



University of California, Berkeley

Center for Slavic and East European Studies

Newsletter

Summer 2002
Vol. 19, No. 3

In this issue:

Notes from the Director	1
ORIAS Summer Institute	2
James Krapfl	
<i>The Rhetoric of the Velvet</i>	
<i>Revolution</i>	3
In Memoria	8
Peter J. Schmelz	
<i>Andrey Volkonsky, the Young</i>	
<i>Composers, and the Beginnings of</i>	
<i>Twelve-tone Music in the Soviet</i>	
<i>Union, 1956-1961</i>	9
2001-2002 Events	20
Outreach Programs	22
Faculty and Student News	26
Hertelendy Fellowship Awarded	28
Kujachich Endowment Funding	28
Associates of the Slavic Center	29
Fellowship Opportunities	30
Upcoming Events	31
BPS Working Paper Series	32
CCAsP Newsletter	32

**Newsletter of the Center for Slavic
and East European Studies**

University of California, Berkeley
Institute of Slavic, East European, and
Eurasian Studies

260 Stephens Hall # 2304
Berkeley, CA 94720-2304
iseees@uclink4.berkeley.edu
<http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~csees/>

Editors: Stella Bourgoïn and Barbara
Voytek.

Submit mailing changes to the above
address or call (510) 642-3230.

Please send suggestions, corrections,
or inquiries to the *Newsletter* editors
at the address above. We welcome
your comments and suggestions.

Notes from the Director

The 2001–2002 academic year has come to a close. During an exceptionally active spring semester, the Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies presided over many conferences, lectures, bag lunches, working groups, and seminars. As always, our programmatic activities were designed to give faculty, students, and members of the community a better empirical understanding of our region and to improve the methodological and theoretical tools we use for analysis.

In the aftermath of the events of September 11, these efforts have been placed in a new context and have acquired new meaning. Two conferences this spring—"Reconfiguring East and West in the Bush-Putin Era" (the Annual Teacher Outreach Conference) and "Political Violence in Russia and the Former Soviet Union: Past and Present" (the Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference)—dealt directly with issues relating to the constellation of circumstances following 9/11. The CCAsP conference, "Currents, Cross-Currents, and Conflict: Transnationalism and Diaspora in Central Asia and the Caucasus," focused attention on a part of the world that has drawn a great deal of attention in recent months. Thanks to Dr. Edward Walker, executive director of the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Studies, we participated in the planning of an International and Area Studies course, "Afghanistan and Its Neighbors," that was open to the public. Speakers included the journalist Ahmed Rashid and French scholar Olivier Roy.

During the spring semester, ISEEEES also sponsored a variety of presentations on other themes. Of special note was the second Peter N. Kujachich Annual Lecture in Serbian and Montenegrin Studies, presented this year by Susan Woodward, professor of political science at the City University of New York's Graduate Center. Speaking on the topic "Nation-Building under Western Eyes," Professor Woodward examined the complexities and dangers of trying to impose peace and prosperity in the former Yugoslav republics. At the end of the spring semester, ISEEEES organized a special lecture in memory of Marjorie Koenig, a longtime Associate of the Slavic Center. Igor Lukes, professor of history at Boston University, presented a lecture, "Behind the Walls of the Schoenborn Palace: American-Czech Relations, 1938–1953."

A seminar series for graduate students and faculty, "New Directions in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies," has run throughout the 2001–2002 academic year. Designed to highlight the diverse intellectual agendas and approaches to research among our colleagues, this lively seminar included presentations by Berkeley faculty and visiting scholars: Vadim Radaev (Department of Economic Sociology, State University – Higher School of Economics, Moscow), M. Steven Fish (Department of Political Science, UCB), Vadim Volkov (Department of Sociology, European University, St. Petersburg), Gregory Grossman (Department of Economics, UCB), Martin Malia (Department of History, UCB), Reginald Zelnik (Department

of History, UCB), Michael Nacht (Goldman School of Public Policy, UCB), Ronald Suny (Department of Political Science, University of Chicago), Nicholas Riasanovsky (Department of History, UCB), and Irina Paperno (Department of Slavic Languages and Literature, UCB). We are grateful to the Carnegie Corporation for its continuing support of this seminar and to BPS for organizing the seminar.

Our new Caucasus and Central Asia Program (CCAsP), under the direction of Dr. Sanjyot Mehendale, has made many contributions to the Institute and to the campus this academic year. We were particularly gratified to learn in the fall that CCAsP will receive support from the National Security Education Program, making possible a variety of expanded curriculum and research opportunities. In April, CCAsP and ISEES cosponsored a special program, "A Musical Journey Along the Silk Road," held in conjunction with Yo-Yo Ma's "Silk Road Project" at Zellerbach Hall.

In all of the foregoing activities and much else as well, ISEES has benefited from the US Department of Education Title VI grant. Recent increases in our allotment of FLAS academic year and summer fellowships have further enriched our program of area and language training. With help from the Title VI grant and from many other sources—including our generous Associates of the Slavic Center—we are able to fulfill our mission to support research, graduate training, and a broad array of scholarly and public programs.

We are already planning ISEES activities for the 2002–2003 academic year. Our Annual Fall Reception will take place on October 9. Strobe Talbott, Deputy Secretary of State in the Clinton administration, will present the Colin Miller Memorial Lecture on October 18. ISEES graduate students, James Krapfl and Maria Stoilkova are organizing a conference on November 8–10, "One Ring to Rule Them All? Power and Power Relations in East European Politics and Societies." The Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference is planned for March 7 at UCB and the Annual Teacher Outreach Conference will be held on April 26–27.

As we go to press, we have learned of the passing of Alexander Vucinich, an esteemed colleague who came to Berkeley for his retirement after a long and distinguished career. He has been a valuable member of our community and we will miss him very much. Heartfelt sympathies to his wife Dorothy and to his family. You can read more about Alex within the Newsletter.

Let me wish you all a lovely summer. We look forward to seeing you in the fall.

Victoria Bonnell

Director, Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies

Professor, Department of Sociology

ORIAS Summer Institute for Teachers

The Role of Food in World History

July 29–August 2, 2002

How has the history of humankind been driven by the need for food? Food was arguably the earliest necessity for human society and control of a food supply continues to be a driving force for political and economic organization. Even social customs and religions are affected by myth and ritual concerning the handling of food. As in the past, food-production continues to define our relationship with nature. Civilizations rose and fell because of systems of food-production and distribution. The 2002 ORIAS summer institute for teachers will focus on the history of food as a tool for teaching about world history in the middle and high school classroom.

The institute is free and open to all interested educators. Enrollment is limited to 40. Two graduate credits can be arranged through UC Berkeley Summer Sessions for a tuition fee; there will be a limited number of scholarships available. The Institute meets from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. daily on the Berkeley campus. Applications are available on line

at <http://ias.berkeley.edu/orias/summer2002/home2002.htm> or by contacting Michele Delattre, ORIAS Program Representative, at (510) 643-0868.

Office of Resources for International and Area Studies
University of California, Berkeley
2223 Fulton Street Rm 338
Berkeley CA 94720-2324
orias@uclink4.berkeley.edu

This conference is made possible by Title VI funding from the US Department of Education to the following National Resource Centers at the University of California, Berkeley: the Center for African Studies; the Institute of East Asian Studies; the Institute of European Studies; the Center for Latin American Studies; the Center for Middle Eastern Studies; the Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies; the Center for South Asia Studies; and the Center for Southeast Asia Studies.

The Rhetoric of the Velvet Revolution

James Krapfl

James Krapfl is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History, planning a dissertation on the revolution of 1989 in Czechoslovakia. Together with Maria Stoilkova from the Anthropology Department, he is organizing a successor to the "Faith, Dope, and Charity"¹ conference to take place at Berkeley in November 2002 on the theme "Power and Power Relations in East European Politics and Societies."

At three o'clock the students and people of Olomouc gathered on the Lower Town Square, ready for another splendid happening. Everyone fingered a couple of inflatable balloons in their pockets, and wondered in vain what they might be for. The crowd's curiosity was amplified as it began to drift toward the Theresian Gate [and down Leninova trida to the Stalin-Lenin monument]. Only a few began to suspect....

On the monument's pedestal two posters appeared. The first depicted a droopy-looking red star, limping forward on crutches.... [The second bid Stalin and Lenin] to fly away to warmer regions. Then the curious learned what the balloons were for. With all their strength people began to inflate their balloons and tie them to the ropes which marked off the whole paved area in front of the statues.... The crowd sang, made merry and mostly wondered what would happen next. Student mountain climbers circled around the statues, entwining them with ropes. Suddenly, between the heads of Stalin and Lenin, there appeared a third face—a mountain climber's. He received a resounding acclamation, as did the friend who joined him. "Will they finally begin to remove this awful monument?" the crowd wondered. Soon they learned the truth. Slowly, ropes adorned with countless balloons began to mount the statues.... The crowd surrendered itself to buoyant mirth.

At length the statues were entirely covered with balloons...and the climbers descended amid vigorous applause. The line holding everything to the ground was cut, and someone shouted "Stalin, let go! It's no good to you now anyway!"

"10, 9, 8,...2, 1, START!" In the eyes of all present the statues broke away from their pedestal and floated up, up—and away. The crowd waved them off...and considered that, from this perspective, everyone could at last delight in the statues' beauty and originality.

Thus Palacky University student Lida Duskova described a demonstration that occurred in Olomouc on December 9, 1989.² On one level, her account was obviously false; the statues did not, of course, fly away. On another level, her account was profoundly true, for it

reflected Duskova's and very likely also her peers' perception that, by their collective action, a monster had in fact disappeared from their midst.

Duskova's account illustrates the tendency of crowds in 1989 to define themselves not only through ritual, but through rhetoric as well. In Czechoslovakia, a new sense of community had emerged in the days following the police brutality of November 17, a sense which spread rapidly from the initial group of beaten demonstrators to encompass virtually the entire country.³ Members of this community experienced their solidarity as "awesome," "profound," and even "holy," and naturally they sought to preserve it.⁴ To represent the community in political and cultural institutions, however, required development of the cognitive means of describing the community. The community had to define itself, and to define what it was not. Czechs and Slovaks achieved this revolution in their symbolic system by manipulating physical and metaphysical signs—by identifying themselves not only ritually, but rhetorically as well.

My contention in this essay is that the process by which Czechs and Slovaks transformed their symbolic vocabulary in 1989 was not random, but proceeded according to a logic dictated by popular cognition of purity and danger. The anthropology of these two concepts, classically elucidated by Mary Douglas, insists that the foundation of any symbolic cultural system is the community itself, represented as something pure and holy.⁵ This symbol, a first principle, holds in place a system of classification that maintains culture by simultaneously expressing and defining it. Anything that threatens this ordered system threatens the community that it represents and so is perceived as chaotic, unholy, and dangerous. Very often symbolic systems function so effectively that members of a culture do not even perceive the impure within their midst, but this is not always the case. Since all logical systems are necessarily either incomplete, or incapable of apprehending all truths, the dangerous perpetually exists alongside the pure, and occasionally threatens the ordered system upon which the community depends.⁶ When this happens, the community must do something to re-establish the stability of its categorization scheme: it must purify itself.

A newsletter published by Palacky University students, on strike in November and December 1989, provides a glimpse of this process of symbolic transformation in microcosm. While certainly not voicing the whole range of diverse assumptions and opinions proclaimed by Czechoslovak citizens in various corners of the republic, *Pretlak* (excess pressure) does indicate what was important for a group of Czechs who were to some extent representative.⁷ There are two reasons for this. First, Olomouc served as an information clearinghouse for northern Moravia in November and December, its students and actors regularly travelling to Ostrava and to smaller towns and villages in the vicinity to inform and “agitate.”⁸ University students often hailed from these towns and villages, as well as from more distant parts of the country, with which they remained in contact. As a central place outside the capital, moreover, opinions voiced in Olomouc were in some ways more typical than those expressed in Prague. Second, since national newspapers were still censored or suppressed in November, with local newspapers often censoring themselves even into December, the student publication was an important medium for the wider citizenry of Olomouc and surrounding locales. To address the interests of this broad readership, *Pretlak* carried reprints from the national media, proclamations of the municipal Civic Forum (OF), and letters from ordinary citizens in addition to student commentaries on revolutionary events. Since so many discourses were represented in *Pretlak*, the newsletter is eminently useful for the

purpose of reconstructing popular perceptions in 1989. It cannot tell us everything, but it can highlight what was important.⁹

The Community Defined

The first symbol the new community established—in order to represent its idea of itself—was that of the “community” itself, perceived as a cohesive and united entity. “Unity!” chanted crowds on town squares, more an affirmation of a state they sought to preserve than an appeal to bring a new one into being.¹⁰ “The past few weeks have called forth in all of us,” wrote the student Tomas Zabransky, “a new, hitherto unknown feeling.”¹¹ The Olomouc Civic Forum proclaimed more mundanely, yet no less passionately, “We will build a modern democratic state with a pluralist system of political parties.... ALL of us have agreed on this today.”¹² In both these and many other cases, unity was verbally assumed. Of course there were individuals and groups who did not agree, but they were rhetorically ignored—in a sense, not even perceived—when cognition focused on the community which had developed from November 17.

Durkheim’s observation that societies set themselves up as sacred is particularly appropriate here, for the intense social interaction among all these demonstrating citizens indeed generated a sense of community which people described in spiritual terms.¹³ The Charter 77 spokesman Toms Hradilek spoke of a “beautiful fever,” which he compared to “falling in love.”¹⁴ According to the folk singer Jaromir Nohavica, “the joyful atmosphere was actually tangible,” and felt like being drunk on new wine.¹⁵ Even people who did not know each other in any objective sense felt intersubjectively connected. “Around me there were dozens of *unknown and yet intimately familiar* faces,” wrote the student Milan Hanus. “And, I believe, even the same feeling within.”¹⁶ This sense of synergy was a powerful one, capable of modifying behavior. Accounts of 1989 are replete with examples of a crowd taking up a chant in unison, or of individuals and groups volunteering time, goods, or experience to the cause. This “awesome” spirit can therefore be said to have exerted a moral influence, in the senses both of peer pressure and of deontological obligation.¹⁷ As Durkheim argues:

While one might perhaps contest the statement that all social facts without exception impose themselves from without upon the individual, the doubt does not seem possible as regards religious beliefs and practices, the rules of morality and the innumerable precepts of law—that is to say, all the most characteristic manifestations of collective life. All are expressly obligatory, and this obligation is the proof that these ways of acting and thinking are not the work of the individual but come from a moral power above him, that which the mystic calls God or which can be more scientifically conceived.¹⁸



The “spirit of ‘89” brought people out of the everyday and lent meaning to actions which otherwise would have been inconceivable. The result was a “cleansing” transformation of participants’ ontological states. Recalling a happening in Olomouc, Milan Hanus wrote:

Then someone had an idea to make a human chain and in a moment we had the entire town hall encircled. A few songs at the corner and a parade to the rector’s office, plenty of singing on the way, *a feeling of stupendous wholeness and rightness*. Another one of the moments from these days, a moment when I am proud that I am a student.¹⁹

According to the student Boris Pentejelev, “we were all born on November 17.”²⁰ Jaroslav Hutka said that not only he, but the whole nation had returned from emigration, and striking students in Prague spoke of “the nation’s spiritual coming of age.”²¹ This spiritual transformation—the genesis of a new sense of community *and* identity—provided a powerful referent for future development. As Valtr Komarek, an economist and leading figure in the autumn of 1989, proclaimed, “On this ‘holy’ emotion we must establish the future of the CSSR.”²²

Portrayal of the revolutionary community as a wholesome and “pure” category of existence was rhetorically reaffirmed by reference to the Communist regime, in opposition to which the community had originally formed. The regime was repeatedly portrayed as a monstrous entity, not fitting any acceptable categories of existence, which had led society into a state of dedifferentiation and violated fundamental prohibitions. “A hydra with a thousand heads and a thousand tentacles,” students called it.²³ Even devils were said to distance themselves from the “hellish politics” of the KSC.²⁴ The regime was held responsible for a “deep moral, spiritual, ecological, social, economic and political crisis” and for having no regard for human life—as November 17 seemed to make abundantly clear.²⁵

The sense that the Communist Party represented a danger to the new community accompanied that community’s violent birth, and the continuing threat motivated recurrent impulses to purify society by excluding or expelling the Communist regime. On the physical plane citizens accomplished this by pressuring the government peacefully to resign, but on the symbolic plane there were more violent forms of purification, such as the symbolic execution of Communism in Olomouc on December 15, or the various “funerals” for Communism that took place throughout the country.²⁶ Purification occurred on a purely rhetorical plane as well, as in Duskova’s example above, or in students’ insistence that “it is necessary to draw a sword and cut off the heads of this hydra one by one,” thus eliminating a monster from the community’s midst.²⁷ When Nicolae Ceausescu—who had for Czechoslovaks become a symbol of Communist murderousness—was killed, students reported this news

with the words “*Dracula* is dead,” rhetorically condoning his execution by labeling him a monster.²⁸

The community’s feelings as it purified itself of the Communist danger were likened to an ascension from darkness to light.²⁹ The publicist Michal Horacek proclaimed that “there has been a struggle between good and evil since time immemorial; our students have come out on the side of good and achieved an utter triumph.”³⁰ Rituals and rhetoric of purification reinforced the community’s sense of unity, wholeness, and rightness. It remained for the community to perpetuate this sense, however, by representing itself in political, social, and economic institutions. This process of representation began very shortly after November 17, and it took place first of all discursively.

The Community Discussed

Among the adherents of the “new community,” there was widespread agreement that their society should be free, democratic, pluralist, humane, and above all moral. It should, in short, be all things that the Communist regime was perceived not to have been, for as the crowd insisted on Wenceslas Square, “we are not like them.”³¹ What these terms might mean in practice remained sufficiently ambiguous in November and December of 1989 to ensure that they would unite the community rather than divide it. As Lynn Hunt writes, “uttered in a certain context or included in soon-familiar formulaic expressions, such words bespoke nothing less than adherence to the revolutionary community.”³² The haste with which Communists adopted the new vocabulary attests to its value as a marker of solidarity with the community.³³ Though the definitions of oft-invoked concepts remained fluid, the lines along which they would develop were nonetheless staked out in the discourse of 1989, most importantly by the choice of models according to which the concepts would be interpreted.

Communist rhetoric provided the point of departure for much of this discussion. The Party had, after all, claimed itself to champion freedom, democracy, morality, and so forth. For these words to be worthy of the new community it was necessary to purify them of their Communist associations. Specifically, the interpretation of symbols which had been mediated by Communist ideology had to be replaced by interpretations mediated by alternative models. The dominant ones to emerge were the “West,” and Czechoslovaks’ own past. In part, the choice of models was determined by geographic and historical circumstance, but logic also played a role. Since Communism had defined itself to be against the West and against the “bourgeois” Czechoslovak past, and since the Communists had proven themselves to be liars, truth would logically seem to lie with Communism’s enemies.

While Czechoslovakia in 1989 was perceived as a land of “deep moral and economic crisis,” the West (or its

constituent parts) was imagined to be a place of wholeness. “We belong among the developing countries of Europe, to the Third World,” proclaimed a group of Olomoucers. “In the morning we go to work, after work we grub for goods, at home there is cooking, washing, minimal time for children..., in the evening television and then sleep. It’s comparable to the lives of animals.” In the West, by contrast, “without any propaganda, all life is oriented so that people may be happy and live their lives satisfactorily.”³⁴ Michal Horacek argued that only by studying in the West, and especially in the United States, would his countrymen “learn how to take care of themselves.” He urged striking students to begin thinking about who would take up the American scholarships he was sure were forthcoming, claiming that

those Americans are really awfully nice people; every one of them is giving to some hungry child in India—it’s completely normal. Here if we try to donate five crowns to Nicaragua people go crazy. But with them it’s completely normal. No one advertises anything anywhere; they just send the money. And this is such a pure idea....³⁵

While the idea of the West as a model of material prosperity appealed to many people (“in ten years we’ll be like Austria!”),³⁶ a political dimension was also important. “We’re not some Central American banana republic,” insisted the Olomouc Civic Forum, “where political opponents can be shot.” Instead, “we will build a *modern* democratic state with a pluralist system of political parties...democratically indicating the direction of further development.”³⁷ In the context of this rejection of the Third World, “modern” clearly referred to the contemporaneous Western “Free World,” understood in its bipolar Cold War context.

In reaction to disturbing tendencies they saw in the materialistic, Westward-leaning discourse, some citizens invoked the First Czechoslovak Republic as an alternative model. Quoting Masaryk and Capek, they argued that democracy did not mean having a government of experts—as many demanded—but a government “of people.” In response to a widely voiced expectation that free elections would result in a government of experts—thus assuring the country of prosperity and freeing people of their need to be politically active—student Tomas Hyjanek wrote:

For goodness’ sake! Another spectre, the result of decades of totalitarianism, is forming as it were in the womb of the opposite camp. Ask T. G. Masaryk, our best politician in the past 500 years, if he ever regretted not remaining an astronomer. Ask M. R. Stefanik if he thought his long and Sisyphean struggle seemed to be in vain. Ask Karel Kramar if he regretted losing all his property in the course of his political activities.... There have been attempts to renounce politics...we are presently living through the fiasco of

one of these efforts...[but] it seems that we haven’t liked this state without politics very much.³⁸

Hyjanek’s prediction that, if the materialistic model were adopted, “people will say that history has passed them by,” might seem to have been borne out by subsequent developments.

The First Republic was not the only model from the Czechoslovak past to influence thinking in 1989; one of the most powerful symbols of 1989 was 1968. For many people, 1989 was the fulfillment of the Prague Spring, which had been cruelly interrupted by the Warsaw Pact invasion and subsequent “normalization.” Symbols of 1968, from Marta Kubisova’s “Modlitba” to the person of Alexander Dubcek, were brought once more to light and served again as rallying points for civic unity. The illegitimacy of the invasion was universally proclaimed, and the Czechoslovak Democratic Initiative even proposed that, until free elections could be held, the government should be entrusted to representatives of the pre-invasion leadership.³⁹ Reference to 1968 informed a discourse which argued that, while communism was a nonsensical or at least discredited idea, socialism remained a principle to which the Czechoslovak community should adhere.⁴⁰ In 1968, wrote one retiree, “ordinary worker-Communists called for socialism with a human face, and thereby stood for practically all demands which are being proclaimed today.”⁴¹ Even striking students, early in the revolution, indicated a desire for “a more reliable road to democratic socialism.”⁴² The power of the Western model was such, however, that this discourse could survive only by appealing to the “Swedish model” of socialism, and ultimately it disappeared altogether.⁴³

All these models were invoked because they were seen as viable representations of the pure, wholesome society that Czechoslovaks now considered their birthright. Desire for purity and wholeness blinded Czechs and Slovaks to real flaws in the systems they sought to imitate, to the point of not perceiving defects which from another perspective might seem obvious. The Prognostic Institute, for example, officially “distanced itself” from a suggestion that economic restructuring would bring unemployment.⁴⁴ By adopting models on the basis of ontological desire, moreover, Czechoslovaks transferred to these models authority over how the “text” of further development would be written. As Gunter Gebauer and Christoph Wulf note, in the process of mimicking another’s desire the subject “surrenders” to his mediator power—unknowingly wielded, perhaps, but nonetheless present—over how the subject interprets his universe.⁴⁵

The Community Defended

As the community reflected on itself in mid-December, on the occasion of its one-month anniversary, it rejoiced in its new-found and continuing unity, but voiced concern



about possible dangers. “Believe it or not,” wrote the student Tomas Pinos,

it has been a month since the historic events in Prague. That which played itself out before thousands of spectators on Narodni trida outlined the scheme of subsequent days, which we have experienced in awesome solidarity.

Our revolution, if we can call it that, has been embellished with several adjectives. The most famous is “velvet.” It is indeed nicely named. Velvet is a pleasant and attractive fabric, but beware! It is also very delicate. A sudden change in the weather is enough to damage the material severely. Therefore let us scrupulously monitor climatic development and not let various wild showers destroy our precious coat. Otherwise next month we might not have anything to wear.⁴⁶

Among the perceived dangers were Communists who still occupied most key positions in regional and local administrative structures. Turncoats were a particular strain of this impurity. “Not long ago they stood for the regime, [but] now they try to turn around and join Civic Forum,” wrote Pinos.⁴⁷ A rural elementary school teacher from outside Olomouc complained of a district methodologist, who before the revolution had “zealously served her [Communist Party] superiors,” but who now, “afraid for her position, is tirelessly active in Civic Forum.” “Beware of such people,” the teacher wrote, “who damage the beautiful and clean ideas of the students’ revolution and that of all honest people who fight for a democratic

society and a better future for us all.”⁴⁸ At all levels of administration there were people “who for twenty years insisted one thing and overnight learned to say something else,” and there was great fear that they might, like wolves in sheep’s clothing, manipulate the upcoming free elections in order to reverse the nation’s progress.⁴⁹

A more sinister danger was seen in the still-functional state security agency. In a vein typical of many outcries, Tomas Zabransky wrote:

The past few weeks have called forth in all of us a new, hitherto unknown feeling. A feeling of patriotism, serendipity, pride. A feeling of peculiar pressure in our eyes while singing hymns. A feeling of elation from newly acquired, surprising freedom. Only, this freedom is for now just a temporary state.

Within us there have also awoken feelings of powerless anger and rage...mixed with fear. Fear of an enormous, thousand-headed hydra, defying all attempts at control. The existence of an apparatus which we all know about yet which no one knows how to define, an apparatus which is paradoxically even more dangerous because of its name, an apparatus which has precedents perhaps only in fascist police states or the cannibalistic regime of former President Marcos.⁵⁰

Fear of the secret police intensified as the committee investigating the November 17 massacre continued its search for truth but met with a less-than-transparent response from state security. Fear increased as a result of what was discovered, but even more because of what remained secret.⁵¹

The question of how to respond to these threats was problematic, given the community’s identification with non-violence. “The road to the goal must be as clean as the goal itself,” wrote university professor Josef Jarab.⁵² Some suggested that compromised functionaries should “feel the pressure” and leave of their own accord.⁵³ Others called for more effective methods of purification—at a minimum, making matters public. Zabransky demanded that the activities of the secret police be mapped and their organizational structure exposed to public scrutiny.⁵⁴ His fellow student Tomas Rorecek argued that people should publicly declare their lack of confidence in incapable or discredited individuals by means of petitions or voting.⁵⁵ These approaches did not satisfy everyone, however, and some people called for deliberate punishment.

Proposals to deal with the community’s enemies violently were labeled “provocation” (a term which also included those who tore down student flyers), and provocateurs were presented as yet another threat to the community and its “clean” revolution. Vaclav Havel, who by December had become an acknowledged spokesman for the revolution, insisted that “there must not be a hunt for Communists. There must be justice, but not revenge.” As

continued on page 16

In Memoria: Alexander Vucinich

Alexander Vucinich, professor emeritus of history and the sociology of science at the University of Pennsylvania, passed away on Saturday evening, May 25th. Alex and his wife Dorothy have made their home in Berkeley since the mid-1980s. Here Alex continued to work on major projects—*Einstein and Soviet Ideology* appeared in 2001—and to participate actively in the intellectual life of the community. Since 1985 he has been a research associate of the Slavic Center (later Institute) and since 1990, he has been an Associate of the Slavic Center.

Born in 1914 in Wilmington, California, Alexander Vucinich was the son of Serbian immigrants. At the age of five, he returned to Yugoslavia and eventually completed his undergraduate education at the University of Belgrade. Alex returned to the US in 1938 and served in the army during World War II. He also continued his education at the University of California, Berkeley, and at Columbia University, where he received his Ph.D. He began his teaching career at San Jose State College (1950–64), then moved to the University of Illinois (1964–70), the University of Texas (1970–76), and finally to the University of Pennsylvania (1976–85). Alex authored seven books on the history of science, social science, and social thought in Imperial and Soviet Russia, and his articles have appeared in many journals.

In 2001, the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies presented him with an award for his “Distinguished Contribution to Slavic Studies.” Part of the AAASS citation reads as follows:

[Alex’s] two-volume study of *Science in Russian Culture* (1963, 1970) is a classic in its field. Like Alex’s other writings, it approaches the history of science from the perspective of intellectual and cultural, as well as institutional, history, and displays meticulous attention to detail and a profound respect for the individuals scholars whose lives and achievements he investigates. His *Empire of Knowledge* (1984) and *Darwin in Russian Thought* (1988) are both pioneering works. Alex has an impressive list of research grants, including not one but two Guggenheim Fellowships. And far from contenting himself with an easy-going retirement, Alex has recently published *Einstein and Soviet Ideology*, a monumental study of the complex reception of Einstein in the Soviet Union, as well as a masterful series of articles on the history of Russian mathematics in the journal *Historia Mathematica*.



Alex will be remembered for his contributions to the field of Russian and Soviet studies and for his collegiality and warmth. During his retirement years at Berkeley, he took an active interest in the Institute, its faculty, students, and staff. With his brother, Wayne Vucinich (professor emeritus of history at Stanford University), Alex participated for many years in the annual Berkeley-Stanford conference. We have all benefited from his presence and from that of his wife and constant companion, Dorothy.

A memorial service for Alex will be held in the Geballe Room, 220 Stephens Hall on Sunday, July 21, at 4 p.m.

Andrey Volkonsky, the Young Composers, And the Beginnings of Twelve-tone Music in the Soviet Union, 1956–1961

Peter J. Schmelz

Peter J. Schmelz is currently completing a dissertation titled "Listening, Memory, and the Thaw: Unofficial Music and Society in the Soviet Union, 1956–1974" in the Department of Music History. He will be joining the faculty of the Department of Music at the State University of New York at Buffalo beginning in the Spring 2003 semester as an Assistant Professor in Musicology.

The decade that followed Stalin's death in 1953, a period known in Russian as "Ottepel'," or the "Thaw," saw a loosening of the draconian restrictions of the old regime and an increasing liberalism touching all aspects of Soviet life, society, and the arts. Solzhenitsyn's novels are perhaps the most famous examples of this new openness, but the change was felt just as strongly in music, especially among a group of composers schooled in the conservatories at the beginning of the Thaw, who had access to previously banned foreign scores and records. The group includes many names now familiar to Western audiences: Alfred Schnittke, Edison Denisov, Sofiya Gubaidulina, and Arvo Pärt. The Soviet press referred to them collectively as the "young composers" (*Molodíe Kompozítóri*) presumably because they were still teachable, still open to influence. Attracted far more to the European avant-garde, however, than to Socialist Realism, these composers blamed the long years of Stalinist repression for keeping them musically behind. They felt an intense need to catch up, and the first step they took was to master the techniques of twelve-tone composition.¹

The first composer to experiment with twelve-tone music was the young composer Andrey Volkonsky, a name now unfamiliar to audiences both inside and outside of Russia, although Volkonsky was and still is held in high esteem by his fellow composers. For example, towards the end of his life Denisov reported that Volkonsky's early twelve-tone pieces *Musica Stricta* and *Suite of Mirrors* "had a very great influence on...all of us."² And in a 1966 article Denisov declared that *Suite of Mirrors* was for his generation as important as Shostakovich's Fifth Symphony had been in the 1930s.³ The same could also be said of *Musica Stricta*, whose construction and reception demonstrate the contradictory meanings that twelve-tone music held for the young composers who admired it, the Soviet officials who rejected it, and the audiences who listened with a combination of bafflement and amazement. For Soviet arts officials and audiences, both of whom were distracted by the dissonant sound of the piece and ignorant of its technical construction, *Musica Stricta* represented

resistance against the regime. Yet if *Musica Stricta* was received as a piece of musical resistance, it was, as we shall see, a resistance founded upon a withdrawal into the abstract, technical forms of twelve-tone writing and away from active social engagement.

Musica Stricta was composed in 1956, as far as we can tell through examining Volkonsky's disorganized and multiply dated manuscripts.⁴ By the time of its composition Volkonsky had established himself as a young independent Soviet composer, despite numerous obstacles. Born in Geneva, Switzerland in 1933, Volkonsky was trained there and in Paris, before his family returned to the Soviet Union in 1947.⁵ The move proved to be a shock to his Western-bred sensibility, especially with the restrictions he encountered in the Moscow Conservatory of the early 1950s, when the crack-down of the 1948 Resolution on Music was in full force. He was, to put it mildly, not a docile student, and in 1954 he was expelled under the pretense that he had arrived late for the beginning of the term (though in actuality the birth of his son was the cause of this delay). This expulsion acknowledged the obvious: Volkonsky was incapable of being trained in the Conservatory of the time. He knew too much and for that reason was viewed as a potentially dangerous influence.

After his expulsion, Volkonsky made a living in the Union of Cinematographers writing film music. In 1955, he was, surprisingly, admitted to the Union of Composers, suggesting that his Conservatory expulsion had little long-term damage.⁶ And yet, throughout the rest of the 1950s, the Union was uncertain of how to deal with Volkonsky. His pieces, including the *Piano Quintet* (1955) and the *Viola Sonata* (1956), all received prominent, negative reviews in the Soviet press. But it is significant that his music was reviewed at all, for the Union could have very easily "buried him by silence," as the saying goes. But Volkonsky was apparently too talented to be ignored and had too many friends among the young composers and the establishment to be so easily written off. Furthermore, his

Example 1: *Musica Stricta*, Movement II

II

Allegretto (♩ = 80 - 84)

p misterioso

subject

4

A B mp

L C

6

A B subject

8

mf p mp mf

surname might have given the authorities pause, as Volkonsky was a noble family—the Bolkonsky family in *War and Peace* is modeled on his ancestors. But more importantly, by holding him up as an example, as they had done earlier to Shostakovich, Soviet musical officialdom hoped to discourage his fellow colleagues at the Conservatory who were also attracted to the outlawed music of the West. Indeed it was this paradoxical ambivalence toward his music that partly explains how a piece as experimental as *Musica Stricta* could have been performed at all at the time.

As a piece of twelve-tone music, *Musica Stricta* was, interestingly enough, anything but “strict.” In fact, Volkonsky deviated considerably from Schoenberg’s twelve-tone method. For example, although twelve-tone

rows occur in every movement, no single unifying twelve-tone row occurs throughout the piece. Furthermore, several of the movements include a number of different rows. Each movement is its own test case, and as the piece unfolds, the listener gets the sense of Volkonsky probing and testing the possibilities of the method.

The first movement of *Musica Stricta*, in fact, is not twelve-tone at all. Instead it uses a fundamental unifying motive similar to those used by Schoenberg in his op. 11 and op. 19 piano pieces. Several twelve-tone rows do appear, but they only serve to break up the straightforward presentation of the central motive. These twelve-tone rows are not related to one another and instead provide a contrast with the opening material. At least in this initial movement, Volkonsky appears not to be wedded to twelve-

tone music as a unifying principle. Instead, the twelve-tone rows act as a contrast to the atonal material of the rest of the movement.

In the fugal second movement, however, Volkonsky moves closer to traditional twelve-tone writing. And yet, here again, he uses no fewer than four distinct rows. He pits the basic permutations of the initial row, the “subject” of the fugue, against three other rows (A, B, and C in example 1), while linking the subject and these “countersubjects” with statements of successive fifths (see measures 3–4, 12–13, 16–17, and 18).⁷ (See Example 1.) Volkonsky intuitively and literally followed his own idea of what a twelve-tone fugue should sound like.

The third movement acts as an interlude between the more strictly constructed second and fourth movements. It plays on the opposition between two twelve-tone collections presented in alternation but only rarely stated linearly. The final movement of *Musica Stricta*, however, returns to the fugal texture of the second movement, this time as a double-fugue. The most significant aspect of this movement is the increasing reliance on octave doubling and diatonically-referable chords. The piece is serial throughout and refers to two rows (Example 2)—one the fugal subject (P), the other the countersubject (CS, the mainly chromatic descending figure beginning in the right hand of measure 1). However, the octave doublings and triadic statements that do not refer to either row (beginning especially in measures 19–20 and 22–23 and the final 15 measures—see Example 2) begin to disrupt what had been orderly statements of the row.⁸ The increase in octaves over the course of the movement suggests that in the course of composition Volkonsky got caught up in the dramatic momentum of the piece and instinctively reached for the vocabulary of Prokofiev’s neoclassical piano pieces.

The second and fourth movements of *Musica Stricta* demonstrate how strongly Volkonsky still felt the pull of traditional forms, just as Schoenberg and Webern had been strongly influenced by earlier forms when working with twelve-tone techniques for the first time. Tradition offered him a crutch, a comfortable means for dealing with a technique he was not fully adept at. When I spoke to him in 1999, he admitted his lack of knowledge in composing the piece and exhibited some of the defensiveness characteristic of his generation’s attitudes toward their avant-garde experiments. Referring to the period before he started composing the piece, he told me:

... I decided that I didn’t understand [twelve-tone] techniques very well. I understood [them] in principle. But there [in *Musica Stricta*] I did everything incorrectly. And it’s good that I did it incorrectly. Because there are octaves, for example, which Schoenberg forbade, and there are also triads, which he also forbade. But I simply didn’t know that; I thought that I had written a twelve-tone composition. And it’s true

that [those techniques] exist in places [in the piece]. But I named it *Musica Stricta* because of the strict techniques, although I used them entirely according to my own manner.⁹

At the time Volkonsky thought he had written a twelve-tone composition. The fact that his approach differed from the models he was ostensibly following shows us something about the uneasy position he and his generation occupied during the 1950s and 60s. They desperately wanted to emulate the West and were condemned for doing so at home. It was only when they gained fuller access to twelve-tone scores from the West in the 1960s and 1970s that they realized they had been doing it wrong all along.

For its first audiences on the other hand, the sound of the piece was captivating enough: that it was based on a false understanding of the technique made little difference. As theorist Yuri Kholopov noted, “It is not necessary for the listener to distinguish the number of tones in the series, for they hear the twelve-toneness [*dvenadtsatitonovost*].”¹⁰ However, Soviet listeners had few chances to hear the composition. The first performance of *Musica Stricta* took place in private with Volkonsky performing, no doubt sometime in 1956 or 1957, though the date is uncertain. Maria Yudina, the well-known pianist who was the work’s dedicatee, performed the piece in public nearly five years later on May 6, 1961 at the Gnesin Institute in Moscow, where she was teaching at the time. The first half of the concert began with an arrangement of the *Art of Fugue* for two pianos, followed by Hindemith’s *Sonata for Two Pianos* and Bartók’s *Sonata for Two Pianos and Percussion*.¹¹ The only piece after the intermission was *Musica Stricta*, which she played twice.

Yudina’s premiere of *Musica Stricta* contributed greatly to its reception as a piece of resistance. She approached the performance of the piece aggressively, for as Volkonsky put it, “she loved that kind of provocation.” According to Volkonsky, Yudina turned to the audience before playing and said, “I am going to play a new composition, but I will play it 2 times because you may not understand it. I will repeat it and don’t applaud after the first time, applaud only after the second.”¹² Pianist Aleksey Lyubimov remembers her comments somewhat differently. “Yudina’s concerts were generally very significant occurrences,” he recalled, “...[*Musica Stricta*] pleased the public . . . They already knew Volkonsky and talked about the fact that it would be something unusual. . . And after the applause [following the performance, Yudina] said “let’s listen to that ingenious music again.”¹³

The audience apparently took these instructions in stride. At the time there was, according to Volkonsky, “a tremendous curiosity about new things that it is difficult to conceive of today.”¹⁴ Not everyone, however, enjoyed the new music. One audience member was Roman Ledenyov, himself a “young composer” who would soon develop a

Example 2: *Musica Stricta*, Movement IV (measures 1–7, 52–end)

IV

Allegro marcato (♩ = 88 - 92)

strong taste for Webern's music. Ledenyov remembers being unimpressed by *Musica Stricta*, calling it a "*sukhaya veshch'* [a dry piece]." He suggested to me in conversation that other audience members might have felt the same way.¹⁵

When the piece was performed a few days later in Leningrad, audiences no doubt responded similarly, though I have been unable to talk to any eyewitnesses from these concerts. I have obtained a copy of the advertisement for the Leningrad concert that proudly proclaims, "all pieces performed for the first time," which was undoubtedly true. (See Example 3.) Yudina maintained the piece in her repertoire, and at later concerts her approach to performing the piece became still more aggressive. At another Moscow performance of *Musica Stricta* in the early 1960s she played the piece a second time, in the dark. Reportedly a "huge scandal" erupted and Yudina was quite pleased.¹⁶

The official response to *Musica Stricta* was predictable, if not immediate. A negative review appeared in *Sovetskaya Muzika* in July 1961, two months after the concert. It was typically signed anonymously by "a listener" (*Slushatel'*), and it provides a tantalizing, though ambiguous glimpse of the audience's reaction. This

"listener" reported that, "in the lobby were heard conversations alleging that it was 'so new!'" If this is an accurate reporting of events, it suggests that the apparent novelty of the techniques outweighed any difficulties they might have presented for the audience.¹⁷ The review went on to praise Yudina's playing, as well as Bartók's composition, while lambasting Hindemith ("technically refined but chilly") and unleashing a 2-column attack against Volkonsky. The concluding comments indicate the attitude of the Union of Composers towards Volkonsky at the time, and their unwillingness to let him vanish into obscurity. This "listener" wrote:

For some reason the Moscow Union of Composers has given little attention to the works of such gifted composers as Volkonsky. It is necessary to find the true path to his heart, to make the young composer believe in the benevolence of social criticism, and in the fact that only with honest striving will Volkonsky be seen more quickly at the forefront of the young creators of Soviet music—[these goals] dictated our sharp criticism.¹⁸

They still believed that the "gifted composer" Volkonsky could be saved with a little sharp criticism, which would set him on the right path toward the "forefront of the

52 rit. *a tempo* *espr.* *p* *ff* *f* *ff*

57

61

65 16 16 *ff* *ff*

69 *Adagio* *a tempo* *ff* *p* *ff*

M. P. Beliaeff 4148 Moskau 1957

young creators of Soviet music.” In light of Volkonsky’s later career, these pronouncements seem hopelessly naive indeed.

The negative long-term effects of such sharp criticism on Volkonsky only gradually took shape. In a 1974

interview he is quoted as saying, “From the beginning no one even understood what [*Musica Stricta*] was all about. They continued to perform my works for a few more years. But from 1962 on I was definitively banned.”¹⁹ There is some question as to what form this ban took and

how wide-ranging it was. In any case, whether by official order or common understanding, the end result was the same: by the mid-1960s Volkonsky's music ceased to be performed at all. He eventually gave up composition completely, focusing on the activities of his early music group *Madrigal*, formed in 1964 and named in 1966, an ensemble that would become the leading performer of "early music" (or "music before Bach"—*do Bakhovskoy*) in the Soviet Union.

Yet by the time Volkonsky turned his back on new music in favor of the very old, most of his colleagues had already caught up with the West and were beginning to experiment with the very newest techniques, or what they thought were the very newest techniques: aleatoric devices, jazz, and the noise experiments that were called *sonorika* in Russian. Though Volkonsky was the only composer writing serial music from 1956–1960, others quickly followed his lead, including Pärt, Schnittke, and Denisov. Volkonsky wrote a few more important pieces, including his *Suite of Mirrors* (1960) to poems of Federico Garcia Lorca and the *Laments of Shchaza* (1962) based on Dagestani folk texts. In these pieces he continued to develop his personal approach to twelve-tone music and continued to directly oppose the dictates of Socialist Realism, particularly in his choice of texts (*Suite of Mirrors* begins with the soprano soloist singing,

"Christ"—*Khristos*). These works also became, alongside *Musica Stricta*, some of the most influential pieces of the following decade, resulting in countless imitations, like Denisov's *Sun of the Incas* (*Solntse Inkov*) (1964), or Gubaidulina's *Night in Memphis* (*Noch' v Memfise*) (1968).

Almost more important than Volkonsky's actual compositions, however, were the concert subculture and the small but devoted audience for new music cultivated by the first performances of *Musica Stricta* and Volkonsky's subsequent pieces. This unofficial musical subculture took root in rare performances in small, closed venues such as scientific institutes in Moscow like FIAN—the Physics Institute of the Academy of Science (*Fizicheskii Institut Akademii Nauk*)—or the Kurchatov Institute for Atomic Study (*Institut imeni Kurchatova*). There were also concerts in venues like the Small Hall of the Moscow Conservatory, the Small Hall of the Leningrad Philharmonic, and even the hall at the House of Composers (*Dom Kompozitorov*) in Moscow. The performances at these venues were dictated more by chance than anything else. Though there were official unwritten bans on works, sometimes flukes occurred (as composer Viktor Yekimovsky put it in my interview with him).²⁰ *Musica Stricta* was one of the first flukes and hence the most significant.

КОНЦЕРТНЫЙ ЗАЛ

Вечер современной музыки

ЧЕТВЕРГ 11 МАЯ 1961 г.

Исполнители: Performers: МАРИЯ ВЕНИАМИНОВНА

Ю Д И Н А

Марина Дроздова Марина ДРОЗДОВА Виктор ДЕРЕВЯНКО Viktor Derevyanko

Руслан Никулин Руслан НИКУЛИН Валентин СНЕГИРЕВ Valentin Snegiryov

Программа:

Андрей Волконский — Musica stricta (Fantasia Ricercata) соч. 1967 года

Игорь Стравинский — Соната для двух роялей — соч. 1944 г.

Витольд Лютославский — Вариация на тему Пaganini для двух роялей

Бела Барток — Соната для двух роялей и ударных инструментов (К 80-летию со дня рождения 1881—1945)

Начало в 20 часов

Билеты продаются в кассе Концертного зала и в районных театральных кассах

Игорь Стравинский—Sonata for 2 pianos 4.561 р. Так. НК 3. 1571—800

Witold Lutoslawski—Variations on a Theme of Paganini for 2 pianos

Bela Bartok—Sonata for 2 pianos and percussion

Example 3: Advertisement for the Leningrad Premiere, Thursday, May 11, 1961 at the Concert at the Finland Station

Musica Stricta therefore in many ways encapsulated the position of Volkonsky and his generation. Faced with decades of separation from the perceived advances of Western musical modernism, the young composers felt spurred to experimentation. Confronted with a bureaucratic arts culture that demanded works National in form and Socialist in content, they rebelled by ignoring content completely and focusing exclusively on the abstract, technical forms of twelve-tone writing. And the resulting works, of which *Musica Stricta* was but the first of many, took hold in audiences' imaginations because they were "so new!" in comparison to the countless revolutionary cantatas or optimistic symphonies that had previously been the exclusive offerings. By taking refuge in technical abstraction, the young composers were able to become representatives of resistance thanks to the doubled readings encouraged by the Soviet situation. This was the same doubleness that allowed a piece called *Musica Stricta* to become emblematic of freedom.

However, unlike their fellow creators in literature and the visual arts such as Solzhenitsyn, Aksyonov, or the *Lyanozovo* group of artists who were directly addressing broader social issues, the young composers were more inclined to focus on compositional techniques. As composers dealing with an inherently nonrepresentational medium, they had few alternatives. But the withdrawal into the intricacies of twelve-tone composition ultimately became too stifling for many. In fact, by the end of the decade most had renounced twelve-tone writing for other methods, including aleatory techniques, polystylism, and minimalism. Composer Boris Tishchenko told me, "I consider that Russia is indebted to [Volkonsky] for the fact that it became so free, in the sense of its musical language."²¹ If this is true, then it was freedom with a price. Though the musical language may have been freed, the "young composers" and their small audiences were not. They instead remained straitjacketed in a culture where their only possible creative response was one of withdrawal confined to the margins.

Notes

Research for this article was supported in part by the Title VIII Research Scholar Program, which is funded by the U.S. State Department, Program for Research and Training on Eastern Europe and the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union and administered by the American Councils for International Education: ACTR/ACCELS. The opinions expressed herein are the author's own and do not necessarily express the views of either the U.S. Department of State or the American Councils.

¹ Twelve-tone music is a system first widely used in the compositions of Arnold Schoenberg (1874–1951), in which the twelve notes of the chromatic scale (i.e., all the pitches between C and the C an octave higher on the piano keyboard) are arranged in a distinct and unchanging order

that provides the framework for an entire musical composition. This is in opposition to traditional diatonic harmonic practice where primarily 8 pitches are used, as is the case in pieces from Bach and Beethoven to Mahler and Shostakovich.

² Dmitrii Shul'gin, *Priznanie Edisona Denisova: Po Materialam Besed* (Moscow: Kompositor, 1998): 28. "...eto bilo kak raz te sochineniya, kotorie okazali na nas ochen' bol'shoe vliyanie. Na vsekh nas."

³ In the Italian Communist Party magazine *Il contemporaneo* (August, 1966). See Edison Denisov, "Novaya Tekhnika—Eto Ne Moda," reprinted in its Russian original in Valeria Tsenova, ed., *Svet—Dobro—Vechnost'* (Moscow: Kompozitor, 1999): 33–28.

⁴ Volkonsky is notorious for reworking and redating his pieces. The dates I am using are drawn from Oksana Drozdova's 1996 Moscow Conservatory Dissertation on Volkonsky: Oksana Drozdova, *Andrei Volkonskii* (Moscow: 1996). Her dates were drawn from her own study of Volkonsky's manuscripts at his home in Aix-en-Provence, France.

⁵ This early phase of his career is shrouded in myths, as he is often falsely said to have studied with Nadia Boulanger in Paris (an error to be found even in the article on Volkonsky by Frans C. Lemaire in the most recent edition of the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*; see "Volkonsky, Andrey Mikhaylovich," in Stanley Sadie and John Tyrrell, eds., *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed., [New York: Grove, 2001]).

⁶ See Yuri Kholopov, "Initiator: O Zhizni i Muzyke Andrey Volkonskogo," in Valeriya Tsenova, ed., *Muzika iz Bivshego SSSR* (Moscow: Kompozitor, 1994): 7.

⁷ None of the rows in the second movement is the same as those presented in movement I. Again, there are similar segments between the rows of the two movements, but none of these similarities extends beyond three pitches. The fifths are derived from positions 4–6 in A and 2–4 in B.

⁸ In fact, in the fourth movement Volkonsky shows less variety in his use of row forms than he did in either movements two or three. He adheres almost exclusively to P0, P11, and C5 forms for the last pages (mm. 37–56).

⁹ Andrey Volkonsky, telephone interview with the author, October 21, 1999. "...ya reshil, chto ne ochen' khorosho ponimal etu tekhniku. Ya tak printsip znal. No ya tut zhe sdela vse nepravil'no, i, prichem, khorosho sdela, chto nepravil'no. Potomu chto tam est' oktavi, naprimer, kotorie Shyonberg zapreshchal, est' i trizvuchie, kotoroe tozhe on zapreshchal. Ya etogo ne znal prosto, no mne kazalos', chto ya napisal dodekafonoe sochinenie. Ono pravda...eto tam est' gde-to. No ya nazval etu 'Muziku Striktu' potomu chto eto strogaya tekhnika, khotya ya eyo ispol'zoval sovsem po svoemu."

¹⁰ Kholopov, "Initiator," 10.

¹¹ There is no central archive of concert programs in Russia today, aside from an uncatalogued and incomplete collection at the Moscow Conservatory and some programs in the holdings of the Soviet Union of Composers and the Moscow Philharmonia at RGALI (*Rossiiskii Gosudarstvenii Arkhiv Literaturi i Iskusstva*). The concert programs for works by the "young composers" that I have been able to obtain were drawn exclusively from private collections. Unfortunately, the program for the Moscow premiere of *Musica Stricta* was not to be found among them. The information regarding the pieces at this performance was compiled by Yudina scholar Anatoly Mikhailovich Kuznetsov, who kindly supplied it to me.

¹² Volkonsky interview, October 21, 1999.

¹³ Aleksey Lyubimov, interview with the author, Moscow, November 12, 2000. "Kontserti Yudinoy—eto voobshche bilo ochen' znachitel'noe yavlenie. . . i posle applodimentov (publike todga ponravilos', znali uzhe Volkonskogo i govorili, chto budet chto-to neobichnoe) i posle ispolneniya ona skazala: 'Davayte poslushaem etu genial'nuyu muziku eshchyo raz.'"

¹⁴ Volkonsky interview. "Voobshche eto bilo ogromnoe lyubopitstvo, voobshche k vsemu novomu, kotoroe trudno dazhe predstavit' seychas."

¹⁵ Roman Ledenyov, interview with the author, Moscow, October 18, 2000.

¹⁶ Anatoly Mikhailovich Kuznetsov, interview with the author, Moscow, October 19, 2000.

¹⁷ Slushatel' [Listener], "Na Kontserte M. Yudinoy," *Sovetskaya Muzika*, July 1961, 89–90.

¹⁸ Ibid. "Moskovskii Soyuz kompozitorov pochemu-to udelyaet malo vnimaniya tvorchestvu takikh darovitikh kompozitorov, kak A. Volkonskii. Nuzhno naiti vernii put' k ego serdtsu, sdelat' tak, chtobi molodoy kompozitor poveril v dobrozhelatel'nost' obshchestvennoy kritiki, v to, chto tol'ko iskrennim stremleniem poskoree uvidet's A. Volkonskogo v pervikh ryadakh molodikh tvortsov sovetskoy muziki prodiktovani nashi rezhie suzheniya."

¹⁹ Kholopov, "Initiator," 10. The Volkonsky quotation here is from an interview in the emigre weekly *Russkaya Misl'* (Volkonsky, A., "Interv'yu s A. Lishke," *Russkaya Misl'*, June 27, 1974). That Volkonsky's *Suite of Mirrors* was published in the late 1960s by the publishing house "Muzika," owing to the devices of his friend Aleksander Baltin, demonstrates that the ban could not have been written, or if so, was not closely adhered to. Aleksander Baltin, interview with the author, Moscow, October 2, 2000.

²⁰ Viktor Ekimovsky, interview with the author, Moscow, September 28, 1999. "Sluchaynosti bivali u nas."

²¹ Boris Tishchenko, interview with the author, Moscow, December 10, 2000. "Ya schitayu, chto Rossiya emu obyazana tem, chto ona stala takoy svobodnoy, v smisle muzikal'nogo yazika."

Velvet Revolution, continued from page 7

an example of the "dignity" which Havel said the revolution should maintain, he recalled the demonstration on Letenska, where "OF invited two of the riot police [who had attacked the crowd on November 17] onto the platform. It happened that three quarters of a million people, together with Vaclav Maly, prayed the 'Our Father' that these people might be forgiven. This is a model situation, which should be an example for all others."⁵⁶

The distinction between justice and revenge is not always clear (particularly when viewed from an anthropological perspective), and the attempt to separate them into strictly demarcated categories in Czechoslovakia led to considerable confusion.⁵⁷ On December 15, for example, *Pretlak* carried a cartoon of a tiny man, representing the Communist Party, on the verge of being squashed by the giant foot of Civic Forum.⁵⁸ Three Civic Forum members reacted with vigorous opposition to the cartoon, saying that it reminded them of similar drawings they had seen under fascism or in the days of the Slansky trial. "Civic Forum and all decent people," they wrote, "profess as their creed humanistic ideals and non-violence," and don't want

to humiliate anyone. They appealed to the students to "be like you were at the beginning, with clean hearts, hands and thoughts."⁵⁹ The students responded with an apology, explaining that they did not intend to call for the oppression of Communists, and that they would not under any circumstances renounce the principles of non-violence and tolerance.⁶⁰

Another misunderstanding involved the wall of cardboard boxes that the people of Olomouc had erected around district Party headquarters, "symbolically dividing the carcinogenic structure of the Party from the rest of the self-liberating world."⁶¹ When asked on television what he feared the most, the musician Michal Kocab responded that he was "terrified" of people like those in Olomouc, who had shouted "Come out so we can hang you" over the wall. Palacky University students demanded that Kocab retract the statement, insisting that no such event had occurred. "There were attempts at provocation," they acknowledged.

That is true. But for fourteen days we have maintained a student guard around the building, which deals with

every attempt at provocation deliberately and non-violently. Thus for example on the night of 8 December we prevented the attempt of unknown young people to paint gallows on the wall.⁶²

Ironically, the same students had participated in the happening of December 15, wherein an effigy representing Communism had been hanged.

This tension, between a prohibition against violence and rituals which invoked it, persisted throughout 1989 and into the early 1990s. From an anthropological perspective this is nothing new; cultures throughout the world routinely violate their most sacred taboos in equally sacred rituals.⁶³ Normally, however, the contradiction is not perceived, so that both ritual and prohibition can indefinitely fulfil their functions of preserving the community's scheme of categorization. In Czechoslovakia the contradiction *was* perceived, and it was perhaps this more than anything that caused the demise of consensus about the future of the aging new community.

Conclusion: The Community Destroyed?

A community's culture is a symbolic system; the symbols which compose it derive from and are relevant to the community's sense of itself. That which fits the system's categories and thereby reinforces perception of order is pure; that which defies categorization and challenges the order of the system is dangerous. Since no symbolic system can completely and continuously avoid danger, communities require ritual in order to deal with the threat and re-establish certainty of meaning. The traditional approach is to expel representations of danger in rituals of purification, usually by means of real or symbolic violence. An alternative is to assimilate the ambiguous threat by reorganizing relevant categorization schemes. Either way, some ritual involving the entire community is necessary, since the categorization schemes are social in origin.

As the foregoing analysis of Czechoslovak discourse in 1989 has shown, rhetoric too can help negotiate the margin between neat symbolic systems and the messy reality they endeavor to represent. In their descriptions of popular political activity and of the old regime, student editors and other contributors to *Pretlak* reinforced perception of a radical difference between "us" and "them." They declared in positive terms what the community stood for, and by extrapolating from the founding difference between persecutors and persecuted, they increasingly helped establish concepts like "freedom," "humanity," "democracy," and "non-violence" as synonyms for the Czechoslovak people. Finally, when the words and activities of some members of the community were shown to be contradictory to these "meanings" of the community, editors and contributors responded to the logical danger by creating a new category for the people out of place: "provocateurs."

Rhetoric in 1989 thus served a function which anthropologists normally attribute to myth. It helped maintain popular perception of clear-cut categories and, in doing so, helped maintain the unity of Czechoslovak citizens long enough for them to invest the new Government of National Understanding with the legitimacy it would need to organize free elections and begin the process of revising the Constitution. Moreover, in the same way that most cultures' founding myths cannot usually be attributed to a particular author, so the rhetoric of 1989—at least in the examples analyzed here—can only be said to have been authored by the people as a whole. While *Pretlak* did have an editorial board (the composition of which was not constant), its discourse was clearly "conversational" in nature, providing a forum for dialogue among students and between students and the broader community.⁶⁴ Tomas Hyjanek wrote of how, at the beginning of "the doings," he had observed a man reading a poster bearing the words *pravda zvítězí* (the truth will prevail). "Yes, yes," he had said, "the truth will prevail. Because everything that prevails eventually becomes truth."⁶⁵ While in the 1990s it would increasingly be the case that individuals and groups would manipulate words in the attempt to make their competing versions of the truth "prevail," in 1989 it would seem that discourse truly represented the people, incarnating the revolutionary ideal of "dialogue" according to which "your opponent is not an enemy, but a partner in the search of truth."⁶⁶

In the process of institutionalization—that is, representing the new community in various public structures—the ritual and rhetorical practices which had helped maintain unity in 1989 were largely abandoned. It is beyond the scope of this essay to investigate the reasons for this, though faith that election rituals would provide an adequate substitute was certainly a factor. What the foregoing analysis should make clear, however, is that some form of public ritual and myth is necessary for a community to maintain a fertile symbolic system, a system that can facilitate creative and effective responses to the disorderly challenges which the universe presents. Public rituals are sometimes derided because of their association with sacrificial violence, but it is important to remember that non-violent, assimilatory rituals also exist—as Czechs and Slovaks so poignantly demonstrated in 1989. It is also worth remembering that discourse need not be an arena of manipulative power relations; cooperative, dialogic discourse is also a possibility. In any event, without rituals and myths of one kind or another, a crisis of meaning is inevitable. The crowds that gathered on Wenceslas Square in 1999 to support the *Dekujeme, odejdete* (Thank you, please leave) initiative declared loudly, if not clearly, by demanding the resignation of democratically-elected representatives, that public structures in the Czech lands do not adequately represent society at large. The resulting ambiguity is dangerous, dangerous indeed.

Notes

¹ This paper was presented at the conference “Faith, Dope and Charity: Purity and Danger in East European Politics and Culture,” at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London, November 16–18, 2001. The author would like to thank the Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies at the University of California at Berkeley for underwriting his participation in this conference, and the participants, especially Joanna Dybiec and Kieran Williams, for comments which contributed to this essay’s revision. Thanks are also due to Alexander Maxwell, who commented on an earlier draft.

² Lida Duskova, “Dalsi studentsky hepening—opet skvely,” *Pretlak*, December 10, 1989, pp. 3–4. See also Petr Zatloukal, *Gaudeamus*, Olomouc, 1990, pp. 40–41, 70–71.

³ See, by the author, “The Sacred and the Velvet Revolution,” *Kosmas: Czechoslovak and Central European Journal* 14:2 (2001), pp. 51–64.

⁴ See Jaroslav Hutka, quoted in “Jaroslav Hutka v Olomouci,” *Pretlak*, December 5, 1989, p. 4; Tomas Pinos, “Pratele!” *Pretlak*, December 17, 1989, p. 1; and Valtr Komarek, quoted in “Tiskova beseda s Valtrem Komarkem: Nevahejme zlomit moc mafie,” *Pretlak*, December 2, 1989, p. 2.

⁵ Mary Douglas, *Implicit Meanings: Essays in Anthropology*, London, 1975, pp. xi–xxi.

⁶ Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, New York, 1966, p. 162; see also Douglas Hofstadter, *Gödel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid*, New York, 1989, pp. 71, 86.

⁷ It does not, of course, necessarily indicate what was important for Slovaks. Very early in the revolution the two nations established discourses that were related, but distinct. As a result, most of this essay’s conclusions can be safely applied only to Czech society; where they are relevant to both Czechs and Slovaks, this will be indicated.

⁸ Significantly, this was a term students themselves used.

⁹ The largest non-student mediated discourse in the Czech lands was that mediated by Civic Forum. The two discourses often complemented one another and quite frequently even overlapped in their demands, but they were not congruent. Student-mediated discourse began earlier and remained daringly creative longer. As Civic Forum became more stable in its structure, its discourse evidenced a desire to back away from radical opinions. An example of the rhetorical distinctions between the two discourses can be seen in their use of the term *revolution*. While both discourses initially used the word freely and unabashedly, quotation marks began appearing around the word in the Civic Forum discourse during the first week of December. Students started qualifying the term only toward the middle of the month. (In both discourses, of course, there were voices that continued to use the term without reservation into the 1990s.)

¹⁰ “Stavkujeme dal. Jednotne za spolecnymi cili,” *Pretlak*, December 5, 1989, p. 8.

¹¹ Tomas Zabransky, “Stat ve state,” *Pretlak*, December 10, 1989, p. 1. Emphasis added.

¹² OF Olomouc, “Nekolik vet k Lidovym miliciim,” November 30, 1989, in *Pretlak*, 1 December 1989, p. 2.

¹³ Emile Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, trans. Joseph Ward Swain, New York, 1915.

¹⁴ Tomas Hradilek, quoted in *Pretlak*, November 30, 1989, p. 10.

¹⁵ Jaromir Nohavica, quoted in “Koncert—Hala UP 2.12.1989,” *Pretlak*, December 4, 1989, p. 5.

¹⁶ Milan Hanus, “Happening,” *Pretlak*, December 5, 1989, p. 8. Emphasis added.

¹⁷ Hutka, in “Jaroslav Hutka v Olomouci,” p. 4.

¹⁸ Emile Durkheim, *Sociology and Philosophy*, trans. D.F. Pocock, Glencoe, IL, 1953, p. 25.

¹⁹ Hanus, p. 8. Emphasis added.

²⁰ Boris Pentejelev, “Obcane, my vsichni se narodili 17. listopadu 1989,” Olomouc, private collection of Lenka Wunschova.

²¹ Jaroslav Hutka, quoted in “Koncert—Hala,” p. 6; Koordinacni stavkovy vybor vysokych skol, “Pane premiere, zasname!” December 3, 1989, reprinted in *Pretlak*, December 5, 1989, p. 5.

²² Komarek, in “Tiskova beseda,” p. 2.

²³ “Stavka nekonci,” *Pretlak*, special issue, p. 1.

²⁴ *Pretlak*, December 9, 1989, p. 8. Compare Pardubice’s *Studentsky list*, December 18, 1989.

²⁵ “Co chceme: Programove zasady Obcanskeho fora,” in Milan Otahal and Zdenek Sladek, eds., *Deset prazskych dnu (17.–27. listopad 1989): Dokumentace*, Prague, 1990, p. 503. Some Slovaks, incidentally, added national tension to their list of crisis points (see Verejnost’ proti nasiliu, “Pobureni nasilnymi zakroky...,” Bratislava, November 20, 1989, in L’ubomir Feldek, ed., *Ked’ sme brali do ruk buducnost’*, Bratislava, 1990, p. 11).

²⁶ On the execution, see Ivan Langer and Zdenek Zukal, *Videozurnal studentu*, Olomouc, 1990, Statni okresni archiv Olomouc, sbirka videodokumentace. On the funerals, see the examples of “S bolesti v srdci...,” Horsovsky Tyn, Statni okresni archiv Domazlice, box “Soudobe dokumentace 1989–1991/Vzhledy 1990–1991”; “S hlubokym pocitem stesti...,” Rajhrad, Statni okresni archiv Brno-venkov, sign. F-8.04, sbirka soudobe dokumentace; and “S hlubokym zarmutkem v srdci...,” Archiv mesta Ostravy, box “Revoluce 1989: Materialy 1989–90.”

²⁷ “Stavka nekonei,” p. 1.

²⁸ “Dracula mrtev,” *Pretlak*, December 27, 1989, p. 1. Emphasis added.

- ²⁹ Jaroslav Hutka, in “Jaroslav Hutka v Olomouci,” p. 3.
- ³⁰ Michal Horacek, quoted in Tomas Drabek, “Amerika place,” *Pretlak*, December 27, 1989, p. 3.
- ³¹ “Oni a my,” *Straz lidu* (Prostejov), December 20, 1989, p. 2.
- ³² Lynn Hunt, *Politics, Culture, and Class in the French Revolution*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA, 1984, p. 21.
- ³³ Among the examples which *Pretlak* presented of coat-turning were Karel Urbanek and Jaroslav Tylsar. Urbanek, who replaced Milos Jakes as general secretary of the KSC on November 24, had in the summer of 1989 condemned demonstrators seeking to commemorate the 1968 Warsaw Pact invasion, which he at that time termed “help.” In December 1989, however, he called for rehabilitation of those who had been persecuted for opposing the invasion. (“Hledani souvislosti,” *Pretlak*, December 13, 1989, p. 8.) Tylsar—a cultural inspector for the Olomouc National Committee who had worked with the secret police in 1978 to silence the folk singer Jaroslav Hutka and who had confiscated a petition written by Music Theater workers in support of the students shortly after November 17, threatening to send it “somewhere else”—appeared on the Olomouc town square on November 27, singing with everyone else the songs of Jaroslav Hutka. (Duna Simackova, “Vydrzet, at’ to dopadne, jak chce,” *Pretlak*, December 22, 1989, p. 7.)
- ³⁴ “Reditelce zakladni skoly v Kvasicich,” November 28, 1989, in *Pretlak*, 2 December 1989, pp. 5–6.
- ³⁵ Horacek, p. 3.
- ³⁶ Verejnost’ proti nasiliu and Celoslovensky koordinacny vybor vysokoskolakov, “Priatelja, spoluobcania!”, Stanford, CA, Hoover Institution Archives, Slovak Subject Collection, box 5, folder “Slovakia. Political Parties... Verejnost’ proti Nasiliu, 1989–1990.” See also Valtr Komarek, “Kudy jit dal?,” *Svobodne slovo*, November 28, 1989, reprinted in *Pretlak*, November 28, 1989, p. 4.
- ³⁷ OF Olomouc, “Nekolik vet k Lidovym milicim,” p. 2. Emphasis added.
- ³⁸ Tomas Hyjanek, “Cesta k demokracii,” *Pretlak*, December 7, 1989, p. 1. Readers should note that it was actually Stefanik who had been an astronomer.
- ³⁹ Jiri Suk, ed., *Chronologie zaniku komunistickeho rezimu v Ceskoslovensku, 1985–1990*, Prague, 1999, p. 99.
- ⁴⁰ See, for example, Komarek, in “Tiskova beseda,” p. 1.
- ⁴¹ Robert Brezina, “Stavkovemu vyboru UP Olomouc,” *Pretlak*, December 4, 1989, p. 3.
- ⁴² Studenti UP, “Kdo je kratkozraký,” *Pretlak*, December 3, 1989, p. 3.
- ⁴³ J. Stepan, in “Z nazoru pedagoga UP,” *Pretlak*, December 3, 1989, p. 4; “Svedsky model,” *Pretlak*, December 15, 1989, p. 7.
- ⁴⁴ *Svobodne slovo*, December 4, 1989; reprinted in “Informace/aktuality,” *Pretlak*, December 5, 1989, p. 7.
- ⁴⁵ Gunter Gebauer and Christoph Wulf, *Mimesis: Culture, Art, Society*, trans. Don Reneau, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA, 1995, p. 3.
- ⁴⁶ Pinos, p. 1.
- ⁴⁷ “Co je v současné době pro Československou revoluci nejnebezpečnější?” *Pretlak*, December 19, 1989, p. 2.
- ⁴⁸ P. Hanak, “Tak jak to vlastně myslí te?” *Pretlak*, December 19, 1989, p. 3.
- ⁴⁹ Jan Marek, “Politika kontra poesie,” *Pretlak*, December 27, 1989, p. 6.
- ⁵⁰ Zabransky, p. 1.
- ⁵¹ See Vaclav Bartuska, *Polojasno: Patrani po vinicich 17. listopadu 1989*, Prague, 1990.
- ⁵² Josef Jarab, “Nedelni zamyslení,” *Pretlak*, December 18, 1989, p. 3.
- ⁵³ “Hlasy horníku při setkání zastupců stávkových výborů OKR v sobotu 2. 12. na DOLE HLUBINA,” *Pretlak*, December 6, 1989, p. 6; see also Komarek, in “Tiskova beseda.”
- ⁵⁴ Zabransky, p. 1.
- ⁵⁵ Tomas Rorecek, “Samet bez trhlin!” *Pretlak*, December 17, 1989, p. 5.
- ⁵⁶ Vaclav Havel, quoted in “Volebni program V. Havla,” *Pretlak*, December 27, 1989, p. 7.
- ⁵⁷ On the relationship between justice and revenge, see Rene Girard, *Violence and the Sacred*, trans. Patrick Gregory, Baltimore, MD, 1977, pp. 15–27.
- ⁵⁸ *Pretlak*, December 15, 1989, p. 7.
- ⁵⁹ Milan Hejtmánek, Jaroslav Jezdinsky, and Vera Jezdinska, “K jedné botě,” *Pretlak*, December 18, 1989, p. 2.
- ⁶⁰ “K botě,” *Pretlak*, December 18, 1989, p. 2.
- ⁶¹ Milan Hanus, “Stanice Hvezda...,” *Pretlak*, December 9, 1989, p. 1.
- ⁶² “Dementi,” *Pretlak*, December 22, 1989, p. 5.
- ⁶³ Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, p. 169.
- ⁶⁴ When the editors made a deal with the District National Committee, whereby this government organ would subsidize the printing of *Pretlak* in a printing house, the resulting public outcry forced the newsletter to go back to its original “samizdat” format. “Hanusgate,” as the affair came to be known, was the most remarkable example of how the broader community maintained control of the discursive platform *Pretlak* provided; the “boot scandal” mentioned above was another. “Mili ctenari,” *Pretlak*, December 7, 1989, p. 1; and Milan Hanus, “Par slov uvodem,” *Pretlak*, December 9, 1989, p. 2.
- ⁶⁵ Hyjanek, p. 1.
- ⁶⁶ “Osm pravidel dialogu,” *Pretlak*, November 27, 1989, p. 7.

Conferences and Symposia Cosponsored by ISEEES During 2001–2002

Monday, October 29, 2001 Roundtable Discussion,
“Central Asia and Russia: Responses to the ‘War on Terrorism’”

Speakers: Adrienne Edgar, UC Santa Barbara; Gail Lapidus, Stanford University; Vadim Volkov, European University, St. Petersburg; Edward W. Walker, UCB

Thursday, February 28, 2002 Second Annual Peter N. Kujachich Lecture in Serbian and Montenegrin Studies
Susan L. Woodward, City University of New York, **“Nation-Building under Western Eyes: The Balkans Today”**

Saturday–Sunday, March 16–17, 2002 Annual CCAsP Conference, **“Currents, Cross-Currents, and Conflict: Transnationalism and Diaspora in Central Asia and the Caucasus”**

Speakers: Shirin Akiner, University of London; Stephan Astourian, UCB; Turaj Atabaki, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam; Jolle Demmers, Utrecht University; Valeriya Gentshke, Ulugbek National University of Uzbekistan; Dru Gladney, University of Hawaii at Manoa; Armine Ishkanian, UCB; Ablet Kamalov, Kazakh Academy of Science; Natalya Khan, National University of Uzbekistan; Sanjyot Mehendale, UCB; Eden Naby, Harvard University; John Schoeberlein, Harvard University; Helene Perrine Wagner, Harvard University; Kulbhushan Warikoo, Jawaharlal Nehru University

Tuesday, March 26, 2002 Special Lecture on 9/11 Context and Consequences
Ahmed Rashid, Journalist, **“Looking Forward: Afghanistan, Central Asia, and Global Stability”**

Thursday, April 4, 2002 United Nations Association Film Festival, **“The Camera as Witness: Afghanistan, Israel, Russia, Vietnam, and the USA”**

Saturday–Sunday, April 13–14, 2002 Annual Teacher Outreach Conference, **“Reconfiguring East and West in the Bush-Putin Era”**

Speakers: Victoria Bonnell, UCB; George W. Breslauer, UCB; Kathleen Collins, University of Notre Dame; Sheila Gwaltney, US Foreign Service Officer; Andrew C. Janos, UCB; Juliet Johnson, Loyola University Chicago; Michael McFaul, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; Michael Nacht, UCB

Monday, April 15, 2002 Panel Discussion, **“From 1991 to 9-11: Ten Years of Independence in the Caucasus”**

Speakers: Claire Mouradian, Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales; Stephen F. Jones, Mount Holyoke College; Alec Rasizade, Historical Research Center, Washington, DC; Stephan Astourian, UCB

Tuesday, April 16, 2002 Special Lecture on 9/11 Context and Consequences
Olivier Roy, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, **“Contemporary Islamic Radicalism in the West: A Spillover from Middle East and Central Asian Conflicts or a Consequence of the Westernization of Islam?”**

Monday–Tuesday, April 22–23, 2002 Conference, **“Sound Travels: A Musical Journey Along the Silk Roads”**

Speakers: Patricia Berger, UCB; Dru C. Gladney, University of Hawaii, Manoa; Anne Draffkorn Kilmer, UCB; Alma Kunanbaeva, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Lewis Lancaster, UCB; Theodore Levin, Dartmouth College; Bo Lawergren, City University of New York; Sanjyot Mehendale, UCB; Roderick Whitfield, School of Oriental and African Studies, London; Susan Whitfield, The British Library, London; Izaly Zemtsovsky, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Yo-Yo Ma, Artistic Director, Silk Road Project; and the Silk Road Ensemble Musicians

Friday, April 26, 2002 Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference, **“Political Violence in Russia and the Former Soviet Union—Past and Present”**

Speakers: Steven Barnes, Stanford; John Dunlop, Hoover Institution; Nancy S. Kollmann, Stanford; Michael McFaul, Stanford; Gail Lapidus, Stanford; Norman Naimark, Stanford; Daniel Orlovsky, Southern Methodist University; Lynn Patyk, Stanford; Gabriella Safran, Stanford; Ronald Suny, University of Chicago; Barbara Voytek, UCB; Edward Walker, UCB; Amir Weiner, Stanford; Reginald Zelnik, UCB

Lectures Cosponsored by ISEEES During 2001–2002

Douglas Q. Adams, University of Idaho, “A New Way of Counting in Tocharian B Poetry: Discovery and Analysis.”

Shirin Akiner, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, “Crisis in Afghanistan: Implications for Central Asia.”

Michail Bezrodnyj, Harvard University, “Racial Fantasies in Russian Modernism: Vladimir Soloviev and his School.”

Oleg Bilyy, Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences, “Privatizing the State: The Origins of Corporatism in Post-Communist Ukraine.”

Yuri Blagov, St. Petersburg School of Management, “Business Opportunities in Russia Then and Now: From Yeltsin to Putin.”

His Excellency Martin Butora, Ambassador of the Slovak Republic to the United States, and **Dr. Zora Butorova**, sociologist, “Challenges to Slovakia from Without and from Within.”

Valera and Natasha Cherkashin, visual artists, “Moscow, the End of the Epoch: How We Looked for a Way to Communicate with Soviet Culture.”

Levon Chookaszian, Yerevan State University, Armenia, “Images of Secular Power in Armenian Medieval Art.”

Georgi Derluguian, Northwestern University, “What Was State Socialism?”

Maarten Fraanje, Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research, “The Meaning of Love in the Poetry of A.P. Sumarokov.”

Monika Greenleaf, Stanford University, “Before Autobiography: The Mutating Memoirs of Catherine the Great.”

Viktor Ishaev, Governor of Khabarovskii Krai, Russia, “Putin, Pragmatism, and Russia’s Future.”

Andrew Kahn, University of Oxford, “Karamzin’s Enlightenment Monuments: Memory, History, National Identity.”

Sonja Kerby and **Ann-Marsh Flores**, UCB, “‘Truth,’ Voice, and Identity in the First-Person Narration of Nadezhda Durova’s Autobiographical and Fictional Prose,” and “Coauthorship and the Origins of Russian Women’s Writing: The Case of Zinaida Volkonskaia.”

Natalya Khan, Tashkent State University, “The Afghanistan Campaign: Implications for Uzbekistan.”

Amir Khisamutdinov, Far Eastern State Technical University and Vladivostok State University of Economics and Services, “Russian Emigration to the Pacific Rim.”

Vitaly Komar and **Alexander Melamid**, visual artists, “SOTSART and Beyond: From the Soviet Underground to the West.”

Kogi Kudara, Ryukoku University, Japan, “The Buddhist Culture of the Old Uighur Peoples.”

Shorena Kurtsikidze, UCB, “The Pankisi Gorge: Historical and Ethnographic Survey of Chechens in Georgia.”

Alexander Leskov, University of Pennsylvania, “The Maikop Treasure.”

Wendy Lower, United States Holocaust Museum, “‘Anticipatory Obedience’ and the Nazi Implementation of the Holocaust in Ukraine, 1941-1944.”

Igor Lukes, Boston University, “Behind the Walls of the Schoenborn Palace in Prague: US-Czechoslovak Relations, 1938-1953.”

Vladimir Mau, Working Centre for Economic Reform, Government of the Russian Federation, “Economic Recovery in Russia: How Long Will it Last?”

Kevin Platt, Pomona College, “The Historical Myths of Russian Nationalism: The Poetics and Politics of I.E. Repin’s ‘Ivan IV’ and N.N. Ge’s ‘Peter I’.”

Ruben Safrastyan, Armenian National Academy of Sciences, “Turkey and Eurasia in the Aftermath of September 11.”

Ionel Nicu Sava, University of Bucharest, “Civil Society and the New Political Leadership in Eastern Europe.”

Tatiana Smoliarova, Harvard University, “Two Odes and One Festivity: Petrov’s and Voltaire’s Odes on Catherine the Great’s Magnificent Carousel.”

Sergei Starostin, Russian State University, “The Evolution of Human Languages and Internet Cooperation.”

Ronald Suny, University of Chicago, “Constructing Primordialism: Old Histories for New Nations.”

Alfred Thomas, Harvard University, “Shakespeare’s Bohemia: Englishmen and -women in Early-Modern Prague.”

Susanna Witt, University of Southern Stockholm, “Translation as Mimicry: Pasternak’s Shakespeare.”

Igor Zevelev, Marshall Center, “Russian and American National Identities and Security Strategies: A Comparative Analysis.”

Outreach Programs

Reconfiguring East and West in the Bush-Putin Era

Our 28th Annual Teacher Outreach Conference, “**Reconfiguring East and West in the Bush-Putin Era**,” was held on Saturday and Sunday, April 13–14, 2002 on the Berkeley campus. The conference was well attended, and the feedback we received on conference evaluations show that the weekend was a great success. The Teacher Outreach Conference is funded in part by a Title VI grant from the US Department of Education to the Center for Slavic and East European Studies within ISEES. What follows is a summary of their remarks.

Victoria E. Bonnell, professor of sociology and director of ISEES, introduced the program by providing background for the topic. Last summer when this conference was being organized, US-Russian relations were at a decisive point: issues of arms control, security policy, and Russia’s external orientation were receiving coverage in the Western media. Vladimir Putin took office on December 31, 1999 when Yeltsin resigned, and after he earned 53% of the vote, Putin was inaugurated in May 2000. George W. Bush was inaugurated in January 2001, and so began the Bush-Putin era. We witnessed the evolving relationship between the East (Eastern Europe and Eurasia) and the West (particularly the US) in this post-Cold War era, until the events of September 11, 2001 “shifted the tectonic plates of international politics,” as US National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice characterized it.

Since September, the defining feature of the relationship between East and West—particularly between Russia and the US—has been the war on terrorism and the more recent move to enlist Russia in the effort to keep weapons of mass destruction out of the hands of rogue states, a group that Bush has described as “The Axis of Evil.” These policies have produced a realignment in international politics, most notably in context of this conference is Putin’s turn to the West and his support for American military presence in Central Asia. Witness the creation of the NATO-Russia Council: the conception of “friends” and “enemies” has been undergoing an amazing transformation since the Cold War. Bonnell stated that we are witnessing the making of a geopolitical order that is transforming our notions of politics, economics, multilateral organizations, treaties, coalitions, and security arrangements—and bringing into play a certain measure of anti-Americanism. As the terrain of international politics shifts, one of the challenges will be to distinguish between the short-term changes and the long-term “tectonic shifts.”

George W. Breslauer, Chancellor’s Professor of Political Science and dean of social sciences, then addressed the question, “**Why Did Putin Join the War on Terror?**” After outlining the numerous ways that Russia

has assisted the US in the war on terror—such as sharing intelligence and giving overflight rights, Breslauer explored the possible reasons for doing so. Simple pragmatism—the search for quid pro quos to help Russia with its own dilemmas and goals, such as postponing NATO expansion into the Baltic states—is not sufficient by itself, especially when one considers Putin’s failure to achieve many of these alleged goals. More likely Putin’s reason is a combination of deeper factors: the urge to integrate Russia into Western institutions to modernize Russia; the legacy of Gorbachev and Yeltsin in such modernizing efforts; Putin as a realist and pragmatist believes that Westernization could provide Russia with a prosperous and stable future; and finally, September 11 gave Putin the opportunity to realign Russia with the US while pursuing his own goals.

According to Breslauer, Putin’s main goal is the economic modernization of Russia. He still has a long way to go, and for this he needs the good will of rich democracies and their assistance—though not necessarily financial assistance—such things as WTO membership and debt relief or restructuring. Breslauer also discussed Putin’s progress toward these goals and the roots of his policies and perspectives. The new convergence of Russia’s and the West’s interests will require leadership and creativity on both sides; for Breslauer, the greatest tension is between the US’s impulse to act alone and Russia’s demand to be an active partner. There are many examples of this: for instance, Bush proclaimed Iraq and Iran (along with North Korea) as “the Axis of Evil”; Russia has big economic stakes in those countries. Finally, while most of Russia’s role in the war on terror is only contributory, Russian weapons of mass destruction are susceptible to theft by terrorist groups. Russia’s de-commissioned nuclear weapons—located throughout the country, even near the border with Chechnya—must be properly secured, but the US Congress is concerned about how much it will cost while the Russians are resisting US inspection to ensure that the money will be well spent. Other weapons of mass destruction, chemical and biological, are also not properly secured in the former Soviet Union. The weakness of Russia and the former Soviet Union is a threat to international relations, making US-Russian cooperation essential.

Following that train of thought, **Michael Nacht**, professor of public policy and dean of the Goldman School of Public Policy, spoke next on “**Envisioning a New Security Architecture: The Views from Moscow and Washington**.” Drawing on his experience as Assistant Director for Strategic and Eurasian Affairs of the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (1994–1997), Nacht

characterized President Bill Clinton as “seeing all sides of every position and feeling others’ pain.” Clinton felt that engagement with Russia and China would, over time, contribute to their democratization and market economy growth. Following the classic pattern of American politics, Bush chose to do the exact opposite of Clinton. According to Nacht, Bush and his key people believe the world is a “tough, difficult, unpleasant, dangerous place” and feel their goal is to sustain and increase American democracy, the American economy, and the American way of life. Bush has a hands-off approach to many issues, unlike Clinton who loved policy-making.

When Bush came into office, almost immediately, he spoke critically of Russia, but September 11 has had a fundamental effect on Bush’s foreign policy thinking and that of most of his colleagues. They envision a kind of long-term, grand alliance among the US and Canada, Western Europe, Russia, China, and India in opposition to militant, fundamental Islam, with Japan “going along for the ride.” Over time, Bush has decided to improve relations with Russia and now sees China as the potential problem for the US.

Is this a new security architecture or a collection of short-term changes? On that subject, Nacht discussed the recent Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) in which we see a “widening of goals.” US nuclear arms used to be for deterrence only, but Bush’s NPR stated five goals: assurance—to our allies that we could protect them; dissuasion—our advanced capabilities would discourage arms competition; deterrence—against Russia and China, who both have nuclear capabilities; defense, coupled with conventional defenses—this is a new notion from previous NPRs; and to defeat an attack of a weapon of mass destruction against the US.

Juliet Johnson, assistant professor of political science at Loyola University Chicago, spoke on “**New Patterns of Economic Interdependence.**” An important point to remember is that the extent of economic change, especially economic interdependence, in this region has truly been revolutionary—a complete reorientation of economic systems and trade relationships. She began by illustrating this change with the example of the “gnome war.” After the breakdown of the Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, a number of Polish entrepreneurs decided to undercut the exclusive German market in garden gnomes, flooding the market with inferior but inexpensive “knock-off” gnomes. This resulted in high-level negotiations between the German and Polish governments to regulate the flow of gnomes from East to West, and Poland agreed to ban gnomes that infringed upon German copyrights.

Post-Communist countries experienced significant economic decline after the old economic systems broke down. Johnson discussed what broke down in the Soviet-Bloc economic interdependence: the Council for Mutual

Economic Assistance, uniting Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union; trade ties among the fifteen former Soviet Republics; and the Russian Ruble Zone—the states of the former Soviet Union were using the same currency until 1993. What, instead, replaced these ties: a restructuring of economic relationships and new patterns of economic interdependence. Some examples were: joining the European Union—seen as Eastern Europe’s ticket to rapid economic development, a source for economic assistance, and a “return to Europe”; oil and gas politics in the former Soviet Union—dependence on natural resource exports renders those states quite vulnerable to outside forces and creates a need for foreign capital; and trade and foreign investment in Russia—pure trade or the exchange of goods across borders, foreign indirect investment, and foreign direct investment.



Trade between Russia and the US—both the terms of trade and the type of goods—is very unequal, illustrating that, with the exception of oil and gas, Russia is not “particularly well integrated into the global trading system.” Nor is Russia well integrated into the system of foreign direct investment, due to such things as an unstable political and economic environment, heavy perceptions of corruption, and Russian companies’ “reputation of regularly disenfranchising foreign investors.” There are also negative networks created by these new patterns of economic interdependence: the trafficking of arms, women, drugs (heroin and opium), and cash (through capital flight and money laundering); lifting the Iron Curtain has allowed illegal cross-border economic activity to flourish.

As Johnson summarized, there is a widening gap in economic integration between Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, and this gap in integration contributes to the growing gap in economic growth and investment between Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. The negative networks can expand faster than legitimate ones, especially in countries with severe

domestic economic and political problems. Dependence on natural resource exports skews their economic development and investment patterns. The international community needs to encourage further openness and integration across all of the post-Communist states.

Andrew C. Janos, professor of political science, gave a theoretical background on **“The West and the Rest After the Cold War”** from what he stated was his nineteenth-century traditionalist European perspective. He began by defining the concept of “the West,” not in a geographical but in a political and cultural sense: it is a product and legacy of the Cold War (this explains why Poland is not in the West while Australia is). Countries in the West are some of the most prosperous societies, and these societies have “a natural invested interest in their economic primacy and are conservative defenders of the global status quo” so that they can maintain and increase the economic well-being of their population. Perhaps a less commonly held notion is Janos’ belief that these societies are also revolutionary societies, “the incubators of vast and revolutionary changes in a plethora of human relations—such as the relationship between man and woman, man and nature, man and God, child and parent, man and the animal kingdom—especially a change in the balance of rights of the individual and the political community.”

Why do these changes come from the West? The Western dual identity—economically conservative and culturally revolutionary—is a “powerful and disruptive force in the world, enhanced by technological advancements.” The US economy generates expectations of material standards that cannot always be met in other places, creating frustration, envy, anger, and so on. Secondly, our Western culture “projects a model for behavior that requires re-ranking of social positions while frontally challenging traditional norms that are believed to be immortal and divinely sanctioned.” This impact differs from country to country: it is less in Romania than in Afghanistan, for example. The discrepancy is worse when “a loss of status and traditional belief is not compensated by economic prosperity.” This cultural revolution took such a hold in the US because we experienced great economic gains since the 1960s.

Janos applied an algebraic equation from political science to the non-Western world—including Eastern Europe and non-European countries: consumer ideology + cultural change – economic prosperity = political turmoil. This political turmoil in turn encourages the rise of radical movements. The counter-revolution to our cultural revolution is expressed by “secular tribal radicalism or religious fundamentalism.” The West is left with a serious predicament: shall we accommodate the non-West or shall we just fight it? And if we accommodate it, in what sense shall we do so and to what extent is it practical, even just in terms of economics? The situation call for an architecture of power, and Janos described the nineteenth-century

model whereby the great powers of Europe kept each other in check. He then applied this point of view to the post-Cold War era, describing the administrations of George Bush, Sr.—a power politician who “did not stand for anything”; Bill Clinton—“the first postmodern president of the US,” embodying cultural liberalism and believing in the power of discourse; and George W. Bush—who is “wavering between being a crusader and a power politician.” Finally, September 11 brought a great opportunity to the Bush administration and to the US: five of the six great world powers have Islamic populations, and this opens the door for a new “Great Game.”

Michael McFaul, associate professor of political science at Stanford University and senior associate with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, then discussed the **“Milestones on Russia’s Road to Integration with the West.”** The somewhat positive outcome of September 11 is an opportunity “to fundamentally reshape US-Russia relations for a very long time.” Putin believed that the attack on September 11 was akin to the occurrences of terrorism in Moscow during September 1999; he understood what the US was experiencing and immediately called Bush. McFaul believes that Putin’s alliance with the US was neither tactical nor strategic; rather it was emotional—if the world was going to be kind of black and white, Putin wanted to be on the side of the West. Bush had already framed the world as “the West and the rest.” Following September 11, Bush demonstrated his interest in integrating Russia with the West: he used the term “terrorist” to describe the situation in Chechnya; he proclaimed he wanted to graduate Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment; he believes that Russia should be a part of NATO; and he agreed that he would sign a piece of paper in May 2002 about strategic arms reductions.

Next, McFaul gave his five worries about the new US-Russia relations. First, we should not allow our expectations to grow unrealistically, as we learned from 1991. Second, some interest groups in Russia don’t support US involvement in the region: the Russian military; the military industrial complex who is involved in trading with rogue states; oil companies fear that US involvement will bring other oil companies to the region; the FSB (formerly the KGB) is suspicious about our long-term intentions; the Duma, not just the Communists but Putin’s own party, is suspicious about new allies; the liberals privately are nervous that their agenda for democracy will be lost in the background; and the public does not associate the word “democracy” with the US. Putin’s 70% approval rating keeps all of these groups in check. Third, the EU is reluctant about allowing Russia to join them; meanwhile Russia believes EU membership is coming soon, just after WTO membership. Fourth, US inattention to Russia, both organizational and structural, is a concern. After September 11, the US focus on Russia diminished and few of Bush’s political appointees have Russian language skills or are regional experts; meanwhile, Russia

remains focused on US-Russia relations as a key point in their foreign policy. Fifth, Putin has not always supported democracy in Russia. Our most trusted allies are long-standing democracies, not places where power has shifted rapidly and a stable democracy is not a given—what, McFaul asked, would happen if Russia became a dictatorship instead of a democracy? The US has a national security interest in what happens politically and economically in Russia. According to McFaul, the good news is that the Russian people fundamentally want to be a part of the West and they understand that, to be a part of the West, individuals must have the right to choose how they make their living and the right to choose their leaders. In the long term, Russia is bound to join the West.

Kathleen Collins, assistant professor of government and political science at the University of Notre Dame, began her talk on **“Stabilizing or Destabilizing Central Asia? The Great Powers and Central Asia After September 11”** by contrasting a map with Central Asia in the center with a map of Russia with Central Asia below it. Central Asia’s geopolitical transition challenges the notion of the region as a backwater.

What have been and what are the real security threats to Central Asia? The greatest threat is the regional threat from Afghanistan: the Taliban and the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU), though both are somewhat diminished since US intervention in the region; instability from such things as interethnic conflict, in spite of the current international presence; and possible domestic instability in Pakistan. Other threats are the proliferation of weapons—both conventional and the materials for weapons of mass destruction—and the significant increase in opium production, which moves from Afghanistan into the Central Asian states and Russia. There are domestic threats within the Central Asian states as well. Long-term economic decline is very serious: lack of foreign investment, extremely low salaries, underemployment that is not captured in the official statistics. Along with economic decline comes social decline; the use of child labor in agriculture in rural areas, for example, has caused a drastic decline in education and literacy. Rising narcotics use—in addition to the states simply being transit routes—is a recent development and has caused a rise in the AIDS epidemic in the region. Tension from clan-based political interests has had very negative consequences for the stability of the states in question. Finally, a rise in Islamic sympathizers—most of whom are not necessarily fundamentalists nor terrorists—challenges the stability of Central Asian states.

What’s being done to promote stability in the region? Prior to September 11, especially under Clinton, US policy for promoting democratization in Central Asia was very inconsistent across the region. Bush brought a Realpolitik to the region, especially since September; while US policy is in flux, it is going in a positive direc-

tion. One of the major outcomes has been the use by the US of bases in the region. Though the use of these bases is purportedly short-term, Collins believes that the use could be longer-term. What do the Central Asian states receive in return: economic aid, economic investment, stability in the region, and a reorientation to the West. US engagement in the region does not negate Russia’s interests; the US presence in Central Asia has shifted some of the burden of the security of Central Asia from Russia.

What are future prospects for stability in the region? US engagement is the best hope for the region, both for economic development and for political development. The US must seek a *regional* solution to the Afghan conflict; this is a good opportunity to influence the creation and consolidation of stable, more open, democratic governments within the region. Increased US presence in the region has been, on the whole, a stabilizing factor, and if done as a gradual, long-term process, it will continue to be a stabilizing factor. Finally, there is a lot of support, particularly among the youth, for a greater political liberalization, greater openness, and greater realignment with the West.

Sheila Gwaltney, US Foreign Service Officer and 2001–2002 National Security Affairs Fellow at the Hoover Institution, spoke last on **“Challenges in Central Asia.”** Recently Deputy Chief of Mission at the US Embassy in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, Gwaltney spoke at our conference off the record, so her talk is not summarized here.

For materials from this and previous Teacher Outreach Conferences, visit our Web pages on outreach activities to teachers at <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~csees/outreach.html>.

Faculty and Student News

Ronelle Alexander, professor of Slavic languages and literatures, was nominated for a 2002 AATSEEL book prize for best contribution to language pedagogy for the two volumes of *Intensive Bulgarian: A Textbook and Reference Grammar*, which she wrote with the assistance of Olga M. Mladenova (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2000). AATSEEL will announce the prize winners in December.

George Breslauer, professor of political science and dean of social sciences, recently published *Gorbachev and Yeltsin as Leaders* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002). He also wrote the introduction to Anderson, Fish, et al., *Postcommunism and the Theory of Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

Robin Brooks, Ph.D. candidate in political science, was recognized by her department as an Outstanding Graduate Student Instructor for AY 2001–2002.

Chad Bryant (Ph.D. in history, 2001) has accepted a tenure-track position at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill beginning in the fall.

Michael Burawoy, professor of sociology, received funding for next AY from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation's Program on Global Security and Sustainability. He is collaborating with a colleague from Russia, Pavel Krotov, on a project entitled "Urban Inequities After Socialism: The Case of Provincial Russian Capital."

Christopher Caes, Ph.D. candidate in Slavic languages and literatures, was recognized by the Slavic department as an Outstanding Graduate Student Instructor for AY 2001–2002.

Armen Der Kiureghian, professor of civil and environmental engineering, was awarded the Movses Khorenatsi medal from the government of Armenia on the tenth anniversary of the founding of the American University of Armenia for educating high-caliber specialists and fostering educational and scientific collaborations between Armenia and the US.

M. Steven Fish, associate professor of political science, coauthored the recent book *Postcommunism and the Theory of Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001). Fish also contributed the volume's chapter on "The Dynamics of Democratic Erosion."

Victoria Frede, Ph.D. candidate in history, will spend next academic year as a postdoctoral fellow at the Harriman Institute.

David Frick, professor of Slavic languages and literatures, received a short-term grant for 2002 from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Scott Gehlbach, Ph.D. candidate in political science, received an International Dissertation Field Research Fellowship from SSRC during AY 2001–2002 for his research on "New Democratic Institutions and Corruption in Post-Communist Countries."

Kristen Ghodsee (Ph.D. in social and cultural studies from the Graduate School of Education, 2002) will take up the position of assistant professor in Bowdoin College's Women's Studies Program in Fall 2002. Her recent dissertation is entitled "Sun, Sand, and Socialism: Women, Economic Transformation, and Tourism Employment in Post-Communist Bulgaria."

Kristen presented a paper entitled "Human Trafficking, Sex Slaves, Brain Drain, and Economic Immigration: Conflicting Discourses of Mobility in Bulgaria and the European Union" at the Annual Soyuz Symposium, held in February 2002 at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Elenory Gilburd, Ph.D. candidate in history, received an International Dissertation Field Research Fellowship from SSRC during AY 2001–2002 for her research "'To See Paris and Die': Foreign Culture in the Soviet Union, 1956–1968."

Olya Gurevich, Ph.D. candidate in Slavic languages and literatures, presented a paper on "The Effect of Declension Loss of Prepositions" at the Thirteenth Biennial Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics, Literature, and Folklore, held in April 2002 at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Armine Ishkanian, presented a paper entitled "Surviving Post-Soviet Poverty: The Experiences and Narratives of Armenian Temporary Labor Migrants in the US" at the Annual Soyuz Symposium, held in February 2002 at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Kari Anne Johnstone (Ph.D. in political science, 2002) spent the past academic year at the Kennan Institute as a research scholar. Her recent dissertation is entitled "International Influence on Ethnic Minority Policy in Post-Communist Ukraine and Slovakia."

Raymond June, Ph.D. candidate in social and cultural studies at the Graduate School of Education, spoke on “Czech Intellectuals and the Formation of the Transparent State” at the workshop on “Organizing Visions: The Ambiguity of Transparency in Science, Technology, and Politics,” sponsored by Cornell’s Department of Science and Technology Studies during April 2002.

Konstantine Klioutchkine, Ph.D. candidate in Slavic Languages and Literatures, will be joining Pomona College in Claremont, California, as assistant professor of Russian. His dissertation, which he expects to file in 2002, focuses on “Russian Literature and the Press, 1860–1913.”

Traci Lindsey, Ph.D. candidate in Slavic languages and literatures, presented a paper on “Case Loss and the Definitive Article in Bulgarian” at the Thirteenth Biennial Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics, Literature, and Folklore, held in April 2002 at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Olga Matich, professor of Slavic languages and literatures, is organizing a conference for the journal *Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie* entitled “Russians in Hollywood/Hollywood on Russia” in Moscow during June 2002. She will be showing two Hollywood silent films on the Russian Revolution and presenting a paper about them.

She recently presented a talk on “Alexander Blok: Degeneracy and the Blood Taint” at an international colloquium on the history of the Russian body held during May 2002 at the Université de Paris-Sorbonne.

Sean McMeekin (Ph.D. in history, 2001) has accepted a position at Bilkent University in Ankara, Turkey.

Stiliana Milkova, Ph.D. candidate in comparative literature, presented a paper on “The Circle Misul and the Rise of Bulgarian Modernism” at the Thirteenth Biennial Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics, Literature, and Folklore, held in April 2002 at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Sean Murphy, Ph.D. candidate in history, was recognized by the Department of History as an Outstanding Graduate Student Instructor for AY 2001–2002.

Renee Permuter, Ph.D. candidate in linguistics, presented a paper on “Macedonia Definiteness” at the Thirteenth Biennial Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics, Literature, and Folklore, held in April 2002 at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Ethan Pollock (Ph.D. in history, 2002) is spending AY 2002–2003 at Columbia University as a postdoctoral fellow, after which he will take up a tenure track position at Syracuse University.

Shawn Salmon, Ph.D. candidate in history, was recognized by the Department of History as an Outstanding Graduate Student Instructor for AY 2001–2002.

Maria Stoilkova, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, presented the paper “A Quest for Belonging: Bulgarian Emigration Crisis” at the American Anthropological Association’s annual meeting held November 28–December 2, 2001 in Washington, DC.

Michelle Viise, Ph.D. candidate in Slavic languages and literatures, received an ACLS Grant for Eastern European Studies during AY 2001–2002 for her research on “Models of Nationhood Advanced in 17th-century Ruthenian Orthodox and Uniate Texts.”

Ilya Vinkovetsky (Ph.D. in history, 2002) has accepted a position as assistant professor at the American University in Bulgaria. He filed his dissertation, “Native Americans and the Russian Empire, 1804–1867,” in May.

Lisa Walker, Ph.D. candidate in history, presented the paper “To Ensure the Harmonious Development of Body and Mind: Hygiene and Schools in Russia, 1874–1912” at a conference of the British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies during April 2002.

Kevin Wallsten, Ph.D. candidate in political science, was recognized by his department as an Outstanding Graduate Student Instructor for AY 2001–2002.

Margarita Yanson, Ph.D. candidate in comparative literature, was recognized by the Department of Comparative Literature as an Outstanding Graduate Student Instructor for AY 2001–2002.

Zachary Zwald, Ph.D. candidate in political science, was recognized by his department as an Outstanding Graduate Student Instructor for AY 2001–2002.

Hertelendy Fellowship Awarded

The Executive Committee of ISEEEES has chosen to award a Hertelendy Fellowship in Hungarian Studies for 2002–2003 to an excellent applicant who will be studying at the School of Journalism in the fall. The awardee is **Mr. Marton Dunai**, a native of Hungary, who seeks a career in international journalism with emphasis on Hungary and Europe. Mr. Dunai is completing his BA at the University of Budapest. He has worked for five years for

Nepszabadsag as a journalist and editor and is a correspondent for *Transitions Online*, the successor to *Transitions* magazine. He has in the past received stipends to study journalism in Denmark and the Netherlands. The faculty on the Executive Committee were familiar with Mr. Dunai's writing for *Transitions Online*. We are sure that his presence here will be a positive factor for the School of Journalism and for the Institute.

Kujachich Endowment Funding

Following a competition in March 2002, several initiatives and proposals were awarded grants from the Peter N. Kujachich Endowment in Serbian and Montenegrin Studies for AY 2002–2003. The Endowment supports such activities as research, instruction, colloquia, symposia, lecture series and publications, and creative thought and writing in the social sciences, humanities, and arts that focus on the experience of the Serbian and Montenegrin peoples.

Professor Eugene Hammel (Department of Demography) and **Dr. Mirjana Stevanovic** (Department of Anthropology) were awarded a major grant for their research project, "The Migration of Major Ethnic Groups in Serbia (including Kosovo), Montenegro, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Macedonia circa 1930–1991." The project continues and expands their earlier research that was recently published as a supplement to this Newsletter.

Ilija Labalo, undergraduate in the Department of Philosophy, received a grant to conduct research in Yugoslavia and investigate the progress of President Kostunica's proposed Commission for Truth and Reconciliation. Upon return to campus in the fall, Ilija will analyze his findings, working with Professor Andrew Janos of the Department of Political Science. He expects to publish an article in our Newsletter next year.

Emily Shaw, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Political Science, was awarded a grant to assist her in the improvement of her Serbian language skills by spending

some time during the summer in Yugoslavia. She expects to be enrolled in a language program in Novi Sad. Although Kujachich funds are not normally used for language training (because of the availability of FLAS fellowships), Emily's situation was an exception that merited positive consideration.

ISEEEES has also received a generous award to continue the **Peter N. Kujachich Annual Lecture in Serbian and Montenegrin Studies**. This popular program will be held again in the spring of 2003. Veljko Vujacic (Oberlin College) spoke about Slobodan Milosevic's career for the 2001 lecture, and Susan Woodward (City University of New York) spoke on nation-building in the Balkans for the 2002 lecture.

The **Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures** will also continue to benefit from a two-year award that was made last year to assist in the teaching of Serbian/Croatian. Several students will be enrolled, many with the assistance of FLAS fellowships (funded by a Title VI grant from the US Department of Education to ISEEEES).

The call for proposals for 2003–2004 funding will be published in the Spring 2003 issue of this Newsletter. For information on supporting programs of study on our regions, please contact Barbara Voytek, executive director of the ISEEEES, at (510) 643-6736.

Associates of the Slavic Center

The Center acknowledges with sincere appreciation the following individuals who have contributed to the annual giving program, the Associates of the Slavic Center (or have been enrolled due to their particular generosity toward Cal to support some aspect of Slavic & East European Studies), between January 1 and May 31, 2002. Financial support from the Associates is vital to our program of research, training, and extra-curricular activities. We would like to thank all members of ASC for their generous assistance.

CENTER CIRCLE

Richard and Beatrice Heggie*
Anonymous*

BENEFACTOR

Enid Merle Emerson*

SPONSORS

Carlo and Eleanor Anderson*
Dick Castile*
Patricia Durbin-Heavey*
Alexander Edeleanu*
Arlin Peters*

MEMBERS

Ralph T. and Ruth Fisher*
Mark Holman*
Walter Parchomenko*

COMPANY MATCH

Chevron Texaco Corporation*
(gifts from Carlo and Eleanor
Anderson and from Arlin Peters)



For those of you who are not yet members, we encourage you to join. We believe you will enjoy the stimulating programs; even if you cannot participate as often as you might wish, your continuing contribution critically supports the Center's mission and goals.

Members (\$10 to \$100). Members of ASC receive monthly "Updates" and special mailings to notify them of events and special activities, such as cultural performances and major conferences. In this way, notification of even last-minute items is direct.

Sponsors (\$100-up). ASC Sponsors also receive a uniquely designed notepad folio which promotes Slavic and East European Studies at Berkeley. They also receive invitations to special informal afternoon and evening talks on campus featuring guest speakers from the faculty as well as visiting scholars.

Benefactors (\$500-up). ASC Benefactors receive invitations to the dinner and evening programs associated with our annual conferences, such as the annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference in the spring.

Center Circle (\$1,000-up). In addition to enjoying the above-mentioned benefits, donors within the Center Circle will also become Chancellor's Associates of the University, joining a select group of alumni and friends who support Cal through unrestricted giving. Membership in this group offers a number of University benefits

It is a policy of the University of California and the Berkeley Foundation that a portion of the gifts and/or income therefrom is used to defray the costs of raising and administering the funds. Donations are tax-deductible to the extent allowed by law.

Send your check, made payable to the Regents of the University of California, to:

Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies
University of California, Berkeley
260 Stephens Hall # 2304
Berkeley CA 94720-2304
Attn: ASC

Name(s) _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Home _____ Business _____

Phone _____ Phone _____

If your employer has a matching gift program, please print name of corporation below:

____ I have made a contribution but wish to remain anonymous.

Fellowship and Other Opportunities

ISEEES Travel Grants provide up to \$400 in limited travel support for ISEEES-affiliated grad students and faculty. Awards are made to those presenting a paper at a meeting of a recognized scholarly organization. Awards are made on a first-come, first-served basis, and priority is given to those who did not receive ISEEES funding in the past AY. To apply send request with budget. Deadline: on-going. Contact: Barbara Voytek, ISEEES, UC Berkeley, 260 Stephens Hall # 2304, Berkeley CA 94720-2304; Tel: 510-643-6736; bvoytek@socrates.berkeley.edu.

British Council

Chevening Awards fund the cost of study in Britain for 3-12 months for citizens or residents of the Russian Federation, 35 years of age or younger. Awards are made for advanced study in several fields. Applications must show how their studies may contribute to change in Russia through further developments in governance, the democratic culture, or the market economy. Deadline: 9/30/02. Contact: Chevening Scholarships, The British Council, BIL, UI, Nikoloyamskaya 1, Moscow 109189, Russia; Tel: 095-234-0201, 234-0236; Fax: 095-234-0205; bc.moscow@britishcouncil.ru; <http://www.britishcouncil.ru/education/scholarship/chevening.htm>.

Central European University

The **Center for Policy Studies** offers **International Policy Fellowships** for one year of analytical policy research for open society leaders and professional policy training. Applicants must be permanent residents of a country where the Soros Foundations work. Fellows participate in 4 seminars in Budapest over the course of the year. Applications must be made on line. Deadline: 8/1/02. Contact: International Policy Fellowships, Open Society Institute, Oktober 6 utca 12, H-1051 Budapest, Hungary; Tel: 36-1-327-3863; Fax: 36-1-327-3809; fellows@osi.hu; <http://www.osi.hu/ipf/apply.html>.

Collegium Budapest

The **Institute for Advanced Study's Junior Fellowships** fund research in residence on Central and Eastern Europe in any field. Deadline: 6/15/02. Contact: Collegium Budapest, Junior Fellowships, Szentharonsag u. 2., H-1014 Budapest; Tel: 36-1-22-48-300; Fax: 36-1-22-48-310; vera.kempa@colbud.hu; <http://www.colbud.hu/>.

Fulbright/IEE

Full Grants for Study and Research Abroad provide round-trip travel, tuition, books, and a stipend for one academic year to US citizens holding a BA or equivalent. Grants provide opportunity for personal development and international experience and can be used for course work or for master's or dissertation research. Deadline: 9/9/02. Contact: Fulbright Program Advisor, Graduate Fellowships Office, 318 Sproul Hall # 5900; Tel: 510-642-0672; http://www.grad.berkeley.edu/fellowships/fellowships_deadlines.shtml.

Kosciuszko Foundation

The **Metchie J. E. Budka Award** provides \$1,500 for outstanding scholarly work in Polish literature (14th Century to 1939) or Polish history (962 to 1939). The competition is open to grad students at US universities and to postdocs in their first three years. Deadline: 7/17/02. Contact: Metchie J. E. Budka Award, The Kosciuszko

Foundation, 15 E 65th St, New York NY 10021-6595; Tel: 212-734-2130; Fax: 212-628-4552; thekf@aol.com; <http://www.kosciuszkofoundation.org/>.

Library of Congress

Kluge Center Fellowships provide \$3,500/mo for 6-12 months of residential research in the collections of the Library of Congress. Scholars who have received a terminal advanced degree within the past seven years in the humanities, the social sciences, or in a professional field such as architecture or law are eligible. Deadline: 9/30/01. Contact: John W. Kluge Center Office of Scholarly Programs, Library of Congress LJ 120, 101 Independence Ave SE, Washington DC 20540-4860; Tel: 202-707-3302; Fax: 202-707-3595; scholarly@loc.gov; <http://www.loc.gov/loc/kluge/>.

Research Council of Norway

Financial Support for Cooperation within Higher Education and Research between Norway and South Eastern Europe 2000-2004 provides support to Master/PhD students and researchers from South Eastern Europe for stays in Norway for 1-10 months to study or conduct research or for short-term stays in Norway of up to 2 weeks in order to initiate and organize joint projects with Norwegian institutions. Deadline: 6/15/02. Contact: International Scholarship Section, The Research Council of Norway, PO Box 2700, St. Hanshaugen, N-0131 Oslo, Norway; Tel: 47-22-03-70-00; Fax: 47-22-03-70-01; intstip@forskningsradet.no; http://www.forskningsradet.no/fag/andre/is/is_sorostEuropa2001.html.

Social Science Research Council (SSRC)

Abe Fellowships provide 3-12 months of full-time support over 2 years for international multidisciplinary research on topics of pressing global concern. Open to citizens of the US or Japan who hold a PhD or the terminal degree in their field. Deadline: 9/1/02. Contact: Abe Fellowship Program, Social Science Research Council, 810 Seventh Ave, New York NY 10019; Tel: 212-377-2700 ext. 423; Fax: 212-377-272; abe@ssrc.org; <http://www.ssrc.org/fellowships/>.

Society for Slovene Studies

The **Graduate Student Prize** provides \$1,000 for the best paper in any discipline written by a grad student on a topic involving Slovene studies. Slovene citizens and students studying in Slovenia are not eligible. Deadline: 8/1/02. Contact: Professor Timothy Pogacar, Editor, Slovene Studies, Bowling Green State University, Dept of GREAL, Bowling Green OH 43403; <http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/~ljubljan/gradprize.html>.

Woodrow Wilson Center

East European Studies Short Term Grants provide a stipend of \$100 a day, up to one month, for grad students and postdocs who are engaged in specialized research requiring access to Washington, DC and its research institutions may apply. Grants do not include residence. Deadline: 6/01/02. Contact: East European Studies, Woodrow Wilson Center, One Woodrow Wilson Plaza, 1300 Pennsylvania Ave NW, Washington DC 20523; Tel: 202-691-4000; Fax: 202-691-4001; kneppm@wwic.si.edu; <http://www.wics.si.edu/ees/grants.htm>.

Upcoming Events

Events are subject to change; for current information on ISEEEES-sponsored events, please call (510) 642-3230.

Through June 28, 2002. *Film Screening:* "Wry Smiles, Suspicious Glances: The Films of Andrzej Munk." At the Pacific Film Archive, 2575 Bancroft Avenue, UC Berkeley, each Friday in June, times vary. Fees: \$7 general, \$4.50 seniors/disabled/under 12, \$4 UCB students. Sponsored by Film Polski. Contact: PFA, (510) 642-1412, <http://www.bampfa.berkeley.edu/pfa/>.

Through June 30, 2002. *Film Screening:* "The Visionary Videoworks of Alexander Sokurov." At the Pacific Film Archive, 2575 Bancroft Avenue, UC Berkeley, times vary. Fees: \$7 general, \$4.50 seniors/disabled/under 12, \$4 UCB students. Contact: PFA, (510) 642-1412, <http://www.bampfa.berkeley.edu/pfa/>.

Through July 14, 2002. *Exhibition:* "Asian Elephant Art and Conservation Project" by Vitaly Komar and Alexander Melamid, visual artists. At the Berkeley Art Museum, 2626 Bancroft Way; Wed–Sun, 11 a.m.–7 p.m. Fees: \$6 general, \$4 students/seniors/disabled, UCB students/faculty/staff free. Contact: BAM, (510) 642-0808 or <http://www.bampfa.berkeley.edu/main.html>.

June 13–30, 2002. *Russian Festival:* The San Francisco Symphony, will perform a series of concerts highlighting Russian music. At Davies Symphony Hall, San Francisco, times vary. Fees: prices vary by event; tickets may be purchased at the SFS Box Office, (415) 864-6000. Contact: SF Symphony, <http://www.sfsymphony.org/> or (415) 552-8000.

Thursday, July 11, 2002. *Performance:* San Francisco Symphony will perform a Tchaikovsky Showcase, featuring Soovin Kim, violin. At Davies Symphony Hall, San Francisco, 8 p.m. Fees: \$15-56; tickets may be purchased at the SFS Box Office, (415) 864-6000. Contact: SF Symphony, <http://www.sfsymphony.org/> or (415) 552-8000.

July 14–October 13, 2002. *Exhibition:* "Alexander Rodchenko (1891–1956): Modern Photography, Photomontage, and Film." At the Berkeley Art Museum, 2626 Bancroft Way; Wed.–Sun., 11 a.m.–7 p.m. Fees: \$6 general, \$4 students/seniors/disabled, UCB students/faculty/staff free. Contact: BAM, (510) 642-0808 or <http://www.bampfa.berkeley.edu/main.html>.

Saturday July 27, 2002. *Fort Ross Living History Day:* Among other programs, Slavyanka, the Russian Men's Choir, will perform (10:30 a.m. and 2 p.m.). At Fort Ross,

19005 Coast Highway 1, Jenner, California, 10 a.m.–5 p.m. Fees: free. Contact: Fort Ross State Historic Park, (707) 847-3286.

July 29–August 2, 2002. *ORIAS Summer Institute for K-12 Teachers:* "The Role of Food in World History." See announcement on page 2.

Thursday & Saturday, September 5 & 7, 2002.

Performance: San Francisco Symphony will perform Rachmaninoff's *Vocalise*. On Thurs at the Flint Center, Cupertino, 8 p.m.; Sat at Davies Hall, San Francisco, 8 p.m. Fees: tickets go on sale 8/23/02 and may be purchased at the SFS Box Office, (415) 864-6000. Contact: SF Symphony, <http://www.sfsymphony.org/> or (415) 552-8000.

Save the Date

Wednesday, October 9, 2002. *Annual Fall Reception.* Join us for good company and fabulous Russian cuisine. In the Toll Room, Alumni House, 4–6 p.m. Sponsored by ISEEEES.

Friday, October 18, 2002. *Annual Colin Miller Memorial Lecture:* Strobe Talbott, former Deputy Secretary of State, will be our speaker. At 4 p.m., a campus location will be announced. Sponsored by ISEEEES.

Friday–Sunday, November 8–10, 2002. *Conference:* "Power and Power Relations in East European Politics and Societies." In 370 Dwinelle Hall; a schedule will be announced. Sponsored by ISEEEES and others.

Friday, March 7, 2003. *Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference.* This year's conference will be held on the Berkeley campus; a topic will be announced in the fall. In the Toll Room, Alumni House. Sponsored by ISEEEES and the Center for Russian and East European Studies at Stanford University.

Saturday–Sunday, April 26–27, 2003. *Annual Teacher Outreach Conference.* A topic will be announced in the fall. In the Toll Room, Alumni House. Sponsored by ISEEEES and CSEES.

1470632324

Center for Slavic and East European Studies
University of California, Berkeley
Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies
260 Stephens Hall # 2304
Berkeley, CA 94720-2304

NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

BPS Working Paper Series

The Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies (BPS) is completing three new working paper titles. Funding for the publication of these working papers comes from a grant by the Carnegie Corporation of New York to BPS.

Civilizing the State Bureaucracy: The Unfulfilled Promise of Public Administration Reform in Poland, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic (1990–2000) by Conor O'Dwyer, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Political Science, Spring 2002.

Language "Purity" and the De-Russification of Tatar by Suzanne Wertheim, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Linguistics, Spring 2002.

Georgia's Pankisi Gorge: An Ethnographic Survey by Shorena Kurtsikidze and Vakhtang Chikovani, Spring 2002.

These titles will be posted to the BPS publications Web page, <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~bsp/publications.html>. The complete list of BPS working papers are available to download as PDF documents at that address. For more information on this series, contact BPS directly at bsp@socrates.berkeley.edu or (510) 643-6737.

Caucasus and Central Asia Newsletter

The Caucasus and Central Asia Program (CCAsP) is pleased to announce the forthcoming publication of the *Caucasus and Central Asia Newsletter*. The newsletter is distributed in print to a community of Caucasus and Central Asia scholars; issues are available to all in PDF format on CCAsP's publications Web page, <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~bsp/caucasus/publications.html>. For more information, contact CCAsP at ccap@uclink.berkeley.edu, <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~bsp/caucasus/>, or (510) 643-5845.

Issue 2, Summer 2002

"The Afghanistan Campaign (Operation Enduring Freedom): Implications for Uzbekistan," Natalya Khan

"Tomorrow, Tomorrow, and Tomorrow...Georgia's Endless Transition," Stephen F. Jones

"Azerbaijan in the Morning After Independence: Less Oil, More Graft," Alec Radizade

"Inner Asia: A Geographical Perspective," David Hooson