

News of the Profession

THE ASSOCIATION

Election of Directors: A preferential ballot in December, ratified by the proxies sent to an official "Meeting of Members" on January 21, 1965, in Urbana, resulted in the election to the Board of Directors of Hugh McLean of the University of Chicago and Oswald P. Backus, III, of the University of Kansas. Their terms will run from 1965 to 1967 inclusive. By the same process, the four vacancies on the Nominating Committee were filled by Hans Rogger of the University of California at Los Angeles, W. A. Douglas Jackson of the University of Washington, Raymond Garthoff of the U.S. Department of State, and George Gibian of Cornell University. Mr. Rogger, as the recipient of the largest number of votes, by our custom became the Chairman of this Committee for 1965 and will continue as a member during 1966. Mr. Treadgold, as the outgoing Chairman, continues as a member of the Committee during the year 1965.

APPOINTMENTS AND STAFF CHANGES

This section contains news of promotions, regular appointments, and retirements. For information on visiting appointments, leaves of absence of a year or less, and summer appointments, see the *Newsletter*.

American University: Jaroslaw Pelenski, formerly of King's College, Wilkes-Barre, appointed Assistant Professor of History. *Arizona State University*: Marvin Jackson promoted to Assistant Professor of Economics. *Boise Junior College*: Frederick Kellogg appointed Assistant Professor of History. *Boston University*: Mrs. W. C. (Diane Shaver) Clemens, Jr., appointed Instructor of Russian History; M. K. Dziewanowski of Boston College appointed Professor of Russian and East European History. *University of California, Berkeley*: Simon Karlinsky

appointed Assistant Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures.

University of California, Riverside: Louis A. Pedrotti promoted to Associate Professor of Russian. *University of British Columbia*: Allen Sinel appointed Instructor of History. *Columbia University*: William E. Harkins appointed Chairman of the Department of Slavic Languages; Harry J. Psomiades promoted to Assistant Dean of the School of International Affairs. *Cornell College*: Mihailo Mihailovic promoted to Professor of Russian.

Florida State University: Victor S. Mamatey appointed Chairman of the Department of History. *George Washington University*: Ralph K. White of the USIA appointed Professor of Psychology and a member of the Institute of Sino-Soviet Studies. *Illinois State University, Bloomington*: Donald Edward Davis appointed Assistant Professor of History. *Indiana University*: Loren R. Graham appointed Assistant Professor of History. *International Organization, Cambridge, Massachusetts*: Jessie R. Janjigian appointed Associate Editor. *Library of Congress*: Frank Reilly appointed Senior Technical Editor (Slavic).

University of Michigan: William Zimmerman promoted to Assistant Professor of Political Science. *University of Minnesota*: Theofanis G. Stavrou promoted to Associate Professor of History. *Monmouth College*: Benjamin Rigberg promoted to Professor of History. *NCA Foreign Relations Project*: Howard D. Mehlinger appointed Assistant Director of the Foreign Relations Project.

The New York Times: Harrison E. Salisbury promoted to Assistant Managing Editor. *Northwestern University*: Karl D. Kramer appointed Assistant Professor of Russian Literature. *Ohio State University*: Jack M. Lauber appointed Instructor of

History; David F. Robinson appointed Assistant Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures. *University of Oregon*: Joseph R. Fiszman promoted to Assistant Professor of Political Science. *Pratt Institute*: Jack Minkoff promoted to Associate Professor of Economics and Chairman of the Department of Social Studies. *Reed College*: Carl R. Proffer promoted to Assistant Professor of Russian.

Sacramento State College: Richard D. Hughes appointed Assistant Professor of Government. *University of San Diego*: Richard Dalton appointed Instructor of History. *South Carolina Voter Education Project*: Richard Miles appointed Field Director. *Spartan Books, Inc., Washington, D.C.*: Edward F. McCartan appointed Editor-in-Chief. *St. Louis University*: F. Henri Jaspas promoted to Assistant Professor of Modern Languages. *St. Michael's College, Winooski, Vermont*: The Rev. J. A. Lanoue, S.S.E., promoted to Associate Professor of History.

University of Tampa: Stephen L. Speronis appointed Vice-President for Development in addition to his duties as Professor of History and Political Science. *Trinity College*: Sister Mary Frances, S.S.N.D., promoted to Associate Professor of German and Russian. *U.S. Department of Commerce*: Leon Lewins promoted to Acting Director, Sino-Soviet Division, Bureau of International Commerce. *U.S. Department of State*: Robert Gerald Livingston of the American Embassy in Belgrade appointed Deputy Chief, Eastern Affairs Section, American Embassy in Berlin, Germany; Helmut Sonnenfeldt of The Johns Hopkins University appointed Chief, Bloc International Activities Division; Lecturer on Soviet Affairs, School of Advanced International Studies; and Research Consultant, Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research.

University of West Ontario: B. Kymlicka promoted to Assistant Professor of Political Science. *Windham College*: Kenneth Craven appointed Director of Research and Development. *University of Wisconsin*: H. Kent Geiger of Ohio State University appointed Professor of Sociology and Russian Area Studies Program. *Yale University*: Ivo J. Lederer promoted to Associate Professor of History.

**"Beyond doubt the
best single volume
of post-Stalin
Russian writing
available in English"**

—SATURDAY REVIEW

HALF-WAY TO THE MOON

**New Writings
from Russia**

Edited by PATRICIA BLAKE
and MAX HAYWARD

"Represented in this collection are some of the bravest and most talented voices on the contemporary Soviet literary scene: Voznesensky, Evtushenko, Akhmadulina, Vinokurov, Slutsky, and Sosnora among the poets, and Solzhenitsyn, Kazakov, Aksonov, Nagibin, Nekrasov, and Okudzhava among the prose writers. . . . [Their] passion for truth, for the tearing away of masks, for escaping the constraints of positive and negative heroes and restoring the human dimensions of literature provides the unifying theme of this anthology."—MERLE FAINSOD, *New York Times Book Review*

"A wonderful collection. . . . We find ourselves on the inside of Russian life looking out. The stories and poems have been vividly translated."—*The New Yorker*

\$5.95 at bookstores, or from

Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
383 Madison Ave., N.Y., N.Y. 10017

New, from

Oxford

Mission to Turkestan

Being the Memoirs of Count Pahlen 1908-1909

By COUNT K. K. PAHLEN. Edited by RICHARD A. PIERCE; translated by N. J. COURISS. Available for the first time, the vivid personal account of the Baltic German who was sent to investigate conditions in Russian-ruled Turkestan in 1907. "Though a loyal subject of the Tsar the fact that he was not a Russian 'enabled him to take an objective view of Russian methods.' . . . That he was writing after the Revolution allowed him to write with a 'now it can be told' openness about the corruption of pre-revolutionary times."

—*The Times Literary Supplement*
2 maps. \$5.60

Sons Against Fathers

Studies in Russian Radicalism and Revolution

By EUGENE LAMPERT. This book deals with Russian radical thought of the 1860's, which expressed and helped to shape a crucial period in Russian history. In the first part the author shows how new political, economic, and cultural trends brought conflict between two generations, as familiarized by Turgenev in *Fathers and Sons*. In the second part he studies three young radical intellectuals — Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov, and Pisarev. 3 plates. \$10.10

Oxford University Press
New York

EDITOR'S NOTES

Contributions both to this section and to the *Newsletter* are welcome at any time. The deadlines for inclusion in this section are October 15 for the March issue, January 15 for the June issue, April 15 for the September issue, and July 15 for the December issue. The deadlines for the *Newsletter* are February 28 for the spring issue and September 30 for the fall issue. All items should be sent to Professor Tatjana Cizevska in care of the AAASS, 1207 West Oregon St., University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61803.

United States post offices will no longer forward magazines or journals. Publications will be returned to the publisher at a charge of at least ten cents each. If you move, please send immediate notice to the AAASS headquarters in Urbana, giving both new and old addresses. At least four weeks are needed to change an address for copies of the *Slavic Review*, the *Newsletter*, the *American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies*, and the *Directory*.

AAASS mailing lists are available at the following rates: \$25.00 plus costs for printing the membership on envelopes or labels; \$25.00 plus costs for printing the subscription list on envelopes or labels. Costs are about one cent per name, currently about \$16.50 for the membership list and about \$8.00 for the subscription list. Persons or institutions wishing to use this service should write to the Secretary's office in Urbana.

All those whose interests include the Slavic and East European field are invited to join the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies. Membership rates are: regular, \$10.00 per year; sustaining, \$25.00 per year; student, \$5.00 per year (full-time students as well as students who are part-time teaching assistants); associate, \$10.00 per year. All classes of members receive the *Slavic Review* (regular subscription price for institutions \$10.00), the *American Bibliography of Russian and East European Studies* (regular price \$3.00) published yearly by Indiana University, the Association's *Newsletter* (separate subscriptions \$1.50 per year in the United States and Canada, \$1.80 abroad) published twice yearly at the University of Illinois, and the *Directory* of the Association (sold to non-members at \$5.00) in the years when it is published. Application blanks are available from the AAASS headquarters.

YURI PETROVICH DENIKE, 1887-1964

On December 29, 1964, Yuri Petrovich Denike (George Denicke) died in Brussels at the age of seventy-eight. One of the last surviving editors of the hardy émigré journal, *Sotsialisticheskii Vestnik*, Denike had been associated since 1917 with the Menshevik wing of the Russian Social Democrats. Yet his career, and above all his ideas, his attitudes, his style of life, vividly demonstrated the futility of trying to reduce the generation of the intelligentsia to which he belonged to any simple political or ideological formulas.

Born in Kazan in 1887, Denike was drawn, while still in the Gymnasium (as he put it, by the “revolutionary bacilla in the air”), to the revolutionary movement and specifically to Bolshevism—then the dominant tendency among Kazan Social Democrats. The intellectual path he traveled to Bolshevism may seem singular, for he was attracted by Ernst Mach and Nietzsche before he read Marx, by Aulard’s *History of the French Revolution* before he read Lenin. Yet this intellectual heterodoxy and catholicity, and the curious combination of “tough-minded” scientific realism and romanticism that underlay them, were by no means uncharacteristic of the Bolshevik generation of 1905—of its older representatives in the intelligentsia, such as Bogdanov, Bazarov, and Lunacharsky, just as of the precocious seventeen- and eighteen-year-old Gymnasium and university students who were so irresistibly, and briefly, attracted to them.

In the summer of 1905, a believer in Marxist “scientific method”—in the materialist interpretation of history if not in the crudeness of the dialectic—Denike enrolled in the Petersburg Polytechnic, the only institution in Russia that seemed to him to promise an adequate training in economics. But he was quickly pulled into the revolutionary maelstrom of Petersburg. He became a member of the Bolshevik College of Agitators, and then one of the “responsible agitators” of the Petersburg Soviet—“responsible,” at the age of eighteen, for the workers of the whole Narva district, including the giant Putilov Works.

The defeats of November and December 1905 did not end Denike’s connection with Bolshevism. Still under the spell of the simple and seemingly irrefutable logic of Lenin’s conceptions of the “democratic revolution” and the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, he was drawn into the higher reaches of the “collective” assembled around the Bolshevik Center. It was only after the dissolution of the First Duma that, no longer able to share Lenin’s persistent expectation of revolutionary uprisings in the countryside, Denike began to question, openly, his leader’s revolutionary assumptions. When it came, the parting of ways was swift, for Denike was not one to countenance the arbitrary and disingenuous methods that already, in 1906-7, characterized the Bolshevik faction’s suppression of dissent in its ranks.

A brief episode in the industrial center of Lugansk, in which Denike was involved with Voroshilov and other Bolshevik *primirentsy* in an effort to establish a nonfactional Social Democratic center—an effort which would have taken him as a nonfactional delegate to the Fifth (London) Party Congress but for his premature arrest by the tsarist police—ended this first chapter of his revolutionary career. By the time he was released from jail

(the spring of 1907), the revolutionary tide had clearly receded, and, like so many others in the younger generation of the revolutionary intelligentsia, Denike was attracted by the broader intellectual and social vistas that seemed to open despite, or perhaps even because of, the "political stagnation" of the Stolypin years. He felt the need to refurbish his intellectual baggage, now that his fundamental assumptions about Russian society had been repudiated by events. He also felt very deeply the sense of revulsion that affected so many of his contemporaries against their earlier life in the underground—with the blunting of emotions, the psychological distance in human relations, indeed the dulling of all perceptions which this life had caused. All these reactions now blended in Denike's mind into a sense that he knew all too little about *real* human beings and social groups, and must learn more. Even though this meant subjection to a period of police surveillance and restrictions, he decided to go back to Kazan to resume a "legal" existence and study, in a proper scientific manner, individual and group psychology.

On his return Denike did in fact help organize an informal university circle to conduct "psycho-physiological" explorations of the sources of human behavior. But since he was prohibited for two years from resuming his university studies, he combined these pursuits with a job as a reporter and commentator for a "progressive," non-Party Kazan newspaper. Most of Denike's articles for this paper were devoted to matters of public concern, but they now tended to focus on *malye dela*, on modest but practical causes in which he was able to feel more tangibly the effect of his involvement: exposures of cases of corruption in the Kazan civil service, of reactionary "caste" tendencies in the conduct of the new conservative leadership of the Kazan zemstvos, and the like. But Denike's writings now ranged considerably beyond public causes; he also contributed reviews and commentaries on the contemporary cultural scene, finding it for the first time permissible to indulge in the literary, and especially the musical, interests that he had always entertained.

These interests became even more impassioned when Denike moved to Moscow in 1910 to resume formally his university career. Some of his earlier infatuation with positivism had cooled, and he decided to enroll in the distinguished Historical Faculty of the University of Moscow. In the serious, professional atmosphere that then prevailed, even among the students at the University, Denike soon discovered in himself a quite exceptional range of scholarly gifts. His promise as a historian was quickly confirmed by the quality of two early published studies: the first on Thucydides, which appeared while he was still a student in Moscow; the other on Xenophon, which was published after his return to Kazan. Yet even while he was absorbed in his studies, Denike was attracted, as a bee to honey, by the glittering cultural life of the old capital. As a part-time reporter for a Moscow theatrical journal, he reviewed the brilliant productions of the Stanislavsky and the Maly, attended concerts and art exhibits, became deeply involved in the dissonant and often conflicting cultural movements and circles of prewar Moscow.

As the range of his interests, activities, and acquaintances widened, Denike's concern with the politics of the Social Democratic Party and of

the labor movement—indeed, with all the manifestations of actual or potential revolutionary currents—was proportionately diluted. It was not that he had ceased to consider himself a Social Democrat or even that he had lost his belief in the approach of a revolution. If anything, his belief in the inevitability of the overthrow of the tsarist regime hardened as he observed the many signs of its progressive disintegration. But this hardening of conviction was accompanied by a lessening of personal involvement, by an inability to see how he could, or perhaps even why he should, personally contribute to the inevitable outcome.

This attitude did not alter when in 1914 he had to return, for family reasons, to Kazan. Denike continued his historical studies at the University of Kazan, to which he was soon “attached,” in preparation for professorship; and he also resumed his career as a local journalist and *obshchestvennyi deiatel'*. Even the outbreak of war did not significantly affect the rhythm of his now settled existence, although it affected his mood. Denike shared the quiet pessimism that rapidly descended on most of Kazan society, a mood born out of the expectation of defeat. But while the thoughts of most of his colleagues apparently did not wander beyond the territorial losses and the “bourgeois,” Kadet-led revolution that Russia was likely to undergo, Denike already had an acute sense of the social disintegration and anarchy that this revolution, born in the ashes of military defeat, was likely to bring. This sense of things to come found echo in a vast historical study of the problem of legitimation of authority in the history of the Roman Empire on which he embarked in 1915 (and never finished). Yet even as visions of disintegration in the ancient world and the new coalesced in his mind, he spent much of his time during these years preparing a daily newspaper column on the progress of the war, moving pins on the maps hanging in his office in an effort to decipher from the deceptive military communiqués the usually retreating lines of the Russian armies.

It was in this setting that Denike received the news of the downfall of the tsarist regime. “Like an old war horse” (as he put it), he was immediately drawn back, if on a smaller stage, to the turmoil of revolutionary politics. Elected vice-chairman of both Kazan’s Soviet of Worker and Soldier Deputies and its Committee of Public Safety, he quickly became a veritable embodiment of the *dvoevlastie*, the one person on the local scene to whom gravitated whatever “legitimate” authority and responsibility could be maintained as the old world collapsed. The whole problem of the governmental power looked very different from the provinces than it did in Petrograd. In Kazan, at least, the authority of “bourgeois democracy” appeared from the very first far too empty, the need to maintain public order in the face of overwhelming pressures far too obvious, and the alternatives to the exercise of power far too stark, to indulge in any theoretical demurs over the problems that assuming a share of the power in an ostensibly bourgeois revolution posed for a socialist party. In the existing vacuum all real authority and responsibility flew to the local soviet and its socialist leadership, and without second thoughts Denike made his peace with this fact.

On his rare visits to the capital during these feverish and immensely wearying months, the whole atmosphere of Petrograd reminded Denike of

an insane asylum—in some respects not too unlike that asylum in Kazan whose inmates had decided at the outbreak of the Revolution to elect a new administration and send their own deputies to the soviet. It wasn't merely the interminable speeches and discussions in which the leaders of the Petrograd Soviet expended so much of their time that reminded Denike of this episode, but also their extraordinary remoteness from the pressing problems and needs that could all too easily be discerned at the grass roots. Denike was also astounded by the violent swings of mood—between the heights of exhilaration and the depths of depression—that he encountered during his visits to the capital. From the perspective of Kazan, such episodes as the June demonstrations, the July Days, the abortive military offensive, and the Bolshevik leaders' momentary loss of popularity during the summer of 1917, which loomed so large in Petrograd, appeared as mere ripples imperceptibly affecting the basic drift of popular attitudes and opinion away from the Provisional Government. By early August the Bolsheviks' popularity in Kazan was already higher—or, to put it more accurately, the stock of the Provisional Government was already lower—than it had been in late June and early July, and the government's downfall seemed but a matter of time.

This is not to suggest that Denike ceased to work and struggle during these months. But he struggled with a sense of impending doom. The only comfort that he could derive from the whole situation, and little comfort it was, stemmed from the conviction that the Bolsheviks would not be able to hold onto the power they sought so hard to conquer—that just as it was now moving so irresistibly to the left, the historical pendulum would soon swing just as inexorably to the right. This conviction was not quickly dispelled after October. Indeed, why should it have been? The Bolsheviks appeared all too clearly incapable of coping with the immense economic and military problems they had so lightly dismissed before their seizure of power. And the working class, which had so irresistibly been attracted by their promises, just as irresistibly drew away from them when these promises remained unfulfilled. But the question of how the discontent which was already so evident among the workers should be harnessed, and to what purpose, appeared infinitely more perplexing now that it had to be answered.

In search of a new role, or at least of new answers, Denike had moved to Petrograd in November, and in January 1918 he and a few other Menshevik *praktiki* assumed the leadership of what eventually became a genuine organized workers' movement to elect, outside the framework of the already lifeless soviets, assemblies of independent, representative workers' deputies (*sobraniia upolnomochennykh*). This movement steadily picked up momentum during the spring of 1918, culminating in a national conference of Factory Representatives which was arbitrarily dissolved by the Bolsheviks in July. But the specific ends to which this movement was to be directed had presented, well before its eventual suppression, an almost insoluble problem for both its leaders and followers. For the workers' sense of revulsion for Bolshevism was matched with a deep feeling of despair—with a sense of having no way out—which was reflected, directly or indirectly, in the political hesitations of their would-be Menshevik leaders. Under the circumstances, the movement had to be directed largely at the formulation and presentation of economic objectives and demands. The Menshevik leaders

sought to comfort themselves with the view that their historical role was now to try to rally as best they could, from the bottom up, the demoralized forces of the working class—so that, once the inevitable swing of the pendulum swept the Bolsheviks out of power, Soviet democracy might be able to resist the encroachments of reaction on the gains that the February Revolution had brought.

This vision was no clear guide to policy, and its relevance to action became even more obscure after the outbreak of the Civil War, when the increasingly reactionary character of the opposition to Bolshevism became more and more apparent. In the conflicts that tore the remnants of the Menshevik Party asunder as it confronted what most of its members conceived to be the choice between “Bolshevik tyranny” and “reaction,” Denike sided with those on the Menshevik right who refused to entertain the suggestion of giving active support to the Soviet power, even in the face of Denikin and Wrangel. But as Denike was himself aware, even this was no substitute for policy.

It was therefore in a mood of political helplessness that Denike now sought refuge in scholarly pursuits. On the invitation of his old friend Riazanov, he was drawn into the first stages of the work of the Communist Academy (and with some of his friends used its offices as a Menshevik Party *iauka*). Indeed, the Academic Council of the newly reorganized University of Moscow offered him a professorship of history, which was promptly vetoed by the authorities. And now largely removed from political life, he followed with interest the political and psychological evolution of the Bolshevik leadership. Denike still had many old and new friends among the Soviet leaders, and he had a unique opportunity to watch, with his own typical combination of sympathy and detachment, their mental hesitations, their *crises de cœur et de conscience*, as they wavered in the face of the country's growing economic disintegration and social unrest. By the beginning of 1921 the crisis reached its peak; revolutionary disorders spread through much of the countryside and eventually to Petrograd itself. Denike was privy to the major policy debates that this crisis unleashed in the Politburo and was an important participant in the extraordinary conversations which Stalin and other Bolsheviks opened, seemingly in all seriousness, in January-February 1921, about a possible sharing if not eventual surrender of their power, given the necessity of retreating to sober “nonsocialist” economic policies. When the turning point came, during the bloody days of Kronstadt, Denike was able to gather from his friend Bukharin a sense of the terrible psychological price which at least some of the Bolshevik leaders paid for their ultimate resolution to hold onto power at any price.

By the spring of 1921 it had become clear that the economic concessions of the NEP were to be combined with an unrelenting tightening of political controls, with further suppression of political dissent, within as well as without the Bolshevik Party. At the end of the year, Denike, who was now completely exhausted physically as well as psychologically, managed to obtain an assignment to Germany, and in 1922 left Russia, never to return.

He was now to live through 42 years of exile, in pre-Hitler Germany, pre-war France, and eventually the United States. For Denike as for others of the intelligentsia in the emigration, these were inevitably years of uprootedness, frequent hardship, and loneliness. More than most of his fellow

émigrés, this seemingly gregarious man was by temperament a loner. Yet more than most, he managed to immerse himself deeply in the political, social, and cultural life of each of the countries in which he settled. While in Germany, he was invited by Hilferding to become his chief collaborator on *Die Gesellschaft*, and contributed to this journal some of its most insightful commentaries on the new tragedy he had to witness in the inability of German Social Democrats to resist the rise of Hitlerism. In the France of the late 1930s, he was close to some of the leaders of the French Socialist Party and observed, again from a ringside seat, their incapacity to shed old dogmas and measure up to the growing threat of Nazism and Fascism. Yet even through these long and sour years, Denike was extraordinarily alive. To the end he lifted his face to every new intellectual breeze that came his way, remained ever interested in the changes he observed on the political and social scene, and found hope in them where hope could be found. Eternally Bohemian, eternally free, himself a stranger in the world by choice as by necessity, he continued always to be attracted by the estranged, the downtrodden, the uprooted whom he encountered on the paths he had to travel.

*Hoover Institution and Center for Advanced
Studies in the Behavioral Sciences,
Stanford University*

LEOPOLD HAIMSON