Conferences and Lecture Series

The Heritage of Sasanian Iran: Dinars, Drahms and Coppers of the Late Sasanian and Early Muslim Periods

American Numismatic Society, New York City, USA, June 8-9, 2001

Reported by: Stuart D. Sears, Ph.D., The American University in Cairo, Department of Arabic Studies, Box 2511, Cairo 11511, Egypt, sears@aucegypt.edu

This conference on medieval Iranian coins attracted scholars and participants from around the world. The conference presented a wide range of papers on Late Sasanian and early Muslim coinages. It also featured a workshop on the reading of the Pahlavi legends on these coins. The conference was held in memory of William B. Warden (1947-2000), a numismatist devoted to these coinages. The Society of Iranian Studies and Sanford J. Durst co-sponsored it with the American Numismatic Society. More than thirty people attended from across the United States, Europe and the Middle East.

The papers interpreted the different coinages struck in Iran and its adjacent regions during the sixth and seventh centuries CE as documents of social, political and economic life. Michael L. Bates, Curator of Islamic Coins at the ANS, gave the plenary lecture entitled “The Coinages of Iran and Its Neighbors in the Seventh Century.” The lecture traced the development of the late Sasanian coin type and its imitation in numerous succeeding coinages in Iran and adjacent regions.

The first panel, entitled “The Representation of Dynasty and Government in the Late Sasanian Period,” emphasized the constancy of dynastic ideology and administrative policies under the late Sasanians despite dynastic conflicts and wars with the Byzantines and the Muslims. In “The Roman Near East under Sasanian Rule (603-630): History and Coinage,” Clive Foss (The University of Massachusetts at Boston) argued that Khusro II generally maintained local administrative structures in Syria after its conquest by him. The Persian occupation was less destructive than generally believed to be. In this context, the Sasanian government employed Byzantine coinage in Syria, some of it locally struck. In “Queen Buran and the Restoration of Sasanian Imperial Propaganda,” Touraj Daryaee (The University of California at Riverside) argued for a new reading of the legends on a unique dinar of Queen Buran. The new reading reveals Queen Buran as the restorer of the imperial ideology of her father, Khusro II, claiming once again descent from the Gods. In “Patterns of Administrative Authority among the Mints of Yazdigird III,” Susan Tyler-Smith meticulously documented the continuity of local mint administration in especially western and southern Iran through the turmoil of the Muslim conquests.

The second panel, entitled “The Exchange of Coinage between Eras,” discussed the vagaries of monetary policy and practices from the pre-Islamic into the early Muslim periods. In “Islam’s ‘Silver Mean’: Evidence for the Origin and Early Use of the ‘Weight of Seven’ in the Late Antique and Early Muslim Periods,” Stuart D. Sears (The American University in Cairo) documented the use of the standard weight of seven tenths a mithqal for the striking and exchange of coins before the Umayyad caliph 'Abd al-Malik’s monetary reforms at the end of the seventh century and even before Islam. Attempts in literary sources to give this standard a specifically Islamic identity may reflect the difficulty it faced in superseding other weight standards for Iranian silver in the eighth century. In “Bukharan Silver Coinage at the Time of Arab Conquest,” Aleksandr Naymark (Hofstra University) traced the imitation of Sasanian style coinage at Bukhara from the fifth century to the end of the seventh century. In particular, he gave a new reading for the legends of a group of issues attributing them to a king named Khunik. This attribution is important since it provides a nearly certain chronological context for a portion of an otherwise difficult series lacking reliable names and dates. In “The Chronology of Arab-Sasanian Copper
Coinage,” Stephen Album (Independent Scholar) outlined distinct phases in the production and use of copper coins in late seventh century and early eighth century Iran. The phases were marked by iconographic and epigraphic conventions with the imitation of the Sasanian type, the introduction of pictorial images and Arabic legends and, finally, the use of only Arabic legends.

The third panel, entitled “Questions of Identity on Early Muslim Drahms,” treated different problems in the identity of mints, name legends and iconographical features. In “From Identity to Piety: the Words and Images on Early Islamic Coins,” Habibehe Rahim (St. John’s University) discussed the variety of symbolic representations of political and religious ideology on early Islamic coinage. In “Kharijite Rebel or Umayyad Partisan?: The Issue of 'Abd al-Aziz b. MDWL?,” Stuart D. Sears (The American University in Cairo) presented the very rare issue of an only recently discovered ruler. Despite questions about the exact identity of this person, the issue demonstrates the tenacious character of Umayyad rule in Fars in the early stages of the second fiina (CE 680-92) as different political factions contested the caliphate’s authority. In the next presentation, Alan S. De Shazo (independent scholar) argued convincingly for the attribution of an obscure mint legend ‘ShW’ to a site in the district of Darabgird. The legend occurs both singly and in combination with the familiar legend of Darabgird, ‘DA.’ In “The Mihrab and Anazza Drahm,” Luke Treadwell (Oxford University) reinterpreted the iconography of the well-known drahm struck among the caliph 'Abd al-Malik’s experimental issues. He suggested that the issue reflected primarily martial rather than religious propaganda in the context of successive coin designs at the mint of Damascus. The so-called mihrab probably represents a protective covering emptied of its cross as it was generally known from many other media. It covered instead a spear or arrow.

Participants have been invited to submit their papers for publication to the Journal of Ancient Iranian Studies, The American Journal of Numismatics and Al-Sikka. The conference will meet again in 2002 on June 7th and 8th. Abstracts for proposed talks and inquiries should be sent by March 15, 2002, to Stuart D. Sears (sears@aucegypt.edu) or Michael L. Bates (bates@amnumsoc.org).

---

Rethinking Social Science Research on the Developing World in the 21st Century

Sponsored by the Social Science Research Council, Park City, Utah, USA, June 7-10, 2001

Reported by: Morgan Liu, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Anthropology, University of Michigan, 1512 Rackham Building, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1070, USA, Tel.: +1/734-615-3714, Fax: +1/734-763-5507, morgman@umich.edu, with Edward Schatz, Southern Illinois University, schatz@siu.edu, and Carole McGranahan, University of Colorado, carole@colorado.edu

This invitation-only conference was an interdisciplinary dialogue among researchers doing locally-grounded, context-sensitive social science (in economics, political science, sociology, anthropology, history, psychology, and geography) on the developing world. The conference addressed theoretical and methodological issues that have direct bearing on scholarship in Central Eurasia. One panel featured three research projects located in Inner Asia (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan/Uzbekistan, Tibet). All conference participants are former fellows of SSRC's International Predissertation Fellowship Program.

The conference focused on the question: how can researchers understand the developing world in the context of urgent global issues and the multiplicity of new non-state actors that have emerged to address them? A host of problems with global circulation and impact — children’s health, women’s status, refugees, arms proliferation, land reform, electoral design, legal institutions, militant ideologies — demand relevant expertise that most existing social science has been inadequate in supplying. On the other hand, public policy in the developing world has been increasingly conceived in think tanks and consulting firms, and implemented by the private sector, NGOs, and transnational
organizations, so that the loci of authority and innovation have shifted away from sovereign nation-states.

One reason for this mismatch in problem and scholarly expertise, said speaker Kenneth Prewitt (New School University, U.S. Census 2000), is that the evolution of social science in the United States was wedded to the U.S.'s 20th century agendas of crafting a modern welfare state and liberal democracy. This American model has then been exported to other academic institutions in the world. In order to meet the new global complexities, the social sciences (particularly economics, political science, and sociology) need to think beyond liberal state-centered perspectives and create scholarship that treats the emergent, border-crossing flows of people, goods, money, and ideas in very primary terms of analysis. Yet, most analyses of post-socialist Eurasia, for example, have been centered on the new states themselves, with their security arrangements, political systems, and transitioning economies.

A fundamental premise of the conference was that many of these issues are best tackled through interdisciplinary work. Some of the most productive sessions occurred among scholars of different disciplinary backgrounds who shared common thematic or geographic interests. Another conclusion of the conference was the need to move toward treating non-Western scholars as equal interlocutors in the theory and methodology of research, rather than just data-rich “local experts.” Post-Soviet scholars, in particular, can enter the international dialogue with their unique perspectives on global modernities.

One panel attempted to address such issues in specifically Central Eurasian contexts. In a paper entitled “Studying Meso-Level Identity Politics in Kazakhstan,” Edward Schatz (Davis Center for Russian Studies, Harvard University) discussed the politics of “clan” identities in Kazakhstan. He argued that clan politics in Central Asia has a particular dynamic, based on the fact that genealogical background is not visible. Because political and social actors can conceal and reveal their genealogies strategically, clan politics is very much a politics of perception.

Morgan Liu (Anthropology, University of Michigan) argued in his paper, “A Very Modern Khan in Post-Soviet Central Asia,” that Western analyses of post-Soviet politics and economic reform should take into consideration local understandings of modernity and societal progress, which may not map neatly onto the “international consensus” about development. He discussed his ethnographic fieldwork among Uzbeks in Osh, Kyrgyzstan, where notions about legitimate authority advocate harsh methods of rule by the president of Uzbekistan, Islam Karimov, who is admired as a modern “khan” figure.

Carole McGranahan (Anthropology, University of Colorado) contended that histories of the Tibetan resistance army are suspended between internal regional politics and global Cold War politics. In her paper, “Shooting at Trucks: Tibet, the CIA, and Arrested Histories,” she discussed how army veterans manage to tell their stories despite the joint “arrest” of resistance histories by the Tibetan Government-in-Exile and the CIA, which partially funded and trained resistance soldiers. The arrest of these histories is not just a story of government secrecy, but of the contradictions within and between internal and external ways of fixing Tibet as a modern socio-political entity.

---

The Geopolitical and Economic Transitions in Eurasia

Fatih University, Istanbul, Turkey, May 9-12, 2001

Reported by: Havva Karakas-Keles, Research Assistant, Fatih University, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü, 34900 Büyükçekmece Istanbul, Turkey, Tel.: +90 (212) 889-0810, 889-5045, Fax: +90 (212) 889-0832, havvakeles@fatih.edu.tr

After the Soviet Union collapsed and the Cold War ended, the Eurasian heartland once again assumed its importance for both Turkey and the rest of the world. The developments in post-Soviet Central
Asia are strictly under observation in our global international political system. As a historic bridge between East and West, Central Asia continues to have strategic importance far beyond its impacts on immediate neighbors, and is of great concern to both the United States and the European Union. When potential petroleum wealth is added to this strategic equation, Central Asia faces a new and even more challenging future, as both global markets and the international political system keenly observe the changing situation.

In this context, Fatih University hosted its first international conference in Istanbul, on May 9-12, 2001. The conference, “The Geopolitical and Economic Transitions in Eurasia,” was jointly organized by Indiana University’s Department of Near Eastern Languages and Culture and Fatih University’s School of Economics and Administrative Sciences. The purpose of the conference was to bring together scholars, policymakers, and members of the private sector in order to address future prospects and constraints facing the region as it attempts to develop better functioning economies and more democratic political structures in the post-Soviet era. At the conference, the theme “geopolitical and economic transitions” in Central Asia and the Caucasus was developed through seven sessions: current issues in Eurasia, economic relations, international politics, transboundary cooperation and problems, identity and civil society, individual experiences of transition, and international security. After the conference, a tour to the historical sites of Istanbul and a yacht trip on the Bosphorus was arranged for the participants.

Vildan Serin of Fatih University presented a paper titled “Recent Trends of Foreign Economic Liberalization in post-Soviet Central Asia: Impacts of the Market Economy Transition.” Her paper dealt with the economic indicators and development prospects of Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. She also examined the impact of economic liberalization on economic growth rates, living standards and distribution of wealth in the region.

In his paper “Central Asia’s Lost Capital Assets: Denial of Development or Curse of Globalization?” Eric W. Sievers discussed the current flawed definitions of sustainable development and the connection of sustainable development to a wider understanding of diverse forms of capital assets. After a comparison of the region’s capital assets for the Soviet and post-Soviet periods, he analyzed the impact of foreign donor prescriptions in the region, and suggested that regional dynamics and structural changes in the international economy need to be reconciled in order to effect a more viable development approach.

One of the most noteworthy and thought-provoking papers was presented by Professor Nazif Shahrani of Indiana University, who addressed the one-sided nature of ongoing civil society discussions in the field and suggested an approach more sensitive to context and culture. His paper, “Prospects for Re-building Communities of Trust in Post-Soviet Central Asia,” dealt mainly with the potential dangers of taking Western-driven “global” models of development to Central Asia, while purposefully ignoring the significant role of traditional local Muslim models of civil society capable of addressing development needs of post-Soviet Central Asian societies in a more culturally appropriate manner. Such models include Waqf or awqaf, Sufi brotherhoods, and mahalla or mosque centered neighborhood associations. He also stressed the analytical utility of the concept of civil society beyond its presumed Western forms and examined the prospects for rebuilding alternative social mechanisms, movements, and discourses of development and democratization in post-Soviet Central Asian Muslim societies.

Another general topic discussed at the conference was the security issue in Eurasia. Bulent Aras from Fatih University presented a paper titled “The Organisation of Black Sea Economic Cooperation and Regional Security.” He stressed the role of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC) as an opportunity that should be utilized for enhancing security and coping with the future challenges. He also touched upon the conflicts among the members of the BSEC such as the Nagorno-Karabakh issue between Armenia and Azerbaijan, the dispute between Russia and Ukraine over the former Soviet Union’s Black Sea fleet, the conflict between Turkey and Greece over the issues of Cyprus, the Aegean Sea and the Turkish minority in Western Thrace. As a policy recommendation for the members of the BSEC, he added that cooperation prospects are always likely to stay under the shadow of potential conflicts among member states, and that the BSEC members would have no alternative to solving their security problems themselves: regional-cum-subregional collaboration might be the only way to accomplish this.
In a similar manner, Miguel A. Perez Martin of Autonomous University of Madrid explored major security challenges facing the Caspian region, and the possibility of exploring a solution based on Adler Barnett’s Security Community concept. In his paper, “Security Community in the Caspian Sea,” he evaluated the subject by providing a survey of the main economic and political problems of the Caspian countries, the legal status of the Caspian Sea and the potential for cooperation in the region, with a special focus on the opportunities offered by the establishment of a joint energy resources management mechanism.

On the issue of political transitions in Central Asia and the Caucasus in the post-Soviet era, Juliboy Eltazarov from the Department of Uzbek Language of Samarqand State University presented a paper on “Some Problems of Competition among the World Geopolitical Powers in Post-Soviet Central Asia.” He discussed regional security issues within the context of international competition between three competing blocs or poles: the Western bloc led by the United States, the former Communist bloc, and a new Islamic pole involving some theocratic and fundamentalist regimes. He argued that among the first two poles, “Russia is in a euphoria situation after the victory over communism and seems to have abandoned its imperialistic ambitions, and the Western world is busy with a rebuilding process in post-communist Eastern and Central Europe.” As a result, he pointed to the prospects of the third pole gaining a foothold in the region.

In the preceding decade Turkey assumed a special importance for both the newly independent states of Central Asia and for the international community, since it is the only NATO ally that shares common historical, cultural and linguistic ties with the Turkic republics of Central Asia. Although it is impossible for Turkey to assume the role of “Big Brother” for the Central Asian republics as the successor of Russia, this situation does not cast a shadow over the crucial importance of the role that Turkey can play in Central Asia. Giovanni Ercoleani from the Scottish Centre for International Security stressed the role of Turkey to the Central Asian “Turkic brother-nations” in the following words: “Turkey has not only established the basis for greater influence in the region with relatively significant trade relations, energy projects, education relations and people-to-people efforts, but through its language has exported stability and a democratic method, and this was a possible interpretation of the NATO New Strategic Concept.”

The conference lasted two days and hosted participants from academic, business and governmental sectors who gathered in Istanbul from a wide range of countries. It was a fruitful venue to share information and ideas about current geopolitical, economic, and cultural developments in post-Soviet Central Asia.

---

Reconceptualizing Central Asia: States and Societies in Formation

The Olin Critical Issues Series, Davis Center for Russian Studies, Harvard University, January - May 2001

Reported by: Pauline Jones Luong, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Political Science, Yale University, New Haven Conn., USA, pauline.luong@yale.edu, and John Schoeberlein, Director, Harvard Forum for Central Asian Studies, Cambridge, Mass., USA, schoeber@fas.harvard.edu

Ten years on after independence, there is much to consider about where the Central Asian states have come from and where they are going. This year’s Olin Critical Issues series at Harvard’s Davis Center, entitled “Reconceptualizing Central Asia: States and Societies in Formation,” took up the challenge of assessing how the five Central Asian states are changing along disparate trajectories. Equally, the series aimed to explore how our understanding of the region — both its past and present — is changing as a result of new access to the field and new intellectual infusions into Central Asian studies. The lecture series featured presentations by eight scholars from the young generation, representing a broad range of disciplines, who have in common that they all have recent field experience and “fresh data” and they are all tackling the problem of understanding the region in the light of Central Asia’s relation to non-Soviet cases, its turbulent recent history, and the upheaval in scholarship itself.

The common thread, which the various contributions to the series approached from widely
different angles is the relationship between state and society. This is an important theme for reconceptualization for a number of reasons. First, every post-Soviet state has had to redefine this relationship in one way or another, given the critical role that the state played in defining the Soviet experience. Second, Central Asian societies seek to establish new roles for individual and community in the market economy and emerging civil society, and new bases for the legitimacy of the regime, based on concepts of democracy, individual authority, tradition, efficacy, international recognition, and national, religious and other identities. The reconceptualization of state-society relations is also important, because, whereas in Soviet times scholars tended to treat the USSR as a special case where the state operated on a totalitarian model, determining everything within the society, the experience of the new generation of scholars with extensive field experience generally reveals that the situation is and was much more complicated. There are many elements in the relationship between state and society, including multi-leveled institutions, variegated social spaces, coexisting and contradictory ideologies, and the living out of individual lives. Results of recent work have obliged us to treat the state itself as much more heterogeneous and complex, and to treat the arrows of causality in the state-society system as much more multi-directional than was typical for earlier scholarship.

This series in a sense marks a return to Central Asia for the Olin Series, as ten years have elapsed since it was devoted to a Central Asian topic. That series was titled “Central Asia in Historical Perspective.” It was chaired by Beatrice Manz, who also contributed many insightful comments to this year’s presentations, and it covered a range of topics in both recent and distant history. Central Asian topics have also figured in the intervening years, of course, and the ten years since independence have demonstrated that however much Central Asia might turn eastward or toward the Islamic world, it is destined to “belong” still with its fellow post-Soviet states for the foreseeable future.

The Olin Series this year was conceptualized as more of a “project” than is typically the case with a lecture series. Pauline Jones Luong and John Schoebel, the series’ co-chairs, began with the rather specific topic of state-society relations, and a set of associated theoretical/thematic questions, and they invited a number of colleagues to propose topics within this frame. As a result, the project brought in eight contributors (two anthropologists, one historian, three political scientists, and two sociologists) with very different perspectives on a common theme.

The presentations in the series came in thematic pairs, which provided some further integration both for the series and for our way of working with one another to give detailed feedback on ideas in the process of development. Pauline Jones Luong (Political Science, Yale University) launched the series with her talk on “Economic Decentralization in Kazakhstan.” Luong looked at the puzzle of the decentralizing state in Kazakhstan, asking the question of what drives this process in the context of a regime with authoritarian tendencies and an international community that considers decentralization to be a part of democratization and market development. Alisher Ilkhomov (Expert-Fikri Research Center, Tashkent) explored a very closely related theme in “Center-Periphery Relations in Uzbekistan,” where the regime has sought very strong central control, but the country’s political-regional make-up makes Tashkent’s aspiration at odds with very strong interests and social processes in the regional economies and power structures.

The talk by Marianne Kamp (History, Univ. of Wyoming), “Social Services and Expectations of the State’s Role in Uzbekistan,” took the longer view on changing attitudes towards women’s role in society. Women had been “emancipated” during Soviet times, but some now wish to implement more conservative ideals. This attitude has emerged even though the regime makes claims to a Western orientation and many women themselves are not so keen on “tradition” as men are. The theme of social relations and the changing state context also resonated in the presentation by Cynthia Werner (Anthropology, Texas A&M Univ.), “State-Society Relations and Marriage in Kazakhstan.” Werner focused on the practice of “bride-stealing,” a “tradition” with newly emerging forms that are simultaneously illegal, as an infringement on individual rights, and informally validated by the new regime as a part of the return to authentic Kazakh traditions.

The presentation by Kelly McMann (Davis Center, Harvard Univ.) on “NGOs and Civil Society in Kyrgyzstan” examined the role that NGOs play in Kyrgyzstan’s move toward democratization. McMann argued that the lines between the state and civil society are very blurred in that NGOs that function well often have very tight links with the
government. The paper by Erika Weinthal (Political Science, Tel Aviv Univ.), "State Capacity and the Internationalization of Environmental Protection in Central Asia," raised the level of analysis to that of international actors and the state, examining the dubious extent to which aid programs and policies have led to useful institution-building in environmental protection.

The presentation by John Schoeberlein (Central Asian Studies, Harvard Univ.) on "Cultural Nationalism, Islam and State Ideology," examined the ways that new regimes are seeking to build legitimacy through adoption of cultural ideologies. He asked the question whether these efforts are effective in promoting loyalty, or whether the effectiveness of this link is simply assumed by both state actors and scholars observing the region. Laura Adams (Sociology, Babson College), speaking on "Cultural Elites in Uzbekistan," also looked at the question of regime legitimacy. Adams explored the question of why the cultural elite in Uzbekistan is not fundamentally oppositional and instead participates eagerly in the state's project of building cultural ideologies.

The presentations were the first stage in an interactive process that this project entails. They were followed by the submission of chapters for an edited volume based on each author's presentation and detailed feedback by all of the contributors, which culminated in the fall with a final workshop in which participants worked together to ensure that their chapters for the book functioned well as an integrated whole, drawing on the perspectives contained in other chapters. The book is now being reviewed for publication by two university presses.

---

Second CESS Annual Conference

Madison, Wisconsin, USA, October 11-14, 2001

This is a list of the actual participants in the 2001 Annual Conference. It will be a regular feature of the Conferences and Lecture Series section in the first number of each volume of CESR.

Linguistics I

Chair: John Colarusso (McMaster Univ.)

Uli Schamiloglu (Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison)
"The New World and the Turkic Lexicon"

John Colarusso (McMaster Univ.)
"Some Ethnonyms from the Caucasus"

Bert Beynen (Des Moines Area Community College & Iowa State Univ.)
"A Semantic Analysis of the Archaic Plural in Modern Georgian"

Identity & Politics

Chair: John Schoeberlein (Harvard Univ.)

Henry E. Hale (Indiana Univ.-Bloomingon)
"Uzbekistan's Path to Independence"

Hakan Yavuz (Univ. of Utah/Notre Dame Univ.)
"Turkish Identity Politics and Central Asia"

Pınar Akçalı (Middle East Technical Univ.)
"Civil Society and Identity Formation in Central Asia: Prospects and Limitations"

Modern History

Chair: Steven Duke (Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison)

Virginia Martin (Univ. of Alabama in Huntsville)
"Perjury in the Colonial Courthouse. The Meaning and Practice of Oath-taking among Kazakhs in the 19th century"

Marianne Kamp (Univ. of Wyoming)
"Remembering Collectivization in Uzbekistan"

Steven Duke (Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison)
"Non-Russian Schools and Society in Saratov Province, 1865-1895"

Education

Chair: Vladimir Boyko (Barnaul State Pedagogical Univ.)

Vladimir Boyko (Barnaul State Pedagogical Univ.)
"Central Asian Studies in Post-Soviet Russia: The Challenges for a New Old Discipline"

Martha C. Merrill (Indiana Univ.-Bloomington)
"Obstacles to University Reform in Post-Soviet Kyrgyzstan"

Sevda Jabrail Mamedova (Indiana Univ./Baku State Univ.)
"Current Education in Azerbaijan: New Dimensions"
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**Chair:** Talant Mawkanuli (Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison)
Fatma Sahan (Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison)
“Verbal Noun Structures in -U in Kazan Tatar”
Marti Roos (Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison)
“The Verbal Noun Suffix -MA in Western Yugur”
Talant Mawkanuli (Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison)
“Orthographic Divergence in Kazak in China and Kazakhstan”

**Culture & Identity**

**Chair:** H. B. Paksoy (Texas Tech Univ.-Lubbock)
H. B. Paksoy (Texas Tech Univ.-Lubbock)
“Cultural Politics and Identity in Central Asia”
Kyle T. Evered (Univ. of Oregon)
“Romancing the Region: Mapping the Discursive Terrains Found in Turkish Constructs of a "Türk dünyası”
Aida Huseynova (Indiana Univ./Baku Music Academy)
“20th Century Azerbaijani Ballet: From National Dance to Modern Choreography”
Tatarstan: Language, Memories, Transitions

Chair: Uli Schamiloglu (Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison)
Helen M. Faller (Univ. of Michigan)
"The Fallout of Soviet Nationalities Policies with Respect to Tatarstan"
Suzanne Wertheim (Univ. of California-Berkeley)
"Language Policy and Reality: How do the Youth of Tatarstan Speak?"

Roundtable Discussion - The Aftermath of September 11, 2001

Moderator: John Schoeberlein (Harvard Univ.)
Ambassador Nelson Ledsky (National Democratic Institute)
John Colarusso (McMaster Univ.)
Alisher Ilkhamov ("Ekspert-Fikri" Center for Social and Marketing Research, Tashkent, Uzbekistan)
Abdumannob Polat (Central Asian Human Rights Information Network of the Union of Councils)
Zarema Kasendeyeva (Indiana Univ.-Bloomington)
Laura Adams (Babson College)

Featured Speakers

Ambassador Nelson Ledsky (National Democratic Institute)
"Democracy in Central Asia and the Caucasus"
Alisher Ilkhamov ("Ekspert-Fikri" Center for Social and Marketing Research, Tashkent, Uzbekistan)
"Center-Periphery Relations in Uzbekistan"
Anatoly Khazanov (Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison)
"Central Asia Ten Years After"