The end of the semester is in sight, and we at the Center for Slavic and East European Studies are beginning to review the academic year and our accomplishments. It was a very successful year! We are pleased to announce that the Department of Education Title VI grant, naming the Center a National Resource Center, was again renewed. These funds help our operations and, even more importantly, provide needed scholarships.

The activities of this semester were varied and plentiful. I would like to highlight just a few. On January 24, the Center co-hosted a wonderful reception following the performance of the Budapest Festival Orchestra at Zellerbach Auditorium. Proceeds from the reception went to help support this exciting group. Close to two hundred people came to our Annual Colin Miller Memorial Lecture in February which featured the Honorable Jack F. Matlock, former US ambassador to the Soviet Union and currently the George F. Kennan Professor at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton. Following the lecture, we held a reception in Ambassador Matlock’s honor. At the end of February, we held the third conference in our ongoing joint project with the Center for German and European Studies, “Challenges to Sovereignty from Above and Below in East and West Europe.”

The Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference, with faculty from both campuses discussing the invention of tradition in post-Communist Eastern Europe and Russia, provided a fascinating view of recent events in our region. This spring event is always popular and serves to underline the cooperative relationships between Berkeley and Stanford in our area. “Russia on the Eve of the 21st Century” was the topic of our annual teachers outreach conference which was, by general consensus, proclaimed to be one of the best we have ever held. The audience was very enthusiastic and their evaluations indicate that much was learned.

A symposium held this April (in collaboration with Cal Performances and the Doreen B. Townsend Center for the Humanities) dealt with the topic of Russian village culture. The symposium combined scholarly presentations and demonstrations by members of the Russian Village Festival ensembles. It was followed by an exhilarating performance at the Zellerbach Theater, “From the Village Fair to the Stage: Rituals and Celebrations of the Russian People.” Long after the program had ended, the performers were still dancing outside the theater with members of the audience—a very special treat.

The Center also cosponsored a less exuberant but equally enlightening panel discussion on the East European literary scene before and after the fall of Communism which featured Czeslaw Milosz and Ivan Klima, as well as Martina Moravcova, our current Fulbright scholar from Prague. The panel discussion was moderated by Michael Heim, professor of Slavic languages and literatures at UCLA, and attracted an interested and informed audience.

The semester ended for us with a conference on “Institutions, Identities, and Ethnic Conflict: International Experience and its Implications for the Caucasus.” The conference was organized by the Program in Graduate Study of the Contemporary Caucasus, directed by the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies. Throughout the semester, in addition to these conferences and symposia, the Center has hosted many excellent speakers and working group meetings. (continued on page 3)
The Future of Social Services in the Former Soviet Union

By Nina B. Bubnova

Since 1989, the social infrastructure of the Former Soviet Union (FSU) has been for the most part supported by industrial enterprises, which offer various social services and benefits to their employees. This system of providing social services and benefits through private enterprises has historical roots in prerevolutionary Russia. Managers of enterprises would sometimes extend their responsibilities to providing canteens, bath houses, and housing for their employees. After the revolution, with major industrialization, giant factories and plants were built in rural and uninhabited areas. This required the construction of a basic social infrastructure for future workers. While the social benefits provided by Soviet enterprises varied enormously, the services often included construction and maintenance of housing, kindergartens, sports and cultural facilities; provision of housing utilities such as heat, electricity, cold and hot water, sewage services; child care; and on-site medical treatment for work-related illness.

These social services were funded during the Soviet period from five main financing sources: state budgetary funds, local government allocations, enterprise revenues, user fees of service recipients, and allocations from national extra-budgetary funds, such as pension funds. Beginning in 1992, the privatization and reorganization of state-owned enterprises along with the discontinuation of state subsidies (dotacii) led to massive closures of enterprise-run social facilities, such as sanatoria, clubs and kindergartens, and enterprise-maintained utilities, such as heating.

This inability of enterprises to continue the provision of social assets has led government and international aid institutions to debate the fate of the large portion of the social infrastructure now supposedly operated and maintained by these enterprises. Specifically, the following questions arise: (1) why has a seventy-plus-year-old system of enterprise service provision revealed itself to be unsustainable in new economic conditions, (2) what has to be changed in the current system of service delivery given these new conditions, and (3) what are the viable alternatives to enterprise service provision?

The system of enterprise social services provision was dependent on subsidies from both the federal and municipal government. In the past, these funds supported over 95 percent of enterprise operation and the maintenance of the social infrastructure. These subsidies have rapidly declined, however, tightening enterprise budgets and making them reluctant to invest in the maintenance of social assets.

Along with cash subsidies, enterprises also received tax subsidies in the form of profit tax, payroll tax, and personal income tax exemptions. These tax breaks proved detrimental to the efficiency of the enterprises, giving both the enterprise and its employees incentives to minimize taxable profit and maximize non-taxable non-wage labor remuneration. Social benefits thus became an important substitute for taxable wages; employees and employers demanded labor compensation from the government in the form of an excessively high, economically inefficient level of enterprise-based social services. This created economic inefficiencies in resource use that are much less sustainable in a market-oriented economy. To take the example of child care, enterprise-run kindergartens in Kazakhstan had a teacher to pupil ratio of 1:40.
ratio of four to one, as compared to the fifteen to one ratio of the local municipal kindergartens. This relatively lavish expenditure on childcare was subsidized two-fold by the government: by direct government subsidies and tax breaks.

When social subsidies from the government to enterprises were discontinued in 1992, former state enterprises were forced to subsidize the social benefits provided to their employees by cross-subsidizing, by including the cost of employee social services in the unit price of their product. Because they often continue to provide extensive social services to their employees, former state enterprises cannot compete well with new enterprises that provide fewer benefits, and consequently these enterprises are less attractive to investors.

Although after 1992 the federal government stopped direct subsidies to enterprises, it continued to provide tax incentives encouraging companies to spend money on social services for their employees. These tax incentives, of course, resulted in significant decreases in tax revenue for the state. The magnitude of tax revenue loss can be captured by looking at the 1994 figures: 3.5 percent of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was spent by enterprises in 1994 on social expenditures, rendering that portion of the GDP tax exempt. At the same time, employees received over 40 percent of overall labor remuneration in the form of social services. Thus the government provided 40 percent of personal income, and that portion of personal income was tax exempt.

If the system of enterprise-based social services hurt the productivity of existing enterprises and strained the tax revenue of the federal government, it also disadvantaged newly emerging private firms in the post-1989 period interested in providing social services. Unlike the former state-run enterprises, new private companies have lacked the broad forms of government financial support. Consequently, these new firms are forced to set higher prices and face higher costs in attracting new employees because of the start-up costs of constructing and providing new services.

The FSU’s decentralized system of social services has also proven less than ideal for employees. There is a wide disparity in the quality and quantity of social benefits that workers receive, varying significantly by region, type of industry, and job level within a company. Also, because social benefits are tied to employment, the enterprise provision of social services has hindered labor mobility.

The countries of the FSU have taken different approaches to rectify the problems associated with an enterprise-based distribution of social services. However, in the majority of FSU countries, such as Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Moldova, and Kyrgyzstan, the policy has been for companies to divest assets to municipal government. Municipalities are indeed convenient agents for the transfer social benefits. Constrained by social obligation, the municipal governments are not able to reject undertaking their new responsibilities. But are they the most efficient and equitable holders of these responsibilities?

The fiscal difficulties of municipalities have been compounded by a fall in tax revenues (which in turn resulted from the drastic drop in production output in recent years). The consequences have been the discontinuation of benefits or a sharp decline in the quality of service provision and the deferral of most maintenance and repairs of buildings and facilities. Municipalities are forced to defer maintenance even of social facilities that they owned traditionally. In fact, an analysis of municipalities’ financing and management resources suggests that they do not exceed those of the enterprises.

In order for the divestiture of social benefits to be successful, then, a new means of financing them must be found. A likely solution is establishing federal and regional subsidies to the municipalities to support the assets they are now in charge of. But will the municipal governments prove better or more efficient guardians of social benefits than privatized state-run enterprises? Through decades of providing social services, state-run enterprises accumulated strong economic, personal, and barter ties with suppliers of the necessary goods for maintaining facilities and providing social services. New municipal managers lack these networks. Less experienced than owners of enterprises, municipal governments also lack the market pressures that may help to improve social services. The municipal government’s monopoly of social services will give them little incentive to improve efficiency, to implement technological innovations, and to reduce the price of services to users.

Given the drawbacks of depending on municipal governments to provide citizens of the FSU with social services, I would like to suggest an alternative possibility. The transfer of the responsibility for providing social services to the municipalities can only serve as a transitional step. Eventually, the FSU countries must rely largely on the free market to provide social services.

Chair’s Notes (continued from page 1)

Although we are all looking forward to a relaxing summer, we are also busy making plans for the fall semester. I am pleased to be able to report that we shall have a visiting professor from Yerevan at Cal in the fall, teaching two courses in International and Area Studies and Anthropology. Professor Levon Abrahamian was chosen to be the 1997-98 William Saroyan Visiting Professor in Armenian Studies. He will also be the visiting scholar for the Program for Graduate Study of the Contemporary Caucasus, and thus will have an office in the Berkeley Program for Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies. Izaly Zemtsovy, an ethnomusicology and folkloristics specialist will teach in several departments next year, joining the Slavic department and the folklore program within the anthropology department in the fall. In the spring, he will hold the Bloch Professorship in Music. Alexei Yurchak, a post-doc from Duke University will teach courses in anthropology, including a seminar on post-Soviet anthropology.

We wish you all a very pleasant summer!

Victoria E. Bonnell, Chair
However, while free market mechanisms must be integral to any new system of social services, the central and municipal governments must play a key role in protecting their citizens and assuring access to essential services, especially in this period of transition.

Market mechanisms will help to rectify the inefficiencies present in the distribution of social services. A simple transfer of assets from state-run enterprises to the municipal governments is not enough to rectify the shortcomings of the current system. Several of its features have to be restructured in order to remove negative economic incentives on service delivery, and a market approach would allow for this kind of restructuring. In particular, the tax breaks that encourage non-cash labor compensation must be discontinued and user fees for social services should be adjusted to cover the full cost of service provision, removing the barriers for entry of private social service providers. Companies could cash out existing benefits, raise wages based on the average value of the benefits, and establish a competitive system of service provision which generates market prices that reflect the marginal costs of production.

Municipalities still play a role in this scheme: they must continue to provide social services to ensure the access of the entire population to essential services and prevent the deterioration of the social infrastructure. It is unclear how long such a “short-term” will last, however. As mentioned above, the process of social assets divestiture is extremely difficult because municipalities lack sufficient funding from the central governments. Countries such as Russia, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan have legally established fiscal programs targeted to support the transfer of social assets, but even in these countries a minor share of the stock has been transferred. Other countries, such as Moldova and Kyrgyzstan, provide no consistent fiscal support to municipalities for divesting social assets. As a result, roughly 80 percent of kindergartens in Moldova have been closed and the rest are deteriorating. Thus the role of municipalities is crucial in preventing such “market” outcomes.

The problem that arises for this transition period is how to enable municipalities to take on the operation of divested social assets. The divestiture of social assets to municipalities is a clear example of a larger trend: fiscal decentralization, the shifting of central government responsibilities to the lower levels of the government. Tax subsidies and transfers from the central government, which in some cases covered up to 90 percent of enterprise social assets provision, have made enterprise social assets to a large extent a central government responsibility. The truth is that the central government cannot simply shift this responsibility to local government while holding the other side of the equation constant, i.e., without increasing tax sharing and transfers and giving more power to municipalities in establishing their own tax base. Thus to achieve even an intermediate transfer of services to municipalities, a number of structural fiscal policy changes are required.

After this transition period, the decisions about who should provide which services in the long run primarily depends on the nature of the social service being provided. In the scenario I am proposing, competitive private enterprises would provide consumers with the services that can be characterized as “private goods”: housing, vacation resorts, residential utilities, and, arguably, child care and health care. Allowing people to pay for these goods and services on the open market will prove more efficient than relying on municipal governments who in turn rely on subsidies from the central government. FSU governments should in fact facilitate the emergence of a private sector to provide these goods and services by redirecting current enterprise and municipal subsidies for service provision into low-interest loans for private firms entering the social service delivery market, giving them a better chance of competing with the social services provided by state-run enterprises. Along with assistance to the emerging private sector, such a policy would allow savings to already strapped federal and regional budgets.

In an ideal world, those who benefit from the changes in social service policy that I have outlined would fully compensate the losers. In a scenario that works as planned, state subsidies, tax breaks and enterprise cross-subsidies for services would be withdrawn, but each employee’s cash wages would be increased by the cost to the enterprise of the non-cash benefits previously provided. Part of the fiscal savings to governments would be used to offset the higher payroll tax obligations of enterprises and higher personal income tax due from employees. Alternatively, because most employees will be unwilling to pay the full economic costs that enterprises incurred in providing non-cash benefits, wages might be increased by less than these incremental costs, allowing enterprises to share in the potential efficiency gains from this reform.

It must be admitted, however, that in practice, there is quite limited scope for reforming the provision of enterprise-based services in ways that achieve full compensation of the losers by the winners in the short run. The collapse in production and real incomes, the limited administrative capacity of most government ministries relative to the new demands made on them, the growth of “arrears” in financial relationships among governments and state enterprises, and the pressure to transform state-owned enterprises into profit-making enterprises all tend to result in cutting benefits without offsetting increases in wages or income transfers from government during the period of transition.

Adjustment processes during the transition period are likely to be far from ideal, with severe financial constraints and a need for social protection mechanisms that can be administered simply. Moreover, even if the transition to the market proves successful, FSU governments will still face the responsibility of ensuring that the poor continue to have access to essential social services, perhaps through vouchers or cash assistance. The new countries of the FSU should be careful not to replace an inefficient system of social services with an exclusive one.
I’ve fallen pretty hard for this city—or rather, for the “Ossi” half of this city, an acquired taste that most of my Wessi friends find perverse. One of my bedroom windows faces the site of East Berlin’s former Stalin monument. Relieved of its name and namesake statue, it now consists of three square holes bordered by a granite curb. Behind it looms a wall of alternating facades: socialist-realist neoclassicism interspersed with Khrushchev-era blocks faced in an all-purpose yellow ceramic tile that I’ve also seen in train station rest rooms. My other window looks around the corner toward the townscape that this architectural screen was built to hide. A brick church tower rises amid a scrappy assortment of graying war veterans, some still pockmarked with fifty-year-old memories of advancing Russian troops. Here and there a low concrete-panel structure floats in a weedy expanse crisscrossed by paths—the socialist city’s legacy to a proletariat liberated from the tyranny of the sidewalk.

What is so enchanting about a room with a view of the Karl-Marx-Allee (néé Stalinallee) anyway? My status as a doctoral candidate doing research on Stalinist urbanism lends authority, but not credibility, to my attempts to explain this love affair to friends who don’t share it. From behind a windshield, East Berlin’s streets unreel in an unsightly sequence of gap-toothed blocks and underutilized real estate. But on foot it becomes a permeable city, every other block offering up an alternate route and vista. My shopping trips include visions of frozen laundry strung out on balconies; scavenged vehicles under the watchful eye of a chained guard dog; and a new Nissan dealership beside a burned out neo-Gothic factory. These inside-out views of the capital have a “warts-and-all” intimacy impossible in West Berlin, where property is private, propriety deters trespassing, and postwar reconstruction has sealed the edges of the city’s enormous nineteenth-century blocks. In short, the western city is finished. Land uses in the eastern city, by contrast, are unoptimized (from the urban planner’s point of view) and ambiguous.

All of that is changing fast. The former no-man’s-land of the Berlin Wall, once a boundary in every citizen’s cognitive map, is now being transformed into a business center by the likes of Sony or Daimler Benz. With the exception of design students dismayed by finance capital’s bridling influence on architectural fantasy, Berliners seem proud of skyscrapers rising on “Europe’s biggest construction site,” as they repeatedly inform me. Ossis, however, are less enthusiastic about incursions of western capital on eastern turf. Berlin’s massive subsidies for the modernization of the Soviet-style prefabricated, concrete housing slabs of the sixties and seventies are uniformly appreciated, but not so the glassy commercial blocks that now punctuate the former socialist townscape. “We’re becoming a city of bank office buildings,” lamented an eastern Berliner in a district-by-district survey done by Peter Gerlach of the Institute for Regional Development and Structural Planning.

Greg Castillo is a Ph.D. student in the department of architecture and an affiliated graduate student with the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies.
“Before, none of us were really interested in the open tracts of land in town,” another colleague yielded a late.”

They’ve become private property, it’s too.

Of the respondents commented. “Now that in the open tracts of land in town,” another

“Before, none of us were really interested

feeling of being a scale figure wandering

in every sense of the word, invoking the

architect’s massing model.

In the council building’s lobby, a panel
display of Berlin’s past and present
planning is crowded with studious visitors. In anticipation of a full
afternoon of lectures without a cigarette, smoking is the order of the
day. Not being a smoker myself, I hasten
to the coffee bar and, beneath a stained-
glass portrait of Karl Liebknecht

My walk to the Mitte on the appointed
day takes me across open lots, under

elevated train tacks, past a scrap of

eighteenth-century Berlin (complete with
tavern, churchyard, cobblestone lane, and
remains of a city wall), to an unexpected
confrontation with the GDR’s recent
planning heritage: an eight-lane highway
lined with concrete high-rises, which
block further progress. A lengthy detour
gets me to the State Council building by
way of Nikolaiviertel, the swan song of
architectural culture under “real and
existing socialism.” Here, in time for
Berlin’s 750-year jubilee in 1987, East
German designers attempted to recreate
the winding streets of a medieval
neighborhood surrounding a surviving
church, building an entire ensemble out of
a standard set of prefabricated concrete
panels. The resulting district is pedestrian
in every sense of the word, invoking the
feeling of being a scale figure wandering
past the cardboard surfaces of an

The corner of Friedrichstrasse and
Leipzigerstrasse. Reprinted from Berlin: The

exhorting me to take to the streets, arm
myself with a thousand calories in
pastry and proceed to the auditorium.

For the next three and a half hours, an
all-male battery of planners lay out the
new plan in presentations notably short
on understatement. The first talk, “The
Loss of the City,” establishes the
context of Eastern Europe’s recent
urbanism as a succession of historical
dysfunctions: war, the decimation and
deportation of residents, and a classless
totalitarianism which sought to
eliminate heterogeneous districts and
populations. Early post-Communist
transformations have been improvisa-
tional; for example, the landscape of
kiosks created by “bazaar capitalism.”
That time is over, the speaker assures
us. Berlin’s new plan signals the
reemergence of the Bürgerstadt and the
end of socialist urbanism.

A discussion of “The Murdered City”
comes next. Postwar modernism
sacrificed the habitable city for
automotive mobility, we are informed.
This was the ironic common denominator
between East and West: urban evisce-
ration in the interest of high-speed traffic,
promoted for both the benefit of a
consumer society and an international
working class (a hiss from the audience).

Next, a review of specific proposals for
western Berlin, starring a computer
projection that flies across a city map in
real time, regenerating close-ups of
specific parts of town as we watch (groans
of awe from the audience). The main
recommendations—only sugges-
tions, we are reminded—are for the
redevelopment of the Kurfürstendamm
area, the brash fifties heart of the western
city, as a more traditionally configured
set of public spaces. The speaker explains
that the problem with the automotive city
was one of urban “imageability,” without
which the city becomes puzzling, even
stressful. Urban variety is to be
fostered—we are shown a slide of
Gramercy Park, New York City. Spatial
ambiguity is to be avoided. The motto of
the new plan for Berlin: Density as
Prerequisite.

The computer projection heads east,
flaying over where the Wall now isn’t,
stopped above the island in the Spree
River occupied successively by a fishing
village, a late-medieval fortress, a
baroque city palace, and now the GDR’s
vacant Palace of the Republic and mass-
demonstration plaza—socialist city,
ground zero. “Provisional Results of the
Project Team for the Historic Center” is
the cautionous title of this presentation. A
team member outlines their dilemma.
Which is worse: to be excoriated for
meddling with the architectural symbols
of East German identity, or for not wiping
the slate clean of ugly concrete slabs? We
are shown computer simulations of a
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BOOK REVIEW

By Robert Wessling


In the “Lesbian and Gay Nineties” attention has increasingly turned to the international dimensions of sexual diversity. And since the fall of the Iron Curtain, a major barrier having long inhibited international dialogue with Russian gay men and lesbians has been removed. The recent publication of the first two major books in English dealing with gay and lesbian life in contemporary Russia are direct products of this new atmosphere of communication: the travel memoir *Cracks in the Iron Closet* by San Francisco journalist David Tuller and the anthology *Out of the Blue, Russia’s Hidden Gay Literature*, edited by Middlebury College professor Kevin Moss.

Publishing on the topic of homosexuality in Russia has long been a problematic undertaking. In the days of the Soviet Union, access to relevant materials in libraries and archives was largely restricted, and contact with the gay underworld could lead to a foreigner’s immediate expulsion. The prohibitive environment was the direct legacy of the criminalization of homosexuality under Stalin in the 1930s. The good news is that Article 121, the legal statute banning homosexuality, was repealed under Yeltsin in 1993, thus further diminishing the restrictive conditions that had made books like these unimaginable.

Tuller’s *Cracks in the Iron Closet* belongs to a long tradition of travel writing on Russia. In the 1970s, jet-setting journalists cornered the market for this kind of writing, most notably with *The Russians* correspondent Hedrick Smith’s bestseller, *The Russians*. Tuller does for sexual minorities what Smith and his ilk have done for mainstream Russians. Despite his more limited focus, Tuller does not avoid the chief pitfall of the genre: categorical statements about a whole people based on quirky encounters with a representative few. Tuller’s intimate involvement with his subjects, however, introduces a refreshing element of sexual vérité.

The book is framed by the story of Tuller’s dacha romance with a Russian lesbian. The romance leads Tuller to ponder his own experience of homosexuality, specifically how the imperatives of an openly gay identity in the US had confined him to same-sex intimacy. The story of the author’s unexpected sexual liberation during his travels foregrounds the more general story of gay and lesbian liberation in contemporary Russia. Have Russians, after decades of stifling oppression, finally come out of the closet? Most of them have not. Homophobia remains a compelling...
reason for many gay and lesbian Russians not to come out to family, friends, co-workers, and employers. Tuller encountered a prevalent attitude among lesbians and gay men that may also explain why Russians have yet to make their sexual preference public: years of enforced conformity have left many former Soviets wary of group identities. It is no wonder that the story of Russia’s sexual liberation does not easily correspond to the American tradition of exuberantly coming out of the closet.

Despite this reticence, Tuller found that most lesbian and gay Russians were no less enthusiastic about their sexual identity. He understands Russian lesbian and gay pride as “a pride that blossomed from a sense of uniqueness in a society that had always condemned departures from the norm. A pride that revealed in the concealment of a private life rather than its disclosure; a pride that cherished the secret of sharing it with the chosen few rather than the masses.” Outside the post-Soviet context, however, this “gay pride with a distinctly Russian flavor” sounds more like an apologia of the contentedly closeted elite.

Indeed, there remain nagging problems for Russian gay men and lesbians that need to be confronted in public: the AIDS epidemic and institutionalized homophobia, to name only two. One important chapter in the book, based on interviews with an AIDS prevention center director (formerly a police informant) and the gay men of the community suspicious of AIDS initiatives vividly relates the problems of “anonymous” HIV testing in a post-totalitarian society. There is also a chapter investigating the institutionalized homophobia responsible for the continued incarceration of hundreds of gay men, legally amnestied after the repeal of Article 121. Problems such as these would best be addressed by an outspoken group, but Tuller’s study of the gay and lesbian movement since 1990 illustrates the inherent difficulties of political organizing amid the Soviet legacy of mass paranoia.

Out of the Blue allows Russian gays and lesbians to speak themselves about some of the issues Tuller raises, providing in English translation a preliminary canon of Russian nineteenth- and twentieth-century homoerotic and gay writing. Simon Karlinsky’s introduction (with a short bibliography of secondary sources) surveys homoeroticism in Russian literature since the tenth century and the outstanding contributions of lesbians and gay men to Russian culture of the last century. The anthology is divided into four sections: “Gay Themes in Golden Age Literature” (nineteenth century) includes lesser-known works by Pushkin, Lermontov, Tolstoy, Gogol, and Leontiev; “The First Flowering of Gay Culture” (early twentieth century) contains prose and verse by Kuzmin, Sologub, Vyacheslav Ivanov, Rozanov, Esenin, and Klyuev; “Hidden from View” (Soviet period) presents writing from the Soviet gay underground and the Russian emigration by Ivnev, Steiger, Georgy Ivanov, Kharitonov, Pereleshin, and Gennady Trifonov.

The final section, “Gay Life Reborn,” is an eclectic mix of gay writing since 1991, incorporating new materials from Russia’s gay press. The selection of letters to the editor provides illuminating, if depressing, reading. Many of the letter writers recount disturbing experiences of loneliness, social stigmatization, and unfaithful boyfriends. This kind of anonymous public testimony is pervasive among isolated gay men in Russia; one writer grapples with an explanation: “To be honest I don’t know why I’m writing a letter to strangers. Probably I want to share my pain with someone, you have to share it, but the problem is—with whom?” Two letters from prison describe the abhorrent physical and sexual abuse that straight-identified men routinely inflict upon gay men in Russian prisons. Meditating on this theme, the young gay journalist Yaroslav Migutin wrote an off-beat, mythopoeic obituary, included in the volume, of his occasional lover “Misha Beautiful,” who was murdered in prison at age 19.

Most of the anthologized selections of fiction and verse from the 1990s belong to the realm of popularized gay erotica, long a taboo genre in Russia. The best among them are Sergei Rybikov’s “Lays of the Gay Slavs,” folkloric stylizations of contemporary gay life. The more self-consciously literary writing includes Nikolai Kolyada’s play “Slingshot,” produced by the San Diego Repertory Theater in 1987; Vladimir Makanin’s “The Prisoner of the Caucasus,” in which homosexuality serves as a metaphor of the perverse, murderous imperialism apparent in the Russian military’s attempt to conquer the “beauty” of contemporary Chechnya; Vassily Aksyonov’s story “Around Dupont,” about a Russian émigré with AIDS who expatriates in Washington, DC; and an excerpt from a dense Proustian novella by the young gay writer Dimitri Bushuev.

Like Cracks in the Iron Closet, Out of the Blue provides valuable new information and materials, outlines the larger issues affecting gay and lesbian Russians, and offers a selected glimpse of their everyday lives. Both works convince us of the importance that Russian gay and lesbian experience holds for our understanding of sexual diversity.
The Eighteenth Century, it has helped to constitute national awareness, identification, and conscience. Often, it was a tool of resistance and an ideological weapon. Writers were looked upon as moral authorities: they represented the intellectual frontier and were supposed to answer the essential questions of the moment. Lately, however, the role of literature seems to be changing.

Czeslaw Milosz in his new book Searching for My Home in a way continues the old tradition. Being of mixed origin—Polish and Lithuanian—and searching for his own roots, he tries to promote understanding between these two ethnic groups. But both Milosz and Klima pointed out that they were interested not just in dealing with the problems of their particular country, but in addressing general problems of the human condition. In Ivan Klima’s case, he often deals with the eternal theme of the relation between a man and a woman and the problems of trust and fidelity. Also—and the panelists pointed this out several times—contemporary literature is being written under new circumstances. The years after 1989 bring unexpected trials and moral values, new problems and new topics. The last seven years undoubtedly enabled artistic freedom and did away with censorship and political oppression. But a new challenge has emerged: the artist has to fight for his artistic freedom under the pressure of a market economy.

As Ivan Klima mentioned, voices exist that bemoan the beauty of the bygone days of a conspiratorial brotherhood in literature, with people hungry to read standing in line for hours in front of book stores. Milosz calls these voices heretic, for they omit to mention that hundreds of publishing houses exist today, that there is no limit to the literature being offered to today’s readers, that there are several independent literary magazines introducing foreign literature—that the dream of the pre-1989 society is being realized at the same time that it is being quickly forgotten.

Despite the broadening of literary horizons in Eastern Europe, there is not much cultural exchange going on today among countries in the same region. It seems that these countries, forced into friendship under Soviet rule, have to go through their desired period of “coming back to Europe”—meaning Western Europe—before they are able to see each other as partners with a similar fate.

In fact, many of the literary issues these countries face are similar. One problem that came up during the panel was the need to contend with the deterioration of meaning in language. For example, Klima’s Love and Garbage and Vaclav Havel’s Memorandum and The Garden Party all deal with the theme of the emptying out of language in the pre-1989 period, with its (continued on page 13)
Out of the Drawer: Ivan Klima Visits Berkeley
By Martina Moravcova

This year, as part of its Avenali lecture series, the Townsend Center for the Humanities invited Ivan Klima, one of the Czech Republic’s most famous writers and intellectuals, to lecture and participate in symposia.

In early April, Klima gave a lecture entitled “Living in History and Fiction,” in which he addressed specific problems of Central European literature. Along with Peter Sellars, he participated in a “Conversation on Art and Politics” and at the end of the month, he took part in a panel discussion with Czeslaw Milosz about Central European literature before and after 1989.

In the early 1960s, Klima was an editor of Literarni noviny, a literary weekly which quickly became a platform for exciting debates and introduced its readers to modern literature written both in Czechoslovakia and abroad. Along with his work as an editor, in the early sixties, he wrote two remarkable books of short stories, Lovers for One Night and Lovers for One Day and, a play, The Castle. During the 1969-70 academic year, Klima taught as a visiting professor at the University of Michigan. In 1970, he returned to occupied Czechoslovakia, being a writer for whom living in his home country and writing and communicating in his mother tongue are of vital importance.

Klima’s work was banned in his country from 1970 until 1990 but like many others, he continued writing “for the drawer,” publishing his plays, novels, and short stories in samizdat and abroad. His most famous works of this period were Ship Named Hope, Judge on Trial, Love and Garbage and a collection of short stories entitled My First Loves.

The first work to appear officially in Prague in 1990 was also a collection of short stories, My Merry Mornings. People waited in line for several hours for him to autograph their copies of the book, and as he himself remembers, he would keep signing from morning until the afternoon. For Czech readers, this was one of the first possibilities to demonstrate not only that banned authors were not erased from public memory, but also that they had become symbols and idols of resistance.

Recently Klima has written a collection of essays entitled The Spirit of Prague and two new novels, Waiting for the Dark, Waiting for the Light and The Last Degree of Intimacy. In these two works, he is one of the first Czech writers to address some of the new moral dilemmas and changing scale of values emerging in Czech society after 1989. Although Czech problems are his focus, his books raise universally valid questions and doubts. To bring just one example to your attention, I would like to quote from Love and Garbage: “The amount of freedom is not increasing in our age, even though it may sometimes seem to be that way. All that increases is the needless movement of things, words, garbage and violence. And because nothing can vanish from the face of the planet, the fruits of our activity do not liberate us but bury us.”

When, after his several talks and visits to different seminars, I wanted to get one of his books out of the library, all of them were checked out. Few things would please a teacher of literature more.

Copyright Roman Sejkot.

1996-97 EVENT HIGHLIGHTS

Public Lectures


**Conferences**


♦ XXI Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference: The Invention of Tradition After Communism.


♦ Annual Outreach Conference: Russia on the Eve of the Twenty-First Century


♦ Institutions, Identity, and Ethnic Conflict in the Caucasus


**Symposium**

♦ Russian Village Culture Symposium
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## Fall Course Offerings

Following are selected area-related courses and core faculty course offerings for Fall 1997. Time and location are subject to change—please contact the department near the beginning of the semester for scheduling updates.

### Anthropology
- **Anthropology 2. Introduction to Anthropology.** Ruth Tringham. MWF 11-12, 100 Lewis.
- **Anthropology 250X. Post-Soviet Anthropology.** Alexei Yurchak. M 12-2, 2224 Piedmont.

### Dramatic Art
- **Dramatic Art 151A. Theater History.** Mel Gordon. MWF 2-3, Durham Theater.

### Geography
- **Geography 39C. Freshman Seminar.** David Hooson. Tu 10-12:30, 575 McCone.
- **Geography 263. Former Soviet Union.** Th 10-11, 575 McCone.

### History
- **History 171B. Russia 1700-1917.** Nicholas V. Riasanovsky. MWF 11-12, 250 Dwinelle.
- **History 173C. History of Eastern Europe from 1900 to the Present.** John Connelly. TuTh 12:30-2, location: tbc.

### IAS
- **IAS 150. 4. Peoples and Cultures of the Former Soviet Union.** Levon Abrahamian. TuTh 3:30-5, 101 Moffitt.
- **IAS 150.5. Armenian Culture and Identity in the Changing World.** Levon Abrahamian. TuTh 9:30-11, 123 Wheeler.

### Political Science

By this time the audience is laughing, standing and talking, heading outside for a smoke. I follow and, on the way out, hear the arguments that will sell tomorrow’s dailies: “reclamation of downtown for the pedestrian”; “master planning as the death of democratic-city building”; “a return to European urban traditions”; “a return to centralizing and authoritarian technocracy”; “a plot to stock the city with a well-heeled majority of conservative voters”; “utter disrespect for the GDR’s own design traditions,” “just another Wessi provocation.”

Outside it is cold, dark, and snowing. Directly in front of the glass doors of the council building is a canopy that was not there when I entered. A noisy crowd gathers around it. A young woman with blue hair hands out fliers inviting everyone to try their luck at “Casino Berlin.” Beside her an accomplice acts as croupier. A translucent gaming table, lit from underneath, gives the gamblers’ faces an eerie glow as they move chips across a model.
of the Alexanderplatz, buying up blocks at a couple of groschen a pop. When the table becomes chaotically crowded with plastic tokens and coins and the game reaches some critical point known only to the croupier, a switch is flipped, a cardboard model of the square’s four-hundred-meter television tower falls on its face, players cry out, and the game starts all over again. Across the street, a Christmas carnival complete with food stalls and fun park rides is in full swing in an open lot beside the GDR’s vacated Palace of the Republic.

I was witness to a piece of history that afternoon: the unveiling of the first master plan for a unified Berlin. But as I take in the scene before me, I realize that this is a historic moment as well: a transient period of urban ambiguity and free play impossible under the previous regime—a moment that will probably not survive the capital improvements of Berlin’s new order. The socialist city is dead. Long live the socialist city.

Panel Report
(continued from page 9)

rigid structures and formulae, empty phrases, tautologies, and impoverished vocabulary, void of imagination and emotion.

The post-Communist period has offered new language problems and dilemmas, primarily the fight against the simplified language of advertisement and Americanization brought in mostly by journalists unconcerned about originality and fond of clichés. When the first billboard advertising appeared on the streets of Prague, people took mischievous pleasure in inventively adding little snippets of poetry, changing words to reveal a double meaning, and drawing pictures undermining the saccharine idyll of the images so irritating to the Czech sense of irony. Today, advertising goes unnoticed and is unconsciously memorized as phrases from the television are becoming part of people’s everyday vocabulary. All playful inventiveness seems to be gone. Once again, a new challenge for the “united” East European literary scene.
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Fellowships and Other Opportunities

The Metchie J. E. Budka Award of the Kosciuszko Foundation
For outstanding scholarly work in Polish literature, Polish history and Polish-American (US) relations. $1,000 award. Eligibility: graduate students and new postdocs (within 3 years). Deadline: July 16, 1997. For details on applying, contact the Kosciuszko Foundation, 15 East 65th Street, New York City 10021-6595. Tel: (212)734-2130; Fax: (212) 628-4552.

CIES Fulbright Opportunities
For university lecturing or advanced research in nearly 140 countries. Application deadline: August 1, 1997. CIES, 3007 Tilden Street, NW, Ste. 5M, Box GNEWs, Washington DC 20008-3009; Tel: (202) 686-7877; cies1@ciesnet.cies.org. CIES also has a Web site (http://www.cies.org) that should have the application online.

The University of Illinois Summer Research Laboratory on Russia and Eastern Europe
Associateships available for any time between June 10 and August 4. Full library privileges, potential housing awards, workshops. Contact: Vicki Miller, Russian and East European Center, U. of Illinois, 104 International Studies Bldg., 910 S. Fifth Street, Champaign IL 61820; Tel: (217) 333-1244; Fax: (217) 333-1582.

IREX Short-term Travel Grants
Grants for collaborative activities, senior scholar travel grants, and grants for independent short-term research. Deadline: June 1, 1997. Contact: IREX at 1616 H St., NW, Washington DC 20006; Tel: (202) 628-8188; Fax: (202) 628-8189; irex%irexmain@irex.org.

The Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies
Short-Term Grants (up to 1 month) provide a stipend of $80 per day to scholars at any level needing to use research resources in the Washington, DC area. Closing dates: June 1, Dec. 1, March 1.

The institute is sponsoring internships for graduate students. Interns provide research assistance to resident scholars. Applicants should have a B. A. and a good command of Russian. For information on either grants or internships, contact: Kennan Institute, 370 L’Enfant Promenade, SW, Suite 704, Washington, DC 20024; Tel: (202) 287-3400.

The Drago and Danica Kosovac Prize
For outstanding theses (senior or honors) at UCB in the social sciences and/or humanities which research some aspect of Serbian history or culture. Contact: Barbara Voytek, CSEES. Tel: (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. Deadlines: June 1, Sept. 1, Dec. 1. Contact: either Tatiana Zhdanova or Elizabeth McKeon, MacArthur Foundation, 8 Khlebnyi Pereulok, 2nd fl., 121069 Moscow, Russia; Tel: 095-290-5088; Fax: 095-2956-6358; macarthur@glas.apc.org; or Andrew Kuchins, 140 S. Dearborn St., Ste. 1100, Chicago IL 60603; Tel: (312)726-8000; Fax: (312) 917-0200.

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

National Foreign Language Center (NFLC) 1998-99 Institute of Advanced Studies/Mellon Fellowship

Social Science Research Council/ MacArthur Foundation
Program in International Peace and Security, 1997 Visiting Scholar Fellowship Program. Junior scholars and professionals from Central and Eastern Europe and the non-Russian successor states, engaged in innovative research on peace and security issues at major universities outside their home regions. Deadline: July 15. Contact: Robert Latham, SSRC, 605 Third Avenue, 17th Floor, New York, NY 10158; Tel: (212) 661-0280; Fax: (212) 370-7896; chiplckd@acflcluster.nyu.edu.

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

For information contact: John R. Lampe, Director, East European Studies. The Woodrow Wilson Center, 370 L’Enfant Promenade, SW, Suite 704, Washington, DC 20024; Tel: (202) 287-3000, ext. 222; Fax: (202) 287-3772.
NEW PUBLICATION BY CSEES FACULTY

Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia: Ethnic Conflict and the Dissolution of Multinational States

By Andrew C. Janos,
Professor of Political Science,
University of California, Berkeley

In the wake of the collapse of the Soviet Bloc, regional economic disparities conspired with divergent cultural traditions to bring about the dissolution of the Czechoslovak and Yugoslav states. Andrew Janos treats these two instances of state disintegration in an explicitly comparative manner that will be of interest to both scholars of Central Europe and social scientists generally.

$10.25. 63 Pages. 40% discount for all UCB faculty, students, and staff. To order, contact IAS Publications at (510) 642-4065 or e-mail: iaspub@violet.berkeley.edu.

CONTACT CSEES

Center for Slavic and East European Studies
361 Stephens Hall #2304
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720-2304

Telephone: (510) 642-3230
Fax: (510) 643-5045
E-mail: csees@uclink.berkeley.edu
WWW: http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~csees

CSEES WEB SITE MOVE

The Center’s web site has moved to http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~csees. Please update your bookmarks.