From the Director

Sadly, the Harriman Institute this year bids farewell to three figures who have in large part defined it both as an institution and as a community. As most of you already know, Marshall Shulman—member of the institute’s first class, Director of the institute for many years, architect of the transformation of the Russian Institute into the W. Averell Harriman Institute for Advanced Study of the Soviet Union and ultimately the Harriman Institute, heart and soul of our community—passed away peacefully at home in the company of his family on June 21st at the age of 91. Marshall remained active in Harriman events almost to the end, and many of you saw Marshall as his ever charming self at the Harriman 60th anniversary banquet at the Columbia Club in New York last November. A memorial service for Marshall was held at St. Paul’s Chapel on the Columbia campus on September 10th. A booklet of reminiscences about Marshall by friends, colleagues and students was published by the Institute and can be read on the News Archive page of the Harriman website (Sept. 10th).

This semester witnesses the departure from Columbia of two other past Directors of the Harriman Institute. Robert Legvold, Marshall’s successor who guided the institute through the heady years of glasnost and perestroika, retires in December after a final semester on leave. Well known as a foremost expert on international relations in our region, Bob will certainly be keeping busy, but we hope that he will find time to come back to New York and participate in Harriman activities as frequently as his schedule allows.

Mark von Hagen, my predecessor as Director, has left us to take up the

Richard Wortman Honored by AAASS

For Distinguished Contributions to Slavic Studies

We are proud to be able to share with you the citation from the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, which has awarded Richard Wortman its highest honor:

“An illustrious scholar and a generous and inspiring colleague, teacher, and mentor, Richard S. Wortman has changed our perspectives on imperial Russian history. Trained at Cornell University and the University of Chicago, Professor Wortman joined the faculty of the University of Chicago in 1963, moved to Princeton University in 1977, and then to Columbia University in 1988, where he is currently Bryce Professor of European Legal History.

Over a distinguished career spanning more than four decades, Professor Wortman has brought to historical studies innovative ideas and approaches, together with impeccable scholarship. His pathbreaking books and articles cross disciplinary boundaries (he draws from sociology, anthropology, psychology, political theory, legal studies, and many other sources) and he set a new standard for the application of cultural analysis to Russian history.

challenge of chairing the History Department at Arizona State University in Tempe. While we are terribly sorry to see Mark go, we can only envy him his pool and the balmy wintertime weather that awaits him. Fortunately, Mark, who among his other many contributions to the Harriman Institute, has most recently been the guiding spirit behind the growth of the institute’s Ukrainian Studies Program, has agreed to serve as Chair of the newly reconstituted Professional Advisory Council of the Harriman Institute. We therefore hope we will be able to lure him back to New York frequently and that he will remain very much involved in the ongoing development of Ukrainian studies at Columbia as well as in other institute initiatives. While we are sad to see Bob and Mark leave, we wish them well in going on to rewarding new phases of their lives.

These departures unquestionably mark the end of an era, but, in doing so, they challenge us to chart a course for the Harriman Institute which will allow it to live up to the legacy of its visionary past. Looking to the future, on a brighter note I am happy to announce that political scientist Timothy Frye has been elected by the Faculty Executive Committee to succeed me as Director of the Harriman Institute. Since Tim is out on a much deserved leave this year and feels it prudent not to take up the directorship immediately upon his return to Columbia after his sabbatical, I have agreed to remain on for an extra year as director (through the 2008-09 academic year). During that year, Tim and I will be working very closely together so as to ease the transition between directors. I very much look forward to working with Tim. For the time being, though, let us join in wishing him a restful and productive leave.

Yet another significant changing of the guard has taken place at the same time. After ten years of distinguished service, Lisa Anderson has stepped down as Dean of Columbia’s School of International and Public Affairs. Please join me in welcoming to SIPA Acting Dean John Coatsworth, a historian and specialist in Latin America, who came to Columbia last year from Harvard. (You’ll find his full biography on the SIPA website.) John has already, after barely two months in office, shown himself to be a knowledgeable dean, sympathetic to the issues faced by the regional institutes at Columbia today. He should prove an excellent guide for SIPA during this transitional period.

Finally, on the subject of changing personnel, my assistant Natasha Novikova has left her position to move on to greener pastures, so you will see a new face sitting outside my office. Masha Udensiva-Brenner, my new assistant, comes to us with impressive administrative credentials, a love of creative writing, fluent Russian and a knowledge of Czech. She is certain to be a valuable asset to the institute, and I urge you to make her feel at home.

The Harriman Institute has already gotten off to an exciting start this year. Four presidents from our region spoke at Columbia in the World Leaders Forum with the co-sponsorship of the institute (see page 8). These visits were succeeded by the world premier of a Requiem for the slain Russian journalist Anna Politkovskaya on October 7, the anniversary of her death; an International Symposium of Russian Ballet; and the conference “Agents and Agencies: (Re)Making Identity in Russia Today,” which brought together scholars from Russia and from around the United States in stimulating dialogue. As we strive to maintain our momentum throughout the year, an important series of events will explore the topic “Russia and Islam.” Following up on the initiative launched by Jack Snyder when he was Acting Director of the institute as well as on the success of the pilot project guided by sociologist David Stark, historian Mark Mazower will lead the institute’s core project this year on this crucial topic for our times.

I hope that you have all become familiar with our new website, which is now the most accurate and convenient way for you all to keep up with Harri- man Institute events as they “break,” so to speak. I hope to see all of you, whether at one event or many, over the course of this year. And, as always, I welcome your suggestions.

With best regards,
Catharine Nepomnyashchy

(Mosse Wortman, continued from page 1)
Fall 2006 was an exciting time for those in the Harriman community interested in East-Central Europe. At the invitation of Columbia University President Lee C. Bollinger, Václav Havel, the leading dissident in communist Czechoslovakia and, later, the first President of both post-communist Czechoslovakia and the Czech Republic, spent seven weeks in residence at Columbia. The guest of CUArts, under the leadership of Gregory Mosher, President Havel became the focal point for many activities on campus and around New York City, and the Harriman Institute participated vigorously in several of them. Faculty members were prominent in lending their expertise to the website that the Center for New Media, Teaching and Learning created to accompany the residency (www.havel.columbia.edu), and contributed in many other ways to the success of the University’s programs surrounding the Havel visit. We organized a series of lectures, and two Harriman faculty members, Brad Abrams of the History Department and Christopher Harwood of the Slavic Department, taught a course on the history, literature and film of East-Central European dissent. Among all of the events that took place under Harriman auspices, however, two sets stand out for their contributions. First, Professors Harwood and Abrams organized a one-day symposium, “The Examined Life: The Literature and Politics of Václav Havel,” which attracted 150 guests from across the United States. The morning session, devoted to literature, brought together the leading North American Havel scholars Marketa Goetz-Stankiewicz, Peter Steiner and Carol Rocamora, as well as Havel’s principal American translator into English, Paul Wilson. The afternoon session featured former dissident and current Czech Ambassador to the United Nations Martin Palouš, Jiří Pehe and a keynote address by the former dissident and Chairperson of the Czech Senate, Petr Pithart. After a day filled with exciting intellectual discussion, the Harriman played host to the most famous Czech rock band of all time, the Plastic People of the Universe, whose trial in 1976 was a major event in the creation of Charter 77. The second set of events took place in the world of the theatre. Harriman Director Catharine Nepomnyashchy co-taught a course on Havel and his Beggar’s Opera with Amy Trompetter of the Barnard Theater Department. This culminated in the production of Havel’s adaptation of John Gay’s famous play, attended by President Havel and his wife, which played for two sold-out nights at Miller Theater and was the only student production included in the New York City Havel Theater Festival.
Politics and Literature. The two realms are often intertwined, and during periods of both stability and upheaval, they consistently inform one another. But as Vladimir Voinovich made clear in his lecture, creating literature in the Soviet Union did not mean that politics informed your art—it weighed down upon it and imposed itself with brutal force. Though the great modern satirist (or, according to Voinovich himself, “lyricist”) noted that his dissident experience was comparatively peaceful, a personal conflict with the State undoubtedly had a major impact on Voinovich. In the Soviet Union, “they arrested writers because literature played a great role.” As a result, “writers were the first target of Soviet methods.”

Voinovich was not the first or the second target of repression, but his subversive literature led to his expulsion from the Writers Union, making him an automatic enemy of the Soviet Union. Though an official rejection meant that no one—except for foreigners and Russians reading photocopies of photocopies in secret—would have access to his writing, Voinovich was not treated as poorly as other dissidents. That said, while the dual punishments of almost constant house arrest and a persistently meddling KGB were the most difficult elements of his situation—they meant that he lacked the concentration and the energy to write. He stated that “in Lenin’s prison cell, you could write, but in my case, every day, the KGB did something to make life impossible.”

Though comparatively minor, the KGB’s constant torments reflected the Soviet government’s approach to its citizens—Voinovich starkly noted that the goal was “to break everyone.” The pervasive constraints of an existence under the Soviet regime meant that, at times, Voinovich did not conceive of himself as a satirical writer. Indeed, “I was describing life as it was, but life itself was satirical.” As a result, the writer’s honesty was unnecessary and unwanted, and the transition from Khrushchev’s somewhat lax attitude to Brezhnev’s highly authoritarian repression only served to confirm that Voinovich was a dangerous dissident.

But throughout his quasi-captivity, brutal honesty was Voinovich’s guiding principle. After all, the man who played tricks on the KGB agents assigned to guard his apartment was also the man whose letter to Brezhnev upon his exile from the Soviet Union accused the leader and his associates of depriving the Soviet Union of its glory, of “lay[ing] the groundwork for the regime’s collapse.” His skepticism extended to other major figures, as well. Just as he had found Stalin unappealing as a small child, Voinovich came to dislike the almost religious fervor that accompanied Solzhenitsyn’s rise to fame. He noted that he was one of the first to meet him ecstatically, but he began to realize that “godlike elements were being attributed to him that he did not have.”

In the context of his almost biological predisposition toward skepticism, it is only natural that Voinovich does not see Russia’s current regime in a positive light. That said, he did not seek to equate Putin with Stalin, Brezhnev, or Khrushchev. Indeed, he noted that while “the people did not deserve the Soviet regime, they deserve this regime.” And just as the Soviet Union needed Voinovich and other dissidents to help guide it toward its demise (though most of the responsibility for the regime’s end “rests on Soviet authorities”), Putin’s administration needs its critics. But Voinovich says that he is not that critic. Though “a general description should be written” to illuminate the regime, these days Voinovich is more concerned with lyricism. For a man who considers his most celebrated satirical work, The Life and Extraordinary Adventures of Private Ivan Chonkin, the beginnings of an epic, the quest for “pure” literature could very well be another subversive act.

Mark Krotov, Columbia College, is Associate Editor of The Birch, A Journal of Eastern European and Eurasian Culture: www.thebirchonline.org.
When in the 1960s I studied musicology at the Gnesin Institute in Moscow, concurrently with receiving a doctorate in Slavic linguistics, I did not feel particularly involved with Russian music. The musical section of my mind was almost exclusively occupied by the Germans—from Bach and the Vienna classics, to Wagner and Mahler (at that time, a fruit whose consumption was not forbidden but discouraged), to the New Vienna school (definitely forbidden but attainable in private). To say that I felt averse to Russian music would be an exaggeration; rather, I took it for granted, the way one takes one’s native language (until one learns to take a really hard look at it)—that is, as something one is intimately familiar and perfectly comfortable with, an existential emotional and aesthetic environment. Of course, Russian music sounded all around, whether you wanted to hear it or not. In an overwhelming majority of cases, one could instantly recognize a hitherto unknown piece of music as “Russian” by its sound, although one would be hard pressed to explain what specific ingredients constituted its unmistakable yet elusive peculiarity.

This attitude reflected, I believe, the peculiar place occupied by national music in the Russian cultural tradition. On the one hand, it seems fair to describe Russian culture as very “musical”; one has only to remember innumerable touching scenes in Russian literature and films in which characters swoon to the sounds of a peasant song, a church chorus, a piano, a violin, or the voice of an opera diva. On the other hand, whenever pressing philosophical, social, psychological, or aesthetic problems are raised, music, with very few exceptions, takes the back seat to literature, and in the twentieth century, to the visual arts as well. Certainly, Russian music took part in every new important cultural trend, but it was a part whose intellectual and aesthetic underpinnings had already been shaped elsewhere. Glinka’s A Life for the Tsar was received with enthusiasm as a musical proclamation of Russian narodnost’, the idea developed by writers, literary critics, and philosophers during the preceding decade. The uncompromising quest for “realism” of the musical voice, proclaimed by Dargomyzhsky in the 1850s and ardently followed by the young Musorgsky and Rimsky-Korsakov in the 1860s, was clearly derived from Belinsky’s definition of the “natural school” in the 1840s and the subsequent affirmation of the superiority of reality over art by Chernyshevsky. At the time of their appearance, Stravinsky’s “Russian ballets” attained more international fame than the works of any contemporary Russian avant-garde writer or artist (with the possible exception of Kandinsky); yet on the Russian cultural scene of the 1910s Stravinsky remained a marginal figure whose role in shaping Russian modernist culture was minor compared with that of Vyacheslav Ivanov, Andrey Bely, Velemir Khlebnikov, Viktor Shklovsky, and Kazimir Malevich.

One feature of Russian music reflecting its dependence on literature is the remarkable persistence with which Russian opera composers relied on works of the national literary pantheon for their subjects. In the nineteenth century at least, this trend set Russian opera apart from other Western operatic traditions. Of course, many nineteenth-century Western operas drew their subject matter from famous works of literature; but typically, with very few exceptions, composers chose works from a national literature other than their own, written in a different language. Rossini and Verdi took inspiration from Shakespeare, Schiller, Alexander Dumas fils; Gounod and Massenet followed Goethe, while Beethoven’s Fidelio used the drama by J. N. Bouilly; Wagner relied on early mythology and medieval novels rather than on modern literature. Even in such cases as Bizet’s Carmen and Massenet’s Manon, the literary original, although belonging to the same national tradition, was a work in prose, which meant that it was not used directly in the libretto. The latter practice, however, was typical for the Russian operatic tradition. Pushkin particularly, in his symbolic role as the “founder” of modern literature, was ubiquitous on the Russian operatic stage. As a survey conducted in the 1990s attests, the number of operas based on Pushkin’s works has neared 150 so far, including works by Glinka, Dargomyzhsky, Musorgsky, Chaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, Rakhmaninov, and Stravinsky that clearly belong to the national operatic canon. Gogol follows as a strong second, with major operas by Chaikovsky, Musorgsky, and Shostakovich based on his works. In the twentieth century, when prosaic discourse became more common in the opera, the way was opened for major Russian nineteenth-century novels to become lavishly represented on the operatic stage: Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Bryusov in Prokofiev’s War and Peace, The Gambler, and The Fiery Angel, Turgenev in Ippolitov-Ivanov’s Asya, Leskov in Shostakovich’s Lady.

Boris Gasparov

Through the Lens of Music: An Approach to Russian Cultural History
"Macbeth of the Mtsensk District," all permeated with direct textual borrowings from their literary prototypes.

The dependence, both ideological and textual, of Russian music on national literature and literary consciousness gave rise to a peculiar tradition of bemoaning the "desecration" of literary classics at the hands of composers. This tradition, which persisted from Glinka’s *Ruslan and Ludmila* to the ventures of Stravinsky, Shostakovich and Prokofiev onto literary terrain, survived all changes of taste and ideology. Even operas that virtually superseded their literary prototypes in the national cultural memory, such as *Boris Godunov* or *Eugene Onegin*, drew acid remarks from critics and the public for the way they handled their literary "originals."

This dependence, bordering on addiction, on national literature can be taken as a sign of the emphatically "logocentric" character of the Russian cultural tradition. Indeed, while no cultural history of Russia (or even history of ideas, for that matter) is conceivable without a heavy reliance on its literature, I have witnessed many cultural historians readily, one could even say almost happily, profess their "total ignorance" concerning musical matters. What makes Russian "logocentrism" peculiar, however, is the way it coexists with an unmistakable emotional response evoked by indigenous music. In a nation accustomed to looking at its writers with expectations of messianic proportions, music turns out to be the phenomenon truly inextricable from everyday life. In this capacity, music invades literature, making familiar verses and characters inseparable from their musical doubles. Yet in an intellectual landscape of the national culture music typically occupies a place at its margin, where it becomes barely noticeable.

A remarkable exception to this attitude can be found in works by Richard Taruskin and Caryl Emerson. Taruskin’s *Defining Russia Musically* in particular deserves credit for pioneering the exploration of the role of Russian music in Russian culture at large. Perhaps my only disagreement with cultural history.

Taruskin’s approach concerns his emphasis on the “definition.” My own attitude is more that of a cultural historian whose attention is focused on the historical relativity of emerging values—the result of discontinuity and the capricious vicissitudes of the historical process. I believe that accommodating music into the picture highlights precisely these aspects of music.

Macbeth of the Mtsensk District, all permeated with direct textual borrowings from their literary prototypes.

The dependence, both ideological and textual, of Russian music on national literature and literary consciousness gave rise to a peculiar tradition of bemoaning the “desecration” of literary classics at the hands of composers. This tradition, which persisted from Glinka’s *Ruslan and Ludmila* to the ventures of Stravinsky, Shostakovich and Prokofiev onto literary terrain, survived all changes of taste and ideology. Even operas that virtually superseded their literary prototypes in the national cultural memory, such as *Boris Godunov* or *Eugene Onegin*, drew acid remarks from critics and the public for the way they handled their literary “originals.”

This dependence, bordering on addiction, on national literature can be taken as a sign of the emphatically “logocentric” character of the Russian cultural tradition. Indeed, while no cultural history of Russia (or even history of ideas, for that matter) is conceivable without a heavy reliance on its literature, I have witnessed many cultural historians readily, one could even say almost happily, profess their “total ignorance” concerning musical matters. What makes Russian “logocentrism” peculiar, however, is the way it coexists with an unmistakable emotional response evoked by indigenous music. In a nation accustomed to looking at its writers with expectations of messianic proportions, music turns out to be the phenomenon truly inextricable from everyday life. In this capacity, music invades literature, making familiar verses and characters inseparable from their musical doubles. Yet in an intellectual landscape of the national culture music typically occupies a place at its margin, where it becomes barely noticeable.

A remarkable exception to this attitude can be found in works by Richard Taruskin and Caryl Emerson. Taruskin’s *Defining Russia Musically* in particular deserves credit for pioneering the exploration of the role of Russian music in Russian culture at large. Perhaps my only disagreement with fact, it is almost entirely based on excerpts from Pushkin’s novel in verse; but we are aware to what extent Chaikovsky’s characters might supersede for us Pushkin’s world of the 1820s, whose psychological underpinnings and behavioral premises are much more remote from our own than those of the 1860-70s, the period to which the opera belongs?

Here we come to one peculiar effect that ensues from an almost symbiotic attachment of Russian music to Russian literature. So closely is the music associated with its literary counterpart that it drags the latter to itself, as it were, causing its displacement into a different rhetorical environment and a different historical epoch. When a major work of literature—particularly, Pushkin’s—becomes the subject of an opera written twenty (Glinka’s *Ruslan*), forty (Musorgsky’s *Boris*), sixty (Chaikovsky’s *The Queen of Spades*), or one hundred (Stravinsky’s *Mavra*) years later, by a composer belonging to a different generation and different social and cultural milieu, for a public brought up on the works of contemporary writers, its situations and characters, ostensibly entrenched in the national memory, receive a new meaning in the new cultural context and under the auspices of a different genre. These shifts in meaning can tell us as much about the era to which the original literary or historical narrative belonged as about the time of its operatic reincarnation.

Consider, for example, the fate of *Ruslan and Ludmila*, when the work of a teenage poet, whose sparkling irreverence reflected the upbeat mood of the decade prior to December 1825, entered, as Glinka’s opera, the somber and intensely introspective world of Nicholas’s Russia in the 1840s. In Pushkin’s *Ruslan*, after all the splendor and might of the Blackamoor’s evil realm has been exposed as a ridiculous fake (first by Ludmila, who proved to be unattainable for an impotent potentate, then by Ruslan, who disposes of all the sorcerer’s might in one stroke, by cutting off the grotesque vestige of his power—his long beard), the young couple comes from
the shadows of the past unscathed, as if awakened from a bad dream (as Russia itself will awaken soon, Pushkin prophesied in a poetic epistle to Chaaadev). At the end of the poem—as befits a fairy tale—the nuptial feast simply resumes. Unlike Pushkin’s heroes, their operatic counterparts—in the true spirit of “people of the forties”—attain a profound inner transformation as the result of the suffering and oppression. In the initial scenes of the opera, we see them assuming brilliant but conventional operatic postures—Ludmila with her Italianized cavatina, Ruslan with generically heroic musical rhetoric. However, after all the anguish, despair, and self-doubt they experience, the remarkable change in their personalities is portrayed in music. The new voice in which Ruslan and Ludmila now express themselves is remote from the polished and sophisticated cosmopolitanism of their earlier musical selves. In the way they sing in the last two acts one recognizes features of the Russian popular “romance”—that favorite vehicle of private musical pastime of all strata of the Russian urban population, of which Glinka himself was the unsurpassed master. Ludmila in her lament “Ach, my grief, my little grief,” Ruslan in his monologue “Ludmila, give the answer to my heart,” and finally, in their love duet they both completely cast off their earlier operatic brilliance and embrace the rhetoric of the romance, with its simple musical language, direct (to the point of naive) emotional appeal, and a cozy “Russianness” to the sound. True to the spirit of Glinka’s generation—the generation of Stankevich and Herzen, Fet and the Aksakovs—his heroes turn their backs on the cosmopolitan imperial splendor of grand opera and discover another world, epitomized by the sounds of the popular “romance”—the world of private dignity, unpretentious intimacy and unabashed emotionality. It is hard to imagine a more eloquent expression of “the spirit of the forties,” with its retreat to the private sphere, away from the oppressive magnificence of a superpower, its intense soul-searching, and

the acute sense of nationality. Seen in this mirror, Pushkin’s Ruslan and Ludmila, by contrast, reveals the imprint of its own time, with its effortless elegance, insouciant cosmopolitanism, and irreverent élan. Looking at the two Ruslans, we can appreciate the psychological and ideological distance that separated the Russia of a sparkling, teasing literary pastiche of 1820 from the Russia of an almost unbearably lengthy, overburdened, alternately flamboyant and somber opera of 1842.

Another characteristic case of this historical displacement can be found in Eugene Onegin by Pushkin and Chaikovsky. Pushkin’s novel in verse was written in a pre-realist literary context, best represented by such authors as Jane Austen and Benjamin Constant; in Chaikovsky’s opera, its situations and characters reemerged into a world whose aesthetic and psychological premises were defined primarily by the realist novel. The opera’s plot seems to follow Pushkin’s very closely; and yet, as if by some magic, it assumes typical features of a novel by Turgenev (whose echoes can also be sensed in Goncharov’s Oblomov and The Ravine, and Dostoievsky’s Idiot): a male visitor arrives unexpectedly at a female household; in the course of the conversation that follows, the heroine instantly recognizes the value of the newcomer. Showing remarkable force of character, she declares to him her love. The hero, however, proves unable to meet this challenge; his retreat reveals his inner emptiness and portends his eventual moral bankruptcy. He shows himself to be a “superfluous man,” a socio-psychological type defined by Belinsky in the 1840s and named after Turgenev’s novella of 1856, Diary of a Superfluous Man. This perception reflected the aesthetic and moral values of the “generation of the 1860s” to which the composer and his listeners belonged. The opera made explicit the inner transformation that Pushkin’s novel in verse was undergoing in the public’s perception during the half-century since its appearance. The seeming familiarity of the characters and of the ambiance in which they acted obfuscated the profound yet subtle difference between the world of Russian aristocratic culture of the 1810-20s—a world akin to that in which Jane Austen’s heroines fell in love, suffered, and triumphed against all odds in the end—and Russian society after the Great Reforms.

Confronting Pushkin’s Onegin with his operatic reincarnation as a Turgenevized “superfluous man” can tell us a lot about the psychological, aesthetic, and ethical values of the society in which this transformation occurred. But by the same token, this may help us to take a fresh look at the novel itself, its author, and its times—to have a glimpse beyond the screen of a realist novel that time has put between Pushkin and us. What we can see there is a world of stiff conventions and oblique, elliptic ways by which people expressed themselves and communicated their feelings to each other. It is a world in which breaking conventions and acting directly, according to one’s feelings, signified not exceptional integrity and strength of character but poor judgment and provinciality. In writing her letter, Tatiana felt inspired by her favorite heroines from eighteenth-century Sentimentalist novels—the only reading she had access to in her rural seclusion (apparently, those books had been brought along by her mother after her marriage). To a late nineteenth-century or twentieth-century reader, it was difficult to imagine what impression these effusions must have made on an addressee brought up on Byron, Tchaubriand, and Constant; what answer should or could he give to a letter that asked whether he is the guardian angel or the fiendish seducer of the sender? Pushkin’s Eugene Onegin—not its late nineteenth-century transformation in readers’ consciousness, reflected in and canonized by Chaikovsky’s opera—offers us a picture of a world of growing inhibitions and stiffening conventions that was taking the place of eighteenth-century libertarianism and sentimentality in the wake of the Napoleonic wars and the Restoration, a picture that would be interesting to compare to the one that emerged from the nov-
els of Stendhal and early Balzac. Yet it does it in an implicit, elliptic way, befitting the homogeneous, hermetic state of Russian aristocratic culture of Pushkin’s time. It is a world hidden beneath stiff surfaces, artfully orchestrated nonchalance, and dizzying omissions, a world virtually inaccessible to readers accustomed to believe what they see, to listen to words rather than silences, to follow a tangible chain of events rather than pursue ethereal threads of what might, or should, or could not have happened. By making the historical displacement explicit, Chaikovsky’s opera invites us to re-examine not only Pushkin and his time but ourselves as Pushkin’s readers.

Exploration of such displacements, and their impact on our understanding of Russian cultural history, constitutes the principal theme of my book, Five Operas and a Symphony: Word and Music in Russian Culture (Yale University Press, 2005). The five operas and a symphony in question are Glinka’s Ruslan and Ludmila; Musorgsky’s Boris Godunov and Khovanshchina; Chaikovsky’s Eugene Onegin and The Queen of Spades; and Shostakovich’s Fourth Symphony. Each work serves as a viewing point for a tableau reflecting a certain moment in Russian history: the building of the empire and growth of national consciousness in the time of Nicholas I (1830-40s); the age of realism and populism (1860-70s), and the religious and metaphysical reaction against it in the late 1870s; the advent of modernism (1890s); and the beginning of high Stalinism (the early 1930s). Together, these snapshots add up to a coherent “story” of ideological and aesthetic trends in Russia as they evolved over more than a century, from Pushkin’s time to the rise of the totalitarian mentality and aesthetic in the 1930s.

Viewing each of these periods, and their succession, through the lens of music highlights, first of all, the discontinuity of the cultural process. By appealing to its literary or historical (as in the case of Khovanshchina) prototypes and counterparts, music in fact makes tangible the sharp turns taken by Russian culture as it moves from one generation to another, and the extent of memory suppression involved in this process. We can “hear” how times and peoples change, and together with them, familiar works change their perceptual shape too. Musorgsky’s second “peoples’ drama,” ostensibly a straight continuation of the premises that had resulted in Boris Godunov, turned out to be something profoundly different—a work kindred to Dostoevsky’s last novels and Wagner’s Parsifal. Chaikovsky, after reshaping Eugene Onegin into the mold of the archetypal Russian realist novel of the 1860s, turned out to be one of the first in Russia in the early 1890s to sense the early tremors of modernism—the trend whose adherents he pitied more than abhorred. He turned Pushkin’s “card-game anecdote” into an expressionist opera, an early precursor of Richard Strauss and Alban Berg. If we now see The Queen of Spades as an integral part of the “Petersburg myth,” it is primarily thanks to the shape its characters and situations received in the opera. Shostakovich, after an exuberant avant-garde start in the late 1920s, turned to traditional musical genres—a full-scale musical drama, a grand symphony—at the same time when literature turned to the conventional novelistic narrative under the auspices of socialist realism. Comparing Shostakovich and his literary counterparts to each other and to their nineteenth-century antecedents (the historical and psychological novel, the symphonies by Chaikovsky and Mahler) makes us better understand the aesthetic and psychological dimensions of the “great break” that occurred at the turn of the 1930s. By being fully integrated into cultural history, music reshapes habitual perceptions, shows breaks where one expects continuity, and makes us more acutely aware of all the vicissitudes of the process of cultural development.

Boris Gasparov, Bakhmeteff Professor of Russian and East European Studies, was honored in December 2006 at a special reception, held in the Frederick P. Rose Hall, Lincoln Center, as one of the recipients of the 39th Annual ASCAP Deems Taylor Awards, which he received for his Five Operas and a Symphony. The ASCAP Deems Taylor Awards are given for outstanding print, broadcast and new media coverage of music.

**WORLD LEADERS FORUM**

During the last week in September, the presidents of four countries in our region visited Columbia as part of President Lee Bollinger’s World Leaders Forum: Željko Komšić (Bosnia and Herzegovina), Toomas Hendrik Ilves (Estonia), Columbia Law School graduate Mikheil Saakashvili, and Gurbanguly Berdymukhammedov, pictured right with President Bollinger.

Launched in 2003, the World Leaders Forum is an annual University-wide initiative that helps realize Columbia’s commitment to serving as a center for public discussion and debate on the large economic, political, social, and cultural questions of our time that cut across both traditional academic and international boundaries.

Videos of all four events can be accessed on the Columbia website:

http://www.worldleaders.columbia.edu/.
Timothy Frye’s (Political Science) article “Original Sin, Good Works and Property Rights in Russia” appears in the July 2006 issue of World Politics, which came out this past spring. His review of The Coast of Utopia, “Show Stoppard” was published in The American Interest (July-August 2007). Over the course of the past year, Frye gave invited talks at Stanford, UC-Berkeley, University of Wisconsin-Madison, the University of Texas-Austin, the Higher Economics School in Moscow, and the Kennan Institute in Washington, D.C. He is on leave this year as a Visiting Scholar at Harvard’s Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies.

Lynn Garafola (Dance/Barnard) gave a paper on “Petipa and the Making of Ballet’s ‘Classical Tradition’” at the symposium “The Russian Ballet: Choreographers and Critics” held last year at the Center for Russian Culture, Amherst College. She curated, with Patriza Veroli, the exhibition “500 Years of Italian Dance: Treasures from the CIA Fornaroli Collection,” at the New York Public Library (2006). Garafola organized, together with Catharine Nepomnyashchy, the Harriman Institute’s International Symposium on Russian Ballet in October 2007.


Gulnar Kendirbai (Adjunct, History) presented a lecture in May on “The Nomads of Eurasia: History and Culture” at the invitation of the History Department of New York University. She spent this past summer conducting research in Kazakhstan, supported in part by a Harriman PepsiCo Fellowship.

Tom Kent (Journalism) gave a presentation at a conference in Paris of IFRA (international newspaper trade association) on multimedia newsroom design and ways to change the culture of news organizations from a newspaper culture to a digital, multimedia culture.

Liza Knapp (Slavic Languages) is the recipient of a 2007 Presidential Teaching Award, in recognition of her outstanding contributions to the University as teacher and mentor.

Robert Legvold (Political Science) edited a volume honoring Marshall Shulman, Russia’s Foreign Policy in the 21st Century and the Shadow of the Past (Studies of the Harriman Institute), which was brought out by Columbia University Press earlier this year. In addition, the book series on international relations in the post-Soviet space, directed by Legvold under the auspices of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and published by MIT Press, is now available in part in English and in its entirety in Russian on the web site of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (http://www.amacad.org/projects/postsoviet.aspx) The books are: Thinking Strategically: The Major Powers, Kazakhstan, and the Central
Asian Nexus; Swords and Sustenance: The Economics of Security in Belarus and Ukraine; Russian Military Power: Power and Policy; and Statehood and Security: Georgia after the Rose Revolution.

Kimberly Marten’s (Chair, Political Science, Barnard) new publications include “Statebuilding and Force: The Proper Role of Foreign Militaries,” Journal of Intervention and State-Building (June 2007); “Russian Efforts to Control Kazakhstan’s Oil: The Kumkol Case,” Post-Soviet Affairs (Jan.-Mar. 2007); and “Is Stability the Answer?” in Leashing the Dogs of War: Conflict Management in a Divided World, ed. Pamela Aall, Chester A. Crocker and Fen Osler Hampson (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2007). Professor Marten gave a talk in October at the Forest Hills branch of the Queens Public Library on “Putin’s Russia: Potential Partner, Irritant, or Threat to the West?”

Deborah Martinsen (Associate Dean of the Core Curriculum & Slavic Languages) attended the XIIIth International Dostoevsky Symposium in Budapest this past July. Martinsen was elected President of the International Dostoevsky Society (IDS), a position she will hold in addition to her office as Executive Secretary of the North American Dostoevsky Society (NADS). Her most recent articles are: “The Underground Man in America: The Case of Nabakov’s Lolita,” in the Pushkinskii Dom Festschrift in Honor of V. A. Tunimanov, forthcoming; “Peterburgskie odinocchki u Dostoevskogo: rasskazy ot pervogo litsa,” in Dostoevskii i mirovaia kul’tura (St. Petersburg, 2007); “Pervorodnyi styd,” in Brat’ia Karamazovy: sovremennoe sostoianie izuchenii (Moscow: Nauka, 2007); and “Of Shame and Human Bondage: Dostoevsky’s Notes from Underground,” in Dostoevsky on the Threshold of Other Worlds, eds. Lesley Milne and Sarah Young (Derbyshire, England: Brancote Press, 2006). She is working on a book entitled Narratives from Underground, a comparative literary and narratological analysis of twentieth-century underground narratives. She has been invited to present papers at the international and interdisciplinary conference “Art, Creativity, and Spirituality in Dostoevsky’s Brothers Karamazov,” which will be held at the College of the Holy Cross in Worcester, Mass., in April 2008 and at the “Aspects of Dostoevsky” conference, to be held at Mansfield College, Oxford, in September 2008.

John A. McGuckin (Religion) was awarded the Order of Stephen the Great (The Gold Cross of Moldavia and Bukovina) by the Romanian Orthodox Hierarchs, at a University reception in Iasi, to mark his academic work and his efforts on behalf of Romanian Departments of Humanities in Iasi, Timisoara, Baia Mare Sibiu and other sites. He was recently in Romania making a film, together with co-producer and Emmy award-winner Norris Chumley, about the revival of monastic life there. The film Sophia—Secret Wisdom will be shown on American and Romanian TV, and will appear in a director’s cut as an art-house film. His book The Orthodox Church: Its History and Cultural Tradition will be published next year by Blackwell Press.

Mark Mazower (History) joined Carlo Ginzburg and Sanjay Subrahmanyan for a discussion of “Fear, Reverence, Terror,” sponsored by the Heyman Center for the Humanities (Nov. 2007). He is the director of the Harri-man Institute’s Research Project, “Russia and Islam: Religion, the State and Modernity During and After the Age of Empire.” For more information on the project and scheduled events, visit the project website: http://russia-islam.harrimaninstitute.org/about.html

Ronald Meyer (Slavic Languages) read a paper at the conference held at the Vladimir Nabokov Museum, St. Peters burg, in October 2007, on the occasion of Andrei Bitov’s seventieth birthday. Meyer’s essay “Jealous Poetess or Pushkinist?: Anna Akhmatova in the Works of Andrei Bitov” appeared earlier this year in Russian Literature. He prepared for publication the late Robert A. Maguire’s translation of Dostoyevsky’s Demons, which will be published in March 2008 by Penguin Books UK. Meyer is currently working on another volume of Dostoyevsky in translation for Penguin.

John S. Migiel (HI Associate Director) delivered the keynote speech, “‘Witchhunts’ and ‘Bearbaiting’? Conservative Politics in Poland Today,” at the First Annual Research Forum of the Centre for Russian, Central and East European Studies, University of Glasgow. He was the co-convenor and panel chair at the Conference on Polish-German Reconciliation: A Never-Ending Story?, sponsored by the East Central European Center, the Polish Studies Program and the Institute for the Study of Europe and presented a paper on “Polish-Americans and the Transnational Challenge” at the Conference on Diasporas, Transnationalism and Foreign Policy, sponsored by the Alliance Program and the Association for Canadian Studies. This past spring he taught courses at the Higher School of Business-National Louis University in Nowy Sacz, Poland, on East Central Europe after the fall of the Soviet Union and on the making of U.S. foreign policy. He is co-editor, with Piotry S. Wandycz of Essays on Polish Foreign Policy, published by the Pilsudski Institute and Columbia University.

Alexander J. Motyl’s (History) second novel, Who Killed Andrei Warhol?, has been published by Seven Locks Press.

Catharine Nepomnyashchyy (Slavic Languages, HI Director) participated in a roundtable of Russian and Western journalists and media analysts to discuss the press coverage of the death of Alexander Litvinenko. The event was organized by Russian Profile, in conjunction with the Congress of the International Federation of Journalists held in Moscow in May 2007. She contributed the chapter “Jane Austen in Russia: Hidden Presence and Belated Bloom” to the volume The Reception of Jane Austen in Europe, edited by A. Mandal and B. Southam (Continuum, 2007). In October 2007, Nepomnyashchyy presented a paper on “The Ideologies of the Soviet Ballerina,” at the International Symposium of Russian Ballet, which she organized together with Professor Lynn Garafola, and another paper on “Jane Austen in Russian-Language Blogs” at the conference on Agents and Agencies:
The (Re)Making of Identity in Russia Today, which was co-sponsored by the Harriman Institute and ISE Center, Moscow (Information, Scholarship, Education).

Cathy Popkin (Chair, Slavic Languages) contributed the article “Restor(y)ing Health: Case History of ‘A Nervous Breakdown’” to the collection Anton Pavlovich Chekhov: Poetics-Hermeneutics-Thematics, ed. J. Douglas Clayton (Ottawa: Slavic Research Group, 2006).

Jeník Radon’s (SIPA) series “Eurasian Pipelines: Road to Peace, Development and Interdependencies” held its Third Colloquium on November 12-13, 2007. Topics included: The Pipeline Race to India and Pakistan—is the so-called Peace Pipeline from Iran Prospective Reality or Wishful Thinking? Is the Turkmenistan Route Still an Option? For more information, please check the Harriman website.

Ivan Sanders (Hungarian) reports that he had “the dubious honor of translating the notorious, and pathetic, last public address” (delivered on April 12, 1989) of János Kádár, Hungary’s long-time Communist leader. The speech appears in a recent issue of the Hungarian Quarterly. His translation of a George Konrád essay and of an extract from a new novel by György Spíró is in a recent issue of Habitus, a new “Diaspora journal.” He has contributed articles to the forthcoming multivolume Jews in Eastern Europe: The Yivo Encyclopedia. This past summer he was a guest lecturer on a Danube cruise, sponsored by Columbia’s Alumni Association. On April 26, 2007, Sanders conducted a conversation with novelist George Konrád at the Hungarian Cultural Center in New York on the occasion of the American publication of Mr. Konrád’s memoirs, A Guest in My Own Country. His essay “Teaching Péter Esterházy in New York” was published in the literary weekly Élet és Irodalom, and his review article of Kati Marton’s book The Great Escape—Nine Jews Who Fled Hitler and Changed the World appears in the Fall 2007 issue of the Hungarian Quarterly.


Michael Stanislawski (History) is the author of A Murder in Lemberg: Politics, Religion, and Violence in Modern Jewish History (Princeton University Press, 2007). Based entirely on previously unknown archival materials in L’viv, Ukraine, the book documents the assassination of the Reform Rabbi of the city by an Orthodox Jew during the Revolution of 1848.

David Stark’s (Sociology) recent publications include “Sociotechnologies of Assembly” (with Monique Girard) in Governance and Information: The Rewiring of Governing and Deliberation in the 21st Century (2007); “Rooted Transnational Publics: Integrating Foreign Ties and Civic Activism” (with Balazs Vedres and Laszlo Bruszt) in Theory and Society (2006); and “Social Times of Network Spaces: Network Sequences and Foreign Investment in Hungary” (with Balazs Vedres), American Journal of Sociology (2006).

Rebecca Stanton (Slavic Languages, Barnard) spent the past academic year on leave, first as a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Davis Center, Harvard University, and then in Odessa, Ukraine, on an American Councils/U.S. Title VIII Combined Research and Language Training Fellowship, working on her book on literary Odessa and studying Ukrainian. Her article “Talking Back to Nabokov: A Commentary on Commentary” was published in Ulbandus 10.
GLOBAL UNDERGROUND by Valera & Natasha Cherkashin

November 14 — December 11, 2007
Harriman Institute, 12th Floor, International Affairs Building

Valera & Natasha Cherkashin have worked together as a team since 1988. They’ve exhibited a number of international projects in the United States, Europe and Russia.

Global Underground, the Cherkashins’ new project, reveals the complexities and universality in cultural diversity found inside mass-transportation systems around the world. In the era of globalization in the 21st century, with the unprecedented freedom of movement by individuals internationally, Global Underground expresses visual features of each underground system. The project joins and reflects shared cultural distinctions from around the world.

In every country, the subway reflects extraordinary history as well as technological advances with cultural qualities that represent their individual period of construction. Moreover, the specific character and ornamentation of subway stations, their urban background and development, and the inhabitants of each city, further characterize the individual sites. Global Underground includes a number of artistic dimensions including video and digital forms of art.

Artworks about the Moscow and New York subways will be shown at this exhibit.