Beginning this spring, the Russian and East European Center will become the Russian, East European, and Eurasian Center, following considerable discussion among our faculty and students (and review and approval by a whole string of campus committees). Why change a name that has been used for nearly half a century, especially as we were spared the need, faced by many other universities, to drop “Soviet” from their centers’ names? As you will see in the brief essays in this issue by several of our faculty, various interpretations of this change can be suggested.

In part, the reason for the change is simple and practical. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union more than a decade ago, the term Russia can no longer (if it ever could) reasonably stand for all the former Soviet states. As a result, throughout the profession, it has now become common to use the term Eurasia to refer to the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union, especially in the Caucasus and Central Asia. The term has also been used, and we intend this broader meaning, to refer to parts of Central Asia that were never incorporated into the Russian Empire or the Soviet Union—though which, in practice, we have also included in our programs—especially Afghanistan, but also to other areas whose cultural and political histories intersect those of Europe and Asia (Turkey, for example).

Still, it can be asked, now that the Cold War is over, even though it never completely defined or confined us, what logic remains to justify linking these disparate lands in one program? Why should we, to put this concretely, continue to organize courses, BA and MA degree programs, conferences, lectures, and outreach activities that try to bring together such diverse nations? One answer, the historical one, is that today’s borders are politics. This warrants maintaining a unified area studies scholarship.

What it depicts. That extra E in our abbreviated name of course reflects radical geopolitical changes, from the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the general ousting of communism as the official ideology of dozens of countries in the region to a post-9/11 world, in which Eurasia containing and bordering Muslim countries now commands much more political and academic attention than ever before. I, however, consider the other two functions of names more important.

What it invokes. The name change acts as an active reminder that, despite their cultural differences and the imminent accession to the European Union of most of the East European countries, decades of shared communist experience still loom large in Russians’, East Europeans’ and Eurasians’ memory and identity, and thus politics. This warrants maintaining a unified area studies scholarship.

What it creates. Beyond continuing our active scholarly engagement with this shared past, what I hope the name will generate is a more vigorous decentering of Russia in our studies and ways of teaching. This is not to deny Russia’s geopolitical significance, nor is it a call for ending teaching or funding for research on Russia. But it is to call for a renewed epistemology, in which Russia is examined relationally, that is, as radically shaped by the peripheries it ruled before, during and after state socialism. Conversely, these peripheries need to be investigated sui generis, as having scholarly merits independent of their subordinated position in the Russian imperium. Ideally, such a new epistemology should lead to a fruitful synthesis of postsocialist and postcolonial studies. This, in turn, will not only theoretically update our area studies, finally wrangling it out of the grip of Kremlinology, Orientalism, and other academic dictates of the Cold War, but will propel us, its practitioners, in the avant garde of the social sciences and humanities.

What’s in a Name? REEEC Changes Its Name to REEEC

Starting in Spring 2004, the Russian and East European Center is officially changing its name to the Russian, East European, and Eurasian Center (see “Letter from the Director”). Below are some thoughts on the name change by REE(E)C faculty:

Zsuzsa Gille
Assistant Professor of Sociology

A name depicts. A name invokes. A name creates. What does it mean then to change our name from Russian and East European to Russian, East European, and Eurasian?

What it depicts. That extra E in our abbreviated name of course reflects radical geopolitical changes, from the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the general ousting of communism as the official ideology of dozens of countries in the region to a post-9/11 world, in which Eurasia containing and bordering Muslim countries now commands much more political and academic attention than ever before. I, however, consider the other two functions of names more important.

What it invokes. The name change acts as an active reminder that, despite their cultural differences and the imminent accession to the European Union of most of the East European countries, decades of shared communist experience still loom large in Russians’, East Europeans’ and Eurasians’ memory and identity, and thus politics. This warrants maintaining a unified area studies scholarship.

What it creates. Beyond continuing our active scholarly engagement with this shared past, what I hope the name will generate is a more vigorous decentering of Russia in our studies and ways of teaching. This is not to deny Russia’s geopolitical significance, nor is it a call for ending teaching or funding for research on Russia. But it is to call for a renewed epistemology, in which Russia is examined relationally, that is, as radically shaped by the peripheries it ruled before, during and after state socialism. Conversely, these peripheries need to be investigated sui generis, as having scholarly merits independent of their subordinated position in the Russian imperium. Ideally, such a new epistemology should lead to a fruitful synthesis of postsocialist and postcolonial studies. This, in turn, will not only theoretically update our area studies, finally wrangling it out of the grip of Kremlinology, Orientalism, and other academic dictates of the Cold War, but will propel us, its practitioners, in the avant garde of the social sciences and humanities.

Carol Leff
Associate Professor of Political Science

Before 1989, it was quite easy for political scientists to define our specialized turf. The Cold War provided our
not the only borders that should define the connections between places. The histories of nations, empires, and communism have made varied borders, all of which have left their legacies.  

Another, more pragmatic, answer argues that boundaries depend completely on the questions we ask: thus, the historical connections forged by the Ottoman empire or Soviet Communism, for example, or by ethnicity and religion, are mapped with different boundaries making different “regions.” No less, it can be argued that all borders (and the names we use to mark them) are acts of trying to fix identities and connections, to include and exclude, that often do interpretive violence to the complexity of lived identities and linkages. Of course, such border-making is not just an act of interpretive violence; these imposed boundaries have often been put and held in place with real physical violence.

All of these considerations have shaped our decision to add the word “Eurasia” to our name. In one sense, this changes nothing—we are not adding or subtracting areas of study to our programs. In another sense, it does make a difference, for it signals our growing recognition of the shifting and porous boundaries in this large region and our acknowledgement of the hugely important connections with what is beyond even these generous and unstable boundaries—especially Europe and Asia. The very ambiguity of the term Eurasia (and, for that matter, of the term eastern Europe) is appropriate, therefore. Still, what has always determined and will continue to determine the content and directions of our programs is your work—the many students, scholars, and others associated with the Center. Your interests and work have led to this change and will continue to shape what we do and who we are. So, welcome to REEEC!

—Mark D. Steinberg

### Name Change—continued

definitions and set boundaries, and we hardly noticed, I think, the historical-cultural slippage that came with drawing a thick line (or an iron curtain) around communist states. If a country wasn’t communist, then we didn’t have to think about it; in fact, horizons were even more constricted, for analysis of Soviet bloc politics was heavily Moscow-centric. The end of the Cold War was an opportunity for radical expansion of the research agenda and for more nuanced and farther-reaching inquiry.

I may be the only member currently on the REEC Executive Committee who was serving when the Cold War ended, and I well remember the discussion—we were deeply relieved that REEC had never labeled itself a center for “Soviet” studies. US government agencies showed an apparently puckish sense of humor in redesignating the former Soviet Union as “Eurasia” as if the nomenclature of the warring states in the novel 1984 had suddenly caught up to reality. This relabeling, however, was very much to the point, recapturing the broader sweep of historical and cultural meanings that lay buried under the label “Soviet.” So, with the luxury of a decade in which to consider an appropriate name for our venerable Center, we too now recognize that complexity. But the new name is not the resolution of issues, but a recognition of ongoing challenge. We still have rethinking to do. For example, if East Central Europe had been, in Kundera’s famous phrase, “kidnapped by the east,” how do we now think about rejoining “Europe”? Transnational institutions and especially the EU will set new boundaries for Europe and for the kind of comparative politics that scholars explore.

This model of European integration represents a new and more fruitful challenge to how we think about the space we study. Area studies has a bad name in political science, as an indictment of atheoretical thinking. At its best, this has never been true. Indeed, area specialization made considerable sense in the communist period because the area shared a common and highly distinctive political system. And even now, area specialization is not a substitute for, but instead a prerequisite to, solid theory. And now political scientists have a new agenda that can only be addressed if we maintain in good repair the interdisciplinary grounding that helps to anchor politics in its broader historical and socio-cultural legacies.

### Harriet Murav
Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures and Comparative Literature

My daughter was looking at a map of the world the other day, and she remarked, “I didn’t realize Russia was also Asia, I thought it was all Europe.” Since at least the 18th century, Russians have been arguing about their status as European and Asian, and indeed their presence in Central Asia, historically, was rationalized in terms of their ability to perform Europe’s so-called civilizing mission in the East. The new name, “Russian, East European, and Eurasian Center” better reflects our understanding of the ways in which geographical terms such as Russia, Asia, and Europe are deeply embedded in long-lived and ongoing political and cultural contestations about history, modernity, and difference. The new name also reflects important shifts that our field has been undergoing since the collapse of communism. The image of Russia and East Europe as a gray monolith presided over by gray men in winter overcoats is outmoded, to say the least. My recent work has been focused on the problem of the Jew in Soviet nationality policy and its long-reaching implications in recent Russian literature. More than once, I find myself reading works set in Soviet Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Siberia, and I struggle to understand the intersections and collisions among the cultures, literatures, and traditions that bear the labels “indigenous,” Soviet, and Jewish. The Russian, East European, and Eurasian Center, with its marvelous resources, its outstanding staff, and network of scholars here at U of I and elsewhere, provides a home for the boundary-crossing and interdisciplinary research that is so important to our field today.

### Shannon O’Lear
Assistant Professor of Geography

In a recent review of a book on Russia and geopolitics, Ralph Clem notes the overwhelming changes that have taken place on the Eurasian continent since 1988: “Who, from that chronological vantage point, would have thought that today American troops would be on the ground in Uzbekistan, that a host of former communist states would be members of NATO (and that some would also be aspirants to the European Union), or, for that matter, that Moscow would become one of the world’s largest markets for Mercedes automobiles and Mars candy bars?”*
Unlike even two years ago, now it is not unusual to read about newly independent republics in Central Asia and the Caucasus in major media outlets. Although US military presence in Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, and Georgia and the cooperation of Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, and Azerbaijan in US military efforts may have rekindled our awareness and interest in the area, the situation has moved beyond mere geopolitics. Enhanced exchange with Eurasian states has drawn attention to issues of widespread poverty contrasted in some cases with resource wealth, fostered sensitivity to diverse meanings of Islam and Christianity in these places, and engaged scholars and policymakers in consideration of the accomplishments and challenges of building independent states, civil societies and healthy environments amidst Soviet legacies. The addition of “Eurasia” to the Center name reflects the dynamic geography of the former Soviet realm as well as the Center’s intention to enhance and maintain a focus on the cultural, linguistic, social, historical, economic and political richness of the region.

Donna Buchanan
Associate Professor of Musicology

If my students’ research topics are any indication, in recent years the emphasis in cultural and area studies scholarship has shifted from inquiries situated within and bounded by the nation-state, to those that track an individual’s or group’s experiences across all kinds of borders, whether physical, political, historical, or ontological. This shift reflects new understandings of identity as multiplicitous, composite, ever dynamic, and political, as well as emerging from increasingly integrated and expanded networks of transcultural experience. My students’ research resonates with these trends, demonstrating a refocusing of the interpretive lens from studies “of” or “in” to “between,” and underscoring why it is helpful and even necessary to consider how specific communities are related to others both within and outside the territories falling under our Center’s purview.

For instance, Denise Gill’s senior thesis examines Smyrnaica and Rebetika, two genres of popular music born of intercultural contact in late Ottoman Asia Minor and the early 20th century Greco-Turkish population exchanges. She concludes that these genres are more fruitfully understood as products of Aegean life than as specifically Greek or Turkish, reflecting regional interchange that superseded state and ethnic bounds. Maggie Adams’s MM thesis considers the impact of policy on the arts among Kazakhs living on both sides of Sino-Soviet border, a topic which exposes inadequacies in current border zone scholarship. Her doctoral dissertation, now in progress, investigates the musical traditions accompanying various state-sponsored holidays and festivals as a springboard for understanding how cultural policymakers are grappling with Kazakhstan’s ethnic diversity (which includes substantial Russian, Chinese, Korean, Uzbek and other minority populations) in the forging of a post-socialist Kazakh/Kazakhstani identity.

The work of Natasha Kipp and Julia Cortinas is, if possible, even more complicated. Kipp’s MM thesis, currently underway, focuses on the contribution of Azeri composer Uzeir Hajibeyov to Azeri, Soviet, and Eurasian life. She analyzes Leili and Majnun, an epic tale widespread in the Middle East, Central Asia, and the Caucasus, which Hajibeyov adopted as the basis for an opera western European in structure, but whose musical substance draws upon the Azeri modal system. The opera became an Azeri national icon during the Soviet period, despite the fact that it is rife with Sufist imagery prevalent through the region. Embedded in the opera are thus layers of meaning whose significance reverberates with many times, peoples, and places. Finally, Cortinas’ dissertation research, also in progress, comprises a multi-sited investigation of how contemporary professional bayan (Russian button accordion) performers residing in North America and Russia convey Russian ethnic identity through their music. She hypothesizes that while such folk orchestras were endemic to Soviet art, their continuance today may derive from a re-imagining of their socialist qualities as inherently Russian and raises questions about the extent to which “Soviet” and “Russian” became conflated as emblems of ethnicity and citizenship.

Rich in musical and theoretical complexity, these topics demand fluency in multiple cultures and in some cases, multiple languages and require the authors to consider a REEE territory or community in

—continued on page 4, see Name Change
Name Change—continued

relation to other parts of the globe. I can think of no better illustration of why the inclusion of Eurasia in the Center’s name is appropriate and productive. In today’s world, it just makes sense.

Maria Todorova
Professor of History

Names should be and usually are a helpful device: they aid in recognizing people, objects, entities, events and distinguish them from the amorphous mass of history and everyday life. On the other hand, they also project a certain fixity on things, they presuppose a constant identity and thus keep reality in a straitjacket. Some of us change our names when we marry or when we divorce, but we still are (supposedly) the same human being. Yet, even if we never marry or keep the same name, we certainly are not the same person we used to be 30, 40 or even 10 years ago.

Let us begin by looking at our old name: REEC, the old “married” name of the region. It was based on the use of the designator “Russia” as shorthand for the Soviet Union and of “Eastern European” as the political shorthand for Warsaw Pact Europe. With the demise of the Soviet Union, Russia remained, albeit contracted, as well as a host of independent nation states emerging from the former USSR. They are being now subsumed (for the sake of utility) by the designator “Eurasia,” since many, Russia included, cross the symbolic divide between Europe and Asia. The irony is that the employment of this term harks back to a particular ideology — Eurasianism — which is intimately linked to the Russian imperial project. Nevertheless, its brevity has assured that it has entered a number of institutional frameworks: diplomatic, political, academic.

Eastern Europe, on the other hand, after the divorce has ceased to exist. The name is no longer employed in real life but only as a historical designator. In fact, the State Department decreed that the term be dropped from diplomatic usage, and all former Soviet satellites in Europe be now subsumed under Central Europe. Eastern Europe was thus symbolically (though not in practice) reserved for the Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia itself. If we pedantically follow the State Department’s nomenclature, our new name — “Russian, East European, and Eurasian Center” — actually designates an area smaller than the previous one. But the worst thing for scholars is to be pedantic (even worse, to follow the State Department).

So, how does our name change alter our research and teaching efforts? In my view, little if at all. What unifies, in fact, the enormous region stretching from Prague to Vladivostok? Regions have both breadth (geography) and depth (history). They are made of consecutive layers of historical legacies, which may overlap or include some of their parts in alternative geographical formations.

Thus, the Roman Empire and the Roman territory incorporated part of our Center’s territory — the Balkans — in a region stretching from the British Isles to Mesopotamia. Another legacy — the Habsburg — included areas from Central Europe, the Balkans and parts of what today is subsumed under Eurasia. The shifting space of Turkic and Mongol migrations has involved in different periods territories stretching from Central Asia to Central Europe to Russia to India to China. There is only one legacy, however, which links the space from Prague to Vladivostok (our Center’s territory) in one historic and geographic region, and this is the communist legacy. Does this

mean that, strictly speaking, this ought to be the Center’s only object of study? Of course not. The Center has and will continue to support all the rich variety of interests and disciplinary approaches towards different areas and time periods of this enormous region.

This brings us, however, to the role of institutions in shaping regions. Centers for the study of Russia and Eastern Europe are brainchildren of the Cold War classifications although, naturally, the scholarship, which was inspired and promoted by these centers, had a much broader mission and significance. Institutions are notoriously conservative or simply inert; they lag behind the political and intellectual changes. Today, however, centers like ours are of utmost importance, especially as the former Eastern Europe is concerned. In the US, Europe is synonymous with Western Europe in curricula, textbooks and institutionally. As long as this is the case, “Eastern Europe” needs special care. The question whether it should or how it would be decoupled from Russia and Eurasia comes with its own pros and cons, but it is not the subject of this intervention. In the end, no matter how we are called, the quality of our work is determined and measured by anything but our name.


Slavic Happenings

The Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures is delighted to announce that Valeria Sobol (PhD’03, Columbia University) joined us this fall as our new Russian language coordinator and specialist in 18th-19th century Russian literature (Her faculty profile will be featured in the spring 2004 issue of the Center News). Her husband, David Cooper, will be teaching a new course on Slavic folklore this spring as RUSS 360. Harriet Murav, Lilya Kaganovsky, and Richard Tempest teamed up with Diane Koenker, Mark Steinberg, and John Randolph in History to teach a new graduate course this fall: “From Dandies to Men of Steel: Gender, Masculinity, and the Body in Russia, 1830-1930.” With generous support from REEC, the Program in Jewish Culture and Society, and the International Council, the Department is bringing specialists in Russian-Jewish culture to campus this fall and spring: Gennady Estraikh (NYU) and David Sheeer (University of Denver) will lecture in November with Anna Shternshis (University of Toronto) and Mikhail Krutikov (University of Michigan) speaking in the spring. Oana Popescu-Sandu and Maggie Ivanova, graduate students in Comparative Literature who work on Russian and Slavic literature, will be presenting papers at this year’s AATSEEL conference in San Diego. This February, Lilya Kaganovsky is co-organizing a conference on “Russian Cinema After Communism” with Dragan Kujundzic (UC-Irvine), with a public screening of Aleksandr Sokurov’s Russian Ark (Russkii kovcheg, 2002) at Boardman’s Art Theatre in Champaign.
Report from the Field:
Images of Zagreb, Croatia

By Katherine Sredl (PhD candidate, Institute of Communications Research)

With generous support of IREX, IIE, and Borden fellowships, I spent 2002-03 in Croatia conducting my dissertation research on post-socialist consumer culture. The fourteen months I experienced in Croatia (mainly in Zagreb and Split) positioned me to understand more critically not only consumers in post-socialist Europe but the structures of consumption in constructing new identities in the post-socialist marketplace. Outside the dichotomy of west and east, right and wrong, we can see the experience of consumption in post-socialist Europe as a way of understanding that much of the transition experience of post-socialist consumers is about social construction of identity on the local, national and international level, in ways similar to the socialist era and also in entirely new ways that both resemble and significantly differ from the US marketplace identities. In addition to lecturing at the Universities of Zagreb and Split faculty of economics, department of marketing, I enjoyed conducting fieldwork in advertising agencies, markets, shops, and street cafes and interviewing consumers who try to make sense of as well as embody the varied post-socialist Croatian identities. I thank colleagues, professors, and institutions at U of I who have assisted me in this project.

1) Katherine busy at work
2) watching each other on a Saturday afternoon in Zagreb
3) post-socialist consumer in Croatia
4) statue of Ban Josip Jelacic in the square named for him, the social center of Zagreb

New Faculty Profile:
Miranda Beaven Remnek

We are pleased to welcome Miranda Beaven Remnek to our community. She joined the University in January 2003 as Head of the Slavic and East European Library and Professor of Library Administration. She received her PhD in history from the University of California, Berkeley, with her dissertation on “The Expansion of Russian Reading Audiences, 1828-1848.” She received her MLS from the University of Western Ontario and her MA in Slavic from Stanford University.

Professor Remnek comes us from the University of Minnesota Libraries where she worked as Bibliographer of Russian and East European Studies since 1979 as well as Coordinator of the Electronic Text Research Center since 1995. One of her main interests is to enhance the use of digital texts in our field, in which she is a forerunner. At Minnesota, she founded the “Early 19th Century Russian Readership & Culture” project to convert Russian primary sources into digital texts, and at Illinois she plans to improve the Slavic Library’s work in the digital field. As part of a national effort, the Slavic Library will be participating in the development of a comprehensive registry of digital collections in the field of Slavic, East European and Eurasian Studies. In addition, the Slavic Library will be working on several other projects dealing with digital databases including integration of Slavic digital collections into local/national repositories, development of digital supply mechanisms for delivery of hard-to-obtain research materials, and creation of image databases for use in teaching. Along with directing the projects of the Slavic Library, Remnek is serving as co-chair for the AAASS Bibliography and Documentation Committee Digital Projects Working Group. She will also be working with other librarians at U of I as coordinator of a newly formed e-text working group.

This fall Professor Remnek took a three-week trip to Russia where she represented the University at the Frankfurt Book Fair in Germany and visited the Russian State Library in Moscow, the Russian National Library and the Library of the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg, and Tiumen State University, where she gave a presentation on “Digital Library Projects at Illinois.” One purpose, among many, of the trip was to discuss digital collaboration with Russian colleagues.
Faculty/Staff/Associates News

Nancy Benson was promoted to Associate Professor in Journalism after successfully achieving tenure.

Dmitry Bobyshev published in 2003: Ya zeds (Moscow); Zhakomstva slov (Moscow), Zhar-Kust (Paris); “Cherevtchina nachego vremeni,” Arion (Moscow), and presented “The Petersburg Myth in Russian Culture” at the Russian Literary Symposium at Middlebury. He also received the Research Board award for a trip to Russia to support “Paradigms of Freedom in Russian Literature” and Scholars’ Travel Fund to participate in “Moscow Poetry Biennale 2003.”


Stephen P. Hill gave a lecture, “Russians in Hollywood’s History,” at the Bloomington-Vladimir Sister City Association meeting in June.

Diane Koenker was on leave during spring 2003 in London, where she was a visiting scholar at University College London. While on leave, she presented “The Proletarian Tourist in the 1930s: Between Mass Excursion and Mass Escape” at the University of Sheffield, at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies of University College London, and at the University of Bielefeld, Germany. At Oxford University she presented “Worker Culture and the Crisis of Class Identity at the End of the Soviet 1920s.” She published “A Journal Editor’s Guide to Publishing Etiquette,” NewsNet (2003).


Peter Maggs completed a needs study for legislation reform in Tajikistan at the request of the organization administering US aid. In April he attended an international law roundtable at St. Petersburg State University, at which President Putin, President Chirac, and Chancellor Schroeder spoke. He presented “The Civil Codes of Central Eurasia” at the Central Eurasian Studies Society conference in October.

Harriet Murav published Identity Theft: The Jew in Russia and the Case of Avraam Uri Kovner (Stanford, 2003) and “Maslova’s Exorbitant Body,” Tolstoy Studies Journal (2003). She is now Head of the Slavic Department.


Temira Pachmuss published lirii ivusk, Pohvaha rossiiskoi poezi (Fallim, 2002) and “Sub’ektivnye suzhdienia lirii Ivaska,” La Pensee Russe (Paris, 2003). She also received a letter from the Institute of Russian Literature of the Russian Academy of Sciences, conveying gratitude for her work and publications on the Russian Silver Age.


Judith Pintar received the Alpha Lambda Delta Freshman Honor Society Campus Award for the Outstanding Teacher of Freshman, 2002-03.

Mark Steinberg was promoted to Professor and his book Voices of Revolution, 1917, appeared this fall in paperback.

Maria Todorova has been awarded the Fellowship at the Wissenschaftkolleg zu Berlin for 2004-2005. She edited and co-authored Balkan Identities: Nation and Memory (Hurst & NYU, 2003) and published several articles including: “Historische Vermächtnisse als Analysekategorie. Der Fall Südosteuropa,” in Europa und die Grenzen im Kopf, ed. Karl Kaiser (Wieser Verlag, 2003); “Memoirs, Biography, Historiography: the Reconstruction of Levski’s Life Story,” in Festschrift für Veselin Traikov (Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 2003). In June she organized a graduate student workshop for the Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeastern Europe in Sofia, and in September she co-organized and presented at a conference on “Remembering Communism: Genres of Representation” in Braunschweig, Germany.

Visiting Scholars Fall 2003

Andrew Herscher is a Mellon Fellow in Comparative Literature. His work deals with spatial forms of political violence in the Balkans, especially Kosovo, where he has been working in the Hague Tribunal, UN, and various NGOs, including one he co-founded, the Kosovo Cultural Heritage Project.

Lidia Macovei is a visiting scholar in the College of Law from the Free International University of Moldova.

Carsten Schapkow is a visiting professor of European Jewish History from the Simon Dubnow Institute for Jewish History and Culture at the University of Leipzig.

Mezher Yuksel is a visiting scholar at REEC from the Middle East Technical University in Ankara. At Illinois, he is working with Keith Hitchins on Kurdish nationalism as an unintended consequence of the modernization project in Turkey.

Anissa Gaisina is a Mortenson Center scholar from Russia.

Alumni News

Sascha L. Goluboff (PhD’99, anthropology) is an Assistant Professor of Anthropology at Washington and Lee University and has recently published Jewish Russians: Upheavals in a Moscow Synagogue (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003- www.upenn.edu/pennpress/book/13843. html).

Jung Ah Kim (PhD’02, Slavic) is a lecturer of Russian literature at Seoul National University, Korea.

Jeff Sahadeo (PhD’02, history) is Associate Director of the Institute of European and Russian Studies at Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada.

Heather L. Tafel (PhD’03, political science) has a one-year teaching position in Political Science at Grand Valley State University in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Ian Watson (BA’00, REES) finished his MA in international relations at the University of Kentucky and is now working as an arms control policy analyst at Science Applications International Corporation in McLean, VA.
Contribute to the new REEC Graduate Student Research Fund

As you will note from this and other issues of the Center News, REEC is able to sponsor a wide range of programs designed to enhance the study of Russia, Eurasia, and Eastern Europe. Much of this is funded by the US Department of Education and the Department of State along with the University. However, none of those funds can be used for REEC-affiliated graduate students to conduct research in the field, and university funds for research travel are very limited. In particular, the ability of doctoral students to obtain major grants for dissertation research is much enhanced by preliminary field research, and MA students normally cannot find support for thesis research abroad. To address these needs, we are seeking to establish a new REEC Graduate Student Research Grant. The grant would be open to graduate students in all disciplines at UIUC.

Please send your contribution to: REEC, University of Illinois, 104 ISB, 910 S. 5th St., Champaign, IL 61820. Your gifts are tax-deductible. Thank you very much for your support.

Name ____________________________________________
Address __________________________________________
Phone __________________________

☐ I would like to contribute to the REEC Graduate Student Research Fund. ☐ Please charge my credit card. Amount $_____
☐ I would like to contribute to the REEC General Fund. Credit Card Type: □ Visa □ MC □ Discover □ AMEX
Make check payable to: UIF/REEC.
☐ $1000 □ $500 □ $250 □ $100 □ $50 □ $ ______
Expiration Date ____________________________
Signature ____________________________

[ cut and return with check ]
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Student News
Stu Burns (history) presented “The Undying Empires: Imagined Balkan Nations and the Concept of Homeland” at the Ohio Valley History Conference in October.
Muzhgan Nazarova (LIS) presented “The Internet in Azerbaijan: Its Impact on Everyday Life” at the conference of the Association of Internet Research in Toronto in October.

Incoming REES MA Students 2003-04
Ashley Fillmer, Polina Golovatina, Joseph Lenkart

2002-2003 Graduates
PhDs:
Stephen Herzog (history)
Marjorie Hilton (history)
Molly Johnson (history)
Aida Orgocka (human development and family studies)
Heather Tafel (political science)

MA:
Margarethe Adams (MM, musicology)
Anca Dragu (journalism)
Juliya Dolinina (LIS)
Raymond Hrinko (REES)
Irene Kolchinsky (LIS)
Adam Malamen (REES)
Lindsay Shaw (REES)
Robert Whiting (REES)

BAs:
Denise Gill (BM, music history/ethnomusicology)
Marko Katic (anthropology)
Adam Krieger (history/REES)
Miriam Nibley (Russian lang & lit)
Zeljko Popovic (history/philosophy)
Joseph Underhill (Russian lang & lit)

FLAS Fellowship Recipients Summer 2003
Margarethe Adams (musicology-Kazakh)
Rachel Facey (REES-Belarusian)
Ross Musselman (history-Serbian/Croatian)
Dmitry Tartakovsky (history-Romanian)
Natasha Kipp (musicology-Azerbaijan)
Alicia Szymonik (REES-Romanian)
Elizabeth Spreng (anthropology-Czech)
Elana Jakel (history-Russian)
Jessica Shelvik (musicology-Russian)

Academic Year 2003-04
Margarethe Adams (musicology-Turkish)
Andrew Asher (anthropology-Polish)
Sharyl Corrado (history-Russian)
Julia Cortinas (musicology-Russian)
Randall Dills (history-Russian)
Rachel Facey (REES-Russian)
Ashley Fillmer (REES-Polish)
Michael Findley (political science-Serbian/Croatian)
Diana Flesner (musicology-Bulgarian)
Elana Jakel (history-Russian)
Natasha Kipp (musicology-Russian)
Tatiana Kuznic (comparative literature-Czech)
Gregory Kveberg (history-Russian)
Michael Lasker (biochemistry-Russian)
Kate Meehan (history-Serbian/Croatian)
Jessica Shelvik (musicology-Turkish)

Elizabeth Spreng (anthropology-Czech)
Alicia Szymonik (REES-Russian)
Dmitry Tartakovsky (history-Yiddish)
Robert Whiting (geography-Serbian/Croatian)
Slavic Review Editorial Assistants 2003-04
Margarethe Adams, Sharyl Corrado, Michael Findley
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Lecturer(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 9</td>
<td>“A Communal Identity but not a Corporate One? Soslovie, State and Local Interests in Pre-Emancipation Russia”</td>
<td>Mollie Cavender (History, Ohio State University, Mansfield)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 23</td>
<td>“Terrorism in the Balkans: Domestic or Imported?”</td>
<td>Petar Boskovic (Institute for Strategic Studies and Development, Belgrade, Union of Serbia and Montenegro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7</td>
<td>“From Partizan vs. Ustasa to Prada vs. Gucci: Consumer Culture in Croatia Since 1991”</td>
<td>Katherine Sredl (Institute of Communications Research, UIUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21</td>
<td>“Process Oskara Wilda i sud nad Sashei Pylnikovym (po romanu F. Sologuba ‘Melkii Bes’)”</td>
<td>Margarita Pavlova (Pushkinskii Dom, St. Petersburg, Russia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11</td>
<td>“Croatia: From a Homeland to a Nation”</td>
<td>Robert Whiting (Geography, UIUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2</td>
<td>“Financial Sector Implication for the Standard of Living in Russia: Comparisons with the US”</td>
<td>Ronald Spahr and Nancy Scannell (Business Administration, University of Illinois, Springfield; REEC Regional Faculty Associates)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>