

With skillful use of his new powers, Gorbachev pushed aside the old guard and reassigned top posts to like-minded anti-Stalinists such as Eduard Shevardnadze (b. 1928) and radical reformers, notably Aleksandr Yakovlev (1923–2005). He then embarked on diplomatic campaigns abroad that, over five years, grew into a foreign policy revolution featuring massive, asymmetrical cuts in Soviet weapons arsenals, acceptance of the peaceful liberation of Eastern Europe, and finally, a radical push to join Europe as a democracy.

At home, Gorbachev managed—despite incessant opposition—to introduce increasingly important political reforms, dubbed *perestroika* (political and economic restructuring) and *glasnost* (openness in media and society). Though always predisposed toward reform, Gorbachev did not stress democratization until 1987, when his powers had grown strong enough and his own views consolidated. In 1988 he established competitive elections and a genuine legislative body. He worked to implement checks and balances, a law-governed state, political and religious freedoms, and genuine federalism. Radical economic reform proved far harder, because liberalizing prices risked social upheaval. The economy stagnated as the command economy unraveled, while market institutions remained unborn. The combination of political freedoms, high expectations, and economic decline exacerbated tensions between the fifteen republics and the Soviet state. Striving to keep the U.S.S.R. together, Gorbachev embarked on a new federal framework; but politics at home undercut him. An attempted coup in August 1991 left him critically weakened. In December Boris Yeltsin (1931–2007), president of the Russian Republic, dealt the final blow to Gorbachev—and to the U.S.S.R.—by withdrawing Russia from the Soviet Union. Gorbachev resigned, leaving a great legacy. He brought freedom to Russia and played the most decisive part in ending the cold war.

SEE ALSO *Cold War; Democracy; Democratization; Economies, Transitional; Glasnost; Russian Federation; Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; Yeltsin, Boris*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, Archie. 1996. *The Gorbachev Factor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- English, Robert. 2000. *Russia and the Idea of the West*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mlynář, Zdeněk, and Mikhail Gorbachev. 2002. *Conversations with Gorbachev*. Trans. George Shriver. New York: Columbia University Press.

Julie M. Newton

GORDON, MILTON

SEE *Assimilation*.

GOSNELL, HAROLD

1896–1997

Harold F. Gosnell played a major role in the development of the scientific approach to political research. He was among the first political scientists to utilize randomized field experiments, correlation, regression, and factor analysis, which he skillfully blended with archival research, participant observation, elite interviewing, and ethnography to produce seminal studies of elections, voting behavior, party politics, political machines, and African American politics.

Harold Gosnell grew up in Rochester, New York, and received a bachelor's degree from the University of Rochester in 1918. He matriculated as a graduate student at the University of Chicago, where, under the tutelage of Charles Merriam, he received a PhD in 1922. Gosnell immediately joined the political science faculty at the University of Chicago, where he was part of the nucleus of the Chicago School of Political Science, which endeavored to construct a science of politics on the model of the natural sciences.

Gosnell was deeply concerned with the functioning of elections and the factors that led citizens to participate in them or not. His *Non-Voting: Causes and Methods of Control* (1924), authored with Merriam, examined a random sample of 6,000 nonvoters in the Chicago mayoral election of 1923. It identified the principal causes of non-voting as non-registration, disbelief in women's voting, disgust or indifference, and physical impairments or difficulties. Merriam and Gosnell argued that efficient party organization and simplification of registration laws would enhance citizen participation in elections. In *Getting Out the Vote* (1927) Gosnell conducted randomized field experiments in the Chicago elections of 1924 and 1925 to determine whether nonpartisan notices could stimulate citizen registration and voting. He found that a nonpartisan appeals could boost registration by about 9 percent but mattered less where party organizations were strong and education levels high; they had a greater marginal effect on women, African Americans, and the less educated.

A fascination with party organizations, especially political machines, permeated almost all of Gosnell's work, starting with the first of his twelve books, *Boss Platt and His New York Machine* (1924), which traced the rise and fall of machine politics in New York. In *Negro Politicians* (1935) he documented changes in Chicago politics brought about by the northward migration of African

Gospel, Glory and Gold

Americans, their loyalty to and role in the Republican Party, and the first signs of shifting loyalties to the Democrats after the initiation of the New Deal. He detailed the centrality of black churches and the black press (especially the *Chicago Defender*) in mobilizing opinion and sustaining organization in the community. Gosnell generalized his arguments on party organization in *Machine Politics: Chicago Model* (1937). He demonstrated the success of ward bosses and precinct captains in insulating the parties from broader trends in national politics brought about by the Great Depression. Gosnell saw ballot simplification, proportional representation, civil service laws, and other reforms as ways to wean democracy from the imperatives of patronage and graft.

Gosnell left Chicago in 1941 for Washington, D.C., where he held positions in several federal agencies and then served as professor of political science at Howard University from 1962 to 1970. The American Political Science Association recognizes his achievements by awarding each year the Harold F. Gosnell Prize of Excellence for the best work of political methodology presented at a political science conference.

SEE ALSO *American Political Science Association; Chicago Defender; Democratic Party, U.S.; Elections; New Deal, The; Political Science; Politics, Black; Politics, Urban; Random Samples; Republican Party; Sampling; Science; Statistics; Survey; Voting*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Hansen, John Mark. 1997. In Memoriam: Harold F. Gosnell. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 30 (3): 582–587.
- Heaney, Michael T., and John Mark Hansen. 2006. Building the Chicago School. *American Political Science Review* 100 (4): 589–596.

Michael T. Heaney

GOSPEL, GLORY AND GOLD

SEE *Gold, God, and Glory.*

GOSPELS

SEE *Christianity.*

GOSSIP

SEE *Rumors.*

GOULD, STEPHEN JAY

1941–2002

Stephen Jay Gould was a paleontologist, evolutionary biologist, essayist, and public intellectual. He lived a rich life achieving heights of academic success as a professor at Harvard University as well as attaining public recognition as an erudite, literate scientific essayist. Gould's importance stems from his distinctive and important contributions as an evolutionary biologist and paleontologist, as well as his participation in public debates bringing his humanist and scientific commitments to bear on important social and scientific issues.

As a biologist Gould is best known for the theory of “punctuated equilibria” which he formulated jointly with the American paleontologist Niles Eldredge. The fossil record is an imprint of the past providing researchers with extensive evidence not only for the fact of evolution but a detailed map of the branching pathways connecting the diversity of life. The evolutionary paths emanating from different life forms can be traced through the chronological ordering of this fossil record. In standard Darwinian explanation the pace of evolutionary change is assumed to be slow. Accordingly, small incremental changes are accumulated to amount eventually to the grand differences that scientists associate with distinct species. The fossil record, however, does not show continuous change between life forms; rather there seem to be gaps. These discontinuities in the record could reflect scientists' incomplete knowledge or simply gaps in the fossil record itself. Gould and Eldredge attempted to explain the “gaps” in the fossil record by questioning the assumptions made about the pace of evolutionary change. They argued that for long periods species enjoy stability, giving way to rapid and drastic change over short periods of time. Thus, the so-called gaps in the fossil record actually reflect a fact about the pace of evolutionary change rather than representing missing evidence.

Gould viewed evolutionary biology as a historical science. To him evolution was not a deterministic unfolding of events but a process highly contingent on the vicissitudes of circumstance. His views brought him into conflict with some of his peers who tried to veer evolutionary biology toward a more mechanical paradigm in which the evolutionary process was reduced to natural selection operating at the genetic level. Perhaps his most visible sparring partner in this debate was Richard Dawkins, who had presented arguably the strongest version of the mechanical paradigm. Dawkins envisioned organisms as “lumbering robots” carrying out instructions encoded in the organism's DNA. Dawkins departed from orthodox Darwinism in placing the gene as opposed to the organ-