

---

# NEWS OF THE PROFESSION

---

## CONFERENCES 1970

*September 8-12:* American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Los Angeles, California. Program Chairman: Richard L. Merritt, Department of Political Science, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801.

*October 15-17:* Southern Conference on Slavic Studies Ninth Annual Meeting, Loyola University, New Orleans, Louisiana. Contact: Jordan E. Kurland, Associate General Secretary, American Association of University Professors, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. Program Chairman: Nikola R. Pribic, Department of Modern Languages, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306.

*October 29-31:* Southern AATSEEL Meeting, Memphis, Tennessee. Program Chairman: Olga Shaskevich, Department of Foreign Languages, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001.

*November 6-7:* Ninth Annual Bi-State Slavic Conference, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas. Contact: Slavic and Soviet Area Studies, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044, if you wish to attend or contribute a paper.

*November 13-15:* Fifth Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences in America, New York University, New York, N.Y. Contact: Dr. John Lexa, Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences in America, 381 Park Avenue South, Room 1121, New York, N.Y. 10016. Program Chairman: Anthony L. Vanek, same address.

*November 18-22:* American Anthropological Association Annual Meeting, San Diego State College, San Diego, California 92115.

## 1971

*March 25-27:* American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies Annual Meeting in conjunction with the Far

Western Slavic Conference, Denver, Colorado.

## 1972

*March 16-18:* American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies Annual Meeting in conjunction with the Southwestern AAASS, Dallas, Texas.

## INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS

In honor of the Bi-State Slavic Conference's November 1969 meeting in Columbia, Missouri, the University of Missouri Library issued a special edition of its *Friends of the Library Notes*, devoted exclusively to a description of the library's Russian and East European holdings. Missouri faculty specialists dealing with the Slavic world enumerated the more notable items in their respective disciplines. Charles Timberlake contributed the section on Russian and East European history, John R. Swanson the section on Soviet politics, James M. Curtis and Sarah P. Burke the sections on prerevolutionary and twentieth-century Russian literature. Individual copies of this issue of the *Notes* may be obtained by writing to the library.

A portion of the significant Slavic holdings of the New York Public Library are described in a recent article by Edward Kasinec, "Eighteenth Century Russian Publications in the New York Public Library: A Preliminary Catalogue," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, November 1969, pp. 599-614.

A new International Association of Researchers into the Life and Works of F. M. Dostoevsky is now being organized to mark the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the writer's birth in 1971. The aim of the association is to promote cooperation between Dostoevsky scholars in all countries, to exchange information via newsletter and international conferences, and to issue a directory of persons in the field and their publications on the author.

All those wishing to take part in the work of the association are asked to contact the appropriate Organizing Committee member listed below and supply him with a

short autobiography and a list of their own articles, books, and theses, both past and current, dealing with Dostoevsky.

In Canada contact: N. V. Pervushin, Department of Russian, McGill University, Montreal 2, Quebec, Canada. In the United States contact: Vladimir I. Seduro, 29 Mellon Avenue, Troy, New York 12180, or Nadine Natov-Popluiko, 88-38, 191st Street, Hollis, New York 11423.

A new Institute for Balkan Studies has been created under the auspices of the Serbian Academy of Sciences in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. The new institute will embrace all fields of Balkan studies, including archaeology, history, linguistics, ethnology, sociology, economy, law, the history of literature and the arts. The institute plans to publish an annual *Balkanica* in foreign languages, as well as a series of monographs and collections of documents, and to hold national and international meetings. The collaboration of American institutions and scholars involved in the Balkan field is solicited by the institute in order to arrange exchanges of publications and to develop bibliographical and archival documentation. Address inquiries to: Vaso Cubrilović, Director, Institute for Balkanology, Serbian Academy of Sciences, Knez Mihailova 35, Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

The Ukrainian Historical Association, since 1965 the publisher of *Ukrains'kyi Istoryk*, has announced that henceforth the journal will print articles in English as well as in Ukrainian. The association currently plans to issue annually a *Ukrainian Historical Bibliography* that will be international in scope and will cover books and articles in a topical and chronological arrangement. It is hoped that the first volume will be ready at the end of 1970.

Address all articles and books for review in *Ukrains'kyi Istoryk* to: Lubomyr R. Wynar, Editor, *Ukrainian Historian*, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio 44240.

*Soviet Geography: Review and Translation* provides translations of selected papers from Soviet geographic journals in all fields of the discipline, but with some emphasis on social and economic aspects and mathematical techniques. It also provides tables of contents of relevant Soviet journals, lists of geographical articles translated elsewhere, and news notes prepared by Theodore Shabad, editor and translator.

The National Science Foundation, which has supported *Soviet Geography* since 1960,

has recently renewed its grant, but has indicated that the journal must eventually become self-supporting. Therefore, the journal has announced that effective January 1970 institutional subscriptions are \$35.00 a year; the price of \$10.00 for individual subscribers has been retained.

Harvard University's Russian Research Center has announced that a limited number of postdoctoral research fellowships will be available for the academic year 1971-72 for scholars engaged in research on any aspect of Russian or East European life, particularly economics, government, history, literature, and sociology.

Scholars who already have financial support from another source may apply for the status of associate, which carries no stipend but provides access to the research facilities of the center and the university. Applications are due by January 15, 1971. Address inquiries to: Russian Research Center, 1737 Cambridge Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138.

#### CONFERENCE REPORTS

The Sixth International Conference of the Foundation for Foreign Affairs and the German Studiengesellschaft für Fragen mittel- und osteuropäischer Partnerschaft, took place in Deidesheim, Germany, April 1-3, 1970.

The general topic of the conference was "Reforms in the Communist World and the Nations of Europe." The introductory lecture was given by Professor Eugen Lemberg of Frankfurt. Panels dealing with political, cultural, and economic reforms were chaired by Professors John A. Armstrong of Wisconsin, Boris Meissner of Cologne, Jerzy Hauptman of Missouri, Gotthold Rhode of Mainz, L. A. D. Dellin of Vermont, and Hermann Gross of Munich. Panelists included Adam Bromke of Carleton, Stephen Kertesz of Notre Dame, Franz Ronneberger of Nuremberg, Gyula Borbandi of Munich, Karl Dedecius of Frankfurt, Gabor Kocsis of Ratingen, Franz Künzel of Unterpfaffenhofen, Michael Garmnikow of Munich, H. H. Höhmann of Cologne, J. Hawlowitsch of Munich, and Ernst Lederer of Lüntorf.

The conference was attended by about 150 invited guests from many European countries, Canada, and the United States. The proceedings will be published soon in German and English.

L. A. D. DELLIN.  
*University of Vermont*

The National Association for Soviet and East European Studies (NASEES) held its annual meeting April 17–19, 1970, at the University of London. Attendance totaled 110 persons, eighteen of whom were from abroad. Topics, chairmen, and discussants of the three major sessions were as follows: (1) "Soviet Science and Technology," R. Hutchings, Royal Institute of International Affairs. Discussants: D. J. Holloway, Institute of Strategic Studies, and R. Amman, University of Birmingham. (2) "Social, Political, and Economic Circumstances of Workers' Councils," USSR—G. P. van den Berg, University of Leiden; Yugoslavia—F. Singleton, Bradford University; Other East European Countries—M. C. Kaser, St. Antony's College, Oxford. Discussant: J. Zupanov, Zagreb University. (3) "Sources of National Identity in East Europe," R. Auty, Brasenose College, Oxford. Discussant: J. F. Triska, Stanford University.

#### APPOINTMENTS AND STAFF CHANGES

*Brown University:* Roman Jakobson, emeritus of Harvard University, appointed visiting professor in comparative literature, fall semester 1970; Antonín Dostál of Charles University and the Byzantinological Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences appointed professor of Slavic languages and literatures; Sam Driver and Patricia Arant promoted to associate professor of Slavic languages.

*California State College at Los Angeles:* Harry Kenneth Rosenthal of Northern Illinois University appointed assistant professor of history.

*Columbia University:* Rado L. Lencek appointed associate professor of South Slavic linguistics; Vojtech Mastny appointed acting director of the Institute on East Central Europe in 1970–71 during the absence of Istvan Deak on sabbatical leave.

*University of Detroit:* George W. Simmonds of Wayne State University appointed associate professor of history.

*Duke University:* Ludmila Foster of the College of Holy Cross appointed assistant professor of Slavic languages and literatures.

*University of Illinois:* Peter B. Maggs promoted to professor of law; Keith A. Hitchins promoted to professor of history; Steven P. Hill promoted to associate professor of Russian; Christina Wolcott promoted to assistant professor of library science; Jan Gorecki of the Jagellonian

University of Cracow and recently of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford appointed professor of sociology.

*Queens College of City University of New York:* Henry W. Morton promoted to professor of political science.

*University of Rhode Island:* Sona Aro-nian of the University of Pittsburgh appointed in the Department of Languages.

*Ripon College:* William J. Wolley appointed assistant professor of history.

*Slavic Bibliographic and Documentation Center:* Anita Navon of Catholic University appointed to the staff.

*State University of New York at Buffalo:* Frederic J. Fleron, Jr., of the University of Kentucky appointed associate professor of political science.

*University of Virginia:* G. Warren Nutter granted leave of absence to serve as assistant secretary of defense for international security affairs; Christopher Collins appointed director of the Center for Russian and Communist Studies.

*University of Washington:* W. A. Douglas Jackson appointed associate director of the Russian and East European Studies Program of the Far Eastern and Russian Institute; Jack V. Haney appointed assistant professor and acting chairman of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literature.

#### NOTES

The American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies is an international, interdisciplinary organization of persons interested in the Slavic and East European field. *Regular* memberships are \$15.00 per year; *sustaining* memberships are \$25.00 per year. A *student* membership (without vote) at \$7.50 per year is available to full-time students with U.S. mailing addresses. Students outside the United States, as well as students with teaching assistantships or part-time jobs, may join as regular members. There are also nonvoting *associate* memberships at \$15.00 per year. *Joint* memberships are available for a married couple, both of whom wish to join the Association but who need only one copy of the publications; both names will be listed, but the fee and voting rights are those of a single membership. The membership dues for *emeritus* members are \$7.50.

All classes of membership receive the quarterly *Slavic Review*; the *American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies* (regular price \$3.50), published

now by Ohio State University; the Association's *Newsletter* (regular price \$4.00 per year in the United States, \$4.00 abroad), published four times a year at Ohio State University; and the *Directory* of the Association (sold to nonmembers at \$5.00) in the years when it is published. Application blanks for membership are available from the AAASS, Ohio State University, 190 West Nineteenth Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210.

Contributions both to this section and to the *Newsletter* are welcome at any time. Send all items to Mrs. Ruth C. Morley in care of the AAASS in Columbus.

United States post offices will not forward magazines or journals. They are returned to the publisher at a charge of at least ten cents each. If you move, please send immediate notice to AAASS headquarters in Columbus, giving both new and old addresses. Allow four weeks to effect a change of address.

AAASS mailing lists are available on envelopes or labels. Persons or organizations wishing to use this service should write to Mrs. Anne Bachelder, Business Manager, AAASS, 190 West Nineteenth Avenue, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210.

### THE FUTURE OF SOVIET STUDIES IN THE UNITED STATES

MARSHALL D. SHULMAN, *Columbia University*

(Presented before the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies Annual Meeting, Columbus, Ohio, March 26, 1970)

The field of Soviet studies in America is approaching a period of straitened circumstances, and thus we are compelled to think clearly about our directions and our priorities. The prospect for a lower level of support for Soviet studies arises from a shift of attention by this society away from foreign problems in general and concern with the Soviet Union in particular. Partly this shift reflects a characteristic cyclical swing in the national mood toward domestic preoccupations;<sup>1</sup> in part it marks a healthy recovery from the disproportionate tensions of the Cold War period. Possibly also this change reflects some doubt on the academic side that the intrinsic interest of the field is sufficient to justify a continuation of the present scale of effort.

We, like any group with common interests, tend to identify our endeavors with the fate of all mankind, but we are now obliged to ask ourselves with reasonable detachment what scale of effort the field of Soviet studies now warrants in comparison with other academic subjects, and what the distribution of effort should be within our field. I would therefore like to put before you as a basis for discussion a few propositions about some academic and public policy aspects of Soviet studies today, as well as some concrete proposals regarding the resources required to maintain the level and kind of effort we think necessary.

I assert at the outset my conviction that the field is not constricted by inherent limitations of the subject. The impressive work that has been done during the past two decades, far from exhausting the field, has laid the foundations for work that is intellectually exciting and of compelling practical significance, both because of the complex processes of change in the Soviet Union and because our methods of inquiry have been effectively broadened by advances in the social sciences. Our need, however, is not for numbers but for a higher level of training and scholarship.

Among the substantive academic problems facing the Soviet field today, two have particular force: a need to redefine the area concept in the light of our present stage of development, and a need for a sustained and systematic effort to resolve the old problem of underrepresented disciplines.

1. Ward Morehouse, "American University Student Interest in International Studies," an informal survey by the Center for International Programs and Comparative Studies, State Education Department, University of the State of New York, Albany, January 1970.

The area concept in Soviet studies has had its ups and downs over the last two decades. In 1947 the Committee on World Area Research of the Social Science Research Council set forth recommendations for multidisciplinary area training which corresponded to the principles largely followed, at least as aspiration, by the major training programs set up in the postwar period. The guiding idea was to prepare students to deal with the Soviet system and society as a whole by studying up to five disciplines if possible, combined with interdisciplinary seminars. In a review of the field a decade later by a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies<sup>2</sup> it was judged that the area training approach suffered from serious limitations in practice. Particularly in the case of students preparing for academic careers it was felt that an emphasis upon area training resulted in inadequate work in their respective disciplines. The result was a swing away from the area concept: fewer "core" courses were required from a spread of disciplines, and traditional disciplinary interests reasserted themselves. An increasing number of students began to bypass the area training programs in favor of a Soviet concentration within conventional disciplinary training programs. The opening up of possibilities for study in the Soviet Union at about the same time moderated somewhat the swing away from area training, because it was felt that multidisciplinary preparation was necessary to the exchange experience. However, the swing was re-enforced by a growing feeling that once the descriptive foundations of the field were done the intellectual frontiers of the field were to be found not in the framework of area studies but in applying to the Soviet field innovative methodologies from the social sciences. Now, with the passage of a second decade, the swing of the pendulum has gone so far as to call into question the present utility of the area approach. Graduate students are coming into the field with better preparation from their undergraduate and even secondary school training; this situation, together with the growth of interest in comparative and developmental approaches to Soviet studies, and the wider application of newer theories and methodologies from the social sciences,<sup>3</sup> has raised questions whether the area approach to Soviet studies still has a role to play and justifies support.

We have reached a point, I believe, at which the swing of the pendulum should be arrested. What our experience suggests is not a simple linear scale between "area" at one end and "discipline" at the other, but a more differentiated approach according to the specific purpose at hand. (1) The area training program, in its multidisciplinary sense, has shown its usefulness for the professional training of those who are going into government, journalism, or other applied fields. (2) Although some multidisciplinary work is useful in the early graduate training stage of those who are going on to academic careers, it should be subordinated to thorough preparation in the respective disciplines. (3) Where there is need for a revitalization of the area approach, in an *interdisciplinary* sense, is in providing research opportunities for superior advanced graduate students and mature scholars.<sup>4</sup> This third level is responsive to the fact that many of the most interesting

2. Cyril E. Black and John M. Thompson, eds., *American Teaching About Russia* (Bloomington, 1959); also, Harold H. Fisher, ed., *American Research on Russia* (Bloomington, 1959).

3. Robert E. Ward, "Area Studies in the 1970's," an informal memorandum prepared for the Social Science Research Council, Nov. 28, 1969.

4. See the conclusion in Black and Thompson, *American Teaching About Russia*, that the only successful examples of interdisciplinary study involved advanced graduate students, young teachers, and senior scholars. "This suggests that inter-disciplinary study

problems now before us in the study of Soviet developments are of a nature that requires interdisciplinary study at a high level of competence—for example, the impact of advanced technology upon the Soviet system and society; the political, cultural, and economic implications of the nationalities problem; ideological and political influences in contemporary literature; the complex political and social problems involved in economic planning and administration. In addition to these suggestive illustrations of problem-focused research requiring interdisciplinary competence, we find similar requirements arising out of many of the newer developments in social science theory and methodology—in the studies of elites and interest groups, bureaucratic politics and organizational theory, decision-making processes, in perception, communication, and sociological work-studies, and in the use of quantitative techniques.

These problems and methods suggest a greater level of effort to develop at least *some* centers of advanced training and research, seminars, workshops, and conferences where truly interdisciplinary work is possible at a high level of scholarship. If this priority is accepted, it should be reflected in the assignment of funds for fellowships and conferences. The numbers involved are not likely to be large, but the intellectual stimulation of such work would be felt widely not only in the Soviet field but in the social sciences generally.

A second substantive academic need of the Soviet field is to conduct a systematic and coordinated effort to fill the gaps in the so-called underrepresented disciplines: sociology, anthropology, social psychology, the fine arts, education, religion, the organization of the natural sciences, demography, and geography. This is a perennial complaint, and from time to time letters have been written to department chairmen, buds of promise have been nurtured, but in spite of everything we remain in a situation in which many potentially useful tools of analysis remain unavailable, and many aspects of Soviet life and culture are omitted from our studies. There are those who have faith in the laissez-faire distribution of scholarly effort: if the materials are interesting enough and are available for study, they say, scholars will be attracted without special inducement. Unfortunately, the unseen hand has worked as imperfectly here as elsewhere; some help is needed to overcome the special difficulties of those who would combine academic careers in these disciplines with at least a minor preoccupation with things Soviet.

Perhaps the most important gap is in sociology. The difficulty of conducting systematic sociological studies in the Soviet Union and the attractions—including financial—of other sociological investigations have for quite some time made it difficult to recruit qualified students in this field. But the need is now more urgent, and the moment is perhaps more propitious than it has been. The beginning of sociological investigations in the Soviet Union, the fascinating sociological dimensions of processes of change in the Soviet system, and the hopeful beginnings of cultural exchanges in the sociological field—all argue for renewed efforts in this direction. There is no doubt that, despite the remaining difficulty of doing the kind of intensive field investigation in the Soviet Union that is normal elsewhere, sociologists could make *the* single most exciting contribution to Soviet studies today.

With the cooperation of the universities and the main organizations in this

---

is possible only after a multi-disciplinary knowledge of the area has been acquired, some command of and practice in a disciplinary skill has been developed, and some reflection and maturing of judgment has occurred" (p. 83).

field, it might be possible to seed the Soviet field with a small number of qualified young scholars in these disciplines in five years' time. It would be necessary, first of all, to recognize that we would ask of these young scholars not a total commitment to the Soviet field but only that it be one of their interests; second, we would want to formulate a minimum program of preparation in the field, including the language, that could be accomplished in one year of concentrated study; and, third, with the cooperation of the Foreign Area Fellowship Program and the International Research and Exchanges Board, and with augmented funds if necessary, ten special development fellowships would be made available each year for advanced graduate students in these designated fields, each such fellowship to run for three years—a year of preparation, a year of study in the Soviet Union (if possible), and a year of writing time. Sustained contacts would be necessary with chairmen of the relevant departments at major universities to help in the selection of highly qualified advanced graduate students who had completed their course work for the doctorate in their disciplines. Over a seven-year period 150 such young scholars could be exposed to the field. No new mechanisms would be necessary to carry out such a project, and if augmented funds are required, I believe they could be obtained for such a purpose; what is required is that either the AAASS or the Joint Committee, or both, accept entrepreneurial responsibility for launching and coordinating the development program.

Our field of Soviet studies has a dual character: as a pursuit of knowledge it has sought to maintain high standards of academic objectivity and to contribute intellectual insights and methods to other branches of scholarship; it is also, in the word of the day, "relevant," being a subject matter vitally involved in the question of whether life can survive on this planet. As scholars we strive for independence, objectivity, and integrity. As citizens we hope that our knowledge can contribute to informed, enlightened, and wise decisions on the part of the public and the government.

Because of its relevance to matters of public policy, the Soviet field has received support beyond what it would have been able to claim in its purely academic character. The first Soviet sputnik in 1957 had among its other effects the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which has contributed greatly to language and area instruction in this country by doubling the number studying Russian in colleges and graduate schools over a decade. Although the word "defense" had a certain magic in those days in loosening the legislative purse strings, it happily has not been construed in narrow terms and has made possible academically independent work which at the same time has undoubtedly contributed to a higher level of competence to deal with the international environment than would have been the case without such help. The government, through the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State, has also given valuable financial support to the cultural exchange program, and we hope it will continue to do so despite budget reductions.

The climate of the times has inevitably raised the level of tension between these two aspects of our field. We have rightly sought to distinguish and to protect vigilantly the sphere in which academic independence must remain wholly autonomous—for example, we need to fight for the rescinding of paragraph 706 of the State Department Appropriations Act, which would exclude from the exchanges students who had participated in campus demonstrations—but there has also arisen in the academic community an indiscriminate hostility to the government which is self-defeating in its effect. This sentiment contributes to the destructive polarization

of American political life. It has kept many of our able young people from considering government careers. It has diminished the contribution our scholars could make to an enlightened public policy. The present administration, it should be added, has not made it any easier to bridge this gulf. Nevertheless, we should ask ourselves whether in this society we do not, as citizens, share a responsibility for matters of public policy. There are many areas in which we could contribute more effectively than we do. For example, it would be of enormous help if our field could contribute a large cadre of young scholars who could combine knowledge of Soviet affairs with competence in the subject of arms control. We are thinly manned in this area, despite the opportunity it offers to render practical service to the cause of peace. Such specialists could broaden and deepen the many nongovernmental channels of communication which, if used responsibly, can in some degree help prepare the ground for a recognition by the United States and the USSR of their rational self-interest in moderating the senseless arms race. Scholars with such competence could help the two governments understand and communicate with each other and could contribute steadiness and moderation to a public opinion that tends to alternate between unmitigated hostility and millennial optimism.

In this connection it is interesting to take note of the development of studies in the Soviet Union about the United States. Some ten or more years ago Mikoyan observed during a visit to this country that the Soviet Union should emulate our development of Soviet studies here. A year or two ago this suggestion was realized with the establishment of the Institute of the United States of America, under the USSR Academy of Sciences. Its director is the able "Americanist," Dr. Georgii A. Arbatov, who is building up the institute to its complement of two hundred researchers, many of whom will be recent university graduates, covering all major aspects of American life. The institute is now publishing a monthly journal, *USA: Economics, Politics, Ideology*, which is impressive in its scope and size and which, it is to be hoped, will in time help Soviet readers to go beyond the primitive "know your enemy" stereotypes that now fill so much of the Soviet press.

We should welcome the appearance of this new institute, and we should do what we can to help its scholars become acquainted with the United States. They will doubtless be formidable adversaries in some ways, but the more that Soviet actions can be based on knowledge rather than primitive stereotypes the less likely we all are to suffer the consequences of reckless miscalculations.

There is an element of irony in turning now to a consideration of the serious reduction in financial support for Soviet studies in this country. At a time when the foundations have been under fire, it is worth our giving public testimony to the foresight and wisdom of the foundations—Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford, in particular—for their crucial role in the development of Soviet studies in the United States. Had it not been for their support and encouragement, the field would have been but a fraction of its present size and effectiveness, the exchange program would have been impossible, and our libraries would have been inadequate for either teaching or research.

But foundations now face new demands on their resources, particularly at a time when public attention is sharply directed to domestic problems. The universities, many of which are experiencing extraordinary financial strains, are able to absorb only part of the costs of programs initiated with outside support—programs that are often regarded as marginal to the main continuing responsibilities of the university. At the same time, the government has indicated its intention to reduce its support of foreign language and area programs sharply and abruptly. Currently



the committees of the Congress are considering appropriations for fiscal 1971 covering Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which would cut by two-thirds the support for all foreign language and area programs—from eighteen million to six million dollars. (By way of comparison, the cost of one F-111 attack plane, according to a recent announcement in Washington, is more than sixteen million dollars. The Defense Department has ordered 547 F-111's.) The Office of Education has indicated its intention to phase out these programs completely the following year.

If these reductions are not eased and the program is not extended, the effect will be catastrophic for the field of Soviet studies in the United States. The effect will be even greater than the amounts directly involved, because every government dollar has been matched by at least two dollars from the universities. In fact, the average is more like seven to one in matching funds. It seems probable that some programs of Soviet studies will be closed down and that most programs will find it necessary to reduce course offerings and to cut their teaching staffs, library support, and student fellowships.

No one would argue that all present activities are indispensable and that no economies can be made and no programs made better or more efficient. In fact, a large-scale review of these language and area programs is now being conducted by the Social Science Research Council with the support of the U.S. Office of Education, which could provide the basis for better long-term planning. But the abrupt and drastic reductions now contemplated will not allow time for orderly planning. It takes time to build these programs, and even if the support should be restored in a few years when the consequences of these cuts are more widely realized, it would be some years before the trained staffs and programs now suddenly dissipated could be replaced.

Even if the NDEA Title VI appropriation can be restored to its present level of eighteen million dollars and if the act can be extended for another three years—which at this moment seems uncertain—the underlying question would remain: where in this society does the responsibility rest for support of Soviet studies? It seems unlikely that the universities and the federal government together would support more than half of the present level of Soviet studies. A distinction needs to be made between subsidies and seed money: some lines of effort, after the investment of seed money, can be made self-supporting. Others cannot be, although they are also important, and they will therefore need continuing subsidy. If anything like the present scale of teaching and research is needed, it is clear that additional sources of support will have to be found.

It is reasonable to believe that among some of the smaller foundations, in the business community, and among private donors this need can be made clear and persuasive. This kind of fund-raising is, however, extremely time-consuming, and few university programs could manage it individually. What seems indicated, therefore, is a consortium effort at fund-raising for the Soviet field as a whole. The case for the field as a whole can be made on broader grounds than for any single university program, and while the distribution of funds among the universities and such field-wide activities as publications would be difficult, it should not be an insuperable task for a respected board of trustees, operating on the basis of established criteria governing the distribution.

The assumption implicit in the previous section is that the present scale of effort is justified in comparison with other foreign and domestic subjects requiring study. Is this assumption warranted? Are we producing more students than are

being absorbed? Are we by and large engaged in significant scholarship, on either intellectual or public policy grounds?

Impressions of one individual, or several, would not provide reliable answers to these questions. The field has grown too variegated for any one of us to have a sense of the whole. It is now fourteen years since the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies commissioned a review of the problems and achievements of Russian studies in the United States after its first decade, in order to suggest fruitful lines of development during the following decade. One of the consequences of that study was the recommendation that a professional membership organization be developed, and as we can see at this convention, this has been done, and successfully done. It would therefore seem appropriate if a similar review could now be conducted by a division of labor between the AAASS and the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies, each taking responsibility for that part of the review for which it is best equipped. It might be that the AAASS would wish to survey graduate, undergraduate, and secondary teaching about the Soviet Union in the United States—the preliminary survey for the AAASS edited by Piotr Wandycz of Yale, covering Russian and East European courses in American and Canadian universities, is an excellent start in this direction—and that the Joint Committee might wish to address itself to research progress and problems in the various disciplines. The survey would be able to build upon the preceding study, and would not therefore be as formidable nor as time-consuming a task. It would however enable us to judge more effectively what scale of effort the field of Soviet studies now warrants, and what the distribution of effort should be within the field.

Whatever directions such a survey might point for the future, of one thing I am confident: the high quality of the young students coming into our field today is the best assurance that the field of Soviet studies will have a lively future. In the long run, it will be the quality of our scholarship and of our teaching rather than our numbers that will be important.

---

#### ARKADII V. BELINKOV, 1921–1970

It was my good fortune to meet Arkadii Belinkov shortly after his arrival in the United States, back in July 1968. It so happened that only a week earlier I had come across his remarkable study of Iurii Tynianov as a historical novelist. I emerged from these two encounters with the firm conviction that the worn, intense man whom I saw on a memorable summer afternoon was one of present-day Russia's most significant literary critics and most intransigent intellectuals.

Belinkov paid a heavy price for his fidelity to the best traditions of the Russian intelligentsia. In 1944, when still a budding literary scholar, about to graduate from the University of Moscow, he was arrested for having written a script criticizing the Hitler-Stalin pact. He was sentenced to death, but was reprieved and spent thirteen harrowing years in forced labor camps. He was released in 1956, with a severe heart ailment which was to plague him until his death.

Yet if Belinkov's health was broken, his spirit was undaunted and his intellectual powers unimpaired. The literary brilliance of his first full-length book—*Iurii Tynianov* (1960)—won him plaudits from such venerable men of letters as Kornei Chukovsky; its prodigious scholarship established Belinkov as one of the leading literary historians of his generation. Yet *Iurii Tynianov* was a political as well as an intellectual event: the plight of a Küchelbecker or a Griboedov under the

repressive regime of Nicholas I acquired here an explosive contemporary relevance which was not lost on the intelligent reader.

The theme of the intellectual's predicament in an autocratic society reappeared in Belinkov's extensive study of Iurii Olesha, bearing a significant title "The Capitulation and Fall of a Soviet Intellectual." This time the author's intent did not elude the official watchdogs. Violent attacks on Belinkov in *Literaturnaia gazeta*, triggered by a magazine publication of two sections of his new manuscript, were unmistakably ominous. In the summer of 1968 Belinkov and his wife Natalia fled to the West. In September of that year he joined Yale's Department of Slavic Languages as a lecturer in Russian literature.

The adjustment to the new environment was not easy. Virtual isolation from the mainstream of the university life—due to the language barrier—was hard on the articulate and forceful man who only a few months earlier had been at the center of his native country's intellectual ferment. To a victim and impassioned foe of Soviet totalitarianism, determined to tell the West about the new wave of political repression in Russia, the lukewarm responses of some of his colleagues or students, preoccupied with painful American dilemmas, smacked of indifference, if not hostility, to his message—hence the occasional abrasiveness which seems to have alienated some of the potential beneficiaries of Arkadii's vast experience and insight. Yet those of us who worked with him closely and got to know him intimately came to appreciate not only his inexhaustible fund of knowledge, his brilliant grasp of the Soviet cultural scene, but also his amazing spiritual resilience.

Upon settling in New Haven, Belinkov plunged into feverish pedagogical and literary activity. He lectured on various aspects of Russian literature and society in his Yale courses and seminars as well as in public appearances at a number of other American universities. He was revising his book on Olesha for impending publication in English and was gathering materials for a large-scale study of Alexander Solzhenitsyn. Lately he had been hard at work on a reinterpretation of the post-Stalin "thaw," scheduled to appear in a magazine speaking for recent Soviet defectors—a new literary venture in which he was to assume a leading role.

Needless to say, this schedule—which would have taxed heavily a sturdier constitution—was pursued in open disregard of the doctor's orders. Friends pleaded with Arkadii in vain. He would invariably retort: "I did not come here to take it easy. I came to finish the job which I could no longer do in Russia. Let me be: I have so little time."

He had even less time than he knew. The body ravaged by years of mistreatment and abuse refused to function: on May 14 Belinkov died in the Yale–New Haven Hospital. He was not destined "to finish the job." Yet by what he has done and by what he has so valiantly endeavored to do, he has left behind a legacy of scholarly attainment, of integrity and courage which commands respect and impels admiration.

VICTOR ERLICH  
Yale University

#### WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN, 1897–1969

William Henry Chamberlin spent the years 1922–34 in the Soviet Union as Moscow correspondent of the *Christian Science Monitor*. These years were decisive for his long career as journalist and free-lance writer. Born in Brooklyn on February 17,

1897, a 1917 graduate of Haverford, he entered the world of early postrevolutionary Russia in his twenties, departing more than a decade later on the brink of the great Stalin purges. His experiences during NEP and the First Five-Year Plan profoundly influenced his outlook in his subsequent activities as contributing editor to the *New Leader* and the *Wall Street Journal* and as author of numerous books in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. The evolution of his political position is perhaps most succinctly indicated by the titles of some of his books over the years: *Soviet Russia: A Living Record and a History* (1930), *The Soviet Planned Economic Order* (1931), *Russia's Iron Age* (1934), *Collectivism: A False Utopia* (1937), *The Russian Enigma: An Interpretation* (1943), *Beyond Containment* (1953), *The Evolution of a Conservative* (1959), and *Appeasement: Road to War* (1962). The conservative trend of his political views is part of the long-drawn debate in American society about its domestic complexion and its foreign posture, an area of polemic that has certainly not diminished in the months since Chamberlin's death.

The outstanding feature of his career, however, is that he has left one scholarly monument that seems, in an extraordinary way, to stand outside the flux of opinion. His major work, *The Russian Revolution, 1917–1921*, which was published in 1935, still remains the best single work in any language to cover the revolutionary year 1917 and the civil struggle that ensued. By now the volume of writings on the Russian Revolution is quite overwhelming, and certainly many monographs have carried the study of a number of important points beyond those reached by Chamberlin. But one can only be staggered, when one goes back to this book, at the richness of information, the clarity of insight, the ability to get at the main issues, and the capacity to achieve a coherent narrative through the chaos of those years.

His work stands as something of a rebuke to professional historians, but more significantly it raises some fascinating questions about the virtues of perspective that we presumably gain by "distance" from the subject. Here we have a journalist, writing little more than a decade after one of the tumultuous and controversial events in modern history, producing something that rings true more than three decades later. Repeatedly the contemporary researcher engaged in exploring some favored new angle on the Revolution will find, perhaps with chagrin, that Chamberlin was aware of it long since.

How was this achievement (paralleling perhaps the late Louis Fischer's history of Soviet foreign policy) possible? Apart from Chamberlin's remarkable talents as an inquirer, the answer may in part be biographical—the particular combination of his initial noninvolvement (he was not a John Reed), the subsequent immediacy of scene and sources (he was fortunate in the persons and materials still accessible in the 1920s), and, presumably, a slowly developing critical view of the event and its aftermath. Somehow, these elements together produced in a relatively brief span of time that difficult combination of information, sensitivity, and balance that we like to call mature historical scholarship.

Whatever the explanation, we, as students and teachers of Russian history, have reason to be grateful for William Henry Chamberlin's achievement: a book to recommend for the serious beginner, an indispensable starting point for many of the continuing and needed discussions of the numerous unresolved issues, and a valued companion to have in one's library.

HENRY L. ROBERTS  
*Dartmouth College*