Karen S. Rubinson

Welcome from the President

Dear Colleagues:

The last year has been one of great accomplishment for ARISC, as you can see from the many activities reflected in the newsletter. It was very satisfying to award 3 graduate fellowships to support dissertation research in the South Caucasus. The range of research subjects among the grant applicants reflects the rich possibilities of research in the area and it was hard to have funds to support only a small number of projects.

ARISC is now a Center in Developing Status of CAORC (see us at www.caroc.org)! The application process was led by Adam T. Smith, former ARISC Treasurer and now the ARISC Representative to CAORC, and Talin Lindsay, ARISC’s Executive Director. The process of pulling together the lists of lectures, conferences, grants and other programs, together with ARISC’s individual and institutional members, not only demonstrated to the CAORC board that ARISC was a viable organization, but showed concretely how much progress ARISC has made in building our organization.

Another project during the past year was to apply for a 4-year grant from the Department of Education specifically for American Overseas Research Centers. ARISC officers, especially Vice-President Bill Fierman and Secretary Lauren Ristvet, as well as many board members dedicated a large amount of time preparing the proposal. Data gathering about the status of the study of the South Caucasus among member institutions as well as non-member ones yielded interesting data about the growth of interest in the area among scholars in many fields. That was part of the case we made to the DOE in the application submitted on April 4, 2011. Unfortunately, on May 20, we were informed that the program was cancelled due to Federal budget cuts [http://www2.ed.gov/programs/iegpsaorc/applicant.html]. In writing the grant many innovative ideas for programming and grants were developed and we will seek funds to support them from other sources.

ARISC did receive two grants this year, the first from the Leon Levy Foundation to support a meeting to plan 5-year goals and identify possible funding to support them. An outgrowth of that meeting was the second grant, from Project Discovery! to support collaborative Armenian-American projects on the Cultural Heritage of Armenia. ARISC has just awarded the first grant under that program.

The meeting, held in September 2010, was a wonderful opportunity for the ARISC board to meet in person, instead of our customary electronic forum. Certainly the synergy of so many dedicated people together for the weekend yielded a vibrant outline for ARISC’s future. It also provided an opportunity to meet many individual members who are not on the board; learning from them about their experiences in the SC and their reasons for joining ARISC inspire us to keep moving forward.

Karen
New Programs
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LEON LEVY FOUNDATION GRANT

We are deeply grateful to the Leon Levy Foundation for a $10,000 grant that enabled us to hold a planning meeting in late September 2010. The Leon Levy Foundation, founded in 2004, is a private, not-for-profit foundation created from Leon Levy’s Estate. The Foundation endeavors to continue Leon Levy’s philanthropic legacy and to build on his vision, encouraging and supporting excellence in several areas, including the Arts and Humanities.

PLANNING MEETING

Ten ARISC Directors as well as the Executive Director met at the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World (ISAW) at New York University to discuss the previous year’s operations, activities and challenges, hold elections for open officer seats and brainstorm both short- and long-term ideas for fundraising to sustain the organization.

Since most of our directors had never met one another, as our annual meetings have been held through teleconferencing, the opportunity to finally meet colleagues and exchange ideas proved extraordinarily valuable for ARISC and was extremely fruitful. Our Directors identified six short-term goals and laid the framework for a vision of ARISC some five years down the line. We also created a fundraising committee, consisting of two Directors. The opportunity to have South Caucasus experts with diverse experiences in one room to discuss ideas led to a vibrant dynamic we have not seen during our teleconferenced meetings.

Our Directors left the meeting with an energized sense of duty to our still young organization and have worked towards making several of those goals a reality. We thank the Leon Levy Foundation for the unique opportunity to bring together our Directors in one room to brainstorm and plan a new way forward for our organization.

GRANT FROM PROJECT DISCOVERY!

ARISC was awarded a grant of $25,000 from Project Discovery!, an independent, non-profit organization dedicated to the discovery and preservation of the archaeological and cultural legacy of ancient Armenia.

With this grant and several additional donations, ARISC has established a Collaborative Heritage Management Grant in the Republic of Armenia. The call invited proposals from collaborative teams in support of the preservation and conservation of the Republic of Armenia’s archaeological and historical heritage. This ARISC program, generously funded by Project Discovery!, seeks to foster joint work between American and Armenian scholars and institutions dedicated to the proper curation of heritage materials such as artifacts, sites, and manuscripts.

ARISC aims to establish similar grants for Azerbaijan and Georgia.

ARISC's first recipients of the Collaborative Heritage Management in Armenia competition, with a grant of $2,500, are Lyssa Stapleton (University of California, Los Angeles) and Dr. Pavel Avetisyan (Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography of the National Academy of Sciences of Armenia): Long-Term Preservation of Artifacts from the Site of Areni-1, Armenia.

JSTOR

Access to the humanities, social science, science and business research tool JSTOR is available in Yerevan, Baku, and Tbilisi for the scholarly community through the support and cooperation of the Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC).

JSTOR provides electronic access to past and current volumes of many scholarly journals including those on the lists found at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/archives/collections.jsp.

All three CRRC libraries are open from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM and their locations are available on the ARISC website (www.arisc.org).

Please be sure to inform the librarian that you heard about the resource through ARISC.

TRAVELING ABROAD?

ARISC has representatives in each of the South Caucasian countries who are available to assist with the logistics of your research. Need to find a mid-term place to stay before heading into the field? Would you like to rent a bus to take your students to various sites? Want to know which internet service to subscribe to? Contact our reps!

ARISC co-sponsors events both in the US and the countries of the South Caucasus to further knowledge about the area in the US, share recent scholarship and create links with local scholars. As a relatively new organization, we rely on the assistance of our members to make this possible. If you will be traveling to any of the South Caucasian states in 2011, please email info@arisc.org to let us know where and when you will be going.

In the past, many of our members have used this opportunity to give talks on their ongoing research or fieldwork and even collaborated their lectures with local scholars.

We would very much appreciate your help!
Megan Dean

“Neither Empire nor Nation: Networks of Trade in the Caucasus, 1750-1925”

My research seeks to map a history of the Caucasus that challenges readers to reflect upon the limits of identity politics, state control and violence and that puts the cycles of coexistence and violence into a broader historical perspective. Inhabitants of this region were not stateless, but they were accustomed to living beyond the reach of the state and to playing rival Ottoman, imperial Russian, Persian and European powers off one another. In focusing my research on flows of people and goods, I explore how basic economic exchanges and cultural interactions unfolded in daily life in the Caucasus, a frontier zone of multiple empires.

I prepared myself for archival research by sketching out three commodity communities connecting Tbilisi, Trabzon, and Batumi over the long nineteenth century. This sketch has served as a valuable reference point during these months in the archives. The first commodity community included pastoralists, indigenous inhabitants and Russian military settlers engaging in subsistence level trade. It eventually evolved into a broader agricultural and raw export oriented economy. The second commodity community traced long distance “silk road” trade from Persia to Trabzon via the Eastern Anatolian plain. The third commodity
community highlighted the development of an industrial economy through the trade of oil, kerosene, iron and manganese sectors in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. During my archival research I refer back to these three different commodity communities to ask how they adapted to the formal and informal presence of the Russian Empire in the region and how they reveal long-term changes in the power dynamics among traders, buyers and imperial elite, in the types of goods traded, and the geographic connections commerce forged.

I have focused my archival research in Georgia by reading records from the Governor General's Office, the Diplomatic Consular Archive, the legal department, and the Tbilisi courts. Within these repositories I have sought out petitions, legal contracts, formal claims (pretenziia), wills, and property records. These files enable me to follow who conducted business with whom and how they did so under varying circumstances. Many of these files are remarkably vivid stories of financial loss, familial frustrations, and more rarely flourishing success. I will continue to map and analyze them upon the completion of my research. While I am still in the process of collecting data, the research that I have collected thus far supports my initial hypotheses that networks of people trading with one another in the Caucasus are not clearly determined by strict ethnic or cultural identities. Traders actively engaged states but were never wholly controlled by them. States showed considerable flexibility in accommodating subjects and negotiating with regional rivals.

The richest subject I have pursued in these two months of ARISC-funded research involves the trade in people. While captive narratives are common in nineteenth-century Russian and Georgian literature, human trafficking has not been examined in previous archivally-based histories of the region. Thus I can use these archival discoveries to make a unique historiographical contribution. Diplomatic consular records have revealed extensive correspondence on the illegal trade of captives and runaways who crisscrossed between the Russian and Ottoman Empires. Property deeds issued in the Tbilisi courts, meanwhile, document the legal sale of serfs and transfers of state peasants.

Trade in people sheds light on the social history of the Caucasus in several different ways. It shows the state bureaucracies at work and how information circulated within communities and across political borders. It documents how the legal, cultural and social standing of individuals were debated and reassigned, often on a case by case basis. For example, the petitions of runaway peasants often feature complex conversion narratives. Yet it is clear that converting from the Orthodox Church to Islam, or vice versa, did not determine on which side of the Russo-Ottoman border the runaways would remain. Questions of identity aside, I see the combined study of illegal trade of slaves and the legal trade of serfs as an opportunity to investigate how the Russian Empire reshaped the illicit and licit boundaries of trade in the region. Juxtaposing the trade of people with other commodities will, I believe, make this study of how the formal and informal presence of the Russian Empire influenced the development of social life in the Caucasus a more compelling narrative for readers.

My ongoing research presents an interpretive challenge about how I may depict the geography of trading networks in the Caucasus in my dissertation. Reading nineteenth-century merchants’ wills and contractual disputes in the
Georgian archives shows me that nineteenth century merchants did business on a global scale. The files that I have read include a wide range of cities such as Alexandria, Diyarbakir, Glasgow, Istanbul, Leipzig, Lyon, Manila, and Moscow. At the same time, I have also taken many notes on more localized trading across villages and with Tbilisi. The picture that emerges differs from what I had imagined previously because it is simultaneously broader and narrower than I anticipated. The raw data does not easily suggest a history of specific trading circuits or enable me to follow the careers of individual merchants over long periods of time. Rarely have I been able to read about the same merchant twice. Instead I may need to establish a coherent narrative from a collage of commercial transactions and isolated disputes among merchants.

Megan Dean is a PhD candidate in the History Department at Stanford University.

Aimee Dobbs

“Negotiating Public Schools for Muslims among Russian Imperial Bureaucrats, Local Administrators, and Azerbaijani Elites, 1862-1890”

My dissertation research, which focuses on nineteenth-century discussions about Muslim schooling among Russian administrators and Azerbaijani elites, comprises six major resource bases: official state documents; Caucasian School District statistics and annual reports; district regulations, orders, and administrative literature regarding inorodtsy schooling; relevant articles in the Azerbaijani and Russian-language periodical press; correspondence among the Azerbaijani intelligentsia and state officials; and personal papers, diaries, and memoirs of those involved in the schooling project. Last summer’s fellowship period generally comprised the collection of materials pertaining to the latter five areas.

From the National Parliamentary Library of Georgia, I now have copies of the following statistical texts: Statistical Information concerning Educational Institutions of the Caucasian School District, 1879-1893 and the Digest of Statistical Information concerning Educational Institutions of the Caucasian School District over Twenty Years, 1878-1898 as well as copies of the District’s Commemorative Books for 1879 and 1880 (pamiatnaia knizhka). I have collected as many reports (1883-1900) of the District’s Curator as possible and as many pertinent regulations, orders, and circulars as I could identify from 1867 to 1900. For reference materials, I have a copy of the Digest of Orders Printed in the Circulars of the Caucasus School District, 1867-1902 and the Index of the Contents of the Circulars of the Caucasus School District, 1877-1886. Information from these statistics and reports will reveal the nature of the imperial schooling project in the Caucasus as well as its evolution over time.

From administrative literature, I have collected the works of local education administrators, teachers, and pedagogues. L. N. Modzalevskii’s The Path of Educational Issues in the Caucasus from 1802-1880, Director A. I. Slovinskii’s Jubilee Presentation of Zakavkazskii Teachers’ Seminary in Tbilisi from 1901, and a compilation of articles on teaching Russian language and literacy by educators from the Caucasian School District are some examples. These publications will elucidate local administrators’ attitudes towards the Caucasian schooling project and provide insight into specific challenges faced by them.

In periodical literature, I have collected articles from Kavkaz, Novoe Obozrenie, Russkaia Shkola, and Kavkazskii Kalendár’. Most of these articles focus on inorodtsy education, although some of them discuss the nature and value of Azerbaijani-language publications, particularly newspapers. Using these and previously-collected articles from other publications, I am tracing lines of discussion about schooling and language issues as well as assessing the continuities and changes in those discussions over time.

At the National Archives of Georgia I identified and collected some correspondence among Azerbaijani elites, school directors, the Curator of the Caucasian School District, the Caucasian Censorship Committee, the Viceroy’s office, and state ministries that ranged from permissions for opening Muslim schools, publishing Azerbaijani newspapers, printing Tatar-language textbooks, and summarizing philanthropic societies’ activities to letters from the Ministry of Internal Affairs to the region’s provincial governors requesting information about the Muslim progressive movement and local administrative impressions of the movement’s character (f. 422, 480, 12). Correspondence will reveal the dynamic character of exchange, the spaces of negotiation, as well as the variety of personalities involved. Unfortunately, I was not able to collect as much of the correspondence as I would have liked due to time and cost-constraints. However, I now know what is available in Tbilisi, so I will endeavor to make another trip in the near future.

Of particular importance are the papers I collected about Zakavkazskii Teachers’ Seminary: circulars about its opening, reports of the Viceroy’s visits, articles about the Seminary, curriculum descriptions, pupil/staff lists, and reports by the Seminary’s Director and the Inspector of the Tatar Department (f. 416, 422). Unfortunately, the fond for Zakavkazskii Teachers’ Seminary (f. 1722) was surprisingly thin and primarily spanned the years 1900-1920. And despite my best efforts and the professional assistance from CRRC, the National Archive, and the National Parliamentary Library, I was unable to
locate materials once housed at the Museum of the Ministry of Public Education - Georgia SSR. This museum no longer exists and the whereabouts of its fondy are unknown, even to the Ministry of Education. Still, the documents I have collected will elucidate the centrality of this institution to Azerbaijani socio-intellectual development.

For personal papers, diaries, and memoirs, I now have copies of Lev Modzalevsky’s autobiography, the diary of P.A. Valuev, and High Commissioner Vorontsov-Dashkov’s memoirs of his first years in the Caucasus. From the National Archives, I copied K. P. Yanovsky’s and Hasan Bek Zardabi’s career summaries as well as correspondence discussing their contemporary positions. I also have the personal papers regarding the teaching positions of Firudin Bek Kocharli (Yerevan Gymnasium) and Hasan Bek Zardabi (Baku Real School). These materials add to the collection of documents of the Azerbaijani intelligentsia that I compiled a year ago at the Institute of Manuscripts in Baku. Similar to correspondence and literature, personal papers, diaries, and memoirs disclose vast information about the stances, attitudes, and the character of those involved in the schooling discourse.

In addition to materials-collection, I have also continued to enter relevant titles and material locations to the bibliographic database that I have been developing over the last year and a half. To date, the database contains over 900 entries comprising secondary and primary materials in Russian and Azerbaijani mainly on the topics of nineteenth and early twentieth century inorodtsy education and Azerbaijani socio-intellectual and educational development.

An in-depth analysis of these materials will illustrate the nature and evolution of discourse among Russian administrators and Azerbaijanis regarding Muslim schooling, and by extension, reveal the complexities and intricacies of the Russian Empire’s colonial relationship with its southern periphery.

Last summer’s research has shown Tbilisi and its surrounds to be an apical point of colonial convergence. In my study, the city afforded the environment, access, and spaces for Azerbaijani socio-intellectual development. Virtually all of the Azerbaijani “enlighteners” from the mid-nineteenth to early twentieth centuries lived, worked, and/or were educated in or around the city. This is also true for the Georgian and, to a lesser extent, Armenian intelligentsias.

Institutions of cultural production, such as the colonial-administrative apparatus, imperial schools (specifically Zakavkazskii Teachers’ Seminary), printing presses, and philanthropic societies drove the development of ethno-religiously-based intelligentsias in the Caucasus; and all were centered or began in Tbilisi. Hence the impact of these institutions upon Azerbaijani cultural and intellectual development is not unique.

From the late 1840s, the Russian state employed government grants as a method to train native cadres for the civil service. And despite Grand Duke Mikhail Nikolaevitch’s reticence to continue this trend in the 1860s and 1870s, the state’s new venture towards developing native teacher cadres for village and uezd schools gave non-Russians new opportunities for official state recognition of their right to actively participate in the imperial system.

With the exception of one, all of the first Azerbaijani newspapers (Ziya, Ziya-i Kavkaz, Keshkul) were originally published in Tbilisi. Articles passed through the Caucasus Censorship Committee before finding a place on the newsstand and thus in a direct manner the Committee took part in “educating” editors through their article prohibitions and commentary and in some cases, scathing reviews. Editors thus learned...
what to include in their papers and how to approach the committee when articles were banned. Hence the committee inadvertently became a principal shaping force of both the form and content of the Empire's first Muslim newspapers.

If newspapers were the voice of Tbilisi’s non-Russian intelligentsia, then philanthropic societies became the key promoters of newly-conceived, socio-intellectual and cultural tenets that fused tradition with modernity and linguistic/religious uniqueness with the intelligentsias’ call to cultural preservation. Tbilisi’s philanthropic societies invested time and money into the development of schools, native-language materials, translations, and teacher training. So like the state, these institutions fostered the Georgian, Armenian, and Azerbaijani intelligentsias’ development, respectively. Though similar institutions existed in St. Petersburg and Moscow, remarkable is the spread of non-Russian philanthropic societies to Baku at the turn of the century. For instance, Neshr-Maarif (founded by Hasan Bek Zardabi and Zeynal Abdin Taghiev) played the same role in society as did Tbilisi’s Society for the Spread of Literacy among Georgians.

Through educational and work experiences the Azerbaijani intelligentsia became invested in the state apparatus. And their newly-established capital was predominately state-dependent. Whether by direct participation in or observation of cultural-producing institutions, Tbilisi’s Azerbaijani “immigrants” cultivated social and cultural capital that later came to challenge traditional Azerbaijani circles of power. The newly-emerging Azerbaijani elite eventually endeavored to use its new position as a liaison between the state and the local Muslim population as a method by which to claim the right to lead a modernization campaign, thereby attempting to redefine local educational, social, and cultural values.

This research trip to Tbilisi was nothing less than transformative. Not only was I able to further develop my understanding of the relationship between state and the Azerbaijani intelligentsia, I was able to contextualize this relationship within the larger regional setting. That was imperative since Soviet and Western histories of the Caucasus generally demarcate the region by SSR borders. For instance, histories of Azerbaijan predominately focus on the occurrences, people, dates, etc. within the borders of Azerbaijan SSR despite the fact that in the nineteenth century the area was demarcated in a completely different fashion. Consequently, new scholars of the region face a long-established, yet misleading paradigm that shapes their understanding and approach to the historical subject. My work in Tbilisi broke down that paradigm, replacing it with a more accurate understanding of the region as well as of the place of my subjects within it.

Aimee Dobbs is a PhD candidate in the History Department at Indiana University.

Sarah Garding

“Courting the Nation Abroad: Diaspora Policies in Postcommunist Armenia, Croatia, and Serbia”

My dissertation looks at sending state policies to engage or limit the participation of emigrants and their kin in the politics of their perceived homeland. This includes policies on citizenship, extraterritorial voting, parliamentary representation, and formal state agencies dedicated to diaspora affairs. The question that motivates this research is the following: Why do some sending/diasporic states institutionalize avenues of diaspora participation and representation in the homeland polity while others try to limit it? To answer it, I use qualitative and quantitative research methods to assess varying policies in post-Soviet Armenia and post-Yugoslav Croatia and Serbia. I am also compiling a cross-national dataset to analyze broader trends amongst sending states.

My field research in Armenia, Croatia, and Serbia included semi-structured interviews with government officials, party organizers, local experts, and diaspora returnees. I also use government documents, parliamentary debate transcripts, party records, and local and diaspora news media to reconstruct debates over the diaspora's role in the homeland. I met with leaders of the Serbian and Croatian diaspora communities in Berlin and Stuttgart, Germany, in July 2010. This fall I will carry out short-term research in diaspora communities in North America.

My research in the West Balkans and South Caucasus suggests that the predominant argument made by scholars researching diaspora/emigration policies in the Latin American context, which highlights resource dependency and economic transition as the primary motives for engaging the diaspora, does not hold in the postcommunist context. Political calculations on the part of homeland political elites were an extremely important factor. I found that political actors' concerns about the effects of diaspora involvement on electoral competition and, to a lesser extent, foreign policy agendas strongly mediated any supposed relationship between economic dependence on diaspora resources and government policies towards the diaspora. The fact that many former sending states and which are no longer directly dependent on economic resources from the diaspora are nevertheless finding ways to incorporate them into the homeland polity suggests that economic factors are not a necessary condition for state engagement of the diaspora. Similarly, there are numerous sending states whose economies are highly dependent on the diaspora’s remittances and aid, yet resist demands for dual citizenship and the right to vote abroad.

The late communist and early postcommunist period marked the
formation of new political parties and factions. It was during this time that homeland political elites calculated the potential impact of diaspora money and votes on the electoral fortunes of their party vehicles. These calculations were based on existing stocks of knowledge on the diaspora landscape, as well as new contacts that they—or their opponents—forged with diaspora actors during this time. This was extremely important in establishing the trajectory of state-diaspora relations. For instance, in Croatia, the future president, Franjo Tudjman, began annual trips to North America in 1987—well before the 1990 elections. These trips allowed him to make vital contacts with diaspora activists, develop his future party’s political platform, mobilize resources, and generate a sense of momentum. Thanks to diaspora donations, the party competed in the 1990 founding election with a campaign war chest of USD 2-4 million, compared to other new opposition parties, whose resources were in the thousands. At this time, given economic statism and a paucity of private domestic capital, outside resources—whether from the diaspora or foreign organizations and governments—had a strong effect on the distribution of resources among the homeland’s new parties.

To return Croatian example, voting rights and diaspora representation were extended because it was clear that the HDZ, which controlled the government and parliament at the time of passage, would receive the lion’s share of the diaspora’s electoral and material support. Other parties that had tried and failed to lure diaspora support were, not surprisingly, opposed to extending these rights.

In Serbia, Slobodan Milosevic and his party vehicle, the SPS, dominated the political agenda throughout the 1990s. Despite early hints of support from the diaspora, Milosevic could never be as certain as Tudjman as to who the diaspora would support. Some of the opposition right-wing parties, whose ideologies had an affinity to the dominant political ideologies of the diaspora at that time, sent delegates to North America and Europe during the late 1980s and early 1990s, and they had set up branches in the diaspora. Milosevic certainly did not want to risk the influx of votes and, more importantly, resources to the parties opposed to him.

In Armenia, by contrast, the diaspora had long been split along partisan lines, and rather than join forces with one or another of the new parties that sprouted in Armenia, they came out with a joint statement in 1988 calling for caution and restraint and went against popular opinion and the strategies of the nationalist Karabakh movement. This early display of independent political maneuvering on the part of the diaspora set the stage for future showdowns between the diaspora parties, particularly the Dashnaks, and the ruling APNM and President Ter-Petrosyan. By reintroducing separate parties in the early 1990s, these antagonisms were reinforced. In ruling circles there continues to be hesitation of extending liberal dual citizenship and extraterritorial voting rights to the diaspora, as the fact that Armenians outside of Armenia outnumber Armenians within Armenia by two to one could heavily affect electoral outcomes if dual citizenship were easily obtained and the diaspora had the right to vote outside of Armenia. It is certainly not a coincidence that external voting rights were eliminated when dual citizenship was reluctantly conceded in 2007. Whereas the Croatian diaspora by and large acted as a junior partner and supporter of the ruling party and government (at least in the 1990s) and the Serbian diaspora refrained from lending significant support to any political faction, the Armenian diaspora parties participated directly and in competition with other party formations in the homeland.

The first postcommunist period of sweeping elite turnover (1998 in Armenia and 2000 in Croatia and Serbia) also disrupted politics-as-usual and was a second period for reconfiguring state-diaspora ties and elite attitudes towards diaspora involvement. For example, state-diaspora relations improved remarkably in Serbia after the opposition came to power in 2000. By contrast, government policies towards the Croatian diaspora were scaled back after the opposition came to power in 2000, and this trend continued even after a reformed HDZ returned to power in 2003. In Armenia, too, state-diaspora ties improved after Robert Kocharyan claimed power in 1998, although overall there has continued to be a reluctance to incorporate the Armenian diaspora into the homeland political community.

Some homeland parties invested heavily in developing an international organizational infrastructure in diaspora communities, while others were less active in this area. Given the fact that the most vocal and active elements of the Armenian, Croatian, and Serbian diasporas tended to be anti-communist and nationalist, it was typically nationalist, right-of-center parties in the homeland that were most active in transnationalizing their activities—the HDZ in Croatia (and to a lesser extent the HSP, HNS and HSLS) and the SPO in Serbia. Again, in Armenia the situation was different because the pre-existing diaspora parties already had an extensive organizational infrastructure in the diaspora. So whereas Croatian and Serbian parties were essentially homesteading in communities where older parties had not already staked a claim, Armenian homeland parties, had they opted to build branches abroad, would have had to compete with already institutionalized parties in the diaspora.

In Armenia, to a greater extent than during my field research in Croatia and Serbia, I gained a greater awareness of the different ways in which individuals identify as belonging to a diaspora, and
the ways in which they participate in diaspora communities. While my diaspora respondents in Croatia and Serbia were primarily returnees of an older generation, who tended to be active in traditional diaspora organizations during their time abroad (folklore groups, general benevolence societies, traditional political parties, political movements), my respondents in Armenia had more varied backgrounds and “practiced” being diasporans in different ways. One of the upshots of doing my field research in the summer was that I had the opportunity to speak with a variety of diasporans of all ages who were visiting for the summer, including a group of young birth right volunteers. My exchanges with younger generations of diasporans made me realize that the forms of participation across generational cohorts are not static. The fact that young diasporans are less inclined to participate in the same types of cultural or political groups that their grandparents participated in doesn't mean that they are less involved, but rather that they are participating in different ways, albeit ways that are less quantifiable because they tend not to be through formal organizations. I was particularly struck by the deep affiliation that my diaspora respondents had with the “Armenian Cause” and the strong identification of young respondents, who were third or fourth generation Americans of Armenian descent, as belonging to the Armenian diaspora. Most of them spoke Armenian (with varying levels of proficiency) and felt an attachment to a perceived external homeland that is much stronger than is typically felt by third or fourth generation descendants of immigrants. Indeed, the descendants of Croatian and Serbian immigrants to Europe, North America, and Australia tended to assimilate fairly quickly and thoroughly within several generations. Of course, because I was speaking with diaspora youth who were visiting Armenia, my “sample” is inherently biased, and it is not clear how representative they are of the broader community of Armenian youth in the diaspora. Still, based on my discussions with them, as well as some background reading, the preservation of Armenian identity and culture (preserved in the sense that it continues to exist, not in the sense that it is passed along unchanged) is remarkably strong. My sense is that Armenian identity tends to be most strongly “preserved” across generations in communities of Armenians that went to countries that are not traditional immigration countries. In the Armenian case, this would be communities in countries like Iran, Lebanon, and Syria, as opposed to traditional immigrant receiving countries like the U.S., Australia, and Canada and, to a lesser extent, France. An interesting comparison would be the Croatian communities in South American countries, which also tend to be significantly less assimilated than the descendants of contemporaneous immigrants to North America and Australia.

Another interesting difference amongst the Armenian, Croatian, and Serbian diasporas is the ways in which they became engaged. A noteworthy difference in the manner in which some elements of the Armenian diaspora participated is their practice of direct participation; that is, reestablishing traditional, hitherto diaspora-based parties to compete directly in elections. Yet another subset of the diaspora seems to concentrate its efforts on the issue of genocide recognition, with participation in day-to-day politics a much lower priority. Some of my respondents, both diasporans and homeland party officials, criticized the diaspora for its relatively weak reaction to the March 2008 post-election violence in Armenia.
In contrast to Armenia’s Dashnaks, Hunchaks, and Ramgavars, major players in the Croatian diaspora took on an auxiliary role, acting as supporters to new homeland parties (almost exclusively the HDZ), and Serbs in the diaspora were so divided amongst themselves that they virtually lacked the ability to concentrate their efforts to the benefit of any particular party or faction. I believe that these varied patterns of political influence—direct competition, concentrated support for one/few homeland parties, dispersed support, and abstention—reflect broader differences in the ways in which diaspora organizations participate in homeland politics. The sources of this variation are a fascinating and under-studied area of research in diaspora and migration studies.

Sarah Garding is a PhD candidate in the Department of Political Science at the University of California, Berkeley.

2010-11 Graduate Fellowships

In our second year of awarding Graduate Fellowships, three awards of $1,500 were made to graduate students enrolled in degree-granting programs in the US. The aim of these awards is to help cover travel to and/or living expenses in the Southern Caucasus. Several highly qualified applicants applied. Awards were made for the following projects.

- The Forgotten Revolt: The 1956 Pro-Stalinist Protests in Soviet Georgia and its Cold-War Implications (Melissa Gayan, Emory University).
- Documentation of Khinalug (Tamrika Khvitsishvili, University of Utah).

ARISC members can look forward to reports on these projects in forthcoming newsletters. ARISC sends its best wishes to the awardees for a fruitful research season!

ARISC In Appreciation

ARISC would like to thank all our 2010-11 country representatives for their tremendous work. In Armenia, Richard Antaramian, Armine Nalbandian and Yurik Avetisyan have been assisting; Leyla Rustamli and Leah Feldman were the ARISC Representatives in Azerbaijan; and in Georgia, ARISC was represented by William Sadd, Etuna Tsintsadze and Giorgi Bedianashvili.

We are also very grateful to the Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC), especially Hans Gutbrod (Regional Director), and Country Directors Heghine Manasyan (Armenia), Gursel Aliyev (Azerbaijan) and Koba Turmanidze (Georgia), for allowing us space and resources at their libraries for our country representatives. Sabina Manafova and Anar Valiyev; as well as Jeyhun Karamov of the US-Educated Azerbaijani Alumni Association, have assisted with coordinating events in Azerbaijan, as has Timothy Blauvelt of American Councils in Georgia.

And many, many thanks to everyone at the Council of American Overseas Research Centers (CAORC) for all their assistance and guidance in helping us make big strides towards establishing our centers.

Donations

ARISC is very fortunate and thankful to have received generous donations from Lusine and Tigran Martirosyan, Rose and John Hagopian, and from the Harry and Ovsanna Chitjian Family Foundation in support of the Cultural Heritage Management in Armenia Grant. Thank you!
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“Courting the Nation Abroad: Diaspora Policies in Post-communist Armenia, Croatia and Serbia”

Sarah Garding
PhD candidate, University of California, Berkeley
ARISC Fellow

August 27, 2010
14.00-16.00
CRRC-Armenia

Over the last several decades, a growing number of contemporary and historical sending states have developed policies to engage their diasporas in the politics and economy of the homeland. In Eastern Europe and Eurasia, the collapse of communism presented a unique opportunity for new governments to reconfigure relations with their diasporas and overcome the antagonism that had hitherto marred state-diaspora relations. This talk addressed the varying approaches to engaging the diaspora in post-Soviet and post-Yugoslav Armenia, Croatia, and Serbia. Specifically, it focused on citizenship policies, extraterritorial voting, parliamentary representation, and the creation of diaspora bureaucracies -- policies that are often used by sending states to deepen emigrants' political ties to their country of perceived origin. These three postcommunist countries simultaneously grappled with war, independence, state-building, and economic collapse, and thus one might expect to find strong policies to engage the diaspora. In fact, governments in these three states showed varied willingness to deepen state-diaspora ties. This talk assessed the sources of this variation.

Sarah Garding is a PhD candidate in the Department of Political Science at the University of California, Berkeley. Her dissertation looks at the policies of post-Soviet Armenia and post-Yugoslav Croatia and Serbia towards diaspora populations, and the participation of the latter in homeland political affairs in the wake of independence. She carried out the research for this project in Croatia and Serbia during 2009-2010 as an IREX fellow, and was in Yerevan as a fellow with the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus.

This talk was co-sponsored by the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus (ARISC) and the Caucasus Research Resource Center (CRRC).

“Rethinking the Origins of Civilization in Azerbaijan: 2010 Excavations at Oglanqala, Naxcivan”

Dr. Lauren Ristvet
University of Pennsylvania

August 10, 2010
7:00pm
Azerbaijan University of Languages
Baku, Azerbaijan

From 2008-2010, a joint American-Azerbaijani team of archaeologists and scientists have been excavating an Iron Age site called Oglanqala in Naxcivan. The project focuses on the creation of a small state during the 9th century, one of the earliest in Azerbaijan, and the important roles resistance and cultural exchange played in the origins of politics here. The fortification walls of Oglanqala enclose an area of 12 hectares, but there are extensive architectural remains and pottery scatters across a 50 hectare area, making this one of the largest sites in the Caucasus from this period. Excavation has revealed four phases, from 1200-100 BC, during which this site was one of the principle centers of Azerbaijan.

Lauren Ristvet (BA, Yale 1999; MPhil, PhD, Cambridge 2005) specializes in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern history and archaeology, with an emphasis on the formation and collapse of archaic states, landscape archaeology, human response to environmental disaster, and ancient imperialism. She is the associate director of excavations at Tell Leilan, Syria (ancient Shehna/Shubat-Enlil), where she has excavated since 1999. This was one of the largest ancient cities in Northern Mesopotamia, and the short-lived capital of the Kingdom of Upper Mesopotamia during the 18th century B.C. She is also co-director of the Naxcivan Archaeological Project in Naxcivan, Azerbaijan, a combined survey and excavation project.

This event is co-sponsored by the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus (ARISC) and the US Educated Azerbaijani Alumni Association (AAA).
This presentation focused on the role of Tbilisi and its surrounds in fostering the development of an Azerbaijani intelligentsia in the mid-late nineteenth century. Of particular focus are the institutions of cultural production; the colonial-administrative apparatus, Imperial schools (specifically Gori Teachers' Seminary), printing presses, and philanthropic societies that generated spaces for cultural and intellectual development among immigrant Azerbaijanis. Whether by direct participation in or observation of these institutions, through their experiences these men cultivated state-dependent social and cultural capital that came to challenge traditional Azerbaijani circles of power. This newly-emerging Azerbaijani elite eventually endeavored to use its new position as a liaison between the state and the local Muslim population as a method by which to claim the right to lead the modernization campaign, thereby redefining local educational, social, and cultural values. Thus an understanding of Tbilisi's influence upon the Azerbaijani intelligentsia aids Ms. Dobbs' overall dissertation research by providing a point of genesis from which they came to understand themselves as the heart of the modernization campaign and the Russian Imperial state as a lever of transformation.

Aimee Dobbs is a PhD Candidate from Indiana University Department of History and an ARISC Fellow. Her research is on nineteenth-century Russian Imperial educational efforts and local Azerbaijani responses from 1862 to 1890. In the summer of 2010 she had been researching in Tbilisi, Georgia on a grant from the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus. In the previous year she spent her time researching in Baku, Azerbaijan on a Fulbright-Hays grant. Ms. Dobbs's primary research interests include education policies and the establishment of non-Russian schools in late imperial Russia, colonial relationships, and the formation of nationalism among the Russian empire's Muslim groups.

This talk was co-sponsored by the Caucasus Research Resource Center (CRRC) and the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus (ARISC).

The Kura Araxes Culture is a unique culture of the 4th and early 3rd millennia BC in the Transcaucasian area. Originally thought to be a minor village culture, it is now clear that it was part of an ancient globalization stretching from the Persian Gulf to the plains of the North Caucasus opening into eastern Europe and western China. Peoples from the Transcaucasus migrated into the Taurus and Zagros Mountains all the way to the north Jordan valley of modern Israel in the early 3rd millennium creating a unique blending of cultures. This illustrated talk spoke of the nature of this culture and work of an Armenian-American team under the leadership of Hakop Simonyan at Shengavit.

Dr. Mitchell Rothman is a Professor of Anthropology and Archaeology at Widener University in Pennsylvania and a consulting scholar at the University of Pennsylvania Museum. Beginning in 1974 he has been doing archaeology in the greater Middle East, first in Iran then Turkey, and now Armenia and has analyzed material from Iraq. His interest is in the development of cultures in the 4th and 3rd millennia BC. His publications include books on the theory of cultural evolution, Tepe Gawra, Iraq, Godin Tepe, Iran, and the Uruk Culture of Mesopotamia. His interest in the Kura Araks Culture began while surveying in Mus by Lake Van.

This talk was co-sponsored by the Caucasus Research Resource Center (CRRC) and the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus (ARISC).
Adam Walker presented his PhD research in this talk. The question of the eventual success of the Georgian wine industry on the international wine market is the subject of intense scrutiny among a variety of state, private, and development interests within Georgia, a focus which has, since privatization, considerably narrowed the scope of rural interventions. This focus on wine is understandable since, aside from its status as a privileged export commodity, wine is a beverage that has wide-ranging symbolic and political importance in Georgia. As an essential requirement in toasting during the supra, wine operates as a complex symbol that mediates conflicting ideologies of consumption, idealized forms of sociality, and claims to nation and “tradition.”

Yet the particularities of decollectivization and privatization of land and wineries have produced a disjuncture between the interests of large-scale producers and re-traditionalized, land-holding farmers. This paper was an attempt to articulate how the increasing economic and social inequality that is part and parcel of the neoliberalizing postsocialist Georgian landscape can be analyzed by foregrounding the contestation over the meaning and value of wine and its intersection with claims over property and terroir. In particular, the push to integrate Georgian wine production into an international marketplace by a matrix of state, private, and international-development interests is accompanied by a range of techniques which, in the name of the “protection of Georgian wine appellations,” may increasingly reconfigure the bases on which the construction and consolidation of value can take place, and claims by rural populations for state-intervention can be legitimized.

In this talk, Erin Hofmann presented her Ph.D. project, which focused on gender differences in the motivations for labor migration from Georgia. In this mixed methods project, she used a combination of statistical analysis and in-depth interviews to explain the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of male and female migrants from Georgia, and explored the role of gender norms and family structures in explaining differences between male and female migration. Georgia is unusual among migrant-sending countries due to its high levels of both male and female migration, and the extreme diversity of destination countries where Georgian migrants can be found. The issue of migration from Georgia has received little attention outside the country, despite its potential to enrich our theories of gender and migration.

The presentation focused on the theoretical background of the research, the challenges of conducting migration research in Georgia, the potential benefits of combining survey data and interviews, and methods for exploring migration as a household decision.
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Workshop: Research Grant Writing

This workshop, led by Anar Valiyev and Sabina Manafova, aimed to help scholars and academicians in the humanities and social sciences learn how to write winning proposals for research related grants. A comprehensive, hands-on workshop that covered researching funding sources and writing real proposals, this program aimed to teach participants how to use the proposal writing format, the most widely used in the world. Participants left this workshop with new skills and the ability to apply those skills to their own needs or to the needs of their institutions.

During the first session, participants were given instruction and practical exercises going through all the stages of a grant proposal. In the second session participants prepared their own complete proposals related to their research interests, which were then reviewed and evaluated.

This workshop was sponsored by the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus (ARISC) and the Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC).

"On the Question How to do Study Dynamics of Violence in the South Ossetian Conflict: Patterns, Practices, Mechanisms"

In this WiP, Lara Sigwart presented her Ph.D. project, which studies dynamics of violence in the South Ossetian conflict from 1989 to 2008. In her project, she hypothesized that practices of state actors in the context of the conflict relate to their power-consolidating ambitions and, in this way, help to explain how violence came to escalate at certain points in time, and not at others. Considering this, structures such as Russian and Western policies, internal power shifts, economic incentives and political talks factor into the transitions between the respective phases of violence.

The presentation focused on the turning points in the process of violence after 1989, shedding light on the working hypotheses with which the project deals. The presentation then turned to the methodical problems the project faced at its current state, such as how to gather the data, how to use the data, and answers to be obtained from the data.

This series was co-sponsored by the Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC), American Councils for International Education, and the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus (ARISC).
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“Youth Culture in Modern Georgia - A Case of Westernization or Invention of a New Tradition?”

Dr. Lika Tsuladze

June 2, 2010
5:30 - 6:30pm
CRRC-Tbilisi, Georgia

In this WiP, Lika Tsuladze presented her research, which sought to find out how youth identities are constructed through bricolage in modern Georgia. The main method of her research is discourse analysis. In a unique way, Tsuladze has involved her students as co-researchers in her research in order to analyze the youth culture seen from the perspective of youth themselves.

This series was co-sponsored by the Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC), American Councils for International Education, and the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus (ARISC).

“Small Scale Monitoring of IDPs: the Art of the Possible”

David Jijelava

May 19, 2010
5:30 - 6:30pm
CRRC-Tbilisi, Georgia

In this talk, which was part of the WiP series, David Jijelava discussed a project he recently finished which involved a brief analysis of donor development projects going on in new settlements. He was then working to try to design another project to continue this analysis. He discussed this research and gained insights from attendees about what one can realistically achieve in small scale monitoring of this kind.

This series was co-sponsored by the Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC), American Councils for International Education, and the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus (ARISC).

“On Nationalism and Abkhazia: Theoretically speaking, of course”

William Sadd

May 5, 2010
5:30 - 6:30pm
CRRC-Tbilisi, Georgia

In this WiP, William Sadd outlined the different theoretical approaches to studying nationalism more generally, and explored what use, if any, the 'historical ethno-symbolist' approach can serve in understanding nationalism in Abkhazia at the end of the Soviet Era. This talk was a proposal, and still in early stages of development.

This series was co-sponsored by the Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC), American Councils for International Education, and the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus (ARISC).

“Studying Community Safety in a Post-Conflict Scenario”

Dr. Hans Gutbrod, Mr. David Wood, and Mr. Giorgi Babunashvili

April 28, 2010
6:00 - 7:00pm
CRRC-Tbilisi, Georgia

This talk was part of the Works-in-Progress (WiP) series. How do we get at community safety in a post-conflict scenario? How do we use focus groups to plan for a survey? This workshop introduced a draft questionnaire that was being designed for a survey in May 2010.

Registered participants received access to the questionnaire, which we then discussed in detail. The workshop was introduced by Hans Gutbrod, and co-moderated by David Wood from Saferworld (who has done similar work in Moldova, Macedonia and other locations) and Giorgi Babunashvili from CRRC.

This was a great session for learning about the nuances of questionnaire development.

This series was co-sponsored by the Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC), American Councils for International Education, and the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus (ARISC).

“Difference in Attitudes towards Political Participation of Azeris in Azerbaijan and Georgia”

Joshua Noonan
Fulbright fellow, Azerbaijan and Georgia

April 21, 2010
5:30 - 6:30pm
CRRC-Tbilisi, Georgia

This talk was part of the Works-in-Progress (WiP) series. Mr. Noonan’s topic concerned the comparison of the attitudes towards political participation for Azerbaijani minorities in Georgia and those attitudes of Azerbaijanis in Azerbaijan in order to find if and why these attitudes are divergent.

This series was co-sponsored by the Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC), American Councils for International Education, and the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus (ARISC).
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(Continued from Page 15)

"Complexity of the Caucasus"
Sarah Slye
April 14, 2010
5:30pm
CRRC-Tbilisi, Georgia

Undertaking academic research on the Caucasus in the Caucasus can be quite a challenge. It is a region usually overlooked not only because of its status as a borderland but also due to its complexity. Simply put most people can't handle it and don't get it. That's why, back in the USA, there are so few mentors for students interested in the region. Ms. Slye discussed several strategies for overcoming this handicap and emerging victorious.

This talk was part of the Works-in-Progress (WiP) series and was co-sponsored by the Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC), American Councils for International Education, and the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus (ARISC).

Workshop: "Anthropologies of the South Caucasus"
April 9, 2010, 10am - 6pm
Harriman Institute, Columbia University

A workshop sponsored by the Harriman Institute, Columbia University, and the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus.

Click here for the full program.
Click here for the workshop flyer.

"Neither Empire Nor Nation: Networks of Trade in the Caucasus, 1750-1925"
Megan Dean
Ph.D. candidate, Stanford University
ARISC Fellow
March 31, 2010
5:30pm
CRRC-Tbilisi, Georgia

Megan Dean presented her ongoing research, "Neither Empire Nor Nation: Networks of Trade in the Caucasus, 1750-1925" at Tbilisi's Caucasus Research Resources Center (CRRC). Her work probes the limits of identity politics, state control and violence and explores how basic economic exchanges and cultural interactions unfolded in daily life in the Caucasus, a frontier zone of multiple empires. A 2010 recipient of the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus (ARISC) Graduate Fellowship for her research at the National Archives of Georgia, she is also a Ph.D. Candidate in history at Stanford University in California.

This talk was co-sponsored by the Caucasus Research Resource Center (CRRC) and the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus (ARISC).

Works-in-Progress (WiP) Series
Spring 2010
Tuesday evenings
CRRC-Tbilisi, Georgia

This series was co-sponsored by the Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC), American Councils for International Education, and the American Research Institute of the South Caucasus (ARISC).

The purpose of this series was to provide support and productive criticism to those researching and developing academic projects pertaining to Georgia and the Caucasus region; and to engage the vibrant academic community living in Tbilisi, and local residents, with a more consistent level of discourse, discussion, and debate in consideration of the most curious matters concerning Georgia and its neighbors. Some of the other talks in this series (not mentioned above) included:

"Party' or 'Tusovka': A Questionnaire on the Changing Roles of English and Russian in Georgia"
- John King

"Georgian Dialectology and Language Contact in the Caucasus: Two Case Studies"
- Thomas Wier (Ph.D candidate, University of Chicago)

"How do Foreigners Learn Georgian? Results from a Small Expatriate Census"
- Dr. Hans Gutbrod and Mr. Malte Viefhues

“An Experiment in Language Status in Georgia”
- Dr. Timothy Blawelt (American Councils)
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Wall in Khinaliq, Azerbaijan. Photo by Alice Harris.

In Armenia, ARISC was very fortunate to have Richard Antaramian, Armine Nalbandian and Yurik Avetisyan as Representatives. Mr. Antaramian is a Ph.D. candidate in History at the University of Michigan. He spent 2009-10 in Armenia as a Fulbright-Hays Fellow, where his research focused on the history of social and political relations in 19th century Ottoman Anatolia, and assisted with creating country guides, our Facebook page and coordinating talks.

Ms. Nalbandian, an ARISC member, was working for the National Competitiveness Foundation for Armenia, when she also took on the responsibilities of ARISC’s Yerevan Rep. With a recent MS in Development Studies from the London School of Economics, she was instrumental in on-the-ground research for our application to the DoEd AORC grant.

Mr. Avetisyan has recently become ARISC’s newest Yerevan Rep. He has a BA in Political Science and English from Yerevan State Linguistic University. He is currently assisting scholars with their their travel needs to Yerevan in a very professional manner. Please contact him at ARISCYerevan@yahoo.com for any assistance you may need!

Leyla Rustamli was ARISC’s first Rep, both in Baku and for our organization. Ms. Rustamli completed her MA in Foreign Relations of the Middle and Near East Countries from Baku Statue University while working for ARISC, carefully putting together comprehensive guides on libraries, archives, local academics, lodging, and transportation. She assisted with visiting scholars and coordinated numerous events. Working on her PhD, she is a member of the teaching staff of the IR Dept. of the University of Languages.

Dr. Anar Vahiyev, who led our workshop in Baku, also stepped in to ably coordinate an ARISC talk in summer 2010.

Leah Feldman is a graduate student in Comparative Literature at UCLA. A Fulbright IEE Fellowship brought Ms. Feldman to Baku for several months. Under her enterprising leadership, ARISC started its first reading group, beginning with The Heavenly Rose Garden, by Abbas Qoli Aqa Bakikhano. Ms. Feldman was also key in conducting research for our application to the DoEd AORC grant.

Our current Baku Rep is Maryam Jabarova (see p18), who can be reached at ARISCBaku@yahoo.com.

Our Georgia Reps have been quite busy coordinating events. William Sadd, our first Georgia Rep, initiated and helped coordinate the Works-in-Progress series, cosponsored by CRRC and American Councils. This series runs weekly in Tbilisi, providing a unique opportunity for scholars to present ongoing research. A graduate of Boston College, Mr. Sadd’s research centers on nationalism and separatism in Georgia and the region of Abkhazia.

Etuna Tsintsadze-Maass taught graduate-level courses on conflict transformation as a visiting professor at the Georgian Inst. of Public Affairs and Tbilisi State University when she agreed to serve as the Tbilisi Rep in Summer 2010. She had completed her MA in International Peace Studies from the University of Notre Dame. Ms. Tsintsadze coordinated talks and worked on country guides for ARISC.

Our current Tbilisi Rep, Giorgi Bedianashvili, has a master’s in Archaeology from the University of Paris I-Sorbonne. He recently returned to Tbilisi after a semester at Purdue University as a Carnegie Fellow. Mr. Bedianashvili can be reached at ARISC TBilisi@yahoo.com and is working on coordinating several talks for ARISC.
Reps in Profile

MARYAM JABAROVA
BAKU REPRESENTATIVE
I entered Khazar University in Baku in 2008 and am now a 4th year BA student, majoring in European Studies. My research interests are focused on the EU enlargement and Azerbaijan’s integration to the Euro-Atlantic area.

While studying at Khazar, I have successfully participated in a number of conferences and trainings and simulation games, including the 3rd Security Forum of the Southern Caucasus and the Model OSCE Conference. I have successfully participated in the Imagine 2011 Armenian-Azerbaijani Dialogue Program, held in Bakuriani, Georgia.

I hold a number of certificates and also was awarded thrice with the Dean’s Honor List for academic performance. As a two-year member of the Khazar University Student Union, I was involved in organizing different conferences, sports events, debates as well as some charity events such as concerts. When I am not working, I love to read and to learn.

GIORGI BEDIANASHVILI
TBILISI REPRESENTATIVE
I obtained my master’s degree at the Sorbonne University. In 2006-2008 with the professional scholarship of the Ministry of Culture of France, I worked on the Caucasian archaeological collections stored at the National Archaeological Museum of France. And in 2010-2001 I was a Carnegie Fellow at Purdue University.

Currently, I work for the Georgian National Museum as an archaeologist. I have authored of a number of articles on Georgian Archaeology and have more than eight years of fieldwork experience in Georgia as well as abroad. My research interest is in Late Bronze/Early Iron Age of Caucasus.

YURIK AVETISYAN
YEREVAN REPRESENTATIVE
After my demobilization from the army, I matriculated at Yerevan State Linguistic University in 2006 specializing in Political Science and English Language. While my tuition was fully covered by the state, other expenses weren’t so I took a position as a night-shift hotel receptionist and completed my BA on a mere two-three hours’ sleep a day. I have also taken part in some volunteer activities including planting trees with the FYCA NGO in Armenia.

After graduation in 2010, I participated in the Expert School organized by political scientist Richard Giragosian (and founder of RSC), which gave me the chance to shift my theoretical knowledge of politics into a practical one. Now I have a window of opportunity to be the ARISC Yerevan Rep and by doing some volunteer work to feel valued by people who make an enormously invaluable contribution to foster and bolster scholarly study in the South Caucasus.
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