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Practical information

Panels and papers
There will be 75-minute panels with 30-minute breaks. Larger panels will be split up and take place one after another. As the panel schedule is very tight, we kindly ask all chairs and panellists to follow the guidelines and to consider it a sporting challenge to finish in time. We recommend panels should be structured as follows: 5 minutes general introduction by the panel chair, 5 minutes introduction of panellists by the panel chair, 4 x 8–10 minutes paper presentations, 20 minutes discussion and 5 minutes summary by the panel chair. Please check the programme structure carefully to note slight deviations from the schedule for panels with either 3 or 5 presentations.

Registration
Panels and Round Table Discussions will take place on the secure online platform GoToMeeting. We provide separate links for each of the different conference events prior to the conference. To prevent abuse, please do not share or publish these links under any circumstances. If you would like to bring colleagues to one of the events, please tell them to register beforehand with us and we will provide them with access credentials in time.

A separate registration is necessary for the Opening Keynote Roundtable Discussion: “Globalising Belarus? – New Perspectives on Transregional Entanglements” (21.04.2021, 17:00-19:00). Please register via the online form on our website https://www.leibniz-eega.de/event-calendar/globalising-belarus/ or via e-mail to Leibniz-eega@leibniz-ifl.de.

Time specification
All times given in the programme refer to Central European Time Zone (CET).

Photography and filming
During the conference, the conference organisers would like to take screenshots for public relations and science communication. Images may be published in print, online and social media. If you do not wish you or your content to be pictured in such form, please direct an e-mail to leibniz-eega@leibniz-ifl.de. The sessions will not be recorded.
### Conference Timetable

**Tuesday, 20.04.2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18:30</td>
<td>ZOIS Forum &quot;The end of communism as a generational phenomenon?&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wednesday, 21.04.2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:45</td>
<td>Panel 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45-13:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45-15:00</td>
<td>Panel 2a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-15:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15-16:30</td>
<td>Panel 2b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30-17:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00-19:00</td>
<td>Opening Keynote – Roundtable Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thursday, 22.04.2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00-09:15</td>
<td>Panel 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:15-09:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:45-11:00</td>
<td>Panel 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:45</td>
<td>Panel 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45-14:15</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:15-15:30</td>
<td>Panel 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-17:30</td>
<td>Panel 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Friday 23.04.2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00-09:30</td>
<td>Panel 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30-10:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-11:30</td>
<td>Panel 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-13:00</td>
<td>Panel 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00-14:00</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-15:30</td>
<td>Panel 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-17:15</td>
<td>Panel 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Saturday, 24.04.2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00-10:15</td>
<td>Panel 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-10:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-12:00</td>
<td>Panel 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-13:30</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-14:45</td>
<td>Panel 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45-15:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15-16:30</td>
<td>Panel 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30-17:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00-18:15</td>
<td>Final Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Panels

- **Methodology and History (M&H)**
- **Sociology and Geography (S&G)**
- **Literature and Culture (L&C)**
- **Politics and International Relations (P&IR)**

These streams are identified within the panel reference, and are colour-coded throughout this programme.
Programme Schedule

The details of the panels and papers within this schedule can be found in the preceding Abstracts Panels and Papers section. The aim of this chapter is to give you a succinct overview of what is happening at any particular time.

Tuesday, 20.04.2021

18:30       ZOIS Forum "The end of communism as a generational phenomenon?"

Online panel discussion with Matthias Neumann (University of East Anglia), Marci Shore (University of Yale), Mikhail Anipkin (sociologist) and Félix Krawatzek (ZOIS)

Generational renewal is a vector of social and political change in any society. A shared generational outlook can sometimes explain the dynamics that unfold during moments of profound rupture. But to what extent can the Soviet Union’s collapse be interpreted through a generational prism and how important was the question of generational belonging for contemporaries of the 1980s? What can we learn more generally about the history of communism and its end when looking at it through a generational prism? We will discuss these questions and also contextualise the changes that 1991 symbolises in a wider European and global context.

Click here for more information and here for the Live Stream.

Wednesday, 21.04.2021


Panel Organiser: Szinan Radi (University of Nottingham), Panel Chair: Dr Matthias Neumann (University of East Anglia)

Barbora Buzássyová (Slovak Academy of Sciences)

Szabolcs László (Indiana University, Bloomington)
*The Transnational Kodály Method: Mapping the Network of Music Educators during the Cold War (1960s-70s)*

Jessica Lovett (University of Nottingham)
*Soviet Demography on a Global Stage: Population statistics as diplomacy, performance, and competition in the Brezhnev era Soviet Union (1964-1982)*

Airi Uuna (Tallinn University)
*Joining Profitable Forces: A Finnish-Soviet Venture in Commercial Film Business*
13:45-15:00  Panel 2a): Societies in Motion – Mobilities, Perspectives and Engagements of Urban and Diasporic Youth; Part 1: People in Flux – Global, Regional, Local Mobilities

Panel Chair: Hakob Matevosyan (Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO))

Tsypylma Darieva (Centre for East European and International Studies (ZOiS))
*On the move: diasporic youth and engagement with the homeland*

Anne White (University College London)
*Poland: emigration and immigration dynamics*

Olga Tkach (Centre for Independent Social Research (CISR), St. Petersburg)
*Newcomer university students in St. Petersburg: Fragmented maturing through family-sponsored interregional mobility and housing tenancy*

Lela Rekhviashvili; Wladimir Sgibnev (Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography),
*Narrating urban mobilities: urban transport and claims to modernity in former Soviet peripheries*

15:15-16:30  Panel 2b): Societies in Motion – Mobilities, Perspectives and Engagements of Urban and Diasporic Youth; Part 2: Paradigms in Flux: Attitudes, Perspectives, Engagements

Panel Chair: Hakob Matevosyan (Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO))

Félix Krawatzek (Centre for East European and International Studies (ZOiS))
*What is beyond your own nose? Youth, views on other countries and political attitudes*

Gwendolyn Sasse; Olga Onuch (Centre for East European and International Studies (ZOiS))
*The Transregional Dynamics of Exit and Voice: Alternative or Interconnected Logics?*

Agnieszka Świgost-Kapocsi (Jagiellonian University, Kraków)
*Doomed to fail? Polish industrial cities and female labour market*

Aurelija Novelskaite; Raminta Pučėtaitė; Rasa Pušnaitė-Gelgotė (Vilnius University)
*Human capability in the organisational context: Gender pay gap, working conditions, and gender*

17:00-19:00  Opening Keynote Roundtable Discussion: “Globalising Belarus? – New Perspectives on Transregional Entanglements”

The round table discussion “Globalising Belarus? – New Perspectives on Transregional Entanglements” with guest speakers from research institutions, culture and the German Historical Institute in Belarus, Germany, and Poland serves as the keynote round table for this year’s BASEES Regional Conference in cooperation with the Leibniz ScienceCampus “Eastern Europe – Global Area”. Moderated by acclaimed independent journalist Gemma Pörzgen, the discussion examines the transregional entanglements of Belarusian stakeholders and research, art and culture institutions. Since summer 2020, we have been seeing a massive protest movement against the rulership of President Alexander
Lukashenko. In a historic first, this has propelled Belarus onto the world stage. Since then, thousands of protesters have risked their freedom and the government has doubled down on efforts to repress the opposition.

Is Belarus really globalising? Has the perception of Belarus as a globally connected society changed in light of the recent political demonstrations and protests against the Belarusian government and President Alexander Lukashenko? Arguably, art, culture and research in Belarus have been partly isolated in the past, with informal networks developing shadow government institutions. How do artists, journalists, and researchers deal with the difficult situation in their country? How did the situation change under increased media attention, and how has it changed now that public interest has petered out? The guests of the round table discussion address these issues through the perspective of personal connections (e.g. with actors and groups of actors in Lithuania and Poland), mutual influences (e.g. in the fields of artistic production), scholarly exchanges (through scholarships, joint initiatives and academic support), as well as the many disconnects that scholars are facing practically, and ontologically. Contradictions and clichés are discussed as well as options and pathways for the future. Finally, the question of what Belarus can tell us vis-a-vis the dialectics of the global is being put on centre stage.

In the discussion, Stefan Rohdewald (historian, Leipzig University), Alla Leukavets (political scientist, currently EEGA Postdoc Fellow), Felix Ackermann (historian, German Historical Institute Warsaw), and Iryna Herasimovich (translator and essayist) together with the audience online open up new perspectives on transregional entanglements of the region.

Stefan Rohdewald: Professor of Eastern and Southeastern European History at Leipzig University. He focuses on shared history of Eastern Europe and the Near East, urban history, remembrance and transconfessionalism.

Alla Leukavets: Policy Analyst at the Center for Strategic and Foreign Policy Studies in Minsk, Belarus. She specializes in domestic and foreign policy of Belarus and other Eastern Partnership countries, Eurasian integration, and elections in non-democratic regimes.

Felix Ackermann: Research Fellow at the German Historical Institute Warsaw. He is a historian and anthropologist. His research interests are Historical Urban Anthropology, Ethnicity, Violence and Migration, and Applied Cultural Studies.

Iryna Herasimovich: Translator, culture manager and essayist in Belarus. She studied Modern foreign language with a specialization in world literature. She worked also as a research assistant at the Institute for German Studies at the Center for International Studies and has translated authors such as Michael Kumpfmüller, Lukas Bärfuss, Jonas Lüscher and Ilma Rakusa into Belarusian.

Gemma Pörzgen: Free journalist in Berlin with focus on Eastern Europe, foreign policy, media for print, radio and online. She is a moderator, speaker on specialist topics and media consultant. She has worked as an editor and correspondent for several newspapers.

Note: With interpretation into both German and English.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Panel 3: EU-nization of gender equality policies in Central and Eastern European Research and Higher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00-09:15</td>
<td>Panel Organiser: Marta Warat, Panel Chairs: Marta Warat, Ewa Krzaklewka; Paulina Sekuła (Jagiellonian University in Kraków); Discussant: Olga Kotowska-Wójcik (Uniwersytet Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego w Warszawie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jovana Trbovc Mihajlović (Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts) EU Policies meet Socialist Legacy: Who Teaches Whom about Gender Equality in Research Sphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanna Achromowicz; Anna Chmiel (University of Wrocław) Gender Equality Audit and Monitoring tool: University of Wrocław case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natalija Mažeikienė (Vytautas Magnus University); Sybille Reidl (Joanneum Forschungsgesellschaft mbH); Aurelija Novelskaitė (Vilnius University) Promoting gender equality in higher education institutions. An agenda for feminist institutionalism in context of neoliberalist reforms in Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brigita Miloš (University of Rijeka) Rijeka's Centre for Woman's Studies: Case Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Panel 4: East-Central European colonialism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:45-11:00</td>
<td>Panel Organiser: Bálint Varga (Center for Humanities, Budapest); Panel Chair: Katja Castryck-Naumann (Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bálint Varga (Center for Humanities, Budapest) An imperialism on the margins: Hungary, Southeast Europe, and the Ottoman Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marta Grzechnik (University of Gdansk) Catching up and escaping: The case of East-Central European colonialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piotr Puchalski (Pedagogical University of Cracow) Reversing the Victim Paradigm: Polish Jews as Colonial Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zoltán Ginelli (Leipzig University, Leibniz ScienceCampus EEGA) Postcolonial Hungary: The Positioning Politics of Semiperipheral Post/Coloniality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Panel 5: Reindustrialization and the agents of new centralities and peripheralities in non-metropolitan spaces of Central and Eastern Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:45</td>
<td>Panel Organiser: Vladan Hruška; Panel Chair: Vladan Hruška (Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem); Discussant: Tim Leibert (Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franziska Görmar; Nadir Kinossian (Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography) The agency of narrative: Negotiating change in old-industrial regions of Europe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jan Piša; Vladan Hruška (Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem)
*Agents of change in old industrial towns: motivations, barriers and incentives*

Melinda Mihály; Erika Nagy (Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Centre for Economic and Regional Studies)
*Contesting centrality and peripherality: Agents, strategies and changing dependencies shaping economic recovery in old CEE industrial centres*

Krzysztof Gwosdz; Arkadiusz Kocaj; Agnieszka Świgost-Kapocsi (Jagiellonian University in Kraków); Agnieszka Sobala-Gwodsz (The Bronisław Markiewicz State Higher School of Technology and Economics in Jarosław)
*Trapped in factory economies? The developments trajectories of medium-sized industrial towns in Poland in the second decade of 2000s*

### 14:15-15:30 Panel 6: Transregional entanglements in crime and punishment

Panel Organiser: Judith Pallot (University of Oxford); Panel Chair: Sofya Gavrilova (University of Oxford)

Bill Bowring (Birkbeck College, UK)
*Globalising human rights and penality in Russia: a complex engagement with the Council of Europe (CoE)’s European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and European Convention for the Prevention of Torture (CPT)*

Judith Pallot (University of Oxford)
*Transregional entanglements in crime and punishment: What extradition and asylum cases can tell us about ‘globalized normative orders’ in the protection of prisoners’ human rights in Russia and East Central Europe*

Costanza Curro (Aleksanteri Institute, Helsinki University)
*Perspectives on the Europeanisation of Georgia’s penal system*

Rustam Urinboyev (University of Lund)
*Locked up in Russia: transnational prisoners’ social relationships within and across the prison walls*

### 16:00-17:30 Panel 7: Economic Integration and Globalization? Trade, Transfer, Interests, and the "Socialist Bloc"

Panel Organiser: Dániel Luka (Pécsi Tudományegyetem); Bence Kocsev (Leipzig University); Panel Chair: Uwe Müller (Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO)); Discussant: Steffi Marung (Leipzig University)

Max Trecker (Institut für Zeitgeschichte München-Berlin)
*Forging the Indian Steel Industry: The Economic Side of the Cold War in the Global South*

Bence Kocsev (Leipzig University)
*Spaces of Interaction. Towards a new analytical category to understand East-South relations*

Dániel Luka (Pécsi Tudományegyetem)
*Regulation and Coordination of Agriculture in the COMECON and in the European...*
Thursday 22.04.2021

08:00-09:30 Panel 8: Challenging the System: State Power, Protest and Opposition

Panel Chair: Gilad Ben-Nun (Leipzig University / PREVEX)

Łukasz Dwilewicz (Warsaw School of Economics)
*Polish membership in the Comecon during the rule of Władysław Gomułka (1956-1970)*

Kaarel Piirimäe (University of Helsinki / University of Tartu)
*How Gorbachev's New Thinking in foreign affairs interacted with perestroika in the republics and catalysed Soviet collapse*

Friday 23.04.2021

08:00-09:30 Panel 8: Challenging the System: State Power, Protest and Opposition

Panel Chair: Gilad Ben-Nun (Leipzig University / PREVEX)

Eszter Bartha (Eötvös Loránd University of Budapest / Hannah-Arendt Institut für Totalitarismusforschung); András Tóth
*From lonely fighters to right-wing political communities: Was there a working-class countermovement in Hungary after 1989?*

Sophie Schmäing (University of Giessen)
*Democratization from below? Local understandings of citizen participation in post-Maidan Ukraine*

Nadja Douglas (Centre for East European and International Studies (ZOIS))
*Belarus: Mobilisation of society and regime in the context of externally-induced crisis*

Danil Romanov (National Research University Higher School of Economics); Egor Fain (Central European University)
*Regional Legislatures and the Opposition under Authoritarianism: A Case of the Russian Systemic Oppositions*

Olga Terenetska (Central European University)
*On the Role of Empathy in Innovative Forms of Digital Storytelling in Digital Transformation in Education and Cultural Heritage sector in the Populistic and Corrupted CEE countries during in the COVID19 era*

10:00-11:30 Panel 9: (A)typical Sources of Globalizing Eastern Europe: Methodological Issues

Panel Organiser: Réka Krizmanics (Central European University/Global and European Studies, Leipzig University); Panel Chair: Anna Calori (Global and European Studies Institute, Leipzig University); Discussant: Steffi Marung (Leipzig University)

Réka Krizmanics (Central European University/Global and European Studies, Leipzig University)
*Hungarian experts’ travelogues of the Global South*

Anna Calori (Global and European Studies Institute, Leipzig University)
*Beyond a historiography of doom? Global Eastern Europe after the end of history*
Vedran Duančić (Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts)
*Trans-Atlantic and Trans-Ideological Correspondence Between Scientists and Making of Scientific Diplomacy in the Early Cold War*

Justyna Aniceta Turkowska (University of Edinburgh)
“Development requires suitable cartographic material”: Geophysical Sciences, Eastern European Knowledge Claims and Mapping of West Africa in the 1960-1980s

**12:00-13:00**
**Panel 10: Institutional Powers and Informal Networks in Political Decision Making and Economic Developments**

Panel Chair: Alexander Dontsow (Leipzig University / EEGA Fellow)

Elena Semenova (University of Jena); Keith Dowding
*Institutional Effects on Government and Ministerial Durability: Evidence from Central and Eastern Europe*

Julia Langbein (Centre for East European and International Studies (ZOiS)); Ildar Gazizullin; Dmytro Naumenko
*Trade Liberalisation and Opening in post-Soviet Limited Access Orders*

Nurlan Aliyev (University of Warsaw)
*Informality and policymaking in southern Russia: the case of Dagestan*

**14:00-15:30**
**Panel 11: Contested Landscapes and Identities: Networks, Narratives, Negotiations**

Panel Chair: Frank Hadler (Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO))

Martin Rohde (Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg)
‘Western Ukrainian Borderlands’ in Transregional Perspectives. (Re-)Discovering Lemkos, Boykos and Hutsuls

Tracie L Wilson (Martin Luther University Halle)
*Entangled Ecologies: Contested Landscapes, Migrations, and Reproductions*

Martina Urbinati; Simona Cannalire (University of Bologna, Italy)
*Renegotiating Urban Memories in the European Periphery: The Case of Kaunas as a Laboratory*

Isabel Sawkins (University of Exeter)
“The memory of the Holocaust will serve as a lesson and a warning only if it remains fully intact, without any omissions.”

Dominik Gutmeyr (University of Graz)
*Camera Caucasica. Networks of Photographic Practices in the Transimperial Caucasus*

**16:00-17:15**
**Panel 12: Navigating Between the Worlds: Colonial and Neo-Colonial Interdependences and Formations**

Panel Chair: Lena Dallywater (Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography)
Balogun Bolaji (University of Leeds)
*Not quite White, not quite European – not Polish sons and daughters of the soil*

Zsuzanna Varga (Central European University)
*Becoming globally known for hunting: Socialist Hungary exporting knowledge on wildlife management to East Africa*

Miwako Okabe (University of Helsinki)
*Racism in the socialist state: The case of German Democratic Republic*

Riikkamari Muhonen (Central European University)
*Dealing with other forms of socialism in the Soviet space: Political activism of foreign students in 1960s and 1970s Soviet Union and responses of the Soviet administration*

---

Saturday, 24.04.2021

**09:00-10:15** Panel 13: Changing global conditions of infrastructural and large-scale development projects in Eastern Europe

Panel Organiser: Linda Szabó (Periféria Policy and Research Center); Panel Chair: Csaba Jelinek (Periféria Policy and Research Center); Discussant: Giulia Dal Maso (University of Bologna)

Ágnes Gagyi (University of Gothenburg); Tamás Gerőcs (SUNY Binghamton)
*Global crisis and the realignment of Eastern European capitalist class alliances: the case of Hungarian illiberalism*

Linda Szabó; Csaba Jelinek (Periféria Policy and Research Center)
*The Flow of Chinese Capital into Hungarian Infrastructure and Logistics: the Case of the Budapest-Belgrade Railway*

Sergiu Novac (Central European University)
*Investing in a Radiant Future: Nuclear Power’s Place in Easter Europe’s “Green Revolution”*

Lela Rekhviashvili (Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography)
*Questioning dominant accounts of Chinese investments in Eastern Europe and Eurasia*

**10:45-12:00** Panel 14: Working with the Past, Shaping New Urban Memories: Cultural Urbanism in Central and Eastern Europe

Panel Organiser: Mikhail Ilchenko (Institute of Philosophy and Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences/GWZO); Panel Chair: Arnold Bartetzky (Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO))

Mikhail Ilchenko (Institute of Philosophy and Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences/GWZO)
*Re-evaluating Modernist Heritage: New Representations of Urban History in Eastern Europe*
Bojana Matejić (University of Arts in Belgrade, Faculty of Fine Arts)
Artistic Interventions in Post-Yugoslav Public Spaces after 1989: Critical reflections on Transition from the Transnational Perspective

Basan Kuberlinov (Department of Art History and Visual Culture, Friedrich-Schiller-University, Jena)
“Lenin squares” in the post-Soviet countries: symbolic transformations and new meanings

Nadir Kinossian (Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography)
Rethinking the Post-Socialist City


Panel Chair: Maryia Danilovich (Belarusian State University/EEGA Fellow)

Elkhan Nuriyev (Centre for East European and International Studies (ZOIS / GWZO Leipzig)
Competing Regionalisms in the Eastern Partnership Countries: Global Trends, Regional Implications

Ruben Elamiryan (Public Administration Academy of Armenia, Russian-Armenian University)
The Return of Geopolitics: Eastern Partnership Countries between the European Union and China

Ia Eradze (ZZF Potsdam)
(Re)conceptualising Postsocialist States beyond Transition Paradigm and ‘Western’ State Model: Georgia as a hybrid state

Alexander Dontsow (Leipzig University / EEGA Fellow)
Pairing and Cohesion between the Companies operating in the Framework of the Belt and Road Initiative in the International Format

15:15-16:30 Panel 16: The Unpredictable Past and Uncertain Future of East European Music: the cases of Bulgaria and Serbia

Panel Organiser: Ivana Medić (Institute of Musicology SASA, Belgrade, Serbia); Panel Chair: Galina Tsyng (Center for the Belarusian Culture, Language and Literature Research of the National Academy of Sciences of Belarus)

This panel is organised by the BASEES Study Group for Russian and East European Music (REEM).

Stanimira Dermendzhieva (University of Athens, Greece)
Bulgarian School of Music: National Identity and Europeanisation

Laura Emmery (Emory University, Atlanta GA, USA)
Reception of Serbian Composers in the United States: Globalization, Mobility, and Integration
17:00-18:15 Final Discussion

The closing discussion concludes the BASEES Regional Conference 2021 in cooperation with the Leibniz ScienceCampus "Eastern Europe - Global Area" together with representatives of all partner institutions BASEES, EEGA, ZOiS and DGO, and the conference delegates. In this session, trends and themes of the panel discussions are reviewed and concluded, highlights and open questions summarized, whilst at the same time opening up for further steps and paths forward in joint scholarly discussion and cooperation in the study of Eastern Europe as a global area. Guest speakers feature, among others, Sebastian Lentz (director IfL and speaker EEGA), Matthias Neumann (BASEES president), and Gwendolyn Sasse (director ZOiS Berlin).
As a general rule there will be 75-minute panels with four papers, divided by 30-minute breaks. This leaves 5 minutes for general introduction, 5 minutes to introduce panellists, 4 x 8–10 minutes for paper presentations, 20 minutes for discussion and 5 minutes for summary. Please check the programme structure carefully to note slight deviations from this schedule for panels with either 3 or 5 presentations.


Methodology and History

Panel Organiser: Szinan Radi (University of Nottingham)

Panel Chair: Dr Matthias Neumann (University of East Anglia)

Panel Abstract:

This dedicated postgraduate panel (sponsored by BASEES) would like to contribute to contemporary academic discussions surrounding Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union with a specific focus on these states’ transnational entanglements in the communist period. Central to its papers’ interest is how these countries were seen from the inside as well as the outside during the communist period and how global interactions influenced these differing views. The panel asks to what extent were these views and various experiences constitutive in influencing the integration of Eastern Europe and what other processes could have played part? The first paper will look at Czechoslovak educational aid strategies to Africa within the broader framework of global debates on the nature of development aid promoted by UNESCO. It will argue that Czechoslovak experts mediated the Czechoslovak educational aid designs to global community to same extent as they translated the international policies into local milieus. The second paper will look at transnational collaborations of Hungarian, American, Canadian, Australian, and Japanese music educators and will trace how pedagogues from these countries forged professional ties through participation in international gatherings. The third paper will explore social responses to demographic change in the Soviet Union between 1964 and 1982. It will trace how population dynamics became a major issue of competition for the Soviet government internationally. The fourth paper will look at how the Soviet Union began to seek new ways of economic cooperation with capitalist Finland in the perestroika period. It will explore the implications of professional cooperation in the commercial film business through the case study of the Soviet-Finnish “ERF Video SP”.

Barbora Buzássyová (Slovak Academy of Sciences)


The paper will explore the shifting patterns of Czechoslovak educational aid strategies to Africa within the broader framework of global debates on the nature of development aid promoted by UNESCO during the first and second development decades. Adopting the understanding of Czechoslovak experts in UNESCO’s structures as “the agents of internationalization” I argue that they mediated the Czechoslovak educational aid designs to global community to same extent as they translated the international policies into local milieus. The presentation will address also the specificities related to personal experience with the work abroad, from the selection criteria, to the presumed roles experts were prescribed to perform to the potential privileges they enjoyed during their service in international sites, outside the Party’s supervising gaze. In the concluding part I will try to discuss whether the changing rhetoric (and real conduct) of Czechoslovak aid programmes could be understood as a subtle process towards “Europeanization” of Czechoslovak foreign policy or rather as a “life-saving” tactics of Czechoslovak socialism.
Szabolcs László (Indiana University, Bloomington)

The Transnational Kodály Method: Mapping the Network of Music Educators during the Cold War (1960s-70s)

My paper examines the transnational collaborations of Hungarian, American, Canadian, Australian, and Japanese music educators that led to the construction of the “Kodály method” as a globally marketable model for teaching music in the 1960s and 1970s. It traces how pedagogues from these countries forged professional ties through participation at the conferences of the International Society for Music Education (ISME), and at various workshops and summer courses – and shows how their collaboration produced global events, like the International Kodály Symposium (since 1973), and an umbrella organization: the International Kodály Society (in 1975). I explore the processes through which this Hungarian educational model was adopted in the various countries, focusing on both adaptations in theoretical writings and in the form of institutional arrangements. My research finds that the relationship between Hungarian educators and their international peers was characterized by balance and reciprocity – and not by the otherwise dominant power-dynamics of the economic and military spheres of the Cold War. Finally, I analyze how the Hungarian communist authorities gradually incorporated the “Kodály method” into their domestic and foreign policy framework. By the mid-1970s the method simultaneously functioned as an official Hungarian cultural diplomacy project, representative of a small state’s effort to gain international recognition. The worldwide dissemination of the “Kodály method” provides an instructive example of a liminal case in which the different agendas of transnational collaboration and geopolitically oriented cultural diplomacy interacted within the larger framework of twentieth-century global integration.

Jessica Lovett (University of Nottingham)


This paper is based on my current doctoral research which explores social responses to demographic change in the Soviet Union 1964-1982. This period is of particular interest because during the 1970s Soviet birth rates fell below replacement level for the first time, infant and male mortality rates began to rise, and life expectancy stagnated. Unlike previous decades, the period was therefore one of slowing population growth and worsening health indicators.

Simultaneously, ever greater international cooperation and coordination on population issues was occurring. The United Nations Fund for Population Activities was established in 1969, and the Soviet Union played a major role in the conferences, discussions, and programs this initiative created. Using evidence from the archives, this paper will show how population dynamics became a major issue of competition for the Soviet government, who wanted to demonstrate to the rest of the world that the Soviet regime had led to a healthy, virial, and growing population. In this context, international conferences became performative arenas where Soviet delegates tried to showcase Soviet achievements. Demonstrating the superiority of communism for health and population was a difficult task when the statistics showed otherwise, and this placed the Soviet delegation of demographers in a precarious position. The paper will explore the censorship process for statistics of this kind to appear internationally and discuss the ideology-reality standoff that occurred as a result.

The ultimate goal of demonstrating the benefits of communism was to position the USSR as a nation that developing countries would emulate. At this time, many developing nations were seeking help from the UN to cope with high mortality and excessive population booms. Using population expertise as a diplomatic tool, archives show the Soviet Union hoped to draw these countries into their sphere of influence, and, eventually, aimed to establish friendly communist nations abroad.

Airi Uuna (Tallinn University)

Joining Profitable Forces: A Finnish-Soviet Venture in Commercial Film Business

“Joining Profitable Forces: A Finnish-Soviet Venture in Commercial Film Business” by Peedu Ojamaa (CEO of ERF) came with breaking news – “Eesti Reklaamfilm” will together with a Finnish video production company establish a new venture, which will be called “ERF Video SP”. Those last two letters were derived from the Russian pair of words совместное предприятие and stood for joint venture, which now, under the framework of Gorbachev’s Perestroika, were allowed to be established, writes Osiolin, a former employee of the company, writes (Osolin 2020: 342).

The studio “Estonian Commercial Film Producers” (“Eesti Reklaamfilm”, abbr. ERF) was one of the numerous advertising companies in the Soviet Union. Starting out as a local company in the small Estonian SSR, ERF quickly became active on an All-Union level. Due the cultural and geographical proximity to Finland, ERF managed to establish first contacts with the neighbors already in the 1970s. Yet, Perestroika opened up for ERF attractive new
opportunities, which were chased after by creating the spin-off “ERF Video SP”. In the presentation, the following questions will be inquired: what factors motivated to establish such a company; how did this joint venture profile itself; how did the cooperation oscillate between capitalism and communism; what strategies were applied to fit in the global market?

Its rather small organizational size, the accessibility of archival sources and the access to former employees, make ERF a particularly interesting case study. It enables a deeper insight into the organizational workings of the Soviet economy during the transformations of Perestroika. The presentation is inspired by my doctoral thesis on the Soviet advertising industry. (Reference: Osolin, Olav. Minu esimene elu. Tallinn: Varrak, 2020, p. 342.)

Panel 2a): Societies in Motion – Mobilities, Perspectives and Engagements of Urban and Diasporic Youth; Part 1: People in Flux – Global, Regional, Local Mobilities

Sociology and Geography

Panel Chair: Hakob Matevosyan (Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO))

Panel Abstract:

The Double Panel “Societies in Motion” focuses on mobilities and relocations, with a special attention to youth, or younger generations that are most affected by changes in education, labour markets, and urban structures. Whereas part one of the panel is especially dedicated to physical motion in space, hence dynamics concerning global diasporas and migration, transregional mobility and urban transport, the papers in the second part of the panel pay special attention to changing attitudes, paradigms, and engagements, and the respective shifts in societies and economies that both result from them as well as create these changing attitudes and responses. How are individuals challenged and empowered, how to they locate and relocate, and which impacts have legal and (infra-)structural openings and controls of governments, organisations and local authorities on young people’s horizons? These are the questions the panel asks.

Tsypylma Darieva (Centre for East European and International Studies (ZOiS))

On the move: diasporic youth and engagement with the homeland

Return mobilities and homeland trips are becoming increasingly popular in Eastern Europe and Eurasia among young members of global diasporas and second generation migrants. For a long, return and homecoming has been considered as a ‘latent’, ‘structurally invisible’ form of migration shaped by informal practices of homecoming and emotional relations. In this anthropologically informed paper, I discuss the phenomenon of Armenian ‘root mobility’ as voluntary journeys to and from the ‘ancestral homeland’ among those who enjoy the freedom of mobility. New forms of diasporic youth engagement with the homeland are not regulated and controlled by the state or kin relations, but rather by non-profit diasporic and international organisations. This mode of interactions and interventions between new generation of diasporic organisations and the homeland have a social and political dynamic that sidesteps the ‘weak’ Armenian state. In reference to existing literature and own research in Armenia I discuss ‘roots’ mobility and transnational youth activism as a way of creating of new places of global belonging. The key figures of this mobility are young volunteers and young professionals, tourists and diasporic lobby activists of Armenian descent, who claim to be agents of change. Homeland engagement is not unique to diasporic Armenians. There are similar movements and related activities among other East European immigrant groups and post-migration generations. In this paper I outline the ways the ancestral homeland is incorporated into modern biographies of diasporic youth by showing a typology of motivations and diasporic aspirations for a ‘journey to the future’.
Anne White (University College London)

Poland: emigration and immigration dynamics

Poland has a strong identity as a country of emigration, although this has changed over the last couple of years thanks to a large influx of Ukrainian migrants almost everywhere in Poland. My paper will discuss how emigration and immigration identities intersect within the context of a single Polish city, Płock. Based on conversations with key informants at local institutions, as well as 48 interviews with foreigners and Polish return migrants living in the city in 2019, my paper explores and compare migration as a livelihood strategy for Polish and Ukrainian migrants, but also contrasts their experiences, as labour migrants, with those of people from other countries who happen to live in Płock because they are married to Poles. There are obvious distinctions between the legal rights of migrants from the Former Soviet Union in Poland, and Poles who migrate as EU citizens to other EU destinations. Nonetheless, I argue that their experiences and opportunities are shaped by the common experience of living in a common European mobility space where dense, informal migrant networks (usually working through social media) can provide surprisingly similar opportunities and experiences.

Olga Tkach (Centre for Independent Social Research (CISR), St. Petersburg)

Newcomer university students in St. Petersburg: Fragmented maturing through family-sponsored interregional mobility and housing tenancy

This paper explores youth transregional internal mobility rather than transnational migration. Movement between the regions – predominantly, from the smaller towns to the big cities and from the periphery to the centre – is a huge, but mostly understudied, phenomenon of Russian society and state. One of the major segments of such interregional moves is educational migration attracted by the advanced universities, especially located in Moscow and St. Petersburg. This paper is based on thirty youth residential biographies collected in 2017-2018. The interviewees are BA and MA student who once moved from various regions of Russia to St. Petersburg, the second largest Russian city, as high school graduates to get higher education.

One of the issues that new arrivals come across in the hosting city as is a lack of appropriate and affordable housing for young people. Either from the first glance at the allocated dormitory or after a short negative experience with it, they opt for rental housing – individual or shared. The research of accommodation strategies revealed the key role of the students’ families – predominantly parents – left behind who facilitate housing and homemaking for their grown up children economically, organizationally and emotionally. Therefore, in this paper rented housing will be considered from the perspective of welfare built up based on family responsibilisation. Informal and semi-formal tenancy relations that involve different actors, such as homeowners, co-tenants, real estate agents and students’ relatives will be analyzed as the main arena for childhood – adulthood transit in the context of inter-city relocation.

Lela Rekhviasvili; Wladimir Sgibnev (Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography)

Narrating urban mobilities: urban transport and claims to modernity in former Soviet peripheries

Mobility and particularly urban transport has been one of the key sectors over which the Soviet modernity project was projected. In many post-Soviet cities, primarily in former Soviet peripheries, the breakdown of Soviet public transport infrastructure and proliferation and persistence of small and privately owned passenger busses, locally known as marshrutkas, became one of the markers of access to this modernity. This article looks at the marshrutka mobility phenomenon in two peripheral post-Soviet cities of Central Asia and South Caucasus: Bishkek (capital of Kyrgyzstan) and Tbilisi (capital of Georgia). The article draws on ethnographic material and semi-structured interviews to discuss narratives over the marshrutka sector by municipal authorities, marshrutka operating companies, urban movements and importantly, by marshrutka drivers. It discusses how informal transport, even if crucial to daily urban mobility, has been stigmatised and demonised by civil and political actors, transport users and even providers alike. Drawing on a conceptual toolkit rooted in post-Soviet decolonial thinking, such stigmatisation and self-orientalising discourses are understood in relation to claims and imaginaries of access to modernity. The article discusses how underestimation and even hatred of informal transport for post-Soviet urban inhabitants is related to the regrets for the loss of Soviet modernity on the one hand, and incapacity of performing (imagined) Western modernity on the other. Then, the politics of governing urban transport as well as experiences of informal transport providers are marked by self-orientalising discourses, feelings of shame, and loss of dignity. The article further discusses how such claims to modernity, alongside a rejection of Soviet-era and post-Soviet practices, shapes urban governance, regulation and marketisation in Bishkek and Tbilisi.
Panel 2b): Societies in Motion – Mobilities, Perspectives and Engagements of Urban and Diasporic Youth; Part 2: Paradigms in Flux: Attitudes, Perspectives, Engagements

Panel Chair: Hakob Matevosyan (Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO))

Paper Félix Krawatzek (Centre for East European and International Studies (ZOiS))
What is beyond your own nose? Youth, views on other countries and political attitudes
Most young people in Eastern Europe travel abroad and have friends living there. These young people therefore have direct encounters with countries other than their own, which complement the mediated experiences with foreign countries that they may make at home. But what kind of political, economic, and social associations do young people make with other countries and how do these relate to their political attitudes? What political visions for their own country do they imagine when talking about the abroad? This presentation examines how Eastern Europe is globalised from within and how young citizens relate to the global world surrounding them. It explores new focus group data generated in Russia (2019) and Poland (2020), in order to understand the frames that a person uses to relate to major external countries or regions and to assess how this view on the world relates to a person’s political and social outlook, as well as the country’s official political and societal discourse.

Gwendolyn Sasse; Olga Onuch (Centre for East European and International Studies (ZOiS))
The Transregional Dynamics of Exit and Voice: Alternative or Interconnected Logics?
“Exit” and “voice” (Hirschman 1970) are conceptualised as alternative responses to political or economic crises. The factors informing each response remain underexplored. Migrants and protesters tend to be drawn from similar demographic groups (e.g. young, educated, urban) and rely on social networks. The question therefore arises what accounts for choosing one response over the other against the backdrop of these shared characteristics? In order to answer this question and thereby conceptually and empirically connect two extensive fields of research - on protests and migration -, we trace the patterns and processes behind the different choices. Additionally, we probe if the two responses are alternatives, or if they are interlinked or even build on one another. This approach requires a transregional perspective, as individuals before, during and after protest and migration are being analysed in their countries of origin and different migration destinations.

This paper utilises original data collected as part of the ORA-funded MOBILISE project, namely nationally representative surveys in Poland and Ukraine, online surveys of Ukrainian and Polish migrants, and focus group and interview data collected in Poland and Ukraine as well as in migration destinations in Germany and Spain. The paper (as well as the project at large which also includes the country cases Argentina and Morocco and their migrants in different European destinations) makes a step towards connecting the rather separate strands of research on protest and migration through a more systematic transregional approach.

Agnieszka Świgost-Kapocsi (Jagiellonian University, Kraków)
Doomed to fail? Polish industrial cities and female labour market
The development trajectory of cities is shaped by a lot of factors like its economic, social and spatial characteristics. Moreover, there are plenty of external factors (e.g. state policy, cultural changes, business cycles). But in industrial cities some factors have a bigger impact than others and it is visible in its development. One of them is the labour market, especially female. The level of women's activity in the city (not only in terms of the labour market, but more broadly) may have a specific impact on the city's development. However, the role of women potentially affecting the city’s development is related to their features of human (level of education, competences and aspirations) and social capital. And these features are shaped, among others, under the influence of conditions of gender but also are dependent on the place-specific factors.

The aim of the paper is to show the development of the female labor market in industrial cities. How have female labor markets in industrial cities developed in the last 50 years? How did labor markets respond to the transformational shock? How did it influence the women’s life chances? The analysis of data on women's education and participation in industry will be presented. The study covers 70 Polish industrial cities in the period related to the economic transformation (1970-2011).
Human capability in the organisational context: Gender pay gap, working conditions, and gender

Previous research shows that gender pay gap (GPG) can be explained by factors operating at micro, meso and macro levels. Those levels interconnect in organizational settings: operating under macro level circumstances enterprises provide conditions for individuals’ enabling and empowerment. Ulrich’s (2002) framework of realizing human capability in the organizational context sets existential empowerment as the grand goal as organizations can empower an individual by in-house training, guarantees of basic human and employees’ rights and caring about their employees. More specifically, in this paper we aim to shed some empirical light on how working conditions such as work life balance, job contents and demands, employee participation in decision-making, employees’ representation, equality, autonomy, etc. affect women’s empowerment through earnings. Geographically restricted (case of Lithuania) results of secondary data analysis (SPSS: analysis of variance, correlation and linear regression analysis) of the VI European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS) confirm interdependences between earning (i.e. indicator of empowerment) and working conditions (i.e. organizational capabilities – empowering factors). The findings suggest that structures of the organizational empowering factors (the ones which predetermine higher earnings) and effects of the factors differ depending on women’s earning status (i.e. whether she earns average wage per hour or she earns less than the average wage (GPG) in a particular occupation). The findings go in line with interpretations provided by intersectional approaches and suggest insights for organizational policies aimed at decreasing the GPG. The findings worth to be extended to comparisons of the phenomena in other similar (small, post-soviet) societies.

Panel 3: EU-nization of gender equality policies in Central and Eastern European Research and Higher Education

Politics and International Relations

Panel Organiser: Marta Warat (Jagiellonian University, Kraków)

Panel Chairs: Marta Warat; Ewa Krzaklewska; Paulina Sekuła (Jagiellonian University, Kraków)

Discussant: Olga Kotowska-Wójcik (Uniwersytet Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego w Warszawie)

Panel Abstract:

Over the past 20 years, Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) has gone through significant political, economic and cultural changes. The pace of transformation has varied – not only among the countries in the region, but also in relation to different areas, revealing the relation between national context and global processes. One of the examples illustrating the uneven development is the integration of gender dimension in research and teaching and the implementation of gender equality policies in higher education. On the one hand, the legacy of soviet ideology of gender equality evoked great resistance to any discussion about women’s emancipation and egalitarian reforms. This negligence of gender equality has been reinforced by a global tendency towards neoliberalization of academia. The latter means a shift in the university ideological mission from being focused on empowerment, justice, fairness, equality and producing communities of knowledge towards market rationality based on efficiency, effectiveness, quality assessments, global competitiveness, commodification of research and teaching as well as in-equalization of academic community. On the other, being a part of the European Higher Education Area forces CEE countries to develop policies dealing with gender equality in research and higher education. The EU provides not only financial resources but also new language and institutional mechanisms supporting the implementation of gender equality. Yet, this support come at a price as the EU policies and practices are underpinned by an assumption of CEE universities “lagging behind” or “catching up” with more developed North-West countries.

Taking into account this interplay of national and global processes, this panel will address the following problems: What is the current status of gender equality policies / measures in higher education institutions in CEE? What are the conceptual underpinnings of the EU policies and projects on gender equality in academia? Is the logic of “transfer
of knowledge” and “underperforming” of higher education institutions still present? How is the national context reflected in these policies? How do the higher education institutions deal with the tensions and competing discourses when it comes to implementing gender equality policies? How do they position themselves towards European policies and global processes in academia?

Jovana Trbovc Mihajlović (Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts)

EU Policies meet Socialist Legacy: Who Teaches Whom about Gender Equality in Research Sphere

Policies of the European Research Area, specifically those dealing with gender equality, are based on underlying assumption that Eastern European countries are “underperforming”. These EU policies and financial scheme of SwafS have introduced new jargon and institutional mechanisms which are becoming a way to “mainstream” principles of gender equality into academic sphere. Many of these gender mainstreaming measures ensure gender equality by enabling women to secure job and career progress, while balancing it with care work in private life. Therefore, the SwafS projects dedicated to gender equality are often designed in such a way that “good practices” are “transferred” from institutions in “higher-performing countries” (by the rule: West) to those in “lower-performing countries” (by the rule: East). However, many of the gender equality measures already existed in socialist states as part of the welfare state mechanism and social protection policies. On the basis of participating in three EU projects, the author reflects on conceptual underpinnings and practical challenges of the EU policies and projects on gender equality in academia. The paper presents how imagined trajectory of “knowledge transfer” is ingrained in the documents that define and condition design of the European projects dedicated to improving gender equality in research and higher education. Then it describes how post-socialist setting makes certain gender equality measures “imported” from the Western institutions obsolete and/or ill-fitting. Finally, the paper discusses to what extent principles of ‘gender equality’ have been part of lived reality of scholars in socialist Yugoslavia.

Hanna Achremowicz; Anna Chmiel (University of Wroclaw)

Gender Equality Audit and Monitoring tool: University of Wroclaw case study

In recent years, a growing interest in promoting gender equality in higher education institutions has been observed across European countries, leading to the development and implementation of gender equality measures. These processes, however, have remained uneven among Member States. While noticeable improvements can be observed in Western and Nordic higher education institutions, the uptake of institutional change is significantly lower in Central and Eastern European countries. To narrow this gap, the European Commission has funded several projects aimed at developing gender equality policies. These projects are based on the assumption that knowledge transfer, networking and policy exchange facilitate the implementation of such policies. This presentation – based on the University of Wroclaw case study - discusses to what extent this expectation can lead to an institutional change. More specifically, it focuses on the findings from the survey-based gender equality audit and qualitative interviews to reflect upon the usability of the shared tools (specifically Gender Equality Audit and Monitoring tool) and practices to advance gender equality.

Natalija Mažeikienė (Vytautas Magnus University); Sybille Reidl (Joanneum Research Forschungsgesellschaft mbH);
Aurelija Novelskaitė (Vilnius University)

Promoting gender equality in higher education institutions. An agenda for feminist institutionalism in context of neoliberalist reforms in Lithuania

Feminism and gender equality are not a new topics in Lithuania but they possess one specific features in this region: prevalence of soviet ideology of gender equality for about 50 years which transmuted into peremptory resistance to any discussions about gender equality after recovering political independence in the region in the early 1990s. The backlash against feminism and gender equality was challenged by Lithuania’s accession to the EU as the EU financial resources provided for the establishment of gender equality, and focus on gender issues in science in particular since 1999 forced CEE countries to develop corresponding policies. Considering the widely reported resistances to institutional change related to gender equality, in this presentation I will strive to shed some light on the ‘new institutionalism’ developments by introducing gender equality measures as and agenda of feminist institutionalism in the higher education institutions in Lithuania. The analysis is based on two cases: Vilnius University and Vytautas Magnus University. I will discuss important national or regional framework conditions (i.e. laws or regulations, societal values) that hinder or facilitate the implementation of gender equality measures in the organisations as well as shed light on wider macro-level reaching (i.e. political, economic, socio-cultural) contexts in a post-soviet society (i.e. Lithuania). Initial knowledge suggests that results will delineate tensions occurring at the ‘entrepreneurial’
university with sound New Public Management strategies while designing measures of the GEP: several competing discourses of social justice and efficiency come to the fore.

Brigita Miloš (University of Rijeka)

Rijeka's Centre for Woman's Studies: Case Study

The aim of this paper is to present gender-related thematics in the context of higher education in the Republic of Croatia with the main point being Rijeka's Centre for Woman's Studies.

Panel 4: East-Central European colonialism

Methodology and History

Panel Organiser: Bálint Varga (Center for Humanities, Budapest)

Panel Chair: Katja Castryck-Naumann (Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO))

Panel Abstract:

According to conventional wisdom, East-Central European societies did not claim a part in the colonization of the extra-European world. One would, after all, fail to find Polish, Hungarian, or Czech colonies on the map of Africa, Asia or any other part of the world. On the contrary: a solid tradition in East-Central Europe claims that this region was itself a victim of imperialism and suffered from the hands of the Great Powers both in West Europe and Russia. However, East Central Europeans have engaged in the process of colonialism in a variety of ways, including proselytizing, commercial networks, geographic explorations and a broad range of scientific activities (anthropology, linguistics, etc.). While there is a strong tendency to deny East-Central European involvement in the history of colonialism in general, the very actors of these engagements have been celebrated as the pioneers of European civilization and as the embodiments of the national genius - without a clear nexus to colonial aspirations though. This obvious discrepancy has recently attracted the interest of scholars working with postcolonial concepts. A growing literature abandoned the outsider status of East-Central Europe in the history of colonialism and demonstrates the nuanced ways in which non-colonized peoples and countries in this region did form part of the colonial order. Without the intention to blur the differences between 'proper' colonial empires and East-Central European colonial engagement, this roundtable addresses the question how to write a colonial history of East-Central Europe.

Bálint Varga (Center for Humanities, Budapest)

An imperialism on the margins: Hungary, Southeast Europe, and the Ottoman Empire

This paper discusses how Hungarian political and business elites came to the idea that Southeast Europe was a Hungarian zone of influence where an informal empire could be built. The genuine idea of an imperial economy-based empire, however, resulted in failure. The second phase of Hungarian imperialism centered on culture, more precisely on the postulated identity of Magyars, Turks, and some selected other peoples. During World War I, these ideas resulted in the attempt to create a postwar Hungarian empire in German alliance.

Marta Grzechnik (University of Gdansk)

Catching up and escaping: The case of East-Central European colonialism

This contribution discusses the so-called Second World's problematic relation to European colonialism. On one hand, it can claim innocence from colonial expansion, and even victimhood: of German and Russian/Soviet imperialisms, and Western Europe’s orientalization.
and othering. On the other hand, it is also complicit in European colonialism in a number of ways: as a dominating power with regard to its own borderlands (e.g. the Polish Kresy), aspiring colonial power, and reproducer of hierarchies and stereotypes shaped by the European “colonial mind”. The Second World’s semi-peripheral position locks it between aspirations of joining the core – the First World – and fear of falling to the peripheral position of the Third World, between catching up and escaping.

Piotr Puchalski (Pedagogical University of Cracow)
Reversing the Victim Paradigm: Polish Jews as Colonial Subjects
Jews as Colonial Actors before the Holocaust The existence of anti-Semitism in Eastern Europe before World War II is well documented. Much less known, however, are the instances in which anti-Jewish sentiments, humanitarian concerns and/or mere pragmatism transformed into support for Zionism. In my roundtable remarks concerned with the Polish case, I will take a step further and suggest that until mid-1939 the Polish government supported some Jews in their role as commercial intermediaries in the colonies, especially in South Africa. As a result, a mutually beneficial and lucrative relationship emerged, which suggests the advantages of looking at Polish-Jewish relations through a colonial lens.

Zoltán Ginelli (Leipzig University, Fellow Leibniz ScienceCampus EEGA)
Postcolonial Hungary: The Positioning Politics of Semiperipheral Post/Coloniality
Is there a postcolonial Hungary? Postcolonial studies have focused on the global economic center and periphery, but remained remarkably silent about the complex historical relations, experiences and epistemologies of Eastern European and particularly Hungarian colonialism and imperialism. Local dismissals follow from the common argument “we never had colonies”, or – if included in colonial history – “we were always colonized”, and resultantly “we are not responsible for the consequences of colonialism and imperialism.” This paper introduces the concept of semiperipheral post/coloniality to understand Hungarian coloniality in the long-term historical context of integrating into the world economy, and thereby offers a structuralist critique of constructivist and relationalist approaches to postcolonialism and the hegemonic narratives of global colonial history. Hungarian semiperipheral integration articulated an uneasy and antagonistic in-between position dynamic: being colonizer but colonized, catching up to but contesting the center, bridging to but demarcating from the periphery. Historically, Hungarian colonialist-imperialist ambitions followed nationalist and global racial-civilizational aspirations, but pragmatically developed East-West in-betweeness and uneasy criticism against the imperialist West. After WWII, state-socialist anti-colonialism contested geopolitical fault-lines and European Economic Community (1957) protectionism, but were driven by pragmatic, state-led foreign policy aims to lever East-West double dependency by opening to Afro-Asian decolonization. But the postsocialist “return to Europe” and neoliberal “transition” silenced both anti-colonial critique and previous cultural-economic relations to the postcolonial world in a “postsocialist amnesia”. After 2010, Orbán’s authoritarian “illiberal” turn repositioned Hungary in the country’s “global opening”. Geopolitical maneuvering produced a new colonial discourse which positions Hungary against the liberal, Atlantic-Western colonial-imperial center of the European Union, while constructs selective racial-civilizational demarcation from the periphery, and appropriates global colonial history to embrace Hungarian whiteness and victimization. The postcolonial identity politics of “we never had colonies” and “we will not become colonies”, and that former imperialists are responsibly for globalization, gender politics, multiculturalism and migration feeds the nationalist “defense” of sovereignty, but also functions to readapt to ongoing hegemonic shifts in the world economy by exploiting Hungary’s silenced but complex experiences of coloniality. This paper explores these neglected historical continuities and political stakes in the revival of this colonial discourse in Hungary.

Panel 5: Reindustrialization and the agents of new centralities and peripheralities in non-metropolitan spaces of Central and Eastern Europe
Sociology and Geography
Panel Organiser: Vladan Hruška (Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem)

Panel Chair: Vladan Hruška (Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem)

Discussant: Tim Leibert (Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography)

Panel Abstract:

Since the 1990s Eastern European countries have undergone significant economic restructuring accompanied by a gradual change from the industrial to post-industrial economy. However, the tertiarization process was spatially highly unequal and especially in peripheral regions industrial firms still very intensively form regional economies and their performance. Apart from restructuring of traditional companies here, this industrial focus has been reinforced by the influx of foreign direct investment which has contributed to intensive integration of these regions in global production networks and their following exposition to new kinds of social and geographical relations and patterns of power distribution across different scales. In this panel we would like to focus especially on the role of individuals constructing these new development paths. Which strategies they employ and how? What are their capacities to influence the new path creation? What are their approaches aiming to manage this multi-actor and multi-scale complexity of social and economic relations? Besides discussing their agencies shaping new development paths in non-core regions, we would like to discuss emerging new dependencies within social and economic relations and geographical scales.

Franziska Görmar; Nadir Kinossian (Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography)

The agency of narrative: Negotiating change in old-industrial regions of Europe

"Europe and its societies are currently undergoing a profound economic transformation marked by a shift in manufacturing to automation, industry 4.0, as well as globalised production patterns. This economic restructuring often combined with demographic shrinkage and outmigration affects old-industrial regions in various ways. Economic geography has used the concepts of path dependence and lock-ins to analyse barriers to change. For the last 15 years, the focus of research has been shifting from path dependency to path creation, highlighting the notion of agency as a decisive factor in local and regional development. This contribution perceives agency as distributed and evolving along multiple networks of actors and events, in which old-industrial places form specific institutionalised nodes. It will be argued that, for those located in them, these places contain very different meanings which are diffused through multiple, often competing spatial narratives. Narratives have a strong legitimizing power and potentially drive the decisions of political and economic agents in policy arenas at multiple scales. This contribution will hence examine the interrelationship between spatial imaginaries, narratives and agency and illustrate these theoretical reflections with empirical insights in Eastern German case studies."

Jan Píša; Vladan Hruška (Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem)

Agents of change in old industrial towns: motivations, barriers and incentives

Economic restructuring of post-socialist countries during last three decades have caused significant spatial disparities in formerly relatively homogenous states of Central and Eastern Europe. Regions with strong concentration on heavy industries, once symbols of successful socialist industrialisation, have been especially affected by the turn to neoliberal globally integrated economy. However, despite the label of being lagging, problematic there are some agencies which contradict this perception and indicate new possible pathways of development (albeit on individual/firm rather than local or even regional level yet). From the spatial planning view, it is necessary to mobilise, reveal and support such ‘agents of change’ in order to intensify their activities which in turn brings new development impulses for a given locality. Within our contribution we would like to discuss their motivations, incentives and barriers for their agencies in the context of local structural conditions and institutional arrangement and within the multi-scale complexity of social relations. This will be based on case studies from old industrial towns in Ústí nad Labem Region in Czechia.

Melinda Mihály; Erika Nagy (Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Centre for Economic and Regional Studies)
Contesting centrality and peripherality: Agents, strategies and changing dependencies shaping economic recovery in old CEE industrial centres

Export-driven re-industrialisation has been a considered a trajectory to economic recovery and self-sustaining local and regional development in crises-hit non-metropolitan spaces across CEE since the early 1990s. This narrative was embedded in the neoliberal agenda of post-socialist transition and economic restructuring – yet challenged recently by the 2008/11 crisis and recent trends in manufacturing. Relating our paper conceptually to current debates on peripheralisation and uneven development, we discuss socio-economic restructuring of old industrial centres as an outcome of various entangled strategies of local and non-local agents, being shaped by unequal positions and multiple dependencies. We place the local state – its changing scope and roles in economic change – in the focus to address the following questions: (i) How did the strategies of local elites/their responses to the transition crisis reflected and reproduced the hegemonic narratives CEE economic restructuring and dependent/core-periphery relationships? How did such dependencies unfold – and how they were supported by the local state and its changing relations to local and non-local agents (investors, nation-state, EU)? (ii) What new patterns of local, regional, global/inter-local relations emerged as result of reindustrialisation? (iii) How do such processes contribute to understanding peripheralisation and unevenness as diverse, contested and context dependent processes that reflect the spatial logic of the current regime of capitalism? Our argumentation rests on the field work results from Tatabánya and Győr (Hungary) that exhibit new centralities (economic growth, global embedding, migration targets) and also peripheralities (dependent financialisation, positions in GPNs, state centralisation/austerity). By discussing peripherality through this lens, we also aim to channel knowledge and experiences rooted in CEE everyday reality into international debates on uneven development, to get rid from binaries (see e.g. Peck, 2016) – such as being the cultural ‘other’ to core economy-focused concepts and theories.

Krzysztof Gwosdz; Arkadiusz Kocaj; Agnieszka Świgost-Kapocsi(Jagiellonian University, Kraków); Agnieszka Sobala-Gwosdz (The Bronislaw Markiewicz State Higher School of Technology and Economics in Jaroslaw)

Trapped in factory economies? The developments trajectories of medium-sized industrial towns in Poland in the second decade of 2000s

Following heavy deindustrialisation of several industrial towns in Poland in the 1990s, some of them regained its economic base in 2000s primarily due to the massive foreign investments, but also as the result of dynamic growth of the domestic medium and small companies. Despite the fact, that reindustrialisation turned out to be a viable option for some time for such localities, the majority of industrial towns hardly can be labelled as dynamic local economies nowadays. Several of them were trapped in the branch plant syndrome, and upgrading process is weak and started only recently. Some towns managed to developed more advanced local competences & capabilities, but still losing ground in favour of metropolitan regions. They are facing ageing population, brain-drain, and inferior position in the spatial division of labour. The developmental drift of mid-size towns performing the role of subregional centres became in political agenda after 2015 and some programs for promotion more advanced functions (i.e. business services and industry 4.0 platforms) were implemented. The authors discuss in-depth the developmental trajectories and possibilities for further upgrading on the example of two industrial towns in Poland: Legnica located in the southwestern part of the country (pop. 90 thous.) and Mielec (pop. 60 thous.) in eastern Poland. Both towns were successful in attracting FDI in the 1990s and 2000s, based – inter alia – on the incentives offered by special economic zones programme (Mielec was the town where 1st Polish SEZ was established in 1995, and in Legnica, it has been operating since 1999). The towns offer an interesting case study of (dis)continuation, and transformation of development trajectories and socio-technological regimes, and well-illustrate the challenges associated with the upgrading of non-metropolitan urban centres towards a knowledge-based economy. The interviews conducted with company managers, government officials and business institutions representatives (n=25) enabled to reveal the peculiarities of local innovations systems and processes and barriers to further upgrading of the local economies.

Panel 6: Transregional entanglements in crime and punishment

Politics and International Relations

Panel Organiser: Judith Pallot (University of Oxford)
Panel Chair: Sofya Gavrilova (University of Oxford)

Panel Abstract:

The aim of the panel is to examine the way in which the membership of transnational criminal-justice institutions has had an impact on the lives of people who commit offences in the former communist countries of Eurasia. Bill Bowring, who was involved in drafting the new criminal procedure code for Russia on its joining the Council of Europe, will give an overview of the effectiveness in the years that followed of the instruments that he helped shape in improving conditions in Russian prisons. Opening the borders of the communist countries worked both ways; whilst CoE inspectors were allowed in to the post-communist countries, so offenders seeking to avoid justice could leave and seek refuge elsewhere. In her presentation, Judith Pallot will examine the light that extradition proceedings shine on how Russia understands prisoners’ rights issues. In his presentation, Rustam Urinboyev will look at a different aspect of cross border mobility of criminal offenders. Using materials collected from interviews, he will discuss the role of internet and mobile phone communication across the prison walls and international borders in the experiences of Uzbek prisoners in Russian prisons. Costanza Curro, finally, will use interviews taken with prisoners in Georgia to examine how local everyday practices of prisoners mediate and obstruct the realisation of reforms Europe deems necessary to take the former communist countries away from the Soviet penal model.

Bill Bowring (Birkbeck College, UK)
Globalising human rights and penality in Russia: a complex engagement with the Council of Europe (CoE)’s European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and European Convention for the Prevention of Torture (CPT)
Russia ratified the ECHR in 1998, having joined the CoE in 1996. In 1999-2000 I was one of the three CoE experts working with Russia, drafting the new Criminal Procedural Code (CPC, UPK). This attempted to bring Russian criminal justice closer to European human rights standards, with new roles for prosecutor and judge, remand on bail as the norm, and greater adversariality in a traditionally inquisitorial system. The numbers of accused held in pre-trial detention fell dramatically as a result. The CPC has subsequently been improved by judgments of the Constitutional Court, citing ECHR precedents. Has this process gone into reverse following the re-election of President Putin in 2012? Also as a condition of membership, the penitentiary system was transferred from the Ministry of the Interior to the Ministry of Justice. In 1998 Russia also ratified the CPT. Ratification means that the CPT and its Anti-Torture Committee can visit Russia without notice, visit any place of deprivation of liberty also without notice, open all doors, and speak to detainees in private. Delegations always include penitentiary and medical experts. Since 1998 29 visits have been carried out, 7 periodic and 22 ad hoc. The CPT has adopted 25 reports, on which only 4 have been published: Russia has not adopted the automatic publication procedure. The CPT has therefore made 4 public statements, its nuclear option. What difference has this made, if any?

Judith Pallot (University of Oxford)
Transregional entanglements in crime and punishment: What extradition and asylum cases can tell us about ‘globalized normative orders’ in the protection of prisoners’ human rights in Russia and East Central Europe.
One of the consequences of the borderless world is the internationalization of crime and punishment. The impermeability of borders between USSR and East Central Europe and ‘the West’ meant that fleeing to another jurisdiction to escape punishment was only an option for the truly reckless (although the border was used punitively by the state to banish critics). The impermeability of borders also served to keep criminal networks local. All of this changed with the fall of the Berlin Wall. As countless commentators have observed, in the last thirty years Russian and East European criminal gangs have expanded their activities well beyond the borders of the successor states. An associated, but less reported on, consequence of the permeability of borders is the use fugitives of flight to another country to avoid criminal justice at home. In the past twenty years the Russian Federation has made ever more frequent recourse to bi-lateral extradition agreements to pursue its ‘fugitives from justice’. However, its success has been variable, not least in Europe, and is dependent upon a combination of geopolitics, interpretation of international human rights regime and the operation of the extradition process in particular countries. Against the backdrop of the variable response among the member countries of the Council of Europe, in my presentation I examine the history of extradition between the UK and the Russian Federation and what it reveals about the understanding of prisoners’ rights in the Russian Federation.
**Costanza Curro (Aleksanteri Institute, Helsinki University)**

*Perspectives on the Europeanisation of Georgia’s penal system.*

Reforms of the prison system have been at the core of Georgia’s efforts to ‘bring legislation, institutions and practice further into European standards in the areas of human rights, the rule of law and democracy’ (CoE – Action Plan for Georgia 2020-2023). Under Mikheil Saak’ashvili’s presidency (2003-2012), Georgia attempted to rid itself of the Soviet legacies in the criminal justice system and bring domestic legislation in line with international norms. Local and international media, as well as internal and external observers, have stressed the ambiguous patterns and outcomes of these reforms, focusing on the strengthening of the rule of law since the 1990s, but also on gross deficiencies in protecting prisoners’ human rights and dignity. The image of Georgia on the international scene is that of a country which, while in need of further improvements, has been taking significant steps to reach the standard of its Western counterparts. Using in-depth interviews with current and former prisoners the paper will contribute a different perspective to this picture, bringing emic perspectives on prison everyday life in the post-Soviet space to the centre of global processes underpinning penal reforms, the paper casts a light on the intertwining of narratives and practices at different ‘levels’ - local and global, individual and collective, formal and informal, supportive and subversive of existing power relations.

**Rustam Urinboyev (University of Lund)**

*Locked up in Russia: transnational prisoners’ social relationships within and across the prison walls*

This paper aims to explore the daily smartphone-mediated communication practices of Central Asian migrants in Russia. Particular emphasis will be given to understanding the role of smartphones in shaping migrants’ transnational identities and practices, daily coping strategies and risk-sharing practices. Empirically, I present the results of my extensive multi-sited ethnographic fieldwork undertaken in Moscow, Russia, and Fergana region, Uzbekistan between January 2014 and September 2020, which involved ethnographic interviews with (1) Uzbek migrants working in Moscow and (2) Uzbek migrants/ex-prisoners who served sentences in Russian penal institutions. A case in point is Uzbek migrant workers in Russia and their daily smartphone-mediated transnational ties and interactions within “outside” (migrants working in Russian labour market) and “inside” (migrants serving sentences in Russian prisons) environments.

With 11.6 million foreign-born people on its territory, Russia is the fourth-largest recipient of migrants worldwide. The majority of migrants (approximately 2 million) originate from Uzbekistan. However, in spite of their large presence in Russia, there is little in the way of “Uzbek transnational community” established in Russia due to repressive legal environment and widespread anti-migrant sentiments that do not allow non-citizens to express their diasporic and transnational identities in public places. As a result, Central Asian migrants in Russia can hardly engage in collective action or transnational activism. Nevertheless, Uzbek migrants do engage in transnational practices and reproduce their ethnic identities, but their activities and networks are hidden from the public eye and take place in a virtual environment via smartphones and social media. Smartphones serve as an alternative means for Uzbek migrants to reproduce and enact their transnational relations, identities, and communities.

Hence, in this paper I argue that even though Uzbek labour migrants’ transnational activism are hardly visible in public places, rapid improvements in technologies of communication (e.g. smartphones and social media) have enabled Uzbek migrants to stay in touch with their origin societies as well as to create some form of permanent, smartphone-based transnational communities in Russia, which usually gathers around migrants that hail from the same mahalla or village in Uzbekistan. The existence of such smartphone-based transnational environment helps migrants cope with the challenges of ‘musofirchilik’ (being alien) and avoid or manoeuvre around structural constraints, social exclusion, racism and the lack of social security. These processes will be investigated through ethnographic study of the daily smartphone-mediated communicative practices among Uzbek migrants operating “outside” (labour market) and “inside” (prison) contexts.
Panel 7: Economic Integration and Globalization? Trade, Transfer, Interests, and the "Socialist Bloc"

Methodology and History

Panel Organiser: Dániel Luka (Pécsi Tudományegyetem); Bence Kocsev (Leipzig University)

Panel Chair: Uwe Müller (Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO))

Discussant: Steffi Marung (Leipzig University)

Panel Abstract:

Economies in Central- and Eastern Europe experienced numerous effects of global processes in the 20th century. World wars, economic crises, technological development, continental and intercontinental institutionalization formed economic trends and organizing methods in economy. This panel seeks to explore the details of the Soviet-type/communist globalization regarding economy, to contextualize scientific cooperation, coordination of production linked to industry and agriculture, management of commerce, labor division and resource usage at transnational level within the “socialist bloc” in the second half of the 20th century. Did the countries of the bloc economically integrate in the framework of the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON)? What kind of connections did COMECON countries have with capitalist countries? How did Soviet-type planned economies transform in Central and Eastern Europe while facing globalization? What kind of effect had COMECON on Western globalization? Putting COMECON into an international context could reveal impacts, effects, interaction, technology transfer, extent of trade between West and East. How did the two “economic globalization” attempts clash and interacted? Furthermore non-European countries as members like Cuba and Vietnam, or non-member countries in the Third World could be especially in focus to evaluate the activities of this international economic organization. COMECON generally, single economy of a country in the “socialist bloc” particularly could stay in the center of transregional and transnational, even transcontinental analysis, and to add this way new knowledge to the history of COMECON and to economy of the “socialist bloc”. Not just papers on country studies, but case-studies and analysis at grass-root levels are welcome. Search for causes and effects on economic thinking and economic reforms offers main basis for interdisciplinary approaches in this regard. Researches on COMECON could boost findings on economic relations besides findings of political history on political integration (Kominform) and findings of military history on military integration (Warsaw Pact). Various aspects can highlight not just political-economic, but social-, educational-, institutional-, organizational- and legal-economic relations, for instance changes related to consumers’ attitude and to international economic and private law."

Max Trecker (Institut für Zeitgeschichte München-Berlin)

Forging the Indian Steel Industry: The Economic Side of the Cold War in the Global South

In my presentation I focus on the erection of public sector steel factories in India between the late 1950s and 1980s. I ask why Soviet designs and technologies could at times prove more appealing to Indian economic planners and politicians than the ones of their Western competitors. I therefore compare the parallel buildup of the steel plants at Bhilai and Rourkela in the late 1950s which occurred in direct competition between a Soviet and a West German consortium. I move on with the steel works of Bokaro and Visakhapatnam in the presentation which were built under the guidance of Soviet engineers with significant contributions of other East European state firms and Indian companies. I show that Soviet economic planners and engineers proved more capable to adapt to the particular needs of their Indian customers than Western businessmen, thereby questioning grand narratives of a sluggish and ever-declining performance of the export industries of the Soviet bloc.

Bence Kocsev (Leipzig University)

Spaces of Interaction. Towards a new analytical category to understand East-South relations

Seizing on the opportunities triggered by the Khrushchev „thaw”, a great variety of economic, political, cultural, and academic relations had been developed between the socialist countries of Eastern Europa and the newly
independent countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin-America. Given the exponentially expanding and intensive “East-South” relations since the 1960s, research on the global influence of socialism even argues that alternative practices and projects of globalization existed within the framework of these relations. Applying a rather macro perspective and building on the theoretical framework that investigates the contribution of socialist states to post-World War II globalization, the proposed paper will shift the focus of analysis to economic “spaces of interaction”, a concept set forth in the recently published collective volume, “Between East and South. Spaces of Interaction in the Globalizing Economy of the Cold War”. While investigating and categorizing the manifold spaces of interaction being responsible for the acceleration of economic interconnectedness between the socialist bloc and the Third World, the paper will also explore the (often diverging) rationales and motives that guided the socialist experts, managers, traders, or scholars in the creation and development of these entanglements. Moreover, interpreting the concept from a spatial perspective, the paper will also assess the extent these spaces challenged or consolidated the dominant spatial formats of the era (e.g. the bloc) and thus blurred or reproduced Cold War bipolarity.

Dániel Luka (Pécsi Tudományegyetem)
*Regulation and Coordination of Agriculture in the COMECON and in the European Economic Community*

The analysis seeks to estimate the effectiveness of two integration models regarding agriculture: the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) of the European Economic Community (ECC) and the experiment of communist economic cooperation at transnational level, the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON) in the 1960s. Applying comparative, transnational and interdisciplinary methods and aspects, control and coordination of agriculture will be elaborated in times of major changes in whole Europe. What kind of regulations were in force in the ECC and in the COMECON regarding agriculture? How did international economic and political processes affect agriculture of these countries? Capitalist market economy on the one hand, communist planned economy and controlled market on the other hand were competing each other while international policy, economy and world market were basic factors of decision-making. This time period was significant for economic models, forming common agricultural policy in Western Europe and parallel finishing mass cooperativization and collectivization of agriculture in Central and Eastern Europe, excepting Yugoslavia and Poland, the beginning of the 1960s was almost starting point at the same time to create and to implement new agricultural programs and policies. It is also interesting to assess various interests of each country and their connection to each other, furthermore to estimate Soviet control and patterns. The “socialist bloc” entered in the 1960s clearly to a new phase but development was uncertain. In this context, it is more interesting to put the communist economic reforms into an international “area” and to elaborate their causes and effects.

Łukasz Dwilewicz (Warsaw School of Economics)
*Polish membership in the Comecon during the rule of Władysław Gomułka (1956-1970)*

The political liberalization in Poland, which was the result of taking the political leadership of the country and the Polish United Worker’s Party by Władysław Gomułka, was accompanying the general shift of the mode of international relations inside the Soviet Bloc. The real activation of the Council for Mutual Economic Cooperation and switch towards multilateralism were promising prognostics for future cooperation. The dominance of communist parties in the political life of the CMEA countries meant that the major issues had to be decided by the first and general secretaries of those parties. The asymmetrical character of the relations inside the bloc implied that nothing really important could be agreed without the general secretary of CPSU. In this environment, the Polish membership in the Comecon was in some respects a function of bilateral Polish-Soviet bargaining. The top level meetings between Polish and Soviet leaders were, besides economic affairs, also dealing with the wider issues of East-West global rivalry and the Comecon was only one of the elements of the puzzle. Economic successes of capitalist countries and the retreat of Soviet offensive in the Third World pushed Gomułka in 1969 towards proposals of a deeper reform of the CMEA. These outlines of more integrated Eastern bloc were generally ignored by the Soviets. The fall of Gomułka in 1970 perhaps contributed to general lack of progress of “socialist economic integration”.

Kaarel Piirimäe (University of Helsinki / University of Tartu)
*How Gorbachev’s New Thinking in foreign affairs interacted with perestroika in the republics and catalysed Soviet collapse*

The New Thinking (NT) marked a radical change in Soviet foreign policy, introduced by Mikhail Gorbachev around 1987-1988. NT adopted entirely new propositions about the nature of international relations: interdependence,
humanity taking precedence over class, the need to avoid nuclear war, political understanding of security, etc. A lesser known facet of NT was the intended democratization of diplomacy and the partial devolution of decision-making from the centre to the republics. After the constitutional amendments of 1944 the republics had the formal right to engage in direct relations with foreign countries, but in fact those contacts had always been limited and strictly controlled by the centre. With the NT it seemed that the republics would finally be given a more constructive role. This paper draws on archival findings from the Estonian, Latvian and Ukrainian SSRs to analyse the changes in the external activities of the constituent republics from ca 1986 to 1990. The paper argues that NT was supposed to release the potential of the Soviet people to improve the ‘economic mechanism’, but it became a Communist survival strategy in the context of glasnost and demokratizatsiya that had unleashed the centrifugal forces of nationalism. The NT was a great gamble: by empowering (in a limited way) the republics to conduct their own foreign relations it also gave national movements the chance to bring their claims to international fora; therefore, NT not only ended the Cold War but contributed to the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Panel 8: Challenging the System: State Power, Protest and Opposition

Politics and International Relations

Panel Chair: Gilad Ben-Nun (Leipzig University / PREVEX)

Panel Abstract:

Mobilisations of societies and regimes vis-à-vis dominant power structures and authoritarian control are in the centre of this panel. Democratization, (self-)empowerment and mobilisation are keywords not only since and through the recent protest activities in Belarus. Social movements (and countermovements), opposition and minority voices have been highly relevant issues in many societies in Eastern Europe for several decades. Examples from the late 20th century up to today point to the role of new media and digitalization, of local self government bodies and citizen participation, but also to the institutional blockages and the utilization of legislatures to co-opt opposition or to secure the interests of domestic business. Through a variety of methods and sources, ranging from document analysis and problem-centred interviews to quantitative data, the papers in this panel shed light on actors and groups of actors in opposition to the status quo.

Eszer Bartha (Eötvös Loránd University of Budapest / Hannah-Arendt Institut für Totalitarismusforschung, Dresden); András Tóth

From lonely fighters to right-wing political communities: Was there a working-class countermovement in Hungary after 1989?

The purpose of this paper is to examine through a Hungarian case study why the left “resigned” from the representation of the working class in East-Central-Europe and the consequences of this failure or refusal to represent working-class interests at a national level, carries with itself. The paper is built on Karl Polanyi’s interpretation of the disembedding of the economy from society and the subsequent double movement that extreme liberalization calls to life. Hann applied this argument to Easter Europe after the change of regimes, which was particularly true for the socialist working class, the majority of whom experienced unemployment or the threat of it, the disintegration of established working-class communities and falling standards of living.

Under these conditions, trade unions were expected to flourish; whereas in reality, we can witness exactly the opposite in East-Central-Europe, where trade unions failed to become effective countermovements after the changes of regimes. The paper sets out to explain why trade unions failed to become a successful countermovement in the Polanyian sense of the word by analyzing four sources of power available to unions. Then, we go on to analyze the social and political consequences of this failure, demonstrating through the analysis of life-history interviews how “lonely fighters” can become right-wing voters and activists, thanks to the rise of a new political culture on the shopfloor.
Sophie Schmäing (University of Giessen)

Democratization from below? Local understandings of citizen participation in post-Maidan Ukraine

Since the severe political crisis in 2014, the improvement of local self-government bodies in Ukraine has been high on the political agenda due to the implemented decentralization reform inter alia thought to reduce corruption and foster democratization ‘from below’. Indeed, the reform triggered the introduction of a range of measures aiming to increase transparency of local decision-making and enhance citizen participation. Participatory budgeting, a practice which includes citizens in the allocation of local budgets has been one of the most popular and most far reaching newly introduced forms of citizen participation since it includes the gogovernance of local authorities and citizens. How, then, does participatory budgeting (re)shape relations between local administrations, politicians, civil society representatives and ‘ordinary’ citizens and what are the broader implication for local democracy in Ukraine?

Adopting a pragmatic, practice-oriented perspective on citizen participation and building on insides from relational and political sociology, the talk explores participatory budgeting practices in Kyiv, L’viv and Dnipro. Drawing on interviews, analysis of legislation, local newspaper reports and websites I trace the respective implementation processes. Similar to other ‘democratic innovations’, participatory budgeting, first implemented by leftist movements in Porto Alegre in the 1980s, is today promoted by a variety of political spectrums and actors, from protest movements committed to the ideals of participatory democracy to the World Bank aiming to strengthen ‘good governance’. I show who are the actors involved in the implementation and promotion of participatory budgeting in the three cities in Ukraine and reveal the concepts of citizen participation on which they rely.

Furthermore, I show how these concepts influence who participates, how the collaboration between local administrations, politicians, civil society representatives and ‘ordinary’ citizens plays out and if participants’ own understandings of (active) citizenship correspond to or contradict the overall framings. Carving out the stark differences between the three cases, the talk aims to contribute to debates on the role of the local policy level and local citizen participation for democracy in Ukraine stressing the role of differing understandings of how state-citizen relations and political decision-making should be manufactured.

Nadja Douglas [Centre for East European and International Studies (ZOiS)]

Belarus: Mobilisation of society and regime in the context of externally-induced crisis

Protest activities in authoritarian settings represent a recurrent topic in the respective research literature. The different ways regimes respond or mobilise forces themselves, however, is discussed to a much lesser extent. This contribution analyses how externally-induced crisis (economic downturn and lately the global Covid-19-epidemic) lead to growing dissatisfaction with the regime in Belarus. The marginalised role of the political opposition have led to protest activities driven mainly by grassroots and individual civic actors. The paper will put an emphasis on the reactions by the national security apparatus, meant to secure the power of the president and the internal order in the country. Both sides of the state-society-relationship—state security and insubordinate citizenry —have cultivated a growing mutual distrust. The aim is to identify mobilising factors of both civic protest, and of counteraction measures by state power structures in order to shed light on how these dynamics and interactions can be seen to be emblematic for the evolving state-society relations in Belarus. The paper relies on document analysis and data from problem-centred interviews, conducted by the author with various actor groups on the ground.

Daniil Romanov (National Research University Higher School of Economics); Egor Fain (Central European University)

Regional Legislatures and the Opposition under Authoritarianism: A Case of the Russian Systemic Oppositions

Recently many scholars have emphasized the role which quasi-democratic legislatures play in an authoritarian context. Some scholars treat legislative institutions as ‘rubber stamps’ (Brancati 2014), while others suppose that autocrats could utilize legislatures to either co-opt opposition (Gandhi and Przeworski 2007), establish authoritarian ‘power-sharing’ (Boix and Svolik 2013), or even secure the interests of domestic business (Szakonyi 2018). Some scholars identify the role which sub-national legislatures play in mitigating systemic opposition parties’ inclinations to protest (Reuter and Robinson 2015). In our study, we extend this logic even further: drawing upon the scheme of assessing various protest agendas (Lankina and Tertytchnaya 2020), we distinguish between political and non-political protests to study whether co-optation works differently for two types of protests. To test our assumption, we collected the data on protests activity of CPRF from 78 Russian regions the period from the beginning of 2016 to the end of 2018. Subsequently, the data on the distribution of leadership positions controlled by the CPRF members in regional legislatures were collected as well. We find out that a proportion of leadership positions in rental committees could significantly mitigate the protest activity of local CPRF branches, while the proportion of CPRF
deputies could increase the number of political protests. Our findings suggest that only access to policy-making is important for managing the systemic opposition, not only legislative deputy mandates.

Olga Terenetska (Central European University)

On the Role of Empathy in Innovative Forms of Digital Storytelling in Digital Transformation in Education and Cultural Heritage sector in the Populistic and Corrupted CEE countries during in the COVID19 era

Digital Storytelling (DS), an important means of communication increasingly popular in multiple academic fields, offers socially disadvantaged and minority voices a space to express themselves, promote cultural diversity and identity development through its interactive and dynamic features. Several innovative forms and formats of DS have been recently practiced by cultural institutions from the standpoint of their impact on enrichment of their respective User Experience, including the emotional pathways and impact.

Digital divide in Europe has significantly increased since the start of COVID19 pandemic while making it difficult for public to orient themselves in the world of information without solid media literacy skills, exacerbated by social radicalisation driven by rising social inequality exerting great amount of pressure on their personal lives and professional careers by further limiting their civil rights and freedom of movement, bringing them closer to the poverty line. Therefore empathy, an integral part of Emotional Intelligence, is of particular value in the emotional part of User Experience in DS.

State Corruption and censorship have been given an unlimited power at times of COVID19 pandemics in the CEE and Balkan countries with highest levels of populism and state corruption. This presentation aims to explain how innovative features in Digital Storytelling empower marginalised groups and energize civil society in their resistance to corrupted fake narratives used by populistic governments using an example of a Digital Storytelling (DS) project consisting of interviews and stories of several generations of people affected by totalitarian regimes of the 20th centuries.

Panel 9: (A)typical Sources of Globalizing Eastern Europe: Methodological Issues

Methodology & History

Panel Organiser: Réka Krizmanics (Central European University/Global and European Studies, Leipzig University)

Panel Chair: Anna Calori (Global and European Studies Institute, Leipzig University)

Discussant: Steffi Marung (Senior Researcher/ Central project SFB 1199 „Processes of Spatialization under the Global Condition”, Leipzig University)

Panel Abstract:

Inscribing the experience of globality in the history of state socialist Eastern Europe is becoming a concern of more and more scholars both from within and outside of this region. It remains yet an emerging field of interest, and its findings have been published mostly in the form of various case studies, in special issues and collective volumes. In these contributions, the authors turn their attention to East-South relations, departing from the earlier focus on transsystemic exchanges and the established chronologies following the logic of the Cold War which considered 1989/1991 to be a rupture. Although synthetizing works are expected to be published soon, as of now there has been meager attempt to problematize the methodological challenges that the transcendence of the Cold War binary poses, the potential pitfalls of caging these histories into the framework of nation-states, and how one may inhabit the discursive space about global history whose tenets rest on Occidental scholarship.
While it builds on nation-state based case studies, our panel aims to facilitate a conversation about these very challenges, using the case studies pertaining to Yugoslavia, Romania, Hungary as a springboard to speak to the above-highlighted issues. Some of the presentations will focus on specific types of source materials and their utilization for the purposes of global history while others will directly speak to theoretical implications of carving out a space for the Eastern European experience of globality, connecting our discussion to another recent trend in historiography about the region that seeks to historicize the 1990s.

Réka Krizmanics (Central European University/Global and European Studies, Leipzig University)

Hungarian experts’ travelogues of the Global South

“Expert missions in countries of the Global South were available and attractive opportunities for skilled workers, professionals and academics in state socialist Hungary from the 1960s onwards. The motivations for application varied greatly. At the ideological level though, the idea of the mission was framed within the discourse of socialist internationalism and solidarity. Chosen experts went under a complex process of preparation for the mission and upon their return, they submitted activity reports. These reports were arguably utilized in the complex process of shaping the party-state’s ideas about the Global South and the training of future experts. Some participants left a different kind of trace as well, publishing a travelogue-like book about their experiences. They appeared in the series Világutazók [Globe Trotters] that featured the reprint of classic travelogues, contemporary foreign and Hungarian accounts, including these expert publications. The aim of my paper is to present these books as sources of global history and to compare three types of accounts. The first type was written by female experts, the second was authored by women who primarily framed themselves as the accompanying wives of experts and the third type is written by male experts. Comparing the self-positioning of the authors, their main areas of interests and discursive strategies that allow an investigation into their multilayered relations with locals and their roles in the new environment, I will discuss the potentials these accounts bear in theorizing about the interplays of gender, expertise and (state socialist) ideology.”

Anna Calori, Global and European Studies Institute, Leipzig University

Beyond a histor(iography) of doom? Global Eastern Europe after the end of history

Late socialist history in Yugoslavia is often viewed from the perspective of dissolution. Historical works look back at the 1980s and 1990s revisiting them as the decade of disasters and disarrays, which led to inevitable collapse. Dissolution was written in the DNA of the 1980s. While the 1960s and 1970s are viewed as the heyday of socialist internationalism, the two following decades are often analysed as a period of crisis and retreat from these global aspirations.

Yet, companies, workers, experts, managers continued to expand and strengthen global contacts during the 1980s. While the dissolution of socialist regimes significantly downsized international trade, it did not fully obliterate it. If socialist globalization ended in 1989, what came afterwards, and how to historicise it?

What does a reliance on old “socialist” networks and friendship tell us about the global history of (post)socialist Eastern Europe? And what kind of shifts in global imaginaries and horizons did “transition” entail for ordinary citizens of socialist/post-socialist countries? What sort of expectations and prospects of change did they envision, and to what extent did the “globalist dream” feature in them?

And further, how can we discern expectations of change, the sense of disappointment that emerged as they went unmet, and a feeling of nostalgia for the missed chances of transformation?

This paper will reflect upon the opportunities and challenges of including personal histories of expectation into the emerging historiography on global socialism and the “transition” period in late and post-socialist societies.

Vedran Duančić (Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts)

Trans-Atlantic and Trans-Ideological Correspondence Between Scientists and Making of Scientific Diplomacy in the Early Cold War

“Never officially enforced or renounced, Lysenkoism in socialist Yugoslavia was propagated since 1945 and lingered on well into the 1950s, even after the Tito-Stalin Split precipitated an early and dramatic de-Stalinization. In 1952, students in Sarajevo revolted against the lectures in “reactionary” biology by professor Mirko Korić (1894–1977) and demanded to be taught Michurinist biology instead. University authorities investigated Korić’s ideological transgressions. However, what was supposed to be an easy dismissal of a faculty member, threatened to become an international scandal at a time when Yugoslavia could hardly afford tensions with its new Western allies. Determined
to put up a fight, Korić wrote to his former schoolmate, Milislav Demerec (1895–1966), now one of the most influential geneticists in the world and director of a large U.S. research institute, asking for help. Indeed, Demerec pressured the Yugoslav authorities, exploiting Yugoslavia’s sensitive geopolitical situation in the early 1950s. Through this case study, I will examine what letters between individuals—one of the most ubiquitous historical sources—could achieve at a time of unprecedented importance of high diplomacy during the early Cold War. Personal correspondences complicate the notion of a Cold War scientific diplomacy, especially in a country that was just starting to develop a comprehensive scientific policy. As opposed to a relatively slow pace of developments in state-sponsored scientific diplomacy, correspondence between fellow scientists was dynamic and reveals a readiness to address multiple politically sensitive issues that high diplomacy often tried to suppress."

Justyna Aniceta Turkowska (University of Edinburgh)

"Development requires suitable cartographic material": Geophysical Sciences, Eastern European Knowledge Claims and Mapping of West Africa in the 1960-1980s

Whereas the exchange of experts between the Eastern European states and the Global South in the 1960-1980s has already been declared as one of the recognised fields of historical investigation, little attention has been paid to the history of its material side. Not only that every project required specific instruments and material-based knowledge, it further (re-)produced it, and above all it, these material objects used for and resulted from such projects constituted the key features in advance of the aid cooperation and created a complex network of personal relations that in turn were used to facilitate the globalised connections.

To bridge this gap, this paper investigates the Eastern European geological knowledge claims, its material realisation and the consequential engagement in the process of mapping the Sub-Saharan landscapes that in the course of decolonisation has become a side of (a-)new spatial measuring and describing. Historically, geologists were among the very first experts sent to Sub-Saharan Africa to foster technological and thus societal modernisation. The geological claims projected on and tested in Ghana and Nigeria depended however not only on the precise measurement but were rather dictated by local knowledge and geological equipment, like for instance the very sensitive electronic rangefinder. This paper explores how the geological equipment and its circulation between Eastern European countries and the West African local sites of geological work impacted the formation of delocalised knowledge claims and the structures of Eastern European globalised self-perception.

Panel 10: Institutional Powers and Informal Networks in Political Decision Making and Economic Developments

Politics and International Relations

Panel Chair: Alexander Dontsow (Leipzig University / EEGA Fellow)

Panel Abstract:

In this panel, the relation of informality and institutional powers in policy making and economic development in societies of Eastern Europe is investigated. Papers examine how, on the one hand, institutional powers determine and shape access to political and economic resources, and how, on the other hand, individual actors develop mechanisms to promote and secure their interests and agendas through informal networks, pre-existing alliances and coalitions of elites. With the help of quantitative and qualitative data, the studies scrutinize systems of “national quota” and ministerial durability and demonstrate structures and effects of informal practices. Of key concern are the relations between the two, institutional powers and existing alliances, and changing dynamics over time.

Elena Semenova (Friedrich Schiller University Jena); Keith Dowding

Institutional Effects on Government and Ministerial Durability: Evidence from Central and Eastern Europe
In this paper, we examine the variation in the institutional powers granted to both presidents and prime ministers to dissolve parliaments, terminate cabinets and appoint ministers to show how those powers affect cabinet durability (and the mode of cabinet termination) and ministerial durability (i.e., the overall duration a minister remains in cabinet). We use the most extensive survival data set on ministers in 14 Central and Eastern European countries available to date as well as the data set on government survival in these countries. Our Cox regression models demonstrate that the institutional rules granting extensive powers to the presidents are powerful determinants of ministerial durability. Moreover, the same institutional powers available to the presidents and prime ministers to dissolve parliaments and dismiss cabinets have often different impacts on cabinet and ministerial durability. These results show that the specific powers given to chief executives are important for issues surrounding implications for ministerial and cabinet durability and electoral accountability.

Julia Langbein (Centre for East European and International Studies (ZOiS)); Ildar Gazizullin, Dmytro Naumenko

Trade Liberalisation and Opening in post-Soviet Limited Access Orders

How does trade liberalisation shape post-Soviet Limited Access Orders (LAOs) where dominant elites restrict access to political and economic resources for the sake of private gains? By drawing on the case of trade liberalisation between the EU and Ukraine, this paper argues that the effect of trade liberalisation largely depends on the quality of the pre-existing alliance between political and economic elites in different sectors. The findings imply that external trading partners wishing to promote economic and political opening must not ignore the ownership structure of key exporting sectors and the involvement of these key owners in rent-seeking practices. Otherwise, trade liberalisation helps to ensure the durability of LAOs.

Nurlan Aliyev (Faculty of Political Science and International Studies, University of Warsaw)

Informality and policymaking in southern Russia: the case of Dagestan

From 1990s to the mid 2000s, the system of "national quotas" was in force in Dagestan, when in some districts only representatives of a certain nationality were eligible to run as candidates. Even after the abolition of that rule, the situation has not changed much: the formed system still ensures the representation in the parliament of the main nationalities of the republic. Approximately in 2010 multi-ethnic groups/clans which have huge influences on politics in Dagestan were established. Moreover, Dagestan’s strategic geographic location, multi-ethnic society, clan system, and the presence of radical religious movements there heavily complicates the issue. Furthermore, since 1990s Dagestan has been a scene of insurgency, occasional outbreaks of separatism, ethnic tension, criminal violence and terrorist acts. In such region where clan, tribe practices has historically played a huge role in the life of the society, a study on relations between Informality and policymaking is interesting. In this study informality and policymaking in Dagestan is analysed. The influences of informal relations on decision making, social and economic developments and politics are researched. It also explains how informal practices affect policymaking at the top level and also at the everyday life. The research also analysis how informal practises in Dagestan have improved from internal level to the relations between region and centre/Moscow, and also, between the subject of the Russian Federation and foreign countries. The analysis tries to explain how relationships between informal and formal have been changed or whether such relations have been affected after Vladimir Vasilyev’s appointment in 2017.

Panel 11: Contested Landscapes and Identities: Networks, Narratives, Negotiations

Sociology and Geography

Panel Chair: Frank Hadler (Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO))

Panel Abstract:

In a transregional perspective, studies in this panel investigate the ways in which macro-narratives in and about Eastern Europe interlink with diverse identity projects and cultural politics, and how landscapes, identities, memories and commemorations are contested and negotiated. Examples ranging from the 19th to the early
20th century up to today, and covering a variety of regional contexts, discover dominant and competing rhetorics by politicians, minority groups, and local populations, and the mechanisms that are employed to foster one’s position. The regional, global and local networks of actors that provide the basis for knowledge production and circulation of narratives are of equal importance here to grasp configurations and reconfigurations beyond the national framework.

Martin Rohde (Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg)

‘Western Ukrainian Borderlands’ in Transregional Perspectives. (Re-)Discovering Lemkos, Boykos and Hutsuls

This paper discusses competing macro-narratives on the Eastern Carpathians in transition from the late prewar to the early interwar period. I will argue how the ethnographic curiosity of the 19th century produced categories used for self-empowerment in the 1920s.

Lemkos, Boykos, Hutsuls were intensely researched by scholars interested in Ethnography, Linguistics, Slavic and Ukrainian Studies since the late 19th century. The ‘Ruthenian mountaineers’ and the lands they inhibited were considered as national frontiers since the late 19th century. All of them transcended the administrative borders of Austria and Hungary, as they belonged to Eastern Galicia, four Countries in Northeastern Hungary and Northern Bukowina. During the interwar period, the regions split between Poland and Czechoslovakia, the South of the Hutsul region belonged to Northern Romania. The Ukrainian project concurred with the Russophile movement and local Rusyn identity projects in Poland as well as in Czechoslovakia, while both states as well as their national movements articulated their own perspectives on the respective groups.

The transformation of East-Central Europe in the aftermath of World War I turned distant peripheries into interface peripheries (Zarycki). Local voices and the Ukrainian national movement could make themselves heard with several new strategies and political possibilities, facilitated through their regional entanglements and transregional connections to their peer groups in the other states. As I will argue, this had transformative impact on the perception of those regions despite the ambitions of the new states to appropriate the regions and integrate them into their own territorial visions.

Tracie L Wilson (Martin Luther University Halle)

Entangled Ecologies: Contested Landscapes, Migrations, and Reproductions

Since the 1990s many politicians, religious leaders, and media in Poland have depicted environmental organizations as “eco-fascists” and working on behalf of alien interests. I undertook field work in the years leading up to Poland’s entry into the European Union. At that time wolves were just beginning to return to Germany and German journalists and wildlife scientists whom I encountered in Poland suggested that Germans might find it difficult to come to terms with wolves returning, that they were viewed as exotic creatures from a distant past or from less domesticated places.

In this paper, I examine the ways that disputes over recovering wildlife populations are entangled with broader narratives that provoke ambivalence toward open borders, migration, as well as cultural and biological fluidity. Here I reflect on the complex linkages between Germany and Poland, relationships to other contested mobilities, and the increasingly transregional aspects of conservation debates. In the global south, scholars underscore the contradictory impacts that have followed the implementation of wildlife conservation regimes, including a preponderance for the negative consequences of increases in wildlife populations to be foisted unfairly onto more marginalized communities. The symbolic force of the wolf is significant with debates over wolves expressing attitudes about how to cope with “the other,” or “the foreign,” as well as that which we feel has been foisted upon us. Indeed, it is striking the degree to which the Alternative für Deutschland’s rhetoric about the threat of wolves mirrors their discourse on the purported threats of migrants.

Martina Urbinati; Simona Cannalire (University of Bologna, Italy)

Renegotiating Urban Memories in the European Periphery: The Case of Kaunas as a Laboratory

Three decades have now passed since Lithuania declared its independence from the Soviet Union. Following the phenomenon of progressive distancing from the Communist past, the effects of post-Soviet transition are nowadays visible in the changing urban landscape understood as the bearer of memory. The city of Kaunas (Lithuania) is used here as case study as it looks forward to move away from the “temporary capital” label and play the role of European capital of culture in 2022. The main objective of this study is to explore how Kaunas’ urban transformation affects the collective memory of the local population and in turn shapes the cultural identity of the city. Based on original survey
data, this study finds that even though multiple cultural identities can coexist, there is evidence to believe that the local youth is still divided about the city’s historical legacy of the 20th century. Finally, this article marks a step in the direction of integrating the study of urban areas into the discussion about historical memory and conflicting interpretations of the past.

Isabel Sawkins (University of Exeter)

“The memory of the Holocaust will serve as a lesson and a warning only if it remains fully intact, without any omissions.”

Until recently, Russia had not remembered the Holocaust as a unique evil in twentieth century history. This was true both in the Soviet Union and in an independent Russia. However, this position has changed markedly since Vladimir Putin’s return to the presidency in 2012. A specific Holocaust memory has now developed in the Russian Federation, one which emphasises “Soviet heroism, the fascist leaning of former republics and contemporary Russia’s supposedly tolerant, multicultural society in which the most painful periods of history are confronted”.

This paper explores this phenomenon by analysing speeches that reference the Holocaust by Vladimir Putin. It will examine the speeches’ principal themes, which include the Soviets as victims (both on occupied Soviet territory and abroad) and heroes (for example through the liberation of Auschwitz-Birkenau). Holocaust commemoration is considered a way to prevent repetition of these tragedies, which is all the more important given what Putin considers to be the current politicisation of the legacy of the Holocaust and attempts by other countries to rewrite history.

Dominik Gutmeyr (University of Graz)

Camera Caucasica. Networks of Photographic Practices in the Transimperial Caucasus

The proposed paper looks at the networks that provide the conceptual and practical basis for the production, reception and circulation of 19th century photography in the wider Caucasus region between and beyond the Russian, Ottoman and Persian Empires. Against the backdrop of the introduction of photography to the region — a story of salts, glass, paper and cameras co-authoring the global introduction of photography among a variety of visual traditions —, it is the present paper’s ambition to think the Caucasus beyond conventional, imperial borders of the long 19th century and to address the transregional entanglement of knowledge exchange informing photographic practices. The history of the first Caucasus daguerreotypes is thereby representative for photography in relation to manifold processes of circulation and reciprocal negotiation within an intercultural contact zone while the first couple of decades of portrait photography show the entanglements of photographic practices in the 19th century as a case study of global networks of knowledge production and circulation beyond a nationalised history of photography.

Hence, the paper argues that photographic practices in the wider Caucasus region, just as anywhere else, were not at all objects of Western or Russian diffusionism but one more aspect of co-constructive processes of global negotiation between a variety of actors, resulting in ever-changing reconfigurations of knowledge and visual cultures in a dynamic zone of transimperial interaction whose history of photography is often demoted by the same Eurocentric perspective that had shaped the nowadays defused discourses on distinctly Western origins of modern science.

Panel 12: Navigating Between the Worlds: Colonial and Neo-Colonial Interdependencies and Formations

Sociology and Geography

Panel Chair: Lena Dallywater (Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography)

Panel Abstract:

Migration, educational mobility and border-crossing structures of knowledge production are central part of Eastern Europe’s manifold global entanglements and interconnections. Transnational flows of people, goods and ideas are however only one side of the coin. The long legacies of colonialism and its effect on racial formations and identities in societies in the ‘East’ have long been neglected. Papers in the panel “Navigating Between Worlds: Colonial and Neo-Colonial Interdependencies and Formations” shed light on these formations, examining, for example, manifestations
of ‘race’ in Poland, and Hungarian strategies for finding new markets for the country by building neocolonial dependencies in Africa. Impacts of colonial and neocolonial formations on every-day discriminations and racisms are analyzed as well as the effects that those navigating between worlds, e.g. foreign students in the mid-20th century Soviet Union, had on the spaces and societies they arrived in. Ideological tensions and the vexed issue of socialist states and racism comes to light in the individual studies.

Balogun Bolaji (University of Leeds)

*Not quite White, not quite European – not Polish sons and daughters of the soil*

Scholarship in Poland has sought to consider in and out migration. Whilst this body of works engages forcefully with migration, it has yet to fully grapple with the global racial formation and the diverse range of racial identities in Poland. Simultaneously, studies on borders are often reduced to securitisation where the racialised – immigrants, foreigners, and asylum-seekers are often connected to the internal security logic, where racial logic is either ignored or not fully acknowledged. In doing so, the nations of Central and Eastern Europe are imagined to be untouched and not influenced by the global racial formation and its impacts on race relations. Taking this absence as a point of entry, this discussion seeks to explore the ways in which ‘race’ and racism engage with migration in Poland. Studying the everyday lives of the Polish native-born children of immigrants of sub-Saharan African background in Poland provides an opportunity to engage with their representation as not sons and daughters of the soil and what this signifies in the broader Polish society. ‘Inherited restrictive immigration’ status may appear as a factor that reduces their integration into the Polish society, I argue that such restriction is premised on the notion of ‘race’. I provide often neglected manifestations of ‘race’ and racism in the everyday experiences of black and mixed-race Poles of sub-Saharan African background (either born or raised in Poland). To this end, I locate ‘race’ and racism as part of the configuration of nations of Central and Eastern Europe.

Zsuzanna Varga (Central European University, Comparative Gender Studies)

*Becoming globally known for hunting: Socialist Hungary exporting knowledge on wildlife management to East Africa*

In the 1970s Hungarian hunters from the nomenklatura, ministers and deputies of agriculture believed that their practices of game optimization were worthy of worldwide recognition, and even though their methods were brought to fruition in Europe, they might as well work in Africa. The country excelled in two areas: in producing world record trophies and in turning these trophies into German marks and US dollars. Hungarians saw their model of selling trophy hunts to Westerners as a distinctly socialist, non-exploitative practice that could aid Tanzania in overcoming the legacy of colonialism - at least in the field of wildlife management. As manifestations of peaceful cooperation, Hungarians envisioned a research institute near Arusha and hunting concessions. The scientific work had begun on how to best adjust their expertise on deer management to such species as elephants. Yet, underneath the ethos of sharing knowledge, their efforts were underpinned by the recognition that this was the time to join in the race for building neocolonial dependencies in Africa and to find new markets for the country. Sending out experts, improving research facilities was one affordable way for this Eastern European country to increase its global connections.

Miwako Okabe (University of Helsinki)

*Racism in the socialist state: The case of German Democratic Republic*

This paper explores the racial discrimination against non-white peoples in everyday life in the German Democratic Republic in the 1960s. Officially, the authorities in the socialist states propagated that there was no racism in the socialist bloc However, Karl-Marx-University Leipzig saw the racial discrimination against non-white foreign students. The University of Leipzig had the largest number of foreign students in the GDR, representing the friendship between states and among peoples. Therefore, this paper clarifies how the students who came from African and Asian states faced the problem of racism by using the sources from State Security Service (Stasi).

On the one hand, the discrimination such as antisemitism was not visible officially in the GDR, since they identified themselves as an anti-fascist state and, therefore, no official documents referred the problem of discrimination in the GDR as Wolfgang Benz has suggested in his study. On the other hand, ironically, the Stasi, symbol of violence and dictatorship in the GDR, gathered also the information about such racism among the people. Many historians have argued the racism from the late 19th to 20th century by focusing on the Holocaust by Nazi Germany, African-American civil rights movement, and Apartheid and its resistance with the discussion about imperialism and nationalism on the assumption of the theory of western imperialism. Contrary to those researches, this paper concentrates on the issue of socialist states and racism by focusing the case of the GDR.
Riikkamari Muhonen (Central European University)

Dealing with other forms of socialism in the Soviet space: Political activism of foreign students in 1960s and 1970s Soviet Union and responses of the Soviet administration

My dissertation project deals with the ways in which ideological work was conducted among the students that had arrived from the newly-independent countries of the developing world to study in the Peoples’ Friendship University, a flagship institution of international education in the Soviet Union. Based on the same archival sources, in this paper I wish to discuss the different forms of socialism that were present and highly popular among the student community. These included Maoism, Pan-Africanism and Arab socialism, all of which were considered harmful competing ideologies by the Soviet administration. My paper looks at the co-existence of these different ideas of socialism in the Soviet space, the political activities of the students, and the ways in which the Soviet administration aimed to control them. I will also look at the students’ activities after they returned home: how did the different forms of socialism survive through the Soviet education process and ideological pressure? In what kinds of political activities did the students engage themselves after returning home? The paper aims to provide a case study of the problematic relations between different understandings of socialism and how these tensions were dealt with in grass-root level interactions. At the same time, it provides a new point of view to relations between the Second and the Third worlds by stressing the influence of contrasting ideologies on the practical level of these relations and the ways in which the ideological questions were mediated on both sides.

Panel 13: Changing global conditions of infrastructural and large-scale development projects in Eastern Europe

Sociology and Geography

Panel Organiser: Linda Szabó (Periféria Policy and Research Center)

Panel Chair: Csaba Jelinek (Periféria Policy and Research Center)

Discussant: Giulia Dal Maso (University of Bologna)

Panel Abstract:

While last decades has witnessed a systematic fading of the global hegemony of transatlantic powers (Arrighi 2010), a multipolarity of global governance has been emerging, which created opportunities for rising powers (e.g. the BRICS, and more specifically for China and Russia) to expand their foreign policies in both fields of economy and politics. This kind of global restructuring of power relations opened space for new forms of dependencies in various regions. With a focus on Eastern Europe, understood as a periphery of the European power bloc, the 2008 crisis has put particular pressure on countries in the region to seek alternative sources of financing economic development. This has resulted in the emergence of new channels for state loans and foreign direct investments, and the forming of novel kind of dependencies, often centered around spectacular investments in fields of infrastructure and the built environment. Among various kinds of interests attached to large-scale development projects, investments into the built environment, and more particularly into physical infrastructures have historically proved to also disclose actual geopolitical (dis)interests; and while infrastructural developments can act both as foundations for economic development and social inclusion, they also create an instrument of wealth extraction, may enhance inequality, and contribute to potential crises (Furlong 2019). Hence, to explore how the emerging multipolarity of global governance affect the dependency of Eastern Europe on global powers, this panel seeks to map out and compare the changing structure of global actors participating in such kind of large-scale investments both within the region and over time. The aim of this panel is thus to bring together scholars and researchers whose empirical engagements and/or theoretical interventions address the following issues:
- The history and political economy of investments into physical infrastructures in Eastern Europe
- The increasing role of China and Russia in large-scale development projects in Eastern Europe
- The potential, or actual conflicts of interests between newly emerging and the regionally established, or globally powerful actors (i.e. China, Russia, the EU, and the USA) in the field of large-scale development projects
- Changes in financing infrastructural developments and large-scale investments in the built environment
- The altering institutional environment in which such large-scale investments are embedded
- Discourses and emerging policy narratives about novel sources of investments and new directions of dependencies
- Intersecting theories of the political economy of infrastructure building; dependent development and financialization; rent-seeking and multi-scalar uneven development"

Ágnes Gagyi (University of Gothenburg); Tamás Gerőcs (Binghamton University)

Global crisis and the realignment of Eastern European capitalist class alliances: the case of Hungarian illiberalism

The present Hungarian regime is often quoted as a poster boy for a new global tendency towards authoritarianism and protectionism; the “illiberal” wave that comes as a result of neoliberalism’s crisis. Our paper analyses the Hungarian regime through its integration into current dynamics of systemic change. Instead of a mere ideological wave, our analysis shows the image of a temporary constellation where national bourgeois classes use the opportunity of the world economic crisis to integrate themselves as junior coalition partners into global capitalist alliances reconfiguring under the pressure of the global crisis. In terms of internal power relations, the success of the regime’s temporary accumulation model is based on the economic and political exhaustion of Hungary’s previous neoliberal accumulation model, which was based on foreign direct investment by Western European capital in its previous financialized phase of crisis compensation politics, and local elite coalitions supporting the liberal politics. This breakdown of the previously dominant regional capitalist alliance provided the political space the current regime needed for a state-based reorganization of local relations of integration. The global contextual factors the regime relies on are given by the extension of German industrial production into Europe, and by the inflow of Russian and Chinese excess capital which seeks global expansion to realign geopolitical space for its own benefit. The paper follows the chains of integration through which the reorganization of Hungary today fits into these two aspects of the global crisis.

Sergiu Novac (Central European University)

Investing in a Radiant Future: Nuclear Power’s Place in Easter Europe’s “Green Revolution”

Globally, the civil nuclear industry has entered the era of decommissioning, since the large bulk of the fleet has been built during the 1970s and 80s. This means that most facilities have either surpassed or are soon reaching the end of their projected lifetime cycle. However, nuclear industry actors are hoping for a revival of nuclear power producing facilities, arguing that it is the only “green”, zero-emission, electricity producing technology available. This paper explores the tension between decommissioning and re-commissioning of nuclear power plants, focusing on Eastern Europe. At its core lies the question of what new economic and technological dependencies are created in the new wave of nuclearization and how they relate to the past nuclear dependencies of Eastern Europe. The first part will survey the nuclear ambitions of Eastern European countries of the former socialist block. The second part will engage with three different recent cases of the tense relationship between decommissioning and re-commissioning: the Paks II project in Hungary; Ignalina Power Plant in Lithuania and a plant in neighboring Belarus; the commissioning of two more reactors at Cernavoda, Romania. While the first two cases expose the intricacies of Russia’s involvement in the region and the flawed developmental agenda of the EU, the Romanian case reveals China’s ambitions to get a foothold in the nuclear landscape of the Eastern European region.

Lela Rekhviashvili (Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography)

Questioning dominant accounts of Chinese investments in Eastern Europe and Eurasia

This paper analyses existing knowledge on Chinese economic exchange and investments in Eastern Europe and Eurasia, making two suggestions. First, current interpretative lenses of Western media, policy commentary as well as academic research on the topic face major limits, obscuring possibilities for further research. Existing analyses constructs China as an exceptional political and economic threat for the continent, reinforces EU’s and broadly the ‘West’s’ higher moral ground, takes statist analytical framework dismissing the uneven consequences of engagement with China for different classes, social groups, locales. Second, Chinese engagements with Eastern Europe and Eurasia is not so exceptional. For one, the domination of foreign investments in economy and infrastructures is
nothing new for the most of Eastern Europe and Eurasia. Furthermore, East-West material and discursive divides are also not new, and in the past three decades have been further lamented through the Europeanisation project. Lastly, China’s outwards investments and its’ mega infrastructure project BRI are also not unique, but represent one of the widely studied systemic characteristics of capitalism: the tendency of overaccumulated capital towards geographic expansion. Existing research can learn much from the history of world capitalist system so far shaped by Euro-Atlantic hegemony. Demonstrating these points I argue that existing research can learn much from, pre-existing processes of financialisation of infrastructures, pre-existing causes of East-West divides, and the history of world capitalist system so far shaped by Euro-Atlantic hegemony.

Linda Szabó; Csaba Jelinek (Periféria Policy and Research Center)

The Flow of Chinese Capital into Hungarian Infrastructure and Logistics: the Case of the Budapest-Belgrade Railway

While since the crisis of 2008 the increasing scale of Chinese investments has become remarkable in the whole of Europe, both Chinese business and politics got some specific characteristics in the Eastern peripheries. Less investments have been carried out through mergers and acquisitions, less for learning new high-end technologies, but more have been seeking new markets, and opportunities for infrastructural developments in various fields, including transport, energy, and communication, as well as tourism. The political framework and conditions for economic cooperation is structurally varying also by the launch of the regional level ‘16+1’ (now ‘17+1’) agreement, which in terms of its profile is quite similar to China’s agreements with other regions from global peripheries (i.e. the FOCAC, and CCF). Accordingly, instead of looking at Chinese FDI in Europe in general, it is worth visiting specific cases of Chinese investments in Eastern Europe in particular, and explore their interplay with all local, European, and global politics. Therefore the aim of this paper is to do so through the study of the infrastructural development of the Budapest-Belgrade railway line, which is politically being narrated to be a means for improving transportation, and for facilitating Chinese-European trade. While given its dismissal to use EU funds, and to be carried out with Chinese loans, by a consortium of Chinese-Hungarian companies with strong political ties on both sides, its study can critically discuss questions of rent-seeking, of growing inequalities, and of changing geopolitics in Eastern Europe.

Panel 14: Working with the Past, Shaping New Urban Memories: Cultural Urbanism in Central and Eastern Europe

Literature and Culture

Panel Organiser: Mikhail Ilchenko (Institute of Philosophy and Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences/GWZO)

Panel Chair: Arnold Bartetzky (Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe (GWZO))

Panel Abstract:

For the last decade, the global processes of cultural urbanism significantly changed the image of Eastern European cities. Following the global trends, urban spaces in Eastern Europe became a platform for various cultural initiatives, revitalization projects and art experiences. But as cultural urbanism perceives all urban heritage as a scene for creative experiments and renovation, it is important to reveal how these new global tendencies impact the perception of the urban past in Eastern European cities. For Central and Eastern European cities, a distinctive attitude towards the past proved to become one of the fundamental characteristics determining their image and identity. This “past” is continuously present in public discourse; it is experienced; it provokes emotional reactions and is reflected, in its various representations, within a public space.

The dominating view on creative urbanism within established neoliberal theoretical framework appears to be too narrow to explain all effects of global cultural trends for Eastern Europe. How do the new cultural projects focusing on revitalization of urban heritage represent the complex past of the Eastern European cities? Are they transforming...
its experience and emotional resonance? Do they even leave any kind of space for this past? Or, maybe, this past is disappearing, becoming dissolved within the new discourses and symbolic meanings?

This panel aims at initiating a multi-disciplinary discussion on how the global cultural urban processes influence the development of new narratives and perceptions of the past and history in Central and Eastern Europe. The session seeks to analyze urban transformations in terms of their symbolic changes viewed from various perspectives: anthropological, historical, economic, cultural, artistic.

Mikhail Ilchenko (Institute of Philosophy and Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences/GWZO)

Re-evaluating Modernist Heritage: New Representations of Urban History in Eastern Europe

"For Eastern Europe modernist architecture played an essential symbolic role. In the interwar period it represented the emergence and re-establishment of the new national states and societies, and after the Second World War it became an integral part of the social reforming within the new socialist systems. Thus, modernist urban experiments seriously contributed to the reinforcement of the region’s unique cultural identity for decades. Symbolic link between modernist architecture and Eastern Europe became so strong that all the most radical, ambitious and large-scale in the urban planning started to be associated in the public mind with the “Eastern”. This paper aims a) to compare the current ways of perception of the modernist urban heritage in various local contexts of Eastern Europe, and b) to explore how these new perceptions and attitudes affect the development of the new national narratives and identities. The paper analyzes various cultural initiatives, revitalization projects and art experiments, which deal with the modernist legacy in the cities of Eastern Europe. It presents the results of the two-year archival and field research conducted in Russia, Ukraine, Germany, Poland and Czech Republic and devoted to symbolic transformation of the modernist urban heritage under changing social conditions. The research is based on the analysis of various types of materials, including series of expert interviews, historical archive documents, different literary sources, materials of national and local press, catalogues of art exhibitions and cultural projects."

Bojana Matejić (University of Arts in Belgrade, Faculty of Fine Arts)

Artistic Interventions in Post-Yugoslav Public Spaces after 1989: Critical reflections on Transition from the Transnational Perspective

The aims of this paper are mapping and contextualizing of the post-Yugoslav artistic responses to a (post-)transition from state socialism to liberal democracy / globalized free-market economy in the public ex-Yugoslav spaces after 1989. The term transition is used in the meaning of moving away (either gradual, as in a crisis, or accelerated, as in a break) from the Cold War, real socialist, state-socialist culture and art towards a reconstructed, and in many cases restored bourgeois society accompanied by implementation of liberal, national capitalism. The focus are critical artistic actions and interventions in public space that address issues of reconstruction and restoration of nationalist agendas, and transformation of symbolic meaning, patterns of erasure or denial, reviving, and conditions of de- and re-politicization of the Socialist heritage. Against the methodological nationalism that tends to study new reborn state cultures in the ex-Yugoslav territories as self-contained, this paper investigates the instances of transnational communal artistic work through a difficult and conflictual past. The paper seeks to offer a new reading of post-Yugoslav cultural and artistic practices – that have responded to the transition mainly through the lens of trauma paradigm so far – both in terms of methodology (i.e transnational approach) and new case studies, exceeding moralizing inclinations of memory studies.

Basan Kuberlinov (Friedrich-Schiller-University, Jena)

“Lenin squares” in the post-Soviet countries: symbolic transformations and new meanings

“Lenin squares” are central squares in cities and towns of the former Soviet Union. They were planned together with the establishment of the new administrative centers in the course of the administrative-territorial organization of the Soviet state in 1920s. Initially designed as public places for spontaneous mass manifestations and gatherings associated with the early revolutionary culture, these squares became the stage for Soviet propaganda during Stalinization of the Soviet society in 1920-30s. They were used for holiday parades and were decorated with the monuments of Lenin that gave them the name and fostered their symbolic meaning as the centers of the Soviet power. The collapse of the Soviet Union initiated reinterpretation of the “Lenin squares”. In many cases they were renamed; Lenin monuments were removed; and other monuments were erected in the attempt to change the meaning of the squares and the surrounding architecture which still constitute the focal points of many towns and cities in the post-Soviet states. Using the example of the “Lenin squares” in Yerevan, Minsk and Elista, the capitals of
the former Soviet Republics of Armenia, Belorussia and the Soviet Autonomous Republic of Kalmykia, the paper will present the history of the establishment of the “Lenin squares” as symbolic places of the Soviet political power during the formation of the Soviet society in 1920-30s and consider how different strategies were applied to deal with this historical meaning in the newly established states in the post-Soviet era.

Nadir Kinossian (Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography)
Rethinking the Post-Socialist City
Since the collapse of state socialism in Europe, various aspects of transition, including the transformation of cities, have attracted scholarly attention. Despite the momentous scale of such changes, the influence and visibility of research on the 'post-socialist city' remain limited. This critical review provides an appraisal of current debates on the post-socialist city and outlines a theoretical framework for analysis, informed by the following: 1) rejection of neoliberalism as a default narrative; 2) understanding of socialist legacies as a constitutive part of new regimes; 3) shifting the focus of attention to institutional and governance aspects of the post-socialist city. While rejecting the purported uniqueness of post-socialist cities, this review explores avenues for better connecting them with mainstream urban theorising and demonstrating more engagement with policy relevant research.


Politics and International Relations

Panel Chair: Maryia Danilovich (Belarusian State University/EEGA Fellow)

Panel Abstract:
The last two decades have seen the emergence of new regional cooperation initiatives, and in particular, the Russia-led Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU), the EU’s Eastern Partnership (EaP) and China’s Belt and Road Initiative (BRI). The panel seeks to enrich our understanding of the effects of ‘New Regionalisms’, global competition and trade liberalisation on markets and economies in Eastern Europe. Papers explore competing regionalisms in the post-Soviet space and the clash of interests in the EaP region between global, regional, and local players for influence, markets, and natural resources that is transpiring since the late 1980s to today. The different programs and projects, as driving forces and results of a rising major power competition, are examined as well as the (re)conceptualisations of post-socialist states, beyond the Transition Paradigm and ‘Western’ state model, they bring about. Can concepts like hybridity help us understand the ambivalences and transitions in the region? How to grasp dynamics in geopolitics and international relations from the late 20th-century to the present? This is what the papers ask and discuss.

Elkhan Nuriyev (Centre for East European and International Studies (ZOiS)/ GWZO Leipzig)
Competing Regionalisms in the Eastern Partnership Countries: Global Trends, Regional Implications
In post-Soviet territory, which comprises countries with very different cultures that lean towards different extra-regional poles of influence, ‘New Regionalism’ serves as a step towards more global and multilateral relations. The last two decades have seen the emergence of new regional cooperation initiatives, and in particular, the Russia-led Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU), the EU’s Eastern Partnership (EaP) and China’s Belt and Road Initiative (BRI). Although they all are at various phases of their implementation, each one of them seems to entail bigger geopolitical visions promoting competing ideas of regionalisms. As these integration projects are currently evolving in Eurasia, the post-Soviet states are straddling fault lines and choosing sides in the entire region. Many important challenges facing the regional countries have put them at the juncture of those potential fault lines. This is especially true for the EU’s Eastern Partnership countries, which remain to varying degrees unstable, unreformed, and ripe with conflict. The paper explores how competing regionalism is presented in the post-Soviet space by looking into its main
characteristics and examining the key factors that define the self-positioning of EU’s Eastern Partnership countries under the global condition. The paper also analyses different approaches of the EU, Russia and China to dynamics of regional identity building, and investigates how these differences affect the EU’s eastern neighborhood. This paper seeks to enrich the understanding of region-building processes by explaining the Eastern Partnership countries’ engagement in competing regional integration projects.

Ruben Elamiryan (Public Administration Academy of Armenia, Russian-Armenian University)

The Return of Geopolitics: Eastern Partnership Countries between the European Union and China

The rising major power competition increases the potential for clash of interests in the Eastern Partnership (EaP) region between global, regional, and local players for influence, markets, and natural resources. From this perspective the main objective of the submission is to reveal and analyze the main declared and latent political, economic, and geopolitical goals of the European Union and China in the EaP region. It starts tracing the transformation of the EU’s and China’s foreign policy priorities in the region since 2009 when the EaP was inaugurated, as well as stops on 2013 when Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) was officially introduced. The submission compares the EaP program and BRI based on strategic approaches from both centers of power towards the EaP region, economic cooperation (trade, foreign direct investments, and foreign aid in case of the EU), current and potential infrastructure development, discovering opportunities for cooperation and challenges which might lead to confrontation. To provide more comprehensive picture, the research examines the foreign policy priorities of the six EaP countries with regard to those centers of power. Finally, it tests the opportunity to develop cooperative coexistence in the region among the above great powers. The submission is based on strategic documents, published materials, official reports, and studies on the foreign policy priorities of the EU and China in Eurasia and EaP region. World Bank, IMF, WTO, and EUAID reports are discussed to reveal economic cooperation between the countries of the region. Public and expert interviews make the study more comprehensive.

Ia Eradze (ZFF Potsdam)

(Re)conceptualising Postsocialist States beyond Transition Paradigm and ‘Western’ State Model: Georgia as a hybrid state

Postsocialist states have been analysed through the lenses of transition, measuring their capacities along marketization and democratization and framing most of these countries as ‘failed’ states. Critical scholarship from the global south has already challenged this teleological view and shifted analytical and normative frames beyond the ‘western’ state model. However, the theoretical conceptualisation of such states remains puzzling.

This paper engages with the quest for finding a plausible theoretical framework for approaching postsocialist states on the example of Georgia. This is done by conceptualising Georgia as a peripheral hybrid state, drawing on political economic state theory debate in lines with Gramsci and Poulantzas, as well as dependency theory. The concept of hybridity is understood in political economic terms, in contrast with the most literature on transition hybrid states, that characterise hybridity as something between democracy and authoritarianism. Instead, the following questions are asked for redefining this concept: what are the cultural, socio-economic dimensions of hybridity? What does hybridity mean in terms of government-market relation or governance technologies? How is hybridity related with informalities in politics and in the economic sphere? Hybridity is understood as a way of coping with the discrepancies between the ‘old self’ and the new imperatives of the transition process for post-socialist countries, as a result of trying to put a new skin on the old body, which does not work. Yet, hybridity is a dynamic concept and its patterns might vary from one regime to another, though it usually rests on informal practices and façade politics.

Alexander Dontsow (Leipzig University / EEGA Fellow)

Pairing and Cohesion between the Companies operating in the Framework of the Belt and Road Initiative in the International Format

This article is about the Belt and Road Initiative of the People’s Republic of China. It concerns the projects and development associated with it in Russia, the Eurasian Economic Union, and the Central-Eastern Europe. The later primarily means 17+1 format. Based on the examples of inter-company pairings and cooperation in those regions — the nature of state-to-enterprise and business-to-business relationship is uncovered, and by doing so, explaining the role of nationalized corporations in geopolitical context. The paper argues that Russian and Chinese private and state-enterprise being instrumentalized by the respective governments for the purpose of achieving
"national objectives", whereas for-profit operations are less important for those companies. The main body is divided into four parts: The Belt and Road Initiative and the People’s Republic of China; The Belt and Road Initiative projects in Central-Eastern Europe; The Belt and Road Initiative projects in Russia; The Belt and Road Initiative and the Eurasian Economic Union cooperation. China (PRC) is the initiator of the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI, OBOR) on the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) level, and therefore, its governments’ association with the main state-corporations involved in the development of the BRI projects abroad has to be studied firstly in order to understand the project’s foreign developments. Each of the following parts provide information on the projects being realized in the framework of “One Belt, One Road” and entail participation of the local companies and governments, as well as those from the People’s Republic of China in their construction in the respective regions. However, it is firstly substantial to review the initiative and explain how do companies’ “pairing” and “cohesion” relate to the OBOR, and why it is important. For this, describing the initiative and identifying crucial companies in its development will be the beginning of the paper.

Panel 16: The Unpredictable Past and Uncertain Future of East European Music: the cases of Bulgaria and Serbia

Literature and Culture

Panel Organiser: Ivana Medić (Institute of Musicology SASA, Belgrade, Serbia)

Panel Chair: Galina Tsmyg (Center for the Belarusian Culture, Language and Literature Research of the National Academy of Sciences of Belarus)

Panel Abstract:

The panel "The Unpredictable Past and Uncertain Future of East European Music: the cases of Bulgaria and Serbia" is organised by the BASEES Study Group for Russian and East European Music (REEM). In the panel, various aspects of Bulgarian and Serbian music history and their regional and global entanglements will be presented and discussed in a comparative perspective. In the presentations, issues such as national identity and Europeanisation are encountered, through, for example, the examination of current trends in the historical interpretation of Bulgarian Art music between the two world wars. Also issues of globalization, mobility and integration are discussed, by relating the emigration of composers from Serbia to socio-cultural and geopolitical events. Finally, in the paper "Legal Aliens: Serbian Composers in Western Europe Today", the fates of Serbian composers of art music who emigrated to Western Europe are presented. The panel combines perspectives from Musicology, History, and Sociology to shed light on past and future developments of East European Music under the global condition.

This panel is organised by the BASEES Study Group for Russian and East European Music (REEM).

Stanimira Dermendzhieva (University of Athens, Greece)

Bulgarian School of Music: National Identity and Europeanisation

"At the threshold of the 21st century, Bulgarian musicology followed the paradigm of other Eastern European countries and sought to give a new historical interpretation to the 20th century's national musical heritage. The history of Bulgarian music was rewritten after the end of the communist regime (1944-1989), emphasizing the importance of the avant-garde radical and protesting composers of the 1960s. This paper investigates the current trends in the historical interpretation of Art music between the two world wars. Nowadays, Bulgarian musicology considers that the debate over the idea of national style in the 1930s actually touched on the modernity of Bulgarian music. The composers, members of the “Contemporary Music” association (established in 1933 and later becoming the Union of Bulgarian Composers), were aware of their new strategic mission: to unite the cultural uniqueness of both Bulgarian folk and art music with the pan-European “musical vocabulary” of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Europeanisation in reality may be only a peripheral variant of a larger trend of globalisation. This study
explores the realisation of the modern idea of national identity in the perspective and values of European traditions and intercultural dialogue."

Laura Emmery (Emory University, Atlanta GA, USA)

Reception of Serbian Composers in the United States: Globalization, Mobility, and Integration

Following the Yugoslav Wars of the 1990s and the subsequent international economic sanctions imposed against Serbia that lasted until the early 2000s, many composers emigrated from Serbia to the United States in pursuit of better opportunities. A significant number of female composers found success navigating the complex American arts scene, particularly in large and diverse metropolises like New York and Chicago, gaining prominent commissions and performances. Their compositions and distinct aesthetics have been highly critically-acclaimed and positively received by the American audiences—from general and multicultural, to academic and new music enthusiasts, as well as Serbian communities in the United States, showing the versatility and adaptability of these composers, but also the reception of cultural diversity in the new era of globalization. They have successfully written in a variety of styles and genres—from concert orchestral, choral, and chamber music, to compositions for electronics and laptop, operas, multimedia projects, and film music. It is these émigrés, namely Aleksandra Vrebalov, Milica Paranosic, Natasha Bogojevich, and Katarina Miljkovic, who have brought the reception of Serbian classical composers to the forefront of the arts scene in the United States.

In this study I examine the socio-cultural and geo-political events that led to the mobilization, border-crossing, integration, and success of these composers. Applying the theories of globalization (Hall et al 1992, Brubaker and Cooper 2000), and one of its main characteristics in the domain of the arts, standardization (Radoman 2012), my case study analyzes the integration of Serbian composers into the multicultural societies and the reception by the audiences in the US, as well as their political and economic integration. I illustrate how the globalization and standardization of music—where the artists and societies no longer seek to imposer global similarities but rather respect the differences—created these “transregional entanglements.”

Ivana Medić (Institute of Musicology SASA, Belgrade, Serbia)

Legal Aliens: Serbian Composers in Western Europe Today

This paper presents a continuation of my ongoing investigation of the destinies of Serbian art music composers who have emigrated since the tragic 1990s. I have managed to locate more than 60 Serbian composers who currently live and work abroad, which is a very significant number for such a small country with a relatively underdeveloped art music tradition. On this occasion I will focus on the professional and personal trajectories of composers who have managed to establish careers in various Western European countries (Germany, The Netherlands, France, The United Kingdom, Switzerland, Sweden, etc.) Over the period of five years I have conducted extensive interviews with a number of these composers (Aleksandar Damnjanović, Marko Nikodijević, Jovana Backović, Đuro Živković, Jasna Veličković, Milica Đorđević, Miša Cvijović, Snežana Nešić and many others), during which we tackled challenging (and sometimes painful) notions of diaspora communities, identities, acceptance / rejection, assimilation, naturalisation, and other professional and personal challenges faced by expats. Instead of attempting to offer an overarching narrative on Serbian emigre composers, in this paper I present a panorama of parallel personal histories in comparative perspectives.
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