Notes from the Chair

Let me begin my remarks by wishing you all the very best in happiness and health in 1996! A glance at any newspaper will indicate that the Center will have its work cut out for it — between the daily reports of NATO activities in the former Yugoslavia and the upcoming presidential elections in Russia, we expect to be very busy.

I do not need to repeat the list of activities that are presented within these pages. The Fall Newsletter also provided a good overview of the upcoming months’ events. However, I would like to highlight a couple of the major undertakings scheduled by the Center.

On February 10, you are all invited to attend our afternoon symposium on “The Russian Stravinsky” to be held in conjunction with the evening performance of the Pokrovsky Dance Ensemble’s Les Noces, presented by Cal Performances. The symposium will focus on Stravinsky’s Russian roots with special attention to Les Noces. The list of participants is provided within this Newsletter. I hope you will join us for this unique event.

Friday, March 22, is another date to mark on your calendars. On that day, we will hold the public program connected with a three-day conference on “Ethnographies of Transition: the Political and Cultural Dimensions of Emergent Market Economies in Russia and Eastern Europe.” The invited speakers are Ivan Szelenyi, department of sociology, UCLA; Ellen Comisso, department of political science, UCSD; and Manuel Castells, city and regional planning, UCB, together with Emma Kiselyova, Institute of Economics and Engineering of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk.

Our annual Berkeley-Stanford conference is taking shape, set for March 8 at Stanford. The theme is “Strategies of Nationhood: from National Assimilation to Ethnic Cleansing.” A full program will be sent to our Associates of the Slavic Center. It will also be reported in the spring Newsletter. Our annual Teachers Outreach Conference is set for April 19th through the 21st. We shall present a full program on the Balkans, including a presentation of the historical background, an overview of current happenings and prospects, and an analysis of international intervention and relations in such conflict. Again, a separate mailing will go out concerning this important event.

We shall also continue our program of invited speakers, series of bag lunch talks, public lectures, and seminars. We expect the spring semester to be rich with opportunities that I hope many of you will be able to enjoy.

Victoria E. Bonnell,
Chair
Between 1929 and 1939, a barren plateau in the middle of the Ural Mountains was transformed into the largest steel making plant in the Soviet Union and a city of over 20,000 people. The building of this new city, Magnitogorsk, symbolized the rapid, heavy industrialization taking place all over the Soviet Union and it serves as the topic of Stephen Kotkin’s new book, Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilization. His historical account of the rise of the “magnetic mountain,” which runs about 350 pages and includes over 60 black and white illustrations, seems to be aimed at a general audience. For the specialist, there are an additional 250 pages of endnotes and source notes, providing more extensive detail and historiographical discussions. Both audiences will find an admirable account of the social history of the steel city, along with provocative, if far from conclusive, arguments about the general history of the Soviet Union and the nature of the emerging Stalinist brand of socialism.

In the first section of the book, “Building Socialism: The Grand Strategies of the State,” Kotkin paints a vivid picture of the chaotic construction of the city and the plant, built during the process of “crash industrialization” of the government’s First Five-Year Plan. The rush to construct the plant overtook all other considerations, including those of effectiveness and quality. For example, after years of slow construction, laborers hastily completed the railroad line connecting Magnitogorsk with the outside world. But the tracks lacked proper ballast, restricting trains to the snail-like pace of 10 kilometers per hour. (Kotkin recounts one trip during which foreign engineers would jump from the train, play soccer, then trot along and catch up with it.) Since traditional construction methods could not meet the demands for speed made by the Party, the leaders of Magnitogorsk used whatever shortcuts they could in building the plant and the surrounding city. Pressed for time, and lacking the necessary construction equipment, they often disregarded even the expensive advice of foreign experts. As a result, residents of Magnitogorsk had to put up with faulty factory equipment and intolerable living conditions, many of them spending the harsh winters in tents or mud huts.

Kotkin emphasizes that the building of the plant took precedence over all other construction projects. The much anticipated plans for the construction of the city, carefully drawn by German architect Ernst May, had to be discarded in the end, because the factory itself so dominated the landscape that there remained little choice but to simply build around it. The ragtag collection of “temporary structures,” which were not replaced for years, as well as the few solid buildings inhabited by the new elite of managers, Party apparatchiks, and honored workers, slowly became a city, if not the one which had been envisioned. The book also gives a good description of the social makeup of the fluid community of mostly unskilled workers who came to build the plant and then stayed to operate it.

Kotkin is quite sensitive in his analysis of the building of Magnitogorsk, balancing accounts of anarchy and rotting equipment with reports of its successes: the plant did go into operation, producing huge amounts of steel, some of it of substandard quality. Descriptions of forced laborers (prisoners and former kulaks) are interspersed with accounts of formerly unskilled workers who participated in the construction and became part of the new Soviet elite.

With the basic background established, in the second half of the book, “Living Socialism: The Little Tactics of Habitat,” Kotkin moves on to a fascinating study of how life in the “new socialist city” was lived. Employing a methodology pioneered by the French scholar Michel Foucault (with whom Kotkin studied at Berkeley and to whose memory the book is dedicated), Kotkin seeks to discover the “little tactics” that allowed the Soviet citizens to find some room for maneuver within the “fields of action” created by the state authorities. In simpler language, the state’s commitment to its own ideology of socialism forced it to create certain structures, rules, and categories in order to implement its plans. Although these concepts and organizations gave the state a great deal of control over the population, they also created a space in which individuals could assert themselves. To give a concrete example, the state required citizens to carry an increasing amount of personal identification papers, but it lacked the ability to keep close track of these documents in a place as chaotic as Magnitogorsk during the mid-1930s. People could forge or alter their documents, thus recreating their identities, which in turn allowed them to manipulate the system: a former kulak, a designated state enemy, could in this way become a Party worker, with all the attendant advantages.

Kotkin gives numerous examples of other ways in which individuals could find room for maneuver in the system. One means was through cooperation, by becoming an obedient,
detailed depiction of daily life in a Soviet boom town. But Kotkin aims at more than a previously little known aspects of the daily lives of citizens of places like Magnitogorsk. Kutkin gives the example of the chairman of a nearby collective farm who, unable to procure the engines he needed through official channels, simply stole some he found lying around unguarded at a Magnitogorsk construction site.

Kotkin’s discussion of tactics, clearly the best and most interesting part of the book, give the reader access to previously little known aspects of the daily lives of citizens of places like Magnitogorsk. But Kotkin aims at more than a detailed depiction of daily life in a Soviet boom town. Through his account of life in Magnitogorsk, Kotkin hopes to convince the reader that a new civilization, based on anti-capitalist ideas, was in fact being built in the USSR. In doing so, he enters into several interrelated historiographical debates on the history of the 1930s and the relationship of Communist ideology to Stalinist practice. In his introduction and end notes, Kotkin spends a great deal of space describing, often schematically, and evaluating, at times unfairly, these historiographic disputes. Without going into detail, one of Kotkin’s central projects in the book is to refute what he calls the “revisionist” position on the 1930s. According to Kotkin, revisionists such as Sheila Fitzpatrick and Moshe Lewin (whom Kotkin quite wrongly proclaims the historiographic heirs of Trotsky’s “revolution betrayed” theory) continue to argue that the events of the years 1929 to 1934 represented a serious break with the industrialization was truly a socialist society or merely a Stalinist aberration of true socialism. Kotkin tries to make the case that since socialist ideology created the conditions which both built the city and governed the ways in which the residents lived their lives, what happened in Magnitogorsk was socialism.

Kotkin makes a similar ideological argument in the last chapter of the book, where he switches back to a slightly more elite vision of Soviet life, concentrating on the effects of the Party purges and “Great Terror” of 1933-38 on Magnitogorsk. He documents the growth of tension among the four groups that held some measure of official power in the city: the city soviet, the factory administration (which was subordinated to the Commissariat of Heavy Industry), and the secret police (the OGPU; NKVD after 1934), all of which were at least nominally representatives of state power, and the Communist Party. While ostensibly discussing the local politics of Magnitogorsk, Kotkin presents his theory about the larger reasons for the purges and the Terror, arguing that they were the logical result of the ideological basis of the state. The state was created to build (and later continued on next page)
defend) socialism, and the Party’s purpose was to ensure this took place. In order to properly lead socialist development, the Party believed that it needed to be ideologically pure. Since the development of the state was imperfect and obvious problems existed, the Party decided that it clearly was not properly performing its job. Since, to the Bolshevik mind, this could not be due to the ideology itself, or the leadership, it must have been due to the Party’s membership: hence the necessity of the purges. When, in 1936, the Party began publicly to make a direct connection between ideological impurity and active attacks on the Party and put the NKVD in charge of the purges, the Terror was born.

Throughout the book, Kotkin privileges ideology as the key to understanding Stalinism and the Terror. All the major events of the decade are presented as the natural outcome of the 1917 Revolution: “The presence of the Communist Party, alongside the fully functional state administration, turned out to be something of a time bomb, planted in 1917 and detonated in the second half of the 1930s.” (p. 353) All major policy changes, in his opinion, do not reflect a fundamental shift in the definition of socialism, but rather attempts to realize the ideology in changing circumstances.

Kotkin’s desire to reinterpret broader historiographic questions creates another problem with the book: as compelling and interesting as his evidence is, on occasions he attempts to universalize his findings beyond the borders of Magnitogorsk to the whole of the Soviet Union. While this may work in some cases, it is problematic in others. Magnitogorsk was an isolated city built from scratch. While it was clearly an important symbol, as a new city, as a sign of internal colonization, as a representative of the heavy industry fetishized by Communists, it was not the epitome of the new socialist city, but rather one variant of it. Both Moscow and Leningrad, for example, underwent major reconstructions during the 1930s, which resulted in such changes as the construction of the Moscow Metro. And while it is likely that people across the Soviet Union did engage in the “little tactics of habitat,” it is by no means clear that they used the same methods as the citizens of Magnitogorsk: Sheila Fitzpatrick’s latest book, Stalin’s Peasants, indicates that collectivized peasants faced very different problems and found different solutions to them.

A related problem arises in the chapter on the purges, in which Kotkin claims to have uncovered the local dynamic by which they unfolded. While his account of Party infighting is interesting and provides us with important new information about this process, it is still quite limited in terms of location, scope, and sources. Based entirely on published newspaper accounts and a few files hidden by an employee of the local procurator (a position somewhat similar to a US district attorney), his description focuses almost entirely on how the Terror effected Party members in this single industrial district. His document base gives him no explanation for how these events might have affected the general population, a problem still afflicting all Western scholars. Given these limitations, as well as the fact that his information is only from Magnitogorsk, the broader extrapolations Kotkin makes from this material are not well supported. Beyond his description of some of the local dynamics of the purges and Terror, Kotkin’s account, like all others, is reduced to theory, sign reading, and guesswork. This does not automatically invalidate his interpretation or mean that others are somehow inherently better: it only means that the materials he has found can only give us another localized and incomplete picture of the elusive time of terror in the late 1930s.

None of these criticisms, however, are meant to detract from what Kotkin has achieved, which is indeed quite impressive. Not only has he helped to develop a valuable new methodology for investigating the social history of the Soviet Union with his theory of “little tactics,” but he has created an excellent local study of the massive changes which shook the Soviet Union during the late 1920s and early 1930s. For this we can be quite thankful.

Brian Kassof, Ph.D. student, History Department, University of California, Berkeley
Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution After the Cold War

At last, a book has been written that makes sense of the senseless. Susan Woodward’s Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution After the Cold War is the most outstanding analysis of the Yugoslav disaster to date. Woodward, a senior fellow in the Foreign Policy Studies Program at the Brookings Institution, uses a culturally sensitive political-economic framework to trace the origins and continuation of the war in former Yugoslavia.

Woodward is one of the few American scholars who has a profound understanding of both the changes in the international environment that made the war possible and the internal dynamics of the war. After studying and teaching about Yugoslavia for many years before the war’s outbreak, Woodward served in 1994 as a senior adviser to Yasushi Akashi, the special representative of UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros Ghali for former Yugoslavia. Woodward’s unique combination of long-term, intimate knowledge of the area along with behind-the-scenes policy experience situates her well for writing such a book. Unlike many of the recent works on this war, Woodward’s does not try to wallop the reader over the head with gory, emotion-heightening stories, inciting him or her to choose an ethnic side as the war-causing enemy. Her level-headed analysis of the internal and international political developments leading up to and fueling the war is a refreshing departure from the many variations on the “ancient hatreds” theme.

Woodward’s primary explanation for the war is clear: it originated in the breakdown of institutions, embodied in the Yugoslav state, that facilitated peaceful negotiation of political and economic conflicts. The war was not inevitable and its origins were not in atavistic ethnic hatred. Woodward completes her next task, explaining how and why that state broke down and what arose in its place, with a detailed, nuanced, and complex analysis. In the first part of the book, Woodward traces the gradual demise of carefully balanced multiethnic institutions that supported the rights, security, and well-being of its people. Woodward argues that Yugoslavia was not an artificial state (for the war, then, would never have arisen — there would be nothing to fight about if the divisions were so clear), but a highly interdependent one. She maintains that Yugoslavia’s special sociocultural fabric and geopolitical and economic position were as central to its success as to its eventual demise. During the cold war (and indeed, for most of its history), Yugoslavia straddled the divide between East and West, and, unlike any other country in the region, maintained economic and political relationships with the Communist East, the non-Communist West, and the less developed Third World. But this balancing act has always been difficult to sustain.

Woodward argues that in the aftermath of the cold war, the absence of international agreement on how to create new institutions for a “new world order” left Yugoslavia in a precarious position: “it did not fit any of the categories for which international and regional organizations were designed.” Woodward sees Yugoslavia’s destruction as primarily due to structural forces, internal reacting to external, that tore the country apart. Although she does not blame single actors or figures, Woodward criticizes both international organizations and individual countries that attempted, at a time of changing norms and security regimes, to apply outdated, generic cold-war policy prescriptions to Yugoslavia, a country that has historically been the exception to such rules. In particular, Woodward singles out the International Monetary Fund (IMF) for prescribing economic liberalism with political conservatism in the 1980s, which, ironically, fueled Milosevic’s political-economic agenda and, more importantly, sparked heated political battles by forcing a decentralized Yugoslavia to centralize financial institutions for debt payment contrary to the will of its republics, especially Slovenia. Second, the European Community (EC, now European Union) helped to further conflict with its
contradictory policy of supporting ethnonational self-determination as a general principle while insisting on maintaining the administrative borders of the former Yugoslav republics as internationally recognized, international borders. Third, Germany, under the leadership of the long-serving foreign minister, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, helped destroy the multiethnic state by forcing the hand of the other EC countries in recognizing Slovenian and Croatian independence. Finally, the US, among other blunders, encouraged the otherwise willing Bosnian Muslims in late January 1993 not to sign the only peace plan that moved away from Bosnian partition purely by ethnic group—the Vance-Owen plan.

As her criticisms make clear, Woodward, in keeping with her position as a nonpartisan scholar and adviser, promotes only policies that work toward developing non-ethnic political identities and individual human rights—her unwillingness to actively take sides should not be read as implicit sympathy for the Serbs. In looking for solutions to the conflict, Woodward contends that the international community must become aware of the consequences of its actions, for “Yugoslav actors, by habit of many centuries, [see] international action as a resource to exploit. International publicity, recognition, humanitarian assistance, and peacekeeping forces [become] endogenous elements in their political strategies” (p. 397). Thus actors on the ground respond to the West, which, for its part, has displayed disinterest or a lack of understanding for the conflict and engaged in futile debates, such as whether the war is an ethnic civil war or a Serb-led war of aggression. From this ambivalence and misunderstanding have come such solutions as “containing (or bombing) the aggressors” or “letting them fight it out on the ground.” The proper response of the international community is represented by neither of these policies nor by the decision to try war criminals, which has tended to make exclusive nationalists feel victimized. Instead, Woodward argues that institutions must be constructed that regulate economic, cultural, and political conflict: “to find lasting, stable solutions to the Yugoslav crisis, outsiders have to think about supporting the development of the political institutions and political climate within the area that [will] enable the people themselves to generate solutions.” Since Woodward does not describe what specific policies this might entail, one is left to draw one’s own inferences.

Another missing piece in Balkan Tragedy is a good explanation for Macedonia. Woodward has successfully argued that generic, poorly conceived economic and political intrusions fueled the war in multiethnic Bosnia and Croatia. But these same tactics were used in Macedonia, which, thus far, has not imploded. Could US, UN, and NATO policy have stumbled on success in this area? Or are other factors responsible for the relative stability of this “state”?

A final unanswered question lies in Woodward’s investigation of the effectiveness of economic sanctions. She concludes that “the sanctions, instead of undermining the sitting regime, increased the power of the government and of Milosevic personally,” as Serbia became cut off from all outside influence. The sanctions, which only nurtured nationalist sentiments, “were more likely to exacerbate the causes of war and its escalation and expansion.” While this was surely the case several years ago, now, after years of enduring the crippling international economic blockade, lifting the sanctions appears to have become a significant means of luring Milosevic to the bargaining table. While her analysis of the failure of sanctions as an instrument of international pressure is convincing, it is not clear how Woodward would account for recent events.

Outweighing these still-open questions are the many high points in Balkan Tragedy. Chapter Five, for example, offers an excellent analysis of the conflicting consequences of liberalization and democratization. Here Woodward reveals what many have learned in Africa and Latin America—liberalization is an extremely painful process that can easily run amok without sufficient state capacity to regulate the unavoidable corruption and disputes over property. Economic conflicts can become politicized and, in multiethnic societies, can escalate into competitions over national interest, identity, and territory. The addition of electoral politics gives politicians “the courage to escalate their demands and rhetoric and to sabotage negotiations.”

In her analysis of Yugoslav institutions, Woodward examines a very interesting and often overlooked component in the prevention of conflict and warfare, the Yugoslav People’s Army (YPA). She sets out to dispel the contention of many experts that the YPA was all along an instrument of the Serb nationalists. Under the old Yugoslav constitution, the YPA had voting rights on par with the six republics and two autonomous republics, giving it the nickname, the “ninth republic.” During the movements for independence, the YPA was the only negotiating partner that would, for its institutional survival, vote for non-ethnic solutions to political problems. Woodward explains that the army was “ideologically a communist institution, dogmatically anti-nationalist,” and while it was staffed by many Serbs, largely from Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia, it was not a “Serbian” army. But early EC and US mistrust and unwillingness to recognize the positive potential of the YPA as a nonpartisan negotiator helped split this institution apart. Because the international community continued to equate ethnic origin with political loyalty, the YPA was both driven to and pulled toward Serb nationalists.
Overall, Woodward’s focus is on the interplay between endogenous and exogenous forces that have encouraged all sides on the ground to divide and fight with one another. But peace may now be in sight. What are the prospects for this peace? While this book was written over a year before the signing of the Dayton peace plan this December in Paris, Woodward’s masterful dissection of self-contradictory policies and misplaced debates aids in understanding the fundamental problem with this plan. While the Dayton plan has stopped big battles on the ground, (which of course is no small accomplishment) it reflects the continuation of Western inability to decide whether to favor self-determination or multiethnicity. Under the plan, Bosnia is to be a unitary state, but with two, sometimes three, ethnonationally determined armies, currencies, and local administrations. Thus institutional tensions similar to those that allowed for the outbreak of war are still present. This does not bode well for the future of Bosnia as a multiethnic, sovereign state.

Lise Morjé Svenson, Ph.D. student, Political Science Department, University of California, Berkeley

Calendar of Events

~ Tuesday, January 23.

~ Tuesday, January 23.
Panel Discussion. “The Russian Elections: Who Won, Why and Who Cares?” M. Steven Fish, UC Berkeley; Gregory Freidin, Stanford University; Michael McFaul, Stanford University. Cosponsored with the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies. 223 Moses. 4-6 p.m.

~ Wednesday, January 24.

~ Monday, January 29.
Colloquium. Anne Nesbet, professor of Slavic languages and literatures, UCB. “Shadows and Projections: Battleship Potemkin and the Construction of the Soviet Cinema Audience.” Sponsored by the Slavic department. 219 Dwinelle. 4 p.m.

~ Tuesday, January 30.

Maria Olujic, a Ph.D. recipient from anthropology, UC Berkeley, returns to our community to teach courses in medical anthropology entitled “The Body of Violence” and “Ethnicity and Nationalism in War and Peace.” As a recipient of the Harry Frank Guggenheim Fellowship, she is currently conducting research on The Meaning and Experience of Sexual Coercion: War Rapes in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Anica Petrovic, professor of ethnomusicology from the University of Sarajevo, will teach two courses on Eastern European music and music in ritual. In addition to serving as a fellow with the National Humanities Center, she has taught at Duke University, the University of Washington, and UC Santa Cruz.
Calendar of Events

Please note: for current information on Center events, 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. The following listing is only up-to-date as of the printing of the Newsletter.

~ Tuesday, February 6.

~ Wednesday, February 7.

~ Wednesday, February 7.

~ Thursday, February 8.
Brown Bag Lunch. Follow-up discussion on Jean-Loup Amselle’s February 7th lecture. 442 Stephens. 12 noon.

~ Saturday, February 10.

~ Saturday, February 10.
Dance Performance. Les Noces by Stravinsky, performed by the Pokrovsky Dance Ensemble. Presented by Cal Performances. Zellerbach Auditorium. 8 p.m.

~ Monday, February 12.

~ Wednesday, February 21.

~ Friday & Saturday, Feb. 23 & 24.

~ Friday, March 8.

~ Friday, March 22.
Public Conference. First day of conference on “Ethnographies of Transition: the Political and Cultural Dimensions of Emergent Market Economies in Russia and Eastern Europe.” Speakers: Ivan Szelenyi, department of sociology, UCLA; Ellen Comisso, department of political science, UCSD; and Manuel Castells, city and regional planning, UCB, together with Emma Kiselyova, Institute of Economics and Engineering of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk. Cosponsored with the Institute of International Studies. Lipman Room, 8th Floor, Barrows Hall.

~ Friday, April 13.
Conference on “Russia in 1913.” Program in preparation.

~ Friday-Sunday, April 19-21.
### Spring Courses

**Core Faculty Offerings and Selected Area-Related Courses: Spring, 1996**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology 119</td>
<td>The Body of Violence</td>
<td>Olujic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology 219</td>
<td>Ethnicity and Nationalism in War and Peace</td>
<td>Olujic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature 100</td>
<td>Introduction to Comparative Literature</td>
<td>Naiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature 223</td>
<td>The Literary Invention of the Common People</td>
<td>Ruttenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic Art 129</td>
<td>Senior Proseminar on the Stanislavsky System</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography 263</td>
<td>Emerging Regions and Peoples of the Former Soviet Union</td>
<td>Hooson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 100</td>
<td>A Cultural History of Poland</td>
<td>Frick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 103B.4</td>
<td>East-Central European (Auto)biography in the 20th Century</td>
<td>Connelly</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>Friedlander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 103D.2</td>
<td>From World Wars to Cold War—1940-1945-1950</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 158C</td>
<td>Europe since 1914</td>
<td>Connelly and Feldman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 171</td>
<td>Russia, 1917 to the Present</td>
<td>Slezkine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 275B</td>
<td>Late Modern Europe, 1789-1870</td>
<td>Slezkine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 285B.6</td>
<td>Research Seminar in History of Late Imperial Russia, 1864-1917</td>
<td>Zelnik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music 135</td>
<td>East European Music</td>
<td>Petrovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music 232</td>
<td>Topics in Ethnomusicology</td>
<td>Petrovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Eastern Studies 173A</td>
<td>Central Asia and the Turks</td>
<td>Schwartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science 2</td>
<td>Introduction to Comparative Politics</td>
<td>Jowitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science 24</td>
<td>Russia Since Communism</td>
<td>Breslauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science 129B</td>
<td>Russia after Communism</td>
<td>Fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science 200</td>
<td>Comparative Politics</td>
<td>Fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science 205</td>
<td>The Nation Building Process</td>
<td>Jowitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science 241D</td>
<td>Politics of Post-Communist Societies</td>
<td>Breslauer and Janos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 39D</td>
<td>Literature in Revolution: The Soviet 1920s</td>
<td>Ram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 46</td>
<td>20th Century Russian Literature</td>
<td>Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 133</td>
<td>The Novel in Russia and the West: Marriage and Adultery</td>
<td>Knapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 134E</td>
<td>Research in Russian Literature: Chekhov</td>
<td>McLean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 150</td>
<td>A Cultural History of Poland</td>
<td>Frick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 188</td>
<td>Love in Russian Literature and Culture</td>
<td>Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 214</td>
<td>From the Judaizers to the Old Believers: Orthodoxy and Heresy in Late Medieval Muscovy</td>
<td>Frick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 245A</td>
<td>Readings in Russian Romanticism</td>
<td>Ram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 280.1</td>
<td>Graduate Literature Seminar: Andrei Platonov</td>
<td>Naiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology 101B</td>
<td>Social Theory</td>
<td>Burawoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology 170</td>
<td>Social Change</td>
<td>Garcelon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology 273C</td>
<td>Advanced Seminar in Comparative Historical Research</td>
<td>Bonnell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring 1996 Area Related Language Courses include Russian, Polish, Czech, Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian and Hungarian (Slavic Department), Structures of Contemporary Romanian (Romance Philology) and Turkish language (Near Eastern Studies).
The Russian Stravinsky

Symposium Participants

Caryl Emerson
Princeton University

Simon Karlinsky
U.C. Berkeley

Richard Taruskin
U.C. Berkeley

Dmitri Pokrovsky
Artistic Director,
Pokrovsky Ensemble

Robert Johnson
Juilliard School

With special film screening of
Bronislava Nijinska's Les Noces

Saturday, February 10, 1996
Zellerbach Hall
U.C. Berkeley
2 pm - 5 pm

Sponsored by the Center for Slavic and East European Studies and Cal Performances
This symposium takes its name from Karolina Pavlova’s savvy exploration of creativity and the feminine in her novel, *Double Life*. The aim of the symposium is to provide a forum for new work on Russian women writers and to elaborate the theoretical context in which their work is read. We will examine the way in which women writers appropriate and revise mythologies of the feminine, establish literary legitimacy in a canon centered on male authorship, and overcome the expectations a dominantly patriarchal culture places on womanhood. The Canon of Russian literature, that well-defined and rather static document, has yet to be thoroughly reread under a feminist lens; this symposium will serve to gather scholarship in the field and to help raise the tenor of feminist studies in Russian literature to a new level of sophistication and accessibility.
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.
- Travel Grants to participate in international meetings held outside the US. Applicants must hold the Ph.D. or terminal degree in their field. $500 limit.

Application forms for these 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.

American Council of Teachers of Russian/American Council for Collaboration in Education and Language Study.
- Research Scholar Program for graduate students and faculty engaged in study and research at academic centers throughout the CIS.
- The Combined Research and Training Program for graduate students to study language and do research in CIS.
- Regional Scholar Program offers awards for US universities to host visiting scholars from the CIS. Contact: ACTR/ACCELS, 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 700, Washington DC 20036; (202) 833-7522.

Civic Education Program Visiting Lecturer Program for 1996-97.
Lecturers in social sciences placed in Albania, Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovakia and Ukraine. Receive stipend, airfare and Western health insurance. Contact: CEP, P.O. Box 205445 Yale Station, New Haven CT 06520. Tel. (203) 781-0263; fax (203) 781-0265; cep@minerva.cis.yale.edu

FLAS (Foreign Language and Area Studies) 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 with application for admission by the departmental deadline. Summer FLAS deadline: February 2.

Contact the Graduate Fellowship Office, 318 Sproul Hall; 642-0672. In addition to source books on funding, the office has listings of grant and fellowship opportunities on file. Office hours are Monday-Friday, 9:00 to noon and 1:00 to 4:00.

Hokkaido University, Slavic Research Center, Foreign Visiting Fellowship Program for 1997-98.
Foreign specialists in Slavic affairs may spend 10 months at the Center. Contact: Head, Foreign Visiting Fellowship Program, Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido U., Kita-9 Nishi-7 Kita-ku, Sapporo 060, Japan; Tel. 706-3158. Deadline: March 16, 1996.

Institute of International Education (IIE).
Professional Development Fellowships for young US researchers in professional, policy, and public administration-related fields who want to develop a specialized knowledge of East Central Europe, the Baltic States and the NIS. Overseas study from 3 to 7 months. Recent graduates or in second/terminal year of a graduate or professional degree program. Contact: US Student Programs, Professional Development Fellowships, IIE, 809 United Nations Plaza, NYC 10017-3580. Tel. (212) 984-5330; fax (212) 984-5325. Deadline: February 2, 1996.
**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. Deadlines: October 1, 1995; February 1, 1996; June 1, 1996.
- Special Projects in Library and Information Science: mid January 1996 (call IREX for date).
- 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 duration) to be spent at the Institute in Washington. Deadlines: December 1, March 1, and June 1.
- Internships for Graduate Students. Good command of Russian and BA essential. Provide research assistance for resident scholars.

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 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.

**SSRC WORKSHOPS.**


For further information: Social Science Research Council, 605 Third Avenue, NYC 10158; Tel (212) 661-0280; Fax (212) 370-7896.

**The MacArthur Foundation.**

Fund for Foreign Travel. To help individuals from former Soviet Union to participate in workshops or present papers abroad. Deadlines: June 1 and September 1, 1996. 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.

**University of Pittsburgh’s BURK Program.**

Travel and research opportunities in Belarus, Ukraine, Russia, Kazakhstan, Albania, Romania and former Yugoslavia. For business and economics faculty, non-specialists in East European studies, from US academic institutions. Contact: James V. Palmer, CREES, 4G17 Forbes Quadrangle, Pittsburgh PA 15260. Tel. (412) 648-7418; fax (412) 648-2199; crees@vms.cis.pitt.edu

**Social Science Research Council (SSRC) —**


The Center acknowledges with sincere appreciation the following individuals who have contributed to the annual giving program, the Associates of the Slavic Center, between September 15, 1995, and January 1, 1996. 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)
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Anonymous*
Elsa M. Miller*

SPONSORS

Mr. and Mrs. Robert M. Ikeda*
Jane C. McCoy*
Jane and Serge Petroff*

MEMBERS

Harald Drews*
Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Eekman
Victor Herbert*
Keith and Helen Taylor*
Charles and Katalin V. Tobias*
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 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 luncheons before the major football games. They also have the use of 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 #2304, 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.
CENTER NEWS

The Slavic Center sadly announces the departure of Dr. Elizabeth Shepard from her position as program director, a position she held for more than twenty years before taking retirement in September 1995. For most of the students and faculty at Cal over those years, Beth Shepard was the Slavic Center.

Beth was always available to the advice seeker, financial assistance seeker, or general information seeker. In addition, she was a distinguished scholar with several published articles on topics from Russian literature of the 1800s, as well as invited presentations and public lectures. She had received her Ph.D. in Slavic Languages and Literatures from Cal, providing a close connection with the university from which the university benefitted greatly. Beth’s knowledge of Russian language and literature, culture, and history also made her an excellent and popular guide for Cal Bears’ trips to the former USSR.

Among those who recognize Beth’s contribution to area studies in general are the area centers’ vice chairs who will miss Beth’s expertise in matters dealing with federal grants. She became the acknowledged “guru” for Title VI for all of us, especially after she served as the elected representative of the Title VI East European centers on the executive committee of the Council of National Resource Center Directors from 1990 to 1993. She also recently spearheaded the creation of ORIAS (Office of Resources for International and Area Studies), thereby centralizing the vital outreach services of the area centers.

In brief, there was no search for a replacement for Beth Shepard upon her departure because all of us knew that there could be no replacement. We wish her the very best in all her future ventures.