Editor’s Note: To continue our year-long series, “De-colonizing Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies,” we are pleased to feature Victoria Donovan’s essay, “The (Sorry) State of the Field or Why Western Humanists Need to Listen in Silence and Solidarity.” We are also delighted to publish the second installment of Addis Mason’s interview with Allison Blakely, Professor Emeritus of European and Comparative History at Boston University. Other highlights include 2022 ASEEES President Joan Neuberger’s address at the annual convention in Chicago, as well as the annual report from Executive Director, Lynda Park.

If you are interested in contributing to NewsNet, please contact ASEEES Deputy Director and NewsNet Editor, Kelly McGee: (kmcgee@pitt.edu).
I don’t need to tell this audience that 2022 was a devastating year for people in our region and for the members of our association who care about the region. We can add February 24 to the days in history that “change everything.” Invasion, destruction, and trauma experienced by people we know and love, and horrific atrocities perpetrated by people we thought we knew, have radically changed the ways we think about and relate to the worlds we live in, visit, and study. Watching Russia’s full-scale invasion of Ukraine from afar, watching in despair, even those who correctly predicted a war or who were unsurprised by the imperial heart of darkness we can no longer look away from, found ourselves rethinking many of our assumptions about the worlds we study. And the war itself, as it continues, presents lasting problems, instability, and challenges on an enormous scale: I know that everyone in this room is thinking about these issues, and many of you are involved in seeking to address them actively and in a variety of ways. The accelerated Russian war against Ukraine makes this year’s ASEEES conference an especially important one. If there is such a thing as a silver lining, it is the urgency with which we are revisiting basic assumptions in all our disciplines, expanding attention to Ukrainian studies, discussing decolonization (and recognizing those who have been doing this for a long time), and generally making spaces for listening harder to voices that have been marginalized and silenced.

In 2022, we all had plans and goals we were unable to meet and wishes that didn’t come true. Some of those are related to the Russian war against Ukraine, which I’ll come back to; some are related to Covid, which, of course is still with us. But for me, in this room, at this moment, as President of ASEEES, I wanted to talk about and planned to talk about a different subject altogether: that is precarity, especially academic precarity. And although no one is more precarious than people under military assault, and many of us this year are giving papers that address economic, political, cultural, and other issues in the framework of precarity, I wanted our conference to begin to give some serious attention to the precarity that surrounds us in our workplaces.

This is not a popular topic. And if there is some resistance to decentering Russia and rewriting the narratives that have dominated our intellectual lives, I would argue that there is even stronger reluctance to examine the institutional structures that support the privileged, tenured and tenure-track faculty among us and separate us from the underprivileged—non-tenure-track, contingent, adjunct, and graduate students—and all the contract workers among us. While many of us still have a certain amount of autonomy and security in our teaching and research, that comes at the expense of those with little autonomy and little job security. And our privileged positions continue only to the extent that we privileged faculty can ignore the structures that shape our institutions. As anthropologist Tariq Rahman put it, this is a “conversation that is taboo when it comes to articles or panels but inundates every other corner of academia. Hardly a week goes by without an epic Twitter thread, a renunciatory blog post, or a crushing statistic. It is not a conversation that needs to happen. It is a conversation that is always already happening and that has made [many people] exhausted, desperate, and grasping for rationality.”

Academic workplace precarity is a form of precarity that affects all of us, non-tenure track faculty of course, but also including tenured and decorated faculty at elite institutions. All of us.

We all know that there is a jobs crisis and that the jobs crisis itself is not new. To take only one example, going back to 1976 when I was accepted to graduate school, I received clearly-worded statements from the universities that admitted me warning that jobs were scarce, that there were no guarantees, and that I should know that going in. But for many of us, our understanding of the origins and larger implications of this job crisis stops at our own job search or our graduate students’ job search or our department’s refusal to replace us when we retire. In part, we neglect the bigger picture because we are all so busy just trying to do our jobs. But our busyness and our jobs crisis are integrally connected. The rise of the neo-liberal university, with its corporate, managerial approach to higher education, has found ways to circumvent tenure and threaten the values of academic freedom and intellectual autonomy by transforming the conditions under which we all work.
Perhaps because I spend a lot of time on social media, and I follow current labor issues generally, I am acutely aware of the exhaustion, desperation, and irrationality that academic precarity causes. But I am continually surprised at the lack of awareness among my colleagues and friends in academia, of both the extent and the pain precarity causes. Doesn’t everyone know that nearly 70% of college and university professors in the United States are contingent, non-tenure-track contract workers? Apparently not, as I am continually surprised to discover. Or that a generation ago the numbers were reversed: in 1969, 78% of higher education faculty were tenured and tenure-track. Now, to put it another way, only 46% (approximately) of faculty at tenure granting institutions even have tenure. And at four-year doctoral institutions it’s even fewer: At four-year institutions with doctoral programs, only 38% of faculty have tenure. I think these numbers are staggering and I think it’s important to try to understand how the institutions that produced so many of us, and employ us, could transform so profoundly over such a short period of time.

Like all aggregate statistics, this 70% of faculty who are contract workers is a number that hides an immense variety of jobs and experiences that I can only hint at here. That pool of contingent faculty includes almost all those who teach at the 1,300 community colleges in the United States. But it also includes retired faculty members teaching part-time, and politicians and businesspeople who teach a single course at professional schools everywhere. These numbers also represent a wide variety of institutions and departments within institutions. Some schools have a high proportion of contingent faculty and some have a low percentage. Some pay their contract faculty by the course, starting as low as approximately $1,500, and some pay salaries, though those salaries are almost universally far below those of tenure-track and tenured professors.

What we all know is that the lack of jobs means that we admit fewer graduate students, and some of us might warn them a little more explicitly about their prospects; and some of us might train them a little differently to make them eligible for “alt-ac” related jobs; and some of us might lobby for raising grad student “stipends.” But these “solutions” barely scratch the surface of the deeper structural problems and the majority of faculty do not support graduate student unions. While the American Association of University Professors supports the right of grad students to unionize, when push comes to shove a majority of faculty in the US do not support grad student strikes and collective bargaining negotiations and even fewer support unionization of contract faculty. In many cases faculty are busy trying to survive the increased demands for tenure and promotion, for service and teaching, to say nothing of trying to meet the increased psychological needs of our Covid-era students.

If the corps of precarious graduate students and contingent faculty seems marginal to the demanding work lives of those of us who are tenured or tenure-track, that is an intentional strategy of higher education administrations. I want to shift the way we think about these issues because, of course, they’re directly related. The employment crisis is an intentional strategy of the corporate university that has been in progress since at least the 1980s, with a number of inflection points since, especially the crash and recession of 2008-09, which accelerated the jobs crisis. But we tend to think about these as separate unconnected issues.

When we do work for no pay because we enjoy it,—when we develop a website, create and run a podcast, teach an overload, invent a new digital tool—we are modelling behavior that is then imposed on contract faculty. We privileged faculty are complicit, a word I use intentionally and carefully, in keeping tenure-track and tenured faculty separate from contract faculty. I believe that we should all think of ourselves as labor, no matter how integrated we are into the administrations of our workplaces. And that means that we have more in common with contract faculty than we generally think. Those Russian historians not getting replaced when we retire?—they are in fact being replaced, in at least some cases, with contract workers who are paid a fraction of our salaries, and are teaching 50-100% more classes and increasingly are being required to participate in service and extracurricular activities if they want to keep their jobs. Because professors tend to think of ourselves as “special kinds of workers” committed to the life of the mind, our preferences have allowed what might be called “managerial creep.” When we do work for no pay because we enjoy it—when we develop a website, create and run a podcast, teach an overload, invent a new digital tool—we are modelling behavior that is then imposed on contract faculty. In Dead Man Working, Carl Cederstrom and Peter Fleming write that “The traditional line between capital and labor no longer makes sense to anyone. Today the real struggle is between capital and Life.” We believe that we choose to fill our days with overwork, doing the things we love. But in the meantime, our attention to the work we love allowed the intrusion of administration to increasingly enact policies to “discipline and punish” us. The managerial university is obsessed with efficiency and effectiveness, with behaviors that can be measured. Quality assurance, accountability, and cost-savings require more administrators. Our students are being reconstrued as customers who must be recruited and please so that they continue to provide revenue.

Yes, I am blaming the victim here: we all dislike assessment, and we know that our contributions and innovation, our mentoring and teaching cannot be measured quantitatively; yet we now all work in institutions of higher education where measurement of outcomes is pretty much all that matters. The work we do for pleasure occupies an ever-narrowing ledge and because we continue to engage in such activities, we are being replaced by people who will do that work for a fraction of our salaries without complaining because they can be fired. The institutions where this is not happening are decreasing in number and occupy only the very top layer of an increasingly stratified higher education landscape. In some of those institutions there are still “protected spaces for unhurried scholarly contemplation,” as one author defined the ideal of the liberal university, but everywhere else there is short-term thinking and a view of higher education as nothing more but...
Don’t get me wrong: I loved my job, I feel deeply grateful to have had a career at a flagship public university during a period when they were compelled to hire women, when I had freedom to decide what and how I wanted to teach without constant surveillance and assessment, and when I could do the research and writing I wanted to do, the way I wanted to do it, ways that likely would have gotten me fired or under-compensated if I were any younger. The University of Texas at Austin is still a highly privileged workplace compared to the majority of institutions of higher education and yet my younger colleagues at UT are operating in a space that feels unprotected, arbitrary, precarious, and causes them to feel disillusioned, exhausted, stressed, and burned-out. And by the time I retired earlier this year, I was increasingly angry, frustrated, and appalled at the inhuman price faculty at all levels were being asked to pay just to do our basic jobs of teaching and research.

I believe that the multiple employment crises we are witnessing are evidence of a critical turning point in the very nature of our institutions of higher education. Obviously, there is a complexity of historical-political developments at work here: the globalization of the US economy in the 1970s, the shift of the cost of higher education from the states, which is to say from public taxes to the individual families, technologies that reinforce desires for measurement and surveillance, a general downturn in the economy that makes higher ed have to be a path to employment. But focusing on those important factors can distract us from thinking about practical measures we might take to try to reclaim our institutions. I believe that if we begin to think of ourselves as a community of faculty members of all kinds, a community that includes graduate students and contract faculty together with tenured and tenure-track faculty, we can be more effective at fighting back at this critical juncture.

What can we do? We can start by educating ourselves about the conditions in which all members of our community are working. When we balance our graduate students’ needs against those of our undergraduates, -- as when our graduate students go on strike and are unavailable to do our undergraduate grading -- we can think past the short-term costs to our undergraduates’ chances of getting into law school and work to imagine creative solutions to problems (that don’t just shift the work back on ourselves) like flexible assignments, peer assessments, and un-grading.

We can also support the contract faculty at our colleges and universities. If we stand up for them, we stand up for humane treatment of all faculty. Contract faculty deserve living wages, contracts that spell out their responsibilities, and freedom from extra-curricular responsibilities unless they are getting paid for them. They should have regular schedules for contract renewal (that is, not waiting to get contracts until after semesters start, a common practice). They should be eligible for teaching awards and for research and travel funding. They should be consulted in policy decisions that affect their work; language coordinators, for example, are often excluded from contributing to departmental policy-making about language teaching. And they should be treated with respect, a message that deans need to convey to department chairs and to enforce. Institutions should have special ombudspersons for contract workers whose complaints can otherwise simply lead to firing them. Do you know if any of these are problems at your institution? Yes, it takes time and commitment to engage with and learn about our precarious colleagues, but in my experience, it is time much better spent than almost any other committee on which I served.

This sort of investigation and support, if it is to be effective, will have to be on-going. When the dean offers your department a contingent line, that is not the time to demand a tenure-track line. But an ongoing effort to improve the conditions of non-tenure-track faculty and a concerted effort to protect tenure-track lines in the context of faculty unity might create conditions to make it possible to push back against some of the mind-numbing, number-crunching assessment demands that bloat administrations and rob us of funding for faculty. Our faculty colleagues work in all sorts of conditions and I believe that improvement for some and support for all is good for everyone. We can talk to our contingent and precarious colleagues and include their needs in departmental policy making to support their goals on a long-term basis. Is there an effort to unionize? We can support it. According to ASEEES member and academic freedom expert Henry Reichman, unionization of precarious faculty has been gaining momentum and has been successful at improving salaries, benefits, protection of academic freedom, and job security. If we organize as a united, single community, we have a slightly better chance of responding to administration efforts to divide and conquer.

If we don’t do this kind of collective work to resist the corporatization of the managerial university, we won’t be able to do the urgent work of decolonization and de-centering of Russia.

These issues not only unite all faculty but have a direct connection to changes in our ASEEES fields. If we don’t do this kind of collective work to resist the corporatization of the managerial university, we won’t be able to do the urgent work of decolonization and de-centering of Russia. The neo-liberal university that views students as consumers and represents our research as niche-hobbies of no practical use, will not be interested in hiring people to teach Ukrainian, much less Georgian and Buryat and Estonian. And if our graduate students have to take on extra paid work to make ends meet, they won’t have time to learn a second or third “less commonly
taught” language. So while it’s absolutely essential to start a conversation about how leading scholars in our field only know Russian, without some structural reforms in university administration, we will not be able to remedy that. Do you want to be able to hire faculty members whose books don’t have Stalin or Putin in their titles? At institutions that see students’ opinions, no matter how narrow or uniformed, as second only to donors in importance, it is difficult to fight back against the priorities of branding. Advertising and public education about these issues directed at students and donors and other stakeholders is necessary if one wants to remove “Russia” from the names of departments and centers. Many of these student-consumers do not know what “Slavic” means, or where “Eurasia” begins and ends. Anecdotally, it appears that, in response to Russia’s wholesale invasion of Ukraine this year, enrollments in Russian language classes have decreased but numbers for Russian history and politics are up dramatically, and for the same reasons.

I hope that some of our members will add these academic structural issues to discussions of the intellectual project of decolonization next year at ASEEES, when that is our general theme. The future of our fields will require not just re-educating ourselves and our students, and listening to students who are already thinking in these terms, but re-thinking our roles and our alliances in our institutions, and a commitment to long-term support for our most precarious colleagues; because when it comes to our positions as academic workers, we are all in this together.

Joan Neuberger is Earl E. Sheffield Regents Professor of History at The University of Texas at Austin. She studied Russian Literature at Grinnell College (B.A. 1975) and Russian History at Stanford University (Ph.D. 1985). She served as 2022 ASEEES President.

Endnotes
6 Starving the Beast, film directed by Steven Mims, 2016. https://starvingthebeast.net/
8 Cited in Troiani et al, 17.
11 My thanks to Bruce Grant, Hank Reichman, and Valerie Kivelson for their invaluable help with this text.
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We are grateful to all of our donors that have made contributions at all levels to support ASEEES and growth of the field. Please consider donating to research, travel grants, or mutual aid in 2023.
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This year ASEEES celebrates its 75th anniversary. The academic reach of ASEEES members and their commitment to the field have been key to the Association’s longevity. Each issue of NewsNet in 2023 will celebrate ASEEES lifetime members’ reflections, histories, and experiences with the Association as we look towards the future of our field.

ASEEES is home, a place to live, learn, recuperate, grow, engage with colleagues. It is simply indispensable to prevent mental stagnation or the arrogance that you can now stop learning because you know all you need to know. My favorite memory was after convincing Moshe Lewin to come to the convention, I was able to take him around and see him interact with the younger generations of scholars. That convention and many others were times when I was compelled to rethink directions in my research as those younger generations brought new insights into the field.

- Ron Suny

Over the years, ASEEES has played a key role in helping me to identify and pursue the interdisciplinary research about which I’m most passionate. The annual convention is where I discovered others working on Performance Studies in my field, as well as the network of LGBTQ scholars that is now Q*ASEEES. It’s also been the venue where I’ve been able to test new avenues of collaborative research, which have proven more productive than any topic I’ve ever cooked up on my own.

- Julie Cassiday

I rejoined the field after pursuing another career for over two decades. My involvement in ASEEES has definitely eased the transition. ASEEES provided personal connections and a sense of shared mission which propelled me forward. I face the future with greater enthusiasm thanks to the ASEEES community.

- Charles Allen

The informal conversations at the conventions, the panels, and lectures have shaped and altered how I conceive of my own research. I am always impressed how others illuminate what I could not see myself. And new panel ideas, collaborations, and investigatory directions sometimes happen because of those encounters at ASEEES. It’s also rewarding when others tell you that you had such an impact on others.

- Morgan Liu

ASEEES is, and always has been, my primary national scholarly organization. It served me well when I was a nervous grad student meeting established scholars in the field for the first time, I published my first “real” article in Slavic Review, and I have built and maintained close friendships through conferences over the years. Plus, every year, I get to meet great new folks as well! As a faculty member at a small liberal arts college, the annual convention, NewsNet, and Slavic Review are the ways I keep in touch with what people around the country are doing and thinking.

- Joshua Sanborn

A sense of belonging to our extended family of scholars, practitioners, and just great friends who like me have dedicated a life furthering the study of the always fascinating Eurasian mosaic.

- Fredo Arias-King

As someone who did research across disciplinary boundaries, I can honestly say that I could not have explored the new areas and made the connections I did without participation in a multidisciplinary organization such as ASEEES. Thank you to all my colleagues in literature, history, religion, philosophy, art history, film, sociology and countless other fields. I am indebted to you all and to the organization that brought all of us together.

- Judith Kornblatt

I clearly remember my first ASEEES in Toronto in 2003, and my early involvement in the Soyuz Network for Postsocialist Cultural Studies. I also served as the Associate Program Chair of the ASEEES meetings in Boston in 2009, so I have clear memories of single handedly trying to arrange more than 100 individual paper submissions into coherent panels. But my clearest memory of ASEEES is listening to Bruce Grant’s presidential address in 2011. After AAASS changed its name, Grant declared that “we are all Eurasian” now and told a wonderfully funny story about struggling to overcome his stammer while doing his first extended fieldwork as a young anthropologist. He had the whole ballroom laughing.

- Kristen Ghodsee
American Councils is pleased to offer intensive language programming in Albanian, Armenian, Azerbaijani, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Bulgarian, Chechen, Dari, Farsi, Georgian, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Macedonian, Pashto, Persian, Romanian, Russian, Tajiki, Turkish, Ukrainian, and Uzbek. Summer and Fall 2023 programs provide 20 hours of intensive study per week, host families, volunteering opportunities, conversation partners, and U.S. academic credit through Bryn Mawr College.

Applications for Summer 2023 are due February 15, 2023
Applications for Fall 2023 are due March 15, 2023

Eligibility requirements, financial aid, and scholarship info are available at: www.acStudyAbroad.org
Questions? Contact us: outbound@americancouncils.org
ASEEES 55th Annual Convention

Virtual Convention
October 19 - October 20, 2023

Philadelphia Marriott Downtown
November 30 - December 3, 2023

Theme: Decolonization
2023 ASEEES President: Juliet Johnson, McGill University

Call for Proposals

ASEEES is delighted to host a small virtual convention in October followed by the in-person convention in Philadelphia from November 30-December 3, 2023. In the session proposal submission process, you will be presented with an option to apply to either the in-person or the virtual convention. The number of sessions for the virtual convention will be limited. We acknowledge that circumstances surrounding the Covid-19 pandemic continue to evolve and sympathize with possible health, travel, and financial restrictions of our members. However, we are unable to accommodate the option to move from an in-person to virtual or virtual to in-person format. We thank you for understanding this constraint when submitting proposals.

Accepting Proposals For:
- Panels
- Roundtables
- Book Discussion Roundtables
- Lightning Rounds
- Individual Papers (the virtual convention only)
- Film Screenings (the in-person convention only)
- Affiliate Group Meeting Requests

Please review the revised categories for 2023.

Important Dates

March 15  Deadline - All 2023 Convention panel/roundtable/individual paper proposals
April 1    Deadline - Meeting room requests
April 1    Deadline - All film screening submissions

Professional Bio (New)

Required for convention participants: Please enter a one-paragraph professional bio in your profile on the new ASEEES member site for use in the convention proposal review.

*NEW as of 2023: Individual paper proposals will only be considered for the virtual convention due to the high withdrawal rate of individual paper presenters for the in-person convention. If you wish to submit a proposal for the in-person convention, you must do so as part of a cohesive panel proposal.
The (Sorry) State of the Field or Why Western Humanists Need to Listen in Silence and Solidarity

by Victoria Donovan

Originally presented as a contribution to the roundtable, “Humanists on the State of the Field a Year after the Russian Invasion of Ukraine,” at ASEEES, Chicago (November 2022).

In a recent post on Twitter, a colleague commented on a panel with a similar title to ours, criticizing the intellectual arrogance that is required to position oneself as the spokesperson for an entire field, especially when that field is not one’s home, and arguing that, right now it would be more appropriate to talk about the “state of the field” in terms of the “right state” or “sorry state” of the discipline problematically known as Slavic Studies. Taking my cue from this discomforting and, in my view, wholly justified comment, I would like to speak directly in this essay to the “right state” of our field.

Our field was already in a state before February 2022, but the escalation of the war against Ukraine has brought it into sharp focus. The state we were in had been determined, in large part, by the hierarchal, extractivist, and exclusionary values that formed and continue to form the culture of many higher education institutions. These values expressed themselves in various ways: through the cult of research leadership that fostered competition for resources and exploitation of local partners; through the fetishization of the single-authored monograph, which likewise leads to a devaluation and marginalization of local contributions, relegating these to a list of acknowledgements; and through a lack of appreciation for cross-border collaborative work, which results in researchers who wish to undertake such work having to do so as invisible labor, or to use Sara Ahmed’s feminist term, “sweaty” work.1 This was the state of our field before February 2022. It continues to be the state of the field today. However, right now in this moment of toxic opportunity, opened up by the escalation of the war and the epistemological crisis it has engendered, we have a chance to change it.

The war has underlined the privilege of Western academics: those of us for whom the field is not our home, who may be distressed and appalled by the war, but who are not most intimately impacted by it. And by drawing attention to this privilege, it has also underlined the impossibility of continuing to conduct research in the detached and professionally self-serving ways that we have until now. It is one thing to discuss the inaccessibility of archives or the ethics of continuing collaborations with Russian partners, but there are other fundamental questions that we must also address: how are we to continue or—in the case of many Russianists who are preparing to embark on projects in the so-called peripheries—to begin building research partnerships that are not exploitative or hierarchical while also working within exploitative and hierarchical research institutions? How are we to resist the neo-colonial logic that is powering Russia’s war against Ukraine by embodying anti-colonial research ethics, by building solidarity with those whom we engage in our work? I would like to offer some alternative research approaches, drawing on my own collaborative work in Ukraine that I believe can offer a different paradigm of engagement. While drawing attention to what I believe are examples of good practice learned from Ukrainian partners, I will also try to speak frankly about what Ahmed has called the “institutional walls” that present obstacles to this kind of activity.
“Un/archiving Post/industry” is a digitization initiative that was realized by the Centre for Urban History in Lviv and the University of St Andrews, in partnership with local museums in Mariupol, Pokrovsk, and Kramatorsk in 2020-2021. The aim of the project was to digitize vulnerable industrial heritage collections in the Ukrainian East and stimulate community engagement with these materials through the coordination of summer schools, film festivals, community workshops, and exhibitions. The project resulted in the digitization of some 30,000 photonegatives and 90 hours of film, including family photography and home video from private archives, and dozens of interviews with heritage practitioners from communities across Eastern Ukraine. These digitized resources present a unique, community-generated record of life in Eastern Ukraine that will allow us to write a radically different history of this violently contested region. These materials are more valuable now since the museums that we worked with have been destroyed, displaced, or occupied as a result of the war. Freely available through the Centre for Urban History’s Open Access Urban Media Archive, they will allow us to continue to engage in scholarly discussion about the future of Donbas while this region is being violated by Russian troops, and also for local heritage practitioners to continue their work online bringing new aspects of local culture and history to light for displaced audiences.

Digitzation initiatives such as this may appear to present solutions to the problems of access that historians outside of the region are now experiencing, as well as a way of fostering mutually beneficial research collaborations with local partners. Drawing on this recent experience of digitization, as well as ongoing discussions about archival ethics in parallel scholarly fields, however, I would like to sound a note of warning about what I imagine may be a wave of archival ethics in parallel scholarly fields, however, I would like to sound a note of warning about what I imagine may be a wave of digitization projects in our “field” be carried out ethically and in the “spirit of humility” about which Dorothy Berry talks?

In the “Un/archiving Post/industry” project, we thought carefully about these questions. Community engagement was at the very core of the project and took the form of returning digitized assets back to local communities, both to museums and to individuals who donated their collections, involving communities in the contextualization and presentation of their materials: for example, at Home Movie Days where they were invited to lead discussion around their digitized video materials, and using processes of rolling consent to give people control over the ways that the materials are used (e.g. in documentary film, art practice). Before the escalation of the war, this work was creating the foundations for real community investment in the project. One of our colleagues at the Local History Museum in Mariupol found that the digitized materials were being uploaded and discussed on local history forums and social media sites, generating not just nostalgia, but also lively conversation around contemporary questions of industry-impacted ecologies, post-industrial transformation, and politics of contemporary urban planning. The project also encouraged new generation engagement with the digitized collections through artist and activist project residencies. These resulted in new works of contemporary art that reflected on questions of de-communization and de-colonization of the archival record of Soviet industry by artists Oleksandr Kuchynskyi, Anna Pylypliuk, and Volodymyr Shypotlinykov.

There is an opportunity now, as Western scholars who have long benefitted from the inequitable arrangements that have prioritized our voices above those of others from the region, to get behind these initiatives, link arms with decolonial scholars, and press for change in our field that has long been in a sorry state.

To return to the question of “institutional walls” that present obstacles to such work, community engagement projects such as these are labor intensive and resource demanding. To be done well and not just as an afterthought to an academic publication, they require significant time. While we may like to think, as academics, that we are capable of expanding limitlessly to fit in this kind of work alongside our “day jobs” of teaching, writing, and publishing academic articles and books, this is simply not true and, indeed, is a damaging work model to advocate (you need only look at the sector specific statistics on academic burnout and mental health to confirm this). What we need, then, for this kind of ethically informed, collaborative work to thrive is a shift in academic culture so that this kind of knowledge production, which is sometimes diminished inside universities that prioritize traditional kinds of outputs, is recognized as significant and valuable. Rather than paying lip-service to the notion of socially engaged research, which is often thought of as “social work” lacking institutional value, we should envisage better models for research, developing these in conversation with local partners, and conceiving outputs that do not only benefit ourselves and our careers, but also the places we study.
The escalation of the war has accelerated conversations around decolonizing Western knowledge of Ukraine and Russia, amplifying voices of local scholars who have long been calling for more equitable kinds of research practice. There is an opportunity now, as Western scholars who have long benefitted from the inequitable arrangements that have prioritized our voices above those of others from the region, to get behind these initiatives, link arms with decolonial scholars, and press for change in our field that has long been in a sorry state. The challenge of this is to work in the “spirit of humility” that Berry advocates, not to claim leadership or institutional ownership over the changes taking place, not to milk data and extract resources exclusively for institutional and personal benefit, and not to reconstruct the same hierarchies on the foundations of those that are being dismantled. This challenge is serious and involves discomfort: the discomfort of controlling our egos and our desires to speak loudly on behalf of “the state of our field” and instead to speak directly about the state of our field, and to listen in silence and solidarity.

**Endnotes**

New Member Portal

The ASEEES Member Portal has moved to a new platform to improve the member experience. If you have been a member any time since 2011, your profile has been migrated to the new member portal.

What’s Next for Members?

1. Login to the New Portal

Your username should have remained the same, and continues to be your email address. Click “Forgot Password” to create your new login.

2. Professional Bio

Take a moment to make sure that all of your information is correct and add your professional bio. Please note: this is not your CV and has a 1,000 character limit. If you are planning to participate in the 2023 convention, this is essential for the submission review process.

3. Renew Your Membership

Membership rates for 2023 remain the same. If you have not yet renewed your membership, you can easily see your status and renew from your “Account & Settings.”

Help with signing in and membership

If you need assistance signing in or purchasing membership, please complete this contact form.

CALL FOR APPLICATIONS: MONTEREY SUMMER SYMPOSIUM ON RUSSIA 2023 IN ARMENIA & GEORGIA

July 2-17, 2023
Deadline: Feb 1, 2023

The Monterey Initiative in Russian Studies at the Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey invites applications for the Monterey Summer Symposium on Russia 2023 in Armenia and Georgia, running from July 2 to July 17, 2023.

In the Monterey Summer Symposium 2023, twelve selected fellows will learn about imperial geopolitics in Eurasia and the world. They will analyze the war in Ukraine in comparative historical context, examining the end of the Soviet empire and its on-going consequences. They will delve into the South Caucasus and Caucasus more generally in the Soviet and post-Soviet cultural space, exploring their geopolitics. They will look carefully at the roles played by Russia, Iran, Turkey, the United States, and China in the region, including in the Black Sea region; and they will assess the impact of the war in Ukraine on the Caucasus. While addressing these themes, fellows will conduct sociological field research on the influx of Russian citizens on Armenia and Georgia. They will be taught by such leading experts as Thomas Graham, Dominic Lieven, Robert Legvold, Olesya Vartanyan, Yuri Slezkine, Andrei Zorin, Georgi Derlugyan, Anatol Lieven, Craig Calhoun, Hanna Notte, Arthur Atanesyan, Elena Chernenko, and many others.

Applications will be accepted until February 1, 2023.

Questions? Contact us: montereyinitiative@middlebury.edu
An Interview with Allison Blakely: Part II
by Addis Mason

Interviewer’s Note: At a time when an increasing number of scholars have begun to address race, color bias, and the role of Africans and the African diaspora in Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies, Allison Blakely’s pioneering work on the role of blacks in Russian and European history merits particular attention. Moreover, his comparative and transnational approaches to these topics from the outset of his long and storied career further attest to his leading role in moving beyond the bounds of national history in his examination of the history of blacks in Russia, Europe, and the Americas. With Russian history as his starting point, he has assiduously linked large swathes of time and place, from Europe to Africa and the Americas and from the early modern period to the present, to show the ways in which the image and activity of peoples of African descent have played an important part in the history of Europe. The following interview was conducted by email at the end of October and the beginning of November 2022. The interview covers Professor Blakely’s intellectual development and influences, scholarship amidst the global ferment of the 1960s and early 1970s, and work on the role and image of black people in Russian and European history.

—Addis Mason

Part I of Addis Mason’s interview with Professor Blakely was published in the November 2022 issue of NewsNet.

PART II.

AM: How did the Cold War and national and global ferment of the 1960s and early 1970s impact your scholarship?

AB: My experience as a graduate student at the University of California at Berkeley during most of the 1960s, followed by my teaching as an instructor in the Western Civilization Program at Stanford, then by the beginning of my career as a professor at Howard University in the 1970s felt literally like being directly engaged in the Cold War and national and global ferment of that time. This was rendered all the more real by the fact that after receiving my master’s degree in Russian history and reaching the all-but-dissertation stage, I was obligated to serve two years of active duty in the army because I had been awarded an R.O.T.C. commission as a second lieutenant along with my BA degree. The Army had considerably granted me a four-year delay from active duty at that time so that I could accept a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship that could not be postponed. Unfortunately, by the time my four years were up the Vietnam War had accelerated, and I had become intensively engaged in the anti-war and Civil Rights movements in the San Francisco Bay area. Also unfortunate was that despite my appeals to the Army for reassignment, I served a year of my obligation as an intelligence officer in Vietnam, beginning as a first lieutenant, since I was promoted while on educational leave and then promoted to captain while in Vietnam. My personal experiences related to that undeclared, Cold War surrogate conflict were too complex to chronicle here; but suffice it to say that this deepened my understanding of modern revolutions and liberation movements, as well as nationalism and socialism. Even in the early 1960s, it became clear that life was not going to allow me to settle into an idyllic scholarly career pursuing further the subject of revolutionary populism that I was to eventually choose for my Ph.D. dissertation. Perhaps I should have begun to suspect as much when the history I was studying seemingly began to come alive all around me at Berkeley. For example, it was impossible not to notice the historical parallels between the “to the people” movement of radical Russian populist students of the 1860s and the civil rights struggle and social activism of our day, when even such a politically moderate and dedicated student as I managed to merit a formal letter from the university administration threatening expulsion during the so-called Free Speech Movement, which was in fact about much more than free speech. Other historical parallels were also evident. For instance, the anti-war protests would later force political concessions upon erstwhile conservative democratic President Lyndon Johnson that called to mind the similar dilemma of autocratic Tsar Nicholas II, who during the disastrous [Russo-Japanese] War blundered Russia into Asia and had to move toward a more constitutional regime in the face of accelerating liberal opposition at home accompanied by massive public marches and demonstrations. The historical parallels were even more striking for me as a black intellectual because the Civil Rights legislation of the 1960s represented a veritable second Emancipation and Reconstruction era in American history, since those of a century earlier had been aborted by the legitimization of Jim Crowism and continuation of formal inferiority of black citizens. I was also struck by the fact that a prominent black leader in the Civil Rights movement, W.E.B. Du Bois, had dubbed the educated black American elite the “talented tenth.” Radical black Americans proclaimed themselves the voice of the oppressed black population in terms very similar to what the Russian Narodniki intelligentsia had advanced in the name of the oppressed Russian peasantry that constituted over 90% of the Russian population. The Black Panther Party, founded in neighboring Oakland, California during these years even created “freedom schools” reminiscent of the Russian populists...
of the 1870s, many of whom were also students. In the mid-60s I attended events on campus and nearby in Oakland involving black radical visitors including: Stokely Carmichael, Malcolm X, Panthers Eldridge Cleaver and Bobby Seale, and James Baldwin, whom I first learned liked to be called Jimmy by his friends when we awakened him from a nap at a friend-of-a-friend’s apartment he was staying in during that visit. I attended the speech by Malcolm X at Oakland’s McClymonds High School because he was among the speakers the university at that time considered too controversial to schedule on campus. However, I was able to get close to him during a short visit he made.

The racial discrimination I had experienced growing up as a black person in American society, in Oregon as well as my native state of Alabama, had brought me to a set of beliefs that made it impossible for me to resist joining direct efforts at reform through participation in social movements.

During my first four years at Berkeley, I was fully participating in social activism alongside extra intensive studying to make up for my having less previous preparation in European and Russian history than most of my peers. The racial discrimination I had experienced growing up as a black person in American society, in Oregon as well as my native state of Alabama, had brought me to a set of beliefs that made it impossible for me to resist joining direct efforts at reform through participation in social movements. My first form of activism in the ‘60s was through continuing my involvement in the Civil Rights movement in which I had participated since my early teen years. I was a member of the NAACP [National Association of Colored People] and CORE [Congress of Racial Equality], and in Berkeley, San Francisco, and Oakland participated in numerous restaurant-chain boycotts, marches, voter registration drives, and protests challenging what officials called “urban renewal,” but we called “poor folks removal.” I also became vice president in a Friends of SNCC [Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee] chapter we established at Berkeley, that raised money and supplies went south to support voter registration drives and other work of SNCC throughout the South, especially in Mississippi and Alabama. It was my role in SNCC that led to the threat of expulsion. This was also true for the Free Speech Movement’s most noted spokesperson, a very quiet and polite undergraduate philosophy major named Mario Savio, who became so prominently involved because he was president of the Friends of SNCC while I was vice president.

Another reason I was highly conscious of the Cold War was that I made my first visit to the Soviet Union in 1965, on an intensive Russian language study tour lasting five weeks, after a month’s prior preparation at the University of Indiana’s summer Slavic Workshop. At that point I had also advanced my Russian language and literature background further through additional courses I had taken at Berkeley to satisfy a stipulation for two National Defense Foreign Language Fellowships I had enjoyed after the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship expired. The NDFL Program had of course been established in response to the Cold War. That trip to Russia had a permanent impact on the nature of my scholarship and political thinking. It reinforced my enthusiasm for Russian Studies, while at the same time brought a jarring awareness of the images in the vivid propaganda posters, billboards, and statues visible at every turn and the stark contrast of Soviet reality. I especially became conscious of the depth of the hypocrisy in Soviet propaganda on the issues related to race and color bias. As a black American extremely embittered over the disparity between the democratic ideals and their practice in my native land, I naively thought that at least this newly established Soviet Russia might have come closer to realizing its professed goals of a just society. Instead, I suffered a degree of disillusionment that would only grow as I later learned more through further study of prevailing attitudes in Russia and the related behavior of the Soviet regime. One reason impressions from the trip are so memorable is that the Watts Riot in Los Angeles occurred while I was in Moscow. The most memorable single incident in my awakening was the reaction of some of my young Russian hosts to American news media pictures in Pravda from the Riot. One particularly shocking one featured young black men lying in a row on their stomachs with their wrists handcuffed behind them. As I awaited expressions of outrage and sympathy from my new Soviet acquaintances, their first remark was instead: “But look at those shoes!” And, indeed, they were wearing nice shoes; but it only then dawned on me that in Soviet society this sort of material item took priority over humanitarian ideals. I returned from that trip with a clear realization that the “workers’ paradise” our hosts touted was falling just as short of its goals as was the native land to which I was devoted to its goals of “liberty and justice for all.”

AM: What prompted you to examine early twentieth-century Russian populism, and particularly the Socialist Revolutionary Party?

AB: When I returned from my year in Vietnam in 1968 to complete the writing stage of my dissertation, I was more interested than ever in the comparative history of democracy and social revolutions because I had witnessed firsthand some of the social dynamics of such movements, as well as the intensity of determination of some peoples to be free to pursue their own cultural and political destinies. My return to Berkeley also brought me an experience that further reminded me that my study of revolutions was not purely academic. On May 15, 1969, then-governor Ronald Reagan sent State Highway Patrolmen and later over 2000 National Guardsmen to Berkeley to quell student protests both on the campus and centered around a block of university property a few blocks south called People’s Park. Governor Reagan set the tone for this engagement by characterizing the park as a refuge for communist sympathizers, protesters, and sex deviants and was quoted as saying, “If it takes a bloodbath, let’s get it over with. No more appeasement.” Over the course of the day the crowd of protesters swelled to over 6,000. The Governor declared a state of emergency that placed the city of Berkeley under occupation and patrolled by the National Guard for two weeks. The confrontation included the employment of tear gas dropped on the campus from the air by a helicopter, and some by troops with canisters off campus. The students had no masks, while the advancing troops and police were masked. On campus, there was a preliminary warning by megaphone to clear the campus plaza just before the chemical drop; but then a wall of troops standing with bayonets affixed to their rifles closed off the entrance, preventing exit or entry, trapping hundreds within the one-square-mile campus. I had been trained in the Army on how to use gas masks, but never had one as a civilian. The soldiers used rifles with fixed bayonets for crowd control. I had been wounded in a rocket attack at the onset of the Tet Offensive in my eleventh month in Vietnam, but had never faced or seen fixed bayonets during my entire year there. And now, just over a year back from the war zone, this was part of my welcome home. The police and guardsmen at times fired shotguns at the crowd, resulting in over 100 needing hospital treatment, and one bystander killed. I had never imagined that such a cruel and violent military attack could occur in the United States, except in black towns or neighborhoods. I found the Socialist Revolutionary Party especially interesting in the emergent Russian political spectrum around the turn of the century because, as I indicated earlier, they were at least intellectually committed to the
best interests of the vast majority of the Russian people, in particular
the most powerless in society. This was in keeping with a lifelong
interest I have had in the question of whether a popular democracy, a
system where the people rule, is possible. In my study of history, I
have yet to find an example of where popular democracy has been
fully implemented in a major society in deed as well as word. For
example, it was disappointing to me when I first learned decades ago
that the ancient Athenian democracy had even a higher percentage
of slaves than that of the United States before its abolition of slavery,
and that respectable women lacked even the freedom to appear in
public at will. I still wonder whether post-revolutionary Russia could
have enjoyed a more just society had the Socialist-Revolutionaries,
or even the Mensheviks, prevailed rather than the Bolsheviks. I did
eventually complete a presentable book manuscript based on my
dissertation. However, by the time I circulated it among publishers,
the related books by the British scholar, Maureen Perrie, and the
German scholar, Manfred Hildermeier, had appeared and were of
such high quality that mine contained little sufficiently new to merit
publication. I had known we were all at work on the same themes;
but I also knew that some dissertations are never completed, and
that some published are not of high quality.

I think aspects of my comparative study of social and political movements
are still informing my understanding of the continuing evolution of the struggle
for civil equality for African Americans in American society as struggles of
outcast elements in other societies around the world.

AM: Are there particular themes or interests which evolved out of
your early studies that have carried through to your later work?

AB: The themes of popular democracy and social justice have been
the most consistent throughout my career. Howard University
allowed me to develop my interest in comparative history, which
is what I had always wanted to pursue, even as an undergraduate.
There was no such field then, and little respectability in the
profession for the concept. Simply being a Europeanist at Howard,
with a student body that even now is over 70% black, in fact made
thinking comparatively inescapable. My students literally forced
me to go beyond my formal training to consider the connections
between European history and Black history by the questions they
constantly asked. I also became personally swept into the history
of the Black diaspora. For example, in the course of my multiple
research visits to the Netherlands in the early 1970s to exploit
the rich archival materials on Russian populism in Amsterdam
I’ve mentioned, I began to experience racism there after the
independence of Surinam in 1975 suddenly brought a much larger
black population to the Netherlands. When speaking Dutch, I was
mistaken for a black Surinamer, and was treated far differently than
earlier when I had been seen as a professor from the United States.
This apparent radical change in behavior in Dutch society, which
enjoyed a sterling reputation for its toleration and social conscience,
made such a strong impression on me that I spent the next decade
in pursuit of the historical explanations for this investigation that
required delving deeper into anthropology, art history, literature,
folklore, and religion than I had ever imagined I would go. As a result
of publications from this work, my reputation as a scholar on the
African Diaspora, a sub-field just coming into being, eclipsed that as a Russianist, even though my interest in the subject of popular
democracy still continues strong today.

AB: I think this stemmed mainly from that same affinity I sensed way
back in high school between rural Russian culture and my own from
rural Alabama. The main history courses I took as an undergraduate
were in nineteenth and twentieth-century United States history;
and I defended a senior thesis on the Reconstruction period. After
I took my first survey course in Russian history at Berkeley, I was
struck by the fact that the abolishment of serfdom there occurred at
around the same time as the emancipation of the enslaved in
the United States, and in both cases were brought about by the
government for reasons of the state, rather than from popular
revolts or because it was the just thing to do. I was also impressed by
the fact that both leaders had been assassinated, and the apparent
depth of divisions in society that seemed to suggest. In the Russian
case the assassination was carried out by one of the underground
populist factions that were demanding even more radical reforms,
and in the American a disgruntled adherent of the losing side in the
Civil War. The type of populism that gained a foothold in the United
States in the late nineteenth century was reformist, rather than
revolutionary, and fizzled out after the two major parties simply
incorporated its most popular planks. It was among black radicals
that revolutionary populism emerged in the United States because
pervasive racism prevented the American political spectrum from
accommodating their demands, as it did for those of the nascent
American populist and socialist parties, while brushing aside black
political demands, with acquiescence of the general public. I think
aspects of my comparative study of social and political movements
are still informing my understanding of the continuing evolution
of the struggle for civil equality for African Americans in American
society as struggles of outcast elements in other societies around
the world. I’ve learned that the shared traits in my comparisons
of the Russian and American scenarios are not unique to them,
as I have traced historical patterns showing surprising similarities
across time and across cultures that convince me this has been a
universal experience throughout the history of human societies.
My outlook was reinforced through teaching basic courses on world
civilizations for decades. For example, I became similarly fascinated
by the parallels between what happened to our American Kennedy brothers in the 1960s with what transpired with the Gracchi brothers in the Roman Republic over two thousand years ago. These two patrician senators were murdered by their fellow senators for advancing proposals that would redistribute the land and wealth more equitably, and justly reward the soldiers and farmers who built the empire. In the same vein, regarding the ancient Athenian democracy, it was impossible for me to miss the similarity between its competition with Sparta and our American-Russian Cold War. Historical developments such as the struggle for wealth and power have been dominant in societies throughout history; myriad, artificial social devices such as class, race, and color have often been employed to advance their pursuit and human reactions to this have also been predictable. I don’t claim to fully understand all of this, but have concluded long ago that it is driven far more by voluntary human behavior than any kind of immutable forces of history.

The final installment of Addis Mason’s interview with Professor Blakely will be published in the March issue of NewsNet.

Addis Mason is an independent scholar of Imperial Russian cultural and intellectual history. She is completing a monograph on the development of progressive Russian nationalism in the first half of the nineteenth century and its intersection with broader nineteenth-century discourses on Europe and the West, empire, race, gender, region, and national identity. She received her MA and PhD in Imperial Russian history from Stanford University.

NEW Dissertation Research Grant in Ukrainian Studies

Donate to the Dissertation Research Grant in Ukrainian Studies

ASEEES is pleased to establish the Dissertation Research Grant in Ukrainian Studies. The goal is to raise $60,000 so that we can launch the program in Spring 2023. To donate, please visit the new member portal. You do not need to login to make a donation.

We have a generous matching gift of $10,000. Please consider giving or making a pledge so that your gift can double!

Complete a donation card or make a donation online.

2023 ASEEES Distinguished Contributions Award
Call for Nominations

The Association’s Distinguished Contributions to Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies Award honors members of the profession who have made major contributions to the field. Distinguished Contributions may be conceived of in diverse ways, and the Association seeks to recognize outstanding service, leadership, scholarship, mentoring, and public outreach.

Nomination Details
Deadline: May 1, 2023

Accept an unpaid internship in the US for 25 hrs/wk in Russian Studies, and receive a $2,000/month grant.

MA, PhD, professional school students, and recent graduates are eligible.

You do not need to have a confirmed position to apply.

www.asees.org/programs/asees-internship-grant-program

Gumener’s 1921 memoir is a rare historical source about relief work spanning the most devastating years of Russia’s Civil War-era pogroms. Gumener worked for the major Russian and American organizations that provided aid to Jewish victims, and thus presents a unique perspective on leaders, parties, and institutions struggling to respond to the suffering and dislocation. This annotated translation serves as a roadmap for the reader, clarifying the social and political contexts in which the events took place. A Ukrainian Chapter is a contribution to the history of pogroms, relief work, and Jewish party politics, through the experience of an eyewitness.


This volume aims to promote further understanding of Russia’s unique contributions to STEM-related fields by documenting and analyzing the complex transformations occasioned by the country’s “continuum of crisis” during the years c. 1914–24. Sixteen chapters shed new light on longstanding debates regarding Russia’s path to modernization; the contributions of its technical and scientific experts; and the extent to which the institutions and methods adopted by Soviet leaders were built upon foundations established by their imperial predecessors.

Vol. 23, no. 4 (Fall 2022)

Articles

Maria Grazia Bartolini
“Thy Name Is as Ointment Put Forth”

Fabian Baumann
Nationality as Choice of Path

Martin Rohde
Ukrainian “National Science” from a Spatial Perspective

Forum: How Deadly Was the Gulag?

Mikhail Nakonechnyi
The Gulag’s “Dead Souls”

Stephen G. Wheatcroft
The Mortality of Released Prisoners and the Scale of Soviet Penal Mortality, 1939–45

Mikhail Nakonechnyi
A Response to Stephen G. Wheatcroft

Reaction by Golfo Alexopoulos

Review Essay

Mehmet Volkan Kâşici
Living under Stalin’s Rule in Kazakhstan

Three String Books is an imprint of Slavica Publishers devoted to translations of literary works and belles-lettres from Central and Eastern Europe, including Russia and the other successor states of the former Soviet Union.


The 19th century in Serbia began with two uprisings against an Ottoman overlordship that had oppressed not only the Serbs, but all of Southeastern Europe for almost 400 years. Fired by memories of their medieval empire and determined to restore Serbia as a Christian state with European-style institutions, Serbia’s two princely families, the Karadžovecs and the Obrenovićes, vied with one another to modernize the country and eventually, in 1878, to achieve its full independence from the Ottoman Empire. Kata Nesiba tells in vivid detail a major portion of the story of Serbia’s emancipation and modernization. Based on extensive research in Serbian archives, the author and illustrator uncover the tumultuous life of Kata, a Belgrade sex worker, as she lives and works in mid-century Serbia. They adduce numerous side stories, as well, to depict the sexual mores of the country at that time, not just of the “whores and harlots of Belgrade,” but also of the cross-dressing tavern entertainers, the LGBT population, political figures both small and great—Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, the “Father of Serbian Literacy” among them—and the ever-diminishing power of the Turks in Serbia’s political, economic, and social life. From dusty archives Kata Nesiba brings to life the authentic stories of the men and women who experienced some of the most turbulent times in Serbia’s long and fraught history. And, as the author and illustrator delight in pointing out, so much of what happened then is happening again, in a Serbia once again independent.
ASEEES Actions Related to Russia’s War against Ukraine

Russia’s invasion of Ukraine on February 24, 2022 has changed the world and ASEEES as an association. In an extraordinary decision, the ASEEES Board publicly condemned the invasion and issued other related statements. As a scholarly society, we focused our efforts on assisting displaced scholars and students in and from Ukraine. In partnership with Science for Ukraine, we worked to serve as a hub of information by creating a webpage on resources and a calendar of events as well as hosting webinars on how to host/support displaced scholars. We donated $10,000 to the HURI-IWM non-residential fellowships for Ukrainian scholars staying in Ukraine. Working with HURI and the Davis Center at Harvard, we’re currently conducting a grant-funded project on gathering data on displaced scholars. ASEEES has also responded to calls from our members to challenge Russo-centrism in our field and organization. We have been publishing a series of articles on “De-colonizing Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies in Undergraduate Teaching and Graduate Training” in NewsNet. Slavic Review has been publishing forum discussions. At the 2022 Chicago convention, ASEEES featured Ukrainian studies sessions and inaugurated a new fund for Dissertation Research Grant in Ukrainian Studies. The 2023 convention theme, Decolonization, is an invitation for the whole field to address this issue head-on. The consequences of this horrendous war will undoubtedly reverberate through the entire field of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies for years to come. We at ASEEES are committed to being at the forefront of these discussions and will rise to the challenge, adapt, and enhance the field for the better.

Please find below the annual report for 2022.

Membership

For 2022, we had 3,268 individual members (compared to 3,262 in 2021): at least 603 student members (18% of total members); 266 affiliate members (8%); and 91 lifetime members (2.8%). We had 1,070 international members (33% of total members) from 59 countries, of which 537 were from 18 countries in Eastern Europe and Eurasia, including 67 from Russia and 78 from Poland. As anticipated, we saw a decrease in Russian membership. Members from Ukraine went from 20 in 2021 to 30 in 2022, 7 of whom were given complimentary membership. For a comparison to a pre-pandemic year, in 2019 we had 3,490 total members: 685 student members; 337 affiliate members; and 1,246 international members from 49 countries. For trends in membership over the last decade, please see the table appended to this report. For institutional membership, we had 50 members: 19 premium and 31 regular members.
Annual Convention

The 54th Annual Convention was held at the Chicago Palmer House Hilton on November 10-13, 2022, with a smaller virtual convention on October 13-14. With the theme “Precarity,” 563 sessions in total (351 panels, 178 roundtable, 34 individual paper panels/lightning rounds) were scheduled in the program: 130 for the virtual and 433 in person. The in-person convention also featured the presidential plenary, award ceremony, film series, literary events, and receptions. We were particularly delighted that a series of lightning rounds on undergraduate research, organized by Howard University to encourage underrepresented students of color in Slavic studies, was held in person for the first time, after virtual participation in 2020 and 2021.

As noted above, the 2022 Convention spotlighted Ukrainian studies and the work of our Ukrainian colleagues. Over 90 scheduled sessions addressed Ukrainian studies. The Presidential Plenary, “Ukrainian Literature in Wartime,” chaired by the 2022 President Joan Neuberger, featured Alex Averbuch (U of Alberta), Vitaly Chernetsky (U of Kansas), and Yuliya Ladygina (Penn State U). We also established a new Ukrainian Scholar Travel Grant program and waived convention registration for participants who are Ukrainian citizens. Other events of note: The Vice-Presidential Roundtable, “Decolonizing and De-Centering Russian Studies,” addressed de-centering Russia in SEEES in the humanities and social sciences; Joan Neuberger gave her presidential address, “Precarity and the Possibilities of Reinvention,” during the award ceremony.

I thank the Program Committee, especially the chair Betsy Hemenway, for their hard work on the convention. I thank the ASEEES staff, Margaret Manges, Kelly McGee, Jenn Legler, and Nathan Isaacson, for their incredible effort in organizing what in essence are two conventions.

The final registration numbers were the following: 2,565 registrants, consisting of 1,953 for in-person+virtual (76.1%) and 612 for virtual only (23.9%) - 2,056 registrants were ASEEES members (80.2%); 599 were first-time attendees (23.3%); 562 were students (21.9%), including 142 undergraduates for the virtual convention. Of the 825 international registrants (32.1%) from 53 countries, the largest contingents were from the UK (120), Canada (109), and Germany (85); 36 registrants were from Ukraine. However, we had 143 registrants with no country indication, many of whom were likely to be international. We offered 153 registration waivers, including waivers to participants with Ukrainian citizenship (48) and to undergraduate students participating in the Howard University Think Tank program. We thank the 15 sponsors, 48 exhibitors, and 21 advertisers for their support.

The 2023 annual convention will be held at the Philadelphia Marriott Downtown from November 30 -December 3, along with the virtual convention from October 19-20. As noted above, the convention theme is Decolonization. The Convention Program Committee Chair is Bob Weinberg at Swarthmore College. ASEEES will celebrate its 75th anniversary.

Slavic Review

2022 was the sixth year of a seven-year contract with Cambridge University Press (CUP) to publish Slavic Review, which ends at the end of 2023. The academic journal publishing world has dramatically changed since we signed the initial contract in 2016. Traditional subscriptions continue to decline, and print publication costs continue to rise. The intense push for Open Access and the adoption of the Transformative Agreement model leave much financial uncertainties for a small humanities/social science journal like Slavic Review. In September we issued an RFP for Slavic Review publishing, and we’re currently in contract negotiations for 2024-2028. Also, to lower the cost of printing and to reduce our carbon footprint, the default mode of the journal delivery starting in 2023 will be digital only. Members will need to indicate that they are “opting in” for a print copy delivery on their member profile.

The tenure of Harriet Murav as the Slavic Review editor ends in August 2023 after two five-year terms. In the spring of 2022, we posted a call for letters of interest for the editorship for 2023-2028. After review, the Slavic Review Committee nominated Eugene Avrutin, Tobor Family Endowed Professor of Modern European Jewish History at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, to serve as the next editor from August 15, 2023 to August 14, 2028, and the Board approved the nomination. We thank Eugene Avrutin for his willingness to serve in this critical position.

Fundraising

In the fiscal year 2022 (July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022), we received a total of $578,897 in gifts, pledges, and grants, including the pledge payment for the Kulczycki Book Prize Fund, KAT Foundation’s annual gift for the Cohen-Tucker Fellowships, a new Carnegie Corporation grant on the assessment of Russian studies 2022, and a joint Carnegie/Lounsbery Foundation grant for the displaced scholar data project. We also have two new endowed funds: the Maya Peterson Research Grant Fund (for Environmental studies) and the James Bailey Research Grant Fund (in Folklore studies), each with a gift/pledge of $150,000. We thank all the donors to ASEEES. Any members interested in major gifts or planned giving, please contact me anytime about giving opportunities.

ASEEES Research and Other Grants

Thanks to the generosity of our donors and institutional funders, we were able to award 42 fellowships and grants, totaling $373,000 in 2022.

- Dissertation Research Grant: We awarded 14 grants, including the Women’s and Gender studies grant, the Maya Peterson grants in environmental studies, and the Bradley-Ruane Russian studies grant.
- Summer Dissertation Writing Grant: We awarded 6 grants. This was the third year of this program.
- Cohen-Tucker Dissertation Fellowship: We awarded five research fellowships, including one on women’s and gender studies, and two dissertation completion fellowships.
- Internship Grant Program: We awarded 10 grants. Grantees...
receive a monthly stipend of $2000 for either 2 summer months or 4 spring or fall months.

- First Book Subvention: We awarded 5 subvention grants with the maximum amount of $2,500.

Convention Travel Grants
For the 2022 Chicago convention, ASEEES awarded 97 travel grants for a total of $66,500.

- For the Graduate Student Travel Grant, we awarded 44 grants (19 students at US institutions and 26 non-US institutions, including citizens of 18 different countries), each worth up to $1,000.
- For the Regional Scholar Travel Grant, we offered 15 grants of up to $1,000.
- We instituted a new Ukrainian Scholar Travel Grant program this year. We awarded 13 grants; 4 had to withdraw, ending with 9 accepted grants of up to $1,000 each.
- For the Russian Scholar Travel Grant, we awarded 12 grants of up to $1,000. This program was funded by roll-over funds from a 2020 grant from the Carnegie Corporation.
- For the Convention Opportunity Travel Grant, we awarded 6 grants of up to $500 each.
- For the Diversity and Inclusion Travel Grant, we awarded 11 grants of up to $500 each.

Initiative for Diversity and Inclusion
Since launching the Initiative for Diversity and Inclusion (IDI) in February 2021, ASEEES has offered a total of 78 complimentary 2-year memberships to interested and eligible BIPOC colleagues and first-generation undergraduates, thanks to a gift from Doug Smith and Stephanie Ellis-Smith. 35 of the 78 group members are new members of ASEEES. The goal continues to be for ASEEES to provide structural support to create a community for under-represented students, scholars, and professionals in the US so that they can network, share their experiences, and mentor each other. The group includes students, working professionals, and professors at various stages of their careers, including students who were selected for the Undergraduate Think Tank coordinated by Howard University. Since the start of the program and throughout 2022, ASEEES has hosted several Zoom events, during which participants were able to meet each other and hold informal conversations. In September 2021 we launched the IDI Mentoring Program. We renewed this program in 2022 by offering to pair mentors or mentees with new partners, as well as offering to match new members.

ASEEES Career Series
In spring 2022, ASEEES continued the Exploring Career Diversity Conversation Series for members who are graduate students or recent graduates interested in broadening their career trajectories. Supported by the Committee for Careers beyond Academia, we hosted four conversations with professionals in various non-academic sectors. Many of the professionals who volunteered their time for the Conversation Series continue to serve as senior contacts for the Exploring Career Diversity Service, which matches them with junior colleagues for a one-time conversation or informational interview. This service continues to be a successful program for graduate students and recent graduate students.

In fall 2022, we continued the Demystifying the Academic Job Market Series with a webinar on “Demystifying the Tenure Process.” Sunnie Rucker-Chang (Ohio State U) and Molly Blasing (U of Kentucky) presented useful information on preparing to go on the job market, tenure, and promotion.

Board Election/Incoming Members
The 2022 annual election for the Board of Directors was held from June-September, and the results were the following: Vitaly Chernenksy (Slavic, U of Kansas) was elected Vice President/ President-Elect; Kristen Ghodsee (REES, U Penn) and Alison Smith (History, U of Toronto) were elected Members-at-Large for 2023-2025. A total of 3,017 ballots were sent out, and 1,134 voted for a response rate of 38%. The other incoming Board members in 2023 are: Sharon Kowalsky (Texas A&M U-Commerce) as the Council of Regional Affiliates representative; Cynthia Buckley (U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign) as the Sociology representative; Krista Goff (U of Miami) as the AHA representative; and Anna Arays (Yale U) as the CLIR representative. Also, At-Large Board member Kimberly Zarecor will serve on the Executive Committee for a two-year term, 2023-2024.

I would like to express my gratitude to the ASEEES Board, especially the outgoing 2022 Board members for their service: Sibelan Forrester, Michael Kunichika, Karen Petrone, Robert Niebuhr, Joseph Lenkart, Kate Pride Brown, and Asif Siddiqi.

I thank ASEEES staff Kelly McGee, Jenn Legler, Margaret Manges, and Roxana Espinoza for their assistance in preparing this report and for their tireless work for the association.

Finally, I thank the University of Pittsburgh for hosting the main ASEEES office and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign for hosting the Slavic Review editorial office. We would not be able to do our work without the support these universities provide.
Decolonization in Focus

The Russian war in Ukraine has had innumerable impacts, from personal to political, local, national, and global. One of the many sea changes wrought by the war has been the reckoning within East European & Eurasian Studies over the outsized role Russia has played and continues to play in the field and what could and should be done about it. The invited panelists in this series will consider the relationships of power that have long dominated the region, how they have impacted the field of study, and what, if anything, could and should be done about it. The series will have six virtual panels featuring speakers from various disciplines and institutions. Panelists and participants will be encouraged to consider why decolonizing East European & Eurasian Studies matters, how to implement concrete change in teaching, and how to conceive of the future of expertise within the field.

For further information on the sessions and the bios of all speakers, please follow the registration links for each session.

Sponsorship

This series was developed and executed by the Center for Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies at the University of Pittsburgh and the Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies at Harvard University, with support from the Association for Slavic, East European & Eurasian Studies.

The following centers provided additional financial support:

Center for East European and Russian/Eurasian Studies, University of Chicago
Center for Russia, East Europe, and Central Asia, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Center for Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies, University of Kansas
Center for Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies, University of Michigan
Center for Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies, University of Texas at Austin
Center for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies, Ohio State University
Center for Slavic, Eurasian and East European Studies, UNC-Chapel Hill
Inner Asian and Uralic National Resource Center, Indiana University, Bloomington
Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies, University of California, Berkeley
Robert F. Byrnes Russian and East European Institute, Indiana University, Bloomington

Panel I: Decolonization: Why Does It Matter?
Friday, February 3, 2023, 12 –1:30 pm EST
Moderator: **Tamar Shirinian**, Assistant Professor, U of Tennessee
Speakers: **Epp Anns**, Lecturer, CSEEES, Ohio State U
**Svitlana Biedariev**, Art Historian, Curator, and Artist, The Ibero-American University (Mexico) / the Kyiv School of Economics (Ukraine)
**Marina Mogilner**, Associate Professor of History, U of Illinois at Chicago

Panel II: Discourse and Decolonization: Perspectives from Outside the Anglophone Academy
Friday, February 10, 2023, 12 –1:30 pm EST
Moderator: **Vitaly Chernetsky**, Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures, U of Kansas, President-Elect ASEEES
Speakers: **Katarzyna Górák-Sosnowska**, Associate Professor of Economics, U of Warsaw (Poland)
**Botakoz Kassymbekova**, Assistant Professor of History, University of Basel (Switzerland)
**Iryna Sklokinia**, Historian and Researcher, Lviv Center for Urban History (Ukraine)

Panel III: Emerging Scholars on the State of the Field, Activism, and Advocacy
Friday, February 24, 2023, 12 –1:30 pm EST
Moderator: **Jessica Pisano**, Associate Professor, The New School for Social Research and Eugene Lang College
Speakers: **Amanda Zadorian**, Visiting Assistant Professor of Politics, Oberlin College
**Mariia Shynkarenko**, Ph.D. Candidate, New School for Social Research
**Karolina Koziura**, Ph.D. Candidate, New School for Social Research

Panel IV: Decolonization: Impact Beyond the Ivory Tower?
Friday, March 3, 2023, 12 –1:30 pm EST
Moderator: **Douglas Rogers**, Professor and Chair of Anthropology, Yale U
Speakers: **Anna Arays**, Librarian for Slavic and East European Studies, Yale U
**Fatima Tlis**, Journalist, Voice of America
**Erica Marat**, Associate Professor and Chair, Regional and Analytical Studies Department, National Defense U

Panel V: Syllabus Design and Critical Pedagogies in the Classroom: How Do We Teach Differently?
Friday, March 17, 2023, 12 –1:30 pm EST
Moderator: **Caress Schenk**, Associate Professor of Political Science, Nazarbayev U (Kazakhstan)
Speakers: **Shoshana Keller**, Chair and William R. Kenan Jr. Professor of History, Director of Russian Studies, Hamilton College
**Irina Roldugina**, UCIS Postdoctoral Fellow, U of Pittsburgh
**Louis Porter**, Assistant Professor of History, Texas State U

Panel VI: The Future of SEEES Expertise: How Can We Anticipate Tomorrow’s Differences?
Friday, March 31, 2023, 12 –1:30 pm EST
Moderator: **Juliet Johnson**, Professor of Political Science, McGill U (Canada), President ASEEES
Speakers: **Ilya Gerasimov**, Executive Director, Ab Imperio Quarterly, U of Illinois at Chicago
**Ararat Osipian**, Founding Fellow, New University in Exile Consortium, New York
**Serhy Yekelchyk**, Professor of Germanic and Slavic Studies, U of Victoria (Canada)
2023 ASEEES Board of Directors and Committee Assignments

2023 ASEEES Board of Directors

Executive Committee
Juliet Johnson, McGill U - President
Vitaly Chernetsky, U of Kansas - President-Elect/Vice President
Joan Neuberger, U of Texas at Austin - Immediate Past President
Christine Worobec, Northern Illinois U - Treasurer
Kimberly Zarecor, Iowa State U - Member-at-Large
Harriet Murav, U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign - Editor, Slavic Review
Lynda Park, U of Pittsburgh – ASEEES Executive Director (ex officio)
Anna Arays, Yale U - CLIR representative
Michael Bernhard, U of Florida - APSA representative
Cynthia Buckley, U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign - Sociology representative
Theodora Dragostinova, Ohio State U - Member-at-large
Karen Evans-Romaine, U of Wisconsin, Madison - AATSEEL representative
Kristen Ghodseee, U of Pennsylvania - Member-at-large
Krista Goff, U of Miami - AHA representative
Amanda Gregg, Middlebury College - Economics representative
Zachary Hicks, UC Berkeley - Graduate student representative
Edward Holland, U of Arkansas - AAG representative
Andrew Janco, U of Pennsylvania - Member-at-large
Neringa Klumbyte, Miami U of Ohio - AAA representative
Sharon Kowalsky, Texas A&M U-Commerce - Council of Regional Affiliates representative
Sunnie Rucker-Chang, Ohio State U - Member-at-large
Alison Smith, U of Toronto - Member-at-large
Alexandra Vacroux, Harvard U - Council of Institutional Members representative

2023 ASEEES Committees

Nominating Committee
Joan Neuberger, U of Texas at Austin, Chair
Amelia Glaser, UC San Diego
Vera Kuklina, George Washington U

Committee on Academic Freedom and Advocacy
Jan Kubik, Rutgers: The State U of New Jersey/U College London (UK), 2022-2024, Chair
Rachel Applebaum, Tufts U, 2023-2025
Ian Campbell, UC Davis, 2022-2023
Barbara Henry, U of Washington, 2022-2024
Eileen Kane, Connecticut College, 2023-2025
Colleen Lucey, U of Arizona, 2021-2023
Jeff Sahadeo, Carleton U (Canada), 2021-2023
Valeria Sobol, U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2023-2025

Committee on Mentoring
Sunnie Rucker-Chang, U of Cincinnati, 2021-2023, Chair
Molly Blasing, U of Kentucky, 2023-2025
Kiril Tomoff, UC Riverside, 2023-2025

Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession
Anne Eakin Moss, Johns Hopkins U, 2021-2023, Chair
Sara Dickinson, University of Genoa, 2023-2025 (ex-officio as AWSS president)
Leah Valtin-Erwin, Indiana U Bloomington, 2022-2023 (graduate student representative)

Communications Advisory Committee
Edith Clowes, U of Virginia, 2022-2024, Chair
Zachary Hick, UC Berkeley, 2023-2024 (Graduate Student Rep)
Nathaniel Knight, Seton Hall U, 2022-2024
Joe Lenkart, U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2021-2023
Robert Niebuhr, Arizona State U, 2021-2023

Committee for the Advocacy of Diversity and Inclusion
Zsuzsanna Magdo, U of Pittsburgh, 2018-2023, Chair
Vince Bohlinger, Rhode Island College, 2023-2025
Anita Kurimay, Bryn Mawr College, 2021-2023
Louis Porter, Texas State U, 2022-2024
Kimberly St. Julian-Varnon, U of Pennsylvania, 2021-2023

CLIR Executive Council
Anna Arays, Yale U, Executive Council Chair, 2023-2026
Olga Makarova, U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign - Member-at-Large, 2023-2026
Kirill Tolpygo, UNC at Chapel Hill - The Slavic and East European Materials Project Chair, 2022-2024
Janice Pilch, Rutgers University - Subcommittee on Copyright Issues Chair, 2023-2026
Liladhar Pendse, UB Berkeley - Subcommittee on Collection Development Chair, 2023-2026
Brendan Niebuurt, U of Michigan - Subcommittee on Education and Access Chair, 2023-2026
Jon Giulian, U of Kansas, website administrator

Investment Sub-Committee of the Executive Committee
Christine Worobec, Northern Illinois U, 2021-2023, Chair
Juliet Johnson, McGill U (Canada), 2018-2023
Iikka Korhonen, Bank of Finland, 2023-2025

Committee on Environmental Sustainability
José Vergara, Bryn Mawr College, 2023-2025, Chair
Elizabeth Plantan, Stetson U, 2023-2025
Elana Resnick, UCSB, 2023-2025 (break AY 2023-4)

Slavic Review Committee
Mark Steinberg, U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2020-2023, Chair
Michael Bernhard, U of Florida, 2020-2023
Angela Cannon, Library of Congress, 2020-2023
Sibelan Forrester, Swarthmore College, 2020-2023

Code of Conduct Committee
Janet Johnson, CUNY Brooklyn College, 2022-2024, Chair
Eric Naiman, UC Berkeley, 2022-2026
Alison Smith, U of Toronto (Canada), 2022-2026

Committee on Careers Beyond Academia
Elana Jakel, US Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2021-2023, Chair
Daniel Peris, Federated Investors, 2018-2023
Shanna Penn, Taube Philanthropies, 2021-2023
Terrell Starr, Journalist/Entrepreneur, 2022-2024
Steven Stoltenberg, US Department of State (retired), 2021-2023
2023 Prize Committees

**Distinguished Contributions Award Committee**
Choi Chatterjee, California State U, Los Angeles, 2021-2023, Chair
Raquel Greene, Grinnell College, 2023-2025
Kate Holland, U of Toronto (Canada), 2022-2024
Morgan Liu, Ohio State U, 2023-2025
Valerie Sperling, Clark U, 2022-2024

**Wayne S. Vucinich Book Prize Committee**
Margaret Beissinger, Princeton U, 2022-2023, Chair
Lilya Kaganovsky, UCLA, 2023-2024
Steve Nafziger, Williams College, 2022-2023
Robert Nemes, Colgate U, 2023-2024

**Davis Center Book Prize Committee**
Jeffrey Kopstein, UC Irvine, 2020-2023, Chair
Fabio Mattioli, U Melbourne (Australia), 2023-2025
Gulnaz Sharafutdinova, Kings College London (UK), 2023-2024

**USC Book Prize Committee**
Ana Hedberg Olenina, Arizona State U, 2022-2023, Chair
Martha Kelly, U of Missouri, 2022-2024
Maria Taroutina, NYU Singapore, 2023-2025

**Reginald Zelnik Book Prize Committee**
Ronald Suny, U of Michigan, 2021-2023, Chair
Barbara Engel, U of Colorado, 2021-2023
Aaron Retish, Wayne State U, 2022-2024

**W. Bruce Lincoln Book Prize Committee**
David Brandenberger, U of Richmond, 2021-2023, Chair
Andy Bruno, Northern Illinois U, 2022-2024
Krista Goff, U of Miami, 2022-2024

**Marshall Shulman Book Prize Committee**
Eldor Méhilli, CUNY Hunter College, 2022-2024, Chair
Lorenz Luthi, McGill U (Canada), 2023-2025
Jelena Subotic, Georgia State U, 2021-2023

**Ed A Hewett Book Prize Committee**
Cynthia Buckley, U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2022-2024, Chair
Timothy Frye, Columbia U, 2022-2024

**Barbara Jelavich Book Prize Committee**
Theodora Dragostinova, Ohio State U, 2021, 2023-24, Chair
Emily Greble, Vanderbilt U, 2023-2025
Nicholas Novosel, US Department of the Army, 2022-2024

**Kulczycki Book Prize Committee**
Benjamin Paloff, U of Michigan, 2021-2023, Chair
Kathryn Ciancia, U of Wisconsin-Madison, 2022-2023
Anna Grzymala-Busse, Stanford U, 2023-2025

**Pritsak Book Prize Committee**
Steve Seegel, U of Texas at Austin, 2021-2023, Chair
Margarita Balmaceda, Harvard U/Seton Hall U, 2022-2024
Yuliya Ilichuk, Stanford U, 2023-2025

**Holmgren Graduate Student Essay Prize Committee**
Andrea Lanoux, Connecticut College, 2021-2023, Chair
Adeeb Khalid, Carleton College, 2023-2025
Maria Popova, McGill U (Canada), 2022-2024

**Tucker/Cohen Dissertation Prize**
Alexis Peri, Boston U, 2022-2024, Chair
Melissa Chakars, St. Joseph’s U, 2023-2025
Kathleen Smith, Georgetown U, 2022-2024

2023 Grant & Fellowship Committees

**ASEEES Dissertation Grant Committee**
Natalia Aleksiu, U of Florida, 2021-2023, Chair
Amy Bryzgel, Northeastern U, 2023-2025
Colleen Moore, James Madison U, 2023-2025

**Cohen-Tucker Dissertation Fellowship Selection Committee**
Galya Diment, U of Washington, 2022-2024, Chair
Ed Cohn, Grinnell College, 2023-2025
Lisa Kirschenbaum, West Chester U, 2023-2025

**Convention Opportunity Travel Grant and Diversity and Inclusion Travel Grant Committee**
Lenny Urena Valerio, U of New Mexico, 2021-2023, Chair
Matthew Romaniello, Weber State U, 2022-2024
Kenneth Yin, LaGuardia Community College (CUNY), 2023-2025

**Graduate Student Travel Grant Committee**
Brian LaPierre, U of Southern Mississippi, 2020-2023, Chair
Kathleen Manukyan, U of Pittsburgh, 2023-2025
Andrea Rusnock, Indiana U South Bend, 2022-2024

**First Book Subvention Committee**
Paul Hanebrink, Rutgers, 2021-2023, Chair
Molly Brunson, Yale U, 2023-2025
Brigid O’Keeffe, Brooklyn College, 2022-2024
Gwen Walker, U of Wisconsin, 2021-2023 (non-voting member)

**Regional Scholar Travel Grant Committee**
Janine Holc, Loyola U Maryland, 2022-2024, Chair
Lauren McCarthy, Carleton College, 2023-2024
Jan Muskamp, U of Pittsburgh, 2021-2023
Affiliate Prizes
ASEEES Congratulates the 2022 Affiliate Group Prize Winners

Association for Women in Slavic Studies

2022 Outstanding Achievement Award
Dr. Joanna Regulska. Vice Provost and Dean, Global Affairs Professor, Gender, Sexuality and Women’s Studies, University of California, Davis And Professor Emerita, Department of Women’s and Gender Studies and Department of Geography, Rutgers University

Heldt prize for best book by a woman-identifying scholar in any area of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies
• Winner: Jadwiga Biskupska. Survivors: Warsaw under the Nazi Occupation. Cambridge University Press, 2022
• Honorable Mention: Eliza Ablovatski. Revolution and Political Violence in Central Europe: The Deluge of 1919. Cambridge University Press, 2021

Mary Zirin Prize for Independent Scholars
Dr. Sonja Simonyi is being recognized for the breadth and the excellence of her research on under-researched topics within Eastern European cultural studies.

Patricia Herlihy Graduate Research Award
Ellia Rossman, a Ph.D. Candidate at University College London in the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, “How to be a Soviet Girl: Female Adolescence in the USSR after the Second World War (1946-1991).”

AWSS Graduate Essay Prize
McKenna Elizabeth Marko, University of Michigan, “Mediating Gendered Landscapes of Pain and Trauma: Women’s Testimonies from Goli otok and Sveti Grgur.”

Central Eurasian Studies Association

Book Award in Social Sciences

Book Award in History & the Humanities

Czechoslovak Studies Association

Stanley Z. Pech Prize (Articles published between 2020-2021)
Michael W. Dean, Pierce College, “Žan Kudla Is My Name, It Brings Me Wealth and Fame! The Fortunes of a Barroom Song Tradition between Gilded Age Chicago and Fin-de-Siècle Prague,” Kosmas, n.s. 3, no. 11 (2021).

CSA Book Prize

Early Slav Studies Association

Early Slav Studies Association Article Prize
• Honorable Mention: Tomasz Grusiecki. “Close Others: Poles in the Visual Imaginary of Early Modern Amsterdam”

Eighteenth-Century Russian Studies Association

Marc Raeff Book Prize

Hungarian Studies Association

Mark Pittaway Article Prize

The Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences of America

Ludwik Krzyzanowski Polish Review Best Article Award

Bronisław Malinowski Social Sciences Award
Agnieszka Graff, University of Warsaw, and Elżbieta Korolczuk, Södertörn University (Stockholm) and University of Warsaw, Anti-Gender Politics in the Populist Moment (Routledge, 2021).

Susanne Lotarski Distinguished Achievement Award
• Winner: Irena Grudzińska Gross, Polish Academy of Sciences
• Winner: Madeline G. Levine, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Rachel Feldhay Brenner Award in Polish-Jewish Studies

Waclaw Lednicki Award in the Humanities
• Winner: Katarzyna Bartoszynska, Jagiellonian University, Family, Taboo and Communism in Poland, 1956-1989 (Peter Lang, 2021).

Oskar Halecki Polish History Award

Affiliate Awards cont.
Affiliate Awards cont.

Slovak Studies Association

Best Book Prize


Society for Romanian Studies

Keith Hitchins Dissertation Prize

- Winner: Rucsandra Pop, “Mihai Pop de la școala sociologică la școala etnologică—o biografie intelectuală,” 2020, Universitatea din București

Graduate Student Essay Prize

- Winner: Leah Valtin-Erwin, PhD Candidate, History, Indiana University Bloomington, “Professional Customers: German Cash & Carry Wholesale in Romania (1996-1999).”
- Honorable Mention: Irina Nicorici, PhD student, Sociology, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, “The Curious Case of Soviet Citizenship for Sale.”

The Cohen-Tucker Dissertation Completion Fellowships, with maximum stipends of $25,000, are available for students in any discipline whose dissertation topics are within 19th-early 21st century Russian historical studies. Please see the website for full eligibility requirements.

New Title VIII Senior Scholar Grant

- For assistant, associate, and adjunct faculty with 5+ years of experience.
- $3,500 per month stipend and resources up to 6 months.
- Applicants must be U.S citizens.

Title VIII Research Grant

- For post-doctoral academic participants in the early stages of their career.
- $3,500 per month stipend and resources for 3-9 months.
- Applicants must be U.S citizens.

Title VIII Summer Grant

- MA or higher required.
- $7,000 stipend and resources available for 2 months.
- Applicants must be U.S citizens.
Member News

Vladimir Agenosov’s book, Resurrected from non-existence. Anthology of DP Writers and the Second Emigration, was published by Aletheya, 2022.

Jonathan Brunstedt’s book, The Soviet Myth of World War II: Patriotic Memory and the Russian Question in the USSR, was chosen by Foreign Affairs magazine as one of the “Best Books of 2022.”

Emily Channell-Justice’s book, Without the State: Self-Organization and Political Activism in Ukraine, was published by University of Toronto Press, November 2022.


Jeff Eden’s book, God Save the USSR: Soviet Muslims and the Second World War, was chosen by Foreign Affairs magazine as one of the “Best Books of 2022.”

Alyssa D. Gillespie received a 2022 NEA Translation Fellowship for her work on her collection of Marina Tsvetaeva’s verse, to be published in the Russian Library series of Columbia University Press.

Emily Greble was promoted to professor at Vanderbilt University.

Dilnoza Khasilova received an international volunteer service award from NAFSA: Association of International Educators.


Georg B. Michels was awarded the Hans Rosenberg Book Prize by the Central European History Society for his monograph, The Habsburg Empire Under Siege: Ottoman Expansion and Hungarian Revolt in the Age of Grand Vizier Ahmed Köprülü (1661–76), published by McGill-Queens University Press, 2021.


Agnieszka Mrozik’s book on Polish communist women, literature and women’s emancipation in postwar Poland, Architektki PRL-u. Komunistki, literatura i emancypacja kobiet w powojennej Polsce, was published by Wydawnictwo IBL PAN, 2022.

Announcing the digitization of the bi-lingual quarterly publication devoted to Polish Highlander culture in Poland and America and to the Góral (highlander) diaspora in America, co-edited by Dr. Thaddeus V. Gromada and Janina Gromada Kedron. (published by Tatra Eagle Press: http://MBC.Malopolska.pl.)

For more information, please contact Dr. Thaddeus V. Gromada: thadgromada@gmail.com.