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This year has been the Institute’s fifth, during which it seems rapidly to be coming of age, although we are still counting the years of this young Institute, perhaps wistfully, for the last time. The present academic year saw the largest cohort of fellows ever, and also witnessed a remarkable augmentation of engaging and dynamic workshops and other types of events that turned the Institute at once into a vibrant place of intellectual interaction and concentrated, productive research.

For the first time, senior and junior fellows were joined by fellows coming under two new programs, the Artists in Residence fellowship and the Global Challenge Fellowship. The former scheme was mounted with the generous support of CEU’s Humanities Initiative and developed for this year in cooperation with the university’s Visual Studies Platform. This fellowship reaches out to artists who combine a keen interest in merging artistic practice with scholarly curiosity and work. This year, the institute was lucky to host three international artists, coming from different fields, Irina Botea (Romania) in documentary video art, Margery Amdur (USA) in installation art and Axel Braun (Germany) in documentary photography. The fact that the artists did not stay in their ateliers and office but brought their work to our community of fellows created a fascinating, and enduring, conjunction of artistic and scholarly discussions on methods and modes of presentation and representation.

The new Global Challenge Fellowship is offered jointly with the university’s School of Public Policy as well as the Global Public Policy Institute in Berlin and is supported by the Volkswagen Foundation. In this unique scheme, professionals and scholars in selected areas of public policy from non-OECD countries are hosted jointly by our Institute and the School, facilitating conversations between academics
and professionals, creating links with other parts of the world, inspiring each other in ways for which there is usually little opportunity. In its first year, an anthropologist from India, Medha Chatuverdi, a political scientist from Iran, Mohammad Hassan Khani and an economist from South-Africa, John Luiz were awarded this fellowship. For our Institute, this proved to be a most promising start, and a venture into new ways of opening the Institute to research of direct public relevance.

The extraordinary array of workshops and events organized by fellows provide another indicator of intellectual chemistry and the academic stimulus of this year’s class. A full list is offered at the end of this book. These meetings and discussions took place as individually organized workshops or collaborative events inspired on the spot or suggested by encounters, but they all bear the mark of novelty and intense intellectual engagement. As a result, new, and sometimes surprising, partnerships with local and international institutions took off on campus. This year, some cluster of themes emerged when Habsburg historians joined Ottoman and Romanov scholars, when modern East European sociologists met Soviet history experts, when fellows from different disciplines argued on the interface of life science, sociology and history, when literary studies scholars met with political scientists to seek for a new perspective on cults. Some of these workshops and questions that arose here led to the emergence of new research groups and constellations for which the Institute will remain a hub and partner in conversation and site for intriguing, engaging discussion and productive writing.

In a slight departure from earlier practice, we asked fellows contributing to this Yearbook to write about their stay at our Institute, both on campus in Pest and at the Raoul Wallenberg Guesthouse on the hills of Buda. Reflecting the fellows’ time in Budapest, the testimonies offer a live impression of their stay. These reflections document an intensive intellectual year, with unexpected encounters and new venues emerging, with new chapters developed, new books and articles being produced, all of which together constitute what makes an Institute for Advanced Study.

I had only some vague ideas about the inner life of the still young Institute for Advanced Study when I took office in the summer of 2015 and moved from my department to the Institute. Approaching this task with a certain a sense of reverence, paired with excitement and curiosity, the class of 2015/16, “my first year”, proved to be most rewarding and absorbing. The present Annual Yearbook offers some testimony to this experience.
Fellows
I came to Budapest to finish a book on how anatomy, a fundamental medical discipline, responded to dramatic social and political changes in Vienna, a leading centre of medical research and education as well as a diverse and dynamic capital of a large empire and then a small country. The manuscript had been sitting untouched since my job in New Zealand (from late 2008) and my children (born in 2010 and 2013) had claimed much of my time. I also intended to revive professional networks that had suffered through the combination of distance and parental leaves; and to give my children an opportunity to live overseas, experience a large European city and see their maternal family more often. In New Zealand I work on history and philosophy of evolution, heredity and evolution and I collaborate with scientists and philosophers of science. The IAS year was to provide an opportunity to talk to historians and social scientists. The plan was ambitious and practical challenges were many, although the staff at the IAS and the Raoul Wallenberg Guesthouse supported us generously. But eventually the daycare was found, babysitters booked and I could get on with my plan.

The book immediately started to take a rather different shape to the one sketched years ago. Some of the change was influenced by my New Zealand research. But my IAS year had much to do with it too. Talking
to the colleagues at IAS and CEU as well as in Vienna working on genetic
to research on Roma (Mihai Surdu), forms of eugenics in Hungary (Emese
Lafferton, History), the concepts of human nature (Maria Kronfeldner,
Philosophy), social sciences in the early twentieth century Romania (Calin
Cotoi), “soft” heredity and socio-biology in Vienna (colleagues in Vienna),
as well as many guest lecturers and visitors (mainly, but not only, to the
Science Studies lecture series organized by Karl Hall) was invaluable.
These conversations encouraged me to inquire how ideas about evolution
and heredity, which underpinned social programmes aimed at improving
the ‘quality’ of population, played out in anatomy. The next step was to
consider the relationship between different concepts of heredity (e.g.
“Lamarckian” or “soft” heredity changeable by environmental influences
versus “hard” heredity resistant to external factors) and not just party
politics, as has often been done, but what may be considered national
traditions in science. My idea was to show that the view of medicine
that had been fostered in the Empire since the reforms of Maria Theresa
and Joseph II in the eighteenth century—medicine as practical applied
knowledge rather than science—gave rise to an idiosyncratic “Lamarckian”
heredity, eventually underpinning the 1920s social welfare programmes.
My thoughts about this longue durée history of biology and medicine in
the Habsburg Empire were influenced by conversations with Madalina
Veres and William O’Reilly, and the workshop organized by Madalina in
May 2016, on the production and communication of scientific knowledge
within the imperial realm. I tested my argument as it developed, from an
early draft in January at Science Studies Seminar Series, a short version
at a conference in early May (organized by IAS fellow Calin Cotoi), to
a longer version presented in late May in Vienna. Without these test
runs, a big lecture on Vienna in Vienna would have been daunting!
The IAS year also reshaped the last part of the book, on anatomy from
the fall of “Red” Vienna to the aftermath of the Second World War. The
protagonist was Eduard Pernkopf, a talented anatomist as well as leading
Nazi academic of “Anschluss” Vienna. Pernkopf profited from the easy
supply with cadavers of prisoners executed under harsh Nazi legislation
to produce an anatomical atlas that in the second half of the twentieth
century would be hailed as the masterpiece of medical illustration. While
the politics of anatomy in “Third Reich”—and its consequences for
present-day medicine—remains prominent in my work, conversations
with artists at the IAS and art historians in Vienna have made me realize that I needed to say more about art and creativity in difficult times. Pernkopf’s atlas would not have been a success without the unusually qualified, creative and tightly knit group of artists that produced it. What kind of political and social processes brought this group to anatomy? How did the economic crisis post-1929 and the disappearance of Jewish patrons in the 1930s change the forms of artistic creativity? Talking to Axel Braun and Irina Botea, observing how they engage with current and historical social issues, how they choose media, and how they move between genres, spurred me to ask similar questions from “my” historical actors.

There are many other stories I could write about how the year at the IAS has changed my work: from what I am reading now to the direction of my new project. I have mentioned only a few all my fellow-fellows while I have learned much from all of them. But these two paragraphs about two crucial parts of my book illustrate how these influences were both wide and unexpected. The same can be said about the influences on my family. My six-year daughter now understands what a refugee is, has developed a love for puppetry and has a close Hungarian friend with whom she Skypes frequently. My dinosaur-obsessed toddler son has seen real dinosaur remains, something he cannot see in New Zealand. We will all fondly remember Budapest and we hope to be back soon.

Mohammad Hassan Khani
Imam Sadiq University, Tehran, Iran, Senior Global Challenges Fellow at IAS CEU

Regional Integration as a Means for Lasting Peace & Sustainable Development in the Middle East

The Global Challenges Fellowship provided me with a very good opportunity for a few months to stay away from my routine regular activities such as teaching and administrative tasks, and to focus basically on a research project that I have been working on for a long time. Residing at CEU and enjoying the academic environment at the Institute for Advanced Study & School of Public Policy gave me this wonderful chance to concentrate on my research project regarding regional integration as a trend in International Relations in general and its chance in the Middle East in particular. Since the second half of the twentieth century onwards, regional integration has been regarded as a mechanism which proved to be fruitful in moving towards integration and convergence in different regions of the world. Defining and drawing the lines common interests is the first step in this long road. It is the objective of this project to explore how moving towards regional integration based on geographical closeness,
cultural interaction, and economic cooperation can create the framework for a less divided Middle East leading to a new regional subsystem which is more united and more harmonized, somehow similar to that of the EU today. The project further suggests and explores the mechanisms by which Middle East countries can move towards this kind of regional integration by planning and adopting a transnational public policy, building their own transnational institution and structures. It also investigates how the EU both as a model and as a facilitator can contribute to this process, paving the way for reconciliation, mutual understanding, and partnership between Islam and West. An important part of this project is about the challenges of this approach in which the author argues that that there are a huge number of significant obstacles on the road namely rivalry among some countries in the region, attempts by some members to become dominant actor in the region, intervention by outside players, colonial and postcolonial legacies, and also different preferences and priorities. A large part of my project will seek to find the ways by which we can create what Karl Deutsch names as a “sense of community” in the countries in the Middle East. This surely constitutes a very essential element in the process of integration. It is one of my arguments that the following issues must be seen as the foundation of moving towards integration in the Middle East:

- Developing a common understanding about each other, and about the region, and developing a genuine and natural empathy towards each other in a way that each nation feels and perceives the other nation's pain and misery or joy and prosperity as its own.
- Creating a relative degree of loyalty and building bilateral and multilateral sense of trust, faith and confidence towards each other which makes it easy to cooperate with each other.
- Reassuring the fact that in spite of the different nationalities, ethnic roots, and religions that they belong to, still they can enjoy a deep and meaningful sense of oneness which gives them a sense of common identity.

While enjoying the above factors, it is easy to imagine how nations of such qualities and similarities can start acting in a collective and cooperative manner, overcoming the difficulties, reducing the areas of dispute and turning challenges of a conflict into opportunities for cooperation and moving towards regional integration. It is not difficult to imagine how different countries which share the above
factors can facilitate their move towards integration. However as far as the Middle East is concerned it seems that there must be a minimum level of the above factors available for starting the process of regional integrations, and then as the result of the process, if successful, these seven issues will reach to the maximum level. The lack of this minimum level perhaps is the most important challenge facing the process of Regional Integration in this region.

The nations engaged in the integration process usually start this process by trying it in just one or a very few fields and then gradually this limited areas can and will lead to taking joint decisions in a wide range of other fields from security to political relations, from agriculture to culture, from environment and energy to transport and trade etc. As time passes, and as the new concerns emerge, the new areas of cooperation and competition begin to come into sight. Hence, the durability, consistency and stability of any integration attempt which demonstrates itself in a regional bloc and organization does depend to a great extent on how the lines of cooperation and competition between players will be defined and drawn. Again as far as Middle East is concerned it is very important that the countries in this region learn and accept that cooperation and competition do work at the same time in a healthy manner. Since in regional integration these lines are defined on the most natural commonality between the member states, therefore the risk of collapse and disintegration becomes less and less.

Talking about challenges facing regional integration in the Middle East I argue that the following factors are among the most important ones: Historical differences and gaps, colonial and postcolonial legacies (MAPS), ethnic and sectarian variations, absence of a political will, deep mistrust, chronic misunderstandings, sharp, deep and meaningful difference between people and ruling authorities in some countries in terms of their view of the region, their preferences, their priorities, (nations vs. states) unlike the EU and ASEAN. In these two cases the views of nations and governments were and are identical or very close unlike in many Arab countries in the Middle East where there is a huge gap between the two.

It is one of my main argument in this project that regional integration in the Middles East is not only a means for achieving peace and reconciliation in this region, but can also be a big contribution to international peace and security. In this context an important part of this project will look into the role of outside
players in general and that of the EU in particular in this process. The project finally tries to make a few suggestions and suggest solutions from an Iranian perspective. These two final parts is the ones that I continue working on during the next couple of months.

Initiating this research project and planning to turn it to a policy paper or an academic journal, I began my work prior to my arrival at IAS by collecting data from different sources including books and articles authored by scholars in this field accessible in my home country. Upon arrival, I continued a comprehensive literature review to see and read and evaluate the sources which could be helpful for my project. In addition to doing these reviews, I conducted many face to face discussions with a number university faculty from different departments and schools, and also with a number of fellows who were here in fellowship programs. These meetings were surely a very important aspect of my stay here and a very useful part of the fellowship program in terms of establishing new connections. The people I met and their institutional affiliations are a valuable asset to me in terms of giving me and my colleagues at ISU, and also my graduate and postgraduate students there, the opportunity to expand the circle of our academic network enabling us for more academic cooperation and collaborations in different forms namely sharing thoughts and views in different disciplines, sharing the conferences and seminar opportunities, and even discussing the possibly of exchange programs between our institutions.

My experience has been phenomenal. The opportunity to be based at the IAS and GPPi for these months has been extraordinary. It has provided me with the opportunity to think, write and engage with scholarship full time resulting in tremendous productivity in a relatively short period. The weekly IAS seminars, the almost daily opportunities to attend CEU seminars, and the interaction with leading scholars has been enlightening. All the facilities were excellent. I had access to everything I needed to work productively and the staff at the IAS/SPP and Guesthouse were outstanding.

As regards the academic objectives of the Fellowship, these have been met. I worked on two journal papers to near completion and
intend submitting them to top-tier international journal publications. Unfortunately scholars from Africa do not always get these sorts of opportunities so being able to publish in leading journals is a major achievement which the Fellowship has assisted with.

In the first paper we examine locational portfolio switching as a mechanism for institutional arbitrage within multinational enterprises (MNEs). Our stylized framework suggests three threshold levels of home country institutional risk affecting outward foreign direct investment: hysteresis (in a stable home country), escape (for a highly unstable home country) and, our focus in this paper, the middle case when there is some but potentially manageable instability, resulting in locational portfolio switching. We argue that instability in a locale can trigger a dynamic process by which firms shift and rebalance the portfolio of institutional locations across which they operate. We examine this in a longitudinal study of South Africa.

In the second paper we examine the clash of values within MNEs. With increasing levels of globalization and changing economic structures, MNEs are recognizing the added value that diversity brings to the organization. Diversity in the global workplace is a complex issue, but LGBT diversity in particular, presents its own unique set of challenges as a result of the polarized divide worldwide between countries where recognition and acceptance of LGBT rights is increasing, and those where it is socially taboo, illegal, or in some extreme cases, even punishable by death. A MNE’s human resource management (HRM) practices needs to be mindful of the cultural and social differences between the local context of host countries and that of their home countries. Balancing the localization of HRM practices with the need for global integration is a critical dilemma for MNEs. A qualitative approach is used in this study to explore the HRM challenges that MNEs face with regard to LGBT employees and how they are managed. We argue that MNEs experience difficulty in reconciling their global values and policies with local socio-cultural environments and legislative requirements as regards LGBT rights. This is compounded by the ‘invisibility’ of LGBT employees and heteronormative environments.

c) The Fellowship states that “The goal of this unique collaborative program is to forge closer ties between Europe and researchers from outside the “established West,” and to encourage the development
of fresh perspectives on some of the world’s most pressing global public policy challenges.” Both my papers speak to this directly and have significant policy and practical implications.

As regards the first paper. Firstly, it reinforces the importance of institutions. They matter not only for host countries but also in home countries where they influence the capability of firms to internationalize and provide complementary country specific advantages to emerging MNEs investing in similar locales. They are also important push factors which influence the nature and location of investment decision abroad. Secondly, from a policy perspective it points to the importance of getting the institutions right. The process of internationalization can either be a positive one where it reinforces development back home or can represent one of fleeing home country uncertainty. The latter may result in the gradual detachment from the home base and negatively affect development prospects. Thirdly, from a managerial standpoint, our work helps them to better understand the process of internationalization and to make sense of the different choices they face in potential host countries and that their needs may differ over time. Firms are not passive institution takers but can become institution makers through their investment decisions. They can also turn institutional disadvantage to their advantage by investing in countries with similar institutional environments which they understand and often which act as entry barriers to MNEs from the industrialized world. Lastly, we have demonstrated the importance of the Latin saying ‘caveat emptor’ – ‘let the buyer (or investor) beware’. Many a MNE may still be tripped up by the institutional and policy uncertainty in emerging markets. Witnessing the push motive of outward OFDI from emerging markets should act as an important signal to potential investors in these countries. Home country advantage includes that of insider information about policy, risk and transaction costs. This should not be underestimated by those MNEs seeking to do business in emerging countries.

As regards the second paper, we show that corporate values need to be embedded in every facet of an organization and this means promoting these values actively. An MNE cannot live these values at home and then fail to implement them in its subsidiaries. Whilst we have focused on one dimension namely how these values affect LGBT employees, compromising on this is a slippery slope towards
further compromises. Living the values may be testing especially for an MNE which operates in culturally distant locales but if the values are fundamental then they need to be imposed from above - or the MNE should either not articulate these values or should not be operating in that country. We are fast-reaching a time when corporate activism will no longer be extraordinary but be expected.

I have also built up valuable contacts on this Fellowship and foresee this leading to further collaboration in the future. I intend staying in contact with SPP and IAS at CEU and the other Fellows; as well as with the GPPi.

Let me begin by saying that my six months at the IAS have been an absolute pleasure and one of the most rewarding periods I have spent as a researcher and as a historian. From the time I arrived in January until my departure in June 2016, I was made feel welcome, comfortable, supported and encouraged and I was presented with that rare, precious opportunity to think, test and write.

When I arrived in January, my first encounter with the IAS was actually with the staff at the Wallenberg Guesthouse; I arrived in the evening time and so moved directly in to my apartment there. The first morning, I met with Ágnes Forgo who showed me around and insured my apartment and access to shared resources at the residence was comfortable and as required. Ágnes began as she and her colleagues, especially Éva Gelei, would continue; entirely supporting and always speedy in her replies to my emails. The Wallenberg Guesthouse is a wonderful resource and surely a key part of the successfully Fellowship scheme. Having a modern, comfortable, ideally-located residence which is a breathtaking walk from the IAS offices is quite exceptional. The residence also offers the best balance between privacy and community; fellows in residence can share common space, can call on each other and entertain, if they choose and at those times when a fellow chooses to be more isolated, writing or reading, then that is also possible. Another aspect of life at Wallenberg was the ability to book guest accommodation for friends and family who visited; this made it so much easier than having to house visitors at a distance. The Wallenberg Guesthouse is an important reason why the IAS Fellowship scheme is so desirous and,
ultimately, why it was such a successful research and writing time for me.

In advance of my arrival in Budapest, I had communicated a hope to have an office at the IAS, allowing me to spend most of my working days in a distinct work environment and in a space where I would be closer to the CEU library and other colleagues. As in this instance, my email correspondence before arriving was with Éva Gönczi, and her professionalism and expeditious replies to my many emails of enquire before I arrived made settling in extremely easy and rapid. On arrival at the IAS on my first morning, Éva met me, showed me around and introduced me to many people. This was a great start to my stay and I met on that first day some of the fellows who had been in residence since October.

I believe the greatest support while being a Fellow, in addition to that offered institutionally by the Director of the Institute and the staff, is that which came from being part of a community of scholars, each of whom was all-too-aware of how exceptional it is to be granted a period of time away from one’s home institution to work on one’s own work. More, it became clear what the complementarity of interests among members of the fellowship meant, there were subsets of the fellowship with overlapping academic interests which led to immediate synergies. This did not occur to the detriment of the fellowship as a whole, nor to the exclusion of anyone, but rather added to the dynamism of many conversations we had at the Institute or on one’s own time. Again, the ability to meet in the Institute common room over coffee, to meet over lunch or dinner at the Wallenberg or elsewhere, all made the cultivation of these shared interests very easy. And importantly, I should note that these friendships and shared work interest have resulted in I and some of my fellow fellows organizing conference panels in the United States, meeting at conferences in France and organising a conference in the UK, all in the first three months after my fellowship came to an end.

My working life at the IAS, then, was made very easy, as was the opportunities to socialize with other resident fellows. The focal point of the IAS week was the Wednesday seminar and lunch, the one weekly occasion when all fellows gathered together to listen, in turn, to each other speak on their current work and to continue conversation over lunch thereafter. One simple practice is worthy of mention: each week, the speaker was introduced by the speaker form the preceding week. I felt
this was a fine practice and another way in which fellows worked together. Wednesday seminars and lunches were good opportunities, too, to catch up with fellows whom one might not otherwise have seen on a regular basis, perhaps because they did not opt to have an office at the IAS.

All told, I made real and significant progress with my work while a Fellow. I attribute my success to the ease and comfort afforded me while a fellow, the care and support offered me, in the first instance, by the Director of the IAS, Prof Nadia Al-Bagdadi, whose very real interest in each fellow’s work was a marvel to see, and whose commitment to the Institute and its Fellows is exemplary; by the wonderful staff at the IAS and at the Wallenberg Guesthouse; by my fellow Fellows, and by the many members of CEU’s Department of History and other colleagues at the MTA/Hungarian Academy of Sciences and at ELTE with whom I interacted and from whom I learned so much. And not least, I owe thanks to the city of Budapest and to her residents. Budapest and the IAS will remain very special to me and I am immensely grateful to have spent time as a fellow of the Institute. May it always be a place of academic life and learning. Őszintén kívánom, hogy az IAS jövendőbeli tagjai is olyan termékeny és élményekben gazdag időszakot töltsenek Magyarországon, mint amilyenben nekem volt részem.

Corina L. Petrescu
The University of Mississippi

The Jewish State Theater in Bucharest

When I arrived in Budapest in October 2015, I was looking forward to nine months of just research. It was my first sabbatical after 10 years of academic activity and I really wanted to make it count. I had planned out how I was going to finish the first draft of my manuscript, while not allowing anything else to distract me. I did not plan to attend any conferences in my major field of research (German Studies) and I declined the IAS’s generous offer to organize any workshops or conferences pertaining to my new field (Jewish Studies). I wanted to focus on writing. The IAS’s greatest appeal to me had been the prospect of having time—I thought of it in terms of the IAS’s gift to me—just to do my own research and to write. And that I did, but also so much more. Whether by public lectures and workshops at CEU, documentary film series at the Open Society Archives, a good conversation with a Fellow over a cup of coffee and a piece of krémes, a walk along the banks of the Danube while mentally mapping out my next task at hand, my time as a Fellow was
greatly enriched. The IAS offered me the opportunity to think beyond the confines of a particular project and to broaden my perspectives by sharing ideas and having discussions with Fellows from multiple disciplines.

My work at the IAS marked a return to a project I had begun ten years earlier as a post-doctoral fellow but I had not completed because post-graduate reality (getting a tenure-track job and then tenure, raising a child, etc.) had kicked in. Because in my heart I had never turned away from it, I assumed that I would jump right into it, obtain some more archival materials from archives that had not been available to me earlier, analyze them, put things to paper, and wrap everything up, at least in the form of a first draft.

Intermezzo: My goal is to write a cultural history of Teatrul Evreiesc de Stat (TES/ The Jewish State Theater) in Bucharest, Romania, from its establishment in 1948, in the aftermath of the Second World War and the Shoah, to the present. I seek to uncover the factors that made this founding possible as well as situate the theater in the historical, cultural, and political context of communist and post-communist Romania. The purpose of this research is to further a better understanding of Jewish life in post-Second World War Eastern Europe.

My work was a continuation, not a fresh start, so how hard could it be? But I was wrong. Going over my old notes and annotations, I found myself wondering about some of the connections I had made or the angles I had taken on one issue or another. Several books that I had used earlier had been reedited, so I had to consult them again. New books had been published about various aspects of Jewish theater mostly in the USA, but also in Britain, the former Soviet Union, and even South Africa. While their existence attested to a growing interest in the topic in general, it also made me wonder how come no one had paid any attention to the Jewish theater in Romania over the course of the previous decade. It was after all a still functioning, more or less Yiddish-language theater that could look upon a tradition reaching as far back as 1876! Was I really the only one who thought this to be worthy of investigation? If that was so, would my passive knowledge of Yiddish be enough to do justice to this cultural forum? Would I not miss out on meanings and nuances by simply reading documents in Yiddish (letters, but also diaries of former actors) with a mostly German frame of mind? How about the plays performed on stage but never translated
into any other language that I mastered? Would aspects therein not be
lost on me because I did not speak Yiddish? Particularly with respect
to the theater’s existence during Romania’s communist years, nuances
were essential, so how could I approach my project without seriously
improved language skills? I needed time to work on these skills and
now I had it. Could I pass on the chance to work toward fluency? I
couldn’t; even less so after I learned that a Yiddish conversation class
was offered at ELTE University. I attended that class religiously and
learned a lot, while also striking a friendship with “my professor”, Szonja
Komoróczy. Szonja has been an inspiration in terms of her vast knowledge
of Jewish cultural history across spaces and centuries. But I have come
to appreciate her in particular for her kind and generous nature both
as an academic and as a person. Dem grestn dank, tayere Szonja!

The challenge of being a Fellow at an interdisciplinary institute
for advanced studies is making your research accessible to the other
Fellows—who naturally do not come from your own discipline—, and
convincing them that your work has larger implications than merely
creating a niche for oneself. During the Wednesday Seminars and the
ensuing discussions over lunch, each Fellow tried to do just that. I
appreciated all the critical comments and suggestions I received after
my lecture as some of them have pushed me to consider aspects of my
work differently from my original approach. For example, I decided
to regard Jewish theatrical life in what became Greater Romania
in 1918 in the larger context of Central and Eastern Europe going
as far back as the immediate aftermath of the First World War.

Louise Vásvari’s presence at the IAS during the second half of my
fellowship has impacted not only my work but also my social life in
Budapest. Professionally, we discovered a common interest in a forgotten
Shoah survivor, Ana Novac, whose life and oeuvre she approached
through Novac’s memoirist writing published in France while I was
interested in Novac’s dramaturgic work prior to her emigration from
Romania. Long discussions over several lunches have led me to consider
writing an article about Ana Novac’s tragic existence as a female Shoah
survivor from multicultural Transylvania, whose life story was marked
by the two major ideologies of the mid- and late 20th century, Fascism
and Communism. Socially, Louise has helped me navigate Budapest’s
culinary map in ways I could not have done by myself given that I do
not speak Hungarian, nor have I had the leisure to learn more than a few common phrases. The life of a pescaterian is not easy in the land of geese and Mangalica pigs, but with Louise’s help I found places off the beaten path of tourists and not belonging to chain restaurants that served classic Hungarian dishes with a vegetarian twist.

Yet, my greatest discovery in Budapest stimulated by Éva Fodor’s lecture at the first Fellows’ Club meeting has been the cukrászda, the ultimate cake shop. After too many visits to count—both impromptu and carefully orchestrated—to numerous such cake shops, I must confess to having turned from a chocoholic into a krémes-addict. If the carefully reconstructed architecture of the city’s central districts or its wonderful musical scene will not win Budapest a spot in your heart, then this creamy-custardy goodness sandwiched between layers of flaky pastry called krémes is certainly going to do so.

As I look back on my collage “Life @ IAS”, I am happily surprised at what I was able to achieve during these nine months without focusing just on my research. I wrote first drafts of the introduction and two chapters for my project on the TES. I finalized a volume I have co-edited with Valentina Glajar and Alison Lewis about secret police files as a form of life writing, which is forthcoming in December 2016. I edited the first drafts of six articles that will appear in a special issue of the German Studies’ journal Monatshefte (forthcoming in summer 2018), where I am a guest editor alongside my previously mentioned two colleagues—the special issue focusses on literary and filmic representations of state repression and surveillance in late 20th and early 21stcentury German-language culture. I submitted three articles for publication—two will appear in print before the end of the year and one is under review—and an abstract (which was accepted) to the Yiddish Studies conference in Germany in September 2016. For June 2016, I co-organized a panel at the Modern Language Association’s first international symposium in Düsseldorf, Germany, to promote the aforementioned book on secret police files, and I also collaborated with Valentina Glajar and Alison Lewis on a seminar, Cold War Spy Stories, for the German Studies Association’s conference in San Diego, CA, USA in Fall 2016. I refreshed my French knowledge by engaging with Ana Novac’s works in that language, and I reached a basic, yet satisfying, fluency in Yiddish to build upon as I progress in my research. Last, but certainly not the least important addition to the
collage, are the relationships—both professional and personal—that I developed. The former will hopefully lead to fruitful exchanges and collaborations, and the latter to joyous reencounters in the near future.

My research topic is the history of the communist-led peace movement from the 1940s to the 1960s.

Initiated by the 1948 Wroclaw Congress of Intellectuals for Peace, the communist-led peace movement was a powerful instrument of Soviet foreign policy, which by the early 1950s had eclipsed Cominform as the centrepiece of Stalin’s cold war strategy. The movement’s leadership – the World Peace Council (WPC) – was the apex of a global network of thousands of national and local peace committees. The WPC was also supported by a dazzling array of scientists, artists and intellectuals. Hundreds of millions of people across the world supported WPC anti-nuclear petitions such as the Stockholm Appeal.

The communist peace movement is commonly seen as a transmission belt for Moscow’s foreign policy. But recent research in Russian archives shows that the transmission of policies, ideas and influence was a two-way affair. The peace movement helped shape not just Moscow’s foreign policy but the postwar identity of the Soviet Union and other communist bloc countries as peace-loving states.

After Stalin’s death the Soviet leadership embraced the WPC’s agenda with even more enthusiasm and Moscow’s discourse on world politics began to coalesce with that of the peace movement - a discourse in which global society was seen as a domain of citizen action and initiative as well as a site of class struggle. Within the Soviet Union there developed a powerful domestic peace movement, which reinforced the priority given by the leadership to the struggle for peace internationally. Through its international connections the Soviet peace movement was instrumental in countering the USSR’s isolationism during the late Stalin era and in fostering reengagement with the outside world in the post-Stalin period. Within the wider communist bloc the struggle for peace was a crucial source of legitimation for the emerging people’s democracies.

The peace movement failed to end the cold war but it did act as a counterweight to its further escalation. In the post-Stalin era the movement’s campaigns and propaganda was an important
factor in the shift in western public opinion towards détente and the ‘spirit of Geneva’. The peace movement was particularly important in France and Italy, where it was sponsored by strong communist parties and allied to influential neutralist movements.

By 1956 the WPC had been transformed from a Soviet front organisation into a more independent, diverse and pluralistic movement. It is this change in character that explains the depth of the split in the movement over the Soviet invasion of Hungary.

During my stay in Budapest I focused on the role of Ilya Ehrenburg, a Soviet delegate to the WPC and a key lobbyist for the peace movement in Moscow. Ehrenburg’s influence was particularly pronounced after Stalin’s death and he played a pivotal role during the 1956 crisis. Ehrenburg’s response to the Hungarian events was the topic of my IAS seminar paper.

The IAS Fellowship enabled me to make a short trip to the Russian archives in Moscow and to work in the Open Society Archive (OSA) in Budapest. In the OSA I found a great deal of new material on Ehrenburg and on various other aspects of the peace movement’s history.

As a result of the Fellowship, my thinking about the research has evolved into a project that will explore the peace movement through a study of the core leadership of the WPC: J.D. Bernal, Isabelle Blume, Pierre Cot, Ilya Ehrenburg, Frédéric Joliot-Curie and Pietro Nenni. An examination of the individual and collective roles of ‘Stalin’s Peacemakers’ will uncover the different dimensions of this important topic in early cold war history – a story of the rise and fall of a powerful movement, which casts light on how nuclear war was averted and on the critical role of transnational movements in shaping not just great power relations but the domestic identities of diverse societies.

The Fellowship was a wonderful experience, not least because of the stimulation and friendship of my colleagues.
The specific objective of my fellowship with IAS was to transform my PhD thesis into a book to be published by a renowned publisher. The larger objective of my two-year fellowship with the Open Society Foundation Roma Initiatives Office (OSF RIO) was to contribute to the shift of the dominant discourse on Roma from social inclusion to identity and other topics. During my stay at IAS, I managed to write almost the entire manuscript of the future book and CEU Press approved my book concept for publication. I conducted additional research to be able to turn my thesis into a manuscript.

On the down size, I did not finalize the manuscript of my book as the initial plan was. However, and this might be regarded as the most important achievement of my fellowship, I used the opportunities offered by my stay at IAS to apply for the position of Chair in Romani Studies at CEU. Following an open competition, I was selected to serve as the first Chair in Romani Studies at CEU. I consider my successful application for the Chair position as the most important achievement, going beyond the objectives set for my stay with IAS or the overall objective of my fellowship with OSF RIO.

In addition to conducting research, writing the manuscript and getting it accepted for publication, during my stay at IAS I engaged in other academic activities that contributed to my visibility as a scholar. Below are some of the highlights of such activities:

On November 2, 2015, I was invited as a keynote speaker at the conference organized by the Center for Higher Education Research at the University of Sussex on inclusive education. My presentation “Inclusive education and ethnic identity: Educational policies for Roma in Central and Eastern Europe” was based on my previous work on education and policy-making towards Roma. Roma and non-Roma PhD students and academics from Universities of Sussex, CEU, Plymouth and Brighton attended the conference.

On November 3, 2015 I gave a presentation on “Antigypsyism and institutional responses to it” at the conference organized by University of Brighton. Academics from UK, Hungary, Belgium, Germany, Netherlands, Spain, and US focusing on Romani studies attended the conference. I presented the European Roma Institute for Arts and Culture as an institutional response to antigypsyism in Europe and its potential to generate social change for the Roma communities.
On November 6, 2015, I gave a lecture called “Antigypsyism as a System of Oppression” to Roma Access Program students, talking about its intellectual roots and manifestations. I participated in the conference “Inside the Struggle: The U.S. Civil Rights Movement & the European Roma Rights Crisis” that took place on December 7-8 at CEU where I had a presentation on policy-making towards Roma and reflected on framings and challenges in the policy-making process.

On December 10, 2015, I was invited to organize a workshop in the conference organized by the German Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs and OSF on the topic of anti-Gypsyism and research. In addition to getting to know other scholars and experiences from institutions combating anti-Semitism in Germany and elsewhere, a lesson I got out of this event is the necessity to develop a definition and to insist on the ways antigypsysism is embedded in state institutions.

On February 22, 2016 I delivered a lecture at CEU based on my work for the upcoming book “Ethnicity, Power and Inclusion: Why Policies towards Roma in Europe are failing”. I had a tremendous opportunity to present my work and my ideas and to receive invaluable feedback from a highly qualified and diverse audience. My lecture was summarized by a journalist for a Hungarian language news portal: http://abcug.hu/ugy-probaljuk-segiteni-romakat-hogy-azt-sem-tudjuk-kik-azok/

On March 7, 2016, I delivered a presentation on the situation of Roma in Europe to a group of 15 journalism students from Arizona State University. The meeting was organized by the CEU Center for Media, Data and Society.

I submitted an abstract to contribute to a book with a chapter on critical policy-making towards Roma in Europe that was accepted by the editors and was included within the book concept submitted to a publisher.

I worked with Professor Ethel Brooks and other academics to organize the 2016 CEU Summer School Performing Romani Identities: Strategy and Critique. This is a major event for Romani studies at CEU, being the second time when the event is organized by a group of Roma and non-Roma faculty, exploring critical approaches to Romani studies.

After spending an academic year with IAS, I can say that I was privileged to be part of the group of fellows that IAS hosted during 2015-2016. In fact, if I have to mention one single aspect about my fellowship with IAS, it is the benefit of being part of a stimulating and creative
intellectual environment. IAS is a very welcoming place where one could share ideas, expect feedback and receive support from all colleagues. Even though some of the colleagues are working on some very different topics, one might still learn from other disciplines something relevant for his/her own research topic. The weekly seminar and the follow up lunch is a very good idea and IAS should continue to organize them. These are occasions where all the fellows have the opportunity to meet and talk. It is especially relevant for those that are not living in the CEU Guest House and/or do not have an office at IAS. In addition to individual work, socialization is one of the most important components of the IAS fellowship. I benefited from sharing ideas with colleagues, learning from them and receiving generous feedback on my work.

Last but not least, the IAS team was very friendly, welcoming and supportive. I did enjoy my time at IAS and I hope I will keep in contact with other fellows and the IAS team.

I spent five months at the IAS at CEU. This was a very productive and stimulating time for my research. I started on new project which built on my previous work (Trust in Early Modern International Political Thought, 1598-1713 Cambridge University Press 2017) to explore the role of trust and mistrust between European states in the emergence of international political thought through the first half of the eighteenth century, from the Peace of Utrecht in 1713 to the Peace of Paris in 1763.

The atmosphere and working conditions at the CEU were superb. I greatly enjoyed the weekly seminars and our discussions on the range of projects. IAS understands very well to create a stimulating atmosphere for critical formal and informal discussions. Their way of running things can only be recommended. It has been one of the best experiences in a long time of various research visits at many different institutions. I profited from the discussion groups which were organised by the History department and other events at the Academy and other academic institutions in Budapest. The city itself is a lively and culturally vibrant place which offers a range of attractive cultural events even if one doesn’t speak the language.

The aim of my new project was to look at new aspects I hadn’t studied so far: a) the relations between commerce and peace in this period and b) the world beyond Europe and the relations between European
and non-European actors and their interests. Multi-faceted arguments concerning trust in interstate relations circulated within Europe during the eighteenth century – a historical situation where war and conflict were rife and trust between states was volatile. If the relations between sovereign states were inherently antagonistic, could there ever be trust between states? What were the political and economic incentives to trust? To what extent did eighteenth-century discourses and doctrines of international law and balance of power, or the projects to establish federal structures and institutions to achieve peace and stability, rely on trust? Or, to what extent did these different concepts help to improve conditions in order to foster trust?

Programmatic eighteenth-century approaches to relations between European states generated three great currents of political thought. Firstly, theories informed by reason of state and state interest led to the concept of a competitive balance of power and competitive economics. Reason of state demanded the calculation of the state’s interests, to be pursued by all available political, military and economic means. Thus, as a correlate of reason of state in foreign policy, the concepts of a balance of power and of politics informed by state interests increasingly dominated international political thought. Secondly, juridical and philosophical theories applied natural law to interstate relations and proposed a jus publicum Europaeum as a reliable juridical framework. A new kind of international law emerged as the law of states, as understood by Burlamaqui (1694-1748), Heineccius (1681-1741), Wolff (1679-1754), Vattel (1714-1767) and Moser (1701-1785). Thirdly, a number of projects aimed to achieve perpetual peace on the basis of a state system tamed by federal structures.

To distinguish between these different approaches, we need to contextualise them both in comparison with rival positions and in relation to concrete political controversies and the prevailing interested parties. But all three approaches confronted the central obstacle: the sovereignty of the state. In this complex set of circumstances, what was the political role of trust? The positive notion of trust and trustworthiness found its negative counterweight in mistrust and untrustworthiness. Given the mutual fear and suspicion of European states, trust remained precarious, even as a system of interstate relations was beginning to take shape. The structural deficiencies of this emergent system made the concept of trust a key issue. Looking at trust as a principle underlying the eighteenth-
century discourses of interstate relations shows that references to trust – or to fides, good faith, Vertrauen and confiance – were deployed as a tool in political conflicts. The claim to faithfulness for one’s own side was as much part of the strategic deployment of trust as was the denial of the trustworthiness of an adversary. There are thus two very different levels to be assessed regarding the conceptualisation of trust. The first is a more abstract concept of trust as a fundamental and philosophical value that provides a basis for organising relations between political and economic actors. The second is a more cynical strategic use in the polemics that accompanied various interstate conflicts. There is also a third aspect of trust, which concerns the actual conduct of foreign policy. The conventions and practices of diplomacy have a significant role in the dynamics of trust-building and also mistrust (and espionage). The establishment of embassies, the exchange of ambassadors and the very elaborate ceremonials associated with this world need to be investigated, because they show how also in the praxis of politics trust and mistrust played a major role. Political conduct and treaty-making within Europe and with other peoples in the world was not primarily informed by theoretical principles, but by decisions which were based on concrete political circumstances. Again, the question of trust and mistrust was at the centre of these dynamics.

Certain thematic questions recur in discussions in the period I am investigating: Are the political and economic interests of sovereign states mutually exclusive? How can order among states be achieved? How do other agents like trading companies fit into this framework? Trust is not something that can simply be demanded or enforced by another. A risky advance needs to be made by one side in order to gain the trust of the other. The arguments regarding trust and mistrust help us to organise and better understand the different approaches to interstate relations, but the concept of trust itself was not foundational for international political thought. Balance-of-power thinking regarded trust as purely strategic, whereas the proponents of designs for peace proposed institutional solutions to make trust among states possible. They perceived trust as an essential aim. To achieve it, the existing anarchical situation between states had to be changed fundamentally by introducing federative structures. Implementing the necessary requirements for trust would mean establishing the conditions for peace between states. My study will
re-evaluate these programmes and the key concepts of eighteenth-century international political thought that operated through the prism of trust. This study is not only of interest to the specialists and students of the early modern period, but also to all those thinking about ways of overcoming conflicts which are aggravated by a lack of mutual trust.

During my fellowship I also read a range of relevant key texts. The intensive study of these sources enabled me to structure this material according to a set of relevant key concepts. The fellowship at the IAS at CEU enabled me to make a good start on my new project and I hope to return to CEU and its interesting and welcoming colleagues before too long.

The project I worked on during my stay at the IAS as a Thyssen Senior Fellow interconnects social and political theory and particularly seeks to make use of major conceptual frameworks from the social theory discourse as conceptual sources of inspiration for novel perspectives in political theory. I argue that a number of epistemological and methodological problems connected with the “structure-agency debate” in social theory are crucial in this respect. My project focuses on a specific approach of theorizing the question of how social structures and individual agency are connected and which I call political characterology. I claim that while different aspects of a characterological interpretation of the structure-agency-problem have very often been implicitly applied throughout the modern history of social and political theorizing, a systematic conceptualization of this genuine approach does not yet exist. In my research, I seek to bring together these scattered characterological motives in the modern theoretical discourse and develop a systematic account of a characterological political theory. I claim that a decisive feature of the practical consciousness of social and political actors is that it is substantially shaped by permanent processes of practical translations of actors’ perception of the enabling and the constraining aspects of their structured environment into notions of representative forms of individual performance which correspond to these structural features. Systematically speaking, the characterological approach expands the alleged “duality” of structure and agency into a three-dimensional relation between structures, characters, and agents, establishing an intermediate level of abstraction which reciprocally connects the structural logic of society with the
personal logic of individual actors. Empirically speaking, it reciprocally connects concrete incidents and stories with the rather abstract categories of structural theoretical analysis.

During my fellowship at the IAS I identified and further clarified crucial systematic aspects of the characterological framework of theorizing and substantially enhanced my understanding of the relation between the characterological approach and major traditions of thought within the 19th and 20th century political and social theory debate. I focused, for instance, on the question of the distinctiveness of political modes of relating to society, hence of political as opposed to psychological, social or economic character types. Besides my continued studies of the tradition of Montesquieuian and Tocquevilleian political theorizing up to the present which is an important source of insights into the political aspects of the relation between structure and agency, my critical interpretation of the concept of “character masks” as applied in Karl Marx’s social theory turned out to be very helpful in this respect. I also studied the characterological implications in Max Weber’s, Norbert Elias’s and Robert Bellah’s social theories, in Erich Fromm’s social psychology, Erving Goffman’s “dramaturgical” account of social theory, Pierre Bourdieu’s and Margaret Archer’s theories of action and Anthony Giddens’ structuration theory. On the basis of these analyses, I developed the outline of a systematic conceptual framework for a theoretical understanding of political character types as well as of their peculiarly political contextual environments.

Another focus of my work at IAS emphasized more general epistemological questions involved in characterological theorizing. Especially the question of the relation between practical consciousness and theoretical rationality turned out to be crucial for the epistemological foundations of a characterological approach of political theorizing. In pursuing this question, I continued my examination of Hannah Arendt’s writings. I consider Arendt’s work to be a peculiarly instructive example of a characterological political theory, especially regarding its potentials in analyzing and theorizing processes of structural transformation and of the dynamics involved in them on the level of individual agency and habit formation. Continuing my studies on Arendt at the IAS, I had many opportunities for discussions and scholarly exchanges especially about this aspect of my project. I continuously discussed aspects of Arendt’s theory with a number of fellow colleagues and faculty members at CEU. Also in
my main lecture in IAS fellows’ lectures series I delivered in January 2016 I focused on Arendt’s account of characterological theorizing.

My further examinations of Arendt’s work particularly focused on the epistemological basis of her characterological theory. The results of these efforts are presented in a monograph published by Palgrave Macmillan, which I completed during my time at the IAS. The study focuses on the epistemological sub-text, which runs through all of Arendt’s writings and which primarily deals with the question of how to relate the critical experiential position of political theory with the practical experiences generated in political action. My study especially seeks to elicit Arendt’s genuine method of “epistemological deviations” from practical political consciousness by which she establishes her peculiar perspective as a theorist.

My research project carried out during the fellowship with IAS CEU aims to build a comprehensive mapping of genetics literature on Roma (“Gypsies”) since 1921 with the publication of the first blood groups study that included “Gypsies” as research subjects. Up to now, there were more than 200 genetics publications on Roma that appeared in peer reviewed scientific journals as well as in collective volumes (and the updating of the database is still ongoing, especially with recent papers). This genetics literature, which is the primary source of my content, discourse and bibliometric analysis pertains to three different but strongly intertwined strands of research: biomedical, population genetics, and forensic. Yet, disciplinary boundaries are difficult to trace not only within biological research but also between genetics and social sciences from which geneticists (selectively) import assumptions and descriptions of Roma population. Accordingly, my analysis takes into account the Roma-related genetic research, the social sciences research which geneticists quote as source, and the history of their entanglements. The literature I analyze was written in several languages (English, German, French, Romanian, Czech, Spanish) and was published both in Central and Eastern Europe and in Western Europe.

During my term with IAS, I benefited greatly from presenting my research findings and receiving feedback from different scholars and audiences in the IAS and CEU community: scholars in history and philosophy of science, science studies, bioethics, sociology and history, as
well as students in the departments of Philosophy and the Roma Access Program. I received useful help in updating the database with Czech sources (and having Czech papers translated into English) from the collaboration with a CEU PhD student from the History Department.

One of the objectives of my project was to retrace the history of “Gypsies” as an epistemic object and the privileged place genetics has in it. The history of post war genetic research on Roma as well as its continuities and departures from the interwar period remains largely unacknowledged by social scientists but also by geneticists. “Gypsies” were seen by seroanthropologists as an ideal case population for proving racial theories, while after the Second World War genetic research stripped by the racial language of the previous period continued unabated in suggesting Roma as a “genetic isolate”. Even if contemporary genetic research presents itself as antiracist, a series of scholars commenting on current genetic research argues conceptual intricacies of “populational thinking” as well as the risks of essentialization, reification and racialization of entities framed as “genetic isolates”. As Roger Brubaker argues in his book “Grounds for Difference” (2016) we are assisting to a “return of biology” which social scientists cannot ignore; Roma-related genetic research which flourished after 1990 is part and parcel of this return. Yet, the strong re-emergence of Roma as a subject in genetics after 1990 came together with an increased interest in Roma from the part of politicians and policy makers but also of other actors such as journalists, social scientists as well as NGOs and representatives of international organizations. My research demonstrates that the circulation of biohistorical narratives, classificatory practices and sampling strategies connects various social domains, such as social sciences, police surveillance, genetics, policy making and Romani activism, all invested in the shaping and stabilizing of Roma groupness. It also maps the interdisciplinary dynamics driving this knowledge co-production and critically assesses genetic literature on Roma and the ethical implications that the narratives of Roma as a genetic isolate bring in times of growing nationalism, extremism and antigypsim.

The issue of identifying, classifying and labeling Roma has been a complicated and contentious one both in administrative and scientific practices including those related to genetics. I set as one of my main research objectives to scrutinize how genetics contributes to the reification
of the Roma on four levels: that of basic research assumptions on ethnic groupness, of the sampling strategies used to generalize genetic findings, of the narratives imported by geneticists from social sciences or unscientific accounts and of the interpretation of data. As many researchers have admitted, the category Roma was (and is) elusive, not only in the official statistics recorded over time in censuses, but also in other historical documents. Yet, many geneticists seem to be either unaware of these objections that problematize Roma classification or unwilling to consider them relevant for their research design.

The size of “the Roma population” - an important element of genetic research claiming representativeness - is itself part of classificatory struggles having a long history of conflicting expert estimates produced over time by police, academics, state representatives or by an interdisciplinary collaboration among these actors. As my research shows, on longue durée police produced “Gypsies” population figures by lumping together individuals seen as dangerous because of their spatial mobility but not necessarily related by a common language, religion, cultural practice, occupation, physical appearance or lifestyle. Experts also assembled historically “Gypsies” or “Roma” population estimates but their numbers, always much larger than those produced by censuses, never had solid grounds, their sources and methods of calculations were not disclosed or numeric extrapolations have been made on racialised premises (e.g. darker skin). Finally, I showed that administrative censuses, through the statistical practice of post-coding under the umbrella term “Roma” (heterogeneous occupational labels deemed by some anthropologists to be related to Roma), gathered a significant number of people that neither self-identify as Roma nor speak the Romani language. Yet, the size of “the Roma population” and its political-academic co-construction is not problematized by most of the genetic research scrutinized but simply endorsed.

As my research findings show, most of the samples used to infer conclusions about “Roma in Europe” or “Roma” as a generic label are of a small size (mostly from some tens of cases in medical genetics research to few hundred cases in population genetics), data are collected in only a few countries with some preferred locations (e.g. Bulgaria), and the population universe from which the samples are drawn – that is Roma population size – is simply taken over from politically endorsed numbers that circumscribe a political object and a policy target. In most of the
genetic research that I analyzed, the epistemic object is framed in the titles of the papers and along the texts as “the Roma group”, a fixed entity both numerical and in regard to the population profile depicted (described exclusively as a poor and marginal population). Yet, not only the sample sizes are problematic, the geographical distribution unbalanced (e.g. countries such as Romania are not being sampled, despite its large number of Roma) and the complexity of socio-demographic variables disregarded (e.g. samples from ethnically mixed communities not considered, more affluent subjects/areas skipped) but what is termed as “genetic data” or “raw data” is often part of a process of assemblage. Individuals retained in genetic samples are most often pre-labeled as Roma subjects by various other actors, be they anthropologists in Romani studies, community representatives or public authorities. Political categories and labels are transformed and made consistent by genetic research through laboratory practices in a re-inscription of categories of (political) practice as categories of (scientific) analysis. Samples are often “calibrated” by including only those individuals who have what are thought to be typical Romani names, occupations or neighborhoods, and after an evaluation of self-reported Romani ancestry and knowledge of Romani language. Criteria of inclusion and exclusion in the genetic samples are most often arbitrary, being driven by considerations of financial parsimony, availability of contacts in the researched communities and the choice of social markers considered good proxies for Romani identity.

However, not only politics enters the frame of genetic research on Roma through population estimates but also social sciences, which provide the main narratives that genetics research endorses such as the single Indian origin of all Roma and their portrayal as an endogamous group which makes it an ideal population to study for geneticists. Nevertheless, the quotation from social sciences research is often highly selective with references only to very few sources describing Roma as endogamous or even the omission of those sources sustaining the opposite view. Moreover, the interpretation of social sciences texts by geneticists is a key element for an understanding of how the assumption of endogamy is postulated from sources that could be read either way or even rather interpreted as supporting non-endogamous conceptualization of Roma. Yet, data interpretation affects not only the assumption package taken over by genetic research, but also the reading of findings from genetic research.
and the claims made based on these findings. In this regard, in some cases the preference is given to interpretations of data that sustain grounds for biological difference between the Roma and “Europeans” over equally valid interpretations rejecting such difference. Despite all this, genetics is generally regarded as a field with highest claims of objectivity, even though conceptualizing Roma as a coherent population suffers a series of pitfalls.

My term with IAS CEU was rich in academic networking and it opened new avenues for collaboration with fellow scholars as well as opportunities to participate in academic events. I have been invited to present as a key speaker in the conference “Measuring Ethnicity and Migration - Classification and Statistical Representation in Academic Research and Administration” organized by the Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities (KWI) Essen. I had also a presentation in the IAS-CEU organized conference “Comparative Ways into Competing Versions of Modernity in East Central Europe”. The IAS fellowship offered also excellent conditions and allowed for time to write and plan for new publications. I had the chance to do a final review of my book Those Who Count. Expert Practices of Roma Classification, which is currently under print with CEU Press. I also prepared ground for future publications reflecting my recent research interests in science studies. I will take the findings of my research and all the wealth of experiences that I enjoyed with IAS into a new three year project at University College Freiburg titled “The Genetic Construction of Roma Groupness and its Interdisciplinary Entanglements”. The new project I am involved with is supported by DFG (German Research Foundation) and coordinated by Prof. Dr. Veronika Lipphardt.

Alexandra Urakova  
Gorky Institute of World Literature, Russian Academy of Sciences

Gift Economy and Nineteenth-Century American Literature

At the Institute for Advanced Study, I was working on the monograph tentatively entitled “Gift Economy and Nineteenth Century American Literature.” The book methodologically relying on gift theory and economic criticism aims at examining gift transactions as represented in major literary works of the s. c. “long Nineteenth Century” in American literature. One of the main premises of my study is that American literary history of the period presents a particularly interesting case shedding light on the social and cultural function of the gift exchange within the emerging market economy. At the same time, the book takes into
account the specificity of literary representation of gifts, for example, congeniality between giving and creativity as suggested by the meaning of the word “gift,” at once a present and a talent. This relation becomes more problematic and complex when market economy superseding albeit not entirely excluding pre-capitalist forms of literary patronage, engages literary texts in its transactions. Being at IAS encouraged me to elaborate interdisciplinary aspects of my project relating it to a broader anthropological and social context. It also prompted me revise and attenuate my initial design putting heavier emphasis on the problem of sentimental exchange and the subject of dangerous and poisonous gifts in the literature of the period.

At IAS, my main goal was to refine the theoretical framework of the book and collect bibliographical material for the study in progress. My situation was different from that of other fellows since at the Russian Academy of Sciences where I work, I have no access to international electronic databases nor can I use the Interlibrary Loan; the libraries in Moscow have very limited secondary literature on my subject. This circumstance had an impact on my research experience at IAS CEU: I spent much of my time downloading, reading, and scanning articles and books. It was particularly important for me to situate my research within the established research framework, with a special emphasis on what has been done in the last decade. Although gift theory has a century long history, its expansion into literary studies has begun only in the 1980s, with a special focus on the Early Modern literature. It was all the more relevant for me to discover books, essays, and book chapters that apply the results of gift theory to the study of literature, especially to the literature of the modern period that I study and to the 19th American literature in particular.

One of the outcomes of my work at IAS was a workshop on the subject of my research entitled “Gift Economy and the US Antebellum Literary Market” (June 6, 2016). Specifically, it focused on the exchange of gift books – elegant literary annuals manufactured to be given away for Christmas and New Year from the mid 1820s through the 1850s. At the same time, the workshop had a broader theoretical and interdisciplinary perspective; antebellum gifts and gift books served as a starting point for the discussion of the complex interrelation between gifts and commodities in modern Western societies. Thanks to this opportunity, I made important professional contacts. On my behalf, IAS invited an expert
in my field, American scholar Leon Jackson whose book The Business of Letters: Authorial Economies in Antebellum America (Stanford UP, 2008) is one of the central to my project. Seeking to extend the framework of the workshop, I invited Davide Torsello (CEU), a classical anthropologist and author of Gift, Exchange, and Favor. Foundation and Development for Economic Anthropology (Mondadori, 2008) and Sandor Hites (Institute for Literary Studies HAS), a literary scholar working in the field of economic criticism. Professional cooperation continued beyond the workshop and in November 2016 I came back to Budapest to give a talk “Consumption, sentimentality, and violence: North-American perspective on the history of gift giving” at the workshop “Histories of Gift-giving workshop” hosted at CEU by Professor Torsello.

2) Two articles on the subject of my research were published: “Hawthorne's Gifts: Rereading ‘Alice Doane’s Appeal’ and ‘The Great Carbuncle’ in The Token,” New England Quarterly (Vol. 89, No. 4, December 2016: 587-613) and “‘Subtle distinctions’: Emerson’s ‘Gifts’ and Sentimental Rhetoric of Gift-Giving” in Anglo-Saxonica (a peer reviewed journal of the University of Lisboa – in print).

3) I continue working on my book-length study that I am planning to implement and to publish. I am currently working on the article based on my talk at IAS seminar and on a chapter on Poe’s short story “Ligeia” for Oxford Handbook to Poe.

4) I worked on the subject of literary cults in close collaboration with Zsofia Kalavszy from the Institute for Literary Studies HAS and with IAS fellows, Hans-Jörg Sigwart and Jessica Pisano. The project aims at exploring the phenomenon of cults in relation to literature and art (cults of authors, cults of literary works, cults of literature and culture) as a complex, multi-leveled phenomenon of modernity. Coordinating and continuing the work of literary researchers from Hungary and Russia who have been working in the area of cult studies during the past decades, we aim to give a new direction to the study of this subject, challenge the existing premises, and develop new theoretical, inter- and trans-disciplinary perspectives. The project resulted in the workshop “Literary Cults: Transnational Perspectives and Approaches” (IAS CEU, June 10, with the participation of Péter Dávidházi, Nadia Al Bagdadi, Zsofia Kalavszy, Hans-Jörg Sigwart, Jessica Pisano, Stephen Rachman, and Orsolya Rákai) and in the development of an international and
interdisciplinary focus group (Kalavszky, Sigwart, Pisano, and myself).

During my stay at IAS, I was invited to speak at the meeting with scholars at the Institute for Literary Studies HAS on February 2, 2016; gave a talk “‘I say to you that I am dead!’: The Body as a Narrative Force in Poe’s Fiction” at the conference Body as Narrative Medium, Body as Medium of Narratives (Petofi Literary Museum, Budapest, Apr. 1, 2016); gave a talk “Rereading Antebellum Gift Books: Hawthorne’s ‘The Minister’s Black Veil’” in The Token” at the International EAAS [European American Studies Association] conference (Ovidius University, Constanta, Apr. 24, 2016).

With the support of the Senior Core Fellowship at IAS CEU I worked on my research topic Worker – Society – History. Social History of labor and Hungarian workers society in 20th century from a Central European comparative point of view.

The modernization of industrial labor and the increasing power of the workers were important chapters of the 20th century. The period I tried to study is one of the major systemic changes – from capitalism to communist central planning and after 1989, back to a capitalist market economy. The changes of workers and factories were influenced by the process of industrialization, post-industrialization and globalization. Taking the example of the Factory of Ózd Metallurgy (Hungary), I examined the structural changes of the working class and the living conditions of workers from the dynamic start at the beginning of the 20th century until the collapse of the ironworks at end of the 20th century. The local and factory society can be characterized as a strongly stratified community, where the following factors and values were most important:

The role of work, special knowledge and experiences of work, the strong connection to work and factory, the intensive personal relationships and networks at work and in private life, social security, the feeling of relative well-being (depending on social position), the helping role of relatives’ networks, the role of the factory in the local social processes and the factory as the main actor of social integration. I was able to expand my knowledge and gather more data about similar industrial cities (e.g. Gelsenkirchen, Duisburg, Bochum, Gdansk, Nova Huta, Ostrava, Eisenhüttenstadt, Dunaújváros) in Western- and Central-East-Europe.

Tibor Valuch
University of Eger, Hungary

The Social History of Labor and Hungarian Workers’ Society in the 20th Century from a Central European Comparative Perspective
Most researchers dealt with the problems of workers in the framework of short term analyses. As opposed to that I have been investigating the social history of Central-East-European workers, the relationship between work, politics, economy and society in a long term perspective.

So the basic research questions were the following: What changes took place in the composition of the factory’s working class? How can this group be described in terms of age, genders, marital status, education, skills? How important were the family relationships in everyday life and their working life? Which were the main groups of the factory workers? How can these groups be described regarding their position in (local) society and social mobility during the 20th century? What did it mean to be a factory worker? How did their life change continuously in terms of lifestyle, earning and consumption? How did the employers’ and the employees’ relation change in the period covered? What was shaping individual and collective life strategies and attitudes to work? What kind of influence did the changes of the political system in Central-East-Europe have during the ’40-s and after 1989 on the community of factory workers?

What role did the factory and its worker play in local society? What happened to these people after the closure of the factory? Which were the main social consequences of deindustrialization? What kind of similarities and differences can be found in the situation of old (Ózd, Ostrava, Gelsenkirchen) and the newly developed – so called socialist - industrial centers (Dunaújváros, Eisenhüttenstadt, Nova Huta)?

I used interdisciplinary research methodology, including traditional historical analysis, statistical investigation and genealogical reconstruction of workers families, analyses of life stories and ways of life and oral history. These methods may help us understand the main components and mechanisms of factory society and its structural specialties in the 20th century I have also applied a macro level historical, statistical and sociological analysis of the workers at the factories and the urban communities they lived in.

The main results of my research in the scholarship period are the following:

1./ I collected the relevant literature related to rethinking conceptual questions and problems.

2./ I also collected the necessary literature and data for comparisons in Central-East-Europe.
3./ I built up the databases of different registers of Ózd.
4./ I began to analyse the life story interviews of the former multigenerational worker family members.
6./ I began to write my overview essay about the historiography of contemporary Central-East-European labor history research activities and literatures.

My six-month tenure (January to June 2016) at the Institute of Advanced Studies at CEU allowed me to continue research, writing, and publishing various sections of the main book project for which I received my fellowship, a book-length project on women’s Holocaust life writing. At the same time my stay also provided me with the opportunity to do significant work on two broadly related newer projects, “Gender and Cinematic Representations of the Holocaust,” and “The Epistolary Traces of a Hungarian Family in Interwar Hungary, 1926-1939.”

My major project, titled “Broken Memories: Women Writing Holocaust Lives and Beyond”, involves a retrieval of a heterogeneity of women’s voices and their gender-related experiences as historical subjects before, during, and in the aftermath of the Holocaust, from which valuable insights can emerge both for Holocaust studies and Gender Studies. During my months at IAS I wrote or revised several chapters of my book project, including the historical and theoretical Introduction, “Gendered Life Writing and Trauma of War.” Other chapters of my projected book that I have reworked at IAS are “Women’s Traumatic Embodied Narratives of the Gendered Holocaust Body,” and “En-gendering Memory through Food Talk and Alimentary Life Writing in the Holocaust and in Its Aftermath,” which has just appeared in a Hungarian version in Múlt és Jövő.
In my Wednesday IAS lecture I offered a gendered analysis of case studies of women’s diaries and memoirs within their historical context of wartime life writing. My presentation was divided into two sections: the first, “Lives and Afterlives of Female Teenage Holocaust Diarists” was about surviving writing from the Holocaust (including cases where the scribes themselves did not survive), while in the second part, “Looking Back Through the “Chronotope of the Holocaust,” I presented the multiple reasons for the steadily wider scope of post-Holocaust retrospective life writing that has broadened the enormous dimensions of the Holocaust.

Related both to my chapter on ‘Holocaust Embodiment’ and my IAS talk on diaries, I also wrote a new article, The Yellow Star and Everyday Life under Exceptional Circumstances: Diaries of 1944-1945 Budapest, which emerged from six Hungarian wartime diaries written during the war but published only very recently that I have collected in Budapest during the last half year. All of these war diaries lay forgotten until recently in archives or in private hands. Since all five diaries are in Hungarian it is important to bring their contents to the attention of a broader reading public, and my article has already appeared in the Fall 2016 issue of Hungarian Cultural Studies and is scheduled also to appear in a Hungarian version.

In April 2016 I organized and moderated a special event with Géza Röhrig, a Hungarian writer and star of the 2015 Oscar-winning Hungarian film Son of Saul. I discussed in my lecture how Son of Saul is a film that represents an absolute paradigm shift in Holocaust films by avoiding both the narrative and visual clichés of the genre, and in overcoming the problematic of the limits of representation of the Holocaust that many, and most famously Adorno, have argued could not or should not be depicted. I am presently expanding this lecture to include as well the cinematic representations of gender in Holocaust film, which I plan to present in spring 2017 as a Plenary Lecture at Wake Forest University.

In May 2016 I participated in the IAS workshop on “Literary Cults: Transnational Perspectives and Approaches,” organized by my colleague Alexandra Urakova in association with some members of the Literary Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. I presented a paper titled “Afterlives of Anne Frank,” in which I discussed the Americanization and subsequent universalization of the cult of Anne Frank. I examined how to maintain Anne Frank’s status as archetypal innocent victim it has
been necessary to mute reference to the gendered and sexual voice of her writing, which raises the question of what degree of ethical responsibility do representations of the Holocaust have towards the past as well as to the needs of contemporary audiences from different cultural backgrounds, with no or minimal historical knowledge.

Finally, a very personal new project that I began to research while at IAS is the study of letter writing, which belongs to the emerging feminist subfield of life writing research. My project, titled “The Epistolary Traces of a Hungarian Family in Interwar Hungary, 1926-1939” is a very personal one since the archive I am working with consists of some two hundred family letters that very recently came into my possession, the great majority are written by my paternal grandfather. The letters uncover family dramas, some of which have become falsified in later family memory, and at the same time even in some of their seemingly mundane details illustrate many facets of the social and economic history of Hungary, including rapid urbanization, nationalization of surnames, religious conversion, assimilation and failed strategies of integration, mixed marriage, and the unemployment of the overabundant university graduates, some of whom, like my uncle, to whom these letters were written, were forced into emigration.
Choosing a career in academics for early stage researchers is not an easy choice to make given the limited resources in some of the countries the researchers come from. Having said that, an opportunity like the Global Challenges Fellowship at the IAS, CEU, makes that decision easier. Coming from India, this has proven to be a great opportunity for me to disseminate my work from a platform which is not only international, but also extremely critical and constructive. So far, my work had been limited to India and certain organizations and universities which collaborated with the different organizations I worked with, but with the GCF, I was truly able to understand the finer nuances of academic research and methodologies thus applied in a larger global context. As a part of this fellowship, it wasn’t only my own research that motivated me, interacting with other academics from different contexts with widely different projects was an added advantage, one that added to my overall knowledge base.

The project I was chosen for was on Left Wing Extremism in India and what it has come to become since it first emerged before Indian independence from the British colonial rule in 1947. In a liberal democracy, a rights-based movement metamorphosing itself into an insurgency over time is a reflection of abject failure by the state in fulfilling its responsibilities towards the citizens. When this is said about a country
which is home to the world's second largest population, is the largest democracy and the movement/insurgency has raged on for over six decades, the scale and magnitude of such failure is much greater.

According to the Ministry of Home Affairs of India, between 2010 and 2015, there have been 11,667 casualties as a result of the ongoing conflict in at least ten states in north and east of India. These states incidentally also sit on approximately 85 per cent of India's natural resource reserves. Mining of different ores, including coal, bauxite, iron ore, manganese, copper, mica, limestone and uranium an important activity in at least three of these states and contributes in exacerbating the conflict. This also raises the question of uneven distribution of the benefits accrued from these resources amongst the locals of the region who are the most marginalized communities in India, leading to a relative sense of depravation which adds to the existing ferment.

Therefore, containment of this conflict is high on the Government of India’s agenda. However, in the absence of a unified strategy or lack of implementation of it has resulted in this conflict to rage on for decades. Left Wing Extremism has been termed the greatest internal security challenge for India by successive governments at the Centre. However, this challenge has so far been met with a somewhat disengaged and inconsistent approach. It was initially considered a law and order problem and India being a federal state, made it a state specific issue. Then it was termed as acts of terror and brute force was applied to counter it, which led to an exacerbation of the conflict, the collateral damage claiming the existing tribal population as the biggest casualties in what is termed as the Red Corridor of India. There were also debates about deploying the national army to annihilate the threat that this conflict imposed. These policy decisions were not taken owing to the fact that it is an internal security threat rather than one from across Indian borders.

As a student of political science, this is a subject which is of interest to me because failure of political processes and stakeholder inclusion has led to a ferment which is not completely under control anymore. The casualties reflect mostly the local populations which are some of the most primitive tribes in the world. What makes it an interesting study is the role of local populations who have been either coerced or convinced to side with the either of the two warring sides, the state or the insurgents. Having interacted with some of the local tribes in the areas
now named as the Red Corridor, it was evident that they too seek only peace, however, not at the cost of their land and resources being taken by anyone. This feeds into the larger question of identity and representation which has thus far not been considered seriously in these areas.

As a part of GCF, I got an opportunity to examine these issues with the background of my field work and secondary data available through various sources. In a region like Central and Eastern Europe, which has had its fair share of ethnic conflicts, it seemed the right fit to observe the conflict in India from a distance to gain a new perspective. Listening to experts about the Roma issue specifically, I could draw some parallels between the two case studies.

The facilities provided by IAS have been phenomenal in encouraging such diverse views in existing problems worldwide. From opportunities to engage in meaningful dialogue with other researchers and faculty members in other departments, to comfortable living arrangements where the members and staff at the Wallenberg Guesthouse ensured a very pleasant stay, it has been a very fruitful experience.

The biggest objective that I came with was to write a quality research paper, which is now underway and will be completed with peer reviews in the coming weeks. I found this a great opportunity to be able to fulfil this objective without any disturbances or distractions. I did however feel that being at a university with a strong research base, it would have been better if I could have been allowed to take some classes like Methodology or Research Design.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the staff and faculty at the IAS and SPP for providing me the resources to pursue this study I undertook. Without constant support from Nadia, Eva and Katalin, this would have been challenging at times. They ensured an extremely productive work environment at all times for all fellows. In addition, they were always available for guidance and counselling and worked endlessly in providing not only an academic environment, but also facilitation socialization among fellows by organizing interesting events. At the Guesthouse too, Agnes was the quiet and efficient support system who took care of all issues pertaining to housing and living in Budapest preemptively and was always available for resolving all logistical queries. I would especially like to extend gratitude to Martin Molder, my Mentor in this project without whose constant guidance and encouragement, I
wouldn’t have been able to arrive at a concrete work of academic research.

As my fellowship comes to an end, I am going back feeling a sense of accomplishment and camaraderie towards other fellows and IAS. I remain available for all future engagement with the IAS and would be happy to assist in whatever way I can. It has been an extremely fruitful experience, both academically and in terms of increasing my existing knowledge base and skill set. In the end, I can extend gratitude to the organizers of this fellowship for this opportunity and I look forward to more such engagement.

My stay at IAS CEU in Budapest proved to be one of my most productive periods as a fellow of research institutes. A very good combination of work, centered on my specific topic, with conversations and exchanges with fellows working on close but also on unrelated topics helped me to see my research from a larger theoretical but also historical and even geographical perspective. I particularly enjoyed the weekly presentations and the lively discussions that followed at the Q&A section but also afterwards. This kind of intense coming together of various disciplines and theoretical and methodological points of view created a kind of rhythm and sketched a vibrant collective intellectual life.

My work focused at first on the Russian left wing social-revolutionary refugees from fin-de-siècle but after some initial findings at CEU and in the Academy library, I switched to a thorough investigation of their transformation into physicians and public administrators. During my stay at the Institute I moved from an in depth analysis of a small group of individuals connected to the anarchist movement to a much larger argument about the emergence of social modernity/middling modernity that took me from 1848 revolutionaries to Vienna and Budapest educated physicians.

I arrived at this kind of enlargement of my previous argument by individual research but also because of the stimulating intellectual atmosphere at IAS CEU. As I attempted to create and use hybrid interpretation tools based on social and cultural history, political anthropology, and science and technology studies I was lucky enough to find in some of the IAS fellows very sympathetic and knowledgeable interlocutors that proved crucial for my efforts.

I argue now that the emergence of social modernity in the lower
Danube lands can be traced to the instauration of quarantinist outposts against the last waves of plague and the first ones of cholera. The crisis of this sanitary arrangement opened the way for a series of failed but productive projects of modernization. The collective political body was imagined and created through the nationalization of the medical profession and the attempts to create a sanitary social body. The failure to connect urban and rural bodies inside a democratic, all embracing network opened up spaces for discourses questioning the identity of the collective body. Was there a “Romanian element”? What did that mean and was it degenerating? Demographic anti-Semitism and the first attempts to think socio-economic and sanitary failures as racial degeneracy emerged from the fissures of the national sanitary system. Bacteriology was able to partially absorb these critiques and propose a larger interventionist project in the space opened by the old-style sanitary police.

The model of a “health for all” public hygiene and sanitary police in the Romanian principalities emerged out of the quarantine based state hygiene, imposed during Russian military administration in order to fight cholera’s advance. I understand this process as part of the creation of a middling, expertise-led social modernity. It coincided with attempts to imagine and manage the national body, the people on which the new modernizing state was based. The social-sanitary collective body envisaged by public hygiene projected a unified social space from where the national body could be imagined and constituted.

The creation of local medicine and hygiene meant the establishment of institutes, practices, technologies, and discourses similar to the ones that were put into place in “Europe” – especially in Paris and Vienna. There was a central tension between this necessary connection to a trans-national scientific and administrative network and the efforts to create a legitimate national social-scientific space. In actor-network theory, the constitution of legitimate regional spaces is based on the erection and management of strong and extended networks. They make recognizable and inter-operational notions, practices, diplomas, technologies, and discourses produced in different places, and fold regional spaces by creating “immutable mobiles” that connect geographically remote but structurally similar locations.

In the case that I describe here, the tension between “region-spaces” and “network-spaces” was mediated by the nationalization of medicine
and public hygiene. The Faculty of Medicine from Bucharest began to grant diplomas and doctoral titles, and create legitimate professionals involved in modernizing and disciplining the social environments and the bodies of the people. However, the attempts to nationalize the medical and hygienic professions, to constitute a national-sanitary body out of medico-hygienic data gathering and administrative intervention and control, stumbled on the rural problem. The main solution of continuity in the national political body – from where peasant revolts were still emerging in fin-de-siècle – disrupted the democratic public hygiene model. Public hygiene and medicine should have been present in and around the bodies of the vast majority of Romanians: the peasants. As the newly nationalized professions and sciences were able to function almost exclusively in towns, at the quarantined borders, and fluvial ports, they were, apparently, not national enough.

Discourses on the political national body were articulated from inside the framework provided by the social-sanitary body. Because the public hygiene model was not able to effectively include the majority, it fell prey to disruptive movements. The new locally produced physicians, in their role of frustrated agents of rural modernization, turned to anti-peasant and orientalizing discourses. Using degeneration tropes – introduced, strangely enough, by anarchist exiles in Romania – and demographically based anti-Semitic arguments focused on the danger posed by Jewish high fertility and low mortality. In 1880, a synthesis emerged, centred on the “racial degeneracy” of the “Romanian element”. The progressive promises of public hygiene seemed to backfire, as they were both unable to stop the “degeneracy” of Romanians – understood in an ethnonational way – and inadvertently helped the urban-based Jews. The emergence of the Pathology and Bacteriology Institute, in 1887, headed by the rising scholar Victor Babeş, dealt the last blow to the cameralist-democratic model of public hygiene inspired by the imperial Viennese Medical School.

I see all these projects of locally creating and instituting the social and the national as a series of failed but productive attempts. Their productivity is part of their failure that is, usually, framed as such by later projects. Border quarantine failed from the point of view of public hygiene and sanitary police that attempted, as a response to this perceived failure, a neoquarantinist and sanitationist approach. As a failing project, quarantine opened a huge social space for the intervention of nationalized
medicine and hygiene. When public hygiene was seen as unable to solve the divides between nationalized profession and national body, or between rural and urban - new spaces of reformist discourse and intervention opened. In the cracks exposed by the failure of the public hygiene project emerged the dilemmas of racial degeneracy and of the ethnic and racial constitution of the Romanian people. These attempts were not able to constitute themselves as successful social and political projects.

Bacteriology fared better from this point of view as it convincingly continued and surpassed old style public hygiene by bringing the diseases and bacteria in the laboratories and partially colonizing the collective sanitary and national bodies with laboratory based knowledge. The problems plaguing the Romanian people – from diseases to degeneracy and ethnic others – seemed to be solvable inside this new medical-epidemiological setting. V. Babeș’ ambitious attempts to create a bacteriologically informed and managed state pointed, however, to new lines of fracture and future failures.

This is the main argument I developed while in Budapest that started from my original project but enlarged and, hopefully, improved it. I published parts of it in East Central Europe, to present variants of it at the CEU IAS meetings and during some conferences in Budapest, Bucharest, Lvov, and Kaunas as an IAS fellow.

I used more frequently some of the Budapest libraries: first of all and mostly the CEU library (and its loan services) but also the Academy, the Ervin Szabo and the National Széchényi ones. I was also lucky enough to find some very interesting interlocutors outside IAS and also talk and even plan some collaborative research with some CEU faculty, especially with members of the History Department such as Balázs Trencsényi. I participated in some of the meetings of the Institute of Political History, co-organized a conference with them and planned a joint edited book with some colleagues from “Nicolae Iorga” History Institute (Bucharest).

I tried to track down the scientific and political contexts and the bio-bibliographical traces left by Victor Babeș in Vienna and Budapest with mixed succes. My understanding of his epistemological and political whereabouts greatly increased but I plan to deepen my investigations in the future in order to clarify some unclear moments from his life. I hope to be able to develop my research further on and to publish the book I’ve been working on and at least one more article.
I came to IAS CEU with the goal to finish three papers that I had been asked to write two contributions for collective volumes and one article for a French peer review journal. The first chapter came out from a presentation I gave in 2014 at Oxford University on “Trans-imperial familiarity: the Ottoman Embassies in Eighteenth-Century Vienna”, and for a volume edited by Tracey Sowerby (Oxford) and Jan Hennings (CEU). My collaboration on this with Jan Hennings allowed me also to develop connections with the history department and to enjoy with him regular discussions in the different conferences and workshops that we attended together from Budapest to Bern. Jan Hennings and I are now thinking to set up an informal working group. During my stay at the Institute, I finished this chapter that will be published in May 2017 in London by Routledge.

Following up on my previous side research on “métissages gastronomiques”, the second chapter I finalized during my stay focused on “Foreignness in eighteenth century German cookbooks”, and developed from the presentation I made last October in Bordeaux. I completed the research before coming to Budapest but during the writing phase I could count on the support and expertise in history of food and history of sciences of Robin Nadeau. His advice definitely improved the quality of the paper and brought it to another level of interest. Written in French, the chapter will be published by Gallimard in a collective volume focusing on métissage and circulation of material culture in early modern Europe, under the direction of Michel Figeac in 2017.

The last paper I worked on during the three months of my stay in Budapest dealt with Ottomans in the cities of the Habsburg monarchies in the eighteenth century and questions the ethno-religious paradigm of diaspora studies on which is based the dominant historiography. This article was meant for the peer-reviewed journal Diasporas, and it is for me the opportunity to extend the result of my thesis on the Ottoman milieu in Vienna to comparisons between Vienna, Trieste, Temesvar and Pest. My stay in Hungary allowed me to have access to a new bibliography, a new historiography and to know better the work of William O’Reilly on Temesvar and migration in Central Europe that considerably enriched my paper. The article was submitted just before my departure from IAS and received a very positive review that allows its publication by the end of 2016.
During my stay at IAS, I also had opportunities to present the results of my former research and the hypothesis of my new one. First I was honored by the offer made by Nadia Al-Bagdadi to organize a book-launch for the volume that came out from my thesis with the title L'Orient à Vienne au dix-huitième siècle, published in May 2015 by the Voltaire Foundation in Oxford among its new collection ‘Oxford University Studies in the Eighteenth Century’. It was for me the opportunity to present in English a research initially conducted and published in French and to collect advice from IAS fellows, faculty of the History Department and from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences to prepare the English version. A similar occasion to present the results of my doctoral research was the invitation by Madalena Veres to take part in the workshop she organized on ‘Intertwined enlightenments’.

During the fellow seminar I delivered a talk about my new project, with the perspective to build an ERC starting grant application, focusing on regional integration in a cross-cultural context, especially the Habsburg monarchy and the Ottoman Empire in the eighteenth century. My talk focused on Trieste as a case study. It was the first time that I publically presented this research. The feedback I received from fellows in history, political sciences, sociology and economy was very rich, challenging and stimulating and they helped me to reshape, rephrase or adjust certain parts of my project, especially in paying more attention to spillover effect phenomena. The result of this was certainly the two papers I delivered in Bern in June at a conference on the transformation of intercultural diplomacy between Asia and Europe, 1700-1850, and the week before at the College de France where I was invited by Sanjay Subrahmanyam.

I am now working on the biography of one of the major protagonists of my project, Peter Herbert-Rathkeal to explore the notion of “cercles d’appartenance sociale” recently elaborated by French early modern social historians such as Simona Cerutti. In my perspective studying the circles of the social belonging of an individual is challenging the very fashionable paradigm of cross-cultural studies that puts emphasis on the ability of people to switch from one world to the other. On the contrary, contrasting the different circles of social belonging of a historical actor: a family, a household, a city, a métiers, a religious community, a national community etc. leads to break with artificial cultural borders and sheds a new light on the different overlapping of social spaces in which
actors moved and forbid to exclusively focus on one of them, in the way diaspora studies are used to.

So my stay at IAS was the most fruitful experience of my young academic career, I am very grateful for all the opportunities that were offered to me, and sincerely look forward to having a new opportunity to enjoy such atmosphere and experience.

My two main original objectives as a Junior Fellow at the Institute of Advanced Studies at the Central European University were (1) to transform my doctoral dissertation, which I had just completed, into academic publications and (2) to become personally acquainted with scholars who conduct research on Roma communities in Europe, thus embedding myself in a new intellectual network that could further my knowledge and understanding of my chosen field.

I put much time and effort into the first task, although unexpected health complications did cause me to struggle at times and I am still wrapping up the final products of my work in this beautiful city. I am in the concluding stage of transforming the core chapter of my dissertation into a journal article, and I am halfway through doing this with another chapter. For a while my plan was to break down these two chapters into five articles, given their substantial length, the complexity of my theoretical framework, and the richness of my ethnographic data. But eventually I decided that they were more impactful as single, cohesive pieces. In addition, I revised and shortened my dissertation of over 450 pages in order to turn it into a more manageable book manuscript. I intend to submit the final product to the CEU Press, given its relevance to the geographic region and the university’s history of intellectual investment in the fields of Roma, women’s, and religious studies.

Regarding my second objective, I established valuable contacts at CEU and beyond. I met with many professors, researchers, masters and doctoral students, and NGO staff whose scholarly and activist work relates to my own research. I even discussed future collaborations with some of them.

Lastly, my fellowship at the Institute benefitted me in ways that I had not foreseen or predicted. The nine months I spent in Budapest constituted a transformative experience on a personal and professional level that I will always treasure. In addition to growing and learning as a
young scholar who is embarking on a new career path, I also established cherished personal connections with scholars, university staff, and other individuals who taught me important personal and professional lessons and who, I hope, will forever remain a part of my life. I am truly grateful for this wonderful opportunity and amazing experience!

Most of my recent work is focused on three areas: Fictional characters and their names; repeatable artworks; and the logic and semantics of conditionals. During my time at IAS CEU I have managed to make progress on all three of these projects. Initially, I intended to work exclusively on a monograph on fictional characters, but after reviewing my development with my head of department, we decided it would be better at this stage of my career to work more on research papers and have the monograph as a more medium term goal. So although I did lots of work on my book, I also wrote several other draft papers during my time at the Institute. Below I set out my main project on fictional characters.

During my time at IAS CEU I gave two talks on this topic, one at the department of philosophy and one at the Fellows' seminar at IAS. Preparing these talks and the discussion that followed helped me immensely in two respects. First, I am now clearer on the central thesis of the book than I was before. Second, writing these talks up, along with other material, means that I have now gone a long way to finishing the book, although there is still more to be done.

Currently in philosophy there is a debate amongst realists and irrealists as to whether fictional characters really exist. This debate can seem silly to those outside philosophy - of course fictional characters don’t exist, that’s why they’re fictional! Now although there is a sense in which this is true, we need to say more since there is good evidence for the claim that fictional characters do exist. For example, Conan Doyle created Sherlock Holmes, but how can that be true Holmes does not exist.

A number of other authors have tried to reconcile our irrealist and realist thought, and provide an adequate account of the phenomenology of fiction by positing an ambiguity in fictional names such as ‘Holmes’. On its initial use by an author, Holmes1, the name has no referent and the author is merely pretending to refer. However, the author thereby creates a fictional character that we can refer to with a derivative use of the name, Holmes2.
Although I agree with this approach, extent versions of it are inadequate in a number of ways incomplete and in a number of ways. First, it means that fictions are not about fictional characters - A Study in Scarlet is about Holmes1, but it is Holmes2 that is a fictional character. In order to avoid this unwelcome consequence I also posit an ambiguity in the phrase ‘fictional character’. On its primary usage, fictional character1, it applies to the subjects of fictions such as Holmes1 thus allowing us to say that fictional are about fictional characters1; on its derivative use, fictional character2, it applies to the objects created by authors, thus allowing us to say that Conan Doyle created the fictional character2 Holmes2.

Second, extant approaches do not say what type of object fictional characters2 are. Third, they do not explain why fictional names are ambiguous. My approach rectifies both of these shortcomings. Now it is well known that there are a number of productive metonymies that allow us to use a word which properly applies to one type of thing, to derivatively apply to another type of thing. To illustrate consider the following sorts of metonymy:

Location for Located: Wall Street is worried. Scotland Yard are sending a detective.

Producer for Product: Grisham reads much better in Hungarian. I listened to Brahms for three hours last night.

Container for Contents: I drank the whole bottle. The Kettle is boiling.

Tools for Job: The press will have a field day. The buses are on strike.

One particularly interesting metonymy is that which allows us to use a noun that properly applies to x to apply derivatively to some representation of or surrogate for x:

1. Alice rolled the dice and then moved herself three spaces.
2. John thought Hitchcock looked insufficiently bald in that scene (as played by Welles).
3. (At a waxwork museum/portrait gallery) Elvis, Michael Jackson, and Madonna are on the ground floor, Peter Pan, Zeus, and Cinderella are in the basement.
4. As I approach the famous Széchenyi Chain Bridge, I see two lions at the entrance.

In my view, fictional characters2, such as Holmes2, are representations of fictional characters1, such as Holmes1. I thereby both give an answer to the question what are fictional characters1 and simultaneously explain the ambiguity of fictional names and related phrases.
My stay at IAS CEU allowed me to start writing a book on the so-called cookbooks in classical antiquity. This project proposes to find evidence of food literature in ancient Greece and in the Roman world and to reflect on its purpose and influence on cuisine in classical antiquity and the early Middle Ages. My thesis consists in showing that modern scholars have misunderstood the purpose of ancient treatises on food and have projected modern conceptions about food and literature onto Greek and Roman societies. My book shows that there is no such thing as real learned chefs writing cookbooks in classical antiquity and that Greek and Roman intellectuals who did write treatises on food and cuisine did not understand the relationship between food and literature the same way we do.

Only recently have modern scholars begun to apply a rigorous scholarly approach to ancient cuisine that departed from the usual antiquarian reading of ancient literature on food. In addition, most studies on "ancient cookbooks" published until now are intended for the general public and lack rigorous analysis. They share the desire to "re-enact" ancient cuisine and offer accessible recipes to modern amateur chefs. Their account of ancient cultures is accordingly not only superficial, but also often inaccurate, since their interpretations are mostly based on modern
assumptions. My book and the workshop organized on April 8 2016 titled Cooking Knowledge: An Intellectual History of Food and Cuisine aimed to set the facts straight and to give an academically rigorous account of ancient treatises on cuisine in ancient Western European history.

The book and the workshop reconsidered the importance of food literature in ancient and medieval times and their influence on their respective food culture. It is my claim that the importance of food literature has been exaggerated in modern scholarship. In contrast, my research challenges evidence of the so-called “cookbooks” in ancient Greece and Rome and reflects on their purpose and influence in classical antiquity. Modern scholars have misunderstood the purpose of food literature and have projected the modern conception of “cookbooks” and “gastronomy” onto Greek and Roman societies, and, in many ways, onto Western Medieval Europe. This belief is often established on the basis that claims made by cooks in ancient Greek comedy can be considered representative of reality. My book shows that there is no such thing as learned chefs writing cookbooks in classical antiquity. If a certain literature discussing food can be found, it should not be considered as a proof of claims made by comedy chefs. In the context of a society where literacy is limited to an elite, where the communication of technical knowledge is still mainly embedded in an oral culture and where menial tasks are performed by slaves, claims made by comedy chefs make little sense. My book asserts that ancient Europeans did not share our concerns with food, or at least that they did not share the same values and intellectual categories. Adopting a source-critical approach, my book and the workshop organized on April 8 put food literature back in its literary, social, intellectual, and historical context.

My paper presented at the Fellow’s seminar on April 13 2016 was based on chapter 3 of my book. I argued that there is no clear evidence of the existence of cookbooks in classical antiquity before the 4th century CE, with the exception of two contentious lists preserved by Pollux and Athenaeus of Naucratis. The latter list was examined in details during my presentation. My paper showed that what modern authors perceive as “gastronomic recipes” should be put back in its intellectual, literary and social context, and should be understood instead under three headings more closely related to ancient categories and ancient literature: lexicography, agricultural treatises that focused
on conservation of harvested goods and medical treatises interested in the preservation of health. I claim that food literature discusses recipes and ingredients within those three ancient categories: a lexicographical approach defining and describing existing knowledge on food and cuisine that puts a specific emphasis on erudition and ethnological descriptions (and the utilizations of descriptive lists), a description of recipes to preserve harvested goods on Greek and Roman farms, and a description of medical properties of foodstuffs in medical literature that sometimes explains how they should be prepared (explaining the influence of the cooking method on nutritive values).

While cooking and cuisine may be considered an “art form” today, such an understanding of ancient cuisine among modern scholars is the result of a misapprehension. For instance, what modern translations render as “the art of cuisine” was in fact conceived as technical knowledge (technê) in ancient times. This is confirmed by the fact that cooking in Antiquity was a menial task primarily performed by slaves. To understand such a phenomenon, we have to go back to the origins of intellectual and medical literature and ask how cuisine was described in such treatises. Cuisine is discussed mostly under medical considerations and practical agricultural concerns, as discussed at the workshop “Cooking Knowledge: An Intellectual History of Food and Cuisine” held on April 8, 2016. Discussions underlined how the perception of cooking as either an art form or a science is a historical phenomenon that is not characteristic of all time periods.

Guest speakers included Prof. Bruno Laurioux, Professor of Medieval History at the University François-Rabelais at Tours and Chairman of the Scientific Committee at the European Institute for Food History and Culture, Dr. Robin Nadeau, Humanities Initiative Fellow at CEU – IAS, and Prof. John Wilkins, Professor Emeritus of Ancient Greek Culture at the University of Exeter. Prof. Laurioux exposed how the perception of cooking as an “art form” or as a “science” is a—modern—cultural construction in Western history. I challenged the modern reading of ancient lists of ingredients as recipes. They should be considered rather within the literary genre of ancient lexicography. Prof. Wilkins found related scientific grounds binding ancient medical treatises on food and Achaeus’ mock epic. The workshop was a great success, thanks to IAS’ financial support and logistics. Since the workshop was organized
during the break between the winter and the summer semesters at CEU, students were free to attend. About 40 people, mainly students came to the presentation of papers and took part in the open discussion at the end. On a more personal note, this workshop gave me the opportunity to discuss professional and personal issues with Prof. Laurioux in particular.

As discussed during the workshop food literature had a very different use from our modern cookbooks. In a forthcoming article, I claim that food literature has among other utility—such as entertainment—to provide prescriptive information on food conservation and health preservation. There are no recipes with a blatant epicurean function to be found in the ancient world before Apicius in the 4th century CE. In further research, I would like to develop further the idea that the Apicius book may be a compilation from treatises on farming work that gave information on the preparation and the conservation of meat in particular.

In summary, my book shows that food is depicted differently in ancient literature. The focus is not on recipes that can be reproduced by chefs but rather within intellectual, agricultural and medical concerns. The 4th century BCE presents a turning point in intellectual history, since knowledge is being described and classified within new categories of knowledge. Food becomes therefore classified within descriptive listings, or explained by definitions. We have to consider that a part of this literature on food was written by grammarians and had a lexicographic utility. Secondly, the 4th and 3rd century BCE sees a multiplication of agricultural treatises (inspired by Hesiod’s Works and Days and Xenophon’s Economicus). Food is then presented within this logic of farm production, efficiency, and the conservation of harvested goods. Finally, with the development of humoural medicine, medical treatises start defining the effects of given food products on humors, digestion, and health.

About a third of the book is now completed and the book project is under consideration by a major university press. I was also able to write the first draft of one peer-reviewed paper, and a second one is on the way (details below).

One of IAS CEU greatest strengths is its multidisciplinary environment. Formal and informal discussions with fellow IAS Fellows allowed me to develop my theories further. Two Senior Fellows also helped me navigate through the bureaucracy of academia.
As a Humanities Initiative Fellow, I also had the opportunity to teach a M.A. seminar within the Department of Medieval Studies titled “Food and Society from the Roman Empire to the Early Middle Ages” and to exchange ideas with very stimulated graduate students. This allowed me not only to be more fully integrated into the intellectual and social life of a CEU department but also to interact with colleagues from outside IAS. Although, the Humanities Initiative Fellowship could have been more closely related to the CEU Humanities Initiative program.

On a more personal note, I developed new friendships with some fellows outside the IAS office-space and the Wallenberg Guesthouse. I appreciated the few events that were organized by IAS and that people could also freely take advantage of what the Institute and the city had to offer. My stay at IAS and in Budapest was certainly a very positive experience that inspired me to apply to other similar fellowships.

During my year in Budapest, in order to receive constructive feedback on my work, I looked for opportunities to present my research in front of diverse audiences. Due to the interest in my project, I gave lectures and conference papers in Budapest, Leipzig, Marburg, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and Vienna. The most useful criticism and suggestions I received on my work came from my IAS-colleagues. The presentation I gave as part of the Wednesday seminars, entitled “Agents of Enlightenment: Habsburg Military Engineers and the Implementation of Imperial Cartographic Projects in the Eighteenth Century” led to a heated-discussion about the meaning of “Enlightenment” in Central Europe and the connections between science and empire during the eighteenth century.

The academic dialogue I engaged in with the other IAS fellows and the larger CEU-community forced me to reevaluate my understanding of the role of Habsburg cartographers in the process of imperial centralization and expansion. Therefore, the title of my book manuscript in profess became “Foot Soldiers of Empire: Habsburg Cartographers in the Age of Enlightened Reform” and the spotlight moved on the activities of military men and astronomers. My material allows us to step out from the halls of the imperial residence and government bureaus to follow this new generation of military-men and scientists engaged in a process of measuring, representing and improving imperial landscapes. These
‘foot soldiers of empire’ constantly mediated between Viennese priorities, provincial and local contexts and their own personal agendas. The second major addition to my project is an introductory chapter comparing the imperial experience of the Habsburg Monarchy with respect to developments in other early-modern empires, such as Britain, France, Spain and Russia. Contrasting the story of an almost land-locked empire, namely the Habsburg Monarchy, with maritime empires reveals how the geographic and geopolitical challenges specific to this Central European polity impacted its mapmaking policies and the larger process of centralization.

In addition to working on my first book manuscript, the proximity to archives in Budapest and Vienna encouraged me to pursue ideas for new academic projects. First, trips to the Map Collection of the Military Museum, the Map Collection of Széchényi Library and the Hungarian National Archives, gave me access to new sources for the study of Habsburg cartography and mapmakers in the eighteenth century. Whereas my current book project is heavily focused on the post-1750 time period, military engineers had been surveying and representing strategic points in the Habsburg borderlands decades before. Therefore, I hope to publish a series of articles analyzing the efforts of Habsburg mapmakers to represent the southeastern border provinces of the Monarchy, namely Transylvania (annexed in 1699) and Austrian Wallachia (incorporated as part of the empire between 1718 and 1740).

I also started archival work for my second book-length project, with the current title “Translating Habsburg Oceanic Ventures: Geographic Knowledge and Imperial Cartography in the Eighteenth Century.” In this new undertaking, I plan to analyze Habsburg involvement with transoceanic projects and the translation of these experiences into repositories of knowledge. The rich literature addressing the developments of the British, Dutch, French, Spanish or Portuguese empires in the early-modern period, rarely acknowledges that these states viewed the Habsburgs as a competitor and a serious threat to their global interests, especially in the 1720s-1730s and 1770s-1780s. In order to understand the full extent of the Habsburg Monarchy’s transformation into a centralized multiethnic state towards the end of the eighteenth century, we need to consider both their European and extra-European engagements. Even though the Austrian Habsburgs never achieved a global empire, the
transoceanic experiences of their administrators, engineers, scientists and traders, often translated in cartographic format, informed internal and international policies. A short research trip to Vienna in early March, 2016, helped me access cartographic material representing extra-European territories preserved in Habsburg repositories. Additionally, the papers of long-distance trading companies supported by the Habsburg rulers provided a means to contextualize the maps and geographic descriptions identified in Viennese collections.

My academic pursuits as an IAS fellow were luckily not solitary ventures. Instead, I actively pursued building a network of scholars interested in the intersection of the history of science and empire in the early-modern period. Located at the crossroad of imperial traditions, Budapest provided the perfect site for organizing an international workshop on the topic “Intertwined Enlightenments? Studies of science and empire in the Habsburg, Ottoman and Russian realms during the eighteenth century.” With the encouragement and support of Nadia Al-Bagdadi, László Kontler and Karl Hall, I invited thirteen scholars from Europe and the United States to insert the experiences of the Habsburg Monarchy, and the Russian and the Ottoman empires into “science and empire” studies more firmly than before. The animated discussions during the workshop sessions involved presenters, session chairs and a very active audience incorporating academics from a variety of higher education institutions in Budapest, such as CEU, ELTE, Corvinus University, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Hungarian National Archives. In the upcoming year I plan to continue this collaboration in the form of a special issue of a peer-reviewed journal.

As a Humanities Initiative Fellow I had the opportunity to become integrated both in the life of the IAS and the Department of History. During the Fall of 2015, I taught the seminar “Cartography and Empires in Early Modern Europe (1400-1800)” and the weekly discussions with my students, enriched my own understanding of the material we read together. For twelve weeks we examined imperial maps in the age of European empires and we discussed how monarchs incorporated maps as essential tools for governing, defending and expanding their lands. The final papers my students wrote, on topics ranging from sixteenth-century representations of Constantinople, maps of Bohemia before the Thirty Years’ War, the first mapping of the Greek Kingdom and the
geographic production of German Colonial Societies in the nineteenth century, demonstrated their intellectual courage to engage with topics outside of their main research focus. The CEU students' enthusiasm for integrating cartographic material in their historical analyses motivated the organization of a workshop on “Historical Cartography” together with the Herder Institute (Marburg, Germany). Dr. Victoria Harms (CEU MA Alumna, 2007), Postdoctoral Fellow at the Herder Institute and Dr. Christian Lotz, Head of the Map Collection of the Herder Institute hosted eight CEU graduate students and me for three days. The students spent the time in Marburg learning how to integrate maps as primary sources in their projects and conducted individual research in the Herder Institute’s collections.

I also benefitted from the advice and intellectual guidance of CEU faculty, especially Laszlo Kontler, Nadia Al-Bagdadi, Emese Lafferton, Karl Hall, Jan Hennings and Tijana Krstić. Already known to me from their academic work, these scholars whole-heartedly provided feedback on my project, suggestions for future funding opportunities and offered me the chance to present my findings as part of the Science Studies lecture series. Their dedication to building a first-class academic program and research portfolio at CEU was inspiring and I can only hope to join similar higher-education institutions in the future.

Colleagues from IAS and CEU in a similar stage of their career like myself helped me navigate the transition from graduate student to postdoctoral fellow. They became wonderful interlocutors for discussing book projects, the process of applying for academic jobs and organizing academic events. Robin Nadeau’s and Katalin Straner’s perseverance, work ethic and adaptability in the face of the adverse job market conditions provided examples that I will strive to follow.

Considering the diverse interests and disciplines of the IAS fellows I was very fortunate to have a number of colleagues working on topics engaging directly with the history of the Habsburg Monarchy. David Do Paço’s and Tatjana Buklijas’ inspired incursions into the Ottoman past and medical history of Vienna underscored for me new facets of the Habsburg capital’s history. Tatjana Buklijas’ ability to connect the history of science and empire in an organic manner informs my determination to contextualize the history of Habsburg cartography in a similar manner.

Although junior fellows were not officially paired with a more senior
mentor, most of us relied on the knowledge and experience of our colleagues. In my case, William O’Reilly’s arrival in January provided a positive impetus to my current project and future research plans. The last months were filled with enthusiastic discussions about the Habsburg military border, cartography and science, military engineers, migration and the Habsburg global ambitions. William O’Reilly’s generosity in sharing archival findings and insightful details about eighteenth-century Habsburg history, and in providing extensive feedback on my presentations and written work became for me one of the most valuable aspects of this fellowship.

Bringing together scholars at various stages in their academic career, from a variety of teaching and research institutions, the IAS was the perfect place for a newly minted PhD like myself. At this time, when opportunities for tenure-track or postdoctoral positions in the humanities are decreasing while the number of applicants is increasing substantially, there is nothing more valuable than learning from other people’s career choices and professional pathways. Moreover, as a young mother with a partner in academia, I have been lucky to meet at IAS and the larger CEU community people with similar family circumstances, who did not hesitate to share their experiences and provide professional and personal support.

The office area and the Guesthouse facilitated organized encounters that enriched both my intellectual and personal life in Budapest. The inner courtyard and the common rooms in the Raoul Wallenberg Guesthouse offered an inspired venue for potluck parties and other social gatherings. Living in the same place as most of the other fellows helped build a sense of community that went beyond exchanging scholarly references or developing academic collaborations. I will miss the impromptu visits to share meals and news with Mihai and Laura Surdu, take part in pizza nights and play dates with Tatjana Buklijas and her family or hear about Corina Petrescu’s latest walking adventures through the city. Being part of the IAS-family reminded me of the importance of social ties and the human fabric of academia. I am very grateful that thanks to the IAS I also became part of the far-reaching CEU network and I hope I will preserve the strong ties that I created with the academic community in Budapest.
We aim at devising the basic principles of a data-driven science for social mining, i.e., the conceptual and computational tools to create abstract models of social behavior and dynamics based on novel analytical paradigm at the crossroad of network science and data mining from big data of human activities. We concentrate on three aspects of social behavior: the patterns of human mobility, the diffusion dynamics in social networks, and the patterns of success in sports.

The behavioral models we aim at should represent profiles of human dynamics at different scales, replicable, re-applicable and re-localizable to different context and different geographies. Such models are expected to shed a deeper light on the way cities work, as well as on the diffusion phenomena in social networks and the understanding of how success is reached in sport, based on novel network representations of human dynamics and novel social sensing and mining techniques for capturing and analyzing the digital traces of human activities. We adopt a data-driven science approach, where theory emerges from large-scale experiments, based on the unique experiences and datasets made available by our KDD Lab. at Univ. Pisa, in collaboration with the Center of Network Science at CEU. We shall build on our vast experience in analyzing large-scale mobility
data, such as GPS tracks, GSM (mobile phone records) datasets and many more big data sources, which make it possible to study the evolutionary dynamics of diffusion, success and movement phenomena.

Traditional regime-type designations—democracy, authoritarianism, and their hybrid cousins—help us think about how power is enacted in relationships between states and society, but they also reify state-society relationships as homogenous across territory and coextensive with state boundaries. My project reexamines state-society relationships in the contexts of contemporary Russia and Ukraine. Drawing on extensive fieldwork-based research, my manuscript analyzes the political economy of popular participation in imitations of democratic institutions, from staged electoral contests to elite-driven social movements. In these contexts, far from simply reproducing elements of the Soviet past, such performances articulate a distinct politics that expresses a global shift in the configuration of state and capital. Using the concept of political theater, I show how spatial variation in the ways individuals experience interaction with state agents can help us understand how and where fractures develop in public understandings of political legitimacy—and how ordinary people even may come to disagree about the proper boundaries of the polity.

My book manuscript seeks to denaturalize dominant relations and discourses in order to generate a theory of the political grounded in everyday practice but situated within a global framework. Based in reflection upon the security-political nexus and anchored in field research conducted over several years in rural areas of Zakarpattia (Ukraine), my analysis first deconstructs contemporary arrangements providing for a sense of security in order to assemble the analytical elements required to create a subsequent vision of the political that is reflective of lived experience. It is through the process of radical immanent critique, destabilizing the political as a transcendent idea, that I re-frame our current political realities and explore the possibility of an emancipatory project that would, in the words of Max Horkheimer, “foreshadow the path of progress.”

Following my reconceptualization of the political within a “global” rather than “international” framework in my current manuscript, my
next project pushes forward my investigation to explore structural and relational elements associated with formal and informal contemporary social movements. Asking the question “How are social movements writ large adapting to the changing global landscape?” this project will generate a grounded theorization that reflects the phenomenological and relational nature of social organizations. I proceed from the premise that the structuring of society at all levels is in a constant state of change, adapting to pressures, be they political, economic, environmental, etc. From this point of view, organizations are best studied from a relational perspective, for which I initially explore possibilities offered by systems, structuration and assemblage theories. This millennium has witnessed the acceleration of globalization, the fragmentation and networking of militant movements, a dramatic increase in the flow of refugees and oppression in general, and the disaggregation of the political left under the pressure of market based logics. For a civil society to have a fair chance to adapt and survive, it must understand the world as it is. This project undertakes this challenge.
The focus of my project is on personal, familial, and cultural mythology and its relationship to creativity. During my time in Budapest I examined, first hand, how people living within Budapest associate and understand their chosen professions in relationship to their lineage.

This research is for a book project about identity and creativity and how they inspire community based art in today’s societies. In addition to gathering information for this project I worked on a proposal to be submitted to the CEU to create and install an art object based on my research. I gave two public presentation on my development as an artist. Thus I hoped to contribute to the development of the Visual Studies Platform at the university. Other aspects of this research I plan to incorporate in my teaching at Rutgers University.

Philosophically, my approach to art is post-modern. I am a person who embraces paradox and I reject distinctions of “subject” and “object.” Most of our key concepts, values, beliefs and structures derive their historicity from cultural construction which itself is personal. I am interested in how (our) personal and cultural histories are altered, as we as human beings are constantly revising, to better understand, our positions within our communities and our visions for the future. In this respect scholarly studies on cultural memory help me to conceptualize my work.
I create work from a place of seeking to respond to the Pre-Socratic question “How shall one be-in-the-world?” However, I reject the postmodern notion that all knowledge has become externalized, materialized, and commoditized under the pressure of the information age and totalitarianism, and that our underlying “Metanarratives” of human purpose have become irrelevant. However, given its long history of falling in and out of occupation and how pervasively the Hungarian psyche is veiled with the effects of that dance, I could not imagine a more interesting place to explore this matter than Hungary. My project dealt with the roots of social knowledge through the lens of identity and lineage.

Axel Brown
Multimedia Artist

My artistic research project some kind of opposition (2014-16) revisited the unresolved controversy about the Gabcikovo-Nagymaros Dam System, a disputed infrastructure project that was partly established along the Danube in Hungary and Slovakia since 1977.

The results of the project were presented in an exhibition at Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives at Central European University from 11 March to 1 May 2016. The exhibition traces the activities of Duna Kör (Danube Circle) – one of the first environmental initiatives in Central and Eastern Europe – and its substantial role as a civic movement during the years of regime change in Hungary. Video footage from the 1980s and early 90s by documentary filmmakers, Ádám Csillag and Fekete Doboz (Black Box) provides the base for Braun’s artistic approach to the topic.

Found footage from archives and personal collections as well as new photo and video productions are contextualized within the framework of a multimedia installation. On the one hand, the exhibition tells the story of a civic movement that successfully opposed an authoritarian regime. On the other hand, it provides an ideal example for the complex processes and discussions that characterize the developments of our living spaces in the age of the Anthropocene. Furthermore it is meant to contribute to the current discussions about European integration and anti-democratic tendencies in Central and Eastern Europe.

The project would not have been feasible without the relentless support of translator, research assistant and project manager Szilvia Nagy. The exhibition was supported by Kunststiftung NRW and the Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives. The artistic research project
Irina Botea Bucan  
*Visual artist and educator*

has been supported by a Visegrad Scholarship at the Open Society Archives in 2014 and an Artist-in-Residence Fellowship by the Institute for Advanced Study and Visual Studies Platform at Central European University in 2015/16.

**POLITICISED LANDSCAPES**, a collateral program with presentations, panel discussions and film screenings, was organized to extend the focus of the exhibition. The series of events was supported by CEU IAS and the Visual Studies Platform at CEU.

While being an artist-in-residence at CEU IAS, I primarily focused on the development of an experimental (ethnographic) documentary on the history and contemporary relevance of cultural houses and community cultural clubs in Hungary.

The background to this proposal reflects my ongoing research and artistic practice as a Romanian born visual artist, researcher and educator. Essentially, the artist-in-residence proposal was designed to build upon my artistic interests and archived-based investigations that have recently been initiated at OSA.

Throughout the 50-year period prior to December 1989, almost every city, town and village in Romania had a cultural center, called Câmin Cultural or Casa de Cultură (houses or ‘homely places’ for culture). Their construction materialized the utopian dream of communism to create a communal place where everyone could be both engaged and surveyed. No matter how remote or small a village, a House of Culture would be built there so that no-one would be left outside ‘official culture’. However, culturally diverse communities and individuals often appropriated these spaces in complex and contrasting ways. Today, many centers have disappeared due to lack of funds, while others have been transformed into bars, restaurants or discos. However, some have kept their initial utopian function of alternative education and ‘culture for everybody’.

Being an artist-in-residence in Budapest at CEU IAS, provided me with the opportunity to extend and develop my comparative research perspective through focusing on the transformation of the cultural houses and community cultural clubs in Hungary.

This experimental film proposal looks at how cultural houses and community cultural clubs were not only destinations for disseminating
official culture, often in bluntly ideological and propagandistic ways, but also places where the population was ‘activated’ creatively through encouraging contact and participation in theatre, filmmaking, visual arts, music and crafts. Cultural houses also functioned to ensure the distribution of material knowledge concerning hygiene, medical awareness and skills necessary for economic production.

My project challenges established arguments that claim that art and cultural activities in oppressive regimes lack individual agency, subscribing instead to the view that ‘[m]uch as authority sought to control the meanings and uses of space, the spatial practices of the citizens were not contained by the party-state machine’ (Reid & Crowley, 2012).

The main questions that the experimental film will address are:
• How did everyday social and cultural practices in cultural houses differ from, and politically challenge, a centralised policy agenda during the communist era?
• How were these places appropriated in the social context of different multi-ethnic communities?
• In the context of a growing interest in socially engaged art in contemporary Hungary do state owned cultural houses represent a distinctly different model of participation in cultural activities than that provided by increasingly privatized contemporary art and cultural institutions throughout Europe?

For the above project, I worked closely with Kinga Bódi, Katalin Aknai, Kata Balazs, Ioana Macrea Toma, Marton Szarvas and Jon Dean, who all supported and helped to facilitate “directed interviews” with a range of artists and cultural workers having personal experiences of the “cultural house system”, including: Tibor Varnagy, Ernesztin Reszler, Imre Bak, Károly Halász, Katalin Timár, János Sugár, Éva Molnár, Wave Music, Young Artists Studio and members of the Orfeo group (Mihály Kiss, Ilona Nemeth and Tamas Fodor)

Additionally, together with my collaborator Jon Dean, I organized a symposium on “Aesthetics and Politics of “Amateur” and “Home Identities”. The event proposed two topics for debate: the politics of an “amateur” identity and its relationship with aesthetic experimentation and the concept of “home” as an institutional identity within the context of two case studies: Casa Radio (Radio House Bucharest) and Memorial Houses. Guest speakers were Daria Ghiu, Maria Balabas, Nicu
Ilfoveanu, Jon Dean and the event was moderated by Irina Botea Bucan and Jon Dean. 

Daria Ghiu and Maria Balabas presented “The origins, history and aims of the Radio House Bucuresti”; Nicu Ilfoveanu discussed “Amateur experimentation and failure in photography”. I also organized film screenings; “General Mood” by Irina Botea Bucan and Jon Dean; Film “Postale” by Irina Botea and Nicu Ilfoveanu.

The proposed film “Hungarian cultural houses between political program and cultural appropriation” is part of my current practice-based research on cultural houses in the Eastern Bloc; an historical and anthropological comparative analysis of the diverse and conflicting ways in which these centers currently operate through focusing on internal micro-processes and community usage.
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FELLOW SEMINARS

4 November, 2015  Dorit Geva, Associate Professor of Sociology at the Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, CEU, Faculty Fellow IAS CEU
Beauty and the Bourse: Marine Le Pen, Class Grievances, and the Gendered Political Field

11 November, 2015  Geoff Roberts, Professor of History, University College Cork; Senior Fellow, IAS CEU
Ilya Ehrenburg, the Peace Movement and the Crisis of 1956

18 November, 2015  Lee Walters, University of Southampton, UK,
Junior Fellow at IAS CEU
Fictional Characters: Represented and Representation

25 November, 2015  Corina Petrescu, University of Mississippi, US,
Senior Fellow at IAS CEU
A Different 1956 – 80 Years of Yiddish Theater in Romania
2 December, 2015  Dino Pedreschi, Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining Lab, Università di Pisa e Istituto di Scienza e Tecnologie dell’Informazione del CNR, Affiliated Fellow at IAS CEU
Towards a Digital Time Machine fueled by Big Data and Social Mining

9 December, 2015  Tatjana Buklijas, Research Fellow, Liggins Institute, University of Auckland, New Zealand; Senior Thyssen Fellow at IAS CEU
Discipline, Dissection and the City: The Politics of Anatomy in Modern Vienna

13 January, 2016  Calin Cotoi, University of Bucharest, Romania, Junior EURIAS Fellow, IAS CEU
Anarchists, Hygienists, and Sociologists: Imperial Networks and Nation Building in fin-de-siècle Romania

20 January, 2016  Mihai Surdu, University of Bucharest
Whose Blood, which Genes? Narratives and Sampling Strategies in Roma-Related Genetic Research

27 January, 2016  Hans Jörg Sigwart, Senior Lecturer for Political Theory, University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany, Senior Thyssen Fellow at IAS CEU
Living Embodiments of Transformation: On Hannah Arendt’s Characterological Theory of Totalitarianism

3 February, 2016  Madalina Veres, Humanities Initiative Fellow at IAS CEU
Agents of Enlightenment: Habsburg Military Engineers and the Implementation of Imperial Cartographic Projects in the Eighteenth Century
10 February, 2016  IULIUS ROSTAS, Corvinus University, Affiliated Fellow at IAS CEU, Open Society Foundations Roma Initiatives Fellow  
*Ethnicity, Power and Inclusion: Why Policies towards Roma in Europe Are Failing*

17 February, 2016  LOUISE VASVARI, Stony Brook University, Senior Fellow at IAS CEU  
*Women Writing Holocaust Lives and Beyond*

24 February, 2016  DAVID DO PAÇO, Sciences Po, junior fellow at IAS CEU  
*A Cross-Cultural Regional Integration: Austria and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century*

2 March, 2016  MEDHA CHATURVEDI, Global Challenges Fellow, School of Public Policy/Institute for Advanced Study  
*Political Representation and Counterinsurgency: A Case Study of India’s Left Wing Extremism*

16 March, 2016  TIBOR VALUCH, University of Eger, Hungary  
*Workers in East and West - the social stratification, life strategies, and lifestyles of Workers’ Class in Hungary, Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia after WWII*

23 March, 2016  STELA KRASTEVA, University of California, Los Angeles  
*Evangelical Christianity and Roma Communities in Post-Socialist Bulgaria*

13 April, 2016  ROBIN NADEAU, University of Exeter, UK  
*Too Many Cookbooks. The History of Cookery Books in Antiquity*
20 April, 2016  Mohammad Hassan Khani, Imam Sadiq University, Tehran
Regional Integration as a Means for Lasting Peace &
Sustainable Development in the Middle East

27 April, 2016  Peter Schröder, University College, London, UK
Trust & Mistrust as political concepts in the History of Political Thought

11 May, 2016  Alexandra Urakova, Gorky Institute of World
Literature, Russian Academy of Sciences
Dangerous Gifts: Uncle Tom’s Cabin, Gift Economy, and Race

18 May, 2016  William O’Reilly, University of Cambridge, UK
The emperor who would be king: HRE Charles VI
and the ‘Nationalities’, 1711-1740

25 May, 2016  John Luiz, University of Cape Town
Institutional Arbitrage as a Driver of Outward Foreign Direct Investment

8 June, 2016  IAS Alumni Lecture
David Ruderman, Joseph Meyerhoff Professor of Modern Jewish
History, University of Pennsylvania
The Intellectual and Spiritual Journey of a Nineteenth-Century
Convert: From Judaism to Christianity to Hebrew Christianity
12 May, 2016

Fínbarr Barry Flood, William R. Kenan Jr. Professor of the Humanities, Institute of Fine Arts and Department of Art History, New York University

Islam, Image and Iconoclasm
Axel Braun, artist and photographer,
junior artist-in-residence at IAS CEU
Towards an Understanding of Anthropocene Landscapes
(Exhibition jointly organized with the CEU Visual Studies Platform.)

Axel Braun has developed an artistic research practice that deals with human-altered landscapes as indicators for changing ideals, structures and processes in society. As an artist Axel understands controversies about large technologies and infrastructure projects as complex discursive fields that need to be mapped – and whose aesthetical qualities merit visualization. His installations aim to provide multisensual access to his topics in order to facilitate in-depth experience of rhetoric strategies and visual narratives. In a time that is characterized by the close relation of the paradigm of sustainability and the threat of climate change, he approaches contemporary landscapes as indicators for processes that can be encountered both locally and globally. Apart from reflections on changing ideas of nature, progress or growth, his work provokes questions on power and responsibility.
“My work stands on the shoulders of the feminist movement of the 1970s. My roots are deeply embedded in this generation where making work about domesticity, autobiography, hand-made crafts, and the decorative was a political statement. When women started breaking the rules about who they had to be, and artists started breaking the rules about what art had to be. I am not afraid to make art that some would call decorative or about adornment; however, the term Baroque is more fitting. My work has always been about abundance and accumulation. The installation provided the greatest elasticity in a time when flexibility, protest, and re-inventions were part of the psychological culture. It enabled me to gather seemingly unrelated thoughts, techniques, and passions within one playing field. Process, reflection, metaphor, materials, and the visual translation of issues about time and the human condition are at the core of the work. Working with others to produce labor-intensive environmental projects derives from my deliberate effort to “slow down time.” In a fast paced and technologically interconnected non-stop world what I attempt, with the support of others, is to produce work using repetitive, ritualized, hand-made and primarily low tech creative techniques, like meditation practice, encourage viewers to step outside their everyday always pressing concerns. Art and social practice is a conversation at the fore of the contemporary art dialogue, yet, I am clear that my contribution is one that quietly nurtures and hopefully offers hope within an environment that promotes an unorthodox sense of beauty.”

Judit Frigyesi, Bar Ilan University

Béla Bartók’s The Miraculous Mandarin was conceived in a highly politicized atmosphere, during and immediately after WWI. Its hero is an imaginary Chinese mandarin, who is frightening and even absurd
and yet a personage that possesses supernatural power that the “West”
cannot subdue. What is the meaning of such a seemingly racist depiction
of the “Chinese” in a Hungarian “national” work at that historical time?
I will argue that, even though at first sight, it seems logical, the above
is the wrong question. The characterisations traditionally suggested
for this piece (orientalist, nationalist, social/moral drama) are all
misleading. This work is none of these. I propose that The Miraculous
Mandarin is the capturing, in music, of a primeval human psychological
process on the one hand and the creation of a mythology on the other.
It is not “theatre” per se, but a transformation ritual. My topic thus is a
philosophical one: the conflict between the theatrical (surface) drama,
which connects with political-social power structures, and the emotional,
/mythical, and philosophical drama, which transcends these powers.

23 February, 2016

IRINA BOTEA, senior artist-in-residence at IAS CEU
Prioritizing Human Agency as a Vehicle for Meaning,
Reenactments, Auditions, Translations
(Jointly organized with the CEU Visual Studies Platform.)

Over the past twenty years, Irina Botea has been engaged in an art
practice that uses multiple methodologies to consistently question
dominant socio-political ideas and prioritize human agency as a
vehicle for meaning. Currently, her focus is on the decentralization
of cultural discourses and the possibility of sustaining creative
differentiation that arguably exists outside of a dominant hegemonic
system of values and critique. Simultaneously, Irina has had a
proactive involvement in teaching at various educational institutions
and community venues, including: The School of the Art Institute
Chicago, Piet Zwart Institute Rotterdam, and Atelier 35 Bucharest.
L’Orient à Vienne au dix-huitième siècle
(Book presentation)

L’Orient à Vienne au dix-huitième siècle explores the Austro-Ottoman milieu of Vienna and sheds a new light on the administrative, social and urban history of a cosmopolitan city in the heart of Europe at the age of the Enlightenment.

1956: The Meaning and Remembrance of the Revolution in Contemporary Hungary

The revolution in 1956 is one of the most important and perhaps most disputed events of contemporary Hungarian history. After a brief summary of the revolution, the presentation will attempt to give an overview of the main problems of the historical remembrance of 1956, focusing on the central questions: What kind of collective memory exists about 1956 in Hungary today? How and why were the official and the private commemorations of 1956 divided during the Kádár period? Why didn’t the memory of 1956 become the starting point for political resistance over decades and how did this change in the 1980s? Why was it clear that Imre Nagy’s reburial signaled the collapse of the communist regime in Hungary? How have people used the historical heritage of 1956? As the memory of the 1956 revolution became part of political identity, how did it influence the liberation process of common and individual memory after the change of regime?
Only recently have modern scholars begun to apply a rigorous scholarly approach to ancient cuisine. Many studies published until now are intended for the general public and lack rigorous analysis. They share the desire to “re-enact” ancient cuisine and offer accessible recipes to modern amateur chefs. Their account of ancient cultures is accordingly not only superficial, but also frequently inaccurate, since their interpretations are based on modern assumptions. The workshop aimed to set the facts straight and to give an academically rigorous account of ancient treatises on cuisine in ancient Western European history.
6-7 May, 2016  **Comparative Ways into Competing Versions of Modernity in East Central Europe**  
Conference organized by IAS CEU (EURIAS fellow Calin Cotoi) jointly with the “Nicolae Iorga” History Institute of the Romanian Academy and the Institute for Political History, Budapest

The conference aimed to discuss how competing modernization projects in East Central Europe are generating their own technical, administrative and academic elites and how such professional groups come to shape the very processes they were called to steer. Concretely, we were focusing on how various technical-reformist and scientific-disciplinary projects (public hygiene, demographics, statistics, social medicine, physical anthropology, sociology, human geography etc.) populated and connected the larger political modernization projects. Elites, experts, discourses, technologies, diplomas and scientific templates travel inside transnational networks bringing (most often) Western European visions for local problems, dilemmas and reform attempts. In the process, local projects were assembled; “obligatory passage points” were created and new variants of social modernity and nation building got constituted.

19-20 May, 2016  **Intertwined Enlightenments? Studies of science and empire in the Habsburg, Ottoman and Russian realms during the eighteenth century**  
Conference organized by IAS (Humanities Initiative Fellow Madalina Veres) and the Department of History at CEU  
Invited speakers include Harun Küçük, University of Pennsylvania; Simon Werrett, University College London and Marianne Klemun, University of Vienna

The study of empires, Enlightenment and the production and circulation of scientific knowledge in the eighteenth century has yielded a respectable amount of exciting scholarship during the last three decades or so. This scholarship has predominantly focused on the reciprocities between the cultivation of scientific knowledge and the shaping of the colonial
nexus in the maritime empires maintained by western European states, such as the British, French or the Spanish Empires. While almost exclusively confined to the Eurasian landmass and North Africa, the Habsburg Monarchy, and the Russian and the Ottoman empires also took an active part in the production of science on a global scale. The workshop aimed to insert the experience of these empires into “science and empire” studies more firmly than it has been hitherto achieved.

6 June, 2016

**Gift Economy and the US Antebellum Literary Market**

IAS workshop with guest speaker Leon Jackson (University of South Carolina) and Alexandra Urakova (Russian Academy of Sciences, senior fellow at IAS CEU) and Sándor Hites, Senior Research Fellow at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences

The workshop was focusing on the problem of gift economies and gift exchange in relation to the antebellum literary market (1820s-1850s). The antebellum period is of particular importance for American literary history for many different reasons: most strikingly, because it witnessed a transition to a full-fledged market economy. Many processes within the literary culture of the time were symptomatic of this transition. The speakers, however, shared the premise that the “authorship in the antebellum period was transacted through a multitude of distinct economies, each of which had its own rules and reciprocities, its own exchange rituals and ethical strictures, and even, sometimes, its own currencies” (Leon Jackson, The Business of Letters: Authorial Economies in Antebellum America, Stanford: Stanford UP, 2008, p. 2). Gift exchange was one of these economies. Gift exchange mediated relations between the agents of the literary market. Entrenched in a number of intertwining cultural discourses of the time, gift economies are crucial for our understanding of antebellum literary identity. In a broader perspective, using the antebellum period as a case, the workshop intends to question how gift theory developed by the twentieth century’s anthropologists, sociologists, and philosophers may enrich and challenge literary studies.
8-9 June, 2016  **Master Class in Hermeneutics: A Dialogue about Reading Genesis**

with David B. Ruderman (University of Pennsylvania) and Peter Stallybrass (University of Pennsylvania) co-organized by the Center for Religious Studies and IAS at CEU

Two experts on the history of the Bible discussed some of the startlingly different ways in which the opening chapter of Genesis has been understood, as well as the sometimes contradictory uses to which its verses have been put by ancients vs. moderns, Jews vs. Christians, and historians vs. literary scholars.

10 June, 2016  **Literary Cults: Transnational Perspectives and Approaches**

Workshop co-organized by the IAS (senior fellow Alexandra Urakova) and the Literary Research Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences

The subject of literary cults appears to have particular resonance in post-socialist Hungary and Russia since both countries witnessed first-hand the personality cults of the Soviet era; the shared experience has made Hungarian and Russian scholars especially sensitive to cult rhetoric embedded in modern literary practice. It is our aim in this workshop to go beyond our original recognition and to test and explore the transnational and multinational dimensions of literary cults and their relations to larger cultural structures (mainstream media, the nation state, the worldwide web.) Therefore the aim was (1) to share Hungarian and Russian experience of studying cultic phenomena; (2) look at this subject from outside these two research traditions engaging international scholars with different cultural background and scholars from different disciplines; (3) discuss specific cases of literary cults (Faris Ahmad al-Shidyaq, Alexander Pushkin, Edgar Allan Poe, and Anne Frank among them).
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