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On the electoral map, Zelensky led in all regions of Ukraine where voting could take place, nationwide television had made Zelensky famous. In 2003 he started his television show, Vechnyi Kvartal (Evening Channel), which has produced television programs, films, and live shows for not just Ukraine, but the post-Soviet sphere and Eastern Europe. Their television comedy show, Svaty (The In-laws), has completed six seasons, had the highest ratings for three of them in Ukraine. In 2012-14, the Monte Carlo Television Festival considered it among the top three comedy series viewed worldwide, next to The Big Bang Theory and Desperate Housewives.4

The show that gave Zelensky the most political clout was the television series Sluga Naroda (Servant of the People), which premiered on Ukrainian television in 2015. Servant of the People is about a struggling high school history teacher in provincial Ukraine who, frustrated with his country’s political system, delivers an impromptu speech against corruption that a student films in class. The student’s video goes viral on YouTube and gets Zelensky’s character, Vasyl Holoborodko, elected president. Servant of the People is about more than just a novice president battling corruption. The series portrays ordinary Ukrainian citizens complicit in this culture of corruption, from housewives urging their husbands to accept bribes so that they can buy fur coats to neighbors who abuse one another yet will go out of their way to please government ministers.5

Zelensky Hysteria

At first it looked like Zelensky had no chance of winning. Out of 40 candidates for president, Zelensky’s campaign strategy was bizarre. As he began his campaign in January 2019, Zelensky, going by the brand name of “Ze,” said idea crowdsourcing and popular referendums would determine his political program.6 Zelensky held few live political rallies. He did not engage in any ambitious billboard campaign. Instead, he performed with his comedy team. His campaign team used the social networks and YouTube to broadcast campaign messages. The television network hosting Zelensky’s shows, 1+1, gave Zelensky a venue for appearing as a president on Servant of the People, narrating a documentary on the life of Ronald Reagan (another actor who became a president), and greeting viewers with the New Year at midnight, during a spot traditionally reserved for the President of Ukraine.

Due to his amorphous campaign rhetoric and his past comedy acts, Zelensky seemed like a clown, someone else’s puppet. One suspected puppet master was Ihor Kolomoisky, a prominent oligarch who supported the Euromaidan protests and, after Russia’s military intervention, funded volunteer battalions to defend Ukraine. While this led to him becoming governor of the Dnipropetrovsk Region in Ukraine’s southeast in 2014, his relations with President Poroshenko soured, and he was out of office the next year. The owner of 1+1, Privatbank, and other assets, Kolomoisky allegedly embezzled some $5 billion from Privatbank, causing the Poroshenko administration to nationalize the bank in 2016. Kolomoisky left Ukraine and claimed that the forced nationalization of his bank was illegal. Kolomoisky gave Zelensky not only air time through the 1+1 channel, but also provided security and logistical support to Zelensky’s campaign team. Andriy Bohdan, Kolomoisky’s personal lawyer, became Zelensky’s legal counsel.7

Russian president Vladimir Putin became Zelensky’s second suspected puppet master, largely through a subtle smear campaign. Euromaidan Press claimed that Zelensky’s campaign program bore an eerie likeness to that of the Russian Liberal Democratic Party of Vladimir Zhirinovsky. A website known for intimidating journalists and political opponents, Myrotvorets’ (Peacemaker) – called simply a “non-governmental organization” by some media – claimed that it had intercepted emails proving that a former pro-Russian Donbas militant, owner of a crypto-currency trading platform, had organized the transfer of cash from Russia’s FSB to the Zelensky campaign. Euromaidan Press reported this news, while being unable to verify the information completely.8 Yet at least some suggested, rightly, that this kind of Russian support was negligible, given the enormous resources Kolomoisky and his 1+1 television channel provided.9

Still, experts warned that Zelensky’s victory would doom Ukraine because Putin would take advantage of his lack of political experience. Alexander Motyl claimed that Servant of the People episodes suggested Zelensky was “dangerously pro-Russian.” He argued that Zelensky’s show treats Ukrainian nationalists, not Russia, as the main threat to the country. Zelensky, if elected, may make all kinds...
of concessions to Putin, including ceding the country’s sovereignty. Such experts stressed the importance of Poroshenko winning reelection. Adrian Karatnycky of the Atlantic Council said this would protect Ukraine from Russian interference running rampant during the elections, and would keep it safe from further Russian military aggression. Quoting Ukrainian historian and public intellectual Yaroslav Hrytsak, Karatnycky concluded that it was just a matter of time before Ukraine’s educated elite backed Poroshenko and thus guaranteed his victory at the polls. “The main decision for liberals today is whether to support Poroshenko in the first round or wait until the second.”

Day of Reckoning

Hrytsak’s liberals did not determine the outcome of the presidential race. Zelensky’s electoral victory was a direct indictment of them and the view of Ukraine that they and their Western partners shared. Educated elites most active in the Euromaidan protests of 2013-14 tied that revolution’s fortunes to the Poroshenko presidency. Poroshenko himself played an active role in supporting the protests, through his television channel, Channel 5, and through his own intervention in key events that led to the toppling of President Viktor Yanukovych in February 2014. The Poroshenko presidency, despite attempted reforms, ushered in yet another cycle of systemic corruption. Rather than breaking with a system of bribes, graft, and embezzlement at all levels of state administration, it perpetuated it. A 2018 Gallup poll found 91 percent of Ukrainians claimed government corruption was widespread. Ukraine’s national government was the least trusted in the world (9 percent), far below the median for former Soviet republics (48 percent) and the global average (56 percent). Even the Yanukovych administration, overthrown by protests in February 2014, did not have such a low rating, though admittedly confidence in that government was also extremely weak (no higher than 24 percent). Rather than overcoming the arbitrariness and lawlessness of past regimes, Poroshenko’s encouraged US a “culture of impunity” where crimes remained unpunished or uninvestigated, security organs detained and tortured citizens, and far-right vigilante groups freely intimidated and assaulted their opponents. In late February 2019, investigative journalists claimed the son of one of Poroshenko’s close business partners extorted millions of dollars from the state’s military industries by selling them parts smuggled from Russia at grossly exaggerated prices.

Despite greater openness with the European Union, including visa-free travel, continued economic decline and the Donbas war had ruined people’s standard of living. The value of the hryvnia to the US dollar plummeted from 8 to 27 (as of 2018). In 2015, the average salary of Ukrainians was 190 US dollars a month (a little over 6 US dollars a day). From 2014 to 2017 (before even visa-free travel with EU countries began), over 25 percent of all working age, economically active citizens (those not students, pensioners, mothers on maternity leave, or those disabled and unable to work) left Ukraine for employment abroad. The sharp drop in Ukrainians’ living standards, made worse by austerity, has hardly been the prosperity of the “European dream” shared by Euromaidan activists and their supporters more than five years ago. Ukrainian’s cultural and intellectual establishment, gripped by scrapping about such corruption and economic hardships, chose to side with Poroshenko to the end. Poroshenko’s presidency reinforced myths they shared and perpetuated (sometimes with Western help) about the Euromaidan protests and Ukraine’s war with Russia. The Euromaidan protests were about a civilizational choice. They were a contest of wills between the “tolerant ones” (tolerancy), those who adhered to human rights, rule of law, democracy, and European values, and the “Soviet ones” (sovky), those who blindly followed their post-Soviet leaders and feared change. Marci Shore and Timothy Snyder have been the most fervent Western perpetrators of such myths. The protests represented a “rebirth of metaphysics” for not just Ukraine, but Eastern Europe, where the values of Europe acquired real meaning in acts of resistance on Ukraine’s Independence Square. The Ukraine crisis occupied center stage in a global war for the “truth” and liberal democracy. Such myths transformed those who were indifferent to the Euromaidan protests, who refused to support the protests, or who openly opposed them into people who were culturally, intellectually, and even spiritually lacking. This was especially true for residents of the Donbas region, who, according to Hrytsak, were allegedly too skeptical, too materialist, and too spiritually deprived to appreciate the altruism of the Euromaidan protesters. Such myths ignored the fact that the Euromaidan protests never gained support from half of the country – mostly residents of the east and south – and that the violence that eventually brought down the Yanukovych regime only polarized and confined political public opinion further. On the threat of Russian military aggression ensured national unity.

As it failed to produce reforms that benefited ordinary citizens, the Poroshenko administration used the threat of Russian military aggression, and nationalist tropes, to bolster Poroshenko’s reelection bid. “Army, Language, Faith” became his campaign slogan. Poroshenko guaranteed strong defense against Russian military aggression. When Russian naval forces seized three Ukrainian naval vessels and 24 sailors in November 2018 and closed the Sea of Azov off to Ukrainian shipping, Poroshenko with Parliament’s approval temporarily imposed martial law in 10 regions along Ukraine’s east and south, claiming that Russian forces threatened to seize those territories as well. The move was viewed as politically motivated, given that nearly all of those regions were least supportive of Poroshenko’s presidency. In early January 2019, the Poroshenko administration succeeded in obtaining independent status for the Orthodox Church in Ukraine, removing it from the control of the Moscow Patriarchate. Poroshenko later went on a tour across Ukraine with the document, known as the Tomos, claiming that Ukraine had achieved spiritual independence from the Russian world at last. Poroshenko voiced support for a law strengthening the use of the Ukrainian language in education and government. Parliament passed the law shortly after Poroshenko’s electoral defeat.

Ukrainian cultural and intellectual figures lined up behind Poroshenko. At a late January 2019 rally in the Kyiv International Exposition Center, writers, actors, musicians, and politicians joined Poroshenko to express their support for his platform. They claimed that Zelensky, former Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko, and other rival candidates threatened to undermine Ukraine with empty populist rhetoric, authoritarianism and a return to the days of Yanukovych’s “pro-Russian” regime. The rally offered an even more stark slogan on display: “Either Poroshenko or Putin,” with portraits of the two leaders facing one another. Once it became clear that Poroshenko was most likely to lose to Zelensky in the first round and even in the second, Ukrainian intellectuals warned that a Zelensky victory would be a disaster for Ukraine. As many as 26 representatives of the Ukrainian intelligentsia—mostly writers, academics, and former Soviet dissidents—claimed Zelensky’s election would make a mockery of Ukraine. Western champions of Ukraine and the Euromaidan protests joined in the jeremiads against a possible Zelensky win. Bernard-Henri Lévy, who had spoken to the Maidan in early February 2014 and claimed that the Europe was he proud of stood before him, warned a Kyiv audience in late March 2019 that Zelensky was a “leap into the unknown.”

Fear and Loathing of the 25 (Or Less) Percent

The jeremiads did little more than echo among the faithful. When the results of the first, and then the second, rounds of voting came in, intellectuals and public figures who supported the Euromaidan were furious. They took out their anger against the vast majority who had voted for Zelensky.

Volodymyr Viatroych, director of the Ukrainian Institute of National Memory, whose work included the passing of controversial laws in 2015 banning Communist symbols and commemorating controversial nationalist figures who had collaborated with Nazi Germany, highlighted the dangers of “the majority” to his readers on Facebook one week before the second round of the elections. “The majority does not read books,” he wrote April 14, 2019. “The majority does not know a single foreign language. The majority has not seen the world not just beyond Ukraine, but even beyond their own televisions. The majority did not come
to the Maidans [public protests in 2004 and 2013-14], they did not stop the 'Russian Spring' in the south and east, did not fight at the front, did not form volunteer groups to help soldiers." He claimed that "the majority" quickly changes its loyalties, and that it was "the majority that defined the outcome". He compared Zelensky's victory to a popular uprising like that of the Yellow Vests in France, only within the legal system, voting against such issues as the war in Donbas (namely politicians' exploitation of that war to benefit themselves), corruption, and the divisive nationalism that Poroshenko had turned to in order to maintain popular support. Still, as Cherepanyn admitted, what had united the 73 percent of Ukraine's voters behind Zelensky was not voting for Zelensky but voting against something.

While Zelensky's victory bridged regional divides, such divisions remain highly salient for the most important problems facing Ukraine. One survey by the Kyiv International Institute of Sociology indicates that in February 2019, around 62-65 percent of residents of Ukraine's west and center said that Russia bore responsibility for starting the war in Donbas, 10-12.5 percent said Ukraine was responsible, and 25 percent could not answer the question. In contrast, in Ukraine's south, as many as 47 percent could not answer the question, while 23 percent blamed Ukraine and only 30 percent blamed Russia. In the east, the contrast with the west and center was even starker. Most, a total of 55 percent, could not answer the question, while 31 percent blamed Ukraine and only 14.5 percent said Russia was responsible for starting the war.

Zelensky's presidential win thus is no laughing matter for either his opponents or his supporters. Ukraine remains in dire economic straits. The corrupt system in Servant of the People pervades Ukrainian society and involves ordinary people who, regardless of their individual qualities, matter in any representative democracy that claims to live by its ideals. Russia remains a military threat, though far from all Ukrainians agree who is to blame for the war it continues to direct and support in the Donbas region. The gulf between educated elites and "the majority" bears resemblance to the Russian Empire of 1905-1917, where, Leopold Haimson wrote long ago, dual polarization between educated elites ("obschestvennost") and the state and between educated elites and the masses threatened to topple the entire system. While this latest drama in Ukraine's history could end as comedy, farce, or tragedy, it is clear that "the people" deserve better treatment than that given to it by the pundits, the experts, and some scholars over the past five years.

William Jay Risch, Associate Professor of History, Georgia College, is the author of The Ukrainian West: Culture and the Fate of Empire in Soviet Lviv (Harvard University Press, 2011) and of the forthcoming One Step from Madness: Power and Disillusionment in Ukraine's Euromaidan Revolution.
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WAR ON THE ACADEMY: The Hungarian Government’s Crackdown on Research Freedom

Stefano Bottoni
HUNGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

For years now, the nationalist-conservative Hungarian government led by Viktor Orbán has pursued a repressive grip on higher education, with the ultimate goal of exercising political control over research. Since 2014, a chancellor has supervised public universities. This position is only superficially similar to that of the administrative director. In fact, the chancellor—usually a scholar linked to the governing party—oversaw expenditure, recruitment, and the general internal life of the university. This authority has paved the way for attacks against the Central European University (CEU).

An amendment to the higher education law issued in March 2017 forced foreign universities operating in Hungary to open a campus also in their country of origin. Founded by businessman George Soros in 1991, the CEU suddenly found itself in a legal limbo as an institution considered politically insidious. In December 2018, after a year and a half of futile negotiations with the Hungarian government, CEU President Michael Ignatieff announced the transfer of all graduate programs accredited in the United States from Budapest to New York.

This rude awakening began during the electoral campaign that led to the third consecutive triumph of Prime Minister Orbán on April 8, 2018. In January the weekly Figyelő (“The Observer”), owned at that time by prominent Fidesz-ideologue and historian Mária Schmidt, began to publish defamatory articles that listed individual researchers or entire research institutes as politically hostile, useless, or even “harmful” to society. Meanwhile, the government developed a network of research institutes, parallel to those of the Academy, particularly in the humanities. For instance, the “Veritas” historical institute (founded in 2014) is a government entity that employs around thirty researchers engaged in the period between the creation of the Dual Monarchy in 1867 and the end of the Second World War. In the same year, the National Memory Commission (“Emlékezet Bizottság”) was established to promote an official narrative and research agenda for the period 1945-1990. The committee is made up of five members, strictly politically nominated, supervising a scientific body of about twenty researchers.

Another institute commissioned by the government in 2014, Research Institute and Archives for the History of Regime Change (“Rendszerváltás Történetét Kutató Intézet”), researches the transition of 1989-90. These institutions, instrumental to political power and generously financed by the state budget, have been joined over the years by various think tanks in fields such as economics, geopolitics and migration, including the government-backed (fin de siècle) Századvég Foundation—a powerful machine of policy-making and propaganda that moves hundreds of millions of euros.

The Hungarian Academy of Sciences was founded in 1825 on the initiative of Count István Széchenyi to promote the Hungarian language and culture. Until the Second World War, this body functioned as an exclusive club for established scholars and in the interwar period openly supported Admiral Horthy, excluding scholars of Jewish origin. In 1948-49, the Sovietization of the country made a radical change to the “parlor” of Hungarian science. The purge of intellectuals was accompanied by a rigid separation of roles, on the Soviet model, between higher education and academic research. In the early 1950s, the Academy became, on the structural level, a complex multi-level organization (academics-researchers-members of consultative body) subject to strict ideological control. The Academy and its research institutes carved out a niche of freedom in the “soft” but enveloping dictatorship of the 1970s and 1980s. The institutes of philosophy, history, sociology, and world economy employed dozens of internationally renowned scholars who, though barred from teaching in universities, were allowed to conduct their own research and publish in obscure journals.

The entry of the Soros Foundation in Hungary, allowed by the authorities through a memorandum of understanding with the Hungarian Academy of Sciences signed in 1984, marked the end of the public monopoly of the Communist state on research funding and scientific publications. In the following ten years, the Foundation sent 50 million dollars to Hungary. In addition to funding hundreds of economists, sociologists, and writers, it distributed 475 photocopiers to universities and research centers throughout Hungary. The state authorities retained influence over the recipients of scholarships and research projects granted in heavy currency, but, thanks to the Soros Foundation, the Academy of Sciences carved out a space of autonomy previously unthinkable.

After the post-Communist transition, the Academy chose the path of a gradual renewal, eschewing purges or abjurations of the Communist past. A law approved in 1994 secured freedom of public research through

in 15 centers. Besides this, 16,000 persons in possession of a doctorate or equivalent degree participate in the consultative body that regulates Hungarian scientific life. Having labored for years under the illusion of being a national symbol rooted in the social fabric and national history of Hungary, they too have now become a target like the CEU.

...
the Academy's full managerial and financial autonomy. Under the chairmanship of two historians, the conservative Domokos Kosáry and the socialist Ferenc Glatz, the Academy struggled, not without success, to harmonize its traditional "national" profile with the challenges of technological and scientific globalization of knowledge. In 2011-12, a comprehensive reform consolidated the network of research institutes into 15 administrative and scientific macro-units, the research centers. One for humanities, for example, brought together seven previously independent institutes (including that of history) and today employs 440 researchers and administrative staff members. Over the years, the weight of external funding has progressively grown to approximately one third of the budget of the research institutes.

Despite these changes, the Minister of Innovation and Technology, the engineer and academican László Palkovics argues that the public research system in Hungary is still affected by the legacy of the Soviet system. Palkovics believes that the Academy enjoys excessive "freedom," while research in the humanities, a supposed luxury for a small country of modest wealth, should be replaced by technological innovation in support of "national" profile with the challenges of technological change and the uncertain "temporarily" (until March 31, the last term of the "general assessment" of academic efficiency) the sums previously allocated in the budget law. To the institutions. The Academy can therefore provide only the basic salary of researchers and the administrative staff. A month and a half after the introduction of this punitive measure, numerous laboratory activities have been suspended, the editorial projects of 2019 have stalled, and applications to European funds are impossible due to the uncertainty regarding the availability of overheads. According to the legal department of the Academy, Palkovics argued in vain not only the 1994 law on the functioning of the Academy but also its own budget law. To remedy the problem, Minister Palkovics announced on January 31 a "public tender" in which each research center must present a proposal of research activities planned until December 31, 2019. All this in 5,500 characters, spaces and financial tables included, by February 28, 2019. The Ministry suggested "culture" and "family" macro-sectors as research topics for the humanities and social sciences. As you can guess, the Academy was in fact forced to participate, to earn its own budget, in a scientific faire. Furthermore, the "tender" for the approximately 85 million euros available, which is more or less equivalent to the "old" budget, is open to other competitors such as universities, public institutions, but also the previously mentioned alternative think tanks. However, unlike the Academy, these other actors have regular financing, while the Academic research centers are in fact private as of January 1, 2019.

At the time of writing, the future of the Academy of Sciences is completely uncertain. The political will to punish the academic world, considered insufficiently aligned, has stimulated an unprecedented bottom-up reaction. The thousands of researchers (with an average age of just 41 years) who represent the operating arm, though often forgotten, of the Academy of Sciences, feel betrayed by their superiors have self-organized, joining the trade unions for the first time in decades and forming a civil initiative called the "Academy Staff Forum."

On February 12, 2019, the Forum organized the first protest demonstration ever carried out by the Academy's employees in downtown Budapest, attended by over 3,000 people: not only scholars but also ordinary citizens indignantly over the insult to the most ancient and prestigious national academic institution. That same day, the Academy Bureau, at the end of a dramatic meeting, decided - despite pressure from the crowd and the media - to reject the "thematic tender of excellence" proposed by the Ministry if it illegally withholds public funds already allocated for the research institutes. In the Hungarian press, detailed reports on the attempted dismemberment of the current research centers have appeared. Rumors circulate of a gigantic public foundation, the control of which would be entrusted to the government, that will hijack the Academy's research centers. The Ministry's plans include the transformation, scheduled for July 1, 2019, of the Corvinus University of Budapest (formerly "Károli György University"), which specializes in economic sciences and international relations, into a foundation called "Máecenas Universitatis Corvinii." Financed by a share package with a total value of over 1.2 billion euros, all the real estate and securities matrimony of the Corvinus University would come together in this foundation. Minister Palkovics has already outlined the unbundling of the research institutes and their transfer to a new foundation, telling the president of the Academy Lovász, that this is the basic prerequisite for reaching an agreement on research funding not only for 2019 but also for the foreseeable future. Thus, the question of the Academy has acquired the dynamic of power-
opposition. The leading bodies of the Academy, without offering a formal legitimacy to the Workers’ Forum, received the message of the protest, and on February 26, 2019, the Presidency of the Academy of Sciences resolved almost unanimously to refuse to participate without written guarantees from the Ministry.

This gesture of dignity further raises the stakes as it puts the government at a crossroads: opting for a tactical retreat, implicitly recognizing the foolishness of the project, or accelerating the same path to crush the resistance of scholars. The Academy has the financial resources necessary to cover the budget leaks for a few months but no more, and at the moment the government intends to guarantee the payment of salaries only until March 31, 2019. Thousands of researchers are therefore at the mercy of a conflict, now fueled by government propaganda, that the Academy tried to manage in an accommodating way before realizing that the government was aiming, not for a compromise, but for a total victory.

On May 6, 2019, the General Assembly of the Academy of Sciences delivered a series of resolutions stating that the research network should remain under the purview of the Academy, even if the government is delegated substantially more power in their management system than at present. According to General Assembly’s resolution, the Academy set up several conditions for agreeing to the new management system: a start date of January 1, 2020, at the earliest; the exclusive inclusion of institutions currently within the Academy’s research network; the preservation of the independent legal status of current institutions until that date; and the retention of public servant status of Academy’s staff. Finally, the Academy called on the government to allow independent international partners to take an active part in the development of the new research structure.

The government has rejected these demands and seems determined to realize its centralization plans by overthrowing the 1994 Academy Law. The standoff continues, while the Academy’s staff has been living and working for almost one year under existential risk.

The question of the Academy concerns not only scientific policy, but also the freedom of research and expression. The fate of research institutes assumes a national political relevance, while the Academy Presidency is flooded with declarations of solidarity from Hungarian government and especially international partners.

What are the reasons for the government’s war on the Academy of Sciences? We can identify two closely related motivations: struggle for resources and ideological ambition.

The Hungarian government knows that with the next European budget, Budapest will surely lose a significant part of the development funds provided by Brussels: an estimated 6 billion euros between 2021 and 2027. The only significant exception is the funds allocated to research and innovation, several billion euros of which will flow into the country. The forced detachment of research centers from the Academy structure eliminates an autonomous competitive entity and guarantees the implementation of the so-called "vertical of power" on the crony management of this enormous amount of public money.

In any case, the most penalized are the humanities and social sciences sectors: not because of their (low) cost of management but because they still represent an autonomous and critical factor for government policies in fields such as economy, demography, and the politics of the memory. What is at stake is the Hungarian government’s control over the Academy of Sciences, with a series of resolutions stating that the government was aiming, not for a compromise, but for a total victory.

This collection of articles by leading historians analyzes a wide variety of military experiences in Russia’s First World War and to a lesser extent the Russian Civil War. Here the notion of the “front” extends far beyond the lines of trenches and even beyond the army-controlled front-zones to include not just combatants but also closely associated non-combatants such as nurses, military chaplains, front-zone civilian workers, POWs, and disabled veterans. The book’s overarching conclusion is that while Russia’s Great War shared many of the features of WWII in Western Europe, it was also characterized by a host of factors that strongly differentiated the Russian experience of the war from the Western.


Arthur Bullard’s The Russian Pendum­ium (1919) is a personal and political analy­sis of the Russian Revolution, from the Revolution of 1905 through the begin­ning of the Civil War in 1918. Bullard’s experience as an advisor to Colonel E. M. House, Woodrow Wilson’s chief aide, and as a key staffer for the Commis­sion for Public Information in Russia strongly influence his recommenda­tion that the United States avoid mili­tary intervention and engage the new government by providing educational opportunities for its citizens.

Stefana Bottini is a Senior Research Fellow at the Research Center for the Humanities of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He was visiting fellow at the Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung (Potsdam, 2012) and Fellow of Imre Kertész Kolleg (Jena, 2015). He is the author of Lost Awaited West: Eastern Europe since 1944 (Indiana University Press, 2017), and Stalin’s Legacy in Romania: The Hungarian Autonomous Region 1952–1960 (Lexington Books, 2018).

A 64-page / 128-word article on the mass-migration of Hungarian Jews from Hungary to the United States, between the fall of 1949 and the end of January 1951. In 1949, 10,000 Hungarian Jews arrived in the United States, and another 12,000 in 1950. In all, 22,000 Hungarian Jews immigrated to the United States between 1949 and 1951. This flight through the Iron Curtain to West Berlin set the Teneschenring, a massive manhunt by 27,000 East German police and Red Army regulars.

Bohumil Hra­bal, Murder Ballads and Other Leg­ends, trans. Timo­thy West, viii + xiv + 453 p., $19.95.

“Some texts, after I’ve writ­ten them, have woken me up in the night so that I break out in a sweat and can’t sleep.” With this confession, legendary author Bohumil Hrabal concludes this genre-bending collection of stories published at the height of his fame in the 1960s. At the book’s heart is the character of a Czech, an early version of the novella (and Oscar-winning film) Closely Watched Trains. Beautifully illustrated with woodcuts from early modern broadside ballads, Murder Ballads and Other Legends appears here in English for the first time, 50 years after it first appeared in Czech.

Bohumil Hrabal (1914–97) is re­garded as one of the leading Czech prose stylists of the 20th century. His work has been translated into more than two dozen languages, and in 1995 Publisher’s Weekly named him “the most revered Czech writer.”

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.


Voted Book of the Year by the Czech Book Academy in 2004, So Far So Good: The Malin Family and the Greatest Story of the Cold War by Jan Novák is now published by Slavica in the original English. Although it reads like a thriller, this “novel-document” is based on the true story of three young Czech men, Radek and Citrad Malín and their American friend Stirling, who plotted of anti-Communist resistance and flight through the Iron Curtain to West Berlin set off the Teneschenring, a massive manhunt by 27,000 East German police and Red Army regulars.
70 Years of Scholarship and 50 Years of Collaboration
continue thanks to our generous Future of the Field donors

Dissertation Research Grant
Suzanne Harris Brandt, Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Constructing the Capital City: The Politics of Urban Development and Image Making in Eurasia’s Hybrid Regimes”

Natalie Cometti, Brandeis University, History, “The Politics of Love: The ‘Enthusiasts’ and Feminism in Nineteenth-Century Poland”

Zeynep Oluaglu Dursun, History, Binghamton University, “Reluctant Repatriates: Soviet Refugees and Their Repatriation from Turkey at the End of World War II”


Stas Gorelik, Political Science, George Washington University, “When triggers cause unrest: Explaining New Revolutions in the Post-Soviet Region”


Dima Körtukov, Political Science, Indiana University, Bloomington, “Political Change in Ordered Societies: Electoral Politics and the End of USSR”

Grace Mahoney, Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Michigan, “House Museums in Soviet Culture and Their Literary Interlocutors”


Fedor Maximishin, History, University of Michigan, “Spiritual Bureaucracy: Poetic Function and Bureaucratic Language in the Sect of Stranniki, 1840-1860”

Yauheniya Mironava, Slavic Languages and Literatures, Harvard University, “Redefining Ornamentalism: Patterns of Time in Remizov, Khlebnikov, and Nabokov”

Marhso Saparova, Sociology and Anthropology, Northeastern University, “Gendered Globalization, Gendered Spaces: Transnational Migration from Turkmenistan to Turkey”

Arpi Movsesian, Comparative Literature, University of California, Santa Barbara, “Notes from the Archives: Shakespearean Fools in Dostoevsky”

Julian Pokay, Slavic Languages and Literatures, Harvard University, “Poetic Friendship and Poetic Circles, the (Self-) Formation of the Poet, and the Role of the Muse in Leningrad Underground Culture of the Early 1960s”

Aleksandra Simonova, Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, “Crimean Sevastopol between Russia and Ukraine”

Deirdre Smith, Art History, University of Texas, Austin, “Umjetnik radi: Stilinović, Šutej, and Trbuljak on Art, Work, and Life”

Thomas Stevens, History, University of Pennsylvania, “From Civil Wars to Stalinism: Veterans and Violence in Soviet Tambov”

*indicates alternates

Thanks to individual and institutional donors who have given generously to the Future of the Field Campaign, we were able to double the funding for research grants for 2019 and to offer 23 grants to students working on diverse research topics (including four new grants, highlighted at left). Please consider giving to the Future of the Field today! Donations may be made in honor or in memory of a mentor, a scholar, or a colleague who made your success possible.

The growing list of donors can be found here: www.aseees.org/future/contributors

Give Today!
Tyler Adkins
Anthropology, Princeton University

"Talkan in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction: Anthropology, Princeton University"

Tyler Adkins's project seeks to understand the indigenization of late Soviet modes of life in present-day Altai Republic, Russia through an oral history of domestic food production in rural areas. More specifically, this research project examines the paradox of why the domestic labor of food production—ostensibly a "survival" of pre-Soviet rural economy—is now remembered by post-Soviet Altai people as an exemplary instance of the virtues of the Soviet way of life. In combining oral history with ethnography, this project aims to understand not only the late-Soviet period but also contemporary, post-Soviet Altai and its relation to its Soviet past: how do Soviet-era ways of living and working now appear as objects of nostalgic desire, rejection or emulation in the creation of post-Soviet Altai selves?

Ismael Biyashev
History, University of Illinois at Chicago

"Beyond Myths and Ruins: Archaeology and History, Cornell University"

Biyashev raises new questions about the nature of Russian imperial modernity and about the ruptures and continuities between the late imperial and early Soviet contexts of studying nomadic archaeology. His dissertation devotes special attention to native and indigenous historical actors in Southern Russia, Central Asia, and Siberia. Additionally, the case studies that he examines call into question the effortless transition between the imperial and national, thus reevaluating Russia's trajectory as an imperial power. He considers how multiple imperial agents and subjects, including representatives of nomadic cultures under Russian imperial rule, self-styled amateur archaeologists, and other actors interpreted and instrumentalized ancient nomadic material culture. Lastly, his project answers the call to interdisciplinary research issued by specialists in both history and archaeology to shed new light on hitherto unexplored facets of both disciplines.

Geoffry Durham
History, University of Pennsylvania

"The Standards of Evaluation: Weights, Measures, and the Politics of Building a Russian Imperial Economy, 1775-1857"

Durham's dissertation investigates the drive to standardize the units of weight and measurement in the Russian Empire between 1775 and 1857. He begins with Catherine II's attempts to implement a universal uniformity in order to foster commercial development, and ends with the turn to replace Russian units with the metric system. He approaches these reforms as technologies of economy- and state-building enacted during a period marked by substantial territorial expansion, the Napoleonic Wars, and the renovation of imperial governance. In analyzing how the non-standardized metrological system functioned, he also explores why an ethos of standardization emerged in these years, identifying nodes of support for and opposition to the reforms within the broader population is a central concern of his project. Through the reactions of peasants, merchants, landlords, industrialists, academicians, and bureaucrats he attempts to delineate the consolidation of interest groups along political and economic lines. This project is thus at once a study of the state's plans to mediate commercial relations and of the people who constituted those relations.

W. Forrest Holden
History, University of Michigan

"Disciplining Belief: Gender, Superstition, and Witchcraft Persecution, 1760-1860"

Holden's dissertation is a cultural history of magic-belief and witchcraft persecution in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Drawing on trial records, published divination pamphlets, and literary representations of magic and witchcraft, it considers the relationship between the Enlightenment notions of individual subjectivity, the decriminalization of witchcraft, and the increasing tendency to accuse women, rather than men, of practicing magic. Based on these sources, this dissertation argues that the Enlightenment understanding of gender that emerged in Western Europe informed the practice of witchcraft persecution on both the part of the state, and on the part of ordinary accusers in witchcraft cases.

Svetlana Ter-Grigoryan
History, The Ohio State University

"There is No Sex in the USSR": Sex, Soviet Identity, and Glasnost"

Ter-Grigoryan's dissertation argues that Soviet public discourse, scholarly studies, and cultural representations on and about sexuality acted as a site for Soviet people to explore and negotiate larger issues around Soviet identity, moral upheaval, and rapid reform. Between 1987 and 1991, Soviet people engaged in literary, cultural, medical, and legal debates about the role of sex and sexuality in Soviet society. Prior to glasnost, the official stance of the state was that sex primarily a means to an end: the conception of future Soviet generations. Glasnost allowed people to reconsider several aspects of everyday life, including sexuality. Her project helps expand a limited understanding of support for and opposition to the reforms within the broader population is a central concern of his project. Through the reactions of peasants, merchants, landlords, industrialists, academicians, and bureaucrats he attempts to delineate the consolidation of interest groups along political and economic lines. This project is thus at once a study of the state's plans to mediate commercial relations and of the people who constituted those relations.

Virginia Olmsted-McGregor
History, UNC at Chapel Hill

"Soviet by Design: Fashion, Consumption, and International Competition during Late Socialism, 1948-1980"

Olmsted-McGregor’s dissertation examines the evolution of a Soviet fashion industry and the primary state institution of clothing design, the All-Union House of Design (ODMO). The ODMO could influence every level of production, as its designers not only designed clothing, but also advised factory managers, decided which clothing went into mass production, and bore responsibility for marketing. Designers believed that fashion could unify the Soviet Union on two fronts: at home, with citizens wearing Soviet-designed and manufactured clothing, and abroad, at international competitions, as a symbol of the USSR’s artistic and cultural dominance. Olmsted-McGregor studies the ODMO in order to gain a greater understanding of the artistic and cultural history of the USSR, the “Cultural” Cold War, and the nature of the command economy. Her project draws on the methodologies of institutional, gender, cultural, and transnational history, which allows her to examine the ODMO's place within the Soviet state and economy, the impact of the organization’s activities and relations, as well as the artistic and cultural context influencing design. Her study speaks to the limited scholarship on Russian, Soviet, and Eastern bloc fashion, to debates on Cold War competition and consumption, and to emerging discussion of everyday life and the nature of “late” socialism.

The Cohen-Tucker Fellowship Program is sponsored by the KAT Charitable Foundation, which we thank for its generous support.
Based on moral and economic principles, copyright law is included in the 1948 United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a fundamental right. According to its provisions, “Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.” Spearheaded by Eleanor Roosevelt, this post-war declaration constituted a universal acknowledgment of the rights of all individuals and an affirmation of human dignity following the devastating policies of fascist regimes during World War II. It aimed and still aims to ensure that creativity and original expression are appropriately rewarded and encouraged. Current anti-copyright rhetoric defies this universally accepted principle of equality under the law.

While it has become popular to claim that copyright is an unnecessary evil that restricts people’s access to cultural works, history shows that balanced copyright law greatly benefits people and culture by ensuring that cultural production is funded. Copyright law does not unduly restrict use of copyrighted works for educational or scholarly uses. It has always been limited in duration and in scope, ensuring that works enter the public domain within a defined period. In addition, most national laws have generous limitations and exceptions to allow for reasonable, non-commercial, and personal uses. But for nearly three decades, technology corporations have fought these norms by advancing campaigns to promote negative attitudes and behaviors toward copyright and to erode copyright law from within through legislative change in their favor. More and more creators go unpaid as they become economically marginalized and as revenues are diverted from the cultural sector to the technology sector.

What is a balanced approach to copyright in an age when such influence may blur truth and create confusion, when formulas based on the notion of liberation from an oppressor may obscure a fundamental negation of human rights? How should scholars approach copyright issues? Should scholars resent copyright law or appreciate this system that honors the rights of creators and publishers who bring quality works to the public? It may be helpful to take a look at the terms of copyright law relative to the work in question. For example, licenses that would be binding over both countries because the copyright status in the country of origin. The work may be in the public domain in one or both countries because the copyright has expired or because it was never registered. More and more creators go unpaid as they become economically marginalized and as revenues are diverted from the cultural sector to the technology sector.

The purpose of this exercise is to show that a diligent copyright review is feasible, even if it involves some thought. Such a review not only limits a scholar’s liability, but more importantly, retains a critical application of reason, as well as mutual respect for creators, and affirms the value of human creativity and intellect.

When assessing the copyright status of an image, some basic facts need to be ascertained: the lifespan of the author/s, whether the work is anonymous or pseudonymous, the work’s published or unpublished status, its date of creation or first publication, its place of first publication, whether the work was initially published posthumously, and possibly other pertinent information. U.S. law applies to a use within the U.S. for a work for which the country of origin is foreign. A scholar should determine, at a minimum, the U.S. copyright status of the work intended for reproduction in a U.S. publication and its copyright status in the country of origin. The work may be in the public domain in one or both countries because the copyright has expired or because it was never registered.

When accessing the copyright status of an image, some basic facts need to be ascertained: the lifespan of the author/s, whether the work is anonymous or pseudonymous, the work’s published or unpublished status, its date of creation or first publication, its place of first publication, whether the work was initially published posthumously, and possibly other pertinent information. U.S. law applies to a use within the U.S. for a work for which the country of origin is foreign. A scholar should determine, at a minimum, the U.S. copyright status of the work intended for reproduction in a U.S. publication and its copyright status in the country of origin. The work may be in the public domain in one or both countries because the copyright has expired or because it was never registered.

The purpose of this exercise is to show that a diligent copyright review is feasible, even if it involves some thought. Such a review not only limits a scholar’s liability, but more importantly, retains a critical application of reason, as well as mutual respect for creators, and affirms the value of human creativity and intellect.

When assessing the copyright status of an image, some basic facts need to be ascertained: the lifespan of the author/s, whether the work is anonymous or pseudonymous, the work’s published or unpublished status, its date of creation or first publication, its place of first publication, whether the work was initially published posthumously, and possibly other pertinent information. U.S. law applies to a use within the U.S. for a work for which the country of origin is foreign. A scholar should determine, at a minimum, the U.S. copyright status of the work intended for reproduction in a U.S. publication and its copyright status in the country of origin. The work may be in the public domain in one or both countries because the copyright has expired or because it was never registered.
database, the terms and conditions of that database need to be checked. Copyright exceptions may still apply.

Although there is no copyright limitation or exception that easily applies globally to the republication of images in a scholarly work, its lack does not preclude the use of these images. Traditional publishers have different policies regarding republication of copyrighted images based on exceptions, permissions, or risk assessment. Ultimately, the publisher decides whether to allow republication based on the facts a scholar brings to the table as well as documentation of attempts a scholar has made to identify, locate, and contact a copyright holder. For images of well-known illustrators, artists, or photographers, likely places for scholars to search for names of current copyright holders are previous publications that contain such acknowledgments. Reasonable, but not necessarily exhaustive, searches of the internet and reference works to ascertain the names of rightsholders, who may be family members or other heirs, may be necessary. At the same time, publishers have become more understanding about the problems that can arise when a scholar is unable to identify or locate a copyright holder, or when the potential copyright holder does not respond to a permissions request, especially with respect to older images. The publisher may agree to rely on a copyright exception, such as fair use or an orphan works exception, without the scholar having to indemnify the publisher against legal damages; or the publisher may rely on a copyright exception on the condition that the scholar indemnify the publisher; or the publisher may agree to go ahead if the risk is minimal, with or without an indemnification.

Dealing with republication of images in a scholarly publication need not be an onerous process.

The Committee on Libraries and Information Resources’ (CLIR) Subcommittee on Copyright Issues guides scholars and librarians on copyright issues and can explain alternatives in the decision-making process. Our website is being revised and soon will have updated information. Please contact Janice T. Pilch, subcommittee chair, at janice.pilch@rutgers.edu with questions on Slavic, East European, and Eurasian copyright, and we will be happy to help.

The views expressed in this article belong solely to the author. These comments do not reflect and are not associated with any opinion, policy, or practice of Rutgers University or of ASEEES.

Janice T. Pilch is a member of the library faculty at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey and chair of the ASEEES CLIR Subcommittee on Copyright Issues that is dedicated to education in international copyright issues for the benefit of librarians and scholars in the field of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian studies.

The views expressed in this article belong solely to the author. These comments do not reflect and are not associated with any opinion, policy, or practice of Rutgers University or of ASEEES.

Forthcoming in Slavic Review Volume 78, Summer 2019

CRITICAL DISCUSSION FORUM: NEW WAR FRONTIERS AND THE END OF POSTSOCIALISM

• Introduction by Neringa Klumbyte

• “Commemoration and the New Frontiers of War in Ukraine” by Catherine Wanner

• “Sovereign Uncertainty and the Dangers to Liberalism at the Baltic Frontier” by Neringa Klumbyte

• “Would You Flee, or Would You Fight? Tracing the Tensions at the Latvian-Russian Border” by Liene Ozolina

• “The Rhetoric of War and the Reshaping of Civil Society in the Republic of North Macedonia” by Vasiliki Neofotistos

• Afterword by Nancy Ries

ARTICLES

• “Phantom Borders in Eastern Europe: A New Concept for Regional Research” by Béatrice von Hirschhausen, Hannes Grandits, Claudia Kraft, Dietmar Müller, and Thomas Serrier

• “We’re Eighty Years Since: Panteleimon Kulish’s Gothic Ukraine” by Valeria Sobol

• “The Synchronous War Novel: Ordeal of the Unarmed Person in Serhiy Zhadan’s Internat” by Tanya Zaharchenko

• Articles for Title VIII programs due Oct 1

• Applications for spring 2020 programs due Oct 15

• Applications for Title VIII programs due Oct 1

• Applications for spring 2020 programs due Oct 15
AWARDS AWARDS 2019 AWSS Outstanding Achievement Award recognizes the work of a scholar in the field of Slavic/East European/Women’s Studies and has been instrumental in the development of the AWSS. The Prize aims to acknowledge the achievements of independent scholars and to encourage their continued scholarship and service in the fields of Slavic or Central and Eastern European Women’s Studies. The Committee encourages the nomination of candidates at all career stages. For the purpose of this award, an independent scholar is defined as a scholar who is not employed at an institution of higher learning, or an employee of a university or college who is not eligible to compete for institutional support for research (for example, those teaching under short-term contracts or working in administrative posts). We welcome nominations from CSS and Central and Eastern Europe.

The Zirin Prize Committee will accept nominations (including self-nominations) until September 1, 2019. Nominations must include: (1) a nomination letter, no more than two pages long, double-spaced; (2) the nominee’s current curriculum vitae; and (3) a sample publication (e.g., article or book chapter). The nomination letter should describe the scholar’s contribution to the field, as well as their work in progress. Nominations should be sent to Ellen Elias-Bursac at eliasbursac@gmail.com.

2019 Graduate Essay Prize is awarded to the author of a chapter or article-length essay on any topic in any field or area of Slavic/East European/Central Asian Studies written by a woman, or on a topic in Slavic/East European/Central Asian Women’s Gender Studies written by a woman or a man. This competition is open to current doctoral students and to those who defended a doctoral dissertation in 2018-2019. If the essay is a seminar paper, it must have been written during the academic year 2018-2019. If the essay is a dissertation chapter, it should be accompanied by the dissertation abstract and table of contents. Previous submissions and published materials are ineligible. Essays should be no longer than 50 double-spaced pages, including reference matter, and in English (quoted text in any other language should be translated). Completed submissions must be received by September 1, 2019. Send email essay and CV’s to the Prize Committee as email attachments:
- Amy Randall, arandall@sdsu.edu
- Emily Schuckman-Matthews, ematthews@sdsu.edu
- Betsy Jones Hemenway, ehemenway@luc.edu
- Olga Grynchenko

EARLY SLAVIC STUDIES ASSOCIATION PRIZES

The Early Slavic Studies Association (ESSA) announces its prizes for best monograph and best article in the field of Early Slavic Studies for 2019. The prize committee is also willing to consider a special award for best translation of primary source material in the field, to be awarded at the committee’s discretion. Books and peer-reviewed essays published between September 1, 2018 and August 31, 2019 are eligible for the award. All nominated works must be in English. The committee will accept nominations and self-nominations. Authors must be members in good standing of the ESSA. Please contact Cynthia M. Vakareliyska, cynthia.vakareliyska@ufl.edu.

All nominations should be sent to the chair of the prize committee, Olga Grynchenko at olga.grynchenko@ufl.edu.
Brokers of Modernity: East Central Europe and the Rise of Modernist Architects, 1910-1950, by Martin Kohlrausch, was published by Leuven University Press in March 2019. The first half of the twentieth century witnessed the rise of modernist architects. Brokers of Modernity reveals how East Central Europe turned into one of the pre-eminent testing grounds of the new belief system of modernism. By combining the internationalism of the CIAM organization and the modernising aspirations of the new states built after 1918, the reach of modernist architects extended far beyond their established fields. Yet, these architects paid a price when Europe’s age of extremes intensified. Mainly drawing on Polish, but also wider Central and Eastern European cases, this book delivers a pioneering study of the dynamics of modernist architects as a group, examining how they became qualified, how they organized, communicated and attempted to live the modernist lifestyle themselves. In doing so, Brokers of Modernity raises questions concerning collective work in general and also invites us to examine the social role of architects today. 

Courting Gender Justice: Russia, Turkey, and the European Court of Human Rights, by Lisa McIntosh Sundstrom, Valerie Sperling, and Melike Sayoglu, was published by Oxford University Press in March 2019. 

Women and the LGBT community in Russia and Turkey face pervasive discrimination. Only a small percentage challenge their mistreatment in court. A minority of activists who have exhausted their domestic appeals turn to their last court of resort: the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR). Russian citizens have brought tens of thousands of cases to the ECHR over the past two decades. But only one of these cases resulted in a finding of gender discrimination—and that case was brought by a man. By comparison, the Court has found gender discrimination more frequently in decisions on Turkish cases. Courting Gender Justice explores the obstacles that confront those who try to bring gender discrimination cases to court. To shed light on the factors that make it more or less possible in discrimination cases, the book compares forms of discrimination faced by women and LGBT people in Russia and Turkey. Additionally, it grounds the law in the personal experiences of individual people fighting to defend their rights.

Crima in War and Transformation by Mara Kozelsky, published by Oxford University Press in 2019, examines the toll of violence on civilians and the environment. War landed on Crimea’s coast in September 1854, and within a month, it had plunged the peninsula into a subsistence crisis. Having exhausted local resources, the imperial army extracted food and supplies from deep within Ukraine. The Allies conducted a guerre de course, burning cities and villages to the ground. Officers accused Tatars of betrayal and deported large segments of the local population. Peace did not bring relief to Crimea. Removal of bodies and human waste took months. Epidemics swept away young men and the elderly. Officials estimated the Crimean War devastation exceeded that of Napoleon’s invasion. Recovery packages failed human need, and by 1864, nearly 200,000 Tatars left Crimea. Covering mobilization through reconstruction, Crimea in War and Transformation provides insight into an understudied conflict and suggests the experience of war produced the Great Reforms.

Crisis and Change in Post-Cold War Global Politics: Ukraine in a Comparative Perspective, edited by Erica Resende, Dovile Budryte, and Didem Buhanli-Gulmez, was published by Palgrave in 2018. This volume analyzes crises in International Relations (IR) in an innovative way. Rather than conceptualizing a crisis as something unexpected that has to be managed, the contributors argue that a crisis needs to be analyzed within a wider context of change: when new discourses are formed, communities are re/installed, and new identities emerge. Focusing on Ukraine, the book explores various questions related to crisis and change in the region. How are crises culturally and socially constructed? How do issues of agency and structure come into play in Ukraine? Which subjectivities were brought into existence by Ukraine crisis discourses? Chapters explore the participation of women in Euromaidan, identity shifts in the Crimean Tatar community and diaspora politics, discourses related to corruption, anti-Soviet partisan warfare, and the annexation of Crimea, as well as long distance impacts of the crisis.

Empire of Friends: Soviet Power and Socialist Internationalism in Cold War Czechoslovakia by Rachel Applebaum, was published by Cornell University Press in April 2019. Applebaum shows how the Soviet Union promoted a policy of transnational friendship with its Eastern Bloc satellites to create a cohesive socialist world. This friendship project resulted in a new type of imperial control based on cross-border contacts between ordinary citizens. Pioneering the elderly, the middle class, and students throughout the region, the book reveals how East Central Europe turned into one understudied conflict and suggests the experience of war produced the Great Reforms.

Iron Curtain Twitchers: Russo-American Cold War Relations, by Jennifer M. Hudson, was published by Rowman & Littlefield in November 2018. The Cold War is often viewed in an absolutist terminology: the United States and the Soviet Union characterized one another in oppositional rhetoric and pejorative propaganda. Yet such characterizations neglect the complexities that created a transatlantic conflict. Iron Curtain Twitchers analyzes the disparate perspectives of public politicians and private citizens throughout the Cold War’s duration and its aftermath to better understand the political, cultural, and geopolitical nuances of U.S.-Russian relations.

In Justice Behind the Iron Curtain, (University of Toronto Press, October 2018), Gabriel N. Finder and Alexander V. Prusin examine Poland’s role in prosecuting Nazi German criminals during the first decade and a half of the postwar era. Finder and Prusin contend that the Polish trials of Nazi war criminals were a pragmatic political response to postwar Polish society and Poland’s cravings for vengeance against German Nazis and that Poland’s prosecutions of Nazis exhibited a fair degree of due process resembling similar proceedings in Western democratic countries. The authors examine reactions to the trials among Poles and Jews. Although Polish-Jewish relations were uneasy in the wake of the German wartime occupation
examples of medieval Russian art. The book cycle that is among the most significant Cathedral contains an Apocalypse fresco Monastery, whose sixteenth-century Trinity monasteries, including the Trinity-Danilov Cathedral of the Transfiguration of the Savior. context, particularly the mid-twelfth century architectural monuments in their historical The first part of the book analyzes William Craft Brumfield, and published by Tri Russia series, written and photographed by Photographs Pereslavl-Zalesskii: Architectural Heritage in volume sixteen in Discovering to the non-Russian republics. Imperial Russian tsars and Soviet leaders maintained an ambivalent attitude towards the maverick city. With the withering of the lucrative grain trade by the time of the Soviet Union, Odessa became a neglected city, drained of its foreign flavor. With the independence of Ukraine in 1991, there were hopes raised that the architectural beauty and economic prospects of the city would be revived. Given the current hostilities in Eastern Ukraine with the potential of the Odessa area becoming a possible land bridge to the Crimea Peninsula, the fate of the former Pearl of the Black Sea hangs in suspension. This book brings together research on Odessa and its culture, community, and economy published by Herlihy over several decades of her work. Pereslavl-Zalesskii: Architectural Heritage in Photographs is volume sixteen in Discovering Russia series, written and photographed by William Craft Brumfield, and published by Tri Kvadrate publishers in 2018. The first part of the book analyzes architectural monuments in their historical context, particularly the mid-twelfth century Cathedral of the Transfiguration of the Savior. The book also focuses on the town’s five major monasteries, including the Trinity-Danilov Monastery, whose sixteenth-century Trinity Cathedral contains an Apocalypse fresco cycle that is among the most significant examples of medieval Russian art. The book concludes with a photographic survey of architectural monuments mentioned in the text. Rooted Cosmopolitans: Jews and Human Rights in the Twentieth Century, by James Loeffler, was published by Yale University Press in May 2018. 2018 marks the seventieth anniversary of the birth of the State of Israel and the creation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Both remain tied together in the ongoing debates about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, global antisemitism, and American foreign policy. Loeffler explores this history through the stories of five Jewish founders of international human rights, following them from the prewar shetels of eastern Europe to the postwar United Nations, a journey that includes the Nuremberg and Eichmann trials, the founding of Amnesty International, and the UN resolution of 1975 labeling Zionism as racism. The result is a book that challenges assumptions about the history of human rights and offers a new perspective on the roots of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Russia’s Regional Identities: The Power of the Provinces, edited by Edith W. Clowes, Gisela Odessa and Efros, and Ani Kokobobo, was published by Routledge in 2018. Contemporary Russia is often viewed as a centralized regime based in Moscow, with dependent provinces, made subservient by Putin’s policies limiting regional autonomy. This book, however, demonstrates that beyond this largely political view, by looking at Russia’s regions more in cultural and social terms, a quite different picture emerges, of a Russia rich in variety, with different regional identities, cultures, traditions and memories. The book explores how identities are formed and rethought in contemporary Russia, and outlines the nature of particular regional identities, from Siberia and the Urals to southern Russia, from the Russian heartland to the non-Russian republics. Sing to Victory! Song in Soviet Society during World War II, by Suzanne Ament, was published by Academic Studies Press in January 2019. A woman wearing a ballgown singing in the snow for returning ski troops; a technician’s tears ruining a master recording of a new wartime song; fresh recruits spontaneously standing and doffing their caps to a new song, thereby creating the new wartime anthem. This multi-faceted book depicts the relationship between song and society during World War II in the USSR. Chapter topics range from the creation and distribution of the songs to how the public received and shaped them. The body of song that came out of that era created a true cultural legacy which reflected both the hearts of the individuals fighting as well as the narrative of the party and state in bringing the nation to victory. State of Madness: Psychiatry, Literature, and Dissent After Stalin, by Rebecca Reich (Northern Illinois University Press, March 2018), examines the collision between psychiatric and literary discourses in the years after Stalin’s death. State psychiatrists deployed set narratives of mental illness to pathologize dissenting politics and art. Dissidents responded by highlighting a pernicious overlap between those narratives and their life-stories. The state, they suggested, had crafted an idealized view of reality that itself resembled a pathological work of art. Writers Brodsky, Sinavskii, and Erofeev similarly engaged with psychiatric discourse to probe where creativity ended and insanity began. Together, these dissenters cast themselves as psychiatrists to a sick society. By challenging psychiatry’s right to declare them or what they wrote insane, dissenters exposed as a self-serving fiction the state’s renewed claims to rationality and modernity in the post-Stalin years.
Global Education Outreach Program supports Polish-Jewish studies worldwide

Call for applications at POLIN Museum polin.on/en/geop

ERIC P. HAMP

Eric Hamp passed away on February 17, 2019 at the age of 98. Hamp, an iconic scholar of Slavic and Pan-Slavic languages and Russian literature, made contributions to the study of Slavic and Central Asian languages as well as of many smaller IE branches such as Albanian, many of these based on his own dialect field work. He added to our knowledge of the Slavic and Central Asian languages. Further, he was a scholar of American Indian language.

Hamp began his career as a University of Chicago instructor in 1950, retiring in 1991 as the Robert Maynard Hutchins Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus of Linguistics, Slavic Languages and Literatures, Psychology, and the Committee on the Ancient World. He served as chair of the Department of Linguistics (1966-1969) and director for the Center for Slavic and Soviet Studies (1986-1991). He wrote more than 3,500 articles and reviews, and nearly every important aspect of historical linguistics has been dealt with, often multiple times, in Hamp's writings.

Excerpted from text provided by Christine Worobec.
Proposals and inquiries should be sent to campus for this event. Rossi and Michèle Sarde about Rossi’s life and work. Jacques, le Français and English (University of Toronto, 2020) Criticism and Methods; Operations Abroad and Society; Policing Culture; Identifying new materials changes our understandings of this gathering is to explore those problems and how the hitherto classified materials change our import. This conference represents a major opportunity to showcase and explore how the hitherto classified materials change our understandings of Soviet system, its legacy that resonates today. The political police and the Soviet legacy that resonates today. The exhibition is not merely a history lesson for 21st-century audiences; it provides a lens through which visitors can critically examine how such witch hunts continue today. Many are preparing for a landmark pride month this June, celebrating once unimaginable social and legal gains since the Stonewall uprising on June 28, 1969, kicked off the gay rights movement. However, the imminent 50th anniversary is by no means an endpoint for action, as physical and legislative attacks persist against individuals in LGBTQ communities persist not only in non-democratic nations, but across the US. Yevgeny Fiks was born in Moscow in 1972 and has been living and working in New York since 1994. His multimedia practice has bridged both worlds, exploring themes of memory, repression, and the legacy of the Cold War. The exhibition across time periods resonates strongly with the Zimmerli’s commitment to contemporary issues in art and its rich collection of art from the Soviet period, as found in the Dodge Collection of Nonconformist Art from the Soviet Union.

**INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER NEWS**

**GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY**

The Political Police and the Soviet System: Insights from Newly Opened KGB Archives in the Former Soviet States An International Conference at Georgetown University. April 3-4, 2020

Sponsors include: The Jacques Rossi Memorial Fund for Gulag Research, Georgetown University; Georgetown Office for Global Engagement; Russian History Seminar of Washington, DC; International Centre for the History and Sociology of WWII, Higher School of Economics; and Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, Woodrow Wilson Center.

While the history of Stalinism and state repression is one of the most studied topics in the Soviet history, little is known about the institutional basis of the institutions state security has remained one of the largest missing pieces in our understanding of Soviet history. Historians have been relatively slow to take advantage of these new opportunities and interpret their importance. This conference represents a major opportunity to showcase and explore how the hitherto classified materials change our understandings of Soviet system, its legacy that resonates today. The political police and the Soviet legacy that resonates today. The exhibition is not merely a history lesson for 21st-century audiences; it provides a lens through which visitors can critically examine how such witch hunts continue today. Many are preparing for a landmark pride month this June, celebrating once unimaginable social and legal gains since the Stonewall uprising on June 28, 1969, kicked off the gay rights movement. However, the imminent 50th anniversary is by no means an endpoint for action, as physical and legislative attacks persist against individuals in LGBTQ communities persist not only in non-democratic nations, but across the US.
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Sponsors include: The Jacques Rossi Memorial Fund for Gulag Research, Georgetown University; Georgetown Office for Global Engagement; Russian History Seminar of Washington, DC; International Centre for the History and Sociology of WWII, Higher School of Economics; and Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, Woodrow Wilson Center.

While the history of Stalinism and state repression is one of the most studied topics in the Soviet history, little is known about the institutional basis of the institutions state security has remained one of the largest missing pieces in our understanding of Soviet history. Historians have been relatively slow to take advantage of these new opportunities and interpret their importance. This conference represents a major opportunity to showcase and explore how the hitherto classified materials change our understandings of Soviet system, its legacy that resonates today. The political police and the Soviet legacy that resonates today. The exhibition is not merely a history lesson for 21st-century audiences; it provides a lens through which visitors can critically examine how such witch hunts continue today. Many are preparing for a landmark pride month this June, celebrating once unimaginable social and legal gains since the Stonewall uprising on June 28, 1969, kicked off the gay rights movement. However, the imminent 50th anniversary is by no means an endpoint for action, as physical and legislative attacks persist against individuals in LGBTQ communities persist not only in non-democratic nations, but across the US.

**THE KENNAN INSTITUTE AT THE WILSON CENTER**

George F. Kennan Fellowships

Kennan Fellowships will be based at the Wilson Center in DC for three-month residencies. Fellows will receive access to the Library of Congress, National Archives, and policy research centers in DC, as well as the opportunity to meet with key experts and officials. While conducting research, Kennan Fellows are expected to participate in discussions with the policy and academic communities, including speaking engagements, meetings, conferences, and other activities organized by the Kennan Institute and Wilson Center. Upon completion of the fellowship, the fellows become alumni, for whom Kennan will continue to offer opportunities for collaboration and engagement. There are no citizenship requirements for this grant.

Applicants have an option to apply for the fellowship as individuals or as a part of a team. If applying as a team, applicants must be citizens of at least two different countries. The goal of such joint fellowships is to promote collaborative research projects, among US, Russian, and Ukrainian experts. Kennan Fellowship Teams will produce joint papers or(s) for policy-relevant publications; Present work at DC, Russia, and/or Ukraine events; Conduct meetings and engage with policymakers in DC.

Completed applications are due by September 1.

**Title VIII Short Term Scholarships**

These grants allow US citizens whose policy-relevant research in the social sciences or humanities focuses on the countries of Eurasia, to spend up to one month using the library, archival, and other specialized resources of the DC area, while in residence at a Kennan Center. The deadline for these grants is September 15, 2019. Please see the website for more details on the **Title VIII Short Term Grants.**

The Kennan Institute welcomes the following scholars:

**Title VIII Research Scholars**

- Natalie Belsky, University of Minnesota Duluth, “Centers in the East: Evacuees in the Soviet Hinterland during the Second World War”
- Title VIII Summer Research Scholars
- Carolyn Coberly, University of Virginia, “Authoritarian Party Systems”
- Patrick Domingo, Indiana University Bloomington, “Koussevitzky and the Russian Musical Diapason”
- Keith Gessen, Columbia University, “The Russia Hands”

**Title VIII Short Term Research Scholars**

- Wael Hudson, Eisenhofer School, National Defense University, “Residual Forces: Their Presence (and Absence) and US Grand Strategy During and After the Korean and Vietnam Wars”
- Olena Lennon, University of New Haven, “Lobbying for Ukraine: Perceptions of Advancing Russian Efforts in the Washington, DC Area”
- Washington Viewpoints on the energy geopolitics relations between Russia, Ukraine, Poland & Germany”
- Svetlana Ter-Gregoryan, OSU, “There is No Sea in the USSR”

**Galma Starovoitova Fellows on Human Rights and Conflict Resolution in the Washington, DC Area**: New Challenges and Opportunities in Influencing the U.S. Foreign Policy”
- Thomas D’Ommale, Free University Berlin, “Washington Viewpoints on the energy geopolitics relations between Russia, Ukraine, Poland & Germany”
- Svetlana Ter-Gregoryan, OSU, “There is No Sea in the USSR”

**ZIMMERLI ART MUSEUM AT RUTGERS**

The Zimmerli Art Museum at Rutgers is pleased to announce Mister Deviant, Conrado Deacon: Deacon: Selected Works by Yevgeny Fiks, a new exhibition on view June 15 through July 31, 2019. The nine works, consisting of still photographs and multimedia installations, address the subject of the political deviant, the sexual outlaw, and theamera, who all became the shared “others” for the Cold War-era Soviets and Americans, and remain a problematic political legacy that resonates today. Mister Deviant, Conrado Deacon: Deacon confronts the instrumentalization of homophobia, anti-liberalism, and anti-modemism as tools of propaganda and ideology in both the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. It explores the exchange of various nonconformist groups on both sides of the ideological divide, including political dissidents, queers, and avant-garde artists.

Ranging from dry factuality to humor and farce, the exhibition begins with a series of prints and photographs titled “How to Make Stalin’s Atom Bomb to Destroy America,” highlighting the interlocking histories of the ‘Red’ and ‘Lavender’ scares during the McCarthy era in the United States.

**PUSHKIN HOUSE**

Serhii Plokhy, professor of Ukrainian history at Harvard University, has won the Pushkin House Russian Book Prize for a second time, with Chernobyl History of a Tragedy (Allen Lane/Penguin). Chernobyl is the first book to comprehensively chronicle the origins of the 1986 nuclear power station disaster, the fatal blast, clean-up and aftermath, and the longer term consequences that helped lead to the collapse of the USSR. It highlights deep tensions and dysfunctionality within the Soviet political system, individual stories of bravery and courage, and lessons for the global nuclear industry today. It also indicates how central the explosion and its aftermath were to the collapse of the USSR.

The prize, run by Pushkin House, the oldest arts charity in the UK exploring, celebrating and supporting the best of Russian culture, promotes and encourages the best accessible non-fiction writing in English about Russia and the Russian-speaking world. Plokhy received the award on June 12, 2019.

The full shortlist (author interviews are available by clicking on thehyperlinked text below) includes:

- 1983: The World at The Brink by Taylor Downing (Little, Brown)
- The Very: Russia’s Super Mafia by Mark Galeotti (Yale University Press)
- To See Pots and Die: The Soviet Lives of Western Culture by Eleanor Gilbun (Belknap Press at Harvard University Press)
- The Spy and the Traitor by Ben Macintyre (Viking)
- Maybe Esther by Katya Petrowskaja, translated from German by Shelley Frisch (4th Estate)

The exhibition is not merely a history lesson for 21st-century audiences; it provides a lens through which visitors can critically examine how such witch hunts continue today. Many are preparing for a landmark pride month this June, celebrating once unimaginable social and legal gains since the Stonewall uprising on June 28, 1969, kicked off the gay rights movement. However, the imminent 50th anniversary is by no means an endpoint for action, as physical and legislative attacks persist against individuals in LGBTQ communities persist not only in non-democratic nations, but across the US.

Yevgeny Fiks was born in Moscow in 1972 and has been living and working in New York since 1994. His multimedia practice has bridged both worlds, exploring themes of memory, repression, and the legacy of the Cold War. The exhibition across time periods resonates strongly with the Zimmerli’s commitment to contemporary issues in art and its rich collection of art from the Soviet period, as found in the Dodge Collection of Nonconformist Art from the Soviet Union.
51st ANNUAL CONVENTION
Saturday, Nov. 23 - Tuesday, Nov. 26, 2019
San Francisco Marriott Marquis

PRELIMINARY PROGRAM
Plan your schedule from over 650 sessions plus 40 affiliate meetings

CONVENTION REGISTRATION
Early Bird rate ends August 19

HOTEL INFORMATION
Reserve your room today; we will sell out

EXHIBIT | ADVERTISE | SPONSOR
Show support for SEEES studies and be recognized by all attendees

DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION CONVENTION TRAVEL GRANT
We will offer grants of up to $500 to subsidize travel to attend the ASEEES Annual Convention. Deadline: August 31