We have just concluded an academic year filled with many activities coordinated by the Center for Slavic and East European Studies. The range and diversity of our conferences, lectures, workshops, working groups, and bag lunches testifies to the extraordinary vitality of the faculty, students and staff associated with the Center. In early March, we co-sponsored and helped to organize two remarkable symposia reflecting the broad spectrum of topics addressed by our Center and faculty. On March 3, a four-hour program of speakers on “Current Prospects for Armenia” examined the complex circumstances confronting that country and its people. An audience of close to two hundred joined in the afternoon.

On March 4, a group of internationally acclaimed scholars addressed the topic, “When Ivan Met Mickey: Walt Disney’s Mark on Sergei Eisenstein.” Among the presenters were Naum Kleiman who came specially from the Eisenstein Archive in Moscow. Our annual Colin Miller Memorial Lecture featured Professor Nina Tumarkin, department of history, Wellesley College. She gave a timely lecture, “The Agony of Victory: Russia Remembers World War II.” A review of her recent book, *The Living and the Dead: the Rise and Fall of the Cult of World War II in Russia*, is presented in the Newsletter by one of our Ph.D. candidates in history. Our Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference, entitled, “Time and Money in Russian Culture” also generated a great deal of interest. Scholars from many different disciplines explored cultural attitudes and practices relating to time and money from early modern Russia to the present day. Finally, the Annual Teachers Outreach Conference examined the problems of “identities in transition” in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Conference speakers probed the ways personal and collective identities have changed over the past decade with respect to gender, class, nationality, religion, and politics. The presentations were insightful and informative, and we have decided to prepare a volume of the papers presented at the conference — hopefully to come out before the end of the year.

Through these and other activities, students, faculty and Associates of the Slavic Center have drawn together into a closer intellectual community than ever before. Our new program of Working Groups has brought graduate students and faculty into small informal discussion groups focused on particular topics. This past year five Working Groups have been supported jointly by the Center and the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies, with participation from the disciplines of history, political science, sociology, and Slavic languages and literatures.

One vehicle for closer cooperation among faculty is the Convenor Group, “Europe East and West After the Collapse of Communism: Challenges to Sovereignty from Above and Below,” recently launched by the Slavic Center in collaboration with the Center for German and East European Studies. This project involves about twenty faculty members from Berkeley and elsewhere, including many Center-affiliated faculty members in the social sciences. We expect to meet bi-annually over the next two academic years to discuss a variety of topics pertaining to East and West Europe after the collapse of communism and the end of the Cold War.

Our intellectual community has also been enriched by the high level of participation in activities by Associates of the Slavic Center. It has been very gratifying to see so many Center Associates attending conferences, bag lunches, and lectures. Your contribution has been two-fold: you support our program of training and research, and your presence at Center activities encourages our efforts.

*continued on next page*
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The Slavic and East European community on the Berkeley campus has continued to prosper in other ways as well. The University administration, under the leadership of Chancellor Chang-Lin Tien, Vice-Chancellor Carol Christ and Dean of International and Area Studies Richard Buxbaum, has provided further evidence that this campus remains committed to research and teaching about the vast region that now comprises thirty countries, stretching from Poland to Mongolia. At a time when many other campuses in this country are reducing their faculty and programs in the area of East Europe and the former Soviet Union, the Berkeley campus has taken the lead in maintaining and fortifying support for faculty engaged in the study of this region.

We are proud to announce two new appointments to the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures. Harsha Ram will join our faculty as an Assistant Professor and will lend strength to our offerings in the area of nineteenth century Russian literature and culture. He currently teaches at Sarah Lawrence College and has a degree from Yale University. Professor Viktor Zhivov, a leading authority on early modern Russian literature and culture, will also join our faculty. Professor Zhivov teaches at Moscow State University and will be dividing his time between Berkeley and Moscow.

The political science department has appointed Dr. Steven Fish as Assistant Professor, specializing in the study of contemporary Russian politics. Professor Fish, is the author of the book Democracy from Scratch: Opposition and Regime in the New Russian Revolution recently published by Princeton University Press. He has a Ph.D. from Stanford and teaches at the University of Pennsylvania. Although the Berkeley Slavic community has seen some retirements in recent years, these and other recent appointments and promotions serve to ensure that we retain the faculty resources essential for keeping this campus in the forefront of scholarly research and teaching.

We are sad to report that Professor William Slottman, a long-time Berkeley faculty member in the History Department and affiliate of the Slavic Center, passed away on May 4, 1995. He will be remembered with warmth and appreciation by the many students and colleagues whose lives he touched.

Nearly one year has elapsed since the Berkeley-Stanford Program on Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies became the Berkeley Program on Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies, newly christened and also newly structured as a more integral part of the Berkeley Slavic Center. I am pleased to report that this premier graduate training program has flourished under the new conditions, and the close interaction between the Berkeley Program and Slavic Center has been mutually beneficial for all concerned. We now co-sponsor and co-organize many events. George Breslauer, Chair of the BPS, and I have been working with Ned Walker and Barbara Voytek to ensure that we maximize our present resources and locate new sources of funding to perpetuate the Berkeley Program in the years to come.

Although the summer is a quiet time at the Slavic Center, we are beginning to make preparations for the coming academic year, 1995-1996. Many of you have seen the notice in this year’s brochure for Cal Performances announcing a symposium on “The Russian Stravinsky,” to be held in conjunction with a performance of Stravinsky’s Les Noces by the Pokrovsky Ensemble. We are also planning conferences on organized crime in Russia today and on the political economy of East Europe and the former Soviet Union, as well as many other stimulating events. We will provide more information on these and other plans in the fall Newsletter.

In the meantime, I want to wish you a pleasant summer and express my gratitude to all of you who helped make the past year at the Slavic Center such a success.

Victoria E. Bonnell
Two Perspectives on Ukrainian Identity

Kari Johnstone, Ph.D. student,
Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley

April brought Berkeley audiences two opportunities to contemplate questions of Ukrainian identity—one from the historical perspective, one from the contemporary. On April 12, Professor Oleksiy Haran, a political scientist at Ukraine’s independent University of Kiev-Mohyla Academy, spoke on the “New Configuration of Political Forces in Ukraine.” Two weeks later, on April 24, Professor Mark Von Hagen, a historian at Columbia University, presented a talk entitled, “Does Ukraine Have a History?” Both lectures addressed questions which Ukrainians face in the current post-communist period since gaining independence in 1991. Almost all political issues—center around questions of Ukrainian national identity, which bear on both past and future.

Mark Von Hagen began his talk with the provocative question: “Does Ukraine have a history?” When rephrasing it to ask if Ukraine has “a written history of its experienced past that commands some widespread acceptance and authority in the international scholarly and political communities,” he offered the ambiguous answer that “it’s not so simple.” He suggested answers to this question by examining both Ukraine’s place in history and the historiography of Ukraine. Geopolitical realities, he explained, have suppressed or distorted the historiography of Ukraine for the last two centuries. The vested interests of the hegemons of the region, Germany and Russia, in both its Tsarist and Soviet forms, have either denied or belittled the history of Ukraine as that of a provincial “borderland” (which gave Ukraine its name, which literally means “borderland”). Few prominent historians, both in and outside of Ukraine, have gained their place in the field through the study of Ukraine’s history. As a consequence, Ukraine’s scholarly historiography has been quite bleak.

Due to its status within various empires and the lack of recognition and legitimacy from the German and Russian historical traditions, Ukraine’s identity and history have been tenuous and ambiguous for centuries. Ukraine was not one of the modern, historically “legitimate” nations. Thus, Von Hagen asserted, Ukraine, like the other countries of East and Central Europe, seems somewhat artificial and not fully deserving of a state. These trends have greatly influenced attitudes about the legitimacy of claims to Ukrainian nation- and statehood. Von Hagen described Ukraine as a “non-historical nation” that has lacked historical continuity between a nation and state. In addition to the political ramifications, Ukrainians have endured problems with the continuity of elites and the cultural assimilation that they experienced under both Russian and Polish rule. These conditions have generated among Ukrainians an inferiority complex relative to the dominant Russian and Polish cultures. Due to what Von Hagen described as “cultural and historical permeability,” both Ukrainian historiography and national identity have suffered.

Thus Ukrainians today are compelled to reexamine their history, as are all the countries in the post-communist world. To a large extent, they must also create a new national narrative that will help to form a Ukrainian identity and to build legitimacy and support for the newly independent Ukrainian state. Von Hagen suggested that, “Today in the context of recently proclaimed sovereignty and independence, Ukrainian political leaders, opinion-shapers, and scholars are attempting to reassert the historicity of their state with new or newly rehabilitated narratives of their past.” He argued that this writing or rewriting of Ukraine’s history is particularly apparent in some institutions, such as schools, universities, and the army. One of the primary questions that remains is what kind of history these institutions will propagate. This, he suggested, will largely be determined by political considerations—such as what type of national identity Ukrainians succeed in creating and who will be included in the Ukrainian “nation.” To what extent will Ukrainian ethnic identity determine Ukrainian national identity in the newly independent Ukraine?

The answer of one Ukrainian scholar highlights the interrelatedness of conceptions of Ukrainian history to contemporary Ukrainian politics and identity formation: “If Ukraine has a future, then it will have a history.” As Berkeley’s other Ukrainian talk this April, by Oleksiy Haran, illustrated that these questions of Ukraine’s past and future very much impact the way Ukrainians’ see their present. The primary political considerations of Ukrainians today involve determining “where we have been and where we are going,” as well as who the “we” includes, as Von Hagen suggested. Von Hagen’s talk highlighted the dilemma Ukrainians face in coming to terms with their past; Haran’s, in coming to terms with their present and future.

Haran provided an overview of Ukrainian politics since gaining independence in 1991 after seventy years under Soviet rule and two hundred and sixty years under Russian Tsarist rule. One of the particularly painful issues that Ukraine has faced in this period, the economy, is directly related to the way in which Ukrainians came to seek their independence, he argued. A formerly active Rukh member himself, he explained that Rukh facilitated the transition to independence because it weakened the authority of the Communists and cooperated
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with the “national Communists.” (Rukh, which means “movement” in Ukrainian, was the national-oriented, pro-democracy, anti-Soviet umbrella organization which emerged in the perestroika period and played an extremely influential role in Ukrainian politics in the years 1989-1992). Once they had succeeded in persuading the Ukrainian population to vote for independence by a more than ninety percent margin in a December 1991 referendum, Rukh, Haran asserted, was compelled to pay back the “national Communists” for their support. By continuing to cooperate with the “national Communists,” who maintained the majority in parliament in the post-communist period, Rukh and other “national Democrats” were unable to implement much-needed economic reforms.

Haran surveyed the current political forces in Ukraine and the primary issues around which they form. He listed the four major political blocs—the Leftists, Centrists or “Liberals,” “National Democrats,” and “Radical Nationalists” —and their respective size in the Ukrainian parliament after the latest elections in March 1994 (165, 124, 93, and “5 or 6,” respectively, out of the 405 seats currently filled of the total 450). Having regionally distinct support bases, these blocs center around different conceptions of the scope and pace of economic reform, relations with Russia, and other questions related to the formation and protection of a Ukrainian national identity. Haran himself, as his Rukh roots would predict, sympathizes with the National Democrats particularly on the importance of cultivating a Ukrainian national identity. One aspect of this that he supported was the protection of the Ukrainian language and policies which encourage its increased usage to compensate for its suppression under earlier policies of Russification.

One of the questions that Haran raised in his talk that is most relevant for Ukrainians’ future is also directly related to interpretations of their past. It revolves around Ukraine’s relations with Russia. Ukrainians are divided historically over how they see their past interactions with their powerful neighbor to the North. Many in the Western regions of Ukraine view Russia as an imperial oppressor; while the majority in the East have a more positive attitude toward their historical and cultural ties to Russia. These views of the past directly influence the type of relationship Ukrainians now want to have with Russia and how they envision the future of the Ukrainian state. Those in the East and South, where the Communists have their power base, prefer a closer political and economic union with Russia. Western Ukrainians, on the other hand, are suspicious of Russia’s interests in such close ties and argue for a relationship based mostly on economic ties and limited political cooperation in order to maintain the sovereignty of the Ukrainian state. More sympathetic to the latter view, Haran suggested that the Russian invasion in Chechnya has alarmed many Ukrainians and, combined with some Russian politicians’ attitudes, possibly signals a more aggressive Russian role in the Former Soviet Union.

This question of Ukraine’s relations with Russia highlights the interrelatedness of both of these talks. The influence that Russia has wielded over Ukrainians for centuries, which Von Hagen described in terms of historiography and political and cultural assimilation, has shaped Ukrainians’ perceptions of their past. As they are writing a new historical narrative and forming their national identity, Ukrainians are consistently returning to their interactions with Russia in attempts to understand what the nature of this crucial relationship was, what its current form is, and what they want it to be in the future.
The speaker for the Eleventh Annual Colin Miller Lecture on March 23 was Nina Tumarkin, chair of the department of history at Wellesley College. Tumarkin spoke on the topic of her new book, *The Living and the Dead: The Rise and Fall of the Cult of World War II in Russia*, a history of Russia’s commemoration of the “Great Patriotic War.”

She entitled her talk “The Agony of Victory: Russia Remembers World War II,” an inversion of the cliché slogan about the thrill of victory and the agony of defeat, preferred by military historians and sportswriters alike. “It makes sense,” Tumarkin explained, “to talk about the agony of victory when one talks about the way World War II has been and is remembered in the Soviet Union.”

“Commemorating war dead has got to be one of the most primal of human activities,” Tumarkin said during her lecture, a fundamental response to the relief at being alive and the fear of retribution. Modern warfare, however, which replaces battlegrounds and hand-to-hand combat with the slaughter of the nameless soldier by the invisible enemy, has made commemoration more difficult. After World War II, Tumarkin pointed out, the Soviet Union was not able even to bury all of the dead, let alone to identify them. After 1,418 days of occupation, the Soviet Union lost an estimated thirty million people; two to three million of whom remain unburied. Combined with the killings during collectivization, the purges, and the Terror, Tumarkin remarked, “it’s almost inconceivable to remember.”

Ironically, the cult of The Great Patriotic War which arose in the Soviet Union in the postwar era, and reached its height during the Brezhnev years, had as its motto: “no one is forgotten; nothing is forgotten.” The cult, complete with patron saints, holy relics, and sacred days, was less about remembering and more about forgetting. It was the thrill of victory rather than the agony of war that became the leitmotif of the master narrative of the war propagated by the Communist Party. The narrative, as Tumarkin recounted it, goes something like this:

“Collectivization and rapid industrialization under the First and Second Five-year plans prepared our country for war, and despite an overpowering surprise attack by the fascist beast and its inhuman wartime practices, despite the loss of twenty million valiant martyrs to the cause, our country, under the leadership of the Communist Party headed by Comrade Stalin, arose as one united front and expelled our enemy from our own territory and that of Eastern Europe, thus saving Europe—and the world—from fascist enslavement.”

This master plot served as an important source of legitimation for the Soviet regime, especially in the Brezhnev era. In one beautifully synthesized lie, the Party could justify the atrocities of the 1930s, the unreasonable loss of life during the war, and the occupation of Eastern Europe, and glorify itself as the savior of the Russian people, if not the world.

The formation and propagation of this cult is the focus of Tumarkin’s book, but she does not simply show how the Party manipulated the war and the memory of the war to its own ends. Breaking a scholarly taboo, Tumarkin explains in a candid introduction her own personal interest in the question of commemorating and remembering the dead: she relays the difficulties she faced in confronting the early deaths of her father, her brother, and her sister. The book ends with an account of the last hours at the bedside of her dying aunt, spent singing Russian songs.

Tumarkin’s personal experiences do not merely serve as a frame for the book. *The Living and the Dead* is a historical account of the cult of war, but it is also Tumarkin’s journal of her reactions and impressions during her several visits to the Soviet Union (and then to the former Soviet Union) in the 1980s and 90s. In a chapter entitled “Valley of Death,” for example, Tumarkin recounts her expedition in August of 1992 to Rzhev, a town northwest of Moscow on the upper reaches of the Volga river. Tumarkin accompanied a volunteer group called Dozor (Patrol), one of many groups devoted to finding and properly burying the war dead. “The first morning,” she writes, “I sat on the edge of the trench and, together with a twelve year old boy whose conflicted feelings about the work had earned him the epithet ‘hobbit,’ used my knife to scrape the earth from each bone before carefully placing it in a tan jute bag. After fifty years in the soil, the bones had turned as brown as wood. I wondered if my father’s bones were brown too after almost forty years, or my brother’s fifteen years. I wished I could see them, touch them, talk to them.” Some readers may find Tumarkin’s personal recollections distracting, if not inappropriate, in a scholarly work. But the pain Tumarkin feels for her personal loss serves to underscore the horrible anonymity of death in the Soviet Union during the war, when it was often impossible to say good-bye, to comfort the dying, and sometimes even to remember them.

In any case, the autobiographical moments in Tumarkin’s work do not in the least detract from a serious study of the formation and propagation of the cult of war. Tumarkin’s account of the German invasion of the Soviet Union is intended for the general reader, and though she devotes some attention to major historical questions, her main intent is to provide a feeling for daily life during the war through memoirs and fictional accounts.
of the period. She adds to the scholarly debate on the war, however, by focusing closely on the way in which the reality of the war was manipulated from the very start. From its christening by Pravda on June 23 as “The Great Patriotic War,” the German invasion was linked to all of Russia’s military past, particularly to the Napoleonic invasion. It also became a holy war: the military march entitled “Sacred War” was played over and over while Pravda exhorted citizens: “may holy hatred become our chief, our only feeling.” War martyrs were canonized in stories, songs, and films: Zoya Kosmodemianskaia, the Joan of Arc of the war who was hanged for setting fire to a German stable; Aleksandr Matrosov, who saved his comrades by throwing himself on an exploding pillbox gun port.

While war heroes proved useful to the propaganda machine during the occupation, after the war, Tumarkin claims, the role of individual soldiers and citizens in the war effort was downplayed. “The contemporary Soviet press maintained that Stalin, the Communist Party, the Red Army, and the great Soviet people (especially those that had died in the war effort), in that order, had won the war.” The invasion and occupation had produced, in the words of historian Michael Gefter, “a spontaneous de-Stalinization,” a period of greater freedom and individual responsibility, and Stalin feared that Soviet citizens would feel a sense of entitlement after the hardships of the war. Consequently, Tumarkin argues, the military hero was expected to aspire to new greatness. In his speech on Victory Day, May 9, 1946, one year after the end of the war, Stalin spoke not of military feats past, but of economic ones to come. As war heroes were demoted, the war itself was sugar coated: no casualty figures were published; paintings and posters depicted battle scenes that more closely resembled picnics; and war amputees, paraplegics and cripples were quietly sent off to special colonies in the far north. No mention was made of the horrible blunders and defeats of 1941, the execution of army and navy high commands, or of order number 270, which promised dire consequences for those captured in war and their families. While Stalin feared the consequences a successful war would have on the domestic front, the reminder of the might of the armia osvoboditel’nts, or liberator army, was put to good diplomatic use. The regime wasted no time in erecting monuments and panoramas in the Eastern Bloc countries.

Krushchev’s denunciations of Stalin allowed for a more balanced assessment of the generalissimo’s supposedly monumental role in winning the war, and the Thaw produced a flood of war memoirs, diaries, and less formulaic fictional accounts of the period. But the Brezhnev era, Tumarkin argues, marked the intensification of the cult of war and the consolidation of the master narrative. As before, Stalin was made Hero Number One of the war effort, but the military heroes and heroines were also resurrected. In 1965, Victory Day was made into a official holiday for commemorating the war dead and its heroic survivors and in 1967, Brezhnev lit the eternal flame at the new Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Moscow. The targets of the newly-energized cult, Tumarkin claims, were the country’s alienated youth in whom the government hoped to inspire an affected, if not genuine, sense of respect for the regime. An important part of the war cult was the militarization of Soviet youth. According to Tumarkin, by the mid-1970s, some thirty million Soviet children were involved in military preparedness, a tradition which continued
into the late 1980s—as Tumarkin discovered when in 1987 a schoolteacher told her with “with a smile and a lilting chirp” how her ninth and tenth graders had learned to disassemble grenades.

With the beginning of glasnost, the carefully woven master narrative began to unravel. The search for truth about Russia’s past, Tumarkin explained in her lecture, has become a kind of collective psychotherapy; the nation as a whole is trying to recover and understand its repressed memories. The official tale of the thrill of victory has become an agonizing search for the truth of war. In November 1987, Mikhail Gorbachev made a speech on the anniversary of the revolution, calling for an effort to fill in the “blank spots” of the nation’s history. From 1987-89, the press continually made revelations about the Terror, the purges, and collectivization, but it was not until 1990 that the two great myths of the Soviet Union were desacralized: the cult of Lenin and the Cult of the Great Patriotic War.

The heroes of Tumarkin’s book are those who struggled valiantly to fill in the “blank spots” and to make commemoration and mourning possible: the journalist and writer Vasili Grossman whose 1960 novel on the battle of Stalingrad Zhizn’ i sud’ba (Life and Fate) became the most important novel of the Great Patriotic War when it was finally published in the Soviet Union in 1988; the writer Anatoli Kuznetzov who at age of fourteen began recording everything he saw and heard about Babi Yar, the site of the mass genocide of Kievan Jews; the sculptor Danil Mitlanskii whose thin young soldiers express the horrible vulnerability of young men sent off to war. (One of Mitlanskii’s soldiers makes up part of the cover art for Tumarkin’s book.)

While Tumarkin occasionally finds artistic treasures such as Mitlanskii’s statues, she wades through a lot of kitsch. With the sharp eye of a journalist, she describes the tinsel and tank affairs of Victory days and commemorations of the revolution that she attended and she recounts with humor and horror the dozens of steel and concrete monuments replete with stern soldiers, great mothers, stars and sickles that she saw. What is perhaps missing from Tumarkin’s wonderful book is a closer look at these war monuments, panoramas, paintings, and posters. While she clearly demonstrates that the images were false and politically motivated, she does not dig very deep into the iconography used in representing the war.

In her talk, Tumarkin gave a glimpse of the cult to come. On February 10th, 1995, the State Duma passed a law declaring a whole series of “days of military glory” beginning with April 18th as a celebration of Aleksandr Nevskii’s victory in 1242 and preserving May 9th as a day of remembering the Great Patriotic War. A new master narrative, it seems, is taking shape. During the question and answer session, Tumarkin gave a savvy prediction about President Clinton’s decision to participate in this year’s Victory Day celebration: “It’s going to be a disaster,” she admitted, “but whatever the politics of it, I believe it is so important for us to finally, for the first time in history, to publicly recognize those thirty million losses.”

Anna Wertz, Ph.D. candidate, Department of History, University of California, Berkeley
Don’t let them scare you about the land ending here,” admonishes Vladimir Vysotsky in a quotation introducing the first chapter of John Stephan’s ground-breaking study of the Russian Far East. Heeding Vysotsky’s advice, the book goes on to illustrate that, indeed, the Russian Far East is no cul-de-sac. Stephan, the author of earlier monographs on Sakhalin (1971) and the Kurile Islands (1974), provides quite possibly the most comprehensive scholarly treatment of his subject in any language. For this virtue alone, his book is essential reading for anyone interested in the Russian Far East.

But the work has many other virtues. Stephan’s careful sotry begins well before the coming of the Russians, examining the early Chinese presence in parts of the region, along with that of various natives. Throughout the book, the author takes pains to point out the ideologically and strategically motivated half-truths and outright lies provided by various sides, a particularly laudable service in a work on a little-known, but at times hotly contested, region. He documents, for example, how Soviet scholars of the early 1980s, and sadly, even in the later glasnost years, denied that the Russian Far East had any Chinese past whatsoever, whereas some of the Chinese colleagues claimed the entire region as historically Chinese. In weaving together his arguments, Stephan employs numerous Chinese and Japanese as well as European sources. All the while, his own writing is refreshingly straightforward and direct.

The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were heady times in the Russian Far East and, appropriately, they are well represented in Stephan’s account. In the section of the book that perhaps makes his most significant contribution to the history of the region, the author contemplates the boldness of the Amurtsy, the development of regionalist thought, Russian participation in the division of China, the building of the trans-Siberian railroad, mass migration from European Russia and Ukraine, the Russo-Japanese War, the formation and disappearance of the Far Eastern Republic, and the turmoil of the Civil War. In the chapters on the Revolution, the Civil War, the Intervention, and the Far Eastern Republic, Stephan brings clarity to a time of great confusion.

The book goes on to cover the Russian Far East under Soviet rule. It is worth noting that although the Far East has followed the general patterns of development that characterized the Soviet Union as a whole — NEP, the Five Year Plans, etc. — these patterns manifested themselves differently in this removed region than they did in the Center. It hardly could have been otherwise, given the distances involved. Stephan points out, for example, that NEP lasted a good two years in the Far East after its termination in metropolitan Russia in 1928. Following a time-honored practice in voevodas, governors, and atamans of eastern Siberia of old — who held to the saying, “God is high above, and the Tsar is far away” (a Siberian version of “When the cat is away, the mice will play”) — Soviet Far Eastern party officials Yan Gamarnik and Vasily Blucher took advantage of their distance from the Kremlin to develop what began to look to Stalin too much like an autonomous power base. Of course, Blucher and Gamarnik’s intentions could hardly be termed anti-Soviet. Indeed an argument can be made that the chaotic Far East of the early Soviet period required a degree of local improvisation that could only be provided by strong local leaders, who in turn
need plenty of help and support from the Center. Blucher and Gamarnik, not adverse to using violence when it suited their goals, were in fact to a large extent responsible for stabilizing Soviet rule in the Far East. Still, Stalin saw to it that they — along with virtually the entire Far East apparat — were wiped out and replaced by more pliable figures.

The Far East has mythical connotations to outsiders. For Russians, the Far East is a place of mystery because for decades it was a region where most people were forbidden to go, while so many others were sent there involuntarily — a good number never to return. As Vysotsky expresses in another song, the mere mention of the town of Magadan makes European Russians shudder. This Far East — the Far East of towns where today former labor camp guards and nomenklatura types live side-by-side with their former prisoners — is also described in Stephan’s work. But the image of the Far East is hardly only one of labor camps. The mention of Kamchatka, for example, brings to mind visions of glorious volcanoes and geysers. Vladivostok, founded in 1860, a port city situated on the hills that have microclimates, reminds some travelers of San Francisco — remotely, to be sure. The mythic Siberian native, Dersu Uzala, created by Vladimir Arseniev and brought to the screen in magnificent fashion by Akira Kurosawa, is one of the most enduring Far East images.

The book contains an extensive “Reference Matter” section with fifty pages of appendices, including “Biographical Notes” on all the major figures in Far Eastern history, a timeline on administrative chronology, population figures, and a listing of post-1991 governors. With all these attributes, Stephan’s study is bound to become a handy reference guide for future scholars.

These scholars still have plenty of work to do, not least because, as Stephan himself readily admits, he did not use Soviet archives — they were still largely closed when he researched the manuscript. Moreover, Stephan’s work is of a broad sweep, touching on many issues, but delving into few of them in depth. Nevertheless, the appearance of this book is a major event, and one can only hope that, with the hardback priced at nearly fifty dollars, Stanford University Press will soon put out a softbound edition.

Illustrations in this section are from books reviewed.
EISENSTEIN SYMPOSIUM

On March 4, the Center co-sponsored one of its most delightful events, “When Ivan Met Mickey: Walt Disney’s Mark on Sergei Eisenstein.” The other co-sponsors were the Doreen B. Townsend Center for the Humanities, the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures and the Berkeley Film Program. The symposium was organized by Olga Matich and held at the Pacific Film Archive. We asked her to provide an overview of the theme of the event.

Sergei Eisenstein and Walt Disney met each other in the early thirties and became friends. Urged by Eisenstein, the Moscow International Film Festival in 1935 awarded a prize to the Three Little Pigs. Eisenstein corresponded with Disney and wrote about his use of sound, color, contour, and line. He was fascinated by his coordination of sight and sound, which he called the “synchronization of the senses.” Eisenstein’s interest in Disney’s animation wasn’t only formalist. He believed that his cartoons revived animism and totemism in the modern consciousness. As to Disney’s direct influence on Eisenstein’s films, it left a discernible mark on Ivan the Terrible and on Alexander Nevsky.

The discovery of the connection between the two filmmakers is recent. The first to write about it was the curator of the Eisenstein Archives, Naum Kleiman, who published Eisenstein’s essay on Disney in 1986. The first public discussion of the connection took place at the Pacific Film Archives this March. The common theme linking the papers was the question of cross-medium and cross-cultural appropriation and translation of cinematic culture. It became quite clear from the discussion that one of the curious aspects of the Eisenstein-Disney relationship was the adaptation of the “American” Disney animations to the “Russo-Soviet” context of Eisenstein’s last films. The presentations were richly illustrated by the showing of Disney’s Silly Symphonies, Willie the Operatic Whale, which were made available to the conference by Walt Disney Studios, selections from Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs as well as selections from Eisenstein’s later films.

The speakers considered the Eisenstein-Disney connection from several perspectives: Mikhail Yampolsky, the author of Tiresias Memory: Intertextuality and Film and Professor of Comparative and Russian Literature at NYU applied Walter Benjamin’s theoretical views to a discussion of Eisenstein’s and Disney’s films as organic machines. Russell Merritt, the co-author of Walt in Wonderland: The Silent Films of Walt Disney, spoke about Eisenstein’s and Prokofiev’s debt in Alexander Nevsky to Mickey Mouse, metaphorically speaking. Author of Early Cinema in Russia and Its Cultural Reception and Visiting Professor of Russian Film at USC, Yuri Tsivian discussed Eisenstein’s interest in Disney in relation to Ivan the Terrible from a psychoanalytic vantage point. And Anne Nesbet, Assistant Professor of Soviet film and Russian literature at Berkeley, treated the topic of inanimations in Ivan the Terrible in relation to Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs. A general discussion of each paper was prefaced by two commentators: Naum Kleiman, director of the Moscow Film Museum and leading Eisenstein scholar, and Mel Gordon of Berkeley, whose most recent book is Biomechanics, Meyerhold and Eisenstein-Training in Revolutionary Russia.
Many of you are aware of the holdings of the Center for Slavic and East European Studies within the Carl Rosberg Library for International and Area Studies in Stephens Hall. The following is a sampling of the journals and newspapers which are available at the library directly off the shelf.

Periodicals in English -
- Business Central Europe (on reserve)
- Current Digest of the Soviet Press
- FBIS-Central Eurasia
- FBIS-East Europe
- Moscow News
- Nationalities Papers
- Newspot (Turkish)
- PlanEcon Report (on reserve)
- Radio Free Europe Research/Radio Liberty (old issues on reserve)
- Slavic Review
- Post Soviet Affairs (on reserve)
- Post Soviet Geography (on reserve)
- Europe-Asia Studies
- Transition (on reserve)
- Warsaw Voice

Journals and Newspapers in Russian -
- Argumenti i fakti
- Izvestiia
- Kommersant
- Kommunist
- Nezavisimaii gazeta
- Ogonjek
- Pravda
- Rabochaia Tribuna
- Rossiyskiye Vesti

In addition there are several newsletters that come to the Center. They are kept on file either in the Center office at 361 Stephens or the office of the Berkeley Program in Soviet Studies at 270 Stephens. These materials include the following:

- Association for the Study of Nationalities (newsletter)
- BISNIS Trade and Investment Opportunities in Russia (US Chamber of Commerce)
- Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (reports)
- Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress on Parliamentary Development (reports)
- CSIS Post-Soviet Prospects (newsletter)
- Civil Society (newsletter)
- Eastern Europe Business bulletin (US Chamber of Commerce)
- Transitions (The World Bank newsletter)

Other Library news: Mr. Francis Macy, an Associate of the Slavic Center, generously donated a collection of Russian journals on psychology as well as other books in Russian and a series of the published reports of Radio Liberty/Radio Free Europe. On behalf of all the students, faculty, and other scholars associated with the Center, we would like to thank Mr. Macy for his kind gift.
The Center acknowledges with sincere appreciation the following individuals who have contributed to the annual giving program, the Associates of the Slavic Center, between January 15 and May 1, 1995. 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. (* signifies gift of continuing membership)

**Center Circle**
Enid M. Emerson*
Elsa M. Miller*

**Benefactors**
Anonymous*

**Sponsors**
Carol M. Alexander*
Debbie Y. Ball*
Tye Ellinwood*
Mary Louise Green*
Charles V. Hughes*
Anonymous*
Marjorie I. Koenig*
John and Mary Macmeeken*
Rozanne E. Noon*
Maxine P. Rosner*

**Members**
Genia Bukowska*
David and Ellen Elliott
Ms. Lillian Elner
Nina Gramowich*
Iris Greenberg-Smith*
Malcolm and Katherine Holmberg
Marjorie S. Kendall*
Francis U. Macy*
John and Carol Pitts
Maria Sakovich*
Gregory F. Sheehan*
**Associate Membership**

**Associate Membership.** 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. This year we are not mailing a separate letter about ASC; please take a minute to read about the Associates and if possible, join.

**Members ($50 to $100).** Members of ASC regularly receive Newsletter “Updates” and special mailings to notify them of last-minute events and special activities, such as cultural performances and major conferences.

**Sponsors ($100-up).** ASC Sponsors also receive a uniquely designed t-shirt, promoting 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 will also be our guests at 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 Robert Gordon Sproul Associates of the University. As such, they are invited to the Chancellor’s annual black tie banquet and to luncheons before the major football games. They also receive membership in the Faculty Club and twenty other worldwide faculty clubs. The names of donors of $1,000 or more appear in the Annual Report of Private Giving.

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.

**Associates of the Slavic Center**

Send your check, made payable to the Regents of the University of California, to the Center for Slavic and East European Studies, 361 Stephens Hall, University of California, Berkeley CA 94720. Attn: ASC

Name(s) __________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

Address ___________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

City _____________________________ State ______ Zip __________

Home Phone _______________ Business 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.
The pace of change in the Soviet successor states and Eastern Europe has been, and continues to be, truly remarkable. Moreover, the character and tempo of this change has been strikingly different between countries. As a result, it has become extremely difficult for anyone, including graduate students and faculty involved in their courses and research projects, to follow current events in a single country, let alone many.

In view of this, the Program decided this past winter to organize a current events working group, officially dubbed the “Workshop on Current Developments in the Former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.” Our hope was that the workshop would help keep our community of faculty and graduate students up-to-date on events in our part of the world by allowing us to draw on the Program’s extremely diverse and knowledgeable cohort of affiliated graduate students. We also hoped that the working group would provide us with a regular opportunity to get together informally and exchange ideas about “the burning issues of the day.”

The format of the working group was as follows. Two or three graduate students made twenty to thirty minute presentations each on a common topic. The workshops usually took place Tuesday evenings, from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. We asked that presentations be geared to an audience without a great deal of particular knowledge of the political/economic/social issue being addressed, and that the presenters make sharp, sound-bite sensitive presentations that summarized basic facts and basic issues, which the group could then argue over collectively. Prior to each session, presenters agreed on a division of labor, and they were encouraged to take issue with each other to help stimulate discussion.

The working group’s first session took place last December and featured a presentation by David Woodruff on the Russian economy. Next, on February 14 Tomek Grabowski and Carrie Timko discussed politics and economic conditions in Poland. A week later, Kari Johnstone, Adriana Petryna, and Andrei Palianytsia (a friend of Kari’s currently pursuing a Ph.D. in political science at Michigan) discussed Ukrainian politics, economic reform, the Crimea, and Ukrainian relations with Russia. On March 7, Catherine Dale, Joel Ostrow, and Jeff Robins analyzed the political situation in Russia. Catherine addressed the Russian right, Jeff gave a briefing on Chechnya and Russian center-periphery relations, and Joel analyzed the balance of political forces in Moscow in anticipation of the upcoming parliamentary and presidential elections. Next, Shari Cohen and Andy Schwartz gave presentations on April 4 on the Czech and Slovak Republics two years after the “velvet divorce.” Shari analyzed the political situation in Slovakia, while Andy focused on the Czech economy. On April 11, Marc Howard, John Leslie, and Meredith Heiser (an Assistant Professor of Political Science at nearby Foothill College), covered the former GDR, focusing in particular on the political success of the former communist party, lessons of economic reform, and the attitudes of former GDR citizens toward the “Wessies.” The next session was on Central Asia and took place on April 18. Laura Adams discussed Uzbekistan, Taqi Kizilbash covered the civil war and Russian involvement in Tajikistan, and Kathleen Collins (a Ph.D. candidate in Political Science at Stanford) reported on Kyrgyzstan. Our last session, which dealt with new problems in international security after the Cold War, took place on May 2. It included a presentation by Andrew Lynch on the growth of transnational organized crime, another by Arthur Khachikian (a Ph.D. candidate at Stanford in Political Science) on the lessons of peacekeeping and outside intervention in ethnic conflicts, and by Lise Morje Svenson on the deteriorating situation in Croatia.

Let me take this opportunity to thank all the presenters for their efforts and the high quality of their talks. Thanks also to those who showed up and contributed to the lively discussions that followed (Marc Howard has been named a Hero of Academic Labor for having been at every session!). And thanks finally to Susanne Kauer for organizing logistics and keeping everyone informed of upcoming sessions.

Edward Walker, Executive Director
Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies
On March 17, the Center for Slavic and East European Studies of Berkeley, and the Center for Russian and East European Studies of Stanford University, cosponsored their annual Berkeley-Stanford conference. Contrary to some beliefs, this annual gathering predates the Berkeley-Stanford Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies (which had been founded in 1985). This year’s Berkeley-Stanford Conference was the nineteenth. The annual event alternates between campuses, which is why it is sometimes officially the Stanford-Berkeley Conference.

According to Center archives, the first conference was held in Berkeley under the auspices of the Chair at that time, Professor Reginald Zelnik (history). The purpose of the annual conference was to promote closer ties and cooperation between the two campuses in the area of Slavic and East European Studies. In April 1977, participants from both campuses addressed the topic, “Alexander Solzhenitsyn’s Gulag Archipelago: An Appraisal.” Running through the list of topics is like reviewing almost 20 years of scholarship in the area:

June 1979: “The Humanities and Social Sciences in the USSR: Current Studies and Trends.”
May 1980: “Twentieth Century Russia.”
March 1993: “The Disintegration of Multinational Communist States.”
April 1994: “Russia and her Neighbors.”

This year the conference was at Berkeley and the theme was “Time and Money in Russian Culture.” The topic differed slightly from past efforts, with emphasis less on crises and more on cultural comparison. Ken Jowitt kicked off the event with a “keynote address” on “Time and Money in Leninist Systems.” A panel on Time and Money in Imperial Russia was made up of Viktor Zhivov, a new appointee in the Berkeley Slavic Department, and Stephen Moeller-Sally, from Stanford’s Slavic Department. Reggie Zelnik of Berkeley was the commentator. The afternoon was a full program -- Stephen Hanson, University of Washington, and Eric Naiman, UC Berkeley, examined the concept of Time and Money in the Soviet Union. Our chair, Vicki Bonnell, provided commentary. The final session was on Time and Money in Post-Communist Russia. Michael Burawoy and David Woodruff, both of UC Berkeley gave extremely timely presentation. Gregory Freidin, Stanford, was the commentator. The program was very well-received and was a commendable addition to the list of Berkeley-Stanford conferences which have gone before.
The Center notes with sadness the demise of William B. Slottman, emeritus professor of history, on May 4 at the age of 70 after undergoing heart surgery in Berkeley. A popular professor whose classes on the history of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Habsburg Monarchy were always filled to capacity, Bill was known for his unusual style of teaching and his determination to befriend his students. He had earned his BA from Fordham University in 1949 and Ph.D. from Harvard in 1958. He began teaching at Cal in 1963 and retired in 1993 — a thirty-year contribution which was especially appreciated by the undergraduates. He took the time to be a “reachable” professor who genuinely cared about their college experiences. Whenever Bill attended a Center event, there were at least five freshmen in tow who came to know us through their teacher. For those introductions and for his devotion to the students and to his teaching, we shall continue to be grateful to Bill Slottman.

Barbara Connolly (Ph.D., political science, 1994), who has been teaching at UC Davis, accepted a tenure track position at Tufts University starting in January 1996.

Armen Der Kiureghian, professor of civil engineering and member of the Committee on Armenian Studies at UC Berkeley, has been elected a member of the Academy of Engineering of Armenia.

Steven Fish will be joining the department of political science as an assistant professor. With a Ph.D. from Stanford, Dr. Fish is a product of the Berkeley-Stanford Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies. We wish him a warm welcome home.

Marc Garcelon (Ph.D., sociology, 1995) was awarded a UC-EAP Junior Faculty Grant to travel to Moscow this summer. He will then return to Washington, D.C. where he is a fellow at the Kennan Institute.

Congratulations to Page Herrlinger (history), Maranatha Ivanova (political science) and Sarah Hull (Slavic) who are recipients of UC Berkeley’s Outstanding Graduate Student Instructor Award. This award is cited by the Graduate Division’s Graduate Student Instructor Teaching and Resource Center.

Andrew C. Janos, professor of political science, was awarded a major research grant by the National Council for Soviet and East European Studies. The project is entitled “The Political Economy of Ethnic Conflict: Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.” It will begin in the summer of 1995.

Kenneth T. Jowitt, professor of political science, was one of three recipients on campus of the Distinguished Teaching Award, presented by the Social Sciences Division of the College of Letters and Science. This year’s awards were earmarked for recognizing “sustained excellence in teaching large undergraduate lecture courses. Professor Jowitt’s teaching of PoliSci 2 has achieved legend status. He has also been awarded the Kernan Robson Professorship, previously held by Professors Robert Scalapino and Hanna Pitkin.

Hasha Ram, who is currently teaching at Sarah Lawrence, will join our faculty as an assistant professor and will lend strength to our offerings in the area of nineteenth century Russian literature and culture. Dr. Ram received his Ph.D. degree from Yale University.

Ruth E. Tringham, professor of anthropology, was awarded a significant research grant by the National Science Foundation in 1994. The project is entitled, “The Social Archaeology of Houses in Eneolithic Bulgaria: Excavations at Podgoritsa.” Research has already begun with a field season in 1994 and an extended excavation season planned for 1995. Further details about the project are found elsewhere in this Newsletter. Professor Tringham was also awarded a Fellowship for University Teachers from the National Endowment for the Humanities for her innovative linkage of computer-generated imagery and archaeological methodology. The title of the project, “Constructing the Prehistories of a European Village: Hypermedia Interpretation of the Archaeological Excavations at Opovo, Yugoslavia.”

An IREX short-term travel grant was awarded to Barbara Voytek, executive director of the Center and faculty associate of the Archaeological Research Facility. She will spend two weeks this summer in Slovenia, discussing future collaborative efforts with the Department of Archaeology of the University of Ljubljana. Dr. Voytek was also awarded an ACLS travel grant to participate in an international…

continued on next page
conference on prehistoric flint-mining, being held in Poland in September of 1995.

Veljko Vujacic (Ph.D., sociology, 1995) has been appointed assistant professor in the department of xx at Oberlin College.

Lisa Weeden (political science) has recently been awarded a Townsend Fellowship.

David Woodruff (political science) will be teaching at MIT next year in the department of political science.

Professor Viktor Zhivov, a leading authority on early modern Russian literature and culture, will join the department of Slavic languages and literatures. Professor Zhivov teaches at Moscow State University and will be dividing his time between Berkeley and Moscow.

THE BERKELEY PROGRAM IN SOVIET AND POST-SOVIET STUDIES

Fellowship support has been awarded to the following Berkeley students: Summer Language Training Fellowships go to Laura Adams (sociology); Catherine Dale (political science); Keith Darden (political science); Marc Howard (political science); Maranatha Ivanova (political science); Kari Johnstone (political science); and Lise Svensson (political science). Summer Research Grants have been awarded to Marie-Alice L’Heureux (architecture); and Lucan Way (political science). Graduate Training Fellowships go to Anne Clunan (political science); David Hoffman (incoming, political science); Maranatha Ivanova (political science); and Margaret Vashel (incoming, political science). Dissertation Fellowships have been given to Peter Blitstein (history); Mark Walker (political science); and Lucan Way (political science).

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION WRITE-UP GRANTS have been awarded by the Center to Howard Allen (sociology) and Shari Cohen (political science). Howard’s dissertation is entitled, “Directed Culture: Theater, Authority and the New Spectator in soviet Russia, 1917-1937.” Cohen’s work also promises to be of great interest and significance, “Politics Without a Past: The Absence of History in Post-communist Nationalisms.” The funding of the fellowships comes from the Center’s Endowment Fund which was established by a challenge grant from the Mellon Foundation that was matched by many generous donors.

The Center’s Endowment Fund is also the source of the Mellon Travel Grants for Faculty, Bibliographers, and Academic Personnel. This year the following are the awardees: Diane Clemens (history); Mel Gordon (dramatic art); David Hooson (geography); Eric Naiman (Slavic); Anne Nesbet (Slavic); Johanna Nichols (Slavic); Alan Timberlake (Slavic); Irina Voytek (CSEES); Reginald Zelnik (history).

FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES FELLOWSHIPS, TITLE VI

Grants for summer language training are going to the following graduate students: Matthew Baerman (Slavic languages and literatures) will focus on his Polish language skills; Jonathan Barnes (Slavic languages and literatures) is going to Bulgaria for intensive language training; Zygmunt Bialkowski (history) will be in Russia improving his language skills; Peter Blitstein (history) will be concentrating on his Russian this summer; Andrew Dolbey (linguistics) will be working on the Finnish language; Charles Greer (Slavic languages and literatures) will be busy with Serbian language training; Maranatha Ivanova (political science) will perfect her Russian language; Kari Johnstone (political science) faces a summer of intensive Czech language training; Sonja Kerby (Slavic languages and literatures) will tone her Russian skills; Marie L’Heureux (architecture) will be studying Estonian this summer; Danielle Lussier (music) will be working on her Hungarian; Lucan Way (political science) chose to spend much of his summer improving his Ukrainian.

THE INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AND EXCHANGES BOARD (IREX) has announced the following awardees from the UC Berkeley campus: Laura Adams (political science), Sarah Banks (comparative literature), Joanne Conrad (Near East studies), David Petersen (linguistics), and Adriana Petryna (anthropology) have each been awarded a long-term grant for research in Eurasia. Adriana was also the winner of a Fulbright Doctoral Dissertation Abroad award.

Keith Darden (political science) was awarded an NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION PROJECT grant for breadth development.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL offered graduate training grants to Maranatha Ivanova (political science) and Valerie Sperling (political science).

The department of history awarded a Mellon Dissertation Write-Up grant to Ilya Vinkovetsky and an Ehrman Fellowship to Peter Blitstein.
THE RUSSIAN HISTORY WORKING GROUP

The Russian History Group, a working group comprised of approximately fifteen graduate students and faculty involved in the study of Russian and Soviet history, provides a regular and congenial forum for participants to present and discuss works-in-progress and recent scholarly contributions in the field. Begun last spring on the initiative of graduate students David Engerman and faculty members Reggie Zelnik and Yuri Slezkine, the Group continued to meet throughout the 1994-1995 academic year. It was coordinated this year by Page Herrlinger; Ron Bialkowski and Kim Friedlander helped out regularly with organizing as well. Funding for xeroxing and pizza dinners was provided by a generous grant from the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies and supplemental support from the department of history.

This year the group met a total of eleven times to discuss a variety of dissertation chapters and proposals, papers, and books. Among the advanced graduate students in the Berkeley history department to present some of their dissertation research were D’Ann Penner, Page Herrlinger, Bob Geraci, David Engerman, Jeff Rossman and Kim Friedlander; Greg Castillo, an advanced graduate student in architecture, and John Strickland, a grad student in history at U.C. Davis, also presented. In addition, several visiting faculty members met with the Group to discuss their latest projects: Mark Von Hagen (Columbia University), presented some of his research on Ukraine during the World War I; Ted Weeks (a Berkeley Ph.D., now an Asst. Professor at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale) shared a chapter on Polish anti-Semitism in the late 19th and early 20th centuries; and Sheila Fitzpatrick (the University of Chicago) discussed several chapters from her latest book, Stalin’s Peasants. The group plans to continue to resume its regular meetings in the fall.

Page Herrlinger, Ph.D. candidate
Department of History, University of California, Berkeley

---

Annual Teachers’ Outreach Conference

Twelve academic experts came together to address a broad cross section of themes on the topic, “Identities in Transition: Gender, Class, Religion, Nationality and Politics in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union” at our Annual Outreach Conference for teachers on April 7, 8 and 9. Our Chair, Victoria Bonnell, launched the program with welcoming remarks and George Breslauer, Chair of BPS, engaged us with his keynote address on identity. A highlight of this year’s conference was the thematic panel format which promoted an informal exchange between panel members and the audience: Gail Kligman (UCLA) and Gail Lapidus (Stanford University) composed the panel on gender; Akos Rona-Tas (UC San Diego) and Victoria Bonnell addressed issues of class; Steve Stoltenberg (UC Berkeley) and John Dunlop (Hoover Institution) spoke on religion; Veljko Vujacic (Harvard University) and Yuri Slezkine (UC Berkeley) addressed topics on nationality and ethnicity; Marjorie Castle (Stanford University) and Michael Urban (UC Santa Cruz) discussed politics; and Ken Jowitt (UC Berkeley) closed the conference with an insightful summation address on frontier reality.

The Slavic Center intents to publish a volume on the conference. Please see upcoming issues for more information.
Professor Ruth Tringham Launches Project in Bulgaria

Ruth Tringham, professor of anthropology, has launched a major archaeological research project with extensive funding from the National Science Foundation which will cover the initial stage of the project. The settlement mound or “tell” of Podgoritsa, near Turgovishte, Northeast Bulgaria, will be the scene of archaeological excavation and analysis for at least the next three years. There are plans to continue into the new millennium to complete the exposure of all occupation phases as well as the excavation of the nearby prehistoric cemetery if the funding is forthcoming. The tell dates to the Eneolithic Period (ca. 5000-4500 BC). The project is a collaborative effort among US, UK and Bulgarian archaeologists — from the University of California, Berkeley, the School of History and Archaeology at the University of Wales in Cardiff, the Regional Historical Museum of Turgovishte and the Institute of Archaeology, Sofia.

The Eneolithic Period in Northeast Bulgaria has been the focus of much thought, debate, and ideas about the past throughout decades of archaeological practice from many different philosophical viewpoints. Although significance of the Podgoritsa project may be framed specifically in terms of the prehistory of Southeast Europe, its questions are of general theoretical interest for the study of early agricultural societies, involving population growth and expansion, the social consequences of sedentism, the intensification of production, and the role of the household as organizing unit of social reproduction. These general theoretical topics form the basis of the development and growth of socio-economic complexity amongst the early agricultural populations throughout Europe. Ruth Tringham is the Principal Investigator of the Podgoritsa project. She brings with her years of experience with excavation and analysis of sites in Yugoslavia including Selevac, Gomolava, and Opovo. She also brings with her a cadre of trained graduate students from Cal: Jason Bass, Julie Near, and Mirjana Stevanovic. Other graduate students who will participate come from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Trent University, New York University, the University of Wales at Cardiff, and Sofia University.

Dr. Douglass Bailey of the University of Cardiff is co-director of the project, while Dr. Ilke Angelova, Director of the Turgovishte Museum, is a principal on the Bulgarian side, along with Dr. Jordana Yurukova, the Director of the Institute of Archaeology, Sofia.

Pre-Revolutionary Russian Art and Architecture

Faculty, students, and members of the community were treated to a series of lectures in February which were informative and visually delightful. The idea for such a series arose in 1994 when Dr. Elena Yablonskaya, Curator at the Armory of the Moscow Kremlin Museum, gave a talk about the collections. The wealth of information which could be expressed through the art and architecture of that time was immediately apparent. Thus, Dr. Yablonskaya returned to Berkeley for an expanded presentation of her knowledge and the Armory’s collections.

Dr. Yablonskaya graduated from the History Faculty, Moscow State University, and is Senior Researcher at the Museum of the Moscow Kremlin. The themes of the lectures were: “Russian Architecture from the 12th to the 17th Centuries;” “The History of Russian Icon Painting;” “Masterpieces from the Kremlin;” “Russian Painting;” “Russian Culture in the 17th and 18th Centuries;” and “Russian Jewelry Art from the 12th to the Early 20th Centuries.” Co-sponsored by Townsend Center, department of anthropology and the Kazakh-American Research Project.
Bag Lunch Series
January 31 Svetozar Koljevic, Professor in the Department of English at the University of Novi Sad, Yugoslavia, discussed Nationalism as Literary Inspiration: A View from Sarajevo. This event was co-sponsored with the Departments of Slavic Languages and Literature and Comparative Literature.

February 7 Igor Zvelev, head research associate at IMEMO, spoke on Building the State and Building the Nation in Russia: 1991-1994.


February 22 Catherine Bracewell, Professor of History at the School for Slavonic Studies at London University, gave a talk entitled, Women and Nationalism in the Former Yugoslavia.

February 24 John Fine, a Professor of History with the University of Michigan gave a talk entitled, Sarajevo: Past and Present.

March 1 Leonid A. Beliaev, Chief of the Department of Moscow Archaeology with the Institute of Archaeology in Moscow, spoke on Ancient Moscow Monasteries from a Historical and an Archaeological View.

March 7 Gilbert Rozman, Professor of Sociology at Princeton University, gave a talk entitled Northeast Asian Regionalism: Multinational Scholarship and Training in Russia, China and Japan.

March 8 Leonid Khotin, Research Associate with the CSEES, discussed Directors, Entrepreneurs and the New Russians in Russia Today.

March 15 Mikhail Gulyaev, a degree candidate at California State University, Fresno, spoke on Mass Media and Ideology in Contemporary Russia.

March 22 Gayane Hagopian, Visiting Scholar with Berkeley’s Department of Linguistics, gave a talk on baptism and kinship terms in Armenia entitled, The Godmother: Is She Necessary to Baptize the Son?

April 5 Eric Martinot, Ph.D. candidate with Berkeley’s Energy and Resources Group, spoke on Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Development in Russia: The Role of Western Technology Transfer and Assistance.

April 11 Judith Rasson, with the Institute of Archaeology, UCLA, gave a presentation with slides on Archaeology in Albania: The Power of the Past.

April 12 Oleksiy Haran, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Kiev-Mohyla Academy, and Visiting Scholar at the Harriman Institute at Columbia University, spoke on The New Configuration of Political Forces in Ukraine.

April 13 Ioachim Klein, Professor of Slavic Literature at the University of Leiden, spoke on The Belomor Canal: Literature and Propaganda in Stalin’s Time.

April 19 James Derleth, Assistant Professor at the University of the Pacific and former Visiting Professor at the American University of Bulgaria, spoke on The 1994 Bulgarian Elections: Back to the Future?

April 21 Victor Friedman, Professor of Slavic Languages & Literature at the University of Chicago, spoke on The Politics of Statistics: Language, Nationality and the Macedonian Census of 1994.

April 24 Mark Von Hagen, Professor of History at Columbia University, gave a talk entitled Does Ukraine Have a History?

April 26 David Ost, Professor of Political Science at Hobart/William Smith Colleges spoke on the future of the field in a talk entitled Slavic Studies: Where to Now? Why Bother?

May 3 Istvan Deak, Professor of History, Columbia University, spoke on The Armies of Austro-Hungary, the Soviet-Union and Yugoslavia: the Glory and Fall of Three Great Multiethnc Institutions. His talk was sponsored with the Center for German and European Studies and the History Department.

Film Showing
March 20 Peter Forgacs, Director of the Bela Balazs Film Studio, Budapest introduced and discussed his film, Dusi and Jeno, from The Private Hungary Series.
Lectures, Panel Discussions and Colloquia

January 27  Johanna Nichols, Professor of Slavic Languages & Literature; Edward Walker, Executive Director, Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies and Daniel Sneider, Former Moscow Bureau Chief of the Christian Science Monitor and Visiting Fellow at the Center for International Security and Arms Control, participated in a panel discussion on Chechnya and the Russian Federation. This event was co-sponsored by the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies.

February 7, 9, 14, 16, 21, 23 & 28  Elena Yablonsky, Historian and Curator at the Moscow Kremlin Museum Armory, conducted seven slide lectures on the theme “Pre-Revolutionary Art and Architecture in Russia.” The series was co-sponsored with the Townsend Center for the Humanities, the Kazakh-American Research Project and the Department of Anthropology.

February 11  A one day Teachers Workshop was held on the theme, From Revolution to Transition: A Comparison of China and the Soviet Union at the World Affairs Council in San Francisco. The workshop was organized by the Institute of East Asian Studies and the Center for Slavic and East European Studies.

February 13  Yuri Orlov, Senior Scientist/Physicist at Cornell University’s Newman Laboratory of Nuclear Studies, gave a public lecture on The Rise of the Red and the Brown in Russia. This event was co-sponsored by the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies.

February 27  A colloquium was held with Alexei Kojevnikov, Professor of History and Philosophy of Science at Indiana University, who gave a talk entitled Ideology and Practice of Scientific Schools in the Former USSR. The colloquium co-sponsored with the History of Science and Technology.

March 9  Sheila Fitzpatrick, Professor of History with the University of Chicago, gave a public lecture on The Uses of Literacy: Denunciations and Other Public Epistolary Practices in Stalin’s Russia. This event was co-sponsored by the Departments of History and Comparative Literature.

March 13  Emil Pain, advisor to President Yeltsin on Nationality Policy and Regional Policy, and Andranik Migranian, senior researcher with the Institute for International Economic and Political Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, participated in a panel discussion on Russia After Chechnya. The panel discussion was co-sponsored with the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies.

March 23  Nina Tumarkin, Professor of History and Director of the Russian Area Studies Program at Wellesley College, delivered our Eleventh Annual Colin Miller Lecture on The Agony of Victory: Russia Remembers World War II.

March 24  Nina Tumarkin gave a guitar performance and lecture entitled, When You Hear Russian Songs, Do You Suffer?

April 4  Milan Hauner, an Honorary Fellow with the University of Wisconsin, Madison, gave a public lecture on President Benes of Czechoslovakia Between Russia and Germany. His lecture was co-sponsored with the Center for German and East European Studies.

April 12  Simon Clarke with the University of Warwick, United Kingdom, and Andrew Walder, from Harvard University, gave a public lecture on Chinese and Russian Labor in an Era of Transition. This lecture was co-sponsored by IIS, IEAS, CGES, CSAS, CAS and CMES.

May 2  Manfred Heinemann, Professor of Education with the University of Hannover in Germany, spoke on Soviet Higher Education Policy in East Germany. This talk was co-sponsored with the Center for Studies in Higher Education, the Center for German and European Studies and the Center for Western European Studies.

Conferences and Symposia

March 3  A mini conference was held on the Current Prospects for Armenia. The conference was co-sponsored with the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies, the Center for Middle Eastern Studies, UC Berkeley Armenian Alumni, Armenian Students Association and the American University of Armenia.

March 4  When Ivan Met Mickey: Walt Disney’s Mark on Sergei Eisenstein was the subject of a symposium and film showing at the Pacific Film Archive. It was co-sponsored with the Doreen B. Townsend Center for the Humanities, the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures and the Group Major in Film.

March 17  The XIX Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference on the topic, Time and Money in Russian Culture, was held at Berkeley this year.

April 7-9  Identities in Transition: Gender, Class, Nationality, Religion, and Politics in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union was the theme for our Annual Outreach Conference held at the Alumni House.
ACTR Program on Russian Art and Architecture

ACTR is organizing a seventeen-day program at the Russian National Institute of Art in Moscow including lectures on the history of Russian art and architecture and visits to sites surrounding Moscow. The cost of the program is $2800. For information contact: Dr. Brumfield, Dept. of Germanic and Slavic Languages, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA 70118. Ph. (504) 865-5276; e-mail: brumfiel@mailhost.tcs.tulane.edu

BURK (U of Pittsburgh Center for Russian & Eastern European Studies/ Business in Belarus, Ukraine, Russia and Kazakhstan Program). Offers travel and research opportunities to business and economics faculty from US academic institutions in the above-mentioned countries as well as Albania, Romania, and the former Yugoslavia. For non-specialists in East European studies. James V. Palmer, BURK Project Coordinator, CREES, 4G17 Forbes Quadrangle, Pittsburgh PA 15260. Tel (412)648-7418. Fax (412)648-2199. e-mail: crees@vms.cis.pitt.edu

CIES Fulbright Opportunities

For university lecturing or advanced research in nearly 140 countries. Application deadline: August 1. CIES, 3007 Tilden Street, NW, Ste. 5M, Box GNEWS, Washington DC 20008-3009; Ph. (202) 686-7877; e-mail: cies1@ciesnet.cies.org

Czechoslovak Society Student Awards Competition

The Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences will give out one undergraduate student prize and one graduate student prize for the best paper on some aspect of Czech and/or Slovak history. The paper must be submitted by the professor for whom it was written. The winners will receive $250, a diploma, and a one-year membership. Papers must be submitted by June 1, 1995. For guidelines contact: Vera Borkovec, 12013 Kemp Mill Rd., Silver Spring, MD 20902

The University of Illinois, Summer Research Laboratory on Russia and Eastern Europe

Associateships available for any time between June 12 and August 4. Full library privileges, potential housing awards, workshops. Contact: Vicki Miller, Russian and East European Center, U. of Illinois, 104 International Studies Bldg., 910 S. Fifth Street, Champaign IL 61820; Ph. (217) 333-1244; FAX: (217) 333-1582.

IREX Short-term Travel Grants


The Barbara Jelavich Prize

The AAASS announces the 1995 competition for a new prize, in honor of Barbara Jelavich, to be awarded annually for a distinguished monograph published in English in the US in the areas of 19th- and 20th-century Southeast European or Hapsburg studies, or Ottoman or Russian Diplomatic history. Deadline: May 15. Contact: Keith Hitchins, Dept of History, 309 Gregory, U of Illinois, 810 South Wright Street, Urbana IL 61801. Ph. (217) 333-9891.

The Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies

Short-Term Grants (up to 1 month) provide a stipend of $80 per day to scholars at any level needing to use research resources in the Washington DC area. Closing dates: June 1, Dec. 1, March 1. The institute is sponsoring internships for graduate students. Interns provide research assistance to resident scholars. Applicants should have a B. A. and a good command of Russian. For information on either grants or internships, contact: Kennan Institute, 370 L’Enfant Promenade, SW, Suite 704, Washington, DC 20024; Ph. (202) 287-3400

The Drago and Danica Kosovac Prize

For outstanding theses (Senior or Honors) at UCB in the Social Sciences and/or Humanities which research some aspect of Serbian history or culture. Contact: Barbara Voytek, CSEES. Ph.: 643-6736; e-mail: bvoytek@uclink.berkeley.edu

MacArthur Foundation

Fund for foreign travel to help individuals from the FSU who have been invited to give a paper at a conference or participate in a workshop relevant to continued on next page
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their profession. Deadlines: June 1, Sept. 1, Dec. 1. Contact: either Tatiana Zhdanova or Elizabeth McKeon, MacArthur Foundation, 8 Khlebnyi Pereulok, 2nd fl., 121069 Moscow, Russia; Ph. 095-290-5088; FAX: 095-2956-6358; macarthur@glas.apc.org; or Andrew Kuchins, 140 S. Dearborn St., Ste. 1100, Chicago IL 60603; Ph. (312) 726-8000; FAX: (312) 917-0200.

National Endowment for the Humanities

Division of Research Programs and Division of Preservation and Access have funding for conferences, publications, translations, summer stipends and dissertation grants. Deadlines range between May 15 and Oct. 16. For detailed information: NEH Overview, Room 402, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington DC 20506; Ph.: (202) 606-8400; nehopa@gwuvm.gwu.edu. Deadlines and other information are also posted on the NEH bulletin board, reached via modem at (202) 606-8688.

National Research Council, office for Central Europe and Eurasia

Collaboration in Basic Science and Engineering (COBASE) grant program. Long-term grants of $3,000 to $15,000 available to support US specialists visiting CEE or NIS colleagues for collaboration with research for one to six months. Only projects in scientific fields funded by the NSF will be supported. Deadline: July 7. Contact: Office for Central Europe and Eurasia, NRC, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington DC 20418; Ph.: (202) 334-3680; FAX: (202) 334-2614; ocee@nas.edu

National Science Foundation, Division of Social, Behavioral, and Economic Research (SBER)

There are four programs within the Social and Political Science Cluster which can be of interest to specialists in Central/East Europe and Former Soviet Union: Law and Social Science Program; Methodology, Measurement, and Statistics Program; Political Science Program; and Sociology Program. Special emphasis is given by NSF on proposals which address Democratization, Human Capital, and Human Dimensions of Global Change. Deadlines for regular research and dissertation improvement proposals vary but include August 15. Contact: NSF, SBER, Ph.: (703) 306-1760; FAX: (703) 306-0485 or (703) 306-0486 or sber@nsf.gov

Social Science Research Council/MacArthur Foundation

Program in International Peace and Security, 1995 Visiting Scholar Fellowship Program. Junior scholars and professionals from Central and Eastern Europe and the non-Russian successor states, engaged in innovative research on peace and security issues at major universities outside their home regions. Deadline: July 15. Contact: Robert Latham, SSRC, 605 Third Avenue, 17th Floor, New York NY 10158; Ph. (212) 661-0280; FAX: (212) 370-7896; chiplckd@acfccluster.nyu.edu

University of California President's Research Fellowships in the Humanities

Support for research available to individual faculty members in the humanities. Deadline: October 9. Contact: Office of the President, 300 Lakeside Drive, 18th Floor, Oakland 94612-3550; Ph. (510) 987-9472.

Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

Fellowship Competition for 1996-95. Applicants may be of any nationality and professional background, including government, the corporate world, the professions as well as academic. Deadline: October 1. For information: Fellowship Office, 1000 Jefferson Drive, SW, Washington DC 20560; Ph. (202) 357-2841; FAX: (202) 357-4439.

East European Studies, W. W. International Center for Scholars

Research Scholarships for 2-4 months' research in Washington DC. Deadline: November 1.

Short Term Grants. Grants for research to be conducted in Washington, D.C. are available to advanced graduate students as well as PhDs. Stipend of $80 per day for up to thirty days. Applications should include: 1-2 page proposal, c.v., and two letters of reference. Deadlines: March 1, June 1, September 1.

For information contact: John R. Lampe, Director, East European Studies, The Woodrow Wilson Center, 370 L’Enfant Promenade, SW, Suite 704, Washington, DC 20024; Ph. (202) 287-3000, ext. 222; FAX: (202) 287-3772
VISITING PROFESSOR OF LAW COMES TO BERKELEY IN THE FALL

Gianmaria Ajani, professor of comparative law at the University of Trento, Italy, comes to Berkeley in the fall to teach a short course in the Law School. Professor Ajani has been the Head of the Department of Law at Trento since 1991, and since 1994, he has been Director (jointly with Professor Giuseppe Porro) of the Course on International Trade held at the United National ILO Center in Turin.

Professor Ajani received his JD in 1979 from the University of Turin. During 1992 he was legal consultant to the International Monetary Fund and was responsible for the drafting of a preliminary text of the new Civil Code of Albania. Professor Ajani is currently doing research on legal “transplants” in the Russian Federation and Center and East European countries. The main focus of his research is the analysis of the influence of European law on the transformation of Central and East European law.

The course which he will teach is Law 263.3, “Economic Transformation and Law.” It begins August 21, runs for less than a full semester, and meets Tuesday from 5 to 6 p.m. and Wednesdays from 4 to 6 p.m. The course control number is 49622. The course is open to non-law graduate students.