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The academic year 2016/17 has been a memorable one for the Institute. It began with great anticipation, marking and celebrating the ias’s fifth anniversary with a special conference. The end of the year was marked by ceu being obliged to face special legislation enacted by the Hungarian authorities which threatened the continuing operation of our mother institution, ceu and, by extension the Institute. These lines are being written now with some temporal distance from the initial shock, which has now diminished in intensity although the situation remains unresolved and very uncertain. However, as much as these developments overshadowed the second half of the academic year, overall we look back at a dynamic and fruitful year, marked by outings and gatherings with the Fellows, institutional fixtures such as the Annual ias Lecture, delivered this year by French historian Robert Darnton in a packed auditorium and as the meeting of the Academic Advisory Board, and much more.

What this year to us was an important moment and a marker of institutional history of this very young institution, may appear to be a rather modest achievement to most of you. Fifth anniversaries rarely invite celebration. In normal academic lifespans, five years more often mark the end of something, a research project, a 5-year plan, a move up the career leader. The simple reason why the Institute took pride in marking this
anniversary with a special conference is that when IAS CEU welcomed its first cohort of Fellows September 2011, it was far from certain that it would become a durable, let alone a thriving institution. Today, IAS CEU has become a fully independent expansive unit at the university, its presence established among European and international networks of sister institutions. Space and Place – Mobility and Frontiers in 21st Century Advanced Research was the theme of our fifth anniversary conference. The theme resonates strongly with current challenges that are in some ways specific to our Institute but not exclusive to us. It refers us to the rapidly changing virtual modes of connectivity and networks, changing patterns and habits of work of individual academics and of institutions overall. The conference brought together current and former fellows, long term and new institutional partners of IAS, and directors of IAS in our immediate neighborhood, Bucharest, Sofia, and Vienna. Discussions focused on the impact of temporary translocation to new, and often unfamiliar environments, calling up themes of familiarity and unfamiliarity, cumulativeness and breaks, concentration and interruption, real and virtual senses of place, freedom and constraint, engagement and reticence, potentially private time and realization of the limits on time.

In retrospect, the theme defining our fifth anniversary took another, unexpected connotation and turn as well. If Collegium Budapest was the first institute “behind the iron curtain” to become a ‘place of happiness’, in the happy expression of renown economist János Kornai, whose critical mind marked his international and local reputation and career, this lasted only very briefly, as the challenge to free and critical thinking appears to be nowhere greater at the moment than in this, Eastern part of Europe. How the changing political and cultural environment has changed the rationale and legitimacy of institutes like ours was and continues to be subject to discussion among institutes in the region. That these developments should be of concern to all European institutions and academics was the tenor of the brilliant keynote lecture by an eminent doyen of Institutes of Advanced Study, Wolf Lepenies, whose leadership and wisdom continue to be sources of intellectual inspiration and political and institutional support.

It goes without saying that the year had much more than this to say for itself. Twenty-seven fellows spent time with us in Budapest during the year, coming from the different fields of economics, history, sociology, religious studies, political science, philosophy, law and classics. Artists in residence apart, the projects of our fellows were not designed in terms of the theme of space and place. Nevertheless, one cannot avoid noting the spatial turns of many of our Fellows’ research interests, covering themes around the globe as diverse as from India-Pakistan Border Management: Violence, Institutions and Peacebuilding to Elective Affinities: Friendship in Russia, from Coffee and Socialism in the Venezuelan Andes to Tudor Diplomacy in a multi-confessional Age or from ‘The Impact of Libor Rigging on the International Markets of Europe to Sándor Márai in Budapest.

Thus every year has its very special flavor, marked by events large and small, encounters among fellows and the academic community, and as it were, annual pet themes and tonalities. The list of events at the end of this Yearbook displays the wide array of fascinating individual research projects as well as the beginnings of new collective projects, emerging from encounters and elective affinities between scholars at IAS. A special year, yet again!

Nadia Al-Bagdadi
fellows
I arrived at IAS CEU at the beginning of January 2017 after serving a three-year period as head of my department, a position almost entirely dedicated to administrative and day to day issues. This period was so exhausting for me that I began to worry that I would never be able to focus on my research again. Thanks to the fantastic conditions provided by IAS and its staff, and especially at the Wallenberg Guesthouse, my mood changed in a matter of days. CEU awoke my intellectual curiosity and while enjoying almost ideal surrounding of Budavar, very soon I could spend entire days reading and writing my project.

During my six months’ stay I made considerable progress on what I want to turn into a book length monograph. Twice during my stay, I made a trip to the archives and collected material. In addition, I attended a conference at University College Dublin’s Centre for War Studies, from 30 March to 2 April 2017, together with other members of the network for the study of Transnational War Resistance where I discussed the research I am doing at IAS. Furthermore, I benefited from CEU’s rich library and especially their Inter-library loan service free of charge. Most importantly the stimulating atmosphere at CEU induced me to think thoroughly about my project and its outcomes. In this sense, I had several long discussions with CEU professors and doctoral students who were

Bojan Aleksov
University College London, School of Slavonic and Eastern European Studies, Senior Thyssen fellow

Jewish Refugees in the Balkans: Entangled Perspectives on Second World War and the Holocaust
interested in my work and were very supportive and beneficially critical. Many of them came to my presentation delivered at IAS Fellows’ lectures series, which was a great honor but also a motivation to continue and complete my research once I am back in London. In my presentation, I basically read out the first draft of my introduction which I wrote over the last few months setting out my topic, its place in the existing literature and the challenges I face regarding my narrative sources (autobiographies/memoirs/personal recollections/interviews). There was a lively debate and the participants pointed out to me some very relevant issues to consider.

In addition to the introduction I have now a full structure for my book provisionally entitled Jewish Refugees in the Balkans 1933-1945 and drafts of all chapters though they are very far from being ready. I still have unresolved issues such as my criticism of/relationship with the existing literature; the statistics and numbers; list of victims and whether to publish them as they are bound to be inconclusive; lack of visual material; balance of context and comparison; whether it is appropriate to consider Yugoslavia (and one chapter on Albania) as the Balkans, etc. I hope to resolve these in the future and benefit from two presentations that I am already invited to. Drafting this report has moved me to spell out and further re-think some of these issues so it is a very good practice to ask for a narrative report.

Evaluating my stay beyond my own research I could find only words of praise for other IAS fellows and their work. Except for a few occasions when I was traveling I attended all the Wednesday seminars and thoroughly enjoyed. Compared to other institutions where I worked or was a guest before I have to stress that the scholarly level of seminars was strikingly high, debates very real and discussions serious, far away from academic conventions of many places where lectures are delivered only to satisfy protocol. Furthermore, I benefited from other lectures organized throughout the year by IAS such as with Robert Darnton, Susan Gal and others. I also enjoyed some of the side events organized by IAS and some of the fellows like the presentation on political and academic freedom in India, where I learnt so much, screenings and discussions with Yoni Goldstein about his film or the debate on academic writing organized by Yu Song as well as some social events organized by Eva Gönczi. In addition, I benefitted tremendously from lunch and discussions with other fellows like Yusuf Akbar, Djordje Stefanovich, Dunja Njaradi, Jonathan A. Batten

Monash University, Australia

The Impact of LIBOR Rigging on the International Debt Markets of Europe

David, Jorgensen, Seth Bledsoe, Tamas Vonyo and Tracey Sowerby, to mention but a few. I only wish there were more fellows whose research was more akin to mine but I understand the multitude of constraints in the selection of fellows and other problems that might arise when opting for research clusters rather than individual scholars. I also regret for not being able to discuss more with fellows who completed their stay before or shortly after I came and with those who were with us for a very short period, but I realize these time constraints and the advantage of having fellows even for a very short time. On the whole I want to emphasize that Nadia Al-Bagdadi and her team at the IAS are doing a fantastic job in facilitating research and besides providing us fellows with great conditions for work contribute enormously to the research and intellectual profile of the CEU. The most precious and differentiating aspect of CEU IAS compared to other similar programs elsewhere is in the personal and human touch of its team headed by Nadia.

The IAS at CEU were extraordinary and generous hosts during the period of my stay! Apart from the superb accommodation and research facilities, the IAS offered almost weekly seminars (and delicious lunches) that enabled researchers, often from very different backgrounds, to discuss new ideas in both a formal and informal setting. In addition, there were other events that ranged from academic meetings to wellness events occurring more broadly within CEU. Without doubt, this period has been one of the most productive, interesting and exciting in my career!

The key objective of my fellowship was to investigate the far-ranging impacts of financial market manipulation and insider trading, with a focus on the well documented manipulation of the London Interbank Offered Rate (LIBOR). This interest rate is a key benchmark interest rates used for pricing trillions of euros of international bank loans and securities. Beginning in 2007- around the time of the Global Financial Crisis- regulators became concerned about possible manipulation of this key rate. By 2012 a number of key international banks, including Barclays, Union Bank of Switzerland and the Royal Bank of Scotland had admitted fault and were fined.
to a decline in the future demand for fossil fuels, we demonstrate that financial markets can offset adverse oil price risk by holding various global stock portfolios of developed and emerging stock markets. We show empirically that measuring the statistical degree of stock-oil market integration for these portfolios is critical to managing the time-varying degrees of integration that exist between oil and stock markets. Importantly, under normal market conditions, when markets are segmented, there is the opportunity for oil investors to diversify the additional energy price risk, caused by COP21, through the purchase of stocks. Even over the full sample period, we document risk adjusted positive benefits to investors from holding diversified oil-stock portfolios for the global stock market regions, except for the Far East. One key feature of this research is that we have developed tables of monthly data that can be used by economists to better measure and manage these risks.

I came to IAS as a long-time friend of the CEU, having come here as a visiting professor in the late 1990s–early 2000s. At the start of this academic year, I was wrapping up a decade-long period of research into one field and entering a new field that still felt dauntingly large and unfamiliar. But I like a challenge, and dislike working within narrow disciplinary or methodological boundaries. The IAS proved to be a most excellent place to begin a new project of this kind. By engaging with other fellows’ work, I was exposed to approaches and comments from a variety of angles and forced to present my nascent thoughts in ways that make some sense to people outside my field of political philosophy.

Our weekly Fellows’ seminars were fascinating, creative, and fun. Like all my fellow IAS fellows, I learned a great deal from other presentations. Everyone did a superb job of framing their research in accessible, often entertaining-yet-serious ways, whether they were scholars of ancient theology or contemporary high finance, filmmakers or empirical policy analysts. Apart from the intellectual content of these talks, I’m grateful to IAS and my fellow fellows for inspiring me to learn a useful new skill – how to make slides and a slide presentations. As one of the more *senior* of the fellows, I’d somehow managed to get through my many years on earth without ever doing PowerPoint or slides of any kind. Having bit the bullet and used slides for my IAS talk, I’ve discovered a whole new manipulation, the role now played by whistle-blowers (since the regulators cannot now easily identify price manipulation in complex financial markets) and the common good. This paper uses evidence from the LIBOR scandal to provide perspectives on these issues. This paper is co-authored with two colleagues Peter G. Szilagyi (CEU) and Igor Loncarski (Ljubljana) and argues that there may be circumstances under which the prevention of market manipulation may not ultimately serve the common good. Clearly, prevention of these crimes is necessary given their considerable economic and social impacts. We use the recent prosecutions for manipulation of the important LIBOR (London Interbank Offered Rate) to argue that top-down approaches to the rule enforcement of individuals and corporations, cannot ultimately succeed in preventing these types of crimes.

One key concern with current regulatory approaches is that they assume individuals make rational, consequence-based decisions. This allows the abdication of individual moral responsibility in favour of institutional and regulatory guidance. The LIBOR scandal, however, shows that compliance to these rules is especially problematic in organizations plagued with self-centred, narcissistic and ruthless profit-driven cultures.

Alternatively, we suggest that a bottom-up approach, which relies upon individuals acting in the interest of the common good, may be more effective in organizational environments that are duty, as well as incentive, based. This approach requires individuals to accept a degree of moral responsibility for their actions, and to some extent the actions of others. We -perhaps too idealistically- believe that properly motivated and instructed, individuals can think and act better than they might otherwise do despite behavioural bias.

In addition to this paper, work also started on a project linked to the financial market implications of the new COP21 implementation. COP21 refers to the agreement from the 2015 United Nations Climate Change Conference in Paris. The key result was an agreement to set a goal of limiting global warming to less than 2 degrees Celsius (°C) compared to pre-industrial levels. The agreement calls for zero net anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions to be reached during the second half of the 21st century.

While it is well accepted that COP21 implementation should lead...
range of lecturing modes that work rather well for different audiences. I admit that I was reluctant to talk in a lecture format about my own work, since it was still very early days and I didn’t think I had enough well-processed ‘meat’ to feed to a group of non-specialists. Looking back, though, I see that the more usual closed-shop workshop set-up found in other research institutes – with fellows presenting sketchier thoughts in a more casual way around a table – might not work well with scholars from such diverse fields of study. The element of performance in a stand-up lecture does make the audience focus more intently on an unfamiliar subject, while slides can help people remember key points and refer to them in discussion. In the end I found it really helpful to organize my thoughts with all this in view. The outlines I worked out for my talk, and comments from the audience of fellows and other attendees, proved a valuable basis for further research. I’ve since given several talks on my IAS research subject to other audiences whose questions and comments have been immensely stimulating, helping me work toward a clearer focus.

Another valuable activity sponsored by IAS was a research panel I organized on ‘Crises of Political Communication: Misleading political speech and how to deal with it.’ Over several months, I talked to and recruited five CEU faculty members to speak on different aspects of the topic. The panel was held on 3 May, which happened to be World Press Freedom Day; so we joined forces with the Centre for Media and Data Studies (CMDS) to make our IAS panel part of a wider event entitled Journalism and Politics in the Age of Misinformation, co-hosted by IAS and CMDS. Simon Rippon (Philosophy, Public Policy) spoke about why democracies need to rely on the epistemic authority of experts, intellectuals, and the media, and how demagogues have undermined that authority in recent years. Maria Kronfledner (Philosophy) examined how politicians and industry use the rhetoric of complexity and uncertainty to foster doubt and ignorance in hearers. Andras Bozoki (Political Science) discussed the transformation of political discourse in our times and in the last century, and the surprise return of political propaganda. Michael Ignatieff (CEU Rector) talked about how politically motivated attacks on norms of speech and truth-seeking have eroded public trust in intellectuals and universities. Marius Dragomir (Centre for Media and Data Studies) asked: why has the ‘Open Society media camp’ failed to persuade large segments of the public in recent years? and offered suggestions for rectifying that failure. I learned a great deal from all their presentations and formed what I hope will be lasting intellectual friendships with panelists.

As for writing, I’ve come a long way since the beginning of my fellowship in October, though I’m not quite at a stage where I feel ready to submit anything for publication. I hoped to accomplish two main things this year in relation to my IAS project: (1) to collect research materials, clarify my main lines of argument, and write detailed preliminary sketches that can form the basis for a book (see next question below); and (2) start drafting a book proposal to submit to publishers. Thanks to the time and other resources afforded by my IAS fellowship, I’ve been able to do a lot on (1) and am working on (2).

To Nadia Al-Bagdadi, Eva Gonczi, and their support staff at IAS, I can only express warm gratitude for all their hard work, support, and friendliness over this challenging year for the CEU. They projected a strong, open spirit through better times and worse, managing all difficulties quite heroically. I often regretted that I didn’t, or couldn’t, spend more time around the IAS offices due to other demands on my time, and was very sorry when travels meant I had to miss the occasional seminar. All the IAS leaders and staff were wonderful, warm hosts from start to finish. I appreciate not only your kindnesses to me – as you know, often above and beyond any call of duty! – but also your tact and thoughtfulness when dealing with awkward moments involving other fellows. Many, many thanks!

I’m sure everyone says that being resident at the Wallenberg Guest House is akin to living in heaven. If someone could persuade the Swedes to add a private swimming pool and our own large-ish thermal bath, heaven couldn’t compete. With such glorious views and comforts exceeding those of home, no wonder we seldom ventured out to work in our office at IAS, fine though it was. Agnes Forgo, Eva Gellei, and the whole Wallenberg team are just wonderful, every single one of them. I think we were fairly low-key guests without many special needs, but when we did need the slightest help with anything, they were there giving it in spades, without any delay and in the best good spirit. We’ve been spoiled rotten. So much gratitude, and we look forward to staying here briefly again in late August.
My fellowship at the Institute for Advanced Study allowed me to begin writing my book, Elective Affinities: Friendship and Russia’s Political Elites, 1750-1840. In September 2016, when I arrived, I had spent four or five years gathering materials and notes. I had also presented several conference papers and written three articles on isolated aspects of the project. It was not until I arrived in Budapest, however, that I began substantive work on the book. Teaching, administrative work at my permanent job (at U.C. Berkeley), together with a laborious journal editorship, had not given me time to think through substantive questions or to read key works of secondary literature tangentially related—but nevertheless of key importance—to my project.

Beginning work on the book thus proved far more challenging than I had anticipated. I was able to write Section I, consisting of two chapters covering the period between 1755 and 1763. I am immensely thankful to Nadia Al-Bagdadi, Éva Gönczi and the IAS Budapest overall, as well as to the Thyssen Foundation for providing me with the time and the space to dedicate myself to my book. Section I of the book, “Russia’s Moral Weeklies and the Politics of Friendship (1755-1763),” consists of two chapters. Both center on the same set of sources: roughly 120 poems, epigrams, essays, short-stories, and letters printed in Russia’s earliest literary journals, called “moral weeklies,” between 1755 and 1765 (during the reigns of empress Elizabeth, Peter III, and early reign of Catherine II). I had gathered theses and many other sources over previous years working in rare book rooms of libraries and archives in St. Petersburg and Moscow. I had also spent considerable time reading 18th-century French and German publications on friendship, in order to establish what might have been borrowed and what original about my Russian sources. Largely, I had been unsuccessful in establishing what might have been borrowed and what original about my Russian sources. Largely, I had been unsuccessful in this endeavor. However, in Budapest, and many other sources over previous years working in rare book rooms of libraries and archives in St. Petersburg and Moscow, I had also spent considerable time reading 18th-century French and German publications on friendship, in order to establish what might have been borrowed and what original about my Russian sources. Largely, I had been unsuccessful in this endeavor. However, in Budapest, and many other sources over previous years working in rare book rooms of libraries and archives in St. Petersburg and Moscow, I had also spent considerable time reading 18th-century French and German publications on friendship, in order to establish what might have been borrowed and what original about my Russian sources. Largely, I had been unsuccessful in this endeavor. However, in Budapest, and many other sources over previous years working in rare book rooms of libraries and archives in St. Petersburg and Moscow, I had also spent considerable time reading 18th-century French and German publications on friendship, in order to establish what might have been borrowed and what original about my Russian sources. Largely, I had been unsuccessful in this endeavor. However, in Budapest, and many other sources over previous years working in rare book rooms of libraries and archives in St. Petersburg and Moscow, I had also spent considerable time reading 18th-century French and German publications on friendship, in order to establish what might have been borrowed and what original about my Russian sources. Largely, I had been unsuccessful in this endeavor. However, in Budapest, and many other sources over previous years working in rare book rooms of libraries and archives in St. Petersburg and Moscow, I had also spent considerable time reading 18th-century French and German publications on friendship, in order to establish what might have been borrowed and what original about my Russian sources. Largely, I had been unsuccessful in this endeavor. However, in Budapest, and many other sources over previous years working in rare book rooms of libraries and archives in St. Petersburg and Moscow, I had also spent considerable time reading 18th-century French and German publications on friendship, in order to establish what might have been borrowed and what original about my Russian sources. Largely, I had been unsuccessful in this endeavor. However, in Budapest, and many other sources over previous years working in rare book rooms of libraries and archives in St. Petersburg and Moscow, I had also spent considerable time reading 18th-century French and German publications on friendship, in order to establish what might have been borrowed and what original about my Russian sources. Largely, I had been unsuccessful in this endeavor. However, in Budapest, and many other sources over previous years working in rare book rooms of libraries and archives in St. Petersburg and Moscow, I had also spent considerable time reading 18th-century French and German publications on friendship, in order to establish what might have been borrowed and what original about my Russian sources. Largely, I had been unsuccessful in this endeavor. However, in Budapest, and many other sources over previous years working in rare book rooms of libraries and archives in St. Petersburg and Moscow, I had also spent considerable time reading 18th-century French and German publications on friendship, in order to establish what might have been borrowed and what original about my Russian sources. Largely, I had been unsuccessful in this endeavor. However, in Budapest, and many other sources over previous years working in rare book rooms of libraries and archives in St. Petersburg and Moscow, I had also spent considerable time reading 18th-century French and German publications on friendship, in order to establish what might have been borrowed and what original about my Russian sources. Largely, I had been unsuccessful in this endeavor. However, in Budapest, and many other sources over previous years working in rare book rooms of libraries and archives in St. Petersburg and Moscow, I had also spent considerable time reading 18th-century French and German publications on friendship, in order to establish what might have been borrowed and what original about my Russian sources. Largely, I had been unsuccessful in this endeavor. However, in Budapest, and many other sources over previous years working in rare book rooms of libraries and archives in St. Petersburg and Moscow, I had also spent considerable time reading 18th-century French and German publications on friendship, in order to establish what might have been borrowed and what original about my Russian sources. Largely, I had been unsuccessful in this endeavor. However, in Budapest, and many other sources over previous years working in rare book rooms of libraries and archives in St. Petersburg and Mosco

identification of their individual interests with the "common good". In this way, as I tried to demonstrate, the friendship cult was introduced into Russia with an ulterior motive: that of strengthening the relationship between the nobility and the state by helping transform service from an obligation into a product of personal inclination. Russian noble servitors should learn to view their colleagues as friends—and their friends as colleagues—, involved in a group project to improve the fatherland.

The major themes in Section 1 will be developed in subsequent sections of my book, which I will continue to work on in the coming years. Section 2 will show how new conceptions of personal morality and identity gave rise to new conceptions of friendship, which needed to be elaborated in other genres, mostly particularly in personal correspondence (as I describe further below). Plays, novels, and short stories will also furnish major sources in Section 2. Section 3 will show how the dissemination and growing influence of friendship ideals contributed to changing political ideals. The climax occurred at the turn of the nineteenth century (during the reigns of Paul I and Alexander I). Alexander I actively encouraged high-ranking members of the nobility to enact the ideals of friendship at court, inviting a select few to join a 'Secret committee' or 'Committee of friends.' Alexander also publicly patronized poets who favored the theme of friendship. His utopian experiments failed for many reasons, becoming a public spectacle in several acts. Section 4 will show how members of Russia's political elites re-appropriated the cult of friendship to serve the opposite ends it was created for: while they continued to see friendship as strengthening individual self-identification with the common good, they would use the loyalty and trust on which friendship was predicated as a tool for political opposition, both clandestine and overt in the 1810s-1840s (reigns of Alexander I and Nicholas I).

Although I had previously given several presentations on friendship in Imperial Russia, it was not until I came to Budapest in the fall of 2016 that I began to present on the content and core claims of my book. The feedback I received shaped and will continue to shape my written work in important ways.

My first presentation at the IAS, delivered in October 2016, summarized the material I hoped to cover during my sabbatical year. It was titled "Importing the Sentimental Cult of Friendship into Russia, 1750-1780." In February 2017, I delivered modified versions of this paper at Tubingen University and at the Academy of Sciences in Budapest. All versions of this paper centered on two bodies of sources. One was the Russian moral weekly, particularly the epistolary poems of the late 1750s and early 1760s. The other was personal correspondence written in the mode of literary Sentimentalism. Members of the Russian nobility only began to write such letters in the 1770s. Significantly, contributors to the "moral weeklies" were among the first to adopt the sentimental letter in the 1770s. The key question I wished to resolve in this paper was why it took them so long.

My proposed answer is that Sentimental letter writing to intimate friends was predicated on new conceptions of the self, which were only beginning to establish themselves in Russia of the mid-18th century. The new philosophical emphasis on experience as source of moral and scientific knowledge and as the source individual identity lent value to individual experience, and it made the narration of such experiences in letters seem a worthy activity. These same conceptions also altered the manner in which writers described friendship. Up through the mid-18th century, friendship had been understood as a bond that united two virtuous individuals. Friendship was itself a virtue because it helped individuals adhere to moral principles to which they had already committed. From the mid-18th century, however, writers placed new emphasis on experience as the key to moral knowledge. Human beings only learned to distinguish good from evil by observing and responding to pain and pleasure, both in themselves and in others. Friendship is a relationship that trains the individual to track these responses more closely, largely as a result of the sympathy they experience toward their friend. In other words, friendship was no longer simply a union of two virtuous individuals, but the source of virtue in individuals.

The favored genre of the late 1750s and early 1760s—epistolary poems—proved inadequate as vehicles for transmitting the new ethics of friendship. Educated persons increasingly turned to personal letters, "sentimental letters," a new genre that required them to reflect on daily experiences, inserting them into new narratives of moral development. Women were overrepresented among letter-writers of the 1770s and 1780s, as I posited, because they were more willing to experiment with the reevaluation of quotidian experience than were their male family members. In addition, women appear to have been quicker to master the new skills necessary.
in composing sentimental letters. These included the cultivation of new styles of penmanship and different rules for the composition of letters (forms of address and signature, margins on the page, etc.). 

Colleagues at the IAS who heard my lecture gave me valuable feedback on the style of the epistolary poems (Maria Rybakova) and the physical layout of the sentimental letter (Tracey Sowerby). The latter encouraged me to think more deeply about how the highly ritualized format of a letter might display distinctive forms of intimacy. By breaching the rules of letter writing—and grammar—letter writers could demonstrate sincerity and spontaneity, essential to sentimental conceptions of friendship. The development of sentimental letters, in form as well as the content between 1770 and the 1790s will be analyzed in a dedicated chapter in Section 2 of my book. Letters will also be a key source in Sections 3 and 4, covering the first four decades of the 19th century.

In sum, the two chapters I wrote at the IAS in Budapest between September 2016 and June 2017 covered less ground than I had initially planned. Yet, I feel I was able to address crucial conceptual and methodological problems that would otherwise have remained troublesome. Most importantly, I believe that I was able to demonstrate one of the central hypotheses of Elective Affinities, namely that there was an integral connection between politics and the cult of friendship as it developed in Russia in the later 18th and early 19th century. No less importantly, I showed that writers who advanced the cult of friendship were highly conscious of this connection, ensuring that friendship remained subject to public scrutiny, both in theory and in practice. I also hope that I was able to make 18th century conceptions of friendship, so different to our own, understandable and credible to my potential readers.

During my academic year in Budapest, I benefited greatly from conversations with colleagues at CEU (Alfred Rieber, Jan Hennings, Karl Hall, and my former student Charles Shaw). No less important were meetings with colleagues at other Budapest universities, Zsófia Kavalszky, Szuszanna Hétenyi, and Gábor Várdna. I greatly hope to return to Budapest in order to continue learning from these scholars.

I was in residence at IAS CEU from October 1, 2016 to March 31, 2017 on a year-long Sabbatical from my home institution, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. I had the intention of utilizing this period to do five things in general: 1) reflect over the current research I am doing in the context of the escalation dynamics between the two South Asian nuclear rivals on the basis of the fieldwork and literature survey I had already completed, 2) critically analyze the evidence and material collected in the past year, prior to arriving at CEU, 3) meet experts and academics working in the larger field of conflict dynamics and escalation in other contexts, and 4) participate in the life of a European academic institution, and 5) to write a major chunk of my book manuscript. I will evaluate my stay at CEU on the basis of these five objectives I had in mind prior to arriving in Budapest and joining the fellowship.

Back in New Delhi, I had a hectic teaching and supervision schedule along with attending conferences, and commenting in the popular media outlets, among similar activities. Having conducted my field work and carried out the interviews for over a year, I had realized that it was important for me to take time off from my busy schedule to gather my thoughts and reflect over the material I had amassed on the theme of my research. The Global Challenge Fellowship (GCF) was the perfect opportunity for me to do precisely that as it did not involve teaching or research supervision. I used the first month or so to let the literature and material talk to me - which it did. The University was a perfect place to meet colleagues from vastly different fields and yet with an interest in matters of war and peace, conflict and conflict resolution. It was a wonderful setting to look beyond one’s narrow intellectual and disciplinary confines, in the true inter-disciplinary spirit, and learn new ways of approaching issues, asking new questions and adopting innovative methodologies. The problem with the contemporary social science disciplines is their jealously-guarded disciplinary boundaries which often produce outputs that do not make sense to anyone else. The IAS Wednesday Fellow seminars were intellectually stimulating and, to me personally, opened many innovative ways of addressing problems in social sciences, conceptually and methodologically. All in all, the CEU as the hub of intellectual activity in Europe was the right place for me to engage in some intellectual overhauling.

Then came the second phase, analyzing the vast amount of data and...
conversations from back in South Asia, and make sense of them. I ploughed through the material patiently, stringing connections, making correlations, weaving together a set of arguments. The material and insights which looked disaggregated previously now started making sense to me: the intellectually vibrant and challenging CEU and IAS was after all influencing the way I was look afresh at the old material.

Having gleaned fresh insights from my own research, I now decided to look at the big picture about conflict escalation. Several researchers and academics I met in several of CEU’s departments gave useful suggestions. The well-stacked CEU library and the exceptionally helpful library staff proved to be a great help in accessing the existing literature on conflict escalation in various global settings, including from the Cold War years. Thereafter I visited The Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) in Norway which conducts first-rate research on the conditions for peaceful relations between states, groups and people. At PRIO, and later at the Oslo University, I met several researchers and academics with whom I discussed my work and explored potential areas of academic and research collaboration. Given the fact that there hasn’t been much research on the ceasefire violations in Kashmir and because much of the research on conflict escalation fixated on conventional military escalation, there was a great deal of discussion on comparative cases and potential future collaboration. Needless to mention here that the research trip to Oslo was fully funded by the GCF. The visit to Oslo provided further insights into how I can pitch my own work in the larger ‘big picture’ context rather than limit it to the South Asian setting alone, to widely disseminate the findings of the study beyond the South Asianists.

While all this was going on, I also enjoyed being part of the intellectual life of a first-rate academic institution. The several talks I attended at the University on religion, peace-building, EU, political theory, among others, were all very helpful. I also gave a few lectures: at IAS, at the Centre for Religious Studies, and at Pázmány Péter Catholic University. I met several faculty members, researchers, students from around the world, with whom I discussed my work, their areas of research, student papers, PhD theses, among others. It was a wonderful and enriching experience. I also actively participated in the South Asia study group at CEU and met several colleagues working on South Asian issues.

Having come from a university back in India where the right-wing government has of late been curtailing academic freedom, I could identify with the stand-off between CEU and the Hungarian government. I listened to the President of CEU and other colleagues at CEU talk about the political and bureaucratic pressure from the government and why it is important to stand up to it – and I fully agreed with them besides identifying with their struggle. The struggle for academic freedom is global today, not confined to India, Hungary or Turkey. But when a country in the EU curtails the freedom of its academic institutions, we have reason to be concerned. So I am.

The final objective of my stay at CEU was to write my book manuscript – and I completed around 60 percent of the first draft of my book while in residence at CEU. The in-depth academic discussions that I had with several individuals at CEU, the facilities at the CEU library and the calm and tranquility of the Raoul Wallenberg Guesthouse contributed immensely contributed to my ability to achieve this task. The IAS activities kept me engaged just enough and gave me ample time to myself which I could utilize to write several chapters of my book.

My fellowship year was mostly spent on working on a book project, the working title of which is **Mysticism and Metaphysics in Parmenides**. This is a monograph devoted to a comprehensive study of the philosophy of Parmenides of Elea (5th century BCE) and to resolving the most debated issues raised by his modern interpreters. These might be summarized as follows: what sense could be made of the rather counter-intuitive theses on “what-is” propounded and argued for in the Alêtheia (“Truth/Reality”) section of the poem and the consequent repudiation of the physical
world as mere “appearance” (doxa)? Do arguments proposed bear out the metaphysical theses at all, or are they fundamentally flawed in the last analysis? What sense could be made of the elaborate cosmology contained in the second main section of the poem, Doxa (“Appearance/Opinion”), given the facts that 1) if theses developed in Alêtheia are true, then the cosmological entities and the principles governing motion and change contained in Doxa are specious, and that 2) the whole Doxa section seems to be gratuitous and yet too elaborate and plausible to qualify as illusory. Finally, how is the (epic) form of the poem related to its content? Is the motif of revelation contained in the Proem (fr. 1) to be taken at face value, as internal to the philosophy, or should it be put aside as allegorical or rhetorical?

The most fundamental methodological principle observed in my study is compliance with historical cogency, which needs special emphasis in interpreting Parmenides for two main reasons. First, since he is the earliest Greek thinker to systematically employ argumentative reasoning in presenting his theses, it is tempting to disregard the mythical introduction to his poem (the Proem) with its motif of revelation, which suggests along traditional poetic lines that, given human limitations and ignorance, knowledge of some momentous truth could only be acquired through superhuman inspiration. Second, because Parmenides is concerned with highly abstract metaphysical problems and employs reasoning of an a priori kind in an unprecedented manner, some influential modern interpreters have ignored his historical background and engaged with his thought from the perspective of some specific (mainly linguistic or logical) issues addressed by contemporary philosophy. While inspiring for contemporary thought, this procedure is implausible in seeking an account of Greek philosophy within its own historical context and thus leads to misleading conclusions about its early developments. Historical cogency suggests, first and foremost, that it is anachronistic to explain away the motif of revelation as allegorical or rhetorical in Parmenides’ poem, for this account assumes a mind-set for which reason and religion exclude each other, an attitude difficult to be attributed to the earliest Greek philosophers. Hence, the form of the poem and its content are to be understood as intrinsically related.

A major question arising from both of these methodological guidelines concerns the upshot, the validity and the function of arguments developed in Alêtheia. The answer supported in the book is that the arguments are to be taken for what they are, but are insufficient in establishing the metaphysical theses proposed in Alêtheia and that Parmenides is well aware of their limitations. The explanatory advantage of this interpretation is multifarious. First, Parmenides arguments need not be flawed, and hence, he might ultimately be acquitted of fallacy. Second, on this interpretation, the adoption of the motif of revelation might be done justice to: arguments are not meant to be demonstrative in attaining a full insight into Reality. Third, the theoretical contradiction between Alêtheia and Doxa is not to be resolved but understood as part of the authorial intention of a dialectical objective. Hence, the presentation of Doxa is dialectical and
its elaborate nature is well put in the service of that objective. On these grounds I argue that Parmenides challenges our ordinary conceptions about the world in order to mobilize the critical function of reason. Hence, reason and reasoning have an instrumental and critical function in Parmenides’ poem without undermining the motif of revelation.

At IAS I mainly focused on issues to do with the historical contextualization of Parmenides’ thought, both in terms of the form and the content of his poem. Thus, I studied the relationship of divine inspiration and poetic autonomy in early Greek poetry and the development of the Greeks’ view of sources of knowledge from Homer to the earliest Greek philosophers and historiographers. I also explored the wide range of reconstructions of Parmenides’ arguments in Alêtheia in terms of their historical (and logical) plausibility in order to outline a reasoning that I believe is both more charitable and historically cogent than suggested by standard accounts. I drafted three out of seven chapters of the book manuscript dealing with these issues and have revised some chapters drafted earlier.

I have also finished an article on an independent topic entitled “Philosophy as the ‘Love of Wisdom’” (in Hungarian), which studies the earliest Greek testimonies (by or about Presocratic philosophers) about the notion of philosophia and explores its abiding implications relating to self-knowledge, freedom and democratic citizenship.

I have had a series of profitable and inspiring discussions with IAS Fellows, members of the Department of Philosophy, and guest speakers or workshop participants invited by the Department of Philosophy and the Center for Religious Studies. I have also greatly profited from attending various international academic events (of which I especially appreciated the President’s Seminar Series) organized by CEU and presentations in the Fellows’ Seminar Series. I would also like to highlight CEU’s excellent library service, which was indispensable in pursuing my research and which, in my experience, is unparalleled in Hungary. Finally, I must also note the high level of administrative, organizational and communicative proficiency experienced at IAS and CEU.

I spent my (regrettably, far too short) time as a fellow at the CEU’s IAS on the following activities:

I made headway on my proposed project of Christian Democracy: A New Intellectual History. In particular, I was able to make progress on an article entitled “What the Dictum Really Meant – and What it Might Mean for Us,” which deals with the thought of the German constitutional lawyer Ernst-Wolfgang Böckenförde (who plays an important role in the book I intend to write on Christian democracy). The article will be published in Constellations: An International Journal of Critical and Democratic Theory in 2018. I was also able to do some work on the final chapter of the book, which analyzes the “Christian national idea” as it is currently being propounded by leading political figures in Hungary and Poland. I was also working on a chapter for an edited volume on architecture and political theory. The text is entitled “What (if anything) is Democratic Architecture?” I also wrote two occasional pieces, one for Süddeutsche Zeitung entitled “Universitäten als Feinde des Volkes” and another for the blog of the New York Review of Books entitled “Hungary: The War on Education.”

I gave my Fellow seminar talk on my proposed history of Christian Democracy and I also addressed a group of CEU graduate students working on intellectual history and political thought. I was fortunate enough to speak to the seminar on intellectual history chaired by Balázs Trencksenyi at another point during the academic year 16/17, and to offer a lecture on populism in the Rector’s lecture series on revisiting Open Society. Beyond Budapest, I was able to participate in a panel on populism at the Copenhagen Documentary Film Festival, speak at a conference on populism organized by the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung in Berlin and have a debate with Pierre Rosanvallon on populism at the IAS in Paris.

Religion was at the heart of early modern diplomatic practice. Religious ideas and texts suffused diplomatic rhetoric and theory both within Europe and beyond. Rulers considered their religious elites suitable for diplomatic missions by virtue of their education. Religious rituals punctuated Christian diplomatic practice both in terms of diplomatic sociability and in terms of guaranteeing agreements between rulers. My research at IAS examined how the Tudor government adapted when these
established norms were challenged by the Reformation on the one hand and the expansion of English diplomatic activity beyond Catholic Europe on the other. From an English point of view, by c.1600 England engaged in cross-confessional diplomacy in multiple spheres. In effect, it engaged in multi-confessional diplomacy, a fact that became more important as the public circulation of diplomatic information became more prevalent.

To understand the impact of these challenges to diplomatic practice, my research primarily focused on two areas: the rituals and ceremonies of formal diplomatic relations, and the ways in which religious considerations impacted on the selection of diplomatic personnel. It did so using records relating to English diplomacy with Safavid Persia, the Ottoman Empire, Russia and Mughal India, as well as a select few case studies within Europe. This revealed some differences in the selection of diplomatic personnel for embassies within Europe than for those without. For instance, the established norm in the Ottoman Empire was that the embassy secretary succeed to the ambassadorship as local knowledge and connections were essential, but it was rare for such a direct succession to occur in Europe, where prior service as a secretary might harm an ambassador’s status. Meanwhile, there remained considerable debate about whether Protestant ambassadors should be sent to Protestant princes and Catholics diplomats to Catholic princes, as some diplomatic theorists suggested. In practice, however, the problems (representational and political) caused by the few ambassadors that did not share their monarch’s beliefs proved to be just as, if not more, serious than the difficulties of maintaining a diplomatic household abroad that did not observe the same form of Christianity as the court at which it was based.

Scholars of the Reformation such as Susan Karant-Nunn have explored the ‘reformation of ritual’ that occurred within parochial religious practices and everyday life. My interest lies in the parallel, but less explored, reformation of diplomatic ritual that occurred at the level of international politics. Ceremonial accommodations had to be made at a number of levels within Christian cross-confessional relations once the English came to view Catholic and Orthodox practices as idolatrous or lacking in substantive spiritual meaning; while those polities more reformed than England viewed some aspects of English diplomatic protocol as idolatrous in turn. As diplomatic ceremonial substantiated and constructed political relationships, new, mutually acceptable solutions needed to be found. This might involve making compromises within the old ritual framework, such as substituting a mass book for a bible or only attending part of a liturgical service and leaving before the ‘idolatrous’ part began. When establishing relationships with new powers, English diplomats had to conform themselves to the conventions of their host if they were to be successful. That did not mean that compromises did not occur, but rather that the diplomats had to accept, in large part, the ritual framework of the new normative culture in order to be acceptable to their hosts and represent their monarchs effectively. They could do so to some extent because sufficient ambiguity remained within these diplomatic practices that each party could interpret the same act in slightly different ways. Only if the two interpretations were made to confront one another did real difficulties occur. Moreover, I would argue, many diplomats were capable of reading the basic semiotic signals, even at courts quite different from their own, as many of the conventions surrounding politicized space and other diplomatic languages were similar, even if their precise meaning was not.

The results of my IAS project form the core of three chapters in two monographs I am writing about Tudor diplomacy for Oxford University Press. Several autonomous essays also arose from this research. One examines an instance of cross-confessional gift-giving within Europe, arguing that sending controversial religious items could be a deliberate diplomatic tool, designed to force a king’s hand and thereby cut through months of laborious discussion. The rejection of such gifts should not necessarily be interpreted as a failure. An early version of this essay was presented at a joint IAS-CEMS workshop that I co-organized with another fellow, Tudor Sala, and an IAS alumna, Alexandra Urakova; it will be included in the volume we are editing from the event. I also made considerable progress on an article that examines a different cross-confessional gift and in doing so explores the interplay of different diplomatic languages through the relationship between gift-giving, religious polemic, and diplomatic ceremonial. A third essay, which is a contribution to a volume I am co-editing on diplomatic cultures at the Ottoman court, compares the experiences of Persian and Moroccan diplomats with those of their European counterparts. Thanks to the supportive environment at IAS, I also found time to write an essay on mise-en-page and the politics of paper in early modern inter-princely correspondence and
I finished two co-authored introductions to edited collections. One of these volumes, *Practices of Diplomacy in the Early Modern World*, was co-edited with Jan Hennings, Associate Professor at CEU’s History department, in part during my fellowship. My thanks go to IAS CEU and my fellow fellows for a productive and rewarding nine months.

I had the privilege of spending nine months at IAS CEU, from October 2016 to June 2017. Neither the many attractions of the city of Budapest, nor the yet more numerous draws of the Wallenberg Guesthouse, were sufficient to undermine the stimulating intellectual community that prevailed at IAS CEU, one that fostered exchange and catalyzed productivity. During my time at IAS CEU, I finished correcting the proofs of a 200+-page long manuscript and completed a substantive portion of the primary source research for my forthcoming monograph on the Islamic political in the eleventh century. I traveled to England, Germany and France to deliver talks at the University of Cambridge, Universität Leipzig, and L’Ecole des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris. I gave two talks at CEU itself and traveled twice to the Middle East to attend conferences and participate in seminars.

I met exceptional scholars, fellow fellows at IAS and regular faculty at CEU, and profited from the many seminars and talks at the university. I learned more about various aspects of Ottoman statecraft than I had since graduate school, and I grew to love this beautiful city and its complicated history.

There was more still. At the Open Society Archives, I attended fantastic film festivals, many of which surpassed expectations and exceeded what I had experienced in New York. It wasn’t just that the films were carefully selected or that they were of exceptional quality, or even that they were properly contextualized by expert introductions. It was seeing them in Budapest, in a setting where politics, history, culture and religion—many of the themes and concepts that we in the Humanities and Social Sciences spend a lifetime to understand and rethink—are an intimate part of life, that made for a remarkable experience. Thank you, IAS CEU, I couldn’t imagine time better spent.

Neguin Yavari
Columbia University, USA

*Text and Governance in the Islamic World in the Eleventh Century*
My objective coming to IAS was to broaden my focus and gather inspiration for the book entitled *Symbolism of International Criminal Law* that I am currently working on. My stay at the Institute provided me with plenty of opportunities to engage with other fellows coming from various academic backgrounds. I sought their advice on how to make my book relevant to different audiences. I consider weekly lectures dedicated to each fellow’s research and followed by lunch to be a great way of interacting with the IAS community both formally and informally. I gained a lot of insight from my weekly seminar that took place on 9 November 2016.

I am very impressed by the CEU’s vibrant academic life, public lectures and events and its unique emphasis on creativity. I felt that different disciplines often come together in harmonious ways and are skillfully bridged by those working and studying here. I was inspired to seek alternative modes of academic expression through art and I am particularly pleased to have been able to organize, with generous support of IAS CEU, a workshop on symbolic expression at the ICTY. This event provided a platform to discuss my research, invite a guest speaker and organize a performance aimed at highlighting the main objective of international criminal law, which, in my view, is didactic. Several fellows...
took part in the performance and our film director in residence kindly filmed it. I am planning to keep exploring ways in which art and law may co-exist, especially when it comes to international criminal law.

During my stay at IAS I made an extensive use of the OSA Blinken Archives for my research as they contain reports of the Commission of Experts whose work preceded the establishment of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. It was my first time engaging in the archival work and the venue could not have been more perfect. I also benefitted from feedback and support of the CEU Legal Studies Department.

Although I could only stay at IAS for a short period of time, it was an extremely productive and exciting stay. The logistics, of course, played a great part in this: it was extremely helpful to walk in and find everything ready, and I felt privileged to be able to concentrate solely on research, with every little thing (from administrative matters and technical issues to the cleaning of the apartment) being taken care of by the wonderful IAS and Raoul Wallenberg Guesthouse staff. This is a lot of efficient people and smiley faces that I will miss. I also felt very lucky to live and work in such a beautiful and vibrant city as Budapest. Walking to the office by crossing the Danube on the famous and beautiful Chain Bridge was a daily treat. Baths, museums, churches, castles, and stunning architecture all round provided entertainment whenever I felt that a break was in order, and I always came back to my desk fully re-energized. I also have only good things to say about my office and the CEU setting, where I never lacked anything – thanks to CEU’s wonderful library and online resources and, again, to the IAS staff anticipating every need of ours. This framework made it very easy for me to concentrate on the writing and reading that I had to do. I divided my time between two main tasks. The first was writing the articles and coordinating the edited volumes and journal special issues that stemmed out of my work in the project INTERCO-SSH ("International Cooperation in the Social Sciences and Humanities: Comparative Perspectives and Future Possibilities"), in the framework of which I was hired as a post-doctoral researcher from September 2014 to August 2016. The project, which benefits from a grant from the European Union’s Seventh Framework Program, is now into its last few months of funding, and entering the crucial phase of the dissemination of its results. I have been, therefore, using some of the time at IAS to write articles about the comparative history of the social sciences. I notably wrote about the emergence and growth of international and European professional associations in those disciplines. I also focused on the setting up and development of the European University Institute in Florence, Italy. These pieces are part of a collective volume and a journal special issue that I am co-coordinating; the internationalization of the social sciences and humanities, and the development of these disciplines in the European Research Area. These collective efforts will be substantial contributions to a field that has, so far, been seldom studied.

I devoted another substantial share of my time to working on my new research project. It focuses on marginalization in science. More precisely, it stems from the idea that science is a highly stratified social activity: its elite figures draw a wide range of resources from their occupation, while others face a variety of difficulties, e.g. a less recognized status, problems with getting access to grants and prestigious publication outlets, etc. My project seeks to understand why a lot of the most marginal researchers cope with, and even consent to or contribute to, these inequalities and the scientific standards that produce them. As the project is still in its early stages, working at IAS was a good opportunity for me to deepen my knowledge of relevant literature, and to get critical feedback from colleagues about my theoretical framework, my hypotheses, and the fieldwork that I envisioned. This brings me to one of the highlights of my stay in Budapest: the presentation of my project at the weekly IAS seminar. It was a great opportunity for me to present my topic to an audience made of both non-specialist scholars and academics specializing in science studies, I enjoyed the challenge of putting together a talk that would be engaging for both types of audiences. The seminar was a great experience, and I got extremely valuable comments and questions on my project. Participants also suggested references and sources which I did not know, and which are proving valuable for the refinement of my hypotheses and the planning of my fieldwork. All this helped me revise my project in view of the data collection phase, and of future grant applications.

My interactions with Budapest scholars was not limited to my IAS seminar presentation. Throughout my stay, I had opportunities to meet Thibaud Boncourt
Université libre de Bruxelles,
Belgium

Maintaining the Scientific Order. A Study of Scientific Socialization in the United States
David Jorgensen
Colby College, USA

The main research project that I began at IAS CEU was titled The Heretical Moses: Heterodox Christianity and the Jewish Law. This project capitalizes on developments in recent but disconnected scholarship on three important late-antique heterodox Christian movements, the last historical evidence for which all comes from the Eastern frontiers of the Roman Empire: the Valentinians, the Marcionites, and the "Jewish Christian" community responsible for the Pseudo-Clementine literature. The project investigates the reception of the Pentateuch in these heterodox Christian groups with an eye towards their potential influence upon each other, the possible reassessment of traditional heresiologist-influenced academic boundaries between these groups, the role all of these groups played in the development of "orthodox" conceptions of Pentateuchal law, and the complex untidiness of the long "parting of the ways" between Christianity and Judaism.

The text I focused most on during my time at CEU was the Epistle to Flora, a text that is known to us only by virtue of its preservation by the fourth-century heresiologist Epiphanius of Salamis. This text is a short theological treatise and an introduction to one basic problem with two aspects: the nature of the law given through Moses, and the nature of the lawgiver deity. Interpretation of this text has, in my view, been hindered by the false assumption that the author of the text, a person known as Ptolemy, is the same person as a Christian teacher of the same name who lost his life in Rome as a martyr prior to 155 C.E. It is the tale of this martyr – a melodrama of an ancient polyamorous marriage that ran afoul of the wife's conversion to Christianity, leading to the wife's divorce of her husband due to irreconcilable sexual differences and the husband's subsequent revenge unleashed upon his wife's Christian tutor – that provides the bulk of the evidence traditionally marshaled to identify the two historical Ptolemies as one person. In this, first step in the broader project, I argue for the contrary view, that the two Ptolemies are two distinct people, a position that in subsequent research will reopen the broader question of the theological milieu in which the text was produced. I presented a paper on this part of the research at the annual meeting of the North American Patristics Society in Chicago in May, 2017, titled "Ptolemy vs. Ptolemy: The Role of Divorce in the Identification of the Martyr with the Author of the Epistle to Flora."

I was fortunate to have another opportunity in Budapest to present my research, as I was invited by Professor Gábor Buzási to give a lecture to his Gospel of Matthew class at Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE) in April. The lecture, titled "Early Readers of the Gospel of Matthew: The "Gnostic" and his Epistle to Flora," was a graduate-level introduction to the text that was at the center of my research this year. I focused the lecture on a genre analysis of the text and its exegesis of St. Matthew and the letters of Paul become authoritative texts for gentile Christians. Although this lecture was quite different from the paper
I presented the following month in Chicago, it nevertheless served as useful preparation. Subsequent to the lecture, I met with some ELTE PhD students to discuss our respective research in more depth.

Meanwhile, another line of my research benefited in quite unexpected ways. During the fall, a theory and method article I had submitted to Religion Compass underwent peer review and was accepted for publication with a chance to revise for the final version. That fall I had a number of stimulating conversations with Seth Bledsoe concerning theory and method in the study of religion, conversations that intensified in the winter as we both attended the Center for Religious Studies doctoral seminar organized by Professor Aziz Al-Azmeh. This seminar was one of the highlights of my year. It focused on various theoretical or methodological approaches to the study of religion drawn from a variety of disciplines and featured several provocative guest lecturers. Concurrently, I benefitted profusely from conversations with Aaron Kappeler, and his command of terminology in the field of anthropology, terminology that is all too often borrowed in religious studies with a lack of precision. My exchanges with Aaron filled in a critical gap in my lexicon and illuminated some key distinctions I was attempting to make in the article. Altogether these interactions allowed me to revise the article with substantially greater clarity. The article, “Approaches to Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Study of Early Christianity,” should be out later in 2017.

It is not, I feel, incidental to record that some of these and other conversations with our fellow fellows were conducted while up to our chins in steaming water below the echoing, stained-glass-flecked, vaulted roof of an Ottoman bath, or on an old HÉV train slowly chugging through a wintery landscape under a sharp blue sky. The ability to focus on the work we love was to a great degree enhanced by the stimulating architectural and natural landscapes of Budapest and its environs. Yet the creative stimulus must always be paired with diligent toil, and to this end I co-organized a small writers group with Yu Song. We met regularly during the winter months at Centrál Kávéház to write silently together toward daily goals beneath its wood-paneled walls and high ceilings. Some of us had the additional goal of working through the large array of coffees and desserts on the menu, but I did not manage to taste them all.

It was also invigorating to interact with both faculty and students at a number of events, especially those sponsored by the Center for Religious Studies. One recurring event and one special trip were highlights. The films at the CRS movie nights – including classics such as Quo Vadis and The Messenger, and newcomers such as Agora – were introduced with fascinating introductory commentary by Professor Carsten Wilke that situated these films in their own historical contexts, each of which saw Hollywood attempting to navigate between various political and cultural pressures. But nothing can compare to the CRS trip to the southern town of Mohács to witness the pre-Lenten festival known as Busójárás. This regional variation on Mardi Gras or Carnival celebrates ancient fertility and seasonal rituals whose roots are at least as old as the Roman Lupercalia, now inflected with the somewhat more recent and still culturally resonant memory of ousting the occupying Turks at the consequential battle that took place nearby in 1687. It is incredibly difficult to summarize the multiple “meanings” of this festival in a short space, but this is all the more reason why my experience there, supplemented by my photos and videos, will make this an excellent case study in the complexity of religious ritual to incorporate into my future teaching.

I have omitted any overt discussion of politics, even though the events of 2016-2017 in the United States, Europe, and especially Hungary could scarcely be ignored, and of course we were constantly talking about them, in groups of up to seventy thousand. Suffice it to say that the year has been one long lesson in the vital importance of academic, journalistic, and intellectual freedom, and for me has reawakened dormant interests in epistemology and the production of knowledge.

All in all this was a very stimulating and reinvigorating year that came at the right time for me as I transitioned away from my dissertation and first book project into new research territory. The blend of creative stimuli and the time and opportunity to explore new areas was a perfect combination for the beginning stages of a new project. I now have a clear idea of the scope and sequence of at least the near future of the research agenda and have nearly completed the first of several articles on that trajectory. I am now scrambling to get my notes in order before plunging into teaching this semester, so that they will be coherent the next time I have a chance to turn back to them – hopefully at least one day a week! Alas, the coffeehouses in Maine don't quite compare.

A heartfelt “köszönöm szépen” to all of the faculty and staff who made this experience possible.
During the period of my fellowship at the Institute for Advanced Study, I was able to complete reading of a number of key scholarly texts on the history and historical political economy of Venezuela which went into the writing of a full draft of my current article on the coffee trade and political consent called Coffee and Socialism in the Venezuelan Andes. This article is currently under review for *Foci: The Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology*, and I expect to have revisions on the article submission in the coming months. In addition to the time required to read and to synthesize the material contained in such texts as *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* and *Coffee and Capitalism in the Venezuelan Andes*, my period of residence at the IAS provided me with the opportunity to receive feedback on earlier drafts of the paper from faculty members in the Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, History and the School of Public Policy. My IAS presentation was also extremely helpful and encouraged me to address questions on the history of socialist agrarian reform, development in the global south, the work of the British historian E.P. Thompson, and the concept of moral economy. Because of the connections between the IAS and faculties at CEU, I was able to deliver a lecture to the joint graduate seminar *Political Radicalism in Global Perspective* convened by Don Kalb and Constantin Iordachi in addition to the regular seminar. My experience in this seminar allowed me to engage with a number of Ph.D. candidates in the home discipline of anthropology and adjacent disciplines to forge relationships with several graduate students that are developing research projects closely aligned with my own interest in the politics of natural resources and extractive economies. As a result of this interaction and the support of IAS Faculty Fellow Judit Bodnar, a graduate student in anthropology whose MA thesis centers on popular responses to environmental destruction and social dislocation in the wake of oil pipeline construction in northern Minnesota. This supervisory role in tandem with CEU faculty and Sadie will contribute to my professional profile and practical experience with supervision of graduate students as well as potential collaborative projects in the future. Prior to arriving at IAS, I had begun to consider the possibility of developing a multi-sited research project on the biopolitics of energy and natural resource conservation. I hoped to start building networks that would later help me create a working group on ecology, natural resources, and subaltern politics. I consider the connections I have made with anthropologists and sociologists working on similar issues at Central European to be some of the first concrete steps in the realization of this objective. My regular attendance at a colloquium in Sociology and Social Anthropology and talks at the Center for Religious Studies’ “Striking from the Margins: State, Religion and Disintegration in the Middle East” research seminar also sharpened my thinking on the dynamics of statecraft and state formation and the relationship between natural resource politics and the international system. In addition to work on my primary project, during the fall academic term, I was able to finish the second draft of an article that was already in preparation dealing with hydroelectric infrastructure and the history of the military dictatorship in Venezuela. Following submission of this manuscript to the journal *Dialectical Anthropology*, I received a review of “conditional accept” and I was able to complete the minor revisions suggested by the reviewers during the second term of my fellowship. The article will appear in a special issue of the journal entitled “Revolution” in the fall 2017 and the Institute for Advanced Study and Central European University will be listed in the acknowledgements section. In the spring 2017 term, I was asked to take part in a performance art piece associated with the workshop on the International Criminal Court for the former Yugoslavia organized by IAS fellow Marina Aligro. In collaboration with several other fellows in the IAS, the performance piece involved the reading of several actual verdicts and testimonies from the war crimes tribunals in the Balkans and an active dialog and participation with an audience of students, faculty, and interested members of the CEU community. This same month, I was also invited to participate in the annual hate speech monologs organized by the School of Public Policy adjunct faculty member Peter Molnar. The performance with IAS fellow Seth Bledsoe, helped facilitate the telling of stories by a number of CEU graduate students and monologs, which illustrated and conveyed their reflections on the pervasive and quotidian nature of hate speech and its ability to come from unexpected quarters. One of my most enjoyable and unexpected experiences at IAS was the chance to dialog with Etienne Balibar and ask a question about the politics of postwar Europe that has vexed me since I was
an undergraduate student. Thanks to IAS sponsorship of his talk and an invitation by IAS director, I was able to have a conversation I never imagined and that will stand out for a long time.

The period of the IAS fellowship also afforded me with the time and space to apply to a number of tenure-track faculty and long-term research positions at international institutions. During the fellowship I was able to interviews for positions at such institutions as the University of Bergen in Norway, Kansas State University in the United States and Victoria University of Wellington in New Zealand. Ultimately, I accepted a Visiting Assistant Professor position at Union College, a private liberal arts institution in the state of New York and will begin work there in September 2017.

Apart from the many tangible scholarly accomplishments I achieved as a result of my time in Budapest, I leave the IAS with a renewed sense of purpose and belief in the mission of the university and its role in democratic society. It is a conviction, which, I confess, to have partially lost sight of in recent years and which I had begun to take for granted over the course of nearly a decade in higher education. I have been reminded that the university is one of the only spaces in society where ideas can be more or less freely exchanged without the immediate or direct pressures of political and economic forces and that this space has to be fought for and preserved in the face of a number of threats. Recent events at CEU have attuned me to this reality and brought this vision of the university as a democratic space back into focus for me. It is for this gift that I am most thankful to the Institute for Advanced Study and it is one that I will not soon forget. The reputation of Central European University as a space for open debate and defender of academic freedom has only grown as a result of the efforts of certain reactionary elements to close it. I feel honored to have been a part of the Central European University in this difficult period and to be able in some small way to represent the institution and its values as I make my way around the academy. It is a reputation and an example that I will strive to uphold for years to come.

At the end of my fellowship at the IAS, I am pleased to claim that it was worth applying. A very productive year is behind me, and I spent this year in a stimulating environment. With a background in sociology and working with large-scale empirical data, I have benefited much from the colorful research interests of my fellow fellows; especially from the various ways of asking research questions.

During the 9 months, I spent here at IAS I organized a workshop with the title: “Field Experiments in Education” The workshop brought together economists, psychologists, and sociologists who use this experimental method. The aim of the workshop was to provide opportunity for young researchers to exchange ideas and experiences within the topic of field experiments in education. Participant of the workshop were amazed by the IAS hospitality and found the workshop productive. Since some of the participants are already organizing the second workshop in field experiments, I believe that their enthusiasm is not just an empty phrase.
I would like to thank Éva, Nadia, Judit and Jan for all their support. You guys, made my life very easy at IAS. I hope we will keep in touch!

I had a great opportunity to be a fellow at the Institute for the Advanced Studies in Budapest between October 2016 and February 2017. During this time, I had the pleasure of being part of the IAS family which grows and thrives through the years. I had a chance to engage with the scholars from all over the world and get real support from the IAS team. For this I am eternally grateful. In such a unique environment (and we should not forget that these environments seem to be diminishing rapidly throughout the world), I was inspired to discover new topics and avenues of research and to enhance and refresh my own research in many exciting ways. In some ways, I managed to change my research interests and deviate from my original research plans.

I always felt that the environments that nurture real interdisciplinary dialogues are those that best suit my research sensibilities. Having obtained BA in ethnology and anthropology (University of Belgrade, Serbia), MA in Slavonic Studies (University of Nottingham, UK) and PhD in Theatre Studies (Lancaster University, UK) and with a long-time practice in contemporary dance, I was never going to become an ‘expert’ in only one field. My research, therefore, is theoretically and methodologically situated in the common ground between anthropology, dance, and performance studies. For my PhD, I conducted ethnographic research on dance and performing arts communities in South-Eastern Europe and Turkey. During my PhD, which resulted in the book Backstage Economies: Masculinities and Labour in Contemporary Dance World (Chester University press 2014), I realized how difficult and challenging it is to combine methodologies deriving from social sciences and (dance) art – although they do sometimes share common theoretical backgrounds. I realized back then that this is going to be my life-long project.

The project I applied with to the IAS was called: ‘Exploring Precarity and Labour Transformation in One Serbian Dance Society’ and it aimed at addressing my key research interests (dance and labour) with trying out new methodologies that derive from dance and performance studies and combining them with ethnographic fieldwork – the methodology I was already familiar with.

This research project tried to explore affective dimensions of economic transformation through local paradigms of precarity in Serbia. I first encountered and explored the notion of precarity as a normal way of living and working in neoliberal economy during my PhD research and during the completion of my book manuscript. Within the same interdisciplinary grounding this project wanted to further explore precarity, affect, and economic transformation in a particular context of ‘cultural work’ in post-socialist Serbia. Ethnographies of post-socialism on former Yugoslavia and Serbia until recently largely focused on questions of ethnicity and violence leaving all other questions unexplored. Nevertheless, the lives of people in Serbia are as much characterized by processes originating from post-socialist transformation as they have been by ethnic conflicts. In this project I wished to move away from ‘gatekeeping concepts’ (Appadurai 1986) and to add to a growing literature on economic transformation and neoliberal restructuring in Serbia and former Yugoslavia (Erdei 2014; Jansen 2014; Rajković 2015). Through long-term ethnographic fieldwork (as my initial methodological tool) the project charted narratives and practices of hope, morality and common good in the state-owned, working-class, folk dance society in Subotica, Serbia. With massive layoffs and privatization of its assets, this once successful and prosperous society in socialist Yugoslavia now faced a serious financial and existential crisis – a crisis that created new kinds of relationships between dancers and the state that anthropologist Andrea Muehlebach calls ‘ethical citizenship’ in neoliberal era (2012). These affective relationships tended to focus on the ideas of personal responsibility, active citizenship and the power of cultural work in the midst of austerity measures and precarity. Another important focal point of the research was the focus on dance and dancing bodies and the way they help us understand precarity and ethical endurance in late capitalism (Povinelli 2014). Before I came to IAS, I have already conducted extensive fieldwork on several occasions throughout 2014 and 2015 which was funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia. I planned to continue with fieldwork throughout 2016 and use my stay at IAS to complete this research and prepare for publication. That was the plan but in fact it did not happened that way. Sometimes, we get tired with the topics we are too used to interest.

At IAS, I had the pleasure of being part of the IAS family which grows and thrives through the years. I had a chance to engage with the scholars from all over the world and get real support from the IAS team. For this I am eternally grateful. In such a unique environment (and we should not forget that these environments seem to be diminishing rapidly throughout the world), I was inspired to discover new topics and avenues of research and to enhance and refresh my own research in many exciting ways. In some ways, I managed to change my research interests and deviate from my original research plans.

I always felt that the environments that nurture real interdisciplinary dialogues are those that best suit my research sensibilities. Having obtained BA in ethnology and anthropology (University of Belgrade, Serbia), MA in Slavonic Studies (University of Nottingham, UK) and PhD in Theatre Studies (Lancaster University, UK) and with a long-time practice in contemporary dance, I was never going to become an ‘expert’ in only one field. My research, therefore, is theoretically and methodologically situated in the common ground between anthropology, dance, and performance studies. For my PhD, I conducted ethnographic research on dance and performing arts communities in South-Eastern Europe and Turkey. During my PhD, which resulted in the book Backstage Economies: Masculinities and Labour in Contemporary Dance World (Chester University press 2014), I realized how difficult and challenging it is to combine methodologies deriving from social sciences and (dance) art – although they do sometimes share common theoretical backgrounds. I realized back then that this is going to be my life-long project.

The project I applied with to the IAS was called: ‘Exploring Precarity and Labour Transformation in One Serbian Dance Society’ and it aimed at addressing my key research interests (dance and labour) with trying out new methodologies that derive from dance and performance studies and combining them with ethnographic fieldwork – the methodology I was already familiar with.
interests and we feel no longer capable of turning the material into (yet) another publication. No matter how great the material is. My experience at IAS is like that. During the first month of my stay I felt a huge sense of opening. I had long conversations with fellow anthropologists and historians about the topics that seem to be unrelated to mine, but which nevertheless held a fascination for me. I somehow remembered what interdisciplinarity meant. I also explored CEU library with an idea of reading books that seemed unrelated or not completely related to my research questions. Incidentally, one of these books turned out to be the one that inspired me to look at my materials and my research questions from a different angle. I began to develop interest which was somewhat broader – namely, I was interested in dance and war – with questions which seemed more fundamental somehow. Paradoxically, I managed to remain within the frame of my previous topic and that is the politics of choreographed folklore in former Yugoslavia (and contemporary Serbia) but this time with the different twist. This time, by critically looking at the notion of choreography of folk dance and by going back to the practice of folk dancing in the Partisan units during the World War II, I tried to utilize Andrew Hewitt’s (2005) notion of ‘social choreography’ to show how folk dance served both as an aesthetic ideal and as a matrix for new social order that was being forged during the war. Again, this perspective allowed me to stay within both my topic and my commitment to interdisciplinarity by combining the notion of ‘choreography’ as a term developed within dance studies and the idea of the ‘social’. This research turn brought a frenzy of new activities and research plans. I travelled to Belgrade and Zagreb several times in search of books and archival material; I established a rapport with the director of Serbian National Folk Dance Company to begin archival and ethnographic research in the company on my return to Serbia and generally I immensely benefited from the endless formal and informal feedback from my co-fellows and other members of the CEU family. After my presentation I received an invitation from a co-fellow Adelina Stefan to take part in the conference ‘Cold War Mobilities and (Im)mobilities: Entangled Histories of Postwar Eastern and Southern Europe, 1945-1989’, which took place at CEU in June 2017. This also added another angle to my research material. So no, I did not prepare the book manuscript, but I re-discovered my research passion.

I had a chance to engage and have coffee and conversations with other scholars working at the CEU. I was involved with the activities of the CEU Yugo-Research group and I met with professor Elisa Helma from the Gender Studies Department and Mate Nikola Tokić, Visiting Humanities Professor. Their encouragement and knowledge on former Yugoslavia helped me clarify some of the shortcomings of my own research. I had a great opportunity to meet and have many conversations with Professor József Böröcz from Rutgers University, US. I facilitated his talk at CEU: ‘The Performing Arts Ensemble of the Hungarian People’s Army Visits the People’s Republic of China in the Autumn of 1956’. I further had conversations with Professor Don Kalbf from Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology and Charles Shaw and Marsha Siefert from the History Department. The encouragement and enthusiasm of Dr. Siefert is something that truly marked my stay at IAS and I believe in our future co-operation. Now I do not think that I need to recommend IAS more. My own career path so far involved both studying and working in British and Serbian academic communities. In years, I came to value the importance of academic mobility and knowledge exchange – both for disciplinary developments (asking more challenging and innovative questions) and my own career advancement. Having returned to my native Serbia in 2014, a country with a relatively poor research infrastructure, I came to value even more the importance of international mobility for young academics working across the globe. My stay at IAS definitely helped my academic career. Finally, I have to add that the period of my stay in IAS was marked by the extraordinary political, economic and cultural shifts that were taking part in the world but primarily in the US and Europe. In fact, one of the first joint activities that we fellows organized was a communal watching of the US elections. Anxieties, political processes and sentiments that are reshaping the time we live in deserve careful rethinking and consideration – perhaps they slowly are opening themselves for future research, perhaps by some future fellows. However, sad and threatening they may be, I was glad to live through them with such an extraordinary group of people at such an extraordinary place.
The Junior Thyssen Fellowship generously gave me ten full months, with no restrictions or limitations, to pursue in Budapest a book project on the role religion played in the ancient history of surveillance, an ideal place, heavy with scars and history, to think and write about insurgents, snitches, angels, and spies. After all, for the last hundred years or so various forms of state surveillance have shaped Hungarian society; a dark chapter that still awaits a proper reappraisal. Naturally, I was excited and curious as I thought ahead to my sojourn at the Institute for Advanced Study (IAS) at Central European University (CEU). Back then I could hardly have imagined that once there, I was never really going to leave. The following paragraphs will outline how a mixture of serendipity and generosity have allowed me to write these lines away from Hungary … while still in Hungary.

The book that I have been working on in Budapest seeks to substantiate with historical evidence the broad claim that total surveillance — whether as ideal or nightmare, as theory or practice, as tradition or innovation — is by no means a contrivance of the present or the near future, but rather a construction of the distant past. Belief in supernatural beings or forces played a key role in implementing and legitimizing those first models of extensive supervision and control, exercised ideally over whole societies, but more realistically over segments thereof. Broad comparative research projects like my own depend on lively exchange with experts in individual fields. I benefited greatly from regular conversations with CEU faculty who challenged my ideas, provided honest feedback, excused my errors, and pointed to important supplementary bibliography. It is a great pleasure to mention (in alphabetical order) the most committed dialogue partners on things surveillant and much more: Chrys Margaritides, Volker Menze, Istvan Perczel, and Curie Virag. Additionally, a number of institutions at CEU were gracious in taking interest in my research and in inviting me to give public lectures or participate in international workshops. As part of the anniversary series of the Center for Eastern Mediterranean Studies, early in 2017 I gave a public lecture entitled “Imagining Total Surveillance among Daoist communities in China.”

In early May 2017 I participated in a workshop organized by the JustData research group, an interdisciplinary project (part of CEU’s successful Intellectual Themes Initiative) that engages the technical and ethical challenges of big data. Hosted by the School of Public Policy, the workshop, entitled “(Big) Hopes and Hazards of Big Data” and organized by Anand Murugesan, sought to clarify how identification technologies (re)shape civil liberties and challenge democratic values. I contributed a paper on “Dynamics of Surveillance in the Ancient World,” using The Apocalypse of John, one of the quintessential documents of total surveillance in the ancient world, as a historical case study. I profited greatly from the discussions generated by both events and from the feedback to my papers.

I was already aware of the quality of the CEU faculty and students, still I was surprised by the number and variety of the public lectures and academic events hosted on a weekly basis by CEU. Thanks to this intense influx of exceptional external academics, I was able to meet several scholars whose work I already esteemed highly or whose research proved relevant to my book project. From a number of excellent lectures, I would like to mention (again in alphabetical order) those of Robert Darnton (Harvard University), James Kapalo (University College Cork), Volkhard Krech (Ruhr-Universität Bochum), Matthew Leigh (University of Oxford), Edward Slingerland (University of British Columbia), and Martin Wallraff (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München). An Institute for Advanced Study is measured not only by the excellence of its institutional affiliation but also, and foremost, by the quality of its fellows. The weekly Fellows’ seminar was truly an exciting learning experience. The spectrum and standard of the presentations were a joy for the intellectually curious. Of greatest benefit for me as a scholar was the stimulating methodological friction with areas and topics beyond my academic comfort zone. I learned a great deal from conversations with my fellow fellows and forged friendships which I cherish. The chance encounter with a former IAS fellow who was attending a conference at CEU sparked a common project on the dangers of gift-giving that galvanized into an IAS intergenerational collaboration. I joined forces with Alexandra Urakova, a literary scholar and IAS fellow in 2015/16, and Tracey Sowery, a historian of early modern diplomacy and IAS fellow in 2016/17, and in May 2017 we organized a two-day international workshop hosted by IAS and CEMS at CEU entitled “Dangerous
Gifts and Pernicious Transactions from Antiquity to the Digital Age. I contributed to the workshop also with a paper on early Christian concepts of the Eucharist as a dangerous gift. The interest generated by the conference and the lacuna in scholarship with a comparative and diachronic approach to the dangers of gift-giving encouraged my co-conspirators and me to transform the workshop into a book publication. Substantial progress has already been made, and we are confident we will finish the manuscript by early 2018, ready for review by Routledge.

This kind of stimulating academic and personal exchange and collaboration brought tenacity, creativity, and enthusiasm to the more lonely hours of research and writing related to my main project, a book entitled Surveillant Antiquities: Religion and the Invention of the Surveillance Society in the Ancient World. The CEU interlibrary loan staff were swift in procuring obscure articles and books. The new service that makes books from the CEU-ELTE Medieval Library (located at ELTE) easily available at CEU was of great benefit, saving me much time. The working conditions in the Raul Wallenberg Guesthouse were—and I’m really not exaggerating—paradisiacal: a quiet environment, a friendly staff who try to accommodate even the most exotic wishes, and a spacious and light-filled architecture which makes the solitary work of a scholar blissful. Thanks to these exceptional conditions I was able to finish advanced drafts of two chapters of my book project and write early and partial drafts of two more chapters. Chapter 6, entitled “Ledgers of Sins: Surveillant Bureaucracies in Late Antique Rome and China”, outlines the startling models of accounting for sins conceived under the influence of state-funded bureaucratic revolutions in late ancient Rome and China autonomous and/or insurgent religious communities such as ancient Christian monasteries (e.g. the Pachomian federation) and early Daoist movements in late Han and post-Han China (e.g. the Celestial Masters of Hanzhong). Material on surveillance in early Christianity was initially to form part of a larger chapter in which I would map the distinctive forms of surveillance developed in ancient religious/philosophical sects such as the Pythagoreans, the Epicureans, the community at Qumran, and early Christian communities. The richness of the data proved to require a standalone chapter. Chapter 5, entitled “The Christian Panopticon”, focuses on how notions of divine supervision were balanced against concepts of demonic surveillance in early Christian communities from the first three centuries. In addition to these two chapters, I have written an early draft of part of the introduction to the book, in which I engage critically the recent theories of Ara Norenzayan and Dominic Johnson on the animating role, both cultural and social, played by religious surveillance in ancient cultures. Furthermore, I have worked on the part of the first chapter, “Surveillance and the State in the First Empires (Assyria, Egypt, Persia)”, which outlines the surveillance revolution carried through by the Neo-Assyrian empire with its combination of state bureaucracy and an elaborate worldly (intelligence) and otherworldly (divination) system of supervision and control I intend to complete the remaining four chapters and finish the manuscript by the end of 2018.

In hindsight it was only natural that my research would bring me into contact with the Vera and Donald Blinken Open Society Archives (OSA), an internationally acclaimed institution affiliated with CEU. A common interest in the historical study of surveillance laid the foundations for collaboration on the organization of a large international conference hosted by OSA-IAS-CEU to be held in early summer 2018. The conference, tentatively entitled ‘Surveillant Histories: A Global Perspective’, aims to provide the necessary but largely neglected historical perspective (and the critical depth that comes with it) on the present global debate over the challenges and dangers of surveillance that has been rekindled by the recent revelations of whistleblower Edward Snowden.

The common project with OSA, a handful of friendships strengthened or newly forged, two and a half bookshelves of acquired books with the note “Budapest” on the last page followed by the date of purchase or delivery, a suitcase and several boxes of memories, an obsession for a city, and an attachment to a people and to a language that, alas, remains still alien brought me closer than ever to Budapest, so close that the physical distance I have now regained from the city is emotionally, and academically, negligible.
I am really grateful to the Volkswagen Foundation and the School of Public Policy and IAS at CEU for granting me the Global Challenges Fellowship. It has been a great opportunity for me and I benefited tremendously from the fellowship.

The great teams at SPP and IAS provided fellows with generous supports in every aspect including arranging accommodation, organizing academic activities and museum visits, establishing contacts with CEU colleagues, providing various help with fellows’ research and other activities. Everyone in the team, Director Prof. Nadia Al-Bagdadi, Ms. Eva Gönzcz and Mr. Jan Brokér at IAS, Dean, Prof. Julia Buxton and Dr. Cristina Corduneanu-Huci at SPP, Manager Ágnes Forgó at Raoul Wallenberg Guesthouse had been super supportive and friendly, and always encouraging us to explore more possibilities with our research and academic networking.

The fellowship gave me a precious opportunity to fully focus on my research and be immersed in a pure and friendly academic atmosphere. With the cozy apartment, nice office space, and library access provided by SPP and IAS and the supportive and friendly colleagues and fellows at CEU, I was able to focus on my writing and be more productive. During this fellowship, I have completed two coauthored article manuscripts (entitled “The left-behind elderly in rural China: Migration, old age support and subjective wellbeing” and “Public response to the two-child policy in China: An analysis of online opinions” respectively), submitted two abstracts of conference papers (entitled “Women’s political participation in rural China: Agency, power redistribution and inheritance” and “Women’s political participation status and structure in China” respectively), and deployed a draft of book manuscript on “Institutionalizing rural women’s political participation in China: Migration, old age support and subjective wellbeing”.
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Top-down Policies and Bottom-up Capability Projects: Institutionalizing Chinese Women’s Grassroots Political Participation

The main objective of my work at the CEU-IAS was to make progress on the co-authored book manuscript titled The Way Home: Peaceful Return of Victims of Forced Displacement in Eastern Europe and the Middle East. Whilst several scholars have focused on ethnic cleansing (e.g. McGarry 1998; Mann 2005), until now, only a handful of academic studies have examined voluntary return. Amongst those the general assumption is that forced displacements are irreversible once new demographic facts are established on the ground (e.g., Kaufmann 1996; Adelman & Barkan 2011). The project aims to challenge this assumption by investigating cases of return and non-return. Specifically, it focuses on cases of forced displacement in Bosnia, Turkey, and Cyprus, and probes the following issues: a) How do victims of displacement choose to return; b) What factors explain initial intentions and sustainable return options; and c) How could novel institutional solutions address the immediate and long term needs of the displaced. The project combines large-n surveys amongst the displaced with focused comparisons of cases representing different stages of displacement and return. In Cyprus, the project focuses on intentions among the internally displaced: return options are not available yet; in Turkey, it examines return under
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Peaceful Return of Victims of Forced Displacement in Eastern Europe and the Middle East

Reserved seats election for women” from which I received many useful comments and feedback for my future research. In Dr. Cristina Corduneanu-Huci’s class, I also gave a guest lecture on “Migrant children in urban China: Acculturation and school adaptation” to SPP postgraduate students. I organized a fellow’s workshop on “Academic Writing and Publication” in which fellows shared their own experience in academic writing and publication. The workshop led to a weekly fellow’s writing group which was organized by David Jorgensen. With the financial support in the fellowship, I also visited Carnets du Centre Chine (CNRS/EHESS) in Paris and, Department of Asian Studies at Metropolitan University Prague in Prague. These visits helped me to build up research networks and potential collaboration opportunities.

The fellowship gave me a precious opportunity to fully focus on my research and be immersed in a pure and friendly academic atmosphere. With the cozy apartment, nice office space, and library access provided by SPP and IAS and the supportive and friendly colleagues and fellows at CEU, I was able to focus on my writing and be more productive. During this fellowship, I have completed two coauthored article manuscripts (entitled “The left-behind elderly in rural China: Migration, old age support and subjective wellbeing” and “Public response to the two-child policy in China: An analysis of online opinions” respectively), submitted two abstracts of conference papers (entitled “Women’s political participation in rural China: Agency, power redistribution and inheritance” and “Women’s political participation status and structure in China” respectively), and drafted an outline of my book manuscript on “Women’s political participation in rural China: Institutional arrangements, empowerment and capability building”. The fellowship gave me a fantastic platform to present my own research projects and organize academic events. I gave a Fellow seminar on “Institutionalizing rural women’s political participation in China: Migration, old age support and subjective wellbeing” and “Public response to the two-child policy in China: An analysis of online opinions” respectively, submitted two abstracts of conference papers (entitled “Women’s political participation in rural China: Agency, power redistribution and inheritance” and “Women’s political participation status and structure in China” respectively), and drafted an outline of my book manuscript on “Women’s political participation in rural China: Institutional arrangements, empowerment and capability building”.

The friendship and networks with my colleagues and fellows in SPP and IAS will carry on. Through this fellowship, I built deep friendship and close networks with colleagues and fellows at CEU. We will stay in touch and hopefully develop collaborations in the future.

The main objective of my work at the CEU-IAS was to make progress on the co-authored book manuscript titled The Way Home: Peaceful Return of Victims of Forced Displacement in Eastern Europe and the Middle East. Whilst several scholars have focused on ethnic cleansing (e.g. McGarry 1998; Mann 2005), until now, only a handful of academic studies have examined voluntary return. Amongst those the general assumption is that forced displacements are irreversible once new demographic facts are established on the ground (e.g., Kaufmann 1996; Adelman & Barkan 2011). The project aims to challenge this assumption by investigating cases of return and non-return. Specifically, it focuses on cases of forced displacement in Bosnia, Turkey, and Cyprus, and probes the following issues: a) How do victims of displacement choose to return; b) What factors explain initial intentions and sustainable return options; and c) How could novel institutional solutions address the immediate and long term needs of the displaced. The project combines large-n surveys amongst the displaced with focused comparisons of cases representing different stages of displacement and return. In Cyprus, the project focuses on intentions among the internally displaced: return options are not available yet; in Turkey, it examines return under
conditions of continuing low level violence in the Kurdish regions; in post-Dayton Bosnia, it investigates the conditions that led to sustainable and non-sustainable returns. The project will result in a book manuscript to be submitted to an academic publisher.

During my stay at IAS, we made significant progress on the book. I completed (with Neophytos Loizides and Sean Metivier) an article "Struggling for and Within the Community: What Leads Bosnian Forced Migrants to Desire Community Return?" which was accepted for publication at Ethnopolitics (accepted in June 2017, forthcoming in 2018). Furthermore, I finished the manuscript (with Neophytos Loizides) "Peaceful Returns: Reversing Ethnic Cleansing after the Bosnian War," and it was accepted for publication in International Migration (accepted in July 2017, forthcoming in 2018). In addition, International Migration invited our special issue (with Neophytos Loizides and Ayse Betul Celik) on refugee returns, which is to be completed by August 2017.

During a May short trip to the ex-Yugoslav region, I obtained The Bosnian Book of Dead, a detailed statistical analysis of war-time mortality in Bosnia. In combination with the recently released 2013 Bosnian Census results, this dataset will enable me to conduct a multi-level analysis of the Bosnian refugee returns. By taking into account contextual characteristics of the Bosnian municipalities of displacement, this analysis will represent a methodological breakthrough in the study of refugee returns.

Work on the refugee return intentions in Cyprus also made significant progress, as the EURIAS research funding enabled me to hire a CEU research assistant Gergo Toth. Mr. Toth completed initial multivariate data analysis of the 2015 Cypriot survey dataset of return intentions. I also presented the main findings, the method, and a new theoretical framework of our project at the IAS (April 2017) and EURIAS Annual Conference at the EURIAS Annual Conference, Delmenhorst Institute for Advanced Studies, Germany. After several months of negotiations, we received an invitation for a detailed book proposal from Cornell University Press in March 2017.

In addition to the progress made on the book manuscript, our co-authored paper (with Jonathan Hall, Iosif Kovras, and Neophytos Loizides) "Exposure to Violence, War-Related Losses and Attitudes Towards Transitional Justice: Evidence from Post-Dayton Bosnia and Herzegovina was accepted for publication at Political Psychology (accepted in January 2017, forthcoming in 2018).

IAS was a superb research environment for my Sabbatical. I received excellent help with logistic issues from Agnes Fergo, Jan Broker, and Eva Gonczi. A great variety of research talks by international scholars who visited the CEU in 2016-2017 helped to advance my own thinking. I received very useful feedback after the presentations at the IAS and the EURIAS meeting at Delmenhorst. Finally, being freed from non-research obligations gave me time to read and think, and, consequently, to dramatically improve the methodological approach and the theoretical framework for the book.
As a Humanities Initiative Fellow with a teaching responsibility for the Fall semester, I arrived in Budapest about a month before most of the other fellows. This provided some time to acquaint myself both with CEU and Budapest without having to "hit the ground running" on my research project. After the first walk across the famous Chain Bridge from my new home at the Guesthouse to the Institute I immediately knew that the atmosphere of Budapest and CEU—which lies at the city’s heart—would be conducive for a year of research and writing. My objectives were clear: complete the final touches of my book (a revision of my dissertation), begin an intense investigation into my new project, and knock out a few of those incidental obligations that one can so easily accumulate as an academic such as book reviews and encyclopedia entries. In addition to the research output, I also attended to some of the more practical and professional aspects of academia, namely teaching and applying for positions. What follows is a roughly chronological outline of each of these scholarly pursuits and a few concluding reflections on my stay at the IAS CEU during the 2016–2017 academic year.

The course I taught was called "Martyrdom, Terrorism, and the Discourse of Religious Violence." A course of my own design, the class brought forward various "texts" from antiquity to the modern day wherein...
violence was encountered in a purportedly religious context. I had seven students from several faculties (History, Nationalism, Medieval Studies) and nationalities. The topic of the course was not directly related to my research theme, but its methodological impulse was in concert with my research agenda. In the seminars, we raised questions of agency, identity, and power as we explored historical and contemporary traditions and issues in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Of note from this experience were the students themselves. They were of a higher caliber than I had had previously, and they challenged me not only as an educator but in my research acumen. I can honestly say that some of the work I am currently doing is a direct result of interaction with CEU students, many of whom I fully expect to maintain contact.

The primary goal for my research project, which was in its nascent phase, was to develop more fully a theoretical framework for investigating concepts of identity, ethnicity, and group cohesion in the ancient Mediterranean. Thus, much of my time was focused on research and organizing a more coherent vision for the project. Still, this did lead to some initial pre-publication outputs. For example, in an invited paper at conference in November I gave a new reading of Daniel 6 in light of its Aramaic literary context, especially with regard to the Jewish author's worldview and implicit assertion about to whose authority one should submit, i.e., loyalty vis-à-vis king and God. To my great delight, the paper was well received by the group of Daniel scholars, suggesting the move to incorporate a broader approach to Daniel's literary content can be fruitful.

In the winter semester I held my research lecture at the IAS Fellows Seminar. I took this opportunity to give a more in-depth presentation of the research and the goals of my project, with a particular focus on the several methodological problems that one encounters when investigating ethnicity, identity, and religion in antiquity. I received very incisive and helpful feedback from the other fellows during the Q&A and even more during the Fellows Lunch. Although I was in the beginning stages of writing, the criticisms and suggestions were invaluable for giving shape and direction to the project. The forthcoming publications over the next couple of years will be thanks to this much-needed assistance at the earliest stage.

Speaking of the Fellows Seminar more generally, I found this weekly ritual to be the most intellectually stimulating experience. There was a consistent collegial tone but at the same time the fellows, myself included, demonstrated a constructively critical edge. To be sure, I was uncertain at first about the usefulness of such a broadly interdisciplinary venue—N.B. I had prior experience working in interdisciplinary contexts, but still primarily within the humanities—yet to my great surprise and delight each week's lecturer and topic, from Russian love-letters to Venetian coffee farmers to Socialist tourism, had my synapses firing on all cylinders. In fact, I likely gained more from hearing the presentations and having conversations with social scientists than those closest to my field of study.

IAS CEU further nourished an environment of friendship, collegiality, and support. Those ad hoc, organic moments, of interaction—whether over coffee/tea or the several impromptu gatherings for beer/wine—that helped to build strong relationships across several lines—departmental, institutional, and international. As an early career scholar on a junior-level fellowship, much of my time in the Fall (outside of teaching) was spent seeking and applying for the next position. I was not alone in this. In the gauntlet that is the job market, it was comforting to have a few fellow-travelers around, especially David and Aaron, who were constant companions in the contemplating, complaining, commiserating, and, ultimately, congratulating that accompanies such an exhausting endeavor. One of the greatest advantages, though, that the IAS has to offer junior scholars such as myself is the opportunity to work closely with senior fellows (as well as full-time faculty in CEU more broadly) who were always ready to offer advice on improving one's approach to the project, to incorporate a broader approach to Daniel's literary context can be fruitful.

As an early career scholar on a junior-level fellowship, much of my time in the Fall (outside of teaching) was spent seeking and applying for the next position. I was not alone in this. In the gauntlet that is the job market, it was comforting to have a few fellow-travelers around, especially David and Aaron, who were constant companions in the contemplating, complaining, commiserating, and, ultimately, congratulating that accompanies such an exhausting endeavor. One of the greatest advantages, though, that the IAS has to offer junior scholars such as myself is the opportunity to work closely with senior fellows (as well as full-time faculty in CEU more broadly) who were always ready to offer advice on improving one's approach to the project, to incorporate a broader approach to Daniel's literary context can be fruitful.

In the winter semester I held my research lecture at the IAS Fellows Seminar. I took this opportunity to give a more in-depth presentation of the research and the goals of my project, with a particular focus on the several methodological problems that one encounters when investigating ethnicity, identity, and religion in antiquity. I received very incisive and helpful feedback from the other fellows during the Q&A and even more during the Fellows Lunch. Although I was in the beginning stages of writing, the criticisms and suggestions were invaluable for giving shape and direction to the project. The forthcoming publications over the next couple of years will be thanks to this much-needed assistance at the earliest stage.

Speaking of the Fellows Seminar more generally, I found this weekly ritual to be the most intellectually stimulating experience. There was a consistent collegial tone but at the same time the fellows, myself included, demonstrated a constructively critical edge. To be sure, I was uncertain at first about the usefulness of such a broadly interdisciplinary venue—N.B. I had prior experience working in interdisciplinary contexts, but still primarily within the humanities—yet to my great surprise and delight each week's lecturer and topic, from Russian love-letters to Venetian coffee farmers to Socialist tourism, had my synapses firing on all cylinders. In fact, I likely gained more from hearing the presentations and having conversations with social scientists than those closest to my field of study.

IAS CEU further nourished an environment of friendship, collegiality, and support. Those ad hoc, organic moments, of interaction—whether over coffee/tea or the several impromptu gatherings for beer/wine—that helped to build strong relationships across several lines—departmental, institutional, and international. As an early career scholar on a junior-level fellowship, much of my time in the Fall (outside of teaching) was spent seeking and applying for the next position. I was not alone in this. In the gauntlet that is the job market, it was comforting to have a few fellow-travelers around, especially David and Aaron, who were constant companions in the contemplating, complaining, commiserating, and, ultimately, congratulating that accompanies such an exhausting endeavor. One of the greatest advantages, though, that the IAS has to offer junior scholars such as myself is the opportunity to work closely with senior fellows (as well as full-time faculty in CEU more broadly) who were always ready to offer advice on improving one's approach to the project, to incorporate a broader approach to Daniel's literary context can be fruitful.

With the foregoing sentiment, I return once again to my opening statement about the atmosphere. One not created only by the beauty of the city's two-halves, split by the ever-impressive Danube, but the people, the individuals who welcomed me and my colleagues and made it truly feel like home. On a practical note, for example, I am certain that I will never have a smoother, problem-free transitional period. Moving to a new city,
a new university, and an entirely new system can be frustratingly difficult, but this was not my experience coming to Budapest and to CEU. This is due in no small part to Eva, in the office, and Agnes, at the Guesthouse. The broader CEU community was also welcoming. One happily quirky aspect is that one hardly needs to plan any casual meeting with new colleagues as there are so many lectures, workshops, and conferences each week that you will undoubtedly encounter each other over a glass of Hungarian white and a few pogácsa at the near daily receptions in Nador 15. Lastly, while it’s unfortunate to end on such an unhappy note, a review of my experience at CEU cannot be complete without comment on the tumultuous few months beginning around mid-March. Distracting to say the least, the threat that the university faced and is currently facing from the Hungarian government was a wake-up call: the threats to academic freedom, democracy, and decency are global issues, but one must not forget that they are experienced locally. I was honored and humbled to be a part of the tremendous efforts to resist such threats, but I remain ever more impressed by the hopeful, albeit cautious, outlook from my colleagues at CEU who do not have the luxury as I do of reflecting on these events from afar. For this reason, and many more, I intend and hope to maintain a strong connection to CEU as I move forward.

I came to IAS CEU with a few goals in mind: to start turning my dissertation defended at the University of Pittsburgh in May 2016, into a book, to establish as many academic contacts as possible at CEU and beyond and enhance my teaching experience. My project, which examines to what extent international tourism brought about a modernization from below in socialist Romania and Franco’s Spain by helping ordinary citizens in the two countries to go around state authority in various ways, was significantly enhanced over the ten months I spent at IAS CEU. If my initial focus was mainly on the official politics regarding international tourism of the two regimes and the effects at the everyday level, both in academic meetings and informal discussions a third level of analysis emerged, that of intermediaries including international organizations or Western corporations. Discussions with Marsha Siefert from the CEU’s History Department, but also a lecture I gave in December 2016 at the University of Amsterdam at the invitation of Christian Noack were particularly enlightening in this respect. My presentation at the Fellows’ seminar helped me clarify some aspects of my project, especially its methodological part. At the same time, the proximity of the Open Society Archives in Budapest and the possibility to take short trips to Hungarian archives allowed me to add new and exciting material to my research. Access to CEU library with its rich collection on Eastern Europe was also helpful for further developing my project. All these enabled me to put together a book proposal that I sent to a number of publishing houses and to finish writing an article on “Postcards Transfer across the Iron Curtain: Foreign Tourists and Transcultural Exchanges in Socialist Romania during the 1960s and 1980s”, forthcoming in the International Journal for History, Culture and Modernity (HCM), special issue on “Photo Transfer in Cold War Europe.” Furthermore, I am about to finish an article on commodification of culture and advertising socialist Romania and Franco’s Spain as tourist destinations in the 1960s-1970s, which I will submit to a peer-reviewed academic journal. Also, while at IAS CEU I managed to revise two chapters out of the four of my dissertation.

In addition to writing articles and revising my dissertation, I also took part in various conferences and workshops in Europe and the United States. In this respect, I would like to highlight one presentation that I gave in the History Department at CEU and another one at the University of Miami, as part of a research grant to study the Pan Am Archive at the University of Miami Libraries. While my talk at the CEU’s History Department benefitted from the feedback of an academic audience specialized in Eastern Europe, my presentation at the University of Miami Libraries had a more diverse audience with broader questions. Both types of lectures were eye opening for me as they invited reflection on new facets and questions.

As part of my attempt to meet scholars in my field and to build professional networks, I organized a workshop entitled, “Cold War Mobilities and (Im)mobilities: Entangled Histories of Eastern and Southern Europe, 1945-1989.” This workshop was meant to open the conversation on the ways in which eastern and southern Europe were built as “the other” in relation to the wealthier northwestern Europe, but also on the ways in which their entangled histories challenge the clear-cut division between socialist East and capitalist West in the
postwar period. Ten scholars from Europe and the United States discussed these issues in their papers during the one-day workshop that I organized with the support of the Institute for Advanced Study and of the Department of History at CEU. Beyond presenting our papers, the members of the group also identified many common research interests during formal and informal discussions. We plan to continue this collaboration by publishing a special issue in a peer-reviewed journal, but also by organizing further events together.

In addition to research and writing I also had the possibility to teach. In the fall semester, I taught a graduate class on "Consumption and Consumer Culture under Capitalism and Socialism" in the History Department. My students, MAs from the History and Sociology programs but also from Gender Studies, met for twelve weeks and discussed how and why consumer culture originated, how consumption became entangled in the project of "Western modernity" and how "modernity" and consumption played out in the Cold War context and in the ensuing competition between socialism and capitalism. In our discussions, we paid attention to issues such as gender, class, labor identities and structures, colonialism, but also Eurocentrism and Americanization. Based on readings and discussions, students had to write a midterm and a final paper. The possibility to teach a class at graduate level enhanced my teaching abilities as it allowed me not just to convey ideas about consumption among highly motivated and well-prepared students but also to learn from their comments for my further classes.

Last but not least, both the Wallenberg Guesthouse and IAS staff made my stay in Budapest extremely pleasant. As I arrived in Budapest I was welcomed by Agnes Forgo and Eva Gelei at the CEU’s Raoul Wallenberg Guesthouse, and in the second day of my arrival Eva Gonczi, the Institute’s Academic Secretary, kindly showed me my office and the surrounding facilities. During our first meeting, she also introduced me to the intellectual environment of the Institute for Advanced Study and of CEU. Discussions with Nadia Al-Bagdadi, the Director of the Institute, helped me put together the workshop on Cold War Mobilities and (Im)mobilities and her suggestions spanned from intellectual to practical matters.

The weekly presentations and lunches offered a space to interact with the other fellows and to engage in intense intellectual debates. Without doubt, my stay at IAS CEU reminded me of the sense of community that academic life can sometimes still provide. Living at the Raoul Wallenberg Guesthouse along with the other fellows delivered both privacy, when wanted, and the possibility to spend time with colleagues either in the Fellows’ Room or in the quite bucolic courtyard. The sense of community became particularly important in late March 2017 when CEU was forced to fight for its very own existence. Street protests and community meetings brought us all closer and made us aware of the role that universities have in challenging authoritarian regimes, not just in Hungary, but everywhere else. In a nutshell, I could not be more grateful for the opportunity to have spent ten months at IAS CEU as a Humanities Initiative Fellow, and I hope further generations of fellows will continue to have the same chance.
The IAS provided both a highly stimulating and congenial environment for my research in 2016–17. Above all, my affiliate fellowship allowed me to make substantial progress on my book project, entitled “Towards a New World Order? The Search for a Legitimate Peace in the Era of the First World War”. As planned, I focused on chapters that analyse and seek to shed a new light on the challenges of creating a new international order of “self-determined” nation-states in central and Eastern Europe in the aftermath of the 20th century’s “original catastrophe”. And here not only the resources of the CEU library but also many opportunities to discuss aspects of my work both with “fellow fellows” and with scholars in the CEU’s History Department and Nationalism Studies Program proved immensely beneficial.

In a wider context, the weekly IAS seminars and lunches provided excellent opportunities to learn about and engage with a vast spectrum of projects and areas of scholarship beyond the boundaries of my own discipline. I myself gave a talk on the subject “Towards a New World Order? The Impossible Peace of 1919 – a Transatlantic Interpretation” in which I sought to present new transatlantic and global perspectives on the peacemaking processes after the Great War. During my time as IAS fellow I also presented papers on various aspects of my research.

Patrick Cohrs
Yale University, USA
Towards a New World Order

AFFILIATED FELLOWS
at international conferences in Munich, Vienna and Berlin as well as at the Libera Università Internazionale degli Studi Sociali in Rome.

The pronounced interdisciplinary orientation of the IAS fellowship programme is highly commendable and works very well. While I was originally somewhat sceptical about the wisdom of long fellows’ presentations I came around to the view that this format is quite appropriate because it gives presenters time to bring their subjects to life and permits a more in-depth exchange between them and the audience. Personally, I particularly valued the commitment of its director, Nadia Al-Bagdadi, to making IAS into a centre of excellence that – unlike other institutions of its kind, notably in the United States – allows its fellows to concentrate on their research and writing and gives priority to creating a conducive environment to this end. In addition, both Professor Al-Bagdadi and Éva Gőnczi deserve special credit for running the programme so steadfastly and smoothly during a year that proved so challenging for the CEU. And the same of course goes for the other members of the IAS staff.

It was a delight to stay at the Wallenberg Guesthouse, which is very hard to beat both as a comfortable accommodation and as starting-point for explorations of the many glories of Budapest. I especially appreciated the Guesthouse’s most kind, competent and helpful staff and wish to thank Ágnes Forgó, Éva Gelei and all the other members of the staff for making me feel so welcome and for always being there when help or advice were needed.

I have spent three months at the IAS as an affiliated junior fellow from September to December 2016. I came here as part of my sabbatical funded by Bocconi University, with the primary aim of conducting research in Budapest libraries and building contacts with experts on the literature and data sources most relevant to my topic.

For several years, one of my key research objectives has been to reconstruct the existing narrative on the growth performance of Eastern European economies in the era of state socialism. This narrative is still largely based on the scholarship of the postwar period, on the comparative economic systems approach, in particular. The quantitative accounts of centrally planned economies have relied partly, or exclusively, on distorted official statistics, especially for investment and capital stock. Both recent empirical research and new growth and development theory offers important insights that provide a new interpretative framework for the development of centrally planned economies.

I have recently published an article in the *Economic History Review* that places Eastern Europe into the standard theory of postwar growth in Europe, estimating growth regressions on a panel of 24 European countries between 1950 and 1989. I am also preparing a book chapter, in collaboration with Andrei Markevich, for a major collection on the New Economic History of Central, East and Southeast Europe that reviews the most up-to-date quantitative evidence on growth and structural change in the former Soviet bloc. My current project conducts a deeper introspection with two aims: reconstructing aggregate growth accounts for Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland between 1950 and 1989, and estimating industry-level production functions with panel econometrics for Hungary in the same period. The first part of the project started in 2015, in collaboration with Alexander Klein, and has already yielded a working paper. I have spent a substantial part of my time at the IAS collecting additional data for a major revision of our analysis that was required before submitting the article to a leading field journal. This revision has been essentially completed.

In the meantime, I have begun to build up the industry-level database that will form the basis of the second part of the project. I did not need to reinvent the wheel, for a vast international literature provides guidance on how to accomplish this task. Some of the meticulous data work such an undertaking entails had also been done by previous scholarship. Particularly significant is the re-estimation of industrial output by the *Research Project on National Income in East Central Europe* under the leadership of Thad P. Alton since the 1960s. Czirják (1968) estimated Hungarian industrial production from 1938 to 1967, while Alton et al. (1982, 1991) provide cross-country evidence from the 1970s onward. These data sources are methodologically consistent and use standard western accounting terms. The only additional work needed is to connect the two datasets by extending the original series of Czirják to 1989. For this, production data on a large number of manufactures had to be collected from industry repositories available at the library of the Central Statistical Office (KSH).
Much more work is required on the input side of growth accounts. Labour input in worker hours at the industry level can be reconstructed from industry and employment statistics, which also provide evidence on labour composition. This allows us to adjust for compositional shifts, both in terms of qualifications and experience, in measuring labour services. The international literature on the study of growth dynamics in industry has paid particular attention to the role of equipment investment (see De Long 1992, Inklaar et al. 2011, among others). Detailed industry repositories in Hungary report data on the number and aggregate horsepower of machine tools installed in manufacturing plants. The data is disaggregated both by industry and by power source (which helps us track the modernisation of equipment shifting from coal to diesel and electric power). Most of the data have been collected during my stay, but work remains to be done.

Besides the new research described above, I used my time at the IAS to finish the manuscript of my forthcoming monograph at Cambridge University Press, entitled *The economic consequences of the war: West Germany’s growth miracle after 1945*. The chance to be away from the daily chores of academia proved most beneficial in completing this task, even if it has limited the time that I could devote to new research in Budapest.

I had two main opportunities to present my research to fellow academics: the IAS Fellow seminar and an invited talk at the Department of Social and Economic History at ELTE. The latter offered an opportunity to consult several leading experts of twentieth-century Hungarian economic history and integrate their insights into my current work. Being part of the IAS meant to live and work in the most stimulating atmosphere forged by a unique set of remarkable talent. For anyone wishing to unravel the workings of society, past and present, opening up to different schools of thought and scholastic approaches is inspirational, if not essential. I am sincerely grateful for having been blessed by this opportunity especially in a year of calamities that will go down in history as one that defined the twenty-first century.

A longer stay would have allowed further consultation with local academics and to further develop my project on socialist growth accounts into a broader research agenda for the forthcoming years. Since my sabbatical program focuses on two major projects, I had to limit my stay at IAS to only three months. In the last weeks of my stay, I had to gradually shift attention to launching my second research project for the year, which focuses on the impact of war-induced mass migration on urban housing and post-war economic development in West Germany. The project is funded by a junior research grant from Bocconi University and is based largely in Berlin, where I work with research assistants and carry out several research missions.

The IAS has been very supportive throughout my stay here in Budapest. The staff members showed flexibility in arranging the dates of my stay and were forthcoming in arranging office accommodation for me during these three months. The guesthouse has been an integral part of the experience of us fellows at the IAS by both offering first-class accommodation at the centre of the city in close proximity to our institute, but also by giving us the chance to withdraw into a quieter work environment whenever our aims demanded it. I must express special gratitude to the staff members at the guesthouse, who were eager to help my wife and I, in every way, possible, and thus made our stay so enjoyable. This great city is not unknown to us, but these three months have left us with fond memories.
First of all, I want to express my gratitude for having been awarded the Research Fellowship at IAS. The IAS Fellowship (four months September 2016-January 2017) was used to develop a comparative framework for economic sharing contrasting it with current and historical economic exchange practices: markets, hierarchies and networks. The main goal has been to contribute to enhancing theoretical explanations for the existence of Sharing Economy practices, organizations and institutions. This was done with a view to develop business policy and strategy mechanisms for industries impacted by the emergence of economic sharing. The research considered the following related questions:

- How do we intellectually place the Sharing Economy in a broader analysis/tradition of understanding economic exchange and industrial typologies? (For example, is it an extension of contemporary business networks or does it represent a novel form of exchange?)
- Does the Sharing Economy fundamentally alter our understanding of markets versus hierarchies and, if so, in which ways does the Sharing Economy imply a reshaping of the organizational form of the business enterprise itself?

The research I carried out at IAS deepened my understanding in two areas of theoretical exploration. The first pertained to the
significant divergence on both the scope and boundaries of the Sharing Economy. While valuable in terms of initial typology, early research however, lacked theoretical grounding. Early worked showed that, descriptively, the Sharing Economy currently exhibited a high degree of diversity, encompassing an assortment of activities such as neo-barter, renting, resource/service pooling, gifting, sales, group buying, production and repair. Some of these are relatively old, whereas others are innovations of recent years.

The second area of deeper understanding relates to the normative implications of the growth of the Sharing Economy. Some scholars on the Sharing Economy have conceived it to be an economy of access and exploitation permitting large firms to capture profits by connecting supply and demand through control of a network formed from business models that limit employer obligations. Such a condition could erode the rights of salaried and socially secured workers, exploiting ‘on-demand’ labour. Others, see the Sharing Economy as a new form of solidarity focusing on individual emancipation and environmental progress disrupting hierarchical power found in vertically integrated corporations of the twentieth century.

As a CEU faculty member, the need for orientation at CEU was obviously not so important as for my colleagues coming to IAS from other institutions but nevertheless, everyone at IAS was helpful whenever I had a question about how IAS worked. Having my work shared with scholars at IAS coming from very diverse disciplines encouraged me to consider the normative aspects of the Sharing Economy in a different light. In particular, implicit positivist constructs taken for granted in the strategic management literature were questioned effectively by my colleagues from the Humanities and other Social Sciences. Consequently, I have become more sceptical of the normative benefits of economic sharing by this experience. This has been an eye-opener for me.

Through theoretical elaboration and the development of exploratory hypotheses on economic sharing I was able to more effectively explore these two areas of controversy by systematically mapping the theoretical terrain of the Sharing Economy in preparation for systematic empirical exploration which I intend to do in the future.

The IAS struck a productive balance between freedom to pursue research goals and obligations to share these with the IAS community. In particular the weekly IAS Fellow seminars were intellectually stimulating and eye-opening. I learned an immense amount about truly intriguing and complex intellectual endeavours. I was also exposed to different research methodologies and was able to frame arguments and explore them. Very thought provoking indeed!

The opportunity to prepare an IAS Fellow Seminar was a truly effective mechanism for encouraging me to prepare my work. It provided an excellent deadline/benchmark for my research efforts and it helped me prepare for a research workshop at the University of Pisa in January 2017 as well as future presentations. I was also invited to the EU Commission to advise DG Environment on the sustainability impact of the Sharing Economy – I made contacts with policymakers and industry managers which was very helpful too when it will come to doing further empirical research. The feedback and comments I received from my fellow scholars was really useful and constructive. These insights sharpened my arguments and clarified ways in which I could shape the research.

One month after completing my Fellowship, I first-authored a joint working paper (with Professor Andrea Tracogna, University of Trieste) drawing directly from the research done during my stay at IAS so without doubt, I achieved my research goals in the four month period. Since the Sharing Economy is transforming numerous industries, I chose to focus on a sector especially vulnerable to disruption: The Hotel industry. Airbnb represents the epitome of this threat. This paper pursues two fundamental research objectives. First, it develops a set of exploratory research propositions based on an application of transaction cost theory (TCT). Second, it offers strategic recommendations for the hotel industry based on our TCT analysis. In the paper, we argue that in revising their business models to cope with the new competitive challenges posed by sharing platforms, Hotels can leverage their superior capacity in managing these three features of transactions cost theory (frequency, uncertainty and asset specificity) to develop what we termed integrated sharing platforms. By using a TCT lens to view the emergence of sharing platforms, this is the first effort to develop a theoretically grounded approach to understanding how transaction features impact sharing platforms offering clear implications for the hotel industry. It is currently under review at the leading academic journal in the tourism and hospitality management field.
Moving forward I have the following research goals for this area of intellectual enquiry. First, is to build a broader empirical study based on the theoretical and exploratory propositions developed in the IAS Research Fellowship. This will require considerable methodological and empirical development and will need several months in development and deployment. It may form the part of a future Sabbatical (Academic Leave) application. Second, I would aim to write a practitioner focused paper to be published in a more widely distributed management journal such as California Management Review or Sloan Management Review.

In summary, the faculty fellowship granted to me by IAS was an indispensable aid to my research. By freeing up my teaching, I was able to be fully focused on developing the theoretical basis of my research and I was able to carry out exhaustive literature review and research. I received outstanding support from the IAS team and was positively and continuously encouraged by everyone. I truly appreciated the efforts made by IAS to find me office space – it gave a real sense of belonging and I truly appreciated it! The IAS luncheons were wonderful, collegial experiences and I got to know my fellow-scholars through great conversation and delicious food. Last but not least, I have made friends during the IAS fellowship and the friendly, inclusive atmosphere created by Nadia, Eva and their team made the IAS not just a center of first-class scholarship but a meeting place for people from all over the world. In many ways, the opportunity to be a Research Fellow at IAS is one of the main reasons why I chose an academic career. The experience more than lived up to expectations. I miss it already and hope to maintain relations with IAS by attending the Fellows’ Seminars in the coming academic year 17/18. I also would be more than happy to help IAS with reviews of applications for IAS Faculty Fellowships.

Judit Bodnar
Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, CEU

A House in Buda: A Micro-History of a Middle-Class Dwelling

During my stay at IAS I started a new project, which feeds my long-standing interests in housing and urban change through a new lens—the history of an apartment building. Tentatively entitled “A house in Buda: A micro-history of middle-class living” traces the history of an ordinary apartment building, which was constructed for upper-middle-class tenants in an upper-middle-class area of Budapest in 1925. Today it still comprises solid middle-class dwellings and businesses in what is widely regarded as a dependable bourgeois neighborhood. Time, however, did not stand still. Its apparently constant status is a result of a multitude of social processes over time. The building straddled major front lines during WWII and the 1956 revolution; it was damaged, rebuilt and renovated, first by the state then by private capital. The apartments were nationalized after the war then privatized following 1989, many units first subdivided then merged, the bigger ones turned into communal apartments housing two to three families then slowly turned back to single-family units. Staying middle-class entailed a careful negotiation of turbulent historical periods, several urban restructuring processes and regimes of justice, throughout which the infrastructure and even the very imaginaries of middle-class dwelling have changed. It is these changes that I aimed to map by navigating between micro and macro scales and analyzing how an apartment building connects residents to each other, as well as to the city and larger historical structures. I collected and analyzed archival sources and interviewed long-time tenants and their families in addition to examining secondary sources in several disciplines.

I found IAS a truly stimulating environment. The weekly Fellow seminar talks, the core audience of which was provided by the very carefully selected interdisciplinary group of IAS fellows but also attracted scholars from CEU and the city were the right kind of publicity for discussing ideas with a not overly narrow expert crowd. Intellectual exchange was exciting, challenging and always respectful. This was made possible not only by the careful selection process but also by the superb organization of the annual rhythm of the Institute and its everyday operation. Good ideas reach their audience easier if facilitated by an infrastructure that is intellectually well-conceived and administratively well-managed. This is what I saw at its best at IAS. I can only congratulate them. It is no small achievement. Thank you.
My stay in Budapest has been absolutely fantastic. I arrived with the following vague project in my head: “For seven years I have been haunted by the life and work of the Hungarian writer Sandor Marai. Sandor Marai (1900-1989), the author of 46 books, haunted, in his turn, by the memory of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, lived for many years in exile in San Diego, California, where he committed suicide on February 21, 1989. All throughout his exile, although isolated and separated from his readers, he continued to write in Hungarian. I am a Russian author who has left Russia in 1994 and who is currently living in San Diego. Despite having left over 20 years ago, I continue to write in Russian. Like Sandor Marai, I am haunted by the memory of an empire that has dominated my young years and has disappeared since: the USSR. I am planning to explore in depth the interlocking motifs of location and dislocation in Sandor Marai’s and my own life and work.”

After arriving to Hungary, I set out to explore the “Marai locations.” San Diego, the place of Marai’s suicide (and my later place of work), the house he lived in and the Balboa park he loved, was already known to me: all I had to do was take photographs and write down my impressions. I wrote down my memories of growing up in Moscow, USSR (to have a point of comparison with Sandor Marai’s childhood) and set out on a
two-day trip to explore the modern-day Kosice – the former Kassa where Marai grew up and which was an inspiration for his novel The Rebels
with its flashback into the disintegrating Austro-Hungarian Empire.

The questions I was trying to answer are: does a remembered location (a location that is intrinsically linked with important and traumatic memories) create a certain “palace of memory,” into which all subsequent experiences are stored, thereby robbing the subsequent domiciles of their reality as places?

What are the links between that central “location” of one’s life and the native language that one retains even in exile and continues to write in? Is there such a thing as the “idiom of location,” a language of a very particular place (such as your hometown) and time (such as the dissolution of an empire)?

What are the mechanisms by which this “idiom of location” is transported into exile on another continent and into a different era? And does it undergo any modifications there? Thinking of a language as a “palace of memory” allowed me to connect these questions to the annual IAS theme of Space and Place. Space, as trope, image and metonymy, serves as a productive sign for processes of location, movement and settlement: fixed yet ever-changing grounded while also conceptually abstract and vast (…Space and Place might be beyond reach, beyond repair, or both, conjuring up an idyll of things past, bringing into presence an absence that is as palpable as the present, prompting a nostalgia for the future as much as for the recollected past.”

I have also taken one semester of Hungarian language at CEU, which allowed me to decipher some of Marai’s sentences in Hungarian (albeit with great difficulty).

The written part of my essay closely follows the format I have established for myself during my presentation at the IAS fellow seminar. I am subdividing my materials into “Space and Place” chapters, where “Place” stands for a concrete geographical place: Kosice/Kassa, Miko Street in Budapest, The Central Kavehaz, the Rudas Baths, countries in Western Europe visited by Marai, Balboa Park in San Diego, the Pacific Ocean, etc.; and “Space” stands for the emotional or mental state, such as Childhood, Wanderlust, Homecoming, Resistance, Illness, Despair, Love. The discovery I made during my research at IAS and that intrigues me most is Marai’s conception of mother tongue as homeland. He seems to have conceived language (Hungarian language as his case) as having a spatiality of ground while also conceptually abstract and vast (…). What is the spatiality of language (Hungarian language as his case) as having a spatiality of ground while also conceptually abstract and vast (…). Space and Place might be beyond reach, beyond repair, or both, conjuring up an idyll of things past, bringing into presence an absence that is as palpable as the present, prompting a nostalgia for the future as much as for the recollected past.”

The objective of my fellowship was to produce a hybrid genre documentary disclosing the historical and architectural links between the world’s first fully integrated modernist city project, Brasilia, and the techno-mystical, esoteric, and transcendental spaces that have emerged around it. This multi-platform media project proposes a lateral consideration of the built environment and collective ownership of its meanings in times of political and pandemic crisis. Radiating outwards from the space age city of Brasilia, the project gathers imagery of life in a landscape of UFO cults, energy pyramids, cosmic monuments, and new age cities. It looks to Brazil’s capital not as a triumph or failure of its utopian desires but as a generative domain for imagining alternative cosmologies. Architecture in this context is interpreted as symbolically porous and undefined and presents an inclusive possibility for intimate systems of knowledge and resistance.

Yoni Goldstein
Mass Ornament Films, USA
Visual Artist in Residence
A Machine to Live in

“hotline” connecting him to the spirit of his wife, or an authentic mystical experience. He also held the opinion that one can only love another person in one’s native language, something that I found doubly intriguing because it contradicted my experience and my own writerly conception of the “language of love” (to my mind, our earthly languages and the angelic language are involved in an impediment in that angelic business). Discussing these questions with IAS fellows during the Question-and-Answer time following my presentation was very inspiring and insightful. I came to the conclusion that to understand the link between language and space in the work of an émigré writer, it is not enough to compare Marai and myself – that, in fact, I needed a broader field of comparison. I decided to expand my project to include other Central and Eastern European writers/thinkers, such as Mireea Eliaide from Romania and Julia Kristeva from Bulgaria, and see how their relationship with language, space and memories change (or did not change) once they left their respective countries. When I spoke about my project at the conference “Narratologies 2” (organized by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences), it was suggested to me that I should include the Czech-French author Milan Kundera into my project, which I will be very happy to do. In the same way as Marai, while trying to understand Russian soldiers in Budapest, was, in fact (as he says) trying to understand himself, I hope, through my project, to be able to understand my own trajectory and role in the cultural landscape of contemporary Europe.
Events
19 October 2016  Victoria Frede-Montemayor, U. C. Berkeley, USA
The Sentimental Cult of Friendship in 18th Century Russia: From Poems to Letters

26 October 2016  Thibaud Boncourt, FNRS, ULB, Belgium
Scientific Marginality in the United States: A Research Project

2 November 2016  Alexander Soros, University of California at Berkeley, USA
Toward Heine’s Pantheism, or, what constitutes philosophy?

9 November 2016  Marina Arsenova, University of Copenhagen, Denmark
Symbolism of International Criminal Law

16 November 2016  Tamás Vonyó, Bocconi University, Italy
Growth under Socialism: new Perspectives from Economic Theory and Economic History

23 November 2016  Happymon Jacob, Jawaharlal Nehru University, India
Managing Contested Borders: A Case Study of the India-Pakistan Border
Robert Darton, Carl H. Pforzheimer University Professor, Emeritus, Harvard University
Censors at Work: Bourbon France, British India, and Communist East Germany

The difficulty with the history of censorship is that it looks so simple: it pits oppression against freedom of expression. But if one looks harder, it appears more complicated—and full of surprises. How did censors actually do their work? How did they understand it? And how did it fit into the surrounding social and political context? By studying the day-to-day operations of censors under three authoritarian regimes—Bourbon France in the eighteenth century, British India in the nineteenth century, and Communist East Germany in the twentieth century—it is possible to rethink our understanding of censorship in general.
The Performing Arts Ensemble of the Hungarian People's Army Visits the People's Republic of China in the Autumn of 1956
Guest lecture by József Böröcz, Rutgers University

The Ensemble was an iconic cultural institution in late-Stalinist Hungary. The touring party consisted of over two hundred people, travelling by chartered train through the USSR and China. The Ensemble gave over 100 performances, drawing an enormous success. The news of the uprising in Budapest reached them with a few days’ delay, setting off a series of events that would come to determine their faiths as artists, as well as politically engaged citizens, for the rest of their lives. Professor Böröcz started to collect archival information, photographs, cinematic materials as well as oral history interviews about this event a few years ago, while affiliated with the Collegium Budapest - Institute for Advanced Study.

Translation and the Materiality of Objects: Histories of European Porcelain
Public Lecture by Susan Gal, Mae and Sidney G. Metzl Distinguished Service Professor of Anthropology and Linguistics, University of Chicago
Porcelain is, today, a familiar material of dishes, figurines and tiles. The qualities of such objects – fineness, artistry – point to similar qualities in their buyers and users. Certainly, that is the role of material objects in systems of social distinction. Yet, this view often presumes that material qualities pre-exist the social and need only be recognized. In this side of a current ontological debate in Anthropology and Cultural Studies, materiality is the ultimate limit on cultural interpretation. I argue, instead, that the properties of materials are not fixed. They are semiotic achievements reached by a dialectical process of embodied social interaction with objects within political and economic institutions. The histories of “porcelain” in Europe show the varied qualities it has embodied as it has been swept up – and translated – into diverse regimes of knowledge, state economic strategies, and politico-ethical discourses. Translations of porcelain destabilized attributed qualities, changing “it” as sign and as material.

23 March 2017

Is there a Way out of the Crisis of the European Construction?
Public lecture by Étienne Balibar, Professor Emeritus Université de Paris-Ouest Nanterre, Anniversary Chair in Modern European Philosophy, Kingston University, London
(In cooperation with Institut Français Budapest)

Whereas, after the historic turning point of 1989 and the adoption of the Maastricht treatise, there was widespread conviction that an enlarged and institutionally strengthened European Union was becoming a major force of contemporary history, a brutal succession of setbacks in the last decade have produced the exact opposite representation: existential crisis of the E.U., perhaps on the verge of collapsing and in any case in a deep crisis of legitimacy as a political project. They include the Greek crisis and the vacillations of the euro, the refugee crisis, the Brexit, the increasing tensions between Northern and Southern, Eastern and Western member states, the development of strong anti-European “populist” movements on all sides of the continent. The lecture argues that, in such “interregnum”, where neither a return to pure national sovereignty nor progression towards innovative federalism seem possible, the history of the European construction must be revisited, so that new political foundations can be discussed democratically.

11 May 2017

Train to Adulthood
Film show and discussion with film director Klára Trencsényi

The pioneer railway where children can be engine drivers or conductors, sell tickets or dispatch trains used to be the dream of every boy (and many girls) between Leipzig and Vladivostok. The Budapest twins Viktor and Karmen and their friend Gergő, too, operate old fashioned switches, levers and telephones, line up for the flag ceremony and sing the old hymn around the camp fire: “The pioneers’ land is full of happy tunes…” What could easily have been an exercise in sugary and phony nostalgia unfolds as a nuanced and sensitive coming of age drama – and not a happy one. Because the three of them, all on the threshold of adulthood, must shoulder responsibilities not only at the railway: they were confronted with the tough reality of capitalism at an early age. The twins’ single mother works hard but earns hardly enough to buy food, and the family are losing the roof over their heads. As for Gergő, he lives with his grandparents because his parents are forced to work abroad, and he must decide whether this will be his future, too.
On the occasion of its 5th anniversary IAS CEU organized a conference dedicated to the theme of Space and Place – Mobility and Frontiers in 21st Century Advanced Research. This theme connects in part with our Writers and Visual Artists in Residence program, and partly with the rapidly changing virtual modes of connectivity and networks. How might the model of an IAS feed into an ever more virtual world, where contact, connection, accumulation and concentration are achieved in new ways? How does moving to a new place and environment relate to the new sense of permanent proximity and presence created by hyperlinked individuals and centers of research? How do virtual and long-distance circuits of knowledge relate to, enhance or hamper the intense experience of close interaction? The discussions reflected on these questions with our former fellows, representatives of sister institutions and leading research foundations, and look forward to fruitful discussions.

Speakers and participants: Liviu Matei (CEU Provost and Pro-Rector), Nadia Al-Bagdadi (IAS CEU Director), Prof. Dr. Dr. hc. Wolf Lepenies (Professor Emeritus, Freie Universität, Berlin; Permanent Fellow at Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin), Erica Benner (Senior Fellow IAS CEU, Yale University), Corina L. Petrescu (The University of Mississippi, former IAS CEU Fellow), William O’Reilly (University of Cambridge, former IAS CEU Fellow and Long-term Fellow), Curie Virág (University of Toronto, former IAS CEU Fellow), Gábor Zólyomi (Eötvös Loránd University, former IAS CEUFellow), Zsuzsanna Gábor (Director, Academic Cooperation and Research Office, CEU), Marian Baroum (Fritz Thyssen Foundation, Germany), Siegfried Beer (Botschibor Institute for Austrian-American Studies USA), Göran Blomqvist (Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, Sweden), Olivier Bouin (Network of French Institutes for Advanced Study, France), Alex Soros (Honorary Fellow, IAS CEU; Member of Board of Trustees, CEU), Diana Mishkova (Center for Advanced Study Sofia), Shalini Randeria (Institute for Human Sciences, Vienna), Valentina Sandu-Dediu (New Europe College, Bucharest)

27 October 2016
Building Institutions with Ideas: On Institutes for Advanced Study – Scholarship and Politics
Keynote Address by Wolf Lepenies, Professor Emeritus, Freie Universität, Berlin; Permanent Fellow at the Institute for Advanced Study, Berlin

Having spent most of his scholarly life at Institutes for Advanced Study, Wolf Lepenies recollected his years at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton and his rectorship (1986-2001) as well as permanent fellowship at the Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin. His experience in helping to found and fund the Collegium Budapest, the New Europe College in Bucharest, Centre for Advanced Study Sofia and the Bibliotheca Classica in Saint Petersburg will play a pivotal role in reflecting how Institutes for Advanced Study can react to political and historical challenges.
Symbolic Expression at the International Criminal Tribunal of the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY)
Special IAS seminar organized by IAS Junior Fellow Marina Aksenova

The purpose of the workshop was to discuss symbolic expression at the ICTY, which manifests itself in a number of ways: through the process of its establishment, its institutional design, rhetoric in the judgments, and, finally, through the way in which the ICTY and scholarly community frames its achievements and failures.

Participants: Judge Howard Morrison, (International Criminal Court, ex-ICTY), Professor Renáta Uitz, Department of Legal Studies, CEU, Marina Aksenova, IAS Junior Fellow, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Journalism and Politics in the Age of Misinformation
Crises of Political Communication: Misleading Public Speech and How to Deal with it

To mark the World Press Freedom Day in Budapest, IAS CEU, the Center for Media, Data and Society (CMDS) at the CEU School of Public Policy with the support of the Centre for Media Pluralism and Media Freedom of the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies at European University Institute (EUI) in Florence organized a debate, where scholars and practitioners from a variety of fields and disciplines will discuss and try to find solutions to the major problems that independent journalism and political communication are grappling with today. Part of the event was a panel discussion among scholars from politics, media studies, philosophy, and history, as well as former political practitioners organized by Erica Benner, Senior Fellow, Institute for Advanced Study, CEU and Fellow in Political Philosophy, Dept. of Political Science, Yale University.

Panel members included Michael Ignatieff, CEU President and Rector; András Bozóki, Professor of Political Science, Dept. of Political Science, CEU; Marius Dragomir, Director, Center for Media, Data and Society, School of Public Policy, CEU; Maria Kronfeldner, Associate Professor, Dept. of Philosophy, CEU; Simon Rippon, Associate Professor, Dept. of Philosophy and School of Public Policy, CEU

Dangerous Gifts & Pernicious Transactions from Antiquity to the Digital Age
Conference organized by Institute for Advanced Study at CEU and the Center for Eastern Mediterranean Studies at CEU
Organizers: current and former IAS fellows Tudor Sala, Alexandra Urakova and Tracey Sowerby

"Gifts make slaves as whips make dogs." Dangerous, violent, and self-destructive gift-giving remains an alluring challenge for historians and anthropologists almost a hundred years after Marcel Mauss's landmark essay on the gift. Globally, the notion of toxic and fateful gifts has haunted mythologies, folklores, and literatures for millennia. Yet even in everyday practice—to say nothing of more brittle spheres such as politics or religion—it is not always easy to draw a line between voluntary giving and coercion, between generosity and excess, between benevolence and insult, and between gratitude and bribery. No matter how much modern consumerist ideology pursues and tries to exploit the idea of a "pure" gift that is gratuitous, wholesome, and pleasing, the ambiguity of gift-giving is deeply embedded in human culture: the dark side of the gift is the shadow of the perfect gift. Drawing together anthropologists, historians, literary scholars and theologians, this workshop pursued the controversial and dazzling subject of dangerous gifts and pernicious transactions from antiquity to the digital age. We asked what is the politics of dangerous gift giving? When do gifts do the donor more harm than good? In what circumstances are religious gifts ambivalent? When do they become treacherous? And are digital gifts more dangerous than beneficial?

Keynote Speaker: Russell Belk (School of Business, York University)

Little Nothings: Intangible, Ephemeral, Digital Gifts.

Speakers and Participants: Nadia Al-Bagdadi, György Geréby, Volker Menze, István Perczel, Tudor Sala, Alexandra Urakova, Tolga U. Esmer, Davide Torsello, Sandor Hites, Ellen Litwicki, Jan Hennings, Neguin Yavari, Erica Benner, Tracey Sowerby
Field Experiments in Education

Workshop organized by IAS Junior Fellow Tamás Keller and Daniel Horn, Research Fellow, Institute of Economics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences

There is a growing interest in randomized experiments in social sciences, yet this method is relatively new in education. This workshop brought together economists, psychologists, and sociologists who use this experimental method. The aim of the workshop was to provide an opportunity for young researchers to exchange ideas and experiences within the topic of field experiments in education.

Speakers and participants: Carlo Barone (Sciences Po), Anna Adamecz-Völgyi (Budapest Institute), Gianluca Argentin (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore), Márton Medgyesi (TÁRKI Social Research Institute, Budapest), Károly Tókács (Corvinus University, Budapest), Frauke Peter (DIW Berlin), Péter Róbert (TÁRKI Social Research Institute, Budapest), Jessika Golle (University of Tübingen), Philipp Albert (WZB Berlin Social Science Center), Hubert János Kiss (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest), Djordje Stefanovic (Junior EURIAS Fellow, IAS CEU), Johannes Wächs (PhD Candidate, CEU)

Cold War Mobilities and (Im)mobilities: Entangled Histories of Postwar Eastern and Southern Europe, 1945-1989

Workshop organized by Oana Adelina Stefan, Humanities Initiative Fellow, IAS CEU with the Institute for Advanced Study and the Department of History at CEU

The workshop aimed at rethinking the geopolitics of postwar Europe by proposing a closer examination of the relationships and similarities between Eastern and Southern Europe. At the same time, it revisited the idea of a bipolar Europe divided between the ‘communist East’ and ‘capitalist West’. It explored mobilities and (im)mobilities within and between these two regions, their exchanges at various levels, but also their interconnections with the ‘West’ broadly defined. The workshop addressed the following questions: How did various forms of mobility shape the role of Eastern European socialist countries and of the authoritarian regimes in Spain, Portugal, and Greece in the postwar global economy? How did the particular economic interests of these regions/countries challenge the concept of postwar bipolar world as divided between the Soviet Union and the United States? What (im)mobilities were embedded in the structures of the two types of regimes: socialism and Southern authoritarianisms? How did ideas and goods circulate alongside people between Eastern, Southern, and Western Europe in the postwar period and how does this call for rethinking Cold War structures?

Keynote Speaker: James Mark, University of Exeter: Entangled Peripheries: Eastern and Southern Europe during and after the Cold War
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Eszter Bornemiszsa is a fiber artist living in Budapest, Hungary. She creates wall hangings, installations and objects from the ubiquitous material of waste newspaper and cloth. Originally a mathematician, she started working with textiles in the mid '90s with experimenting and exploring her own ways in surface design and quilting. She has extensively exhibited in solo- and juried shows nationally and internationally and won several prizes.

IAS CEU is proud of showing her textiles displayed on the walls of the Institute.