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PROGRAM

Friday, April 27
Harriman Institute

9:00 - 9:15 AM | Coffee/Tea and Cookies

9:15 - 9:30 AM | Opening Remarks

Valentina Izmirlieva (Columbia University)
Rory Finnin (Cambridge University)

9:30 - 10:45 AM | “Races, Spaces, Places”
Keynote address by Charles King (Georgetown University)

10:45 AM - 12:15 PM | Media and Ideology

Vsevolod Samokhvalov (University of Liege), “Why is Crimea So Special: The Holy Grail of Russia’s ‘Great Power Identity’”
Sophie Pinkham (Columbia University), “Putin’s Crimean Rhetoric and Imperial Nostalgia”

Moderator: Valentina Izmirlieva (Columbia University)

12:30 - 2:00 PM | Lunch for Panelists (Faculty House)

2:15 - 4:30 PM | Ecology and War

Carlos Cordova (Oklahoma State University), “The Transformation of the Crimean Plains: From Prehistory to 2014 and Beyond”
Mara Kozelsky (University of South Alabama), “Crimea in War and Transformation”
Johanna Conterio (Flinders University), “The Landscape Shock: Climate and Health on the Southern Coast of Crimea, 1928-1941”

Moderator: Rory Finnin (Cambridge University)

4:30 – 6:00 PM | Refreshments

6:00 - 7:30 PM | Inaugural Shevelov Memorial Lecture in Ukrainian Studies

Valentina Izmirlieva (Columbia University), “The Cult of St. Volodimer and the Theft of History”

7:30 – 8:30 PM | Reception
Saturday, April 28
Harriman Institute

9:15 - 9:30 AM | Coffee/Tea and Cookies

9:30 AM - 11:45 AM | Toward a History of Crimea

Owen Doonan (California State University Northridge) & Jane Rempel (University of Sheffield), “The Emergence and Development of the North Anatolian—Crimean Communication Corridor in Antiquity”
Victor Ostapchuk (University of Toronto), “Between Pride and Prejudice: Warfare and Violence in Crimean Tatar History”
Oleksandr Halenko (National Academy of Science, Kyiv, Ukraine), “Why Crimea Matters for Ukraine”
Moderator: Mark Andryczyk (Harriman Institute)

12:00 – 1:00 PM | Catered Lunch for Panelists

1:15 – 3:15 PM | Workshop “Teaching Crimea”

3:15 – 3:30 PM | Coffee/Tea and Cookies

3:30 AM - 5:45 AM | The Case of the Crimean Tatar

Idil Izmirli (George Washington University), “Islam, Islamic Institutions and Politics of Persecution in Pre- and Post-Occupation Crimea”
Maria Sonevtsky (Bard College/University of California Berkeley), “The Past as Prolific Symbolic Resource: Crimean Tatar Folk Ensembles and the Plasticity of Tradition”
Austin Charron (University of Kansas), “Ukrainians of Crimean Tatar Origin: Internally Displaced Crimean Tatars and Ukrainian Civic Nationalism”
Moderator: Sophie Pinkham (Columbia University)

5:45 – 7:00 PM | Wine and Cheese Reception

Moderator: Yuri Shevchuk (Columbia University)

Organizing Committee
Valentina Izmirliova
Sophie Pinkham
Mark Andryczyk
PARTICIPANTS

Mark Andryczyk (Ph.D. in Ukrainian Literature from the University of Toronto, 2005) has taught Ukrainian literature at Columbia University’s Department of Slavic Languages and administered the Ukrainian Studies Program at the Harriman Institute since 2007. He is the author of The Intellectual as Hero in 1990s Ukrainian Fiction (2012; Ukrainian translation 2014) and the editor of The White Chalk of Days, the Contemporary Ukrainian Literature Series Anthology (2017). A prolific translator from Ukrainian, he has most recently prepared eleven essays by Yuri Andrukhovych for the publication My Final Territory: Selected Essays (2018). Since 2008, Andryczyk has organized the Contemporary Ukrainian Literature Series (cosponsored by the Harriman and Kennan Institutes), which has brought leading Ukrainian literary figures to audiences in North America.

Austin Charron is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Geography and Atmospheric Science at the University of Kansas. He is a cultural and political geographer specializing broadly in Eurasia and the former Soviet Union, with a focus on Ukraine and Crimea. His research interests relate primarily to the roles of territory, ethnicity, and institutions in the construction of socio-spatial identities.

Johanna Conterio is Lecturer in International and Modern European History at Flinders University in Adelaide, Australia. Her research is focused on the environmental, medical, social, and cultural history of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in transnational, international, and global context. She is particularly interested in the history of environment and health, nature protection, urban planning, maritime environments, and culture. She has a Ph.D. and M.A. in History from Harvard University and a B.A. in Comparative Literature from Yale University.

Carlos Cordova is a Professor of Geography at Oklahoma State University. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Texas in 1997 and specializes in geoarchaeology and Quaternary paleoecology. He has years of experience working in Jordan, Crimea, Southern Africa, the Great Plains of North America, Russia (Volga Region), and Mexico. His main research is framed around topics of climate change, environmental change, and human-environmental relations in prehistoric and historic times. He has published in numerous journals in the fields of archaeology, earth sciences, environmental change, and regional geography and is the author of Millennial Landscape Change in Jordan: Geoarchaeology and Cultural Ecology (2007), Crimea and the Black Sea: An Environmental History (2015), and the forthcoming Geoarchaeology: The Human Environmental Perspective. He is currently working on a book on the Valley of Mexico and the lakes that disappeared to give room to Mexico City.

Owen Doonan is Professor of Art History at California State University Northridge. He has directed the Sinop Regional Archaeological Project (SRAP) since 1996 and, since 2015, also the Sinop Kale Excavations under the auspices of the Sinop Museum. He has authored more than 40 articles and the monograph Sinop Landscapes (2004) and has received numerous grants in support of the work at Sinop, including two three-year grants from the NEH, the National Geographic Society, ARIT and other sources. He served as the G. M. A. Hanfmann Lecturer for the Archaeological Institute of America (2016-17), and has received fellowships from the NEH, the Getty Research Institute, and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

Rory Finnin is Head of the Department of Slavonic Studies at the University of Cambridge. He is also the Director of the Cambridge Ukrainian Studies programme and Chair of the Cambridge Committee for Russian and East European Studies (CamCREES). His work focuses on literature and national identity in Ukraine and also explores nationalism theory, human rights discourse, and problems of cultural memory. He has written extensively on representations of Crimea and the Crimean Tatars in Ukrainian, Russian, and Turkish literatures.

Oleksandr Halenko is curator of the Center for the Study of Civilizations in the Black Sea Area at the Institute of History of Ukraine. After forced engagement with the history of Soviet Ukraine during his post-
Idil P. Izmirli is currently a Visiting Scholar at George Mason University’s School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution. Dr. Izmirli’s research in Crimea and Ukraine has been funded by various US Title VIII research grants including Fulbright, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars’ Kennan Institute, IREX-IARO and three consecutive IREX STGs, the Regional Policy Symposium on Regional Security in Eastern Europe and Eurasia Junior Scholarship, the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), as well as two consecutive fellowships from George Mason University’s “Partnership for Conflict Resolution Development in Ukraine” program, supported by the US Department of State. In 2012, she was hired by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe’s (OSCE) High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM) as one of the experts on Crimea to prepare a report on the Integration of Formerly Deported People in Crimea, Ukraine, which was published on August 16, 2013. In 2017, she was invited by the U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Intelligence and Research’s Office of Analytic Outreach Program as a Featured Speaker to give a talk on the causes and the results of the current situation in Crimea.

Valentina Izmirlieva (Ph.D. in medieval Slavic studies from the University of Chicago, 1999) is a historian of Balkan and Russian religious cultures. She holds an appointment as Professor in the Slavic Department of Columbia University, where she currently serves as Department Chair. She is also the Faculty Director of the Columbia Summer Program in Balkan Transcultural Studies, hosted by Boğaziçi University, and leads the global Black Sea Networks Initiative (http://blackseanetworks.org/), the recipient of the President’s Global Innovation Fund grant for 2016-2018. Much of Izmirlieva's work addresses cultural exchanges among Christians, Jews, and Muslims in the context of multi-ethnic, multi-religious empires and their successor states. She is the author of All the Names of The Lord: Lists, Mysticism and Magic (2008) and co-editor (with Boris Gasparov) of the volume Translation and Tradition in Slavia Orthodoxa (2012). Her current projects include a monograph about Christian pilgrims to Jerusalem who took as their model the Muslim Hajj to Mecca and a study of state hagiography at the age of Putin. In 2012-2013, she was a Mellon Fellow at the Center for Scholars and Writers at the New York Public Library and, in 2017, received Columbia University’s Lenfest Distinguished Faculty Award.

Charles King is Professor of International Affairs and Government and chair of the Department of Government at Georgetown University. He previously served as chair of the faculty of Georgetown's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service. He is currently completing The Humanity Lab: Race, Culture, and the Struggle for an American Idea, a collective biography of Franz Boas, Margaret Mead, and other early anthropologists and the rise of cultural relativism as a way of understanding the world. King's other research has focused on nationalism, ethnic politics, transitions from authoritarianism, urban history, and the relationship between history and the social sciences. He is the author or editor of seven books, including Midnight at the Pera Palace: The Birth of Modern Istanbul (2014), which was a New York Times Editors' Choice and was awarded the French “Prix de Voyage Urbain;” Odessa: Genius and Death in a City of Dreams (2011), which received the National Jewish Book Award; and The Ghost of Freedom: A History of the Caucasus (2008), which was named “History Book of the Year” by the Moscow Times. His work has been translated into more than a dozen languages. King has been a Fulbright scholar, a Fellow of the Woodrow Wilson Center, a Public Scholar of the National Endowment for the Humanities, a three-time recipient of professor-of-the-year honors from Georgetown students and has received both the School of Foreign Service Dean's Medal and the McGuire Medal, the highest awards for service to the school and its students. He holds a doctorate in Politics from Oxford University, where he was a British Marshall Scholar.

Mara Kozelsky is Professor of History at University of South Alabama. Her areas of interest include religious and political history, history of the Russian Empire in Ukraine and Crimea, and the Crimean War. She is author of Christianizing Crimea: Shaping Sacred Space in the Russian Empire and Beyond (2010) and the

**Victor Ostapchuk** (Ph.D. Harvard 1989) is Associate Professor at the Department of Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations at the University of Toronto. He is the editor-in-chief of the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute’s series “Studies in Ottoman Documents pertaining to Ukraine and the Black Sea Countries” and the co-director of the Akkerman Fortress Project. He has published widely on the history and historical archaeology of the Ottoman Black Sea.

**Sophie Pinkham** is a PhD candidate in Columbia University’s Slavic department. Her dissertation analyzes the political uses of the image of Pushkin in the transition from communism, particularly in relation to the search for a post-Soviet Russian “national idea.” She is the author of *Black Square: Adventures in Post-Soviet Ukraine* (W.W. Norton, 2016).

**Jane Rempel** is Lecturer in Classical Archaeology at the University of Sheffield. Her research focuses on ancient Greek archaeology, specifically issues surrounding colonization and social interaction in the Black Sea region. Notable project areas include Crimea, Vorotan valley, Armenia and Sinop Kale, Turkey. Notable publications include *Living Through the Dead: Burial and Commemoration in the Classical World* (2011), co-edited with M. Carroll, and “Eleusinian Adornment: Demeter and the Bolshaia Bliznitsa Burials,” in *Dressing the Dead: Clothing, Textiles and Bodily Adornment from Funerary Contexts in the Graeco-Roman World* (2013).

**Vsevolod Samokhvalov** is a Marie Curie Research Fellow at the University of Liege, Belgium and a Visiting Professor to the College of Europe. He is the author of *Russian-European Relations in the Black Sea Region: Great Power Identity and the Idea of Europe* (2017). His primary research focus is on EU-Russia relations, international politics, and the post-communist trajectories of Eastern Ukraine. He received his BA from Odessa National University and MA from the University of Athens. He has worked as a researcher, diplomat, and journalist in the Black Sea region.

**Yuri Shevchuk** is lecturer of Ukrainian language at Columbia University. He holds a Ph.D. in Germanic Philology from Kyiv State University (1987) and an M.A. in Political Science from the New School for Social Research (1996). His research interests include issues of Ukrainian language, identity, and culture, as well as Ukrainian and world cinema. His latest publications are the textbook *Beginner’s Ukrainian with Interactive Online Workbook,* and the monograph (in Ukrainian) *Linguistic Schizophrenia: Whither, Ukraine?* (2015). Shevchuk is editorial board member of the journals *Mundo Eslavo* (University of Granada, Spain) and *Dyvoslovo: Ukrainian Language and Literature in Educational Establishments* (National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine). He is currently working on *Ukrainian English Collocations Dictionary* and a project about Ukrainian language and identity since 1991.

**Maria Sonevetsky** is currently Assistant Professor of Music at Bard College. She will join the ethnomusicology faculty at the University of California, Berkeley in 2018. Her book *Wild Music: Sound and Sovereignty in Ukraine* is forthcoming.
ABSTRACTS

Why is Crimea So Special?: The Role of the Black Sea Region in Russia's Identity
Vsevolod Samokhvalov

This paper explores the role of the Black Sea region in Russia’s identity. Drawing on a constructivist approach, it analyzes texts that were consumed by the Russian elites in their formative years. The paper analyses Soviet history textbooks, historical fiction—particularly that of the influential but understudied writer Valentin Pikul—and media. This analysis yields several insights. Contrary to academic tradition, which holds that Russia’s relationship with Europe was imagined in and through references to the Baltic Sea and Peter the Great’s defeat of Sweden in the 18th century, it demonstrates that the Black Sea region plays an even more important role than the Baltic in Russia’s identity. Through cultural artifacts located in the region, Russian history was linked to the history of world civilization, and it was through the Black Sea region that Russia forged its belonging to Europe. Compared to Peter the Great’s cutting through of the “window to Europe,” Russia’s belonging through the South was much more organic and natural. Finally, it was through pursuit of the right to decide the fates of the nations of the region that Russia sustained its great power identity. These aspects—not always compatible—of the Black Sea’s role in Russian history can help explain tensions in Russia’s identity and illuminate the complex record of Russian-Western interaction in the Black Sea.

Putin’s Crimean Rhetoric and Imperial Nostalgia
Sophie Pinkham

This paper will examine the ways in which Putin’s rhetoric on Crimea—most notably on Russia’s 2014 annexation of Crimea—evokes a long tradition in Russian political discourse, one that reaches far into the imperial past. When discussing historical influences on today’s Russia, Western politicians and media most often refer to the Soviet era. Yet the striking continuities between Putin’s rhetoric and that of Russian imperial expansion are also essential in understanding Putin’s project of reviving Russia’s great power status (or at least reputation). In the case of the annexation of Crimea, there are particularly marked similarities between Putin’s rhetoric and that used under (and by) Catherine the Great. I argue that analysis of the deeper historical roots of Putin’s rhetoric on Crimea allows us to situate the 2014 annexation in the context of Crimea’s long-standing exceptional position within Russian history; it can also help us to better understand Crimea’s political significance as Putin seeks to put forth a quasi-imperial “national idea” for post-Soviet Russia. In Russian political rhetoric, Crimea is a space of inventions: the periphery of the empire becomes central to its legitimacy—__a newly acquired territory becomes a site commemorated as a founding site of Russian identity and tradition—and conquest is rewritten as “return.” Crimea is home to several ethnic groups, has been contested by empires for centuries, and has been a site of interaction of multiple Black Sea cultures. In rhetorical terms, this multivalent quality is essential to the peninsula’s symbolic usefulness: its shared nature Crimea becomes a symbolic means of connecting Russia and its Slavic and/or Orthodox friends around the Black Sea region, creating a counterbalance to competing empires or hegemons and making Russia a “pole” in its own right.

The Transformation of the Crimean Plains: From Prehistory to 2014 and Beyond
Carlos E. Cordova (Oklahoma State University)

The Crimean Plains occupy the northern two thirds of the Peninsula where the original steppe vegetation has been replaced by cropland, urban areas, and industries. Due to its harsh conditions for farming, the Plains played a marginal role in the mainstream cultural and economic development of Crimea. This situation changed in the 1960s when the construction of the North Crimean Canal, a project under the auspices of N. Khrushchev’s Virgin Land Campaign, provided water need for irrigation. Soon after, the breaking of the grassland sod for agriculture, took over all the productive land in the Crimean Plains. Since then, this area has been the fastest developing area of Crimea and the most devastating in terms of the environment, as many types of steppe vegetation shrank or disappeared.

As a result of the political events of early 2014, the North Crimean Canal was cut off from its main source, the Dnieper River. The search for alternative sources of water has led nowhere, given the geographic
and geologic conditions of the Peninsula. A discussion of the nature and role of the Plains from ancient times to the present is summarized in the context of current and the possible coming changes in the restructuring of Crimea’s geographic landscapes.

Crimea in War and Reconstruction, 1854-1874
Mara Kozelsky (University of South Alabama)

When war landed on Crimea’s coast in September 1854, belligerent armies instantly doubled the peninsula’s population. Engineering brigades mowed down forests to build barracks. Ravenous men fell upon orchards like locusts. Hungry soldiers slaughtered Crimean livestock and work animals. Within a month, war had plunged the peninsula into a subsistence crisis. Soldiers and civilians starved as they waited for food to travel from Kharkov by ox cart at a rate of ½ mile per hour. Every army conscripted Tatars as laborers, and fired upon civilian homes. Both sides of the war used scorched earth tactics. Several cities and villages—Sevastopol, Kerch, Balaklava, Genichesk among them—burned to the ground. Peace did not bring any immediate relief to Crimea’s homeless and hungry. Removal of dead bodies and human waste took months. Epidemics following war swept away young children and the elderly. Russian officials estimated the devastation wrought by Crimean War exceeded that of Napoleon’s invasion. Relief packages failed human need, and by 1859, the trickle of Tatar out-migration that had begun during the war turned into a flood. Nearly 200,000 Tatars left Crimea by 1864, adding a demographic crisis to the tally of war’s destruction. This paper, then, chronicles the environment impacts of War on Crimea, and Russian efforts to cope with devastation. I will also address, as time permits, ways in which Russian policy encouraged Tatar outmigration. By the late 1870s, a new Crimea emerged, a space of imperial fantasies, resorts and palaces, and ladies with dogs.

The Landscape Shock: Climate and Health on the Southern Coast of Crimea, 1928-1941
Johanna Conterio

The study of medical climatology in the Soviet Union was centered in Crimea, at the Crimean Institute of Climatology in Yalta. In the 1920s and 1930s, researchers at the Crimean Institute of Climatology developed an experimental approach to the study of climate, focusing on the connections between aesthetics, sensory perception and health. Researchers at the institute studied Crimean landscapes and microclimates, using methods of close observation of the effects of viewing and perceiving these landscapes on the health of patients. This approach fit into the context of developments in French medical climatology in the period. Taking a new approach to the study of the new Soviet person, in this paper I argue that, in the Soviet context, these studies became a foundation for a Stalinist theory of embodiment, grounded in medical culture, indicative of a turn to medical holism after the Great Break.

The Emergence and Development of the North Anatolian: Crimean Communications Corridor in Antiquity
Owen Doonan (California State University Northridge) & Jane Rempel (University of Sheffield)

The engagement of the central north coast of Anatolia and the Crimean forms one of the key structures in the long-term human geography of the Black Sea region. Communications along this route can be traced back to the maritime communities of the Early Bronze Age (second half of the third millennium BCE). What began as occasional contact by itinerant fishermen intensified into a close economic and political relationship from the mid first-millennium BCE. This paper considers the archaeological evidence for the impact of the Anatolian-Crimean contact on the cultural and economic development of these two regions from the Bronze Age until the middle Byzantine conquest of Sinope in the 13th c. CE.

Between Pride and Prejudice: Warfare and Violence in Crimean Tatar History
Victor Ostapchuk (University of Toronto)

The Crimean Khanate, the longest lasting successor state of the Chinggisid Mongol world empire, played a significant world-historical role in early modern times, be it in the relations between the Ottomans,
Moldavia, Poland, Ukraine, North Caucasus, and Russia or as the greatest supplier of slaves for the Ottoman market. Its military prowess coupled with the ability to mount long-range campaigns has been a cause for interest in Crimean Tatar history, though also the violence and cruelty of slaving have been used to condemn the Crimean Tatars and their history. Crimean Tatars themselves have tended to shy away from the "glory and gore" of their connections with the Mongols or their own exploits in the northern Black Sea steppes and further hinterlands. This paper will present facts and myths as well as seek a comparative perspective with the aim of reducing both condemnation and whitewashing when dealing with the history of the Crimean Tatars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why Does Crimea Matter for Ukraine?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oleksandr Halenko (National Academy of Sciences, Ukraine)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prevalent scheme of Ukrainian history, in accordance with the national paradigm, equates Ukraine with the Ukrainians, its principal subject. Such a concept admits Crimea to the national history depending on the presence of Ukrainians in the peninsula, which was a fairly controversial issue before the annexation of the Crimean Khanate by the Russian Empire in 1783. Another Russian occupation of Crimea, which took place three years ago, exploited this obvious misconception of Ukrainian historiography and, in fact, physically called to mind how this peninsula matters for Ukraine. Indeed, Ukrainian historians overlooked the fact that the sovereign Ukrainian state, introduced in 1991, is a new subject in the history of Ukraine. The Ukrainians, unquestionably, represented its main creators. Yet, on the whole, this country, like any other, appears as a result of the complex interaction between multiple actors/subjects of history, who were present in its territory throughout historical time. It is from this perspective that this paper suggests a new scheme for the history of Ukraine and determines a place for Crimea in it.

For a long time, the territory of contemporary Ukrainian state was the scene of coexistence and competition between three civilizations, which occupied relatively stable zones. The Mediterranean seafarers, since antiquity, settled in the Northern Black Sea littoral. They traded with the neighboring nomads of the Eurasian Steppe. The Slavic state Rus’ occupied the forest zone to the north of the steppe. In the 13th century the Mongols shortly brought all three zones under the sway of their formidable empire but drew Slavs into the politics of the Eurasian Steppe and triggered the sedentary colonization of the grasslands - a phenomenon of world importance. The colonization, as it happened in Ukraine, incorporated by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, was motivated by the demands of the European economy and relied on European firearms. Yet its progress was also owed to cultural borrowings from the nomads, the masters of the Steppe, and contributed to the national culture of the nascent Ukrainian nation. Following their political submission to the Russian Empire in 1654 Ukrainians were used by the empire for its further conquests and colonization, including of Crimea, the Caucasus and Siberia. The colonized south of Ukraine turned into the “bread basket of Europe” and one of the world’s industrial centers. In this context, Crimea embodies one of the major achievements of the Ukrainian nation in world history. This matters for Ukraine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Islam, Islamic Institutions, and Politics of Persecution in Pre- and Post-Occupation Crimea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idil Izmirli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before the military occupation of Crimea and the Russian proxy war in Donbas, the largest Muslim community in Ukraine was the Crimean Tatars, who constituted 13 per cent of the population of Crimea. After the mass return to their ancestral homeland in the early 1990s, Islam had become an indivisible part of their ethno-national identity. In 1991, The Spiritual Administration of Muslims of Crimea (DUMK) was established in accordance with the Ukrainian Constitution, with significant support by the Mejlis. They followed traditional Islam (Hanafi school). The Spiritual Center of Muslims in Crimea that advocated Habashi ideology/Sufism was registered in 2010 as the second Muftiyat in Crimea. These two official Islamic Administrative Directorates (Muftiyats) adhered to different interpretations of Islam, often challenged each other’s legitimacy with accusatory law suits in such a way that the Crimean media defined the conflict between them as the ‘open season for holy war between two Muftiyats.” Meanwhile, non-official Islamic groups with new Islamic ideologies, including Hizb-ut Tahrir (HUT), which is illegal in Russia but was legal in Ukraine, were freely promoting their ideologies, publishing books, and conducting conferences. The 2014
annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation drastically changed the dynamics in religious spheres. In August, 2014, the Tauride Muftiyat, was registered in Crimea as the second Muftiyat. Their official state narrative was controlled by Moscow. They started closely cooperating with the Mufti of the Central Spiritual Directorate of Muslims of Russia. Meanwhile, DUMK, now The Spiritual Administration of the Muslims of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol (registered in February 2015, under the Russian law/legislation) started fully collaborating with the occupying forces. The same Mufti who was hand-selected by the Mejlis in 1999, began praising Putin and the Russian Federation and preferred to remain silent while the human rights of Crimean Muslims were being violated. Meanwhile, the FSB mobilized “cleansing operations,” against those who were groundlessly accused of terrorism. At present, kidnappings, torture together with house searches and arrests still continue on a daily basis. To capture the complexity of Islam and Islamic institutions in Crimea, this descriptive paper will first compare and contrast competing narratives of Islam of differing Muftiyats and religious groups in pre-annexation Crimea. Second, it will focus on the significant changes of the Islamic landscape after the annexation. Finally, the paper will demonstrate how the occupying forces utilize politics of persecution against the Crimean Tatars who refuse to collaborate with the authorities.

The Past as Prolific Symbolic Resource:
Crimean Tatar Folk Ensembles and the Plasticity of Tradition
Maria Sonevtsky
This paper examines how various self-identified Crimean Tatar “folk ensembles” position themselves with respect to notions of tradition and (indigenous) modernity, exile and home, and past and present through their varied approaches to Crimean Tatar musical tradition. Drawing on long-term fieldwork conducted in Crimea in 2008-2009, I observe how groups such as Qaytarma, Ensemble Qirim, Destan, and Maqam have participated in the post-Soviet memory wars of Ukraine and Russia. Through competing notions of “traditional music” that draw variously on Ottoman courtly traditions, Soviet legacies of institutionalized folklore, or post-Soviet musical genre hybrids, these groups use different musical strategies to attempt to recuperate a sense of the past. Building on the anthropologist Arjun Appadurai’s (1981) well-known claim about how the past is “a rule-governed, [and] therefore finite, cultural resource,” I seek to assess the rules that govern Crimean Tatars’ claims on the past as they are voiced through competing notions of musical tradition. I ask: How do negotiations around the uses and potentialities of traditional musical practice construct bridges to the Crimean Tatar past despite the multiple ruptures that mark their history? What is shared, and what is contested, by these groups in their orientations to tradition? Assessing the productive uses of contested notions of the past, I seek to identify the willful deformations of the past as represented in Crimean Tatar musical narratives of trauma, dislocation, and resilience. Arguing that Crimean Tatars knowingly play with the plasticity of tradition as a means of survival, I observe the way that these different “folk ensembles” have provided narratives of continuity and coherence for the marginalized Crimean Tatar indigenous community both within and outside of Crimea.

“Ukrainians of Crimean Tatar Origin”: Internally Displaced Crimean Tatars and Ukrainian Civic Nationalism
Austin Charron
Returning to their Crimean homeland after decades of Soviet-imposed exile, the Crimean Tatars soon found themselves residents and citizens of independent Ukraine, a state with which they had little historical connection or ethnic affinity. Nevertheless, most Crimean Tatars viewed Ukraine’s sovereignty over Crimea as a bulwark against the threat of Russian separatism and revanchism, and pragmatically embraced Ukraine in hopes of safety and stability. Now nearly 30 years since they first began returning to Crimea, an entire generation of Crimean Tatars has grown up Ukrainian, and Ukrainian civic identity has become deeply entrenched within the Crimean Tatar community at large. The depth and sincerity of their patriotism was put to the test with the Russian annexation of Crimea in 2014, and Ukrainians now celebrate the Crimean Tatars for their staunch resistance to Russian occupation and steadfast commitment to the Ukrainian state. Moreover, Crimean Tatar IDPs (internally displaced peoples) have emerged as active and vital proponents of a revived Ukrainian civic nationalism since the Euromaidan. Based on ethnographic fieldwork conducted
within communities of Crimean IDPs in Kyiv and Lviv, this paper discusses the evolution of Ukrainian civic nationalism among Crimean Tatars, and considers the role that Ukraine plays more broadly in recent processes of social and spatial identity (re)construction among Crimean Tatar IDPs.