Notes from the Chair

The 1996-97 academic year began at the Center for Slavic and East European Studies with a visit in early September by an external review committee that was invited to evaluate the work of the Center and advise us about the future directions of our activities. The committee was a distinguished one, consisting of Ellen Comisso (political science, UC San Diego), Abbott Gleason (history, Brown University, and currently the president of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies), and William Todd III of the department of Slavic languages and literature at Harvard. I am pleased to state that the review went extremely well. The report was very positive about the Center’s accomplishments, and the committee made a number of constructive suggestions that we will try to carry out.

The Center, together with the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post Soviet Studies, has planned a rich and varied year of events. This fall, a joint project with the Center for German and East European Studies aimed at studying challenges to sovereignty from above and below in West and East Europe will get underway with the first meeting of participants in November. On February 13, 1997, our Annual Colin Miller Memorial Lecture will be held, this year featuring the Honorable Jack Matlock, former U.S. ambassador to Moscow.

Berkeley will be the site of the Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference to be held on March 7, 1997. It will be the twenty-first such conference to be hosted by the two Centers, evidence of our continuing cooperation and mutual goodwill. Those of you who plan to attend our weekend teachers outreach program should mark April 4-6 on your calendars. We are currently formulating the programs for both of these events.

On April 17, we are planning to hold a symposium on Russian Village Culture to accompany a performance at the Zellerbach Theater. The Zellerbach program, “From the Village Fair to the Stage: Rituals and Celebrations of the Russian People,” will feature music and dance by groups from five different regions of Russia. Participants in the Russian Village Culture symposium, preceding the performance, will include Professor Ronelle Alexander from the Slavic department and Professor Richard Taruskin from the department of music as well as other specialists on Russian village culture.

A volume of essays based on the 1995 teachers outreach conference — *Identities in Transition: Eastern Europe and Russia after the Collapse of Communism* — appeared just in time for the Center’s fall reception on October 9. Published by International and Area Studies at UC Berkeley, the volume contains essays by many of our own faculty and one graduate student as well as other distinguished colleagues. It has been brought up to date and makes fascinating reading for everyone who follows the extraordinary transformations taking place in the region. A fuller description of the contents of *Identities in Transition* appears elsewhere in the Newsletter.

We are pleased to welcome Professor Viktor Zhivov to Berkeley, who has been appointed a member of the department of Slavic languages and literatures. Professor Zhivov, a specialist of early modern Russian literature and culture, will be coming to teach at the Berkeley campus every third semester. The rest of the time he will be teaching at Moscow State University. He is a very wonderful addition to the department and to the Center.
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 for students, faculty, scholars, and members of the general public on Armenian studies, including the Armenian language and literature, art and archeology, culture, history, politics, economics, and sociology. The emphasis is on contemporary issues. However, the program is flexible and may encompass any of the study areas mentioned above. Complementary programs in related fields of Near and Middle East, Russian, Caucasus, Byzantine, Greek, Soviet and post-Soviet studies are well developed on the Berkeley campus.

Applications are now being considered for a visiting professor for the Fall 1997 Semester (August 19 to December 18). The field is open and the salary is negotiable. The applicant is expected to teach one or two undergraduate courses on approved topics of Armenian Studies, supervise and assist student research, interact with faculty and students in related fields, present public lectures, and lead the development of an active program. Requirements: the candidate must have a Ph.D. or equivalent, teaching experience, and a high level of proficiency in the English language. The application package must include: a curriculum vitae, syllabus and description of proposed course(s), and at least 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 Students Association, and the Armenian community of the Bay Area, as well as the Slavic Center, the Center for Middle East Studies, the Department of Near East Studies, and other departments on campus.

Interested individuals should send their applications to Dr. Barbara Voytek, Executive Director, Center for Slavic and East European Studies, 361 Stephens Hall #2304, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-2304. Fax: (510) 643-5045 E-mail: csees@uclink.berkeley.edu. The deadline for application is November 1, 1996.

Chair’s Notes continued from page 1

Two visiting professors have come to Berkeley and to the Center this academic year. Professor Dickran Kouymjian, visiting professor in Armenian Studies, is with us for the fall semester. Professor Kouymjian is the Haig and Isabel Berberian Endowed Professor of Armenian Studies and the director of the Sarkis and Meline Kalfayan Center for Armenian Studies at California State University, Fresno. He is teaching one course on Armenian film and another on William Saroyan. The Armenian Studies Program is supported by two endowments, the William Saroyan Endowment and the Krouzian Endowment. On November 15, there will be an all-day conference on William Saroyan, entitled “William Saroyan Plus Fifteen,” to be held in the Maude Fife Room of Wheeler Hall. The program is currently being prepared under direction of Professor Kouymjian. Our second visiting professor is Dr. Martina Moravcova, Charles University, Prague, who will be teaching Czech language and literature courses in the Slavic department in the spring.

This year, we welcome seventeen new graduate students into the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies. They are graduate students from several different departments, including anthropology, political science, and sociology. This training program, the only one of its kind in the United States, brings graduate students in contact with each other and with faculty who study the region. Directed by professor of political science George Breslauer, and executive director, Dr. Edward Walker, the BPS program began the year with a lunch for new graduate students and a barbecue for all program participants at George Breslauer’s house. Both events launched the academic year with the kind of good spirits and community feeling that make the BPS program such an important part of the Center’s activities.

As you read through these pages, you will see more details of the vibrancy of the program in Slavic and East European studies at the University of California, Berkeley. Much of our program is made possible by our friends and true support group, the Associates of the Slavic Center. Many of the travel grants awarded to our graduate students in all departments were made possible because of our Associates. I thank them for their encouragement and assistance through these years and look forward to working with them in the years to come.

Victoria E. Bonnell,
Chair,
Center for Slavic and East European Studies
Walk down a Dresden street today and it’s difficult to believe that the former DDR government considered the city one of its most loyal. Western tourists file by frescos of Saxon princes while an oompa band entertains gray-haired Germans and curiously confused Americans. Western-made washing machines, electric pencil sharpeners, and boom boxes fill the stores in a town where the government once derided the evils of Western consumer lust. All over town, buildings are being repainted and refinished. Even the Frauenkirche, almost completely destroyed during the Allied bombing of World War II, is being rebuilt, stone by stone. Dresden’s eyes seem permanently fixed forward.

But look — or better, listen — a little harder and you will see that the past has not gone away. “Red socks” are everywhere, people say, although actually finding a former Communist “sympathizer” will prove virtually impossible. Others will point to the posh apartments located above those main street stores and tell you that they used to house members of the Stasi, the secret police. And now former citizens can read their own Stasi files and see who among their friends and family had been an informer.

For countries of the former Eastern block, the past is still very much present. But how are they handling this troublesome monster? Are they shunning the past, attempting to mold it into something more presentable, or confronting it? For two and a half years freelance journalist Tina Rosenberg traveled throughout Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the former East Germany, trying to discover how the citizens of post-Communist Central Europe are now coming to terms with their history. What emerged from exhaustive research and countless on-the-spot interviews was her work, *The Haunted Land*, a historical and contemporary study of the region, which explores how reconciling with the past has become both a very private and a very public affair in Central Europe.

Rosenberg’s study of the former Czechoslovakia revolves around an administrative purge and human rights debacle called *lustrace*.
From the Latin for ritual purification, lustrace prevents anyone listed as an informer in the secret police (StB) files from holding upper-level public offices. Sounds good on the surface, but, as Rosenberg correctly points out, lustrace’s broad, clumsy sweep has unjustly ruined reputations and lives. Simply being listed as an informer, or being “StB positive,” brings with it a presumption of guilt that cannot be easily erased. No serious system allowing for appeals or due process exists, a gigantic flaw that has attracted the attention of human rights groups around the world. The only recourse those accused of “collaboration” have is to sue the Interior Ministry and taking on this unfriendly behemoth in court takes time and money, both of which many find in short supply.

Lustrace has been a disaster for several reasons. First, the files sometime lie, or at least stretch the truth. Secret police agents, under pressure to write positive reports, would name unknowing and uncooperative subjects as victims, or exaggerate the usefulness of conversations they had with their “contacts.” Sometimes simple dim-wittedness could land someone’s name in an “StB” positive file. Dissident and now president Vaclav Havel had even been listed as a possible candidate for telling a slow-thinking agent that the StB should feel free to contact him anytime. Their conversations provide good material for his literary projects, Havel said. The committee in charge of investigating the files sent Havel a “clean” certificate, saying that he would not be classified as a “conscious collaborator.” “The certificate made me a little sad, Havel commented later. “It seems to be a rather insignificant result, just a piece of paper where someone states I was not a conscious collaborator. Was I not a conscious one?”

This lack of ambiguity is precisely lustrace’s egregious flaw. Under the Communist system everyone was simultaneously victim and collaborator, or, as Havel once said, “We are all guilty.” One may argue that there exist degrees of responsibility, but few people fit neatly into categories of “guilty” and “not guilty.” While she recognizes the merits of the pro-lustrace view that a purge, though sometimes unfair, is necessary to prevent the return of Communism, Rosenberg powerfully argues against the law, recognizing the dangers of its oversimplification.

People want justice, and they want black and white answers to ease their own consciences, but, as Rosenberg recognizes, reconciliation with the past requires giving up the expectation of complete clarity about what happened and who is to blame.

People want justice, and they want black and white answers to ease their own consciences, but, as Rosenberg recognizes, reconciliation with the past requires giving up the expectation of complete clarity about what happened and who is to blame. Instead of a complete purification of the wrongdoing of the past, Central Europe must be willing to accept a great deal of subtlety and uncertainty, and must view the actions of others with understanding and empathy.

In Poland, one of the greatest symbols of the ambiguity of the Communist past is former Communist Party first secretary, General Wojciech Jaruzelski, whose decision to impose martial law in 1981 has recently become the subject of much legal and historical debate. Creating a portrait of the general on par with Hannah Arendt’s treatment of Nazi criminal Adolf Eichmann, Rosenberg takes care not to portray Jaruzelski as a monster. Neither is she soft. The reader is reminded that this is the man who watched passively during the Gomulka purges of the late fifties and the Jewish purges of 1967. He led Polish troops into Czechoslovakia in 1968. Yet Rosenberg also allows Jaruzelski to speak of his youth spent in Siberia, which left him with a broken back and cracked eyelids (hence the famous dark glasses). And we are reminded that while deliberating over his decision to declare martial law, he tried several times to resign, only to be rebuffed by the Soviets, and spent hours staring at a gun in his desk.

The former party secretary has been accused of treason for his declaration of martial law, and his trial has become a public historical debate about whether Jaruzelski had a choice about imposing it. Both cases are strong. Jaruzelski had reason to believe that if he did not impose martial law himself, a Soviet invasion was possible. With Reagan coming to office, the Soviets could not afford to look weak, and although they claimed that they would not invade to put an end to the “chaos” brought on by Solidarity, they had made Czechoslovakia the same promise in 1968.

But Jaruzelski may be exaggerating the possibility and the consequences of invasion: as Rosenberg points out, at the time, the Soviets were bogged down in Afghanistan and an invasion might have stretched their resources too thin. And Jaruzelski may have been less interested in saving the lives of the “typically romantic” Poles who would fearlessly face Soviet bullets and more interested in saving himself; no doubt the fate of Imre Nagy, the Hungarian leader executed by the Soviets after the 1956 invasion, hung over Jaruzelski’s decision as well—a point that Rosenberg could have stressed a little more. A more likely explanation for Jaruzelski’s decision is not the Soviet threat, but the threat of Solidarity’s increasing radicalism. All that Jaruzelski knew of Solidarity came from the secret police and other official reports, which portrayed the movement in the darkest possible light. It was only when he met the Solidarity leaders face-to-face in 1989 that the general saw that his political opponents were not evil men.

While Rosenberg’s treatment of Jaruzelski displays the same skillful treatment of the complexities of making moral and legal judgments about the
Communist era, her chapter on Poland, with its focus on one elite figure, gives us little insight into the history of “regular people” and their adjustment to the post-Communist period. Numerous important questions remain a mystery. Why did almost a fourth of all Poles join Solidarity while less than a couple thousand signed on to Czechoslovakia’s Charter 77, which called on the East European governments to observe international human rights accords. Why did voters return former Communists to power in the 1995 elections? Rosenberg can provide no clues, although both questions are crucial to understanding how Poles, outside a few high profile individuals, are dealing with the past.

In contrast, the section on the former East Germany contains some of Rosenberg’s most powerful stories of ordinary people. She uses as her peg the German word, Geschichtsaufarbeitung, which means to work through history, and she gives us several examples of people working through the past — or sometimes working around the past — in their own ways. The trial of four border guards who shot and killed the last person attempting to climb the Berlin wall leads us into a discussion of personal moral responsibility and moral indoctrination. The case of Vera Wollenberger, who found in her Stasi files proof that her husband had been informing on her for years, provides a devastating demonstration of how deep Communism cut into people’s personal lives.

While she does give an account of the tensions between past informers and their victims, Rosenberg fails to emphasize another source of division in Germany: the immense cultural and economic differences between East and West Germans. She could have discussed Easterners’ resentment that the trials, and historical debates, are being conducted almost exclusively by Westerners. “It’s another world [in the West]” one of her interviewees says, but we get little sense of this “wall in the head.” By contrasting East Germans’ approach of the past with that of their new co-nationals, the differences between the moral sensibilities of two peoples weaned under different political systems could have been made clearer.

Rosenberg argues, in fact, that post-Communist Eastern Europe is another world, or more precisely, another moral world. She contends that East Germans, as well as Czechs, Slovaks, and Poles, are suffering from the residue of totalitarian rule, which has dulled moral sensibilities, diminished personal responsibility to society, and crushed most independent thought and action, debilitating that must be overcome if the countries are to move forward and succeed. The term totalitarianism has long been under attack for being politically charged, slippery, vague, and conceptually problematic, and Rosenberg should have given us a more careful definition up front. Yet The Haunted Land effectively describes, perhaps better than any long-winded analytical discussion of totalitarianism, what life in a late-Communist society was like. And whatever you want to call it, the pre-1989 society in East Central Europe has poisoned lives and pockmarked society.

As Rosenberg correctly, and passionately, argues, cleansing this “totalitarian residue” will take effort. “The truth shall prevail!” Czech protesters yelled in 1989. That’s not necessarily correct. The truth, or at least a rough sketch of what really went on, must be dragged out kicking and screaming. Trials rarely work, and administrative purges often lead to abuses. Instead, historians and, more importantly, individuals must confront the past armed with all the information available. In this respect, the East Germans have been most successful. Reading your Stasi file, discovering who betrayed you and how, is an extremely painful process. But it is in many ways a catharsis which allows victims to heal. In addition, as more information about the workings of pre-1989 governments comes to the surface, it’s clear that none of them would have functioned without every cog in the machine obediently doing its part. Few can escape complicity. Only after a long, courageous look at the past can East Central Europe truly move forward.

Faculty and Student Notes

George W. Breslauer of the political science department was honored at a dinner held on May 9th, marking the end of his three-year tenure as department chair. Professor Breslauer remains the chair of the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies.

Michael Burawoy, professor of sociology, has been made the chair of that department. In addition, another affiliated Center faculty member, David Frick, has been made chair of the department of Slavic languages and literatures.

A GSI (Graduate Student Instructor) Teaching Effectiveness Award went to Maranatha Ivanova, Ph.D. candidate in political science, who was a TA in PoliSci 129A, Soviet and Russian Foreign Affairs. This competition judges essays by the GSIs which deal with problems they had faced in their classes, sections, or labs. Congratulations, Maranatha!

Congratulations also to Lucan Way, Ph.D. candidate in political science, for having been awarded the Peter H. Odegard Memorial Award in Political Science for 1996. The award is given each year to outstanding graduate students to assist them in the completion of work for the doctorate.

Among the prestigious ASPEN Institute Scholars, we can now include Cal political science professor Kenneth Jowitt.
PANEL REPORT

Russia After the Presidential Elections
By Robin Brooks

On September 27, the Berkeley community had the opportunity to hear a free panel lecture that would have been well worth the admission charged for the same talk two nights later in San Francisco. In a packed conference room in Moses Hall, Professors M. Steven Fish and George Breslauer of the political science department, and Professor Michael Burawoy, chair of the sociology department, gave their impressions of Russia after this summer’s presidential elections. Each approached the subject from a different perspective, and each gave interesting insights into the voting behavior of Russian citizens and the actual impact of the recent elections—and elections in general—on the Russian polity.

Steve Fish spoke first, and discussed three prominent explanations for President Boris Yeltsin’s overwhelming win in July. The first explanation, popular these days in the U.S., is that Yeltsin was able to win by as wide a margin as he did because of his control over the media. Fish explained that this hypothesis is flawed: in fact, he argued, the print media gave fairly balanced coverage to both candidates in the run-off election, and at least two newspapers were clearly favorable in their reporting to Yeltsin’s rival, the Communist candidate Gennady Zyuganov. Even if Yeltsin dominated television and radio reporting, it was because the media wanted to see him reelected, and not because of coercion. Furthermore, there is no empirical historical evidence that television advertisements make any difference for campaigns in Russia. The parliamentary elections in 1993 and 1995 speak to this point. The truth, Fish told the audience, is that Russians are cynical about the media and are unlikely to be influenced by it either way. The second explanation Fish discussed, which is popular in Russia, is that Yeltsin won the election by simply outclassing his competitors with Russia’s “first modern campaign.” Obviously Yeltsin’s campaign was higher-tech than Zyuganov’s, but, Fish asked, why should that matter? In the parliamentary elections in 1993 and 1995 the electorate was attracted to the old fashioned “pavement pounding” style of the Communists’ campaigns. The most widespread explanation for Yeltsin’s success last summer, but the weakest explanation in Fish’s eyes, is the “bribery thesis.” Proponents of this theory assert that Yeltsin, by virtue of his incumbency, had control of enough resources to buy off the electorate with “pork.” But all Yeltsin really did, said Fish, was to allow businesses not to pay their taxes for a month or so, thereby allowing them to pay their workers back wages. But this was only a temporary fix and Yeltsin’s other promises were not fulfilled before the election, so they were not very credible and probably had no effect on the outcome of the presidential elections.

Fish concluded that the real reason for Yeltsin’s victory must have been the popular appeal of his message, especially juxtaposed to Zyuganov’s rather repulsive proposals. Fish also emphasized that the elections were not the triumph of Russian liberalism, since Grigori Yavlinsky of the Yabloko Party was the only genuine liberal who ran last summer, and he received only a very small percentage of the vote. Instead the elections indicated “the triumph of an eclectic non-antiliberalism over full-blooded antiliberalism.” Yeltsin won, according to this theory, by combining his own “soft, great-power nationalism,” based not on race, but on a return to Soviet-style patriotism (rossiskii, rather than russkii), with his running-mate, Lebed’s, emphasis on stability, guardianship of basic rights, and enforcement of public law and order.

Michael Burawoy completely disagreed with Fish’s thesis. Burawoy contended that the substance of the candidates’ messages was largely unimportant for voters, and that the candidates personalities did not affect the election outcomes either. Instead, he argued, voters understood the election as a choice between the past and something new. Burawoy discussed four case studies of women voters in the Republic of Komi to illustrate his point. In each case, he cited demographic factors that made it seem obvious which candidate his interviewee must have favored, but each time the audience was surprised to discover how the woman actually voted in the July elections. For example, one would expect Burawoy’s interviewee, Zina Alexandrevna, to vote Communist because she is an elderly pensioner with her first husband in jail and her current one a drunkard. She would be expected to vote Communist because it is seen as the only genuine liberal who ran last summer, and he received only a very small percentage of the vote. Instead the elections indicated “the triumph of an eclectic non-antiliberalism over full-blooded antiliberalism.” Yeltsin won, according to this theory, by combining his own “soft, great-power nationalism,” based not on race, but on a return to Soviet-style patriotism (rossiskii, rather than russkii), with his running-mate, Lebed’s, emphasis on stability, guardianship of basic rights, and enforcement of public law and order.

Robin Brooks is a Ph.D. student in the department of political science. She is concentrating on cultural identity, mobilization, and nation-building in post-Communist Bulgaria.
But Alexandrevna voted for Yeltsin, and gave Burawoy as her reason, “Nowadays, if you work hard, you can prosper.” Burawoy explained the inconsistencies of the voting behavior of his respondents by citing the weak civil society in Russia and the relative importance of redistributive kinship networks and multiple jobs for shaping Russians’ voting behavior. In this difficult economy, voters become more concerned with the day-to-day struggle to survive than with participating in civil society. Because of these factors, Burawoy said, and because of the lack of democratic institutions, democratic politics is having difficulty taking root in Russia in the 1990s.

George Breslauer wrapped up the panel with a discussion of Yeltsin himself, proposing to answer the questions “what difference does Yeltsin make?” and “how much hinges on Yeltsin’s personal leadership?” Obviously, if Yeltsin dies, the Constitution is clear that the prime minister would take over until new elections could be held, which would have to be within three months. It is less obvious what would happen if Yeltsin were merely incapacitated for several months. Breslauer pointed out that in the current Russian administration, the executive branch is much stronger than the legislative. Consequently, Yeltsin’s strategy is to act as a pivot for his staff, who represent a diversity of interests and attitudes. In this way, Yeltsin is able to swing the power of the executive branch behind whichever orientation seems pragmatic at any given time, and he is also able to play the various factions within his administration off of one another in order to ensure that they do not gang up on him. So if Yeltsin, the pivot, is incapacitated, Breslauer predicted that there will be competition among the contenders for his succession. The members of Yeltsin’s administration will have no incentive to cooperate, except insofar as they are afraid that Yeltsin might recuperate. Breslauer explained that this prospective competition might be lessened by a division of labor among the competitors, and that this possibility is, in fact, likely in the arena of foreign policy, since Russian foreign minister Primakov is widely respected and the other ministries tend to defer to him on foreign-policy decisions. Moreover, there is a broadening consensus concerning the best Russian postures toward NATO and the West, so that Primakov would likely encounter little opposition to his policies. A division of labor is less likely in areas of domestic policy, since tradeoffs would be involved for nearly every issue, and, as a result, Yeltsin’s opportunistic staff would have significant incentives to undercut one another in every realm of domestic policy. In addition, policies are so interrelated across domestic policy realms, that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to parcel out a division of labor in this arena. Consequently, Breslauer predicts that if Yeltsin is incapacitated, a series of mutually incompatible policy decrees will ensue.

The panel on the Russian elections left the audience with several interesting questions. Were Professor Burawoy’s case studies sufficient to discredit Professor Fish’s thesis that Yeltsin’s campaign message made all the difference? Or can one take Professor Breslauer’s assessment of the post-election situation in Russia to imply that voters may have considered Yeltsin’s health along with his policy platform? In light of Breslauer’s presentation and the fact that many observers in both Russia and the U.S. decried July’s election as a choice between the lesser of two evils, it is tempting to wonder whether the Russian people who elected Yeltsin were in fact gambling on his death and the perhaps brighter possibilities which that scenario would precipitate—though this may be too far-fetched. In any case, the question-and-answer period yielded evidence that the audience believed, despite the arguments of the panel participants, that the elections really did not matter—someone even proposed that had Yeltsin lost the elections, he would not have left office.

But Yeltsin has wanted for years to become the father of Russian democracy. Without the legitimacy that official elections bring to the presidency, Russia would eventually have become ungovernable—so maybe the elections really did matter, after all. Although the future is uncertain because of Yeltsin’s health, future elections may be all the more important now that the participating parties have learned from the last election how to run a successful campaign.

Zanussi Visits Bay Area

Award-winning Polish filmmaker Krzysztof Zanussi spoke about his latest film In Full Gallop (1995) to UC Berkeley Polish language students on October 11. Zanussi was introduced by professor emeritus Czeslaw Milosz, who also served as a respondent to the film director’s comments.

Zanussi has been making films professionally for thirty years and belongs to a pleiad of Polish film directors, including Andrzej Wajda, Roman Polanski, Agnieszka Holland and the late Krzysztof Kieslowski, who enjoy an international reputation. Zanussi was awarded the prize for Best Director at the Cannes Film Festival in 1980 for his film Constant Factor, and in the last three decades many of his films have received top prizes at other international festivals.

In Full Gallop had its West Coast premier at the Mill Valley Film Festival on October 10. Zanussi’s film offers an autobiographical look at childhood and horseback riding during the Stalinist 1950s in Poland.

contributed by Robert Wessling
Adventures in Slavic Studies
Jerome B. Landfield and the Beginning of Teaching of Russian History at the University of California, Berkeley

By Ilya Vinkovetsky

While staying at the home of his parents in Binghamton, New York in the summer of 1902, an unemployed young man received two unexpected telegrams. One was from Benjamin Ide Wheeler, president of the University of California at Berkeley and the other was from H. Morse Stephens, a professor in the history department whom President Wheeler had just recently lured to Berkeley from Cornell University. The telegrams asked the young man, who had neither a professional degree nor teaching experience nor any publications to his name, to come to Berkeley as instructor in Modern European, and particularly Russian, history. The academic year was to begin in a few short weeks, and his decision had to be made quickly. Jerome B. Landfield accepted their offer and hurried to get his railroad ticket for the cross-country trip.

Despite his lack of formal qualifications, Landfield did have three ingredients that made him a qualified candidate for a job in a field in which there were virtually no specialists. The first was money, a great help in an age when only the rich could travel from continent to continent with relative ease. The second was his knowledge of the Russian language. The third, and no less important, was his passion for Russia.

By the time he was hired by the university, Landfield had been to Russia at least twice and had discovered much to like there. After his senior year at Cornell in 1894, he was invited by a college friend to stay in a small provincial river town, where as the first American visitor he produced quite an impression. Although Landfield came from a wealthy New York family, he traveled around the country on a third-class train. He picked up Russian quickly, and on his second trip to Russia, in 1897, he was recruited in St. Petersburg by Ethan Allen Hitchcock, the United States ambassador, to do research in the archives of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Landfield's assignment was to discover the exact placement of the Alaska-Canada boundary line, which had become a point of contention between the United States and Canada after the discovery of sizable gold reserves in the region. Landfield had only a limited time for this important, time-consuming project and many documents to look up (mainly on the British-Russian treaty of 1825 that had established the boundary), but the archives were open daily only between eleven in the morning and two in the afternoon, with a break for tea at noon. Faced with these obstacles, Landfield came up with a plan worthy of Tom Sawyer; he took full advantage of the noon break, sipping tea with the officials of the archives and inquiring at length about their various hobbies and interests. In the course of these conversations, the subject of what Landfield was doing there would naturally come up, and he would talk about his project, at first casually or even dismissively. When the curious officials began to press him for details, he would begin to elaborate. Landfield's tea-time discussions soon paid off. In the days that followed, the officials he befriended, some of whom of course had a good knowledge of the materials stored in the archives—and, evidently, some time at their disposal—would offer suggestions, browse through materials, and bring him relevant documents, many of which he would not have thought to request. On several occasions, strictly against the regulations, Landfield took documents out of the archives in order to work on them at night. With this friendly help, Landfield was able to write his report to the ambassador and go on to his next assignment, translator for a Siberian mining expedition—the first of many similar adventures. The Canadian researcher was apparently not as fortunate. He, too, had a good command of Russian, but he did not take the time to cultivate the officials favor, and although they faithfully delivered the documents to him, they did not volunteer information. Consequently, his final
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The report was thinner than Landfield's and evidently proved less helpful to his side in the dispute over the boundary line. Landfield, on the other hand, had demonstrated that he was able to get things done in Russia and this made him valuable to Berkeley.

Hiring Landfield to teach Russian history was part of President Wheeler’s broader strategy to bring Slavic studies to Berkeley. Wheeler, who, among his other accomplishments brought in many professors from elite east coast universities and oversaw a veritable construction boom on the campus, is often acknowledged as a pivotal figure in making the University of California a leading educational institution. Such praise is certainly well deserved when it comes to his promotion of the Slavic field. In his report to the governor of California in 1900, one year after becoming president, Wheeler explained that developing a Slavic program at the university would be one of his priorities. The field was just at the beginning of its development nationwide, with Professor Archibald Cay Coolidge of Harvard offering the only college course, inaugurated in 1896, devoted strictly to Russian history. (322x728)

In 1901, Wheeler appointed Dr. George Rapall Noyes to teach courses in Slavic languages (Russian, Polish, and Bohemian) and Dr. Thomas R. Bacon offered the university’s first-ever course in Slavic history under the lengthy title of “Eastern Europe, a Study in the Rise and Development of Russia and its Relations with Other Nations of Europe and Asia.” Courses in Slavic history have been offered at the University of California ever since, although before Robert J. Kerner joined the history department in 1928, they were sometimes taught by specialists from other departments. Landfield accepted the job at Berkeley in 1902 and right away became a popular lecturer, offering a course on Russian history and a weekly seminar on the political and economic institutions of Russia. He would later teach other courses, including those on “the Eastern Question” and “Historical Geography,” but Russian history would remain at the center of his Berkeley offerings.

Although he was dedicated to teaching, coming to Berkeley did not dampen Landfield’s zest for social life, and, being a bachelor of considerable means, and apparently charm and wit as well, did not hurt his opportunities in San Francisco society. He joined a prominent dinner club and was frequently invited to parties and balls. He would later recall that sometimes he would dance the whole night away in the city, and catch the ferry across the bay in just enough time to change clothes and rush to his classroom to deliver a lecture.

After two years in Berkeley, Professor Stephens and he, bachelors both, grew tired of moving around from house to house, and suggested that the Faculty Club, which was then being built with a lounge, dining room, kitchen, and billiard room, should also include living quarters. Their suggestion was adopted, Landfield provided the money needed for the additional construction, and both men were very satisfied with their new on-campus housing. Stephens, after whom Stephens Hall is now named, would go on to reside in the Faculty Club for a long time, but Landfield left the university in 1906.

Recognizing the significance of the changes brought about in Russia in 1905, Landfield hurried to St. Petersburg in 1906 as soon as the academic year was over to see the proceedings of the first Duma, but soon found it more instructive to observe the deal-making in the tea room and at the homes of prominent delegates than in the Duma hall itself. At one of these homes he met Pavel Miliukov, the famous political leader and historian—whose book collection would later be purchased by the University of California Library. Landfield also guided William Jennings Bryan and his wife around town when they visited St. Petersburg that year. Around the same time, he was introduced to his own future wife, the Princess (kniazhna) Louba (Liubov’) Lobanoff-Rostovsky, who had been a lady-in-waiting to Russia’s two last empresses. Their wedding took place in Cannes in March 1907, with many noted Russian nobles and American society people in attendance.

Although Landfield spent only a short time in Berkeley, his ties with the university did not end with his departure from the teaching ranks. Between 1945 and 1948, he made three gifts to the university’s book collections, donating over 950 volumes in all. Anyone using the library may still come across some of these books, which all carry a book plate identifying Landfield

Landfield among charter members of the Faculty Club, 1902. Reproduced from A History of the Faculty Club at Berkeley (Berkeley, 1990).
as flamboyant as Landfield, at the turn of the century, Slavic Studies at Berkeley was off to a colorful, and auspicious, beginning.

Much of the information in this article comes from Landfield’s aforementioned unpublished biography, which unfortunately he did not complete. A copy of the manuscript, entitled “Operation Kaleidoscope,” is available in the Bancroft Library. Also used were documents from the university archives; the Robert J. Kerner Papers (especially his draft entitled “The Teaching of Slavic History and Historical Research at the University of California” (1939?) in box 14; a forty-four-page pamphlet called “Asiatic and Slavic Studies on the Berkeley Campus, 1896-1947” (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1947); and Landfield’s obituary in the November 23, 1954 issue of the San Francisco Chronicle.

I came across these materials while doing research on a related topic for Professor Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, to whom I am indebted and grateful for this opportunity. This article would not have been possible without the help and advice of Barbara Voytek, executive director, and Eileen Grampp, former administrative assistant of the Center for Slavic and East European Studies; David Engerman, doctoral candidate, James Kettner, professor, and Mabel Lee, graduate adviser, all in the history department; Allan Urbanic, head of the Slavic collection; William Roberts, university archivist; and the staff of the Bancroft Library.

---

Center Visitor Publishes Book on Serbian History

Belgrade author and scholar at the Institute for Balkan Studies, Dusan Batakovic has recently published The Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina: History and Politics (Paris: Dialogue, 1996). Grounded in scholarly research, Batakovic’s study traces the emergence of the Serbs in the region since earliest times, their historical and political development, culture and traditions, and finally, tragic involvement in the Yugoslav civil and religious war of the 1990s. Copies can be ordered, prepaid by check, from Vera L. Tasic, 6226 Chabot Road, Oakland CA 94618. The cost is $8 which includes shipping and handling. Batakovic will give a brown bag lunch at the Center on November 21 (see calendar for full details).

---

Poland’s Newest Nobel Laureate

Wislawa Szymborska won the Nobel Prize for Literature on October 3, joining countryman Czeslaw Milosz as the second Polish poet to receive the prestigious award.

Szymborska has long been considered one of the best poets writing in Poland since the Stalinist Thaw. If initially she was ranked with some hesitation alongside the two other great poets of her generation, Tadeusz Rozewicz and Zbigniew Herbert, from the early 1980s many readers and critics were willing to assign her the leading position in contemporary poetry in Poland.

Born in a small town in western Poland in 1923, Szymborska has lived in Cracow since 1931. She studied Polish philology and sociology at the Jagiellonian University in Cracow and in 1953, began working for the Cracow weekly Zycie literackie (Literary Life) as editor.
of the poetry section and book reviewer.

Her first book of poems, completed for publication in 1948, was never brought to press, thanks to censors who found them ideologically suspect. Although Szymborska would adapt her art and publish two books of poems during the Stalinist years, she overlooked these poems, such as the eulogistic “Joining the Party,” when later anthologizing selections from her oeuvre.

Szymborska’s artistic turning point is symbolized by her 1957 collection Calling Out to Yeti, in which she evokes the recently deceased Stalin in the image of the fabled creature inhabiting the Himalayas. But it was the two collections

published in the 1960s, Salt (1962) and No End of Fun (1967), that catapulted Szymborska’s reputation among her readers and critics. Szymborska became an extremely popular poet in Poland in the 1970s; the first edition of her book A Large Number (1976), printed in ten thousand copies, sold out within a week.


Szymborska is the fifth Pole to be awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature. Milosz received the award in 1980, and the Polish-Jewish author Isaac Bashevis Singer, who writes in Yiddish, took the prize in 1978. Two Polish novelists won the Nobel Prize for Literature earlier this century: Władysław Reymont was awarded the prize in 1924 for his four-volume epic The Peasants (1904-09) and Henryk Sienkiewicz in 1905 for his novel on ancient Rome, Quo Vadis? (1896).

Robert Wessling is a Ph.D. candidate in the department of Slavic languages and literatures studying illness and Russian poetry in the late nineteenth century.

A Great Number

Four billion people on this earth, while my imagination remains as it was. It clumsily copes with great numbers. Still it is sensitive to the particular. It flutters in the dark like a flashlight, and reveals the first random faces while all the rest stay unheeded, unthought of, unlamented. Yet even Dante could not retain all that. And what of us? Even all the Muses could not help.

Non omnis moriar—a premature worry. Yet do I live entire and does it suffice? It never sufficed, and especially now. I choose by discarding, for there is no other means but what I discard is more numerous, more dense, more insistent than it ever was. A little poem, a sigh, cost indescribable losses. A thunderous call is answered by my whisper. I cannot express how much I pass over in silence. A mouse at the foot of a mountain in labor. Life lasts a few marks of a claw on the sand. My dreams—even they are not, as they ought to be, populous.

There is more of loneliness in them than of crowds and noise. Sometimes a person who died long ago drops in for a moment. A door handle moves touched by a single hand. An empty house is overgrown with annexes of an echo. I run from the threshold down into the valley that is silent, as if nobody’s anachronistic.

How that open space is in me still— I don’t know.

translated by Czeslaw Milosz.
Calendar of Events

~ Saturday, October 26
Symposium. “Materiality in Finnish Architecture.” Markku Komonen, Kirsi Leiman, Juha Leiviska, Juhani Pallasmaa, Peter Reed, and Marc Treib. 112 Wurster Hall, 9:30 a.m.-5:00 p.m. Cosponsored by the College of Environmental Design, the Program in Finnish Studies, and CSEES. Although free of charge, tickets are required for seating. Please contact Susan Larson at (510) 643-0868.

~ Monday, October 28
Lecture. Wolfgang K. H. Panofsky, The Emilio Segre Distinguished Lecture in Physics. “The Physical Heritage of the Cold War.” George C. Pimentel Hall. 7:30 p.m. Please contact the physics department for more information at (510) 642-7166.

~ Tuesday, October 29th

~ Wednesday, October 30

~ Friday, November 1 thru Saturday, November 2

~ Saturday, November 2
Concert. Slavyanka, San Francisco Men’s Russian Chorus. Alexi Shipovalnikov, Director. Concert with music from the Russian Orthodox Liturgy and Traditional Russian folk songs. St. Mark’s Episcopal Church, 2300 Bancroft Way, Berkeley, California. 8:00 p.m. Tickets are $15, general, and $12 for students/seniors. Please call (415) 979-8690 for more information.

~ Monday, November 4

~ Wednesday, November 6

~ Monday, November 11
Lecture. Stephen Moeller-Sally, Stanford University. “0000, or the Sign of the Subject in Gogol’s Petersburg.” 123 Dwinelle Hall, 4:00 p.m. Sponsored by the Slavic department; (510) 642-2979.

~ Friday, November 15
Conference. “Saroyan Plus Fifteen.” Sponsored by CSEES, the Armenian Alumni Association, and the department of English. Maude Fife Room, 10:00 am-6:30 pm. See advertisement in this issue.

~ Tuesday, November 19

~ Tuesday, November 19

~ Wednesday, November 20

Calendar Note
There are occasional last-minute changes of events that occur after the Newsletter has been distributed.
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.
~ Thursday, November 21  

~ November 20-December 6  
Exhibition. Francis Violich and Nick Ancel. “The Bridge to Dalmatia.” 106 Wurster Hall, Monday-Friday, 9:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m. Sponsored by the College of Environmental Design.

~ Sunday, November 24  
Concert. Slavyanka, San Francisco Men’s Russian Chorus. Alexei Shipovalnikov, Director. Concert with a full program featuring traditional, popular Russian folk songs and sacred music. Show Case Theater, Civic Center, San Rafael, California. 7:00 p.m. Tickets are $15, general, and $12 for students/seniors. Please call (415) 979-8690 for more information.

~ Monday, November 25  

~ Thursday, November 28 thru Saturday, November 30  
Folkdance Festival. “Kolo Festival 1996.” The premier Balkan folkdance festival of the West Coast, it features folkdance lessons in the mornings and afternoon, folkdance parties, vendors and ethnic foods. SF Russian Center, 2450 Sutter Street near Divisadero. For more information, please call Joanne Splivalo (510) 652-7859 or (800) 730-5615.

---

Saroyan Plus Fifteen:  

Speakers:

David Stephen Calonne  
Edward Halsey Foster  
Barry Gifford  
Herb Gold  
Aram Kevorkian  
Jack Leggett  
Aram Saroyan  
Harold Aram Veeser  
Jon Whitmore

Friday, November 15, 1996  
10:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m.  
Maude Fife Room  
315 Wheeler Hall  
UC Berkeley

Sponsored by the Center for Slavic and East European Studies, International and Area Studies, the English Department, the UC Berkeley Armenian Alumni, and the UC Berkeley Armenian Students Association.

Contact Michael Kloster (510) 893-7415, Evelyn Boyd (510) 946-9320 or Madeline Adrian (415) 566-4546 for more information.
Congratulations to our recent Ph.D.s!

Sarah A. Banks, Comparative Literature, 199, “Mobilizing Representation: French and Russian Theater in the Formation of Modernist Aesthetics.”


Theodore Gerber, Sociology 1995, “In Search of the Soviet Middle Class: Scientists and Other Professionals in Post-Stalin Russia.”


Silvia Tomaskova, Anthropology, 1995, “Boundaries and Differences: Palaeolithic Central Europe under a Microscope.”

Veljko Vujacic, Sociology, 1995, “Communism and Nationalism in Russia and Serbia.”


Good news on the job front for some of our Ph.D.s:

David Woodruff (Political Science) is in a tenure-track position at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Shari Cohen (Political Science) is teaching for the year at Wellesley College, 1996-97.

Robert Darst and Jane Dawson (Political Science) are both in tenure track positions at the University of Oregon.

Benjamin Nathans (History) is currently at Indiana University.

Joel Ostrow (Political Science) has a temporary position at Georgia State University.

David Powelstock (Slavic) is teaching at the University of Chicago.

Rudra Sil (Political Science) is in a tenure track position at the University of Pennsylvania.

Silvia Tomaskova (Anthropology) has accepted a tenure track position at the University of Texas-Austin where she will be after completing a one-year post-doc at Harvard University.

David H. Lempert (Anthropology, Ph.D. 1992) was awarded a 1996 honorary degree from the International Academy of Authorized Education (Moscow External University of the Humanities) for innovation in social science theory, education, law and development. The award honors him for his forthcoming ethnography of urban Russia, *Daily Life in a Crumbling Empire: The Absorption of Russia into the World Economy*, and for a trilogy of works published in 1995-96.
New Courses Offered at Berkeley in Spring 1997

Archaeology, Ethnicity, and Nationalism

In spring of 1997, visiting professor Marek Zvelebil (University of Sheffield) will co-teach a seminar, entitled, 'Archaeology, Ethnicity, and Nationalism,' with Ruth Tringham, professor of anthropology. The course will examine the use and abuse of historical and archaeological evidence within the context of nationalism, particularly that which claims the exclusive right of one ethnic group over a given territory. Among the issues to be explored are the "invention" of tradition; use and misuse of historical landscapes, monuments, and space; arguments for and against genetics, linguistics, and cultural unity through time; and others. The course is supported by a grant from the Center for German and European Studies and assistance from the Slavic Center. The course is listed as Anthropology 230, Section 2.

Cities and Towns in Central Europe: Case Study—Gdansk/Danzig

David Frick will teach a graduate seminar investigating the history of cities and towns in Central Europe. The common focal point will be Gdansk/Danzig, a contested city that has played important roles in the history of Poland and Germany. Discussion will be organized around (a) history and historiographies; (b) confessions, peoples, and cultures; (c) social and political relations; (d) customs and structures of everyday life; (e) urban fictions. The required readings will be in English and will be relatively light in quantity. In addition to these core readings, participants in the seminar will choose a city or town for special attention. The course is cross listed as Slavic 280 and History 280.

Survey of Czech Literature

Martina Moravcova will combine a lecture and seminar format to cover twentieth century Czech literature. Students will examine works of the most interesting Czech writers and poets framed within their historical, political, and cultural context. Readings will cover World War I, the 1920s and the 1930s, World War II, the 1950s, the 1960s, the underground press and exile literature of the post-1968 era, the characteristic texts connected with November '89, and contemporary works. The course will integrate reading, films and slide shows of art works connected with selected pieces of writing. Readings will be conducted in English and include Hasek, Kafka, Capek, Seifert, Lustig, Kundera, Skvorecky, Klima, Havel, and Holub. This course is listed as Slavic 160.

Readings in Czech Literature

In this course, Moravcova will acquaint students with the most important and interesting modern Czech writers. Through close readings of either essays, short stories, interviews or selected parts of novels, they will become familiar with major trends and styles in twentieth century Czech literature. Readings will be accompanied by discussions focusing on the historical and political context and also with questions of translation. Included are authors like Capek, Olbracht, Vancura, Seifert, Orten, Kolar, Kriseova, Havel, and Kunder and Skvorecky. Prerequisites: 116B or knowledge of Czech on a level that would enable reading short but stylistically demanding texts. The course is listed as Slavic 161.

CSEES VISITING SCHOLARS

Dickran Kouymijian is the new William Saroyan and Krouzian Visiting Professor of Armenian studies for the fall of 1996. Kouymijian joins the Berkeley community from California State University, Fresno where he holds the Haig and Isabel Endowed Chair and heads the Armenian Studies program. He has also taught in Beirut, Cairo, Paris, and Armenia. A former president of the Society for Armenian Studies, Professor Kouymijian holds a position on the editorial board of several journals devoted to Armenian studies and has published widely himself, including several works on William Saroyan. Kouymijian’s most recent book is The Arts of Armenia and he is currently part of an international team completing an Album of Armenian Paleography.

Martina Moravcova of Charles University joins the Center as a Fulbright scholar to teach modern Czech literature and language. She holds her Master’s degree from Charles University in the Czech and English languages. She wrote her master’s thesis on Afro-American women writers and received a grant to study this topic at Bard College. In addition to her stay in New York, Moravcova has lived in Canada, Ireland, and Israel.

Ritsuko Sasaki, a native of Kyoto, Japan received her Ph.D. from the School of International Political Economy, University of Tsukuba, where she wrote her dissertation on the disintegration of the Soviet State. Having recently received a grant from a Japanese Foundation to conduct research at the Open Media Research Institute in Prague, Sasaki comes to the Center as a research associate to further her analysis on the impact of referendum and the new democratic institutions on the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.
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RECENT PUBLICATIONS
BY UC BERKELEY’S INTERNATIONAL AND AREA STUDIES ON CENTRAL EUROPE AND THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

Identities in Transition: Eastern Europe and Russia after the Collapse of Communism

Victoria E. Bonnell, ed.
1996 180 pages * $14.95

This volume tackles the powerful effects on the collapse of Communism on individual and collective identities in Russia and Eastern Europe. The authors focus on class, gender, nationality, religion, and politics to determine how and why identities have been changing in the post-Communist era and with what consequences. Their analyses provide stimulating and informative material not only for undergraduate and graduate courses, but also for anyone interested in everyday life after Communism.

ISBN-0-87725-704-3 Collapse of Soviet Communism  $9.50 Quantity____
ISBN 0-87725-192-4  Ivo Andric Revisited  $18.95 Quantity____

Charge__VISA  __MasterCard  Name______________________________
Number_________________  Institution________________________
Expiration________________  Address__________________________
Phone_________________  City, State, Zip_____________________

Postage and handling: add $3.00 for first volume, $1.00 for each additional volume (4th class). California residents add 8.25 percent sales tax. Make check payable to: Regents, University of California. Send completed order form with payment to: IAS Publications 2223 Fulton St., Rm. 338, Berkeley, CA 94720-2324.

---

Ivo Andric Revisited: The Bridge Still Stands
1995 * 239 pages * $18.95

Wayne S. Vucinich, ed.

Ivo Andric won the 1961 Nobel Prize for Literature for an extraordinary body of fiction and poetry rooted in the politics and cultural history of the Balkans. Andric drew on his formal studies, political activism, diplomatic career, and extended residence in Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia to explore the human links that have united the region, to argue that conflict is not inevitable, and to lay the basis for a united Yugoslavia. This volume explores many facets of Andric: the artist immersed in the written and oral South Slavic literary traditions developing his own narrative style; the humanist examining the relationships of victimization, grief, shame, and art; the anthropologist analyzing the dynamics of gender relations; and the historian peeling through the layers of local traditions and historical experience.

---

The Collapse of Soviet Communism: A View from the Information Society
1995 * 92 pages * $9.50

Manuel Castells and Emma Kiselyova

In an original analysis based on several years of field work in Moscow and in Soviet science institutions and high-technology enterprises, Castells and Kiselyova illuminate key structural rigidities in the Soviet system which contributed significantly to its collapse. They describe in detail the compartmentalization of research and development activities which prevented lateral flows of information, raised costs, blocked innovation, and limited possibilities for economic growth. This inside view of the collapse of the Soviet system underscores the crucial importance of the free flow of information for societies to prosper in today’s highly competitive and rapidly changing world.
Associates of the Slavic Center

The Center acknowledges with sincere appreciation the following individuals who have contributed to the Annual Giving Program, the Associates of the Slavic Center, between May 1 and October 1, 1996. Financial support from the Associates is vital to our program of research, training, and extracurricular activities. We would like to thank all members of ASC for their generous assistance. (*signifies gift of continuing membership)

CENTER CIRCLE
Richard Castile*

SPONSORS
Suzanne Adams*
Thomas and Carol Alexander*
Olga A. Carlisle*
Tuffield T. Ellinwood*
John J. Macut*
Rozanne E. Noon*
Chris Olson*
Richard and Sally Tuttle*
Alex and Dorothy Vucinich*

MEMBERS
Ralph T. Fisher*
Yves Franquien*
Nina Gramowich*
Mary Louise Green*
Krista Hanson*
Marjorie Koenig*
Bill and Maka Langfeld*
Kathryn H. McCrodden*
Mimi Malayan
Patricia Perini
Clara Pryor*
Glenn and Helen Seaborg*
Katalin Voros*

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, notification of even last-minute items is direct.

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 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.

Associate 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 the name of your corporation below:
______________________________________________
☐ I have made a contribution but wish to remain anonymous.
Fellowships and Other Opportunities

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:

- Postdoctoral Research Fellowships in East European Studies. Fellowship support for a period of at least six consecutive months of full-time research. $30,000 maximum. Deadline: November 1, 1996.

- 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: January 31, 1997.

- Dissertation Fellowships. An academic year of support for dissertation research or writing to be undertaken outside of East Europe. $15,000 maximum stipend plus expenses. Deadline: November 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: January 31, 1997.

Application 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. e-mail: grants@acls.org; http://www.acls.org

Association for Women in Slavic Studies (AWSS)

Pre-dissertation Fellowship in Slavic Women’s Studies. Applicants, women or men, must be enrolled in a doctoral program and plan to write a dissertation in any area of Slavic women’s studies. $500 fellowship. Contact: Christine D. Worobec, AWSS Pre-dissertation Fellowship, Dept. of History,Kent State U., P. O. Box 5190, Kent OH 44242-0001. Deadline: January 1, 1997.

Harvard University’s Kathryn W. and Shelby Cullom Davis Center for Russian Studies (formerly the Russian Research Center).


IIE Fulbright Grant Opportunities

For graduate study in East Central Europe and the Baltics, 1996-97. Well-qualified graduate students in all fields can apply. US citizenship required.

Department of Education Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation and Research Abroad and Faculty Research Abroad.

Fellowships for dissertation and faculty research. Deadlines: check Graduate Fellowship Office for latest information. Department of Education deadline is November 8, and the Fellowship Office has an earlier deadline.

Apply for either program through Fulbright Program Adviser in the Graduate Fellowship Office. In addition to source books on funding, the office has listings of grant and fellowship opportunities on file. The Graduate Fellowship Office is located at 318 Sproul Hall; (510) 642-0672.

International Research & Exchanges Board (IREX)

- Individual Advanced Research Opportunities (all countries in Central and Eastern Europe; Eurasia; Mongolia): November 1, 1996 (remember that applicants are encouraged to apply simultaneously for a Department of Education “Doctoral Dissertation Abroad” grant or “Faculty Research Abroad” grant which have earlier deadlines).


- Short-Term Travel Grants (all countries in Central and Eastern Europe, Eurasia, Mongolia). For scholarly projects, for brief visits, including presentations at scholarly conferences. Deadlines: February 1, 1997; June 1, 1997.

- Special Projects in Library and Information Science: mid January 1997

IREX, 1616 H Street, N.W., Washington DC 20006; (202) 628-8188; fax (202) 628-8189; e-mail: irex@info.irex.org.

The Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies

Short-term grants (up to one month’s duration). Participants must either have a doctoral degree or be doctoral candidates who have nearly completed dissertations. Stipend is $80 per day. Deadlines: December 1, March 1, June 1, and September 1. Non-Americans are eligible but funding is limited. Fellowships and Grants, Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, 370 L’Enfant Promenade, SW, Suite 704, Washington DC 20024-2518; (202) 287-3400; (fax) 202 287 3772; email: jdesren@sivm.si.edu.

The Drago and Danica Kosovac Prize

For outstanding theses (Senior or Honors) at UCB in the Social Sciences and/or Humanities which research some aspect of Serbian history or culture.
Contact: Barbara Voytek, CSEES; (510)643-6736
e-mail: bvoytek@uclink.berkeley.edu.

**MacArthur Foundation**

Fund for foreign travel to help individuals from the FSU who have been invited to give a paper at a conference or participate in a workshop relevant to their profession. Deadline: December 1, 1996.

Contact: either Tatiana Zhdanova or Elizabeth McKeon, MacArthur Foundation, 8 Khlebnyi Pereulok, 2nd fl., 121069 Moscow, Russia; 095-290-5088; fax: 095-2956-6358; e-mail: macarthur@glas.apc.org; or Andrew Kuchins, 140 S. Dearborn St., Ste. 1100, Chicago IL 60603; (312) 726-8000; fax (312) 917-0200.

**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 AY95-96. To apply, send request with budget to Barbara Voytek, CSEES, 361 Stephens Hall #2304, Berkeley, CA 94720-2304.

**Social Science Research Council (SSRC)**


Fellows are required to undertake training that adds a new competence to the disciplinary skills they already have. Dissertation and Postdoctoral Fellowships. No citizenship, residency, or nationality requirements. Deadline: November 15, 1996.

Research Workshop Competition.


**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, 1996.


U.S. Institute of Peace, 1550 M Street, N.W., Suite 700, Washington DC 20005-1708. (202) 429 3842; fax (202) 429 6063; TTY: (202) 457 1719; email: grant_program@usip.org.

**The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars**

- Research Scholarships: 2-4 months of research in Washington. Deadline: November 1, 1996.


Center News

Welcome back, Vail! Many of you have probably come to realize that Vail Palomino is back at the Center offices, doing what she does best, taking care of accounts, budgets, and overall good will. Vail is working part-time while Brenda Rizzetto completes an internship in Public Affairs which has reduced her time at the Center.

And welcome to Tatiana Vinkovetsky! Tanya has been working for some months at the Center, as receptionist and administrative assistant. She is the first person you meet upon visiting the Center or calling. We are very pleased to welcome her to the Center staff, although she has known of us for some time. Her husband, Ilya, is a graduate student in the department of history.

CSEES Home Page

The Slavic Center is pleased to announce that we are now accessible on the internet. We have created a Web Page that allows you to access general information about the Center and links to related resources. The address of the CSEES home page is http://violet.berkeley.edu/~csees

The Drago and Danica Kosovac Prize

For outstanding theses (Senior or Honors) at UCB in the social sciences and/or humanities which research some aspect of Serbian history or culture. Contact: Barbara Voytek, CSEES. (510)643-6736. E-mail: bvoytek@uclink.berkeley.edu