
Gary Krueger (Wisconsin, 1989)
Andrew Boone (Houston, 1990)
Abu Faij Dowlal (Southern California, 1990)
Mark R. Lundell (Berkeley, 1990)
Gisela M. Esoe (Ohio, 1991)
Thomas Richardson (Columbia, 1991)
Alina Zapalska (Kentucky, 1991)
Anna Meyendorff (Berkeley, 1992)

Christopher Martin (Berkeley, 1989)
Benjamin Slay (Indiana, 1989)
Joshua D. Charap (Pennsylvania, 1990)
Mihaljek Dubravko (Pittsburgh, 1990)
Jehoon Park (Ohio, 1990)
Clifford G. Gaddy (Duke, 1991)
David Sedik (Berkeley, 1991)
Helga Hessenius (Berkeley, 1992)
Appendix B

Abram Bergson, 1937-2003: Selected Writings

Journal Articles (Arranged in Chronological Order)

Bergson, Abram

-----.


-----.


Deals with Soviet industrial price trends of the period 1928-50. The author also discusses some of the difficulties encountered in the collection of the relevant raw price data, as well as some of the methodological problems involved in an investigation of this type. He concludes that Soviet basic industrial prices rose substantially during the period 1928-50; they reached their peak in 1949 (667% of the 1938 level) and declined thereafter to a limited extent. The rise in prices in the period occurred almost entirely in the years 1933-41 and 1949.

-----.


-----.


A comparison of COMECON and OECD performance regarding economic development.

-----.


“. . . argues that the escalating economic costs of forced-draft growth are compelling the Soviet regime to shift from the traditional Stalinist model toward a more balanced approach to economic development.”


“Soviet planners have found that more and more investment is needed to keep the capital stock growing at a steady pace. The result may be a reduced commitment to heavy industry.”


“The Soviet economy is continuing to slow down. Declining rates of growth in capital investment and labor supply will make it difficult to reverse the trend.”


A review of the eleventh Five-Year Plan as approved by the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.


“Even the modest growth targets of the new five-year plan may not be reached, given Soviet bureaucratic planning, technology lags, and the stress on defense spending instead of investments.”


Although available data are scanty and analysis is tenuous, evidence suggests that the inequality of income distribution in the Soviet Union is not markedly different from that in Western nations and is not tending toward a more egalitarian distribution.

Discusses measures of income and income distribution, applies them to the Soviet experience and concludes that “among Western countries for which Lorenz-type data at all comparable to those available for the USSR are at hand, Sweden could well be one where inequality as so represented is no greater or less than in that country. Inequality in the USSR may not be much less than that in Norway and the United Kingdom, but is no doubt less than that in the United States and France.”


The Director of the Economics Research Institute of Gosplan, Vladimir Kostakov, outlines the fundamental Soviet labor problems to be addressed under perestroika. “Covers worker apathy, lack of discipline, poor correspondence between wages and the importance and skill level of various occupations, and unemployment and retraining . . . . He then responds to questions by American participants . . . on the role of cooperatives in absorbing surplus labor displaced by restructuring, and how responsibility for re-employment of dismissed employees will be delegated.”


“Must Soviet factor cost be adjusted?” *Comparative economic studies*, v. 33, winter 1991: 121-125.


Compares consumption in the Soviet Union in the 1980's to that in the United States and various European countries. Consumption per capita in the USSR was
less than 30% of that of the United States. Reasons for this low level of performance are low productivity of the work force, the emphasis on producing investment and defense goods, and Communist ideology.

-----.
“Paper presented October 17, 1990”

-----.

-----.
Drawn from a brief presentation made at the convention of the American Economic Association, January 3-5, 1992.

-----.
An overview of Russia's economic plight examines early reforms, the shortfalls of reform, recent encouraging developments, and the prospects for a more gradual economic transition; touches on the widening gap between rich and poor in Russia.

-----.

-----.

“Bergson assesses summarily the measures that have been compiled for the USSR for comparative GDP estimates and compares them with the controversial CIA data.”


**Books (Arranged in Chronological Order)**

Bergson, Abram, 1914-
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