



Newsletter of the Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies

Fall 2012
Volume 29, Number 2

In this issue:

Notes from the Director	1
Dr. Branislav Radeljić	
<i>European Involvement in Serbia: From</i>	
<i>Intervention to Integration?</i>	3
2012 ASEEEES Conference	9
Fall 2012 Courses	11
Giving Opportunities	12
Associates of the Slavic Center.....	13
Faculty and Student News.....	14
Recent Graduates	15
FLAS and BPS Fellowship	
Recipients	16
Bathsheba Demuth	
<i>Composing the Fur Seal:</i>	
<i>Globalization and Human Adaptation</i>	
<i>in the North Pacific</i>	17
Campus Visitors	22
<i>The Troika Journal</i>	23
UC Berkeley CASE-CRRC Project:	
Fall 2012	24

**Newsletter of the Institute of Slavic,
East European, and Eurasian Studies**

University of California, Berkeley
Institute of Slavic, East European, and
Eurasian Studies

260 Stephens Hall # 2304
Berkeley, CA 94720-2304

iseees@berkeley.edu

<http://iseees.berkeley.edu>

Editor: Zachary Kelly

Subscriptions are free of charge.
Submit mailing changes, suggestions,
corrections, or inquiries to the above
address or call (510) 642-3230.

Notes from the Director

Summer was a time of transition at ISEEEES, with the departure of ISEEEES program coordinator and newsletter editor, Andrei Dubinsky, and the arrival of his successor, Zachary Kelly. Andrei left us to study international relations at the Central European University in Budapest. We wish him well and are very happy that he is continuing his connection with our part of the world.

Zach joined us in August and hit the ground running. Before coming to Berkeley, he worked as assistant director of Indiana University's Summer Language Workshop in Slavic, East European, and Central Asian Languages, a.k.a. SWSEEL. He holds an M.A. in Russian and East European Studies from the Russian and East European Institute at Indiana University and a B.A. in Russian Language and Literature from the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Another valuable addition to our community is Liladhar Pendse, the new Slavic and East European Studies Librarian and Head of Collection Exchange Program at the Berkeley Library. Liladhar came to UC Berkeley from the Princeton University Library where he worked as the Slavic, East European and Eurasian Studies Collection development librarian. Before then, he worked for nine years at the UCLA Library. He is a polyglot and a graduate of the Minsk Medical Institute, Belarus, among other things.

We welcome Zach and Liladhar to the ISEEEES family!

We had a busy fall semester. In September, ISEEEES co-sponsored the conference "Democracy Rising? 2012—Global Prospects, Perils, and Policy Challenges." Co-sponsored by the Institute of Governmental Studies, Institute of International Studies, Center for Middle East Studies, and the Miller Institute for Global Challenges and the Law, this two-day conference brought together speakers from Egypt, India, Russia, Tunisia, and across the United States to discuss global trends in democratic transitions.

In October, ISEEEES, together with the Department of History and the Townsend Center for the Humanities, helped organize an event in honor of the late Nicholas V. Riasanovsky. A memorial celebration, which included

a keynote address by Riasanovsky's student and co-author, Mark D. Steinberg, was followed by a two-day seminar on new directions in Russian intellectual history, organized by Victoria Frede.

Our faculty/graduate student lunchtime seminar series continued to be very successful. This year, we have asked several Institute-affiliated alumni to discuss their intellectual trajectories since leaving Berkeley. So far this year, our guests have been Stephen J. Collier, Assistant Professor at the New School Graduate Program in International Affairs (PhD 2001); Adrienne Edgar, Associate Professor of History at UC Santa Barbara (PhD 1999); and Lucan Way, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Toronto (PhD 2004).

In November, our Carnegie-supported Field Development Project brought four more young scholars for a two-week working visit. These scholars work with our faculty and graduate students in producing a field reading list, an undergraduate lecture course and/or graduate seminar syllabus, and a field survey. This semester's fellows were Petru Negură, "Ion Creangă" State Pedagogical University of Moldova; Mariam Orkodashvili, Tbilisi State University; Aleksandr Osipian, Kramatorsk Institute of Economics and Humanities; and Iryna Ramanava, Institute of History, Belarus National Academy of Sciences.

ISEEES welcomed a number of new visiting scholars and visiting student researchers from Armenia, Brazil, Japan, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Russia, and the United States. Please see page 22 for a list of our visitors and their research topics.

Please mark your calendars for some of our [upcoming events](#). The annual Colin Miller Memorial Lecture is scheduled for Thursday, March 21, at 4 p.m. in the Heyns Room of the Faculty Club. Our guest speaker will be Professor Sergei Guriev, Rector of the New Economic School, Moscow. Professor Guriev will speak on modernization and education reform in Putin's Russia. The annual Peter N. Kujachich Lecture on Serbia and Montenegro will be held on Tuesday, April 9, at 4 p.m. in the Alumni House. This year's speaker will be Professor Andrei Simic, Department of Anthropology, University of Southern California. Professor Simic will discuss aspects of ethnicity, nationalism, and post-Communist society in the former Yugoslavia. The 37th annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference on Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies will be held on Friday, April 26, in the Heyns Room of the Faculty Club. This year's topic is the politics of history.

We look forward to seeing you at these and other happenings throughout 2013. Be sure to check our website <http://iseees.berkeley.edu> for upcoming events and updates to the calendar.

Sincerely yours,

Yuri Slezkine
ISEEES Director
Jane K. Sather Professor of History

Save The Date

The 37th Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference on Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies
The Politics of History

Date: Friday, April 26, 2013 | Place: Heyns Room, Faculty Club, UC Berkeley

**Sponsored by the Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies, UC Berkeley,
and the Center for Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies, Stanford University**

European Involvement in Serbia: From Intervention to Integration?

Dr. Branislav Radeljić

School of Law and Social Sciences, University of East London, UK

Extract from

the Annual Peter N. Kujachich Endowed Lecture in Serbian and Montenegrin Studies
Institute of Slavic, East European and Eurasian Studies
University of California, Berkeley
May 1, 2012

The wars in the former Yugoslavia “shocked the civilized West”¹ and encouraged an endless debate about the Balkans. In 2004, one author wrote that “the very word ‘Balkans’ conjures up images of intrigue, war, and human suffering on a scale abhorrent to Western society. To some people, the Balkan countries lack a clear Western orientation and carry far too much cultural baggage to belong in the European club. Western leaders refer to the region as the back door to Europe, the Balkan powder keg, or Europe’s doorstep. What these euphemisms hide is, perhaps, the wish that the Balkans were located anywhere other than in Europe.”² However, the Yugoslav state crisis was a European problem from the beginning: this despite the fact that for Europeans, the Yugoslav federation became a matter of interest only when the conflict seemed easy to deal with, thus “boosting the EU foreign policy profile – as expressed in the infamous statement by Jacques Poos [European Community representative] that ‘the hour of Europe has come’.”³ The paradox of this statement was twofold: first, it demonstrated how powerful the Europeans were by claiming that “if one problem can be solved by the Europeans, it is the Yugoslav problem. [Yugoslavia] is a European country and it is not up to the Americans,”⁴ and second, it was pronounced in a moment of complete ignorance and lack of serious strategy as

to how to approach the Yugoslav problem. For example, one author points the finger at the Western diplomats stationed in Belgrade, “most of whom went beyond the city limits of the capital only with great reluctance,” and therefore “misunderstood the realities” of Yugoslavia.⁵ Thus, the general discourse stating that Western powers are partly responsible for the Yugoslav crisis is acceptable because of their poor knowledge of the area and diplomatic ignorance and this would explain why the West was initially sympathetic towards a united Yugoslavia. Obviously, the European policy did not manage to resolve the crisis in the Balkans or prevent the spread of violence.

In January 1992, the European Union officially recognized the demise of the Yugoslav federation by recognizing republics of Slovenia and Croatia as independent states. The official statements confirmed what various individual state and non-state actors (diaspora communities, Western media and the Catholic Church) had already insisted on – that the republic of Serbia was responsible for the wars.⁶ Understandably, its President, Slobodan Milošević (1941-2006), is likely to remain one of the most controversial political figures of the 1990s. The face of Milošević equaled Serbia and, more importantly, the Serbs. In his remarkable study, Tomislav Longinović elaborates on the West’s perception of

¹ Lucarelli, Sonia, *Europe and the Breakup of Yugoslavia: A Political Failure in Search of a Scholarly Explanation*, Leiden: Brill, 2000, p. 1.

² Gerolymatos, André, *The Balkan Wars: Conquest, Revolution and Retribution from the Ottoman Era to the Twentieth Century and Beyond*, Staplehurst: Spellmount, 2004, p. 4.

³ Buzan, Barry and Ole Wæver, *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, p. 387.

⁴ Quoted in Mark Almond, *Europe’s Backyard War: The War in the Balkans*, London: Heinemann, 1994, p. 32.

⁵ Meier, Viktor, *Yugoslavia: A History of its Demise*, London and New York, NY: Routledge, 1999, p. 217.

⁶ The *XXVIth General Report on the Activities of the European Communities* stipulated: “Relations with the former Yugoslavia remained very unsettled because of the continuing civil war in the area and its extension to Bosnia-Herzegovina ... As responsibility for the conflict lay mainly with Serbia and Montenegro, the Council, pursuant to UN Security Council Resolution 757, imposed a total trade embargo on the two republics” (Commission of the European Communities, *XXVIth General Report on the Activities of the European Communities 1992*, p. 283). In contrast, the newly recognized Slovenia faced an establishment of direct cooperation with the Community (Bulletin EC 3-1992, point 1.3.27; Bulletin EC 7/8-1992, point 1.4.26).

“the Serbs” as the vampire nation with its “vampire-in-chief, Slobodan Milošević.”⁷ As correctly argued, the Western media were very active during the Yugoslav wars with their images often presenting the Serbs as the only responsible and thus culpable ones – an important aspect that should not be ignored due to the Western media’s capacity to contribute to the policy-making processes in the United States and the then European Community when their respective officials lacked any strategy as how to address the outbreak of the fighting in 1991.

Thus, the first major European intervention in Yugoslavia resulted in the collapse of the Yugoslav federation. The decision to recognize Slovenia and, more importantly, Croatia meant that the war was then transferred to Bosnia-Herzegovina. Once the ‘vampire-in-chief’ had realized that his intention for a Serbia-dominated Yugoslavia, serving the interests of the Serbs living outside the republic of Serbia, was not going to materialize, he pursued the policy of ethnic cleansing that resulted in the Srebrenica Genocide in July 1995.⁸ Still, the growing international criticism and isolation did not prevent the Serbian authorities from testing their power elsewhere. Deeper ethnic antagonisms led to conflict outbreak in Kosovo in 1998, culminating in January 1999 when Serbian military forces committed a crime against humanity killing forty-five civilians in Račak. According to Joschka Fischer, the then German Foreign Minister, acting politely with Belgrade officials would lead only to more mass graves, so he stated that the use of force should be taken into consideration: “I am not a friend of using force, but sometimes it is a necessary means of last resort. So I am ready to use it if there is no other way. If people are being massacred, you cannot mutter about having no mandate. You must act.”⁹

Once the NATO-led bombing campaign against Serbia (or the second major European intervention in the post-Yugoslav region) terminated in June 1999, the West looked forward to the removal of Milošević.

The overthrow of Milošević in October 2000 provided the Serbs with an opportunity to exchange the by then well-established image of a vampire nation with one portraying them as regular human beings. Shortly after, the European Union decided to reward the newly elected anti-Milošević Democratic Opposition of Serbia (DOS) by lifting its economic sanctions, by securing reconstruction assistance, by providing aid packages and by signing trade agreements. The new Prime Minister Zoran Djindjić, whose main success was, in fact, the arrest of Milošević and his transmittal to the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) in The Hague, kept saying that there was no time to waste. In his view, Kosovo was *de facto* independent, and Serbia had to move on with the processes of democratization and Europeanization. However, on the other hand, the new President Vojislav Koštunica, who was also welcomed by the European officials as a symbol of new democratic orientation, did not fully agree with Djindjić’s approach. For example, he rejected the urgency of the Kosovo status claiming that it was better to “wait for another five years, because the later this issue is addressed, the better it will be for [the Serbs].”¹⁰ In addition, the delayed cooperation with the Hague tribunal was a confirmation of Koštunica’s reluctance to break with the Milošević era: on various occasions, he was accusing the tribunal of its undue interference and assault on the dignity of his state.¹¹ As one survey covering the period 2001-2005 showed, Koštunica’s rhetoric managed to influence the Serbian public to the extent that two thirds of the general

⁷ Longinović, Tomislav, *Vampire Nation: Violence as Cultural Imaginary*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011, p. 5.

⁸ In 2005, the United States House of Representatives passed a resolution (H. Res. 199) stating that “the policies of aggression and ethnic cleansing as implemented by Serb forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1992 and 1995 with the direct support of Serbian regime of Slobodan Milošević and its followers ultimately led to the displacement of more than 2,000,000 people, an estimated 200,000 killed, tens of thousands raped or otherwise tortured and abused, and the innocent civilians of Sarajevo and other urban centers repeatedly subjected to shelling and sniper attacks, ... meet the terms defining the crime of genocide in Article 2 of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, created in Paris on December 9, 1948, and entered into force on January 12, 1951.” Later, in 2009, the European Parliament passed a resolution “call[ing] on the Council and the Commission to commemorate appropriately the anniversary of the Srebrenica-Potočari act of genocide by supporting Parliament’s recognition of 11 July as the day of commemoration of the Srebrenica genocide all over the EU, and to call on all the countries of the western Balkans to do the same.”

⁹ Fisher, cited in Ivo H. Daalder and Michael E. O’Hanlon, *Winning Ugly: NATO’s War to Save Kosovo*, Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 2000, p. 75.

¹⁰ “Djindjić wants status resolved now, Koštunica in five years,” <http://www.unmikonline.org/press/2003/mon/jan/lmm200103.htm#4>.

¹¹ Rupnik, Jacques, “The demise of Balkan nationalisms? A skeptical view,” in Judy Batt (ed), *The Western Balkans: Moving on*, Paris: Institute for Security Studies, 2004, p. 105.

public opposed any cooperation with the Hague tribunal.¹²

The assassination of Prime Minister Djindjić in 2003 represented an enormous loss for Serbia: the processes of democratization and Europeanization were immediately interrupted.¹³ As followed, soon after the assassination and the instatement of the replacement government headed by Zoran Živković, Koštunica became the new Prime Minister. The European officials were naïve enough to believe that he was ready to make a big step towards European integration, shifting from introverted post-communist conservatism to a modern, democratic, and open society. They continued to express their support for Serbia, leading to the opening of negotiations for the Stabilization and Association Agreement with the EU in October 2005. However, given an obvious lack of cooperation with the Hague tribunal, the negotiations were suspended in May 2006 and reassumed only after the victory of President Boris Tadić's Democratic Party, in the 2007 Serbian parliamentary elections.

The talks about the Kosovo status and various speculations about the regional implications of Kosovo's policy of independence accentuated the differences between the dominant political parties in Serbia. For example, Prime Minister Koštunica and his Democratic Party of Serbia insisted that "the existence of Kosovo and Metohija as part of Serbia and the existence of the Serbian people in Kosovo [were] the key objectives of Serbia's involvement in the political talks for the future status of that region" and any decision on Kosovo "should be made within Serbia, in the framework of the large autonomy of Kosovo and Metohija within Serbia."¹⁴ As one author observed, Koštunica was an ardent nationalist with a deep-seated suspicion of the West and had a habit of postponing difficult decisions: he preferred being remembered as the patriot who succeeded Milošević than the president who gave away Kosovo.¹⁵

At the same time, President Boris Tadić and his Democratic Party reaffirmed that he would not sign any document on Kosovo's independence. The 2006 Serbian

constitution presented the province of Kosovo as a constituent part of Serbia and he accordingly continued to insist on new rounds of negotiations, thinking that they could change the already established position in the West. What such an approach has done so far is manipulate both the Serbs living in Kosovo and the Serbs living elsewhere, who altogether believe that Kosovo will continue to belong to Serbia. This is where the main difference between the former Prime Minister Djindjić and his successors has been: while Djindjić was capable of reading the EU's messages between the lines and thus understanding that preservation of Kosovo within Serbian borders and Serbia's EU future could never go hand in hand, his successors have tried to convince the public that such an arrangement is actually possible.

The majority of successors, often much too concerned with the preservation of their own political careers, tend to ignore the fact that it is not the European Union that needs Serbia, but the other way around. Accordingly, the compliance with the EU's policy of conditionality has often been assessed as insufficient. However, based on the amount of official statements, it is not the Europeans who lack a clearer vision with regard to the future of Serbia, but the Serbs themselves. This is primarily due to the diametrically opposing views among domestic political elites. For example, Vojislav Šešelj's neo-fascist Serbian Radical Party and, to a lesser extent, Vojislav Koštunica's Democratic Party of Serbia, and numerous former members of Milošević's Socialist Party of Serbia have often encouraged anti-European feelings. In their view, the process of Europeanization and eventual EU membership is not something Serbia should really pursue. In order to justify such a standpoint, their statements are often inspired by European (and American, of course) involvement in the Yugoslav state crisis of the early 1990s and, more importantly, in the 1999 NATO bombing of Serbia. On the other hand, President Tadić's Democratic Party and Tomislav Nikolić's Serbian Progressive Party have generally been pro-European, although some of their members' statements

¹² Beogradski centar za ljudska prava, "Javno mnenje u Srbiji: Stavovi prema pravosudju za ratne zločine i Haškom tribunalu," Beograd: Beogradski centar za ljudska prava, 2005.

¹³ As argued elsewhere, "[t]he assassination stopped Serbian reforms in their tracks. It compromised further cooperation with the ICTY as the only element in the Serbian government inclined to cooperate was removed, and Koštunica went back to his entrenched position of noncompliance" (Subotić, Jelena, "Explaining Difficult States: The Problems of Europeanization in Serbia," *East European Politics and Societies*, Vol. 24, No. 4, 2010, pp. 595-616: 601).

¹⁴ "Vienna talks: Albanians don't hurry to recognize the rights of Serbs in Kosovo," <http://www.regnum.ru/English/623129.html>.

¹⁵ Hundley, Tom, "Wary Serbs watch deadlocked talks on Kosovo's independence," *Chicago Tribune*, 10 June 2006, p. 1.

and actions have occasionally undermined their apparent commitment to the process of Europeanization. Finally, the Liberal Democratic Party, led by Čedomir Jovanović, Prime Minister Djindjić's main advisor, has continued to promote Djindjić's ideas and thus the necessary integration into the EU, but given its small size (like many other political parties in Serbia), the LDP voice tends to remain marginal.

Given that the elites do not share the same or rather similar standpoint with regard to Serbia's European perspective, the process of Europeanization is complicated further. One study, while pointing out that in transitional systems "consensus about basic social, political, and economic priorities and values is often absent," sees public opinion surveys as a useful way to discover what society really thinks and what its main concerns are.¹⁶ For example, back in 2004, the Serbian Government Office for European Union Integration conducted a study in order to see the Serbian public's approach to Europe and accordingly, the respondents were divided into four categories: Euro-enthusiasts, who say that Serbia must make every effort in order to join the EU; Euro-realists, who perceive EU integration as a necessity; Euro-skeptics, who question the intentions of Europe and the West in general; and Euro-phobes, who fear the dominance of Western Europe and thus strongly oppose integration.¹⁷ Based on the results, Euro-realists were the dominant category (35% of respondents), while Euro-phobes were the least popular (12% of respondents). Later on, following Kosovo's declaration of independence in 2008, there were many opinions saying that European policy towards the region is a double standard policy, and "[i]f there had been a credible alternative to the EU, the majority of Serbian voters would have probably opposed Serbian EU accession."¹⁸ In fact, some more recent studies show that support to join the EU has continued to decrease: for example, in December 2010, 57% of respondents were in favor of Serbia's EU membership, whereas in December 2011, this number had

dropped to 51%.¹⁹

As one 2008 study correctly assessed, since the breakup of the Yugoslav federation, "Serbia has been invariably late: late in recognizing the spirit of change in 1989, late in reacting to Milošević's devastating policies, late in seeing the reality in Kosovo, late in accepting the cooperation with The Hague as a conditional *sine qua non*, late in defining the EU integration as the highest priority and hence late in conducting absolutely necessary reforms."²⁰ Indeed, various indices and indicators, such as the 2010 Democracy Index, the Global Competitiveness Index, and the Worldwide Governance Indicators, have demonstrated that Serbia has been late. The only significant progress can be associated with the electoral democracy and elections. Still, elections cannot consolidate democracy; they only serve to confirm democratic legitimacy. What is needed is a strong link between democracy (free and fair elections) and constitutional liberalism (rule of law and limited power) that would lead to the establishment of permanent institutions characterized by depoliticized public sector and independent courts.²¹ Here, although European Union involvement can provide assistance and apply its policy of conditionality, it is the Serbian leadership that decides on the level and speed of cooperation with both the EU and the Hague tribunal, and accordingly, the more they are ready to cooperate, the bigger the awards will be. This is why the title of this paper is followed by a question mark, and this is due to the present situation in Serbia. While cooperation with the Hague tribunal has progressed satisfactorily,²² resulting in Serbia's EU candidacy in 2012, the Kosovo issue is the one that still requires great attention. The current situation, characterized by unviable political, economic, and social components, can easily generate new violence, both within the borders of Kosovo and in its neighboring countries. I argue that Kosovo is a Serbian, regional, and European problem simultaneously.

When discussing Kosovo as a Serbian problem, it

¹⁶ Farkas, Richard P., *Democratization in the Balkans: Prescription for a Badly Scarred Body Politic*, Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press, 2007, p. 40.

¹⁷ Serbian Government Office for EU Integration, "Evropska orijentacija gradjana Srbije," 2004, <http://seio.sr.gov.yu>.

¹⁸ Stojić, Marko, "The changing nature of Serbian political parties' attitudes towards Serbian EU membership," *SEI Working Paper 122*, Brighton: Sussex European Institute, 2011, pp. 1-53: 20.

¹⁹ Serbian Government Office for EU Integration, "Serbia's EU integration supported by 51% of citizens," 2012, <http://www.seio.gov.rs/news.101.html?newsid=1121>.

²⁰ Ristić, Irena, "Serbia's EU Integration Process: The Momentum of 2008," *Panoeconomicus*, Issue 1, 2009, pp. 111-125: 122.

²¹ Vujačić, Ilija, "Deset godina političke tranzicije u Srbiji," *Analiza politike*, Summer 2011, pp. 18-23: 22.

²² Here I primarily refer to the arrest and extradition of Radovan Karadžić in 2008, and Ratko Mladić and Goran Hadžić, in 2011.

is important to note that Belgrade authorities have supported the Kosovo Serbs remaining in Kosovo. However, one of the most alarming issues regards the presence of Serbian enclaves in the province that are still fully politically and economically integrated with Serbia. In the enclaves “no one holds a steady job; the communities rely on handouts from aid organizations and from Belgrade.”²³ Moreover, while frustration is a dominant feature, the enclaves invite violence in order to level the playing field in society. Thus, how are these enclaves going to integrate within independent Kosovo, and who bears responsibility for this process? While we can claim that the Serbian responsibility is to encourage Serbs willing to remain in an independent Kosovo to work towards greater inclusion and representation in the society, instead of following what Belgrade officials have to suggest – usually something that marginalizes them even more, what and how effective are Albanian and European responsibilities?

When seeing Kosovo as a regional problem, there are two main aspects to distinguish. First, the Albanian minority in Serbia, accounting for over 60,000 people, and predominantly inhabiting the southern part of the republic,²⁴ may advocate autonomy. History suggests that young nations inhabiting a relatively small and limited territory but with a high demographic growth, like Albanians, tend to augment and claim the neighboring territory, through war, migration, and then, secession. If the neighboring nation, living in a comparatively large territory, is tired and relatively old with low demographic growth, like the Serbs, the situation is ripe for instability in the form of claims to possessions and territory. A second aspect regards the Serbs in an artificially divided Bosnia and Herzegovina, who have not excluded the possibility of demanding secession since the independence of Kosovo became a reality. Thinking in such a direction is dangerous, as it could challenge both the 1995 Dayton-created peace in Bosnia and the stability of the wider Balkan

region. As a response to Kosovo’s independence, Branislav Dukić, leader of the Serb Movement of Independent Associations, called Milorad Dodik, the Prime Minister of the Serb Republic, to include a referendum on independence in his electoral campaign. In his view, the Bosnian Serbs “shall request independence for the Serb Republic as well. If Kosovo’s illegal parliament can proclaim independence, the Bosnian Serb legal parliament should immediately proclaim independence for Republika Srpska even without calling for a referendum.”²⁵ Needless to say, dismembering Bosnia-Herzegovina would mean going back to the period of the collapse of Yugoslavia.

When thinking about Kosovo as a European problem, there are also various aspects that deserve attention. First, given numerous criteria that any country seeking membership in the European Union must satisfy,²⁶ it is objective to say that Kosovo is likely to face numerous obstacles. Even when negotiating the Kosovo status, the Brussels officials insisted on the policy of “standards before status,” inaugurated by the third UN Mission in Kosovo chief, Michael Steiner of Germany, but once it had become obvious that standards were not going to be fulfilled any time soon, the policy was abandoned. Second, Kosovo is formally recognized by 22 out of 27 Member States of the European Union. The remaining five states (Cyprus, Greece, Romania, Slovakia and Spain) do not intend to recognize Kosovo’s independence, as their decision to do so could generate various problems at home. Finally, independent Kosovo is a Muslim state. Some recent events and consequent statements of the founding states of the European integrationist project have demonstrated that they struggle with their Muslim communities and concepts such as acculturation, assimilation, and tolerance. If analyzed, the historical foundation of the Community had been largely Christian-Democratic and, more importantly, the period around the 1992 Maastricht Treaty embraced Catholic social

²³ Kupchan, Charles A., “Independence for Kosovo,” <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20051101facomment84603/charles-a-kupchan/independenceforkosovo.html>.

²⁴ The Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, “Popis stanovništva, domaćinstava i stanova 2002; Knjiga 1: Nacionalna ili etnička pripadnost po naseljima,” Belgrade: Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, 2003.

²⁵ Alić, Anes, “Bosnian Serbs Protest over Kosovo,” <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Security-Watch/Articles/Detail/?ots591=4888caa0-b3db-1461-98b9-e20e7b9c13d4&lng=en&id=54209>.

²⁶ Any country seeking membership in the European Union must conform to the conditions set out by Article 49 and the principles laid down in Article 6 (1) of the Treaty on the EU. The relevant criteria were established by the Copenhagen European Council in 1993 and strengthened by the Madrid European Council in 1995. To join the EU, a new Member State must meet three criteria: political (implying stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities), economic (implying existence of a functioning market economy and the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union) and must accept the Community acquis (implying ability to take on the obligations of membership, including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union; for the European Council to decide to open negotiations, the political criterion must be satisfied).

doctrine “to guide intellectually and regulate institutionally cognitive meanings and political exigencies of a pluralist Europe.”²⁷ Thus, if the Europeans are concerned with the presence of Islam in their own countries, why are they so keen on the establishment of a Muslim state in the Western Balkans?

Apart from the Kosovo question, there are two other semi-acknowledged questions in Serbia, both capable of affecting the European involvement and further integration of the country in the European Union. The first relates to the Serbian northern province of Vojvodina. As some authors put it, “independence of Kosovo would have implications for Hungarians in Vojvodina.”²⁸ In 2006, the Office for European Affairs of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina was established in Brussels with the aim to coordinate “activities of provincial institutions in the European integration processes.”²⁹ The opening of the regional office does not indicate that Vojvodina will necessarily ignore Serbia (and the EU Integration Office of the Government of Republic of Serbia), but what it does indicate is that Vojvodina is ready to act on its own (based on its autonomous status) to foster its own links with the EU and secure benefits based on the level of commitment to the Union, regardless of the often-delayed policies of the Serbian government.

The second semi-acknowledged question relates to the Sandžak region, divided between Serbia and Montenegro. According to some observers, “[w]ith the Islamic Community holding ‘the balance of power in Sandžak,’ and manipulating its prominent position ‘to extract concessions from politicians and play a more active role in day-to-day politics’ it is clear that political Islam can only grow stronger in the micro region.”³⁰ Mufti Muamer Zukorlić, head of the Islamic Community in Serbia, while supported by various external Muslim communities, has insisted on a greater autonomy for Sandžak that, “would not challenge the sovereignty of either state, he says, nor would it be based on ethnicity.”³¹ But what if the already weakened dialogue between the Belgrade and

Sandžak authorities deteriorates further, to the extent that independence of the Sandžak region becomes the dominant issue to address? Again here, what role would the Europeans play?

Serbia is expected to give up Kosovo if it wants to become a full member of the European Union. Does this mean that if Vojvodina and Sandžak decide to claim independence from Serbia, the Europeans (or the West) will be there to assist them by making Serbia’s progress towards EU membership conditional on their recognition? Such questions make even more sense when thinking that Serbia does not have an alternative to the European Union. Although the lack of alternative was confirmed during the Djindjić government, the leadership that took over has occasionally struggled to confirm this view, leaving an impression that Serbia might have an alternative elsewhere. The Russian federation is not an option for Serbia, neither economically, nor ideologically. With regard to economics, the EU is Serbia’s biggest trade partner, accounting for 56% of domestic exports.³² With regard to ideology, although Titoist Yugoslavia was often proud of its similarity to the Soviet Union, the present-day Serbs are trying to be closer to the EU and the West, in general, rather than to the Russians. In addition, Russia’s decision not to recognize Kosovo’s independence has nothing to do with ideological proximity, but with its own ambition to be more relevant in European Union and international politics.

The desire for eventual membership in the European Union is a common denominator for all Western Balkan countries. It is an incentive to develop modern and effective legislation, and to reform and stabilize the political environment. Still, without full support from Brussels, there is little hope that the region will be able to shake off its reputation. The worst-case scenario would be to allow an increase in the already evident disproportion between the region and its neighbors who are further advanced in EU integration process. The (Western) Balkan question is a European question. Luckily, on various occasions the

²⁷ Holmes, Douglas R., “Experimental identities (after Maastricht),” in Jeffrey T. Checkel and Peter J. Katzenstein (eds), *European Identity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp. 52-80: 63.

²⁸ Hadley, James, “The Way Opened, the Way Blocked: Assessing the Contrasting Fates of Chechnya and Kosovo,” in Aleksandar Pavković and Peter Radan (eds), *On the Way to Statehood: Secession and Globalization*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008, pp. 85-99: 98.

²⁹ Executive Council of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina, “Decision on Establishment of the Office on European Affairs,” Novi Sad, 5 April 2006.

³⁰ Deliso, Christopher, *The Coming Balkan Caliphate: The Threat of Radical Islam to Europe and the West*, Westport, CT: Praeger, 2007, p. 156.

³¹ “Together we are stronger! Rabble-rousing in a Muslim-majority part of Serbia,” *The Economist*, 27 August 2011.

³² “Delević: EU is Serbia’s main trade partner,” <http://www.tanjug.rs/news/36110/delevic--eu-is-serbias-main-trade-partner.htm>.

Europeans have confirmed their commitment to the region.³³ In this respect, we could agree that the future represents an opportunity to break with the past and while for some countries (mainly Serbia and Croatia) this entails taking responsibility for their acts in the past, it also, in turn, facilitates new beginnings.

³³ See, for example, Council of the European Union, "Thessaloniki European Council 2003: Presidency Conclusions," http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/76279.pdf, and European Commission, "Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council – Western Balkans: Enhancing the European perspective," COM (2008) 127 final, 5 March 2008, http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/balkans_communication/western_balkans_communication_050308_en.pdf.

**ISEEES-Affiliated Faculty & Student Presentations at
the 2012 ASEEEES Conference
November 15-18, 2012
New Orleans, Louisiana**

Katya Balter, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, was a member of the panel *Kornei Chukovsky and the Negotiation of Professional Identity in Soviet Russia*.

Henry E. Brady, Dean and Professor at the Goldman School of Public Policy, presented his paper titled "Ethnic Identity and Political Opinions: Social Distance in Estonia 1992 and 2011" on the panel *Public Opinion and Political Behavior in Changing Societies: Estonia, Latvia, and Russia*.

Daniel A. Brooks, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, chaired the panel on *Writers' Demons, Muses, and Guardian Angels*. In addition, he was a member of the panel *Kornei Chukovsky and the Negotiation of Professional Identity in Soviet Russia*.

John F. Connelly, Professor in the Department of History, chaired the panel on *Contested Nationalism in Interwar Poland*. In addition, he was a member of the panel *The State in Communist Eastern Europe: A Research Agenda*.

Sarah Cramsey, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History, presented her paper titled "Creating the Jewish Survivor: The World Jewish Congress, the Czech Government and the Politics of Displaced People" on the panel *Seeing Jewishness Like a State: Reflections on the Relationship between Jews and the State in East Central Europe*. In addition, she served as a discussant on the panel *The Reader and the State: Literary Canons in Post-War Eastern Europe*.

Bathsheba R. Demuth, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History, was a member of the panel *James Scott's High Modernism and Soviet History: Still a Useful Approach?*

Mieka Erley, Ph.D. in Slavic Languages and Literatures, chaired the panel *Imperial and Frontier Spaces in Soviet Literature*. In addition, she was a member of the panel *The Culture of Empire II: Decentering Soviet Perspectives*.

Victoria S. Frede, Associate Professor in the Department of History, was a member of the panel *Journal Publishing from Idea to Article: An Editors' Roundtable*. In addition, she served as a discussant on the panel *1812: Border Crossings between History and Narrative*.

Rhiannon D. Fredericks, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History, presented her paper titled "'We Opened the Second Front!': Grigory Medynskii and Collective Farm Novels during the Great Patriotic War" on the panel *Far from Moscow, Far from the Front: Soviet Writers and the 'Second Fronts' of the Great Patriotic War*.

David Frick, Professor in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, was a member of the panel *Union and Disunion: Borders and Boundaries in the Polish-Lithuanian lands since c. 1300*.

Sarah Garding, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Political Science, presented her paper titled "Diaspora Politics and Party Patronage in Croatia" on the panel *Contemporary Political Institutions in the Western Balkans*.

Cammeron Girvin, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, presented his paper titled "Constructing the Folklore of the Bulgarian Brigadier Movement" on the panel *Beyond Traditional Borders: Constructing Modern Slavic Folk Culture*.

Aglaya Glebova, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History of Art, presented her paper titled "Painting around Forced Labor: Heinrich Vogeler at the White Sea-Baltic Canal" on the panel *Crossing Borders: New Geographic and Aesthetic Terrain in Russian Painting, 1830s-1930s*. In addition, she was a member of the panel *Documenting the Gulag*.

Luba Golburt, Assistant Professor in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, was a member of the panel *Russian Romanticism's Realist Prospects, Russian Realism's Romantic Pasts*. In addition, she served as a discussant on the panel *Receptions of Onegin*.

Zachary Johnson, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, presented his paper titled “Reading the Erotic in ‘The Master and Margarita’” on the panel *Crossing into the Forbidden: Eroticism and Seduction in The Master and Margarita*.

Mark A. Keck-Szajbel, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History, chaired the panel *Seeing Jewishness Like a State: Reflections on the Relationship between Jews and the State in East Central Europe*. In addition, he presented his paper titled “Don’t Think the World is Yours: The Transfer of Culture in 1970s and 1980s East Central Europe” on the panel *Crossing the Borders of Friendship: Mobility across Communist Borders (Panel II)*.

Chloe Kitzinger, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, presented her paper titled “Dinner at the English Club: Approaching the Character-System of Tolstoy’s War and Peace” on the panel *Characters on the Margins in Dostoevsky and Tolstoy*.

Irina Kogel, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, presented her paper titled “Reading in the Dead House: Identity Formation and the Arts in Gustaw Herling-Grudziński’s *A World Apart*” on the panel *Overcoming Trauma: The Instability of Space, Genre, and Identity in Modern Polish Literature*.

Traci S. Lindsey, Ph.D. in Slavic Languages and Literatures, presented her paper titled “Selling Western Values at Stüklen Dom’s M-Center Mall” on the panel *Location and Culture: Cultural Transplantation*. In addition, she served as a discussant on the panel *Russia and Western-Inspired Genre Fiction*.

Julia McAnallen, Ph.D. in Slavic Languages and Literatures, was a member of the panel *Recent Trends in Lexical Borrowing in the Russian Language*.

Marcy E. McCullaugh, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Political Science, presented her paper titled “Typical Tin-Pots: Wealth without Welfare in Azerbaijan” on the panel *The Public Sector in post-Soviet Authoritarian and Hybrid Regimes*. In addition, she participated in the roundtable *Russian Health and Demography*.

Jacob B. Mikanowski, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History, presented his paper titled “Paper Empire: State Publishing and the Literary Sphere in Stalinist Poland” on the panel *The Reader and the State: Literary Canons in Post-War Eastern Europe*.

Eric Naiman, Professor in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, presented his paper titled “Kalganov” on the panel *Characters on the Margins in Dostoevsky and Tolstoy*.

Jeffrey Pennington, Executive Director of the Institute of Slavic, East European and Eurasian Studies, was a member of the panel *Academic Careers Outside the Classroom: Becoming an Academic Professional*.

Eric H. Prendergast, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Linguistics, was a member of the panel *Re-thinking Balkan Borders and Boundaries: Interdisciplinary Approaches, Methodological Innovations, and Never-Ending Stories*.

Harsha Ram, Associate Professor in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, presented his paper titled “Aesthetic Autonomy and the Political Unconscious in Pushkin’s Eugene Onegin” on the panel *Literary Form and the Non-Synchronous Development of Russian Cultural History*. In addition, he was a member of the panel *The Culture of Empire I: Challenges and New Directions*.

Brandon Schechter, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History, chaired the panel *The Reader and the State: Literary Canons in Post-War Eastern Europe*. In addition, he presented his paper titled “Biography in Uniform: Red Army Uniforms and the Construction of Autobiographies, 1941-1945” on the panel *How War Shapes the Self: Making and Remaking Boundaries, Status, and Identities*.

Katy Sosnak, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, presented her paper titled “Dreams about the Japanese: Images and Literature from the Russo-Japanese War” on the panel *Cross-Border Imaginings in the Far East: Russia–China–Japan*.

Elizabeth Wenger, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History, presented her paper titled “Future Imperfective: Censoring Contemporary Authors in Stalinist Poland and East Germany” on the panel *The Reader and the State: Literary Canons in Post-War Eastern Europe*.

Jason Wittenberg, Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science, was a member of the panel *The End of Hungarian Democracy?*

Alexei Yurchak, Associate Professor in the Department of Anthropology, was a member of the panel *Recent Past as a Scholarly Challenge: (Re)reading 1990*.

Fall 2012 Courses

Selected course offerings and selected area-related courses

Slavic R5A	Reading Composition Topic: <i>Lost Love and Murky Memories: Tales of Narrative Manipulation</i>	Sosnak, K.
Slavic R5A	Reading Composition Topic: <i>Childhood</i>	Johnson, Z.
Slavic R5B	Reading Composition Topic: <i>The Adventure of Empire: Violence and Seduction in Fictions of England and Russia</i>	Papava, S
Slavic R5B	Reading Composition Topic: <i>Music and Literature: Transpositions</i>	Lin, T.
Slavic 39C	Images of Eastern Europe	Frick, D.
Slavic 39M	Languages of the USSR	Kavitskaya, D
Slavic 45	19th Century Russian Literature	Ram, H.
Slavic 131	European Avant-garde	Ram, H.
Slavic 147A	East Slavic Folklore	Alexander, R.
Slavic 150	Survey of Polish Literature	Frick, D.
Slavic 182	Pushkin	Golburt, L.
Slavic 200	Slavic Colloquium	Naiman, E.
Slavic 280	The 1920's	Nesbet, A.
Slavic 280	The Russian Drama	Muza, A.
Slavic 281	Pushkin's Prose	Golburt, L.
Buddhist Studies C120.	Buddhism on the Silk Road	Mehendale, S.
History 100	Special Topics: The Rise and Fall of Yugoslavia	Connelly, J.
History 171B	Imperial Russia: From Peter the Great to the Russian Revolution	Frede, V.
History 177A	Armenia from Ethnogenesis to the Dark Ages	Astourian, S.
History 285B	Research Topics in Soviet History	Slezkine, Y.
IAS 150	The World Since 1945	Bohling, J.
Near Eastern Studies C26	Introduction to Central Asia	Mehendale, S.
Political Economy 160	20th Century Europe: Decline or Renewal?	Bohling, J.
Public Policy 286P	US National Security Policy	Nacht, M.
Yiddish 103	Introduction to Soviet Yiddish Literature	Chaver, Y.

The Slavic Department has courses in Armenian, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Bulgarian, Czech, Hungarian, Polish, Romanian, and Russian. The German Department offers Yiddish.

Make a Gift to ISEEEES!

The loyal support of private donors like you supplements the funding we receive from other sources and enables us to meet the standards of excellence required of us by the University of California, Berkeley as an organized research unit and by the U.S. Department of Education as a Title VI National Resource Center. Your support helps to expand and sustain a robust area-specific international education for our students, furthers research opportunities for faculty focusing on our region, and allows us to respond to new programming opportunities and to expand public outreach.

Our Federal and state funding have faced continued reductions, compelling us to draw more and more on our modest endowments to maintain the superior programming and research and academic support our student, faculty, and public constituents have come to expect. As a result, we have expanded opportunities for more targeted giving in order to encompass a variety of ISEEEES programs. Contributions of any size are appreciated and contribute directly to ISEEEES's continued accomplishments. We would be very happy to discuss details of these funds or other giving opportunities. Jeff Pennington, executive director of ISEEEES, can be reached at jpennington@berkeley.edu or (510) 643-6736.

GIVING OPPORTUNITIES

ISEEEES General Support Fund

The ISEEEES General Support Fund is an unrestricted fund that is used to: provide travel grants to affiliated graduate and undergraduate students for the purpose of presenting papers at academic conferences; provide research assistance to affiliated faculty members; convene conferences, open to the public, that examine current topics in Slavic, East European, and Eurasian studies; host an annual reception to foster community building among faculty, students, and the public; and augment the state and grant funds that provide minimal support for ISEEEES operations.

ISEEEES Graduate Student Support Fund

The ISEEEES Graduate Student Support Fund is a new UCB Foundation endowment that was established by a generous gift from an anonymous donor. When fully funded, the ISEEEES Graduate Student Support Fund will be used to support graduate students in the field of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies. The endowment was launched by the initial gift and matching funds from the Graduate Division. Additional gifts to the Fund are encouraged and gratefully accepted.

Colin and Elsa Miller Endowment Fund

The Annual Colin Miller Memorial Lecture honors the memory of a journalist and radio and TV producer who was devoted to the Center for Slavic and East European Studies (as ISEEEES was called before the year 2000). The endowment funds an annual lecture given by a respected scholar in the field of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies.

Hungarian Studies Fund

This fund promotes the teaching of the Hungarian language at UC Berkeley, provides research assistance to faculty and students studying Hungarian topics, and supports lectures, workshops, and conferences devoted to Hungarian studies.

Fund for Romanian Studies

This fund promotes the teaching of the Romanian language at UC Berkeley; supports lectures, workshops, and conferences devoted to Romanian topics; and provides research assistance to faculty and students pursuing Romanian studies.

Support Our Institute!

Associates of the Slavic Center

ISEEES acknowledges with sincere appreciation the following individuals who made their annual contribution to ISEEES between July and December, 2012.

BENEFACTORS

Frank Fletcher*

SPONSORS

Kim Jung Il*

Michael P. Richards*

Kathleen E. Smith*

Katalin Voros*

Stan Vukovich*

MEMBERS

Eugenia Bailey*

Paula Gillett*

Rita Sobolev*

Elena Sokol*

Valerie Sperling*

Anna Taberski

* gift of continuing membership

Your gift will qualify you for membership on our annual giving program: Associates of the Slavic Center. Descriptions of membership benefits by level are included below. Thank you for your continued support.

Members (Gifts under \$100). Members are notified in writing about major upcoming ISEEES events.

Sponsors (Gifts of \$100—\$499). ASC Sponsors receive a specially designed gift that bears the ISEEES logo, promoting Slavic and East European Studies at Berkeley.

Benefactors (Gifts of \$500—\$999). ASC Benefactors receive a complimentary copy of a book authored by ISEEES faculty.

Center Circle (Gifts of \$1,000 and above). Members of the Center Circle will qualify for the Charter Hill Society at UC Berkeley. The Charter Hill Society is Berkeley's new program designed to recognize donors' annual giving to the campus. Benefits of this program include a subscription to *Berkeley Promise Magazine* and an invitation to *Discover Cal* lecture.

It is a policy of the University of California and the Berkeley Foundation that a portion of the gifts and/or income therefrom is used to defray the costs of raising and administering the funds. Donations are tax-deductible to the extent allowed by law.

You can contribute online by visiting the ISEEES website <http://iseees.berkeley.edu/give> and selecting the fund to which you would like to make a gift.

Or send a check, payable to UC Regents, to:

Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies
University of California, Berkeley
260 Stephens Hall #2304
Berkeley CA 94720-2304

Name(s) _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Home _____ Business _____

Phone _____ Phone _____

If your employer has a matching gift program, please print name of corporation below:

_____ I have made a contribution but wish to remain anonymous.

Faculty and Student News

Bathsheba Demuth, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History, received a Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad Fellowship for research in Moscow, Vladivostok, and Chukotka for the 2013-2014 academic year. She was also the recipient of the Association of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies National Graduate Student Essay Prize (2012) for her paper, "More Things on Heaven and Earth: Modernism and Reindeer in the Bering Straits." This essay will appear as a chapter in *Northscapes: History, Technology, and the Making of Northern Environments*, edited by Dolly Jørgensen and Sverker Sörlin, forthcoming from University of British Columbia Press, Fall 2013.

Victoria Frede continued to serve as editor of *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*. She has also been designing a new course for freshmen and sophomores, "Foodways: A Global History," which she will co-teach with Prof. McLennan in the History Department in Spring 2013.

Cammeron Girvin, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, was a co-contributor with Johanna Nichols, Malgorzata Szajbel-Keck, and Elizabeth Purdy to a paper, "Slavic P-Compounds as Non-Canonical Adjectives," presented at the Slavic Linguistics Society conference in Lawrence, Kansas, in August.

Eric Johnson, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History, received a Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad Fellowship for the 2012-13 academic year.

Anastasia Kayiatos became the Provost's Postdoctoral Scholar in the Humanities in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of Southern California. Her article, "Silent Plasticity: Re-Enchanting Soviet Stagnation," has just been published in the December issue of *Women's Study Quarterly*.

Andrew Kornbluth, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History, was awarded a fellowship for the 2012-2013 academic year from the International Research and Exchanges Board – Individual Advanced Research Opportunities Program and serves as a US Holocaust Memorial Museum Takiff Family Foundation Fellow.

Tony Lin, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, received a Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad Fellowship and will spend 2013-2014 in Moscow and Warsaw. He presented the paper "Mythmaking and the Construction of a Polish Chopin" at the 4th International Polish Studies Conference in Chicago, IL. He also presented the paper "The Institution of the International Chopin Piano Competition and Its Social and Cultural Implications" at the American Musicological Society annual meeting in New Orleans, Louisiana.

Cory Merrill, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Comparative Literature, had translations of work by Kiril Medvedev appear in the first published volume of Medvedev's poetry and prose, *It's No Good*, published by Ugly Duckling Presse. The other translators are Keith Gessen, Mark Krotov and Bela Shayevich.

Anne Nesbet, Associate Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures and the program in Film Studies, published *The Cabinet of Earth*, a novel for children ages 9-14, with HarperCollins.

Irina Paperno, Harsha Ram, Luba Golburt, and Eric Naiman delivered talks at a day-long conference on "The Novel in Russia and America" sponsored by the Consortium on the Novel and held at the UC Berkeley English Department on May 2, 2012.

Brandon Schechter, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History, received a Fulbright Research Fellowship for the 2012-2013 academic year in Moscow. He also published an article in *Ab Imperio*, "'The People's Instructions': Indigenizing the Great Patriotic War Among 'Non-Russians,'" and presented his paper "The State's Pot and the Soldier's Spoon: *Paiok* on the Fronts of the Great Patriotic War" at the international conference "World War II, Nazi Crimes, and the Holocaust in the USSR" at the National Research University – Higher School of Economics in Moscow.

Éva Soós Szőke joined the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures as the new Hungarian language lecturer. She holds an M.A. in Hungarian Language and Literature from Eötvös Loránd University of Arts and Sciences in Budapest and a Postgraduate Diploma in Journalism from the Hungarian School of Journalism, also in Budapest.

Elena Tomlinson, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Architecture, received a Fulbright Research Fellowship for the 2012-2013 academic year to study in Romania. During her stay, she will be working on her dissertation with the generous support of a Social Science Research Council – International Dissertation Research Fellowship (2012-2013), an American Council of Learned Societies Dissertation Research and Writing Fellowship in East European Studies (2012-2013), and support from the International Research and Exchanges Board – Individual Advanced Research Opportunities Program (2012-2013).

Katarina White, B.A. candidate in History and Slavic Languages and Literatures with a minor in Human Rights, was recently awarded the Institute of International Studies' Undergraduate Merit Scholarship for her Senior Thesis about the Ruthenian minority in the north of Serbia.

Katarzyna Zacha joined the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures as the new Polish Language lecturer. She holds an M.A. in Polish Philology from the University of Szczecin in Poland and an M.A. in Psychology from the Holy Names University in Oakland.

On October 19-20, 2012, the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, with the Townsend Center for the Humanities and ISEES, hosted the conference, "An Extended Family: Russian Modernism in International Context, in honor of **Olga Matich**, Professor Emerita. The two-day event featured twelve papers delivered by Slavic alumni: **Polina Barskova**, Hampshire College; **Evgenii Bershtein**, Reed College; **Molly Brunson**, Yale University; **Mieka Erley**, Chicago; **Anastasia Kayiatos**, USC; **Konstantine Kliutchkine**, Pomona College; **Michael Kunichika**, New York University; **William Nickell**, University of Chicago; **Victoria Smolkin-Rothrock**, Wesleyan University; **Victoria Somoff**, Dartmouth College; **Jon Stone**, Franklin & Marshall College; and **Alyson Tapp**, Reed College.

On October 26-27, 2012, the Department of History, with the Townsend Center for the Humanities and ISEES, hosted the conference "In Memory of **Nicholas V. Riasanovsky**: The Intellectual Legacy Continued." Former colleagues, students, and family of Riasanovsky gathered to remember his legacy at UC Berkeley. **Yuri Slezkine**, ISEES Director and the Jane K. Sather Professor of History, spoke as a colleague; **Victoria Frede**, Associate Professor of History, spoke of his role as teacher and mentor; **Arlene Riasanovsky**, wife of the late Riasanovsky, spoke of him as husband and father; and **David Wolff**, Professor of History and Area Studies at Hokkaido University, spoke of Riasanovsky's early years as a historian. **Mark D. Steinberg**, Professor of History at the University of Illinois - Champaign-Urbana, delivered the keynote speech on Riasanovsky's intellectual legacy.

Recent Graduates

Boris Barkanov was awarded a Ph.D. in December 2011 by the Department of Political Science for his dissertation "Mercantilist Development in Russia: The Legitimacy of State Power, State Identity, and the Energy Charter Regime (1990 - 2010)."

Helaine Blumenthal was awarded a Ph.D. in May 2012 by the Department of History for her dissertation "Fourteen Convicted, Three Million Condemned: The Slansky Affair and the Reconstitution of Jewish Identities After the Holocaust."

Mieka Erley, Ph.D. in Slavic Languages and Literatures, filed her dissertation, "Reclaiming Native Soil: Cultural Mythologies of Soil in Russia and Its Eastern Borderlands from the 1840s to the 1930s," in August 2012.

Jordan Gans-Morse was awarded a Ph.D. in December 2011 by the Department of Political Science for his dissertation "Building Property Rights: Capitalists and the Demand for Law in Post-Soviet Russia."

Anastasia Kayiatos, Ph.D. in Slavic Languages and Literatures, filed her dissertation, "Silence and Alterity in Russia after Stalin, 1955-1975," in August 2012.

Anaita Khudonazar was awarded a Ph.D. in December 2011 by the Department of Near Eastern Studies for her dissertation "Generational Politics: Narratives of Power in Central Asia's Visual Culture."

Jody M. LaPorte was awarded a Ph.D. in May 2012 by the Department of Political Science for her dissertation "The Logic of Kleptocracy: Corruption, Repression, and Political Opposition in Post-Soviet Eurasia."

Danielle Lussier was awarded a Ph.D. in December 2011 by the Department of Political Science for her dissertation "Activating Democracy: Political Participation and the Fate of Regime Change in Russia and Indonesia."

Jessica Merrill was awarded a Ph.D. in May 2012 by the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures for her dissertation "The Role of Folklore Study in the Rise of Russian Formalist and Czech Structuralist Literary Theory."

Alexis J. Peri was awarded a Ph.D. in December 2011 by the Department of History for her dissertation "Minds Under Siege: Rethinking the Soviet Experience inside the Leningrad Blockade, 1941-45."

Zhivka Valiavicharska was awarded a Ph.D. in December 2011 by the Department of Rhetoric for her dissertation "Spectral Socialisms: Marxism-Leninism and the Future of Marxist Thought in Post-Socialist Bulgaria."

Cameron Wiggins was awarded a Ph.D. in December 2011 by the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures for her dissertation "The Drama in Disguise: Dramatic Modes of Narration and Textual Structure in the Mid-Nineteenth-Century Russian Novel."

FLAS Fellowship Awards

Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) fellowships enable US citizens and permanent residents to acquire a high level of competency in modern foreign languages. FLAS funding for Russian and East European languages comes to UC Berkeley through a Title VI grant from the US Department of Education to ISEES. Applications are accepted through the Graduate Fellowship Office.

Awards for Summer 2012

Antony D'Avirro, Slavic Languages and Literatures, received funding to study Russian at the Russian Language and Culture Institute in Russia.

William Jenkins, History, received funding to study Czech through the University of Pittsburgh East European Summer Language Institute in the Czech Republic.

Joseph Kellner, History, received funding to study Finnish at the Turku Summer University in Finland.

Kevin Kenjar, Anthropology, received funding to study Croatian at the University of Split in Croatia.

Irina Kogel, Slavic Languages and Literatures, received funding to study Polish at the Catholic University of Lublin in Poland.

Benjamin Lyles, School of Law, received funding to study Russian at the Odessa Language Study Center in Ukraine.

Jesus Madrigal, History, received funding to study Russian at St. Petersburg State University in Russia.

Jessica Purkis, History, received funding to study Russian at UC Berkeley.

Awards for AY 2012-2013

Michael Dean, History, received a fellowship to study Polish at UC Berkeley.

Jennifer Flaherty, Slavic Languages and Literatures, received a fellowship to study Russian at UC Berkeley.

Maya Garcia, Slavic Languages and Literatures, received a fellowship to study Russian at UC Berkeley.

Elise Herrala, Sociology, received a fellowship to study Russian at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow, Russia.

Kevin Kenjar, Anthropology, received a fellowship to study Croatian at UC Berkeley.

David Marcus, Anthropology, received a fellowship to study Russian at UC Berkeley.

Katherine Marple-Cantrell, Architecture/Urban and Regional Planning, received a fellowship to study Serbian at UC Berkeley.

Cory Merrill, Comparative Literature, received a fellowship to study Russian at UC Berkeley.

Vincent Peluce, Philosophy, received a fellowship to study Hungarian at UC Berkeley.

Christina Schwartz, Slavic Languages and Literatures, received a fellowship to study Czech at UC Berkeley.

BPS Fellowships

David Beecher

Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History
(Academic Year Fellowship)

Alexandre Beliaev

Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Anthropology
(Summer Fellowship, Academic Year Fellowship)

Andrej Milivojevic

Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History
(Summer Fellowship, Academic Year Fellowship)

Charles Shaw

Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History
(Summer Fellowship, Academic Year Fellowship)

Rhiannon Dowling Fredericks

Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History
(Summer Fellowship)

Eric Johnson

Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History
(Summer Fellowship)

Larisa Kurtovic

Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Anthropology
(Summer Fellowship)

David Marcus

Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Anthropology
(Summer Fellowship)

Olesya Shayduk-Immerman

Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Anthropology
(Summer Fellowship)

Elizabeth Wenger

Ph.D. candidate in the Department of History
(Summer Fellowship)

Composing the Fur Seal: Globalization and Human Adaptation in the North Pacific

Bathsheba Demuth
History, UC Berkeley

Twenty-five million years ago, the ancestors of the northern fur seal went to sea, lured by the evolutionary version of the Promised Land: the fish and invertebrate species abundant in the nutrient-rich waters of the northern Pacific Ocean. Seals, however, retain a tie with *terra firma*: from November until May, they range southward towards Baja and east to the Sea of Japan. But to breed and rear pups, the seals go north. Over half take harbor on the Pribilof Islands north of the Aleutian Chain, and there are other rookeries east of Kamchatka on the Commander Islands, on small territories in the Sea of Okhotsk, the Aleutians, and on the Channel Islands.¹

For most of seal history, this blend of solitary, peripatetic winters and summers spent breeding, birthing and clawing for position in the northern rookeries yielded populations in the millions, threatened only by sharks and the occasional Aleut hunter. By the eighteenth century, however, seals were not the only mammals circulating the north Pacific in search of resources. In 1741, Vitus Bering made the first European venture east to Alaska, mapping an impressive spread of the North American coast for the Russian Empire before being stranded for months on the Commander Islands. Here, the German naturalist Georg Wilhelm Steller wrote a detailed account of the “innumerable herds,” which probably contained between one and two million fur seals at the time.² Steller’s observations were not the only impression the animals left on the Russian party: those who survived shipwreck and

scurvy brought back to Russian markets hundreds of skins from otters and seals, which were worth a small fortune.³ Such furs were a major reason for Bering’s voyage, since they were prized on the global market - especially in China, which had high demand but no domestic access to the quality pelts of the far north. Fur was one of the few commodities that gave Europeans leverage in the markets of Canton.

As a commodity, furs have an unusual property: they are finite at any given time, in that there are only so many of a valuable species in a specific geographic region, but they are potentially infinite *over* time. This is only the case, however, if hunting is not overzealous; if fur-bearing species are pushed toward extinction, they are lost both biologically and as a source of profit. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with profit rather than subsistence as a motive, the pressure on the rookeries intensified. It was not a foregone conclusion that the seal would avoid extinction: the sea otter barely did, and another large aquatic mammal, Steller’s sea cow, was extinct from overhunting within thirty years of Russian discovery.⁴ Yet, the fur seal did survive imperial globalization – an outcome that required human adaptation. Russians had to discover enough about the habits of this amphibious mammal not just to hunt it, but to not hunt too well. This, in turn, required learning what the seal *was*—what it did, how it lived, who was allowed to hunt it and what could kill it both individually and, potentially, as a species. Analyzing the fur seal took place in three main registers: the seal as the object

¹ For fur seal biology, see Marianne L. Riedman, *The Pinnipeds: Seals, Sea Lions, and Walruses* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990). See also Annalisa Berta and James L. Sumich, *Marine Mammals: Evolutionary Biology* (San Diego: Academic Press, 1999).

² Georg Wilhelm Steller, *Journal of a Voyage with Bering 1741-1742*, translated by Margritt A Engel and O.W. Frost (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988), 154.

³ Vasili Berkh, “Chronological History of the Discovery of the Aleutian Islands,” translated by Melvin Ricks, *The Earliest History of Alaska*. (Anchorage: Cook Inlet Historical Society, 1970), 2.

⁴ Leonhard Stejneger gives the date of the last sea cow sighting as 1768, near Bering Island in the Commander group. On Copper Island, the species was effectively exterminated within nine years of human arrival. Stejneger, “How the Great Northern Sea Cow (*Rytina*) Became Exterminated” *American Naturalist* Vol. 21 (1887): 1047-54.

of scientific inquiry, which is how Stellar saw it; the seal as a commodity, as Bering and his followers understood it; and the seal as subject to laws, as the Russian government saw them. All three concepts were intertwined; the law was never totally separate from the market, and zoology was brought to bear on the law. In this way, ideas—from property rights to legal theories of international territory—combined with the material and biological realities of seal breeding and migration patterns, and the very human concerns of supply and demand on a world market.

Russian furring in the North Pacific was, at first, a disorganized process, undertaken by private merchants who spent years seeking returns that were not guaranteed, despite the rich fur stocks. Success depended on various factors—avoiding shipwreck, scurvy and maintaining peaceful relations with the indigenous populations. It also required finding new territory from which to harvest furs. Imperial reports show that the voyages of the 1740s decimated otters on the Commander Islands, prompting a turn to the fur seal—a less valuable substitute, but plentiful and easy to harvest.⁵ Although evidence specific to the fur seal is scarce for this period, repeated ship manifests listing the taking of seal hides in the tens of thousands during the 1770s must have put severe pressure on the Bering and Copper Island rookeries.⁶

The hunt for furs prompted further expansion down the Aleutian chain towards the Alaska mainland. By the 1780s, Russians had deduced from the large numbers of ocean-going seals that other island rookeries must exist. In 1786, Gerasim Gavrilovich Pribilof sighted the island of St. George and, shortly after, St. Paul. Pribilof and his crew arrived in July, at the height of the seal-breeding season,

when the beaches were thick with slow-moving animals. By the time they began the return voyage to Russia, the crew had harvested some 40,000 sealskins.

Pribilof seemingly intended to keep his discovery a secret.⁷ However, during the eight years he spent at sea, the organization of Russian voyages in the Pacific had begun to shift. The Imperial government wanted to consolidate Russian activities in order to manage hunting, trade flows, the treatment of indigenous people and the pressures of international competition. By the 1790s, the Spanish were moving north from California, the French had dispatched navigator *La Perouse*, and Captain Cook arrived in Alaskan waters under the British flag. More British frigates followed suit, leaving the Russian governor-general to lament how the “English, by striking out greedily to obtain fur-bearing animals, spurred on our [indigenous] fur-hunters.”⁸ Foreign traders gave the Aleuts and other tribes leverage over the Russians and the ability to trade for better-quality merchandise. This worried the RAC, not only because of hides lost to competing nations, but also due to worries that the Aleuts harvested fur-bearing animals in excess in order to supply the British and Americans.⁹ Thus, with furs as the primary resource, economics in the north Pacific were territorial, and territory was political.

In 1799, to consolidate Russia’s hold on Alaska Emperor Paul I merged the larger merchant interests operating in the Pacific into a single, monopolistic body, Russian-American Company, which reported directly to the tsar. The RAC was given a twenty year charter to explore, settle and secure the northwestern coast of America from 55° north latitude to the Bering Strait and beyond.¹⁰ With this decree, the islands of St. George and St. Paul came under the control of imperial manager Alexander Baranov. Fur seals became, in legal terms, part of Imperial Russia’s wealth, and the Russian American Company was given exclusive rights

⁵ Although prices fluctuated, Burkh puts the average price of an otter pelt at 300 rubles and a fur seal at 25.

⁶ See Burkh, pages 25-27. There are several reports of fur seal takes between 30,000 and 70,000 skins before the discovery of the Pribilof rookeries, making the likely source Bering and Copper Island. However, given that the likely number of breeding seals on the Commanders was around 1-2 million animals at this point it is difficult to tell what the impact on the Commander herd was in the late 1700s.

⁷ Hubert Howe Bancroft, *History of Alaska 1730-1885* (New York: Antiquarian Press, 1886, 1960), 193.

⁸ A.I. Andreyev, *Russian Discoveries in Pacific North America in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, translated by Carl Ginsburg (Michigan: American Council, 1952), 107.

⁹ This is Bancroft’s contention, but the idea that indigenous people would willfully overhunt is a controversial one. See Calvin Martin, *Keepers of the Game: Indian-animal relationships in the fur trade* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978) and Shepard Krech, *The Ecological Indian: Myth and history* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1999).

¹⁰ Petr Tikhmenev, *A History of the Russian American Company*, edited and translated by Richard A. Pierce and Alton S. Donnelly (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1978.

to “use and profit by everything which has been or which shall be discovered in those localities.”¹¹

The Russian American Company did, in fact, seem to be using everything – or at least every fur – it could find. With the otter population nearly eradicated, the fur seal harvest increased. By 1800, a small number of Russians and Aleut slaves lived permanently on the Pribilof Islands to club, skin, stretch and store hides. The slaughter was massive, and crews regularly killed more animals than could be skinned, abandoning many carcasses to simply rot. Moreover, those hides that were harvested were dried in the open air, a technique that spoiled many skins.¹² In 1802 alone, 800,000 furs were ruined through this treatment.

Despite these problems, seals were considered worth more dead than alive. Skins were a form of currency among local Russians, who were allowed to kill them privately outside of the Company-lead hunt and use the pelts to trade with passing ships. These ships were usually British and American rather than Russian. Although Baranov had been warned explicitly and repeatedly not to trade with foreign vessels, by the early 1800s the Russian American Company consistently fell short of basic foodstuffs.¹³ Russians in Alaska were left to barter furs, the prices depressed by human desperation.¹⁴ This trade was considerable: between 1805 and 1814, British ships moved almost half a million fur seals to Canton in exchange for such necessities as beef, flour, rice, sugar and bread.¹⁵ Thus, for the first twenty or thirty years of intensive commercial interaction, humans saw fur seals as something to be killed and then rapidly transferred into money or more basic supplies, while the seals went on, by American or British ships as well as Russian, to become Chinese luxury goods. In the local and very dire situation of the Russians in Alaska, a dead seal (or several thousand) were equivalent to a live Russian.

Commercial hunting would probably have

exterminated the seals if it were not for two intersecting factors. The first arose from basic economics—the supply of furs began to outstrip demand. By 1803, RAC warehouses in Russia were so overstocked that over 100,000 seal hides were burned and Baranov was ordered to stop harvesting. Too many dead seals, on the balance of the world market, might in the short term be equivalent to nothing at all. The second factor was the dire state of the seal herd. In 1805, Nikolai Petrovich Rezanov inspected the colony for the RAC, and called a halt to the seal hunt. Rezanov’s concern does not seem to have been financial in the same short-term sense as the Company’s decision to burn furs. Rather, he understood that the success of the colonies depended on hides; farming was not viable and other sources of revenue were not forthcoming. What remained to sustain Russia’s demonstration of imperial prowess were furs. While sea otters were more profitable per pelt, procurement was done primarily by indigenous hunters moving over large territories, which made enforcement of catch quotas or exclusive trading close to impossible. The Russians, with a mere 500-odd people in the colonies, would often lose otters to their American and British competition. This left the seals: if they were exterminated, the Russian Alaska might perish as well. The RAC board wrote to Alaska in 1810 that the fur seal catch was “the most important item of our colonial enterprises, which must be preserved at all hazards, even to the temporary neglect of other resources. Everything must be done to prevent a decrease or extermination of these valuable animals.”¹⁶ After 1808, the annual harvest of seals was limited to 40,000 and hunters were ordered to select kills with care, taking only large pelts.¹⁷ Thus the biological future of the fur seal was understood as being interdependent with the market; Russian traders had learned not to let production outstrip demand in the short term and not imperil supply for the long term.

¹¹ “The First Charter of the Russian American Company.” In *Fur Seal Arbitration: Appendix to the Case of the United States, Volume 1* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1892), 14.

¹² Letter from Shelikhov to Baranov, 9 August 1794; quoted in S. B. Okun, *The Russian American Company*, translated by Carl Ginsburg (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), 60. .

¹³ Alaska History Research Project, *Documents Relative to the History of Alaska III* (Alaska: College, 1936-38), 179.

¹⁴ John D’Wolf, *A Voyage to the North Pacific and A Journey through Siberia* (Boston: Nimrod Press, 1968), 89. See also James R. Gibson, *Imperial Russia in Frontier America: The changing geography of supply of Russian America 1784-1867* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976). Gibson sees the failure of Russia to hold onto Alaska as an issue of supply.

¹⁵ *Materialy dlya istorii russkikh zaselenii po beregam vostochnavo okeana III* (Morskago ministerstva: St. Petersburg: 1861), 4.

¹⁶ “From the Board of Administration of the Russian American Company to Captain of the first rank and Knight Ivan Antonovich Kepreianov, written from St. Petersburg March 31 1810,” *Fur Seal Arbitration Appendix Volume 1*, 71.

¹⁷ Tikhmenev, 152.

However, this did not end the threats to the seal herd. The condition of the Alaska colony, where food was scarce and supplies were slow to arrive, left local management with little choice but to demand the largest possible number of pelts from the islands in order to barter with American traders. The American trade in Alaska undermined both the ecological longevity and political sovereignty of the Russian imperial venture and was increasingly worrisome in St. Petersburg. The threat reached a diplomatic tenor by the 1820s. Tsar Alexander I issued an imperial *ukase* (decree) proclaiming that territory “from Bering Straits to 51° northern latitude” on land and within 100 miles of the coast was under exclusive Russian control. Alexander’s demands were sweeping, denying both foreign trade rights and nationalizing the waters of the North Pacific far beyond the usual boundaries in a mix of imperial bravado and economic calculation, in which shielding the living wealth of Alaska was paramount.¹⁸

This wealth, however, required the presence of seals. By 1820, the situation had become so dismal that RAC management demanded “a total suspension of killing every fifth year” and a “prohibition of all killing of furs seals at sea or in the passes of the Aleutian Islands” so “we may hope to make this industry a permanent and reliable source of income for the Company without disturbing the price of these valuable skins in the market.”¹⁹ The RAC suggested alternating these *zapuski* (moratoriums) between the islands of St. Paul and St. George, so that an annual quota of 50,000 hides could still be sent back to Russia. Under the direction of the new RAC governor in Alaska, Baron von Wrangell, *zapuski* were in effect on St. Paul from 1822-24 and 1835-37 and on St. George from 1826-27.

Thus, by the 1830s, the Russian American Company had learned that their economic future required a healthy seal population. But they still needed to establish what a healthy population *was*. As the nineteenth century wore on, it became clear that periodically halting the seal slaughtering was not sufficient. Experiments in restricted hunting did not immediately protect the seal herd, and the harvests fell as low as 7000 per year. If seals and humans were to coexist and supply the market, seals needed to have better

breeding success. The Russians came to this problem with some knowledge of seal behavior and biology gained while hunting, especially in order to distinguish seals by the worth of their pelts. The most valuable seals were pups or the gray, unscarred, velvety furs found on both young males and females. Older dominant bulls, called beachmasters, were usually scarred and had darker, uneven pelts worth far less on the market.

By the 1820s, kill selection based on fur worth left a conspicuous number of large, older male animals in the rookeries, fighting viciously over the females that remained. Working off the information provided by a seal herd already decimated by hunting, sealers were under the impression that dominant bulls were the problem. Baron von Wrangell tried to improve breeding conditions by culling the dominant bulls and young females with periodic one-year respites from hunting. Pups under a year old were, from 1822 onwards, supposed to be spared to produce more breeding males, but instead of “releasing 40 to 50 thousand,” hunters contradicted the order and “in four years released no more than eight to ten thousand.”²⁰

Seal policy through 1840 shows an emerging concept of seal biology. It was assumed that differences in age and sex might impact breeding and other behaviors. Taking females and older males would, in theory, provide a decent yearly quota while still preserving the herd as a long-term resource. Unfortunately, this did not work. By 1834, the seal herd was in crisis. The records here are incomplete, but it seems that a combination of weather in the early 1830s and ongoing slaughter reduced the herd to the point where all sealing was prohibited. Half the Aleut hunters, brought to the Pribilof Islands in advance of the seals’ return, starved. The interdependence of seals and humans was very stark in these years: a few more seasons of killing, and it seemed probable that Alaskan Russians would be left without access to their most basic trade commodity.

Perhaps because of this grim realization, sometime during the late 1830s or early 1840s, sealers on the Pribilof Islands began to pay attention to female seals as more than just valuable pelts. It seems likely that this came at the

¹⁸ Some historians credit the *ukase* with begging the Monroe Doctrine. See Irby C. Nichols, Jr. “The Russian *Ukase* and the Monroe Doctrine: A Re-Evaluation,” *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 36, No. 1 (Feb., 1967): 13-26.

¹⁹ “Letter from the Board of Administration of the Russian American Company to Captain-Lieutenant M.I. Murarief, Chief Manager of the Russian American Colonies” written from St. Petersburg March 15, 1821. *Fur Trade Arbitration Appendix 1*, 58.

²⁰ Ioann Veniaminov, *Zapiski ob ostrovakh Unalashinskago* (Fairbanks: University of Alaska, 1984), 345.

direction of the Creole hunter Kassian Shaiashnikov, whose observations appear occasionally in RAC correspondence and form the core of Ioann Veniaminov's account of seal hunting on the Pribilofs. Veniaminov, an Orthodox priest assigned to the Aleutians in 1824- 1839, produced what is essentially a natural history and hunting guide to the seal. In this account, Veniaminov argued that "the utmost caution be exercised in separating adult and young females from the killable seals" and cited an incident where females were killed with impunity as having lasting damage on the seals' breeding in subsequent years.²¹ Veniaminov also calculated the rate at which the seal herd would increase if killing of females ceased. It is not clear exactly how these observations became policy, but by 1848, the company explicitly began to preserve females and focused their harvest on the two and three-year old males they formerly protected. This policy, combined with radically reduced hunting, finally produced results. The late 1840s and early 1850s saw a considerable decrease in the seal exports from Alaska while the herd was allowed to recover. Alaskan managers had discovered the necessity of making decisions based on both the long-term and short-term well-being of the herd and the hides. It was not a lesson lost after the herd recovered; in 1853, a letter to the Alaskan director of the RAC from St. Petersburg instructed that, as "the fur-seals in the Colonies are rapidly increasing, and as there is every appearance of a good market for the same, the board of administration instructs you herewith to make all necessary arrangements for carrying on the sealing industry on all the islands frequented by these animals to the full extent of their capacity, without depleting the rookeries. The rules for the protection of females, etc., will be strictly observed as heretofore."²² Economics and biology are, in this correspondence, so interdependent as to be part of the same thought.

The discovery of the need to protect females was good news for the fur seal. In 1859, the general manager of the colonies wrote to St. Petersburg with the news that "the taking of 70,000 skins each year for a long period to come will not result in the impoverishment of the rookeries."²³ By

1867, when the Russian Empire sold Alaska to the United States, the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands had returned to nearly their pre-exploitation levels. Through considerable trial for the seals, and much error on the part of humans, Russian agents discovered what wildlife biologists would now call maximum possible sustainable yield. In the process of accomplishing this, Russian hunters and RAC managers understood the seals as economic objects – as the property of the Russian Empire itself, under the management of a monopolistic company. As property, they were also understood economically; ages, colors, sizes and sexes were closely associated with their market value. Seals were also killed or spared based on the demands of the global market – too many meant low prices, too few meant no profits. Their economic value was also very local, meaning not just tea for the Empire but grain for the next harsh Alaskan winter.

The seal as an object with value emerged out of increasingly globalized networks of people, goods, and ideas that overlapped in space, and in the more abstract terrain of international diplomacy and scientific literature. Human networks grew around the species they sought to exploit. However, as the Russian American Company eventually learned, understanding seals only as an economic object put the herd in peril. In order to not outright destroy this particular resource, Russian hunters and RAC management had to learn that furbearing animals were not commodities to the exclusion of their biology. The Alaskan colonies were dependent not only on the world market for the worth of seals, but also on the *seals* to be part of the world market. As the prospect of extinction became very real, new ways of seeing the seal emerged. The Russians became attentive to attributes other than pelt color and size and started looking at their value alive rather than dead. Thus, by the time of Alaska's sale, seals were in a relationship of acknowledged interdependence with human affairs. One Russian even referred to fur seals as "domestic animals." The Russians had come to understand their relationship with these amphibious mammals as one of mutual dependency and simultaneous economic need within an ecological global network.²⁴

²¹ Veniaminov, 157.

²² "Letter from the Board of Administration of the Russian American Company to Captain of the Imperial Navy of the second rank Alexander Hitch Rudakof. Written from St. Petersburg, April 22, 1853," *Fur Seal Arbitration Appendix 1*, 82.

²³ "Letter from the Chief Manager of the Russian American Colonies to the Board of Board of the Administration of the Russian American Colonies. Written from the Colonies, January 13, 1859," *Fur Seal Arbitration Appendix 1*, 86.

²⁴ Veniaminov, 334.

Campus Visitors

Vasili Allenov is a visiting student researcher with ISEEEES for the 2012-2013 Academic Year. As a graduate student from the Far Eastern Federal University's School of Regional and International Studies in Vladivostok, Russia, Allenov is currently taking a 10-month course in International Relations at UC Berkeley.

Giuliana Almeida is a visiting student researcher with ISEEEES during the Fall 2012 semester. She is an M.A. candidate in Language Studies (Russian Culture and Literature Program) at the University of São Paulo, Brazil. While in Berkeley, she will continue her research on Dostoyevsky's biographies.

Vilius Ivanauskas is a visiting Fulbright scholar with ISEEEES for the 2012-2013 Academic Year. He holds a Ph.D. in History from the Lithuanian Institute of History and Klaipėda University. Most recently, Dr. Ivanauskas was a research fellow at the Lithuanian Institute of History, conducting research on soviet intellectuals.

Zhanat Kundakbayeva is a visiting scholar with ISEEEES during the 2012-2013 academic year. Dr. Kundakbayeva is Professor of History at the al Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan. She is a recipient of the Bolashak International Scholarship of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan. While in Berkeley, she will be researching new approaches to historiography and will continue her research of Kazakh history.

Elizabeth McGuire is a visiting scholar with ISEEEES for the 2012-2013 academic year. She holds a Ph.D. in History from UC Berkeley. For the past 2 years, Dr. McGuire has been affiliated with the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs at Harvard University. Her current research project is titled "Communist Neverland: The Russian International Children's Home in Ivanovo and the Global Family it Created, 1933-2013."

Mie Nakachi is a visiting scholar with ISEEEES during the 2012-2013 academic year. She holds a Ph.D. in History from the University of Chicago and has taught as a Visiting Assistant Professor in Russian History and Gender Studies at Hokkaido University in Sapporo, Japan. While in Berkeley, she will research gender issues in the Soviet Union following World War II.

Aghasi Tadevosyan is a visiting Fulbright scholar with ISEEEES for the 2012-2013 academic year. He holds a Ph.D. in Social Anthropology, certified by the Highest Certification Commission of the Republic of Armenia. Dr. Tadevosyan is a professor at Yerevan State University and Senior Scientist at the Institute of Archeology and Ethnography at the National Academy of Sciences in Armenia. His current project involves research regarding transition issues in Armenia, Georgia, and other post-Soviet countries.

Yury Zaretskiy is a Visiting Scholar with ISEEEES for the Fall 2012 semester. He holds a Ph.D. in History from the Institute of General History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, and is currently a Professor of History in the Department of Philosophy at the National Research University - Higher School of Economics, Moscow. His current research focuses on historiography, and he has recently published the book *Strategii Ponimaniia Proshlogo: Teoriia, istoriia, istoriografiia* [Strategies of Understanding the Past: History, Theory, Historiography] (Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie, 2011). While in Berkeley, he is working on a new project that examines historiography in Russian universities from the 18th century to the present with a focus on Soviet and post-Soviet periods.

Ivan Zolotukin is a visiting scholar with ISEEEES for the Fall 2012 semester. Dr. Zolotukin is an associate professor in the Department of International Relations of the Vladivostok Institute of International Studies, Far Eastern Federal University (FEFU). He is currently working to create a Master's Degree course titled "Russia in the Asia-Pacific: Economy, Politics, Security." His research is focused on the political processes in Southeast Asia and the geopolitical situation in the Asia-Pacific.

TROIKA

Troika: An Undergraduate Journal for East European, Eurasian and Slavic Studies is a UC Berkeley publication geared at promoting the study and appreciation of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian cultures by publishing outstanding work by undergraduate students. These works includes academic research papers, memoirs, creative writing, translations, photography, and art.

Troika began as a small student publication in 2010, and the first issue was published in Spring 2011. The journal's following has grown significantly since then with a distribution of several hundred copies of the journal and a more than twofold increase in submissions for the Fall 2012 issue. What started out as a small student publication on campus has now grown to represent undergraduate students from around the world. *Troika's* ongoing drive towards excellence makes this is a great opportunity for any student interested in Eastern European, Eurasian, or Slavic Studies.

The Spring 2012 issue was generously funded by the Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies. The *Troika* staff hosted a release party on August 30, 2012, at the Magnes, the museum of Jewish art and culture in Berkeley. The release party featured a variety of performances, including Polish folk dancing, a Soviet surrealist skit, Serbian traditional songs, and Gypsy dances.

The Fall 2012 issue of the journal is scheduled to be released early in the Spring 2013 semester. If you would like to become involved with *Troika*, please contact the Editor-in-Chief at thetroikajournal@gmail.com. All past issues are available on the *Troika* website (<http://troika.berkeley.edu/archive/>).

Save The Date!

The Annual Colin Miller Lecture

Professor Sergei Guriev, Rector of the New Economic School, Moscow

Date: Thursday, March 21, 2013 | Time: 4:00 p.m.

Place: Heyns Room, Faculty Club, UC Berkeley

.....

The Annual Peter Kujachich Lecture in Serbian and Montenegrin Studies

Professor Andrei W. Simic, Anthropology, University of Southern California

Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2013 | Time: 4:00 p.m.

Place: Toll Room, Alumni House, UC Berkeley

Sponsored by the Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies, UC Berkeley

CASE/CRRC-UC Berkeley Field Project: Fall 2012

The Institute of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, in collaboration with the Centre for Advanced Studies and Education (CASE) at the European Humanities University and the Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC), organizes a bi-annual two-week-long workshop for promising scholars from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine. The workshop is funded by a generous grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Each semester, a total of four scholars ("Carnegie Fellows") are brought to UC Berkeley for an intensive review of key literature, theoretical approaches, and methods employed in a particular field of scholarship. During the Fall 2012 semester, ISEEEES hosted the following scholars:

Petru Negură is a lecturer at the "Ion Creangă" State Pedagogical University of Moldova in Chişinău, Moldova, as well as the Moldova Country Coordinator of the Open Society Foundation's Academic Fellowship Program. He holds a Ph.D. in Sociology from the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris, France. During the CASE/CRRC workshop, he will develop and refine a syllabus on mass education systems in the late Russian empire, interwar eastern Poland (Ukrainian Galicia), interwar Romania (Bessarabia) and Soviet Moldavia from 1918-1956.

Mariam Orkodashvili is a Lecturer at the American University in Tbilisi, Georgia. She holds a doctoral degree in linguistics from Tbilisi State University in conjunction with Moscow State University. Dr. Orkodashvili's research looks at the role of education in post-conflict and transitioning societies. Her current project, Education and Social Cohesion in Post-Chaotic Post-Soviet Societies, provides a comparative study of education's cohesive role in the former Soviet Union.

Alexandr Osipian is an Associate Professor of History in the Department of History and Cultural Studies at Kramatorsk Institute of Economics and Humanities in Ukraine. During the CASE/CRRC workshop he will develop a syllabus for a course on the "Construction and Deconstruction of National Historical Myths in Russia, Ukraine, and Poland," focusing on the role of violence, media, and other political and cultural forces in shaping memory and historical identities.

Iryna Ramanava is an Associate Professor at the Institute of History of the National Academy of Science, Belarus. She received her Ph.D. from the Byelorussian State University in 1998. Professor Ramanava's teaching and research interests include the history of Belarus, Soviet history, oral history, and the sociology of the everyday life. Presently, Professor Ramanava is working on a course Cultural History of Everyday Life in the USSR. The theme she hopes to develop during her visit to UC Berkeley is "From the Historical Anthropology to the New Cultural History."