The fall semester has gotten underway with unusual intensity. During September and October the Center sponsored many activities on the campus. As this Newsletter goes to press in early November, many of us have just returned from a very lively annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, held in Washington DC. I want to take this opportunity to reflect on the current and future events of the Center.

We have begun several new and exciting projects in recent months. One major effort is the Convenor Group on “Europe East and West after the Collapse of Communism: Challenges to Sovereignty from Above and Below.” This research project is jointly sponsored by the Center for German and European Studies and the Center for Slavic and East European Studies. Launched during the spring of 1995 in conversations between myself as Center chair and Gerald Feldman, chair of CGES, the Convenor Group is scheduled to meet for two years of productive scholarship. We expect the project to generate several publications. There are twenty-two participants in the group including one graduate student.

Another major undertaking is our Program for the Study of the Caucasus, directed by the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies and funded by a grant from the Ford Foundation. Although the grant has just been awarded, the Program on the Study of the Caucasus has already moved ahead with plans to organize a conference and invite a scholar from the area to be in residence. Several lectures have been sponsored and several have been planned, as you can see in the Calendar of Events.

The Program on the Study of the Caucasus will dovetail nicely with the Armenian Studies Program in which the Center has been involved. This is the first year for the William Saroyan Visiting Professor in Armenian Studies, held this year by Richard Hovannisian, professor of history at UCLA. He is teaching contemporary Armenian history through the history department. The Center has been assisting with other aspects of the Armenian Studies Program, including visiting lectures and fundraising events. For example, on November 10, Professor Hovannisian will give an evening lecture on the “Republic of Armenia in Retrospect.” The lecture is open to the public. In this effort, co-sponsors include the Armenian Alumni Association and the Armenian Studies Association.

A one-day conference on Crime and Corruption in the Former Soviet Union was held in October. This stimulating event featured two sessions. The morning portion was devoted to the situation in Russia with presentations by Louise Shelley, professor of law, justice and society at the American University; Gregory Grossman, professor emeritus, department of economics; and visiting professor in law, Giannaria Ajani, professor of law at the University of Trento. The afternoon featured a “roundtable” discussion with James Critchlow of Harvard University, addressing the situation in Central Asia; Edward Walker of the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies discussing the Caucasus; Professor Shelley focussing on the Baltics; and Serge Petroff, with the American-Russian Resources Group (ARRG), presenting an analysis of the circumstances which affect foreign investment in Russia.
Since the beginning of the fall semester, we have been proceeding with support for several working groups, smaller in scale that the Convenor Group, but just as productive in terms of opportunities for scholarly work. Several of these groups are co-sponsored by the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies. They cover a range of topics including “Russian and Soviet History,” “Current Developments in the Former Soviet Union and East Europe,” and “Comparative Post-Communism.” The groups consist of graduate students and faculty members.

As we look forward to the spring semester, highlights include a symposium on “The Russian Stravinsky” to be held in conjunction with the Pokrovsky Dance Ensemble’s performance of Les Noces presented by Cal Performances. Les Noces, with music by Igor Stravinsky, will be the subject of discussion in an afternoon symposium preceeding the evening performance by the Pokrovsky Ensemble. Participants will include: Caryl Emerson of Princeton University; Simon Karlinsky, professor emeritus in our Slavic department; Dmitri Pokrovsky, head of the Dance Ensemble; Richard Taruskin, professor of music at Cal; as well as other scholars of Russian music and dance. The date of the event is February 10, 1996, and the place is Zellerbach Auditorium. Be sure to mark it on your calendars.

March will witness a three-day conference, entitled “Ethnographies of Transition: The Political and Cultural Dimensions of Emergent Market Economies in Russia and Eastern Europe.” Professors Michael Burawoy, department of sociology, and Katherine Verdery, department of anthropology, Johns Hopkins University, are the organizers. They designed the conference to bring together scholars from different disciplines — sociology, anthropology, and political science — who have been conducting ethnographic studies of the economic transition in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. On Friday, March 22, the program is open to the public. The invited speakers are Ivan Szelenyi, department of sociology, UCLA; Ellen Comisso, department of political science, UCSD; and Manuel Castells, UCB city and regional planning, together with Emma Kiselyova, Institute of Economics and Engineering of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk. The Saturday and Sunday meetings are closed sessions.

We shall also contribute to the XXth Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference, this year at Stanford, which will treat the topic, “Strategies of Nationhood: from National Assimilation to Ethnic Cleansing.” Again the date is set for March — Friday, March 8. As soon as the program has been finalized, we shall be sure it is distributed. Be sure to check the spring issue of the Newsletter for the latest information.

April is the month for our annual teachers’ outreach conference, and this year we will be meeting on the 19th, 20th and 21st. The title is still being debated, but we expect that the conference will provide an update on current events in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Needless to say, in view of the ongoing situation in the Balkans and the upcoming elections in Russia (among other issues), it will be time for an update.

With these programs and many other events planned for the spring semester, this should be an exceptionally stimulating year at the Center. We are delighted to be contributing to the intellectual life of UC Berkeley, which has been ranked by the National Research Council as the nation’s best overall graduate school with thirty-five of its thirty-six graduate programs ranking in the top ten for scholarly quality in their fields. Organized Research Units, such as the Slavic Center, help to keep this campus at the forefront of higher education in the country.

Victoria E. Bonnell, Chair
Calendar of Events

~ Tuesday, November 7

~ Wednesday, November 8

~ Friday, November 10

~ Tuesday, November 14

~ Tuesday, November 15

~ Thursday, November 16

~ Fri., Sat., November 17, 18
Concert. Bay Area superstars Ensemble Alcatraz and women’s vocal ensemble KITKA join together in concert. Friday: First United Methodist Church, 625 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, at 8 p.m. Saturday: First Congregational Church, Dana & Durant Streets, Berkeley (pre-concert lecture at 7 p.m.) 8 p.m. performance. 510/528-1725

~ Tuesday, November 21

~ Thur.-Sat., November 23-25
Dance Festival. 44th Annual Kolo Festival. Kolo dancing is non-partner line dancing. Beginner to advanced dancers and families welcome. Dance and singing instruction, live music, ethnic foods, crafts and costumes. Registration 510/652-7859 or 800/730-5615.

~ Tuesday, November 28
Public Talk. Leila Alieva, Kennan Institute. “Leadership Strategies in Azerbaijan.” Co-sponsored by the Association for the Study of Nationalities (ASN) and BPS. 270 Stephens. 4 p.m.

~ Tuesday, November 28

~ Friday, December 1
Public Lecture. Marc Nichanian, University of Strasbourg and visiting prof. of Armenian at UCLA. “Modern Armenian Literature: Outcry and Mutism.” Cosponsored by the William Saroyan Chair in Armenian Studies. 7:30 p.m. 160 Kroeger.

~ Wednesday, December 6

~ Tuesday, December 12

Please note: for current information on Center events, please call (510) 642-3230. Even if no one is available to help you, you can listen to a recorded listing of events that is updated every Friday afternoon.
by Veljko Vujacic  
Assistant Professor of Sociology  
Oberlin College

Throughout its seventy-year-old existence as a unified state, Yugoslavia exhibited a degree of complexity unusual even for that cauldron of peoples that we euphemistically call Eastern Europe. Much of this complexity has been lost in newspaper reports on the Yugoslav war in which Serbs, Croats, and Bosnian Moslems are treated as homogeneous entities not subject to further dissection. More frequently than not, the complex regional differences that cross-cut ethnicity have been neglected.

There is no better place to begin to appreciate the tremendous complexity of the Yugoslav lands than the main site of the current war, Bosnia. Here Orthodox, Catholic, Slavic (Bosnian) Moslems, and Sephardic and Ashkenazi Jews coexisted for centuries under the hegemony of the Ottoman and Hapsburg empires. Once the age of nationalism dawned on this part of the world in the period of imperial decline, Bosnia became a point of contention between Serbian and Croatian national ideologues and soon, movements as well. It was the Yugoslav idea that helped bridge the gap between these contending forces, guaranteeing that the fragile interethnic balance would not explode into open warfare. And it is for this reason, among others (such as the large number of interethnic marriages) that the number of “Yugoslavs” was especially high in Bosnia.

It is hardly an accident that the two proverbial and colorful characters of many Yugoslav jokes, Mujo and Haso (Muhamed and Hasan) were Bosnian Moslems. Although Moslem by name and in spirit, the overarching identity of Mujo and Haso was Yugoslav. Stuck between the Catholic Yugoslav West of Slovenia and Croatia, and the Orthodox Yugoslav East of Serbia, Macedonia, and Montenegro, Mujo and Haso were at the very center of the larger homeland—a kind of Yugoslav average, a blend of and connection between Serb and Croat with an equally good understanding of Orthodoxy and Catholicism; if the mixing of Orthodoxy and Catholicism in a south Slavic kitchen would give you a spicy Middle Eastern dish. And just as in an excellent dish of Balkan gilled meat, it is impossible to say whether the spirit is Slavic and the flesh is Ottoman, so it is impossible to separate the two into the Bosnian body and soul. Or, to put it differently, the Bosnian Moslem is rather like a delightful, but also dangerous mixture of slivovitz and Turkish coffee; and, as any foreign traveler who was forced by his aggressively hospitable Yugoslav hosts to have a shot of slivovitz and a cup of Turkish coffee before breakfast knows, the cocktail was not made for timid souls.

Bosnia, everyone will agree, was a small Yugoslavia. With the exception of the most northern and culturally western republic, Slovenia, the various Yugoslav lands offer no clear boundaries between civilizations, nations, religious communities or mentalities. Even in Slovenia, the most ethnically homogeneous successor state, one begins to sense the diversity of culture and experience. The impatient Westerner who crosses the border from the Austrian side will say that Slovenian billages are exactly like Austrian ones; but the one who crosses from Italy will say that they are exactly the same as in northern Italy. Visit the thin stretch of the Slovenian coast on the Istrian Peninsula (which Slovenia shares with neighboring Croatia) and you will see that both foreigners are right and wrong. For Istria, like its cuisine, offers a blend of Central Europe and Italy with a
distinct Slavic touch. And, to your own surprise, you are likely to find that Istrians are people who have assimilated the best of all those cultures: not as kitschy, but as clean as the Austrians; not as loud, but as fundamentally civilized as the Italians; not as proverbially thrifty (not to say stingy) as some Continental Slovenes; not as angry, nor as Mediterranean as their neighbors, the Dalmatian Croats. Travel further down the beautiful Croatian coast and you will enter a more typically Mediterranean world. It reaches its cultural height in the gorgeous, but typically dirty and sweaty town of Split in whose center one finds the formidable palace of the Roman emperor Diocletian; but unlike other ancient palaces, this one is still inhabited by real people who, in rather typical Mediterranean fashion, hang their linenes from the windows. But Split is also a world unto itself, not only a part of Croatian Dalmatia. For the old people of Split, there is only one truly legitimate identity: that of being a citizen of Split. The cruder newcomers, who come from the mountainous Dalmatian hinterland are referred to as “Vlachs,” a perjorative term derived from the name of an ancient Illyrian tribe. Sometimes used in Croatia and Bosnia to describe “primitive Serbs,” in Split, Vlach applies to all crude mountaineers, regardless of nationality.

Just to prove that the south is not always more backward than the north, the city of Dubrovnik, located near the very border of Montenegro, is markedly more “civilized” than some parts of Dalamtia to the north; for if Split is as beautiful as Genoa and as angry as Naples, Dubrovnik is as majestic as a smaller Venice. With its distinct touch of a commercial aristocracy, it truly stands out among all south Slavic cities. Not accidentally, it was here that the Renaissance touched the south Slavic poets like Ian Gundulic who are jealously, egoistically, and meaninglessly claimed by Serbian and Croatian nationalists alike. This is because Dubrovnik, despite its predominantly Catholic character, always had a significant Serbian contingent. Moreover, it is here that, in an interesting aberration from the historical pattern which largely equates Serbdom with Orthodoxy, one finds a contingent of Catholic Serbs who converted to the Western faith through a centuries-long process of intermarriage and cultural mixing.

Istria, Dalmatia, and Dubrovnik, the last with its separate existence as a city-state until the Napoleonic invasions (yes, among all the conquerors in the Balkans, it would be somewhat of a crime if we had missed out on the crowned Jacobin, Napoleon), do not exhaust the complexity of croissant-shaped Croatia. After all, the early Croatian kings ruled over the three historic lands of Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia.

Indeed, Continental Croatia is different. In its capital, Zagreb, the angry, noisy, and urbane Mediterranean world of Dalmatia is replaced with the bourgeois (some would say petit-bourgeois) manners of a medium-sized provincial capital of that great Central European empire whose symbol is the Viennese waltz. Zagreb is, indeed, a typical baroque Central-European town, with the proverbial opera and coffee house at the center of its cultural life; while the southern suburbs of the city imperceptibly flow into the rich fields of Slavonia, itself a part of the larger Panonian Plain, which Croatia shares with Hungary and Vojvodina, the last being the northern part of today’s Serbia. The boring sleepiness of these Slavonian villages and small towns served as a sort of inspiration of all Croat and Yugoslav authors; Krleza would use the metaphor of “our Panonian mud” to convey to the reader a feeling of existential despair from which there is no escape.

Even all this does not capture the full complexity of the Croatian nation, for we left out the most Croatian of all Croatian tribes, the Croats of Herzegovina. It is here, amidst the rocks and snakes, in the rough landscape of Herzegovina, which is rendered more humane only by the beautifully green and treacherous Neretva River, that the great Catholic Madonna of Medjugorje made her appearance. And while Christian miracles are supposed to be be unpredictable, if one were faced with a multiple-choice text before it happened, one would have probably predicted that a Catholic vision was bound to occur among the Herzegovina Croats. It is among them that the brothers of the most ascetic Franciscan order came to proselytize in an attempt to preserve the true faith in the face of Ottoman onslaught from the east. For centuries they said their prayers and sang their chants all the more zealously because their flock was always under the threat of a potential conversion to Islam, in the fashion of some of their Bosnian brothers. Is it surprising that the most determined and vicious Croatian fighters have come from western Herzegovina? And is it surprising that the so-called Herzegovina lobby has a very strong influence on the policies of Tudman’s government, always pushing it more to the right, as if it were not right wing enough?

The complexities of Croatia and Bosnia behind us, we can now travel east to Serbia. If geographical Serbia is not as diverse as Croatia, the mentalities of the different Serbian “tribes” are as distinct as those which can be detected among their Catholic Croatian brethren. First, there are the peaceful Serbs of Vojvodina, a region which flows in Slavonia and is a part of the rich plain to the north. The proverbial hero of

continued on next page
many jokes about these Serbs is the Lala (tulip) from Vojvodina. In one of them, Lala catches a goldfish and, as is always the case, can have his three wishes before he lets the goldfish free:

First wish: I don’t want my wife Sosa [typically a healthy, plump lady] to cheat on me;

Second wish: If she cheats on me, I don’t want to find out about it.

Third wish, Even if I find out about it, I don’t want to get very upset.

Clearly, our Serbian tulip is not a warlike creature. But Vojvodina is not only the site of these peaceful Serbian peasants but also the cradle of modern Serbian culture. In the aftermath of a series of unsuccessful uprisings against the Ottomans, the migrations from Kosovo (the largest one in 1690) brought into Hungarian Vojvodina a large contingent of Serbs, as well as the patriarch of the Serbian Orthodox Church. It was only from Vojvodina that the bishops and more secular and better-educated Serbian intelligentsia and petite bourgeoisie began a Serbian cultural revival in the nineteenth-century age of nationalism, providing rationales for the expansion of the Serbian state, which was gradually gaining ground in its confrontation with the Ottoman empire. Not for nothing was Novi Sad, the capital of Vojvodina, compared to Serbian Athens, a cultural center with no parallel in the Serbian lands.

But there was also rough Montenegro, the “Black Mountain” and the Serbian Spara, daring the Ottoman conqueror to climb up the rocky cliffs and confront warrior clans and tribes known for their patriarchal cruelty as well as their sense of honor. Of them, the English poet Tennyson wrote,

They kept their faith, their freedom and their height,
Chaste, frugal, savage, armed by day and night,
Against the Turk.

Amidst these armed, frugal savages arose in the nineteenth century Petar Petrovic Njegos, a man of exceptional poetic gifts, a cosmopolitan Orthodox bishop and ruler, who wrote one of the most beautiful epic poems of all time, Mountain Wreath. Characteristically, his great epic is devoted to the theme of patriarchal retribution, and its targets are those Serbs who had made the unhappy choice of converting to Islam, there becoming, in the eyes of Njego’s Montenergin heroes, traitors to their tribe and to Orthodoxy, the “true faith.” Here is how one of them admonished his Slavic Moslem brethren to reconvert to Orthodoxy:

Should you not listen to Baltric
I swear to you by Obilic’s faith
and by my arms, my trusty weapons,
our faiths will be immersed in blood,
the better one will not sink!
Bairam cannot make peace with Christmas!

In the nineteenth century age of romantic nationalism when various Westerners, beginning with Lord Byron and the great German historian Leopold von Ranke (who, incidentally wrote one of his histories of the first Serbian insurrection against the Ottoman Turks under Karageorge or Black George) expressed sympathy for the cause of “oppressed peoples,” such words were seen as part of a movement for national liberations. Today they would be interpreted as a justification for ethnic cleansing.

But the historical tragedy of the Balkans lies in the fact that the two processes could not be separated, and the liberation of one people frequently entailed the persecution of another. The most typical example is the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913 when Serbs, Montenegrins, Bulgarians, and Greeks first united to defeat the Turk and then turned against each other in a battle over Macedonia, committing atrocities that

Graduate Student and Faculty Working Groups

The Center, together with the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies, continue their working group program. Modest support is offered toward those who organize a series of regular meetings for a specific constituency to discuss specific issues related to Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Assistance for each working group does not exceed $300 annually, and funds can be used for expenses such as photocopying, refreshments, supplies, etc. To apply for a grant toward a working group, faculty and/or students must prepare a 1-2 page proposal which clearly states the topic of the group and the significance of organizing a regular meeting to address that topic. In addition, it should indicate the membership of the group, the time and place of meetings, as well as their frequency. If necessary, arrangements can be made for meetings in the Slavic Center conference room in 270 Stephens. Finally, the organizers must indicate the way in which they plan to disseminate the work of the group. Questions can be directed toward the Executive Directors: Ned Walker at 642-6168 or Barbara Voytek 643-6736.
are suspiciously reminiscent of the ones we are witnessing today. It is characteristic that Serbs continued perceiving the Second Balkan War as one of liberation: for Skopje, the present capital of the “Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” (this clumsy name itself a confirmation of Greek resentments over Macedonia, as well as its veto power in the European community) was the town of which the medieval Serbian king Dusan chose as the capital of his empire and in which he proclaimed himself tsar in the year 1346. The Macedonians, however, who were less sentimental about Dusan, saw the Second Balkan War as a continuation of their enslavement, albeit under new and different masters, Serbs, Greeks, and perhaps less so, Bulgarians.

Such realities are frequently lost on Westerners and especially those of Anglo-Saxon background, for there is nothing in their historical experience that quite matches such unpleasant complexities. The historical confusion of Western visitors to the Balkans was well captured by Rebecca West, a great English lady and the author or one of the well captured by Rebecca West, a great English lady and the author or one of the best English visitors to the Balkans (Black Lamb and Grey Falcon) she quite correctly observed that

Each people was perpetually making charges of inhumanity against all its neighbors. The Serb, for example, raised his bitterest complaint against the Turk, but was also ready to accuse the Greeks, the Bulgarians, the Vlachs, and the Albanians of every crime under the sun. English persons, therefore, of humanitarian and reformist disposition constantly went to the Balkan Peninsula to see who was in fact ill-treating whom, and being by the very nature of their perfectionist faith unable to accept the horrid hypothesis that everybody was ill-treating everybody else, all came back with a per Balkan people established in their hearts as suffering and innocent, eternally the massacre and never the massacrers.

Besides the warrior-like Montenegrins, there are also the no less warlike Serbs of the Hapsburg military frontier known as the Vojna Krajina (or simply Krajina). Like those of Vojvodina, these Serbs migrated in several waves from the Ottoman territories and were attracted to the frontier by the prospect of landownership. In this respect, their position as well as their mentality was not unlike that of those better-known protectors of another great empire, the Russian Cossacks. In the Hapsburg military frontier, every man from the age of sixteen to sixty was on permanent call; and, in comparison to the other Hapsburg provinces, which gave one soldier for every 142 inhabitants, that ratio on the frontier was one to nine.

For several centuries, therefore, the frontier formed a separate corpus in the empire. Is it surprising, then, that the idea of historical autonomy has survived among these frontier Serbs in Croatia? Not accidentally, it was from this group that the core of Tito’s Partisan movement was made in World War II after being the target of horrible persecution at the hands of Croatian fascists. In view of all this, it should not be so shocking that these warlike Serbian communities are now ready to face the Croatian Army even in the absence of support from Serbia itself, rather than deriving the concrete economic benefits that are promised to them by well-meaning American ambassadors upon their recognition of the Croatian state.

For the stubbornness of these communities is rooted in their historical experiences. And that life in the frontier was no vacation is testified by the following Moslem epic song from Herzegovina:

The bloody Frontier is this-like with dinner blood, with supper blood, everybody chews bloody mouthfuls never one white day for repose.

Finally, there are the Serbs of central Serbia, the hilly Sumadija, their mentality lying somewhere between the preoccupation with peace of the Lala from Vojvodina and the warlike experiences of their cousins from Montenegro and the frontier. There is possibly no other Yugoslav region which has suffered such losses in this century as the Serbian heartland, devastated by the Austro-Hungarian Imperial Army and Nazi occupier, and torn by a fratricidal war which pitted Partisan against Chetnik, communist against monarchist. So, even if the Serbian peasant from Sumadija wanted to stay out of it all, he had little choice but to become a part of that terrifying historical process which brought two world wars to his home.

Last, there is Belgrade, the capital of Serbia and the former Yugoslavia, a city of would-be despots, liberal intellectuals and a (still) remarkably free opposition press, and the site of a bohemian cafe life which combines the spirit of Central Europe with that of Eastern Orthodoxy and the Ottoman Mediterranean. It is a testimony to the vulgarity of Milosevic’s regime that the ruralization of this previously cosmopolitan city was deliberately fostered in order to break down the liberal spirit of the growing Belgrade citizen class, but it is also true that this campaign was only partially successful, as Belgrade was the site of the largest opposition demonstrations in postwar Yugoslavia (in March 1991) and the longest student strike in Yugoslav history (in summer 1992), both of them directed against that colorless apparatchik turned populist despot who has brought such shame upon the whole Serbian nation.

At the end of our Yugoslav journey, we come to Kosovo and Macedonia. The first one, Kosovo, is the site of the
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BOOK REVIEW

Stalin’s Drive to the West, 1938-1945: The Origins of the Cold War.

“Might it not be thought cynical if it seemed we had disposed of these issues, so fateful to millions of people, in such an offhand manner? Let us burn the paper,” Sir Winston Churchill later recalled telling Premier Josef Stalin. The paper in question was the infamous “percentages agreement,” drawn up by Churchill and approved by Stalin at their Moscow meeting in October 1944. The millions of people to whom Churchill referred resided in southeastern Europe, which the two Allied leaders had resolved to split up according to “degree of influence”: Romania was to be 90 percent Russian; Bulgaria, 75 percent Russian; Greece, 90 percent British (with American help); Yugoslavia and Hungary, 50-50. The paper—which Stalin handed back to Churchill, saying “No, you keep it”—represents to many historians an apathy with which the Big Three treated the fate of those living between the Elbe and the Soviet Union. The story has also served Americans well, suggesting that the US was not involved in this ultimate realpolitik deal.

Indeed, the “Sovietization” of Eastern Europe—a term used by the Soviets and the English-speaking allies alike—is often seen as a major tragedy in an especially tragic period. R.G. Raack, a historian of Eastern Europe who has recently retired from the California State University in Hayward, shares his view. His new book, Stalin’s Drive to the West, covers both Soviet territorial aims to its west and the failure—in his terms—of a significant Western response to these aims. Based (as the jacket copy says) on newly available materials from East Bloc archives, the book argues stridently that Stalin had always aimed at taking over all of Europe east of the Elbe, that Stalin’s claim for “defensive” needs were a cover for these ambitions, and that Western diplomats and journalists—and later historians—worked hard to hide this fact from themselves and others in their dealings with the USSR.

After a brief and strongly worded introduction, Raack acquaints the reader with Stalin’s intentions of invading westward with the Czech crisis of 1938. He has more material, however, on the negotiations and renegotiations of the Hitler-Stalin Pact in the fall of 1939. The Sovietization of eastern Poland, which Raack considers part of Stalin’s “prewar dreams,” was effected through an agreement with Nazi Germany as cynical (if not more) as the percentages agreement with Churchill. Extrapolating backwards from the partition of Poland in 1939, Raack goes on to infer that “in 1938, as in 1939, Stalin very much wanted a general war in the West”—be it over Czechoslovakia in 1938, or over Poland the following year.

Tracing Stalin’s ambitions through the war, in a chapter ironically entitled “Stalin Fights the War—of Defense,” Raack focuses on the northern sphere, covering the Finnish campaign and the Sovietization of the Baltics—which took place, he emphasizes, only one day after Nazi armies marched through Paris. Raack also gives considerable attention to the “fulfillment” of the Hitler-Stalin Pact—the partition of Poland.

The activities of the Soviet Army and other Soviet organs
in Poland were treated well in chapter three. Here Raack has enough material, archival and otherwise, to trace out in more detail the machinations of Soviet political officers attached to the Red Army. Not surprisingly, he supplements his own sources with Jan Gross’s important work on this topic, Revolution from Abroad: The Soviet Conquest of Poland’s Western Ukraine and Western Belorussia. In comparison with Gross’s study, however, Raack’s analysis fairs poorly; his work lacks Gross’s interpretative ambitiousness as well as the source base for analysis of social processes.

Raack is successful, however, in describing the Allied conflict over Poland and the rivalry between the London government and the Soviet-supported government in Lublin, which, he argues, was central to the development of the Cold War. A focus on Poland as a mainspring of the Cold War, of course, is not a new interpretation; more general diplomatic histories have long pointed to Poland as a significant harbinger of future Soviet-Western tensions. But Raack presents the Allied-power machinations from a more Polish-centered perspective: for instance, Roosevelt and Churchill’s blithe acceptance of a division closely resembling the Curzon line is treated as much for its domestic, social, and especially political implications in Poland, as for its significance in great-power diplomacy.

Chapter five—the best in the book—deloys a wealth of new materials from East German state and party archives in order to support Raack’s argument about plans for teh “Sovietization” of its occupation zones. While some pages are devoted to the macabre and bizarre history of Hitler’s corpse, pride of place is reserved for East German party leader Wilhelm Pieck’s notes from a Moscow meeting. Among the options discussed at that 1941 meeting—and the one preferred by the Soviets, Raack insists—is taken down in shorthand by Pieck as “prospect of [Nazi] victory dwindles—international fraternization—revolution with the support of the Soviet Union.” Here Raack’s access to internal German documents shows the Soviet focus on political control and propaganda over emergency relief and economic reconstruction. In Marshal Zhukov’s pithy phrase, “It’s quite simple, it must look democratic but everything must be in our hands.” Once again, though, Raack’s source base could be wider. Newly released documents from the Soviet Military Administration in Germany (by its Russian initials, SVAG) were not consulted, nor was a recent collection of SVAG documents from the former Central Party Archive in Moscow.

Raack concludes his narrative with a chapter on “Stalin in the heart of Europe,” devoting special attention to the “Soviet show”: the Potsdam Conference in July 1945. Here Raack’s anger is aimed at the Allies for not holding the USSR to its promised plans of occupation—themselves problematic—even when confronted with evidence of broken promises. Such evidence, Raack aptly notes, was not only at the negotiating table, but visible all around, amid the destruction of the eastern sector. The image of huge color portraits of Stalin hung up over smoldering rubble is an evocative expression of Soviet policy. Thus concludes what Raack called Stalin’s Drang nach Westen; while Stalin wanted more, Raack claims, he had won what he could.

Raack’s use of sources throughout is creative, especially in his examination of numerous American and Soviet documentary films. He weaves together printed sources from a range of formerly restricted archives in Prague, Berlin, and Warsaw, complementing these with reports from American diplomats and journalists—and later historians—worked hard to hide this fact from themselves and others in their dealings with the USSR.

(Raack) stridently argues that Stalin had always aimed at taking over all of Europe east of the Elbe...and that Western diplomats and journalists—and later historians—worked hard to hide this fact from themselves and others in their dealings with the USSR.
match Volkogonov’s angry accusations. Stalin is a “deranged dictator” with a “cold heart” living in “mental disequilibrium,” “paranoic,” “stumped,” and so on. Further, Raack’s conclusion that some “Red government indignities” were “directly attributable to Stalin” remains an unsupported (if not implausible) “inference” so long as Moscow remains only a quick stopover on Raack’s archival excursions. While the former Party Archive and the Foreign Ministry Archive may not contain—or release to researchers—Volkogonov-type revelations, or a full record of the foreign-policy debates in Moscow, assertions about Stalin’s “direct” influence certainly could benefit from an examination of more of these sources.

These limits of sources and interpretation could be more easily overlooked were it not for Raack’s insistence that he is the sole truth-teller amid packs of the self-deceived (or worse). Thus analysts who disagree with Raack “deliberately did not look,” or took “conscience-faith as reality.” This is topped by a remarkable one and one-half page footnote listing individuals misinformed about Stalin’s intentions. While the record of American analysis of Soviet aims in Europe is far from proud, Raack is quick to condemn experts and politicians who had sort out hundreds of pieces of contradicting information arriving daily. Or perhaps he deliberately ignores their circumstances. Raack’s one effort at modesty in this regard—the caveat that his book is “necessarily incomplete” and will be “corrected by others later” is undercut by the next sentence, which boasts that his book “should superannuate countless earlier histories.”

In spite of these problems, however, we should take Raack’s challenge to heart. His use of non-textual sources and his comparative perspective are especially valuable for his topic, a study of events more typically seen as the map upon which the Great Powers solved their own disputes rather than as the wholesale reallocation of territory, which led to untold personal and societal losses. It is an indication of his assessment of these losses that Raack, looking from smoldering central Europe east to smoldering Nagasaki, suggests that the only instrument capable of saving Japan from the tragic division of their country was the atomic bomb.

David Engerman, Ph.D. candidate,
History Department,
University of California,
Berkeley

---

IAS PUBLICATIONS IN SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

IAS Publications has recently produced two works of interest to scholars and students in our area. *Ivo Andrich Revisited: The Bridge Still Stands*, is edited by Wayne Vucinich (History, Stanford University). Ivo Andric was awarded the 1961 Nobel Prize for Literature for his fiction and poetry. This volume examines Andric’s use of South Slavic oral and written traditions, and themes of victimazation, gender relations, and art in the formation of Yugoslav identity.

*The Collapse of Soviet Communism: A View from the Information Society* is the second publication in the IAS series, “Exploratory Essays.” The authors are Manuel Castells, professor of planning and affiliated professor of sociology as well as chair of the Center for Western European Studies at Berkeley, and Emma Kiselyova, assistant director of international relations at the Institute of Economics and Industrial Engineering, Russian Academy of Sciences, and research associate, at the Institute of Urban and Regional Development at Cal.

Copies of either volume are available from IAS Publications, 510/642-4065.
William Saroyan Visiting Professorship in Armenian Studies

Two new endowments support Armenian Studies at the University of California at Berkeley: the William Saroyan Endowment for a Visiting Professor and the Krouzian Study Center Endowment. The objective is to support an integrated program of activities which will lead to opportunities for students, faculty, scholars, and members of the general public to learn about Armenia — its society, languages, culture, history, and socioeconomic position within a global framework. While the emphasis is on contemporary issues, the program is flexible and may encompass any of the study areas mentioned above. Complementary programs in related fields of Near East, Middle East, Russian, Caucasus, Byzantine, and Greek studies are well developed on the Berkeley campus.

Applications are now being considered for a visiting professor for the Fall 1996 Semester (August 21 to December 15). Field open. Salary negotiable. The applicant is expected to teach an undergraduate course(s) on an approved topic of Armenian studies, supervise and assist student research, interact with faculty and students in related fields, present a public lecture, and lead the development of an active program.

Requirements: candidates must have a Ph.D. or equivalent. They must have teaching experience in the English language. Application consists of the following: curriculum vitae; a proposed syllabus and description of course or courses to be taught; two references.

The Armenian Studies Program is administered through the Center for Slavic and East European Studies, an organized research unit within International and Area Studies. It is supported by an advisory committee appointed by the Vice Chancellor with representatives from the Armenian Alumni Association, the Armenian Community within the Bay Area in general, as well as the Slavic Center, the Center for Middle Eastern Studies, and the Department of Near East Studies.

Interested individuals should send a cv and supporting documents to Dr. Barbara Voytek, Executive Director, Center for Slavic and East European Studies, 361 Stephens Hall #2304, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-2304. The deadline for application is December 1, 1995.

William Saroyan Film
An award winning documentary film, Remembering William Saroyan: The Man, The Writer will be shown at St. John Armenian Church Hall 275 Olympia Way San Francisco December 3rd Reception 4:00 p.m. $10 donation 415/591-1951
The VIIth International Flint Symposium was held this year in Warsaw and Ostrowiec Swietokrzyski, Poland. Over 100 participants met at the State Archaeological Museum in Warsaw on the afternoon of the 4th of September and began the conference with a wine reception and tour of the new exhibit. The exhibit is an excellent panorama of the nature and extent of prehistoric flint-mining in Poland. After viewing the exhibit, one understands clearly that Poland was the perfect choice for the flint symposium.

After the reception, we traveled by bus to Ostrowiec in the region of the “Holy Cross Mountains.” The next two days saw intense scholarly activity with three simultaneous sessions: Flint Mines and Mining; Flint Distribution and Technology; and Geology, Mineralogy, Petrography and Geochemistry of Raw Materials of the Stone Age. The third day provided an excursion into the foothills where we were able to witness firsthand the occurrence and evidence of prehistoric exploitation of Upper Jurassic and Upper Cretaceous siliceous rocks which, to European archaeologists, are more commonly known as the “chocolate flint” and the “banded flint” of Poland. In addition, we spent a wonderful afternoon touring the flint mine of Krzemionki, an impressive site and a flint-knapper’s dream. Friday ended the conference with a final day of meetings. This year more emphasis was placed on the socioeconomic context of flint-mining. Anthropological models were discussed, not without rather heated argument.

Participants came largely from Poland, followed by Czechs, Slovaks, Germans, Danes, English, and Dutch. Approximately three each of Hungarian, French, Italian, and Spanish were in attendance. One geologist from Russia, a young Ukrainian and an archaeologist from Belarus were able to come. Three Iranian archaeologists attended, although their interest in flint exploitation was not so immediate as it was for the Europeans. There were three participants from the US.

The significance of the conference lay in several areas. It was the first time the conference was held in the East and the first time the number of archaeologists from the East matched that from the West. The location, Ostrowiec, is a midsize town near many ancient flint mines. Our symposium was a source of great interest for the local people and helped obtain funds for improving the facilities (park and museum) connected with the flint mines. Our four days there attracted attention. The symposium and participants were prominently featured on the local cable TV station, as well as covered in the local news.

In addition, the Polish archaeologists, as well as those from other Eastern countries, connected with Western colleagues for future collaborations. The Danish and English archaeologists are expert in flint exploitation studies and they were impressed with the level of research on the Polish flint mines. Several remained after the conference to teach flint-mining techniques to the Polish students. I expect that with my connection to the Center and to Cal’s Archaeological Research Facility, there will be future collaborations with the Polish archaeologists as well.

Notably, the conference was made possible through the efforts of several institutions whose cooperation and coordination surpassed similar operations I have witnessed in the West. The organizers were the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology of the Polish Academy of Sciences; the State Archaeological Museum in Warsaw; and the Museum of History and Archaeology in Ostrowiec. Sponsors were the State Committee for Scientific Research; the Polish Academy of Sciences; the City of Ostrowiec Swietokrzyski; and the Wojewoda of Kielce. Those who acted in cooperation with the organizers included the Institute of Archaeology of the University of Warsaw; the Institute of Archaeology of the Jagiellonian University; the Institute of Mineralogy, Raw Materials, and Geochemistry; the Academy of Mining and Metallurgy, Krakow; and the Institute of Geological Sciences of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw.

Barbara Voytek,
Executive Director,
CSEES
Is the history of the Russian working class still a viable topic, now that the “workers’ state” no longer exists? Was there, indeed, ever such a thing as a Russian “working class”? On the basis of a recent international conference in the former Russian capital the answer to the first question is surely “yes”: fresh and creative analysis and discussion of Russian labor history is apparently alive and well, both in Russia and in the West. The answer to the second question, however—better formulated as “how useful is the concept working class to our understanding of late Imperial Russian society?”—is now very much in dispute, as witness the attention it received and the controversy it aroused at the conference.

The conference, or “colloquium,” as the Russians prefer to call it (the official Russian title was: Rabochee Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XIX-nachale XX v.; oblik, mentalitet; raboche i obshchestvo; raboche i intelligentsiia) was held in the film projection room of the Gostintsa Smol’nonskaia, just across from the famous Smol’ny Monastery. The main institutional cosponsors were, on the Russian side, the Petersburg filial of the Institute of Russian History (hereafter “IRH”) of the Russian Academy of Sciences, and on the “Western” side, our own UC Berkeley Slavic Center, which played a role as administrator in the NEH-backed, IREX grant that funded the event (special thanks to Brenda Rizzetto for her splendid assistance), the Harriman Institute (Columbia University), and the Maison des Sciences de l’Homme. As “principal investigator” for the project, I was joined by Dr. Sergei I. Potolov of the IRH in the capacity of co-chair of the conference itself, along with a larger “coordinating committee” that included Professors Mark Steinberg of Yale (my close associate in the organization of the program) and Leopold Haiman of Colombia. Steinberg, as many readers of his newsletter will recall, is a UC Berkeley History Ph.D., as were several other participants: Professors Deborah Pearl of Cleveland State University, Gerald Surh of North Carolina State University, and Eugene “Tony” Swift of the University of Essex. Although Russians and Americans were numerically predominant, the event’s international flavor was enhanced by the presence of scholars from Germany, England, France, Finland, and Azerbaijan (the only “successor state” represented besides Russia itself).

The gathering was meant to be exploratory, designed to encourage the examination of the many areas of interplay between workers and other strata (sloei) of Russian society, especially educated society, including both the revolutionary and the non-revolutionary (or less revolutionary) intelligentsia and the educated professionals who dealt with workers in either an official or an unofficial capacity. The conference was also meant to foster the notion, already suggested, if not fully developed, in earlier Soviet works by the concept of oblik, that the mental and moral world of workers was as rich, varied, complex and worthy of study as the world of educated society. Russian workers, including, of course, the so-called worker-intelligentsia, have and should have their own rich and varied cultural and intellectual histories.

Iurii Kirianov of the Moscow IRH, considered by many to be the premier historian of Russian labor, first introduced the then daring concept of oblik into the Soviet historical lexicon in the 1960s. Kirianov gave what amounted to the keynote address at the conference, in which he did himself and oblik one better by invoking the French Annales School notion of mentalité (in Russian, mentalitet). Although some might argue that he was simply introducing a new word for oblik, and that a fuller exploration of worker “mentalité” is still needed, the use of the term was nonetheless emblematic of the powerful desire of the Russian participants to explore modes of analysis that had once been alien to historians of labor. Both the expression and the question of its value came up again and again in the course of the subsequent discussions.

The conference was divided into three sections (usually comprising two sessions each, a morning and an afternoon), each devoted to a broad topic (problema): Topic one, “samoopredelenie, oblik, mentalitet,” included the “mentality” paper by Kirianov, which many saw as the highlight of the conference, especially in the light of its striking departures from the shibboleths of past historiography. A thematic paper by Leo Haimon highlighted the mutual “representations” (predstavleniia) of workers and intelligency within the Social-Democratic movement, and an innovative paper by Steinberg dealt with worker-intelligentsia’s concepts of the individual “self” (lichnost’). Also included in the first topic were papers by E. R. Ol’khovskii on the “formation” of the worker-intelligentsia, by the anthropologist N.S. Polishchuk (the only non-historian participant), on working-class customs and morés, by I. A. Akhanchi, on relations among ethno-religious groups in the Baku oil industry, by N. V. Mikhailov, on the “self-organization of worker collectives and the psychology of Russian workers,” and by Tony Swift, on workers’ theater. Mikhailov’s paper provoked instance discussion because of its emphasis on the peasant origins of industrial collectivism, a tabu line of argument in Russia only a few years ago.

Topic two, “workers and the Russian social movement” (obshchestvennoe dvizhenie), included papers by G. I.
Korolev, comparing and contrasting the ways in which workers and intelligentsia understood the word “socialism,” Joan Neuberger, on some fascinating case studies of workers who brought grievances before the post-Reform justices of the peace (mirovye sud’i), Deborah Pearl, on the complex relations between workers and the People’s Will (Narodnaia Volia), A. S. Kasimov, on the local interactions between workers and intelligentsia in the Central Black-Soil Region, Manfred Hildermeier, on workers and the SR Party, William Rosenberg, on liberal representations of workers, S. L. Firsov, on workers and the Orthodox Church, S. A. Stepanov, on the Black Hundreds’ efforts to recruit workers, Hubertus Jahn, on worker patriotism during World War I, and R. Sh. Ganelin, on representations of the labor movement in the minds of bureaucratic reformers.

Topic three, “workers and intelligentsia,” began with my own paper on the social and personal relations between worker-revolutionaries and revolutionary students in the 1870s, followed by papers by T. M. Kitianina, on workers and the “technical intelligentsia” (members of the Imperial Russian Technical Society), Jerry Surh, on the “chimera” of economism, a case study of the Petersburg “Rabochaia organizatsiia” (1900-03), Sergei Potolov, on worker-intelligentsia relations on the eve of the 1905 Revolution (mainly the Gapon Assembly), Jutta Sherrer, on worker-intelligentsia relations at the Marxist “schools” in Capri and Bologna, and Steven Smith of Essex, who presented an unusual comparative paper on worker-intelligentsia relations in Petersburg and Shanghai. (Discussants included Laura Engelstein of Princeton, Ziva Galili of Rutgers, Louise McReynolds of the University of Hawaii, and Nikolai Smirnov of the IRH.) Finally, on the last day of the conference, with Rosenberg chairing, there was a series of brief concluding remarks by P. B. Volobuev of the Academy of Sciences, Hiamson, Potolov, and myself.

The papers, and the discussions they provoked, highlighted the importance of analyzing the preconceptions with which the various components of Russia’s pre-Revolutionary élites approached the workers whom they hoped to influence, as well as the ways in which their contacts with workers altered those preconceptions in the course of time. Workers and intellectuals were in constant contact from the Great Reforms to the end of the old régime, and many of the papers succeeded in probing those contacts in depth and shedding new light on them. The intelligentsia’s very varied images (“representations”) of workers, and the confusing, contradictory, yet revealing ways in which intelligently struggled with their understanding of the “working class” over time, provided the conference with a recurrent leitmotif. The inclusion of balanced discussions of conservative, nationalist, and religious movements and institutions and of their approaches to workers and to the labor questions was a valuable innovation (though one missing dimension that would have been useful was worker relations with police). Especially gratifying was the amount of attention paid by several speakers to the subject of workers as intelligentsia, their mentality, ethical ideals, and self-identifications. Of course the topics covered were hardly exhaustive, but the conference surely advanced our research agenda and helped enrich the thinking of scholars on both sides of what is fast becoming, from an intellectual standpoint, an artificial divide.

We are now preparing the publication of the proceedings of the conference in book form. A talented Russian publisher, “Blitz,” has been found, though some funding is still needed to subsidize the venture. When that problem has been solved, we also plan to pursue the publication of a large selection of the papers in English.

by Reginald E. Zelnik, Profesor of History, University of California, Berkeley

---

MEMORIAL TO
MARK SAROYAN

Plans are set for the publication of the collected works of Mark Saroyan, UC Berkeley Ph.D. in political science, who passed away last year. International and Area Studies at Cal will publish the work. Harvard University, where Mark taught after completing his degree, contributed generously to the project. The compilation is under the directorship of Timothy Colton and Susan Farrar from Harvard and Gail Lapidus from Stanford. Once again, we would like to thank the alumni who contributed toward the publication of this important work.

NEW COURSE!
STRUCTURES OF CONTEMPORARY ROMANIAN

Instructor: Gabriella Duda, professor of pedagogy and philology at the University of Ploiesti, Romania.

The course presents the main phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical aspects of contemporary standard Romanian. The instructor will design a reader with various texts (literary, newspaper, etc.) for grammatical and lexical exercises. Differences between spoken and written language, formal and informal communication will be highlighted. The course is open to students in Romance Languages, Slavic Languages and Linguistics. Those interested in enrolling are advised to contact Professor Duda at the Slavic Center 642-3230.

Meets MWF 10-11 in 189 Dwinelle
Course 78509
Linguistics 270, Course 52972
famous battle of the Field of the Blackbirds (Kosovo Polje) in which the medieval Serbian kings lost their kingdom to the invading Ottomans in 1389. Successive generations turned this defeat on the field of battle into a spiritual victory for Christianity: for, according to the legend, when faced with the excruciating choice, Serbian tsar Lazar chose the Kingdom in Heaven over the one on Earth, even if simultaneously one of his nobles, Milos Obilic, proceeded to take the life of his opponent, the great Sultan Murat, in an act of earthly retribution. This connection between the two themes of Christian martyrdom and patriarchal revenge was henceforth passed on from generation to generation through epic poems, forming the basis of the defining myth of nineteenth-century Serbian nationalism. In light of this, the Serbian preoccupation with the loss of Kosovo to the growing Albanian population becomes more understandable, even if the practical political consequences are morally unjustifiable.

The Albanians are the only non-Slavic and therefore, strictly speaking, non-Yugoslav tribe in the former Yugoslav space. Their origin is still the subject of great controversy, for they do not seem related to any of the surrounding peoples; the same could be said of the Albanian language which is not a part of the more standard language groups. But aside from being predominantly Moslem (for there are also Orthodox and Catholic Albanians), the Kosovo Albanians are close in mentality to the neighboring Montenegrins. In any case, like the Montenegrins they have tended to live in large clans whose origins are carefully preserved in collective memory; and naturally, in such a society, vendetta over the perennial question of honor is still far from being an uncommon practice.

Last comes Macedonia, which is itself a great mixture of peoples among whom the Yugoslav Macedonians (for there are Macedonians in Bulgaria and Greece as well) predominate. It is this great diversity which gave the name to an exotic French salad with a great many different ingredients—la macedoine. But frustrated nationhood and a legacy of oppression by every conceivable neighbor also made Macedonia a land of sad ballads and the most wonderfully heavy, somber dances, performed in a strange rhythm that is still the subject of musicological interest, and also a land of dark plots and extremist conspiracies, many of which shook Yugoslav and Bulgarian politics in the interwar period. If present-day Macedonia survives its ordeals as a fully independent state, it will be in defiance of a well established historical pattern.

Naturally, this brief tour of Yugoslav or former Yugoslav identities, regions, nations and mentalities has touched only on some select aspects of the larger and even more complex picture. The cultural gap between city and country, the poor people of the mountains and those of the richer plains, various intranational resentments such as those between former apparatchiks and the new nationalists, army officers and “separatists” or “internal traitors,” and a great many other possible divisions have only been hinted at. But if this inevitably short tour has served to convey the idea that not everything is as clear cut as it appears, it will have served its purpose.

I am pleased to report that the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies has been awarded a three-year grant by the Ford Foundation for graduate training and research projects on the contemporary Caucasus. In our proposal to Ford, we argued that while the Caucasus, which we defined as the three Transcaucasian republics of Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia as well as the North Caucasus region of the Russian Federation, is a strategically vital, extremely volatile, and fascinating region, it is at the same time highly understudied. The region is strategically vital because of its very large oil and gas reserves; the security concerns and cultural ties of outside powers in the region (particularly Russia, Turkey, and Iran); and its location as a potential route for pipelines bringing oil and gas from Central Asia to the international marketplace. At the same time, the region is extremely unstable, as evidenced by the still unresolved conflicts over Nagorno-Karabakh, Abkhazia, Chechnya, and South Ossetia; the conflicts between factions of the “titular nationalities” in Azerbaijan and Georgia; and the territorial disputes and ethnic tensions throughout the region. Finally, the rich history and extreme ethnic heterogeneity of the region makes it a fascinating object of study for social scientists. Nevertheless, the Caucasus remains the most understudied region of the former Soviet Union.

The three-year project will bring visiting scholars from the region to teach and conduct research at UC Berkeley; fund graduate training, dissertation, and language training fellowships for UC Berkeley graduate students specializing on the Caucasus; provide travel and conference grants to faculty and graduate students conducting research on the Caucasus; bring speakers to campus for public presentations and seminars, and convene an annual conference. The project has three research themes, one for each year of the grant period: (1) “Nationalism, Ethnopolitics, and Conflict in the Caucasus”; (2) “The Geopolitics of Oil, Gas, and Ecology in the Caucasus and Caspian Sea;” and (3) “State Building and the Reconstruction of Shattered Societies.” The visiting scholar brought to UCB each year will be an expert on that year’s theme and will lead an informal graduate seminar, conduct research, and participate in the annual conference. The research topic of the year will be the organizing theme of the annual conference.

We expect to work closely with the Slavic Center and the Armenian Studies Program here at UC Berkeley in implementing the project. We are also cooperating with the American University of Armenia (AUA). AUA is a graduate university located in Yerevan, Armenia, that began operation in September 1991. Since its inception, AUA has had a formal affiliation with the University of California (UC), which provides AUA with technical support in administration, faculty training, and collaborative programs of scholarly exchange and research. We hope that cooperation with AUA will provide Program graduate students and faculty with access to a range of scholars throughout the Caucasus, as well as with extensive logistical support for conducting research in the region.

We are currently developing other institutional links in the region as well. We have established cooperative ties with the North Ossetian State University (NOSU), which is conveniently located in Russia’s North Caucasus region and is equipped with an excellent library, modern communication equipment, and other facilities for visiting researchers. Catherine Dale, a BPS graduate student in political science and an expert on Georgia and the Abkhaz conflict, has just returned from a two-week trip to Tbilisi, where she interviewed potential visiting scholars and explored the possibility of institutional links, while conducting research for a paper on the Abkhaz crisis which she will present at the end of the year at a conference in Oslo. In addition, Steve Fish, UC Berkeley’s new assistant professor in political science and a specialist on political parties and social movements in post-communist societies, will travel to Baku to conduct research and develop scholarly contacts in Azerbaijan.

We have also begun our speakers series for the project, cooperating with the Armenian Studies Program, the Association for the Study of Nationalities, and the Slavic Center to bring an excellent set of speakers on the Caucasus to campus for the fall term. Already, Katrina Menzigian (Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University) has given a talk on the geopolitics of the Azer oil
industry; Raffi Hovannisian (former foreign minister of Armenia, Yerevan) gave a presentation on Armenian domestic politics and foreign policy; Fiona Hill (Strengthening Democratic Institutions, the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University) presented a paper on Russian policy in the Caucasus; and Nikolai Hovhannisian (director of the Institute for Oriental Studies, Armenian Academy of Sciences) spoke about Armenian politics and diplomacy. In the coming weeks, Sergei Arutiunov (Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology in Moscow) will give a talk on the cultural roots of ethnic conflict in the North Caucasus, including Chechnya; Richard Hovannisian (professor of history at UCLA) will speak on Armenian history and his recently completed multi-volume history of the republic; Ron Suny (professor of political science at the University of Chicago) will give a presentation on the Karabakh conflict; Leila Alieva (Kennan Institute) will speak on current Azerbaijani politics; and Bruce Allyn (the Conflict Management Group, Cambridge, MA) will talk about peacekeeping and the role of international institutions in the Caucasus hot spots.

Finally, we are hoping to facilitate greater communication and interaction between scholars of the Caucasus in this country. We are currently compiling a database of these scholars and their publications, and we will prepare a newsletter to inform those interested in the region about events, resources, new publications, and so on. We also hope to sponsor panels at professional conventions and will bring both scholars from the region and from elsewhere in the U.S. to our annual conferences.

We believe that there is an urgent need to develop scholarly expertise in the study of the Caucasus in this country. With our tradition of excellence in Soviet, post-Soviet, and East European studies; our existing institutional infrastructure; the initiatives already underway on campus in Caucasus studies; and our outstanding faculty and graduate students, we hope that our new program at UC Berkeley will contribute greatly to scholarship and informed policy making on this vital yet understudied part of the world.

Edward W. Walker,
Executive Director
Berkeley Program in
Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies

VISITING SCHOLARS

Gianmaria Ajani, head of the department of law at the University of Trento, Italy, is a visiting professor of comparative law at Boalt Hall. Since 1994, Ajani has acted as co-director of the United Nations’ course on international trade in Turin. A specialist on Russian and East European law, he has also served as a legal consultant to the International Monetary Fund and was responsible for the drafting of a preliminary civil code for Albania. His current research interest is the influence of Western European law on the transformation of legal codes in Central and Eastern Europe. He is teaching a course on economic transformation and the law.

Chen-yu Chang, a graduate student in political science at National Taiwan University in Taipei has come to do research as part of the Republic of China-UC Berkeley Cooperative Program. Her master’s thesis examined nationalist movements in Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, and she intends to do further research on frameworks for analyzing such movements in Eastern Europe.

Robert O. Crummey, professor emeritus of history at the University of California, Davis, is teaching an undergraduate course on his specialization, the early history of Russia. His latest book on the period is The Formation of Muscovy, 1304-1613. He has also recently edited a book of articles on reform in Russia and the USSR and is continuing research on his longtime interest, the Old Believers.

Gabiela Duda, a native of Bucharest, comes to Berkeley as a Fulbright scholar to teach modern Romanian (see course description in this issue). Head of the department of philology and pedagogy at the University of Ploiesti, Duda also helped establish a department of Romanian and English at the university. Her publications include a Romanian textbook and a dictionary of Romanian phrases and idioms for foreigners, as well as several works on Romanian poetics. Her current interests include the evolution of poetic forms.

Grigorii Golosov of Novosibirsk State University joins the university community as a participant in the IREX Contemporary Issues Regional Scholar Exchange Program. A professor of social and political theory, he will examine Western Siberia as a case study of the role of Russia’s new political parties. Golosov has published several articles on Russian politics in a comparative perspective.

Svetlana Mintz teaches Russian history at Khabarovsk State University and cultural studies at the Management Institute in Krasnodar, Russia. In 1990, Mintz joined a commission to reorganize the university’s history curriculum in line with international educational standards. She has received an IREX Social Science Curriculum Fellowship to learn about new methods of historical investigation and theoretical approaches to the study of culture.
Faculty and Student News

FLAS Fellowship Recipients for Academic Year 1995-96

Robin Brooks (Political Science), Bulgarian
Diana Cheren (Art History), Russian
Vladimir Doukhovnikov (Environ. Health), Russian
Charles Greer (Slavic), Serbian
David Hoffinan (Political Science), Russian
Lucian Kim (Journalism), Russian
Konstantin Klioutchkine (Slavic), Czech
Danielle Lussier (Music), Hungarian
Sarah Shul (Slavic), Czech
Anna Wertz (History), Polish


New Students within the Berkeley Program for Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies

Robin Brooks (political science)
Michael Carpenter (political science)
Adam Cohen-Siegel (linguistics)
Lisa Cook (economics)
Catherine Dale (political science)
James Hamon (sociology)
Laura Henry (political science)
Marie-Alice L’Heureux (architecture)
Norm Offestein (agriculture and resource economics)
Jan Plamper (history)
Brian Silverstein (anthropology)
Arthur Small (agriculture and resource economics)


SSRC Awardees in 1995

James C. Hamon (sociology) received a Language Training Grant for Czech. Graduate Training Awards were given to Adrienne Edgar (history) and Marie-Alice L’Heureux (architecture and urban planning); Maranatha Ivanova (political science) was awarded an International Predissertation Fellowship; a Dissertation Fellowship was granted to Valerie Sperling (political science) for her research on “The Development of the Women’s Movement in Post-Communist Russia”; David E. Schneider (music) received a Dissertation Fellowship for his work, “Hungarian Culmination Points: Folk Music and Meaning in Four Concertos by Bela Bartok.”

M. Steven Fish, newly appointed assistant professor in political science, was awarded an SSRC Advanced Research Grant for the study of the development of multipartyism in Russia’s unconsolidated democracy.

New Students in the Area

Robin Brooks (political science)
Michael Carpenter (political science)
Adam Cohen-Siegel (political science)
Stephan Collier (anthropology)
Berit Grobecker (education)
Jim Hamon (sociology)
Laura Henry (political science)
David Hoffman (political science)
Lucian Kim (journalism)
Edward Lee (Slavic)
Jason Ostergren (history)
Jessica Sharzer (Slavic)
David Shmeer (history)
Brian Silverstein (anthropology)
Michelle Viise (Slavic)
Anna Zagorska (history)

Eric Naiman, assistant professor in Slavic and comparative literature, was recently given an F. Warren Hellman award for “exciting, creative research.” He received the award for his study of “Monumental Intimacy: Privacy and the Shaping of Soviet Life.”
Selected Faculty Publications


——. “Getting Russia ‘wrong:’ an answer to S. N. Lipset and L. Bence,” in German, Transit, fall 1995.

——. From the Bronze Horseman to the Lenin Mausoleum: Russia under Western Eyes. Forthcoming, Harvard University Press, 1996.


Fellowships and Other Opportunities

**Slavic Center Travel Grants** The Center’s US Department of Education Title VI grant provides limited travel support for Center-affiliated graduate students and faculty. Awards of up to $300 are made to those presenting a paper at a meeting of a recognized scholarly organization. Awards are made on a first-come, first-serve basis. Priority given to those who did not have grants in AY94-95. To apply, send request with budget to Barbara Voytek (643-6736).

**American Council of Learned Societies** ACLS-administered Grants for East European Studies (except as noted, intended for study outside Eastern Europe; applicants must be citizens or permanent residents of the US). Proposals dealing with Albania, Bulgaria, Romania, and the former Yugoslavia are particularly encouraged:

- Predissertation Travel Grants. To travel to Eastern Europe to examine resources available for research. Up to $5,000 to support a summer trip to Eastern Europe of two months or more. Applicants must have been accepted into a Ph.D. program before applying. Deadline: February 1, 1996.

- East European Individual Language Training Grants. For first- or second-year summer study of any East European language (not languages of the CIS) in the US or intermediate or advanced training in Eastern Europe. Graduating college seniors, grad students, and postdoctoral scholars are eligible to apply. $2,000-2,500. Deadline February 1, 1996.

Applications forms for the above grants must be requested in writing from the Office of Fellowships and Grants, American Council of Learned Societies, 228 East 45th Street, New York NY 10017-3398. No part of the inquiry or application procedure may be conducted by fax.

**Center for German and European Studies Faculty Grants** Applications for graduate student research assistance during Spring 1996 on specific European topics. Awards of $3,000. Deadline: November 17, 1995.

- Short Term Predissertation Research Fellowships. For research in Europe during summer-fall 1996. UC graduate students researching modern European topics, advanced or close to candidacy, eligible to apply. Awards of $3,000. Deadline: January 31, 1996.

For information on application procedure and topics funded for the aforementioned grants, contact CGES, 254 Moses Hall #2316. cges@uclink.berkeley.edu

**Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) Fellowships** Fellowships awarded to students in one or more modern foreign language. Priority given to students in the humanities, social sciences and professional fields. Academic year awards deadline: Continuing students: February 23. Entering students submit fellowship application and topics funded for the aforementioned grants, contact CGES, 254 Moses Hall #2316.

cges@uclink.berkeley.edu

**International Research & Exchanges Board (IREX) —**

- Short-Term Travel Grants (Baltic States; Central and Eastern Europe; Mongolia; Newly Independent States). For scholarly projects, for brief visits, including presentations at scholarly conferences. Deadline: February 1, 1996; June 1, 1996.

- Special Projects in Library and Information Science: mid January 1996 (exact date to be announced).

- Special Projects in the Study of Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia: March 1, 1996.

- Summer Language Training for College and University Instructors of Russian and Other Languages of the NIS: On-site training. Deadline: January 31, 1996.

IREX, 1616 H Street, N.W., Washington DC 20006; Tel (202) 628-8188; Fax (202) 628-8189. irex@info.irex.org

**Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies**

- Short-term Grants (up to one month’s durations) to be spent at the Institute in Washington. Deadlines: December 1; March 1 and June 1.

- Research Scholarships (3-9 months’ duration). Post-doctoral grants to be spent at the Institute. Deadline: October 1.

BOTH PROGRAMS FOR 1996-7 ARE CONTINGENT ON FUNDING. CALL THE INSTITUTE TO CONFIRM.

Kennan Institute/Woodrow Willson Center, 370 L’Enfant Promenade, SW, Ste. 704, Washington DC 20024; (202) 287-3400; Fax (202) 287-3772; Bitnet: wwcem116@sivm; Internet: wwcem116@sivm.si.edu. No applications by fax or e-mail will be considered.

**The MacArthur Foundation** Fund for Foreign Travel. To help individuals from former Soviet Union to
participate in workshops or present papers abroad. Deadlines: September 1 and December 1, 1995. For information and eligibility factors: Tatiana Zhdanova or Elizabeth McKeon, MacArthur Foundation, Moscow; (095) 290-5088; Fax (095) 2956-6358; macarthur@glas.apc.org; or Andrew Kuchins, 140 S. Dearborn St., Ste. 1100, Chicago IL 60603; (312) 726-8000; Fax (312) 917-0200.

**NATO Advanced Research Fellowship Programs**

Individual/Institutional Research Grants in Political/Military Studies. Scholars conduct research on NATO related topics. Deadline: January 1, 1996. Contact: Council for International Exchange of Scholars, 3007 Tilden St., NW, Suite 5M, Box NEWS, Washington DC 20008-3009 (202) 686-7878; Internet: cies1@ciesnet.cies.org

**Social Science Research Council (SSRC)**


Fellows are required to undertake training that adds a new competence to their professional skills. No citizenship, residency, or nationality requirements. Deadline: December 1, 1995.


SSRC-administered Grants for Study of the Soviet Union and Its Successor States (for US citizens):

- Postdoctoral Research Fellowships. Fellowship stipend to provide three years of summer support plus one semester free of teaching. Must have Ph.D. in hand at time of application. $27,000. Deadline: December 1, 1995.

- Graduate Training Fellowships. For students currently enrolled in a graduate program who (1) have strong training in the study of the USSR/Successor States and propose related training or (2) have disciplinary training and wish to acquire competence in the study of the USSR/Successor States. Stipend up to $15,000. Deadline: December 1, 1995.


**The Louis Dupree Prize on Central Asia.**

A prize of $2,500 will be awarded for the most promising dissertation involving field research in Central Asia: Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Kirghizia, Mongolia, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and culturally-related contiguous areas of Iran, Pakistan, Kazakhstan, and China. Only candidates who receive a dissertation research fellowship under an SSRC program are eligible to apply.


The Institute also has a grant program. Call (202) 429-3843 for information.

**East European Studies, The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars**


The Center acknowledges with sincere appreciation the following individuals who have contributed to the annual giving program, the Associates of the Slavic Center, between May 1 and September 15, 1995. Financial support from the Associates is vital to our program of research, training, and extracurricular activities. We would like to thank all members of the ASC for their generous assistance. (*signifies gift of continuing membership)

**CENTER CIRCLE**
- Richard Castile*
- Michael Richards*
- Anonymous*
- Wells Fargo Bank Matching Fund*

**SPONSORS**
- Suzanne Adams*
- Anthony Arnold*
- Howard Hecht*
- John and Mary Macmeeken*
- John Macut*
- Richard Mains
- Chris Olson*
- Richard and Sally Tuttle*
- Dorothy and Alex Vucinich*

**MEMBERS**
- Sergius M. Boikan*
- Olga Carlisle*
- Colby Cogswell*
- Charlene Depner*
- Ralph Fisher*
- Ives Franquien*
- Krista Hanson*
- Nancy Hayes*
- Kathryn McCrodden*
- Clara Pryor*
- Dorothy Robbins*
- Glenn and Helen Seaborg*
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. In this way, they get direct notification about last-minute items.

**Sponsors ($100-up).** ASC Sponsors also receive a handsome Euro ballpoint pen, designed to promote 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 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE CODE</th>
<th>COURSE TITLE</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ROOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History 103B.4</td>
<td>East-Central European (Auto)biography in the 20th Century</td>
<td>John Connelly</td>
<td>W 10-12</td>
<td>190 Barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 103B.8</td>
<td>Making and Remaking Life: Ordinary People and Everyday Life in 20th Century Russia and Germany</td>
<td>Ms. Freidlander</td>
<td>Th 12-2</td>
<td>F318 HAAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This course offers an introduction to the confusing world of East-Central Europe. Through descriptions and self-descriptions of individuals’ lives it explores the meaning behind historical events like World Wars, nation building, the Holocaust, Stalinist purges, economic transformation or educational reform. Against a background of epochal historical change it will probe how individual and group identities, whether ethnic, national, gender, religious, or class have changed, shifted or disappeared. Perhaps no region of the world has been as profoundly influenced by this century’s defining mass movements, fascism and communism; this course tries to elicit historical understanding of these movements—which are now viewed as having been “unmistakably wrong”—by showing how they attracted the allegiance of hundreds of thousands of mostly young men and women.

This seminar considers ordinary people as an historical problem from two perspectives. How did governments that actively and explicitly sought to remake everyday life conceptualize “ordinary people” and how did the subject of these efforts understand their lives? What were the boundaries and interfaces between daily life and politics? We will also look at the ways in which the idea of the ordinary person works when historians make it a central part of their work. Is it possible to ask where history leaves off and memory begins? How does the historian’s own relationship to events work? Readings will focus on the idea of the person and the problem of remembering; historians and the recollections of ordinary people in Nazi Germany; film and history; recreating daily life in the Soviet Union; Stalinist repression; Soviet culture and the work of remembering in the post-Soviet era.