

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Accepted</u>
History		
Russia	28	7
East Europe	13	4
Political Science		
Russia	18	4
East Europe	6	3
Economics		
Russia	4	2
East Europe	7	2
Literature		
Russia	24	4
East Europe	1	1
Language and Linguistics		
Russia	4	0
East Europe	0	0
Geography		
Russia	2	1
East Europe	0	0
Other		
Russia	12	1
East Europe	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>
Totals	123	31

In that initial year the editor did a good deal of soliciting of articles. Of the 31 manuscripts accepted, 10 were solicited.⁺³⁰

Now here are the roughly comparable figures for 1967.⁺³¹

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Accepted</u>	<u>Pending</u>
History			
General	1	1	
Russia	50	18	12
East Europe	10	3	
Political Science (incl. law and international relations)			
General	3	1	
Russia	15	3	1
East Europe	7	1	
Economics			
General	1		
Russia	1		
East Europe	3	1	
Literature			
General			
Russia	31	6	11
East Europe	3	2	1
Geography			
General			
Russia	1		
East Europe	2	1	
Other (communication, sociology, anthropology, arts, education, philosophy, reference and bibliography)			
General	3	2	
Russia	8	3	
East Europe	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	
Totals	144	44	25

Among the comments those figures call forth are these: (1) In both years, articles in history outnumbered all other disciplines by far in submissions, constituting one-third of the items submitted in 1961 and even more than one-third in 1967. (2) History was also the largest category in acceptances, with almost one-third in 1961 and one-half in 1967. (3) Literature was the second largest category of submissions in both years, being over one-fifth both times. (4) The quality of the literary pieces apparently was not similarly high, for in both years the field of literature had a significantly smaller proportion of acceptances than submissions. (5) Political science was a close third in submissions both times, though it did not do as well on acceptances in 1967 as in 1961. (6) Relatively few articles were submitted in the other disciplines (including economics, anthropology, sociology, philosophy, education, the arts, and others) in both years, and their share of acceptances was correspondingly small. (7) Eastern Europe was poorly represented in comparison with Russia ^{during} in both years, furnishing only one-fourth of the submissions in 1961 and even less in 1967. In both years, the rate of acceptances was slightly higher for east European submissions than for Russian submissions.

The editors were keenly aware of these imbalances, and they tried through persuasion and invitation to correct them. ⁴³² But it was obviously hard to make progress.

On the positive side it may be added that, in my opinion at least, standards were not sacrificed merely

96

for the sake of achieving a broad distribution. The rate of acceptances among manuscripts submitted rose between 1961 and 1966-1967 not because the editors became more lenient but, I believe, because readers became aware of the heightened standards being applied in the 1960s, and restricted their submissions accordingly.⁴³³ It may also be noted that throughout the 1960s the Review remained absolutely free of any pressure to publish papers presented at national or regional meetings. Some papers (usually after considerable revision) did later become articles in the Review, but only if they could meet the competition on their own merits.

Insofar as I am aware, there were in the 1960s no articles submitted from eastern European countries by scholars acting on their own initiative. I believe the only contributions published from eastern Europe, and they were very few, were solicited by the editor.

2. The AAASS Newsletter.

The Review had contained a section called "News and Notes" ever since October 1953. The section was edited until 1960 by John P. Hardt, an economist who was first at Columbia and later in Washington. In the summer of 1960, when Fisher became secretary of the new membership organization, he became the editor of that section, which was then renamed "News of the Profession." At the same time, he had been asked to estab-

lish a Newsletter. Its main purpose was to give fuller and less formal coverage to various kinds of professional news than was possible in the columns of the Review.

Items of a scholarly nature or which were important for the permanent record were to appear also (and usually later) in the "News of the Profession." ¹⁻³⁴ That column would serve those many readers of the Review who were not members of the Association, while the Newsletter would be for the membership.

Throughout the nine years under review, beginning in the second half of 1960, the Newsletter appeared twice a year--once in the fall and once in the spring. It was photo-offset from typed copy prepared in the secretariat in Champaign-Urbana. Its average size was about 35 single-spaced pages, the largest issue being 48 pages. From 1962 onward it accepted advertising, but there was never much of that.

Typically a few of the most important items from the Newsletter were condensed for the quarterly "News of the Profession" columns of the Review. There were also some classes of items which appeared in the "News of the Profession" only, the most important being the often very valuable appreciatory essays contributed upon a scholar's death by someone who was well acquainted with his ^{or her} work. It was the editor's responsibility to watch for news of the death of any scholar in the field (often the news came via a laconic stamp on a returned envelope or a note from a relative to the manager saying a person's membership could be cancelled) and to find out who was best equipped to write a short piece about him.

35

The editorship of the Newsletter and the "News of the Profession" passed in the spring of 1963 to Tatjana Cizevska of the Slavic department at Illinois. Frank Y. Gladney of the same department replaced her in the fall of 1966. Gladney, unlike his two predecessors, was given a one-third reduction^{tion} in teaching load in recognition of the demands of the job. The associate editor throughout seven and one-half of the nine years, from the beginning of 1961 through the first half of 1968, was Ruth B. Jones, a faculty wife with editorial experience hired by the University of Illinois' Russian and East European Center. The associate editor helped to collect, classify, and write up the news for both outlets. Before and after Mrs. Jones' tenure, that job was done by faculty people on a volunteer basis--in the fall of 1960 by Herbert H. Kaplan and in the year 1968-69 by Elizabeth M. Talbot. 4-36

The contents of the Newsletter covered the gamut--news of affiliates, of meetings, of developments taking place in colleges and universities and many other kinds of organizations, of grants and fellowships available, and of individual activities including appointments, leaves of absence, and special projects. A few kinds of items were excluded. One was news of research in progress, for the Board felt that all members of the Association should be encouraged to list their own and their students' research with the External Research Division of the Department of State. The Newsletter also stayed out of the

placement-service business, since the professional associations in the disciplines seemed to ^{offer} be far better instruments for that. But almost everything else was accepted, and anyone interested in studying the variety of activity in the Russian and east European field in the United States of the 1960s can find hundreds of revealing items in the Newsletter and the "News of the Profession" section of the Review.

In mid-1969 these responsibilities passed to the new executive secretary of the Association, George J. Demko, at Ohio State. Under him and his associate editor, Ruth Morley, the Newsletter became a quarterly publication.

3. The AAASS Directory of Members.

In addition to the Newsletter, the secretariat produced a Directory of Members. Four editions were published in the period under review: October 1961, December 1962 (distributed in the spring of 1963), January 1966, and February 1968. The directories provided the fullest picture theretofore available concerning specialists on Russia and eastern Europe in the United States and Canada. For each of the members the Directory listed occupational titles, office and residence addresses, academic degrees received (with ^{discipline} field, institution, and year), and major fields of competence. After the alphabetical listing by name, there were separate listings by discipline or field of interest and by place of work or residence. The Directory was distributed free to members, and sold separately for \$5.00. ¹³⁷

4. The American Bibliography of Russian and East European Studies.

This was not a publication of the AAASS during the period 1960-69, but was purchased from the Indiana University Press in bulk at a low price (50 to 80 cents per copy instead of the marked price of \$3.00 or \$3.50) for distribution to the members. Originally it was intended that this should constitute a bonus fifth volume each year, and the volume for 1959 appeared on schedule in 1960. However, the difficulty of producing the Bibliography increased along with the flow of scholarly publications, and by the end of the period under review the members had received bibliographies for the years through 1965 only. Meanwhile, in 1968 Indiana University, having published the Bibliography for a decade, asked several other universities if they would be interested in taking over this important service to the profession. Ohio State emerged as the top bidder. They agreed that Indiana would complete the volume for 1966, and Ohio State would begin its responsibilities with the volume for 1967. ⁻¹³²

5. The Current Digest of the Soviet Press.

The CDSP throughout the nine years under review was not a publication of the AAASS, but was supervised by a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies (later JCSEES) of the ACLS and SSRC. As explained ^{earlier,} ~~elsewhere,~~ one of the features of

the reorganization of mid-1969 was that the responsibility for the CDSP was transferred to the AAASS. At the same time, the offices of the Digest moved from New York to Columbus. This move stemmed from the Digest's need to find another university willing and able to house its operations. Columbia, after giving twenty years of generous support, could not continue, and non-university rents in New York were out of the question. Ohio State proposed not only to provide the needed space but to tie in the Digest with a new academic program designed to train translators. In the spring of 1969 Leo Gruliov, the editor of the CDSP since its founding, accomplished the remarkable feat of keeping the CDSP on its weekly publication schedule while moving its offices and training a largely new staff in Columbus. When the CDSP formally came under AAASS' jurisdiction on July 1, 1969, Mr. Gruliov became ex officio a member of the Board. There was, however, no change in the status of the CDSP as a separate publication, and members of the AAASS had to pay for it like anyone else. The hope was that under the guidance of the new executive secretary and with the help of the three-year Ford grant, the AAASS could expand the base of support for both the Digest and the Review to make the whole combination financially independent. 139

B. Organizational links.

The Triple A Double S has served its interdisciplinary functions not only through the publications just described, but also through links with organizations.

The links have been of three types: (1) purely informal, (2) through formal affiliation, and (3) through affiliation plus representation on the Board. The first type, the informal relationship, has usually meant no more than correspondence between a group and the secretary or the editor of the Newsletter, leading to ^{the} ~~publication~~ ^{izing} of the group's activities in the Newsletter and perhaps to the convening of the group upon occasion of a AAASS convention. The second type, involving formal affiliation, has connoted a more active and more continuous relationship. Where affiliates are concerned, the editor of the Newsletter has not merely awaited incoming reports but has often sought out those who could submit up-to-date information. Throughout the period 1960-69 the news of affiliates was given prominence in the first section of the Newsletter. Affiliates were likely to consist largely of persons who were actually or potentially members of the AAASS, and they commonly helped the AAASS by advertising among their members the benefits of membership in the AAASS. In return, the secretariat provided without charge addressograph runs of the AAASS members, by states or regions. This category of relationship has been used primarily for the regional interdisciplinary groups such as the Far Western Slavic

Conference. The third type of linkage, involving representation on the Board, has been used primarily for groups ^{that have} ~~having~~ their bases in the professional associations in the disciplines, such as the American Historical Association. This arrangement was made initially by the Organizing Committee, as explained earlier, in order to assure an interdisciplinary approach by the new Association. In practice, representation on the Board has not been necessarily correlated with close involvement in the affairs of the Association. In the years 1960-69 there were some members of the Board who never managed ~~to send in any reports on their organizations for the Newsletter,~~ to send in any reports on their organizations for the Newsletter, while on the other hand such regional groups as those in the far west and middle west, without any formal representation on the Board, have ~~in fact~~ been well represented by officers elected in other ways. One point that should be ^{emphasized} ~~clarified~~ here is that membership in the AAASS has not been a requirement for the members of any affiliated organization. Even those that are on a ~~regional~~ regional basis and call themselves chapters or branches of the AAASS have had their own constituencies going beyond those persons who were members of the AAASS.

The organizational link^s ~~ages~~ may be ~~regarded~~ treated under these headings: (1) the Joint Committee on Slavic and East European Studies, which stands apart as a special case; (2) affiliates based on professional associations in the disciplines; (3) affiliates having a geographical basis; (4) affiliates focused on a special topic; and (5) groups connected with the Association informally only.

1. The Joint Committee on Slavic and East European Studies.¹

The first part of this essay described the key part played in the launching of the AAASS by the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies of the ACLS and SSRC. Since the JCSS was in effect sponsoring and subsidizing the new Association, it was natural that a place should be reserved on the Board for the current chairman of the JCSS or his designated representative. From 1960 to 1969 the successive chairmen themselves served in that capacity. They were: 1960-62--Abram Bergson (economics, Harvard), 1962-64--Donald W. Treadgold (history, University of Washington); 1964-65--Chauncy D. Harris (geography, Chicago); 1965-68--John M. Thompson (history, Indiana); and, beginning in 1968, Marshall D. Shulman (international relations, Columbia).

The JCSS in 1968 became the JCSEES: Joint Committee on Slavic and East European Studies. The new name reflected more accurately than the old the area of responsibility that had long been assumed by the body. Within the JCSS or JCSEES there have been sub-committees for such purposes as grants, the teaching of Russian studies in the high schools, and the Current Digest of the Soviet Press (until the CDSP became a responsibility of the AAASS in mid-1969). The subcommittees often have included persons who were not members of the JCSEES itself. During the 1960s the Joint Committee made an abrupt change in its membership policy. Without enlarging itself ^{much} beyond its customary dozen or so members at any given time, the Committee introduced shorter

when the Committee decided to give special attention to Eastern Europe for the first time at that time a new subcommittee was appointed as the subcommittee on East-Central and Southeast European Studies (SSEES) which eventually became more active than its parent committee and which will become a full committee in its

was signed
in the
fall of
1971

of service, providing
terms ~~and~~ much more rapid turnover. In the two decades pre-
ceding 1960 there had been only 25 people who had served on
the Committee at one time or another. In contrast, during the
nine academic years 1960-69, less than even one decade, the
number who served at one time or another on the Joint Committee
totaled 34, of whom 24 were entirely new. ¹²

As shown in several other sections of this study,
the Association's ^{contact} ~~link~~ with the Joint Committee was close and
active throughout the years 1960-69, with the Committee giving
support and guidance as needed.

2. Affiliates based on professional associations
in the disciplines.

In 1960 the Association came into existence already
possessing formal ties with professional groups in five dis-
ciplines through representation on the Board. These were in
the disciplines of economics, geography, history, language
and literature, and political science. The intention was apparently
to pick the five disciplines in which there were the most
Slavic and east European specialists. As the Association
got going it became clear that four of the five were indis-
putably the disciplines best represented within the membership.
The discipline of geography, however, had at various times to
contest for fifth place with law and library science, and

by 1968 seemed to have fallen behind both of them. (See the section on the composition of the membership, above.) As mentioned earlier, during the 1960s formal affiliations were established with a group in library science and with a second organization in the field of language and literature, the latter ~~also~~ being given representation on the Board.

~~at length.~~ In the following paragraphs the affiliates are discussed briefly in alphabetical order by discipline.

Economics: The Association for the Study of Soviet-Type Economies of the American Economics Association. ^{†3}

At the time of the founding of the AAASS there already existed within the American Economics Association this group of persons specializing in Soviet-type economies, and from the start the ASSTE has had a representative on the Board. The ASSTE organizes scholarly sessions and social gatherings at the AEA's yearly convention, late in December. The group is headed by an executive secretary.⁴ The ASSTE's representative on the Board throughout the period 1961-69 was Holland Hunter of Haverford College.

Geography: The Association of American Geographers.⁵

Among geographers the number of Slavic and east European specialists has not been large, and they have formed no special section.

Sessions or papers pertaining to the area have been a ~~not~~ common part of the annual meetings of the AAG, which in the 1960s have been held usually in April or August. The AAG has had a representative on the Board since the beginning. For the period 1961-69 that person was George Kish of Michigan.

History: The Conference on Slavic and East European History of the American Historical Association.⁶

Since the 1940s and earlier, specialists in Russian and eastern European history ^{have been coming} ~~had come~~ together informally at sessions of common interest during the annual December conventions of the American Historical Association. In 1956, on the initiative of Robert F. Byrnes, a group established the Conference on Slavic and East European History. Since then this organization has usually arranged at least one scholarly session, plus a lunch and a smoker, at each AHA meeting. The attendance has usually been between 200 and 300. The officers, elected by mail ballot, include a chairman for the year and

a secretary for a three-year term. Since 1964 the secretary has also been the CSEEH representative on the Board of the

AAASS.⁷ There is

also a six-man Executive Council, three from the East and three from the West (defined as those parts of the United States west of the Eastern Time zone), elected on staggered terms. The secretary, helped by the other officers, arranges the yearly program. In the first nine years of the AAASS, the CSEEH was represented on the Board by S. Harrison Thomson (Colorado, 1960-1963), Robert F. Byrnes (Indiana, 1964-1966), and Herbert J. Ellison (Kansas and Washington, 1967-1969). Of course historians interested in Russia and eastern Europe assemble under many other regional and topical rubrics, such as the Pacific Coast Branch of the AHA or the Conference Group for Central European History of the AHA, whenever there is an appropriate scholarly session as part of a more general program. These groups and subgroups have been rather fully reported in the Newsletter since 1960, but their official voice for AAASS purposes is assumed to be the CSEEH.

Language and literature: The Slavic and East European Literature Section of the Modern Language Association. 18

There is a bewildering variety of organizations within the field of the languages and literatures of eastern Europe, and

their activities have been reported voluminously in the AAASS Newsletter. The Modern Language Association serves as an umbrella for many of them, such as the Midwest MLA or the South Atlantic MLA or the Pennsylvania State MLA, all of which have Slavic and east European subgroups. Then there are Slavic and east European groups within the regional and state sections of the Modern Language Teachers Association, not to speak of other bodies like the Linguistics Society of America and the more than two-decade-old yearly Foreign Language Conference at the University of Kentucky. And of course there is AATSEEL, ~~concerning which see~~ ^{discussed} below. Within the national convention of the MLA, each December, the Slavic and east European specialists have maintained two sections, one for linguistics and one for literature. The Organizing Committee of 1960 decided that the literature section would designate the language and literature representative on the Board. This was probably in accordance with the scholarly prestige of the various eligible groups, but pressure from both literature and linguistics people as well as straight language teachers later brought the addition to the Board of a representative from AATSEEL. The Slavic and East European Literatures Section organizes panels at each of the December meetings of the MLA. The officers are a chairman and a secretary. The secretary becomes the chairman the following year. There is an Advisory and Nominating Committee composed of the four previous chairmen.¹⁹ The group's representatives

on the Board in the 1960s were Deming Brown (Michigan, 1961-63), Edward J. Brown (Indiana, 1964-66), and Irvin Weil (Northwestern, 1967-69).

Language and literature: The American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages:¹⁰

9. Although it has been formally affiliated with the AAASS since 1966 only, AATSEEL has been in some ways a partner of the interdisciplinary Association from the beginning. Virtually all of the language and literature people who have been active in the AAASS have at the same time been members of AATSEEL, and AATSEEL meetings have been extensively reported in the pages of the AAASS Newsletter from its first issue onward. On the other hand AATSEEL, with its Slavic and East European Journal (SEEJ) and its organizational history going back to 1941, has typically embraced a great many language teachers who were not members of the AAASS. By the late 1960s AATSEEL numbered over 2,000 members, and had 22 state or regional chapters plus special programs and committees. (One of its affiliates was the National Council of High School Teachers of Russian.) The topical scope of AATSEEL activity is ^{shown} ~~suggested~~ by the sections that have usually arranged panels at the annual national meeting. These include high school and college methodology sections, a linguistics section, literature and literary discussion sections, and, recently, a poetry reading section, a summer study program

111

section, and a section on South and West Slavic and East European languages. Each section has a chairman and a secretary. They arrange the programs for the annual meeting. That annual meeting has customarily been held in late December in conjunction with the convention of the MLA. (In 1969 AATSEEL met instead in November with the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.) The day-to-day administrator of AATSEEL is the executive secretary-treasurer. There are also many other officers, including an executive council, a president, several vice presidents (usually six, some of whom are reelected once or more), and the editor of SEEJ.¹¹

The AATSEEL representative on the Board of the AAASS from 1967 through 1969 was J. Thomas Shaw (Wisconsin), editor of the SEEJ. But it may be noted that AATSEEL has not had to rely on its official delegate alone. During those same years, for example, the MLA representative on the Board, Irwin Weil, was the person who for several years had been the executive secretary-treasurer of AATSEEL, ^{and} ~~was~~ the president of the Triple A Double S, Edward J. Brown, ^{had recently been} ~~was a recent past~~ president of AATSEEL.

Library science: The Slavic and East European Subsection of the Subject Specialists Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries of the American Library Association.¹²

In view of the need for classificatory precision in the library profession, the librarians' affiliate is appropriately

identified by its full title. It was founded in 1962 when, on the initiative of Slavic librarians from the University of Illinois and Indiana,

some sixty Slavic librarians petitioned the ALA (American Library Association) to authorize a new subsection. The official approval of the ALA came early in 1963, and since then the Subsection has met annually at the summer convention of the ALA. The process of formal affiliation with the AAASS was delayed by bureaucratic leisureliness coupled with infrequent meetings of the governing bodies on both sides, with the Board of the AAASS giving its official approval ~~formally~~ in May of 1966 and the Council of the ALA early in 1968. Meanwhile the SEE Subsection had grown far beyond the original sixty petitioners.

By 1969 it counted about 350 individual members working with Slavic materials, plus another 200 or more "institutional members," that is, libraries that had asked to be on the mailing list of the Subsection. The group published a Biographical Directory of Librarians in the Field of Slavic and East European Studies in 1967 (Chicago: ALA). The SEE Subsection reports to its members not only through the AAASS Newsletter but also, and more fully, through professional library channels, including the journal College and Research Libraries and the more frequent (11 issues per year) newsletter of the ACRL, the CRL News. The officers include a chairman, a vice chairman who is also the chairman-elect for the following year, and a secretary who since 1966 has been on a three-year term.¹³ The Subsection

has not hitherto been represented on the Board of the AAASS.

In addition to the affiliated subsection, there are other library groups and activities that have been reported in the AAASS Newsletter.

Political science: The Conference on Communist Studies of the American Political Science Association.¹⁴

9 Within the American Political Science Association, and especially within the sub-category of comparative political systems, those interested in Soviet and eastern Europe ^{already} had become numerous ~~already~~ by the early fifties. At each national meeting of the APSA there were sessions of mutual interest that brought them together. In 1958 they formed a special organization. At first it was called the Conference on Soviet and Communist Studies. By the early 1960s it was arranging two or three scholarly sessions in addition to a business meeting and a luncheon at the annual APSA conventions in September. Thus it was natural that this group should have been asked to name a representative to the Board of the AAASS from the very first. The representatives so far have been: Frederick C. Barghoorn (Yale, 1960-62), Robert C. Tucker (Princeton, 1962-64), George Fischer (Cornell, 1964-65), A. Doak Barnett (Columbia, 1965-66), Alfred G. Meyer (Michigan, 1966-68), and H. Gordon Skilling (Toronto, 1968-70). Knowledgeable readers will wonder about the presence in that list of a China specialist in 1965-66. The explanation is that in 1964-65 the Conference on Soviet and Communist Studies expanded

114

to include persons interested in China and other Asian Communist states, and changed its name to the Conference on Communist Studies. Not until 1966, however, did the Board of the AAASS ~~get-around-to~~ asking the group to name as its representative someone from the Russian and east European field. Actually Barnett was not able to attend the one Board meeting held during his term, so the AAASS remained geographically uncontaminated. The officers of the Conference on Communist Studies include a president, a vice president who becomes president the following year, and a secretary-treasurer who usually has served for two years.¹⁵

3. Affiliates having a geographical basis.

At the end of the academic year 1968-69 there were seven formal affiliates having a geographical basis. One thing all of them had in common was unclear boundaries, resulting in extensive overlaps. This vagueness apparently caused no problem; rather, it increased the opportunities for individual specialists to meet with their fellow-professionals. At first, back in 1960, some people thought members should join the national Association through one of the branches. The Board even voted that the first affiliate--the Washington D. C. Chapter--could have the secretary of the Association bill its members for ^{both} the national dues ^{and} ~~plus~~ the dues of the local chapter.¹⁶

Such a system, if implemented, would have meant that each member of the AAASS would have been under pressure to commit himself to one or another of the regional affiliates. It might also have meant that only those who were members of the national Association could be members of a regional association. But no such system was ever put into effect. Each regional affiliate maintained its own membership rolls and collected its own dues if it decided to assess any. Each affiliate included quite a few persons who were not members of the AAASS. The fact of affiliation did assure maximum access to the Newsletter as a vehicle for each regional group to reach interested persons, and it also helped the national Association to recruit new members.

In the following paragraphs the seven regional ^{groups} ~~affiliates~~ are treated in the order in which they became formally affiliated.

Washington D. C. Chapter. ¹⁷

The Washington D. C. Chapter is not only ~~by far~~ the oldest geographically-based affiliate of the AAASS, tracing its ancestry back to World War II (see above); it is also an essentially different kind of organization from the others. Since its members are all close at hand, it may meet anywhere from six to ten or more times a year. The typical meeting has been an evening affair (sometimes a lunch), earlier often at the Brookings Institution, more recently at George Washington

116

University, with one speaker and then a discussion. Occasionally the chapter arranges longer conferences, such as the two-day conference of November 1961 at American University concerning the Twenty-second Congress of the CPSU (which drew 120 registrants), or the two-day symposium of 1966 at the University of Maryland on the Twenty-third Congress. As those examples suggest, the intellectual fare of the Washington D. C. Chapter is also markedly different from that of the usual so-called scholarly groups: It deals mainly with problems of the present day, and the speakers often tell of their own recent experiences in Russia and eastern Europe. No other area--including New York City with its very large concentration of specialists--has developed an instrument for mutual stimulation and professional interchange comparable to the Washington D. C. Chapter. Consequently, its meetings are frequently visited by specialists from New York, North Carolina, and nearer parts of the eastern seaboard. The officers have included a large board (13 members in 1961) plus a president (earlier called chairman), vice-president (earlier called vice-chairman), secretary, and treasurer--the last two offices being combined for a time in the mid-1960s.¹⁸

Far Western Slavic Conference.¹⁹

The FWSC was the earliest of the large regional interdisciplinary organizations in the Slavic and east European field, and it exhibits a good deal of regional sentiment--some might

11

call it chauvinism--even to this day. It was organized in Berkeley in 1958 and held its first meeting in 1959 at the Hoover Institution. In 1961 it became a regional affiliate of the AAASS. It has met in the spring, skipping years of national conventions of the AAASS.^{± 20} The typical pattern has been to hold every second meeting in the San Francisco Bay area and the others alternately north and south of it. The meetings in the period 1963-1966 drew from 145 to 160 people; in 1968 and 1969, they drew 210 and 222. Typically the programs of the FWSC have lasted two days and included participants from all over the United States and Canada. On the 1969 program, for example, there were 99 participants, of whom 79 were from the states and Canadian provinces lying formally within FWSC territory, and 20 were from the Middle West, East, and South. The total number on the mailing list, which includes the desert and Rocky Mountain areas and western Canada, climbed from 150 in 1961 to about 350 in 1965 and to 511 in the spring of 1969. Students could not become regular members until 1969, when the constitution was changed to admit graduate students. The officers have included a chairman who in most cases has also been in charge of the program committee, a vice-chairman (who normally succeeds to the presidency in the following year), a secretary-treasurer whose term since 1961 has usually been several years, and sometimes separate chairmen for program and for local arrangements. There is also an Executive Board and since 1963 a special committee on library resources.^{± 21}

Midwest Slavic Conference.

The MSC was planned in 1961, soon after the founding of the AAASS. It was intended as a regional counterpart of the FWSC, to cover central Canada and the north central parts of the U. S. The organizing impetus, as already explained, came from the first officers of the AAASS. It became a regional affiliate in 1962. Its meetings have been in the spring, skipping those years when national AAASS conventions occurred.²³

The early meetings occupied parts of two days but the 1968 and 1969 meetings stretched over into a third day. Attendance has consistently been well over 100, and twice has been over 200--the larger meetings being those in the densely populated eastern part of the area, as in Columbus or Detroit; but even out where the big sky begins there has been a sizable crowd, like the 143 at Lincoln. Owing to the lack of any other special regional organization in the northeastern part of the country throughout most of the sixties, the MSC has drawn many northeasterners to its meetings. At the 1969 meeting, for example, out of 61 people on the three-day program, 21 were from what might loosely be called the East. Outside of a fairly large executive board representing several midwestern states, the officers of the MSC have been essentially only two: the chairman or president, who has been in charge of the program, and the secretary-treasurer, who has been in charge of local arrangements. Since 1962 both of these have been from the university ^{that} ~~which~~ is scheduled to serve as host to the next meeting.²⁴

Southern Conference on Slavic Studies. †25

The SCSS was organized soon after the midwest group, ^{it} ~~was~~ held its first meeting also in 1962. † Its meetings have been in October or November and have spread over two days except in 1969 when a three-day meeting was tried. †26

The meetings have consistently drawn about 100 or more people. A remarkable feature of the SCSS is its success in attracting support and participation not merely from the Deep South but from all over the large area that stretches from the southern ^{edge} ~~border~~ of Pennsylvania to the eastern ^{edge} ~~border~~ of Texas and includes the border states south of the Ohio River. Specialists from Kentucky, West Virginia, Maryland and other border regions have in many cases joined the SCSS rather than the midwest affiliate, even though in several cases the midwest meetings have been physically closer to them. Yet while there has been a good deal of regional pride in evidence, the SCSS has not been exclusively southern. On the program of the 1968 meeting, for example, there were 57 paper givers, discussants, and so on, of whom 6 were from the northeast and 6 were from the midwest. In 1968 the SCSS decided to put out its own twice-yearly newsletter--the first such venture by a regional affiliate. The SCSS also has established its own organizational archive, maintained by the secretary-treasurer. In addition to a fairly large and representative executive committee, the officers include a president, a vice president (who customarily succeeds

to the presidency), a secretary-treasurer (since 1966 the same person, for the sake of continuity), a program chairman, and, in some years, a separate chairman for local arrangements. ^{† 27}

Bi-State (Kansas-Missouri) Slavic Conference. ^{† 28}

The Bi-State Slavic Conference was organized in 1962. ^{† 29}

Its center of gravity was approximately Kansas City, and its first meeting was at William Jewell College in Liberty, Missouri.

It has customarily met in October or November. ^{† 30}

The meetings in the early years lasted one day, ~~only~~, but since 1966 have spread over two days. Attendance has been in the range of 50 to 90. Participants in the early meetings came mostly from Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Illinois, but recently the distribution has been broader. At the 1967 meeting, for example, there were 38 people giving papers or otherwise on the program. Only 19 of them were from Kansas and Missouri, while 6 were from other midwestern states, 9 were from the East, and 4 were from the West. For the most part there have been two officers, as in the Midwest Slavic Conference: a president who is in charge of the program, and a secretary-treasurer who is in charge of the local arrangements. Both are customarily from institutions in the city where the meeting of that year will be held. In 1969 the office of vice president was introduced, its occupant ~~apparently~~ being the program chairman and president for the next year's meeting. ^{† 31}

Southwestern American Association For the Advancement of
Slavic Studies.⁺³²

This chapter, which uses the acronym SWAAASS, was formally founded on March 28, 1964, pursuant to an informal planning session of April, 1963.⁺³³ The SWAAASS is usually classified as a regional affiliate, but it shares some characteristics of the specialist groups formed in the disciplines. Like them, it emerged as a subdivision of an established organization, in this case the Southwestern Social Science Association, which has a yearly meeting and a journal, the Social Science Quarterly. Like them, too, it has its own focus within the spectrum of scholarly disciplines. On the other hand, that focus is relatively broad, encompassing all of the social sciences and including an occasional literary topic treated from a social science view point. And the chapter does have a distinctive geographical base in the four-state region of Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana. Most of its meetings have been held in Texas.³⁴ Originally the group arranged only one session on a Russian or east European topic during the three-day convention of the Southwestern Social Science Association, but interest has grown and recent meetings have had five and seven sessions spreading over two days. As might be expected, these programs have attracted paper-givers and other participants from beyond the four-state area. At the 1969 meeting, among the 29 people on the formal program, 6 were from the northeast,

1 from the southeast, 8 from the midwest, and 2 from the far west. Those regularly attending have numbered between 40 and 80, from a core membership of about 100-125 and a supplementary mailing list somewhat larger.³⁵ The officers, ~~officers~~, elected yearly, are a president, a vice president who is also in charge of the program, and a secretary-treasurer. Since 1965 it has been the custom for the vice president to succeed to the presidency in the following year, and for the secretary-treasurer to ~~assume~~ ^{move up to} the vice presidency.³⁶

Northeastern Slavic Conference of the AAASS.³⁷

¶ It is probably not accidental (as our Russian friends might say) that the section of the country that survived longest without a regional branch of the AAASS was that very section where the concentration of members was heaviest. The pace of conferences and lectures and general academic activity was apparently such, at Columbia and Harvard, that people connected with those institutions felt little need for another conference-arranging body. For those who wanted more opportunity for professional contact, the meetings of the midwest or southern groups were not too far away. Moreover, the first two national meetings, being in New York in 1964 and in Washington in 1967, involved

less travel for northerners than for anyone else. It seems also not accidental that when the initiative for a group did finally come, it came from people who, although several of them had been trained at Columbia and Harvard, were employed at other institutions. As mentioned above, the conference that led to the founding of the NESCAAASS was arranged by a political scientist who invited all AAASS members from New York and New England to meet in Albany. That was December 1-2, 1967. The organization got off to a very fast start, arranging another meeting the following spring and establishing a rule of springtime meetings. It leapt from a three-session program in 1968 to a fourteen-session program in 1969. Both were two-day affairs. As in the case of other regional meetings, many of the participants have come from beyond the core area. Of the 75 paper-givers and other formal participants at the 1969 meeting, 15 were from outside the New York-New England area, including some from as far away as Virginia and Kansas. The fact that the 1971 meeting is planned for Montreal suggests that the Northeastern group, like the Midwest and Far Western groups, will be essentially bi-national. Further evidence of this is that the editor of Canadian Slavic Studies, who is the chairman of the Conference for 1969-1971, has agreed to publish news of the NESCAAASS in his journal. Aside from two extra Executive Board members, the officers are a chairman, vice-chairman, and secretary. They are in charge of the program and arrangements. To judge from the meetings scheduled so far, including those to 1972 (skipping 1970 on account of the third national con-

#38

vention), the chairman is ~~to be~~^{host} from the institution which ~~will~~[^]
~~be the host to the Conference~~^{for meeting} at the end of his term. The
 vice-chairman is to succeed to the chairmanship. Thus the loca-
 tion of the meetings is set at least two years in advance. The
 secretary-treasurer is elected for a term of four years. ±39

4. Special Affiliates.

In ~~the~~^{its} first nine years ~~of~~ the AAASS it attracted
 one affiliate that was based on neither a discipline nor a
 geographical area, but on a topic:

The Conference on Soviet Agriculture and Peasant
 Affairs. ±40 This group is nationwide and interdisciplinary but
 focused^s on the cluster of topics indicated by its title. The
 impetus for the first meeting came from the University of
 Kansas, where in September 1962 Roy D. Laird arranged and
 presided over an international gathering of more than 70
 people interested in Soviet agriculture and the peasantry.
 They came from a wide array of disciplines including agricul-
 tural economics, agronomy, economics, geography, history,
 and political science, and represented over 30 colleges,
 universities, and specialized governmental and private insti-
 tutions. The papers given at the conference were to be
 published by the University of Kansas Press. At the end of
 the three-day meeting the group voted to establish a continuing

organization called the Conference on Soviet Agriculture and Peasant Affairs. They requested affiliation with the AAASS, and this was granted very soon thereafter.

The Conference's second meeting was arranged by Jerzy Karcz at the University of California at Santa Barbara in August 1965, and the third by W. A. Douglas Jackson at the University of Washington in August 1967. Each followed the pattern of the first meeting, except that the Seattle sessions included extensive coverage of Asian countries, especially Communist China. Although there was a committee involved, each meeting seems to have depended mainly on some one person of ability and initiative who was willing to do the necessary work. As of 1969 it was not clear whether anyone possessing the necessary qualifications and institutional backing was prepared to organize a fourth meeting. 41

5. Informally-related groups.

There are many kinds of groups that have had relations with the AAASS in the years 1960-69 without being formally affiliated. Among them are similar associations in other countries.

One of these is the Canadian Association of Slavists. 42

The position of our Canadian fellow-specialists is unusual. On the one hand, they have consistently been accepted as members

of the AAASS on the same basis as persons living in the United States. They have constituted between 3 and 5 percent of our total membership, and they have been active in the Far Western Slavic Conference, the Midwest Slavic Conference, and the new Northeastern Slavic Conference. On the other hand, they have had their own organization, the Canadian Association of Slavists, which is several years older than the AAASS, conducts its own yearly meetings in the spring, and has its own journal, Canadian Slavonic Papers. Though much smaller than the AAASS (it was about one-fourteenth the size of the AAASS in the fall of 1966),⁴³ the CAS has understandably neither considered itself nor been considered as a regional affiliate of the AAASS. Representatives of each organization have delivered words of greeting at the national meetings of the other, and in 1968 there was correspondence concerning the possibility of closer ties, but action was deferred.⁴⁴ The situation was complicated by the natural desire of the CAS to expand the circulation of its own journal. Other complicating factors included the existence of the Eastern Canada Association of Slavists and East-European Specialists and its journal, Slavic and East European Studies, as well as the existence of the journal Canadian Slavic Studies. A special feature of the CAS which distinguishes it markedly from the AAASS or any of its interdisciplinary regional affiliates is the very large role played in the CAS by Slavs who were not only born in eastern Europe but who lived there a significant part of their lives. The AAASS does contain many such people, and some have occupied

leading positions, but the proportion of foreign-born is much smaller.

The second fraternal group is the National Association for Soviet and East European Studies. ^{#45} This group serves the United Kingdom and Ireland. It was established under its present name in April 1967, replacing an annual Conference of Teachers and Research Workers on the USSR, which dated from 1953. The NASEES had a membership of about 200 in the spring of 1969. Its meetings, usually held at the University of London, have recently attracted from 95 persons (in 1967) to 145 (in 1969), of whom about one-fifth or more have been foreign visitors. In accordance with the change in name, the group since 1967 has dealt with not just the USSR but the whole of eastern Europe. The convenor (that is, president) of the NASEES was in friendly correspondence with the secretariat of the AAASS in 1967-69 concerning exchanges of information and membership lists.

Another category of informally-related group is the organization in a discipline that has not yet moved toward affiliation. There is one in the field of sociology. It is called the Subcommittee on Liaison with East European Sociologists. ⁴⁶ In August of 1967 at the annual

meeting of the American Sociological Association, a group of sociologists interested in eastern Europe met on the initiative of Irwin T. Sanders of Education and World Affairs. There were 15 American and two east European sociologists present.

4 for the last 2 years with 100 in University

(Chairman of Socia Dept)

Out of this came the formation of the Subcommittee on Liaison with East European Sociologists ("East European" here interpreted as excluding the USSR), under the Committee on International Cooperation of the ASA. In June 1968 this group began to publish a mimeographed newsletter called "Sociology and Eastern Europe." It had a roster of 42 interested persons as of ^{that} July. ~~of that year~~ There was some correspondence concerning affiliation, but the group evidently decided not to pursue the matter at that time. The officers of the group were, at last report, a chairman and a newsletter editor. +47

Still another informally-related group is one akin to the SWAAASS which seems to be emerging in the Rocky Mountain region. The professional base here is the Rocky Mountain Social Science Association. ^{During} ~~At~~ the RMSSA meetings of May 1968, at Loretto Heights College in Denver, a section on Russia and eastern Europe was organized by Sidney N. Heitman, managing editor of the Rocky Mountain Social Science Journal. A similar group met in 1969. Both times there has been discussion of establishing a new AAASS affiliate, but no decision has yet been taken. +48

Strangely missing from the categories of actual or immediately pending affiliates were groups based on professional interest in a single country or region of eastern Europe, such as Poland or the Ukraine. They are ~~apparently~~ fairly numerous, and some are well organized and long established. One of the more recent of them--the Association for the Advancement of

Baltic Studies, Inc., founded in December 1968--seems ~~even~~ to be modeled to some extent on the Triple A Double S. ^{±49} A few such groups have occasionally turned in items for the Newsletter. But in general they have been strikingly uninterested in the AAASS, if not out of touch with it. In the case of the new Baltic association just mentioned, none of the five officers on the first Board of Directors was a member of the Triple A Double S, and very few of the 205 members were. ^{±50} While such slight overlaps could be explained partly on the basis of the specialized nature of the groups and the language barriers they presented for those Americans not born in the area in question, one cannot help feeling that the AAASS up to 1969 had not done all it could to make itself known and useful to such groups and to recruit members among them. At the same time, one could predict that if such groups were attracted into the orbit of the AAASS, the nationalistic rivalries they carried over from their homelands would increasingly be fought out in the publications and at the meetings of the AAASS.

Beyond those groups there were many others--some of them meeting only once--that did not raise the question of formal affiliation and in some cases were not themselves formally organized, but which corresponded with the secretary or the editor of the Newsletter and received publicity in its pages. These included groups of Russian and east European specialists brought together by such varied organizations

as the Population Association of America, the Institute of International Education, the U. S. Office of Education, the Midwest Conference on Asian Affairs, the American Society of International Law, and many colleges and universities. The total number of such groups mentioned in the Newsletter in the years 1960-69 was more than 160.

C. National Meetings.

The holding of interdisciplinary professional meetings on a national basis was one of the central proposals of the Organizing Committee in the spring of 1960, and the Committee ~~had~~ even suggested that such a meeting might be held as early as 1961.¹ But when regional groups with yearly meetings developed as quickly as they did, the Board decided to hold off. It wanted to give the regional groups time to take firm root. Thus it happened that the first national meeting was not held until 1964.²

The 1964 meeting was held in New York at the Commodore Hotel, April 2-4. Holland Hunter (economics, Haverford) was in charge of the program committee, and William E. Harkins (literature, Columbia) ^{was} in charge of the committee on local arrangements.³ The attendance totaled around 600. Those who registered formally were asked to indicate their principal disciplines or professional affiliations. The largest categories turned out to be history (178), language and literature (106), and political science (90), but there was representation from almost every segment of the social sciences and humanities as well as from some scientific and technical fields.⁴

There were 16 sessions in all, some scheduled two at a time. About half of the sessions were definitely interdisciplinary in content. The paper-givers and formal discussants were drawn mostly from the ranks of the eminent and senior, although a few talented juniors were also included.⁵

wasnt there
a consensus decision made
50 members
9 bills
2nd survey
3 years?

The first national meeting was widely acclaimed as a success. But it had prompted both the Far Western and Midwest regional groups to skip their own meetings for 1964. The Board, believing that healthy regional organizations were of primary importance for the Association decided therefore not to hold the next national convention until the spring of 1967.⁶

That meeting was held in Washington, D. C. at the Shoreham Hotel, March 30-April 1, 1967. The program chairman was Richard E. Pipes (history, Harvard), while the chairman for local arrangements was Leon M. Herman (economic history, Library of Congress).⁷ Some 708 people registered, as compared with 590 in 1964.⁸ There were twelve sessions, of which ~~were~~ ^{were} only four ~~could be said to be fairly~~ broadly interdisciplinary. Pipes reported to the Board his lack of success in arranging other interdisciplinary sessions he had had in mind.⁹ He had, however, been relatively successful in achieving another aim, that of bringing in younger scholars both ^{to present papers} ~~as paper givers~~ and to serve as discussants.¹⁰

Although the meetings of both 1964 and 1967 were profitable not only intellectually but also monetarily,¹¹ the Board decided to ~~hold~~ ^{keep} to a three-year interval before the next national convention. In order to allow maximum time for advance planning, the officers surveyed the proposals made on behalf of several midwestern sites and by fall announced the selection of Columbus, Ohio, for the meeting of 1970. In

addition to its good convention facilities and the proven skill of the Ohio State people at arranging a convention (the Midwest Slavic Conference had met there in 1966), Columbus was favorably located. The secretariat had done a survey of the distribution of the membership within one day's drive (400 miles) of various urban centers. Columbus was found to be within one day's drive of about 700 members, as compared with only about 450 for Chicago (and less than 200 for San Francisco).¹²

In the fall of 1967 President Brown appointed Leon I. Twarog (literature, Ohio State) to be in charge of arrangements for 1970 and John M. Montias (economics, Yale) to chair the program committee. The convention of 1970 falls beyond the chronological limits of this study, but already by mid-1969 the Board could see that it was going to be a successful one. The planning, profiting from the lessons of 1964 and 1967, included special provisions for more interdisciplinary sessions, for the meetings of informal groups interested in a variety of problems, and for volunteers' reports on work in progress.

Meanwhile, the Board was reconsidering the optimum frequency of national conventions. Many people felt that the regional associations were now well enough established that national meetings might be held yearly, in combination with one or another of the regional meetings. One idea was that national meetings might rotate among the regional conferences on a cycle of four years or so. In that spirit, the Board voted in April 1969 to hold a national meeting in 1971 jointly

with the Far Western Slavic Conference, the place and time to be selected by the FWSC.¹³ The FWSC soon decided to meet in Denver ~~place~~. Left still to be worked out experimentally were the precise roles of the national and regional organizations in putting on the convention--in other words, just how "national" it would be. As of 1969 it appeared that the lion's share of the responsibility would be carried by the regional group, with the national officers helping out only to the extent requested.

Neither the national meetings nor the regional meetings played any formal part in the placement process in the 1960s. Members relied mainly on their associations in the various disciplines when ~~they sought~~ ^{seeking} jobs ~~for themselves or wanted to~~ ^{or} survey ^{ing} candidates. But of course the meetings were an important part of the continual process by which professionals assessed each other and made their needs and desires known. At the end of the 1960s, when the job market was getting tighter than it had been for ten years or so, there were suggestions that the next national meeting should make provision for a placement service. How useful it might turn out to be was a matter for speculation, but there seemed no reason not to give it a try.

A touchy question arose in connection with one of the national meetings. This was the matter of honoraria for featured speakers. The national meetings brought in considerable income through registration fees and the rental of space to exhibitors; hence people on the program committee could urge that part of that income might well be used for honoraria.

Many Board members objected to that idea, feeling that any Russian or east European specialist should consider it an honor to be asked to address a national meeting of his fellow-specialists. They thought that any suggestion of payment would inject an improper note into the relationship between colleagues. They were fearful of logrolling, and ^{saw no reason} why a person should receive extra money for doing something which was part of his normal scholarly activity. The proponents of honoraria seemed to come from social science disciplines where honoraria were ~~apparently~~ more common than in history or literature. They argued that we were asking the speaker to do a job he would not otherwise have done, and that pay was perfectly proper. In any case, the solution approved by a majority of the Board was to allow the program committee to offer honoraria to special guest speakers from across the ocean, but not to fellow-specialists from North America. Everyone agreed that if conditions permitted scholar-participants to be brought from any east European countries, the Association should be prepared to cover all of their travel and other expenses.

D. Other functions.

In the period 1960-69 the AAASS served a few functions in addition to those discussed above.

For example, the Board gave its formal support to efforts to help the Library of Congress continue the publication of the Monthly Index of Russian Accessions.¹ It endorsed officially the statement on academic freedom and tenure adopted by the American Association of University Professors.¹² It paid special tribute to an individual scholar when in 1965 it elected Professor Emeritus George Vernadsky as Honorary President of the Association.¹³

In 1963-64 when the U. S. Post Office was delaying the delivery of some unsealed mail which it judged to be Communist propaganda possibly unsolicited by the addressees, the Association polled its members ^{concerning} ~~to ascertain~~ the extent of the problem, and ~~then~~ gave the results ~~of its survey~~ to the American Civil Liberties Union to use in challenging the constitutionality of the actions of the Post Office.¹⁴

The Board also purchased and distributed to all members a special bibliography of paperback books on Russia published by the New York State Education Department.⁵

On the other hand the Board declined the proposal of a publisher to set up a special book club which would offer reprints of scholarly books. The Board welcomed the

publisher to use the Association's mailing list, but did not want to involve the Association ~~itself~~ in soliciting orders or guaranteeing sales.⁶ It rejected a proposal from a commercial press to become the official publisher for the AAASS.⁷ It responded negatively to a request that it sponsor and assist an international conference treating fifty years of Soviet rule.⁸

The Board in 1962 decided against using the Newsletter to list research in progress, and voted instead to encourage all members of the Association to list their own and their students' research with the External Research Division of the U. S. Department of State, in order that its yearly-published lists might be as full as possible.⁹ This decision was up for reexamination in 1969, after the Department of State had been forced to abandon its yearly bulletin.¹⁰

The Board declined to sponsor an honorary fraternity, on the ground that Dobro Slovo and other existing organizations sufficed. It also decided not to get into the business of sponsoring prizes for scholastic excellence in the Slavic and east European field, although it did encourage colleges and other organizations to give AAASS memberships as prizes.¹¹

in 1965
 The Board ^{in 1965} declined to join officially in a protest, proposed by a member, against an Air Force ROTC indoctrination program. It declined in 1965 to join in protests against Soviet repression of prominent literary figures.¹² The Board also de-

clined to put the Association officially on record concerning the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968; however, the Newsletter gave prominence to a condemnatory statement addressed to the Soviet Union and its participating allies by an independent "American Committee of Slavists"--a committee in which members of the AAASS, acting as individuals, played a conspicuous role.¹³

Even if the Board itself shied away from taking political positions, one might ask about signs of political controversy in the membership. During the 1960s such signs were very few. The pages of the Review and the sessions at regional and national meetings gave evidence of vigorous debate on questions of political significance, but there was no substantial challenge to the broad democratic middle from either extreme. Soviet spokesmen might attack the Review, to be sure, as one of them did in 1962.¹⁴ But the official Soviet viewpoint was by that time generally regarded in non-Soviet professional circles as an anthropological curiosity. Meanwhile, the fire of the extreme right had shifted from its McCarthy-era targets, and the Association was spared the painful task of deciding how to respond to a hunt for "subversives" in its ranks. Toward the end of the 1960s concern over our involvement in southeast Asia prompted informal discussions within our Association. At the same time, however, the ideas of the New Left had little appeal for people who had studied professionally the history and politics of Russia and eastern Europe.

Several factors limited

~~The limitations on~~ the functions of the Association

during its first nine years, ~~stemmed from several factors.~~

~~Among them were~~ a desire to maintain strictly the non-political

character of the organization. ~~a degree of~~ ^{There was} uncertainty about

the best possible role for the Association; ~~there were~~ the persistent de-

ficits that made operations dependent on yearly subsidies, and ~~there was~~

~~not least~~ the limited administrative staff. To these must be

added the continuing presence of the Joint Committee on Slavic

(later: and East European) Studies as a grant-giving, conference-

subsidizing, and planning agency for the field. Several members

of the Joint Committee were eager to turn over some of its

functions to the AAASS. But that could not reasonably be done

until the AAASS had more administrative strength and continuity.

~~And~~ In the administration of the AAASS, aside from the editorial

offices of the Review, the officers were all doing their Associa-

tion work on a volunteer basis, in addition to their regular

full-time university or other duties. ~~Moreover~~ since the

president, vice president, and treasurer changed frequently,

and the hired manager was largely involved with clerical and

bookkeeping duties, the main element of ^{administrative} continuity was the

secretary. And he, both because of the demands of his regular

university work and because of his temperament and inclinations,

served more as a helper and advisor to the successive presidents

than as an independent initiator and executor.

Several factors combined to open the way for change

toward the end of the 1960s, as recounted in an earlier section.

The growth of the membership suggested that financial self-

sufficiency was not many years away. The regional associations had taken such firm root that it was time to think of holding national meetings every year and tying them in with the regionals. The development plan worked out by ~~John~~ Thompson, and ~~Herbert~~ Ellison, and their committees won approval from the Ford Foundation and the promise of a grant of \$30,000 per year for three years. The willingness of ~~Donald~~ Treadgold and the University of Washington to take care of the Review solved a particularly pesky problem. Ohio State University through the good offices of Leon Twarog offered a handsome new home for the Current Digest, and Leo Gruliov accomplished the feat of moving it. The central administrative problem could be solved because Ohio State had in George Demko a faculty member who was exceptionally qualified to be the Association's first executive secretary, who was eager to tackle the job, and who would be given strong institutional support. The ACLS then capped the new edifice by turning over to the Association the \$78,000 reserve of the Slavic Publications Fund.

Thanks to those and other factors the Association's functions were being broadened at the end of the period under review. It was taking over the job of supervising the Current Digest.

It appeared likely to assume a supervisory role in library and bibliographic affairs, supplanting COCOSEERS and cooperating with the new Slavic Documentation Center.¹⁵ It was in a better position than before to speak for the whole field and to secure

had maintained before. Spell out

The Coordinating Committee on Slavic & East European Library Resources

141

funds from government, foundation, or other sources. And it was for the first time in a position to play an active role in planning and promoting the development of the field. The two ingredients most essential here were (1) funds, which could cover the expense of bringing planning committees and conferences together or seeding small projects of various kinds, and (2) an administrator who was prepared to devote a large share of his time to the Association. ~~George~~ Demko in his first days as executive secretary immediately set about organizing standing committees for various aspects of development. In accordance with the plans prepared by the Thompson and Ellison committees, he hoped to have several groups at work. One would concern itself with research, identifying areas that especially needed attention. Another would focus on Slavic and eastern Europe in undergraduate and secondary education. It might also arrange short courses for opinion makers and community leaders, and stimulate the preparation of suitable teaching materials.¹⁶ Other standing committees or subcommittees were to be established as needed. For example, one problem that called for special attention was that of relations with the regional branches of the AAASS. Demko planned to use some of the newly available funds to enable the officers of the various regional groups to meet, strengthening their connections with each other as well as with the national headquarters.

V. CONCLUSION.

In the formal sense, the Association's purposes as set forth in 1960 had been achieved long before 1969. The Association had published an expanded and improved journal; it had published a useful newsletter; it had sponsored and encouraged interdisciplinary meetings both regionally and nationally; it had published several directories and had distributed an interdisciplinary bibliography whenever one was available. In many ways it had stimulated interdisciplinary approaches and had advanced study and teaching about Russia and eastern Europe. It had served its own specific clientele and at the same time had made a valuable contribution to society at large.

Beyond the formal accomplishments, ^{one's rating of} ~~how one rated~~ each aspect of the Association's activities depended on one's expectations. The Association could be criticized for not having done more and better in everything. For each of the Association's achievements there were some shortcomings. Similarly, for each shortcoming there were some extenuating reasons. In the foregoing account I have given my own evaluations in each section as I went along, and at the same time I have tried to give the reader enough detail to make his own assessments.

The toughest verdict on what the Association did in the 1960s must come not from the few who read this account ~~as~~ but from the broader circles of those who share a special interest in Russia and eastern Europe. Their verdict will be expressed through their actions in the 1970s.