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CHAPTER FOURTEEN

Local, Global, Digital?:
Digital Humanities and Slavic Area Studies

Megan Browndorf and Erin Pappas

Introduction

In the past ten years, the work done in area studies—that is, the interdisciplinary study of regional topics—has changed dramatically. As such, the nature of the support that librarians need to provide scholars has similarly changed. This change has been particularly acute for librarians supporting Slavic area scholarship as research in the region has continued to lose US federal funding since the dissolution of the Soviet Union. And it has been particularly acute in terms of reactions to new technologies for research, including what has come to be referred to as the digital humanities (DH). This chapter looks at the intersections of digital humanities and Slavic studies, focused specifically on Title VI centers. We examined twenty-one centers, important now and historically, for evidence of projects and support for Slavic work in DH. Many projects have already been written about by librarians. Our goal here is to develop an overview of the last decade, with a specific focus on the overlap of Slavic area studies and digital humanities, in order to help librarians looking for ways to support this work at their home institutions.

We explore ways that area studies librarians can continue to support new methods of scholarship without losing the international expertise that defines our field. We provide background on area studies centers, the digital humanities, and the conceptual (as well as practical) linkages between them. While this chapter has a fairly narrow purview, we hope it will be indicative of larger trends and concerns. It is intended primarily as a survey of former and current national resource centers; a list of the institutions included can be found in this endnote. Although the specific geographic areas covered may vary from institution to institution, most of these resource centers include some permutation of Russia, Eastern Europe, and Central Asia. We then turn our attention to three themes which emerged in our survey of Title VI centers: support and development of tools and methods, digital pedagogy support, and digitization/digital collections. Finally, we bring the discussion back to what librarians trying to support this work can do. We speak spe-
cifically from our experiences as Slavic librarians and so do not touch upon the other regions covered by Title VI funding, though these may share our concerns with vernacular languages, funding, and historically deep institutional collections. As such, we focus here only on programs housed at R1 institutions in the United States with dedicated Slavic area studies centers. While some DH work at these centers dates from the 1990s and early 2000s, we have limited the scope of this study to projects from the last decade. This means we focus only on projects that were begun in 2006 or later. While many digital projects have clear antecedents that reach back much further, to include them here would provide less a current “state of the field” and more a retrospective.

Area Studies: Centers, Libraries, and Support

Since their formal codification in the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Title VI), which provided the federal funding for language centers, area studies has been a bastion of internationalism within American research universities. Federal allocations provided resources to ensure that library collections could support deep and sustained research for world regions as defined by the federal government. As area studies departments appeared in universities, area studies librarianship developed to support them. Large, diverse collections in foreign languages that were built using interdisciplinary, international expertise defined this new approach to librarianship. With regard to university libraries, area studies provided justification for collecting materials in regional vernaculars as well as being potential sources of funding to allow for purchases in foreign scholarship, newspapers, ephemera, and language education.

Yet today these programs are in jeopardy. Plagued by the loss of deep collections budgets, local constraints on foreign purchasing, and the loss of federal funding for specific regions, libraries are finding it increasingly difficult to acquire vernacular materials. Under the auspices of austerity, streamlining, and consolidation, disparate collections and programs are now being replaced with a more generic “international” or “global” studies focus. Librarians continue to support geographically focused interdisciplinary programs as they have since the heyday of area studies in the 1960s but with increasingly less latitude for acquisitions. While the impulse to think beyond the regions predates the current funding contraction, it does point to a trend that sidelines vernacular languages in favor of English-only. The reasons for this are many, but among them may be counted declining support for the humanities in favor of skills-based education and training, as well as a generic “global” focus that encourages colleges and universities to consolidate small departments, especially those with regional language and literature focus, to eliminate waste.

Digital Humanities and the Library

Other changes to this and related fields can be viewed in a more positive light, such as the development and growth of the digital humanities. Although the current political climate remains astonishingly hostile to the humanities, still the digital humanities flourish. Naturally, these are not without their detractors, and for good reason. Atten-
tion has been drawn to the Anglocentrism and whiteness of DH, but these critiques do not in and of themselves ameliorate the underlying issues, including limitations on language. For example, many projects come out of American colleges and universities using English-language resources, having been developed for undergraduate courses. We ask: Where do area studies, rich in cultural and linguistic diversity, fit in this new environment?

While many advancements were crucial to the development of DH, underpinning them all were computing technologies that allowed work to be done at scale. Yet, digital humanities is much more than simply tools and platforms. It strives for an ethos of transparency, collaboration, iteration, and sharing that stands in marked contrast to a humanities tradition of singularity—one scholar, one field, one monograph. Matthew Kirschenbaum sums up the paradigm quite succinctly:

Whatever else it might be then, the digital humanities today is about a scholarship (and a pedagogy) that is publicly visible in ways to which we are generally unaccustomed, a scholarship and pedagogy that’s bound up with infrastructure in ways that are deeper and more explicit than we are generally accustomed, a scholarship and pedagogy that is collaborative and depends on networks of people and that lives an active, 24/7 life online.

When looking at the programs, projects, and DH work being done in Slavic centers, this ethos of public collaboration is apparent, particularly when we look beyond digital or digitized collections.

Especially important for our analysis is this distinction between digital/digitized collections and digital humanities proper. Libraries are often providers of digital collections and may have contributed to digitization in whole or part. These collections have fundamentally enabled the digital turn in the humanities but are not in and of themselves practices, methods, or theoretical orientations. In other words, DH work often depends on the existence of (mostly static) digital collections, but the mere existence of digital collections in certain libraries or centers does not in and of itself indicate any particular affinity for DH work being done there.

In addition to a distinction between digital/digitized collections and the digital humanities, there is also the distinction between digital humanities and traditional humanities to consider. While humanities departments seem under siege—administratively under-supported, derided by policy makers, and faced with declining enrollments—DH has robust support structures, from federal NEH and NEA grants to local monies in the form of innovation or teaching grants. DH is now supported “on a growing number of campuses by a level of funding, infrastructure, and administrative commitments that would have been unthinkable even a decade ago.” Here we may see a parallel between the “traditional” humanities and area studies, which are presumed to be outmoded, in decline, and no longer relevant, in contrast to the growing presence of DH and catch-all “global studies” department and initiatives. Among graduate students, in particular, digital humanities are seen as a necessary skill to be acquired before matriculating or going onto the job market. Digital methodologies, tools, and teaching are seen as in-demand in the academic marketplace, which may explain why graduate students and early-career scholars gravitate toward them.
All twenty-one institutions we examined have some kind of DH presence on campus, though this may manifest differently depending on the local environment. Many institutions have large DH centers which act as hubs for academic departments across the campus. Others have this support distributed throughout academic departments or centrally located in the library. These differences in paradigms for developing research projects and tools—DH center, distributed support model, and library-based model—similarly affect how DH and area studies co-exist on campuses. 

A number of institutions, such as UCLA, Stanford University, and the University of Virginia, have dedicated DH Centers that support most (or all) of the DH work on a campus. These institutions have dedicated digital humanities centers that steward specific projects and initiatives. At these types of institutions, the library plays a minimal role in supporting the digital humanities because that work is being done in a center. However, the library may be working at cross-purposes with that center, duplicating work or failing to capitalize on local or national initiatives.

A second model centers support for DH work in the departments and colleges which do that work. In these institutions, departments and colleges support DH work, sometimes with the support of campus technology centers and the library, but sometimes on their own. In these situations, library support is often conducted through a departmental subject liaison. Examples of institutions that use models like this include Duke University and the University of Texas-Austin.

The last model places DH support squarely in the library. In these institutions, the library is the center for DH work and scholarship and has individuals hired to support DH work on campus. They may work with subject liaisons to support the work. Examples of institutions with models like this include Kansas University and Indiana University. While an institution generally focuses their support in one of these three directions, support for DH throughout the university can include pieces of all three models.

To complicate the issue still further, individuals with what we would consider “library” expertise and knowledge may actually be housed in a separate DH center, while the library pursues initiatives and projects on its own. In other words, library DH and campus DH may be working at cross-purposes, duplicating efforts, or trying to tap into the same limited pool of resources. Returning to area studies faculty and students, we did not find any clear reasons why one model would be preferred over another for DH projects. However, as with all research, it seems likely that scholars would naturally gravitate toward one of these based either on reputation, past experiences, or word-of-mouth. As a matter of course, they may bypass local infrastructures and institutions entirely, the better to collaborate with colleagues across institutions.

Area Studies Today: The State of the Field

To return to area studies, many Title VI-funded centers lost their federal support in the 2013 and 2015 rounds of awards. Of the twenty-one institutions we identified in our initial survey, seven lost their federal funding completely, while the others saw a reduction in the amount distributed. However, all are important historically and at present; federal grant money is not the only metric for impact. These institutions house major area studies collections, employ specialist librarians, catalogers, and bibliographers, and are regular destinations for researchers and visiting scholars. It seems increasingly unlikely that those monies will be recouped in future rounds of funding, making it incumbent
on the institutions themselves to make area studies a continuing priority. Some have met this challenge through shared collections and collection development policies, while others have chosen to severely limit their vernacular expenditures or purchases from foreign presses. Along with high-level language training, interdisciplinarity is a hallmark of area studies. A typical area studies center, for instance, will function as a touchstone for political scientists, language instructors, historians, anthropologists, linguists, economists, and literature scholars. To bring this back to the growth of DH, this means that area studies librarians already possess a sought-after capability within that field—namely, the ability to move fluidly between various disciplines.

We are broadly interested in the ways that digital humanities presumes a globalizing universality—if not Anglophone in nature, then almost unfailingly written in Roman script—that stands in stark contrast to the inherent particularity of area studies in which the world is comprised of discrete and bounded “regions.” Presumably, we have similarly limited time in which to build cultural competence and interdisciplinarity within the digital humanities, thus ensuring that it is truly global in its purview. We would like to push the conversation further and ask how we can ensure that deep, particular knowledge is not glossed over. Even more specifically, what do digital projects offer the Slavic scholarly community, and how can they raise awareness beyond our field? In the following pages, we examine places where the digital humanities and area studies have already intersected and identify three sites of continuing cooperation: digital tools and research, pedagogy, and digitization and exhibition.

Digital Tools and Research

While many different types of digital projects and research have taken place on these twenty-one diverse campuses, two are of particular interest for Slavic research. These are mapping/geospatial/GIS (Global Information Systems) and text-based or linguistic analysis. In terms of the latter, issues that were identified in the 2000s included a dearth of full-run digital collections, poor or no OCR if digitized, and a lack of robust metadata, among others. Michael Neubert, former Slavic librarian and digital projects coordinator at the Library of Congress, edited a volume of Slavic & East European Information Resources devoted to digital libraries. This special issue was simultaneously released as a book entitled Virtual Slavica: Digital Libraries, Digital Archives. In it, librarians discussed such problems as the Comintern Archives, “Making the Cyrillic OPAC a Reality,” and providing digital reference for Slavists at the University of Illinois. Twelve years later, the Comintern Archives are accessible in another form, few of the Cyrillic OPAC problems identified remain to trouble scholarly research, and the University of Illinois is still doing Slavic digital reference. The only other piece to provide an overview of the digital Slavic landscape, Patricia Hswe’s “What You Don’t Know Will Hurt You” holds up only as a retrospective overview. It provides a mix of out-of-date projects and problems, each of which has outgrown their constraints from a decade ago.

However, many of the technical problems that plagued scholars and researchers in the 2000s have now been all but resolved. Vendors, most notably EastView, have taken the lead in making large corpuses of OCR-ed text available to scholars. We are only now beginning to witness the effects of the mass digitization of important collections, either done by vendors, universities and university presses, or some partnership thereof—particularly on text-based analysis projects. The projects that result may reflect
local holdings and concerns or address broader issues, such as rendering Slavic languages machine-readable. Representative projects range from explorations of Bulgarian and Czech dialects, topic modeling the Russian Primary Chronicle, text mining novels from the Russian Revolution, or encoding Cyrillic characters in Unicode.

In our survey of research universities, GIS and geography-based projects appeared fairly frequently. One possibility for their widespread distribution is that, depending on the software program being used, these projects can have a very low barrier to entry. Maps used as base layers for projects are widely and freely available through programs such as Google Earth. They also do not require specialized language skills, and may allow scholars to work well beyond their areas of linguistic expertise as well as tapping into student involvement. Geographic locations and toponyms are also easily translated between the vernacular language and English, with many programs having this functionality already built-in. For example, this means that scholars of the Silk Road—which historically stretched from Asia Minor through Central Asia—may work across languages as disparate as Turkish, Armenian, Georgian, Farsi, Russian, Uzbek, and Chinese, even if they know only one of these languages. While the Electronic Cultural Atlas Initiative (ECAI) Silk Road Atlas project does not rely on GIS per se, it stands out as an early example of geographic work that crosses multiple boundaries: linguistic, spatial, and national.

Digital Pedagogy: Language Learning and Beyond

Many of the institutions we looked at leveraged digital approaches to the humanities for the education of graduate and undergraduate students, whether their own or visiting. Among these, three pedagogical tracks stood out as being particularly important: first, in technical and digital support for language training and language centers; second, in the translation of primary source materials (translation allows such material to be accessible to undergraduate students who may have little to no vernacular language capacity); and finally, in the development of courses with digital aspects. These classes may in and of themselves serve a pedagogical function, the better to train subsequent cohorts of digital humanists.

Early applications of digital technologies to Slavic arose from the study and teaching of regional languages and the sharing of pedagogical material to support those endeavors. Computer-mediated language learning for the languages of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet states grew throughout the 1990s along with the capability to render Cyrillic text digitally. As the technology advanced, so did these projects become more complex. They developed from the straightforward sharing of audio-visual material on websites to online tutorials, interactive modules, and dynamic websites.

In keeping with the interdepartmental nature of area studies, many area studies centers partnered with language learning labs to develop these technologies, even without the guiding mandate of an overarching project or grant. Examples of institutions that have supported or currently support digital technologies in their methods of language instruction include Indiana University, Duke University, and UCLA. Both Indiana’s and UCLA’s programs are supported in conjunction with larger language-learning centers, which include non-Slavic languages, while Duke’s program is developed through its Slavic Language Resource Center.
As the digital humanities have matured, the classroom has become one of the key sites for their development. This includes the creation of lessons, tools, and archives for use by undergraduates and graduate students. As mentioned previously, it also encompasses training advanced students to employ digital humanities methods in their research and teaching. A forerunner among peers, Harvard’s Davis Center hired an individual to coordinate curriculum and use of digital projects and to maintain a list of “pedagogical resources” on its website, including digital artifacts and videos on teaching.25

Teaching DH in the Slavic classroom is particularly developed as part of the training for graduate students, who may then utilize these tools and techniques in their own teaching. It may also reflect the desire of early career scholars and doctoral students to add DH to their skillsets and thus increase their prospects on the academic job market.

For instance, Yale’s Marjeta Bozovic has been experimenting with the Joseph Brodsky Digital Humanities lab. This is a seminar that aims both to teach students about Brodsky and to “introduce students to new ways of conducting and presenting research, using digital tools.”26 Here she partners with DH, library, and IT staff, including the Slavic librarian, and notes:

As early adopters and “digital natives,” graduate students are taking leading roles in many DH projects—as are librarians and specialized technical staff. By pulling different parts of the university into contact and into the open, such partnerships have the potential to forge strategic alliances with consequences beyond the research at hand.27

In much the same vein, Harvard and Stanford both have courses that combine learning about Slavic area studies with learning about DH work.28

Furthermore, these institutions have conferences, support groups, and trainings developed to enable graduate students to bring DH methods into their research. Some of these have been specific to the region: Harvard’s Mapping Cultural Space Across Eurasia fellowship, Columbia’s 2014 NEH Summer Institute on East Central Europe, and Stanford’s “Russian Formalism and the Digital Humanities” conference.29 As a rule, the audience for most DH graduate experiences goes beyond Russian and East European studies. Instead, graduate students doing work at some Title VI universities seek out Digital Humanities groups (such as those at Stanford), fellowships (such as those at Harvard), or conferences and trainings (such as DHSI: Digital Humanities Summer Institute, or HILT: Humanities Intensive Learning & Teaching). Only one or two graduate students associated with or funded by a Title VI center may have projects that rely heavily on digital humanities tools. However, as a rule, the support for learning the tools and applying them tends to originate outside their home departments, particularly at institutions which already have robust digital humanities centers and staffing.

Digitization and Exhibition

Even more than pedagogy or research, DH work in digitization and exhibition has tended to involve significant collaboration with the library, with known vendors, or a combination of the two. Much of the work that involves libraries and librarians has come out of this particular intersection. In our survey of the literature, it became obvious that this was the main instance where librarians were involved from the outset rather than being consulted after the fact—that is, when a project was already well underway. Librarians can and should be consulted early on, especially when metadata standards are necessary for the project to scale correctly. They are much better equipped to do this kind of work
than scholars, who are able to “produce wonderful resources using creative combinations of technology to make a point, either for research or teaching, but sometimes the description of these projects, and how the pieces fit together, proves to be a huge challenge.”

The entire digitization pipeline relies on library expertise, from recommending what collections should be digitized, to taking ownership of project management, to recommending and implementing metadata standards.

This means that whole archival, paper, and microfilm collections have migrated to online, whether through vendor efforts, collaborations between research institutions, or partnerships between them. For instance, the Center for Research Libraries acquires, digitizes, and hosts files from member institutions, which are then made freely available to members of the CRL community. For area studies, these have been done under the auspices of the Slavic and East European Materials Project, which began in 1995 as a way to share regional collections between CRL member institutions. Their digital Ukrainian Émigré Press Collection was drawn from libraries in Europe and North America and represents an excellent example of a fully interinstitutional collaboration. Another example is Yale’s legacy Slavic collection, 2.5 million pages of which was digitized by three separate vendors in 2010–2011. This was a collection of “indisputable historical value.” Also in its favor was its “well-rounded coverage of Slavic philology,” but of utmost importance was “the fact that the publications of the collection [were] no longer covered by copyright laws, and, last but not least, the idea that these titles published in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries could finally become available worldwide to students of Slavic studies.”

No institution is free from dealing with the legacies of digital preservation. It is imperative that ongoing support is planned from the outset, though whether this should take place through the library remains an open question. Specifically, many older projects are now almost inaccessible due to changes in operating standards, upgrades, or ongoing maintenance. Existing exhibitions tend to date from the late 1990s to mid-2000s and, if still available, may be maintained only sporadically. Some are riddled with broken links or dependent on older technologies. If and when older projects are available, they may show their age to the point of being completely unusable, functioning as artifacts rather than learning objects. As Eileen Llona points out, “Lack of infrastructure from the beginning makes the lifetime of these kinds of projects questionable, even if the content value is high.” We follow that assessment and suggest that shared responsibility, whether this takes the form of project-specific communities or dedicated interinstitutional support (i.e., staffing, server space, ongoing maintenance), may mitigate these issues somewhat.

Most of the literature coming out of the Title VI affiliates relates to digitization and sometimes digital analysis. In this respect, they hew to a model that most large research libraries implicitly follow. That is to say, they produce and make available certain kinds of content but are not primarily concerned with how the content or collections are used. In fact, the most up-to-date information about Slavic DH, including applications and pedagogy, relies on more informal and fast-moving channels of communication. Facebook, Twitter, and the ASEEES newsletter are all important for disseminating projects, calling for collaborators, and defining the parameters of the subfield.
DH and Slavic Area Studies: Looking to the Future

Despite the limitations we have laid out above—including rapidly aging projects and infrastructure, limited attention to maintenance, and lack of coordination among centers, disciplines, and scholars—the impact of DH on area studies is likely to continue. Thus, it is incumbent upon librarians to anticipate growth in DH scholarship and its specific demands, needs, and desired outcomes. For example, many of the institutions which we examined have pre-existing DH centers, either located within the library or elsewhere on campus, to help scholars build up the necessary skills to take on digital humanities projects. Some institutions have no such center but nonetheless have a librarian with a job responsibility that addresses DH and/or digital projects more broadly. As librarians, we must ask ourselves: What support can we offer these scholars and what should the role of the library be in their work? To that end, what skills do we already have which allow us to play that role? What skills do we need to develop in ourselves and future area studies librarians?

One strategy might entail using the tools and expertise that area studies librarians have honed through physical collection support in the service of digital projects. Perhaps the “digital turn” can offer a way out of the perceived insignificance of area studies collections, casting them in the same positive light as the (Anglophone) digital humanities now receive. At the same time, developing regional digital resources, especially with international partners, raises a new set of concerns: lack of stability, differing standards, labor expenditures, and poor infrastructure, to name but a few.

Digital humanities differs from traditional scholarship in its explicit attention to and indeed championship of collaborative and distributed labor. This extends to every iteration of a project, which may require collaboration among institutions, and among scholars, researchers, and librarians with various skillsets. One course is for librarians to learn to identify the skills gaps in a project and be able to bring in the right people to fill those gaps. These roles may even be external to the organization—indeed, even to the institution. Institutions, even large R1s with a number of support staff, cannot reasonably expect that librarians can support faculty projects indefinitely. While this might be the case at a liberal arts college or even a four-year comprehensive, the technical demands of today’s DH projects are likely to outstrip any single person’s capacity for support.

In conclusion, we found the following to be generally true. As a rule, DH projects done in conjunction with area studies centers have tended to reflect the preexisting strengths of those centers: language, geography, and interdisciplinary regional analysis. We note that ad-hoc collaboration does exist between regional institutions and their American counterparts but that it has a tendency to be fleeting and project-based. Lasting connections, if they exist, are usually at the interpersonal rather than institutional level. This makes inter-departmental and -institutional collaborations even more vital, especially since Slavic generally has a small footprint in contrast to larger language and literature departments, especially English.

In 2016, the Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies (ASEEES) chartered a Digital Humanities Interest Group. This decision formalized a nascent community that began as a conversation at the 2015 ASEEES convention about DH practices and networks within the field. Their stated goal was to “advance a community of practice around digitally inclined scholarship and research projects, with a strong
focus on the teaching, curation, and preservation thereof in Slavic, East European and Eurasian Studies.” As we have made clear above, DH undertakings often demand that individuals look beyond their own institutions for skills, interests, and funding. Affiliate groups and networks like Slavic DH can help fill those gaps. It remains, however, for area studies librarians to seek out these groups and figure out how to implement their initiatives locally.

Notes
1. In using the terms “Slavic” and “Slavic and East European,” we follow the terminological conventions of the journal *Slavic & East European Information Resources*, wherein these terms are “to be understood as shorthand for the following Slavic and non-Slavic countries: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Georgia, (Modern) Greece, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, the Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan. While we understand that these terms may not be those preferred by the citizens of some of the nations included, we chose them because they are generally understood in English-speaking countries and because the available alternatives are much too long. The list of countries is based on those recognized by the government of the United States, where the journal is based.” (SEEIR, n.d.)

2. These are: Columbia University, Duke University-University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill (joint), Harvard University, Georgetown University, Indiana University, The Ohio State University, Stanford University, University of California-Berkeley, University of California-Los Angeles, University of Chicago, University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign, University of Kansas, University of Michigan, University of Pittsburgh, University of Texas-Austin, University of Washington, University of Wisconsin, Cornell University, Syracuse University, and Yale University.

3. Many liberal arts institutions are doing exceptional work with digital humanities—Lafayette, Grinnell, Carleton, and Haverford, to name but a few; however, as these generally lack the extensive primary and secondary source collections associated with area studies, we have chosen to omit them.


5. These have been defined with varying degrees of specificity in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries but currently correlate to: Latin America; the Middle East (typically in conjunction with North Africa); Sub-Saharan Africa; Europe, Eastern Europe, and Eurasia; and Asia-Pacific (whether Southern, Southeastern, or Eastern). The specific ways that regions map onto the current geo-political and military concerns of the United State are, unfortunately, beyond this scope of this chapter.
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21. Examples include Harvard’s Imperiia Project (http://dighist.fas.harvard.edu/projects/imperiia/), mapping the historical Russian Empire and sponsored GIS training; the Black Sea Networks project (http://blackseanetworks.org/) by Columbia, Yale, New York University, and Cambridge; Stanford’s Geographies of the Holocaust (http://web.stanford.edu/group/spatialhistory/cgi-bin/site/project.php?id=1015); a UC Berkely course from Jewish Studies on “Mapping Diasporas” (https://mappingdiasporas.wordpress.com/).

22. For instance, both the University of Kansas and the University of Washington currently house Silk Road projects. See further, http://silkroad.ku.edu/ and https://depts.washington.edu/silkroad/.


33. Specifically drawn from the Ukrainian Research Institute at Harvard University, the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences in New York City (under the sponsorship of Columbia University), and the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library at the University of Toronto.

34. Lorković, Krätli, and Caizzi, “Yale University Library has Digitized its Legacy Slavic Collection,” 183.


36. One notable exceptions here is Bozovic, “Avant-gardes and Emigres.”
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