Dear Friends:

First of all, I am happy to report that our new Executive Director, Jeff Pennington, has been with us since mid-January and that we are all delighted to have him. Jeff comes to us from Indiana University, Bloomington, where he served as assistant director/outreach coordinator of the European Union Center of Excellence, and, prior to this, of the Inner Asian and Uralic National Resource Center. Jeff has worked in non-profit management in Bucharest, Romania, and has international education experience in Eastern Europe and Japan. He holds a BS in Foreign Service from Georgetown University and an MA in East European Studies from Indiana University. He is fluent in Romanian and has a good command of Hungarian and Japanese. He is a PhD candidate at the Graduate School of International Cooperation Studies at Kobe University (Japan). His dissertation topic is Japanese-East European relations in the interwar period.

Our new BPS administrative assistant is Rebecca Richards. Rebecca graduated from Cal in December 2007 with a BA in Art History and Art Practice. If you have not met Jeff and Rebecca, please stop by to introduce yourselves and say hello.

We have several new visiting scholars:

Kruno Kardov is a visiting student researcher. He is a Ph.D. candidate in sociology at the University of Zagreb. His visit is sponsored by the Junior Faculty Development Program, administered by American Councils. He is interested in sociological theory and is working with Professor Victoria E. Bonnell while in Berkeley.

Olivera Komar, Vice Chair of the Department of Political Science at the Law Faculty, University of Montenegro, is a visiting scholar with ISEEES. Her visit is sponsored by American Councils’ JFDP program. She is researching the politics of European integration and is working with Professor Edward W. Walker while in Berkeley.

Maja Muhik is a visiting student researcher. She is a Ph.D. candidate at the Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Macedonia, and an instructor at the South East European University in Tetovo, Macedonia. Her visit is sponsored by American Councils’ JFDP program. She is researching topics in cultural anthropology, concentrating on theories of culture, gender, agency, subjectivity, power, and justice, and she is working with Professor Alexei Yurchak while in Berkeley.

Gohar Shahnazaryan, Assistant Professor of Sociology at the Yerevan State University of California, Berkeley
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University, is a visiting scholar from Armenia. Her visit is sponsored by the Faculty Development Fellowship Program of the Open Society Institute, and she is working on a course that would examine the impact of macro social and cultural transformations on personal identity, values, and attitudes.

The 32nd Annual Berkeley/Stanford Conference on Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies on Political Succession in Russia took place at Stanford on March 7, 2008. You can view the proceedings online (see pg. 17).

Here are some of the major events coming up:


7th Annual Peter N. Kujachich Lecture in Serbian and Montenegrin Studies: Eric Gordy, Department of Social Sciences, University College London, Narratives of Guilt and Responsibility: Making Sense of ‘Confronting the Past,’ April 17, 2008, 4 p.m., Faculty Club Heyns Room.

2008 SOYUZ Postsocialist Cultural Studies Conference, April 24-26, 2008; this year’s theme: Contemporary Critical Inquiry Through the Lens of Post-Socialism.

Annual teacher outreach conference, Russian Emigration in Historical Perspective: Russians in California, all day Saturday, May 3, 2008, Alumni House Toll Room.

West Coast Forum on Politics and Islam series: Pauline Jones Luong, Department of Political Science, Brown University, Rethinking the Resource Curse: Lessons from the Soviet Successor States, May 7, 2008.

In addition to these public events, we are proceeding with our Mellon Sawyer Seminar on Private Wealth and Public Power: Oligarchs, Tycoons, and Magnates in Comparative Perspective; and our Carnegie-supported Field Development Project will bring four more Russian scholars to Berkeley for a two-week visit. Be sure to check our website for updates to the calendar (socrates.berkeley.edu/~iseees/).

Finally, I would like to use this opportunity to thank the Associates of the Slavic Center. We are working hard to set up a permanent endowment to help our graduate students. We are very grateful to all of you for your help.

Yuri Slezkine
ISEEES Director
Professor of History

Remarks at Barbara Voytek’s Retirement Party, December 13, Victoria E. Bonnell

Professor in the Department of Sociology UC Berkeley, and former Director of the Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies (1994-2004)

We’ve come together today to express our gratitude to Barbara Voytek who will be retiring in a few weeks and to wish her happiness in her life after Berkeley. It’s a bittersweet occasion: we celebrate Barbara and yet we already miss her.

Everyone in this room has been touched in some way by Barbara. She has been part of the Berkeley community for about thirty years—first as a graduate student in anthropology, where she received her Ph.D. in 1985, and then, beginning in 1989, as Executive Director of the Center for Slavic and East European Studies (which became the Institute in 2000). Indeed, over the past three decades Barbara was away from Berkeley for only four years when she was at Stanford directing their Center for Russian and East European Studies and teaching in the anthropology department.

I very much enjoyed working closely with Barbara for ten years, when I served as faculty director of the institute. She never ceased to amaze me. Some people are what I would call one or two note people—they have a couple of areas in which they excel. Then there are those like Barbara who are a whole symphony orchestra unto themselves—they have wide ranging competence, multiple talents, and they are equally at home among the violinists, the French horn players, and the percussionists.

I’d like to use this opportunity to express my admiration for Barbara’s extraordinary versatility and her many accomplishments. We have all seen how she works her magic at the Institute. With grace, imagination, a lively intellect, and practical sense, Barbara has, for eighteen years, presided over the day-to-day operations of the Institute and helped turn it into a model research unit on this campus.

Her roles have been varied and she has somehow managed to juggle many balls in the air. Like Karl Marx’s visionary person under full communism who would hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, and criticize after dinner, Barbara manages to do many different things and to move from one task to another effortlessly (or at least she makes it seem that way).
As an administrator, Barbara is second to none: she runs a tight ship, is masterful in dealing with personnel and other matters, she keeps a close watch on the budget, and she knows the university bureaucracy inside out. She presides over the National Resource Center funded by a Title VI and the FLAS fellowships for graduate students, which is a monumental task—and thanks to her, we have continued to receive generous funding from these sources. Barbara also orchestrates bag lunches, lecture series, conferences, and our newsletter which has expanded under her supervision and now includes substantive articles.

It would be admirable for one person to register all of these achievements, but Barbara does so much more. She is also a community builder, someone with prodigious interpersonal skills. Barbara has been responsible, more than anyone else, for infusing everything we do with civility and compassion. She has inspired uncommon loyalty from ISEEES staff members; faculty have great affection and esteem for her; she has forged long term bonds with members of the community; graduate and undergraduate students are grateful for her advice and assistance; she goes out of her way to help visiting scholars; she has earned a sterling reputation in many different departments and units; and she brings charm and dignity to encounters with visitors to the campus.

The fact is she has given our institute a human face. She can be counted on to inquire about those who are ill, to send gifts for happy occasions, condolences and flowers for sad ones. Her pitch—to continue my musical metaphor—has always been perfect.

What you may not realize is that while doing all of this, Barbara has also actively pursued a career as a scholar, with a focus on archeology. She has a BA in anthropology from Radcliffe College and her doctoral dissertation, “The Exploitation of Lithic Resources in Neolithic Southeast Europe,” provided a point of departure for future excavations in Yugoslavia, Romania, Hungary, and Italy. She is the author or coauthor of 36 articles in the field of East and Southeast European and Mediterranean prehistory, and her work deals with topics such as hunter-gatherers and early food-producers, prehistoric economics, material culture studies, and lithic studies.

Ever since I have known her, Barbara has gone off periodically to distant places to conduct archeological research. These trips have been supported by a long series of grants (since 1989, she has been the recipient of twelve grants—some of them collaborative and multi-year). For ten years she was co-director of a joint US-Italian project with the University of Venice. And Barbara brings to everything she does an extensive knowledge of languages: Serbian/Croatian and Italian, in which she is fluent, followed by French and German and a working knowledge of Bulgarian, Romanian, and Czech. Such linguistic range will be an asset in the years to come, since Barbara is planning to spend part of the time in Europe, especially in Italy, where she and her husband own a home.

We will miss you, Barbara. Under your stewardship, the Slavic Center of 1989 has expanded from a rather modest place into the exuberant institute we have in 2007. An administrator in the morning, a community-builder in the afternoon, a scholar in the evening, and an opera goer after dinner—you have been a remarkable presence on the campus, a gift to us all. And we wish you many joyful and fulfilling years to come.

Barbara Voytek (second on the left) saying goodbye to ISEEES Staff
Kristian Atland is a visiting student researcher with ISEEES this academic year. His visit is sponsored by a Fulbright grant as well as support from Norwegian Defense Research Institute. He will work here on his doctorate project, researching changes in Soviet/Russian security and defense policy toward the European Arctic.

Nina Bagdasarova, Associate Professor at the Kyrgyz Russian Slavic University, is a visiting scholar at ISEEES this year. Her visit is sponsored by a Fulbright grant, and she will conduct research on changes within Kyrgyzstan's political discourse after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Rustam Burnashev, Associate Professor at the Ablai Khan Kazakh University of World Languages and International Relations, Kazakhstan, is a visiting scholar with ISEEES this spring. His visit is sponsored by the Open Society Institute, and he will conduct research on post-communist political systems.

Kruno Kardov is a visiting student researcher with ISEEES this spring. He is currently a Ph.D. candidate in sociology at the University of Zagreb. His visit is sponsored by American Councils’ JFDP program. While in Berkeley, he will conduct sociological theory research and work on developing teaching strategies.

Olivera Komar, Vice Chair of the Department of Political Science at the Law Faculty, University of Montenegro, is a visiting scholar with ISEEES this spring. Her visit is sponsored by American Councils’ JFDP program. She will be researching the politics of European integration during her visit.

Maja Muhik is a visiting student researcher with ISEEES this spring. She is currently a Ph.D. candidate at the Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Macedonia, and an instructor at the South East European University in Tetovo, Macedonia. Her visit is sponsored by American Councils’ JFDP program. While in Berkeley, she will be researching topics in cultural anthropology, concentrating on theories of culture, gender, agency, subjectivity, power, and justice.

Ferenc Raj is a visiting scholar with ISEEES this academic year, during which he will continue his research in Hungarian studies. He holds a Ph.D. in Near Eastern and Judaic Studies and serves as Senior Rabbi of Congregation Beth El in Berkeley.

Gohar Shahnazaryan, Assistant Professor of Sociology at the Yerevan State University, Armenia, is a visiting scholar with ISEEES this spring. Her visit is sponsored by the Open Society Institute, and she will use her time at Berkeley to develop a course that would examine the impact of macro social and cultural transformations on the micro level, like transformation of identity, values, and attitudes.

Izaly Zemtsovsky is a visiting scholar at Berkeley this year, based at ISEEES. He is an ethnomusicologist and folklorist specializing in the cultures of Eurasia. He will research articles on the philosophy of music and ethnomusicology.

### CASE-UC Berkeley Field Project: Spring 2008

The Berkeley Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies is pleased to present our newest CASE scholars arriving from Russia on April 6 for a two-week stay. Our CASE scholars are Polina Golovatina, Oxana Karnauchova, Elvira Kaminskaya, and Artem Lukin. Polina is from Ekaterinburg, where she is a lecturer in the faculty of International Relations at Ural State University. Oxana is from Rostov-on-Don. She is an assistant professor in the Department of Philosophy and Cultural Studies, Southern Federal University. Elvira is an associate professor at Novgorod State University. Artem is an associate professor in the Department of International Relations, Far Eastern National University, Vladivostok. Five graduate students will be working with them. Theocharis Grigoriadis is paired with Artem, Alex Beliaev with Elvira, Sarah Garding and Susanne Wengle with Polina, and Cindy Huang will be working with Oxana. The CASE scholars will primarily be working on academic projects but also spend time getting to know California through events such as tours of San Francisco and the Marin Headlands.
In June of 1957, the Center for Slavic Studies was established at Berkeley under the purview of the Institute of International Studies. The establishment of this center signified an important transition for Slavic Studies at Berkeley, for the center which came into being at this time was not a new creation but was rather the direct descendent of an institute which had been in existence for nearly a decade. The transition which occurred in 1957 was the result of several different factors, most important among them being the death of Robert J. Kerner, the director of the Institute of Slavic Studies, on November 29, 1956; the political maneuvering and restructuring necessitated by the competition amongst universities for private funding; and the general trend towards the decentralization of the University of California, which began with the establishment of the Berkeley and Los Angeles Chancellorships in 1951. This transition was also symbolic of the broader shift away from the Red Scare mentality of the McCarthy era, of which Director Kerner was an apt representative, towards a more open understanding of the Soviet Union. This was an era that would see the establishment of the US-Soviet student exchange program and other such efforts at mutual conciliation. In this new era, marked by a more interdisciplinary, less ideological approach to understanding the outside world, Kerner and his institute were an anachronism.

Discussions about the foundation of an Institute for Slavic Studies began in 1947 and were probably prompted by Professor Robert Kerner of the History Department. In a letter from University Vice-President Monroe Deutsch to President Sproul dated January 1947, Deutsch refers to a conversation which he had recently had with Professor Kerner in which they had discussed the possibility of applying for funds from the Rockefeller Foundation. Deutsch goes on to suggest the possibility of using these funds to found an “Oriental and Slavic Institute.” It is not surprising that they would look to funds from a private philanthropy like the Rockefeller Foundation: in the years following the end of the Second World War there was “a growing disposition on the part of private philanthropies like the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation” and the Ford Foundation to provide funding to American universities for international area studies.

The fear that, in the aftermath of World War II, the United States might once again return to the isolationist stance it had held in the aftermath of the First World War prompted the increased financing of foreign area studies in American universities by concerned interests hoping to cultivate a more internationalist mentality amongst the American populace. In such an environment, men like Deutsch, Kerner, and Sproul had good reason to expect that the Rockefeller Foundation, one of the primary private backers of education since the 1930s, would look favorably upon a request for the funding of an Institute of Slavic Studies.

In June 1947, President Sproul sent “an appeal for aid in the field of Slavic studies” to the Rockefeller Foundation. In this appeal, Sproul cited “the long and distinguished history” of Slavic studies at Berkeley, beginning with the appointment of Berkeley’s first Slavic scholar, Dr. George R. Noyes, in 1901. After laying out the strengths of Berkeley’s Slavic programs, Sproul admitted to certain gaps in “what [would otherwise] be regarded as fairly complete studies in reference to Slavic lands and their peoples.” Ultimately, Sproul requested approximately $93,000 annually over the course of five years to strengthen Berkeley’s Slavic program and to construct a Slavic Institute.

The Rockefeller Foundation, however, had its own agenda. The goals of the Foundation were more directed towards the development of young American scholars, in order to ensure that the University staffs and government corridors of the future might be the province of a more homogenous and home-grown brand of scholars. It expressed concern over the fact that all of the items on Sproul’s agenda were “secondary to getting the necessary leadership,” a fact which seemed to present certain complications considering the near “famine of men to meet requirements” in Slavic studies at that time. The Foundation was also concerned that their funds might be used to lure scholars away from existing programs, creating competition and tension within the field. They worried that, in order to avoid recruiting American scholars from existing institutions, the University might “look to the employment of foreign scholars,” a development that “from the Foundation’s point of view” was undesirable. It was, therefore, necessary that the University of California alter its agenda.

Accordingly, Sproul sent an amended request for funds to the Foundation in November 1947, in which he asked for $100,000 to be distributed over five years for the purpose of establishing an “all-university ‘Graduate Institute of Slavic Studies’ headed by a director.” The request acknowledged the need to cultivate young American scholars as “the task to which [the University] should immediately turn [its] hand,”
and promised to use the funds primarily for this purpose.\textsuperscript{10} This amended request for funds was approved in December 1947.\textsuperscript{11} The following September, Sproul officially asked Professor Kerner to serve as the Institute’s Director,\textsuperscript{12} in spite of “certain rough edges” which Sproul admitted Kerner to have in a letter to the Rockefeller Foundation informing the Foundation of Kerner’s directorship.

At this point in the narrative it is appropriate to examine more closely the person of Robert Kerner because his personality had a great deal to do with the ultimate closure of the Institute and the subsequent foundation of the Slavic Center. Certain character traits of Kerner were a source of great tension, inside the Institute itself and in the various departments with which the Institute was affiliated. It seems that Kerner’s personal ambition and his use of the Institute to further personal goals at variance with the stated objectives of the Rockefeller Foundation may have been an important reason behind subsequent difficulties the Institute faced in receiving further funding.

Kerner had an established reputation for his aggressive tactics in trying to place his own students in various academic and government programs. Professor Raymond Fisher of UCLA, a former graduate student of Kerner, claimed that Kerner greatly desired to become known as “the progenitor of a school of scholars.”\textsuperscript{13} While Fisher acknowledged that Kerner could often be “generous and gracious” in his efforts to promote himself and his students, he was often “crude and tactless.” Fisher further alleged that Kerner’s “conceit was enormous, sometimes subtle, but too often blatant.”\textsuperscript{14}

Kerner’s abrasive personality soured relations between him and his colleagues, as can be seen in an anecdote about a graduate applicant to Berkeley being given a tour of the campus by the dean of the business school. When they came across Kerner sitting at a table, the dean remarked “I should introduce you to Professor Kerner, but he charges five dollars for the honor he bestows upon anyone who shakes his hand.” Such a remark is certainly “indicative of [Kerner’s] reputation on campus” and did not help him to foster relations between the Institute and the various departments during his tenure as director.\textsuperscript{15}

In 1951, Dean Davis of the College of Letters and Sciences expressed frustration with the Institute over what some departments perceived to be “pressure to add to their staffs members not of their own choosing.” The Institute was acting as a “dictator not merely of research programs in the departmental fields represented, but in certain unfortunate cases of course programs as well.” It seemed to Davis that there was “an ambitious program” by the Institute to make itself semi-independent over the research and graduate programs in its field and by indirect means to control undergraduate preparation.\textsuperscript{16}

Clearly, after barely three years of existence, the Institute under Kerner’s direction had failed to cultivate a harmonious relationship between itself and the various departments with which it was affiliated. A little more than three years later, Woodbridge Bingham, director of the Institute of East Asian Studies and a member of the Slavic Institute’s advisory board, expressed concern to Chancellor Kerr over the “high degree of demoralization among faculty and students in the Slavic field” on the Berkeley campus. Bingham noted the failure of the Institute to receive a portion of the grants being offered to other Slavic institutions, and the “transfer of graduate students to other institutions after a short period of work” with the Institute at Berkeley. He ultimately laid the blame at the feet of Kerner, referring to the kind of leadership which he exercised as a great source of difficulty.\textsuperscript{17} That students chose to leave the Institute because of Kerner’s leadership is not surprising considering an anecdote recounted by Professor Nicholas Riasanovsky, in which a big bruiser of a football player was reduced to tears by Kerner when the latter accused him in front of the entire classroom of being a communist spy tasked with monitoring him.\textsuperscript{18}

According to Professor Charles Jelavich, who was to succeed Kerner as the Director of the Slavic Center in its new embodiment in 1957, “Kerner was more or less normal until the [communist] coup in Czechoslovakia” in February of 1948.\textsuperscript{19} Kerner descended from a prominent Czech family and was even placed in charge of Political Intelligence for Central Europe on the Colonel House Inquiry in the aftermath of WWII, providing research and advocating for the creation of a Czechoslovak state.\textsuperscript{20} Jelavich claimed that the coup in Czechoslovakia crushed Kerner, and from that point on he seems to have fallen into an increasingly paranoid state which manifested itself in a sort of anti-communist hysteria.

In the early 1950s, Kerner began to give lectures to such organizations as the Commonwealth Club of California, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the East Bay Children’s Hospital Forum, and other local groups, in which, portraying himself as an expert on the subject due to his status as Director of the Institute, he portrayed various doomsday scenarios and predicted that the outbreak of WWII was not more than five years off. Using such provocative titles as “Time is on the Side of Moscow,” “Soviet Russia Against the World,” and “The Gathering Storm Along the Iron Curtain,” these speeches seem to have all been derived from one master copy, repeatedly employing stock phrases and themes, all confidently predicting America’s doom if it failed to rapidly increase war production and prepare for an imminent showdown with the Soviets. Kerner even used the same doomsday rhetoric in a proposed five-year budget which he sent to the Rockefeller Foundation in 1951, hoping to receive more funding. This budget appeal, which asked for five hundred thousand dollars over five years, described the need for “fundamental research in Slavic Studies” as an issue of survival for America and the rest of the free world.\textsuperscript{21}

Ultimately, it seems that Kerner’s vision for the Institute had more to do with influencing government policy than
with training up young scholars and thereby fulfilling the initial mandate of the Rockefeller Foundation. His “service on the Colonel House Peace Commission was something that contributed to his self-esteem and [seems to have been much of] the basis for his reputation as a commentator on world affairs.” 22 Due to the increasing tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union in the aftermath of WWII, Kerner apparently entertained the hope that he would once again be called upon to serve as an advisor to the government, a hope which was no doubt enhanced by his stature as Director of the Slavic Institute at Berkeley. His efforts to market himself to the various branches of government and military intelligence included the diligent mailing of his papers and speeches to such individuals as Hilten Koetter, Director of Naval Intelligence23, and Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. In late August of 1954, Kerner even made several efforts to obtain a sit-down meeting with Dulles for certain undisclosed reasons, but was unable to do so as Dulles was out of town for an extended period.24

While Kerner was busy promoting himself and the Institute as essential resources in the growing conflict with the Soviet Union, he seems to have done little to pursue the stated goals of the Rockefeller Foundation, namely the training of young American students. The $100,000 awarded to the University of California had been for the express purpose of training young American scholars in Slavic studies by appointing them to temporary research and faculty positions, as well as providing them with funds for travel and research. “Of the seven appointments made by the Institute, in the first year...only one, a research assistantship, went to a young American scholar.” 25 Furthermore, by 1951, no arrangements had been made for young scholars to “travel abroad or to other institutions.” 26 It seems that the Rockefeller Foundation even began to question whether the Institute had “contravened the conditions and purposes of the grant.” 27 Needless to say, Kerner’s 1951 appeal to the Foundation for a further $500,000 was unsuccessful; nor was the Institute, as constituted prior to 1957, ever to receive additional funding from any other organization. After the conclusion of the Rockefeller grant on December 31, 195328, the Institute received all of its funding from the budget of the University of California.

While the preceding portrayal of the Slavic Institute at Berkeley may appear somewhat bleak, it should be noted that the Institute had managed to develop prestige in the field. According to the Social Sciences Research Council, during the Institute’s first five years, it “led the Russian Institute at Columbia in doctorates” conferred.29 Furthermore, the editor of the Russian Review credited the Institute with achieving a “better balance between a pre-revolutionary and Soviet Russia, and between Soviet theory and practice, in research as well as teaching.” 30 It is reasonable to assume that the fact that the Institute failed to receive additional funding must, in no small degree, have been due to Kerner. Indeed, even before Kerner’s failure to implement the terms of the grant, the Rockefeller Foundation had indicated that it was “not favorable to the appointment of Kerner as Director.” 29 It is therefore not surprising that, even prior to Kerner’s death, discussions were underway about the approach of his retirement, which was forecast to be sometime in 1957, and about the reorganization of the Institute once he was gone.30

Within one week of Kerner’s somewhat unexpected death in November 1956 after a few short weeks of illness, preparations were already underway to change the status of the Institute to that of an area center under the purview of the Institute of International Studies.31 There were several reasons for doing so: one important factor was the movement towards the decentralization of the University of California, which had been underway since 1951. During the 1940s, the rapid growth of the University, and the increasing influence and size of campuses such as UCLA, had led to “a rising attack on the high degree of centralization” in the University of California, “initiated by some powerful deans at UCLA” as well as “some of the Southern regents.” 32

These tensions ultimately resulted in the creation of two chancellorships in March 1951: one with administrative oversight over UCLA and the other, given to Clark Kerr, charged with the administration of the Berkeley campus. Up until this time, the other schools in the UC system had been viewed as something akin to extension campuses and were administered by the University President, whose office was located at Berkeley. The Institute of Slavic Studies had, likewise, been given administrative authority over Slavic studies in the entire UC system, not just on the Berkeley campus. Thus, upon the death of Kerner, high priority was given by Chancellor Kerr and others to restrict the semi-autonomy of the Institute and to bring it under the direct supervision of the Berkeley campus.

The Institute of International Studies, the foundation of which Chancellor Kerr had ardently championed in 1955, was the logical place to house the new Slavic Institute. Area Studies had arisen during World War II “to meet the needs of the armed services and occupational authorities for personnel to function in little known regions with cultures very different from that of the United States.” The Social Science Research Council considered the objectives of area studies to include the development of a “universal social science” which would foster understanding of different cultures by emphasizing similarities.33 Such intellectual open-mindedness had been difficult to achieve in the hysterical climate of the McCarthy era. The Institute of International Studies had been formed for the express purpose of fostering interdisciplinary cooperation in area studies by limiting the competition for funding between the separate institutes on campus and by overseeing the relationships between these institutes and the various faculties with which they were involved.32 It was hoped that by presenting a united front in international studies, the
Berkeley campus would establish itself as a leader in the field and thereby attract more funding for research. Other institutes, such as the former Institute of East Asiatic Studies and the former Bureau of International Relations, had already been reconstituted as centers under the Institute of International Studies, and it was only a matter of course that the Slavic Institute become a center as well.

Thus, in June of 1957, the Institute of Slavic Studies was officially disestablished, and a new Center for Slavic Studies was formed under the Chairmanship of Professor Charles Jelavich of the History Department. This center, albeit in a position of reduced authority and autonomy, was arguably better off in its new incarnation. It was further removed from the pressures of departmental politics and in-fighting, as well as from the burden posed by the personal ambitions and agendas of a powerful director. The Center entered a new era of cooperation with its colleagues in international studies, most notably with the Center for Chinese Studies with whom, for a period of time, they conducted monthly faculty seminars which explored the issues of comparative communism in their two regions of study.  

In conclusion, it should be noted that Chancellor Kerr and the other proponents of the Institute of International Studies were not disappointed in their expectation that such an institute would attract funding. Kerr, who has been described as a master comprehender and interpreter of institutions, speculated in 1954 that an Institute of International Studies would “be able to attract a good deal of money from the Ford Foundation.” In October of 1957, the Institute received $350,000 from the Ford Foundation. In July 1960 the University of California received a block grant of $4,000,000 from the Ford Foundation for the development of non-Western studies, and in 1964 another $7,000,000 was awarded for this purpose.

Thus, in 1957, the University of California stood upon the cusp of a new era for international studies. As a newly constituted area center, the Center for Slavic Studies stood perfectly poised to reap the benefits of the coming largesse, and to thereby advance the cause of scholarship and understanding about the Slavic and non-Slavic peoples of Russia and Eastern Europe. The new Slavic Center represented a movement out of the shadows of the ideologically saturated McCarthy era, personified by Robert Kerner, towards an era of broader interdisciplinary research and a more intellectually driven analysis of the Soviet Union and the Communist world.

Endnotes

1 University of California: In Memoriam: April, 1958.
3 Letter from Monroe E. Deutsch to President Sproul: January 14, 1947. CU-5; Box 27; Folder 11.
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The Annual Colin Miller Memorial Lecture honors the memory of a man who was devoted to the Center for Slavic and East European Studies (as ISEEES was called until Fall 2003). After more than twenty years as a journalist and as a radio and television producer, Colin Miller came to Berkeley and audited a variety of courses on Soviet history, politics, and foreign policy, particularly in the area of Soviet-American relations. His interest in the field of Slavic, East European, and Soviet studies drew the attention of the Chancellor of UC Berkeley, who appointed him a member of the Center’s Executive Committee. Upon Miller’s death in 1983, his widow, Elsa Miller, established an endowment in his memory, administered by ISEEES. The endowment funds an annual lecture given by a respected scholar in the field of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies. Elsa Miller passed away in 1997. Upon her death, ISEEES renamed the endowment the Colin and Elsa Miller Endowment.

Since 1984, when the series was inaugurated, the Colin Miller Memorial Lecture has become an extremely well known, well attended, and eagerly anticipated event in the life of our Institute, the University of California as a whole, and the field of Russian and East European studies in this country and beyond. We have had academics, journalists, and politicians lecture on a wide variety of topics. We have been able to introduce our students, colleagues, and affiliates to some of the best specialists on what is still one of the most fascinating and volatile parts of the world. We are very proud to have been able to continue successfully what was started over 20 years ago. This year’s Colin Miller Memorial Lecture was delivered by the celebrated Russian music critic and radio personality, Artemy Troitsky.

Unfortunately, however, we may not be able to keep doing this at the same level for much longer. The Colin and Elsa Miller Endowment, which supports the annual lecture, is not very large. The return is $1,500 to $1,600 a year. The costs attached to the event are growing faster than the principal of the endowment, and soon we will not be able to bring top people to Berkeley anymore.

We would, therefore, like to attempt to raise additional funds in an effort to preserve this valuable tradition. Doubling the endowment would be ideal, but even half of that would go a long way toward creating an endowment that would allow us to fund one successful lecture a year by a distinguished speaker (travel, hotel, reception, dinner, and a modest honorarium). We have been able to progress toward this goal with a generous gift from Elsa Miller’s daughter. Now, we are asking those of you who remember this fine man and friend of the Institute to consider making a donation. Please help us continue the great tradition that is the Annual Colin Miller Memorial Lecture.

---

Campaign for the Colin and Elsa Miller Endowment Fund

The XXII Annual Colin Miller Memorial Lecture
Friday, February 22, 2008
Artemy Troitsky, Celebrated Russian DJ, Music Critic, and Cultural Commentator

Between Putin and Piracy: Russian Pop and the Music Industry in the 21st Century
ISEEES acknowledges with sincere appreciation the following individuals who have contributed to the annual giving program, the Associates of the Slavic Center, between December 1, 2007 and March 20, 2008.

**BeneFACTORS**
Charles Jelavich*

**SPONSORS**
Anonymous*
Paul Belasky*
Laurie Bernstein*
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Contagious, Incurable, or Deconstructed?
The Myth of Grunwald/Tannenberg in Polish and German Collective Identity
Mark Aaron Keck-Szajbel
Ph.D. Candidate in History at the University of California, Berkeley

Two years ago, representatives of six European embassies signed a letter of intent to build a "World Peace Monument." While the smorgasbord of countries was relatively unique – members from Poland, Lithuania, Belarus, Romania, Moldavia, and Germany signed the letter – the date of commemoration was even more peculiar. The letter of intent was signed on the 596th anniversary of the Battle of Grunwald/Tannenberg; the monument was to be built for the 600th anniversary. It was in 1410 that Polish-Lithuanian forces at Grunwald/Tannenberg defeated the Deutsche Ritterorden, or Teutonic Order. How is it possible to commemorate a medieval battle through a world peace monument, and why do these countries feel it necessary to do so?1

While historical events are significant in the creation of a national collective memory, the recent exhibition "The Contagious Middle-Ages," hosted in December 2007 by ISEEES and the Townsend Center for Humanities in UC Berkeley, has reaffirmed the notion that myths and stories surrounding historical events play even more of a crucial role in shaping collective memory.2 Grunwald/Tannenberg (or Zalgiris in Lithuanian) – like the nationality of Matthias Corvinus, or the Battle of Kosovo Polje – is shrouded in myths and stories not directly related with the historical event per se. While the exhibit focused on a renewed interest in the medieval past in post-socialist countries, I would like to show how the polemical attempts at Stimmungsführung (or establishment) between Germany and Poland regarding Grunwald/Tannenberg are not only very present, but, indeed, span almost two centuries. I would additionally like to contest historian Robert Traba’s thesis that Grunwald/Tannenberg is now “in an era of deconstruction.”3 In doing so, I will show not only how the myth has come to belong to both German and Polish collective memories, but also ask if the Grunwald/Tannenberg myth should belong to national collective memories in the age of the European Union. I will examine the motives that led to the capitalization on the myth of Grunwald/Tannenberg in each respective time, and I will close by examining whether a community can celebrate the past without participating in politics.

Grunwald/Tannenberg has a long history, dating back to the invitation extended to the Teutonic Order by Polish Duke Conrad of Masovia in the thirteenth century. The Teutonic Order was summoned in order to protect areas of the Kingdom of Poland and, more importantly, to conquer the heathen Prussians. It was at that time a legal and legitimate invitation. Over two centuries of residence, however, the Teutonic Order not only extended their holdings along the Baltic, they also created a monastic state, effectively fraying all ties to the Kingdom of Poland by placing themselves under tutelage of the pope (an act which caused their expulsion from Transylvania in 1224). The Lithuanian-Polish dynastic union of 1385, while not primarily aimed against the Order, made a conflict of interest imminent due to the Order’s territorial expansion. When Grand Duke of Lithuania Jogaila was crowned King of Poland (as Władysław I Jagiełło), not only did the union make Jagiello the single most powerful monarch in East-Central Europe, it also effectively nullified the raison d’être of the Order, since Jagiello accepted Christianity, thus eliminating the ‘heathen threat’ in the East. The Teutonic Order declared war in May of 1409 against King Jagiello due to a contested fortress on the river Notec and in order to prevent Jagiello from gaining access to the Baltic Sea. Finally the stage was set for the Battle of Grunwald/Tannenberg: on July 15, 1410, Polish-Lithuanian forces with their 20,000 men defeated the Order’s forces of 15,000. Grand master Ulrich von Jungingen fell in the battle, along with the majority of the knights represented on the field. The war officially ended in 1411 with the First Thorner Peace. Despite the decisive defeat, the Order fell only symbolically: the battle did not lead to territorial loss, although it did require the payment of 100,000 Marks in Bohemian coins to the besieging party.

The Battle of Grunwald/Tannenberg came into the Polish collective memory almost immediately. In the fifteenth century Grunwald/Tannenberg would become the theme of inscenation in books and epics. Polish historian and national hero, Jan Długosz, wrote in his chronicle Annales seu cronicae Regni Poloniae that Polish-Lithuanian soldiers sang the pseudo-national anthem, Bogurodzica, at the battle. Historians also enunciated the fact that Lithuania and Poland had, in contrast to the violent means used by the Teutonic Order, voluntarily united in 1410. Hence, Grunwald/Tannenberg became a myth symbolizing Polish benevolent power, especially given the humble settlement after the victory, while at the same time representing their generosity and right-to-be in Central Europe.4

The Battle of Grunwald/Tannenberg, as well as the Teutonic Order, first became crucial in the German collective memory in the late eighteenth century, at the time of Prussian nation-building, and concurrent with Poland’s partition between the Russian, Austrian, and Prussian Empires. Before that time, Grunwald/Tannenberg,
if remembered at all, would have most likely been recalled by Prussians as a positive event, when the inhabitants of Gdańsk, Toruń, and Elblag celebrated the fall of the oppressive Teutonic Knights and the eventual coup d’État by Albrecht von Brandenburg in 1525, who stripped the power of the ecclesiastical state and converted Prussia into a worldly principality.5

But as Prussia claimed substantial parts of Poland, it became crucial for Germans to have ostensibly legitimate claims to the land they held. The Grunwald/Tannenberg story, if worded correctly, fit the mold of such Prussian narratives perfectly. German nationalists warranted their control over areas of former Poland by claiming that they were giving the Poles culture and Ordnung, just as the Teutonic Knights had attempted to do 500 years previously. The Order was noble, christianizing, and German; the "barbaric deeds" of Jagiello in the fifteenth century would come to be seen as a rite of passage to "civilize" all Slavic peoples – that motley crew who, as Bismarck said, "committed the crime of conquest a hundredfold… [pursuing] Polonization by fire and sword" after the Battle of Grunwald/Tannenberg.6 German historians wanted to see the Order as a model, a "precursor of the Prussian state, the German Empire," and, as Wolfgang Wippermann writes, "of the National Socialist ‘Third Reich.’"7

Historical and political myths are ambivalent. As Yves Bizeul writes, they are used not only to deceive people, but also as a "heuristic and ethical instrument, in order to understand and better the world." He goes on to say that a myth "is a symbolic form… rooted in practical life forms," which usually have "a historical background." Grunwald/Tannenberg functions as a myth both in the German and Polish collective identity, and it has provided a lens through which each respective society has been able to perceive its own righteousness.8 What makes the myth so volatile is that its "historical background" requires that both Germans and Poles project the other as an enemy, and also that it entails territorial claims. Furthermore, since both German and Polish nationalists began to competitively use the myth of Grunwald/Tannenberg in their national narratives, it seems as if no amount of time or political cool-down could erase the huge symbolic value of the battle. Hence, during the course of the nineteenth century, Poles and Germans consistently attempted to 'out-do' each other in mythologizing the Battle of Grunwald/Tannenberg.

In Poland, literary and artistic works provided Poles with the cultural capital through which they were then able to identify themselves outside of the framework of foreign hegemony. In 1855, historian Karl Szajnocha published his widely read work Jadwiga i Jagiełło 1374 do 1413. Shortly after, in 1878, the most significant Polish artist of the time, Jan Matejko, immortalized the battle and exhibited his work in cultural centers across the Polish lands (dia. 1). Perhaps the final, conclusive description of the Polish Battle of Grunwald/Tannenberg came at the turn of the century, when the Nobel Prize winning author Henryk Sienkiewicz wrote his epic, Krzyżacy (Teutonic Knights), which circulated in newspapers from 1897 to 1900 and was published in novel form in 1901 (which became mandatory reading in the classroom after WWI).9

Dia. 1: Jan Matejko, Battle of Grunwald, 1878

In reaction, less than a year after the publication of the book, German nationalists revealed a memorial to grand master Ulrich von Jungingen. The memorial crag – which was previously known as the Jagiello Stone (dia. 2), and which was found on what was believed to be the battlefield of Grunwald/Tannenberg – was two meters tall and was inscribed with words of respect to the fallen grandmaster: "In the fight for German existence and German right, Grand Master Ulrich von Jungingen died a heroic death here, 15 July 1410." The stone was placed on the rubble of a chapel that was burned down in 1410, so as to articulate how this German hero fell: a Christian martyr fighting for "German existence and German right" in the East. It was the first monument to Grunwald/Tannenberg.

Dia. 2: Jagiello Stone, Grunwald (Photo. M. Keck-Szajbel)

When Kaiser Wilhelm II openly called for the eradication of the Slavs in Germany in the same year as the defacement of the Jagiello Stone, the world-famous pianist, Ignacy Paderewski, began secret preparations for a Polish monument to Grunwald/Tannenberg.10 At least eight years in the planning, the monument would be unveiled at festivities in 1910 to celebrate the 500th anniversary of the Battle of Grunwald/Tannenberg. In hitherto unknown numbers, these festivities openly publicized a political conflict – not only a contested event half a millennium in the past but also the rights of a Polish homeland in Europe. In 1910, the Jagiello Monument was dedicated in the heart of the town (dia. 3). The monument (which was destroyed by occupying forces in World War II) became crucial for Germans to have ostensibly legitimate claims to the land they held. The Grunwald/Tannenberg story, if worded correctly, fit the mold of such Prussian narratives perfectly. German nationalists warranted their control over areas of former Poland by claiming that they were giving the Poles culture and Ordnung, just as the Teutonic Knights had attempted to do 500 years previously. The Order was noble, christianizing, and German; the “barbaric deeds” of Jagiello in the fifteenth century would come to be seen as a rite of passage to “civilize” all Slavic peoples – that motley crew who, as Bismarck said, “committed the crime of conquest a hundredfold… [pursuing] Polonization by fire and sword” after the Battle of Grunwald/Tannenberg.6 German historians wanted to see the Order as a model, a “precursor of the Prussian state, the German Empire,” and, as Wolfgang Wippermann writes, “of the National Socialist ‘Third Reich.’”7

Historical and political myths are ambivalent. As Yves Bizeul writes, they are used not only to deceive people, but also as a “heuristic and ethical instrument, in order to understand and better the world.” He goes on to say that a myth “is a symbolic form… rooted in practical life forms,” which usually have “a historical background.” Grunwald/Tannenberg functions as a myth both in the German and Polish collective identity, and it has provided a lens through which each respective society has been able to perceive its own righteousness.8 What makes the myth so volatile is that its "historical background" requires that both Germans and Poles project the other as an enemy, and also that it entails territorial claims. Furthermore, since both German and Polish nationalists began to competitively use the myth of Grunwald/Tannenberg in their national narratives, it seems as if no amount of time or political cool-down could erase the huge symbolic value of the battle. Hence, during the course of the nineteenth century, Poles and Germans consistently attempted to ‘out-do’ each other in mythologizing the Battle of Grunwald/Tannenberg.

In Poland, literary and artistic works provided Poles with the cultural capital through which they were then able to identify themselves outside of the framework of foreign hegemony. In 1855, historian Karl Szajnocha published his widely read work Jadwiga i Jagiełło 1374 do 1413. Shortly after, in 1878, the most significant Polish artist of the time, Jan Matejko, immortalized the battle and exhibited his work in cultural centers across the Polish lands (dia. 1). Perhaps the final, conclusive description of the Polish Battle of Grunwald/Tannenberg came at the turn of the century, when the Nobel Prize winning author Henryk Sienkiewicz wrote his epic, Krzyżacy (Teutonic Knights), which circulated in newspapers from 1897 to 1900 and was published in novel form in 1901 (which became mandatory reading in the classroom after WWI).9

Dia. 1: Jan Matejko, Battle of Grunwald, 1878

In reaction, less than a year after the publication of the book, German nationalists revealed a memorial to grand master Ulrich von Jungingen. The memorial crag – which was previously known as the Jagiello Stone (dia. 2), and which was found on what was believed to be the battlefield of Grunwald/Tannenberg – was two meters tall and was inscribed with words of respect to the fallen grandmaster: "In the fight for German existence and German right, Grand Master Ulrich von Jungingen died a heroic death here, 15 July 1410." The stone was placed on the rubble of a chapel that was burned down in 1410, so as to articulate how this German hero fell: a Christian martyr fighting for "German existence and German right" in the East. It was the first monument to Grunwald/Tannenberg.

Dia. 2: Jagiello Stone, Grunwald (Photo. M. Keck-Szajbel)

When Kaiser Wilhelm II openly called for the eradication of the Slavs in Germany in the same year as the defacement of the Jagiello Stone, the world-famous pianist, Ignacy Paderewski, began secret preparations for a Polish monument to Grunwald/Tannenberg.10 At least eight years in the planning, the monument would be unveiled at festivities in 1910 to celebrate the 500th anniversary of the Battle of Grunwald/Tannenberg. In hitherto unknown numbers, these festivities openly publicized a political conflict – not only a contested event half a millennium in the past but also the rights of a Polish homeland in Europe. In 1910, the Jagiello Monument was dedicated in the heart of the town (dia. 3). The monument (which was destroyed by occupying
German forces in 1939) was appreciably larger in comparison to the meager monument to Ulrich von Jungingen in 1901. It stood 10 meters high and centered a larger-than-life-sized figure of a victorious Jagiello on his steed. In front of the king stood Duke Witold, reigning over a fallen Teutonic knight. Freeing themselves from the chains of bondage, a number of other figures encircled the king. Through the images of these previously oppressed figures, the monument was meant to encourage the Polish nation: despite their current bondage, Poles were destined to be victorious again, just as the king and Witold had been, and their archenemy, just as in 1410, was to be the Germans. There was a huge civilian turnout for the celebrations in Kraków: more than 300,000 people from all corners of the world made an appearance in the town during the time of festivity – forcing the imperial railway service to place a number of new trains on the tracks just to transport visitors to Kraków.¹¹

One historian writes that Grunwald/Tannenberg became an "incurable wound" for the Germans in the early twentieth century.¹² The official German response to the 500th anniversary was one of slander, charging that the Polish celebrations were not organized, were not respectable to either the national movement or to Kaiser Franz Josef II, and in the end hurt German-Polish relations.¹³ Once again, the Poles were the 'barbaric Slavic forces' causing harm to the 'civilizing Germans.' Yet if Grunwald/Tannenberg was an 'incurable wound' in 1910, it was miraculously cured after 1914.

In that year, German generals Hindenburg and Ludendorff won a massive victory against the Russian armies invading East Prussia. This battle, which would firmly establish Hindenburg’s and Ludendorff’s reputation in the eyes of the average German, happened to take place in close proximity to the battle of 1410. In contrast to 1410, however, the Germans were not fighting against the Poles but against the Russian armies of General Samsonov. Nevertheless, this grand victory raised German morale both during and after the war. In the interwar years, Germans were happy to praise the leaders of the 1914 battle, this being one of the few battles where they were able to clearly place themselves on the victorious side. The victory in 1914 was also an eclipsing event: all mention of the Battle of 1410 evaded mention by German nationalists and the public press. The Teutonic Knights still provided symbolic continuity in connection with the modern monuments, but the Teutonic defeat of 1410 was forgotten.

The Germans constructed a huge fortress-like monument to the Battle of Tannenberg in the plains of Masuria. Even the construction of this monument was mythical in its own regard. It began with a national design competition and public collection campaign and took over eight years before completion in 1927.¹⁴ The monument had eight towers, connected to each other in octagonal form by an eight-meter-tall stonewall (some would later call the memorial the ‘Deutsche Stonehenge’ due to its inornate exterior and shape). Just one year before the inauguration, Lithuania had annexed the Memel lands in accord with the Treaty of Versailles, while East Prussia (where the monument was built) voted to stay within the German Empire. Hence, the 1927 monument came best to symbolize the territorial rights of Germans specifically in East Prussia.¹⁵

After the death of Hindenburg, the National Socialists actively utilized the myth of Grunwald/Tannenberg as a platform to propagate the renewal of the German spirit. They buried Hindenburg in one of the towers after his death (along with twenty unknown soldiers and the crests of the Teutonic Knights), and they consistently published pamphlets celebrating the "German ecclesiastical order, the first socialistic state in Europe."¹⁶ Hitler also used the myth when he established one of the first Einsatzgruppen, codenamed Operation Tannenberg, explaining later that if "one wanted to correct the mistakes of previous centuries, one would have to engage in radical Volksstumpolitik… just like the Teutonic Knights, [who] did not succeed by means of glace gloves, rather with the Bible and the sword."¹⁷ According to this ideology, the National Socialist should be the modern day Teutonic Knight – but should not fail in his ‘crusade.’

On January 21, 1945, retreating German armies destroyed the Monument to Tannenberg. The Polish Peoples’ Republic used the rubble of the monument to help rebuild their flattened capital.

In post-war West Germany, Grunwald/Tannenberg became a moot point. Not only was Germany stripped of the land in the East, but each respective regime refused to initiate dialogue about "German existence and German right" in East Prussia. There were, nevertheless, some signs that the myth survived the devastation of WWII. In 1953, Merian travel magazine for East Prussia printed a picture of the Tannenberg Monument as if it had not been destroyed, causing a great deal of controversy, although the issue was not recalled.¹⁸ In the 1980s, a heated debate started about the name of a school at Ostpreußendamm in Berlin. The "Tannenberg-Schule" in Berlin changed its name only after it was revealed that the school was named in 1933 in remembrance "of the meaning of the East for Volk und Vaterland."¹⁹
In Poland, the Soviet Union and the People’s Republic actively engaged the myth of Grunwald/Tannenberg to legitimize their power. After the Germans were expelled from Poland, the communists posted posters celebrating the victories of 1410 as well as 1945. Celebrations of Grunwald/Tannenberg were given more meaning as the Soviets instrumentalized the myth to celebrate the ‘unified Slavic’ liberation from the Germans, thereby legitimizing their interests in Poland. These celebrations – controlled through the People’s Republic – would be held annually at the battlefield of 1410.

The celebrations of the 550th Anniversary of the Battle of Grunwald/Tannenberg in 1960 were explicitly political in nature, embracing the ‘enduring friendship’ between Russians and Poles. Organizers were given specific ideals to celebrate the occasion five years in advance: the festivities were to "express the truth about the character of the western territories [e.g. the Recovered Territories] and the century-long battle against Germanization…. [as well as the] century-old, traditional friendship between the Polish people and the peoples of Russia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Belarus, and Czechoslovakia."

The 1960 Grunwald/Tannenberg anniversary would be the largest post-WWII celebration in Poland to date. Official reports claim that more than 200,000 people from all Warsaw Pact countries traveled to attend the ceremonies. This was also one of the first years when, instead of sober ceremonies, hundreds of visitors dressed as knights and reenacted the mythic battle on the field. One reason for the large turnout (and the reenactment) at the celebrations of 1960 was the opening of the film adaptation of Sienkiewicz’s Krzyżacy. The novel had been very popular with the Poles at the turn of the century, and the film, directed by the famed Aleksander Ford, became equally popular. The climax of the film showed the battle between the Order and the united forces, with the field of Grunwald in the background. Three years later, the People’s Republic would construct a series of monuments at the site of the battlefield.

It would include a museum/archeological site dedicated to the 1410 battle and would also contain the Destroyed Monument (dia. 5). This monument is of particular interest, since it was constructed from 27 stones remaining from the original 1910 monument, which was destroyed in 1939. The Jagiello monument was likewise replaced in Kraków after WWII. This time, however, it was called the Grunwald Monument and had the grave of the Unknown Soldier placed immediately in front of it (dia. 6).

After 1960 and until the change of power in 1989-1990, fewer and fewer guests would visit the annual Grunwald/Tannenberg celebrations, and the explicitly political nature of the event waned. But even in 1990, the festivities were visited by envoys from Czechoslovakia, Russia, and Lithuania, all of whom stood beside Polish president Wojciech Jaruzelski and 50,000 visitors to celebrate "unity in plurality." The speech of Bishop Edmund Piszcz also enunciated the desire for "no revenge, no vengeance," vis-à-vis the Germans (despite the logical fallacy of a reenacted medieval battle with no enemy).

Robert Traba is of the opinion that the Grunwald/Tannenberg myth is in a period of destruction. He bases this opinion on the decreasing numbers of visitors at the annual celebrations of Grunwald and as due to Polish-German understanding. According to Traba, the celebrations for Grunwald/Tannenberg have been turned into a kind of ‘renaissance festival,’ where members of many different cultures and backgrounds come together for the spectacle
of reenactment of a medieval battle. In order to illustrate the politically discharged environment of the festivities, he writes that "it sorrows the Teutonic Knights only to lose, hence, they [the organizers] want to let them win next year."23 This is a very lighthearted example of how Grunwald/Tannenberg has come to stand for a festival between many nations.

The mythic value that the celebrations and monuments to Grunwald/Tannenberg once had has indeed been transformed in the eyes of contemporary Poles and Germans. One notices this especially in recent years, as Poland and Lithuania try to keep the annual Grunwald/Tannenberg festivities free from the German ‘Drang nach Osten’ polemic. Hence, at the celebrations in 2000, Lithuanian president Waldo Adamkus and his Polish counterpart, Aleksander Kwaśniewski, did not discuss the German threat. Instead, they came together at the fields of Grunwald, while their ministers of defense signed treaties for a unified NATO force, all the while declaring the "apolitical character of the commemoration."26

In Germany, the most significant semantic alteration of the Grunwald/Tannenberg myth is the absence of the Pole. In other words, the German post-war Grunwald/Tannenberg myth focuses on ‘Innenpolitik’ instead of ‘Ostpolitik’; controversy surrounding Grunwald/Tannenberg focuses on the (lack of) recognition of grievances from East Prussian Germans as legitimate, rather than the protection of land from a Polish other. Hence, when a small, octagonal shaped memorial named Kleines Tannenberg-Denkmal (Small Tannenberg Monument) was christened in Oberschleißheim, Munich in 1995, Bavarian State President Edmund Stoiber (in the presence of a number of uniformed officers) could explain that the memorial was not meant to express Revanchismus, but was meant to be a "monument to the fallen and the missing of two world wars from the federated armies of the air force and the marines of Eastern and Western Prussia."27 Stoiber was aiming to appease a segment of Germans which was ousted from Eastern and Western Prussia at the end of the Second World War. Although Stoiber has a personal interest in the population of Germans which was ousted from Eastern and Western Prussia at the end of the Second World War. Although Stoiber has a personal interest in the population of Germans which was ousted from Eastern and Western Prussia at the end of the Second World War. Although Stoiber has a personal interest in the population of Germans which was ousted from Eastern and Western Prussia at the end of the Second World War. Although Stoiber has a personal interest in the population of Germans which was ousted from Eastern and Western Prussia at the end of the Second World War. Although Stoiber has a personal interest in the population of Germans which was ousted from Eastern and Western Prussia at the end of the Second World War. Although Stoiber has a personal interest in the population of Germans which was ousted from Eastern and Western Prussia at the end of the Second World War. Although Stoiber has a personal interest in the population of Germans which was ousted from Eastern and Western Prussia at the end of the Second World War. Although Stoiber has a personal interest in the population of Germans which was ousted from Eastern and Western Prussia at the end of the Second World War. Although Stoiber has a personal interest in the population of Germans which was ousted from Eastern and Western Prussia at the end of the Second World War. Although Stoiber has a personal interest in the population of Germans which was ousted from Eastern and Western Prussia, did not discuss the Polish menace, the presence of official envoys and state presidents shows how Grunwald/Tannenberg, despite attempts to neutralize certain elements of the myth, is still politically charged. The semantics of the myth of

Grunwald/Tannenberg is currently being reconstructed, but it still functions as a symbol.

Hence, it might be worthwhile to interrogate whether the myth has been thoroughly diffused. Before a ‘new’ monument can be created to celebrate the myth of Grunwald/Tannenberg, one must first ask if such memorials constitute bridges with the past, or if they write the past anew. As cultural anthropologist Aleida Assmann emphasizes, memorial spaces transform events, making them not only paramount in collective identity but also transgressive, in that they create undesirable continuities with the past.28 In the case of contemporary memorials to Grunwald/Tannenberg, the projected continuity is directly tied to territorial claims of the nineteenth and twentieth century. A debate would certainly be relevant in the contemporary EU. But since the ceremonies are either so small, or perceived as politically ‘positive,’ there has yet to be dialogue considering the contemporary meaning of this myth. The project to build a "World Peace Monument" at the site of a medieval war-zone, should it be successful, would be a first step.
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Kujachich Grant and the Study of Obsidian Tools from Serbia

In 2007, a grant from the Peter N. Kujachich Endowment in Serbian and Montenegrin Studies was awarded to Dr. Steven Shackley, Department of Anthropology, at UC Berkeley. The grant was given to facilitate the analysis of obsidian artifacts from prehistoric sites in Serbia. The obsidian tools were elementally characterized using an Energy Dispersive X-ray fluorescence spectrometer at the Archaeological XRL Laboratory at UC Berkeley, of which Dr. Schackley is Director. Marina Milic, PhD candidate at the University of Belgrade, initiated the project and brought the obsidian artifacts from Belgrade. The analysis was focused on answering three main questions: (a) where is the obsidian coming from? (b) were different obsidian types used differently? (c) what was the relationship between obsidian exchange and the trade of other items? And (d) is it possible to source the obsidian in Serbia on the basis of its visual characteristics? During meetings of the Archaeological Institute of America in Chicago of this year, Ms. Milic presented a paper with the preliminary results of the project, indicating that the source of the obsidian was exclusively the Carpathian mountains. The paper was authored by Milic, Shackley, and B. Tripkovic and acknowledged the appreciated assistance of the Kujachich grant.
Discourses of transitional justice demand that societies "break with" or "confront" the crimes of the recent past. The demand implies a social process but sets out to achieve the goal through political and legal means. This discussion will explore the tension between legal processes designed to establish guilt and social processes seeking to encourage responsibility: do guilt and responsibility complement one another or operate at cross purposes? The issue will be explored with reference to the relations between Serbia and the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia since 2000.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthro 2AC</td>
<td>Introduction to Archaeology</td>
<td>R. Tringham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demog 296</td>
<td>Advanced Research Techniques</td>
<td>E. Hammel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 125C</td>
<td>The European Novel</td>
<td>L. Golburt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 171C</td>
<td>The Soviet Union, 1917 to the Present</td>
<td>Y. Slezkine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 177B</td>
<td>From Pre-Modern Empires to the Present</td>
<td>S. Astourian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 275B</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>J. Connelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HistArt 192F</td>
<td>Russian Art: From Argunov to Kabakov</td>
<td>I. Ustyuzhyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music 77</td>
<td>History of Western Music: the 20th Century</td>
<td>R. Taruskin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music 220</td>
<td>Topics in Music History and Criticism: Censorship</td>
<td>R. Taruskin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Stud 15</td>
<td>Introduction to Near Eastern Art and Archaeology</td>
<td>M. Feldman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne Stud 126</td>
<td>Silk Road Art and Archaeology</td>
<td>S. Mehendale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne Stud 190A</td>
<td>Ancient Near Eastern Studies: Archaeology of Afghanistan</td>
<td>S. Mehendale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poli Sci 137C</td>
<td>Democracy and its Alternatives in the Developing World</td>
<td>M. S. Fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poli Sci 149B</td>
<td>Dictatorship and its Discontents</td>
<td>J. Wittenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poli Sci 210</td>
<td>Themes in Comparative Politics: Power and Political Change in Social Science</td>
<td>A.C. Janos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic R5A</td>
<td>Reading and Composition: Power Relationships and Literature of Transformations</td>
<td>E. Fischer-Mikolavich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic R5B</td>
<td>Reading and Composition: Literature and Money</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic R5B</td>
<td>Reading and Composition: Monsters, Loose and Tight: Russia’s Great Books</td>
<td>J. Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic R5B</td>
<td>Reading and Composition: Mind and Language: A Metaphorical Analysis of Political Discourse</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 46</td>
<td>Twentieth-Century Russian Literature</td>
<td>H. Ram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 50</td>
<td>Introduction to Russian/East European/Eurasian Cultures</td>
<td>A. Timberlake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 101</td>
<td>Advanced Russian Phonetics and Oral Performance</td>
<td>A. A. Alexeev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 105B</td>
<td>Advanced Russian/English/Russian Translation</td>
<td>A.A. Alexeev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 133</td>
<td>The Novel in Russia and the West</td>
<td>L. Golburt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 134C</td>
<td>Dostoevsky</td>
<td>O. Matich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 134E/ Theater 166</td>
<td>Chekhov</td>
<td>A. Muza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 158</td>
<td>The Many Springs of Prague: History and Culture of the Czech Lands</td>
<td>E.R. Langer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 158</td>
<td>Representations of Post 1939 Polish History in Literature and Film</td>
<td>W. Szyngwelski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 170</td>
<td>Survey of Yugoslav Literatures</td>
<td>R. Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 190</td>
<td>Russian Culture Taught in Russian: Country, Identity, and Language</td>
<td>A. Muza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 200</td>
<td>Graduate Colloquium</td>
<td>I. Paperno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 222</td>
<td>Descriptive Grammar of Slavic Languages</td>
<td>J.B. Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 280</td>
<td>Studies in Slavic Literature and Linguistics</td>
<td>J.B. Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 280</td>
<td>Studies in Slavic Literature and Linguistics</td>
<td>I. Paperno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 280</td>
<td>Studies in Slavic Literature and Linguistics</td>
<td>A. Timberlake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 280</td>
<td>Studies in Slavic Literature and Linguistics</td>
<td>L. Golburt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 301</td>
<td>Slavic Teaching Methods</td>
<td>R. Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 301</td>
<td>Slavic Teaching Methods</td>
<td>L.C. Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic 301</td>
<td>Slavic Teaching Methods</td>
<td>O. Matich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology 101B</td>
<td>Sociological Theory</td>
<td>D. Riley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater 10</td>
<td>Introduction to Acting</td>
<td>M. Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater 151B</td>
<td>Theater History</td>
<td>M. Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater 166/Slavic 134E</td>
<td>Chekhov</td>
<td>A. Muza</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Slavic Department has courses in Armenian, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Bulgarian, Czech, Georgian, Hungarian, Polish, and Russian. The Jewish Studies department offers Yiddish.
Upcoming Events


Wednesday, April 2, 2008. Public Talk: Geoff Roberts, Professor of History, University College Cork, Ireland, will speak on Stalin as Warlord: Beyond Myth and Propaganda. Sponsored by ISEEES. In 270 Stephens Hall, 4 p.m. For more details call ISEEES, (510) 642-3230.

Thursday, April 3, 2008. Public Talk: Nikola Theodossiev, Senior Assistant Professor in the Department of Archaeology, Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski; Assistant Director at the American Research Center in Sofia; AIA Samuel H. Kress Lectureship in Ancient Art, will speak on Ancient Thrace during the First Millennium BC. Sponsored by ISEEES, Archaeological Research Facility, the Classics Department, and the Archaeological Institute of America. At 7:30 p.m., 370 Dwinelle Hall. For more details call ISEEES, (510) 642-3230.


Tuesday, April 8, 2008. Public Talk: Nozima Kamalova, a visiting scholar at the Center for Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law, Stanford University; Founding Chair, the Legal Aid Society of Uzbekistan, will speak on Human Rights and the War on Terror in Uzbekistan. Sponsored by ISEEES and the Religion, Politics and Globalization Program, UC Berkeley. In 223 Moses Hall, 4 p.m. For more details call ISEEES, (510) 642-3230.

Thursday, April 10, 2008. Public Talk: Martin Putna, Associate Professor of Comparative Literature, Charles University in Prague, will speak on Vaclav Havel’s Religion in the Context of European Secularization. Sponsored by ISEEES. In 270 Stephens Hall at 4 p.m. For more details call ISEEES, (510) 642-3230.

Friday, April 11, 2008. Public Talk: Armen Liloyan, Consul General of Armenia in Los Angeles, will speak on Armenia, Old Nation, Young State: Challenges and Opportunities. Sponsored by ISEEES and the Armenian Studies Program. 12 noon, in 223 Moses Hall. For more details call ASP, (510) 643-6737.

Saturday, April 12, 2008. Concert: University Symphony Orchestra—CalDay. Gordeli, Flute Concerto (soloist Kelsey Seymour); Tchaikovsky, Violin Concerto (soloist Ernest Yen). Sponsored by the Music Department. In Hertz Concert Hall at 11 a.m. For details call 510-642-4864.

Wednesday, April 16, 2008. Public Talk: Dr. Speros Vryonis, Jr. Emeritus Professor of History, UCLA will speak on The Mechanism of Catastrophe: The Turkish Pogrom of September 6-7, 1955 and the Destruction of the Greek Community. Sponsored by ISEEES and the Armenian Studies Program. Location TBA, at 12 noon. For more details call ASP, (510) 643-6737.

Thursday, April 17, 2008. The Eighth Annual Peter N. Kujachich Endowed Lecture in Serbian and Montenegrin Studies: Eric Gordy, Professor at the Department of Social Sciences, University College London, will speak on Narratives of Guilt and Responsibility: Making Sense of “Confronting the Past.” Lecture followed by reception. Sponsored by ISEEES. In the Heyns Room, UC Berkeley Faculty Club, 4 p.m. For more details call ISEEES, (510) 642-3230 or see pg. 18.

Apr 18-Jun 29, 2008. Art Exhibition: Tracing Roads through Central Asia. This exhibition, guest curated by Elena Sorokina, explores the complex relationship between the process of nation building and the political nature of historical memory in the work of a handful artists from Central Asia and surrounding regions. Exhibitions 07-08 is made possible in part by: AT&T, Mike Wilkins and Sheila Duignan, and Members of Yerba Buena Center for the Arts. Additional Funding for YBCA Exhibition 07-08: Genentech Inc, Norwegian Consulate General. 12-5pm. Terrace Galleries, Yerba Buena Center for the Arts Galleries, 701 Mission St. at Third, San Francisco. Tickets: $5-$7. For more information call (415) 978-2700 or go to http://www.ybca.org/tickets/production.aspx?performanceNumber=4201

Wednesday, April 23, 2008. Public Talk: Kristian Atland, visiting Fulbright Scholar at ISEEES and Senior Analyst at the Norwegian Defense Research Institute, will speak on The Arctic: Russia’s New Empire? Sponsored by ISEEES. In 270 Stephens Hall, 4 p.m. For more details call ISEEES, (510) 642-3230.
Friday, April 25, 2008. **Concert:** Kitka in concert with Balkan cabaret, featuring vocalists Mary Sherhart and John Morovich. Kitka is a professional vocal ensemble dedicated to producing concerts, recordings, and educational programs that develop new audiences for music rooted in Eastern European women’s vocal traditions. Kitka also strives to expand the boundaries of this music as an expressive art form. 8 pm. Croatian American Cultural Center, 60 Onandaga Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112. Will also perform on April 27 at 8 p.m., in the First Unitarian Church, 685 14th St, Oakland. For details call (510) 444-0323. http://www.kitka.org/calendar/index.html


May 3-11, 2008. **Performance:** Berkeley Opera will present Béla Bartók’s *Bluebeard’s Castle* (paired with Ravel’s *L’enfant et les Sortilèges*). May 3 at 8 pm; May 7 at 7:30 pm; May 9 at 8 pm, and May 11 at 2 pm. All performances are at Julia Morgan Center for the Arts, 2640 College Avenue, Berkeley. These performances are with orchestra and feature commissioned art which will animate and illuminate the music. Internationally-exhibited Oakland artist Naomie Kremer is creating the art for the Bartók piece, which is being digitalized and animated by Mark Palmer. Bluebeard will be sung in Hungarian with English supertitles, with Kathleen Moss as Judith and Paul Murray as Bluebeard. Jonathan Khuner will conduct. Tickets are $44, with day-of-performance side seats available for $16 and student rush (with I.D.) for $10. For advance tickets, call (925) 798-1300. For more information about Berkeley Opera, go to www.berkeleyopera.org

Saturday, May 3, 2008. **Annual Teacher Outreach Conference.** See pg. 25. Sponsored by ISEEES. In the Toll Room, Alumni House, 8 a.m.-7 p.m. For more details call ISEEES, (510) 642-3230.

Tuesday, May 6, 2008. **Public Lecture:** Zoltan Barany, Frank C. Erwin, Jr. Centennial Professor of Government at the University of Texas, Austin, will speak on *Building Democratic Armies*. Sponsored by ISEEES. In 270 Stephens Hall, 4 pm. For more details call ISEEES, (510) 642-3230.

Wednesday, May 7, 2008. **West Coast Forum on Politics and Islam:** Pauline Jones Luong, Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies at the Department of Political Science, Brown University, will speak on *Rethinking the Resource Curse: Lessons from the Soviet Successor States*. Sponsored by ISEEES. 270 Stephens Hall, 12 noon. For more details call ISEEES, (510) 642-3230.


51st San Francisco International Film Festival April 24-May 8, 2008

SFIIIF is the longest-running film festival in the Americas, presenting over 200 films from 41 countries and featuring 10 new films from Russia, Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans and Eurasia. Includes Alexander Sokurov’s *Alexandra*, Dorota Kedzierzawska’s *Time to Die*, Bela Tarr’s *The Man from London*, and Sergei Bodrov’s epic *Mongol*. Tickets on sale April 3, general admission $12.50. For details see www.sffs.org or call (925) 866-9559.

Friday, April 25, 2008. **Alexandra** (Russia), dir. Alexander Sokurov - The humanist story of an older woman who visits her grandson fighting in Chechnya. When she leaves the base to visit the nearby village, her perceptions of the conflict change. 7:00 p.m., Sundance Kabuki Cinemas, repeats on April 27, 12 noon, Sundance Kabuki Cinemas.
Friday, April 25, 2008.  *Traveling with Pets* (Russia), dir. Vera Storozheva - Lyrical drama about a woman living near a railway line. After her boorish husband dies, she tends her animals, considers moving to the city, and has an affair with an enthusiastic truck driver. 4:00 p.m., Sundance Kabuki Cinemas, repeats 4/26 6:15 p.m., 4/30 9:30 p.m., Sundance Kabuki Cinemas, 4/28 6:30 p.m. Pacific Film Archive.

Sunday, April 27, 2008.  *Mongol* (Gemany/China, Mongolia & Kazakhstan), dir. Sergei Bodrov - Set in the Russian steppes, this action-laced drama follows the young Genghis Khan and his unification of the Mongol people under his iron-fisted rule of principled violence. 9:15 p.m., Sundance Kabuki Cinemas.

Wednesday, April 30, 2008.  *I Served the King of England* (Czech Republic), dir. Jiri Menzel - A lighthearted take on a turbulent period in 20th-Century Europe seen through the eyes of a young, ambitious Czech waiter.

Starting in the 1930s, it covers Hitler’s annexation of the Sudetenland and the Communist takeover of Czechoslovakia. 6:00 p.m., Sundance Kabuki Cinemas.

Wednesday, April 30, 2008.  *Time to Die* (Poland), dir. Dorota Kedzierzawska - The story of an elderly woman living in a rundown mansion with her beloved dog and the various people, including her son, who, she believes, are conspiring to take away her home. 6:30 p.m., Sundance Kabuki Cinemas.

Wednesday, April 30, 2008.  *Vasermil* (Israel), dir. Mushon Salmona - Israel’s multicultural society is explored through the story of three boys all on the same soccer team - an Israeli pizza-seller, an Ethiopian caring for his mother and brother, and a Russian mixed up with the mafia and drugs. 6:30 p.m., Pacific Film Archive.

---

**Faculty and Student News**


**Richard David**, J.D. Candidate in the Berkeley School of Law, has received a fellowship from the UC Berkeley Liu Fellows China Exchange Fund to attend the Workshop on the Development of the China Private Equity Industry: From Policy to Practice in Beijing, on April 1, 2008.


**Andrew C. Janos**, Emeritus and Professor of the Graduate School, presented at the European Institute of the University of Toronto on March 24, 2008. He spoke about *Images of Political Community: Romania and Hungary from Nation Building to European Integration*.

**Mark Keck-Szajbel**, Ph.D. candidate in History presented a paper titled "VR Polen - Gastfreundschaft das ganze Jahr or: Visiting the GDR's Fun Places in Poland" at the Popular Culture Association Annual Conference in San Francisco, March 22, 2008. He also was invited to participate in an international research project "Schleichwege: Inoffizielle Begegnungen und Kontakte sozialistischer Staatsbürger 1956-1989. Zwischen transnationaler Alltagsgeschichte und Kulturtransfer."

**Tony Lin**, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures won the 2008 U.S. Department of State Critical Language Scholarship for participation in the Intensive Summer Russian Language Institute.
Danielle Lussier, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Political Science, presented her paper "The Influence of Soviet Ideological and Cultural Legacies on the Political Behavior of Contemporary Russians" at the Eurasian Political Studies Network annual conference in Moscow on January 31, 2008.

Olga Matich, Professor in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, UC Berkeley, received honorable mention for her book Erotic Utopia: The Decadent Imagination in Russia's Fin de Siècle (University of Wisconsin Press) in the Modern Language Association of America Seventh Aldo and Jeanne Scaglione Award for Studies in Slavic Languages and Literatures. The committee's citation for her book reads: "Olga Matich's Erotic Utopia: The Decadent Imagination in Russia's Fin de Siècle reveals that at the turn of the twentieth century Russian writers fantasized about apocalyptic redemption achieved through an eroticism that led neither to consummation nor procreation. Examining prose, poetry, letters, diaries, portraits, and philosophical tracts and situating her writers in the context of contemporary psychology, Matich shows that the vision of erotic utopia intrigued not only writers who publicized their unconventional love lives (such as Zinaida Gippius and Aleksandr Blok) but also Lev Tolstoy and the philosopher Vladimir Solov'ev. The result is a startling and persuasive tour de force."

Hugh McLean, Professor Emeritus in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, UC Berkeley, published an article titled "Claws on the Behind: Tolstoy and Darwin" in the 2007 issue of Tolstoy Studies Journal. A collection of his essays titled In Quest of Tolstoy will be published in Spring 2008 with Academic Studies Press (Boston).

Elena Morabito, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, was advanced to Doctoral candidacy in December 2007.


Cinzia Solari, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Sociology, was awarded the prestigious Chancellor's Dissertation Year Fellowship. She also presented a paper this month at the Spotlight on Immigration Conference held here at Berkeley. The paper was titled "Between 'Europe' and 'Africa': Building the 'New' Ukraine on the Shoulders of Migrant Women." This paper will also be published as part of a volume on women and Ukraine edited by Marian Rubchak.

Lucas Stratton, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, will be attending the Queer Studies Easter Symposium in Mexico City (March 23-29, 2008). He will present a paper there entitled "The Queer Phenomenology of Evgenii Kharitonov's 'The Oven.'"

Jennifer Utrata, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Sociology, will begin a tenure-track assistant professor job in the Comparative Sociology Department at the University of Puget Sound, a liberal arts college in Tacoma, Washington, in September 2008. She will be teaching social theory and the sociology of gender and family. She will file her dissertation, titled "Counting on Motherhood, Not Men: Single Mothers and Social Change in the New Russia," in May 2008.

Barbara Voytek, former executive director of ISEEES, published an article (with E. Starnini and Ferenc Horváth) titled "Preliminary results of the multidisciplinary study of the chipped stone assemblage from the Tisza Culture site of Tell Gorzsa (Hungary)" in The Lengyel, Polgar and Related Cultures in the Middle/Late Neolithic in Central Europe, edited by J. K. Kozlowski and P. Raczyński, Krakow: Polish Academy of Sciences, 2007.

AAASS Convention 2007

The AAASS annual convention was held in November 2007 in New Orleans, LA. The following ISEEES affiliates made presentations:

Ronelle Alexander, professor in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, presented a paper titled “Tracking the Performance Register in South Slavic Epic” at the panel on Issues in Slavic Oral Poetry.

George William Breslauer, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, participated in the roundtable discussion on Russia in the Year 2007: The Ed Hewett Memorial Roundtable.

John F. Connelly, professor in the Department of History, presented a paper titled “Progressive Catholic Theology and the Race Question” at the panel on Catholicism and Modernity in East Central Europe.

M. Steven Fish, professor in the Department of Political Science, participated in the roundtable on the 2007-08 Russian Elections and Their Meaning.

Victoria Frede, assistant professor in the History Department, presented a paper titled “How Tolerant were Russian Radicals of Freedom of Conscience in the 1860s?”
at the panel on Freedom(s) of Conscience in Imperial Russia: State, Society, Religion.

David Frick, professor in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, presented a paper titled “Getting Ahead: Paths to Prestige and Power in Seventeenth-Century Vilnius” at the panel on Local Power in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. He also served as a discussant for the panel on the Kyiv Caves Monastery Printing House and its Readers During the Seventeenth-Century Orthodox Revival.

Luba Golburt, assistant professor in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, served as a discussant for the panel on the Courtly Carnivalesque: Laughter and Politics in the 18th Century. She also participated in the roundtable titled Theater, History, Narrative in the Age of Empire.

Andrej Krickovic, graduate student in political science, presented a paper titled “From Romantic Liberalism to Realpolitik Consensus: The Evolution of Russian Foreign Policy Thinking in the Post-Soviet Period” at the Political Culture and Post-Soviet Elites panel.

Olga Matich, professor in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures and Jonathan Craig Stone, lecturer in the department, participated in the roundtable discussion on Decadences and Decadents. Professor Matich also participated in the roundtable discussion on Everyday Life as a Paradigm of Meanings.

Elizabeth Anne McGuire, graduate student in the History Department, presented a paper titled “Sino-Soviet Romances: International Socialist Family in Institutions, and in the Flesh” at the panel on Cross Cultural Moments in International Socialism: Chinese and American Experiences in Soviet Russia, 1920-1960.

Stiliana Milkova, lecturer in the Department of Comparative Literature, presented a paper titled “Gogol’s Roman Panorama” at the panel on Writing Russian Travel in Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature.

Renee Perelmutter, graduate student in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, presented a paper titled “To Move or Not to Move: Motion Verbs under Negation in Modern Russian” at the panel on Mobilis in Mobile: Motion Verbs and Aspect in Russian from Historical and Synchronic Perspectives.

Harsha Ram, associate professor in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, presented a paper titled “National Mythopoesis: The Legacy of Symbolism and the Transition to Socialist Realism in Georgian Modernist Poetry” at the panel titled From Symbolism to Socialist Realism.

Jarrod Tanny, graduate student in the History Department, chaired the panel on Odessa: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on the “Golden City.” He also presented a paper titled “The Battle for Old Odessa: The Gilded City of Sin versus the Proletarian State” at the panel on Creating the Socialist City: Conflicting Myths and Consuming Realities.

Alyson Louise Tapp, graduate student in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, presented a paper titled “‘Kak Byt Pisatelem?: Eikhenbaum’s Search for a Genre in the 1920s” at the panel on Scholar-Writers: Boris Eikhenbaum, Victor Shklovsky, and Lydia Ginzburg.

Kathleen Cameron Wiggins, graduate student in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, participated in the roundtable titled Theater, History, Narrative in the Age of Empire.

Alexei Yurchak, associate professor in the Department of Anthropology, participated in the roundtable discussion on Everyday Life as a Paradigm of Meanings. He also participated in the roundtable on Spaces of Change in St. Petersburg and Moscow.

Annual Berkeley/Stanford conference now available for viewing online

We are pleased to announce that the proceedings of the 32nd Annual Berkeley/Stanford conference on Russia, East European & Eurasian Studies are now available for viewing online. This year's conference, held on March 7, was devoted to the topic "Political Succession in Russia" and featured distinguished scholars from UC Berkeley and Stanford. You may access online videos of each of the three panels and select questions and answers at the following links:

http://fora.tv/2008/03/07/Political_Succession_in_Russia_Part_1
http://fora.tv/2008/03/07/Political_Succession_in_Russia_Part_2
http://fora.tv/2008/03/07/Putin-to-X_Succession_Part_I
http://fora.tv/2008/03/07/Putin-to-X_Succession_Part_II

Our conference is being featured on Fora.tv, a public interest website that serves as a portal for important talks and conferences engaging issues in contemporary public affairs. (Fora.tv is a partner with C-SPAN.)
34th Annual Teacher Outreach Conference

Russian Emigration in Historical Perspective: Russians in California

Saturday, May 3, 2008
Toll Room, Alumni House
UC Berkeley Campus

Teaching About Russian Emigration to California

Our teacher outreach conference for 2008 is entitled Russian Emigration in Historical Perspective: Russians in California. It will be held on Saturday, May 3 on campus.

This year's conference involves notable speakers from UC Berkeley and other institutions, including: Paul Belasky, Departments of Geology and Geography, Ohlone College; Kerwin Klein, Department of History, UC Berkeley; Olga Matich, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, UC Berkeley; Anatol Shmelev, Project Archivist, Hoover Institution, Stanford; Andrei Tsygankov, Departments of International Relations and Political Science, San Francisco State University; and Ilya Vinkovetsky, Department of History, Simon Fraser University. Presentation titles include: Russians in Pre-American California; Russians in California: the First and Second Post-revolutionary Waves, 1918-1955; Russians in Hollywood/Hollywood on Russia; The Third Wave of Russian Immigration: California Dreaming at the End of the Cold War; and Russophobia in America after 9/11.

The conference is designed for educators but is open to the general public as well. This event is free of charge, though we do ask for advance registration. Once the program for the day long event is finalized, detailed information will be sent to registrants and details will be posted on our website. Please mark your calendars now!

To register, please contact ISEEES at (510) 642-3230, fax (510) 643-5045, or iseees@berkeley.edu.

We have a limited number of stipends available for active classroom teachers who register in advance and attend the full conference. Priority will be given to those teachers who are coming from a distance. To be considered for a stipend, contact ISEEES at (510) 642-3230.

This conference is made possible by a grant to ISEEES from the US Department of Education under Title IV.
Funding Opportunities

After ISEEES-sponsored grants, opportunities are listed alphabetically by funding source.

Funding Deadlines for Graduate Students in Spring

ISEEES

ISEEES Travel Grants provide limited travel support for ISEEES-affiliated graduate students. Awards up to $400 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 only those who did not receive an ISEEES grant in the past AY are eligible. To apply send request with budget. Deadline: none.

The Drago and Danica Kosovac Prize is awarded for an outstanding senior or honors thesis in the social sciences or humanities that researches some aspect of Serbian culture or history. Cal undergraduate students are eligible to apply. The application includes submission of the thesis and two letters of recommendation. No electronic or faxed applications will be accepted. Deadline: none.

For ISEEES funding contact: Jeffrey Pennington, UC Berkeley, 260 Stephens Hall # 2304, Berkeley CA 94720-2304; Tel: 510-643-6736; jpennington@berkeley.edu

Collegium Budapest

Institute for Advanced Study Junior Fellowships offers 7500 euro/5 mos; 12,500 euro/academic year for research in Central and Eastern Europe. The preferred areas of study are the following: European studies, communication and social networks, theoretical biology, theoretical finance, political economics, history, and anthropology. Applicants must be graduate or postdoctoral students. Deadline: June 30, 2008. Contact: Collegium Budapest, Vera Kempa, Szentháromság u. 2., H-1014 Budapest, Hungary; Tel: 36-1-22-48-300; Fax: 36-1-22-48-310; vera.kempa@colbud.hu; http://www.colbud.hu/programme/junior.shtml

Czecholovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU)

Dr. Joseph Hasek Student Awards in the amount of $250 are available for graduate and undergraduate papers dealing with Czech and Slovak issues. The paper must be submitted in triplicate and have been written for an undergraduate or graduate course during the current academic year. Chapters of theses or dissertations are not admissible. The paper must be for the professor in whose class it was presented, accompanied by the professor’s recommendation. Deadline: May 15, 2008. Contact: Professor Vera Borkovec, 12013 Kemp Mill Road, Silver Spring MD 20902-1515; http://www.svu2000.org/

Kosciuszko Foundation

Metchie J. E. Budka Award in the amount of $1,500 for outstanding scholarly work in Polish literature (14th Century to 1939) or Polish history (962 to 1939). The competition is open to graduate students at US universities and to postdocs in their first three years. Deadline: July 16, 2008. Contact: Metchie J. E. Budka Award, The Kosciuszko Foundation, 15 E 65th St., New York, NY 10021-6595; Tel: 212-734-2130; Fax: 212-628-4552; thekf@aol.com; http://www.kosciuszkofoundation.org/Competitions_Budka.html

Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences of America (PIASA)

Kazimierz Dziewanski Memorial Dissertation Award for $1,000 is awarded for the best doctoral dissertation on a Polish topic filed at an American university in the past calendar year. Deadline: April 6, 2008. Contact: Dr. Thaddeus V. Gromada, Executive Director, Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences of America, 208 E 30th St, New York NY 10016; Tel: 212-686-4164; Fax: 212-545-1130; piasany@verizon.net; http://www.piasa.org/

University of Illinois

Russian and East European Center is funding the Summer Research Lab on Russia & Eastern Europe, which provides library access and some free housing.
awards. Fee-based program, but some free housing awards are available. Summer research associates receive full library privileges for research during June-August, while two weeks of programs include a symposium, workshops, lectures, and films. Applicants must be graduate students, post-docs, or faculty. **Deadline:** April 1, 2008 for non-citizens, April 15, 2008 for citizens. Contact: Russian and East European Center, University of Illinois, 104 International Studies Bldg, 910 S Fifth St, Champaign IL 61820; Tel: 217-333-1244; Fax: 217-333-1582; reec@uiuc.edu; http://www.reec.uiuc.edu/srl/srl.html

**Woodrow Wilson Center**

**East European Studies** offers the **Junior Scholars Training Seminar** in the Washington, DC area. All domestic transportation, accommodation and meal costs will be covered by the sponsors. Applicants must be Ph.D. students at the dissertation level or those who received a Ph.D. in the past year. Research is open to any field of East European or Baltic studies, excluding Russia and the FSU. See Web site for details. **Deadline:** April 14, 2008. Contact: East European Studies, Woodrow Wilson Center, One Woodrow Wilson Plaza, 1300 Pennsylvania Ave NW, Washington DC 20523; Tel: 202-691-4222; Fax: 202-691-4001; ees@wilsoncenter.org; http://www.wilsoncenter.org/

**Funding Deadlines for Postdocs in Spring 2008**

**Fulbright Scholar Program**

**Fulbright New Century Scholars Program** allows thirty top academics and professionals to collaborate for a year on a topic of global significance. Applicants must be postdocs or faculty. **Deadline:** July 17, 2008. Contact: The New Century Scholars Program (MSI), Council for International Exchange of Scholars, 3007 Tilden St., NW, Suite 5L, Washington, DC 20008. Tel: (202) 686-6252; Fax: (202) 362-3442; NCS@cies.iie.org; http://www.cies.org/

**Library of Congress**

**Kluge Center** offers **Kluge Fellowship** in the amount of $4,000/mo for 6-12 months for residential research in the collections of the Library of Congress. The competition is open to scholars who have received a terminal advanced degree within the past seven years in the humanities, the social sciences, or in a professional field such as architecture or law. Exceptions may be made for individuals without continuous academic careers. Applicants must be postdocs or faculty and may be US citizens or foreign nationals. **Deadline:** August 15, 2008. Contact: John W. Kluge Center Office of Scholarly Programs, Library of Congress LJ 120, 101 Independence Ave SE, Washington DC 20540-4860; Tel: 202-707-3302; Fax: 202-707-3595; scholarly@loc.gov; http://www.loc.gov/loc/kluge/

**Woodrow Wilson Center**

**Galina Starovoitova Fellowship on Human Rights and Conflict Resolution** offered by the **Kennan Institute** pays $1700 per month, plus transportation costs and a housing allowance. For prominent scholars and policy makers from the Russian Federation who have successfully bridged the worlds of ideas and public affairs to advance human rights and conflict resolution. Provides 9 months of support to postdocs in residence. The Starovoitova fellow is expected to hold public lectures on themes of conflict resolution and human rights while conducting research on a specific topic and will actively participate in Kennan Institute programs. **Deadline:** April 1, 2008. Contact: Galina Starovoitova Fellowship, Kennan Moscow Project, Pochtovyi Iashchik 90, Moscow, 123001, Russia. Tel: (495) 232-3496; Fax: (495) 232-3497. kennan@kennan.ru; http://www.wilsoncenter.org/

**Job Opening: University of Pittsburgh, Center for Russian & East European Studies, Associate Director**

The Center for Russian & East European Studies (REES) at the University of Pittsburgh seeks to fill the position of Associate Director. REES is a Title VI National Resource Center that works with faculty, students and staff throughout the University, including the humanities, social sciences and professional schools; organizes an educational outreach program for the local community and tri-state region; maintains a wide network of international exchanges; helps support the annual Slavic and East European Summer Language Institute; and publishes the Carl Beck Papers in Russian & East European Studies. The Associate Director advises graduate and professional school students in the REES Graduate Certificate programs. Some national and international travel is required. This is a full-time administrative position, but limited adjunct teaching may be possible.

Review of applications will begin on April 11, 2008 and will continue until the position is filled. Please visit the University’s Human Resources website at www.hr.pitt.edu to apply. In addition to the application, please be sure to submit a curriculum vitae, a statement of administrative and research experience, and reference letters as attachments.
Graduate Student Paper Competition

Graduate students are invited to submit papers devoted to Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. The paper may be in any field of study represented by the AAASS—including Anthropology, History, Linguistics, Literature, Political Science, Sociology, and the Visual Arts and Architecture.

The winning paper will be published as a BPS Working Paper with a summary in the ISEEES Newsletter, and the author will receive a $300 honorarium. The paper will also be entered in the national AAASS graduate student paper competition for 2007. The winner of the AAASS competition receives free travel and room at the AAASS annual convention. Non-winning papers will also be considered for publication in the BPS Working Paper Series if they meet our criteria for publication.

Papers must have a minimum word count of 7,500 and a maximum word count of 14,000 (25 to 50 pages approximately) inclusive of footnotes and bibliography. They should be submitted in electronic format to iseees@berkeley.edu by May 10, 2008.

Contact information:
Jeffrey Pennington
Executive Director
Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies
University of California, Berkeley
260 Stephens Hall #2304
Berkeley, CA 94720-2304
(510) 642-3230
jpennington@berkeley.edu