News of the Profession

“Tolstoy and World Literature” Conference. Yasnaya Polyana, August 11-15, 2010

Despite worrisome forest fires, US State Department alerts, evacuated embassies, airport delays, and an almost unbearable heat, intrepid Tolstoy scholars gathered at Yasnaya Polyana in August for the Seventh International “Tolstoy and World Literature” Conference. Organized by Galina Alekseeva and Donna Orwin, in conjunction with Vladimir Tolstoy, the conference has been running smoothly since the nineties and the weather did not prevent it from taking place this year either. In fact, after smog-filled Moscow, the natural lush of Yasnaya Polyana reminiscent of Tolstoy’s novels, felt like a shelter from the smoke, the heat, and the media coverage of it all.

While “Tolstoy and World Literature” is a conference built around a single author, it usually draws a wide variety of participants, each bringing his or her own perspectives. There were Tolstoy scholars of various nationalities, generations, and disciplines, with a few students of Tolstoy from outside the academe. In the spirit of Tolstoy’s great appreciation for large and diverse communities where individuals can come together despite their national or vocational differences, the conference became a way for people from different backgrounds and with different views to partake in lively discussions. In fact, a sense of togetherness is built into the very structure of the event. Spending four days together at the estate, everyone gathers to listen to panelists, share meals, outings, a swim in the pond, or a musical concert.

The immediate sources of inspiration for these discussions were the scholarly presentations. We heard about Tolstoy and Bakhtin and the underlying dialogism that shaped both Tolstoy’s personal letters as well as his well-known confession. The dialogism of Tolstoy’s own writings gave way to papers about Tolstoy in dialogue with writers and thinkers from across the world. For instance, we heard about the old feud between Tolstoy and Shakespeare as mediated through Bernard Shaw. We made a metaphorical second voyage to Ireland after a few days, to hear about why Tolstoy influenced James Joyce but failed to move Samuel Becket in the same way. We heard about Tolstoy and American writers like Thackeray, about how American transcendentalists responded to Tolstoy, and finally, about how Tolstoy appropriated materials from radical American figures like Lucy Mallory. That Tolstoy is an influential figure in Western and Eastern civilization and that he omnivorously absorbed writings from Western and Eastern minds is a well-known fact, but nowhere is that better illustrated than at a conference like “Tolstoy and World Literature.” In this setting it is possible to see both Tolstoy’s significance and his voracious reading illustrated in his ties, conscious or unconscious, to writers and thinkers like Rousseau and Shakespeare, but also to less obvious figures like Skovoroda, Kundera, and Bjornson.

There were also close readings of Tolstoy’s texts, both of celebrated novels like Anna Karenina and War and Peace, but also of lesser-known works. Participants presented on the changeable nature of the individual in Tolstoy, on war, peace, and culture in War and Peace, but also on lesser-known works like “Al’bert,” Tolstoy’s “Azbuka,” and the late play The Light Shines in the Darkness. Moreover, scholars who had done meticulous work on Tolstoy’s manuscripts told us about Tolstoy’s “curious monks” and the copious, messy drafts of
Tolstoy’s last novel, Resurrection. Tolstoy’s theoretical writings, both in his early and later years, were addressed, and issues of justice and education were explored. Finally, because this conference commemorated the one-hundredth anniversary of Tolstoy’s death, the attending scholars probed issues like the escape of late Tolstoy, or the reaction, reception, and fictional rewritings of Tolstoy’s last days and his dramatic death. The conversation about these last issues went beyond the conference hall as participants gathered for a viewing of the recent film about the last year of Tolstoy’s life, “The Last Station.”

The event came to a wonderful close with a generous banquet sponsored by Yasnaya Polyana, which was the perfect mixture of good food, libations, and cheerful conversation, and the next day participants went their separate ways.

August 11, 2010

Opening remarks: Vladimir Tolstoy (Director, Yasnaya Polyana)

First Session

Ol’ga Slivitskaia (St. Petersburg). The Tolstoyan Person as a Dynamic Identity (Человек Толстого как динамическое тождество).

Svetlana Klimova (Belgorod). The Nature of Artistic Thought (According to Correspondences Between L. N. Tolstoy and N. N. Strakhov) (Природа творческого мышления [по материалам переписки Л. Н. Толстого с Н. Н. Страховым]).

Irina Salmanova (Belgorod). From Correspondences to a Confession in L. N. Tolstoy (От переписки к «Исповеди» Л. Н. Толстого).

Caryl Emerson (USA). Was Bernard Shaw right about the play The Power of Darkness? (On the Question of Tolstoy’s Anti-Shakespearism) (Прав ли Бернард Шоу о пьесе «Власть тьмы»? [к вопросу анти-шекспиризма Л. Н. Толстого]).

Inessa Medzhibovskaia (USA). Tolstoy’s Mysterious Monks (Загадочные монахи Толстого).

Second Session

Vitalii Remizov (Moscow). The Preparation of New Editions About Tolstoy and His Circles (Based on Materials from the Manuscript Division GMT) (Подготовка новых изданий о Л. Н. Толстом и его окружении [по материалам рукописного отдела ГМТ]).

Donna Orwin (Canada). The Belletrism and Truth of the Borodino Field (Беллетризация и правда Бородинского поля).

Helena Tolstoy (Israel). Leitmotivs and Anagrams in War and Peace (Лейтмотивы и анаграммы в «Войне и мире»).

Vladimir Papernyi (Israel). On Distant Semantic Connections in Novels by Lev Tolstoy (Military Leaders and Doctors in War and Peace, Fru-Fru, Anna Karenina, and Vronsky in Anna Karenina) (О далеких смысловых связях в романах Льва Толстого [полководцы и врачи в «Войне и мире», лошадь Фру-Фру, Анна и Вронский в «Анне Карениной»]).

Evgeny Slivkin (USA). Andrei Furioso: Military Aristocrats and Non-aristocrats in Tolstoy; Compromising the Knightly Code (Андрей furioso: военные аристократы и неаристократы у Л. Н. Толстого. Компрометация рыцарского кодекса).

Gerard Abensour (France). Hadji Murat in the Mirror of War and Peace («Хаджи Мурат» в зеркале «Войны и мира»).
August 12, 2010

Third Session

Koiti Itokava (Japan). A Survey of Tolstoy's Escape (Обзор ухода Толстого).


Barbara Löngvist (Finland). L. N. Tolstoy's “Azbuka” as a Literary Creation («Азбука» Л. Н. Толстого как литературное творчество).

Anna Grodetskaia (St. Petersburg). Detail within Contrast (From Observations from the Manuscript of Resurrection) (Подробность в пределах контраста [из наблюдений над рукописью «Воскресения»]).

Ani Kokobobo (USA). Tolstoy's Resurrection as Anti-Novel (Роман Толстого «Воскресение» как анти-роман).

Alexander Zviers (Canada). Darkness in the Interpretation of L. N. Tolstoy's Drama “The Light Shines in the Darkness” (Тьма в интерпретации драмы Л. Н. Толстого «И свет во тьме светит»).

Fourth Session

Irina Lukianets (St. Petersburg). The Fiction about Self in the Autobiographical Prose of L. N. Tolstoy and J. J. Rousseau (Вымысел о себе в автобиографической прозе Л. Н. Толстого и Ж.-Ж. Руссо).

Irina Gniusova (Tomsk). L. N. Tolstoy and W. M. Thackerey (Л. Н. Толстой и У. М. Теккерей).

Galina Alekseeva (Yasnaya Polyana). В. Bjornson's “Monogamy and Polygamy” and Tolstoy's Kreutzer Sonata: Journalism as Key to the Interpretation of the Artistic Text («Единобрачие и многобрачие» В. Бьёрнсона и «Крейцерова соната» Л. Н. Толстого: публицистика как ключ к прочтению художественного текста.)

Anna Ponomareva (UK). Andrei Bely about Tolstoy (Андрей Белый о Толстом).

Ksenia Nagina (Voronezh). The Artistic Anthropology of L. N. Tolstoy and M. Kundera Художественная антропология Л. Толстого и М. Кундеры).

August 13, 2010

Fifth Session

Tatiana Krasavchenko (Moscow). Trajectories of the Perception of Lev Tolstoy in Twentieth-Century British Culture (Траектория восприятия Льва Толстого в английской культуре XX в.).

Dan Mulin (UK). Lev Tolstoy's Pedagogical Ideas: The Discovery of New Meaning (Педагогические идеи Льва Толстого: обретение нового смысла).

Nadia Clayton (USA). Tolstoy's Pedagogical Interlude (Педагогическая интерлюдия Толстого).

Aleksandr Volkovinskii (Ukraine). Anthropological Interpretation of Snake Motifs in the Works of G. Skovoroda and L. Tolstoy (Антропологическое прочтение офитских мотивов в произведениях Г. Сковороды и Л. Толстого).

Irina Mel'nikova (Japan). The Japanese Contacts of L. N. Tolstoy and Konisi Masutaro (1861-1939) (Японские контакты Л. Н. Толстого и Кониси Масутаро [1861-1939]).

Bill Nickell (USA). Great Writer of the World: The Russian Reading to the International Reception of Tolstoy's Death (Великий писатель мира: русское прочтение международной рецепции смерти Толстого).

Stefania Sini (Italy). The Voices, Intonations, and Accents of Tolstoy According to Bakhtin (Голоса, интонации, акценты Толстого по Бахтину).

Sixth Session

Elvira Osipovna (St. Petersburg). Tolstoy's Late Works as Appraised by American Writers (Позднее творчество Л. Н. Толстого в оценке американских писателей).
“Tolstoy in the Twenty-First Century”
International Symposium, October 14-17, 2010. The New School, New York

Scholars from across North America, Europe, and Russia gathered in New York City this October for one of the gems of the Centennial of Tolstoy’s death: a symposium on “Tolstoy in the Twenty-First Century” that examined his works and legacy from a broad interdisciplinary standpoint. Inessa Medzhibovskaya’s meticulously-planned conference brought together scholars from Slavic studies, classics, education, literary studies, musicology, religion, political science, history, philosophy, media studies, and theater, as well as archivists, museum workers, and editors of Tolstoy’s collected works. Over four days, our traditional understanding of Tolstoy was challenged as these scholars presented his life and writings in a new light, drawing not only on his familiar texts, but also on little-read works, manuscript versions, caricatures, representations in humor magazines, archival photographs of his plays, and film and opera adaptations. Here are a few of the highlights.

Anna Grodetskaya (Russian Academy of Sciences) presented images of the manuscript version of Resurrection, showing how the novel literally doubled in size during publication as Tolstoy continued to work on the proofs. Jeff Brooks (Hopkins University) used humor magazines from Tolstoy’s time to demonstrate the way the media linked War and Peace to popular culture, creating an image of the characters as contemporary figures. His presentation reminded us that the novel was not only seen as historical, but was also recognized to address societal concerns of Tolstoy’s day. Tony Briggs (Bristol University and Birmingham University) offered a provocative interpretation of Tolstoy’s biography, presenting Tolstoy as a pessimist who spent his whole mature life under the spell of three tyrannical “monsters”: Rousseau, Schopenhauer, and Chertkov.
In addition to the traditional focuses on Tolstoy’s life and influence in literature and the arts, “Tolstoy in the Twenty-First Century” expanded our gaze to the realms of education, philosophy, history, and political science. Michael Denner (Stetson University) explored Tolstoy’s little-read What Then Shall We Do? (begun in 1882, after Tolstoy helped with the Moscow census) and Tolstoy’s theories about poverty, female sexuality, and power systems. Banu Bargu (NSSR) looked at The Kingdom of God is within You and the lessons it offers on forms of participative democracy. In a roundtable on teaching Tolstoy, Colonel Rick McPeak offered fascinating insights on how he teaches War and Peace to cadets at West Point who are preparing to face the realities of war in their own lives. His comments estranged traditional readings of several famous scenes, raising practical questions of whether one should disobey a commanding officer, if violence can be managed honorably, and what the difference is between strategy and tactics.

The result of this interdisciplinary cross-pollination was a rich and sustained dialogue that spilled over from panel to panel and brought to light new interpretations of Tolstoy’s meaning and relevance for students and scholars in our time. Additionally, the panels were enriched by a cultural program that brought Tolstoy’s legacy to life off the page and outside the scholarly atmosphere of a traditional conference. The program included a film screening of “Railroad Way-Station” (Полустанок, 2010), a photography exhibition, a performance of Beethoven’s “Kreutzer Sonata” by a violinist and pianist of the Mannes Division of the New School for Music, staged readings of adaptations of Resurrection by New School students, and a recording of “The Realm of Darkness” performed by students of the New School at LaMama Theater in the spring of 2010 (see review by Caryl Emerson). As a whole, these cultural events demonstrated the continuing engagement of New School students with Tolstoy’s legacy not just as a nineteenth-century author, but as a living artist whose works speak to our present. It also fed back into the lively discussion that characterized the conference as a whole. The intimate atmosphere of “Tolstoy in the Twenty-First Century” helped draw together both presenters and audience in the type of dialogue of which Tolstoy would have been proud.

Thursday, October 14, 2010

**PANEL 1: TOLSTOY’S PHILOSOPHIES (ART, WAR, and NON-VIOLENCE).** Chair/Moderator: Andrew Meier (Writing, Literary Studies/Lang)

- Donna Orwin (President, North-American Tolstoy Society; Slavic Department, University of Toronto), “Life and Art in Tolstoy’s Sevastopol Sketches”
- Galina Alexeeva (Head of Research, Yasnaya Polyana, Russia): “Witnessing War: Leo Tolstoy and Walt Whitman”

**SPECIAL SESSION: YASNAYA POLYANA–NEW YORK–VALLEY COTTAGE, NY (A DIALOGUE).** Moderator Galina Alexeeva (Yasnaya Polyana)

- Vladimir Tolstoy (director, Yasnaya Polyana Museum-Estate): “Preserving Tolstoy for the 21st Century”
- Robert Whittaker (associate provost for undergraduate studies and online education, Lehman College, CUNY): “The Tolstoy Foundation: Recreating Yasnaya Polyana in Valley Cottage, NY”

**FILM DEMONSTRATION AND DISCUSSION:** RAILROAD WAY STATION (2007).

A documentary (with English subtitles created for the conference) looking into the complex history of Tolstoy’s departure from home and his death at the railway station, Astapovo (November 7-20, 1910).
PANEL 2: TOLSTOY’S PHILOSOPHIES (HISTORY). Chair/Moderator: Eli Zaretsky (History/NSSR)

Dmitri Nikulin (Philosophy, NSSR): “Studying the Laws of History or Why Tolstoy is Not Homer”

Agnes Heller (Philosophy, NSSR): “Georg Lukacs’ Views on Tolstoy”

Friday, October 15, 2010

PANEL 1: TOLSTOY AT WAR (THE ARTS AND SHAKESPEARE). Chair/Moderator: Laura Frost (Literature Chair, Lang/Liberal Studies, NSSR)

Stephen Halliwell (Classics, University of St. Andrews, UK): “Tolstoy, Opera, and the Paradoxical Seductions of Art”

Paul Kottman (Literature and Liberal Studies, Eugene Lang College/NSSR): “Tragic Morality: Tolstoy Reading Shakespeare”

Caryl Emerson (A. Watson Armour III University Professor of Slavic, Princeton): “Tolstoy versus Shakespeare, 1903-1910 (and how George Bernard Shaw Boldly Intervened)”

PANEL 2: TOLSTOY’S PHILOSOPHIES (SOCIETY). Chair/Moderator: Andreas Kalyvas (Political Science, NSSR/editor of Constellations)

Banu Bargu (Political Science, NSSR): “Tolstoy’s The Kingdom of God is Within You and Forms of Participative Democracy”

Michael Denner (Russian Studies, Stetson University; editor, Tolstoy Studies Journal): “Tolstoy as Social Theorist”

Jeff Gordon Love (Russian/German/Philosophy, Clemson University): “Tolstoy’s Nihilism”

PANEL 3: TOLSTOY’S PHILOSOPHIES (ALL AND NOT TOO HUMAN). Chair/Moderator: Jim Miller (Liberal Studies Chair, NSSR)

Alice Crary (Philosophy, NSSR): “Tolstoy and the Imagination of Life”

Lina Steiner (Slavic and Comparative Literature, University of Chicago): “Tolstoy and Humanism”

Tony Briggs (Bristol University and Professor Emeritus at Birmingham University, UK): “The Dark Spirit That Explains Leo Tolstoy”

PANEL 4: TOLSTOY AND LITERARY THEORIES. Chair/Moderator: Noah Isenberg (Literature and Screen Studies Chair, Eugene Lang College/ Liberal Studies, NSSR)

Nicholas Birns (Literature, Eugene Lang College/ New school for General Studies): “The Novel Uncontained?: Tolstoy and British Fiction”

Gary Saul Morson (Distinguished Research Professor, Northwestern University): “Tolstoy’s War on Wit”

Val Vinokur (Literature, Eugene Lang): “Lev, Levin, and Levinas” (Dialogue with Volume Editor)

EVENING CULTURAL PROGRAM: Performance and Discussion. The Kreutzer Sonata: Ludwig van Beethoven/ Performed by Students of Mannes Division, The New School for Music. Discussion led by Caryl Emerson (Princeton University)

Saturday, October 16, 2010

PANEL 1: TOLSTOY AT WAR (MYTHOLOGIES, AESTHETIC HERESIES, AND THEIR CRITICS). Chair/Moderator: Mark Greif (Writing, Eugene Lang/Editor, n+1)

Julie Buckler (Slavic Dept. Chair, Harvard University): “Better Together: Tolstoevsky and Cultural Mythologies of the Great Author”


Dominic Pettman (Media Studies Chair, Eugene Lang/ Liberal Studies, NSSR): “Tolstoy’s Bestiary: Animality and Animosity in The Kreutzer Sonata”
PANEL 2: TOLSTOY IN THE PUBLIC SPHERE (PART I: MANUSCRIPTS, PUBLISHING, AND PRINT CULTURE). Chair/Moderator: Elisabeth Kendall (Writing, Eugene Lang College/Liberal Studies, NSSR)

Alexander Gulin (Institute of World Literature, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow; editor-in-chief, Complete Works of Leo Tolstoy, the new academic edition in 100 volumes): “Publishing Tolstoy in the Twenty-First Century”

Anna Grodetskaya (Institute of Russian Literature, Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg): “Working with Manuscripts of Tolstoy’s Resurrection”

Jeff Brooks (History, Johns Hopkins), “Laughing with the Count: Tolstoy in the Prism of the Humor Magazines”

Coda: Inessa Medzhibovskaya (Literature, Eugene Lang): “Tolstoy’s Unfinished Work in His Manuscripts”

PANEL 2: TOLSTOY IN THE PUBLIC SPHERE (PART II: LIVING DOCUMENTS AND TRIBUTES. Chair/Moderator: Thomas Werner (Photography, Parsons The New School for Design)

Presenters: Galina Zlobina (deputy director, RGALI), Thomas Werner (Photography, Parsons The New School for Design)

Coda: Michael Denner (editor of Tolstoy Studies Journal): “Tolstoy in Drawings and Caricatures”

PANEL 3: TOLSTOY AND SOCIALIZATION OF AESTHETICS. Chair/Moderator: Ivan Raykoff (Music and the Arts, Eugene Lang College)

Simon Morrison (Music, Princeton): “The Original Version(s) of Prokofiev’s War and Peace”

Ken Wark (Media Studies, Eugene Lang College/NSSR): “Tolstoy, Lukacs, and the Class (Un-) Conscious of Radical Culture”

Zishan Ugurlu (Theater, Eugene Lang College): “Tolstoy's Plays: Not Even a Game Anymore”

TOLSTOY'S PEDAGOGY IN PRACTICE. Roundtable of Scholars and the Audience: Teaching Tolstoy in the 21st Century. Chair/Moderator: Donna Orwin (University of Toronto)

Participants: Margaret Boe Birns (The New School for General Studies), Caryl Emerson (Princeton University), Anne Lounsbery (New York University), Colonel Rick McPeak (West Point Academy), Ilya Vinitsky (The University of Pennsylvania), with comments by conference participants and Eugene Lang College Literary Studies faculty

EVENING THEATER PROGRAM: Tolstoy on Stage at The New School

Zishan Ugurlu (moderated). Student Stage Reading of Resurrection [adaptations]

Recording of The Realm of Darkness (Lang at LaMama Theater, spring 2010 directed by Zishan Ugurlu)

Sunday, October 17, 2010

PANEL 1: TOLSTOY ON RELIGION, SPIRITUALITY, AND EDUCATING THE YOUNG. Chair/Moderator: Karen de Moss (Institute for Urban Education, Eugene Lang College)

Vladimir Paperni (Comparative Literature, University of Haifa, Israel): “The Contexts of Leo Tolstoy’s Religion”


Vitaly Remizov (Director, State Tolstoy Museum and Archives, Moscow, Russia): “Tolstoy’s School and Education in the 21st century”

Dan Moulin (Education, Oxford, UK): “Tolstoy the Educator and His Lessons”
PEDAGOGY IN PRACTICE: PEDAGOGY OF BEST STUDENT WORK ON TOLSTOY  
Chair/Moderator: Audrey Gray (B.A., Eugene Lang College, spring 2010)  
Participants: Adam Arthur, Ben Anders, Anne Dellinger, Patrick Dempsey, Nick Paliocha, Kevin Ryan

EVENING CULTURAL PROGRAM. Mannes Students from the preparatory division play Tolstoy’s favorite music (dir. Mary Barto, Mannes College The New School for Music)  
“What Tolstoy Wanted and Did Not Want Music to Do”: Music of Beethoven and Tchaikovsky. Henry Shapiro (piano, Literary Studies, Eugene Lang College) and Masako Yanagita (violin) (members of the West End Trio)  
Multilingual Tolstoy: “Alyosha The Pot” (moderated by Yiye Cho, Parsons The New School for Design)  

Anna Berman  
Princeton University


Tolstoy is, indeed, alive (and well) in Seoul—indeed, throughout East Asia, for that matter. Such was the unanimous impression of those who attended the International Tolstoy Conference organized by the Korean Association of Rusists, the Institute of Russia-CIS Studies, Korea University, the Institute for Russian and Altaic Studies, and Chungbuk National University, and sponsored by the International Center for Korean Studies, Korea University, and The Open Books Co. The conference took place at Korea University, October 1 and 2, 2010, in commemoration of the centenary of the writer’s death.

Donna Tussing Orwin, President of the Tolstoy Society (and representing the University of Toronto), opened the conference with her reinvestigation of Tolstoy’s research on the Battle of Borodino. However much Tolstoy corrected historical accounts, Orwin discerns also a degree of mythologization in its rendition in War and Peace; she notes, for example, his poetic references to harvest; these lend universal resonance to these scenes. Andrey Ranchin of Moscow State University continued this same scrutiny by observing that the encounter took place on Natasha’s saint’s day. Similarly the encounter is linked in folk tradition with picking mushrooms, themselves associated with the eve of Borodino. The associations of Natalia with birth and mushrooms with death suggest a dense mythological substructure for the novel. In a somewhat similar albeit personal vein, Brett Cooke (Texas A&M University) scanned draft treatments of Nicolas Rostov to consider how Tolstoy entertained various images of his father. Some of these were no doubt troubling to the author, especially those that reflected his forebear’s apparent penchant for womanizing. Significantly Tolstoy then sanitized Rostov’s image for the published versions.

Kang Eun Lee (Kyungbuk National University) reminded participants that, while celebrating the jubilee of Tolstoy’s death, we are also approaching the centenary of his “birth” in Korean consciousness. Tolstoy was first studied in Korea as a social phenomenon, as an exemplar of resistance to oppression and war, then as a moral and religious teacher, despite the ongoing clash of ethical ideals and realities of human nature so evident in his works. It should be remembered that he was enormously influential in Japan and Korea at a time when these countries did not enjoy their present robust democracies. Elise Mascarenhas (University of Sao Paolo) extended this dialectic of foreign reception by describing the role Tolstoy plays in contemporary Japanese popular culture, still largely as a moral leader. Reception studies can also operate from a close proximity, as witnessed, according to Andrew Durkin (Indiana University),
in Anton Chekhov’s “creative reaction” to *Anna Karenina*. Durkin showed how Tolstoy’s novel served as a “template” or “source text” for many of Chekhov’s stories, often, however, by subtle, ironic or reverse analogies. Infidelity was, of course, more than just a literary issue in the late nineteenth century; Durkin demonstrated how it was discussed via dense inter-textual references to *Anna* and other classic works which pose such problems so clearly.

Non-literary aspects of Tolstoy’s career continue to fascinate us, as was evident in Sung Bo Shim’s (Kunkuk University) careful study of Tolstoy’s inconsistent but ultimately successful struggle to adopt complete vegetarianism over the last twenty-seven years of his life. Although these efforts originally began with the eighteen-year-old Tolstoy’s stated intention to eat with moderation originally for hygienic reasons—his digestive problems may also have been a motivation—they subsequently took on a social and ethical character. Shi Tieqiang (Beijing University of Foreign Studies) described how much Tolstoy influenced modern views on pedagogy; he and his colleagues are presently designing a Russian grammar for Chinese students following the author’s precepts regarding the importance of inspiring interest in learning via the use of literary and other artistic texts as a basis for real-life dialogues. Maddalena Ottonello (Genoa University) outlined her ongoing project of comparing Tolstoy’s pedagogical experiments with recent neurocognitive findings by Arturo Damasio. She cited passages from the author’s works which appear to anticipate what is now understood regarding the nature of emotions, including how they are “nested” in more archaic structures. Appropriately timed for the centenary of Tolstoy’s death, Hang Jae Lee (Dankook University) discerned Buddhist and Hindu motifs in the writer’s thinking late in his life. He argued that Tolstoy’s famous flight from his family home should be regarded more as his “spiritual liberation.” Bora Chung (Yonsei University) discerned in close readings of *Anna Karenina* and *The Kreutzer Sonata* not just Tolstoy’s antipathy to such features of modern culture as the railroad and classical music, but also opposition to more ambitious attempts to alter human existence. She delineated the writer’s debate with the philosopher Nikolai Fedorov, who espoused technological means of achieving biological immortality. Kyung Wan Lee (Korea University) argued that Tolstoy’s attitudes toward modernity are more ambiguous, not uncharacteristic, given the self-contradictions evident elsewhere in the writer’s work. Lee proposed a reading of the binary interaction of liberalism and pan-Slavism in *Anna Karenina* based on Giddens’ “Biblical Structuration Discourse,” especially with regard to the Zemstvo scenes.

The conference was also distinguished by scholarship of a more purely literary character. Jong Min Kim (Korea University) closely examined the clothes worn in *Anna Karenina*, effectively demonstrating Tolstoy’s care in the selection of telling details. Developing a veritable equivalent to the body language noted by others, Kim suggests that the more care taken by characters in their dress, the more negative the impression. Jong Woo Oh (Sungkyunkwan University) studied how Nikolai Ge’s “What Is Truth?” develops the Mikhailov scene in *Anna Karenina*. Special attention was paid to the unstated and multileveled communication evident in Ge’s famous painting. Tetsuo Mochizuki (Hokkkaido University) greatly enriched our impressions of the multi-voiced discourse of *Anna Karenina* with his encyclopedic study of its myriad forms of analogy. The award-winning Japanese translator’s presentation made clear the many feats of metamental imagination demanded by Tolstoy on the part of the reader, who is called upon to conjure up subjective reactions to a great variety of human situations.

Perhaps most impressive were the young and obviously talented Korean “opponents” who posed keen questions of each paper, thereby generating
much discussion. Representing a wide variety of the Korea’s universities, albeit not all were Tolstoy specialists, they clearly displayed the country’s considerable strength in Russian studies. Plans for the publication of the papers are pending. The conference also witnessed the signing of a cooperation agreement between the Korean and Japanese associations of Rusists, with Professors Young Joong Seog, President of the KAR, and Mitsuyoshi Numano, University of Tokyo, presiding.

Brett Cooke
Texas A&M University

“The Sincerity of Leo Tolstoy” Conference, April 7–9, 2010. Gargnano, Italy

From April 7–9, 2010, scholars from Italy, Russia, Germany, England, and the United States gathered in the Palazzo Feltrinelli in Gargnano, Italy overlooking beautiful Lago Garda, to take part in a three-day conference on “The Sincerity of Leo Tolstoy. His Writings, Thought, and Life Considered on the Centenary of His Death” (La sincerità di Tolstoj. Letteratura, pensiero e vita a 100 anni dalla morte). The conference was ably and expertly organized by Laura Rossi and Damiano Rebecchini of the University of Milan. The weather was perfect, the views were stunning, the papers were provocative, and the food was Italian; it can sincerely be said that everyone had a splendid time. The proceedings of the conference will appear in the series “Quaderni di Acme” by Istituto editoriale universitario “Cisalpino.”

Wednesday, April 7

Opening remarks: Elio Franzini, Dean of the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy, Università degli Studi di Milano

Session 1
Chair: Stefano Garzonio (Università degli Studi di Pisa)

Galina Galagan (IRLI, St. Petersburg), Энергия искренности и концепция жизнепониманий Толстого
Raffaella Faggionato (Università degli Studi di Udine), Масон Баздеев в романе «Война и мир»: уважение или насмешка?

Session 2
Chair: Jurij Murašov (Universität Konstanz)

Fausto Malcovati (Università degli Studi di Milano), “Вы Левины все дики”: Levin e la sincerità
Riccardo Nicolosi (Universität Bonn), Искренность криминальной антропологии в романе Толстого «Воскресение»

Session 3
Chair: Vitalii Remizov (Tolstoy Museum, Moscow)

Mariia Pliukhanova (Università degli Studi di Perugia), Аполлон Григорьев об искренности Толстого как литературном приеме
Jurij Murašov (Universität Konstanz), Поэтология остранения Льва Толстого и «нравственно-религиозные» истины

Session 4
Chair: Rosamund Bartlett (King’s College, London)

Guido Carpi, Cinzia Cadamagnani (Università degli Studi di Pisa), Per la sincerità in economia. L. N. Tolstoj e V. A. Kokorev sull’abolizione del krepostnoe pravo
Antonella Salomoni (Università degli Studi della Calabria), “Vivere secondo giustizia”: il contadino di Tolstoj

Thursday, April 8

Session 5
Chair: Rita Giuliani (Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”)

Inessa Medzhibovskaya (The New School, New York), Tolstoy’s Religion as Drama and Philosophy
“War and Peace across the Disciplines”
International Tolstoy Conference, 7-11 April, 2010. West Point, New York

On April 7-11, 2010 a group of scholars from a variety of disciplines gathered for a conference on War and Peace that was as unique and stimulating as the grounds on which the event was held—West Point Military Academy. It was not only the engaging presentations or the lively conversations, which carried over from the sessions into lunch and dinner and even further into the night, that made this conference so remarkable, but also its geographical locale, which acted as both a complement and a challenge to the ideas about the novel and the concepts of war that were examined. Conference participants did not simply attend sessions that happened to be held on this historic campus; instead, we were invited to participate in the life of the campus as we ate lunch in the mess hall, cheered on teams in displays of physical
strength and agility as a part of the annual Sandhurst Competition, and were provided multiple opportunities to interact with cadets who provided us with the real story of life “on the ground.” These experiences formed a backdrop against which the academic presentations and discussions occurred.

The intersection of history and fiction formed a recurrent thematic refrain that was sounded in different registers throughout the presentations. Engaging this theme on a theoretical level Caryl Emerson cautioned us as readers not to become too ‘Hayden Whitized,’ that we miss Tolstoy’s own understanding of Truth as a vision of transformative power that is able to motivate a subject towards moral action and as a concept that exists outside of White’s dialectical model of history. Weighing in on the sometimes contentious debate regarding Tolstoy’s fidelity to historical facts, Dan Ungurianu examined the types of historical sources that Tolstoy consulted when writing *War and Peace* as well as the accuracy with which he used these sources, arguing that Tolstoy was convinced that he had done sufficient historical preparation to adequately support the work of art that he created.

In considering the reasons for the lack of correspondence between Tolstoy’s portrayal of Moscow during the events of 1812 and eyewitness accounts, Alexander Martin’s talk provided an element of particularity to this general theme. In his paper Martin demonstrated that by representing the city of Moscow from the perspective of the aristocracy Tolstoy was better able to use the city for his own symbolic purposes, portraying it as a space where the classes acted harmoniously and collaboratively. Furthermore, Alan Forrest encouraged us to broaden our scope of what constitutes historical texts as he argued for the use of ‘ego’ documents as a means of reconstructing the inner lives and subjective experience of people throughout history, a concern that also occupied Tolstoy.

Gary Saul Morson’s examination of the concept of open time and the attendant radical uncertainties of war in his keynote address took on an added layer of meaning as he addressed a lecture hall overflowing with over 2,000 cadets, many of whom would soon be graduating and facing the realities of life on the battlefield. In his talk, peppered with an admixture of humor and provocation, Morson encouraged the cadets to consider the likelihood that heroic actions arise from the way that a soldier has trained himself to think and act in ordinary moments and he left them to ponder the possibility that *War and Peace* demonstrates that what really matters in the course of history are unhistoric acts.

Other scholars illuminated the text by examining familiar topics from a new angle, as was the case with David Welch’s talk on the tension between free will and determinism in Tolstoy’s work as seen from the perspective of international relations theory. While both Tolstoy and international relations theorists are concerned with identifying the force that moves the nations, Welch argued that Tolstoy is both more honest and more conflicted about the problematic contradictions that arise when engaging with the concepts of free will and determinism. Elizabeth Samet framed the generic “disobedience” of Tolstoy’s text within the context of the rules of war and military models of obedience. As an example of the text’s disobedience Samet highlighted the contrast between the epic space and time evoked by the novel and the non-epic resolution of the conflict between heroic will and the force of war. Jeff Love provided a fresh perspective on the concept of the “great man” in *War and Peace* by considering Prince Andrei, Pierre Bezukhov, Kutuzov, and Platon Karataev, rather than Napoleon, as possible candidates for this role.

Furthermore, several of the talks explicitly examined Tolstoy’s work through a military lens. Noting Carl von Clausewitz’s two-fold presence in *War and Peace* as a character and a military
theoretician, Andreas Herberg-Rothe examined the way in which Tolstoy condenses Clausewitz’s philosophy of war to its instrumental side and then undermines this instrumentality, a tactic that allowed Tolstoy to remain faithful to the spirit of history while nonetheless adapting characters to fit within his own narrative scheme and purposes. Additionally, Donna Tussing Orwin, one of the conference organizers, analyzed Mikhail Dragomirov’s criticism of Tolstoy’s work as a way to evaluate the text and the ideas therein from a soldier’s point-of-view. In doing so Orwin came to the conclusion that while both Tolstoy and Dragomirov emphasize the importance of will over reason on the battlefield, the latter—a soldier and military commander who was committed to maintaining the significance of his role within battle—disagreed with Tolstoy’s assertion that human will is inimical to human nature and essentially irrational.

Grounding his talk in Clausewitz’s statement that war is an extension of the duel, McPeak, also a conference organizer, proceeded to explore a potentially inverted understanding of these two spheres of activity within the text, exploring the idea that in War and Peace the duel is potentially present as a microcosm of war that could replace the act of war. However, McPeak concluded that, according to Tolstoy, the duel is unable to resolve the conflicts that wars can and therefore cannot be enlisted as a viable alternative to war.

Whether in response to the fruitful assembly of scholars from divergent academic backgrounds, the chance to listen to a Russian hymn on the acclaimed organ in the Cadet Chapel or the mature and respectful demeanor the cadets continually displayed, participants could often be heard commenting that they had never been to a conference quite like this one. Reflecting upon a particular session that was briefly interrupted by the unexpected site of cadets parachuting just outside the window, I would definitely have to agree.

Session 1: Edwina Cruise, Moderator
Caryl Emerson, “On the Advantages and Disadvantages of History for Fiction (Tolstoy’s War and Peace)”
Dan Ungurianu, “Tolstoy’s Use of Historical Sources in War and Peace”

Keynote Address
Saul Morson, “What is Heroism?”

Session 2: Michael Denner, Moderator
Andreas Herberg-Rothe, “Clausewitz and Tolstoy”
Elizabeth Samet, “The Disobedience of War and Peace”

Session 3: Robin Miller, Moderator
Alex Martin, “Napoleon in Moscow: War and Peace Compared with Eyewitness Accounts”
Donna Tussing Orwin, “War and Peace from the Soldier’s Point-of-View”

Session 4: Patrick O’Meara, Moderator
Alan Forrest, “The French At War: Representations of the Enemy in War and Peace”
Jeff Love, “The Great Man in War and Peace”

Session 5: Ilya Vinitsky, Moderator
Rick McPeak, “War and Peace: The Duel as a Microcosm of War”
David Welch, “Tolstoy the International Relations Theorist”

Farewell Address
Vladimir Tolstoy, “Legends About War and Peace in the Tolstoy Family”

Amber Aulen
University of Toronto
“Peace, War and Politics” Lev Tolstoy Centenary Conference, September 22, 2010, University of the Fraser Valley

The University of the Fraser Valley in Abbotsford British Columbia is pleasantly poised in the foothills of the ice carved Cascade Mountains and at the lower edges of glacier thick Mount Baker (11,000 feet)—a fine place indeed to do a centenary symposium on Lev Tolstoy. The event was held on a warm blue sky day, and the University sponsored and funded the full day meeting (September 22, 2010). The symposium was standing room only, and the purpose of the gathering was to reflect on the life and writings of Lev Tolstoy on the one-hundredth anniversary since his death in the autumn of 1910. There was an excellent turnout for the symposium from both the university and the Fraser Valley community. In short, town and gown were admirably brought together.

There were six lectures on Tolstoy that covered a variety of topics, and a question and answer session followed each lecture. The speakers and topics were

1. Alan Cameron: War/Peace in Tolstoy’s Writings
2. Ron Dart: Tolstoy, the Nobel Peace Prize and Gandhi
3. Larry Ewashen: Tolstoy and the Doukhobors
4. Father Michael Gillis: Tolstoy and the Russian Orthodox Tradition
5. Brad Jersak: Tolstoy and the Russian Mennonites

The lectures by Alan and Larissa were excellent overviews (Berlin’s fox) of the themes of war and peace in Tolstoy’s life and writings. The lectures between the broader approaches to Tolstoy burrowed deeper (Berlin’s hedgehog). The presentation by Brad on the Russian Mennonites and by Larry on the Doukhobors illuminated much, and were quite pertinent to the Fraser Valley and British Columbia. Many Russian Mennonites and Doukhobors live in the vicinity and province. The lecture on Tolstoy and the Russian Orthodox Tradition by Father Michael pointed in new directions that have not yet been fully explored, and my presentation on Tolstoy, the Nobel Peace Prize and Gandhi discussed Tolstoy’s 1908 “Letter to a Hindu,” the 1909-1910 correspondence between Tolstoy-Gandhi and Gandhi’s founding of the Tolstoy Farm in 1910 in South Africa.

The symposium was filmed, and it is now being held in the archives of University of the Fraser Valley. Those who are interested in knowing more about the symposium, contact Ron Dart (rdart@shaw.ca).

Ron Dart
University of the Fraser Valley

The Tolstoy Centennial in Paris

There were a number of events in Paris to mark the centennial of Tolstoy’s death, including an international conference organized by the University of Paris-Sorbonne November 17–20. The first two days of the conference were held at the Fondation Singer-Polignac, in the grand hall that served as the music room for the well-known salon hosted by the building’s namesakes. Winnaretta Singer, twentieth child of Isaac Merritt Singer and an heir to his sewing machine fortune, was an unapologetic lesbian and devoted patron of the modernist arts. At the age of twenty-nine she entered a chaste marriage to Edmond de Polignac, a homosexual, and for many years after devoted her energies to supporting the avant-garde arts. The ceiling of the beautiful hall in which the conference was held is decorated with chandeliers and large paintings of cavorting nudes, lyres and tambourines. The setting provided a striking juxtaposition with Tolstoy’s later ideals, perhaps, but it was nonetheless somehow fitting, in that it
evoked the milieu of aesthetic pleasure and temptation, body and ideal, that played so important a role in shaping all of his work.

Those attending the conference received personal invitations to a series of accompanying events, including a reception hosted by the Countess Colette Tolstoy, a performance of The Realm of Darkness (Власть тьмы) at the Russian embassy, and a concert featuring Beethoven’s Kreutzer Sonata. This was an anniversary celebration in the grand tradition.

The opening session of the conference was a standing room only event, with welcoming speeches by George Molinié, the president of the University of Paris-Sorbonne, and Hélène Carrère d’Encausse, secretary of the Académie française, as well as Hilaire Multon, conseiller of the Ministry of Culture. Representing Tolstoy were Vitali Remizov and Vladimir Tolstoy, the directors of the Tolstoy museums in Moscow and at Yasnaya Polyana, as well as Colette Tolstoi, president of “Les Amis de Léon Tolstoi” in France.

The following day began with a wonderful paper on Gogol and Tolstoy by the esteemed Sergei Bocharov, who was followed by a series of speakers from around the world. The international audience was provided with headphones allowing them to listen to simultaneous translations into either Russian or French. Some of these talks, as well as a number of papers that were not presented at the conference, appear in a special edition of Revue des études slaves (LXXXI (2010), fascicule 1) devoted to the centennial.

The French press also remembered the anniversary, with large spreads in the national papers. Tolstoy’s image loomed large on the front page of the literary section of Le Monde on November 19, which featured reviews of a number of Tolstoy publications, most notably an interesting edition of The Kreutzer Sonata that includes the responses of his wife Sofia (her novella Whose Fault? (Чья вина?)) and son Lev (the novella Chopin’s Prelude (Прелюдия Шопена)). (A similar volume has appeared in Russian.) The French edition of Sofia Tolstoy’s memoirs has also been published, along with a reissue of her diaries, in keeping with the attention that her legacy has received all over the world this year. In the same vein the Libération weekly Le mag in its coverage of Tolstoy focused on these publications and the problems of the Tolstoy marriage. While much attention was paid at the conference to the traditional divide in Tolstoy (the writer of great novels vs. the problematic moralist), in some respects the press was drawn to the same questions regarding the “two Tolstoys,” even as they focused explicitly on the private life of the writer and his wife. The conflict in the Tolstoy family is now, perhaps more than at any time since his death, opening up issues in Tolstoy’s morality to public discussion. We will no doubt continue this discussion well into the second century following the writer’s death.

William Nickell
University of California, Santa Cruz