Notes from the Chair

With the holidays behind us (which I hope were enjoyable for you all), we at the Center are preparing for the spring semester. Several events will highlight the next few months. We are pleased to announce that our Annual Colin Miller Memorial Lecture will feature the Honorable Jack Matlock, former US ambassador to the Soviet Union and currently the George F. Kennan Professor at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton. He will speak on Thursday, February 13, 4 p.m., on US policy toward Russia today.

Our joint project with the Center for German and European Studies, which is studying challenges to sovereignty in West and East Europe, will continue after a successful inaugural meeting in November. The next meeting of the “convenor group” is scheduled for late February.

The twentieth-first Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference will be held on our campus, March 7, 1997. Inspiration for this year’s topic comes from an essay by the British historian, Eric Hobsbawm, on the “invention of tradition.” We are asking the speakers to make presentations that focus on the varieties of invented traditions in the post-Communist countries of East Europe and the former Soviet Union.

April 5 and 6 are the dates of our annual teachers outreach conference. The focus this year will be on Russia and its prospects for the twenty-first century. Several experts will join our Berkeley faculty to discuss future scenarios and their significance, not only for Russia but also for US-Russian relations.

On April 17, we will hold an afternoon symposium on Russian Village Culture. It will be followed in the evening by a performance at the Zellerbach Theater, “From the Village Fair to the Stage: Rituals and Celebrations of the Russian People,” featuring music and dance by groups from five different regions of Russia. Participants in the symposium 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. Performers from Russia will also take part in the symposium, presenting dance, music, and costumes.

The Program in Graduate Study of the Contemporary Caucasus, directed by the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies, will hold its annual conference on May 2-3, 1997. The conference is to be cosponsored by the Institute of International Studies’ Program on Ethnic Conflict. Friday, May 2, will be a closed working session. Saturday, May 3, will be open to the public and will be organized specifically for teachers who wish to learn more about this part of the world. The title of the conference is “Institutions, Identities, and Ethnic Conflict: International Experience and its Implications for the Caucasus.”

Complementing the above events, we continue our series of bag lunch talks and seminars offered by visiting scholars and lecturers. Two new visitors will be on campus this year: Ghia Nodia, chair of the Caucasian Institute for Peace, Democracy, and Development and head of the political philosophy department of the Georgian Academy of Sciences, and Marek Zvelebil, professor of archaeology and prehistory of the University of Sheffield. Marek Zvelebil is teaching a joint course with Ruth Tringham
Born in Greensboro, North Carolina, Jack F. Matlock served three tours at the American Embassy in the Soviet Union before taking up his present position as George F. Kennan Professor at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton.

Before his appointment to Moscow, he served in Vienna, Munich, Accra, Zanzibar and Dar es Salaam, in addition to tours in Washington as director of Soviet affairs in the State Department and as deputy director of the Foreign Service Institute. Before entering the Foreign Service, Matlock taught at Dartmouth College and Vanderbilt and more recently, as a professor of international diplomacy at Columbia University. He has authored numerous articles on Russian literature, history, and US-Russian relations. His recent book on the Soviet Collapse, Autopsy of an Empire (1995), was hailed by the New York Review of Books as “a serious and masterful work, well-written, interesting throughout, unique in both concept and execution, and of big historical importance.”
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Monday, February 10 or 11. Lecture. Alex Rondeli, professor of international relations, Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia. Topic on contemporary Georgia to be confirmed. Sponsored by BPS.

Thursday, February 13. Annual Colin Miller Lecture. Jack Matlock, the George F. Kennan Professor, Institute for Advanced Study and former ambassador to the Soviet Union will speak on the topic of United States and Russian Relations. Barrows Hall, Lipman Room, 4 p.m.

Sunday, February 23. Lecture Series. Dolkun Kamberi, a specialist on the archaeology and arts, languages and literature, paleography and religions of the peoples of western China will give a lecture series on the following topics:

“The Discovery of the Ancient Mummies in Western China: the Kroran Beauty and the Chärchän Man.” Sunday, February 23, 3 p.m.160 Kroeber Hall.

“Medieval Uyghur Buddhist Literature from the Turpan Basin.” Tuesday, February 25, 12 p.m. Location TBA.

“A Hundred Years of Tarim Archaeological Exploration (ca. 1886-1996): The Study of the Bronze Age and the Iron Age in Western China.” Wednesday, February 26, 7:30 p.m. 160 Kroeber Hall.

The lecture series is sponsored by the Townsend Center for the Humanities, AIA, Center for Slavic and East European Studies, Indo-European Language and Culture Working Group, Central Asia/Silk Road Working Group, and the Center for the Study of Eurasian Nomads.

For further information and location, please contact Jeannine Davis-Kimball at 549-3708.

Monday February 24. Lecture. Ludmila Haroutunian, professor of sociology, Yerevan State University, Armenia and visiting scholar, George Mason University. Topic on contemporary Armenia to be confirmed. 270 Stephens, 3:00 or 4:00 p.m. Sponsored by BPS.

Monday February 24. Lecture. James Rice, University of Oregon “Turgenev’s Mother and the Birth of Russian Identity.” 4:00 p.m., 123 Wheeler. Cosponsored by the Slavic Department and the CSEES.

Thursday, February 27. Brown Bag Lunch. Veljko Vujacic assistant professor, department of sociology, Oberlin College. Title: TBA.

Friday, March 7. Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference. Inspired by Eric Hobsbawm’s essay on the “invention of tradition,” scholars make presentations on the varieties of invented traditions in the post-Communist countries of East Europe and the former Soviet Union. Lipman Room. 9:30 a.m.-5:00 p.m. Sponsored by CSEES and Stanford’s CREES.

Monday, March 17. Lecture. Irina Paperno, professor, department of Slavic languages and literatures. “Suicide as a Cultural Institution in Russia.” 123 Wheeler, 4:00 p.m. Sponsored by the Slavic department.


Thursday, April 17. Symposium & Performance. A symposium on Russian village culture precedes a music and dance performance on the theme, “From the Village Fair to the Stage: Rituals and Celebrations of the Russian People.” Zellerbach Hall. Free Symposium: 2-4:30 p.m. Performance: 8 p.m. The free symposium is cosponsored by CSEES and the Townsend Humanities Center, (510) 642-3230. Tickets for the performance are $14-$26, call Cal Performances, (510) 642-9988.


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.
BOOK REVIEW

Ivo Andric Revisited: The Bridge Still Stands

By Charles Greer


Since winning the Nobel prize for literature in 1961 with The Bridge on the Drina, a folkloric chronicle of the four-hundred year history of the bridge at Visegrad, Bosnia, Ivo Andric has been identified in the West with the image of the bridge. While this identification aptly describes Andric’s near-exclusive role in linking Yugoslav literature with a Western audience, it also stands for his position as a writer who worked to create a unified identity for “Yugoslavs.” This new collection of essays on Andric is therefore of great interest to those wishing to understand the forces that kept Yugoslavia together and those that tore it apart.

The phrase that the editors have chosen for their collection—“the bridge still stands”—seems to belie their confidence that Andric has weathered the fragmentation of Yugoslavia. Despite their assurance, at the moment, none of the former Yugoslavia’s new nations are enthusiastic about claiming him in their canon of national literature. His books have been banned in Croatian schools, and one of the first incidents of the war in Bosnia was the bombing of a monument to Andric in Visegrad. However, there is little to be gained in simply writing Andric out of the past. As the title of the collection indicates, his literary genius remains, and the critical reading of his literature within the historicized context of the Yugoslav political ideal can shed much light on the past and present of Balkan literature and Balkan identity.

While the bridge is thus a fundamental metaphor for Andric in Yugoslavia, as soon as one begins to unfold the concept of “bridge” as it applies to Andric the subject of study becomes more complex. While two of Andric’s works foreground the bridge image in their titles, The Bridge on the Drina and “The Bridge on the Zepa,” a short story of 1924, in the original, the first bridge is “cuprija” and the second “most.” The former word is based on a Turkish root and the other a Slavic one; the emotional connotations of these words are radically different from one another. The eradication of this difference in meaning in the process of translation calls attention to the problems one encounters when applying Western notions to the Balkans. European categories of many types seem inadequate simplifications when applied to the Balkans: “identity,” “nation,” and particularly, “history” are fragmented into several shades of political meaning, just as “bridge” fragments into the separate concepts of “cuprija” and “most.”

Andric’s own biography—he was a Catholic Serb raised in Bosnia—demonstrates not only the problematic nature of such unified terms but also the personal difficulty posed by the process of “national fission,” (page 82) the fragmentation of Balkan political and national affiliation. Andric’s own identity certainly questions the validity of separating out Serbs, Croats, and Muslims into three distinct national identities; not only have they shared the same soil, but two or more of these labels might often apply to the same person. Likewise, Andric’s works, which are mostly set in Bosnia, provide numerous examples of how Bosnian and Balkan identity simply cannot fit into the categories that Europe has been foisting upon the region for a century.

Andric grew up in a Bosnia that was trying for the first time to assimilate to these categories, particularly to the European category of nationhood. After a thirty-year military occupation, Austria annexed it in 1909. During this occupation and in the years following, various groups agitating for the independence of the region had sprung up, and Ivo Andric was one of Bosnia’s most prominent youth activists. He spent much of World War I imprisoned in Maribor, where he began to compose his first major works, Ex Ponto and Unrest. After the war, and with the establishment of the first Belgrade government in 1918, he entered civil service. The remainder of his life was spent in civil and diplomatic service, including an ambassadorship to Germany on the eve of World War II. While isolated in Belgrade during this war, Andric wrote both of his best known works, The Bridge on the Drina and Bosnian Chronicle, which were published in 1945. Thus Andric’s life is inexorably bound up with questions of politics and history, as his political activism helped to create and to shape two different Yugoslavias.

In some ways, therefore, Andric was the literary figurehead of

Charles Greer is a PhD. student in the department of Slavic languages and literatures. He is concentrating on Balkan political linguistics.
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a united Yugoslavia, and as such, he is an important key to unlocking the history of an eclipsed political institution and an eclipsed but very real South Slavic trans-ethnic identity. Some of the most important lessons to be learned from Andric lie in his understanding of history and the relationship between history and truth. Two of the articles in Ivo Andric Revisited in particular treat these issues, Andrew Wachtel’s “Imagining Yugoslavia: The Historical Archaeology of Ivo Andric” and Dragan Kujundzic’s “Ivo Andric and the Sarcophagus of History.” Wachtel specifically investigates Andric’s role as “one of the most powerful nation-imaginers.” Wachtel cites, for example, Andric’s discovery of the essence of Yugoslav history in an archaeological dig from Bosnian Chronicle:

At a depth of about six yards, one on top of another, like geological strata, you could see the traces of the earlier roads that went through this valley. At the bottom were heavy slabs, the remains of the old Roman way. Three yards above them were the remains of the cobblestones of the medieval road, and last of all, the pebbles and gravel of the Turkish road on which we walk today. And so this accidental cross-section showed me two thousand years of human history. (quoted on page 86)

The history of Bosnia is not something that can be identified from within, but is shaped only from the outside. Empire after empire has left its tracks, quite literally, on Bosnian soil, without regard to how it would fare after the empire receded from this contested borderland.

However, this “deterioration” from heavy Roman slabs to cobblestones to gravel betrays an interesting bias on Andric’s part and a familiar theme examined in many works on Europe and its Others. The core Bosnian identity as proposed by Andric is as an outpost of Roman civilization, and each successive wave of culture represents a corruption or subjugation of that original Western identity. As demonstrated by John Loud’s study of Andric’s 1924 dissertation and Tomislav Z. Longinovic’s “East Within the West: Bosnian Cultural Identity within the Works of Ivo Andric,” Andric definitely saw the Turkish influence in the Balkans through the eyes of the oppressed. The narrative of Andric’s dissertation identifies Bosnia as a land spiritually oppressed by Turkish Islam and harsh Ottoman political institutions, and the effects of five hundred years of Turkish rule are inevitably described as an Orientalist and alien overlay on an ancient and Western foundation.

This bias, which plays an enormous role in the identity of all Christian peoples who came under Turkish rule, is a major component in Andric’s work. As a way around it, however, Andric’s tales dig far into the psychological space between history as a chain of events and history as a collection of narratives. In other words, the disruption of history caused by Ottoman rule did not destroy any part of Bosnia or its identity— it only fragmented it into a series of stories. Such a series of stories constitutes The Bridge on the Drina, which impressionistically strings together four centuries of tales surrounding a stone monument, whose image is explored at length in Kujundzic’s article. Not only does the bridge connect the two banks of the river, it also closes the gap between individual stories themselves, and emphasizes that the space between tales is no more passable or solid than the river below the bridge. Just as Andric juxtaposes contrasting narratives around the same theme, he also often places complicated series of obstacles between reader and narrative, passing the story through several layers of untrustworthy sources or relaying it through several stages of weakened memory. Furthermore, he artfully controls the position of the reader in relation to his words by including or excluding him or her at important points. Three articles in Ivo Andric Revisited concern themselves with such narrative strategies: Ronelle Alexander’s “Narrative Voice and Listener’s Choice in the Prose of Ivo Andric,” Gordana Crnkovic’s “Ex Ponto and Unrest: Victimization and ‘Eternal Art’ ” and Tatyana Popovic’s “Folk Tradition in the Storytelling of Ivo Andric.” The last of these in particular emphasizes the relationship between folklore and Andric’s work. He drew upon folktales extensively, and saw in them the building blocks for a fragmentary picture of history, as the first paragraph of “The Story of the Vizier’s Elephant” expresses perfectly:

The towns and villages of Bosnia are full of stories. Under the guise of improbable events masked by invented names, these tales, which are for the most part imaginary, conceal the true, unacknowledged history of the region, of living people and long-vanished generations. These are those Eastern lies which the Turkish proverb holds to be ‘truer than any truth.’

A unified theme is best represented by fragments and distortions. This strategy has been used successfully in many spheres of written discourse in the Balkans and is prevalent in “Yugoslav” literature from Krleza to Kis. The most trustworthy way to examine the region is through several externally inconsistent yet internally harmonious interpretations of the same theme.

Ivo Andric Revisited provides us such a view of the author’s work, giving us many variations on the central themes of Andric’s oeuvre. While the essays on Andric’s use of narratives and on his Western bias add new insights to already existing discussions of Andric, two articles in particular begin to fill in holes in the study of Andric and offer ideas in new areas deserving extensive study. Radmila Gorup’s “Women in Andric’s Writing” is a welcome addition to the collection; it typologizes relationships between men and women in Andric’s works, but at the same time it only hints at how provocative a feminist interpretation of Andric could be. The introduction by Wayne S. Vucinich and Thomas Eekman’s “Ivo Andric’s Short Stories in the Context of the South Slavic Prose Tradition” provide substantial material on which to base more critical approaches to literature in South Slavdom and the role of the writer within it. And “Grief, Shame, and the Small Man in the Works of Ivo Andric” by Sloboda Vladić-Glover points to some crucial links between Andric and modernism by examining Kierkegaard’s heavy influence on Andric’s literary philosophies.

With such a wealth of varying viewpoints and interwoven themes, this new book of essays fits into a growing series of new volumes of cultural criticism being written in the former Yugoslavia today. Like the work of Andric himself, it is helping to create a new critical framework for assessing Yugoslav writers. If certain parts of the collection do not provide satisfactory conclusions, they all offer superb points of departure for potentially fascinating future work.
BOOK REVIEW

Poverty Is Not a Vice: Charity, Society, and the State in Imperial Russia

By Z. Ronald Bialkowski


In 1819, the Moscow Committee of the Imperial Philanthropic Society requested assistance from the local notables for the establishment of a poorhouse. In a particularly generous mood, Prince F. I. Odoevskii obliged the Society’s request and donated an estate of 1,100 serfs to support a refuge intended for only forty people.

Those intrigued by this peculiar kind of “generosity” that existed in nineteenth-century Russia have often turned to literature for the most vivid depictions of the institution of charity—in his Resurrection, for example, Tolstoy depicted aristocratic philanthropists as eloquent hypocrites. Yet historians of Imperial Russia, more concerned with the tortuous road to the October Revolution, have devoted surprisingly little attention to the rather complex issue of philanthropy and the particular way it was practiced in Russian society. We therefore owe a great debt to Adele Lindenmeyr, whose work demonstrates that while the type of philanthropy represented by Prince Odoevskii certainly existed, Russian philanthropy was more than just the barter of “souls” to save souls.

Hypocrisy and idealism do often converge to form conveniently “ethical” positions and Lindenmeyr’s new study of philanthropy in nineteenth-century Russia demonstrates the way in which Russia’s peculiar brands of hypocrisy and idealism converged to form various “ethical” positions on the question of charity. But in this admirable work, Lindenmeyr navigates her way through the thicket of ethical debate in order to determine the social and cultural significance of charity in Imperial Russia and, in fact, she disputes the notion that only self-interest motivated philanthropy.

Like many historians, Lindenmeyr devotes considerable attention to the tension between Western and customary practice in Russia. Eastern Orthodoxy unquestionably exercised the strongest influence on traditional notions of charity and poverty. Although the Orthodox Church administered almshouses, it taught that Christian charity ought to be spontaneous and personal. The importance of individual charity, Lindenmeyr suggests, contributed in part to “a vision of social harmony” in which the “grateful” poor, popularly known as “those who belong to God” (ubogie), affirmed their benefactors’ own perceived virtue.

In contrast to the Church’s ethic of personal charity, the Russian autocracy from Peter I down through Nicholas I sought to overcome poverty through institutionalization. By charging local bodies with the regulation of the itinerant poor, the government hoped that it could magically legislate a cameralist, “well-ordered” state and society into existence. Yet Lindenmeyr clearly demonstrates that the various institutions entrusted with the regulation of the poor never commanded the fiscal resources to fulfill their rather extensive legal obligations. Even as the scope and depth of poor relief expanded with the establishment of asylums and workhouses, inadequate equipment and underqualified staff meant that these institutions were never effective—let alone “total.” The poor relief of estate bodies, zemstvos, and municipal governments in the latter half of the nineteenth century likewise suffered from the absence of a national poor-relief policy. The famines of 1891-1892 and the social consequences
of rapid urbanization finally persuaded the autocracy to tackle poor law reform. But again local governments were expected to foot the bill for a “reform” many perceived as yet another infringement on their already compromised political autonomy.

In Lindenmeyr’s analysis, the state’s desire to regulate the poor and its inability to fashion an apparatus for this purpose made poor relief a critical point at which an innovative late nineteenth-century society could take over for a rather conservative and unimaginative state. Lindenmeyr devotes much space to analyzing this process, revealing the methods by which a Russian “civil society” took shape through philanthropic activity and voluntarism. Initially, the state was able to exercise substantial control over independent philanthropic organizations, since their success often hinged on Imperial sponsorship. The era of Great Reforms (1855-1881) marked a watershed in the history of Russian philanthropy as non-aristocratic associations overtook those traditionally sponsored by the autocracy.

Reform-era liberals dedicated to *vsesoslovnost*, or the collapsing of barriers between Russia’s “estates,” contemplated various schemes of poor relief. For Westernizers, Lindenmeyr argues, scientific charity, or the individualization of aid, seemed the most equitable plan for realizing this goal. In late nineteenth-century Moscow, for example, the municipal government introduced a highly praised guardianship program providing money, clothes, and medical assistance to the poor. Unfortunately, uneven urbanization and pecuniary considerations made this program more the exception than the rule for most of Russia.

When Westernizing philanthropists proposed reforms such as the Moscow guardianship program, they had to craft their ideas to appeal to a “traditional” Russian conscience. Lindenmeyr demonstrates how reformers in effect “Russified” scientific charity by clothing it in the rhetoric of voluntarism and moral duty. They made use of the Orthodox tradition of personal charity and the holiness of poverty to advance their agenda—even though they often did not share these beliefs—because it represented an alternative to the harsh rhetoric of class struggle on the left and of social Darwinism on the right. This tactic seems to have produced significant results. By 1890, Lindenmeyr contends, private philanthropic organizations had become the “principal provider, innovator, and policymaker” in poor relief and the predominant form of voluntary association in Imperial Russia. But most Russian charities, as is most often the case, survived because of the efforts of a small, dedicated group of volunteers whose great sacrifices could never overcome the cycle of poverty.

Lindenmeyr’s study of Russia’s unsuccessful foray into poor relief and “welfare” policy raises the question of why Russia lagged behind Europe in regimes of “social control.” In nineteenth-century Western Europe the new sciences of society and the mind—psychiatry, sociology, criminology, moral statistics, etc.—had transformed prevailing notions of the poor from the “morally depraved” into the indicators of social and genetic abnormality and alienation or *anomie*. Reformers, criminologists, and psychiatrists often embraced the paradoxical position of treating the “dangerous” classes as patients of the new science and as “degenerates” meant to be permanently confined, if not extirpated. The efforts of Westernizing “reformers” to apply these ideas to Russia achieved limited results since the Russian autocracy never introduced a systematized network of carceral and reformative institutions to “manage” the poor, insane, and criminal as did their Western European counterparts. In part, Russia’s unique geographical and social terrain allowed the autocracy to pursue other measures (albeit ultimately unsuccessful ones) in maintaining social order. The peasant commune insured a modicum of stability in the countryside while “deviants”—revolutionaries and criminals alike—were consigned to the vast Siberian frontier. This outdated approach to social order proved adequate for the autocracy’s purposes, but no equivalent policy was formulated to address the widespread problem of poverty, for Russia’s workhouses relied mostly on local and private funds.

What then did charity accomplish for Imperial Russia? Even though volunteers profoundly altered the lives of many individuals, the greater significance of charity according to Lindenmeyr lay in its social function. She argues that voluntary activity fostered a “civic consciousness” among Russians and thereby contributed to the formation of civil society. This point is a vital one since the problem of civil society—public participation in organizations independent of the state—has become an important issue in the history of Imperial Russia. Lindenmeyr brings a substantial body of empirical research to bear on this problem, providing us with ample evidence of a large network of private philanthropic organizations. The book leaves us unsure, however, of charity’s relationship to an autonomous political culture resistant to external authority, an ability implicit in the notion of civil society. For while clearly charity organizations made up a large part of Russia’s private organizations, it still remains to be determined in what manner these organizations resisted political tyranny. This issue will no doubt receive further attention in the ongoing dialogue of Imperial historiography and by no means should be regarded a major flaw in an otherwise praiseworthy empirical study.

Lindenmeyr’s study, in fact, offers a fresh perspective on an important element of civil society and, by opening up the subject of philanthropy, it is in many ways a foundational work for historians of Imperial Russia. One avenue of further investigation that the book points to is the connection between the philanthropic organizations Lindenmeyr has studied and the informal networks of mutual assistance created among the poor and the working classes. Social and cultural historians of Imperial Russia who decide to pursue this question (and many others) will find *Poverty Is Not a Vice* an invaluable reference and guide to Imperial Russia’s nascent civic culture.
SPEAKER REPORT

A Russian Perspective on NATO Expansion

By Anne Clunan

On September 25th, Professor Vladimir Konstantinovich Volkov of the Institute for Slavic and Balkan Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences spoke on “NATO’s Eastward Expansion and Russia’s Interests.” Examining the question of European security in the post-cold-war era, Volkov criticized NATO expansion as a remnant of a bipolar “bloc” security strategy and offered in its place a Russian vision of pan-European security cooperation more suited to the changing world order. Volkov began his talk by outlining the changes in the international system that may affect European security, the future of NATO, and the emerging structure of international order. He argued that despite the rise of an international “information society,” no truly global society has emerged out of the cold war. Rather, drawing on Harvard professor Samuel Huntington, Volkov argued that regional civilizations—cultural, religious and ethnic groupings—are becoming the dominant feature of international politics. Adopting a real-politik perspective, Volkov argued that the future structure of world order will be based on multipolarity, on a struggle for power among the various regions and particularly their power centers, such as the United States, Russia, Japan, China, Europe, India, and the Arab world. According to Volkov, balance-of-power politics will determine the relations among these regional civilizations, who will be faced increasingly in this new world with ecological and demographic problems.

Volkov then turned to the Russian plan for European security in the context of a multipolar world. On the Russian model, the military component that dominated during the cold war should now become secondary; the primary security problems now are political stability, economic development, social security, and international organized crime. These new problems, according to Volkov, should not be viewed with the old bloc mentality. For this reason, Russia does not wish Europe to be divided along NATO lines but to be united. The Russian government therefore advocates the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), which grew out of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), as the framework for a new European security architecture.

The basic principles behind Volkov’s model for European security seem to be derived from the “new thinking” that was introduced into Soviet foreign policy by former Communist Party general secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and former foreign minister Edvard Shevardnadze, which should be contrasted to the Soviet Union’s cold-war real-politik doctrine of “the correlation of forces.” The “new thinking” begins with the notion of the indivisible and universal nature of security in Europe and the need to eliminate the use of force, and to prevent new divisions in Europe or the dominance of any one state or group of states. In order to meet these goals, there must be a close interrelation between military and non-military aspects of security and coordination of European and Eurasian organizations, with the OSCE playing a central role.

Volkov contrasted the Russian plan with the Western conception of European security, which, he argued, is too heavily based on NATO. As an organization, Volkov maintained, NATO is out of step with the security needs of Europe in a multipolar world. It is still a political-military bloc and not a peacekeeping organization and emphasizes the use of military might to solve problems, while ignoring other aspects of security and other means of maintaining peace. Despite its limited view of security, it has largely eclipsed the United Nations as a peacekeeping body.

Of course, Volkov objected to NATO not simply because of what he sees as its more general failings, but also because it poses a particular threat to Russian security. According to Volkov, NATO has worked to prevent Russia from participating in the new European security order. The organization’s expansion to include the countries of Central Eastern Europe has revealed “NATO’s claim for a monopoly position in the European security process.” This situation has increased tension between Russia, on the one side, and the United States, NATO, and Eastern Europe, on the other.

Volkov argued that his interpretation of NATO expansion is not unique: there is universal consensus among Russian analysts that the United States, in pursuing NATO’s eastward expansion, is pushing Russia towards a new cold war. Two other prominent Russians who have recently visited Berkeley, glasnost architect Alexander Yakovlev and former democratic presidential candidate Yegor Gaidar, have said that NATO expansion was not a threat to Russian security, but rather to Russian democratic forces because the perceived threat of NATO fuels radical Russian nationalism. Holding to the more classical real-politik view, Volkov argued that NATO expansion is not merely a chimeri-
cal threat and went on to outline the ways in which the expanding organization poses a real threat to Russia’s national interests and, in the long run, to US interests as well.

At the geostrategic level, Volkov argued, NATO expansion is an attempt by the United States to deny the reality of a multipolar world and to preserve its position as the lone super power: leading Russian analysts maintain that behind efforts to expand NATO is an attempt to isolate Russia from the rest of Europe. Volkov believes, however, that this effort to preserve a unipolar system, like all others before it, is bound to fail. NATO expansion would only temporarily “postpone Russia’s transformation into a mighty power center in the emerging multipolar world.” If the United States succeeded in isolating Russia from Europe, then Russia would look for alternative partners and allies among other power centers, which in turn would have negative consequences for Europe and the US in the emerging multipolar world. Volkov further pointed out that NATO expansion is as expensive as it is foolhardy. New members will have to modernize their military forces and it is not clear who will bear the costs of expansion. Echoing Alexander Lebed and others, Volkov argued that NATO expansion will mean the end of US hopes for a balanced budget.

A geostrategic failure, the expansion of NATO would also be a diplomatic mistake, creating an irreparable breach of trust between the United States and Russia. Volkov warned that “there is a conviction among a certain segment of the Russian political elite that the Western powers have simply deceived Russia: they have reneged on their promises that … no NATO troops will appear outside the former borders of the FRG” as a condition of German reunification. Gorbachev was assured of this by German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, President Bush and Secretary of State James Baker at the conclusion of the Two + Four Talks on German reunification. Going back on this verbal agreement by NATO would create “an atmosphere of distrust and suspicion.” Moreover, Western pro-NATO arguments regarding alleged Russian threats to Central and Eastern Europe, even those associated with Russia’s political instability, are viewed in Russia as provocative negative propaganda. Even more ominous from the Russian perspective were the announcements of the Polish and Czech governments that they would accept deployment of NATO nuclear weapons on their soil. Volkov asked, “Could it be that the idea was to spur Russia into sharp and provocative replies? Or [did they wish] to make it clear that the treaties … on the reduction and deployment of nuclear weapons and conventional armaments should be revised? Can such statements be regarded as a contribution to European security and stability?”

Volkov went on to explain that expansion of NATO was likely to lead not just to increasing tensions between the US and Russia, but to fissures within the alliance as well. He suggested that Germany is replacing the United States as the leader of NATO, and this may lead to divisions, since the balance among the four major European members of NATO (Germany, France, Britain, and Italy) has been threatened by German reunification. Evidence of this change, Volkov argued, is seen in Germany’s rapid recognition of Croatia and Slovenia, and the German-led anti-Serb stance of the European Community and NATO. Russian observers view NATO expansion as “an ideal form for building up Germany’s influence in that region to [an] extent comparable to … the old projects of Mitteleuropa, which served as the military objective of Kaiser Germany.” Volkov recognized that the Central and East European countries desire NATO membership not only because it is viewed as a stepping stone to membership in the European Union, but also because it would offer them leverage against German dominance.

Volkov concluded by arguing that two visions of NATO’s role in the post-cold war world are currently struggling for dominance in NATO. One is promotion of NATO’s dominant position in the new international system; the other is the transformation of the alliance into a political organization whose chief tasks are peacekeeping and preventive diplomacy. Volkov sees NATO expansion as the expression of the first vision. While Russia is attempting to create a new European security charter for the twenty-first century based on the OSCE, Volkov argued that Russia hopes to strengthen its contacts with NATO. Russia is not asking for a “right of veto over NATO membership, but expansion of its military structure to Eastern Europe, especially nuclear weapons, is against [Russia’s] interests. Nor should expansion to the Baltics be discussed, as this is a direct challenge to Russia’s security interests.” Volkov criticized the United States for not putting forth any concrete plans for Russian cooperation with NATO. While Defense Secretary William Perry has said that NATO should give Russia “a voice but not a vote,” the United States has yet to explain to Moscow what it has in mind.

While Volkov hopes for a more concrete and cooperative relationship between Russian and NATO, he views NATO’s expansion, and its vague offer of partnership to Russia, as signs that the return of the cold war may be imminent. While there may be less consensus in Russia about the meaning of NATO expansion than Volkov contends, his comments and pointed questions serve as a useful check to those who assume NATO is a non-threatening organization and help illuminate Russian perspectives of NATO.
**CSEES VISITING SCHOLARS**

**Martin Kuna**, head of the Department of Spatial Studies in the Institute of Archaeology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, will be visiting Berkeley for two weeks this spring. Dr. Kuna received his Ph.D. from Charles University, Prague, after having completed a thesis on prehistoric copper metallurgy in southeastern Europe. He is a co-director of the Ancient Landscape Reconstruction in Northern Bohemia (ALRNB) project, which the University of California, Berkeley, has recently joined. Other co-directors include Marek Zvelebil (see below), and Jaromir Benes, Prachatice Museum, Czech Republic (see description in the Newsletter: ALRNB — Archaeological Research in the Czech Republic). Dr. Kuna’s short visit is being made possible with the assistance of a short-term IREX travel grant. He will be in residence at the Center for two weeks in late April/early May, 1997.

**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 Czech and English. 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.

**Ghia Nodia**, is the first visiting fellow in the Graduate Training and Research Program on the Contemporary Caucasus of the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies for the spring of 1997. Head of the Department of Political Philosophy of the Academy of

---

**ALRNB—Archaeological Research in the Czech Republic**

The objective of the Ancient Landscape Re-construction in Northern Bohemia (ALRNB) project is to study the cultural landscape of a specific region of Northern Bohemia and the social transformations associated with it. It is expected that the project will help develop a program of long-term landscape and settlement studies in the region, within a general framework of archaeological rescue activities, utilizing the computer technology of Geographic Information Systems. The first five years involved systematic survey, with surface and sub-surface techniques as well as remote sensing, of two transects, running North-South from the Czech-German border across the basins of the Labe and Ohre rivers to the foothills of the uplands of southern Bohemia. The survey has been completed. Now the project is at the stage of processing finds and analyzing materials, as well as data integration using GIS.

In 1996, Dr. Barbara Voytek (executive director of the Center and faculty associate of the Archaeological Research Facility “ARF” at Berkeley) spent two weeks in the Czech Republic for the processing and analysis of the lithic finds, together with Jason Bass, a UCB graduate student in anthropology whose dissertation will be based upon application of GIS techniques to lithic data. Their research was partially funded by a grant from the Stahl Endowment Fund, awarded by the ARF. Voytek and Bass plan to return and continue their analyses in 1997. In addition, the co-directors of ALRNB, Kuna and Zvelebil, will be at Berkeley this spring to discuss future cooperation. Dr. Kuna’s visit is made possible by a grant from IREX to Dr. Voytek, while Prof. Zvelebil’s stay is partially funded by a grant from the Center for German and European Studies, with assistance from the Slavic Center. From this beginning, it is expected that other archaeological research projects and collaborative efforts in the Czech Republic will develop.

The Ancient Landscape Reconstruction in Northern Bohemia (ALRNB) is a joint research program established in 1990 by Professor Marek Zvelebil, Department of Archaeology and Prehistory, University of Sheffield; Dr. Martin Kuna, Institute of Archaeology, Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague; and Dr. Jaromir Benes, formerly of the Institute of Archaeology and currently at the Museum of Prachatice. The program has also been supported by the then director of the institute, Evzen Neustupny, as well as members of the Institute of Botany of the Czech Academy of Sciences; Charles University Department of Archaeology; and the Jewish Museum (Zidovke Muzeum) in Prague.
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, Hrabal, Havel, Kriseova, Kundera 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

Sciences of Georgia and professor of sociology at Tiblisi State University, Nodia is also the founder and director of Georgia’s largest think tank, the Caucasian Institute for Peace, Democracy, and Development. Professor Nodia has published three books and more than 25 articles including many on current political issues in Georgia, Russia, and international media. He is also the recipient of fellowships from the Kennan Institute and the National Endowment for Democracy.

Marek Zvelebil, senior lecturer in the Department of Archaeology and Prehistory, University of Sheffield, is a visiting professor in anthropology and research associate of the Center during spring semester. Professor Zvelebil has a Ph.D. from Cambridge University, having completed a doctorate on the economic development of the prehistoric cultures of the northeast Baltic. Among his current research interests and specialties are the transition from hunting-gathering to food-production in post-Pleistocene Europe and Eurasia, Indo-Europeans and the transition to farming in Europe, and field survey and landscape archaeology. For the past six years, he has been engaged in the joint Czech-British project, Ancient Landscape Reconstruction in Northern Bohemia (ALRNB). Professor Zvelebil will be teaching two courses this semester: Anthro 230(2) Archaeology, Ethnicity and Nationalism (supported by a grant from the Center for German and European Studies); and Anthro 230(4) Domesticating Hunter-Gatherers: The Social and Historical Bases of the Transition to Farming in Europe.
American Council of Learned Societies

ACLs-administered Grants for East European Studies. Proposals dealing with Albania, Bulgaria, Romania, and the former Yugoslavia are particularly encouraged (applicants must be citizens or permanent residents of the US):

- 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.

- 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. (grants@acls.org) (http://www.acls.org)

American Council of Teachers of Russian/American Council for Collaboration in Education and Language Study

- Research Scholar/Language Study Programs in Central Europe for graduate students and young faculty. Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Hungary.

- Research Scholar Program for graduate students and faculty engaged in study and research at academic centers throughout the CIS.

- Business Russian Language and Internship Program

- Study and Research Programs in Kherson, Ukraine

Contact: ACTR/ACCELS, 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 700, Washington DC 20036; (202) 833-7522. Deadline: March 1, 1997; October 1, 1997.

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.

Center for German and European Studies

- Predissertation fellowships for short-term (2-3 months) pre-dissertation research in Europe during the summer-fall of 1997 for graduate students working on modern European topics and enrolled at any UC campus. Request application forms from CGES. Deadline: January 31, 1997.

- Entering Graduate Fellowships of $10,000 each are available for outstanding students who demonstrate an interest in modern European studies. Nominations should be submitted by the sponsoring department or professional school. Nominations should include student’s complete application file and a letter of nomination from the department. These should be sent to CGES, 254 Moses Hall #2316, Berkeley CA 94720-2316. E-mail: cges@uclink.berkeley.edu

Civic Education Project

1996-97 Visiting Lecturer Program. CEP helps assign lecturers to teach social sciences in Eastern Europe and the FSU. Assignments are for one academic year, but visiting lecturers may be eligible to renew for up to three years. CEP lecturers receive living stipend, roundtrip airfare, and Western health insurance. Deadline: February 1, 1997. Contact: CEP PO Box 205445 Yale Station, New Haven CT 06520; tel 203/781-0263; fax 203/781-0265; info@cep.yale.edu; applic@cep.yale.edu; http://www.cep.yale.edu

FLAS (Fellowships for Language and Area Studies)

- Fellowships for academic year 1997-98 enable graduate students who are US citizens or permanent residents to acquire a high level of competence in Bulgarian, Czech, Hungarian, Polish, Russian, or Serbian/Croatian. Priority given to students in humanities, social science, and professional fields. Lowest consideration given to students in beginning level Russian. Berkeley continuing students should pick up and then submit the FLAS application at Grad Fellowships, 318 Sproul Hall. Incoming students apply on the Grad Application for Admission and Fellowships. Deadline for continuing students is February 21, 1997. Incoming students must follow department deadline.

- Fellowships for summer 1997 cover registration fees and provide a stipend of $1,500 to enroll in an intensive foreign language course equivalent to one academic year of languages study (at least 100 hours). Further information and application materials are available at Grad Fellowships, 318 Sproul. Deadline: February 7, 1997.

Hokkaido University, Slavic Research Center, Foreign Visiting Fellowship Program for 1997-98

The Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace

Postdoctoral research fellowships. Academic year grants for 9 to 12 months ($25,000) or summer grants ($3,000) will be awarded, subject to funding. Ph.D. and institutional affiliation are required, as is US citizenship or permanent residence. Submit 3-5 page research proposal, cv, three letters of recommendation dealing with the project, and copy of the Ph.D. diploma. Deadline: call Hoover for details and deadline. Contact: Richard F. Staar, Hoover Institution, Stanford CA 94305-6010; 415/723-1348.

The Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies

Dissertation fellowships and faculty grants (research and research conference grants, teaching grants), and IGCC/MacArthur Ph.D. Fellowships. Applications available from the Institute for International Studies, Moses Hall. Deadline: February 3, 1997.

International Research & Exchanges Board (IREX)

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 (exact date to be announced).

Kosciuszko Foundation

Study and Research in Poland Program. Provides support to US students and faculty on sabbatical to pursue graduate or postgraduate study and/or research at institutions of higher learning in Poland. Kosciuszko Foundation, 15 East 65th Street, NYC 10021-6595. Tel: 212/734-2130. Fax: 212/628-4552. Deadline: January 16, 1997.

The Drago and Danica Kosovac Prize

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

Slavic Center Travel Grants

The Center provides limited travel support for its 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 from the Center’s Title VI Department of Education Grant and from the funds provided by our Associates of the Slavic Center. Priority given to applicants who did not have grants in AY95-96. To apply, send request with budget to Barbara Voytek, CSEES, 361 Stephens.

Social Science Research Council (SSRC)


United States Institute of Peace

The Institute has two principal grantmaking components: unsolicited and solicited. Unsolicited grants are provided for any topic that falls within the Institute’s broad mandate. Solicited grants for 1997 are being offered for the following topics: (a) Post-Settlement Peacebuilding; (b) Negotiation, Mediation, and “Track II” Diplomacy; (c) Regional Security Issues and Conflicts; and (d) Cross-Cultural Negotiation Country Studies. Deadline: January 2, 1997. U.S. Institute of Peace, 1550 M Street, N.W., Suite 700, Washington DC 20005-1708. Tel: 202 429 3842; Fax: 202 429 6063; TTY: 202 457 1719; email: grant_program@usip.org
The Bridge to Dalmatia: A Search for the Meaning of Place

Thanks to the international interests of environmental design librarian Elizabeth Byrne, Berkeley has begun an exchange of architectural and urban planning materials with the University of Zagreb. Facilitated by Francis Violich, professor emeritus of city planning and landscape architecture, the program started last fall when a visiting scholar from Zagreb, Nenad Lipovac, brought examples of city and regional planning materials from their faculty of architecture and its urban planning and design division. The collection includes well-illustrated books, articles, and copies of the faculty’s journal, Prostor, to which the Berkeley library will continue to subscribe. In exchange, the Institute of Urban and Regional Planning (IURD) is providing the Zagreb library with a subscription to the institute’s Working Papers, and the Berkeley library is supplementing this with related books and journals.

The current issue of Prostor includes a paper by Violich, originally prepared for UC’s 1995 conference on Environment Spirit, evaluating Berkeley as a city and a campus on the basis of Violich’s “Ten Properties of Identity with Place.” This concept is further developed in his book, The Bridge to Dalmatia: A Search for the Meaning of Place, forthcoming from Johns Hopkins University Press.

UC Chamber Chorus Releases “Icons of Slavic Music” CD

The Chamber Chorus of the University of California, Berkeley, under the direction of Marika Kuzma, has just issued a Compact Disc entitled “Icons of Slavic Music,” featuring sacred music of the seventeenth to the twentieth century from Russia and Ukraine. The CD was recorded in May 1995, during the Chamber Chorus tour of the East Coast, which included concerts in Washington, D. C., New York City, New Haven, Hartford, and Boston.

In Washington, D. C., the concert was attended by various prominent members of the Ukrainian and Russian communities, among them the Ukrainian ambassador, Yuri Shcherbak and a representative from the Voice of America. The Washington concert was later rebroadcast to Eastern Europe. Critic Joan Reinthaler of the Washington Post praised the Chamber Chorus for its “wonderfully rich sonority” and “intelligent, responsive and well balanced” singing. “Kuzma and her singers were particularly effective in the communion hymn, ‘Receive the Body of Christ’ (Tielo Khristovo Primitie) in which splendid feelings of moving through phrases and of accent and flexibility gave the music life.”

The CD includes excerpts from the familiar and celebrated Rakhmaninov Vsenoshchnoye Bdenie (popularly referred to as the Rakhmaninov Vespers), but also includes some recently uncovered and previously unrecorded motets from Kievan monasteries. There are also some choral concertos by Dmitry Bortniansky (1751-1825), on whom Professor Kuzma has conducted considerable research. She is currently on leave producing the first modern, critical edition of the Bortniansky concertos.

In recent years the UC Chamber Chorus has gained recognition in the Bay Area for its performances and recordings of Handel oratorios with the Philharmonia Baroque Orchestra and the Mark Morris Dancers. Bay Area critics have praised the chorus as “electric,” and “sumptuous”— “the Bay Area’s premiere collegiate ensemble.” Its Compact Disc, “Icons of Slavic Music” marks the Chamber Chorus’ first foray into Slavic music.

In Berkeley, the CD is available at The Musical Offering, 2430 Bancroft Way and at Illuminations Sacred Arts, on Telegraph Avenue at 44th St.
Associates of the Slavic Center

The Center acknowledges with sincere appreciation the following individuals who have contributed to the annual giving program, the Associates of the Slavic Center (or have been enrolled due to their particular generosity toward Cal to support some aspect of Slavic & East European Studies) between October 1, 1996, and January 1, 1997. Financial support from the Associates is vital to our program of research, training, and extra curricular activities. We would like to thank all members of ASC for their generous assistance. (*signifies gift of continuing membership)

CENTER CIRCLE
Paul and Martha Hertelendy*
Peter Kujachich
Elsa Miller*

BENEFACTORS
Bea and Richard Heggie*
Charles Hughes* (Dun & Bradstreet matching gift)

SPONSORS
Dr. Jayne Watt Becker*
Harald Drews*
Peter and Margaret Edgelow*
John and Mary Macmeeken*
Serge and Jane Petroff*

MEMBERS
Frederick Choate
Mr. and Mrs. A. G. Edeleanu

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.

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 the name of your corporation below:

_________________________________________________________________________

__ I have made a contribution but wish to remain anonymous.
A Window on The Russian Far East

A reception and program will be held as part of a new exchange between Oakland’s Montclarion and the *SF Business Times*, funded by USAID and developed locally by the Oakland/Nakhodka Sister City Association. Greater Oakland International Trade Center, 7th floor Port of Oakland Bldg. 530 Water Street, 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. Members: $7/non-members $10. Cosponsored by the Oakland and Nakhodka Sister City Association and the Global Affairs Council. Tuesday, January 21, 1997. For information 510/339-3492.

CSEES & IAS Events

There are occasional last-minute changes of events that occur after the newsletter has been distributed. For the most current listing of CSEES events, please call the (510) 642-3230 to hear a recording of upcoming events. For a full listing of International and Area Studies events, look for the IAS online calendar at [http://www.ias.berkeley.edu](http://www.ias.berkeley.edu)

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](http://violet.berkeley.edu/~csees)
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