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The Transnational Turn
IN RUSSIAN STUDIES

CONNOR DOAK, UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL
KEVIN M.F. PLATT, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
VLAD STRUKOV, UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

Our intervention comes at a historical moment that is “both global and antithetical,” as Padraic Kenney put it in his Presidential Address at the 2016 ASEEES Convention. Kenney’s keynote came at the end of a year that saw a wave of nationalist populism that, curiously enough, was global in its reach: 2016 witnessed the election of Donald Trump in the United States, the United Kingdom’s vote to leave the European Union, the purges in Turkey after a failed coup, and Hungary’s attempt to reject EU quotas on refugees. In this climate, Kenney offered an admirable defense of area studies, highlighting the value of deep knowledge of languages, histories, and cultures of particular regions to comprehend a fractured world. Yet he juxtaposed his praise for area studies with a critique of “transnational studies,” which he deems suitable only for more “exuberant times,” citing the enthusiasm of 1989 when walls tumbled and the star of democracy shone bright. Today, however, Kenney warns: “There is no transnational story to tell; the dance of democracy runs out of music at this point. But area studies, by contrast, does have much more to say.”

This polemic against transnational studies reproves the agon between area studies and comparative transitology from the 1990s. Area studies scholars criticized the transitologists’ universalism, their dismissal of language, culture, and history, and their assumption, in line with Francis Fukuyama, that the global spread of capitalism and liberal democracy would result in the end of history. Here, however, we make the case for a very different kind of transnational studies. As Ian Tyrrell has argued, the term transnational signals a distance from the “deterministic and unidirectional juggernaut of globalization”; it does not presuppose the inevitable convergence of economies, political systems, or cultures. Moreover, the prefix trans- suggests both an emphasis on movement between nations, as well as a gesturing beyond the nation as an epistemological paradigm, though it does not assume—as some predicted in the 1990s—the demise of the nation as an empirical phenomenon. Indeed, the twenty-first century has seen a resurgence of nationalism, and new walls and borders have sprung up between states. Yet these new divisions only render the critical study of nations and borders a more urgent task. Moreover, whereas globalization theory assumed the traffic of ideas would flow from West to East, as developed countries exported liberal democracy to the post-socialist world, the past twenty years have proved that multidirectional verbs of motion are needed to describe the direction of travel. In our region, we might cite Russia’s alleged interference in the elections of Western countries, or, in the realm of culture, the spectacular global success of twenty-first-century Romanian cinema. Pussy Riot provides an intriguing example of multidirectional travel that intertwines politics and culture: initially influenced by the American riot grrl scene, they were later able to exert their own influences on Western modes of protest.

When Kenney writes that there is “no transnational story to tell,” he is correct that there is no single linear narrative in our region that follows a predictable plot. There are, however, multiple transnational stories of how people, cultural artefacts, and ideas move across geographical and political borders, stories of governments and other institutions who have tried to reinforce those borders, as well as stories of failed, partial, or interrupted crossings. Indeed, the contemporary world offers few stories that do not carry a transnational inflection, as we are all participants in global political, cultural, and economic systems, even as some people—or countries—may wish to withdraw from them. Our three volumes attempt to tell these stories, and to provide analytical frameworks that will capture both the multiplicity and the commonalities of transnational flows.

Transnational Russian Studies
Byford, Doak, and Hutchings begin Transnational Russian Studies with a call for a new approach to Russian Studies. Rather than seeing Russian Studies simply as the acquisition of mastery of the language, history, and culture of a bounded space (“Russia”) over time, they argue that Russian Studies should historicize and deconstruct notions such as Russia, Russianness, and Russian language, looking critically at the boundary-work that has sustained these categories. A transnationally-inflected Russian Studies, then, would involve mapping “the ongoing complex and diverse construction of the ‘national’ through particular forms of boundary-making that goes on around languages and cultures; and the continuous parallel processes of crossing or transgressing, relativizing or reconfiguring, breaching or transcending the boundaries thus constructed.” The book forms part of a larger project, Transnational Modern Languages, which seeks to give a distinct identity to modern languages as an “expert mode of enquiry whose founding research question is how languages and cultures operate and interact across diverse axes of connection.”

This editorial brings together three volumes of Transnational Russian Studies, each of whom has recently produced a book that seeks since the beginning of the twenty-first century. While Russianists have long recognized the need to situate Russia—its language, realities, to interrogate our own positionality as researchers, and to re-assess our foundational assumptions of our field as they intersect with political histories and are also calling for an epistemological shift that requires us to look critically at the extend the existing methodologies of Russian Studies to a larger canvas; rather, we
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Global Russian Cultures

The title of Platt's volume, *Global Russian Cultures*, signals an aim to decenter Russian culture from the Russian Federation and to challenge conceptions of it as bounded and singular. As Platt notes in the introduction, "both within and without the Russian Federation, Russian culture is fragmented and multiple, and everywhere it is the object of diverse and contradictory institutional, political, and economic forces. It is a complex field." Global Russian Cultures highlights the distinct cultural articulations of Russianness that flourish outside of the Russian Federation, from Ukraine, the Baltic states and Central Asia to Israel and the United States. As one chapter argues, "the Russian Federation, conceptions of a singular Russian culture compete with the fragmented and multi-ethnic imaginaries that are the legacy of super-national Russian Imperial and Soviet eras. Other chapters propose that "Russian cultures" need not be in Russian, in this light investigating Russian-American writers such as David Bezmozgis, Gary Shteyngart, and Lara Vapnyar, who write in English in Russian, in this light investigating Russian-American writers such as David Bezmozgis, Gary Shteyngart, and Lara Vapnyar, who write in English. The editors and contributors free the discussion from familiar paradigms such as "the West versus Russia" and "the West versus the rest," instead adopting a polycentric approach to the study of globalization as a cultural phenomenon. Through a series of detailed case-studies, the contributors explore how contemporary Russian culture has become a site of exchange among many actors: regional and national, Russian and international, Kremlinfocused and grassroots, Russophone and "other-phone." As a result, Russian culture emerges as a realm of global interactions requiring a different conceptualization of "area studies" and "cultural studies" as disciplines. In the chapter that looks at Russian culture as a form of opposition to the government, the contributors instead consider Russian culture in the context of global concerns such as the changing role of gender, or the spread of neoliberal economics and politics.

The contributors interrogate cultural flows using a wide range of theoretical concepts such as post-Soviet exceptionalism (the fetishization of national borders), but also how it moves between different forms of communication, and travels between the global and the local. In some discourses, this approach has been labelled as "de-westernizing the field." On one level, Strukov and Hudspith subscribe to this paradigm, because for them, to de-westernize means to acknowledge how research is shaped by the researcher's own preconceptions and biases. On another level, they propose to read Russian culture through a polycentric lens, not solely through a non-Western lens. The notion of "the transnational" becomes useful because it points to the porousness of borders and divisions in the modern world.

Finally, the volume investigates Russia's own experiences, and visions of globalization, or what the editors call "alternative globalities." The contributors aim "not to trace how globalization is bestowed on Russia but to investigate alternative notions of globalization and how these globalities compete for leadership on the world stage." Of the three volumes, this is the one that deals most directly with globalization with Russia in the "post-national era" of globalization that the editors date to 2014. Strukov and Hudspith situate the culture of today's Russia in its proper global and geopolitical contexts, while also exploring how classical Russian literature and high culture continue to function as forms of cultural capital, both at home and on the global stage.

### Conclusion

The disciplinary and institutional frameworks of our field, traditionally circumscribed by national, linguistic or area boundaries (Russian history, Slavic languages and literatures, Polish Studies), emerged from an implicit assumption, rooted in Herderian romantic nationalism, that cultures are best examined as discrete ethnolinguistic blocs. Such an approach has many benefits, and none of us would deny the value of linguistic expertise, thick cultural descriptions, and deep historical knowledge. It is not our intention to call for an end to institutions such as Slavic Departments, journals, and the scholarly associations that sustain our field. However, we should recognize that these institutional frameworks make us vulnerable to a certain kind of methodological nationalism, an epistemological stance which naturalizes the division of humanity in broadly "national" terms. While we must avoid tacit essentializations of nationally-circumscribed cultures, we must also avoid falling victim to the risk of turning all cultural flows into a single all-subsuming global process. A transnational approach helps us to navigate between the Scylla of "Cultural studies" as discourses and Practices and the Charybdis of globalization (the idea that language and culture are sheer ephemera in a highly globalized world).

The strength of our field lies in the value we give to a critical understanding of place, a concept that has gained a new importance in both the humanities and social sciences in recent years. As one geographer quipped, globalization has not meant "the end of geography" any more than it has the "end of history"; rather, it has meant "questions of locality, sense of place, and of identity in place matter more than ever." Similar nationally-defined languages and cultures have proved their tenacity in the twenty-first century, yet to comprehend their resilience, a deep knowledge of individual languages, cultures, and regions must be coupled with a transnational...
understanding of how they interact, and are shaped by, the wider world. The translocal paradigm provides one way to examine embodied experience in specific places that does not ignore national boundaries, but is constrained by them epistemologically. In our geographic area, anthropologists have blurred a trail, such as Madeleine Reeves’s studies of border work in Central Asia,17 or Hariz Hallilovich’s examination of displacement and memory in war-torn Bosnia.18 As three scholars based in Slavic Studies or Modern Languages, we would argue that language and culture must now be critically scrutinized in the same way as people and place have been, with greater attention both to how they are used to erect boundaries and consolidate identities, and to the transgression and contestation of boundaries and identities. In order to achieve these aims, we not only require dialogue within institutions such as ASEEES that reaches across disciplinary and spatial divides, but we also need to think about how we might transnationalize our undergraduate programs and graduate training.

Connor Doak is a Lecturer and Director of Teaching for the Department of Russian and Czech at the University of Bristol.

Kevin M.F. Platt is Professor of Russian and East European Studies at the University of Pennsylvania.

Vlad Strukov is an Associate Professor in Film and Digital Cultures at the University of Leeds.

ENNOTES
6. Ibid.
11. Strukov & Hudspith, Russian Culture.
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On Slavic and Eurasian Studies

IN JAPAN

KIMITAKA MATSUZATO, UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO / MOSCOW STATE UNIVERSITY / SHANGHAI INTERNATIONAL STUDIES UNIVERSITY

In contrast to similar associations in the US, Britain, Germany, and South Korea, the Japanese Council for Russian and East European Studies (JCREES) is not a unitary organization based on individual members, but an umbrella organization or a union of four disciplinary and one area study associations. Before the birth of JCREES, disciplinary Slavists’ associations in Japan had developed in parallel since the 1950s. In search of a new identity for Slavic and Eurasian area studies after the collapse of the socialist regimes and in order to have a legitimate representation in the International Council for Central and East European Studies (ICCEES), Japanese Slavists decided to create JCREES in 1998. The Slavic Research Center (presently the Slavic-Eurasian Research Center) of Hokkaido University was assigned to serve as JCREES’s secretariat. After the establishment of JCREES, Hiroshi Kimura, who had been a de facto Japanese delegate in ICCEES since the 1970s, was elected as the official Japanese representative. This role was passed to Kimitaka Matsuuzato in 2005 and from Matsuuzato to Yoshiro Ikeda, professor of the University of Tokyo, in 2013. JCREES holds executive meetings, attended by representatives of its member associations, twice a year. Activities of JCREES as an umbrella organization significantly differ from those of ASEEES, the German Association for East European Studies (DGO), and other monolithic national centers. It neither convenes conferences nor publishes journals, while its member associations continue to conduct these tasks (see Table 1). The member associations pay JCREES small contributions, 20,000-30,000 yen per year, most of which is passed to ICCEES as a membership contribution (JCREES pays $1,000 to ICCEES each year). JCREES plays an important role when it hosts world and regional (East Asian) Slavivist conventions, including the 9th ICCEES World Congress in Makuhari in 2015, as well as the 1st (Sapporo), 5th (Osaka), and 10th (Tokyo) East Asian Conferences on Slavic Eurasian Studies.

Disciplinary Proportion

If we sum up all members of the five associations, we arrive at about 1,400 people. Yet a significant number of Japanese Slavists belong to more than one Slavist association simultaneously. Dual membership between JAREES (area study organization) and one of the four disciplinary organizations is a widespread phenomenon, but even dual membership between disciplinary associations (for example, between the Russian history and Russian literature associations) is becoming all the more common in response to thriving interdisciplinary approaches. If we control for these overlapping memberships, perhaps 800-900 scholars are involved in Slavic Eurasian studies in Japan. By a similar rough calculation, this number seems to be 200-300 fewer than the number of specialists on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe before 1991. This discrepancy looks modest if we consider that the Japanese academic world used to be comparatively left-oriented during the Cold War, when many university faculties of economics and pedagogy had professorial chairs of “socialist economy” and “socialist pedagogy.” After 1991, unsurprisingly, universities reorganized these chairs, for example, into chairs of comparative economics or just abolished them. With the exception of these natural streamlining procedures, Japanese Slavic and Eurasian studies did not encounter the drastic shrinking of the job market that our Western colleagues often suffered. If we did, this was caused by a general crisis of university education due to a decreasing youth population, not by the end of the Cold War. Japanese universities seem more merit and less efficiency-oriented than their Western counterparts.

The Japan Association for Comparative Economic Studies was reorganized from the Japan Association for the Study of Socialist Economies in 1993, so it includes specialists in Chinese, Vietnamese, Mongolian, Cuban, and other former and present socialist economies. Specialists in the economies of Slavic and Eurasian countries account for 70-80 percent of the association’s membership, or 160-180 economists. This number shows a commitment by Japanese economists to specialize in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, especially if we consider the world-wide tendency of de-regionalization (mathematization) of economic studies. An undisputable weakness of Slavic and Eurasian studies in Japan is the scarcity of political scientists and IR specialists involved in the area. Lacking their own disciplinary association, these specialists, as a rule, choose to enlist in JAREES. Based on the JAREES member list, I can identify only about 60 Japanese specialists in politics, IR, defense, and conflicts who are working on the former Soviet and East European countries—a dearth of scholars in this area that damages the whole academic community’s impact on Japanese society. As a whole, in the Slavist community in Japan, humanities specialists numerically predominate over social scientists. This proportion is similar to the American Slavist community, in which historians and literature specialists are more numerous than social scientists. Symptomatically, in both Japan and the US, the Slavist community is comparatively large. In contrast, in the British and South
Korean Slavist communities, we see a numerical parity between humanities specialists and social scientists, and the scale of their communities is relatively small, about 400 specialists in both countries. Humanities courses at universities seem to provide young Slavists with more job opportunities.

Methodological Characteristics

How do Japanese specialists approach Slavic and Eurasian studies? As a political scientist and historian, I will limit my description to within my own disciplines. Japanese Soviet studies were significantly different from the West in two important ways—focusing on the collapse of the Soviet Union, the activists in the Soviet Union. After scientists all at once obtained chances but also in local archives. Political enjoyed opportunities to work not only Foreign graduate students suddenly on Russian and Soviet history without

The situation changed when the Soviet was an important country politically, and Chinese colleagues, whose interest continues to be highly Russia-centric. In China and South Korea, even Ukraine specialists are very few. The reason for Japanese specialists’ indulgence in small obstacles and small issues is that, in my view, before 1991, Japanese intellectual youth became interested in Soviet studies because the Soviet Union was an important country politically, historically, and culturally. Currently, in contrast, Slavic and Eurasian territories attract the post-Cold War generation by their ethno-confessional and cultural variety. No doubt, this is an academic merit that makes Slavic and Eurasian studies in Japan competitive, but also from Asia, but also from North America, Europe, and former socialist countries. During the last decade, new national Slavic associations have appeared in Mongolia and Kazakhstan that soon became full members of ICCEES. The young Mongolian association successfully hosted the 9th East Asian Conference on Slavic Eurasian Studies in Ulaanbaatar in 2018, and the Kazakh association is preparing for the East Asian conference in Nur-Sultan in 2021. Together with Asia

Until the beginning of this century, East Asia did not have a regional Slavist community. Asian Slavists were familiar with historiographies in their target countries (the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe) and in North America and Europe, but hardly knew what their colleagues in the neighboring countries were doing. There was no intra-regional professional cooperation in East Asia that was comparable to the cooperation between North America, Britain, and Continental Europe. One may characterize this intellectual structure, which we have tried to overcome for the last 15 years, as colonial. In March 2008, the Slavist associations in China, Japan, and Korea had a summit meeting in Seoul, which composed a protocol to hold a regional Slavist conference each year, actively involve themselves in ICCEES activities, and invite the 2015 ICCEES World Congress to East Asia. We have realized all of these. Last June, the 10th East Asian Conference on Slavic Eurasian Studies was held at the University of Tokyo, in which about 250 Slavists participated, not only from Asia, but also from North America, Europe, and former socialist countries. During the last decade, new national Slavic associations have appeared in Mongolia and Kazakhstan that soon became full members of ICCEES. The young Mongolian association successfully hosted the 9th East Asian Conference on Slavic Eurasian Studies in Ulaanbaatar in 2018, and the Kazakh association is preparing for the East Asian conference in Nur-Sultan in 2021. The most significant contribution made by the Japanese Slavist community in the last decade was the 9th ICCEES World Congress held in Makuhari in August 2015. This was the first ICCEES world congress held outside North America and Europe, in which 1,300 Slavists from the world participated. Remarkably, 426 Japanese Slavists participated in the congress. This means that more than a half of Japanese Slavists presented papers in English or Russian. In my view, the next stage of intra-regional cooperation of Asian Slavists is to generate our collaboration in undergraduate and graduate education. In this respect, the People’s Republic of China and Kazakhstan are playing a driving role. These two countries actively invite Asian professors for undergraduate and graduate education of young specialists, intensifying intra-Asian collaboration enhances the exposure of Slavic and Eurasian studies in Asia to the world, particularly via English-language publications. When I published my first article in an English-language journal (The Russian Review), I was already 36 years old. My graduate students publish their first article in international English-language journals in their 20s. In recent years, several Japanese Slavists have edited collections in English and published them via prestigious American and European publishers. On the other hand, English-language publications by Japanese Slavists have been far too few, and only 20 to 30 scholars participate in ASEEES annual conventions. Japanese Slavists should consider how to go further.

Kimitaka Matsuzato is a Professor at the University of Tokyo specializing in the history and politics of post-socialist countries. ENDNOTES

1 The only area study association in Japanese Slavic Eurasian studies is the Japan Association for Russian and Eastern European Studies (JAREES) covering various areas of the social sciences and humanities. There used to be two area study organizations—the JAREES and the Japanese Society for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies. They unified on April 1, 2018.

2 To save space in this paper, I use the word “Slavists” to mean “specialists in the former Soviet and Eastern Europe” or “scholars studying Slavic and Eurasian territories.”

3 Indeed, before long, the Russian association normalized its relations with the ICCEES, which accepted the Chinese association as its full member in 2016.
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Ruling Russia in China

WILLIAM ZIMMERMAN, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

In the summer of 2014, Foreign Affairs published a review article by Keith Gessen, “What’s the Matter with Russia? Putin and the Soviet Legacy.” The review was based on two books, one by me (Ruling Russia: Authoritarianism from the Revolution to Putin, Princeton University Press, 2014), the other by Orlando Figes (Revolutionary Russia, Metropolitan Books, 2014). Since then, Ruling Russia has been published in paperback (2016), German (Russland Regieren, Philipp von Zabern, 2015), and, most recently, in Chinese (Truth and Wisdom Press, 2018). Having spent a sizeable fraction of my professional life writing about various authoritarian regimes, the publication of a Chinese version of Ruling Russia strikes me as something of a big deal, one that calls for readers of Slavic Review and NewsNet, myself included, to rethink our expectations about the prospects for a range of book translations in China.

How Ruling Russia came to be published in Chinese takes some telling. The leading advocate for publishing the book was the translator, Hengfu Xin. As I quickly came to realize, she turned out to be both resourceful and purposeful. To my request for permission to cite her, she responded: “Thank you so much for asking! Actually, I’m quite liberal. You can cite me whatever way you like” (email, September 28, 2018). She obtained permission to cite her, she responded: “Thank you so much for asking! Actually, I’m quite liberal. You can cite me whatever way you like” (email, September 28, 2018).

Initially, that aspiration seemed unlikely to progress very far. The publishing house, Truth and Wisdom Press (Shanghai), failed at first to obtain the requisite permission from the national censorship authorities, even though, according to the translator, the President of the Press (Weiven Fan), had been an advocate for the book and shared her appreciation for it.

That favorable evaluation by the president was initially not enough to receive the endorsement of the censors. The book was rejected by the latter and “shelved for a year,” Hengfu Xin reported in 2017. A year later, however, the book “was finally allowed for publication, which was our [good] fortune.” Even so, there were still possible roadblocks, as my translator cautioned: “These days, the official media have still been commemorating the October Revolution.” Hengfu Xin worried that this situation might affect the book’s translation and publication. “Right now, we’re just facing the last fight, but I believe we’ll eventually win it,” she wrote in an email (November 10, 2017).

And eventually they did. There followed more than a year of exchanges between me and Hengfu Xin, and meetings between her and the editorial team. Most of our exchanges touched on the meanings of my texts and her disagreements with the editorial team that oversaw the translation of the manuscript. An important example of the latter turned on the word “regime,” a term that appears frequently in Ruling Russia. (The translation was a bit tricky, since “regime” involved going from French and English to Chinese.) The editorial team, the translator complained, wanted her to “translate the word ‘regime’ uniformly into a single Chinese word for political power,” whereas she opted to use two Chinese words, one for political power, the other for political system, depending on the context. This was but one of the issues that had to be resolved. Somewhat surprisingly to me, the translator and the editorial committee viewed me as the arbiter when she and the board divided. “I have struggled with the editorial team and you are my best support,” she wrote. Importantly, this was a view endorsed by the Press President as well. When “I handed in my revision of the translation,” Hengfu Xin reported, “I talked to the Press President, who agreed that respecting the original intention of the author is the most important above all” (email, November 9, 2017).

Issues concerning proper translation, both in dealing with me and achieving the approval of the editorial team, occupied the translator for the better part of a year. There were, moreover, two other matters that might have complicated the whole process of producing a satisfactorily completed book.

One of these involved the interaction between Truth and Wisdom Press and the national Censorship Board, which a rendered a decision that might have produced a genuine quarrel had the situation been otherwise. The other concerned the Press editor’s announced plan to add an introduction by a Chinese historian. The issue between the Censorship
Board and the publishing house turned on the question of how to deal with the Russian annexation of Crimea. The Censorship Board had strong views on the matter. The hardcover, English-language version of *Ruling Russia* (2014) had provided a map of Russia and environs that showed Crimea as part of Ukraine. The 2016 paperback version had recognized the reality that Crimea had become a part of Russia and the map was adjusted accordingly. I think the Censorship Board was working with the hardcover copy of *Ruling Russia* and was unaware of the updated map in the paperback version. When Truth and Wisdom Press submitted *Ruling Russia* to the censors for final approval, the Board’s response was to insist that the map of Russia be deleted. This was easily enough done, and the page was deleted. I am pretty sure that the Censorship Board thought it had successfully coerced Truth and Wisdom Press to show that Crimea was a part of Russia by having them omit the map. That show of force accomplished, the Censorship Board signed off and allowed the book to be published with no other changes.

The other possible impediment to deferring the deal on the publication of the book turned on a decision by the Editor/President of the press. I learned from the translator that Weiwen Fan was planning to get a historian to write an introduction to the book. My immediate reaction was that I had seen this movie before. Forty of fifty years ago, publishers in Russia and in other parts of Eastern Europe typically secured the services of a notoriously reactionary author or specialist to write a preface to a book that otherwise might not pass muster with the censors. That ploy often permitted the publisher to do an end run on the censors. The author of the preface would receive a tidy sum for exposing the malevolent distortions of the Western author. Readers in the know would simply skip the preface and turn to the subsequent chapters to ascertain what the Western author actually had in mind. My translator had a similar interpretation of what was driving the editor’s plan to have someone write a preface for *Ruling Russia*. She informed me that the preface writer was a “Russian studies expert [who] has a strong government background, which I don’t like.”

A full year went by. On the eve of the scheduled publication, it appeared that the President of the press was sticking to the plan of having someone write an introduction. “Even at [this] very late stage,” Hengfu Xin wrote, “the editor confirmed that to me” (September 29, 2018). But for reasons neither my translator nor folks at Princeton Press in Shanghai were able to explain, that decision was abruptly canceled. What happened? “I really don’t know what actually happened,” Hengfu Xin wrote in the fall of 2018. “All of a sudden, she [the Press President] told me time was up, the introduction won’t be ready in time.” The editor evidently proceeded with market and publication costs in mind and was considerably less concerned about conforming to Party views that were central to the thinking of the censors in Beijing.

In any event, the Chinese language version of *Ruling Russia* was published in late fall 2018, with the approval of the censors, without a map, and without a preface. Chinese readers were left with the task of interpreting the book on their own.

What are we to make of this? I am averse to generalizing on the basis of a sample of one. It is, however, tempting to generalize a bit. Students of the history of Communism will recognize the ploy of a liberal editor securing a notoriously reactionary Party hack to write a preface exposing the erroneous views of the author. With hindsight, though, what strikes me is that the Publishing House and the Censorship Board did not diverge over conventional literary issues. Rather, what the Censorship Board was most concerned to emphasize had to do with geopolitical territorial issues characteristic of China’s emergence as a major power. The Board was determined to be seen as supporting the changing of borders in Crimea—a view that makes most sense when thought of as being analogous to developments along China’s coastal boundaries, where Beijing has cultivated its own claims. This suggests that Western efforts to publish scholarship in China devoted to Russian domestic politics and history may entail fewer impediments than Western scholarship focusing on the interpretation of Russia’s foreign policy or its role as a major power.

William Zimmerman is Research Professor Emeritus at the University of Michigan Center for Political Studies.

### ASEES Awards First Book Subvention in Spring 2020

The winners of the Spring 2020 First Book Subvention are:

- **Cornell University Press for Nested Nationalism: Making and Unmaking Nations in the Soviet Caucasus** by Krista A. Goff
- **Columbia University Press for Internationalist Aesthetics: The Role of China in Early Soviet Culture** by Edward Tyerman

Note: This is a modified and abridged transcription of the interview featuring Eleanory Gilburd, winner of the 2019 Wayne S. Vucinich Prize for *To See Paris and Die* (Harvard University Press). Other subjects, including censorship, art exhibitions, film, and American versus European cultural imports, were also discussed. For the full interview, go to [Sean’s Russia Blog](https://www.seanguillory.com/eleonory-gilburd-interview).
of a woman, Elena, and her grownup musician son. They live in a communal apartment with all sorts of unpleasant characters, eavesdropping and spying on the intimate life of others. The time period is the 1960s. Elena, the main protagonist, has a past to hide, because she is determined at all cost to have her son included in a delegation of Soviet musicians going to Paris to perform. And no moral compromise is too grave for this goal. When she thinks the goal is unreachable, when all her plans seem finished, she leaves, dies by her own hand, having closed doors and windows and opened the gas.

The phrase stands for life's ultimate fulfilment and it also has a sense of fatality and finality to it— that is, that there is nothing else that's left to experience after seeing Paris. You might as well die: there aren't any possibilities after that. For all these reasons, the Thaw is a key moment; several historians have looked at it from a variety of angles. But Soviet viewers looked for other things and found passion, and intimacy, and love, and torment.

SG: Why does this phrase capture your book for a title?

EG: The reason I thought it is so apt for my book's title is that I tried to convey this longing, I tried to convey the impossibility, that unreachability, that unreachable, when all her plans seem finished. That is why before she had no idea what he was talking about. Their curiosity was piqued, and they wanted to know more. These are provincial teachers, agronomists, engineers. I am talking about the capitals, but also about provincial towns, sometimes new towns. These are oftentimes dusty settlements where water pipes are just being laid, but where a movie theater was already built. I don't know of another moment of such democratization and popularization of Western culture with so broad a distribution.

Among the reasons, I should say, for the social and geographic broadness of this phenomenon was Soviet education and the way people were assigned to jobs after graduation all across the Soviet Union. Among the reasons was the Soviet cultural project itself, founded on the idea of classics for the masses. Among the reasons was new media: radio and cinema in the 1950s and 60s, and television later, played a huge role in the distribution of Western culture. For all these reasons, the Thaw is a special moment.

But that is not all. For this moment also overlaps—and not accidentally—with a reevaluation of Soviet history, of socialist realism, of class morality, of the very language of politics, of literature, of music, of so-called “Western language”. And it is in this context that Russian translations of Western texts and films arrive, where they begin to live a Soviet life, begin to change under its impact and, in their turn, impact this reevaluation of values.

SG: Talk about the process of translation, and how it deterritorializes a piece of culture that, say, comes from France and reterritorializes it in a Soviet context.

EG: Right. Translation allows me to reestablish that very active, creative role and the meanings invested in these imports as they cross linguistic and geopolitical borders, where they assume new connotation and intonation. And they lose something of their original meanings from their own domestic context.

SG: Talk about the process of translation.

EG: You're absolutely right: translation in a very broad sense is the key paradigm in this book. First and foremost, it is a mechanism of transfer into another context, it is crucial as a process of naturalization. Translation highlights the channels of transfer. When I was getting ready to go to the archives to do this project, I wasn't planning to write about translation. In my original vision, translation was the first moment of Westernization. There were about 50,000 translations of Western texts and movies that I was observing the archives gets lost, along with entire layers of meaning that are introduced by the new context into these imports.

SG: It also gives the impression of a passive consumption, that Russians are just receivers of culture from the West, and the best they can do is mimic it.

EG: That is not all. For this moment also overlaps—and not accidentally—with a reevaluation of Soviet history, of socialist realism, of class morality, of the very language of politics, of literature, of music, of so-called “Western language”. And it is in this context that Russian translations of Western texts and films arrive, where they begin to live a Soviet life, begin to change under its impact and, in their turn, impact this reevaluation of values.

SG: It gives the impression of a passive consumption, that Russians are just receivers of culture from the West, and the best they can do is mimic it.

EG: But that is not all. For this moment also overlaps—and not accidentally—with a reevaluation of Soviet history, of socialist realism, of class morality, of the very language of politics, of literature, of music, of so-called “Western language”. And it is in this context that Russian translations of Western texts and films arrive, where they begin to live a Soviet life, begin to change under its impact and, in their turn, impact this reevaluation of values.

SG: It also gives the impression of a passive consumption, that Russians are just receivers of culture from the West, and the best they can do is mimic it.

EG: Right. Translation allows me to reestablish that very active, creative role and the meanings invested in these imports as they cross linguistic and geopolitical borders, where they assume new connotation and intonation. And they lose something of their original meanings from their own domestic context.

SG: Talk about the process of translation, and how it deterritorializes a piece of culture that, say, comes from France and reterritorializes it in a Soviet context.

EG: One of the things that I found so interesting and thought was curious is how Soviet life brought together what we would consider incompatible aesthetic phenomena, characters who had very little in common. I have certain pairs of people or aesthetic movements, such as Picasso and Rockwell Kent, or Hemingway and Remarque, or Italian neorealists and French historical drama. In the West, you'd rarely put somebody like Picasso and Rockwell Kent in the same line. But in Soviet culture, they were deeply interrelated.

The modernist canon, to which some of these artists and writers belonged, was entirely non-canonical for Soviet audiences; translation created its own canon, eclectic stylistically and chronologically. To give an example, in interwar Europe, Remarque's novels were read for bitter pacifism. [...] In the Soviet context, that, of course, was there, but other themes were important, perhaps more important, themes like the fate of a lone man, like the salvation of the individual. I would say that if we take Italian neorealism and French historical drama, with costumes, and fencing, and the theatrical staging of it all. These are opposing aesthetic phenomena. But Soviet viewers looked for other things and found passion, and intimacy, and love, and torment.

SG: One of the key events that you put in your study with is the Sixth International Youth Festival in 1957. This seems [to be] a key moment; several historians have looked at it from a variety of different angles. What was this festival and why was it so significant?

EG: It is, of course, one of the central events of the Thaw. For different historians it means different things. For me, the festival was the Soviet Union's first mega-event. That is not to say that the Soviet Union had not had international events before it did, but those were leftist events. This is the first event that began the transformation of Moscow from a city of international leftist events to a city of mega-events. The youth festival attracted invited foreigners from across the world. [...] There were about 34,000 foreigners and two weeks of cultural celebrations, athletic events,
Moscow that we know today were colonized. Little buildings were razed to the ground and big buildings were erected in their stead. Like other mega-events, the festival led to substantial changes in infrastructure. One of the important and interesting aspects about festival planning, for me, is that the city of Moscow was modeled according to Olympic cities. At the Olympic games in Melbourne, besides the Soviet athletic delegation participating in the games, there were all sorts of bureaucrats from various ministries to see how an Olympic city would look like. That Moscow was modeled according to the Melbourne example is very telling. […]

SG: How do you understand the attempt to make the Soviet Union part of world culture in the postwar period?

EG: I don’t think it is, in its most cynical expression, unique to the Thaw. Soviet cultural leaders had always imagined what they were building both as part of European culture and as having universal significance for the rest of the world. I don’t think they are innovative in this sense. They are innovative during the Thaw in a different sense. They want to appeal to ordinary people abroad. In the mid-1950s, they were increasingly realizing that they had been preaching to the converted for decades. They increasingly realized that nobody was watching Soviet films in Europe and the United States, nor reading Soviet magazines specifically about festival planning, for me, is that the city of Moscow was modeled according to Olympic cities. At the Olympic games in Melbourne, besides the Soviet athletic delegation participating in the games, there were all sorts of bureaucrats from various ministries to see how an Olympic city would look like. That Moscow was modeled according to the Melbourne example is very telling. […]

EG: I don’t think it is, in its most cynical expression, unique to the Thaw. Soviet cultural leaders had always imagined what they were building both as part of European culture and as having universal significance for the rest of the world. I don’t think they are innovative in this sense. They are innovative during the Thaw in a different sense. They want to appeal to ordinary people abroad. In the mid-1950s, they were increasingly realizing that they had been preaching to the converted for decades. They increasingly realized that nobody was watching Soviet films in Europe and the United States, nor reading Soviet magazines specifically produced for distribution abroad, nobody except for a narrow circle of people associated with the so-called friendship societies, that nobody was watching Soviet films, often screened in third-rate movie theaters on the outskirts of cities or in working-class neighborhoods. And they want Soviet exports to be in the spotlight, they want Soviet films to be screened in the very centers of European capitals in first-rate movie theaters. And they are willing to enter into standard practices of cultural diplomacy, they are willing to engage with the capitalist world, they are willing to sign cultural exchange agreements. The exchange agreements, renewed every few years, are very formulaic, they quantify everything, they are tedious to read through, but they are the scaffolding upon which this entire edifice of Western imports is built. [What is] innovative during the Thaw is that they want to step out of leftist confines, of communist enclaves and leftist neighborhoods—and they want to appear on Main street. […] This goes to the heart of your questions about how they imagine themselves and Soviet culture as part of Western and more global cultural scene: they want to be on Main street. […]

Eleonory Gilburd is an Assistant Professor of History at the University of Chicago. Gilburd specializes in the history of modern Russia and the Soviet Union, with a particular interest in Soviet culture, society, and their international context. She is currently at work on two book projects: *Weary Sun* explores the history of tango in Stalinist Russia and Eastern Europe. The Entangled Histories of Soviet Newspeak and the Russian Language in the Twentieth Century describes the rise and fall of Soviet newspeak as a language bound to the daily uses and reforms of Russian itself.

Sean Guillory (@seansrussiablog) is the Digital Scholarship Curator at the University of Pittsburgh Center for Russian, East European & Eurasian Studies. He hosts Sean's Russia Blog podcast.
transformed the trajectory of women’s lives. McKinney considers everyday experiences of women as they provided for their families, established businesses, traveled abroad, and adjusted to the new economic, political and social reality after the late Soviet and post-Soviet eras. This book casts light on how these women viewed issues of gender, ethnicity, domestic and international politics, and the end of the Soviet experiment.

Subverting Communism in Romania: Law and Private Property, 1945–1965 (Lexington Books, August 2019), by Mihaela Ţerban, explores the role of law in everyday life and as a mechanism for social change during early communism in Romania. Ţerban focuses on the regime’s attempts to extinguish private property through housing nationalization and expropriation. The book draws from archives that have opened up new perspectives for understanding a mundane yet crucial part of the modern human experience: one’s home and the institution of private property that often sustains it.

“Tat’zharski Orzel/The Tatra Eagle” was a bilingual quarterly published from 1947 to 2019 by Thaddeus V. Gromada and Janina Gromada Kedroń. The editors prepared an Index/Index in anticipation of the digitalization of the journal by the Podhala Digital Library (PDL). The Index/Index is a treasury of information about the Polish Highland Folk Culture and its impact on Polish national culture as well as information about the Góral diaspora in America.

Tolstoy Studies journal published its first monograph in place of the its Volume 30. Tolstoy’s On Life. From the Archival History of Russian Philosophy, by Inessa Medzhivianskaya, was released September 2019. In this first book-length study of Tolstoy’s meditation on death, life, love and happiness, Medzhivianskaya focuses on unknown documents and stories that illuminate the realities of Russian philosophical culture at the end of the long nineteenth century. Bookending the volume is an appendix with documents published in English for the first time.

Trumping Politics as Usual: Masculinity, Misogyny, and the 2016 Elections, by Robert G. Boatright and Valerie Stverak, was published by Oxford University Press in October 2019. Presidential campaigns often have an impact on downballot Congressional races, but the 2016 election presented a new opportunity to see the effects of misogyny, much as in the election written about the 2016 election—and the shadow of 2016 clearly affected the pool of candidates in the 2018 midterms—this book looks at how the Trump and Clinton campaigns changed the behavior of more conventional candidates for Congress in 2016 and 2018.

Arve Hansen, Andrei Rogatchevski, Yngvar Steinholth, and David-Emil Wickström published the monograph A War of Songs: Popular Music and Recent Russian-Ukrainian Relations (Raihem Verlag / Columbia University Press, May 2019) with chapters entitled: “Pop Rock, Ethno-Chaos, Battle Drums, and a Requiem: The Sounds of the Ukrainian Revolution,” “The Euromaidan’s Aftermath and the Genre of Answer Song,” and “Lasha Tumbai; or ‘Russia, Goodbye?’ The Eurovision Song Contest as a Post-Soviet Geopolitical Battleground.”

Yellow Star, Red Star: Holocaust Remembrance after Communism, by Jelena Subotić, was published by Cornell University Press in December 2019. The book demonstrates how East European states used Holocaust remembrance as a political strategy to resolve their contemporary “ontological insecurities”—insecurities about their identities, about their international status, and about their relationships with other international actors. As Subotić concludes, Holocaust memory in Eastern Europe has never been about the Holocaust or about the desire to remember the past, whether during communism or in its aftermath. Rather, it has been about managing national identities in a precarious and uncertain world.
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.


Arghire is growing up in Soviet Kazakhstan, learning the ancient art of the kuy from his musician father. But with the music comes knowledge about his country, his family, and the past that is at times difficult to bear. Based on the author’s own family history, *A Life at Noon* provides us a glimpse into a time and place Western literature has rarely, if ever, seen as the first post-Soviet novel from Kazakhstan to appear in English.

**A أهمية التفاعل الثقافي: تأثير الثورة الروسية على العالم.*


The Russian Revolution of 1917 was quickly perceived by both contemporary and subsequent scholars as not merely a domestic event within the Russian Empire, but as a systemic crisis that fundamentally challenged the assumptions underpinning the existing international system. There were few political developments anywhere in the world in 1917–24 not directly or indirectly influenced by the revolution. *The Arc of Revolution*, the first book, examines the reverberations of the revolution in the geographically contiguous imperial borderslands traditionally contested between imperial Russia and its geopolitical rivals: the terrain stretching from Finland, through Central Europe to the Transcaucasus and Central Asia. The Wider Arc of Revolution, the second and third books, examine the revolution’s broader impact in regions of the world noncontiguous with Russia itself, from North and South America to Asia, Australia, and various parts of Europe.

The emphasis in The Wider Arc is on the complex emotional appeal and ideological legacies of Russian communism, including anti-communism, evidenced well into the 20th century.

**English Language Requirements and Other Considerations**

Money comes knowledge about his father’s own family history, and place Western literature has rarely, if ever, seen as the first post-Soviet novel from Kazakhstan to appear in English.

The winner will be chosen by:

- Ted Weeks, Southern Illinois U
- Yoshiko Herrera, U of Wisconsin-Madison
- Nenina Kliumbyte, Miami U
- Thomas Sefrid, U of Southern California

The USC Book Prize in Literary and Cultural Studies, established in 2009 and sponsored by the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of Southern California, is awarded for an outstanding monograph published on Russian, Eastern Europe, or Eurasia in the fields of literary & cultural studies in 2019.

**Rules of Eligibility**

- The competition is open to works of scholarship in any discipline of the social sciences or humanities (including literature, the arts, film, etc.). Policy analyses, however scholarly, cannot be considered.

The winner will be chosen by:

- Lisa Wakamia, Florida State University
- Diane Nemec Ignashev, Carleton College
- Jon Stone, Franklin & Marshall College

The USC Book Prize in Literary and Cultural Studies, established in 2009 and sponsored by the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of Southern California, is awarded for an outstanding monograph published on Russian, Eastern Europe, or Eurasia in the fields of literary & cultural studies in 2019.

**Rules of Eligibility**

- The competition is open to works of scholarship in literary and cultural studies, including studies in the visual arts, cinema, music, and dance.

The winner will be chosen by:

- Thomas Sefrid, Southern Illinois U
- Yoshiko Herrera, U of Wisconsin-Madison
- Nenina Kliumbyte, Miami U
- Thomas Sefrid, U of Southern California

**USC Book Prize in Literary & Cultural Studies**

*The Winner will be chosen by:*
The competition is open to works of scholarship in anthropology, political science, sociology, or geography in 2019.

RULES OF ELIGIBILITY

- The competition is open to works of scholarship in anthropology, political science, sociology, or geography that cross disciplinary boundaries.

The winner will be chosen by:

- Jeffrey Kopstein, UC Irvine
- Emily Channell-Justice, Ukrainian Research Institute
- Ola Onuch, University of Manchester

DAVIS CENTER BOOK PRIZE IN POLITICAL AND SOCIAL STUDIES

The Davis Center Book Prize in Political and Social Studies, established in 2008 and sponsored by the Jelavich estate, is awarded for an outstanding monograph on the political economy of Russia, Eurasia, and/or Eastern Europe, published in 2019.

RULES OF ELIGIBILITY

- The competition is open to works in any discipline, dealing with any aspect of Polish affairs.

The winner will be chosen by:

- Teresa Nance, Sweet Briar College
- Sara Ivanhoe, Rice University
- Sarah Wilson Sokhey, University of Colorado Boulder
- Robert C.玮, Wellesley College

ED A. HEWETT BOOK PRIZE

The Ed A. Hewett Book Prize, established in 1994 and sponsored by the U of Michigan Center for Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies, is awarded for an outstanding monograph on the political economy of Russia, Eurasia, and/or Eastern Europe.

The winner will be chosen by:

- Gerald Easter, Boston College
- Doug Rogers, Yale University
- Sarah Wilson Sokhey, University of Colorado Boulder

BARBARA JELAVICH BOOK PRIZE

The Barbara Jelavich Book Prize, established in 1995 and sponsored by the Jelavich estate, is awarded for a distinguished monograph published on any aspect of Southeast European or Habsburg studies since 1600, or nineteenth- and twentieth-century Ottoman or Russian diplomatic history.

RULES OF ELIGIBILITY

- The book must be a monograph predominantly on Polish studies.
- Preference will be given to works by first-time authors.
- The competition is open to works in any discipline, dealing with any aspect of Polish affairs.
- Previous winners of this prize are ineligible.

The winner will be chosen by:

- Emma Holding, University of California
- Cezary K. Smolar, Fordham University
- Malgorzata Mazurek, Columbia University
- Piotr Kosicki, U of Maryland

W. BRUCE LINCOLN BOOK PRIZE

The W. Bruce Lincoln Book Prize, sponsored by Mary Lincoln, is awarded biennially (in even numbered years) for an author's first published monograph or scholarly synthesis that is of exceptional merit and lasting significance for the understanding of Russia's past.

The winner will be chosen by:

- Stella Ghervas, Newcastle U
- Sean McMeekin, Bard College
- Kimberly Elman Zarecor, Iowa State University

KULCZYCKI BOOK PRIZE IN POLISH STUDIES

The Kulczycki Book Prize in Polish Studies, established in 1996 and sponsored by the Kulczycki family, is awarded for an outstanding monograph on the political economy of Russia, Eurasia, and/or Eastern Europe.

The winner will be chosen by:

- Rina Kullah, Institute for East European History, University of Vienna
- Jeff Hass, University of Richmond
- Michael Kennedy, Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, Brown University

OMELJAN PRITSAK BOOK PRIZE IN UKRAINIAN STUDIES

The Omeljan Pritsak Book Prize in Ukrainian Studies, established in 2019 and sponsored by the Ukrainian Research Institute at Harvard University, recognizes a distinguished book in the field of Ukrainian studies that was published in 2019.

RULES OF ELIGIBILITY

- The competition is open to works in any discipline, dealing with any aspect of Ukrainian studies, including the works that put Ukrainian experiences in a broad comparative context.

The winner will be chosen by:

- Alexander Bukharov, The Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies Program
- Heather Coleman, University of Alberta
- Catherine Wanner, Penn State University
- Michael Naydan, Penn State University

GRADUATE STUDENT ESSAY PRIZE

The ASEEES Graduate Student Essay Prize was established in 2006 and is awarded for an outstanding essay by a graduate student in Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies. The winner of the competition receives free roundtrip domestic airfare to and room at the ASEEES Annual Convention and an honorarium.

RULES OF ELIGIBILITY

- The winner of the competition receives free roundtrip domestic airfare to and room at the ASEEES Annual Convention and an honorarium.

The winner will be chosen by:

- Laura Olson Osterman, U of Colorado Boulder
- Jovana Babovic, SUNY Geneseo
- Lauri Mälksoo, U of Tartu (Estonia)
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HOOVER INSTITUTION LIBRARY AND ARCHIVES

In celebration of its centennial, the Hoover Institution opened the exhibition Hoover@100: Ideas Defining A Century in Hoover Tower. Hoover@100 is a showcase of documents and artifacts centered around the ideas of peace, freedom, and education—ideas that are embodied in the lives of Herbert Hoover and his wife, Lou Henry, and that drove the Institution’s collecting and the work of its eminent fellows in its first one hundred years. Posters, correspondence, photographs, artifacts, and manuscripts drawn exclusively from the Library & Archives’ collections, along with publications by Hoover fellows, are among the materials on display. The exhibition in Hoover Tower will run through July 31, 2020.

THE KENNAN INSTITUTE AT THE WILSON CENTER

George F. Kennan Fellows will be based at the Wilson Center in Washington, D.C. 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 actively participate in discussions with the policy and academic communities, including speaking engagements at the Wilson Center as well as potentially outside of DC, and attending meetings, conferences, and other activities organized by the Kennan Institute and Wilson Center. Upon completion of the fellowships, the grantees become alumni, for whom Kennan will continue to offer opportunities for collaboration and engagement. There are no citizenship requirements for this grant.

Applicants can apply for the fellowship as individuals or as part of a team. If applying as a team of two or three applicants, the applicants must be citizens of at least two different countries. The goal of such joint fellowships is to promote collaborative research projects among U.S., Russian, and Ukrainian experts. Fellowship Teams will: Produce joint paper(s) for policy-relevant publications; present work at DC, Russia, and/or Ukraine events; and conduct meetings and engage with policymakers.

Competitions will be held twice yearly with the following application deadlines: March 1 and September 1. Applicants must submit a completed application: harvest.wilsoncenter.org/opportunity/george-f-kennan-fellowship.

Galina Starovoitova Fellowship on Human Rights and Conflict Resolution is available to scholars, policy makers, journalists, civic activists, and other engaged persons who successfully bridge the worlds of ideas and public affairs to advance human rights and conflict resolution.

Applicants with experience from a variety of backgrounds (academia, government, the corporate world, the non-profit sector, public affairs to advance human rights and conflict resolution) are encouraged to apply. Applicants are expected to: demonstrate their scholarly development through publication beyond the Kandidat level; and have experience from a variety of backgrounds.

Applicants are expected to: demonstrate their scholarly development through publication beyond the Kandidat level; and have experience from a variety of backgrounds.

Applications are welcomed from individuals or teams from Russia, Ukraine, and/or Belarus. In addition, candidates will be expected to present their research to the public in a series of lectures and symposia. Fellows are expected to hold public lectures on the themes of conflict resolution and human rights while conducting research on a specific topic.

In addition, Fellows will actively participate in discussions with the public policy and academic communities, including giving speeches and lectures at other US universities and taking part in meetings and conferences. The application deadline for this fellowship is May 15, 2020.

Scholars in Residence

The Kennan Institute welcomes its current and incoming scholars:

Title VIII Research Scholars


• Tyler Kirk, Arizona State University, “Remembering the GULAG: Community, Identity and Cultural Memory in Russia’s Far North, 1918–2006”

• Brandon Schechter, Independent Scholar, “The Search for Salvation in the Second World War”

George F. Kennan Fellows

• Victor Khlebtov, St. Petersburg State University, “Russia and Latin America in the Putin Era (and US Reactions)”

• Gonzalo Paz, Georgetown University, “Russia and Latin America in the Putin Era (and US Reactions)”

• Andrew Monaghan, The Russia Research Network, “The Importance of History to Contemporary Russian Ways of War”

• Viktoriya Svyrydenko, V. N. Karazin National University, “remembering the Imperial Past: Public Space and the Politics of Memory in Post-Soviet Ukraine”

George F. Kennan Experts

• Ilia Kusa, Ukrainian Institute for the Future, “Ukrainian Foreign Policy in the New International Environment”

Galina Starovoitova Fellows on Human Rights and Conflict Resolution

• Olimpida Usanova, HELP Program,

ASEEES CLIR Distinguished Service (Librarian) Award Georgia F. Kennan Fellows will be based at the Wilson Center in Washington, D.C. 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 actively participate in discussions with the policy and academic communities, including speaking engagements at the Wilson Center as well as potentially outside of DC, and attending meetings, conferences, and other activities organized by the Kennan Institute and Wilson Center. Upon completion of the fellowships, the grantees become alumni, for whom Kennan will continue to offer opportunities for collaboration and engagement. There are no citizenship requirements for this grant.

Applicants can apply for the fellowship as individuals or as part of a team. If applying as a team of two or three applicants, the applicants must be citizens of at least two different countries. The goal of such joint fellowships is to promote collaborative research projects among U.S., Russian, and Ukrainian experts. Fellowship Teams will: Produce joint paper(s) for policy-relevant publications; present work at DC, Russia, and/or Ukraine events; and conduct meetings and engage with policymakers.

Competitions will be held twice yearly with the following application deadlines: March 1 and September 1. Applicants must submit a completed application: harvest.wilsoncenter.org/opportunity/george-f-kennan-fellowship.

Galina Starovoitova Fellowship on Human Rights and Conflict Resolution is available to scholars, policy makers, journalists, civic activists, and other engaged persons who successfully bridge the worlds of ideas and public affairs to advance human rights and conflict resolution.

Applicants with experience from a variety of backgrounds (academia, government, the corporate world, the non-profit sector, public affairs to advance human rights and conflict resolution) are encouraged to apply. Applicants are expected to: demonstrate their scholarly development through publication beyond the Kandidat level; and have experience from a variety of backgrounds.

Applications are welcomed from individuals or teams from Russia, Ukraine, and/or Belarus. In addition, candidates will be expected to present their research to the public in a series of lectures and symposia. Fellows are expected to hold public lectures on the themes of conflict resolution and human rights while conducting research on a specific topic.

In addition, Fellows will actively participate in discussions with the public policy and academic communities, including giving speeches and lectures at other US universities and taking part in meetings and conferences. The application deadline for this fellowship is May 15, 2020.

Scholars in Residence

The Kennan Institute welcomes its current and incoming scholars:

Title VIII Research Scholars


• Tyler Kirk, Arizona State University, “Remembering the GULAG: Community, Identity and Cultural Memory in Russia’s Far North, 1918–2006”

• Brandon Schechter, Independent Scholar, “The Search for Salvation in the Second World War”

George F. Kennan Fellows

• Victor Khlebtov, St. Petersburg State University, “Russia and Latin America in the Putin Era (and US Reactions)”

• Gonzalo Paz, Georgetown University, “Russia and Latin America in the Putin Era (and US Reactions)”

• Andrew Monaghan, The Russia Research Network, “The Importance of History to Contemporary Russian Ways of War”

• Viktoriya Svyrydenko, V. N. Karazin National University, “remembering the Imperial Past: Public Space and the Politics of Memory in Post-Soviet Ukraine”

George F. Kennan Experts

• Ilia Kusa, Ukrainian Institute for the Future, “Ukrainian Foreign Policy in the New International Environment”

Galina Starovoitova Fellows on Human Rights and Conflict Resolution

• Olimpida Usanova, HELP Program,
The workshop will focus on the Holocaust and everyday Jewish life during World War II and early years after the war in the countries of the former Soviet Union. Topics might include: antisemitism, war in the countries of the former Soviet Union, the Holocaust in the Soviet Union of its Early Aftermath. "The workshop is entitled, "Everyday Life of Jews in the USSR during the Holocaust and its Early Aftermath." The workshop is scheduled for August 30-September 3, 2020 at Yad Vashem in Jerusalem.

The workshop will focus on the Holocaust and everyday Jewish life during World War II and early years after the war in the countries of the former Soviet Union. Topics might include: antisemitism, evacuation and Jewish life in the Soviet rear, ghettoization, collaboration, hiding, resistance, gender, violence, Jewish children and families during the Holocaust, survival in camps and ghettos, Jews in the Red Army, trauma, art and literature.

Participants will be expected to submit a paper (no more than 15 pages) prior to the beginning of the workshop for circulation among the participants. Daily sessions will include 30-minute presentations followed by a discussion (up to 30 min), as well as an opportunity for participants to do research at Yad Vashem's library and archives.

Applications will be accepted from doctoral candidates and scholars who obtained their PhD (or candidate of science degree) within the last five years. Applications are welcome from scholars working in all relevant academic disciplines, including anthropology, archaeology, art history, geography, film studies, history, Jewish studies, law, literature, material culture, philosophy, political science, religion, sociology, and other fields.

Applications materials (CV, abstract of proposed paper, and faculty recommendation), must be emailed to shломит.шахтани@yadvashem.org by April 20, 2020.

ZIMMERLI ART MUSEUM AT RUTGERS

The Zimmerli Art Museum at Rutgers will exhibit the oil painting Two Peasant Women (1928-30) by Kazimir Malevich, a loan from the Moscow-based cultural project Encyclopedia of the Russian Avant-Garde, through May 17, 2020. Malevich (1879-1935) is one of the most significant artists of the 20th century. As a painter, graphic artist, and designer, he worked in almost all of the modernist trends and styles that arose at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. In 1915, he introduced his own style, Suprematism, which emphasized the supremacy of color and shape in painting.

Dialogues – Ilya Kabakov and Viktor Pavlovic: Stories About Ourselves has been extended through May 17, 2020. The exhibit provides an opportunity to view several albums in their entirety. With loose pages of delicately colored images, often complemented by handwritten texts, an album is simultaneously a drawing and a novel, an installation and a performance.

The Zimmerli Art Museum at Rutgers will be closed to the public May 18-August 31, 2020, for renovations. Museum programming will be relocated to partner locations. The Zimmerli will welcome back visitors on September 1, 2020.

Upcoming Articles in Slavic Review

Volume 79 Spring 2020

CLUSTER: POST-COMMUNIST ISLAM
IN A POST-9/11 WORLD. THE STATE OF THE RELIGIOUS MARKETPLACE

Introduction
Mustafa Tuna and Andreares Mesaric

"Disrupting Boundaries between Traditional and Transnational Islam: Pious Women's Engagement with Islamic Authority in Bosnia Herzegovina" Andreares Mesaric

"Anti-Muslim Fear Narrative and the Ban on Said Nursi's Works as 'Extremist Literature' in Russia" Mustafa Tuna

ARTICLES

"Between Sound and Silence: The Failure of the 'Symphony of Sirens' in Baku (1922) and Moscow (1923)" Daniel Schwartz

"The Filmmaker in Wartime: Sergei Eisenstein Inside and Out" Joan Neuberger

"Experience as Device: Encountering Russian Formalism in the Ljubljana School" Kaitlyn Tucker-Sorenson

"Boomerangs and Bombs: The Zagreb School of Animation and Yugoslavia's Third Wave Experiment" Paul Morton

"Academics Executed on the Wulecki Hills in Lviv: From a Local Wartime Crime to a Translocal Memory Event" Eleonora Narselius and Igor Pietraszewski

William E. Butler was awarded the Gold Medal of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine on December 19, 2019 in a ceremony at the Koresky Institute of State and Law "For Scientific Achievements" and honored with two Festschriften by Ukrainian and Russian colleagues, one by comparative lawyers and the other by international lawyers.

On December 5, 2019, William Brumfield, nearly 50 years of work documenting Russia's unique architecture and history was recognized by the Russian Federation during a ceremony at the Russian Embassy in Washington D.C. Russian Ambassador to the United States Anatoly Antonov presented Brumfield with the Order of Friendship medal, the highest state decoration of the Russian Federation given to foreign nationals. The Order of Friendship was established in 1994 to reward Russian and foreign citizens whose work, deeds, and efforts have been aimed at the betterment of relations with the Russian Federation and its people.

The Modern Language Association of America awarded the 15th Scaglione Prize for a Translation of a Literary Work Honorable Mention to Ellen Elias-Bursac and David Williams for Fox, by Dubravka Ugresic (Open Letter Press, 2018).


Polina Dimova was awarded a 2019-20 ACLS Fellowship to complete her book on Modernist synaesthesia, "At the Crossroads of the Senses." She was also recently appointed a new position as Assistant Professor of Russian at the University of Denver, where she will begin teaching in Fall 2020.

Tetyana Dyzhevych defended her dissertation "Political Subjectivities in Russia and Ukraine through the Lens of Post-Soviet Literature." At the University of Illinois at Chicago and started a job as Visiting Assistant Professor of Russian at the New College of Florida, which is the honors college of the Florida State University system.

The Slavic Department at the University of Pittsburgh welcomes Bella Grigoryan as Associate Professor and Chair.

The Royal Society of Canada and its Members have elected ninety-three new Fellows in the Academies of Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, and Science. These individuals have been elected by their peers for their outstanding scholarly, scientific and artistic achievement. Recognition by the RSC is the highest honor an individual can achieve in the Arts, Social Sciences and Sciences. Among the 2019 Fellows is Juliet Johnson, Professor of Political Science at McGill University.

Allison Leigh has been appointed the Slemco/LEQSF Regents Endowed Professor in Art & Architecture at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette.

Morgan Liu was elected for a three-year term to the Presidency of the Central Eurasian Studies Society (CESS), the scholarly organization promoting research in the region and their interconnections. http://centraleurasia.org

Yuval Miller has taken the position of Bren Chair of Russian Military and Political Strategy at the Marine Corps University Krulak Center.

Polina Popova was awarded a Princeton University Library Research Grant (through the Cotsen Fund). Popova used that grant for the three-week research trip to the Rare Book Division of the Princeton University Library in January 2020 where she conducted a research for her dissertation on the representation of power in Soviet children's literature under Stalin.

Douglas Smith's latest book, The Russian Job: The Forgotten Story of How America Saved the Soviet Union from Ruin (Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 2019), was chosen as one of the best books of the year by The Financial Times.

University of Texas at Austin welcomed several new scholars: Chelsi West Ohuere, Maria Sidorkina, and Frane Karabatic.

Susanna Weygandt (Sewanee: The University of the South) is the Russian Program Coordinator of the Summer Intensive Language Program 2020 at Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey.
AATSEEL 2019 BOOK PRIZE WINNERS


• Scholarly merit, originality, and felicity of style should be the main criteria for selection.

• The geographic area of study is broadly defined as the territories of the former imperial Russian state and the Soviet Union. The publication must deal in whole or in part with the long 18th century. The recipient of the award will be recognized with a cash prize, which will be presented in November 2020 at the AASEE annual convention in Washington, DC. The prize will be awarded at the AASSS mee
ASEEES offers travel grant for members to present their papers at its Annual Convention.

- Graduate Student Travel Grant Program
- Russian Scholar Travel Grant Program
- Regional Scholar Travel Grant Program
- Convention Opportunity Travel Grant Program
- Diversity & Inclusion Travel Grant Program

ASEEES Membership

Join the 3,300 individual members and receive:

- Discounted convention registration fees
- Slavic Review and NewsNet
- Access to ASEEES Commons, job, fellowship/grant announcements
- Eligibility for travel grants, research funding, and first book subventions
- Access to mentoring, networking and professional development opportunities

Dues structured at several levels, including Reduced Dues for low-income scholars living and working in Eastern Europe/Eurasia

52nd Annual ASEEES Convention
Nov. 5-8, 2020
Marriott Wardman Park
Washington, DC

Registration information

Hotel information

Note: Programming for the 2020 Annual Convention in November in Washington, DC, is on schedule, and we expect to send out acceptance notifications by no later than mid-April. We are mindful of the contingencies as we move forward. Any changes will be posted on aseees.org/covid-19