Situating the 'Global' in Contemporary Humanities
Conference
17 - 19 October 2019
Promyshlennaya 17, St Petersburg, Russia
School of Arts and Humanities, HSE St Petersburg
Working language: English

Paper Abstracts in the order of the timetable

The concept of the 'global' gained currency since the 1980s in the emergent paradigms of global history and the anthropology of globalisation, and the critique of comparative perspectives in area studies and literary scholarship. How is the global as a matter of academic concern interlinked with the globalisation after the end of the Cold War and more recent geopolitical, and ecological realities — as well as with the globalisation of the humanities and social sciences themselves? What are some of the contours of global networks, cultural flows and hierarchies which we explore — and in which we are also implicated as scholars, authors and teachers? How do academics react to the globalisation of politics of knowledge in different countries and regions? Discussing these issues is the goal of the first annual conference of the School of Arts and Humanities of the HSE St Petersburg.

17 October: 15:30 opening (room 302)

16:00 Roundtable "Global Histories of Empire" (room 302)
Organiser: Alexander Semyonov (HSE St. Petersburg)
Chair: Nikolai Ssorin-Chaikov (HSE St. Petersburg)
Participants: Evgeny Khvalkov (HSE in St. Petersburg), Felix Levin (HSE in St. Petersburg), Federica Morelli (University of Turin), Adrian Selin (HSE in St. Petersburg), Tatyana Borisova (HSE in St. Petersburg), Anton Kotenko (HSE in St. Petersburg), Alexander Semyonov (HSE in St. Petersburg).

The roundtable is aimed at discussing notable trends in historical research on early modern and modern empires. In the past twenty years, empire has emerged as a relatively novel category of historical research allowing historians to capture a phenomenon of sovereignty and diversity outside of the hegemonic nation-centered optics of power and socio-cultural relations. Much like the pursuit of global history, new histories of empires stressed connections and entanglements across the space of political and cultural diversity, as well as engaged in rethinking the Eurocentric narratives of history, bringing "European" and "non-European" centers and peripheries in the singly analytical framework. However, compared to nation the status of empire as a generic and generalizable category remains contested. The idea behind the roundtable is to survey the changes in the analytical toolkit of new imperial historians and to ascertain the possibility of, if not a comparative history of imperial formations, then meta-commentary on key questions of power and diversity in the dialogue between specialists on early modern and modern empires as well as "European" and "non-European" empires. Participants are asked to briefly report on key historiographic debates in their respective fields aiming at unpacking the analytical frames and categories at work, for instance, the usefulness of the category of composite monarchy, the relevance of the category of modernity for exploration of trajectories of imperial society, the added value of research on subjecthood-citizenship, the intended analytical innovation behind new categories, such as "imperial nation," the temporal framing and encapsulated narrative strategies in research on the origin, crises, persistence, and collapse of empire.

Early modern empires:
Evgeny Khvalkov *Venetian and the Genoese Influence on the Early Modern Castilian and Portuguese Colonization Experience*
Felix Levin, *The debate between Juan de Sepúlveda and Bartolomé Las Casas in the global context: discontinuities between early modern and modern colonial discourses.*

Federica Morelli, *Subjecthood and citizenship in the Spanish Atlantic. Is the imperial approach useful to frame this relationship?*
Adrian Selin, *The first attempt at "seeing like an empire": the Novgorod case in the Muscovy*

Modern empires:
Tatyana Borisova, *Empires and arms control*
Anton Kotenko, *Global history of imperial cities*
Alexander Semyonov, *Imperial continuities and imperial transformations*

18:30 Plenary session (room 302)
Key note address:
Poul Holm (Trinity College, Dublin), "The Human Touch: Why the Humanities are Needed for Global Environmental Change, and How"

Ruth Maclennan (Scott Polar Research Institute, University of the Arts, London) "Cloudberries" (2019, 22 min)
Abstract: This paper will discuss ideas of an artist's 'fieldwork' drawing on my research in the Russian Arctic and films (*Call of North, Hero City*). I will present *Cloudberries* (2019) filmed while travelling with an anthropologist, each of us conducting our own research, and exchanging ideas about fieldwork and practice. This paper discusses the contrasts in approach (the role of the subjective camera, open-ended questions, formal experimentation, improvisation) and their value for interdisciplinary research in the environmental humanities, giving voice to a place, and making tangible its political, poetic, psychological and environmental ecologies. 'Cloudberries' was filmed on the Kola Peninsula in a small fishing village along the Northern Sea Route during the hottest summer on record. The village has taken on geo-political significance because it is situated at the nearest point on land from the Shtokman gas field. But lives go on below the radar. The narrator - the filmmaker - is 'just visiting' with her camera. She sits chatting in kitchens, meeting villagers and visitors, listening to the sounds of wildlife and the sea, a music festival, and an abandoned school house full of life. She follows paths of desire (and profit) and sets out to sea.

18 October 11:00-17:00 Parallel panels:

Panel 1. "Environmental Humanities" 18 October 11:00-17:00 (room 414)

Per Högselius (KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden) From uranium to water: reinterpreting resource scarcity in the history of nuclear energy
Abstract: This paper challenges mainstream scholarly perspectives about resource scarcity in nuclear energy history. The conventional wisdom holds that *uranium* is the most critical resource in all things nuclear. By contrast, I argue that another natural resource has been at least as important: *water*. Water supplies, needed for cooling purposes, are of existential importance for nuclear energy. Massive volumes are needed – the flow in a typical modern reactor can amount to as much as 100 cubic meters per second. The water needs to continue flowing at all times, otherwise the reactor will start to heat up in a dangerous way and a core meltdown is around the corner. For this reason basically all nuclear power plants in the world are located in the immediate vicinity of very large natural bodies of water, like the sea, large lakes or major rivers. Unfortunately, this also makes them very vulnerable to flooding, as demonstrated in the most tragic way by the 2011 Fukushima disaster. I show that fears of scarcity of water has been at the heart of nuclear energy visions since as early as the 1930s, when science fiction writers started to elaborate with remarkable precision on the criticality of water for the imagined future of nuclear energy. A closer, systematic look at the most serious nuclear accidents and incidents that have actually taken place in the history of nuclear energy reveals that a vast majority of them are directly related to failures when it comes to mobilizing sufficient water supplies. The problem continues to plague the nuclear energy industry in the twenty-first century; today nuclear-hydraulic engineers struggle not only to enable sufficient volumes of water, but above all, as the world's rivers, lakes and seas are plagued by massive pollution, sufficient volumes of *clean* water.

Achim Klüppelberg (KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden) Nuclear Decision-making in the Soviet Union: Investigating Water in Expert Cultures Concerned with the Siting of Nuclear Power Plants

Abstract: This presentation aims to fill a twofold gap in the existing literature with regard to Soviet nuclear history. Firstly, water will be put at the centre of analysis of the Soviet nuclear programme to gain insights from formerly neglected crucial components of this particular industry. Pipes, valves, tanks, pumps, pressure mechanics and gravity approaches in passive systems all use much older inventions, which are generally not considered in the existing literature. Secondly, the cultural elements of the nuclear inner circle, composed of bureaucrats, politicians and scientific-technical personnel, will be investigated. Hence, it will be studied, how expert culture(s) influenced the decision-making process and the different forms of science communication of nuclear endeavours. It became obvious after the explosion of Chernobyl's fourth reactor block on 26 April 1986 that a specific *Technocratic Culture* in the Soviet nuclear industry hindered safety and largely contributed to this so far biggest acknowledged nuclear catastrophe. To further develop and challenge this argumentation, siting-discourses of several nuclear power plants in the period between 1965 and 1980 will be analysed under a water and expert culture perspective. This project will thus combine two analytical ideas in order to gain new valuable results for the evaluation of nuclear safety in a Soviet context. Consequently, these new insights shall serve to constructively broaden contemporary nuclear safety debates in order to decrease the future probability of atomic catastrophes.

Alexandra Bekasova (HSE St Petersburg), From 'Stepson of Nature' to Valuable Industrial Resource: Limestone in Russia, 1870-1920s

Abstract: Focusing on the accelerated use of limestone as a building material in Russia, and government sponsored scientific studies of widespread limestone deposits throughout the nineteenth-century, this contribution investigates the process of transforming common rocks into measurable and valuable natural resources indispensable for actualizing industrial development on a national scale. Special attention is given to the production of a new body of expert knowledge on the specific properties, qualities and practical uses of raw stone materials, to the actors involved in producing this knowledge, and to their crucial role in forming a scientific support system for the mining and construction industries, which gradually developed an institutional hierarchy in its own right.

Roger Norum (University of Oulu, Finland) and Alessandro Rippa (University of Colorado at Boulder, USA), "Environing Global Infrastructure Locally: China's 'green' Belt and Road development in Southeast Asia"

Abstract: China's global investments abroad are increasingly framed within the language of "green" development. Yet such rhetoric – often understood to lie somewhere between earnest environmentalist concern and blatant greenwashing – chafes with China's own multiple, and often conspicuous, environmental crises domestically. Scholarship on the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), China's global development-cum-geopolitical strategy, has thus far focused on its strategic and financial aspects, while interdisciplinary research on ecologies of Chinese building ambition has primarily investigated the environmental impacts of individual infrastructure projects. What the environmental humanities can bring to this field is scholarship that links empirical studies of infrastructure with research into the socio-environmental phenomena and discourse they produce, enabling us to map the planetary, world-making nature of global building projects. This crucial dynamic has yet to be studied from a comparative, transnational perspective. In this paper we discuss a new, five-year research project that brings critical, in-depth ethnographic analysis to the BRI's encroaching presence across Southeast Asia. By revealing the complex roles played by large-scale infrastructures in the quotidian lives of the communities they touch, the project aims to demonstrate how infrastructure forges new places, subjects, environments and epistemologies.

Amanda Bosworth (Cornell University), "Environmental Diplomacy in the North Pacific: How the Fur Seal Organized Nations as a Boundary Object/Subject, 1867-1911"

Abstract: My dissertation rests at the confluence of [marine] environmental history and foreign relations history. In particular, it shows how the northern fur seal organized foreign relations in the

North Pacific after Russia sold Alaska to the United States. The North Pacific-bordering nations had to find new ways of relating to one another when Alaska shifted from being an extension of Russia across what was essentially an interior sea (the Bering) to being controlled by a nation (the United States) with no prior presence along the Arctic. The seal became the organizing principle, causing Russia, Canada (whose foreign policy was controlled by Great Britain), the United States, and Japan to interact *at sea* and argue over who had ownership of mobile marine lives. I borrow the little-explored concept "boundary object" from sociology to help explain how seals functioned in this new world. Boundary objects create a new space between other things, translating between things, importantly through *action*. They embody different purposes for each group between which they mediate, but consensus is formed around their acknowledged collective usefulness. Marine megafauna built a zone of transnational contestation through their habitation of the North Pacific, and they moved that zone around by their mobile natures. South of the Bering Strait, the same fur seals migrated along a north-south corridor either through American-Canadian waters or Russian-Japanese waters. Seals *created* these corridors. Little has been written about boundary objects since an American sociologist and philosopher first introduced the concept in 1989. In this presentation I will explore why I believe this concept is especially useful for environmental history, and I will offer boundary *subject* as a more productive way to discuss living animals that serve in this role.

Natalia Maksimishina (Central European University), "Never Mind the Sun, Comrade, It's We Who Are the Bosses: Time and Temporality in the Soviet Arctic in the 1930s"
Abstract: My report for the conference "Situating the 'Global' in Contemporary Humanities" is based on the research I made for my master thesis in the Central European University in 2019. The report focuses on the Soviet Union's conquest of its northernmost territories, which reached its full capacity during the 1930s. It follows a special interest in the temporality of the Soviet Arctic, the relationship between Moscow and the Soviet Arctic territories, the role of modern technology, and the pioneers of the Arctic together with their relation to the Arctic nature. I argue that the development of the Soviet Arctic was accompanied and even overshadowed by its image as created in the Soviet press. Using a variety of interrelated sources, such as the Soviet journals *Sovetskaya Arktika [Soviet Arctic]* and the *Bulletin of the Arctic Institute*, I investigate the major attributes that were established for the mythology of the Soviet Arctic. I contrast this with how the Soviet Arctic was portrayed in western sources, namely contemporary travelogues of journalists and international scholars' works. My analysis will show that the myth of the Soviet Arctic as constructed by the Soviet press had several functions. One was to maintain a stronger connection between the Far North and the capital. In addition, the Arctic myth was meant to diminish the perceived difference between the living standards in Moscow and that of the pioneers in their remote settlements. In the context of labour shortage, the positive portrayal of life in the Soviet Arctic was also aimed at increasing internal migration into the region. The Soviet press played a key role in this effort at normalizing the image of the Arctic in public perception, overriding previous, exoticizing tendencies. Modern technologies such as the radio and aviation let the distance to the country's northern frontier vanish and further strengthened the mental connection of the Soviet Arctic with the capital. I will explore how the conjoint effects of the various elements constituting the myth of the Soviet Arctic affected the everyday routine of the northern pioneers. Notably, the regular radio broadcasts transmitted from Moscow organized the daily regime of the Arctic inhabitants and were meant to abolish the time gap between the two places. The image of the ideal Soviet Arctic pioneer was part of the larger Arctic mythology. I challenge the expression "struggle with nature" that is omnipresent in the secondary literature on the Soviet Arctic. Aiming for a more nuanced view, I investigate the meaning of the word "nature" in the sources, developing a different reading of the term. Here, I will argue that the term should be seen in relation to human internal qualities and their interaction with the external world, but that "nature" was not the main antagonist of the human as commonly portrayed. Seen together, the research I made puts into question the relationship between Moscow and the Soviet Arctic as that of a binary opposition of center and periphery, as was argued by scholars before. I also critically engage with aspects of older and more recent historiography on the Soviet Arctic that appear problematic from the point of view that my sources offer.

Julia Lajus (HSE St Petersburg) and Alexey Kraikovski (HSE St Petersburg), "The Space of Blue and Gold": The Nature and Environment of Solovki Islands in History and Heritage

Panel 2: "Ethnographic Museum in the Optics of the Anthropology of Globalisation" 18 October 11:00-17:00 (rooms 221 and 413)

Andrey Golovnev (Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography "Kunstkamera", RAS), "Exhibiting the Atlas of Nomadic Technologies"

Svetlana Adonieva (St Petersburg State U), "Ethnographic Museum as Taxonomy: Ethnic Self-Identification as a Process"

Abstract: The Russian Ethnographic Museum was created to "present a picture of the ethnographic extension of our country, a picture of the peoples living in Russia and its immediate vicinity" (Decree on Establishment, 1895) (1), and also to "educate the public". It offered visitors an "ethnic portrait of every nation"(2). At that time there was no contradiction in the fact that the museum represented cultures of the lower classes (peasantry, philistinism, "foreigners"), it was calling them "people": noble classes were not called people. Someone (subject) described and presented to the "public" his object - "people". At the grand opening in 1923, the museum was called "a monument to the working people of the Great Country"(3): the rhetoric has changed - the subject himself has become a "people", so it would seem that he had to describe himself, "from the inside", from the categories of its own life world, but normative taxonomy has been maintained. The Soviet state optimized it and used it for its needs, making ethnicity an indispensable element of self-identification of citizens ("fifth point" in the passports). Pierre Bourdieu considered as one of the most important types of state power, the power to produce and impose certain categories of thinking: "Realizing in social structures and in mental structures adapted to them, the established institution makes us forget that it is the result of a long series of institutionalization actions and is presented with all its external signs of naturalness "(4) Thinking through ethnic and national categories has become a natural thing for the population of Soviet and post-Soviet Russia: the instrument of state identification of a citizen, external to its subjectivity, has become one of the categories of self-identification. The Ethnographic Museum retains its privilege to produce a normative "distilled" ethnic identity, the question of whether its visitors can use it for self-identity, to me it seems to be one of the pressing issues of the current social contract.

_____

(1)Российский этнографический музей: 1902-2002. СПб: Славия, 2001. C.11. (2) Там же. C.22. 3 Там же. C.26. (4) Бурдье П. Дух государства: генезис и структура бюрократического поля // Поэтика и политика. Альманах Российско-французского центра социологии и философии Института социологии Российской Академии наук. М.: Институт экспериментальной социологии, СПб.: Алетейя, 1999. C. 125-166.

Polina Vanevskaia (HSE Moscow), "Constructing India in Contemporary Museum Spaces in St. Petersburg"

Abstract: In the culturally heterogeneous spaces of modern big cities, it is relevant to turn to the study of the representation of cultural Others who have become territorially close to specific Us. The presented research is based on some theoretical conceptions such as globalization (Giddens E., Eriksen T.), deterritorialization (Giddens E., Appadurai A.), scapes (Urry J., Appadurai A.), locus (Giddens E.), and hybridization (Bhabha H.) The main object of the research is social-cultural space of St. Petersburg, which is empirically conceptualized as the complex of urban places, where patterns and material artifacts of Indian culture are presented. The subject matter of the research is the complex of representations of Indian culture in St. Petersburg. St. Petersburg's museums with Indian expositions (The State Hermitage Museum, Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography (the Kunstkamera), Museum of the History of Religion, Roerich Family museum and institute) are considered as specific loci of Indian culture representation. In addition, the analysis included ethnic shops and cafes, educational institutions and spiritual organizations. The research methodology was focused on semi-structured expert interviews, supervision, and qualitative (ethnographic) content analysis of Internet discourse connected with selected places. According to

results, there are several types of Indian culture representations in socio-cultural space of St. Petersburg, namely domestic, oriental, near and far, artistic, gastronomic, and spiritual. In this context, the museum can be considered as articulation mechanism for cultural diversity of the space of modern big cities.

Valentin Diaconov (Garage Museum of Contemporary Art, Moscow), "Museum of Digital Poverty: How do class and inequality manifest in the ethnographic display?"

Abstract: This talk will take up a form of a speculative institution proposal - the Museum of Digital Poverty (MDP). Operating along the ideological lines of early Imperialist ethnographical museums, the project of MDP is based on the proliferation of neo-folkloric and quasi-anonimous forms of 'digital native' cultural artifacts: Memes, conspiracy theories, various instances of promoting knowledge that is positioned as an antidote to (oppressive) scientific establishment. The mission, exhibition and operative strategies of the MDP, as outlined in the talk, will serve as a contrast to real-world examples of ethnographic curating that ignores issues of class, economic inequality, military pressure and other extra-ethnographic factors. Eric Hobsbawm's evergreen notion of 'invention of tradition' by the industrialists and Romantics plays an important part in the MDP's programmed ignorance of power relations that the 'digital natives' are involved in. In a way, we cannot talk about MDP without trying to reform it: The next stage of the proposal is a simulated 'de-colonizing' of MDP through Dipesh Chakraborty's theory and Fred Wilson's practice.

Han Vermeulen (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology), "Leibniz's Ethnolinguistics and Russian Ethnographic Expeditions from Müller to Boas"

Abstract: The historical linguistics of G.W. Leibniz, formulated between the 1690s and his death in 1716, had an impact on the academic expeditions in Siberia and other parts of the Russian Empire during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It provided the foundation for the comparative ethnographic program of G.F. Müller during the Second Kamchatka Expedition (1733-1743), with which systematic ethnography began. Leibniz's paradigm served as a cornerstone for the physical expeditions led by P.S. Pallas c.s. (1768-1774) and subsequent ethnographic research until the Jesup North Pacific Expedition (1897-1902) led by Franz Boas. The connection between linguistics and ethnography remained strong in Russia and Germany until the late nineteenth century. This relation gave Russian and German ethnographers a head start over their competitors in other academic centres of Europe because it was less judgmental and less speculative than a focus on manners and customs or even on "national character." To Müller, the study of languages was as important as the collection of material culture, of data on economics, religion, etc. It was only with the detailed historical ethnology of Boas that the principle of "one nation – one language" was called into question.

Nikolai Ssorin-Chaikov (HSE St Petersburg), "The gift order of things: empire, territory and museum collections of the Nicholas II trip to the East"

Stanislav Petriashin (Russian Museum of Ethnography), "Soviet Family of Nations": The Quest for Coevalness in Stalinist Ethnographic Museums"

Abstract: Soviet authorities declared their goal to make all peoples ("progressive" and "backward") equal and modern by means of accelerated socio-economic development. In 1930s this objective was announced to be accomplished and ethnographic museums were to display the success of Soviet nationality policy. How the problem of representation of Soviet peoples' coevalness within socialist modernity was solved? What new strategies of fieldwork, collecting, and exhibiting did museum curators develop? What temporal and political implications their solutions appeared to have? I'll try to answer these questions using the example of The State Museum of the Ethnography in Leningrad (SME) in 1930–50s. Anti-colonial rhetoric, display of contemporaneity, persons ("new men"), and Soviet art, elements of collaborative museology were employed in some way to show Soviet nations' equality and being in one socialist time. SME's attempt to exhibit the coevalness of Soviet peoples, however, reintroduced the power/knowledge hierarchy between visitors and museum in the form of present/future distinction. Economic, cultural, and personal achievements on the display represented the so-called "green shoots of future in the present" and served as an

example to follow. Nevertheless, another well-known oppositions, such as anthropologist/informant, museum/source community, and metropolis/colony were somewhat blurred. Thus one can claim that decolonization of western ethnographic museums was also partly anticipated by SME in 1930s.

Panel 3: "Turning the Digital Turn in the History of Art" 18 October 11:00-17:00 (room 409)
The panel is devoted to the new technological opportunities which can be both beneficial for art-historians/cultural scholars and art-educators worldwide, so called 'digital turn'. But rather than looking at the advantages and challenges of digital use in the field, the panel focuses on new developments as a possible tool for more inclusive agenda for art history. In particular, the panel puts an emphasis on feminist and queer issues, de-colonization of art-history, and seeks for the new ways on how to find a place not for very few artists recognized but many invisible and unnamed heroes of past and present art-scenes.

Benjamin Binstock, Center for Advancement of Visual Technologies in Art History (Amsterdam) Turning the Digital: An Imaginary Rembrandt Museum and Imaginary Vermeer Museum

Abstract: We live in the digital age; that "turn" has been made. Yet we can turn this digital age to our advantage, by focusing new means on old problems that were never resolved. Take Johannes Vermeer's Girl with a Pearl Earring, "the Northern Mona Lisa," which is now almost as hard to see through selfie-taking crowds. André Malraux long ago coined the term "imaginary museum," or "museum without walls," to evoke the revolutionary possibilities of reproductions, which have been exponentially expanded in our digital age. Malraux was a scholar of Vermeer and wrote about his use of his family members—wife, daughters, and others—as models for his interior scenes. Several subsequent scholars came to this conclusion, whereas others deny it on dubious grounds. Malraux's initiative offers a way beyond the museum's walls and crowded rooms, through connections between paintings: not just identifying Vermeer's family models, who replace one another and age over time in his paintings, but also reconstructing his painting-by-painting development. This was not previously possible because of several "misfit" works, which do not correspond to his distinctive approach or extraordinary skills, yet were based on his compositions, models, and the same rooms of his house. Since he had no official students, the artist could have been one of his children, specifically his eldest Maria, model for his Girl with a Pearl Earring, who is recognizable in her response in her early self-portrait study Girl with a Red Hat. Along with resolving long neglected problems of connoisseurship and the order of Vermeer's small oeuvre, an Imaginary Vermeer Museum makes possible the discovery of his daughter as his secret apprentice, apropos for this session dedicated to recovering repressed voices.
Such a voice need not be a woman or unknown artist, but could include Rembrandt's. His students are well known, yet only from their own mature, albeit limited voices. The paintings they produced in his studio, emulating his style in their distinct ways, which he sold as his own as his legal right, are currently assigned to Rembrandt. These circumstances result partly from monetary and cultural investment in Rembrandt's name, yet also partly from a failure to follow his painting-by-painting development. Conversely, we cannot follow Rembrandt's development with the paintings currently assigned to him. An Imaginary Rembrandt Museum helps resolve fundamental problems of method and investments in scholarship, yet also opens a Pandora's box of fascinating questions about our understanding of art, turning the digital on the disciplinary foundations that make it possible

Margarita Kuleva, Higher School of Economics (St Petersburg) Data (In)sensibilities

Panos Kompatsiaris, Higher School of Economics (Moscow) Mapping Artistic Networks in Post- Biennials

Abstract: Since the early 1990s global exhibitions of contemporary art are proliferating at an increasing speed in different local contexts and cities across the world. As platforms of cross-disciplinary collaboration and experimentation for art practitioners and socially engaged actors, activists and scholars, contemporary art biennials have become sites of increased visibility. Further so, they are both sites of networking and self-branding in the context of neoliberalism's attention economy as well as sites of disensus, where curators are expected to raise critical awareness on the issues of the day. As a result of these contradictions, the main literature around the 'biennial phenomenon' mainly progresses a double-edged approach describing these mega-shows as both empowering platforms for local contexts and as responsible for spreading the Euro-centric canon and thus guilty for reproducing cultural imperialism. This study wishes to contribute to the literature around biennials by looking at how the above tensions are played out in the context of 'post-socialist biennials'. We look at shows including the Baltic Triennial of International Art, Kaunas Biennale, Prague Biennale, Odessa Biennale or Kiev Biennale, gathering data regarding the educational backgrounds and institutional connections of artists participating in these biennials as well the identity of sponsors and stakeholders. Using a computational methodology derived from natural language processing (NLP) and social network analysis (SNA), the study seeks to answer the following questions: Which art institutions (art schools, universities, residencies, exhibition venues, galleries) are most represented in the scene and to which extent are these institutions connected with local or international contexts? Regarding in particular the educational backgrounds of the artists, do participants from former socialist countries tend to frequent art training institutions abroad, particularly in Western Europe and North America, as local artistic fields become increasingly part of a globalized art system?

Bruno Moreschi, artist, Innovation Center of the University of São Paulo (São Paulo) Institutional critique 2.0 - Artistic Experiences in Artificial Intelligence Systems

Abstract: The presentation will discuss recent research conducted by Moreschi from the experimental and critical use of Artificial Intelligences (especially computer vision) in artistic contexts. Through processes such as reverse engineering, these experiences deconstruct artistic objects and their official discourses, contributing to a kind of expansion of a practice known as institutional critique. Among these experiences, the project Recoding Art, a research that involved creating a platform that centralized 7 comercial Artificial Intelligences to read the collection of Van Abbemuseum, NL; and Another 33rd São Paulo Biennial, which was intended to stimulate non-traditional understandings of this exhibition, some from the experimental and creative use of AIs.

Margarita Skomorokh, Laboratory for Computer Games Research (St Petersburg) Moving / Touching / Seeing: Haptic Vision in Digital Games

Abstract: According to the constructivist approach to the issue of art perception, visual arts change the way how we see. Video games, unlike many other visual arts, encourage interaction with their medium, thus creating a new type of perception, haptic vision, blurring the line between seeing and touching. This talk will address art games with unconventional visual aesthetics where the mechanics of haptic vision is emphasized (rather than camouflaged for the sake of "realism") and artistically explored.

Victor Kudryashov (Media Materia, St Petersburg), "How art speculates future"

Panel 4 "Language, Thought and Material Culture: Legacies of the Leningrad School of Typology and its Context in History of Ideas" 18 October 11:00-13:30 (room 413)

Типологические иследования языка первой половины прошлого века, основной базой которых являлся Институт языка и мышления (до 1932 г.: Институт Яфетидологии) Академии Наук, составляют уникальный эпизод в истории культуры и идей минувшего столетия. Общее стратегическое направление этих исследований, которое можно охарактеризовать как "лингво-анропологическое", складывалось из взаимодействия лингвистической типологии, этнографии, социологии и философии культуры. Интердисциплинарный подход, характерный для школы, и стремление связать явления языковой формы с теми смыслами, которые они получают в социальном и материальном контексте, противостоял дисциплинарному изоляционизму и чисто формальной ориентации как основным направлениям лингвистики XIX века.

Можно назвать три основных направления в рамках Ленинградской типологической школы, тесно сопряженные друг с другом. Первое, связанное прежде всего с именем Н. Я. Марра, подчеркивала многообразие социальных, идеологических и материальных факторов языковых изменений, делающее утопической идею представить эти изменения в виде регулярных моделей. Оно перекликалось с идеями Гуго Шухадта (Hugo Schuchardt) и Карла Фосслера (Karl Vossler), а также с кругом идей М. М. Бахтина и его школы (Алпатов 2005). Второе направление рассматривало язык в связи с этнографическими исследованиями, с эмфазой на изучении социальной структуры и материальной культуры (В. Г. Тан-Богораз). Наконец, третье направление занималось изучением исторических форм и категорий сознания в связи с типологией языковых структур; Лингвистический аспект этого направления был представлен в первую очередь работами И. И. Мещанинова, а историко-культурный - И. Г. Франк-Каменецкого и О. М. Фрейденберг.

"Разгром марризма" в начале 1950-х годов, при всей репрессивной произвольности этого события, отразил всеобщую тенденцию в развитии лингвитической науки во половине XX века: ее возвращение к исследованиям чисто формального направления, направленных на создание унитарных моделей языковой "структуры", изолированных от социальных и антропологических контекстов. Тем более важно подчеркнуть, что традиция когнитивной и социо-этнографической ориентации типологических описаний языка сохранялась в ленинградской-петербургской лингвистике и в новейшее время.

Революционные изменения, произошедшие в сфере гуманитаных наук в последние десятилетия - от пост-соссюровской философии языка до "антропологического поворота" в изучении культурной истории и идеи социума как "воображенного сообщества", - придают наследию ленинградской школы "языка и мышления" новую актуальность. Этот процесс находит отражение в исследованиях, появившихся в последнее время (Алпатов 2004; Patrick Sérot 2004; Ekaterina Velmezova 2007).

Алпатов, В.М., Волошинов, Бахтин и лингвистика, М. 2005
Алпатов, В.М., История одного мифа: Марр и марризм, М., 2004
Sériot, Patrick, ed., Un paradigme perdu: la linguistique marriste, Lausanne, 2004
Velmezova, Ekaterina, Les lois du sense: la semantique marriste, New York, 2007

Evgenii Golovko (Institute of Linguistics, RAS) TBA

Alexander Dmitriev (HSE Miscow), "Philology's departure and return: searching for the last century's intellectual identity"

Boris Gasparov (HSE St Petersburg), "Marr and Saussure: one hundred years later"

Nikolai Vakhtin (EUSPb), "St Petersburg studies of languages and peoples of the North and its demise"

Ekaterina Velmesova (U Lausanne), "Nikolay Marr's heritage: new venues for research"

18 October 17:30
Roundtable "Globalization of Academic Knowledge" (room 414)
Abstract: This round table addresses a significant gap in the interdisciplinary understanding of globalisation: how is the emergence of 'the global' as subject of inquiry in anthropology, history, *etc.*, interlinked with the globalisation of social sciences and humanities themselves? What are global interconnections, inequalities and hierarchies that structure academic careers and practices of research, publishing and teaching? What theories of globalisation are applicable here? And, conversely, how are we to rethink these theories in light of these academic cases? The idea of this round table has been triggered by the ongoing debate about Open Access publishing and its global contours, and, also, by the increasing reliance of Russian academia on citation data of Web of Science and Scopus for management of academic careers.

Panelists: Sarah Green (U of Helsinki, chair of *EASA*, the European Association of Social Anthropologists); Niko Besnier (U of Amsterdam, outgoing editor-in-chief of *American Ethnologist*); Alexander Semyonov (HSE St Petersburg, editor-in-chief of *Ab Imperio*); Elena Bogdanova (Centre for Independent Sociological Research, editor-in-chief of *Laboratorium*); Laia Soto Bermant and Nikolai Ssorin-Chaikov (U of Helsinki and HSE St Petersburg respectively, coeditors-in-chief of *Social Anthropology / Anthropologie Sociale*); Igor Fediukin (HSE Moscow); Aleksandra Kasatkina (Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography "Kunskamera"/ HSE St Petersburg)
Presentation of the new editorial team of the Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale, the journal of the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA) and their first issue of this journal. Editorial team: Nikolai Ssorin-Chaikov, Laia Soto Bermant, Lukas Lay, Jeanne Kormina

19 October 10:00-14:00
Roundtable "Citizenship and Empire": (10:00) (room 118)
Panelists: Sergey Glebov (Amherst and Smith), Frank Gruener (U Bielefeld), Alexander Semyonov (HSE St Petersburg) and Federica Morelli (University of Turin).

The emergence of the category of empire as a way of decentering the nation-centered narratives of history has brought to the historical research a range of new analytical frames and tools. The category of citizenship, often in the form of the innovative pair of subjecthood-citizenship, has attracted recently the attention of a number of historians dealing with different imperial formations. One of attendant historiographic debates centered on the relevance of the concept outside of the experience of liberal and democratic states, highlighting the universal challenge of defining political belonging in both liberal and illiberal polities. Another debate concerned the temporal trajectory of subjecthood-to-citizenship, that is the alleged iron-law logic of evolution of collective, layered, unequal, and indirect subjecthood towards a homogenous space of equivalence among modern citizens, in short, citizenship-nationality. In a way, this discussion on subjecthood-citizenship trajectory reflected the meta-debates on the history of imperial formations, their inevitable restructuring under the challenge of modern sovereignty and nationalism or the persistence of layered and hybrid forms of political belonging and subjectivity.

With regard to the history of the Russian Empire and Soviet Union little research has been done on the continuum of practices and legal frameworks of subjecthood-citizenship, given the continental continuum of the Russian Empire from the autonomous Grand Duchy of Finland to the

extraterritorial colonial exclaves of the Eastern Chinese Railway and the temporal continuum from the layered and inclusive subjecthood of the early modern expansion of the Russian Empire to the revolutionary transformations of imperial citizenship in the Great War and revolutionary upheavals of 1905 and 1917. In terms of temporal setting of the research question one can start an inquiry into the Russian subjecthood-citizenship with the history that failed to happen. Usually treated as a backward little brother of the Europeanized Russian empire the Ottoman empire promulgated the law on citizenship in 1869. There was nothing of this sort of modern and systematic treatment of the issue of citizenship in the Russian Empire up until its end in 1917. This history that failed to happen poses the question of what actually happened, i.e. how questions of political belonging and subjectivity were regulated, engineered and negotiated in the space of ethnic, religious, social, and regional difference. The present roundtable aims at starting a discussion of the history of subjecthood-citizenship in the Russian Empire and early Soviet Union and is structured by the following questions:

·   What are possible approaches to the concept of subjecthood-citizenship beyond the narrow legal history and what are possible frames for considering the question of political belonging and political subjectivity?

·   What is the potential of the focus on subjecthood-citizenship in comparison with the category of nationality in the experience of the Russian Empire of the second half of the 19th and early 20th century?

·   What is the meaning of territory and space in discourses and practices of subjecthood-citizenship?

·   What is the heuristic value of looking at the margins, i.e. the late-acquired territories of the Far East, and Manchuria?

·   What is the relevant temporal frame for approaching the phenomenon of subjecthood-citizenship, particularly the choice between long-term and short-term frames?

·   What could be the role of comparative, trans-regional, and global framing in approaching the issue of Russian subjecthood-citizenship?

Panel "Russian Empire and the History of Animals" (12:30) (room 118)

Over the last 30 years historians all over the world have actively asked themselves what is an empire, where does it begin and end, which spaces are more or less imperial? In this section we would like to explore these questions by combining global history of empires with animal turn in history. Is it possible to place the Russian empire from the point of view of human-animal studies? Which institutions could be considered the most imperial in the age of global circulation of animals between zoological gardens and labs and why? The authors of the papers will suggest their answers to the above mentioned questions by examining closely zoological gardens, forestry science and museums and menageries in the Russian empire.

Anton Kotenko (HSE St Petersburg), "Zoological garden as an imperial institution"

Marina Loskutova (HSE St Petersburg), "Honey harvesting and forestry in the Russian empire in the 19century"

Anastasia Fedotova (S.I. Vavilov Institute of History of Sciences and Technology, RAS) "European bison in museums: why (animal) history matters?"