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The study of Russia in this country is about a century old, beginning at Oberlin College in the middle 1880s with Russian language instruction for missionaries and at Harvard in 1894, when Archibald Cary Coolidge offered a one-semester course in Russian history, one that became a full-year course fourteen years later. The study of Russia and of Eastern Europe and of other parts of the world expanded slowly from the Harvard base. The main steps included purchase of a Russian collection by the Library of Congress in 1907, the First World War and the Enquiry, the flood of well-educated immigrants from Russia and Eastern Europe after the War, and study in the late 1920s and early 1930s in the Soviet Union by the first trickle of specialists, men such as Geroid T. Robinson, Ernest J. Simmons, Philip E. Mosley, Merle Fainsod, and Calvin Hoover. Only twelve universities taught courses in Russian history in 1940, when the United States had only four departments of Slavic Languages and Literatures.

The period after the Second World War produced a major increase. The public sought knowledge about the ally who had suddenly become a threat by seizing and trying to transform Eastern Europe. Many young men who had learned Russian in the armed services became interested in Russian studies. American colleges and universities introduced new courses. The Rockefeller and Ford Foundations made grants to establish the Russian Institute at Columbia and the Russian Research Center at Harvard. Robinson, the senior American specialist in Russian history, was the first director of the Russian Institute, but the shortage of informed scholars was such that the first directors of the Russian Research Center were William L. Langer, Donald C. McKay, and Clyde Kluckhohn, none of whom even knew the language. By the mid-1950s, the vitality and growth that the war had stimulated began to decline, so the principal need became resumption of growth and vigor, spreading graduate training and instruction from the Ivy League institutions in the East and Berkeley in the West throughout the country, and creating a national organization. In short, the American people, even American scholars, who had lived in isolation and ignorance, not only of Russia and the Soviet Union but also of other cultures and peoples and of the changing world, after the War slowly built the present national program on the sturdy foundations created earlier.

Russian studies in the United States has its origins and foundations chiefly in the northeast, with the University of California in Berkeley playing a sec-
ondary and greatly neglected role. The emphasis from the beginning was upon training scholars for research, rather than teachers, theologians rather than parish priests. The founders from the early 1890s through the mid-1950s were men of enormous dedication who devoted themselves to the general welfare, both in serving the government in times of crisis and also in seeking to increase public knowledge. They had a commitment which we in our more relaxed and self-interested time find somewhat difficult to understand. They were "liberal" in generosity and civility, and remarkably evenhanded and objective in their approach. A few were active politically, but their views did not appear in their teaching or writing. For example, Simmons was a fervent supporter of Henry Wallace for the presidency in 1948. John Hazard, a colleague of Simmons at Columbia, who taught about the Soviet political system, had accompanied Vice President Wallace on his official trip to the Soviet Union during the Second World War, but this did not affect the views he expressed in his courses. Indeed, one of the greatest and least recognized contributions of those who founded Russian studies was the congenial, non-political spirit they established, one that prevented the furious, divisive struggle that wracked the Asian field in the 1950s.

I welcome this opportunity to reflect on my training because I have long had an interest in the history of Russian studies and because later generations should know something of the field's origins and early character. My experience is a profoundly personal one, quite different in some ways from that of other members of my generation. Thus, Cyril Black, who was completing graduate work at Harvard when I entered, had an American missionary father and a Bulgarian mother and had studied in France and Germany in the 1930s. Robert C. Tucker and Thomas Porter Whitney went to Moscow during the war to serve in the American Embassy. If they had returned to this country and had entered the academic world in 1945 or 1946, the history of Russian studies would be very different, but they both married Soviet women who were not allowed to leave the Soviet Union while Stalin lived. They therefore spent a decade in Moscow, acquiring a knowledge and understanding of the Soviet system which few Americans will ever achieve, but not becoming active participants in the expansion of the field in a formative period.

My experience is typical in many ways, because most of the young men and women who entered Russian studies in the last forty years have come from small towns and small colleges. Most of them, like me, received a liberal arts education that awakened an interest in the wider world and also gave them the advantage of some knowledge of a number of disciplines.

My early years profoundly shaped my interest in the world, and ultimately in Russia, and my view of history. I grew up in a conservative small town in central New York, one which had voted for the Republican Party consistently since 1865. Its residents were civilized, generous, and patriotic. At no time, even during the depression years, did the village have radicals of any kind. Everyone accepted the depression as just one of those things that occur occasionally in history. Waterville was typical in that it was a WASP village