We are now in the 50th anniversary year of the founding of the Russian and East European Institute. As many of our readers know, Indiana University’s commitment to the study of this area of the world began even earlier. IU President Herman B Wells and other pioneers of international studies at IU began the teaching of East European languages here in the 1940s. After the war, it became obvious that Russia had to be added to the mix, if only because the Soviet Union was occupying a large number of East European countries. Accordingly, in the 1950s Wells hired leading young and mid-career specialists on Russia, and they and their colleagues in East European studies founded the REEI in 1958. The university has ever since maintained its commitment to this area of study through good times and bad. We currently have Russian or East European specialists working in every field of social sciences and humanities, altogether 85 persons.

We would like to mark the occasion of our 50th anniversary in two ways. First, we plan to mount a conference in the fall semester on the question of the “Past and Future of Area Studies.” More about that as the program develops. We would also like to publish a magazine that features a brief history of the institute and short comments by our alumni about their experience at IU and its impact on their lives and careers. In other words, we want to hear from you, our readers who are graduates of the programs affiliated with the REEI, be they a doctoral, master’s degree, graduate certificate, or the undergraduate minor. I cannot promise that we will be able to publish in this single magazine all the comments we receive, as our resources for producing it are limited. If we receive more than we can print, we will make a selection and then mount the entire set on our web site, including those we were unable to publish in the magazine.

I will renew this request for comments when I send out our annual spring letter to alumni.

This spring has again, as in previous years, brought an intellectually invigorating menu of events. One advantage of being at Indiana University is the variety of activities generated by each subset of our field. This semester film series have been especially popular. The Polish Studies Center, Hungarian Cultural Association, Romanian Studies Organization, Czech Club, Ukrainian Club, Belarusian Club, Baltic and Finnish Students Association, and South Slavic group have each presented films. And Mark Trotter, REEI assistant director, organized a series of contemporary Russian films. Many of the same subfields have mounted scholarly conferences, including a Polish Studies conference, a Hungarian Revolution commemoration and Hungarian Studies conference, a Romanian Studies conference, and forthcoming in late May is a Baltic Studies conference.

Two important events were the Russian Elections Workshop and our Roundtable on Islam and Post-Communism. The first inquired about the prospects for Russia and the world following from the new political arrangements established by the recent Russian parliamentary and presidential elections. A panel composed of Elizabeth Wood (History, Massachusetts Institute
of Technology), Regina Smyth (Political Science, Indiana University), Stephen Hanson (Political Science, University of Washington), and former ambassador to Russia and IU alumnus James Collins (now at the Carnegie International Endowment for Peace) analyzed the election results from a variety of viewpoints and proposed instructive hypotheses about what could be expected. The panelists’ presentations were followed by a lively give and take with what could only be described as an elite audience of our very best faculty specialists and graduate students.

The Roundtable on Islam and Post-Communism featured the expertise of outside specialists Zaindi Choltaev (Chechen political activist), Kristen Ghodsee (Anthropology, Bowdoin College), and Edmund Waite (Political Science, University of London). Gardner Bovingdon of IU’s Department of Central Eurasian Studies and a specialist on the Uyghurs provided the initial intellectual challenge in the form of a “provocation” statement and set of questions for the visiting panelists. Our local specialists, Nazif Shahrani (Anthropology), Abdulkader Sinno (Political Science), and Kevin Jaques (Religious Studies) assessed the initial statement, the responses by the visiting scholars, and then added their own perspectives to what proved to be a lively discussion of many of the burning issues of our day, in particular the advance of so-called pure Islam of the Middle Eastern radical Islamists into the long-established and more accommodating ideas and practices of the Muslims of Inner Asia, the Caucasus, and the Balkans.

Finally, I want to express my heartfelt thanks to the people who have assisted the institute through this year of total staff turnover. Denise Gardiner and Lance Erickson, though having moved on to more responsible positions, continued to give us advice and assistance. Mark Trotter, Andrew Burton, and Marianne Davis have taken their places (and that of Jessica Hamilton, who returned to school) and are rapidly mastering the complex financial and administrative requirements of running the institute. During the transition when we were often short staffed, our office graduate assistants, Maren and Richard Payne-Holmes and Brant Beyer, jumped into the breach and pulled us through many a difficult spot, and we are much indebted to them for their good work.

REEI Awards

- DISTINGUISHED ALUMNI
  1988 Alexander Rabinowitch
  1988 Charles Gati
  1995 Gale Stokes
  2000 Helena Goscolo
  2002 Howard I. Aronson
  2002 William Hopkins

- DISTINGUISHED SERVICE
  1988 Theofanis Stavrou
  1988 Robert F. Byrnes
  1989 Karen Niggle
  1996 Robert W. Campbell
  1997 Charles Jelavich
  1997 Janet Rabinowitch
  2000 William B. Edgerton
  2007 Denise Gardiner

---

**REEIfication online**

If you are interested in receiving **REEIfication** online, please email us at reei@indiana.edu and we will be happy to send you the link for each edition.
Female Detective Fiction in Russia

by Leigh Bernstein

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Russian publishing industry exhibited a new trend in response to readership demand. The decentralization of the large state-run publishing houses, the removal of official state censorship, and the large influx of Western books in translation provided readers access to a growing variety of genres. Demand for popular fiction and Western fiction reached new heights. In the Soviet period the publishing industry produced short print runs of contemporary fiction in order to counteract the commodification of the book. With the liberalization of the publishing industry in the 1990s came a wide range of genre choices with which to satisfy readers’ Soviet-era “book hunger” for contemporary fiction. The most popular genre, apart from the high demand for Russian translation of English language romances, was the female detective novel.

Prior to the 1990s in the Soviet Union, the concept of a female detective genre was reminiscent of Agatha Christie’s Miss Marple. No Russian equivalent to the Western woman detective, such as P.D. James’s Cordelia Gray in An Unsuitable Job for a Woman (1972), Marcia Muller’s Sharon Mccone of Edwin of the Iron Shoes (1977), or any of the three most prominent female sleuths in the last thirty years (Sara Paretsky’s V.I. Warshawski, Sue Grafton’s Kinsey Milhone, and Liza Cody’s Anna Lee) existed in the Soviet Union.

Female detective novels, however, proved a marketable, popular, and inexpensive reading option in post-Soviet Russia. From 1994 to 1998, according to Knizhnoe obozrenie, works of detective fiction by female authors almost equaled that of male-authored crime fiction in popularity, and by 1998 they exceeded their male counterparts in bestsellers. Leading the pack in this unprecedented breakthrough by female authors was Marina Anatol’evna Alekseeva, who writes

under the pseudonym Aleksandra Marinina. Marinina won the best book award from the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia for works on the Russian police force for her novels Death for the Sake of Death and Away Game. She was also recognized as “Writer of the Year” at the 1998 Moscow International Book Fair and received the award “Success of the Year” from Ogonek magazine in 1998. Marinina consistently remained on the top ten bestseller list, was the focus of scholarly and journalistic praise and criticism, and recorded large sales through 2006, with 75,000 copies, a high number by Russian book trade standards.

Marinina’s enthusiastic welcome in the literary marketplace coincided with increased interest in gender studies and the role of women in Russian society. Women’s history and feminism in Russia or, rather, how women experienced, were influenced by, and influenced the course of Russian history became a major area of interest in Russian scholarship. Moreover, the role of women as agents for social and political change became an important element for the mobilization of the women’s movement. Despite the elimination of the system of quotas and unopposed candidates in the State Duma, political parties by and for women proved to be powerful and influential in the first half of the 1990s. For example, the political movement Women of Russia (WoR) won 8.1% of the vote, or 22 seats in the December 1993 State Duma elections and specifically addressed the new government’s policies related to the “woman question” by promoting welfare and labor reform. Numerous institutes for gender studies, centers for victims of sexual assault and domestic violence, and various nonprofit support organizations grew in number and influence. The Moscow Center for Gender Studies, The Ivanovo Center for Gender Research, and the Association of Crisis Centers for Women represented only a few of many new independent women’s organizations in the 1990s.

Responses to the rise of a modern women’s movement in post-Soviet Russia were ambivalent and often hostile. Backlash from men and women alike was not unusual. Post-Soviet Russian literature, including popular or pulp fiction, reflected the conflicted response to feminist ideas. Russian feminism and popular literature intersected in the up-and-coming female detective genre of the 1990s. This intersection and conflict is demonstrated in the way Aleksandra Marinina characterizes

continued on page 13
The Russian Political Puzzle

As US presidential candidates continue a long and protracted battle for their party’s nomination that began almost a year ago, the Russian presidential elections happened, comparatively, at the speed of light. The winner, Dmitrii Medvedev, launched his campaign in late January 2008, receiving the blessing and endorsement of President Vladimir Putin; after very few campaign events and appearances, Medvedev was elected president of Russia on March 2, 2008. Given the harassment of opposition candidates and the amount of governmental resources and support marshaled for Medvedev, the outcome of these elections was neither fair nor uncertain.

Polls consistently showed Medvedev with approval ratings that Western politicians would die for, a result of his close association with the highly popular Putin. Former prime minister Mikhail Kasianov, who leads one the parties that is most critical of the Kremlin, was denied his registration for the election when the government charged him with forging signatures in support of his candidacy. Similar accusations were made against the Democratic Party of Russia candidate Andrei Bogdanov. These events essentially guaranteed Medvedev’s victory. What is much more uncertain is whether the new Russian president will bring a different style of governance than Putin and what role Putin will play in the future of Russia as prime minister.

In a February 28, 2008 New York Times article, Stanford University scholar Michael McFaul explained that although Medvedev publicly advocated openness to the West and greater domestic freedoms, this is simply a public relations campaign and actual policy will follow the previous directions laid out by Putin. In reality, there is greater possibility for departure than McFaul allows. The amount of influence Putin will exert on Medvedev’s administration is dependent not only on the personalities of the two men but also on the institutional constraints that they face.

According to the Russian Constitution, created in the wake of Yeltsin’s 1993 showdown with the Supreme Soviet (the legislature inherited from the Soviet-era), the powers of the president far exceed the powers of the prime minister. Both Medvedev and Putin have stated that they will not amend the constitution to give the prime minister greater power. Indeed, one of the primary platforms of Putin during his administration was the strengthening of “the rule of law.” Even though the rule of law has been violated in other areas (governmental consolidation of the media and constant changing of election laws), when it comes to large questions of constitutional power, Putin and Medvedev seem unwilling to violate or change the rules of the game. Putin’s commitment to this principle, in some form, can be seen in his refusal to run for a third term, which would have required a constitutional amendment.

With asymmetrical power in the offices of the presidency and prime minister, though, a dangerous situation of dual power could emerge.

A March 3rd New York Times article makes this very point, arguing that situations of dual leadership in Russia have always been unstable and created significant conflict within government. Yeltsin’s showdown with the Supreme Soviet in 1993 is a notable contemporary example of this. If Putin attempts to control the Russian government from the seat of prime minister, he will face significant obstacles. The president is given authority over foreign and security policy and leads on domestic policy with his ability to introduce legislation into the Duma. The prime minister serves at the whim of the president and essentially only oversees the economy and implementation of domestic policy. If Medvedev decides to break with Putin on a decision, he will have significant institutional authority to do so. Putin, however, is not in a completely weak position. He enjoys high public popularity, and Medvedev was elected based on this popularity. Also, many in the State Duma and bureaucracy are loyal to Putin and owe their positions to him. If both men attempt to exert power in the country, they will inevitably come into conflict and Russia could face another constitutional crisis on the same scale as 1993.

This is where personality becomes important. Putin and Medvedev profess a strong personal and professional relationship that will allow them to work easily together. As long as the two men agree on issues of importance, there is little cause for worry of instability. Russia will continue much as it did under Putin. This is McFaul’s point, that Medvedev is no different from Putin and will follow in lockstep with him. This is not, however, continued on following page.
a stable situation in the long run. Personalities and interests may clash. Governmental analysts were exceedingly conservative in their assessments of Mikhail Gorbachev when he became Secretary-General of the CPSU, yet he proved to be more liberal and altered the course of history in Russia. The personality of Putin is often cited as a critical factor in the breakdown of democracy after the liberal regime of Yeltsin.

Given Medvedev’s willingness to appoint Putin prime minister and Putin’s willingness to take the job, the two seem highly confident that they can coordinate their actions, at least in the short term. It would be unwise for analysts to simply dismiss Medvedev’s public promises of greater cooperation with the West and more political freedoms. Few believed Putin’s pledges not to run for a third term, yet they turned out to be genuine. The possibility exists for a break with the less democratic policies of Putin, but only at the risk of a conflict over the constitution. In the event of a conflict, the institutional power of each office will be critical in determining who will win the policy conflict, and set the course for future Russian policy.

Books used for this article and for further reading:

Nick D’Amico is a first year year PhD student in the Political Science Department

---

**Russia After Putin? Panel on the Russian Elections**

The REEI panel on “Russia After Putin” proved to be one of the most popular and instructive that the institute has featured on Russian politics ever. Each speaker brought a different point of view based on a different research approach. Elizabeth Wood, a historian at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, titled her contribution “Methinks the Gentleman Doth Protest Too Much: Putin and the Presidential Elections of 2008,” and focused on historical parallels to the impending configuration of leadership and considered how Medvedev and Putin may be invoking them. Questioning the view that Russia historically has not sustained periods of dual rulership, Wood pointed to the era of Mikhail Romanov and his co-ruler father, Patriarch Filaret, and their successful joint government.

The second speaker, Regina Smyth, a political scientist at Indiana University, addressed the question of who really rules Russia. She suggested a number of possible answers to that question, ranging from no one at all to members of the former KGB and their associates. In the second scenario Putin is seen as merely a front man. Smyth argued that Medvedev is potentially very powerful and that one of the deciding factors in Russian politics will be the role of the United Russia Party, which she considered to be powerful force in its own right and independent of the state.

Stephen Hanson, a political scientist at the University of Washington, disagreed with Smyth on the power of institutions in Russia. He explained that binding, authoritative institutions did not exist there.

James Collins, a director at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, former U.S. Ambassador to the Russian Federation 1997-2001, and IU alumnus drew on his lifelong experience in negotiating with Russian leaders to offer comments on current and prospective state of U.S. and Russian relations. Collins believes that Putin has a vision for the future and picked Medvedev as his successor because he believes Medvedev will follow that plan, even if that does not necessarily mean that Medvedev is Putin’s puppet. One of Collins’s major points was the need for the US to redefine its Russia policy, because of our mutual concerns about nonproliferation and terrorism.

The contributions of the panelists evoked during the question and answer period a lively and intellectually invigorating discussion of the prospects for Russia’s development and the place of Russia in the world in coming decades.
On March 4, 2008, Indiana University’s newly convened Romanian Studies Organization hosted The Romanian Studies Graduate Student Conference (RSGSC), providing young scholars from a variety of disciplines the opportunity to come together to share and discuss their work on Romania. Participants were able to showcase their work, meet and receive feedback from well-known scholars in the field, and engage in conversations about current issues in Romanian Studies. The unifying theme of the panels and the discussions that they provoked was the question of Romanian identity and the relationship of minorities and other traditionally marginalized groups, such as orphans, the mentally ill, and the Roma to that identity. Research presented at the RSGSC challenged the scholars involved to re-think the established understanding of Romanian-ness and the role of minorities in the Romanian nation.

Seven young scholars, including five IU students, presented papers at the conference. The first panel of the day was entitled “Ceausescu’s Children: Then and Now.” Panelists examined the international politics of child abandonment in post-socialist Romania from the perspective of public policy as well as through the lens of cultural studies. Erin Biebuyck’s “Parenting Romania: Romanian Orphans in the American Print Media” discussed the power relationships reproduced in American journalistic coverage of the Romanian orphans, while Amy Luck’s “From Institutionalized to Independent: Mentoring Romanian Orphans in Transition” examined the efforts of a transnational NGO working to improve the lives of Romanian orphans. The juxtaposition of Biebuyck’s reading of international power relationships in the media with Luck’s thoughtful evaluation of mentoring programs for teenagers and young adults raised in Romanian orphanages led to instructive questions about the role of scholarship in policy debates and about the importance of local ownership in humanitarian efforts. Professor Maria Bucur provided insightful commentary on these papers, encouraging the panelists and the audience to think critically about the power dynamics of international aid programs.

After breaking for lunch, the conference continued with a panel entitled “Romania and the World,” focusing on contemporary politics and the question of shifting identities after Romania’s accession to the European Union. In “Down and Out on the Edge of Europe: Romanian Imaginings and European Utopias,” Jack Friedman of Semel Neuropsychiatric Institute in UCLA discussed marginalized groups in the Romanian citizenry, including the mentally ill and what Friedman termed the “new poor,” in relation to the recent populist movements led by figures such as Gigi Becali and Vadim Tudor. Following Friedman’s presentation, REEI’s Brant Beyer presented his research on the Szekler region of Transylvania in “The European Union and the Szeklers Quest for Autonomy,” examining Szekler arguments for autonomy in the wake of Romania’s EU accession and evaluating several possible outcomes of the current situation. Alin Fumurescu, a doctoral candidate from IU’s Political Science department, responded to Friedman and Beyer with challenging questions informed by recent events in Romania and elsewhere in the region. Fumurescu pressed Beyer to think about the implications of Kosovo’s declaration of independence for Szekler claims for autonomy. Fumurescu also questioned Friedman about the implications of Becali and Tudor’s poor showing in the European Parliamentary elections in 2007 for his argument about populism in Romania.

The final panel of the conference, “Re-imagining the Nation: Ethnic Minorities in Romania,” explored the question of Romanian national identity as a construct based on both civic and ethnic ideas of the nation. Clark University’s Stefan Ionescu discussed the value and the difficulties of using memoirs as primary sources for historical analysis in “The Boom of Testimony after Communism: The Voices of the Jewish Holocaust Survivors in Romania.” In “Roma (and/or) Romanian?: Romanipe, Civic Identity, and the Deportations in Antonescu’s Romania,” Ben Thorne, a doctoral candidate in History at IU, explored the rhetoric used by Roma to express their national identity as Romanians in response to the threat of deportation to Transnistria during the Second World War. On a related topic, Susan Williams presented her research on the articulations of civic and religious identity that...
Since 2003, when the Bush administration decided to go to war in Iraq in spite of strong objections from Russia, relations between the US and Russia have steadily deteriorated. Contentious issues from Russia’s perspective include NATO expansion, US support of “color revolutions,” and the US plan to create a missile defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic. For its part, Washington continues to condemn the Kremlin for consolidating control of TV and radio, strengthening political power in the hands of the executive, supporting the energy giant Gazprom, and using energy policy and pricing to achieve foreign policy goals. Through it all, however, the US and Russia have agreed and cooperated extensively on one policy area. This cooperation occurred under the auspices of the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program and the Threat Reduction and Nonproliferation Assistance (TRNA) program to secure Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs) and the materials and knowledge to build them in the Former Soviet Union (FSU).

Cooperation on the CTR and TRNA programs began at the end of 1991 and led to the destruction of literally thousands of nuclear warheads, intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine launched ballistic missiles, and nuclear-capable bombers in Russia. Furthermore, all nuclear weapons, material, rocket motors, and necessary support equipment, and silos have either been safely moved back to Russia for storage or completely destroyed in the former Soviet countries of Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine. Additionally, numerous former and current weapons scientists, who otherwise might have been unemployed or under-employed and tempted to sell material or their knowledge abroad, have been kept constructively occupied.

This cooperation resulted in the development of extensive expertise in concluding responsibility and immunity agreements for contractors, and in the safe and secure dismantlement, shipment, storage, and disposal of weapons components and material. This expertise, acquired over the past 16 years, is possessed by able-bodied persons both in the United States Departments of State, Energy, and Defense and in the equivalent ministries in Russia. Unfortunately, current US law limits nearly all spending from CTR and TRNA to programs in the FSU. Furthermore, all such programs are scheduled for completion by the end of 2012 and will no longer receive funding after that date. As a result, this accumulated expertise, along with the goodwill between the US and Russia that cooperation on these programs generates, could be lost just when new proliferation threats are emerging elsewhere that would undermine the progress made in the FSU.

Nuclear weapons programs in less-than-stable countries like India and Pakistan could still be sources of WMDs, material, or knowledge for terrorists or “rogue states.” For example, it has already been confirmed that Pakistan’s lead nuclear scientist shared parts and knowledge pertinent to nuclear weapons production with professed US adversaries. Furthermore, for several reasons, including concerns about carbon dioxide emissions and increasing demand for electricity, fifteen countries proclaimed a desire to develop a “peaceful” civilian nuclear power program. According to an article titled “In Pursuit of the Undoable: Troubling Flaws in the World’s Nuclear Safeguards” that appeared in the August 8, 2007 edition of the Economist, this group includes a host of countries in the Middle East, a region known for its lack of stability, specifically Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Turkey and Yemen.

Unfortunately, “peaceful” civilian nuclear reactors designed to produce electricity require the same parts and material (Low Enriched Uranium or LEU) as reactors built for military purposes. Thus, weapons-grade material could be produced from purportedly “peaceful” reactors with a modicum of extra effort. Furthermore, the LEU fuel rods that most nuclear reactors use in the electricity generation process deplete over a period of about three years. What remains is mostly plutonium, a highly radioactive material used for nuclear weapons, which must be temporarily stored on site or in a secure storage facility.
McCloskey Fellow Milica Matijević

Milica Matijević, the third McCloskey fellow, has come to Bloomington as part of a program through IU Bloomington, the National Democratic Institute, and Frank's Friends. She is a junior researcher with the Institute of Comparative Law in Belgrade. In addition to her time in Bloomington, she will visit Washington, DC to interview policy-makers and study Supreme Court cases.

Milica came to IU to study affirmative action and other anti-discrimination policies in the US, especially as implemented in higher education. She is interested in the American anti-discrimination policies because of their explicit economic focus and justification, including Head Start for its role in the early support and empowerment of disadvantaged groups. Milica will also research other programs that combat discrimination, especially in education.

Besides implementation of American programs, Milica will look at the public perception of these policies and the resistance and resentment that they sometimes engender. Society as a whole must support the policy, or else it will not increase integration and anti-discrimination. Milica was astonished by some sources of support for and resistance to affirmative action.

Milica has been interested in anti-discrimination since she was young, seeing discriminatory actions around her while she was growing up. Later, her involvement with the peace-building mission in Kosovo expanded her experience of discrimination and knowledge of what must be done to fight it. She noted that the peace-building mission in Kosovo offered the opportunity to create a multi-ethnic society using affirmative action and other anti-discrimination policies, but that this aspect of rebuilding was not emphasized enough to take hold.

As part of the peace-building mission, Kosovo had some of the most advanced anti-discrimination laws in Europe. Unfortunately, they were inconsistently applied and not fully supported with the bylaws and structures needed to ensure their enforcement. Milica cited the higher education system as one important missed opportunity for integration. Rather than supporting two universities (one that teaches in Albanian and one that teaches in Serbian, as is currently the case), the government could have supported a system to address the needs of all students of Kosovo—either by using both languages, or by using a different language such as English. Milica hopes that her project can be applied in similar situations in other places. By building stable, multi-ethnic societies in areas of ethnic conflict, community leaders may avoid some of the problems that Kosovo has experienced.

Serbia, in contrast to Kosovo, has very limited anti-discrimination programs. There is, for instance, one education program to help Roma students enter the university and pay for their studies, but it is poorly implemented, and the funding is ineffectively distributed to recipients. Learning about this program during research piqued Milica’s interest in how Serbia could improve anti-discrimination efforts in general and in education in particular.

Upon her return to Serbia, Milica hopes to write a manual on how to address and minimize discrimination in the Serbian higher education system. The work will be targeted at political parties and will seek to draw on existing Serbian law, basing recommendations in Serbian practice but introducing approaches she studied here. Milica has broader visions for the implications of this research: she wants her project to help future peace-building efforts in any part of the world demonstrate more sensitivity to minority and discrimination issues.

When I asked Milica what she wanted me to include in this article, she immediately expressed support for fellowships for Serbian students to travel and study abroad. One of the biggest problems facing Serbian youth, she said, is ignorance of other societies. The sense of isolation is overwhelming and creates fertile ground for nationalism, discontent, and discrimination. She hopes this program and others like it will continue to offer opportunities to young Serbs.

Elizabeth Raible is an MA/MPA student in the REEI and School of Public and Environmental Affairs.
Frank McCloskey and the Frank McCloskey Fellowship Program

In 2005, the Frank McCloskey Fellowship Program was created in honor of Frank McCloskey, three-time Mayor of Bloomington and six-term US Representative from Indiana’s 8th district. As a Representative, McCloskey was one of the first members of Congress to push for US involvement in the Yugoslav conflict and was influential in getting the Clinton administration involved. In 2002, McCloskey was appointed the director of the Kosovo project of National Democratic Institute (NDI). After his tenure in Congress, McCloskey entered the master’s degree program of the Russian and East European Institute. “Having Frank in the program was an unexpected boon for students,” Institute Director David Ransel said. “They were very impressed that a congressman would come back to school at his age and sit side by side with them and learn in the same way they did. At the same time, Frank was teaching by giving them the benefit of this experience in Congress and in the region.” Regrettably, McCloskey died of bladder cancer at age 64 before he was able to finish his degree.

After McCloskey’s death in 2003, his wife Roberta, along with friends and colleagues of the McCloskeys, initiated the Frank McCloskey Fellowship Program, a fund supported by contributors in Bloomington, Washington DC, and around the world. The program seeks to increase peace and democracy in the Balkan region by supporting the professional development of young scholars and activists. The program has two aspects: an IU student may travel to the Balkans and work with NDI on research-oriented projects (as the second McCloskey Fellow Ramajana Demirovic did), or a student from the Balkans may travel to Bloomington and Washington DC for research (as Milica Matijević is currently doing).

In 2006 the first McCloskey Fellow, Jelena Savanovic, arrived from Bosnia and Herzegovina. Her research focused on increasing availability of information regarding NGOs, study programs, employment opportunities, human rights information, and local youth services in the Srpska Republic.

28th annual György Ránki Hungarian Symposium

From Friday, April 4 to Sunday, April 6, 2008, IU hosted the 28th annual György Ránki Hungarian Symposium, titled “Folk Music Revival and the Dance-House Movement in Hungary.” This year’s Ránki Symposium was one of the largest scholarly events ever to treat the Folk Music Revival and Dance-House Movement. The symposium included two days of panels, two participatory dance workshops, and two evenings of dance houses, complete with a performance by the Téka Ensemble, an acclaimed dance-house group from Hungary.

The symposium examined the movement from many different angles, as speakers discussed the dance-house movement in Hungary and Transylvania. On the first day of the conference, László Felföldi and Ágnes Fülemile presented papers on the dissolution of the movement, its resurgence in the 1970s and 1980s, and the quest for authenticity during that early revival period. Other speakers focused on the movement in Transylvania, music of the movement and its relation to world music and Romani music, as well as specific actors in the movement. The second day’s panels focused on the ideology and representation of the dance-house movement in Hungarian ethnography, Hungarian communities in America, and academia. Additional activities included dance and music workshops, two dance-houses, and two documentary films, Breaking the Silence, Music in Afghanistan and The Music of Terezin (Theresienstadt).

The dance-house movement started during the 1970s as a folk dance revival based on Hungarian folk music and dance, especially from Transylvania. By the early 1980s, the movement blossomed into a major cultural force influencing Hungarian identity. Beyond its cultural impact, the dance-house movement took on political relevance as dancers in Hungary learned about the repression of Transylvanian Hungarians by Romanian Communist dictator Nicolae Ceaușescu. The conference was a great success and participants are already looking forward to next year’s Ránki Symposium.
Faculty Profile: Svitlana Melnyk

Professor Melnyk teaches Ukrainian and advanced Russian in the Slavic Languages and Literatures Department. Melnyk taught Ukrainian at SWSEEL for the first time last summer and will teach Ukrainian this coming summer. In the following faculty profile Professor Melnyk explains a bit about the importance of language politics and minority languages in Ukraine, as well as the educational consequences of speaking a minority language.

Why has the language question become so important in Ukraine since the fall of communism?

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, language has become a very sensitive issue in Ukraine. Language is a very important cultural and identity marker. In a newly independent state people have, step by step, been losing their Soviet identity and thinking about a new perspective for development. During the existence of the Soviet Union the number of people who claimed to be Russian in Soviet Ukraine gradually increased and the Ukrainian population decreased, according to different national censuses. After Ukraine proclaimed its independence, this process reversed. Now more people consider themselves Ukrainian and consider Ukrainian to be their native language. People are returning to their roots. A very important, related issue is the use of the language question in politics. Language is a card played in all Ukrainian elections.

Can you tell me a bit about your work with linguistic minorities in Ukraine?

I am currently participating in the project “Dimension of the Linguistic Otherness: Prospects of Maintenance and Revitalization of Minority Languages within the New Europe” that deals with linguistic minorities. The research team has obtained a grant from the EU to conduct this study. European countries such as Hungary, Moldova, Czech Republic, Romania, and Ukraine are taking part.

The Ukrainian research team needs to describe the situation with linguistic minorities in Ukraine. Although Ukrainians and Russians make up 95% of the population in Ukraine, the first national census (2001) emphasized that the country is inhabited by representatives of 130 nationalities. Some national communities, such as the Hungarian and Romanian, are strongly represented, while other ethnic groups are much smaller. Moreover, Ukraine is a homeland for four additional indigenous ethnic groups and their languages (Crimean Tatars, Gagauz, Karaim and Krymchak).

In that context the objectives of the project are: to provide an objective analysis of the current linguistic situation in Ukraine in general and the sociolinguistic profile of the linguistic minorities in particular, to investigate the language legislation regarding linguistic minorities in Ukraine, to study how legislation and language rights can affect the sociolinguistic landscape of the country.

Ukraine has joined practically all European and international agreements for protecting national minorities and tries to apply them in domestic legislation, but sometimes these laws do not work properly. According to Ukrainian legislation, the Russian community is considered to be a minority in Ukraine; the Russian community and its language are given special treatment. Other minorities are provided, theoretically, with equal rights and possibilities. In practice, however, there are great differences not only in the expectations and possibilities of minorities but in their rights as well.

For example, Ukraine ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority languages. According to this law, Russian is among the 13 languages which can be protected. Russian, however, has a very strong position in society and does not need protection. Karaim and Krymchak, languages which face the threat of extinction, are not even mentioned in that law. Ukraine has not solved the problem of the protection of endangered small languages. Also, the peculiarity of the Ukrainian sociolinguistic situation is that in some regions of the country (in Donbas and Crimea) Ukrainian is a minority language. Despite these problems, Ukrainian minority and language policy has been successful, because contrary to numerous post-Soviet spheres, Ukraine has avoided a bloody conflict over language.

continued on following page
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Do the ethnic minorities in Ukraine maintain only their languages or have they become bilingual?

Russian and Ukrainian bilingualism is a very important and well-researched aspect of the sociolinguistic situation in Ukraine. It can even be said that this particular aspect has overshadowed other important aspects regarding linguistic minorities in Ukraine. Each national community has its own difficulties and problems to solve. The situation of each community and its language cannot be handled generally. It can be treated only if significant regional diversities and peculiarities are taken into consideration.

The Romanians, Crimean Tatars, and Hungarians strongly support their national traditions and maintain their native languages. The Hungarians are one of the best organized minorities in Ukraine. The Roma have a special situation in Ukraine. Because of their low level of social integration and ethnic features which differ from the majority, a number of negative stereotypes exist regarding them. The situation of the Polish linguistic minority in Ukraine also falls under the purview of our research. Poles are the only community in the country that strengthens not the Russian but the Ukrainian language community. Our research strives to document all the peculiarities of the development of linguistic minorities in Ukraine.

What are the educational consequences of speaking a minority language in Ukraine?

According to Ukrainian legislation, national minorities are guaranteed the right to receive instruction in their native language or to study their languages in educational establishments. The national minorities which maintain their languages have national schools. There are 94 Romanian schools, 70 Hungarian, 14 Crimean Tatar, 8 Moldovan, and 4 Polish schools where the language of instruction is the respective national language. Also, many bilingual schools are functioning in Ukraine and national languages can be taught as a subject in school curriculum (Gagauz, Slovak, Greek, German, Turkish, and others). In many cases, the schools depend on the desire of national communities to support native languages. For example, the Belarusian community in Ukraine is the second largest ethnic minority in the country. Despite this fact, they have not managed to establish a Belarusian school or even native language courses. The Hungarian community has an advanced educational system. Besides the national schools, they have a college with Hungarian as a language of instruction. Of course, national education faces many problems (insufficient funding, teaching materials, well-trained bilingual teachers), but the process of developing national education will continue.

What role does surzhyk, the mix of Ukrainian and Russian, play in Ukrainian politics?

Surzhyk is a stigmatized language. Linguists borrowed this term from agriculture where it means a mixture of different types of grain, for example wheat and rye. And this is a grain of low quality. The contemporary popular Ukrainian writer Yuri Andrukhovych called this language, the mixture of Ukrainian and Russian, an “incestuous child of bilingualism.” The linguistic nature of this language is described by sociolinguists in terms of “creolized language,” “low language,” or “low vernacular variety”; it is usually associated with a low level of education.

In Ukraine, you can hear surzhyk everywhere, but the main problem is that this sublanguage has penetrated into a segment of the political elite and surzhyk now is the language of people who are supposed to be our intellectual leaders. In contemporary politics surzhyk is a linguistic marker of the intellectual abilities of our politicians.

How long have you taught Ukrainian to English speakers?

I taught Ukrainian for English speakers at Pittsburgh University during the summer session (2003). It was my first experience in the United States and I enjoyed it very much. I was excited to find Americans who are interested in the Ukrainian language. Last summer I had the marvelous opportunity to teach the first Ukrainian course offered by the Summer Workshop in Slavic and East European Languages here at Indiana University. I feel very proud to have taught such wonderful students as Nicole McGrath, who described her experience in my class in an earlier edition of the REEI newsletter, and Paul Andersen, an excellent master’s degree student in the Russian and East European Institute. I am very happy to have wonderful students, Michelle Lawrence and Scott Nissen, this semester.

What are you currently researching?

In addition to the research I discussed earlier in this interview, I am conducting, with my colleague, Laada Bilaniuk of the University of Washington, research regarding bilingualism in education in Ukraine. Our article “A Tense and Shifting Balance: Bilingualism and Education in Ukraine,” will be published in the upcoming issue of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism. The article focuses on the recent gains in prestige made by Ukrainian since the fall of the Soviet Union and discusses language usage in the educational domain. Also, I am working on another project with Aneta Pavlenko, of Temple University, about color naming in the Ukrainian and Russian languages.
Islam and Post-Communism Roundtable

The Russian and East European Institute hosted its seventh Post-Communist Roundtable on March 27 and 28. This year local and international scholars focused on Islam and Post-Communism. Professor Gardner Bovingdon of Indiana University started the Public Roundtable portion of the event, which took place in the Dogwood Room of the Indiana Memorial Union, with far-reaching questions about the nature of Islam in the post-Soviet space. Responses to his questions were given by three guest specialists: Zaindi Choltaev, a Chechen political activist and former deputy minister of Chechnya, Kristen Ghodsee of Bowdoin College, and Edmund Waite of the University of London.

Choltaev discussed the history of Islam under Soviet rule and emphasized the negative effects of earlier Soviet-government meddling. The Soviets had effectively infiltrated and exploited Islam in the Chechen region, and this generated competing factions within the faith. The divided nature of Islam in Chechnya then led to “Muslim on Muslim” violence in the region during the post-Soviet era.

Ghodsee, an anthropologist who has been researching Muslims in Bulgaria, pointed out the diversity of ethnic groups embracing Islam in the Balkans. Ghodsee believes that Islam among the people she studies in Bulgaria is resistant to the “globalization” of Islam, a process that implies modernization of Islam combined with the infusion of greater liberalism and democratization into the religion. Bulgarian Muslims identify with more conservative strains of Islam, and indeed many of the young people have been traveling to Saudi Arabia for instruction and then bringing back to their Balkan communities practices more typical of the Middle Eastern varieties of Islam. Ghodsee identified a number of key similarities between Marxist-Leninist doctrine and the fundamentalist transnational strains of Islam. These include a “strong emphasis on social cohesion, redistributive justice and a critique of individualism.” In short, the appeal of Islam derives in part from its commonality with positive legacies of communism that have been lost in the shift to free market capitalism, individualism and materialism that came to Bulgaria in the 1990s.

The third panelist of the Roundtable, Edmund Waite, a specialist on the Uyghurs of China and Kazakhstan, shifted the focus of discussion further East into Inner Asia. Aside from persecution of religious groups, the Chinese government, according to Waite, engages in divisive practices by granting some congregations and mosques legal status while denying it to others. This allows the state to control certain portions of the religious community and marginalize others. Waite placed his discussion in the post-Communist sphere by comparing the Chinese situation to that of Uzbekistan, which deploys similar practices to control its religious community.

Aside from the visiting panelists, IU faculty and students also made significant contributions to the Roundtable. Professor Nazif Shahrani (Anthropology) told of the wide diversity of practices among Muslims throughout Inner Asia and pointed out the negative consequences of religious repression by authoritarian regimes, whose persecutions generate radicalism. Professor Abdulkader Sinno (Political Science) analyzed the varieties of Islam now competing for adherents as elements in a market of ideas. The ability of one or another to take hold was highly contingent on conditions in each market. Professor Kevin Jaques (Religious Studies) spoke to the diversity that had characterized Islam since its inception and pointed out that the competition we see within the world of Islam today is neither new nor unexpected. A follow-up faculty-graduate student seminar on Friday morning brought the visiting scholars and IU students and faculty from several programs and departments into further more intense and detailed discussion of the topics of the public session and focused in particular on the differences in the practices of Muslims in Inner Asia, Europe, and the Caucasus.

The Roundtable continued the tradition of a lively and informative discussion on topics connected to the post-Communist sphere.

Romanian conference continued from page 6
allowed ultra-nationalist Corneliu Z. Codreanu to accept claims of Romanian-ness on the part of some Roma in her paper “Rethinking Interwar Ultra-Nationalism: Corneliu Z. Codreanu and Romanian Roma.” Professor Marius Turda of Oxford Brookes University responded to these papers, provoking a fruitful dialogue on national identity and nationalism in the Romanian context.

After the conclusion of the panels, conference attendees settled in to listen to Professor Marius Turda’s keynote address, “Ethnic Modernism and Scientific Nationalism: Reflections on Biopolitics in Interwar Romania.” Turda’s address focused on the Interwar Romanian politicians and nationalist leaders who argued for a homogeneous nation-state. To conclude the day in an appropriately festive mood, the conference-goers repaired to conference organizer Erin Biebuyck’s house for a reception featuring an American interpretation of the traditional Romanian dishes sarmale and mămăligă. The students of the Romanian Studies Organization consider the conference a great success and plan to host a second student conference in the spring of 2009.

Erin Biebuyck is an MA student in the Russian and East European Institute
Female detective fiction continued from page 3

her protagonist in the Kamenskaia series. Indeed, Marinina’s rendering of Anastasia Kamenskaia, a brilliant and meek investigator with the Moscow police, represents the evolution and direction of feminism in a period of uncertainty and ideological confusion.

The female image of Marinina’s protagonist, Anastasia Kamenskaia, represents a unique reconceptualization of the female detective genre. By convention, women’s detective fiction in the West exploits the patterns of traditional detective fiction as a means of subverting the patriarchal order of society and demonstrating women’s agency. By contrast, Marinina employs Russian paradigms of female gender roles paradoxically to subvert and accommodate the patriarchal system inherent in much of formulaic detective fiction. Marinina draws from the formulas of the Soviet detektiv, the hard-boiled traditional, the police procedural, and the classic amateur detective novel to recreate the image of the Russian woman. The image Marinina paints is perplexing because it does not fit perfectly into any traditional paradigm. Her heroine, Kamenskaia, is a leftover from Soviet times, but exists within the context of contemporary Russian feminism. She represents the changing values of post-Soviet Russia, especially the way women are viewed and their place in society. Marinina is able to integrate liberal feminism and the Soviet ideal in a radically new representation of the female detective. Marinina’s popular heroine is a patchwork of opposing values; she is paradoxically feeble yet exceptionally intelligent, self-reliant yet dependent on those around her, ordinary yet extraordinary in her homeliness, subversive yet accommodating. These contradictions reflect the confusion and uncertainty of the state of feminism in post-Soviet Russian society. Given this new development in the Russian detective genre, it will be illuminating to witness the course of the genre in the following years. Much like early female detective fiction in the West during the late 1970s and 1980s, Marinina experiments and integrates new concepts into the genre, some of which resemble old formulas, some of which draw from the Soviet past, and some of which reflect new models of Russian womanhood. Russian writers of female detective fiction in the early 21st century may not only transform the genre, but may also reveal and invigorate the new Russian feminine.

Leigh Bernstein is an MA/SLIS student with REEI and the School of Library Sciences

Nuclear continued from page 7

(there is currently no long-term storage area anywhere in the world), or reprocessed (which makes loss and theft easier). While several years are required to safely construct a nuclear reactor, the first one could potentially come online as soon as 2015, three years after CTR and TRNA programs conclude in the FSU. If Russia and the US begin working now to form a partnership to deal specifically with this and related issues, they need not become problems.

Together the US and Russia could negotiate and dissuade countries from beginning a nuclear program by providing alternatives to nuclear energy and incentives to accept those alternatives. Last year, for example, the US and Russia, in cooperation with negotiators from neighboring countries, convinced North Korea to accept a deal that would lead to the end of its nuclear program.

If alternative energy sources are unacceptable to some nations, the US-Russia partnership could conclude agreements with those nations to safely produce and provide LEU at fair world market prices, or subsidize the price to certain countries to sweeten the deal, from sources in our two countries. Theoretically, such an offer could extend to every country in the world, thereby removing any necessity for other countries to produce their own material, and significantly reduce the risk of secret weapons programs. Furthermore, the partnership could produce, sell, transport, collect, reprocess and recycle spent fuel rods in newly constructed “fast” reactors. Such reactors could be safely located in either the US or Russia. This solution would be especially timely for the US if the numerous reactors currently proposed receive approval and are built in this country over the next 10 to 25 years. Finally, such a partnership could be the answer to the problem of finding a secure, central, and long-term storage location for materials that cannot be recycled.

A US-Russian partnership seems to offer the greatest opportunity for effectively and efficiently dealing with the difficulties and potential for theft and weapons creation associated with enrichment, storage and reprocessing of nuclear material. Therefore, the US and Russia should not only continue to cooperate on securing WMDs, materials, and associated knowledge in the FSU, but expand their efforts to meet the new threats emerging from around the globe. Such a partnership would further justify the financial investments already made by the US and Russia over the past 16 years and put to good use, or increase, the experience and good will that this cooperation has generated. This arrangement could also be financially beneficial, but at the very least would greatly obviate the threat to the US posed by nuclear weapons far into the future. It is time for the US and Russia to stop criticizing each other and to begin working together to resolve emerging mutual security concerns.

Josh Ruegsegger is an MA/MPA student in the REEI and the School of Public and Environmental Administration.
Faculty News

Andrew Durkin (Slavic) recently published “Hunters off the Beaten Path: The Dismantling of Pastoral Myth in Chekhov and Crane” (141-150) in editors Michael C. Finke and Julie de Sherbinin’s Chekhov the Immigrant: Translating a Cultural Icon, (Slavica, 2007). Finke received his MA and PhD from the Slavic Department (1986 and 1989).


In March, Padraic Kenney presented a paper entitled "The World in 1989," at a conference on "The 1989 Revolutions: Roots, Causes, Legacies" at Stanford University. The paper is part of a book he is completing with the same title: a documentary survey of democratic revolutions around the world in the 1980s and 1990s.

The International Journal of Social Psychiatry recently accepted “Predicting transitory mood from physical activity level among people with severe mental illness in two cultures,” written by Bryan P. McCormick (Recreation and Park Administration), G. C. Frey, C.-T. Lee, S. Chun, J. Sibthorp, T. Gajic, B. Stamatovic-Gajic, & M. Maksimovic. This work was based on a cross cultural examination of the everyday lives of people with mental illnesses in the US and Serbia and was funded in part by a Mellon grant from REEI.

The Korean-language edition of The Bolsheviks Come to Power, titled The Hour of Revolution, by Alex Rabinowitch (History) was published in Seoul in March by Gyoyyang-In Publishers.


Jean Robinson will receive the 2008 W. George Pinnell Award for Outstanding Service from Indiana University on Founders Day.


Frances Trix (Linguistics and Anthropology) presented "Losing the battle of fighting violence: competing narratives of Kosovo/Kosova in the 1990s," at the American Anthropological Association in Washington DC and "Gender Differences and Doubt Raisers" at Sabanci University in Istanbul, Turkey. Her edited book with J. and L. Walbridge, Muslim Voices and Lives in the Contemporary World (Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), will be published this spring. She was just awarded an IARO IREX fellowship for work in Kosova and Macedonia.


Maureen Pirog (SPEA) was awarded an honorary professorship at the State University – Higher School of Economics in Moscow in the Fall 2007. Additionally, she will be presenting a paper at their upcoming conference in April. The topic of her talk will be “The Use of Policy Analysis Research in the US,” co-authored with Angela Evans, Deputy Director of the US Congressional Research Office.
Student News

Student Graduations: MA Degrees

The following students graduated with REEI MA degrees during the 2007-2008 school year. Their names are followed by the names of their master’s thesis and the names of the chairs of their advisory committee.


**Andrew Ringlee** - “The Military Gymnazia in Reform Era Russia, 1863-1882”; Ben Ekloff chaired his committee.

**Robert Aronson** (JD Law/MA Slavic 1977) is an attorney and the managing director at Aronson and Associates P.A., the 21st largest immigration law firm in the US. He lives and works in Minneapolis, MN.

**Lieutenant Colonel John Burbank** (MA REEI 2002) is an Assistant Army Attaché in the Moscow, Russia Embassy. Burbank helps coordinate the military-to-military relationship between the US Department of Defense and the Russian Ministry of Defense and functions as a representative of the Secretary of Defense, the Department of Defense (DoD), the US Army, and the Commander of the United States European Command (EUCOM). His duties include coordination of DoD projects and events in Russia, management of official DoD visits, and, occasionally, representational duties at diplomatic events.

**Steven Bowman** (MA History 1973) is the Head of Defense Policy & Arms Control at the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.

**Jennifer Cash** (PhD Anthropology/REEI minor 2004) is the managing editor of the journal *East European Politics and Societies* and the Visitor Exchange Coordinator for the Center for Russian and East European Studies at the University of Pittsburgh.

**Tyrus Cobb** (MA Political Science 1970) is the CEO of The Northern Nevada Network.


**David Fisher** (PhD History 2003) is an Assistant Professor of History at The University of Texas at Brownsville.

**Jen Gubitz** (BA Jewish Studies/BA English/REEI minor 2005) has returned to school to become a rabbi and has spent the academic year in Israel through Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion.

**John Murawski** (MA English 1988) is a Staff Writer for The News 4 Observer.


**Milos Puaca** (BA Political Science/REEI certificate 1975) is a writer of biofiction about the Serbian princess, Olivera Lazarevic. Puaca recently began consulting for a major logistics consulting firm.

After 42 years at the University of North Carolina, **Joel Schwartz** (PhD Government/REEI certificate 1965) is now an adjunct professor in UNC’s Department of Public Policy.

**Ellie Zusstone** (BS Business/REEI minor 2006) is a sales analyst at AVM, LP.
Languages offered during Summer 2008:

1st through 6th year
Russian

1st year Albanian, Czech, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Hungarian, Macedonian, Mongolian Polish, Romanian, and Ukrainian

1st and 2nd year
Azerbaijani, Georgian, Kazakh, Pashto, Tajik, Turkmen, Uygur, Uzbek

Reading Yiddish for Holocaust Research