

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION  
FOR THE  
ADVANCEMENT OF SLAVIC STUDIES

From Its Origins to 1969

by

Ralph T. Fisher Jr.  
Professor of History  
University of Illinois

August 1970

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. A Chronological Survey	3
A. The Preparatory Phase	3
B. Growth and Development, 1960-1969	15
III. The Structure of the Association	36
A. The Board of Directors	36
B. The Secretariat	53
C. The Membership	56
D. Finances	74
IV. The Functions of the Association	79
A. Publications	79
B. Organizational Links	102
C. National Meetings	131
D. Other Functions	136
V. Conclusion	142
VI. Appendix: The By-Laws of the Association	143
Notes to Chapters and Sections of Chapters	150
I.	150
II.A.	151
II.B.	155
III.A.	169
III.B.	175
III.C.	178
III.D.	184
IV.A.	187
IV.B.	195
IV.C.	212
IV.D.	215

I. INTRODUCTION.

This is a fitting time to survey the interdisciplinary professional association that deals with Russia and eastern Europe. The American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies or AAASS--"Triple A Double S"--entered a new era on July 1, 1969. The organization's first nine years, from 1960 to 1969, took on a new meaning as a period of preparing for the expanded role of the Association in the 1970s.

Its basic goals remained as they were expressed in the Association's first announcement, in the spring of 1960: "to advance scholarly study, publication, and teaching relating to the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and the Communist bloc," and "to encourage cooperation and exchange of information among scholars and institutions concerned with Slavic, East European, and Soviet studies."<sup>1</sup> It would carry on the functions that characterized the years 1960-1969--coordination among disciplines and among regional groups; publication of a scholarly journal, a newsletter, and periodic directories; sponsorship and stimulation of national and regional professional meetings. But new functions were now to be added: the supervision of the Current Digest of the Soviet Press and greatly increased planning and promotional activities. The Association, till 1969 governed by officers who held other full-time jobs, was now provided with a half-time executive secretary. The office staff in the secretariat was increased from one to three persons.

With the aid of a new university home and a three-year grant from the Ford Foundation, the Triple A Double S had prospects of becoming financially self-sustaining in the next few years.

The survey begins with a narrative of developments to 1969. After that come sections describing the structure and functions of the Association. Each section includes evaluative comments and tries to answer the main questions that may be raised about the role of this professional organization.

## II. A CHRONOLOGICAL SURVEY.

### A. The Preparatory Phase.

Although the year 1960 marks the birth of the Triple A Double S as an interdisciplinary professional organization, we must look back to the 1940s and even earlier to understand how it got its start.

Our Association's chief progenitor, and its precursor as a planning and coordinating body, was the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies (JCSS), a committee of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) and the Social Science Research Council (SSRC). It was in 1938 that the ACLS appointed a committee on Slavic studies. In 1948 this committee became a joint committee of the ACLS and the SSRC. This group was small but extremely influential. Its members were drawn from among the most public-spirited and organization-minded as well as most prestigious of American scholars concerned with Russia and eastern Europe. With funds derived from the major foundations, it supported scholarly conferences and publications (including the Current Digest of the Soviet Press), disbursed research ~~and fellowship~~ grants, and sponsored bibliographic and other projects designed to help the whole field.<sup>1</sup>

Another antecedent of our present organization was the professional journal, The American Slavic and East European Review (ASEER). This began in 1941, with support from the ACLS Slavic committee, as a sort of immigrant from Britain, when wartime conditions forced London's distinguished Slavonic and East European Review to interrupt publication. After the British journal had got back on its feet, the ASEER continued on its own. By 1948, when it was being edited at and subsidized by Columbia University, a corporation was established to sponsor it under the laws of the State of New York. This corporation was called the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS). At that stage it was simply a legal umbrella rather than an interdisciplinary professional organization. But its journal, the ASEER, as edited by John N. Hazard through the decade from 1951 to 1960, was interdisciplinary in scope and covered the whole Russian and east European region. Therefore its several hundred subscribers naturally constituted the ready-made core for an interdisciplinary professional organization, and it was almost inevitable that when the time came to establish such an organization, the ASEER and its corporate umbrella should be used for that purpose.

<sup>again</sup> We must look back to the 1940s <sup>to find</sup> ~~also for~~ the earliest sizable interdisciplinary organization that held professional meetings dealing with Russia and eastern Europe: the Washington Unclassified Forum, established

5

by a group of scholars who worked in the government during World War II. Its continuous existence dates from 1945. Beginning in 1948 it met at the Brookings Institution. It embraced government workers, teachers, journalists, librarians, and independent researchers. 12

Another ~~leading~~ element of our Association that dated from the 1940s was the Russian and Slavic area programs that emerged after the war at such places as Columbia, Harvard, Berkeley, and the University of Washington. They played an important role, both formally and informally, in fostering interdisciplinary cooperation in our field. Most of the individuals who assumed leading posts in the Triple A Double S in the 1960s had first known each other as graduate students or faculty members in ~~one or more of those~~ <sup>such</sup> area programs.

~~It was~~ In the late 1950s ~~that~~ several developments conspired to make a nationwide interdisciplinary association seem both desirable and feasible. The hysteria of the McCarthy era, which would have discouraged some people from ~~organizing a~~ <sup>joining such a group a</sup> few years earlier, was now long gone. The Soviet sputnik had spurred Congress to pass the National Defense Education Act, and the U. S. Office of Education was encouraging the development of language and area centers for Russia and eastern Europe at many universities. These interdisciplinary centers, whether cooperating to exchange ideas or competing for scarce personnel, were heightening the already-existing sense of community across the boundaries of the conventional disciplines. J. Thomas Shaw's American Bibliography of Slavic [later Russian] and East European Studies, which at first focussed on the humanities, had been

broadened in 1957 to take in the social sciences as well. The resultant volumes betokened a large and active multidisciplinary constituency, whose various parts could use the Bibliography to keep track of each other's work. The Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants, headquartered first at Columbia and then at Indiana University, served the same multidisciplinary constituency and was becoming an important vehicle for familiarization and cooperation between institutions and ~~across~~ departmental <sup>so</sup> ~~lines~~. Meanwhile, within some of the professional associations in the social sciences--notably in history, political science, and economics--the numbers of persons interested in Russia and eastern Europe had grown <sup>large enough to foster</sup> ~~to the point where they had formed~~ subgroups. Thus there were now several counterparts to the long-established organizations for teachers of Slavic languages and literatures--AATSEEL (the American Association for Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages) and the Slavic subsection in the Modern Language Association.

One other harbinger of a national interdisciplinary organization emerged in 1958 when the Far Western Slavic Conference (FWSC) was formed. Here the interdisciplinary pattern of the Washington Unclassified Forum was extended to encompass the whole territorial expanse of the western United States and Canada. The success of the early meetings of the FWSC showed that scholars would come from the Middle West and the East Coast as well as from the Rocky Mountain area in order to participate in interdisciplinary professional gatherings.



Meanwhile, within the precincts of the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies, discussions were taking place <sup>that</sup> ~~which~~ would lead directly to the birth of our professional association. In 1957 the Committee, which had been surveying the problems confronting East Central European studies in the U. S., turned to survey the problems of Russian studies. A Subcommittee on the Review of Russian Studies was set up. Cyril E. Black, a historian at Princeton, was its chairman. Also on the Subcommittee were Robert F. Byrnes (history) of Indiana University, Charles Jelavich (history) of California at Berkeley, Henry L. Roberts (history) of Columbia, Melville J. Ruggles (political and information science) of the Council on Library Resources, Marshall D. Shulman (political science) of Harvard, and Donald W. Treadgold (history) of the University of Washington. John M. Thompson, a historian then in the employ of the SSRC, served as Staff Assistant to the Subcommittee. <sup>-13</sup>

The Subcommittee began its two years of work in May, 1957. The proposal for a national professional organization must have been made early, ~~in its deliberations~~ for ~~already~~ by March, 1958, an informal draft by Shulman <sup>already</sup> set forth the idea in considerable detail. <sup>-14</sup> The finished report of the Subcommittee appeared in October, 1959. <sup>-15</sup> It stated that a national membership organization was needed as a means "of promoting contact and communication and of encouraging a sense of identification and association among those concerned with Russian and East European studies" in all disciplines and in all kinds of work, including private and governmental research as well as teaching. The report went on:

A national membership organization for Russian and East European studies might have as its chief functions the sponsorship of periodic national meetings, publication of an expanded journal, the stimulation of occasional regional conferences and meetings, the maintenance of a roster of personnel, and the exchange of information through a newsletter or similar device. Such an organization might be expected to be self-supporting in all of its activities except the publication of an enlarged journal.<sup>16</sup>

Having received that report, the JCSS then appointed a ~~new~~ and smaller subcommittee to decide how to create such an organization. This subcommittee was chaired by the chairman of the JCSS itself, William B. Edgerton, a professor of Russian literature at Indiana University. It had only two other members, Henry Roberts and Marshall Shulman. Edgerton and Roberts were both already directors of the American Association of Slavic Studies, Inc., the corporation that owned the American Slavic and East European Review. Other directors included Editor Hazard and Philip E. Mosely, a historian then serving as Director of Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations. (Mosely, it may be noted, was also a past chairman of the JCSS and the only person still on that body who had been with it since its beginning in 1938.) The overlapping personnel facilitated the next step. On March 18, 1960, under the auspices of the ACLS, representatives of the JCSS and the AAASS met and agreed ~~on~~ <sup>to</sup> converting the AAASS into a membership organization.<sup>17</sup> On May 2, 1960, with the help of John Hazard, who held the official title of Secretary-Treasurer of the AAASS, the By-Laws of the Corporation were amended to provide for ~~its~~ <sup>this</sup> conversion.<sup>18</sup>

Meanwhile, the three-man Edgerton subcommittee had consulted with colleagues at various institutions and invited certain ones to join them in forming an Organizing Committee. Those added were Hazard and Mosely, plus Joseph Berliner (economics) of

9

Syracuse University, Victor Erlich (literature) of the University of Washington, Gregory Grossman (economics) of California at Berkeley, Chauncy D. Harris (geography) of the University of Chicago, and Stephen B. Kertesz (political science) of Notre Dame.<sup>9</sup>

Of the ten men on that Organizing Committee, five had served on the JCSS (Edgerton, Harris, Mosely, Roberts, and Shulman). This was appropriate enough in view of the initiating role played by the JCSS throughout. The planned tie-in with the American Slavic and East European Review was signalled not only by the presence of Editor Hazard but also by the inclusion of four other members of his Editorial Committee (Erlich, Harris, Mosely, and Roberts).<sup>10</sup>

Assisting the Organizing Committee as secretary was Thompson, who in 1959 after his work on the survey had left the SSRC for a history position at Indiana and was therefore now a faculty colleague of Chairman Edgerton's. It was Thompson who handled much of the detailed work of planning the initial operating budget of the Association and of finding it a home. It was he who, on behalf of the Organizing Committee, invited Ralph T. Fisher Jr., a historian at the University of Illinois, to become ("temporarily") the secretary of the Association. Fisher, as the director of a new Center for Russian Language and Area Studies, had a small administrative office to which the secretariat of the new Association could be readily attached. On his recommendation the University of Illinois acceded to the

Committee's request to provide the additional space, with the understanding that the Association would cover the salary of a full-time manager of the records and files of the Association.<sup>11</sup>

Both Thompson and Fisher assumed that if such an office manager were provided, the secretaryship itself would not demand enough time to necessitate any reduction in teaching load.

The question of the secretaryship had been decided by May 20.<sup>12</sup> Meanwhile, the Organizing Committee had been seeking an editor for the expanded journal. Toward the end of May they succeeded in persuading Donald W. Treadgold, professor of history at the University of Washington, to take on this major responsibility. The University of Washington agreed to furnish space and part of the editorial staff, and to reduce Treadgold's teaching load whenever he wished, so that he could devote, if need be, as much as half of his time to the managing editorship. Thus it was that by the end of May, 1960, the arrangements had been completed for launching the new organization.<sup>13</sup>

Before going on with the brief narrative of the Association in the 1960s, we may pause for a comment upon the preparatory phase. One thing that stands out, as one looks at the lists of people involved, is not only the multiple roles played by a few individuals but the leading parts played by those who might seem to ~~constitute~~ constitute either a "Columbia gang" or a "Harvard gang." For instance, on the JCSS in 1959 there were twelve men. Eight of them had taught or studied at Columbia, while six (including five of the aforementioned eight) had taught or studied at Harvard.<sup>14</sup> On the Subcommittee that conducted the

12 (846)

11

8 (645) ✓  
10 (705) ✓

Review of Russian Studies, there were eight people including the staff assistant. Six of them had taught or studied at Columbia, and five at Harvard.<sup>15</sup> On the Organizing Committee of the AAASS were ten members. Seven of them had taught or studied at Columbia, and five at Harvard.<sup>16</sup>

However suspicious those enumerations might have looked to the person who had not been associated with either Columbia or Harvard, they did not connote any kind of conspiracy. They reflected in large part the very high productivity of the Columbia and Harvard graduate schools in the years just after World War II-- the years when most of the persons named had come to know each other.<sup>17</sup> They reflected, too, the limited size of the total body of Russian and East European specialists in those years, plus the natural tendency of people making appointments to pick those they had already seen in action. Additional factors in the Columbia case were the presence of the editorial offices of the Review and the physical proximity of the ACLS and the SSRC and the great foundations. There seems to have been little or no ~~kind~~ feeling of exclusiveness among either the Columbia or the Harvard people. We should recall that it was only a relatively few of the many who studied or taught at those places who were active in organizing the Triple A Double S.

Another qualification to keep in mind<sup>n</sup> is that many of those who were viewed by others as Columbia or Harvard people had spent most of their lives elsewhere and did not regard themselves in the same light. For example, Edgerton was a North Carolinian who had gone to college there and taught there for many years. Erlich had been at the University of Washington since 1948 and was strongly attached to that institution. Grossman's university education up through the

MA and his employment since the PhD had been at Berkeley. Harris's associations with Chicago, Oxford, Brigham Young, Indiana, and Nebraska were all of longer duration than his sojourn at Columbia. Treadgold by virtue of his earlier education and his professional service was primarily associated with the Pacific Northwest. Other examples could be cited.

I'm not sure I see the point of stressing where they did their graduate work. We select people in various parts of their faculty affiliation, & JCSS members come from Berkeley, Washington, Indiana, Chicago, Princeton etc.

But even if the concept of Columbia or Harvard cliques had limited validity, it did remain true that a relatively few people seemed to be running the Russian and east European show. The American academic world being as decentralized as it is, one should speak only qualifiedly of anyone's wielding power over a field of study. Still, to the extent that there was power to be acquired, much of it had, up to that point, come to be lodged in the JCSS. And what about that? It seems clear from the record that most if not all of those who in the late 1950s were running the JCSS genuinely desired to disperse some of the power that had accrued to them. The emergence of the AAASS stemmed from their

JCSS expected to direct itself of development activities as soon as Assu was well est'ld capable of assuming these functions from the beginning it was accord with ACS policy, the JCC would go out of existence except as a grant committee as soon as AAASS ready to assume its development functions. This will occur, as far as Russian/Soviet studies are concerned. It will become solely a grant committee body and a JCC as a grant committee will have a role.

conviction that the circle of active participants should be widened. The JCSS was not yet, it is true, prepared to divest itself of all of its control over grants for research, publications, or conferences. But it was eager to share the roles of planning, coordination, and communication. The overlapping understood that in directorates pointed out above were certainly no secret to those in the core group. They recognized that the new organization would have much to do if it were to become truly representative of the hundreds of Russian and east European specialists who by that time had been trained at institutions all across the country.

It is noteworthy in this connection that the Organizing Committee of the JCC was established in Sept 1971 when the JCC was established. It will become a grant committee body and a JCC as a grant committee will have a role.

with the JCSS was... in the JCC... all functions... JCC as a grant committee... JCC as a grant committee... JCC as a grant committee...

wanted the headquarters of the Association to be if possible at some institution other than Columbia or Harvard on the East Coast, Berkeley or Washington on the West Coast, or Indiana in the Middle West.<sup>18</sup> The first four had of course been outstanding centers of Slavic studies ever since World War II, while Indiana had leapt into prominence in this field in 1956-1958.<sup>19</sup>

Thompson in his approach to Fisher ~~was~~ explained how the new Association would be financed until it got going. ~~A~~ ~~Hard Foundation developmental fund of \$15,000 would be made~~ available through the ACLS, mainly to assist in the expansion of the Review. Part of these funds could be used by the secretary to hire a full-time office manager ~~to handle~~ <sup>for the handling of</sup> subscriptions and the solicitation of memberships. Beginning in 1961, it was hoped, a combination of dues, subscriptions, and university contributions would provide enough income to support the considerably enlarged Review,<sup>20</sup> without depleting the modest reserve which Hazard had prudently set aside. As it turned out, the Association during all of its first decade remained partially dependent on the ACLS. Frederick H. Burkhardt, president of the ACLS beginning in 1957, and Gordon B. Turner, its executive associate and later (beginning in 1963) vice president, not only provided the initial developmental grant but also took the lead in obtaining contributions for the Association from many universities year after year. More will be said about that later under the financial heading. It is perhaps relevant here to point out that Burkhardt, earlier a teacher of philosophy, had dealt with eastern European affairs during wartime service in the OSS, while Turner, a specialist in <sup>had been</sup> European.

The ACLS, as  
the recommend-  
tion of the JASS,  
would make  
\$15,000

military history, ~~had acquired some familiarity with people and~~  
~~problems in the eastern European field during his more than a~~  
~~decade at Princeton.~~ <sup>for a decade</sup> In addition to what they did to give the  
Triple A Double S its start, both Burkhardt and Turner have  
assisted the development of teaching and research on Russia and  
eastern Europe in ways far too numerous to list here.

*Handwritten signature: [unclear]*



B. Growth and Development, 1960-1969.

The actual launching of the Association may be said to have taken place on June 1, 1960. This was the date of the letter in which the Organizing Committee invited interested persons to join the AAASS. The letter, an accompanying leaflet, and membership application forms went out to all the pertinent mailing lists Thompson had been able to collect. The lists contained about seven thousand names in all,<sup>1</sup> but some of the lists were marginal for our purposes, and there was no way of knowing how many of the persons named might really be professionally interested in Russia and eastern Europe.

The invitational letter announced the transformation of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies into an active membership organization. It said the Association's purpose, "as a non-profit, non-political group," would be "to encourage scholarly study and teaching" pertaining to the USSR, eastern Europe, and the Communist bloc, and "to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and information." The letter went on to describe four main functions of the Association:

- (1) to sponsor a revised and enlarged journal to be edited by Treadgold;
- (2) to cooperate in distributing an annual bibliography;

← (3) to sponsor professional meetings and scholarly conferences; and

(4) to provide a regular newsletter and other services through a central secretariat. The letter declared that the new organization would not replace existing groups such as the JCSS, the Slavic or Soviet sections of various national associations, in the disciplines, or regional bodies like the Far Western Slavic Conference; rather the AAASS would encourage and assist them and would be an appropriate vehicle for "new, expanded, or intensified activities required by the rapid advance of Slavic and East European studies."<sup>1 2</sup> The accompanying leaflet explained how the Association would be governed (see the section on the Board, below), and gave further details. Concerning the journal, the leaflet explained that where Hazard (like his predecessors Simmons, Strakhovsky, and Cross) had carried the editorship along with a full teaching load and ~~with~~ no extra compensation, the new arrangement called for a paid part-time managing editor. The first number of the expanded journal under Treadgold would appear in the spring of 1961; Hazard had kindly agreed to carry through the remaining two issues of 1960. Special effort would be made in the expanded journal to focus on problems cutting across disciplinary lines and to encourage cross-disciplinary communication.<sup>1 3</sup>

In anticipation of the response to the initial mailing, the Association hired its first office manager, Mrs. Frances Brown Reed. She <sup>e</sup>proceeded <sub>A</sub> to organize the records and files in

the room contributed by the University of Illinois, ~~in support of the Association.~~ (See the section on the <sup>1</sup>Secretariat, below.)

The first meeting of the Editorial Board of the American Slavic and East European Review under Treadgold ~~/its new editor-to-be/~~ took place in Bloomington, Indiana on September 24 and 25, 1960. Here Treadgold and his assistant editor-to-be, Miss Gladys Greenwood, discussed plans with outgoing editor Hazard and the others present.<sup>14</sup> The development of the Review is treated in a separate section below.

The first issue of the new Newsletter, edited in Urbana, appeared late in the fall of 1960. (For more on the Newsletter, see the section on publications, below.) The American Bibliography of Russian and East European Studies for 1959 was distributed to all members of the Association late in the fall.<sup>15</sup>

The response to Edgerton's June 1 invitation and to a follow-up sent out by secretary pro tem Fisher in October<sup>16</sup> had yielded a membership of about 600 by the end of November.<sup>17</sup>

That electorate voted by mail in December in the first formal elections to the Board of Directors,<sup>18</sup> and the new Board of the reconstituted Association held its first meeting on December 29, 1960, in New York.<sup>19</sup>

The Board elected the following persons to hold office through 1961: as president, Edgerton; as vice president, Thompson (then assistant professor of history at Indiana); as secretary, Fisher; and as treasurer, Hazard. Hazard's financial report showed that, thanks to the generous support of a number of

universities, the Association was off to a fairly good start. (See the section on finances, below.) The Board accepted Treadgold's decision that the journal, beginning with the issue of October, 1961, would be renamed the Slavic Review, with an explanatory sub-title: American Quarterly of Soviet and East European Studies. The other significant item was the formal recognition of the Washington Unclassified Forum as a chapter of the AAASS. This group was led by Sergius Yakobson of the Library of Congress and represented at the Board meeting by John P. Hardt. Under the arrangement thus established--which was soon to be applied to groups in other parts of the country--the chapter would continue to manage its own affairs, set its own dues, elect its own officers, and arrange its own meetings. The AAASS was to serve the members of the chapter by providing the Review, by distributing the Bibliography, and by assuring coverage of chapter activities in the Newsletter. Moreover, when the Association's Directory was published, its geographical section would provide an easy way for the members of the chapter to identify and keep track of each other. Several of those present expressed hope that other local and regional groups would affiliate in the future.<sup>10</sup> In line with that hope, in the spring of 1961 the Far Western Slavic Conference--led at that time by Treadgold--requested affiliation.<sup>11</sup> This request, like later requests from similar groups, was unanimously approved by the Board of the Association at its next meeting.<sup>12</sup>

(The FWSC and other affiliates are discussed in the section on organizational linkages, below.)

The first Directory was compiled in the Fall of 1961. It provided the fullest picture theretofore available of those persons in North America and <sup>w</sup>Western Europe who specialized in Slavic and eastern Europe. The listings of occupational titles, academic degrees received, and major fields of competence as well as office and residence addresses made the work very useful, and many copies were purchased by publishers and other institutions. There <sup>were</sup> also a supplementary listing<sup>s</sup> by place of work or residence and another by discipline.<sup>13</sup> Further details on the size and composition of the membership are given in a separate section below. Three more editions of the Directory were published in the 1960s.

The decision was made very easily to have the major disciplines associated with the Board

Two new directors were named in 1961, who were destined to serve through 1969: Holland Hunter, associate professor of economics at Haverford College, was elected by the executive committee of the Association for the Study of Soviet-Type Economies (ASSTE) to represent the American Economics Association on the Board of the AAASS.<sup>14</sup> George Kiss<sup>h</sup>, professor of geography at the University of Michigan, was named by the Association of American Geographers as its representative on the Board.<sup>15</sup>

For further information on the other directors elected or appointed, see the section on the Board, below.

For 1962 the Board elected as president Chauncy D. Harris, professor of geography at the University of Chicago, and as vice president Marshall D. Shulman, professor of international relations at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy and associate director of the Russian Research Center of Harvard University.<sup>16</sup> For the next three years the Board

Perhaps inject comment re inadvisability of making that large composed of individuals not directly by Soviet itself

followed the practice of moving one year's vice president up to the presidency in the following year, so that the office of vice president became in effect that of president-elect. Under this system Shulman was president for 1963, while Joseph S. Berliner (economics, Brandeis) served in 1964.<sup>17</sup>

had

One of the many things Thompson had done during his year as vice president had been to work with John A. Armstrong (political science, Wisconsin) and others to organize a regional group in the Middle West.<sup>18</sup> On April 24-25, 1962, the first Midwest Slavic Conference<sup>2</sup> met in Madison. Those attending numbered 121. The business meeting voted unanimously to establish the MSC as a continuing organization and to request affiliation with the AAASS.<sup>19</sup>

Meanwhile another regional group was being formed in the southeast. People from Duke, the University of North Carolina, and North Carolina Women's College took the initiative, under the chairmanship of John S. Curtiss. They held a meeting October 5 and 6, 1962, at Duke and the University of North Carolina. About 100 persons attended. At their business meeting they voted to establish the Southern Conference on Slavic Studies on a continuing basis and to request affiliation with the Triple A Double S.<sup>20</sup>

Soon after that, still another regional group emerged. This one served a sub-region of the Middle West, centered on Kansas City. Its organizer was William W. Adams, Jr., of William Jewell College in Liberty, Missouri. Its first meeting was held there on November 3, 1962. The group voted to establish a continuing organization, the Kansas-Missouri Bi-

State Slavic Conference (later known simply as the Bi-State Slavic Conference) and to request affiliation with the AAASS.<sup>121</sup>

The year 1962 also saw the establishment of one more affiliate, this one not on a regional but on a topical basis. On September 20-22 a Conference on Soviet Agriculture and Peasant Affairs was held at the University of Kansas. It was arranged and presided over by Roy D. Laird of the host institution, with support from the University of Illinois. Somewhat unexpectedly, the group voted to make the Conference a continuing institution and to request affiliation with the AAASS.<sup>122</sup>

Along with the establishment of affiliates in 1962 went a significant increase in the membership. This was accomplished in part thanks to the help of several dozen "membership representatives" who, making use of the geographical listing in the Fall 1961 Directory, sent to the secretary the names of colleagues and students at their institutions or elsewhere who were not listed there and might like to receive an invitation to join. The response was good. From around 1,000 in December of 1961, the membership rose to about 1,300 by October of 1962.<sup>123</sup> The Slavic Review under Treadgold was meanwhile attracting many new institutional subscribers here and abroad, so that by the same date the number of copies being mailed printed had risen to 2,100.<sup>124</sup>

A new organization of specialists was born in July of 1963. A Slavic and East European Subsection was formed in the Subject Specialists Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries (a part of the American Library Associa-

tion). This action came in response to the petition of some sixty Slavic librarians. The group's first chairman was Laurence H. Miller, Slavic bibliographer at the University of Illinois.<sup>125</sup> In due course that group was accepted as an affiliate of the AAASS.<sup>126</sup>

The big event of 1964 was the first nationwide convention of the AAASS, held April 2-4 in New York. It attracted about 600 participants and was highly successful. (See the section on national meetings, below.)

A new regional affiliate was also added in 1964. This was the Southwest Conference on Slavic Studies,<sup>which</sup> It came into being as a subgroup of the Southwest Social Science Association, meeting in March 1964 in Dallas. George W. Hoffman (geography, Texas) was the first president.<sup>127</sup>

By 1964 many of the universities that contributed to the AAASS in its first years had fulfilled their original three-year commitments. The Association was still falling ten or more thousand dollars short of covering its annual expenses. At the same time the Current Digest of the Soviet Press, sponsored by the ACLS through the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies, was also in the red. The Ford Foundation had declined to provide subsidies for the CDSP and the Slavic Review. At that point Chancellor Herman B Wells and Robert F. Byrnes of Indiana University--Byrnes having recently served for several years as secretary of the JCSS--launched a special campaign for university contributions, under the wing of the ACLS. The result was the



Slavic Publications Fund, administered over the next several years by Gordon Turner as vice president of the ACLA. Thanks to this Fund and the universities that contributed to it, the deficits in the Association's budgets were covered each year until the start of the Ford grant in 1969. <sup>S</sup> (See the section on finances, below.)

At the end of 1964 Treadgold completed four years as managing editor of the Slavic Review, and asked to be relieved.

Henry L. Roberts (history, )

( Columbia) assumed that post. The offices of the Review moved to New York. Roberts appointed as associate editor Louise E. Luke, a former Columbia student in Russian literature who had worked professionally as an editor for the Russian Institute and other Columbia organizations. <sup>100</sup>

At its meeting of October 25, 1964, the Board decided to put both the presidency and the vice presidency on a three-year term, the transfer to take place at the national convention. John A. Armstrong (political science, Wisconsin) was then elected president, to serve until the convention of 1967. Holland Hunter was elected vice president. <sup>129</sup> For the following term, 1967-1970, those elected were Edward J. Brown (literature, Indiana) as president and Leon Lipson (law, Yale) as vice president. <sup>130</sup>

An important question of affiliation was settled in 1966. This concerned AATSEEL, the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages. AATSEEL's members included language teachers in secondary and primary schools, as well as those in colleges and universities. <sup>AATSEEL</sup> It began in 1941, <sup>131</sup>

long before the Triple A Double S. In 1960 when the AAASS was formed, AATSEEL was still relatively small.<sup>‡32</sup> But it grew rapidly in the sixties, approximately keeping pace with enrollment in the AAASS.<sup>‡33</sup> The language

and literature people in the AAASS had received their formal recognition on the Board through the representative of the Slavic subsection of the Modern Language Association. But many AATSEEL members did not belong to the MLA; moreover, AATSEEL, with its own publication (the Slavic and East European Journal) and many local chapters around the country, was serving functions not served by the Slavic subsection of the MLA. So it was <sup>natural</sup> not surprising that adherents of AATSEEL should propose not simply affiliation with the AAASS but also a special representative<sup>on</sup> on the Board.<sup>‡34</sup> The matter was raised formally in May of 1963. The Board granted both requests. Only after that decision did Board member and president-elect Brown, who had kept relatively silent during the debate on this question, confess that he himself was currently the president of AATSEEL!<sup>‡35</sup>

By October 1966 the membership stood at 1,831. An analysis of the U. S. members was made at that time on the basis of urban clusters. This was to provide a notion of the size of the colonies of specialists scattered around the country. A radius of about ten miles from the urban center was used. Of course New York City with nearby towns in New Jersey and on Long Island had by far the largest colony--about 254 persons. Next largest was Washington D. C. with nearby parts of Maryland and Virginia, containing some 121 persons. Other fairly

large colonies were Boston-Cambridge (56), Bloomington (54), Champaign-Urbana (50), Berkeley-San Francisco (38), Chicago (37), Los Angeles (37), and Seattle (36).<sup>136</sup> For further details see the section on the membership, below.

The main event of 1967 was the second national convention. It took place March 30-April 1 in Washington. Registration exceeded 700, and the three-day program was rich and varied.<sup>137</sup> Not long thereafter, Columbus, Ohio, was chosen as the site for the national convention of the spring of 1970.<sup>138</sup>

Aided by the convention, the membership by October of 1967 had reached a total of 2,163. In the ranking of states by number of members the first three positions <sup>remained</sup> remained as <sup>they were during</sup> before: New York (396), California (178), and Illinois (136). <sup>most of the decade!</sup> But Pennsylvania (117) now had moved into fourth position, displacing Massachusetts (110), while the District of Columbia (96) had moved up to sixth place, barely displacing Indiana (92). Canadian members now totaled 99, while Germany had 23 and Great Britain 22. Twenty-two other countries were represented.<sup>139</sup>

Meanwhile, the editorship of the Review had changed again. By the spring of 1966 Henry Roberts had decided, partly for reasons of health, to move to Dartmouth in the summer of 1967. The Board desired that Roberts remain as closely involved with the operation of the Review as he found possible; it recognized also that he must be allowed to shift the main burden, however gradually, to other hands. As explained more fully below, the understanding arrived at was that the Review would re-

main at Columbia and that Miss Luke would take over as managing editor in mid-1967.<sup>140</sup>

The year 1968 was much occupied with the interrelated problems of reorganizing the Association and providing for the support and smooth operation of the Review and the Current Digest.

In large part the reorganization stemmed from the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies. The JCSS under Thompson's chairmanship had been evaluating itself intermittently during the past two years, examining its functions in relation to various activities in the Russian and east European field, including the AAASS, the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants, and the Foreign Area Fellowship Program. The JCSS, the IUCTG, and the FAFP were all directly or indirectly dependent on Ford Foundation money. The JCSS needed, in Thompson's words, "to present a long-term program of activity if further support from the Ford Foundation were to be expected," not only for the JCSS itself but also for other programs. The other programs included not only national enterprises like the IUCTG and the Current Digest of the Soviet Press but also area studies generally, for the Ford Foundation had given signs of moving away from grants to individual universities and toward furnishing support instead, on a reduced scale, through national organizations in each field.<sup>141</sup>

By late 1967 and early 1968 there were also factors within the AAASS that were making reorganization increasingly urgent. Columbia was showing signs of wanting to limit if not eliminate its large subsidies in space and salaries for the Slavic Review. (See the sections on publications and finances, below.) The

subsidies from universities through the Slavic Publications Fund could not be expected to continue more than another two or three years. (See the section on finances.) The AAASS, although it had increased the circulation of the Review about fourfold since 1959, and although it had been growing at about 11 percent per year since the fall of 1962 (after the more rapid initial buildup of 1960-62), needed to grow more rapidly if it were to become self-sustaining. For that, it needed an administrator who could devote at least half his time to the Association, and it needed funds for development--funds which could keep the Association going and growing from the time the Slavic Publications Fund stopped until the Association became large enough to support itself. The most promising source of such funds was the Ford Foundation. And Ford was quite properly interested in seeing the Association develop a larger and more permanent administrative apparatus if it were to be handling sizable funds for planning and development of the field.

In December of 1967 the JCSS decided to ask the AAASS and the IUCTG to join with it in exploring plans for the future organization of the field. Thompson and Marshall *M.* Shulman were named to represent the JCSS on an ad hoc Committee on Organization which would include representatives of the other two groups. At a special meeting on January 12, 1968, the AAASS Board discussed a memo prepared by Thompson on the "Future Organization of the Slavic Field."<sup>140</sup> There was general

agreement that the Association should assume a more active role in planning, development, and coordination for the whole field. Gordon Turner supported the idea from the standpoint of the ACLS. Charles C. Hucker, secretary of the Association for Asian Studies, described the operations of that body, which-- with its annual meetings, its numerous special subcommittees, its grants for conferences, and its secretariat of three persons--seemed to point out the path for the AAASS. The Board approved

the proposal of the ad hoc Committee on Organization, and named Holland Hunter and Leon Lipson to represent the AAASS on it.

On March 28, 1968, the Board held another special meeting.

Here Thompson presented the draft report of his ad hoc Committee on Organization. Their recom-

mendations concerning the IUCTG were to lead later to the establishment of the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX). Like the IUCTG, IREX remained independent of the AAASS, and does not need to concern us further here. As to the AAASS, the report recommended appointing a half-time executive secretary on at least a three-year term, with a paid staff to include at least a full-time office manager and a full-time bookkeeper who could serve both the Review and the Current Digest; providing funds for travel expenses to Board meetings, so that the Board could meet at least twice a year and assume a more active role: holding a national convention every year, probably by rotating the

how so. ?  
 IREX came out of the special committee appointed by the IUCTG & chaired by Joo Hodeser

responsibility among the regional organizations; taking over from the JCSS the responsibility for supervising the Current Digest of the Soviet Press; and augmenting the role of the Association as a planning and development body, with the aid of standing committees to deal with meetings, publications, bibliographic affairs, government relations, and other matters. <sup>146</sup> The report went on to urge that if suitable university homes and subsidies could be found for the three main functions of (1) producing the Review, (2) producing the Digest, and (3) housing and staffing the expanded three-man secretariat, the Association should then seek from the Ford Foundation a five-year development grant, in the hope that in five years the Association could become virtually self-sustaining. <sup>147</sup>

At the same meeting, where the Board received the report of the Thompson committee, <sup>148</sup> it learned that the matter of the Current Digest was already being acted on. As soon as word got out that the Current Digest could no longer remain at Columbia and could not afford other quarters in New York City, Ohio State University had offered it a home. Leon Twarog told the Board of the negotiations then proceeding between Ohio State and the Digest, and brought official word from his Vice President and Provost that Ohio State would also be willing to house the Review and the secretariat. <sup>148</sup>

The Board expressed its appreciation to Thompson and his committee for their report, and President Brown appointed a subcommittee to consider that report and to make appropriate recommendations on such matters as the Slavic Review, the

Current Digest, the proposed office of executive secretary and the home of the secretariat, and the soliciting of foundation support for the Association. Ellison became chairman of that subcommittee, with Brown, Fisher, Hunter and Lipson assisting him. <sup>149</sup>

Through the spring and summer the Ellison subcommittee worked on the several matters entrusted to it, and on September 21, 1968 it reported to a special meeting of the Board. <sup>150</sup>

Meanwhile,  
Concerning the Slavic Review, problems had developed at Columbia since March that had made it urgently necessary to find the Review another home. (That story is told below, in the section on publications.) The Ellison subcommittee, after considering all the available choices, recommended unanimously that the Review be moved to the University of Washington as soon as feasible, there to be edited again by Donald W. Treadgold. The Board approved that recommendation unanimously. <sup>151</sup>

The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, it should be remembered, was at this point still under the supervision of the Joint Committee, which that summer had changed its name from Joint Committee on Slavic Studies (JCSS) to Joint Committee on Slavic and East European Studies (JCSEES). The actual supervisors were Gordon Turner as Vice President of the ACLS and Leon Lipson as chairman of the JCSEES subcommittee on the Current Digest (as well as vice president of the AAASS for the term 1967-70). By this time the plan for moving the Digest from New York to Columbus was already definite, and Editor Leo Grulicow was working out the details of personnel and schedules that were to make it possible, nine months later, to move the whole big



Although it was not yet self-sustaining, the S-P-F had a large balance that would be transferred to the AAASS to tide over the CD + SR for the next few years

operation to Ohio State while maintaining the weekly publication schedule. The question before the Board was whether or not the AAASS should assume responsibility for the Current Digest. ~~The Digest was becoming self-sustaining toward the end of its twenty-year stay at Columbia, but that was under one set of conditions.~~ The Digest was likely to run a deficit, at least for a while, in its new location. But if the Association had responsibility for the Digest the Association would be both rendering a vital service to the field and enhancing its claim to foundation or university support. Turner and Lipson both recommended that the Association take over responsibility for the Current Digest, and the Board unanimously agreed to assume that obligation effective July 1, 1969, immediately after the scheduled move to Ohio. 152

In the matter of the executive secretaryship, the Ellison subcommittee had needed to find an unusually capable person who was interested in devoting a large share of his time to the Association over the next several years and whose university was prepared to back him by releasing at least half his time for Association duties and providing him with office space and staff. After considering various possibilities, the subcommittee arrived at the unanimous recommendation that the Association's first executive secretary be George J. Demko, an associate professor of geography at <sup>The</sup> Ohio State University. Demko's PhD was from Pennsylvania State University. He had conducted a year of research in historical demography in Moscow in 1962-63. Most important from the subcommittee's standpoint was that he had expressed a genuine interest in serving the Association and

had given considerable thought to ways of expanding its activities. The Board unanimously elected Demko to be executive secretary for a five-year term to begin July 1, 1969.<sup>153</sup>

With these important matters settled, in November Ellison and his subcommittee submitted a proposal to the Ford Foundation. In discussions with Dr. Howard R. Swanson, in charge of the Foundation's Office of European and International Affairs, it was agreed that the AAASS would apply for a three-year grant. The application referred to what the AAASS had accomplished since 1960 "in providing a national focus and organizing center for scholars in various disciplines" concerned with Slavic and eastern Europe: the fourfold rise in the circulation of the Review, the triennial national meetings, the vigorous regional associations and conferences, the information provided to the profession through the Newsletter, and the steady growth in membership (which then stood at about 2260).<sup>154</sup> With those gains consolidated (said the application) went on, the Association next planned to assume responsibility for the Current Digest of the Soviet Press, and wanted at the same time to make a special effort to develop the field further. The application mentioned the shift to a half-time executive secretaryship, the more active role of the Board that would be possible if travel expenses could be covered, the plan for national meetings every year, and the expanded activity to be pushed by means of standing committees on meetings, information, publications, policy and development, and research and education.<sup>155</sup> In due course the Ford Foundation

NOT mentioned before

approved a grant of \$30,000 per year for three years to begin July 1, 1969.<sup>56</sup>

Meanwhile, during 1968 an important new regional group had come into existence in the northeast--the North-eastern Slavic Conference of the AAASS--filling the last big gap in the network of regional associations. Lois J. Stone of the State University of New York at Albany took the initiative in calling the organizational meeting, and Mark G. Field of Boston University became the group's first president.<sup>57</sup>

The first half of 1969 was a busy time. In Seattle, Treadgold and his staff, having taken over the Review as of November 1, were struggling against great hardships (including the illness of the associate editor, Gladys Greenwood) to make up for an inherited <sup>lag</sup> gap of several months and to get back on schedule before the end of the year. In New York, Grulicow <sup>editor of the EDSP</sup> was preparing to move the Digest--recruiting new staff for Columbus to replace those who could not leave New York, planning a training schedule for them, and making arrangements for the new facilities in Ohio. In New York, too, the new treasurer, William E. Harkins (literature, Columbia), was studying the financial records of the Association and instituting a better bookkeeping system in order to achieve smooth coordination with the new executive secretary in the handling of funds. From New Haven, Montias was spurring his committee to complete the plans for the program of the national meeting of 1970. In Champaign-Urbana, Frank Gladney and Elizabeth Talbot were producing their last issue of the Newsletter and their final

leo

John W.

not mentioned before

columns for the "News of the Profession" section of the Review, while Fisher and Mrs. Wilson were readying the membership and subscription records and other files of the secretariat for shipment to Columbus. And in Columbus, Twarog and Eason were getting things ready for the Current Digest, Twarog was making arrangements for the 1970 convention, and Demko, after his return from <sup>my</sup> <sup>a</sup> leave, was setting up his office and hiring his staff for the secretariat. Exercising general supervision over all of this were the President Brown in Bloomington and Vice President Lipson in New Haven, while Gordon Turner in New York kept track of things on behalf of the ACLS and the Slavic Publications Fund.

The last Board meeting of the period under review took place on April 26, 1969. <sup>2-52</sup>

In addition to receiving reports concerning the various activities mentioned above, the Board voted to shift to yearly conventions beginning in 1970, and to hold the 1971 meeting in conjunction with the Far Western Slavic Conference. Board members felt that if national meetings were to be held yearly, they must be conducted so as to reinforce rather than weaken the regional conferences, and that this might be done by rotating the national meetings from one to another of the large regional conferences on a cycle of four years. It was with that thought in mind that the West was selected for the meeting of 1971, since previous national meetings had been held in the Northeast (1964) and South (1967) and the 1970 meeting was to be in the Midwest. <sup>2-53</sup>

other

One/important item taken care of by the Board that spring was the election of successors to Brown and Lipson. Holland Hunter (economics, Haverford) was elected president and Herbert J. Ellison (history, University of Washington) vice president for three-year terms to begin at the national convention of March 1970.<sup>160</sup>

On July 1, 1969, the Ford grant came into effect, the Current Digest became part of the operations of the Association, the secretariat in Columbus was officially opened, and the Association with its new executive secretary had a running start toward its goal of becoming financially self-sustaining in the first half of the 1970s.

III. THE STRUCTURE OF THE ASSOCIATION.

Having in mind that brief narrative of the Association during its first nine years, we turn now to examine its structure. We treat first the governing body--the Board of Directors; then the secretariat or office for managing the daily affairs of the Association; then the membership and its composition; and finally the finances of the Association.

A. The Board of Directors.

The By-Laws of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, Inc., came into being March 11, 1948, when the Corporation was established as the owner of the American Slavic and East European Review. Those By-Laws were amended May 2, 1960, by the then officers of the Corporation, in accordance with the plan worked out by the Organizing Committee. By the revised By-Laws, the AAASS was to be run by a Board of six elected members and six representatives of organizations--the JCSS and five groups of specialists in the disciplines of economics, geography, history, literature (and language), and political science.<sup>1</sup> Later on a representative of AATSEEL was added.<sup>1 2</sup>

The six directors elected at large and the seven representing professional organizations were the people who elected (and might also remove) the officers of the Association. The officers included a president, a vice-president, a secretary, and a treasurer. The Board could not only fix the terms of office but could also create additional officers. The editor of the Slavic Review was informally treated as an officer from 1960 on. In 1969 both he and the editor of the Current Digest of the Soviet Press were formally made officers of the Corporation. All officers became voting members of the Board.<sup>13</sup>

A subsequent section of this essay discusses each of the seven organizations that sent directors to serve on the Board. Those who served as directors in this way during the period 1960-69 were as follows:

From the JOSEES (until 1968, JCSS):

- 1960-62: Abram Bergson (economics, Harvard)
- 1962-64: Donald W. Treadgold (history, U. of Washington)
- 1964-65: Chauncy D. Harris (geography, Chicago)
- 1965-68: John M. Thompson III (history, Indiana)
- 1968-<sup>f</sup> : Marshall D. Skulman (international relations, Columbia)

From economics, AEA:

- 1961 - : Holland Hunter (Haverford)

From geography, ACA:

1961- : George Kiss (Michigan)

From history, AHA:

1960-63: S. Harrison Thomson (Colorado)

1964-66: Robert F. Byrnes (Indiana)

1967-69: Herbert J. Ellison (Kansas, then Washington)

From language and literature, AATSEEL:

1967-69: J. Thomas Shaw (Wisconsin)

From language and literature, MLA:

1961-63: Deming Brown (Michigan)

1964-66: Edward J. Brown (Indiana)

1967-69: Erwin Weil (Northwestern)

From political science, APSA:

1960-62: Frederick B. Barghoorn (Yale)

1962-64: Robert C. Tucker (Princeton)

1964-65: George Fischer (Cornell)

1965-66: A. Doak Barnett (Columbia)

1966-68: Alfred G. Meyer (Michigan)

1968-70: H. Gordon Skilling (Toronto)

As that list indicates, the terms of office varied. Two representatives were on indefinite terms, three were on three-year terms, and the JCSEES and political science representatives changed more frequently.<sup>4</sup>

The other six directors were elected, two each



year (except at the start), at an "Annual Meeting of Members," according to the By-Laws. Actually that meeting was a formality handled by the secretary, one or two other members, and the manager, on the basis of proxies. The real decision was made in a preferential ballot which was conducted by mail. All regular and sustaining members received ballots. The names to appear on the ballot were selected by a nominating committee.

The nominating process was so crucial that it should be described clearly. In the summer of 1960 the Organizing Committee appointed a five-man temporary nominating committee.<sup>5</sup> That committee in November put forward twelve candidates for the six elective places on the Board of Directors, and also seven candidates for four positions on a regular nominating committee. The mail ballot of the members came in December. The four winners for the nominating committee, under the chairmanship of the one who got the most votes, prepared the slates for the two new directors and for the nominating committee of the succeeding year. Beginning in 1963,<sup>6</sup> the chairman of one year's nominating committee served as an extra member of the nominating committee during the ensuing year. From 1960 through 1967, 31 people served on the nominating committee.<sup>17</sup>

In 1967 the system of nomination was changed. The immediate cause was a ~~minor storm of~~ protest over the action of the nominating committee of 1966 in presenting only four candidates for the four open positions on the new nominating committee. More than sixty members added write-in votes or notes of protest.<sup>1</sup> The Board took up the matter at its next meeting, March 31, 1967, and decided unanimously to institute a new system. This system in effect made the Board itself the nominating committee, with the president and vice president playing a key role. The idea behind this was not only to assure broader choice but, more important, to increase the likelihood that all persons put up as candidates would be genuinely interested in serving the Association.<sup>19</sup>

? ✓

With those nominating and balloting procedures, then, the directors elected at large were chosen. The six who were elected the first year drew lots for terms of one, two, or three years. Thereafter, two were elected each year. Those elected at large during the period 1960-69 were as follows, with their inclusive years of service:

- 1961 Joseph Berliner (economics, Brandeis)
- 1961 Philip E. Mosely (history, Council on Foreign Relations)
- 1961-62 Merle Fainsod (political science, Harvard)
- 1961-62 William B. Edgerton (literature, Indiana)
- 1961-63 Henry L. Roberts (history, Columbia)
- 1961-63 Alex Inkeles (sociology, Harvard)

- 1962-64 Joseph S. Berliner (economics, Brandeis)
- 1962-64 Victor Erlich (literature, Yale)
- 1963-65 John A. Armstrong (political science, Wisconsin)
- 1963-65 Gleb Struve (literature, Berkeley)
- 1964-66 Alexander Dallin (history, Columbia)
- 1964-66 Franklyn D. Holzman (economics, Tufts)
- 1965-67 Oswald P. Backus (history, Kansas)
- 1965-67 Hugh McLean (literature, Berkeley)
- 1966-68 Zbigniew Brzezinski (political science, Columbia)
- 1966-68 Nicholas V. Riasanovsky (history, Berkeley)
- 1967-69 David Joravsky (history, Northwestern)
- 1967-69 John M. Montias (economics, Yale)
- 1968-70 H. Gordon Skilling (political science, Toronto)
- 1968-70 James H. Billington (history, Princeton)
- 1969-71 Robert V. Daniels, (history, Vermont)
- 1969-71 Theodore H. Von Laue (history, Washington U., St. Louis)<sup>10</sup>

The duties of the thirteen directors were in most cases limited to attending one Board meeting per year. Except in the extraordinary circumstances preceding the conversion of 1969, when the ACLS made funds available for additional meetings, the directors had to obtain their travel expenses from their own universities or cover them personally.

The presidency and vice presidency at first had terms of one year. The first president and vice president were the former chairman and secretary, respectively, of the Organizing Committee. Then for three years the Board made each year's

vice president the president in the following year. In the fall of 1964, after the first national meeting, the Board decided to give the presidency a three-year term, running from one convention to the next. At that time the Board explicitly stated that the vice president would no longer be expected to succeed to the presidency. In 1966 the three-year term was extended to the vice presidency.<sup>11</sup>

*Why?  
So it would be less an honorary & more a working position  
More carryover of experience*

Those who served in the two top offices of the Association during the 1960s were:

President:

- 1961: William B. Edgerton (literature, Indiana)
- 1962: Chauncy D. Harris (geography, Chicago)
- 1963: Marshall D. Shulman (political science, Fletcher)
- 1964: Joseph S. Berliner (economics, Brandeis)
- 1965-67: John A. Armstrong (political science, Wisconsin)
- 1967-70: Edward J. Brown (literature, Indiana)

Vice President

- 1961: John M. Thompson (history, Indiana)
- 1962: Marshall D. Shulman (political science, Fletcher)
- 1963: Joseph S. Berliner, (economics, Brandeis)
- 1964: John A. Armstrong (political science, Wisconsin)
- 1965-67: Holland Hunter, (economics, Haverford)
- 1967-70: Leon Lipson (law, Yale)<sup>12</sup>

In the spring of 1969 the Board elected in advance the president and vice president for the period 1970-73. The new president was to be Holland Hunter, who had served as vice president in 1965-67 and had been on the Board since 1961. The new vice president was to be Herbert J. Ellison, who had been the history representative on the Board in 1967-69.

The office of secretary was linked to the physical location of the business office of the Association. Ralph T. Fisher Jr., historian at Illinois, served during the nine years when the headquarters was in Champaign-Urbana. He was appointed secretary pro-tem by the Organizing Committee for the last half of 1960, then elected secretary for 1961 and each succeeding year, ~~except that~~ <sup>W</sup> when he was on sabbatical leave in 1964-65 two of his colleagues at Illinois served as acting secretaries: Edward G. Lewis (political science) for 1964-65 and Jerome D. Fellmann (geography) for the fall of 1965. The office of secretary during the period 1960-69 did not carry any reduction in teaching load. For handling the day-to-day business of the Association the secretary depended on the manager, a person hired full time (see below). In 1969 an essential feature of the reorganization of the Association was the conversion of the secretaryship into a half-time executive secretaryship. <sup>As mentioned above,</sup> The person chosen by the Board for this crucial position was George J. Demko, ~~the~~ <sup>who</sup> geographer at Ohio State, ~~he~~ was elected for a five-year term running to 1974.

*explain why*

The office of treasurer was linked to the legal home of the Corporation, which by law had been since 1948 the State of New York. Columbia University had kept the books of the Corporation during the years before 1960, when John N. Hazard was editing the Review. That same arrangement continued during the period 1960-69, with one or another professor at Columbia serving as treasurer on a no-released-time basis.<sup>13</sup>

The treasurer, with the part-time help of an accountant or clerical assistant at Columbia, kept track of the receipts from the office in Champaign-Urbana, made payments on bills sent from there, and reported yearly to the Board on the state of the Association's finances. Those who served during 1960-69 were:

- 1960-65: John N. Hazard (law, Columbia)
- 1965-67: Henry L. Roberts (history, Columbia)
- 1967-68: Loren R. Graham (history, Columbia)
- 1968- : William E. Harkins (literature, Columbia)

The editorship of the Slavic Review was during the period 1960-69 the most important office of the Association, in the sense that everything else depended on having a scholarly journal of high quality. The ramifications of the position are discussed in the section on publications, below. The term was a matter for individual negotiation between the Board and the editor. ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ Those who held this

position in 1960-69 were:

- 1950-60: John N. Hazard (law, Columbia)

*Disagree  
Secretary was  
the most  
important  
person, who  
downgrades his  
own office  
& accounts to  
too much  
in their  
control*

*Control*

1961-64: Donald W. Treadgold (history, U. of Washington)

1965-67: Henry L. Roberts (history, Columbia)

1967-68: Louise E. Luke (literature, Columbia)

1968- : Donald W. Treadgold (history, U. of Washington)

In 1969, <sup>in accordance with</sup> ~~to conform to~~ what had been the prevailing practice, the By-Laws were amended to make the editor of the Review legally an officer of the Corporation.

The editor of the Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Leo Grulow, became an officer of the Corporation at the very end of the period under consideration (see the section on publications, below).

The attendance at Board meetings was remarkably good, considering that there were no Association funds for the officers' travel, that most of those elected or appointed to the Board were prominent scholars heavily burdened with other commitments, and that the machinery for selecting directors often failed to take into account whether or not the individual was interested in the Association.<sup>14</sup>

The Board served both as a maker of basic policies and as a confirmer of actions already taken by the officers. The officers enjoyed wide latitude in determining day-to-day policies. In part this was because Board meetings were so infrequent. In part it was because the Board, having chosen

? as officers people it thought would do a good job, was eager to keep them happy and give them all possible support.

Much of each meeting was devoted to reports from each officer to the Board, and discussion through which the directors learned what problems there were and what had been or might be done about them. Although there were usually a few new directors present who needed to acquire the necessary background, the core of holdovers was large enough to reassure the new ones and to prevent too much loss of time in the educative process.

The president, having consulted with the secretary or other officers concerned, usually knew beforehand what actions he wished to recommend, and his recommendations were usually followed, after full discussion. None of the presidents showed any tendency to be overbearing. That was not their style. If there had been such a problem, the directors probably would have put a stop to it, for they were typically independent. It is a tribute to the quality of the leadership and a testimony to the absence of sharply divisive issues that the decisions of the Board in the years 1960-69 were usually reached by consensus and were unanimous.

The only exceptions the secretary can remember are the secret ~~votes~~ ballots for officers, and even there, once the secret balloting had ascertained the informal preferences of the group, the decision became in effect unanimous.

In analyzing the composition of the group, we see that from 1960 to mid-1969, 45 persons from the United States and one from Canada served as editor of the Review or as direc-



tors or other officers on the Board of the Association. They represented a total of about 165 man-office-years, counting each office separately in those cases where one person occupied more than one concurrently.<sup>15</sup>

Among all those people and man-years, there was only one woman, and she served for only one year. Underrepresented though women are in senior academic positions in our society, this small fraction on the Board is nonetheless remarkable.

As to discipline, computing again by man-years in office, we find history, literature, political science, and economics predominating in that order. This accorded with their rank in the membership as a whole. History, economics, geography, and law were represented somewhat more than their numbers in the membership would justify, but the disproportions were not great. Among the "small" fields, only geography, law, and sociology were represented.<sup>16</sup>

A more serious irregularity appears in the distribution of the officers by geographic regions. Tallying them by where they worked at the time of their service, and using the same U. S. Census regions as used below (see the section on the membership), thus omitting the Canadian from Toronto, we find:

Northeast	77
North Central	65
South	0
West	<u>21</u>

163 man-office-years

If we compare regional percentages of members and officers we have these results:

Region	percent of members 1968-69	Percent of officers 1960-69 (in man-years)
Northeast	37	47
North Central	28	40
South	20	0
West	15	13

Those figures were striking confirmation of the charge of underrepresentation <sup>occasionally</sup> voiced by those in the South. Of course the officers were not selected on a regional basis, and probably no one paid special attention to regions in drawing up the slates for the yearly election to the Board of Directors. But these percentages were studied by the Board in 1969 with the thought that measures should be taken to provide representation for that segment of the members residing in the whole southeastern part of our country, from Washington D. C. and Maryland across to Texas.<sup>17</sup>

As the mention of Washington D. C. <sup>^</sup>suggests, there had also been an underrepresentation of people who worked in the government or in quasi-governmental research institutions as contrasted with those who worked for colleges and universities. I do not know what proportion of our membership in the 1960s was typically employed in the government. The "government service" category in the Directory ranged between 44 and 56, <sup>those figures</sup> but certainly understates <sup>d</sup> the case; on the other hand,

6 members were  
reps of errors  
of AAASS  
had no  
control over  
their selection  
of the  
regions of  
the country  
from which  
they came

not all of the 160 or so members who in 1969 lived in the Washington D. C. area were government workers (see the section on membership, below). Perhaps the number was a little over 100, or about 5 percent. Random selection could account for the non-representation of any particular one-twentieth of the membership on the Board, especially since the number of Board members involved was still so small. But in view of the historical importance of the Washington D. C. Chapter in our field and the prominence and expertise of many of its individual members, I believe the absence of any government workers on the Board in the 1960s was significant. Probably it could be explained in part by the separateness of the government and university worlds. We should not necessarily assume that many of our members in the government felt discriminated against. For many of them, as mentioned below, their professional world within the government was probably so varied and all-absorbing that they had little reason to be concerned with the organizational affairs of the AAASS,

of what?

An underrepresented category that was more likely to feel slighted was that portion of the membership that was teaching or studying at small colleges. I do not know how large that proportion was, but I feel sure it was larger than Holland Hunter's share of the 165 man-office-years-- and he was the only Board member of the period 1960-69 who was at a small college.

Inquiring a little further, we see that the Board consisted largely of people who taught at a relatively few universities, all of which had sizable graduate programs on Russia and eastern Europe. Columbia was by far the best represented. Leaving aside Hunter's Haverford, the other institutions that had seven or more man-office-years of representation were, in alphabetical order, Berkeley, Harvard, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Washington, Wisconsin, and Yale. There were twenty-three institutions represented on the Board in the years 1960-69. But the nine universities named <sup>which probably had 1/3 of the personal & strength</sup> accounted together for over two-thirds of the total man-office-years involved.

The Board may also be analyzed from the standpoint of the sort of old school tie mentioned above in connection with the launching of the Association. Taking into account both student and faculty status, we find that out of the 46 people who served on the Board in this period, 28 had been at Columbia for a year or more, while 23 had been at Harvard. Only 5 had been at neither. Since the selection process was so different for the various categories of Board member, again we seem justified in concluding that these figures, while striking, are less a testimony to cliquishness than they are a testimony to the prominence of those two universities in our field up through the postwar decade. For this group was predominantly a product of the <sup>Second World War</sup> ~~war~~ and immediate postwar period. All but one of the 46 had had their formal graduate study before 1955, <sup>18</sup> while only four of the 46 had completed

their graduate degrees before 1939.<sup>19</sup>

What about age? To analyze this we can count, for each of the 46 who served on the Board in 1960-69, that person's age at approximately the mid-point of his service on the Board. The tabulation shows that 45 was the median age, and that 35 of the 46 persons served at ages whose mid-point was from 39 to 49 years old inclusive. One was younger, while 7 were in their fifties and 2 were in their sixties. (One person's age remains unknown to me.)

No one should jump to the conclusion that this age distribution betokened some sort of revolt of the young or middle-aged. Rather, it reflected the familiar fact that the big expansion in our field came only after World War II. Probably the age distribution on the Board did not differ very much from the age distribution among the holders of tenured teaching positions in the Russian and east European field in the country as a whole during the 1960s. But we must not forget to ask whether there was any change in the average age of the Board in the course of the decade. Here we find an interesting answer: The average age of the Board in 1961 was 46 (the median was 45); in 1969 the average (and also the median) had risen to 48. This was still far from an age of decrepitude, but it posed a clear question for the future: Would the trend toward increasingly mature leadership continue in the 1970s, and if so at what rate? To what extent would the graduates of the late 1950s and early 1960s now be brought into positions of leadership to replace the aging but still numerous graduates of the first postwar decade?

Finally, we may look at the Board from the standpoint of whether they were primarily Russian specialists or were people interested primarily in some other part of eastern Europe. Even interpreting "non-Russian" quite broadly, we would be hard pressed to bring our "Russian" total below 39 out of the 46 individuals to be counted. This may have been a fairly accurate reflection of the academic interests of the membership as a whole during the 1960s, but it did lend strength to the oft-made point that our Association, in its publications and meetings, needed to encourage especially the study of the countries lying between Germany and Russia.

~~A~~ B. The Secretariat.

The secretariat of the Triple A Double S in the years 1960-69 consisted of (1) the secretary, (2) the manager, (3) the editor and associate editor of the Newsletter and the "News of the Profession" section of the Slavic Review, and (4) occasional part-time helpers as needed. They occupied one and then two rooms, not counting the secretary's own office, which was the same one he used as director of the Russian and East European Center at the University of Illinois. The actual quarters moved three times to accommodate the needs of the Center.<sup>1</sup> The University of Illinois provided the space and utilities without charge to the Association. The University also covered the telephone (including long distance calls), the secretary's postage and other office costs, including part of the time of the Center's administrative secretary (a University employee), the secretary's travel to AAASS Board, national, and regional meetings, such part-time clerical helpers as were needed by the manager, the wages of the part-time associate editor of the Newsletter, and in the latter part of the decade such released time as was allowed to the editor and associate editor. The Association paid the salary of the manager and her expenses directly connected with AAASS business.

The secretary of the Association was responsible for seeing that the office functioned properly, but during most of the decade the job required only a few hours per week.

57

The job was somewhat more burdensome during the first two and one-half years, when the secretary served also as editor of the Newsletter and the "News of the Profession" section of the Review (see below), and when special efforts were devoted to repeated membership drives and to building up a network of membership representatives. During the period 1961-64, also, the secretary made it a point to do as much as possible, through correspondence and visits, to encourage the formation of regional groups. The other busiest stretch came in 1968 and early 1969, with the crisis in the Slavic Review and the preparations to convert to an executive secretaryship. It had become clear by that time that if the Association were to assume responsibility for the Current Digest and for more planning, grant-making, and promotion across the country, the job could not be done on a limited, no-released-time basis. Thus the search was initiated for the best possible person to take over as a half-time executive secretary--the search completed so successfully with the selection of George J. Demko, ~~a geographer at Ohio State~~ Ohio State provided everything he needed, and even gave him full time off from teaching during his first year in the job, 1969-70--a tremendous boon for him and for the Association.

The manager's duties included taking care of the subscriptions and memberships, compiling and typing the Directory, soliciting advertising for the Directory and for the convention programs, typing the Newsletter in camera-ready form, and many other tasks. <sup>x2</sup> The Association was fortunate



in attracting responsible women for this position. From 1960 to 1964 the manager was Mrs. Frances Brown Reed, widow of the former chief chemist of the Illinois State Geological Survey. ~~Before her marriage to Dr. Reed,~~ <sup>Previously</sup> she had been for twelve years the secretary to the president of the National Association of Food Chains in Washington, D. C. <sup>x3</sup> In January of 1964 she remarried. Her successor was Mrs. Agnes W. Wilson, a university wife who had had many years of secretarial experience at Illinois. <sup>x4</sup>

The work of the editor and associate editor of the Newsletter and "News of the Profession" is covered in the section on publications, below.

C. The Membership.

Several points deserve attention under the heading of the membership: (1) changes in the total membership over time; (2) the distribution of members by category of membership (regular, student, etc.); (3) the distribution by academic disciplines <sup>and positions</sup>; (4) the geographical distribution by state and country; (5) the distribution by major regions within the United States; and (6) the concentrations or urban clusters of members.

1. Changes over time.

In studying the growth of the membership of the Association over the nine academic years 1960-69, we must keep in mind first that the initial buildup was partly at the expense of subscriptions. Thus the total of members plus subscriptions was a better indica-

tion than membership figures alone for judging the net change. For

~~for~~ the whole period it is helpful to keep in mind that the total of memberships and subscriptions reached by mid-1969 was about 3700, or <sup>slightly over</sup> ~~only about~~ four times the total for 1959, <sup>when</sup> ~~before the conversion of the Association into~~ <sup>first became</sup> a membership organization.<sup>1</sup>

~~Another point to keep in mind is that~~ Because of delays in renewals and variations in the timing of membership drives, figures given in the first quarter or third of <sup>any calendar</sup> a year ~~are~~ <sup>were</sup> less accurate indicators of growth ~~for comparative purposes~~ than figures given in the second half. Here are second-half figures for each of the calendar years within the period under consideration:

1960 (ca. Dec. 15)	633
1961 ( Dec.)	ca. 1000
1962 (Oct. 10)	1284
1963 (Oct. 10)	1395
1964 (Sep. 16)	1663
1965 (Dec.)	1563
1966 (Oct. 30)	1831
1967 (Dec. 31)	2180
1968 (Dec.)	2260 <sup>x2</sup>

In order to express that growth in average yearly terms, we need to start with the figure for October 1962, by which time the Association had been recruiting for more than two years and had gone through the initial buildup. From the fall of 1962 through the fall of 1967 the average increase per year was about 11 percent compounded.<sup>x3</sup> In 1968 the incoming flow of new members proceeded normally through the first half of the year, but slowed appreciably in the fall when publication of the Review was interrupted. In part this reflected the secretary's reluctance to put on a full-scale autumn recruitment campaign in the face of the fact that new members might have to wait half a year or more before getting their September and December issues. The interruption in the Review also hampered the process of obtaining both renewals and new members in the first half of 1969.<sup>x4</sup> Nevertheless, <sup>there were signs</sup> ~~there were good grounds for~~

~~expecting~~ that renewals and new memberships would pick up fast in the fall as soon as people became aware that under Treadgold the Review was going to be back on schedule, and it seemed quite likely that the 11 percent yearly rate could be regained and sustained as the Association entered the new era under an executive secretary. Moreover, the fact that another national ~~meeting~~ <sup>convention</sup> was approaching promised, on the basis of the experience of 1964 and 1967, an extra influx of new members. <sup>15</sup>

One comment may be made about membership drives. The membership figures given above show an increase in every year except 1965. This drop probably reflects the lack of any membership drives from late 1964 to early 1966, while the secretary was on leave. Except for that interruption and the previously-explained hiatus of 1968-1969, membership drives were conducted at least once and sometimes twice per year. Aiding in these drives were up to 350 individual members in colleges, universities, and government offices all over the country, who were public-spirited enough to respond to the request of the secretary for suggestions of new members. Such campaigns, repeated frequently, were evidently necessary to the continued growth of the Association. <sup>16</sup>

2. Categories of membership.

By 1969 there were five different categories of membership. The most common was "regular," costing \$12 per

year (earlier \$10). That was originally intended to be ~~for~~ restricted to people professionally interested in the Slavic and east European field. For non-professionals there had been provided a category of "associate member," costing the same but carrying no vote. The Board had the right to determine who would be eligible for regular membership. In the period 1960-69 the Board automatically accepted as regular members any who applied for that category. The number of associates was very small (9 in April 1969). This reflects two facts: (1) The Association had no need to define "professional" very narrowly at this time, and (2) it was not attracting many non-professionals anyway.

There were two cut-rate classes of membership: student and emeritus. Both carried dues of \$6 (earlier \$5). Emeritus members were few (5 in April 1969), but student members were numerous. In April 1969 they comprised about 22 percent of the total. Over the nine-year period the proportion of students ranged between a low of about 18 percent and a high of about 25 percent, with no consistent trend up or down. The student rate was available only to those who obtained a faculty member's certification of full-time student status. Postage costs limited

the student rate to those with U. S. mailing addresses.

There was a fifth class of membership, the "sustaining," designed for those ~~professionals or others~~ who wished to make an extra contribution in support of the Association. The yearly rate was \$25. No special attempt was made to sell the \$25 membership, and there were never many of them. Two people voluntarily made this contribution for the whole period under review:

A. Edythe Mange of Western Michigan University and Philip E. Mosely of Columbia University. A third, Albert L. Weeks of New York University, contributed for four years. The Board in 1969 took special note of their extra contributions and expressed its thanks for their generosity.<sup>17</sup>

3. Distribution of members by academic disciplines.

Each time a Directory was published, it gave an up-to-date indication of the distribution of the members by discipline. In the editions of 1962, 1966, and 1968, members were permitted to list a second discipline if they wished. The results are indicated in the following table.

MEMBERSHIP BREAKDOWN BY DISCIPLINE

	<u>October 1961</u>	<u>December* 1962</u>	<u>January* 1966</u>	<u>February* 1968</u>
ANTHROPOLOGY	6	11	13	16
ARTS		17	18	22
DEMOGRAPHY		10	6	6
ECONOMICS	91	125	122	141
EDUCATION	10	22	33	48
GEOGRAPHY	33	48	40	49
GOVERNMENT SERVICE		56	44	55
HISTORY	358	526	724	919
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS		156	172	265
JOURNALISM	12	23	22	34
LANGUAGE & LITERATURE	225	337	385	492
LAW	34	32	35	53
LIBRARY	10	29	42	71
NATURAL SCIENCES	5	7	15	15
PHILOSOPHY	12	27	29	37
POLITICAL SCIENCE	160	271	290	391
PSYCHOLOGY	5	7	9	7
RELIGION				14
SOCIAL SCIENCES	39	37	52	56
SOCIOLOGY	10	23	24	28
MISCELLANEOUS (categories with less than 6 members)	28	18	21	36
Total of listings, counting duplications*	1038	1782	2096	2755
Total Members	1038	1284	1525	1966

\*Note: In all issues of the Directory from 1962 on, members were permitted to list a second discipline if they wished. Some did not list any.

The absence of certain categories in earlier editions makes the results not exactly comparable. Nevertheless, some features stand out. The relative position of the top five (or four before international relations was introduced) remained the same throughout: (1) history, (2) language and literature, (3) political science, (4) international relations, and (5) economics. Beyond that there were some shifts, with social sciences, government service, geography, and law being in close competition for sixth and seventh places until in 1968 the library science people, having come up fast in 1962 and 1966, emerged in clear possession of sixth place well ahead of the other four. Another <sup>trend</sup> ~~point~~ to note is the above-average increase in the education category. <sup>18</sup>

With respect to the two largest categories, history and language-and-literature, we should observe that in the country as a whole, to judge by the size of AATSEEL, Slavic language and literature specialists outnumbered historians of Slavic and eastern Europe by more than two to one. That the proportions are almost reversed within the AAASS is probably explained mainly by two factors. One is the stronger appeal of the AAASS for college and university teachers than for high school teachers. The other is the essentially interdisciplinary nature of the discipline of history, which makes students of history strive to understand or keep contact with all of the other disciplines listed.

and the fact that historians generally specialize in some area or region while economists do not

Looking again at the table, we should note also that the categories are not all directly comparable. The category



of "government service" says nothing about a department of knowledge. It could go along with any of them. The same is true to a lesser extent of other categories that are fields of employment spanning many disciplines, such as journalism and library science.

There are other observations to be made about the "government service" category. The number who checked it seems considerably lower than the number of members employed in the government. Probably, as mentioned above, that number was over 100. (See also the listing by urban areas, below.) Each person could check only two categories, and it would have been natural for many persons employed in the government to check not "government service" but their subject fields, which often would encompass two of the "disciplines" listed--especially in the overlapping cluster of international relations, history, economics, <sup>and</sup> political science, social sciences. One can speculate further concerning the place of government workers in the Association. As already mentioned, they were underrepresented in the leadership of the AAASS during the 1960s. This was one of the several indications of the Association's primary identification with college and university teachers and students, and its relative lack of appeal to not only government workers but also to people knowledgeable on Russia and eastern Europe in many other walks of life. I do not know how many people were working in the 1960s professionally on Russia and eastern Europe in the various branches of the federal government, but I feel sure it was far more than the 100 or 150 who came within

the orbit of the AAASS and its Washington D. C. Chapter. Some government workers may not have joined because they were already fully occupied with their own intra-governmental circles; others because they were dealing with highly classified materials and could discuss Russian and eastern European affairs only with their colleagues who had similar clearances; still others perhaps because they felt the AAASS was not eager to recruit them, or because they already received its publications in their offices and could see no point in paying the dues out of their own pockets. Probably many of those government workers who did join were ones who had special reasons for maintaining their academic contacts, like those who had received or were working toward advanced professional degrees in the Russian and east European field and who thought they might like to move to a college or university job at some time in the future. It is noteworthy that while the Association in the 1960s enrolled as members virtually all of the leading specialists in our field in university circles, it attracted very few of the top Russian and east European specialists from the State or Defense departments or the CIA.

4. Geographical distribution of members by state and country.

The last analysis of the geographical distribution of members during the period under review was made on March 25, 1969. It included the 2,375 persons who were then on the rolls,

including members for 1968 who had not yet renewed for 1969 (they were still bona fide members, for they had not yet received all their Reviews for 1968). One striking thing was that for the first time all 50 states plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico were represented in the membership.

Here is the tabulation by states:

New York	395
California	188
Illinois	160
Pennsylvania	127
District of Columbia	124
Massachusetts	113
Indiana	112
Michigan	95
Ohio	84
Virginia	78
New Jersey	74
Wisconsin	54
Maryland	52
North Carolina	51
Washington	49
Connecticut	46
Kansas	38
Minnesota	27
Missouri, Texas	26
Colorado	25

Florida, Tennessee	20
Oregon	19
Rhode Island	17
Vermont	15
Georgia, New Hampshire	12
Kentucky	11
Arizona	9
Nebraska, Oklahoma	8
Iowa	7
Louisiana, Utah	6
South Carolina	5
Delaware, Hawaii, Nevada	4
Alaska, Alabama, Maine, Mississippi, New Mexico, West Virginia	3
Arkansas, Idaho, Montana	2
North Dakota, Puerto Rico, South Dakota, Wyoming	1

In the above ranking, those states that had moved up noticeably since the last previous ranking (Fall, 1967) were Ohio (which passed Virginia), North Carolina (which passed Connecticut and Washington), and Oregon (which passed Vermont). In general, the sequence had changed little throughout the nine-year period. New York was always far in the lead, having about one-sixth or more of the total. California and Illinois were consistently second and third, respectively, though their

combined total never exceeded the figure for New York alone. The next four--Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia, Massachusetts, and Indiana--consistently occupied fourth through seventh places but the sequence shifted from one count to the next.<sup>19</sup>

In that same analysis of March 25, 1969, and turning to the countries outside the United States, Canada had 112 members. Of our Canadian members, roughly half (55) were in Ontario. Only ten of our states and the District of Columbia had more members than Ontario. The figures by country were as follows:

Canada	112
Germany	23
Great Britain	21
France	11
Israel	8
Italy	7
Holland, Switzerland, Yugoslavia	4
Japan, USSR	3
Sweden	2
Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Guam, Iceland, India, Mexico, New Zealand, Rumania, South Africa, Spain, West Indies, Zambia	1

Although our foreign members had grown more numerous than before, the general picture had not changed strikingly. Many people had commented from time to time about the possibility of

recruiting additional members abroad, but efforts on the part of the secretary to exchange subscription lists with foreign periodicals had not borne fruit.<sup>10</sup>

5. Geographical distribution of members by regions of the United States

Using once more the data for March 25, 1969, and focusing on those 2,160 of our members who were in the United States, we can use the tabulation by states to examine the distribution of members by regions of the United States. Taking first the nine "Divisions" as defined by the United States Census Bureau, we arrive at these figures: New England (Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut): 206 members, or 9.5%. Middle Atlantic (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania): 596 members, or 27.7%. East North Central (Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin): 505 members, or 23.4%. West North Central (Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas): 108 members, or 5.0%. South Atlantic (Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Puerto Rico): 351 members, or 16.3%. East South Central (Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi): 37 members, or 1.7%. West South Central (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas): 42 members, or 2.0%. Mountain (Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada): 52 members, or 2.4%. Pacific (Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, Hawaii): 263 members, or 12.1%

We can take those figures for Divisions and combine them into "Regions" as defined by the Bureau of the Census, as follows:

<u>Region</u>	<u>Percent of AAASS Members</u>
Northeast (New England and Middle Atlantic)	37.1
North Central (East North Central and West North Central)	28.4
South (South Atlantic, East South Central, West South Central)	19.9
West (Mountain and Pacific)	14.6 "

Those percentages in turn may be compared with the distribution of the population as a whole among the same regions. The Northeast (New England and Middle Atlantic) is then seen to be much better represented among our membership (37.1 percent) than its share of the population as a whole (24.8 percent). The South showed a contrasting situation, with only 19.9 percent of the membership although it had 30.6 percent of the population. The North Central and the West came out to have approximately the same share of the membership as they had of the population as a whole (28.7 percent for the North Central and 15.7 percent for the West).<sup>12</sup>

6. Geographical distribution by urban clusters.

In some ways the distribution of members by urban clusters is more meaningful than the distribution by states.

As a rough index of those clusters of members that were close enough to be in direct contact with each other (for lectures, etc.), we used a ten-mile radius with small variations. Using the March 1969 roll of members, Mrs. Wilson tabulated the following clusters:

New York City (including, as in all cases below, other places within about 10 miles in any direction)	246
Washington, D. C.	160
Bloomington, Indiana	76
Champaign-Urbana, Illinois	73
Boston-Cambridge, Massachusetts	58
Ann Arbor, Michigan	45
Chicago, Illinois	45
Berkeley-San Francisco (7 in San Francisco, 34 East Bay)	44
Los Angeles, California	41
Seattle, Washington	37
Durham-Chapel Hill, North Carolina	35
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	34
Palo Alto-Stanford, California	26
Lawrence, Kansas	25
Toronto, Canada	25
Columbus, Ohio	24
New Haven, Connecticut	21
Princeton, New Jersey	21
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	21
Madison, Wisconsin	20



Denver-Boulder, Colorado	17
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota	17
East Lansing, Michigan	16
St. Louis, Missouri	15
Ithaca, New York	15
Cleveland, Ohio	15
Montreal, Canada	15
Sacramento, California	14
Providence, Rhode Island	13
Charlottesville, Virginia	13
Nashville, Tennessee	12
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	12
Munich, Germany	11
Amherst, Massachusetts	10
Rochester, New York	10
Ottawa, Canada	10

In that ranking of urban clusters, the most striking changes as compared with 1967 were the jump of Ann Arbor from 12th place to 6th, the descent of Madison from 11th place to 19th, the rise of Columbus from 22nd to 16th, and the emergence of significant clusters in several places that had previously had less than ten members: Minneapolis-St. Paul, East Lansing, Cleveland, Sacramento, Providence, Charlottesville, Nashville, Milwaukee, Munich, Amherst, Rochester, and Ottawa.<sup>13</sup>

The statistics on urban clusters of members showed, among other things, the high (many would say excessive)

degree to which our organization was dependent on and limited to university people. That cities with large Eastern European populations like Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, New York, and Philadelphia should have as few members as they did in comparison with small university towns was one demonstration of this.

The point is made most clearly in those big cities that ~~did~~ <sup>had</sup> ~~contain~~ <sup>people</sup> many of Slavic origin, but did not <sup>have</sup> ~~contain~~ universities with large Slavic and east European programs. Consider Cleveland and Detroit with all their Czechs and Poles yet with only 15 and 9 members respectively, or San Francisco with all its Russians yet with only 7 members. Those figures dramatize our failure to reach the educated citizen outside of university circles. To some extent this failure could be expected, for many Americans of Slavic or other eastern European parentage were interested in groups associated specifically with their own nationality, rather than groups concerned with eastern European affairs in general. Also, our Association focussed very little on the place of Slavs and eastern Europeans in North America.

Having in mind the Association's heavy dependence on university people, and <sup>its success in attracting</sup> ~~the fact that it consistently attracted~~ virtually all of the senior specialists in university circles, we need to explain the sharp differences in membership totals for places that seem otherwise similar. Leaving aside large cities with several universities in them, like New York, Washington, ~~and~~ Boston, and Chicago, let us consider the

figures for one-university towns like Bloomington (76), Champaign-Urbana (73), Ann Arbor (45), Palo Alto (26), Lawrence (25), New Haven (21), and Madison (20). These differences were not explainable by the size of the Russian and east European staffs in the various institutions, for those staffs were probably in the range of about twenty to thirty in each case. Clearly the difference was mostly in the enrollment of students. Apparently the faculty was doing a much better job at some places than at others of informing its students about the Slavic Review and other services of the Association. Probably each of those seven places had between thirty and fifty graduate students who were professionally enough oriented to join the Association if they knew about it. Taking into account the many other institutions with graduate programs, we see that we still had in 1969 a large untapped source of members among graduate students.

D. Finances

The AAASS was truly a non-profit organization all through the years 1960-69. Only thanks to the generosity of more than three dozen universities was it able to survive and to produce a publication of the quality of the Slavic Review despite a relatively small circulation.

The main categories of recurring expense for the Association were (1) the printing, producing, and distributing of the Review, (2) a portion of the editorial salaries of the Review, (3) the salary of the manager, (4) the printing and distributing of the Newsletter, (5) the printing and distributing of the Directory in years when one was published, (6) the purchase and distribution of the Bibliography, and (7) the printing and distribution of convention programs in years when a convention was held. There were also lesser outlays including office equipment and supplies, and other minor items that varied from year to year. The yearly expenses in the late 1960s were

running about \$55,000.<sup>1</sup> These did not include the subsidy in space, staff time, salaries, and miscellaneous expenses being contributed by Columbia or the University of Washington for the editing of the Review. In 1967-68 this subsidy was variously estimated at between \$21,000 and \$29,000 per year.<sup>12</sup>

Also excluded were the costs in space, salaries, staff time and miscellaneous expenses then being contributed by the University of Illinois. Depending especially on how the staff

time was estimated, this subsidy was between about \$5,000 and \$9,000 per year, not counting anything for the time of the secretary.<sup>+3</sup> Thus the total <sup>costs</sup> ~~expenditures~~ toward the end of the decade may be placed at around \$85,000 per year.

On the income side the main items--in addition to the Columbia and Illinois contributions just mentioned-- were membership dues and subscriptions (about \$35,000-\$39,000) and advertising in the Review (about \$3,000). Lesser items included sales of and ads in the Directory when one was published, sales of back issues of the Review and the Index to the Review, fees for the use of the mailing list, sales of and ads in the convention program when one was published, exhibitors' fees when a convention was held, and Newsletter ads and sales.<sup>+4</sup>

and registra-  
tion fees  
at conventions  
?

The yearly income in 1966-1968 was running in the low or middle forty thousands.

Those figures were higher on both sides of the ledger than they had been a few years before; but yearly deficits in the range of \$5,000 to ~~as high as~~ \$15,000 were experienced.<sup>+5</sup>

One way to reduce the deficit might have been to increase the membership and subscription rates. This was done in 1966 when the basic rate went from \$10 to \$12.<sup>+6</sup> In March of 1968 the Board decided in view of sharply rising costs to move the basic rate to \$15 for 1969.<sup>+7</sup> However, the interrupted publication schedule of the Review, plus fears that the increase might cause a sizable drop in the number of members, prompted the Board to announce in 1969 the postponement of that increase to 1971.<sup>+8</sup>

Having no other products to sell, the Association was dependent on angels. In the first year the ACLS ~~had~~ played this role, with a contribution of about \$11,000.<sup>9</sup> During the ensuing eight years the saviors were a group of universities that eventually numbered thirty-seven. At first they were appealed to directly by the Organizing Committee and by the president and vice president of the Association. They were asked for a three-year commitment to help the Association get started.<sup>10</sup> By the fall of 1962 there were nine giving \$1,000 each per year, one giving \$600, three giving \$500, and four giving \$250 each.<sup>11</sup> Several of the institutions did not want their gifts announced; hence the Board decided not to publicize the list. It included most of the institutions that had sizable programs in the Russian and east European field. The amount being contributed during the years 1961-63 was more than enough to meet the current deficits, and the Association was able to add to the modest reserve which it had inherited from John Hazard's economical management of the American Slavic and East European Review. However, there were problems. The reserve was far from being large enough to produce significant income on an endowment basis. Some 26 institutions that were invited to contribute had declined to do so.<sup>12</sup> The initial appeal to the big donors had been made for three years and could not be stretched out indefinitely. The presidents and vice presidents of the Association had more than once approached the Ford Foundation--which had made grants to the Asian and African studies associations--without success.<sup>13</sup>

actually  
 v. 3  
 universities  
 specifically  
 excluded  
 support  
 for SR,  
 but perhaps  
 the number  
 is not  
 here.  
 (Check list  
 in footnote;  
 some had  
 not reported  
 SR)  
 "About  
 3 dozen  
 (no list,  
 see  
 footnote)

They had also approached thirteen other foundations and business organizations, but had been rewarded with only one grant-- \$1,000 from the Harry Scherman Foundation.<sup>14</sup>

Rescue came <sup>through</sup> ~~from~~ a new entity, the Slavic Publications Fund. ~~This was set up in 1964~~ by Gordon B. Turner under the auspices of the ACLS. The Fund itself was <sup>initiated</sup> headed by

Chancellor Herman B Wells and Robert F. Byrnes of Indiana <sup>in 1964, and admin by</sup>

They made a concerted appeal to all universities active in the Slavic and east European field. Their appeal was on behalf of both the Slavic Review and the Current Digest of the Soviet Press, which was also not yet self-supporting. The

initial request was for <sup>SIX</sup> ~~five~~ years, and <sup>from 1964 to 1970</sup> ultimately it was

~~extended for a sixth~~. The record of the Slavic Publications Fund was indeed impressive. Over the six years of its existence, 1964-1970, it obtained contributions of \$287,698.09 from thirty-seven universities and research institutions. While allocating enough each year to keep the Digest and the Review in the black, the Fund built up a contingency reserve of over \$78,000, which ultimately was turned over to the AAASS after the AAASS had assumed responsibility for the Digest and, with its executive secretary, was prepared to offer the kind of continuing supervision and sponsorship that was needed.<sup>15</sup> The

AAASS itself received subsidies totaling about \$74,000 in the five calendar years 1964-1968.<sup>16</sup> It was thanks to the Slavic

Publications Fund, then, that the Association maintained its services to members and subscribers and even added slightly to its own emergency reserves.

Meanwhile, as the end of the decade approached, the question of Ford Foundation support had been raised again in connection with the plan to establish an executive secretaryship and to assume responsibility for the Current Digest. The proposal prepared by John Thompson's subcommittee was approved in principle by the Board in the spring of 1968, and a committee chaired by Herbert J. Ellison worked out a proposal to Ford.<sup>17</sup> The Ford Foundation then approved a grant of \$30,000 per year for three years beginning July 1, 1969.<sup>18</sup> The announced intention of this grant was to give the AAASS time, under its new executive secretary, to bring its operations into the black. As of 1969 the prospects for achieving that aim appeared excellent.



IV. THE FUNCTIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

The functions of the Triple A Double S express its purposes or goals as defined above. These functions may be considered under the headings of (1) publications, (2) organizational links, (3) national meetings, and (4) other activities.

IV.A. Publications.

The publications of the Association in the academic years 1960-69 included the quarterly Slavic Review, the twice-yearly Newsletter, and the Directory of Members, which went through four editions. In addition, the AAASS purchased the American Bibliography of Russian and East European Studies for distribution to its members, and at the end of the period it assumed responsibility for the Current Digest of the Soviet Press. Each of these five will now be discussed.

1. The Slavic Review: American Quarterly of Soviet and East European Studies.

The quarterly Review has been both a primary reason for the existence of the Association and a primary inducement for anyone to become a member of it. Cause and effect cannot be separated, but by any standard the growth of the Review in this period was impressive. From 1960 through 1967 the average number of copies mailed per issue during each year rose as follows:

1960:	900
1961:	1200
1962:	2100
1963:	2288
1964:	2539
1965:	<i>figures</i> not available
1966:	2945
1967:	3431 <sup>1</sup>

A moment's thought is enough to bring home the realization that editing the Slavic Review is an exceptionally demanding task. It takes the ability to deal with material in ~~various~~ <sup>numerous</sup> disciplines and pertaining to a variety of cultures and languages. Moreover, many of the contributors to such a journal--including, as Henry Roberts observed, some of the native-born as well as some of the recent arrivals from eastern Europe--have a command of written English that is considerably less than perfect. Add to this that many of the journal's readers carry over into the publishing arena the national antagonisms and suspicions of the region being treated.

No editor of this journal could escape arousing the ire of some segment or other of his professional audience. Simply to stay in the saddle for a while calls for a rare combination of diplomatic, linguistic, and editorial abilities.

During the nine academic years in question, the Review went through four changes of the managing editorship. John N. Hazard, who had edited the American Slavic and East European Review at Columbia since 1950-51, began turning over his duties to Donald W. Treadgold at the University of Washington in the summer of 1960.<sup>+2</sup>

By the end of 1960 a smooth transition had been completed.<sup>+3</sup>

The change to the new name came with the issue of October 1961. At the end of 1964, Treadgold turned over the managing editorship to Henry L. Roberts, and the editorial offices moved back to Columbia. Again there was a smooth transition, in this case spread over the latter half of 1964. In the summer of 1967, when Roberts left Columbia for Dartmouth, Louise E. Luke was named managing editor. Again there was an easy transition, for she had been the associate editor under Roberts and, ~~as~~ he was the first to point out, had been actually performing many of the duties of the managing editorship ever

since ~~Roberts~~ <sup>he had</sup> assumed the post.<sup>4</sup> Miss Luke served until the spring of 1968, when a period of uncertainty intervened/ (see below). In the fall of 1968 Treadgold acceded to the Board's request that he accept another term. By the beginning of 1969 the editorial offices were functioning again back in Seattle, but it took more than a year of strenuous effort before Treadgold and his staff could bring the Review back on schedule.

The scale of operation in the period 1960-69 differed sharply from what had gone before. Hazard had functioned on a very small budget without any released time, helped by a part-time editorial assistant.<sup>45</sup> Under the Treadgold and Roberts regimes the managing editor was supposed to be given a sizable portion of released time for his editorial duties. The actual arrangement depended on him.<sup>6</sup> Each of them operated with an associate editor (Gladys Greenwood part-time with Treadgold, <sup>full-time</sup> Miss Luke with Roberts) and a full-time assistant (Leila Charbonneau with Treadgold, Miriam Bergamini with Roberts). In the period when Miss Luke was managing editor, that was her full-time job, with Mrs. Bergamini serving as her chief assistant. All of the editors had additional ~~editorial~~ clerical personnel. Throughout the period, the "News of the Profession" section of the Review was handled by the editors of the Newsletter (see below).

Throughout the nine academic years under consideration, the division of business functions between the editor's office and the secretariat remained <sup>about</sup> ~~essentially~~ the same. The editorial office handled Review advertising, while the secretariat in Champaign-Urbana handled subscriptions and memberships, complaints about delivery, and orders for recent back issues.

There were some changes during the period 1960-69 in the structure and functions of the groups of academic persons listed on the inside front cover under such headings as Editorial Committee or Editorial Board. Hazard, following

still earlier tradition, had listed an Editorial Committee which included a large share of the most prominent scholars in the field. In 1951 the Committee numbered 16. By 1960 it numbered 24, plus a category of "Honorary Editors" who numbered four and included members of the Editorial Committee who had retired.<sup>7</sup> Among the 16 of 1951, all but one of those who were still living in 1960 were still on one or the other list.<sup>8</sup>

During the Treadgold editorship of 1961-64, the Editorial Committee remained essentially the same, with three additions, one death, and four transfers to the status of Honorary Editor. Treadgold added a smaller group, the Editorial Board, composed of Hazard and four others, to which he could turn for advice more readily than the larger Committee.<sup>9</sup>

Roberts retained exactly the same arrangement; ~~and~~ the only personnel change was one death.<sup>10</sup>

Up to that point the group had remained ~~essentially~~ a sponsoring body, its members selected partly for their own eminence and partly so as to represent the various disciplines and the main universities engaged in Russian and east European studies. It was definitely not a working group. Although certain individuals on the Committee responded faithfully whenever asked, there were others who declined to read manuscripts or write book reviews.<sup>11</sup> Yet they were left on the Committee for reasons

of personal or institutional prestige.

Miss Luke and Roberts, during the last months before his move in 1967, worked out another system. For their sponsoring body, now called the Editorial Advisory Committee, they combined the 23 members of the former Editorial Board and Editorial Committee. Alongside it they created a small group called the Editorial Board, under Roberts' chairmanship. This group consisted mainly of people in the New York area, some of them relatively junior. They were to participate actively in the planning of issues, the preliminary reading of manuscripts, and the selection of manuscript appraisers and of book reviewers. They were expected to meet every month or oftener, and funds were provided for their travel expenses.<sup>12</sup> Miss Luke reported that this group was extremely helpful to her.<sup>13</sup> However, when the editorship was transferred again to Treadgold that group was no longer needed, and Treadgold dissolved it while retaining the Editorial Advisory Committee.<sup>14</sup>

The short-lived Roberts-Luke working board was part of a more comprehensive experiment in the years 1967 and 1968. This experiment was related to and contemporaneous with the discussions and planning that led to the establishment of the executive secretaryship, recounted above. For the Review this was a time of uncertainty and controversy. There is still no unanimously-endorsed version of what happened and why. Yet, it cannot be passed over in silence, for it was a critical

test of the state of development of the Review and the Association.

The starting-point was Roberts' decision, made by the spring of 1966, to move from Columbia to Dartmouth in mid-1967. In a thoughtful seven-page memorandum of May 1966 to the Board, Roberts suggested that the Review should remain at Columbia and that the position of managing editor should become a full-time one. He said:

. . . I have become convinced that part-time, periodically rotating academic editors do not meet the needs with respect to the regular, periodic appearance of a journal such as the Slavic Review has become, or is striving to become. . . . Moreover, in these days of increasing academic mobility, prevalence of leaves of absence between sabbaticals, and the variety of extracurricular chores that we and our colleagues, for love or money, engage in, it seems to me doubtful that, over the long haul, one is likely to find professors of academic and editorial competence who will be able and/or willing to devote the amount of attention, in terms of continuity and duration, that is required. I think Don Treadgold showed remarkable stamina in managing the Review for four years. My

brief experience has been an exhausting one, and I could not have managed at all without the extraordinary labors of my associate editor. In a word, I am doubtful about the editorship being handled on a part-time basis by a college or university professor. (Both Treadgold and I found that the formulas for a corresponding reduction in one's academic duties simply did not work out in practice.)<sup>15</sup>

Roberts went on to urge that the editorial office of the Review be permanently established at Columbia, that there be an academic superstructure including a small, working Editorial Board as described above, and that the real boss and "center of gravity for the whole operation" be Miss Luke. He stressed that "In actual fact, Miss Luke has been carrying on the bulk of these duties during my term as Managing Editor," and he enumerated her "unique combination of talents and skills for this work."<sup>16</sup>

The Board shared his high opinion of Miss Luke's editorial ability, and went ahead to approve in due course, as recounted above, the arrangement Roberts had proposed.

However, for one reason or another, the various people involved were momentarily underestimating the hard realities of the situation. Columbia had been subsidizing



the Review under Roberts' tenure to the tune of between \$21,000 and \$26,000 or even \$29,000 per year, counting salaries and facilities. These large sums were being provided as a price-- although few people would have put it so crassly--of satisfying Roberts as a long-time and key member of the Columbia faculty. Once he had moved to Dartmouth, his leverage evaporated. Roberts and the rest of the Board had agreed that Miss Luke could handle the substance of the job. But before very long Columbia began, quite understandably in a time of tight money, to ask questions about the subsidy and to indicate a desire for relief.<sup>17</sup> The Association did not have the money to cover Columbia's subsidy for more than a few months. A <sup>continuing</sup> university subsidy was required. Miss Luke, for all her ability as an editor, was an editorial employee of Columbia, not a senior professor. Her leverage was slight. Furthermore, there was now no professor at Columbia who was qualified and at the same time willing to assume responsibility for the Review--to demand, in essence, that Columbia continue its support in order to keep him (or her) happy. And to complicate matters further, Miss Luke, having run the show herself as managing editor, indicated she could <sup>see no need for</sup> ~~not countenance the notion of~~ ~~accepting~~ another academic protector of the sort that Roberts had been. This eliminated the possibility that she might carry on the same functions at some other university, under some other person with academic leverage. The upshot was that the Board by the spring of 1968 was obliged to begin seeking

another home for the Review. A subcommittee was set up under Herbert J. Ellison to consider this problem as well as the related questions of the proposed office of executive secretary and the supervision of the Current Digest. One possibility considered briefly was to have the new executive secretary serve as editor, but the committee quickly agreed that the ~~skills~~ <sup>skills</sup> demanded were too different and the combined jobs too large to load onto one person. Letters about the Slavic Review went out early in May to over one hundred universities, explaining both the opportunity and the burdens, including the heavy Columbia subsidy which needed to be taken over.<sup>18</sup> It was no easy task to find a qualified person at an institution that could carry such a subsidy.

Miss Luke, deeply disturbed by the turn of events, thought the Board had shown a lack of confidence in her. In May of 1968 she first slackened her theretofore arduous pace, then virtually abandoned her efforts to cope with the incoming ~~tide~~ <sup>flow</sup> of manuscripts and books for review. Her staff took that cue. The Board for several months kept up its efforts to persuade Miss Luke to carry on as previously agreed, at least until the end of the academic year 1968-69, with the Association supplanting from its meager reserves the Columbia subsidy which by this time was scheduled to end with December 1968. But Miss Luke insisted upon a longer term commitment--something the Board did not see any way of making. Thus over the summer of 1968 the Board nervously watched the worsening situation in the offices of the Review.

By the end of summer, firm invitations had come from three universities. The University of Washington was one of them. The Board in September 1968 decided unanimously that if Treadgold were willing to do another stint, the invitation of Washington should be accepted. Ellison was designated as the Board's representative to work out with Miss Luke the details of the transfer.<sup>19</sup>

Treadgold assumed the editorship formally on November 1,<sup>120</sup> but it took several weeks before the accumulation of unprocessed manuscripts (44 in number) and unassigned books for review (which numbered some 300 by now) could be moved to Seattle, Treadgold's own schedule adjusted, and the new editorial offices put into working order.<sup>21</sup> Miraculously, within a little more than a year Treadgold and his staff overcame the arrearage. The crisis had been successfully passed--but not without underscoring for everyone the Association's continuing dependence on finding some teaching scholar, from among the few who possessed the requisite combination of knowledge, managerial skill, and editorial judgment, who was willing to undertake the editorship and able to persuade his or her university to furnish a large subsidy in personnel and space. The Association was not yet in the position, if indeed it could soon expect to be, of having the funds to hire directly, on a long-term basis, a full-time senior editor and staff independent of any university connection.

Leaving now the special situation of 1968, one may examine other problems connected with the Review in the 1960s.

Some were relatively easy to solve. One was the handling of back issues of the 1950s and 1940s, for which the expanded circulation of the 1960s had created a demand. The Johnson Reprint Corporation agreed in 1962 to look after this. ~~22~~

Another was the providing of an index. Treadgold took care of this by publishing at the end of his first tenure an Index to the Slavic Review and Predecessors, 1941-1964 (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1965). Still another was the expense of using Cyrillic type in the footnotes. This was solved by dropping it.<sup>23</sup> The related problem of finding a suitable printing plant was "solved" by shifts in 1961, 1966 and 1969.<sup>24</sup>

The financial predicament of the Review was part of the whole problem of the finances of the Association, and has been discussed above. As far as the Review itself was concerned, one can justifiably say that in the 1960s the Association was publishing a better journal than it could <sup>properly</sup> support, given the relatively small size of its market of members and subscribers. While our journal was working its way up from a total circulation of 900 in 1960 to about 3400 in 1967, it was rivaling and in some ways surpassing in scholarly quality such academic giants as the American Historical Review, which by 1962 had already passed the 11,000 mark.<sup>25</sup>

91

The most interesting problems concerned the content of the Review. The book review section posed difficulties throughout. The quickening flood of books for review, rising from about 200 in 1961 to 462 in 1967, <sup>126</sup> ~~were~~ <sup>was</sup> only the beginning of the trouble. All the editors expressed frustration at the difficulty of persuading enough of the most competent specialists to agree to do reviews and to turn them in promptly. <sup>127</sup> Many of the reviews that were submitted turned out to demand extensive editorial revision and even complete rewriting. <sup>128</sup>

A partial solution to the book torrent of the mid-1960s was found under the Roberts-Luke regime, when, as mentioned earlier, the editors made use of an active group ~~of specialists~~ in the New York area who helped to identify promising reviewers of specialized works among those younger scholars who were not yet overburdened with other responsibilities.

As for the articles in the Review, one problem was that of the quality of the incoming manuscripts and of the distribution of those manuscripts across the spectrum of disciplines. These were interrelated aspects of the same problem, for the Review could not achieve its aim of bridging the gap between disciplines unless it published a wide variety of articles of fairly broad interest. Yet some disciplines yielded many more acceptable articles than others. This was not solely a matter of the brainpower mobilized in the respective disciplines; it was in part a reflection of the availability

92

and desirability of other outlets for publication. Scholars in history, for example, could often reach more of their colleagues and serve their professional interests better by publishing in the Slavic Review than by publishing in any other journal, including the AHR. But many economists obviously felt that the professional gain from an article in the Slavic Review was less than that from one published in the American Economic Review. Treadgold in his first term had to solicit several articles in order to obtain the quality and topical distribution he sought. One device he introduced was that of the Discussion Section, in which qualified specialists were invited to debate an important topic. These Sections were highly successful, and ultimately appeared in book form. (At Treadgold's insistence, the royalties went to the Association.)<sup>139</sup> The changing topical emphases and the improvement in the quality of the Review in the 1960s affected the flow of manuscripts in ways difficult to measure, acting both to accelerate submissions and to discourage them. The ramifications of these interconnected problems are suggested by some of the figures given in the editors' reports. We may compare the year 1961 (the first full year of Treadgold's tenure) with the year 1967 (the last "normal" year under the combination of Roberts and Miss Luke). Here is a tabulation of the manuscripts submitted for articles and "notes and Comment" in 1961: