

REGIMES OF HISTORICITY AND DISCOURSES OF MODERNITY AND IDENTITY, 1900-1945, IN EAST-CENTRAL, SOUTHEASTERN AND NORTHERN EUROPE

October 2008 – June 2010

Supported by the Volkswagen Foundation, Germany, the Fritz Thyssen Foundation, Germany and the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation, Sweden

Convened by Prof. Dr Diana Mishkova

FULL RESEARCH DESCRIPTION

Context, agenda and continuity of the proposed research

Research context and agenda

The *Regimes of Historicity* project has been inspired by earlier research carried out by the Centre for Advanced Study Sofia and co-hosted by Collegium Budapest, under the theme *We, the People. Visions of National Peculiarity and Political Modernities in the “Europe of Small Nations”* (2004-2005), supported by the German Foreign Office, Stiftelsen Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (Sweden) and the Volkswagen Foundation.

The aim of the *We, the People* project was to excavate, put together and compare various ideological traditions crucial for East-Central and Southeast European political and social thought, by focusing on the political instrumentalisation of the concepts of “folk”, “people” and “ethnos” in that part of Europe during the “long nineteenth” century (c. 1789-1918). The purpose was to trace out the discursive and institutional itineraries through which this set of notions became a focal point of cultural and political thought in various European contexts, coincidental with the emergence of political modernity. This entailed the elaboration of a new comparative methodology which was taking into account the common European “pool of ideas” and typological similarities, but also allowed for a context-sensitive reconstruction of the various ways of domestication, adaptation and subversion. (For a detailed description of the project see www.cas.bg (*Programmes/We, the People*). An important outcome of this initial stage was the emergence of a community of mainly young scholars formed through intensive personal interaction and painstaking negotiations among national traditions and methodological approaches. The results of this collaborative work will be published in the fall of 2007 by the Central European University Press.

The research proposed here is methodologically premised upon the *We, the People* project outlined above while extending its thematic, territorial and temporal scope. Its broad theoretical foundation is the connection, in a certain sense overlapping, between questions of modernity and identity. The various projects of modernisation that had emerged since the late 18th century were inherently related to the question of the kind of community they sought to conjure up hence to reconceptualisation of the “national self.” However, the ideologies and discourses that had explicated that relationship for the “smaller” European cultures, particularly those located on the margins of Europe, have barely been systematically scrutinized or explained in a comparative way.

We propose to undertake this task by focusing on the comparative analysis of the various ideological traditions which thematised the connection between modernity and historicity – a connection lying at the core of modern identity-narratives in the post-romantic era (1900-1945 – in three “small-state” regions: East-Central, Southeastern, and Northern Europe.

By positing the turn-of-the-century as a beginning of the post-romantic era for our three regions, we are maintaining the virtual existence of a specific temporal zone, where Romanticism's life-cycle had a different chronological extension, underwent a series of ideological transformations and was continuously re-processed and re-activated by various twentieth-century intellectual and academic traditions. Most significantly from our perspective, Romantic tenets were integrated into the national academic cultures that were becoming institutionalised around the latter part of the 19th c. on otherwise emphatically naturalist and positivist premises. Indeed, diverging "contemporaneities" of this kind had led Wolfgang Schmale to recently suggest combining the concept of historical meso-regions with Reinhart Koselleck's concept of "Zeitschichten", i.e. layers of different historical periods which can coexist at one and the same point in time (Schmale 2003; Koselleck 2000)

The very choice of ideologies as the vantage point of our research suggests that we do not intend to restrict ourselves to analysing the anti-historicist shifts in the interwar national historiographies alone. Logically, reconstructing the ways in which the "new temporalities" affected the national representations of the past will be one of our central preoccupations. Particularly in conjunction with several newly articulated ideological positions, they sharply underscore the contested nature of national identity. Contestation implied negotiation and conflict over diverse meanings where understandings of time performed a constitutive function. It should also be stressed, that naturalized by the historical method as it is, the notion of time has so far been neither studied nor applied to nationalism studies from this perspective. For all that, our intention is to pay close attention to the temporalised historical dimension in the alternative socio-cultural constructions of and intellectual debates about community and commonality.

Our work thereof will draw upon the methodological advancements and conceptual rigour brought forth by several authors who have recently testified to the ways time horizons shape political discourse and action. The metahistorical categories of "space of experience" and "horizon of expectation" as they were formulated by Reinhart Koselleck for the purposes of his semantics of historical times seek to sort out "how in every present the temporal dimensions of past and future have been related" and how the tension between experience and expectation have structured the articulation of past, present and future (Koselleck 1979). François Hartog's notion of "regimes of historicity" seizes upon Marshall Sahlins' anthropological insights about the forms of history he had encountered in the Pacific islands in order "to illuminate precisely this tension" or ever-growing distance between experience and expectation which Koselleck has postulated as generating historical time (Sahlins 1987; Hartog, 2003). Along similar lines, we draw on the insights of J.G.A. Pocock concerning the "politics of time" i.e. the way political languages are framed in view of their envisioned temporal patterns (from prescriptive traditionalism to eschatological millenarism) (Pocock 1972).

Our treatment of "temporalities" and "historicities", however, goes well beyond historiographical employment and retrospection. It involves visions of past and future, of continuity and discontinuity in a wider spectrum of twentieth-century social and political thinking about modernity and identity. Whilst we have underscored the major ideological divisions, in actuality we intend to tackle them in terms of (social scientific) sub-fields such as economic, sociological, geopolitical, historical, literary, artistic, etc. visions and theories. This will make it possible for us, first of all, to reconsider the usual metaphors rooted in temporal dimensions that are used for non-core Western cultures such as asynchrony, backwardness, catching-up. The kind of questions we intend to address from such an interdisciplinary perspective are aptly summarized by Reinhart Koselleck in a discussion of the German "belated national formation": "To be late can be only the one who does not keep his time-table. But who decides what the time-table to be kept by any single "nation" is? Is it the neighboring nations or the nation that obeys the norms of its neighbors? Or the nation that itself sets its proper goals? Is there in general any plan of the world history that should be observed by the different nations once we have recognized nations as primary subjects of action?" (Koselleck, 2000). The moral and normative implications of such questions (framed in terms of positive and negative *Sonderwege*, civilizational superiority and belatedness) have been at the core of modernist and anti-modernist thought from the far left to the far right, engulfing old and new social scientific disciplines, ever since the dawn of the twentieth century. To a large extent the very structuring of that century's ideological landscape came about by the varying answers given.

As in our previous research, the process of cultural appropriation and mediation will be a central axis of investigation pointing to the complex interplay of local traditions and "imported" ideological

packages. Building upon two regional comparative paradigms – the long-standing *Südostforschungen* and the more recent *Nordic Spaces* research – our aim is to embark on a comparison between historical regions testing for regional peculiarities and common European phenomena. All the more so since these regions were themselves often framed by such temporal references. This approach will open up the possibility for formulating heuristic regional typologies, looking at the specific mechanisms of framing modernity in Southeastern, Central and Northern Europe – in other words, creating regional typologies not in terms of temporality but in terms of framing temporality. Rather than trying to assimilate the often markedly different historical itineraries and experiences, this framework of interpretation creates a possibility of synoptic readings, establishing connections between traditions which were not having a direct impact on each other, but were participating in comparable projects of “domesticating” modernity.

The Modernist Heritage, the Narratives of Identity, and the Concepts of Time

A major feature of the nineteenth-century legacy in the countries concerned which, in retrospect, highlights the nature of the “temporal” paradigm shift that took place at the beginning of the following century, was the actual intermingling of post-Enlightenment and Romantic themes. Consequently, during the second half of the nineteenth century the Romantic construction of identity infiltrated a wide range of modernist discourses and was frequently used to legitimate modernizing projects and reforms. The universalisation of national statehood went hand in hand with the institutionalisation of the “national sciences” aimed to create a normative image of the ethno-national community on the basis of its historical and cultural continuity. Identity was historicised as cumulative advancement on a single evolutionary ladder, while conservative stances, social-radical dissent or “originalist” romanticism left the concept of progress largely unchallenged. While insisting on the *plurality* of times, where each object constitutes its own time, the enlightenment-romantic tradition stopped short of offering an escape from the universalizing “tyranny of progress” into “ontological a-temporality”. The national community, far from celebrating a return to the a-historical organic, validated its *Geist* by essentializing and historicizing its propensity to progress.

At the backdrop of this nineteenth-century legacy, the peculiarity that stands out for the following period is the coexistence of radical modernist ventures with the radical rejection of modernity – a concoction that has parallels with other historical regions and times, in contemporary fundamentalisms for instance.

Starting with the early 20th century, the evolutionist-progressivist construct of history and community began to be increasingly challenged and was seriously undermined during the interwar period marked by political, economic and cultural crisis across Europe. What makes most of our chosen contexts highly interesting is the unprecedented overlapping of the crisis of modernity with the crisis of collective identity, which resulted in a feverish search for new political and cultural models to fit “national specificities”. New discourses emerged which re-organised the entire political debate. They were consistent with the shifts of the broader European cultural context, as most notably signaled by the emergence of *Kulturphilosophie* or cultural morphology, featuring an alternative vision of the normativity of historical tradition and of national community.

This essentially entailed reconceptualisations of accumulated historicity. The twofold crisis was largely perceived as a rupture in an erstwhile continuum and was explicated in terms of a “temporal crisis” – the sapped capacity of the past to lend orientation in the present and a face of the future. A characteristic of the new political languages, from radically modernist to extremely anti-modernist, was the entanglement of identities with historicities. The construction and contestation of alternative visions of the relationship between tradition and modernity, organicism and change, past and future came to be “historicised” along different temporal coordinates and modalities of historical existence which led to (re)conceptualisations of political community and political legitimacy. The concept of “regimes of historicity” is appropriate here as it “seeks to be a heuristic instrument helping to achieve a better understanding not of time, not of all times or the entirety of time, but above all of the moments of temporal crises, here or there, precisely when the links between past, present and future loose their plainness” (Hartog, 2003).

In contrast to the commonplace assumption that the paradigm shift took place in the interwar period, we believe that it is at the beginning of the 20th century when one can locate most of the major new ideological constructs which became institutionalised after 1918. Among them were the critical discourse connecting (aesthetic) modernism and cultural nation-building; the radical-populist discourse; ethnic neo-conservatism, or conservative populism; the social-democratic doctrine (often coupled with some sort of etatism) and various trends of anti-liberal collectivism (corporativism, syndicalism, etc.). While not without roots in the previous decades, all these got a considerable impetus after 1918, with the experience of the collapse of the old order and the dissolution of the optimistic belief in gradual progress.

The itinerary of interwar identity discourses makes for a long and variegated list including modernist and anti-modernist ones as well as a broad range of in-between ideological positions. Of course, many of these discourses can be placed into more than one category. A preliminary register of the political languages would include:

- (neo-)liberalism;
- agrarianism;
- socialism(s);
- technocratism, planned society;
- corporativism;
- political Catholicism, Protestantism and Orthodoxy;
- neo-conservatism, Conservative Revolution;
- biopolitics – eugenics, political anthropology;
- totalitarian ideologies.

A new light can be shed on these ideological options, commonly studied in view of their relative place on a left-right political scale, if they are interpreted from the perspective of their temporal horizons. While classical liberalism was rooted in a linear historical narrative of accumulated welfare and civility, the neo-liberals (such as the Romanian political economist Ștefan Zeletin) gave up this belief and allowed for breaking institutional continuities and reliance on a more powerful “creative” agency – the state power. Similarly, while the social democratic mainstream of the turn of the century was committed to a historicist vision, the various new socialist (or Communist) movements opened up to different other modalities of framing history, ranging from revolutionary eschatology to the cyclical model envisioning the socialist society as a return to pre-modernity in the vision of left-wing agrarian populists. The transformation was equally spectacular in the case of conservative ideologies: while the nineteenth-century version was focusing on protecting continuity with certain elements of the pre-modern socio-economic structures from non-organic change and reckless reformism, the emerging proponents of a Conservative Revolution came to envision a radical transformation, thus asserting “Tradition” in terms of a radical break of continuity with the immediate past.

While the relationship between languages of identity and temporalities will provide the broader framework of our research, our approach will largely focus on the ways this relationship was thematised by different scientific fields. In addition to humanities, history, literary studies and art theory in particular, it will consider the newly formed social sciences, such as sociology, ethnology, political economy, geopolitics, political anthropology, etc., which were strongly influenced by but at the same time helped to frame the ideologies and temporalities under consideration. Affected by the reconfiguration of the ideological landscape, historiography also underwent a profound change in this period. While exposed to the European trends (*Geistesgeschichte*, *Volksgeschichte* etc.) the historical profession reached a structural and discursive autarchy never before experienced in these countries, with mechanisms of local elite-reproduction, institutionalisation of education and publishing and a direct link to policy making. Hence, the historiographic aspects of our theme, namely the reflection on these ideologems in the national histories in our three regions, will also be scrutinized in view of the broader ideological context, incorporating but also adding to the existing scholarship in this area.

In the final analysis the constitutive question of our research ensues from the fact that, although the “European” ingredients were almost identical, the respective national canons gave highly divergent responses to the challenges of the time. But, while some of these intellectual trends thematizing the peculiarity of their “national paths” were studied in their singularity within their respective local contexts,

there is an endemic lack of research initiatives willing to, and capable of, analyzing these discourses in a comparative way. Our project undertakes to put these highly idiosyncratic discourses next to each other, thus undermining their self-professed claim to uniqueness but remaining sensitive to the actual divergences of the answers which different political cultures gave to the crisis of modernity.

The history of “national temporalities” tells us a lot about the actual trajectories of these ideas. While charting the different regimes of historicity in the post-romantic terminology of collective identity our research will, at the same time, seek to highlight the *longue durée* continuity of some basic concepts like folk, nation, ethnos, and the recurrence of others, such as myth, rebirth, organicity or prehistory, which were thematised in the romantic period, submerged in the period of positivist attacks, and resurfaced in the inter-war period. Of course, there are in this respect significant differences between the ways indigenous culture for instance was utilized in different historical regions. In some cases, the new cult of archaism became a state-building ideology, in other cases it remained one of the available discursive options; in some cases it had an overwhelmingly anti-democratic tone, while in other cases it could be instrumentalised by left and right-wing movements alike. But certain common traits, such as the emergence of comparable conceptual frameworks and the trajectory of certain ideas, definitely make it possible to devise a broader European landscape of ideas from this perspective.

Research goals and objectives

The far-reaching aspiration of the proposed project is to “put on the map” the intellectual traditions of those “small nations” which were in many ways important parts of the European circulation of ideas, but whose 19th and 20th century history remained outside of the mainstream of scholarly thematisation. Underlying it is a complex and pioneering research agenda that sets forth to work out a methodological know-how, particularly criteria of selecting, structuring and presenting the most emblematic writings of (a cluster of) “marginalised” national traditions of social and political thinking. The ambition is to help fill in significant gaps in the European intellectual history of the last two centuries by taking a cross-national and cross-regional comparative perspective to (i) the intellectual transformations in Europe (such as fundamental shifts of political and social paradigms, languages and concepts), and (ii) the interconnections between European political cultures. Its aim is the eventual creation of a book-series with the intention of reshaping the “European canon” of political thought, making the “local knowledges” of these cultures accessible to the broader international public and thus creating a more encompassing vision of what constitutes the European cultural-political heritage.

Concretely, our objectives hereby would be:

- mapping the various traditions, main discourses and “actors” of the respective fields;
- tracing out external (Western and intra-regional) discursive and theoretical influences on the intellectual networks. The intended comparative approach is expected to yield important new results in two directions: in establishing the cross-cultural mechanisms of reception of certain scholarly paradigms coming from Western Europe and in identifying some of the almost completely neglected intra-regional cross-fertilisations;
- creating a coherent methodological framework for dealing with questions of collective identity and the institutionalisation of national discourse in a variety of cultural-political contexts. This means the “trading” of classic “Western” methodological paradigms relevant for studying political ideas and discourse (such as the British “contextualist” intellectual history, the German *Begriffsgeschichte*, or the French history of *mentalités*), but also the opportunity of measuring the relevance of new historiographical trends stemming from our three regions in view of the needs of a complex cross-cultural research environment;
- locating the major ideological traditions at play in the various national contexts. What were the ideological options for constructing their national “ideologems”? Could the labels commonly used in the scholarly literature for certain configurations (such as populism, liberal nationalism, racism, etc.) be employed in these contexts or one has to develop an alternative conceptual framework for dealing with these phenomena?

Present state of research in the field. Methodology

A field of historical scholarship that is especially helpful in shaping the theoretical foundations of this research is the intellectual history cultivated at several research and university centres in North America and Europe. In Europe, one can roughly distinguish three main conceptual paradigms in this direction: namely the so-called “Cambridge school” of early modern political thought represented among others by Quentin Skinner and J. G. A. Pocock, the influential German *Begriffsgeschichte* approach represented above all by Reinhart Koselleck, and finally, one part of the French “post-Annales” history of *mentalités* seeking its way towards the challenges of the modern intellectual history. Without disregarding the social, political, and institutional structures, the intellectual history we want to do seeks to profit from the prolific dialogue with the other approaches of recent historical scholarship, above all the various schools of social and cultural history. By fusing intellectual history with some aspects of socio-cultural history our aspiration is to bring together conceptualisations and practices. At the same time, many of their common features notwithstanding, the approaches mentioned above are rooted in their respective institutional backgrounds, cultural settings and historiographical traditions. As the encounters and debates of their representatives in the last decades proved, they show significant divergences in many aspects, despite efforts to bring closer if not harmonize these methodologies. Being aware of these complexities, we prefer to avoid subscribing to a particular school or theoretical perspective. Nevertheless, we shall remain sensitive to the theoretical and methodological incentives of these traditions and reflect on the possible application of this broadly defined research perspective in the Central and Southeast-European context.

While not seeking to supersede these theoretical models, it is obvious that transplanting them into another context raises important methodological issues. Thus, for instance, the models of sociability and political communication envisioned in the *Begriffsgeschichte* tradition were deeply rooted in the German research tradition focusing on the turn from enlightened cosmopolitanism to national ideology in the wake of the Napoleonic wars. In contrast, the emerging political modernity of East-Central Europe, in the mid-19th century encountered a socially and culturally different world - the nation was framed not so much in competition with a universalist cultural tradition but rather in view of the competing loyalties of similar but incompatible nation-building projects within an imperial context, and taking into account exactly the example of “nationalization” of culture in the “West”. This phases-shift of course had enormous consequences as the transformation of political language was rooted in a complex mimetic competition, leading to the emergence of alternative modernities (such as in the case of the autochthonist vs. Westernist debates), which developed parallel conceptual frameworks.

In order to understand the discourses in question, one has to establish a model of cultural reception and also to interpret their local cultural dynamism – the way certain traditions were formed, their relation to each other, etc. – in a broader framework of comparisons. This necessitates combining, rather than confronting, the perspectives of transnational and comparative history - within and across our three regions. While taking into account the dynamism of nationalisation throughout the period which formatted institutions and academic cultures in a national key, our method defies the traditional “national” approach to history and draws on the insights of *Transfersgeschichte* and *histoire croisée*. The purpose is not to prove which approach is better but to use the tensions between them as a constructive way of understanding transfers and their outcomes, differences and similarities. Our invitation, in other words, is to consider anew the relationship between representations and comparisons, between cross-national history’s emphasis on interpretation and meaning, and comparative history’s focus on similarities and differences.

Consequently, the pattern of comparisons proposed here does not follow territorially defined ideological oppositions (e.g. East/West) but instead rests upon the experience of analogous phenomena in the respective national cultures of Nordic, Central and Southeast Europe. Rather than projecting a universal teleological scheme of development, the chosen approach is seeking to demonstrate the potentiality and creativity of local projects. Along these lines, the aim of our research, unlike many other projects on the regions concerned, is not to endorse some essentialist vision of a given historical region, but rather to devise a multi-dimensional mental map. The main aim is thus broadening the field of comparisons, not unifying various phenomena. From this point of view, the project is based not on the belief in the model value of Western European cultural paradigms but on a functional, pragmatic and –

what is very important – *epistemological* compromise which could only allow us to go further with some analytical apparatus.

In this sense, our project draws on the rich scholarly literature, informed by various approaches, of rendering the interwar European turn against modernism intelligible by connecting it to the *longue durée* of political romanticism and its ideological connections to ethno-populist and fascist movements. For instance George L. Mosse (on the connection of Romantic conception of the Volk and the totalitarian political rituals), Fritz Stern (on the “politics of cultural despair”); Zeev Sternhell (on the intellectual origins of extreme-rightist political ideologies); Carl Schorske (on the conflict of various modernist and anti-modernist trends in turn-of-the-century Vienna). Once again, given the divergence of social and political conditions, these developments had different resonance in Northern and East-Central Europe. Nevertheless, there are strong parallels which must be explored, from the “biologisation” of the national discourse to the various uses of the reservoir of “agrarian populism” in political mobilization and state-symbolism.

Expected results and products

Expected scholarly results and theoretical contribution

We believe that the researches carried out on the basis of jointly refined set of methodological precepts and the coordinated set of research criteria could lead to a new understanding of the constitution of the unity and the diversity of national academic and ideological traditions and their role in the construction of modernity (or rather, multiple modernities) in Europe. The systematic presentation of a source material hitherto only superficially taken into account because of the segmentation of national academic discourses and, above all, the linguistic barriers, would provide a good vantage point from which one could offer – in a series of studies gathered in one or several volumes – a new synthesis of the stimulating recent enquiries on modernities and identities in the past two decades. The joint research will provide for an unprecedented cooperative venture of exploring the transmission of knowledge and the thematisation of social sciences from a comparative perspective. Most importantly, this would lend new insights to the studying of the dissemination of scholarly paradigms and the patterns of institutional interaction, and to identifying the agents of cultural transfer.

The envisaged research results and the crowning publication would give a new vision of how historicity was negotiated in the non-core Europe as part of the “big debate” on modernisation and modernity. It is expected that, while developing their individual research projects, participating scholars will be able to come up with something more than the usual collection of unrelated research papers, namely, a coherent vision of the main lines of the history of political ideas before World War II. The individual contributions would go beyond the case-study level and would ideally offer first steps towards monographs. We see this as essential for a breakthrough of non-nation centric historiography in the countries concerned where the usual framework is based on the comparison between “us” and the “European core”. We shall thus contribute to the emergence of a new transnational historiography which will also bring the more recently raised methodological issues into these historiographies. As we do not plan to map national cases but rather intellectual traditions framing temporality and historicity which are transnational by definition (e.g. agrarianism, neo-liberalism, Volksgeschichte), the research results and the subsequent publications will not have a national breakdown but a discursive one, offering a picture which is going beyond regional relevance. Finally, we expect to get a sampling of contextualised intellectual biographies of the main thinkers of these national canons in the timeframe of the project, such as Petar Mutafchiev, Gyula Szekfű, Roman Dmowski, Josef Pekař, Mircea Vulcănescu, Nichifor Crainic, Eugen Lovinescu, Jovan Cvijic, Nikolai Velimirovic, Ion Dragoumis, etc., who are usually key references in local contexts but are rarely internationalized.

Organizational framework

The Centre for Advanced Study will be responsible for the overall organisation and administration of the the project. The junior fellowships will extend over a period of nine months.

During the fellowship periods the participants will concentrate on their individual investigation in their countries of residence, benefiting at the same time from the interdisciplinary and comparative framework of research and exchange provided by CAS. The regular focus-group seminars that are envisaged for them would allow for the harmonisation of the individual research criteria and help elaborate common principles in dealing with divergent types of source-materials, “cultural negotiations” and theoretical transfers. Each individual paper will be subject to detailed examination and in-depth discussions by the other Fellows, thus allowing for the cross-fertilisation of the distinct disciplinary perspectives. The Fellows will also be invited to CAS Sofia for research stays negotiated with each participant individually.

The two extended colloquia, in the spring of 2009 and the spring of 2010, will present the agenda and the outcome of our work before a larger audience, the selected results of which would be published in the crowing collective volume. They are also intended to integrate and engage a larger circle of junior scholars in the thematic field and methodology and to identify a broader pool of up-and-coming researchers willing to participate at a later stage in the execution of the project. The envisaged structure of the colloquia is geared towards an intensive exchange of methodological and historiographical expertise over the relatively extended period of one week. Participants will be asked to produce analytical texts, informed by the general framework of the project, to be distributed in advance and discussed in a systematic way (e.g. by a formal commentator and in a general discussion). The senior Research Fellows will participate in both colloquia.

Another type of sessions will take place around the lectures of specially invited guest-scholars, who are prominent in the tackled thematic fields and/or in related theoretical and methodological debates. The contribution of the guest-scholars and the senior fellows will not be limited to a keynote lecture or presentation of their ongoing research. They will also set up research seminars whereby they will be able to engage in genuine interaction with the junior scholars by commenting on (some of) the papers and contributing to the discussions and the refinement of the theoretical framework of the project.

Work programme and time schedule

Starting in **October 2008**, the research will take place in the following complementary forms:

Fellowship programmes (of 6 to 9 months duration over the two-year time-span of the project) for senior and junior scholars, enabling the participants to concentrate on their individual investigation while benefiting from the interdisciplinary and comparative framework of research and exchange;

Focus-group sessions (two per year) where the participating scholars will have the opportunity to discuss their individual projects and the common research agenda. These joint seminars would allow harmonisation of the individual research criteria and help us elaborate common principles in dealing with divergent types of source-materials, “cultural negotiations” and theoretical transfers.

Two extended colloquia, in the spring of 2009 and the spring of 2010, with the participation of specially invited guests. The colloquia will be devoted to presenting the outcome of the work before a larger audience, the selected results of which would be published in a collective volume.

Conference at the end of the project to present its outcomes before a larger academic audience.

Tasks of the Junior Fellows.

- To propose and elaborate individual projects/case studies within the common thematic frame;
- To participate in the annual working sessions, colloquia, conference;
- To assume the role of formal commentators on their colleagues’ work-in-progress;
- at the end of the project, to present completed research papers, the best of which will be published in a hardcopy publication and the CAS Working Paper Series.