From the Director

As I write my final “from the director” column, I find it hard to believe that eight years have passed since I first assumed the directorship of the Harriman Institute and set out on what has turned out for me personally to be an extraordinary adventure. I could hardly have foreseen at the outset how long I would remain in the position nor what fundamental changes the Harriman Institute, the university, and our world would undergo in the intervening years. To put this all in perspective, let me remind you that the first Harriman opening reception I was to have hosted as director was scheduled for September 11, 2001. I can never forget watching from the 15th floor of the International Affairs Building that morning as the first tower of the World Trade Center crumbled to dust in the distance. In a very real sense, the challenge of finding new points of orientation in a post-9/11 world has given the Harriman Institute’s mission a new urgency in the first decade of the twenty-first century. Our students, faculty, alumni, and friends have been called upon to take a leading role in the public response to events in our city and in our region of the world as the once familiar landscape of global affairs has changed before our eyes. I would like to take this opportunity to reflect on the transformations the institute has undergone, on highpoints and passings, and on the challenges that await the institute in the future.

The highpoints have been many. Beginning with Mikhail Gorbachev’s visit to Columbia at the invitation of the Harriman Institute in March 2002, we have had the opportunity to listen to and engage in often hard-hitting conversations with many of the leading figures in our region. Under the auspices of the World Leaders Forum, an initiative of Columbia President Lee Bollinger, the institute has co-sponsored appearances at Columbia by a host of presidents from our region, notably including Vladimir Putin, the two “Columbia” presidents Mikheil Saakashvili of Georgia (CU Law School) and Toomas Ilves of Estonia (CC) in dialogue, and Gurbanguly Berdymukhamedov of Turkmenistan on his first visit to the United States. In the same spirit, we have hosted major cultural
figures as Harriman lecturers, including Nobel laureate Imre Kertesz of Hungary, Ismail Kadare of Albania, and Russian writers Vladimir Voinovich, Tatiana Tolstaya, and Vladimir Sorokin. Even this greatly abbreviated list is emblematic of the extent to which—spurred on by the interests of an increasingly internationally savvy student body and by the changing terrain of geo-politics—Harriman events have more and more sought to embrace and represent the increasing diversity and complexity of the Eurasian space.

We have worked hard to create synergies among Harriman constituencies and with organizations within and beyond the university, partnering with the New York Public Library, the Performing Arts Library at Lincoln Center, St. Anne’s Warehouse, the Harvard Davis Center (continuing and renovating our annual joint conference on US-Russian relations), the Kennan Institute (most recently on co-hosting a series of readings by Ukrainian writers), the Museum of Jewish Heritage, the Russian American Cultural Center and with such diverse Columbia institutions as the Columbia Arts Initiative, the Center for Literary Translation, the Barnard Theater and Dance departments, the Journalism School, Teachers College, the School of Social Work, and the Weatherhead East Asian Institute (in particular, on the recently launched annual Borton-Mosely Lecture). Model in this respect was the Harriman Institute’s participation in events linked with President Vaclav Havel’s residency at Columbia in the fall of 2006 at the invitation of President Bollinger. The Harriman Institute sponsored a symposium on Havel as politician and writer, a course on Havel and dissidence, a student puppet production of Havel’s play The Beggars Opera, at which the author himself was in attendance, and a concert by the nonconformist Czech rock group the Plastic People of the Universe. In our semester-long celebration of the centennial of the first Paris season of Diaghilev’s Ballets Russes—which culminates as this newsletter goes to press with a symposium on “Between Neoclassicism and Surrealism: Diaghilev’s Ballets Russes in the Context of the Russian-French Connection,” a student performance at Miller Theater of Afternoon of a Faun and Les Noces, an exhibit mounted in the institute gallery space devoted to Diaghilev’s influence on stage design, and an innovative puppet performance of the opera The Golden Cockerel—we have again melded instruction and scholarship, performance and analysis, seriousness of purpose with fun.

And we have not forgotten the heritage of our institute and our field of study. Many of you
participated in events related to our celebration of the institute’s 60th anniversary, including the gala dinner at the Columbia University Club and the reception at the Russian Embassy in Washington. It provided wonderful opportunities to catch up with alumni and to reflect on our past and how to preserve it, a project that is ongoing. In this context I would also remind you, with particular pride, of the series of conversations between some of the foremost journalists who have covered the Soviet Union and post-Soviet Russia we hosted last fall, which brought together Hedrick Smith and Bob Kaiser and Vladimir Pozner and Phil Donahue in spirited dialogues about the past and present challenges of reporting on Russia.

In the same spirit of building events into longer-term and farther-ranging initiatives, the Harriman Institute has made significant interventions in the realm of bringing scholarship into dialogue with policy. In the wake of President Berdymukhamedov’s visit to Columbia, two delegations from the Harriman Institute traveled to Turkmenistan as guests of the Ministry of Education, and, as one outcome of those trips, in January of this year, the institute hosted a groundbreaking conference on education reform in Central Asia at Columbia. In June of last year, in cooperation with the Atlantic Council, Harriman faculty members traveled to Georgia and Abkhazia on a fact finding mission. This journey positioned Harriman faculty members particularly well to provide timely and informed public responses to breaking news during and after the conflict between Georgia and Russia last August. By now, hopefully all of you regularly visit the redesigned Harriman website not only to keep up with institute events, but to read the commentaries Harriman faculty members publish regularly, playing a role fundamental to the institute’s mission of actively participating in scholarly debate while informing the public about events unfolding in our region.

For those of us who spend our days at the institute (and quite a few evenings as well), the most tangible transformation the everyday life of the Harriman Institute has undergone in the past eight years is the renovation of our space. Most of us remember the cluttered, pale yellow partitions that fragmented the layout of the institute in earlier decades, discouraging precisely the sort of informal exchanges between members of our community which make up the very texture of the life of the institute. Our new, open and, most important, welcoming space has served to bring us together in multiple ways—whether through receptions, film screenings, poetry readings, exhibits, or casual, but often spirited intellectual encounters. The institute’s new appearance has therefore served first and foremost to foster community.

Indeed, for me the institute always has been and always will be the people who make it up—from the world leaders, policy and news makers, business people, and scholars who visit briefly to the institute’s most stalwart supporters, its community of students, faculty, staff, alumni and friends. I was especially fortunate to have a fund of wisdom at my disposal in my predecessors as institute director. We continue to mourn
Marshall Shulman, the institute’s spirit and staunchest advocate for decades, as we continue to celebrate his legacy, especially as the institute finds itself on firm footing in the current financial crisis, thanks both to Ambassador Harriman’s generosity and Marshal’s wise stewardship. While Mark von Hagen and Rick Ericson have moved on to other academic institutions and Bob Legvold into a very busy retirement, they remain connected to the institute and hopefully will continue to contribute experience and ideas from a distance in the future. To mention all the other valued members of the institute community from whose support, counsel, and friendship I have benefited over the years would go far beyond the space I have here. So let me just thank you all.

And I ask you to join me in extending a hearty welcome to Tim Frye, my successor as director of the institute. Many of you have gotten to know Tim and his impressive body of scholarship over the years. As a Columbia graduate and Harriman Certificate holder, Tim already has deep roots in the institute and is poised to hit the ground running. It is particularly fitting that he holds the Marshall D. Shulman Professorship of Post-Soviet Foreign Policy as he shepherds the institute’s legacy into a future in which the Harri-
within which the regional institutes will function in the future. I would like to conclude by using this “bully pulpit” to share a few thoughts about what I believe the role of the regional institutes should be as this historic change takes place. In the pithiest terms, I would like to see the regional institutes, Harriman foremost among them, acting as “magnets,” “nodes” and “advocates” (although, as I will suggest below, advocates with claws) in the larger university community.

What do I mean by magnets? I mean that the institutes should serve to draw together scholars and practitioners from different disciplines, programs, and schools of the university who in some significant way engage the regions we represent in their teaching and professional lives. This will place the institutes in a potent position to serve in a leadership role in the university in charting a course that will allow us to break out of the constraints of traditional disciplinary boundaries that can hinder the free flow of scholarly interchange in the university. As magnets, the regional institutes can bring together faculty from every part of the university (humanities, social and natural sciences, professional schools, performing arts) to pool their knowledge and experience in innovative new ways that will truly respond to the challenges posed by a world that is simultaneously more “global” (that is, more linked by transnational forces) and more fragmented (placed into conflict situations as people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds interact more frequently and more intensely). To understand the globe, a truly international university needs to start with the problem, reality, and richness of regional differences. I would also add in this context that as Columbia moves forward on many fronts to partner with educational institutions abroad and to open global research centers, the regional institutes are an important, hitherto neglected resource of valuable regional knowledge that can enhance and facilitate these efforts.

In this capacity, as magnets, however, the regional institutes should in no way be parochial, that is, locked within narrow territorial boundaries. Rather they should serve as “nodes,” as institutional structures that encourage the comparative study of regions. There is a great desire and will among the current cohort of regional directors to work together to cooperate on visionary projects which will recognize regional specificity within the context of global problems. I would suggest the Harriman Institute series on pipelines and on soft borders as model initiatives to be emulated in moving forward.

Thirdly, as advocates the regional institutes should play a key role in ensuring that the regions of the globe are adequately covered in the university’s disciplinary departments. A mechanism needs to be developed for cooperation between disciplinary departments and regional institutes in determining hiring priorities. If Columbia truly aspires to become a leading international university, then it will have to continue to attract and retain faculty who can guide cutting edge graduate research covering all major territories of the globe. From the very beginning, the Russian Institute was predicated on finding the necessary balance between region and discipline. It is therefore only fitting that the institute should play a leading role in promoting cross-fertilizations and cooperations in a world that everyday becomes more complex and interconnected.

In sum, the Harriman Institute is entering an exciting new phase in its history, and I very much look forward to participating in the process as a faculty member, proud Certificate holder, member of the audience for events and hale gal well met at sherry hours. And so, to coin a phrase, thanks for the memories...

My best wishes to all of you near and far,

Cathy Nepomnyashchy
Everybody hates privatization. From Latin America to the postcommunist world, public support for privatization is very low. Studies from the World Bank find that even where privatization has increased access to telecommunications and electricity, the beneficiaries still resent privatization. Why do people dislike privatization so much? Is it because they favor state over private property or because they view the process of privatization as illegitimate? Moreover, is there anything that can be done about it ex post? Can the “original sin” of a corrupt privatization be atoned for by doing “good works?” If so, how?

I began exploring these questions four years ago in a series of surveys with business owners and the mass public in Russia. I then joined with Ekaterina Zhuravskaya and Irina Denisova from the Center for Economic and Financial Research in Moscow and Markus Eller from the Austrian Central Bank to examine this issue across all the postcommunist countries.¹

For the co-authored work, we took advantage of a survey of 28,000 respondents in 28 postcommunist countries funded by the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development to explore mass support for revising privatization. The survey was conducted in face to face interviews in all postcommunist countries, except for Turkmenistan, in the summer of 2007. More specifically the survey asked: “In your opinion, what should be done with most privatized enterprises. They should be ….”

Support for revising privatization was very high across the region. Indeed, 80 percent of respondents wanted to revise privatization in some way – either via renationalization, reprivatization, or a tax levied on current owners. Opposition to maintaining the status quo privatization was also broadly held. In each country in the region a majority of respondents wanted to revise privatization. Even in Poland, one of the most successful economies in the region, only 20 percent of respondents wanted to leave assets in the hands of current owners with no change. In Croatia, only 6 percent of respondents preferred this status quo response. (See Table 1 on page 9.)

Support for revising privatization was broad and deep, but most respondents wanted privatized firms to end up in private hands. Only 29 percent of respondents preferred that privatized assets be renationalized and left in state hands. At the extreme, 48 percent of respondents favored this outcome in Kazakhstan, while only 13 percent of respondents chose this option in Estonia. Thus, opposition to privatization should not be equated with support for state property, although this elision is often made in public reporting on mass support for privatization.

Indeed, in many cases respondents are unhappy with privatization, but ultimately favor private ownership. Thirty-five percent of respondents wanted assets to be “left in the hands of the current owners provided they paid what the assets were worth.” This was the most common answer. Another 17 percent of respondents preferred that firms be renationalized and then reprivatized. These responses reveal that while most respondents are dissatisfied with privatization and would like some form of redress, there is still considerable support for keeping privatized assets in private hands.

It is interesting to note that despite the widespread belief that privatization in Russia is particularly unpopular, responses from Russia are roughly similar to regional averages. Respondents in Russia express slightly higher than average support for renationalizing privatized firms (36.7 versus 29.0). Yet, they are just about as likely to support the status quo privatization (18.5 versus 19.4 percent). In other words, the legitimacy of privatization in Russia is a little bit lower than average for the region.

**Who Wants to Revise Privatization and Why?**

Recognizing the breadth of support for revising privatization led us to ask: Who wants to revise privatization and why? We examined what types of individuals were especially likely to support revising privatization and why they held this view. We wanted to know whether respondents supported a revision of privatization due to a preference for state property or because they viewed privatization as unfair. This distinction is important because the policy implications differ dramatically between these two motivations. If respondents prefer state ownership because their skills and education are not well suited for an economy dominated by private enterprises, then opposition to privatization may be ameliorated by re-training programs. If, however, respondents oppose privatization because the process is perceived to be corrupt, then policymakers may have to use compensation to the losers from privatization to bolster public support for the policy.

In a statistical analysis we found that respondents with human capital ill-suited for a market economy were especially likely to favor revising privatization. Older respondents, those working in lower-skilled jobs, those in poorer health, and those with less education were significantly more likely to support revising privatization. Moreover, these respondents held this view largely due to a preference for state property over private property. That is, these respondents wanted assets be renationalized and left in state hands. This suggests that responses to the survey were not driven solely be emotional appeals or nostalgia for the command economy, but also retained a potent economic logic. Those who were unlikely to be successful in an economy dominated by private ownership were most likely to favor revising privatization and preferred to revise privatization in a way that left assets in state hands.

We also found that individual experiences during the transition influenced support for revising privatization. Controlling for other factors, respondents who suffered severe economic hardships for whatever reason during the transition, such as those who were forced to reduce their food consumption, experienced wage cuts, or sold assets to make ends meet, were more likely to support revising privatization. Groups suffering these rather significant forms of economic hardship support a revision of privatization primarily due to concerns over fairness. Thus, privatization appears to serve as a lightning rod for groups who suffered grave economic losses during transition, but this opposition stems not so much from a preference for state property as from a belief that privatization was conducted unfairly.

We also examined how national-level institutions, such as the quality of democracy and governance institutions, influenced individual attitudes toward revising privatization. On average, democracy and good governance lowered support for a revision of privatization. That is, where democracy was robust and corruption was low the average level of support for revising privatization was lower than where democracy was weak and corruption was rife.

Moreover, support for revising privatization among entrepreneurs and professionals depended on the political environment. In democracies and in well-governed countries, entrepreneurs and professionals were significantly more likely than the rest of the population to oppose revising privatization. Here entrepreneurs and professionals could expect to use their skills and experience to benefit from privatization without fear that their gains would be expropriated by an arbitrary ruler or by corrupt state officials. However, under autocracy and under highly corrupt governments, entrepreneurs and professionals were no more likely to oppose revising privatization than was
the general public. Professionals and entrepreneurs appeared to fear that the gains that they were likely to achieve from privatization were unlikely to be realized in autocratic and corrupt environments.

This finding differs sharply from existing literature which implicitly assumes that the identity of the supporters and opponents of economic reform are similar across environments. For example, entrepreneurs are almost universally assumed to support further reform, but we find that this is not the case. They do so only in democracies and in countries with relatively low levels of corruption. This suggests that the political coalitions needed to advance economic reform are likely to be different in democracies and autocracies.

**Original Sin and Good Works and Privatization in Russia**

The privatizations of years past are certainly reviled in the postcommunist world, but is there anything that can be done about it now? Can owners make their ill-gotten gains more legitimate by doing good works, such as, providing financial aid to local hospitals, orphanages, and cultural institutions? Or can they increase public support for the privatization of their firms by modernizing and investing in their firm? To get at these questions, I conducted a survey of the mass public in Russia in 2006 that asked respondents to evaluate whether the privatization of specific firms should be reversed.\(^2\) I found somewhat surprisingly that the mass public in Russia was significantly more willing to oppose revising privatization if the owners had conducted good works for their region. By contributing to local charitable organizations, the current owners of privatized assets could improve their image and increase popular opposition to revising privatization. However, the public gave little credit to owners for being good businesspeople. Respondents who were told that owners had modernized their firms were no more likely to support privatization than those who were told that managers had not modernized their firms.

**Conclusion**

The breadth and depth of support for the revision of privatization is high across the postcommunist region, and it is therefore not surprising that reversals of privatization have occurred in a number of countries in the region. Indeed, even threats to revise privatization may undermine the incentives that owners have to invest in their firms due to fears of a change in their property rights. Thus, the status of privatized firms remains a potent political issue in the region – one that populist politicians may use to their advantage.

Yet, three optimistic notes emerge from our studies for those who are concerned about the potential economic and political costs of revising privatization. First, while support for revising privatization is high across the region, over 70 percent of respondents prefer that privatized assets ultimately end up in private hands. Second, much of the support for revising privatization on fairness grounds is due to experiences during transition. With time these experiences may fade from memory taking their support for revising privatization with them. Finally, there is some evidence that owners can heighten support for the privatization status quo by engaging in good works. Perhaps by doing so they can atone (somewhat) for sins committed during privatization.

***

Timothy Frye is the Marshall D. Shulman Professor of Post-Soviet Foreign Policy. Professor Frye received a B.A. in Russian language and literature from Middlebury College, an M.L.A. from the School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University and a Ph.D. also from Columbia University in 1997. His research and teaching interests are in comparative politics and political economy with a focus on the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. He is the author of Brokers and Bureaucrats: Building Markets in Russia, (Michigan Press 2000), which won the 2001 Hewett Prize from the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, and Incredible Transformation: Building States and Markets after Communism (forthcoming, Cambridge University Press). He is currently working on a book manuscript, Property Rights and Property Wrongs: What Russia Teaches Us About the Rule of Law.

---

Table 1.

“In your opinion, what should be done with most privatized companies? They should be…”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Renationalized and kept in state hands</th>
<th>Renationalized and then re-privatized again using a more transparent process</th>
<th>Left in the hands of current owners provided that they pay privatized assets’ worth</th>
<th>Left in the hands of current owners with no change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYR Macedonia</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, %</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative, %</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>8 077</td>
<td>4 654</td>
<td>9 697</td>
<td>5 412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AND TEACHERS COLLEGE

Gita Steiner-Khamsi, Ph.D., Professor, Department of International and Transcultural Studies, Teachers College, Columbia University, and President of the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES). She has conducted educational research, produced analytical work, analyzed educational policy and engaged in strategic planning in Mongolia (since 1998) and in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan (since 2006). Her areas of concentration are school reform (extension of schooling to 11 or 12 years), teacher education reform, and teacher salary reform. Born in Iran, raised in Switzerland, and naturalized in the United States, she speaks Farsi/Tajik.

She is widely known for her book *The Global Politics of Educational Borrowing and Lending* (Teachers College Press, 2004). More recent books include *Educational Import. Local Encounters with Global Reforms in Mongolia* (with Ines Stolpe, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), *How NGOs React: Globalization and Education Reform in the Caucasus, Central Asia, and Mongolia* (with Iveta Silova, Kumarian Press, 2008), and *South-South Cooperation in Education and Development* (with Linda Chisholm, Teachers College Press and HSRC Press, 2009). The book *Educational Import. Local Encounters with Global Reforms in Mongolia* (2006) was translated into Mongolian and was awarded the prize for “best book” of the year in Mongolia in 2007. She holds a honorary doctoral degree from the Mongolian National University of Education in Ulaanbaatar.

Since 2002, she has taught graduate-level courses with mixed instructional design (including distance learning, face-to-face seminars, on-site data collection and evaluation) in the post-socialist region. These courses in program evaluation and policy studies, respectively, were co-sponsored by the Open Society Institute. They enabled educational experts, based in government offices and non-governmental organizations in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, Caucasus, and Mongolia, to learn and apply policy analyses, education sector reviews and evaluation of ongoing reforms. These courses have been translated into several languages and are now taught by faculty in universities of the region.

Alexander Karp received his Ph.D. in mathematics education from Herzen Pedagogical University in St. Petersburg, Russia, obtaining degrees from the mathematics and history departments. His scholarly interests span several areas, including gifted education, mathematics teacher education, and the theory of mathematical problem solving, as well as the history of mathematics education in Russia. He considers the study of the last of these subjects to be an integral part of the study of Russian culture and history in general. Consequently, his research focuses not only on educational programs or textbooks (although these, too, are undoubtedly worthy of study), but also on the perception of mathematics as a science and a school subject in society, and on what mathematics education actually looked like in the real world, and not just on what it was supposed to look like according to statutes and regulations. To some degree, such research bears a resemblance to the currently popular studies of everyday life, but mathematics education naturally has its own specific characteristics, determined by the complex influences exerted upon its development by the government and by the scientific mathematics community, by evolved traditions, and by other factors. Alexander Karp’s latest works are devoted to the period between 1917 and the death of Stalin, when following a relatively brief stage after the Russian Revolution, the basic traditions of the Soviet system of mathematics education—with all of its successes and shortcomings—took shape. Alexander Karp is the co-editor of *Russian Mathematics Education*, a two-volume work currently being prepared for publication by World Scientific Publishing, and the managing editor of the *International Journal for the History of Mathematics Education*. He is the author of over 90 publications, including over 20 books.
David E. Fishman is Professor of Jewish History at the Jewish Theological Seminary, teaching courses in modern Jewish history. Dr. Fishman also serves as director of Project Judaica, a Jewish-studies program based in Moscow that is sponsored jointly by JTS and Russian State University for the Humanities.

Dr. Fishman is the author of numerous books and articles on the history and culture of East European Jewry. His books include Russia's First Modern Jews (New York University Press) and The Rise of Modern Yiddish Culture (Pittsburgh University Press). Fishman is the coeditor (with Burton Visotzky) of From Mesopotamia to Modernity: Ten Introductions to Jewish History and Literature (Westview Press, 1999), which also appeared in a revised Russian edition called Ot Abramna do sovremenosti (Russian State University Press, 2002). For 15 years (from 1988 to 2003), Fishman was editor in chief of YIVO-Bleter, the Yiddish-language scholarly journal of the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research. He serves on the editorial boards of Jewish Social Studies, Jews in Russia and Eastern Europe, and Polin.

Dr. Fishman travels frequently to Moscow and other parts of the former Soviet Union on behalf of Project Judaica. He directs its Jewish Archival Survey, which publishes guides to Jewish archival materials in the former Soviet Union, and recently coedited a guide to Jewish collections in the previously top-secret “Special Archive” in Moscow.

A native New Yorker, Fishman received his bachelor's degree from Yeshiva University and his master's degree and doctorate from Harvard. He has taught at Brandeis University, Bar Ilan University, Russian State University in Moscow, and Yeshiva University's Bernard Revel Graduate School of Jewish Studies. He has been a fellow at the Hebrew University's Institute for Advanced Studies and the University of Pennsylvania's Center for Advanced Judaic Studies.

He is working on a book about the contacts and clashes between Jewish Socialists and orthodox Jewry in Russia between 1890 and 1917, tentatively entitled “Rabbis and Revolutionaries: Relations between the Jewish 'Left' and 'Right' in Late Imperial Russia.” Fishman spent the spring 2008 semester on a Fulbright in Vilnius, Lithuania, working on the project, a portion of which was just published in David Assaf and Ada Rapoport Albert (eds), 'Let the Old Make Way for the New': Studies Dedicated to Immanuel Etkes (Jerusalem, Shazar Center for Jewish History, 2009).

David G. Roskies is the Sol and Evelyn Henkind Chair in Yiddish Literature and Culture and professor of Jewish Literature at the Jewish Theological Seminary. Dr. Roskies is a cultural historian of Eastern European Jewry. A prolific author, editor, and scholar, he has published nine books and received numerous awards. One major focus of his work is the Holocaust. In 1971, Dr. Roskies published Night Words: A Midrash on the Holocaust, one of the first liturgies on the subject ever to appear. Night Words has entered its fifth edition, was adapted into Hebrew, and was recently reissued by CLAL as an audiocassette. In 1984, Harvard University Press published Against the Apocalypse: Responses to Catastrophe in Modern Jewish Culture, which won the Ralph Waldo Emerson Prize from Phi Beta Kappa and has since been translated into Russian and Hebrew. A companion volume, The Literature of Destruction, was published by the Jewish Publication Society in 1989. In 2007, Dr. Roskies served as the J. B. and Maurice C. Shapiro Senior Scholar-in-Residence at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. He is under contract with University Press of New England to produce Holocaust Literature: A History and Guide.

A second focus of his work, since 1975, when he coauthored The Shtetl Book: An Introduction to East European Jewish Life and Lore, has been the folklore of Ashkenazi Jewry. Awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1985, Dr. Roskies began studying the modern Jewish return to folklore and fantasy. The fruits of his labor are The Dybbuk and Other Writings by S. Ansky (Yale, 1992) and A Bridge of Longing: The Last Art of Yiddish Storytelling (Harvard, 1995). A third focus of Dr. Roskies' work is The Jewish Search for a Usable Past, the title of a book of related essays published in 1999. Then, in 2008, he finally tried his hand at writing a memoir. Yiddishlands: A Memoir (Wayne State University Press) is the story of modern Yiddish culture as told through the lens of family history and the medium of Yiddish song. In 1981 (with Dr. Alan Mintz), Dr. Roskies cofounded Prooftexts: A Journal of Jewish Literary History, published by Indiana University Press, and has served since 1998 as editor in chief of the New Yiddish Library, published by Yale University Press. A member of the editorial board of the Poem Library of Jewish Culture and Civilization.

A native of Montreal and a product of its Yiddish secular schools, Dr. Roskies was educated at Brandeis University, where he received his doctorate in 1975.
Meet Two of Our M.A. Students

Maral Ryzykulieva, a native of Turkmenistan, will graduate with two Columbia degrees in 2010, a Master of International Affairs from the School of International Public Affairs together with the Harriman Institute-sponsored Master of Regional Studies (MARS)—Russia, Eastern Europe and Eurasia. She is the first student to take this unique approach in combining the two graduate degrees.


Her research and professional interests include investment in the energy sector in emerging markets, particularly in Central Asia. She is currently conducting research on private equity investments in the Caspian region for her Master’s thesis. Her thesis advisors and readers include academics and professionals from Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Russia, and New York. She is a member of the SIPA Energy and Finance clubs.

Maral speaks four languages: Russian, Turkish, English and Turkmen.

When the new President of Turkmenistan, Gurbanguly Berdimuhamedov, came to Columbia in 2007, he proudly pointed to Maral, who may be the only student from her country now at Columbia, saying: “This is our young generation!” Her interview with Turkmenistan national television from that visit has been televised on numerous occasions. Last but not least, Maral was part of the Harriman Institute’s delegation to Turkmenistan this past March. She proudly represented her fellow students from Columbia in her country when she met with hundreds of students at different universities.

Ross Johnston received his B.A. from Tufts University in 2007 with majors in history and Russia & East European studies. He began as a MARS-REES student at the Harriman Institute in the fall of 2007. The focus of his work at the Institute has been on politics, particularly in Russia and Ukraine, and international relations as they pertain to the former Soviet Union. In the summer of 2008, Ross interned at Freedom House’s New York office where he helped write their Countries at the Crossroads Global Governance Blog.

In his second year Ross took a course on nationalism taught by Jack Snyder and decided to build his thesis on research he conducted for this seminar. However, rather than writing a thesis analyzing nationalism, he ended up writing about its absence. Ross argues that the absence of nationalism in the relationship between Ukraine, Crimea and Russia since 1991 can be explained by opaque political and economic networks extending into each of the three elites, which have acted as stabilizers for the relationship. Ultimately, he hopes to publish this piece in some form in order to influence the debate about Russia’s role in the former Soviet Union in the aftermath of the August war between Georgia and Russia.

After graduation Ross intends to put his degree from the Harriman Institute to work in public service for the U.S. Government. This spring he passed the Foreign Service exam and will most likely begin working for the State Department early next year. Until then he is seeking work in policy research in Washington, D.C.
Michael Kreidler (SIPA ’08) has been living and working in Moscow since June 2008. A familiar face in recent years around the Institute, the former Harriman Program Assistant and Bakhtemeff Fellow was awarded the prestigious Alfa Fellowship to study Russian foreign policy and continue improving his language proficiency in Moscow.

The Alfa Fellowship Program is a high-level professional development exchange program which places ten American citizens per year in work assignments at leading Russian organizations in the fields of business, economics, journalism, law, and government. Key goals of the Alfa Fellowship Program include expanding networks of American and Russian professionals, developing greater intercultural understanding, and advancing US/Russian relations.

At present, Michael is fulfilling his professional assignment at the European Public Policy Advisers, a Brussels-based lobbying firm with offices in eight nations across the continent, where he works in the capacity of a management consultant.

In addition to his day-to-day work, the Alfa Fellowship program has afforded Michael the opportunity to meet with numerous leaders and influential figures in government, business, and the non-profit sectors in Moscow and across other regions of Russia.

Michael notes that, while there is never a dull time to visit Russia, it has been particularly interesting over the past six months to observe how the Russian government and Russian writ large are responding to the effects of the global financial crisis, as well as to study Russian-American relations at this critical juncture. The fellowship has also granted Michael, who has previously interned at the U.S. Embassy in Tbilisi, the opportunity to more closely monitor Russian-Georgian relations following the events in the South Caucasus last August.

Following the completion of the Alfa Fellowship Program in April 2009, Michael will return to the United States and continue his study of Russian foreign policy. Prior to the fellowship, Michael passed the oral examination for the Foreign Service, and at present is anticipating receiving the call to duty from the Department of State in July 2009. Michael attributes the fellowship with further enabling him to understand Russian foreign policy from a Russian perspective, and is confident that he will continually draw upon his experience in Moscow as he enters the diplomatic corps.

For more information about the Alfa Fellowship Program, please see http://www.cdsintl.org/fellowshipsabroad/alfa.php

***

Allison Abrams graduated from Columbia’s School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA) with a Masters in International Affairs in 2002, with concentrations in Russian and Post-Soviet Studies and International Finance. While at SIPA, Allison was a Program Assistant with the Harriman Institute. Prior to entering SIPA, she worked as a Program Assistant at the Kennan Institute for Russian Studies of the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars in Washington, D.C. After leaving SIPA, Allison shifted her professional focus to performing policy analyses of U.S. financial markets regulation as part of her work at the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO). The GAO is an independent, nonpartisan federal agency that works for Congress. GAO investigates how the federal government spends taxpayer dollars and its work is generally done at the request of Congress or mandated by law. Allison is now a Senior Analyst at the GAO and leads research projects that have evaluated such issues as U.S. anti-money laundering efforts, Securities and Exchange Commission enforcement efforts, and minority banking. This work has resulted in public reports and GAO testimony before Congress, as well as recommendations to federal agencies’ for improving the implementation of their programs. Allison is currently working on research related to the use of federal funds provided under the recent Recovery Act, also known as the stimulus bill. Allison continues to pursue her interest in Russian and former Soviet Union outside of work by continuing to study Russian, among other activities. Allison has also been teaching English as a Second Language (ESL) for the past several years to native Spanish-speakers in the D.C. area.
“Celebrating the Ballets Russes in Music, Art, and Puppetry: The Golden Cockerel,” was one of the many events the Harriman Institute sponsored this spring to mark the centenary of the first Paris performances of Sergei Diaghilev’s legendary Ballets Russes. The production was conceived by Amy Trompetter, Barnard Research Scholar in Theatre, with Catharine Theimer Nepomnyashchy, Professor of Russian at Barnard College and Director of the Harriman Institute, and Lynn Garafola, Professor of Dance at Barnard College.

Le Coq d’Or (The Golden Cockerel), Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov’s last operatic masterpiece, was based on Alexander Pushkin’s 1834 poem The Tale of the Golden Cockerel (itself loosely based on American writer Washington Irving’s Tales of the Alhambra). Rimsky-Korsakov composed the opera in the aftermath of the 1905 Revolution, but a protracted battle with Tsarist officials, who regarded the piece as seditious, prevented the work from reaching the stage until after the composer’s death. The work entered the international repertory in 1914 at the Paris Opéra in a highly innovative staging by Diaghilev’s Ballets Russes, and was the great success of Diaghilev’s 1914 season.

The Golden Cockerel is both a story of magic and enchantment and a cautionary tale about the misuse of political power. An old Tsar, who spent his youth committing vicious attacks and violent atrocities against his neighbors, is plagued by the past. His neighbors now seek revenge, and the Tsar finds himself unable to rest, until an enigmatic astrologer gives him a magical solution—in exchange for a single wish. The old Tsar, however soon learns the consequences of making—and breaking—a promise.

Inspired by Natalia Goncharova’s renowned neo-primitivist designs for the 1914 production, Amy Trompetter conceived and directed a new adaptation, in which scores of giant puppets inhabit exotically decorative paintings. Shawna Lucey was co-director and choreographer. Lucey has studied dance in Russia and received her MFA from the Boris Shchukin Theater Institute in Moscow. Composer Raphael Mostel arranged a new score from Rimsky-Korsakov’s music, and Catharine Nepomnyashchy created a new English-language libretto, based on Pushkin’s verse. Along with Trompetter, the artistic team featured lighting designer Julie Streeter, assistant set designer Sam Wilson, and assistant costume designer Katalin Pazmandi. Puppeteers for the show included Michael Dennison, Alicia Gerstein, Hilary Hanson, Noah Harrell and Jenny Romaine. The Golden Cockerel was co-sponsored by the Harriman Institute and the Italian Academy.

—Hilary Hanson
“Celebrating Diaghilev in Music and Dance: Afternoon of a Faun and Les Noces,” sponsored by the Harriman Institute this spring to mark the centenary of the first Paris performances of Serge Diaghilev’s legendary Ballets Russes, was conceived by Lynn Garafola and Catharine Nepomnyashchy. The unique event, brought together two landmark works of the Ballets Russes. The first, Afternoon of a Faun (1912), is Vaslav Nijinsky’s celebrated ballet of adolescent sexual awakening to music by Debussy and designs by Léon Bakst. The second, Igor Stravinsky’s Les Noces (1923), is a choral masterpiece evoking a Russian peasant wedding. Presented by the Harriman Institute, in collaboration with the Dance Department and Music Program of Barnard College, this centenary tribute will be performed by a cast of Barnard and Columbia students, with musicians from the Manhattan School of Music. Recorded musical excerpts from Diaghilev ballets were played as “symphonic interludes” before the performance and during the intermission.

Afternoon of a Faun, which was staged by Tina Curran, executive director of the Language of Dance Center, is the version reconstructed by Ann Hutchinson Guest from the score notated by Nijinsky while under house arrest in Budapest during World War I. It was first produced by Les Grands Ballets Canadiens in 1989, and since then, has been staged by a number of university dance programs.

Les Noces was led by Gail Archer, director of the music program at Barnard College and conductor of the Barnard-Columbia Chorus. Originally produced as a ballet with choreography by Bronislava Nijinska, Les Noces will be performed as a cantata, with full chorus, soloists, four concert pianists (from the graduate program in piano of the Manhattan School of Music), and tympani.
Challenges of Education Reform: Central Asia in a Global Context

O
n January 23-24, 2009, the Harriman Institute hosted an international conference, Challenges of Education Reform: Central Asia in a Global Context, which brought together leading academics, practitioners, and education policymakers from Turkmenistan, the United States, and Europe. Representatives of Columbia University’s Harriman Institute, Earth Institute, Journalism School, Barnard College, and Teachers College participated in the conference as panel speakers, chairs, and discussants. Furthermore, two Ambassadors to the United Nations – Kazakhstan’s Ambassador Byrganym Aitimova (also a former Minister of Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan) and Turkmenistan’s Ambassador Aksoltan Ataeva—joined the conference with opening remarks. Over the course of the two days, the conference provided a unique opportunity for participants to (1) examine challenges and opportunities of post-socialist education reform in Central Asia; (2) discuss new and innovative approaches to the education and training of professionals; and (3) explore opportunities for future cooperation opportunities with educational institutions in Turkmenistan.

The conference featured a series of panels, which examined education development in Central Asia since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. The first day was devoted to exploring two main themes—an overview of education reform efforts in the former socialist bloc since the early 1990s (examining both general education and higher education reforms and their implications) and an analysis of the impact of international education assistance in Central Asia, including Western assistance (USAID, World Bank, UN agencies, and international NGOs) and alternative assistance strategies (Russia, Turkey, etc.). The second day focused directly on education in Turkmenistan and allowed an opportunity for conference participants to examine issues and priorities in Turkmenistan’s education since the election of President Gurbanguly Berdymukhamedov in 2007. More importantly, the conference provided an opportunity to discuss possibilities for ongoing collaboration between the Harriman Institute and higher education institutions in Turkmenistan.

—Iveta Silova, Lehigh University

NEW PUBLICATION FROM BAKHMETEFF ARCHIVE

Globachev, K. I. Pravda o russkoi revoliutsii: Vospominannia byvshego nachal'nika petrogradskogo okhrannogo otdeleniia (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2009).

First publication of the Russian version of the recollections of Major-General Konstantin Ivanovich Globachev, the last chief of the Petrograd Okhranka (Tsarist Secret Police). Globachev’s memoirs provide a detailed account of the political events in Russia during the turbulent period of two Russian revolutions and contain valuable information about the role Rasputin played in the life of the Imperial family. Based on a manuscript held at the Bakhmeteff Archive of Columbia University, this book represents another collaborative project of ROSSPEN, one of the foremost publishers in Russia, and the Bakhmeteff Archive.
Rafis Abazov (SIPA) received the Central Asian Geographic Society Award (2008) for his contribution in “developing geographic knowledge about Central Asia and Kazakhstan.” Abazov’s Palgrave Concise Historical Atlas of Central Asia (Palgrave/Macmillan, 2008) presents an overview of cultural, political and geopolitical changes on the Great Silk Road from western China to southern Russia and the Middle East. He pays particular attention to the international competition for access to energy resources and pipelines in the region, the geopolitics of U.S. and Russian military bases and the international war on terrorism. Abazov also authored an article on the impact of the global financial crisis on migrants and their families in Central Asia for the Central Asia-Caucasus Analyst (October 2008).

Alexander Cooley (Political Science, Barnard) received an inaugural Open Society Institute Fellowship from Soros to study the activities of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization in Central Asia. His new publications include a Washington Quarterly article in December, co-authored with Lincoln Mitchell, on the need to recast US-Georgia relations: http://www.twq.com/09winter/index.cfm?id=325; an article in the journal International Affairs (Nov. 2008, Chatham House) on the transatlantic community’s struggle to promote both its democratic values and strategic interests in Central Asia; as well as op-eds and a short article on the Georgia conflict for the Wall Street Journal, Eurasianet, and Current History (Oct. 2008).

Padma Desai (Economics) participated in two panels on “The Implications of the Emerging Resource Constraints (Relating to Natural Resources and Food) for US-Russia Foreign Policy Interaction” organized by the Global Creative Leadership Summit on September 21-23 in New York City. On November 24, she took part in a panel discussion on “The Future of US-Russia Relations” organized by the Institute for Democracy and Cooperation in New York City under the directorship of Andranik Migranyan. The roundtable discussion on “Russia’s Economic Crisis: How Deep? How Wide? How Lethal?” took her to the American Enterprise Institute in Washington, DC on December 9, 2008. She has been a member of the Russia Working Group organized by the Century Foundation under the chairmanship of Senator Gary Hart and Ambassador Jack Matlock for reshaping Russian-American dialogue. She hopes to publish her book, Breaking Out: An Indian Woman’s American Journey, before the end of the year.

Anna Frajlich-Zajac (Slavic) gave a lecture on “Jealousy, Sex and Character: Michal Choromanski and Otto Weininger” at the Book of the Month Club in Greenpoint, Brooklyn. In November 2008 she presented a paper at the invitation of the organizing committee of the conference “The March 1968 Anti-Zionist Campaign and Its Significance for Polish-Jewish Relations,” which was held in London.

Timothy Frye (Political Science) was named Marshall D. Shulman Professor of Post-Soviet Foreign Policy this fall. In addition, he presented a paper, “Partisan Politics in Transition Economies,” at Princeton in September and appeared on World Focus on PBS in October.

Boris Gasparov (Slavic) was interviewed by Aleksei Nilogov for Nezavisimaya Gazeta's "Ex Libris" (Dec. 12, 2008). Gasparov, Bakhmeteff Professor of Russian and East European Studies, answers questions on his conception of linguistic studies, the philosophical resources of the Russian language, and the “personality cult” in the humanities. His book Five Operas and a Symphony (Yale University Press) has been published in Russian translation in Moscow by Klassika-XXI.

Tom Kent, a Harriman Institute adjunct professor, spoke on multimedia news editing at the annual congress of the Federation Professionelle des Journalistes du Quebec on Dec. 6 in Quebec City. He also addressed the Centre de Formation de Journalistes in Paris in October, on U.S. investigative journalism. Both presentations were in French. In July in Moscow, Kent spoke to the Russian Publishing Expo on multimedia journalism. Kent, who is also a deputy managing editor of The Associated Press, teaches the Harriman course, “International Reporting: Covering Russia and the World.” He also teaches at the Journalism School.

Lincoln Mitchell’s (SIPA) “Georgia Postbellum” was published in the American Interest (May-June 2009). He was interviewed by Martin Savidge on Worldfocus about the Georgian
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military mutiny attempt on May 5th.

**Catharine Nepomnyashchy** (HI Director and Slavic), co-edited the volume, *Mapping the Feminine: Russian Women and Cultural Difference* (Slavica Publishers, 2008), a Festschrift in honor of Barnard Professor Emerita Marina Ledkovsky, in which also appeared her article, “Dance as Metaphor: The Russian Ballerina and the Imperial Imagination.” She has also recently published “Jane Austen and Russian Chat,” *Ullbandus: The Slavic Review of Columbia University* (2008); “The Original Black Russian,” *The Root.com* [http://www.theroot.com/id/44710](http://www.theroot.com/id/44710) (February 8, 2008); and “Anna Pavlova,” *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Women in World History*, Bonnie G. Smith and Barbara Engel, eds. (Oxford University Press, 2008). By invitation she taught an OSLEP (Oklahoma Scholar-Leadership Enrichment Program) seminar, “Russian Émi-gré Artists in the Context of American Culture,” and also under the auspices of OSLEP delivered a public lecture, “Vladimir Nabokov: Russian or American Writer?” at the University of Oklahoma, Norman. She delivered the invited lecture, “Russia vs. Georgia: What are the Stakes?” at Drew University and at Washington University in St. Louis. She was featured on the Russian-language program “Persona Grata” aired on NTV America (October 13, 2008) and in the *New York Times* article, “For Often Unsung Scholars, a War Means Center Stage” (August 24, 2008). She was interviewed on the Russia-Georgia conflict on CNN (August 17, 2008) and on XM POTUS 08’ Channel 130 (August 19, 2008) and wrote “Khrushchev to Putin, A War of Words” for the *New York Times* “Times Topics” blog (August 18, 2008).

**Neni Panourgia’s** (Anthropology) *Dangerous Citizens: The Greek Left and the Terror of the State* will be published by Fordham University Press in June.

**Carol Rounds** (Hungarian) is the author of *Hungarian: An Essential Grammar*, the second edition of which was published in December 2008 by Routledge.

**Ivan Sanders** (Hungarian) was Visiting Professor at Budapest’s Central European University in the Fall ’08 semester. While there, he gave a public lecture entitled “Jewish (Over)tones in Viennese and Budapest Operetta.” The two-volume, 2400-page *YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe*, which contains nine articles by Sanders on Hungarian Jewish writers, was published in 2008 by Yale University Press. His discussion of two Hungarian films was aired on CUNY-TV Channel 75 in October 2008. His short commentaries on current events appeared in the Hungarian literary weekly, Élet És Irodalom. *World Literature Today* and the *Hungarian Quarterly* published his reviews of new Hungarian books.

**Stephen Sestanovich** (SIPA) writes about the Obama administration’s foreign policy agenda and its relations with Congress in “Hostile Territory,” *Washington Post* (April 24, 2009).

**Alla Smyslova** (Slavic) defended her Ph.D. dissertation, “Developing Four-Skill Literacy among Heritage Learners: Effects of Linguistic and Non-Linguistic Variables on the Attainment of Low-Proficiency Heritage Students of Russian within a Dedicated College-Level Bridge Course” at Bryn Mawr College.

**Elizabeth Valkenier** (Art History) chaired a session in June 2008 of the NEH seminar on the use of visual resources for teaching Russian history, literature and culture. The seminar was held at the New York Public Library. She chaired a panel on “Narrative and Reception in 19th-Century Russian Painting” at the AAASS convention in Philadelphia (Nov. 2008). She is the editor of *Russian Realist Painting, The Peredvizhniki: An Anthology*, published as a special issue of the journal *Experiment*, edited by John Bowlt. The volume includes documents on the Association of Traveling Art Exhibits and its predecessor, the Artel; exhibits, views of its members on art, art criticism and commentary, and the assessment of their legacy by art historians.
Krzysztof Zanussi at Barnard

On February 18, 2009, internationally renowned Polish film director Krzysztof Zanussi screened his 2005 film Persona Non Grata and discussed Polish-Ukrainian-Russian relations since the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the challenges these nations face today. Prof. Anna Frajlich and Prof. Yuri Shevchuk of the Department of Slavic Languages moderated the discussion (see photo below). The event was sponsored by the Polish Studies Program, the Ukrainian Film Club of Columbia University, the East Central European Institute, the Harriman Institute, and the Film Division of Columbia’s School of the Arts.

HARRIMAN TO HOST INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON LYSENKOISM

The International Workshop on Lysenkoism, co-sponsored by the Harriman Institute and the City University of New York, will take place December 4-5, 2009. Trofim D. Lysenko, a Ukrainian agronomist, was responsible for banning genetics in the Soviet Union and its allies, following a week-long session of the Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences in 1948. The workshop will bring together scholars from over a dozen countries to present their work on the impact and response to Lysenko’s anti-genetics campaign in over a dozen countries in Europe, Asia and Latin America. The workshop will be the first ever devoted to this topic, and as such will constitute a vital contribution to research on international science during the Cold War. The sessions on Friday, December 4, will be held at the CUNY Graduate Center, 365 Fifth Ave., Room 9204/9205. The sessions on Saturday, December 5, will be held at Columbia in IAB 1501. The conference is free and open to the public. For further information please contact William deJong-Lambert at WRL4@columbia.edu/william.dejong-lambert@bcc.cuny.edu.
Endowed Chair in Polish Studies Established at Columbia

Columbia University recently completed a $3 million fundraising effort to establish its first endowed chair in the Polish Studies program at the university’s East Central European Center.

“The new chair in Polish studies reflects not only Poland’s historical contributions to art, literature and the sciences as the birthplace of such notable figures as Czeslaw Milosz, Frederick Chopin, Marie Curie and Pope John Paul II, but also recognizes its current prominent position as a member of the European Union,” said Nicholas Dirks, Columbia’s Vice President and Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. “Students will benefit from the wide array of studies we offer that pay tribute to the remarkable achievements that Poland has realized culturally, economically and politically.”

Following an international search to fill the professorship, a scholar specializing in one of the social sciences as it pertains to Poland and its neighbors will join Columbia’s faculty.

Congratulations 2009 Graduates!
SIPA
Levan Berulava, Evgenia Bukshpun, Valeri Chekheria, Kathryn Critchell, Besnik Hyseni, Oleksandr Ilchuk, Svetoslava Pavlova, Eugene Sokoloff, Oksana Shulyar, Mirka Tvaruzkova

MARS-REERS (May and October)
Lydia Hamilton, Sarah Hoftiezer, Ross Johnston and Manana Khergiani

Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Jessica Teicher and Thomas Anessi