FACULTY RESEARCH

EMPIRE OF DIFFERENCE
Karen Barkey

It is said that often social scientists study the subjects that help explain the influences that shaped their lives, the contradictions and tensions inherent in the settings in which they lived, letting some of the personal guide the research questions of their academic lives.

In many ways my encounter and choice of historical sociology as an academic field and my fascination with empire has been guided by growing up in Istanbul and by both the contrast and continuity between empire and nation-state in modern-day Turkey. Add to this the diverse and anachronistic ways in which the history of the Ottoman Empire was presented to me over my educational life, my desire to rethink the ways in which we need to write and present the history of the empire intensified. The Ottoman Empire also seemed an important case study to reconsider at a time when we ask ourselves how to forge long-lasting political and economic cohesion in the midst of ethnic and national diversity on a multinational scale. In fact, it is quite probable that our current fascination with the study of empire is driven by the recognition that “empire” is a valuable historical analogy for understanding and informing our current dilemma and possibilities. I therefore set out to undertake an analytic historical study of the Ottoman Empire to think about empire theoretically, to revise our historical understanding of the Ottoman case and bring this into the orbit of social science.

Empire of Difference is a comparative study of imperial organization and longevity that assesses Ottoman successes as well as failures against those of other empires with similar characteristics. I examine the Ottoman Empire’s social organization and mechanisms of rule at key moments of its history, emergence, imperial institutionalization, remodeling and transition to nation-state, revealing how the empire managed these moments, adapted, averted crises and what changes made it transform dramatically. The flexible techniques by which the
Ottomans maintained their legitimacy, the cooperation of their diverse elites both at the center and in the provinces, as well as their control over economic and human resources were responsible for the longevity of this particular “negotiated empire.”

I attacked the question of empire from a different perspective, focusing on longevity and imperial maintenance rather than the traditional framework of rise and decline. Many traditional empires were political formations, systems of rule that lasted a long time, mostly due to their flexibility and capacity to adapt and innovate. Longevity, resilience, and flexibility remain key features of empire that have been under-theorized. This is certainly true for the Ottoman case, but also for the comparative cases that I employ in the book, the Romans, Russians and Habsburgs. Therefore, I argued that to understand empire is to be able to follow analytically the slow but critical transformation of imperial states, their adaptation and robustness in the face of diversity, crisis, and change.

I also adopted a distinct theoretical framework which allowed me to answer the question of the longevity of empire in analyses of the organizations and networks connecting large segmented and constantly changing structures, by focusing on the multivalent, networked, vertical, and horizontal linkages and the malleable compacts established between state and social actors. I paid particular attention to the elements that enabled the Ottoman Empire to survive for a long time and over a large territory, by paying attention to state actors, but also to varieties of social and political actors who interacted with the state, shared power, and aspired to positions of authority and privilege, as well as those who tried to poke holes in the various hegemonies of imperial control, dissenters. Most importantly, I consistently paid attention to the middle level of interactions and relations, embedding them firmly into the movement between institutions and individuals.

The variety of topics that the book illuminates include imperial governance, imperial institutions, diversity and multiculturalism, the relation between religion and politics, the manner in which dissent is handled and/or internalized, and the nature of state-society negotiations as imperial states transform to adopt new policies. In each of these sections, some of my arguments were further probed of established arguments, demonstrating, for example, the underpinnings of the eighteenth-century mode of decentralization and its effects through the study of the actual networks of horizontal linkages and the local organization that became alternative regimes of governance. A corollary of such decentralization—not previously analyzed—was the inability of the Ottoman state to fully centralize its financial apparatus and successfully transform a semi-privatized tax-farming system into a public taxation system, in the manner of the British and French states. By introducing a new comparative framework, I show that part of the financial travails of the system was its unprecedented devolution and far-reaching delegation of financial power.

Another interesting outcome of such sustained analytic history, however, was in the counter-intuitive thinking that it furthered, pushing us to understand imperial governance more deeply. A good example of this is the question of “toleration” in the Ottoman Empire. While most scholars understand and use the notion of toleration to characterize the empire’s relative lack of persecution of “the people of the Book,” Christians and Jews, for many centuries, they are unable to simultaneously explain the often vicious persecution of its Muslim heterodox, Sufi brethren, happening at the same time. Or, they are similarly unable to explain how an empire that managed diversity so successfully for many centuries, ended up in the
genocidal policies of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The analysis that I offer, which focuses on the intermediary networks and organizations that make it possible for state society relations to flourish, does just that. I show through the first encounter between the Ottoman state and Jewish and Christian communities to the institutionalization of a script for governance, how the fact that these non-Muslim communities were organized, some hierarchically, others not, facilitated incorporation and governance; I also show how toleration is not simply an idea, but the social product of organizational negotiation, top down and bottom up, where the interests of state actors and social actors coincide. By the same token, the nebulous, fluid, always changing and recombinant networks of the many different Islamic heterodox groups strewn all over the empire made it impossible for state actors to create, what James Scott calls “legibility,” meaning an established form of governing these groups. The lack of organizational stability, the fluid networks of the multifarious dervish orders made them threatening to the state, especially by comparison to the non-Muslim communities looking for peace and order. We therefore have to see the different reactions, toleration versus persecution, as state responses that emanate from different organizational conditions and relations between groups.

In many ways Empire of Difference is meant to look at empires from a different lens and underscore issues of longevity and flexibility of adaptation. It is also a sustained attempt at analytic historical sociology, one that places itself head-on in a social scientific attempt at social analysis.

Karen Barkey is Professor of Sociology. Her Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective, was published earlier this year by Cambridge University Press.

---

Studies of the Harriman Institute

The year 2008 has seen the publication of three new volumes in the series Studies of the Harriman Institute:

http://www.press.uchicago.edu/presssite/metadata.epl?mode=synopsis&bookkey=263312


http://www.ohiostatepress.org/

---

In other news, Iveta Silova was awarded a prize from the Association for the Advancement of Baltic Studies for her book *From Sites of Occupation to Symbols of Multiculturalism: Reconceptualizing Minority Education in Post-Soviet Latvia* (Information Age, 2006). The prize recognizes an outstanding scholarly work in Baltic studies in the humanities or social sciences.
FROM THE DIRECTOR

As I embark on the final year of my term as Director of the institute, I look forward with great excitement to the many and diverse events we have planned for the coming academic year. Here I would just like to say a few words about what I believe will be among the high points of the fall semester. As many of you know, a delegation of five Harriman faculty members traveled to Turkmenistan as guests of the Ministry of Education in March as a follow up to the visit of President Berdymukhammedov to Columbia during the World Leaders Forum last September. Those of us who participated in the delegation were encouraged by signs of reform and were pleased when our trip culminated in the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding with the Turkmen government which promises to lead to significant collaboration between Harriman and Turkmen faculty, students, and policy makers in the realm of education reform. (For more on our trip, see the brief report on page 7.) In June, another delegation of Harriman faculty traveled to Georgia. While there, we were able to visit Abkhazia, met with key players in the disputed territory, and participated in a conference co-sponsored by the Atlantic Council. As a result, the delegation members contributed to a substantial report on the situation in the region which aims to guide U.S. policy. (For more on this trip, see Lincoln Mitchell’s write-up on page 6.) Most important, these faculty interventions form part of larger Harriman Institute initiatives which seek to diversify and deepen our coverage of the post-socialist region in programming that will serve the larger Harriman community. To that end, we have scheduled “debriefings” on the missions to Turkmenistan and Georgia at the beginning of the semester and will hold a one-day forum on Abkhazia in early October. Thanks in large part to a very generous donation by good friend of the Harriman Institute, Ian Hague, the new Georgian Studies Center at the Harriman Institute has gotten off to a robust start, and I am pleased that Lauren Ninoshvili, Harriman Institute certificate holder and Ph.D. candidate in ethnomusicology, will be serving as administrator for the center this year. The Ukrainian Studies Center will continue its normal vibrant activities, and the Njegos Fund will launch its activities with a lecture by renowned Croatian author Dubravka Ugresic.

I am also pleased to announce a particularly notable addition to the Harriman faculty in the person of Debora Spar, newly appointed President of Barnard College. President Spar will also give the initial lecture this year in the ongoing series, “Children in Post-Communist Space.” Acclaimed novelist Gary Shteyngart, who teaches in the Columbia University School of the Arts, has also ac-

(Continued on page 5)

Debora Spar, President of Barnard College, Joins Harriman Institute Faculty

A political scientist by training, in her research Spar focuses on issues of international political economy, examining how rules are established in new or emerging markets and how firms and governments together shape the evolving global economy. Spar is the author of numerous articles and books, including most recently Ruling the Waves: Cycles of Invention, Chaos, and Wealth from the Compass to the Internet and The Baby Business: How Money, Science, and Politics Drive the Commerce of Conception. Prior to coming to Barnard, Spar was the Spangler Family Professor at Harvard Business School and Senior Associate Dean, Director of Research.
Accepted our invitation to join the Harriman Institute faculty, and we look forward to his participation in literary events. In important milestones for our faculty, Professors Alexander Cooley and Valentina Izmirlieva have been granted tenure and Boris Gasparov has been named Boris Bakhmeteff Professor of Russian and East European Studies.

We also look forward to deepening our relationship with our neighbor on the twelfth floor of the International Affairs Building, the Institute for the Study of Europe, under its new Director, historian Victoria de Grazia. Professor de Grazia will oversee the Harriman Institute Core Project for the 2008-2009 academic year, “Great Power(s) in the Mediterranean” (see page 8).

We as always welcome our normal varied and interesting complement of post-doctoral fellows and visiting scholars to our ranks in the fall, and look forward to seeing as many of you as possible at regularly scheduled sherry hours.

Other highlighted activities for the fall include a series of conversations among foremost journalists who covered Russia then and now and a conference on “Mapping the Russian Blogosphere,” efforts that reflect the growing importance of media studies to our understanding of trends unfolding in the region. We will also be continuing our Cold War Film Series as well as putting the Harriman gallery space to good use, beginning in September with an exhibit of photos, “Turkmenistan: People on the Great Silk Road,” by Rafis Abazov, followed in mid-October by an exhibit entitled “Dostoevsky’s Doodles” (see page 12). The Institute will also be sponsoring a film conference, “Screening Sexuality: Desire in Russian, Soviet and Post-Soviet Cinema (October 10-11).”

As this list of our fall programming indicates, the Harriman Institute continues to explore new territory, both literally and figuratively as we chart a new course for regional studies in a global world. I urge you to consult our website frequently for programming updates and news on faculty, student, and alumni achievements. As always, I welcome emails from all of you with suggestions and news.

Yours truly,
Catharine Theimer Nepomnyashchy
Last spring when the Harriman Institute initiated its study group on Georgia-Russia relations, the tensions between Georgia and Russia had become increasingly intense in recent months. The frozen conflicts in Abkhazia and South Ossetia had escalated to the point where both sides acknowledged the possibility of war between the two countries. Georgia’s ongoing efforts to become part of NATO had only raised Russian rancor towards their smaller southern neighbor; and both sides had engaged in heated and aggressive rhetoric. The recent escalation of hostilities in August 2008 make ever more clear the fragile nature of peace in the region.

As part of its study group on Georgia-Russia relations the Harriman Institute sponsored a study trip to Georgia in June. Participants in the group were Harriman Institute Director Catherine Nepomnyashchy, Barnard College Associate Professor of Political Science Alexander Cooley, SIPA Assistant Professor in the Practice of International Politics Lincoln Mitchell and visiting scholar at the Center for Study of Human Rights David L. Phillips.

The purpose of the group was to focus largely on the Abkhazia conflict, which at that time seemed like the biggest single source of tension between Georgia and Russia, and explore ways that the West generally, and the U.S. more specifically can play a useful role in resolving this conflict. Accordingly, the group met with a range of Georgian, Russian and Abkhaz officials during their five-day trip, which included a day in the Abkhaz city of Sukhumi where meetings were held with the de facto Abkhaz president, defense minister, national security advisor and other leaders. The group also visited an IDP center in the west Georgian city of Zugdidi where they spoke to some of the more than 250,000 Georgian IDPs who fled Abkhazia in the early 1990s. In Tbilisi, the group had conversations with numerous senior Georgian officials including the president, incoming speaker of parliament as well as several officials from the Foreign Ministry and Ministry for Reintegration.

During the fall, the members of the group will draft a memo, based on this study trip as well as the current developments and Georgia and their ongoing research and work in the field, on Georgia-Russia relations and how the U.S. should address these issues.

—Lincoln A. Mitchell
Arnold A. Saltzman Assistant Professor in the Practice of International Politics

Harriman Faculty in the News

The outbreak of the conflict between Georgia and Russia occasioned a number of requests from the press for expert opinion from our faculty on the situation. A complete listing of faculty appearances in the media can be found on the News section of the Harriman website. Lincoln Mitchell, for example, wrote pieces for the New York Times, Daily News, Moscow Times and the Huffington Post and appeared on Lou Dobbs and ABC Nightline. David Phillips contributed an opinion piece to the Washington Post, Robert Legvold was quoted on the Voice of America and in the Los Angeles Times, Catharine Nepomnyashchy wrote a piece for the New York Times, Stephen Sestanovich appeared on Charlie Rose.
HARRIMAN DELEGATION VISITS TURKMENISTAN IN MARCH

As a follow up to the visit of President Gurbanguly Berdimuhamedov of Turkmenistan to Columbia University as part of the 2007 World Leaders Forum, a delegation of faculty members from the Harriman Institute visited Turkmenistan in mid-March 2008 at the invitation of the Ministry of Education of Turkmenistan. The delegation consisted of faculty members Catharine Nepomnyashchy (Director of the Harriman Institute), Kimberly Marten, Alexander Cooley, Rafis Abazov, and Jenik Radon. The goal of the visit, outlined in conversations with President Berdimuhamedov, Vice Premier Saparliyev, and Minister of Education Muhammetgeldi Annaamanov while they were in New York last September, was to explore with officials of the government of Turkmenistan opportunities for future collaboration with Columbia University and the Harriman Institute.

During their stay in Turkmenistan, Harriman faculty members visited several leading education institutions to meet with students and faculty and delivered lectures on their research and on how the experience of U.S. higher education in general and specifically of Columbia University’s liberal arts, international affairs, and regional studies programs can serve as model for curriculum reform in Turkmenistan. They were also privileged to join their Turkmen hosts in celebrating the spring holiday Navruz by planting trees outside of the capital city of Ashgabat.

The trip culminated in the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between the government of Turkmenistan and the Harriman Institute. The memorandum outlined plans to make it possible for Turkmen students to study at Columbia, to cooperate with the Ministry of Education of Turkmenistan in organizing conferences in New York and Ashgabat on education reform in Turkmenistan, and to explore further possibilities for cooperation.

Subsequently, two representatives from the Ministry of Education of Turkmenistan visited Columbia University for 10 days as guests of the Harriman Institute. They attended classes, met with students, faculty, and administrators, and attended lectures in order to see how Columbia University works “in action.”

It is hoped that the Harriman delegation’s trip to Turkmenistan will serve as a model for Harriman Institute-sponsored outreach to other countries in the Eurasian region.

From left to right: Rafis Abazov, Catharine Nepomnyashchy with daughter Olga, Kimberly Marten, Alexander Cooley, Vice Premier Hydyr Saparliyev, Jenik Radon, Minister of Education Muhammetgeldi Annaamanov.

Alex Cooley plants a tree for Navruz; Kimberly Marten looks on in the background.
The European Institute, with generous support from the Harriman Institute, is launching a two-year project focusing on “Great Power(s) in the Mediterranean” this autumn. The “s” in parenthesis highlights that the EI will be analyzing the Mediterranean area from the perspective of the longstanding conflicts of multiple powerful states. Given that the region has been the millennial crossroads of major civilizations and that there have been so many powerful contenders for influence, the project will consider the wide range of forces and resources the Great Powers must deploy to establish and sustain their influence. The project is thus concerned with studying not only major shifts in geopolitical influence and trade patterns, but also the domination pursued through commercial exchange, religious crusades, and the imposition of new developmental and cultural models, as well as the resistance to them. The focus is mainly the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. But anybody familiar with the Mediterranean area is aware of the longue durée.

What makes this collaborative project especially significant is that it signals Russia’s presence among the Great Powers acting in the region and at all levels from the eighteenth century to the present. To assist planning, as well as to carry on their own projects, the Harriman grant has enabled us to appoint two postdoctoral fellows: Elena Astafieva, visiting from the CNRS in Paris, who will introduce us to her project on “Pilgrims in the Holy Land,” and Rinna Kullaa of the University of Maryland, who is working on “Yugoslavia and the Non-Aligned World in the Cold War.” That between them they command nine different languages suggests not only their wonderful skills but also the scholarly capacities required to study the Mediterranean area.

The main focus this academic year is the “Cold War in the Mediterranean.” It is not casual that French President Nicolas Sarkozy made it the first order of his foreign policy to build a Mediterranean Union. Since the end of the Cold War, the Great Powers, which have organized the Mediterranean since World War II following the defeat of Western European imperialism, namely, the U.S. and the USSR, have lost their grip in the area. The Soviets were pushed back in the 1970s. Now the U.S.’s influence, too, is declining with the debacle in Iraq and its catastrophic oversight of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Whether or not such a project succeeds and with what kind of participation from Arab and other nations, it signals the European Union’s conviction that in order to safeguard European prosperity and security, it must turn from East-Central Europe to confront the huge problems generated by the disparity of development across the Mediterranean that had its origins in the Cold War era.

The EI’s goal, then, is to examine what the Cold War meant for the region: how it played differently from north to east to south, from Spain to the Balkans, from Turkey to the Middle East, from Egypt to Morocco; where it fits in the succession of Great Power struggles in the area. To start, we have to recognize that the Cold War inscribed that a region once treated as a more or less cohesive area of study, The Mediterranean, was broken up for purposes of political analysis into security regions, notably Western Europe’s Southern flank, the Middle East, and Africa.

The EI intends to overcome this fragmentation at its first event, a conference set for November 14-15 (preceded by films on the Marshall Plan in the region at the Italian Academy, October 30 and November 4). Drawing on Columbia’s own significant scholarly resources, as well as colleagues invited from abroad and other U.S. institutions, our goal is agenda-building. Bringing into dialogue experts with very different disciplinary perspectives, from anthropology to international relations, and dispa-

(Continued on page 11)
Rafis Abazov (SIPA) received Kazakhstan’s Journalism Academy Award (2007) for the best foreign publication on contemporary culture, literature and mass media in Central Asia and Kazakhstan. Abazov’s book *The Culture and Customs of the Central Asian Republics* (Greenwood Press, 2007) presents his research on the cultural changes that have taken place during the twentieth century in this important region on the Great Silk Road and the impact of globalization and independence on the cultural development since 1991.

Alexander Cooley, newly tenured member of the Barnard Department of Political Science, is the author of *Base Politics: Democratic Change and the U.S. Military Overseas*, published earlier this year by Cornell University Press. In his article “Central Asia: U.S. Bases and Democratization,” published in the Winter 2008 issue of *Orbis*, Cooley examines the local political and economic impact of the U.S. military basing presence in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan. Cooley explores how initial basing arrangements, concluded shortly after 9/11 to support U.S. combat operations in Afghanistan, became increasingly politically controversial within these base hosts and entangled in their volatile domestic politics and democratizing pressures.

Padma Desai (Economics) and husband Jagdish Bhagwati were honored by *India Abroad* magazine with Lifetime Achievement awards, presented by Salman Rushdie, at a ceremony held on March 28th in New York. Bhagwati, University Professor at Columbia and a leading free-trade economist, and Desai, the Gladys and Roland Harriman Professor of Comparative Economic Systems, are credited with helping create a blueprint for India’s modernization through their book, *India: Planning for Industrialization* (1970). In May, Desai was honored with an award from the President of India for her scholarly contributions. The award ceremony took place in the Viceroy’s Palace, the official residence of the President.

Michael Eskin was invited by the U.S. Consul General of Germany to lecture on intercultural prejudice on a State Department Visitor Grant. His book *Poetic Affairs: Celan, Grünbein, Brodsky* was published earlier this year by Stanford University Press.

Anna Frajlich-Zajac (Slavic Languages) is the co-author with Felicja Bromberg and Wladyslaw Zajac of *Po Marcu—Wieden, Rzym, Nowy York*, a collection of letters written back home during the first eighteen months of exile. During four weeks in early summer Frajlich-Zajac traveled to Poland to promote this book and give readings of her poetry. She traveled to five cities, gave four poetry readings, three lectures/meetings with students, four radio interviews and 6 book launches.

Lynn Garafola, Professor of Dance, is the Recipient of the 34th Annual Emily Gregory Award. The award recognizes one Barnard College professor for outstanding performance in the classroom. Nominated by a Barnard student through a formal essay, the recipient is honored for having made a significant contribution to the academic community through her teaching. In other news, earlier this year Garafola curated the exhibit “New York Story: Jerome Robbins and His Word” for the New York Public Library of the Performing Arts.

Boris Gasparov, Bakhmeteff Professor of Russian Studies, has been awarded an honorary doctorate by Stockholm University. The formal festivities will take place in September 2008.

Valentina Izmirlieva, newly tenured member of the Department of Slavic Languages, is the author of *All the Names of the Lord: Lists, Mysticism and Magic* (Studies of the Harriman Institute), published earlier this year by Chicago University Press.

Rebecca Kobrin (History) has been awarded a fellowship from the Center for Advanced Jewish Studies at the University of Pennsylvania for 2008-9 to pursue her research on East European Jews’ encounter with and reshaping of American capitalism. She is also finishing her manuscript, “Between Exile and..."
Georgia’s Rose Revolution

Democracy: U.S. Foreign Policy and
many of these.) His book, Harriman
website News for links to
the Russia/Georgia conflict. (See the
appearances in the media in response to
Affairs) has made a number of ap-
’Uncanny,’” Nabokov’s Defense Against Freud’s
includes “King, Queen, Sui-mate:
(Director) forthcoming publications
include “King, Queen, Sui-mate:
Diaspora,” forthcoming from
Indiana University Press.

Kimberly Marten (Political
Science, Barnard) has received a
grant (administered by Barnard Col-
lege) from the Smith Richardson
Foundation for her book project on
“Dealing with Warlords: Lessons
from History.” The project
will examine several historical and
recent cases, including the Federally
Administered Tribal Areas (FATA)
of Pakistan, parts of post-Soviet
Georgia, Sierra Leone, and the An-
bar region of Iraq. In each of these
cases, state-building efforts have had
to deal with what Marten calls
“warlordism”—localized rule over
small slices of territory by armed
men who maintain control through a
combination of force, charisma, and
patronage. The project’s goal is to
understand what kinds of methods
might work best to create stable new
states in warlord societies. The book
that results will try to find a solu-
tion to what Marten calls “the war-
lords dilemma”—the fact
that throughout the world, in
places ranging from Afghanistan to
Somalia, the US has found it neces-
sary to cooperate with warlords for
short-term security interests, even
though warlords have strong incen-
tives to undermine international
state-building efforts, since strong
states by definition challenge their
authority.

Lincoln Mitchell (International
Affairs) has made a number of ap-
pearsances in the media in response to
the Russia/Georgia conflict. (See the
Harriman website News for links to
many of these.) His book, Uncertain
Democracy: U.S. Foreign Policy and
Georgia’s Rose Revolution will be
published by the University of Penn-
sylvania Press later this year.

Catharine Nepomnyashchy’s
(Director) forthcoming publications
include “King, Queen, Sui-mate:
Nabokov’s Defense Against Freud’s
‘Uncanny,’” Intertexts: http://
www.languages.ttu.edu/intertexts/;
“Man in Black: Putin. Power. Im-
age,” Przeglad Rusycystyczny, a special
issue edited by Anatoly
Vishnevsky (forthcoming 2008); and
“The Émigré Alter-Ego: Émigré
Literary Criticism, in A History of
Soviet Literary Theory and Criti-
cism, eds. Evgeny Dobrenko and
Galin Tihanov (forthcoming, NLO,
2008). Nepomnyashchy was the co-
organizer of the conference
“Narratives of Jewish-Slavic En-
counters in Twentieth-Century Eastern
and Central Europe (Prague,
2008); she delivered a paper on
“Pain and Memory: Narrating the
Gulag, or Traces in the Snow and
Ice” at the conference “The Pain of
Words: Narratives of Suffering in
Slavic Cultures” (Princeton Univer-
sity); and she participated on the
panel “Pushkin’s Blackness” at
“Alexander Pushkin: An Historic
Symposium at Harvard” (Harvard
University).

Cathy Popkin, outgoing chair of
the Department of Slavic Languages,
has been named Jesse and George
Siegel Professor in the Humanities.
She contributed a chapter to the vol-
ume Chekhov the Immigrant: Trans-
lating a Cultural Icon, edited by
Michael Finke and Julie de Sherbinin
(Slavica Publishers, 2008).

Jenik Radon (SIPA) co-authored
the article “Getting Human Rights
Right,” published in the Stanford
Social Innovation Journal
(December, 2007), a civil society
journal that focuses on practitioners
who are interested in achieving so-
cial change through organizational
management. The article discusses
the meaning and need for a new ana-
lytical tool for businesses, human
rights impact assessments (HRIAs).
Radon is co-author of “Staatsfonds
vor den Toren” (State Sovereign
Funds before the Gates), published in
Frankfurter Allgemeine (February
2, 2008). He gave a lecture on
“Legal Framework for Humanitarian
Action” at the inaugural seminar of
the new degree-granting institute,
Living Peace and Daily Justice Insti-
tute in Kathmandu, Nepal, of which
he is a founding advisor. The Insti-
tute is focused on peace and recon-
ciliation as well as development
studies.

Irina Reyfman (Slavic Lan-
guages) received the Award for Ex-
cellence in Teaching at the Post-
Secondary Level from the American
Association of Teachers of Slavic
and East European Languages
(AATSEEL) at their annual meeting
in December 2007.

David Stark (Chair, Sociology)
was a Distinguished Visiting Fellow,
Institute of Advanced Study, Dur-
ham, England, Fall 2007; and
Scholar-in-Residence, Max Planck
Institute for the Study of Societies,
Cologne, Spring 2008. He is the re-
cipient of a grant from the National
Science Foundation, Sociology Pro-
gram, for a research project on
“Politicized Business Ties in Hun-
gary: Business Groups in a new De-
mocracy.” Recent publications in-
clude “Opportunities of Constraints:
A Sociologist’s Reflections on Janos
Kornai’s By Force of
Thought;” Theory and Society
(October 2007).
Victor Erlich
1914 (Petrograd) – 2007 (Hamden, Conn.)

Victor Erlich, one of the foremost specialists in Slavic literary studies, beloved colleague and mentor, died at his home in Hamden, Conn., on November 29, 2007. He was ninety-three years old. Erlich, a member of the Yale University faculty since 1961, was the B. E. Bensinger Professor Emeritus of Russian Literature. Erlich received his Ph.D. in 1950 from Columbia University, where he studied with Roman Jakobson, an experience that was to play a large role in his career and scholarship. In addition, he was a member of the inaugural class of the Russian Institute, which opened its doors in 1946, and was in the first class to earn an Institute Certificate. His pioneering book, *Russian Formalism: History—Doctrine*, was first published in 1955 and has been translated into many languages. He published his memoirs with Northwestern University Press under the title *Child of a Turbulent Century* (2006). He was honored for his “Outstanding Contributions to Scholarship” by the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages in 2006.

Postdoctoral Fellows 2008-09

We ask you to welcome the new cohort of postdoctoral fellows that will be spending the coming academic year with us. Elena Astafieva and Rinna Kullaa will be working in conjunction with the Harriman Core Project (see page 8).


Rinna Kullaa, Ph.D., European History, University of Maryland, College Park. “The Mediterranean Dialogue on Communism and Non-Alignment during the Cold War.” rkullaa@umd.edu

Jonathan Larson, Ph.D., Anthropology, Miami University, Ohio. “Anthropological Lessons from Eastern Europe for Theorizing Liberal Selves and Practices of Democracy.” larsjonathan@gmail.com


Program Assistants 2008-09

And please welcome our Program Assistants for the coming academic year: Sarah Hoftiezer is in her second year of study for her Masters in Regional Studies—Russia, Eurasia and Eastern Europe (sah2142@columbia.edu) and Eugene Sokoloff is a second year SIPA student (eas2166@columbia.edu).
DOSTOEVSKY’S DOODLES

Fyodor Dostoevsky created his fiction step by step as he lived, read, remembered, reprocessed, and wrote. For much of his life, he would plan his novels and then the chapters throughout the night, sleep in the morning, and dictate them in the afternoon to his wife, Anna Grigoryevna, whom he had first met as a stenographer. These hundreds of pages of notes, edited over the years by Russia’s greatest scholars, represent that key moment when the accumulated proto-novel crystallized into a text. Like many of us, Dostoevsky doodled hardest when the words came slowest.

Konstantin Barsht, a researcher at the Russian Academy’s Institute for Russian Literature (Pushkin House) in St. Petersburg deplores the absence of the doodles from the great editions of Dostoevsky’s notebook materials and in 2005 edited an eight-hundred-page volume of them (XVII) for the Voskresen’e edition of Dostoevsky’s works published in Moscow. His notes for this exhibit, a selection of those materials, suggest persuasively that some of Dostoevsky’s descriptions of his characters are actually the descriptions of doodled portraits he kept reworking until they were right. Dostoevsky doodled with calligraphy as much as human and architectural images, and Barsht has offered notes that may connect these doodles too with the concerns and thought processes that emerge in Dostoevsky’s novels and other writings. It is exciting to find new access to the workings of literary genius through an activity so many of us mortals engage in too.

“Dostoevsky’s Doodles,” an exhibit curated by Konstantin Barsht, will open in the Harriman Exhibit Space, 12th Floor IAB, on October 15.