Notes from the Chair

It is hard to believe that ten years have passed since the exciting months of late 1989 when events in Eastern Europe dominated the world scene and overshadowed all other news items. It was an unforgettable time. Beginning with Poland in July, expanding to Hungary, Germany, Czechoslovakia, and then to Bulgaria (all effectively in October-November of 1989), the region underwent major transformations. The execution of the Ceausescus on December 23, 1989, marked a bloody end to a series of relatively non-violent revolutions.

The Berlin Wall fell on November 9, 1989, and a few months into 1990, the Baltic States declared their independence. On July 1, 1990, East and West Germany reunited. The following year we witnessed the disintegration of the Soviet Union and of Yugoslavia, which in some cases was accompanied by civil war. Today there are twenty-eight sovereign states in a region (East Europe, the former Soviet Union, and Mongolia) where a decade earlier there were only nine. The collapse of Communism and Soviet domination have brought an end to the Cold War and inaugurated a new era in international relations and the global economy.

These topics will be the focus of our Annual Teachers Outreach Conference, held this year on March 11-12, 2000. The conference, entitled “Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union: Ten Years After the Fall of the Berlin Wall,” will bring together distinguished scholars to examine the current situation in the successor states for the benefit of teachers, members of the community, and Berkeley students and faculty.

The Center itself has undergone many changes over the past ten years which mirror those of the changing world scene. We now find ourselves representing a region that includes sovereign states extending from central Europe to Mongolia, from the Baltic states to Central Asia, covering eleven time zones. The US Department of Education grant to the Center under Title VI has provided a mainstay for our research and training programs. Federal funds make it possible to continue to teach languages such as Hungarian, Czech, Polish, Bulgarian, and Serbian/Croatian and to support our excellent Russian language courses. These funds also bolster our library holdings and leverage new interdisciplinary courses as well as contribute to our outreach programs for teachers, professionals, and the general public.

The Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies (BPS) has been in the forefront of efforts to reconfigure the study of this region. I am particularly pleased to report that the Carnegie Corporation has just awarded BPS a two-year grant that will allow us to further expand and develop our graduate training program in Soviet and post-Soviet studies. BPS is administering our Program for Research and Training on the Contemporary Caucasus and Caspian Littoral, founded with a generous grant from the Ford Foundation and continued now with assistance from the National Security
Education Program. The Caucasus Program was instrumental in supporting a recent conference on diasporas organized by Dr. Stephan Astourian, William Saroyan Visiting Lecturer in Armenian Studies. A program of the conference, which was administered by the Center and cosponsored by several Berkeley units, is included in this Newsletter.

Continuing a tradition which started 24 years ago, Stanford University will host the Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference this year on May 12. The topic will be “Law and Justice in the Former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.” Scholars from both campuses will examine the topic as it has been treated in literature, history, and society. We look forward to this annual reunion with our Stanford colleagues.

In addition to these public events, the Center will continue its series of brown bag lunch talks, lectures, and seminars. Our public events are listed in our Monthly Updates, which are mailed to campus addresses and to the Associates of the Slavic Center (see page 22 about ASC membership). Other research projects are planned, including the closed workshop “Europe East and West After the Collapse of Communism: Challenges to Sovereignty from Above and Below,” which is co-sponsored with the Center for German and European Studies. Also planned for the year 2000 is a working conference, “Entrepreneurs, Entrepreneurialism and Democracy in Communist and Post-Communist Societies,” funded by the Mellon Foundation.

Although the Center has maintained its excellent record in obtaining extramural funds from foundations and granting agencies, the continuing support we have received from our Associates of the Slavic Center (ASC) has been critical to our success, and we are very grateful to its members. ASC support, together with the Elsa and Colin Miller Endowment, was responsible for the recent Colin Miller Memorial Lecture by Professor William Craft Brumfield, which received much acclaim. Our ASC members are vital to our operation, and I would like to thank them all for their continuing assistance.

New faces at the Center include Louanna Curley, our Administrative Assistant in the Center offices, and Denise Monczewski, the Program Assistant at BPS. Welcome to them both.

Finally, let me wish you all a delightful holiday season and much happiness in the new millennium!

Victoria E. Bonnell
Chair, Center for Slavic and East European Studies and the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies
Professor, Department of Sociology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology 2</td>
<td>Introduction to Archaeology</td>
<td>Tringham, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology 134B</td>
<td>Multimedia Authoring in Archaeology</td>
<td>Tringham, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology C160</td>
<td>Forms of Folklore</td>
<td>Dundes, A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology 189.2</td>
<td>Special Topics in Social/Cultural Anthropology: Global Popular Culture: Into the New Millennium</td>
<td>Yurchak, A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology 228B</td>
<td>Multimedia Authoring in Archaeology</td>
<td>Tringham, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology 250A</td>
<td>Folklore Theory and Techniques</td>
<td>Dundes, A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology 280X</td>
<td>Special Topics in Area Studies: Culture, Power, and Identity in Post Soviet Russia</td>
<td>Yurchak, A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature 200</td>
<td>Approaches to Comparative Literature: The Comparative Study of the Novel</td>
<td>Alter, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature 225</td>
<td>Vladimir Nabokov</td>
<td>Naiman, E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demography 145AC</td>
<td>The Immigrant Experience 1790-1990</td>
<td>Hammel, E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic Art 139</td>
<td>Playwriting</td>
<td>Gordon, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic Art 151A</td>
<td>Theatre History</td>
<td>Gordon, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics 115</td>
<td>The World Economy in the Twentieth Century</td>
<td>Eichengreen, B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 24.6</td>
<td>Chekhov in the Theater</td>
<td>Tracy, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 125C (Slavic 132)</td>
<td>The European Novel</td>
<td>Knapp, L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 166 (Slavic 134F)</td>
<td>Special Topics: Vladimir Nabokov in Translation</td>
<td>Naiman, E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography C55</td>
<td>Introduction to Central Asia</td>
<td>Mehendale, S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography C152</td>
<td>Multicultural Europe</td>
<td>Holub, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography 264</td>
<td>Nationalism, Identity, and Territoriality in Europe</td>
<td>Hooson, D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 24.6</td>
<td>Freshman Seminar-Aliens, Senators, and the Bomb: The Early Cold War in Film and Literature</td>
<td>Clemens, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 100.1</td>
<td>Modern Diasporas: Transnational Identity and Politics</td>
<td>Astourian, S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 101.2</td>
<td>Research Topics in Soviet History</td>
<td>Slezkine, Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 103B.2</td>
<td>Crime and Punishment in Nineteenth-Century Europe</td>
<td>Bialkowski, Z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 103B.4</td>
<td>The Caucasus in the Modern Era</td>
<td>Astourian, S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 103B.8</td>
<td>Stalin’s Great Terror</td>
<td>Slezkine, Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 158C</td>
<td>Europe Since 1914</td>
<td>Adamthwaite, A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 171A</td>
<td>Russia to Peter the Great</td>
<td>Riasanovský, N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 171B</td>
<td>Imperial Russia</td>
<td>Zelnik, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 173C</td>
<td>History of Eastern Europe</td>
<td>Connelly, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History C176</td>
<td>Multi-Cultural Europe</td>
<td>Holub, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 275B.3</td>
<td>Modern Europe</td>
<td>Anderson, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 280B.2</td>
<td>Modern East Central Europe</td>
<td>Connelly, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 280B.3</td>
<td>Themes in Twentieth Century International History</td>
<td>Adamthwaite, A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 285B.5</td>
<td>Research Seminar: The History of 19th- &amp; Early 20th-Century Russia</td>
<td>Zelnik, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 285D.1</td>
<td>The Face of the Enemy</td>
<td>Clemens, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAS 1</td>
<td>International Forum: The Balkans</td>
<td>Alexander, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism J234.2</td>
<td>International Reporting</td>
<td>Danner/Tarnoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music 76</td>
<td>History of Western Music I</td>
<td>Taruskin, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music 200B</td>
<td>Introduction to Music Scholarship II</td>
<td>Taruskin, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Eastern Studies 198.1</td>
<td>Introduction to Eastern Armenian</td>
<td>Ayyazova, A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Eastern Studies 298</td>
<td>Georgian Language and Culture</td>
<td>Kurttskidze, S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science 2</td>
<td>Introduction to Comparative Politics</td>
<td>Janos, A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science 120A</td>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>Weber, S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science 137B</td>
<td>Marxism and Fascism in East Asia</td>
<td>Gregor, A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science 205</td>
<td>The Nation-Building Process</td>
<td>Jowitt, K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science 210</td>
<td>An Analytic Study of the Critical Traits of Marxist-Leninist &amp; Fascist Systems</td>
<td>Gregor, A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science 241D</td>
<td>Politics in the Post-Communist World</td>
<td>Janos/Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 45</td>
<td>19th-Century Russian Literature</td>
<td>McLean, H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 132</td>
<td>The European Novel</td>
<td>Knapp, L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 134F</td>
<td>Vladimir Nabokov in Translation</td>
<td>Naiman, E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 134R.1</td>
<td>Research in Russian Literature: Nabokov</td>
<td>Naiman, E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic C139</td>
<td>Language Spread</td>
<td>Nichols/Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 170</td>
<td>Survey of Yugoslav Literatures</td>
<td>Alexander, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 171</td>
<td>Readings in Yugoslav Literatures</td>
<td>Alexander, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 280</td>
<td>Studies in Literature: Boris Pasternak and the Poetry of the Russian Avant-Garde</td>
<td>Fleishman, L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 289</td>
<td>Studies in the Languages of the Caucasus</td>
<td>Nichols, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology 101A</td>
<td>Sociological Theory</td>
<td>Burawoy, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology 170</td>
<td>Social Change</td>
<td>Eyal, G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology 202B.1</td>
<td>Contemporary Theory: Gramsci</td>
<td>Burawoy, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology 202B.2</td>
<td>Contemporary Theory: The New Class</td>
<td>Eyal, G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology 272C</td>
<td>Methodological Issues in Comparative and Historical Research</td>
<td>Bonnell, V.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Campus Visitors

Stephan Astourian, the William Saroyan Visiting Lecturer in Armenian Studies, is teaching two courses each semester through the Department of History. Professor Astourian has a Ph.D. in history from UCLA. Stephan was the Saroyan Visiting Lecturer last academic year as well.

Vasile Boari is affiliated with the Slavic Center during the fall semester. He is conducting research with funding by IREX’s Social Sciences Curriculum Development Program. Dr. Boari is professor and dean with the Faculty of Political Science and Public Administration at Babes-Bolyai University in Romania.

Roumen Daskalov will be a visiting professor in the Department of History during the spring semester where he will be teaching two courses on Balkan history. Dr. Daskalov is an associate professor of history at the University of Sofia, Bulgaria and the Central European University in Budapest.

Lazar Fleishman, professor of Slavic languages and literatures at Stanford University, is a visiting professor in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures this fall. He is teaching a course entitled “Boris Pasternak and the Poetry of the Russian Avant-Garde.”

Issa Guliev, of the Ingush National Theater in Nazran, Russia, is visiting campus during the fall semester. He is serving as a linguistic consultant to Johanna Nichols, professor of Slavic languages and literatures, for a project on Ingush grammar, dictionary, and texts.

Christina Kiaer, assistant professor of art history at Columbia University, will be a visiting assistant professor in the Department of Art History during the spring semester where she will be teaching a graduate seminar on Soviet Modernism. Christina earned her Ph.D. at UC Berkeley in 1995.

Anara Kendirbaeva is here for the academic year as a Fulbright scholar affiliated with the Slavic Center. She is researching a project “Promotion of Small and Medium Enterprises” in Kazakhstan. Dr. Kendirbaeva has a Ph.D. in mathematics from Moscow State University and furthered her study in economics from the Kazakstani Institute of Management, Economics, and Forecasting (KIMEP).

Nino Kizikuzashivili, an environmental scientist from Tbilisi, Georgia, will be visiting campus during the spring semester. He received a Fellowship from the United States Information Agency and the Open Society Institute to conduct research on environmental science at Berkeley.

Shorena Kurtsikidze is a visiting professor in the Department of Near Eastern Studies for the fall semester where she is teaching a course on Georgian language and culture (NES 298). She holds a doctorate in cultural anthropology from the Academy of Sciences of Georgia and a degree in simultaneous interpreting.

Aliaksandr Shylovich will be visiting campus during the spring semester from Minsk, Belarus. He will be conducting research on transportation studies on a fellowship from the United States Information Agency and the Open Society Institute.

Arbi Vagapov is a visiting scholar in the Department of Linguistics for the academic year, serving as a language consultant for a field methods course. He is also working with Professor Johanna Nichols on her current research projects. Dr. Vagapov is professor of linguistics at Chechen State University and director of the M. Gadaev State Institute of the Chechen Language.

Dr. Leszek Zasztowt, a Fulbright scholar affiliated with the Slavic Center, is visiting for the academic year. He is an associate professor in the Institute for the History of Science of the Polish Academy of Sciences and a professor at the Center for East European Studies, University of Warsaw. His Fulbright project is “Education in the Western Region of the Russian Empire, 1860–1917,” with a focus on the Lithuanian, Belarusian, and Ukrainian territories.
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Congratulations, Dean Breslauer!

George W. Breslauer, professor of political science, began the 1999–2000 academic year as the new dean of social sciences. The Division of Social Sciences consists of twelve departments and is located in the largest academic unit on campus, the College of Letters and Sciences. Among other priorities, he will work to recruit and retain world-class scholars to serve the university.

Professor George Breslauer knows something about service himself. He chaired the Department of Political Science for three years, 1993–1996. He was chair of the Slavic Center from 1985 through 1994, and all of the other years during the period of 1976 through 1997, he served on the Slavic Center’s Executive Committee. Overlapping that period, he served eleven academic years on the Executive Committee of the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies, stopping only to serve as chair of BPS from 1994 through 1998.

George was recognized last academic year with a Chancellor’s Professorship for distinguished research, teaching, and service—a three-year award that includes a stipend for research. George took advantage of the honor to go on his first sabbatical leave in nineteen years. During his leave, he completed a manuscript for a new book, *Gorbachev and Yeltsin as Leaders*, keeping up his scholarship on Soviet and post-Soviet politics and foreign policy.

George’s new responsibilities as dean will engage most of his time, and we will miss being free to call upon him to speak about the latest Russian political crisis. He whom the Center will lose as a source of guidance and particular scholarship, the University will gain as a skilled administrator, passionate about excellence in education. And that is a benefit to us all.
In 1875 the historian Daniil L. Mordovtsev published a series of articles in the St. Petersburg journal *Delo*, in which he argued that the civic life of Russia’s provinces was doomed to perennial weakness by the laws of centripetal movement toward the Imperial capital and other large cities. Referring to the local press of Nizhnii Novgorod among other contemporary examples, Mordovtsev claimed that centralizing forces drained the provinces of intellectual energy and left them effectively “widowed.” Aleksandr S. Gatsisskii, a local statistician and father of Nizhnii Novgorod’s historical archival commission, responded vehemently to these claims in an open letter in the local press addressed to Mordovtsev and entitled “Smert’ provintsii, ili net?” (“Death of the provinces, or no?”). Calling himself an “oblastnik”—a regionalist—Gatsisskii defended the viability of intellectual and civic life in the provinces and pointed to a law of decentralization that he claimed could match the centralizing forces that Mordovtsev had noted.  

Gatsisskii found fault not just with Mordovtsev’s conclusions but also with the basic assumptions that informed his thinking. For Gatsisskii, intellectuals who viewed the periphery from the empire’s metropolitan centers, such as Moscow or even Kiev, were only seeking miniature copies of those cities’ intellectual and social spheres in the provinces. Gatsisskii challenged such thinking in his letter, defending the rights of provincial writers to think independently and follow different intellectual paths from those marked out in the empire’s centers. “Are not the provinces,” Gatsisskii asked, “by virtue of the strength or weakness of any single center, an innumerable multitude of centers of their own?”  

Denying that the provinces were merely dull replicas of the capital, he argued that in fact they were positioned to represent Russian civic life more authentically, while the metropolitan intellectuals were only “frenchifying” Russian culture (“ofrantszhivaiut russkuia kul’turu”). Gatsisskii’s was not the lone embittered voice of a provincial intellectual; his comments were a part of a larger social consciousness realized in the late nineteenth century by many who were active in Nizhnii Novgorod’s public life.

An examination of the Nizhnii Novgorod Provincial Scholarly Archival Commission (NizhGUAK) illustrates this social consciousness, which was based in the identities and broader narratives of society that these local individuals projected outwardly in their activities. Between the mid-1880s and 1914, several members of NizhGUAK were articulating what amounted to a new provincial civic identity, comprised of a cluster of values and ideas about local and broader Russian society. At the core of this identity lay a view of the archival commission as part of a burgeoning autonomous civic sphere, independent from church and state institutions. Within this sphere the archivists viewed themselves both as professional specialists and public educators, and they sought to make participation in local civic life accessible across class and estate boundaries. At the same time, as indicated by Gatsisskii’s remarks above, the Nizhnii Novgorod archivists were concerned with this civic sphere primarily in its local context, and they even tended to view the provinces as worthy of cultural and intellectual autonomy from the Imperial center.

Much of this civic identity was framed in terms of a moral obligation to perform socially useful work, and involvement in the archival commission’s public activities gave these individuals a potential outlet for putting their views into practice on the local stage. But between those ideas and the goal of reflecting them in the commission’s activities lay certain obstacles. In entering public discourse with their views about society, the members of NizhGUAK were forced into a pragmatic dialogue with those whose interests clashed with their own. NizhGUAK’s activities, as they were in fact realized, were the result of a kind of dialectical process in which this cluster of ideas forming a local civic identity was tempered by political and social reality.

**Origins of a Civic Consciousness**

NizhGUAK was not a unique organization when it was established in 1887; it was part of a network of provincial archival commissions created starting in 1884. The primary purpose of these commissions was to create a system of
historical archives, where old and unused administrative materials, together with more ancient documents, could be stored and protected. The role of the commissions was to index the materials and make them accessible for historical research. This network of provincial archives was meant to rationalize and professionalize the handling of older documents that, up until the 1880s in Russia, had been an arbitrary and disorganized process, not systematically overseen.

The provincial archival commissions were outgrowths of the provincial Statistical Committees, which were essentially local fact-collectors for the central statistical committee, which conducted statistical reports on the region’s population and economy. On the local level, the archival commissions were formed by the provincial governors, representatives of the central Ministry of Internal Affairs, together with members of those same statistical committees. The archival commissions were what we might call semi-independent—the goal had been to make them autonomous from both church and state, but in fact they were partly beholden to the Ministry of Internal Affairs and to local government institutions.

Perhaps the genealogical strand that stands out most readily among the elements of NizhGUAK archivists’ civic consciousness is that of Russian intelligentsia culture. The most central features of this broad-based cultural background are the impulse to perform socially constructive work and the notion of a “debt to the common people” (dol’ narodu), but NizhGUAK’s intellectual heritage was significantly more complex than these traits indicate. First, the professionalism mentioned above and the importance of rationalization in this early organization of historical archives were in part inherited from the tradition of legal scholarship in Russia. Richard Wortman has suggested that these same priorities were part of the attitude or “consciousness” that developed among the generation that was educated during the 1840s and 50s in legal faculties and schools of jurisprudence. Many of the men who were influential in creating this new system of historical archives had been educated in the same environment and had shifted away from legal careers to become involved in improving Russia’s methods of historical scholarship and preservation.

The professionalism that the Nizhnii Novgorod archivists inherited in part from the legal profession was combined with an equally powerful attention to the social utility of scholarly expertise. This can be traced in part directly to NizhGUAK’s literal administrative parent, the Provincial Statistical Committee. This connection situated the archival commission squarely in the tradition of technical specialists who served in the Russian zemstvo and local administration, sometimes referred to as the “Third Element.” Robert Johnson has examined specifically the statisticians and the statistical profession, and he indicates that these specialists had a firm sense of how their quantitative expertise was to be used to guide and effect positive change in the tsarist regime’s policies. This same ethic was strongly felt and expressed by members of the Russian scientific community and in the tradition of Russian nauka, or science, as it was broadly conceived.4

This powerful coupling of professionalism and social activism, and the sensibility that these values shaped among the archivists, represent a critical point about the development of NizhGUAK. The most active members of NizhGUAK in the 1880s and 90s were dedicated to a closed conversation among intellectuals that would further science, but simultaneously they considered it essential to engage in an open conversation with the non-specialist—and, in this setting, often simply uneducated—public. In their eyes, this open dialogue was the only way to ensure that the advantages of specialization, rationalization, and professionalization were properly realized.

Problems in Practice

When the members of NizhGUAK attempted to reflect their civic consciousness outwardly in the commission’s public activities, they met with certain obstacles. An illustration of the problems they encountered can be found in the commission’s earliest activities, both in the initial process of establishing NizhGUAK in the late 1880s, and in the planning and execution of a founder’s day celebration, organized by the commission in 1889. Even before NizhGUAK began its official activity in 1887, there were indications that certain compromises would be required if it were to stake out a role of any significance in local society. While in the handful of other provinces where the scholarly archival commissions were founded this process went forward without any serious delays, the foundation of the commission took more than three years in Nizhnii Novgorod.

Ostensibly, the only obstacle that blocked the commission’s official opening was difficulty in finding an appropriate and affordable location for the new organization and its archive. Yet it appears that once Nizhnii Novgorod’s governor chose to take action, he solved the problem of location very quickly in 1887, by requesting that the city duma assist the fledgling archival commission with funding. At the same time, on the eve of the commission’s opening, its initial membership of eleven suddenly was tripled, and among the additional twenty members were several people who held positions of authority in municipal and provincial government. The exact details of these actions require further research, but the abrupt and marked change in the commission’s membership at this point suggests that real sacrifices were made in the commission’s autonomy and also in its professionalism.

When the Nizhnii Novgorod archival commission opened in October 1887, virtually immediately its members began planning an event to celebrate the seven-hundredth anniversary of the birth of the city’s founder, Grand Prince Georgii Vsevolodovich. This two-day civic holiday, which took place in March 1889, consisted of a variety of events that
were carefully planned with the aim of drawing in the broadest possible swath of Nizhnii Novgorod’s society. The archivists themselves were proudest of their efforts to make the historical narrative of the Grand Prince’s life and works available to the general public, and these aspects of the festival received particular attention in NizhGUAK’s own record of the events.

In order to involve a broad range of nizhegorodtsy in the holiday, a pamphlet was composed that recounted the Grand Prince’s life, and this pamphlet was distributed free of charge during the celebration. In addition, public readings of this pamphlet and other local historical narratives were staged, and these readings were accompanied with what were called “tumannye kartiny,” a “magic lantern” slide show that served to illustrate the readings and engage listeners. The archival commission organized this entire portion of the celebration in close collaboration with the local chapter of the Society for the Promotion of Primary Education.5

An implicit aim in this inaugural public event was the presentation of a model of Nizhnii Novgorod society that would enable all social classes to meet and interact in the public sphere. But the way the founder’s day celebration occurred in practice unfortunately reflected more the fissures and stratification in post-Reform Nizhnii Novgorod society than it demonstrated the potential for nizhegorodtsy to come together and share a local civic holiday. Rather than providing a festival in which all could participate, what resulted was a series of smaller celebrations, one for nearly each sub-group of local society—the nobility, the entrepreneurs of the Commercial Club and the authorities in municipal government, the clergy, and the uneducated masses—rather than a holiday that invited interaction between the different social strata. Even the aspects of the celebration that the archivists had planned with the specific goal of inviting broad civic interaction fell slightly short of their ideals. The recounting of the founder’s life met with disapproval from local clergy, and the free readings took on the character of an edifying, moralizing gesture toward the uneducated narod.

A Generational Shift in Consciousness

The Nizhnii Novgorod archivists’ civic consciousness was shaped by two important elements. On the one hand they considered themselves part of a burgeoning inclusionary civic sphere where one of their primary goals was to mediate divisions based on social class. These views were combined with an idea of their role as provincial intellectuals and professionals, a notion of the periphery as worthy of cultural autonomy from the center. While these two aspects were meshed to form a single local civic consciousness in the 1880s, by 1913 there is evidence that the priority of social activism had split from the notion of regional autonomy and that this regionalism itself had shifted away from its civic-based origins. By the eve of World War I, in an atmosphere where, in the wake of 1905, the mantle of radical political and social activity had been passed to the now-legal political parties, the Nizhnii Novgorod archival commission had undergone a significant change and had moved much further from the civic consciousness that had influenced its original members. NizhGUAK’s twenty-fifth anniversary celebration in 1913 illustrates how the archivists’ civic consciousness had evolved in the course of a generation.

The pomp and circumstance that surrounded NizhGUAK’s silver anniversary celebration indicates that the attitudes of the commission members and their role in local society both had become quite ossified by 1913. This ceremonial meeting was open only to a limited portion of local society, and the rituals that comprised this celebration—with prayers to a local pantheon of civic saints, including the commission’s founder, Aleksandr Gatsisskii—reflect the commission’s more firmly entrenched position within the social and professional establishment and the fact that many of the members viewed themselves in this light. The language used throughout this event framed Nizhnii Novgorod’s local history in markedly essentialist rhetoric that emphasized the Nizhnii Novgorod region as “rodina” (“motherland”) and resembled an expression of nationalism, with region substituted for the nation. Where local history previously had been celebrated by consciously framing it in the context of the broader Russian historical narrative, now Nizhnii Novgorod local heroism was celebrated without mention of its contribution to Russian national development.6

By 1913 the members of NizhGUAK appear to have discarded the attitudes about social activism and the necessity to create an inclusive civic sphere that had so strongly influenced the commission’s activities in the two decades before. In the absence or weakness of those socially progressive ideas, these later NizhGUAK members expressed a version of the earlier regional consciousness whose foundations had shifted from a civic definition of community to a more integral definition. This later form of local consciousness was founded on connections to the land (“soil,” perhaps, if not “blood”), rather than participation in a civic sphere, and was expressed using a rhetoric that likened locality to nation. Finally, this later form of localism finds a much less comfortable coexistence with Russian national loyalty and represents a potential challenge to a strong identification with the Russian nation or empire as well as a possible locus of unity in the context of the chaos that followed the international and civil wars and the revolution in the second decade of the twentieth century.


2 A.S. Gatsisskii, “Smert’ provintsii ili net? (Otkrytye pis’ma D.L. Mordovtsevu. Pis’mo 1)” (Nizhnii Novgorod,
New Publication from International and Area Studies

Workers and Intelligentsia in Late Imperial Russia: Realities, Representations, Reflections

Reginald E. Zelnik, editor
IAS Publications, Research Series 101
1999, $24.50, 349 pages
ISBN 0-87725-001-4

The collapse of the Soviet Union opened previously unimagined possibilities for insight into Russian social, intellectual, and political history. This volume, a collaboration of American, Russian, and West European scholars, illuminates the creation and complex dynamics of the Russian industrial working class from its peasant origins in the mid-nineteenth century to the collapse of the imperial system in 1917. The authors focus on the shifting attitudes, cultural norms, self-representations, and increasing self-consciousness of workers as they interacted with the new social movements, student groups, the Church, and most dramatically, the political (mainly radical and liberal) intelligentsia. But the authors also examine the obverse: the contending representations of workers by the intelligentsia as they interacted with each other ever more intensely during this turbulent period leading up to the Russian Revolution. The result is a fascinating and detailed account of social and cultural transformation in a key period of Russian and world history.

For information on ordering this book, please contact:
IAS Publications Office
University of California, Berkeley
2223 Fulton St, Room 338
Berkeley, CA 94720-2324
Tel: (510) 642-4065 Fax: (510) 643-7062
iaspub@socrates.berkeley.edu

Russia: An Experiment in Local Self-Government
Reginald E. Zelnik, editor
IAS Publications, Research Series 101
1999, $24.50, 349 pages
ISBN 0-87725-001-4

The collapse of the Soviet Union opened previously unimagined possibilities for insight into Russian social, intellectual, and political history. This volume, a collaboration of American, Russian, and West European scholars, illuminates the creation and complex dynamics of the Russian industrial working class from its peasant origins in the mid-nineteenth century to the collapse of the imperial system in 1917. The authors focus on the shifting attitudes, cultural norms, self-representations, and increasing self-consciousness of workers as they interacted with the new social movements, student groups, the Church, and most dramatically, the political (mainly radical and liberal) intelligentsia. But the authors also examine the obverse: the contending representations of workers by the intelligentsia as they interacted with each other ever more intensely during this turbulent period leading up to the Russian Revolution. The result is a fascinating and detailed account of social and cultural transformation in a key period of Russian and world history.

For information on ordering this book, please contact:
IAS Publications Office
University of California, Berkeley
2223 Fulton St, Room 338
Berkeley, CA 94720-2324
Tel: (510) 642-4065 Fax: (510) 643-7062
iaspub@socrates.berkeley.edu

William Saroyan Visiting Position in Armenian Studies

University of California, Berkeley

The College of Letters and Science and the Center for Slavic and East European Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, are now accepting applications for a visiting position in Armenian Studies. The position is for one year of teaching, officially beginning July 1, 2000, and is renewable for an additional two years. The applicant is expected to teach undergraduate courses on approved topics in Armenian Studies, supervise and assist student research, interact with faculty and students in related fields, present public lectures, and lead the development of an active program. The emphasis is on contemporary Armenia and contemporary issues in the Caucasus, but the program is flexible and may encompass any of several fields, including history, sociology, political science, and anthropology. Title and salary are commensurate with qualifications and experience.

Requirements: the candidate must have a Ph.D. or equivalent, teaching experience, and a high level of proficiency in the English language. The application package must include a curriculum vitae, a proposed syllabus and description of course(s), and at least two references.

Interested individuals should send their applications to Dr. Barbara Voytek, Executive Director, Center for Slavic and East European Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 361 Stephens Hall #2304, Berkeley, CA 94720-2304; Fax: (510) 643-5045; E-mail: bvoytek@socrates.berkeley.edu. The deadline for application is February 1, 2000.

The University of California is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer.
Raymond June, Ph.D. candidate in social and cultural studies at the School of Education, will be in the Czech Republic next year conducting research for his dissertation on financial elites and neo-liberal reform. The photos for the Newsletter were taken during a brief visit in early summer 1999.

Housing the New Elites in Prague

The vogue for luxury apartments in up-and-coming neighborhoods like Vinohrady in Prague’s second district indexes is a material index of the rise of new economic elites. Will increasing urban residential stratification produce, as a newspaper recently called it, a “Beverly Hills in the Czech Republic” (2 June 1999, Lidové Noviny)?
Outreach Programs

1999 Summer Institute for Teachers

In July 1999, together with the other UC Berkeley area studies centers and the Office of Resources for International and Area Studies (ORIAS), the Slavic Center sponsored a week-long summer institute for K-12 teachers, entitled “Travelers: Cultural Interaction in the Medieval World.” Approximately forty teachers from fifteen school districts in Northern California enrolled in the institute, for which they were eligible to receive two continuing education credits.

As the title suggests, participants examined the interaction among various medieval cultures of Europe, Africa, and Asia through the eyes of traders, monks, and other famous travelers. The institute ended with a look at cultural encounters in the New World and an examination of how teachers can use travel to enliven the study of history in the classroom.

Two affiliates of the Slavic Center, visiting scholar Izaly Zemtsovsky and Ph.D. candidate Sabine Stoll, presented material on influential travelers from Central Asia and Eastern Europe. Dr. Zemtsovsky spoke about the culture of the great Mongol khans (including Tamurlain), using art, textiles, and music to introduce participants to social and artistic aspects of their multi-ethnic empire, which at its height stretched from modern China and Mongolia to Central Europe. In response to the great amount of interest generated by his talk, Dr. Zemtsovsky is preparing a curriculum unit on the great khans, which CSEES will make available to teachers in the coming months.

Sabine Stoll, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, enlightened participants on the far-reaching influence of two ninth-century Byzantine monks, Cyril and Methodius, credited with bringing the Orthodox liturgy to the Slavs in their own language. To aid in this mission, Cyril—also canonized as the first Slavic saint—invented a liturgical script, Glagolitic, which served as the root for the Cyrillic alphabet.

A full description of the workshop and other speakers’ presentations may be found on the ORIAS Web site, <http://www.ias.berkeley.edu/orias/>. The program was partially supported by Department of Education funds under Title VI.

Other Outreach News

Mark your calendars: our 26th Annual Teachers’ Outreach Conference will be held on the weekend of March 11–12, 2000. The conference will explore the topic “Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union: Ten Years After the Fall of the Berlin Wall.” Details will be announced in the next few months; please periodically check our Web site or Monthly Updates for new information. In the spring, we are also planning to present a separate workshop on integrating the World Wide Web into the social studies curriculum. This will be an expanded version of the popular Web class that we have offered during the outreach conference, including more “surf” time and a session on Web site creation. Look for more details in our spring 2000 newsletter.

Web Site Spotlight: International Development and Aid

Two new Web sites tap into the awesome networking power of the internet to alleviate hunger and poverty world-wide.

The Hunger Site <http://www.thehungerosite.com/>
An independent Web site that allows visitors to make a free daily donation of food to alleviate hunger worldwide. All donations are funded by corporate sponsorships, and all proceeds go to the United Nations World Food Programme, the largest food aid program in the world.

NetAid <http://www.netaid.com/>
NetAid is a comprehensive new Web site with the aim of connecting ordinary citizens who want to become more informed and/or involved in aid efforts with the international organizations whose missions are to alleviate poverty and aid development. Several projects in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union are described in the sections on Ending Hunger, Helping Refugees, Securing Human Rights, and Relieving Debt.
Looking back over the path that led to the Polish Round Table of 1989 and the turbulent decade that has followed, I will try to capture them as a historian, but I will also draw on my own experience dealing with Poland’s new and old elites and on updates from people who are doing it now.

Up Through 1989

Until 1989 Poland was essentially an East European Communist country like all the others: it had monopoly politics and a state-owned economy, and its system was under stress. Of course, like all the others, it also had some features that made it distinctive. Its traditional elites had been less than completely suppressed by the Communists, so that interaction between new and old elites was part of national life and national folklore. There was a joke about the parish priest and the party first secretary in a village. “You’re not getting pork for Corpus Christi,” the secretary would say. “Then there’ll be no first communion for your daughter,” would be the reply. “In that case there’ll be no cement for the new parish hall.” At that point out came the priest’s heavy artillery: “If you keep this up I won’t write your May Day speech for you this year.” In that sense 1989 may have not been so different from what had gone on before.

But I would urge that the response Poland gave in 1989 to the challenges wracking the whole system is best explained by differences that had arisen over the previous decade. By 1989 Poland had been an economic disaster area for thirteen years—since 1976—when the Gierek economic boom ran out of steam. The other Communist economies were more or less good or bad. Poland’s had been very bad for a long time, and that had had important consequences.

First, the economic crisis had helped create Solidarity, and even after Solidarity was suppressed by martial law in December 1981, it had to be dealt with if the economy was to recover. Solidarity had been large: at its height in 1981 it had eight million members, including about a quarter of the party itself, and when it was suppressed a few less than ten thousand activists were arrested. By 1989 its membership had shrunk, and a new generation of workers was threatening to run out from under the old leadership. But nowhere else in the Communist world was there such a large and disciplined opposition: it had retained its structure, its ethos, many of its troops, and its claim to represent society against the regime. The regime could not eliminate Solidarity: it could only try to isolate it in order to invalidate that claim.

To get around Solidarity, therefore, the regime had spent the 1980s trying to effect major economic reform. Since the crisis was so severe, it had Soviet license to try things that no other area country was permitted. The purpose of economic reform was to avoid political reform, but the effect was to modernize and open up the Polish economy to a degree beyond any that existed elsewhere in East Central Europe and to create a mass of economic actors working outside the traditional Communist economic system that was larger than in any other country except Hungary.

Most Poles already had some experience with economic decision-making, because most farmland was privately owned and most city-dwellers were from country families. But now, in the 1980s, the Poles also became the smugglers of Eastern Europe, spreading throughout the area with their consumer goods to pay for their vacations or simply to make money. They washed over the Black Sea beaches, they filled the “Paradise Train” between Moscow and Berlin. The fraternal GDR felt obliged to shut them out before they bought up the country’s consumer goods. Running alongside the smugglers was a wave of institutional reform: in the 1980s Poland restored and expanded the institutional structure for private economic enterprise that had been abolished in the 1940s. Mostly, this benefited the relatives of party officials, who controlled what capital there was in the country and its most important component, connections. In other words, it was at the origin of nomenklatura capitalism.

Third, this effort failed in its main, political objective, but it had a side effect which was critical to the culmination of 1989. Economic reform did not get the regime around Solidarity. By 1989 Solidarity was still the largest political opposition operating in the Communist world. It was still the Polish regime’s necessary negotiating partner, but the regime and those it represented did not enter these negotiations with empty hands or without hope. In the spring of 1989, when the Round Table met, the Soviet Union was still there, and Gorbachev had not yet made clear that he would not support them in a crunch. They believed they could co-
opt Solidarity and retain the essentials of power, but now they also had the cushion of nomenklatura capitalism. It assured them that they would not be driven into the sea, that even in a Poland they did not wholly control there could be a place for them.

These recent developments best explain the Round Table outcome of 1989. Both negotiating teams at the Round Table were uncertain, suspicious, and vulnerable, but neither was desperate. Both felt the need to compromise, but each also felt strong enough to compromise without losing everything. Only that kind of balance could produce the Round Table result: limited power-sharing with an open-ended future.

Then, in an abrupt reversal, the elections of June 1989 promptly destroyed this fragile equilibrium. To everyone’s surprise, including Solidarity’s, they exterminated the Communists politically. To everyone’s surprise, including Solidarity’s, they forced Solidarity to take responsibility for Poland’s political future. The formation of the Mazowiecki Government that summer marked the end of an era which had scarcely begun.

Since 1989

In fact the new era was potentially a dangerous one. With hyperinflation looming, the new government’s first task was to escape economic catastrophe, but Solidarity had had little interest in economics. Both its leadership and its troops were in politics primarily for moral reasons, and the bulk of its troops were in the large state factories which were sure to be hurt by serious, market-oriented economic reform. Both the commanding heights of socialist industry and the new sinews of private enterprise growing up in the interstices of the socialist economy were substantially in the hands of post-Communists. The danger was that the new political and the old economic elite would fight each other to a standstill, leaving a reformist government trying unsuccessfully to ride herd on a nomenklatura-cum-mafia economy. That happened in other post-Communist countries as economic decline set in; because of the economic crisis, it was an immediate danger for Poland. However, it did not happen in Poland. Just as the June 1989 election ushered in the danger, it also triggered the processes that led Poland out of danger.

First, the Communist political defeat was so complete that it threatened the Communists with ghettoization and gave them strong incentives to become real Social Democrats. They were still in place in the economy and, thanks to the Round Table compromise, in the polity. The threat of lynching was not immediate. One of the new government’s first acts was to proclaim “the thick line” under the past and a fresh start for everyone, but the Communists could not count on either their economic or political assets to keep them in place or to protect them from attack. That fall any prospect of Soviet support disappeared as Communism collapsed all over Eastern Europe, and they knew from a decade if not a lifetime of experience that Poland’s anti-Communists were real anti-Communists, genuinely hostile and genuinely strong. Elsewhere, the post-Communists might pass themselves off as the best available or the lesser evil; in Poland, they were going to have to work hard just to stay Polish.

Second, this made them fellow-travelers of the post-Communist world’s boldest and most radical economic reform, the “shock therapy” introduced on January 1, 1990. Elsewhere in the area Communist managers sat tight, and Communist politicians blocked reform. In Poland such foot-dragging was local but not national. Everyone agreed that tackling the economic crisis was the country’s first political priority, and the so-called “contract parliament” that had emerged from the Round Table turned out to be the ideal vehicle for economic reform. Its post-Communist majority was frightened and pliable; it would pass anything, and until the next parliamentary elections in the fall of 1991, it passed almost everything. Nowhere else in the post-Communist world, and neither before nor since in Poland, has it been so easy to pass so much legislation institutionalizing the new economy.

Over the longer term, new economic elites were clearly the key to avoiding a standoff between the old economic elite and Solidarity, but that was true in the short term as well. With the infancy of Solidarity in the large state factories, it was clear that their early privatization was not in the cards. This meant that the monopoly power of large Communist-run firms had to be curbed by other means. A number of steps were taken to do just that: their subsidies were cut off; the frontiers were opened to imports which provided them with competition; and limitations on market entry were abolished, so that millions of new small firms entered the market to compete with them in products and for labor. Called up to fight a battle, these small and medium firms are also winning the war, for they are providing the infantry of the private economy.

In 1990 and 1991, however, it was by no means clear that these steps would have the desired effects, and it was dead certain that the reform would produce economic recession and rising social and political tensions. In other words, economic reform itself could not be sustained without political support, and there was certain political danger. Two political devices were applied in those years to ward it off. Even in retrospect, they are not much recognized for what they were, and they worked.

First, just as it had been an election which created the new situation, it was the institution of elections which was primarily responsible for Poland’s success in working out of the new danger. During the eight years between 1989 and 1997, when the current government came to power, Poland had six national elections, which in every case went against the incumbents. Most Poles and most foreign analysts deplore this as a sign of political immaturity. New institutions were fragile; relations among them were unclear; parties were weak; and so, the argument goes, Poland needed more stability and fewer elections. I argue, on the contrary, that it was precisely the fragility and immaturity of
other new institutions that made frequent elections essential. Only elections could give the major players—both post-Communist and post-Solidarity—the sense that they had a legitimate place in the political system, where they could defend their essential interests effectively and aspire to change things to their advantage.

Even that might not have been enough, however, without the second factor: Lech Walesa as president. For if the larger political danger was a standoff between Solidarity in office and the post-Communists in their economic redoubts, the specific danger of the early years was conspiratorial activity by frightened post-Communists which would destabilize the system. As in every other post-Communist country, they represented between 10 and 20 percent of the electorate, and they were well represented in many institutions, including the police and the military, as well as in the economy. That was why anti-Communists were so eager to purge. Walesa felt that this cure would have effects worse than the disease, since it would provoke desperate anti-reformist demagoguery that would make it harder rather than easier for Poland to become “normal” or “European.” That has happened elsewhere; it is hard to say whether he was right or wrong about Poland. He was certainly the leader who did the most to make the question moot.

Throughout his five-year tenure as president, between 1990 and 1995, Walesa was careful to fight with every government, but since he saw post-Communist fear and agitation as the greater danger, he was particularly careful to support what he called the “left leg,” to give the post-Communists the feeling that if they acted rightly there was a place for them too in the new Poland. In 1992, when the Olszewski government lunged to “out” police collaborators, he threw it out. In 1993, when the Solidarity trade union frivolously engineered the defeat of the Suchocka government, rather than keep it in power as he could have, Walesa called new elections that the post-Communists were likely to win. By the time he was defeated by a post-Communist in 1995, he had worked himself out of a job. His reputation among Polish intellectuals and Western academics as a mere troublemaker is secure; so too, I think, is his historic merit as the godfather of the Polish transition.

Meanwhile, every single Polish government has tinkered with the pacing of economic and institutional reform, but each has also stuck to the basics that were set out in the *annus mirabilis* of 1989. Many other factors have contributed: Western support has been helpful; positive economic and therefore political results started to kick in relatively early, already in 1992; the myth that the country is rejoining liberal, democratic Western Europe is extremely powerful for Poles, including Polish post-Communists; and since 1994, the prospect of NATO entry has given it strong, crystalline, political form. However, the critical factor has been the one I have described: Poland has been fortunate in its anti-Communists, its Communists, and in its timing. It is often said Poland has avoided dealing with its post-Communist problem; nothing could be further from the truth. It has dealt with it in a very special way, through elections rather than through the legal system, but it has done so better than others. Its anti-Communists were for real and frightened the Communists, but they were also strong enough to allow the post-Communists into the new political system. The post-Communists had position and power enough to avoid extinction but were frightened enough to want to become real Social Democrats, and a cascade of elections and an extraordinary man allowed them to move forward together.

The cost, of course, has been the quasi-Marxian situation that has emerged in Poland with respect to elites. A new world is growing up in the bosom of the old, but it has not yet burst through the integument established in 1989. The political elites which emerged in 1989 are still substantially in charge, still the same people speaking the same languages. Meanwhile, the economic elites have been revolutionized but have not yet found their political voices.

The country’s most decrepit industries are still state-owned: coal, the arms industry, the railways. They eat the budget, and their managements encourage strikes to pressure the government to keep the taps open. They are running sores controlled by nomenklatura, but those who fear nomenklatura capitalism usually point to more success-ful firms. These are the rather large firms which still produce and still compete: electrical equipment, construction materials, metal extraction, and export. They are nomenklatura-dominated and important. Nevertheless, they are also under pressure to act like firms: from post-1989 regulatory agencies, from institutional stockholders, from sheer competition. Five CEO’s of such firms have been ousted recently in “good corporate governance” moves, and one has been replaced by an American female entrepreneur who has headed the Polish-American Enterprise Fund for years. So even here change is underway, and all around, genuine private enterprise is flying past.

There is significant nomenklatura coloring in the banks. Half of banking assets are now in private hands, and foreign banks, like Citibank, are increasingly active. Old categories play a role in policy, and economic and political elites mingle but in new ways. Under this government, the privatization ministry favors Citibank’s bid over another bank with liberal ex-Communist leadership. Nevertheless, competition presses on all. Direct private foreign investment has now topped $30 billion, and its plants and their Polish spin-offs—suppliers, construction firms, associated services—march to a different drummer. The most interesting category is new, middle-sized firms. In the successful smaller cities, local, post-1989 elites consist of local entrepreneurs who are almost exclusively non-Poland has been fortunate in its anti-Communists, its Communists, and in its timing.
nomenclature. Below them is a welter of micro-businesses: thousands and hundreds of thousands of firms which die, subsist, or grow; the feedstock for the middle level; and with scarcely a taste or hint of nomenclature. In short, there is a new economic world that is not so much overtaking as enveloping the old.

These members of the new economic world are also the political future, but their time has not yet come. For now, the people I knew when I left in 1993 are still those you see on television. Political categories that would be considered “normal” in Western Europe exist in Poland—clerical/anticlerical, farm/city, statist/liberal, nativist/cosmopolitan, but they have not yet shouldered their way into the political system. The current system’s political categories are still the old-fashioned moral ones that carried Poland through the transition: do we want to be Communist, or do we want to be “normal”?

As a last paradox, I would argue that the persisting moralism of the political system has in fact been an advantage for Poland. At some point it will become an obstacle, but that point has not yet come. So when the post-Communists won in 1993 they were still afraid, and although they put structural reforms on hold—reforms that would privatize large state firms—they also kept macro-economic policy on track to please the West and counted on good external conditions and growth to keep them winning elections. They were shocked when the post-Solidarity center right organized and beat them in 1997. Post-Solidarity is still anti-Communist and pushes for steps to “out” secret police collaborators and the like. Still, it too values its reputation for responsibility and proceeds to pass a hugely ambitious program of continuing reform: pensions, health, local government, coal, steel, major privatizations, perhaps even agriculture and arms production. It does this all in the name of normality, of adapting to NATO and the European Union.

Poland, then, is not Denmark. At some point it may adopt a politics of dividing up the new and growing pie, without large questions about principles—like the politics that dominated the West throughout most of the postwar period. Since Western Europe may be moving on to other kinds of politics, more jagged and angular, it will be good to know that Poland and perhaps a few others are there to move into the space thus vacated; for it is a space where reason rules. It has not happened yet: the priest and the party secretary may have been superseded, but their direct descendants are alive and well. Walesa may have worked himself out of a job, but so far he has few followers. Who is to say that Poland has suffered, that we have the right to be disappointed and the right to cast stones?

Upcoming Events

Events are subject to change; for current information on Center events, please call (510) 642-3230. When no one is available to take your call, you may listen to the recorded message that lists our upcoming events.

A more timely announcement of our events can be found in our Monthly Updates, published during the academic year. Updates are mailed to campus addresses and to Associates of the Slavic Center (see page 22) by first class mail. Additional copies are available at the Center, 361 Stephens Hall.

Monday, December 20. Film Screening: Beshkempir, the Adopted Son (A. Abdykalykov, Kyrgyzstan/France, 1998). A boy learns he is adopted and comes of age. At the UC Theatre, 2036 University Avenue, Berkeley; 7:20 p.m. Contact: UC Theatre, (510) 843-3456.

Wednesday, January 19. Brown Bag Talk: Lynne Viola, professor, Department of History, University of Toronto, will speak on Russian history. A title will be announced. In 442 Stephens Hall, 12 noon. Sponsored by CSEES.

Tuesday, February 1. Public Lecture: Maya Vassileva, Fulbright scholar, Department of Classics, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, will speak on “The Thracian Tombs of Central Bulgaria: New Evidence for Old Questions.” In 370 Dwinelle Hall, 4 p.m. Sponsored by CSEES, the Indo-European Language and Culture Working Group, the Archaeological Research Facility at U.C. Berkeley and the Center for the Study of Eurasian Nomads, Berkeley.

Thursday, February 3. Noontime Poetry Reading by Czeslaw Milosz, Professor Emeritus, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures. In the Morrison Room, Doe Library, 12:10 p.m. Fees: no charge. Sponsored by the Library, the Morrison Library Fund, Letters and Sciences, the Townsend Center, and Poets & Writers Inc. Contact: Lunch Poems at (510) 642-0137.


Saturday-Sunday, March 11-12. Annual Teachers Outreach Conference: “Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union: Ten Years After the Fall of the Berlin Wall.” Speakers and a schedule will be announced. In the Toll Room, Alumni House. Registration for this conference will be required. Sponsored by CSEES.

Friday, May 12. Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference: “Law and Justice in the Former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.” Speakers and a schedule will be announced. At Stanford. Sponsored by the Center for Russian and East European Studies at Stanford University and CSEES.
**Recents Ph.D.s**

Matthew Baerman filed his dissertation “Free to Fixed Stress in Slavic” with the Slavic languages and literatures department in May 1999.


Klara Moricz filed her dissertation “Jewish Nationalism in Twentieth-Century” with the music department in May 1999.

Miranda Beaven Remnek filed her dissertation “The Expansion of Russian Reading Audiences” with the history department in May 1999.

James Ron filed his dissertation “Frontier and Ghetto: The Institutional Underpinnings of State Violence in Bosnia and Palestine” with the sociology department in May 1999.

Andrew Harrison Schwartz filed his dissertation “The Best Laid Plan: Privatization and Neo-Liberalism in the Czech Republic” with the political science department in May 1999.

Pegatha Jean Taylor filed her dissertation “Saint Bernard of Clairvaux and the West Slavic Crusade: The Formation of Missionary and Crusader Ideals on the German-Slavic Border” with the history department in May 1999.

Mark Clarence Walker filed his dissertation “Vox Caesaris Vox Populi: Why and When Referendums are Called in the Post-Soviet States and their Effects” with the political science department in May 1999.


Robert Diedrich Wessling filed his dissertation “Semyon Nadson and the Cult of the Tubercular Poet” with the Slavic languages and literatures department in December 1998.

**Hertelendy Fellowship Awarded**

The Slavic Center is pleased to announce the winner of the 1999–2000 competition for the Hertelendy Graduate Fellowship in Hungarian Studies. Zsuzsanna Varga, a masters degree candidate at the Graduate School of Journalism, received funding for her research in journalism with an emphasis on Hungarian issues.

The fellowship is intended to support enrolled graduate students working in the general field of Hungarian studies and/or US-Hungarian or European- (including EU) Hungarian relations, all areas of history, language, culture, arts, society, politics, and institutions of Hungary. The fellowship is supported by a generous gift to the university by Martha and Paul Hertelendy.

**Calls for Proposals**

**The Drago and Danica Kosovac Prize**

The Drago and Danica Kosovac Prize is to be awarded for an outstanding thesis (senior or honors thesis) in the social sciences or humanities which researches some aspect of Serbian history or culture. It was established through a donation to the university by Colonel Don Kosovac, one of the Associates of the Slavic Center, in honor of his parents. Although the Drago and Danica Kosovac Prize was founded to provide assistance to undergraduates, at the same time it is meant to stimulate research in Serbian history and culture. Graduate research in these areas would thus be considered.

Any questions can be directed to Barbara Voytek, Executive Director of the Slavic Center, at (510) 643-6736 or bvoytke@socrates.berkeley.edu.

**The Peter N. Kujachich Endowment in Balkan Studies**

The College of Letters and Sciences and International and Area Studies invite proposals from Berkeley faculty and students for funding in 1999–2000 from the Peter N. Kujachich Endowment in Balkan Studies. Approximately $10–13,000 is available each year to support a variety of activities in research and instruction in Balkan studies, including colloquia, visiting professorships, acquisition of materials, and creative thought and writing in the social sciences, humanities, and arts.

Proposals, including budgets and timelines, should be submitted to Barbara Voytek, Executive Director, Center for Slavic and East European Studies, 361 Stephens Hall #2304, by January 30, 2000. Electronic or faxed proposals will not be accepted. Questions may be directed to the Center at (510) 642-3230 or csees@uclink4.berkeley.edu.
Fellowships Awarded

Summer 1999 Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) Fellowships
For Slavic and East European Studies

Edward Bodine (Education, UC San Diego): Advanced Slovak
Anne Dwyer (Slavic Languages and Literatures): Advanced Russian
Eben Friedman (Political Science, UC San Diego): Advanced Slovak
Kristen Ghodsee (Education): Beginning Bulgarian
Darya Kavitskaya (Linguistics): Intermediate Czech
Daniel Rolde (History): Advanced Czech
Christine Schick (Slavic Languages and Literatures): Advanced Czech
Michelle Viise (Slavic Languages and Literatures): Beginning Ukrainian

Academic Year 1999–2000 FLAS Fellowships
For Slavic and East European Studies

Mieczyslaw Boduszynski (Political Science): Intermediate Serbian
Lisa Conathan (Linguistics): Beginning Bulgarian
Cynthia Cox (Journalism): Advanced Russian
John Holmes (History): Advanced Russian
Brian McCook (History): Advanced Polish
Christine Schick (Slavic Languages and Literatures): Advanced Czech
Deborah Yalen (History): Intermediate Polish

Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies
Academic Year 1999–2000 Fellowships

Mike Carpenter (Political Science): Dissertation Fellowship
David Hoffman (Political Science): Dissertation Fellowship
Brian Kassof (History): Dissertation Fellowship
Daniel Kronenfeld (Political Science): Dissertation Fellowship
Jarrod Tanny (History): Graduate Training Fellowship
Jennifer Utrata (Sociology): Graduate Training Fellowship

Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies
Summer 1999 Fellowships

Galina Hale (Political Science): Summer Research Fellowship
Lise Morje Howard (Political Science): Summer Research Fellowship
Marc Howard (Political Science): Summer Research Fellowship

Mellon Sawyer Seminar Graduate Fellowship
For Academic Year 1999–2000

Jane Zavisca (Sociology)
Diasporas: Transnational Identity and the Politics of the Homeland

A conference at the University of California, Berkeley, organized by the William Saroyan Chair in Armenian Studies and the Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies

Cosponsored by the Department of History, International and Area Studies, the Center for Middle Eastern Studies, the Center for Slavic and East European Studies, and the Townsend Center for the Humanities.

Friday–Saturday, November 12–13, 1999
Closed workshop for scholars

Panel I: Thematic Issues

William Safran
Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Colorado, “Describing and Analyzing Diasporas: The Need for Conceptual Cleansing”

Discussant: Gerard Chaliand
Director, European Center for the Study of Conflicts at the Fondation pour les Etudes de Defense, Paris

Panel II: Middle Eastern Diasporas

Eliz Sanasarian
Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Southern California, “Iran: Diasporas and Identity in a Heterogeneous Society”

Bernard Wasserstein
President, Oxford Center for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, and Fellow of St. Cross College, Oxford, “Post-Diaspora Jewry and Post-Zionist Israel”

Yossi Shain
Goldman Professor of Government, Georgetown University, “Transitional Battle for Israel’s Jewish Identity”

Julie Peteet
Professor, Department of Anthropology, University of Louisville, “Points of Departure, Points of Return: The Palestinian Diaspora and Identity”

Amir Hassanpour
Assistant Professor, Department of Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations, University of Toronto, “Time, Space and Communication Technologies: State Formation Movements in the Kurdish Diasporas of the West”

Michel Laguerre
Professor, Department of African American Studies, UC

Panel III: Asian Diasporas

Aihwa Ong
Professor, Department of Anthropology, and Chair, Center of Southeast Asian Studies, UC Berkeley, “Multiple Publics, Multiple Homelands: The Divergent Politics of Diasporan Chinese”

Discussant: Beshara Doumani
Associate Professor, Department of History, UC Berkeley

Vinay Lal
Assistant Professor, Department of History, UC Los Angeles, “The Web of Politics of Diasporic Hinduism: The Case of North America”

Neferti Tadiar
Assistant Professor, Department of History of Consciousness, UC Santa Cruz, “Poetics of Filipina Export”

Discussant: David Palumbo-Liu
Associate Professor, Comparative Literature, and Director, Asian American Studies, Stanford University;

Panel IV: Diasporas in the Former Soviet Union and Europe

Rodgers Brubaker
Professor, Department of Sociology, UC Los Angeles, “Accidental Diasporas and ‘External Homelands’ in Central and Eastern Europe: Past and Present”

Sergei Arutiunov
Chairman, Department of Caucasian Studies, Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, Moscow, “The Impact of the New Caucasian Diaspora on Ethnocultural Relations in the Predominantly Ethnically Russian Provinces of Russia”

Hilary Pilkington
Senior Lecturer in Russian Politics and Society, Center for
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Russian and East European Studies, The University of Birmingham, England, “The ‘Other Russians’: Migration, Displacement and Identity in Post-Soviet Russia”

Levon Abrahamian
Research Professor, Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography, Academy of Sciences of Armenia, Yerevan, “Armenian Diaspora and Homeland: Divergence and Encounter”

Stephan H. Astourian

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

Sunday, November 14, 1999
Public conference

The Armenian Diaspora: Transnational Identity and the Politics of the Homeland

Levon Abrahamian
Research Professor, Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography, Academy of Sciences of Armenia, Yerevan, “Armenian Diaspora and Homeland: Divergence and Encounter”

Sergei Arutiunov
Chairman, Department of Caucasian Studies, Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, “The Impact of the New Caucasian Diaspora on Ethnocultural Relations in the Predominantly Ethnically Russian Provinces of Russia”

Stephan H. Astourian
William Saroyan Visiting Professor in Armenian Studies, Department of History, UC Berkeley, “Twentieth-Century Armenian Diaspora: Trends, Identity, and Politics”

Eliz Sanasarian
Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Southern California, “Diasporas and Identity in an Heterogeneous Society: The Case of Iranian Armenians”

Study Abroad in the Caucasus

Upper-level undergraduates and beginning graduate students now have the opportunity to attend a six-week study abroad program based in Yerevan, Armenia during summer 2000. Jointly sponsored by the University of California Education Abroad Program and the American University of Armenia, the program offers Caucasian studies with classroom instruction in English and travel to Azerbaijan and Georgia. Courses will be taught by UC faculty, and UC students may receive credit for completing the program. Students will reside in apartments or with families. The estimated program cost is $5,400. Applications may be obtained at the Berkeley Programs for Study Abroad, located at 160 Stephens Hall, or by calling the university-wide office at (805) 893-8346. Program information and applications may also be found at the UC Education Abroad Program’s Web site, www.ueeap.ucsb.edu. Applications must be postmarked by March 31, 2000.
In Memoriam

Stephen P. Dunn, 1928–1999

Researcher, translator, and poet—Stephen Dunn, an extraordinary scholar, passed away on June 4.

Stephen earned his Ph.D. in cultural anthropology in 1959 and immediately began as a research associate in Russian studies at Fordham University where he remained for four years. At this time he also began his career as a translator and an editor, editing Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology (later called Anthropology and Archaeology of Eurasia) and Soviet Sociology (later called Sociological Research) among other journals.

Stephen was a visiting professor at UC Berkeley in 1980, teaching about the peoples and cultures of the Soviet Union and was a research associate of the Slavic Center for many years. In addition to his work in Slavic and Soviet studies, Stephen was a poet. Two books of his poetry have been published.

In addition, Stephen published scholarly works on the cultural changes and the ethnography of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, too many to list here. Stephen and Ethel Dunn together dedicated considerable research to the Molokans, and they received funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities for this study, among other awards.

Ethel and Stephen founded the Highgate Road Social Science Research Station, of which he was the director of research. The research institution publishes a journal, first called The Station Relay and now named Russia and Her Neighbors. The Station publishes numerous volumes, including the Molokan Heritage Collection.

Though it is not mentioned on his lengthy curriculum vitae, and rightly so, Stephen’s disability cannot be overlooked. Cerebral palsy did not define his life nor his career, nor did it get in the way of his travels. Although he was confined to a wheelchair, Stephen attended campus events with his colleagues.

Through his contributions to the field and because of his dedication to scholarship, Stephen’s memory will remain.

Kathryn Herrick McCrodden, 1913–1999

The Slavic Center announces with great sadness the death of Kathryn McCrodden, a long-time friend and supporter of our Center.

Kay came to Berkeley in 1965 and began her career at the university after living in many places around the world. She worked as a reference librarian and as manager of the Women’s Faculty Club until her retirement in 1983. Retirement could not keep Kay away, as she truly loved the university, auditing courses and participating in many other campus activities.

Kay became an Associate of the Slavic Center when the group of supporters was founded in 1990, and she often came to conferences and lectures. She loved the arts, particularly music, and she was an accomplished musician and vocalist.

Kay’s petite stature and delicate style were somewhat deceptive, as she is known to have climbed Mt. Whitney in her mid-70s and to have gone paragliding at the age of 80. She was full of vigor and adventure, even when her health was declining. Kay passed away on July 27. We shall all miss her cheerfulness and her sunny smile.
Faculty and Student News

Victoria Frede, Ph.D. candidate in history, received an Individual Advanced Research Award from IREX to conduct eight months of research in St. Petersburg and Moscow on her dissertation project, “Atheism and Irreligion among Educated Russians in the Nineteenth Century.”

David Frick, professor of Slavic languages and literatures, received a 1999 US Fellowship from the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation for his project “Peoples, Confessions, and Languages in Seventeenth-Century Vilnius.”

Kristen Ghodsee, Ph.D. candidate in social and cultural studies at the Graduate School of Education, took part in the Southeastern Europe Area Studies Development Program, funded by IREX, in Bulgaria during summer 1999.

Charles Greer, Ph.D. candidate in Slavic languages and literatures, received an Individual Advanced Research Award from IREX to conduct nine months of research in Belgrade and Novi Sad on his dissertation project, “Standardization of the Serbian Lexicon in Vuk S. Karadzic’s Dictionaries.” Charles also received a dissertation fellowship from ACLS for this project.

Lise Morjé Howard, will spend AY 1999–2000 as a visiting scholar at Georgetown University and as a UC/IGCC Foreign Policy Studies Fellow in Washington, DC.


The UC Berkeley Chamber Chorus, under the direction of Marika Kuzma, traveled to Austria, Slovakia, Poland, Ukraine, and the Czech Republic in June 1999. Marika Kuzma, associate professor of music, is a specialist in Slavic choral music.

Ellen Langer, Ph.D. candidate in Slavic languages and literatures, received an Instructional Development Fellowship for AY 1999–2000 from the Berkeley Language Center for her project “Reading Strategies for the First Year Czech Classroom.”

Irina Paperno, professor of Slavic languages and literatures, is spending the fall semester at The Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in Humanities and Social Sciences. She was named a fellow for AY 1999–2000 but only accepted one semester.

D’Ann Penner (Ph.D. in history, 1995) received a grant from NCEEER for her research project “Electric Trains and Garden Plots: A Comparative Ethnography of Survival and Discontent in Penza and Rostov-on-Don.” She is currently an assistant professor with the Department of History at the University of Memphis.

John Randolph (Ph.D. in history, 1997) has accepted a position as fellow with the Introduction to Humanities Sequence, part of the Area One program at Stanford University.


Michael Zbyszynski, Ph.D. candidate in music composition, had his piece for string orchestra and percussion, “Beneath a Liquid Paper Sky,” performed by the Sinfonia Warszawa, conducted by Pawel Przytocki, on October 22, 1999 in Warsaw. The concert was part of a fortieth anniversary celebration of the Fulbright Program in Poland, and Michael received a 1998–99 Fulbright Research Grant to study at the Krakow Academy of Music with Professor Zbigniew Bujarski.
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 June 1 and December 1, 1999. 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.

**BENEFACTOR**

Harald Drews*

**SPONSORS**

Rozanne E. Noon, Ph.D.*
Janis C. Milstead
Anonymous*
Dorothy and Ronald H. Tyler*
Alex and Dorothy Vucinich*

**MEMBERS**

Tony Peter Bernabich
Jack DeBenedictis
Ilonka Martinka-Torres
Dmitry Sousin
Nina Zagaris

* gift of continuing 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.

**Members ($10 to $100).** Members of ASC receive monthly “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 uniquely designed, brilliant blue coffee mug which promotes 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 receive membership in the Robert Gordon Sproul Associates of the University. Benefits of the Sproul Associates includes invitations to two football luncheons and eligibility for membership in The Faculty Club.

*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.*

---

Send your check, made payable to the Regents of the University of California, to:

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

Name(s) ____________________________________________________
Address ____________________________________________________

City ___________________________ State __________ Zip ________
Home Business
Phone ____________ Phone __________

If your employer has a matching gift program, please print name of corporation below:

__________________________________________________________

___ I have made a contribution but wish to remain anonymous.
Fellowship Opportunities

**Slavic Center Travel Grants** provide limited travel support for faculty and Center-affiliated graduate students. Awards up to $300 are made to those presenting a paper at a meeting of a recognized scholarly organization. Awards are made on a first-come, first-served basis, and priority is given to those who did not receive Slavic Center funding in AY 98–99. Deadline: ongoing. To apply send request with budget to: Barbara Voytek, CSEES, U.C. Berkeley, 361 Stephens Hall # 2304, Berkeley CA 94720-2304.

**Association of American Geographers**
The Robert D. Hodgson Memorial Ph.D. Fund provides up to $500 for dissertation research to candidates preparing doctoral dissertations in geography. Applicants must have been an AAG member for at least one year at the time of application and should have completed all Ph.D. requirements except the dissertation by the term following award approval. Deadline: 12/31/99. Contact: Ehsan M. Khater, Association of American Geographers, 1710 16th St NW, Washington DC 20009-3198; Tel: (202) 234-1450; Fax: (202) 234-2744; gaia@aag.org; http://www.aag.org.

**Brookings Institution**
Three fellowships are available: Economic Studies, Foreign Policy Studies, and Governmental Studies Resident Fellowships. Each provides a $17,500 stipend to doctoral candidates whose research will benefit from access to the data, opportunities for interviewing, and consultation with senior staff members of the Brookings Institution and the Washington, D.C. area. Candidates must be nominated by their graduate department by December 15, 1999. Consult the Web site below for details on each opportunity. Deadline: 12/15/99 for nominations; 2/15/00 for applications. Contact: The Brookings Institution, 1775 Massachusetts Ave NW, Washington DC 20036; Tel: (202) 797-6000; Fax: (202) 797-6004; http://www.brook.edu/admin/fellowships.htm.

**Civic Education Project**
The Eastern Scholar Program provides funds to carry out projects, budget for purchasing/photocopying teaching materials, monthly salary for the ten months of teaching, and a stipend of $3,000. Applicants must be scholars from the region who have trained at universities in the West and are interested in working permanently in their home countries as full-time academics. Deadline: 3/1/00 but early application is encouraged.

The Visiting Lecturer Program, at the Yerevan Brjussov State Institute of Foreign Languages and Yerevan State University, provides a local-currency salary paid by host university, housing, round-trip airfare/ground transportation for visiting scholar and spouse, approximately $5,500 in stipend, health insurance, assistance with deferring student loans, and language instruction. This program places Western scholars for at least one academic year in positions at universities across the region to teach, supervise research, initiate outreach activities, and serve as a resource for the host university and department. Deadline: 2/15/00 but early application is encouraged.

Contact for both: Civic Education Project, Application Committee, 1140 Chapel St Ste 2A, New Haven CT 06511; Tel: (203) 781-0263; Fax: (203) 781-0265; cep@cep.yale.edu.

**International Research & Exchanges Board**
IREX Mongolian Language Training Program awards grants to US students with a developing interest in Mongolia to take part in a 12 week intensive summer language training program in Ulaanbaatar. Deadline: 1/14/00.

IREX Short-Term Travel Grants provide up to Ph.D.s for scholarly projects focusing on Central and Eastern Europe, Eurasia, and Mongolia. Grants are available for two months to individuals who do not require administrative support. Deadline: 2/1/00; 6/1/00.

Contact for both: IREX, 1616 H St NW, Washington DC 20006; Tel: (202) 628-8188; Fax: (202) 628-8189; irex@irex.org; http://www.irex.org.

**Open Society Institute**
The OSI Individual Project Fellowship (IPF) Program awards research fellowships to individuals in the US and abroad who have new ideas and innovative ways of approaching the problems that threaten the development of open societies. IPFs are awarded for applied research, policy studies, and program design. Fellows benefit from collective knowledge and resources of the Soros foundations network and are invited to share ideas at various OSI-sponsored events during the term of their fellowship. Deadline: 12/15/99; 07/15/00. Contact: Open Society Institute, Individual Project Fellowships Program-Applications, 400 W 59th St 3rd Fl, New York NY 10019; Tel: (212) 548-0119; fellows@sorosny.org; http://www.soros.org/individual_fellows/.

**UC Berkeley**
Mabelle McLeod Lewis Fellowships provide funding to advanced doctoral candidates in the humanities to complete a scholarly dissertation project on which significant progress has already been made. Deadline: 12/15/99. Contact: Graduate Fellowships Office, 318 Sproul Hall # 5900; Tel: 510-642-0672; http://www.grad.berkeley.edu/grad/.

**US Dept of Education / UC Berkeley**
Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) Academic Year fellowships allow US citizens and permanent residents to...
acquire a high level of foreign language competency. Awards to continuing students will be $12,000. Fellowships are awarded to students in modern foreign languages and area studies, with priority given to the humanities, social sciences, and professional fields. To be eligible for a FLAS in Russian, you must have completed 27 quarter or 18 semester units in the language, or have otherwise achieved the equivalent proficiency. Deadline: 2/18/00.

FLAS Summer Intensive Language Training fellowships cover the cost of the program and a $2,500 living stipend. Summer FLAS fellowships are awarded to graduate students for intensive language training (at least 120 class hours) for a period of one to two months. Deadline: 3/3/00

Contact for both: Graduate Fellowships Office, 318 Sproul Hall # 5900; Tel: (510) 642-0672; http://www.grad.berkeley.edu/grad/.

University of Michigan
The Advanced Study Center of the International Institute awards Pre-Doctoral Fellowships that provide up to $6,000 per semester for students from all over the globe enrolled in a pre-professional M.A. or doctoral program in any field. Fellows are expected to be in residence in Ann Arbor for the 2000–2001 academic year and be available for the center’s scheduled lectures and discussions.

The Advanced Study Center of the International Institute awards Post-Doctoral Fellowships that provide up to $36,000 for a one-year appointment. The fellow will be appointed both as an assistant professor in an affiliated department of the University of Michigan and as a postdoctoral scholar of the Advanced Study Center. The fellow is expected to teach one course in Fall 2000 and one in Spring 2001, and the appointment not tenure-track.

Deadline for both: 1/15/00. Contact: Advanced Study Center Fellowships, University of Michigan, The International Institute, 1080 University, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1106. Phone 734-764-2268. Fax 734-763-9154; www.umich.edu/~iinet/asc; asc.info@umich.edu.