

ETHNICITY

Russian Minorities in the Baltic States

2010/3

EDITOR:

Vladislav Volkov, Dr.sc.soc. (Daugavpils University, Latvia)

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Maija Kule, Ph.D.Hab., Academician, Professor (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, University of Latvia);

Ilga Apine, Dr.Hist.Hab., Professor (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, University of Latvia);

Aivars Tabuns, Dr.Sc.Soc., Professor (University of Latvia);

Aleksandr Ivanov, Dr.Hist., Professor (Daugavpils University, Latvia);

Leokadia Drobizheva, Dr.Sc. (History), Professor (Institute of Sociology at Russian Academy of Sciences);

David Galbreath, Ph.D. (The University of Aberdeen, Great Britain);

Aksel Kirch, Ph.D., Professor (International University Audentes, Tallinn, Estonia);

Jacek Kurczewski, Dr.Hab., Professor (Warsaw University, Poland);

Leonard Latkovsky, Dr.Hist., Professor (Hood College, USA);

Helena Noskova, Ph.D., Senior Researcher (Institute of Contemporary History of the Academy of Sciences, Czech Republic);

Ekaterina Protassova, Ph.D. (University of Helsinki, Finland);

Anele Vosyliute, Dr.Soc.Sc., Senior Researcher (Institute for Social Research, Lithuania).

MANAGING EDITOR:

Inese Runce, Dr.hist. (Institute of Philosophy and Sociology (University of Latvia)

LITERARY EDITORS:

Silvija Marta Horsta, Alyona Savelyeva

Papers for the «Ethnicity» should be sent to:

«Ethnicity», 1-421 Parādes str., Daugavpils,
Latvia LV-5400

E-mail:

vladislavs.volkovs@du.lv;
runceine@inbox.lv

Ethnicity – a peer-reviewed journal was established by the Institute of Social Investigations (Daugavpils University, Latvia) and Institute of Philosophy and Sociology (University of Latvia). The journal publishes original works about ethnicity in different fields of knowledge – sociology, history, social linguistics, social psychology, law, political science.

Knowledge Base Social Sciences Eastern Europe (<http://www.cee-socialscience.net/journals/index.asp?stock=journals&select=Latvia>)

ISSN 1691-5844

Russian Minorities in the Baltic States

CONTENTS

Vladislav Volkov

RUSSIAN MINORITIES IN THE BALTIC STATES:
CONTEXT OF THE POLICY OF RECOGNITION4

Nadezhda Pazukhina

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE OLD BELIEVERS' CULTURE
STUDIES IN LATVIA FOR CREATING THE CONCEPT
OF "LOCAL RUSSIANS": HISTORIOGRAPHY MATERIALS
FROM 1990-S AND THE BEGINNING OF 21st CENTURY9

Tatyana Feigmane

LATVIAN RUSSIANS IN HISTORIOGRAPHY OF LATVIA
FROM 1990 UNTIL 2010..... 31

Elena Vasilyeva

IMAGE OF A RUSSIAN IN THE TEXTBOOKS
ON LATVIAN LITERATURE..... 64

Triin Vihalemm

TO LEARN OR NOT TO LEARN? DILEMMAS OF LINGUISTIC
INTEGRATION OF RUSSIANS IN ESTONIA 74

Grigorijus Potashenko

RUSSIANS OF LITHUANIA (1990-2010): INTEGRATION
IN CIVIL SOCIETY 99

Olga Popova

POLITICAL SCIENCE IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION:
SCIENTIFIC RESEARCHES ON RUSSIAN-SPEAKING
MINORITIES IN THE BALTIC STATES 111

Sergey Mazur, Aleksey Romanov

RUSSIAN CULTURE PROBLEMS DISCUSSED BY SEMINARIUM
HORTUS HUMANITATIS SOCIETY IN THE ALMANAC
"РУССКИЙ МИР И ЛАТВИЯ" 128

Notes for Contributors 138

Vladislav Volkov

RUSSIAN MINORITIES IN THE BALTIC STATES: CONTEXT OF THE POLICY OF RECOGNITION

This issue of the journal „Ethnicity” publishes articles united by one topic – the character of the policy of recognition of Russian ethnic minorities in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. A seminar-discussion “Russian minorities in the Baltic States: context of the policy of recognition” took place in Riga on September 27, 2010. The seminar was organized by Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Institute for Social Research of Daugavpils University, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of Latvian University. Scientists, politicians, leaders of non-government organisations, journalists from Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Russia and Germany participated in the seminar.

The topic offered by the hosts of the seminar was determined by several reasons. Firstly, Russian minorities compose a significant part of the population in the Baltic states – they are the biggest national minorities in Latvia and Estonia and one of the biggest national minorities in Lithuania. Secondly, legislation in the Baltic states as well as a dominant scientific discourse and trend of public consciousness in these countries link national minorities’ identities mainly to an individual choice of a person who belongs to these minorities. At the same time Russian minorities in the Baltic states after the restored independence in these countries have formed whole segments of a civil society (private educational institutions, non-government organisations, political parties, mass media, etc.) which function in the Russian language. Thus, the representatives of Russian minorities in the Baltic states tend to institutionalise their collective ethnic identity. What is the attitude of Latvian, Lithuanian and Estonian societies towards these

Vladislav Volkov,

Dr. soc., Chief Researcher,
of the Institute of Social
Investigations, Daugavpils University

processes? To what extent do the scientists analyzing these processes accept the concepts of “policy of recognition”, “policy of differences”, “policy of identities”, etc. widely spread in the western social science? These were the key issues discussed in the reports at the seminar.

Analysis of historiography on this issue is a very important part of the research on “policy of recognition” of the Russian minority. Some reports which analysed the processes of establishing the interest of historians in the Baltic states to Russian minorities were presented at the seminar. Nadezhda Pazukhina, Doctor of Culturology from Latvia, in her presentation *“Importance of the Research on Old Believers’ Culture in Latvia during the Formation Process of the Concept “Local Russians”: Historiography Materials from 1990-s and the beginning of the 21st Century”* stated that in the first half of the 1990s representatives of the Latvian Russian intelligentsia tried to “re-discover” a period between wars in Latvia pointing out the existence of the Russian minority in this period and paying attention to the cultural experience of the Russians who unexpectedly for themselves turned out to be in the position of (emigrant) minority outside their ethnic motherland. Here is N. Pazukhina’s opinion on the orientation of these publications: *«These publications were meant for Russians of Latvia to create self-confidence of a united ethnic group which would be based on special historic roots helping to distinguish between the Russian culture in Latvia (the Baltics) and the Soviet or the culture in Russia. It seems to have been the way of creating a common historic memory for all the Russians in Latvia, opposed to the existing political rhetoric on the Russian-speakers as strange (or even evil) elements in the society of Latvia».*

Doctor of History Tatyana Feygmane in the report **“Latvian Historiography of the Russian Minority in 1991-2010”** noted that in the last 20 years there has been made a huge step in the research on the issues related to history and culture of the Russians in Latvia. In T. Feygmane’s opinion *“historiography of the last two decades has not been formed from scratch. We inherited the works of historians from the tsarist and Latvian times. Certain work was carried out in the Soviet times”*. The role of scientific works of I.Zavoloko, A. Zavaryna, B.Infantyev, Y.Abyzov, L.Fleyshman, B.Ravdyn was specially mentioned. T.Feygmane also mentioned the drawbacks in the interpretation of the Russian subject matter: *“Until now there are some serious deficiencies in the historiography of the Russian Latvians: a number of works especially the ones related to pre-historic and medieval periods can hardly be referred to as scientific. In my opinion, the role of the Russians in*

the period of modernization (end of the 19th- beginning of the 20th centuries) has not been thoroughly investigated. Only weak attempts are being made to examine the stand of the Russian Latvians during the German occupation. Unfortunately, at the moment there are no scientists who seriously consider the issue about the role and place of the Russians in the Soviet Latvia”.

Elina Vasilyeva, Associated Professor of Daugavpils University, in her report **“Image of the Russians in Textbooks on Literature in Latvia”** touches upon the issue of recognizing Russian minority from the point of view of culurology.

The researcher’s conclusions about the character of understanding and interpretation of the category “Russian” in the modern textbook “Literature” meant to both Latvian and national minorities’ schools are as follows: “One can see *“a deliberate decrease of “Russian” material within the context of the history of world culture: chapters devoted to the general aesthetic and historic issues of the ancient literature are illustrated by the material which presents various national traditions, Russian culture is excluded from this context (a textbook for the 10th form)”*. In the modern textbook “Russian” is mainly associated with “Soviet”, in relation to the 19th century history “Soviet” is replaced by “tsarist”. Evaluating connotations of the concept “Russian” in modern textbooks E.Vasilyeva asks: “if there might be a transfer of fear of Soviet to all Russian”.

The report by Associated Professor from Riga Stradina University, Doctor Denis Hanov **“Symbolic policy of marginalization in political advertising: Russian as radically Other”** examines the information background of “policy of recognition” of the Russians in Latvia within the election campaign of the conservative national party «Tēvzemei un Brīvībai» (For Fatherland and Freedom) in 2009 at the time of election to the local municipalities. D. Hanov emphasized that the information reaction of the party TB/LNNK on the advertising version created by their political opponents – a political alliance “Harmony Centre” contains *“a formula of the collective trauma and tragedy of thousands of Latvian people in the period of occupation and repressions in 1940-1941. A TV commercial emphasises the fear of modern Russia as the state which is permanently ready to occupy Latvia again. At the same time political and ethnic Others (Russians and namely “Harmony Centre”) become a symbolic tool of a possible repetition of the collective tragedy. Elements of the Russian collective identity are intergrated into the idea of a political fifth column highlighting symbolic forms of marginalisation of the Russian population in Latvia”*.

Associated Professor of the School of Business Administration “Turība”

in Riga Ainars Dimants in the report **“Various strategies of Latvian mass media in the Russian language: between ethnicity and citizenship”** demonstrated such peculiarities of the Russian-speaking information environment as a high proportion of spectators *“watching the programmes of the state-controlled Russian television”*, *“more interest, as compared to Latvians, towards television programmes than printed press”*, *“some growth in interest of the Russian-speaking readers towards Latvian mass media, mainly to daily issues, “women’s” magazines and “yellow” press, “lack of “quality” Latvian editions in the Russian language”*, *“taking into account a larger share of the Latvian citizens among Russian population in Daugavpils, the Russian printed media of this city accepts the values of the Latvian state policy to a more considerable degree as compared to the Russian printed media in Riga”* etc. The speaker also presented his interpretation of the differences in journalism culture in the Russian-language mass media. First – *“ethnic-orientated and orientated to the Russian authoritarianism, which leads to marginalization of the Russian-speaking information environment”*. Second – *“orientated to business information, and regional Daugavpils mass media”*.

The report by Miroslav Mitrofanov, a member of the Latvian 9 Saeima, **“Evolution of political consciousness of the Latvian Russians in 1991-2010”** was devoted to a very complicated character of establishing the Russians as a national minority in Latvia. The politician’s assessment of this process is as follows: *“The society has not changed much inherently. Particularly the inheritance of the Soviet epoch still remains the main factor which determines political self-consciousness of the Russians in Latvia”*. Soviet past had a negative influence on the identity of the Russians in Latvia: *“destruction of public ties, “atomism” of the society, extreme individualism have become peculiar to the Russian-speaking population in Latvia. Only just relatively small religious communities have remained as small islands of public activity”*. According to M.Mitrofanov, the alternative to this is self-organisation of the Russians in Latvia as a self-sufficient ethnic community.

Sergey Mazur, Master of History, a teacher of history at Riga secondary school introduced the participants of the seminar with the materials on the Russian culture presented in 23 issues of the **almanac SEMINARIUM HORTUS HUMANITATIS “Russian world and Latvia”**. This almanac has been issued since 2004 года (editor – A. Romanov).

A Doctor of Sociology Timofey Agarin (a researcher of the European Centre for Minority issues in Flensburg (Germany)) presented a report **“Institutionally mediated conflicts: why do Baltic minority communities remain passive?”** In his report the researcher characterized political

institutions of the post-communist countries and observed the possibilities for civil participation of the Baltic Russian minorities. T. Agarin came to the conclusion that post-communist political institutions are created to effectively manage conflicts for resources but do not have a chance to solve normative conflicts.

Doctor of History Grigory Potashenko (Vilnius University) in the report **“Russians in Lithuania (1990-2010) :integration in civil society”** analysed four forms of changes in cultural identity of Russians in this Baltic country: *“1. a conservative and purely ethnic identity; 2. a more open and transparent ethnic identity with some elements of civil identity; 3. archaic ethnic identity with soviet and/or imperial elements; 4. Post-modernism, cosmopolitan identity”*.

Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor of St.Petersburg State University Olga Popova presented the paper **“Political science in the Russian Federation: the issue of Russian minorities in the Baltic States”**. Professor O.Popova pointed out that the subject about the status of the Russian-speaking population is mainly discussed in the printed press. This leads to decrease in status and restriction in topic level of discussing the issue. At the same time the topicality of this issue for the Russian political scientists is stipulated by the attention to the general context of establishing civil society and formation of a democratic political system.

Doctor of Political Sciences Mikhail Rodin (Tallinn Polytechnic Institute) in the report **“Political identity of ethnic minorities in Latvia”** gave some data from the 2010 sociological survey carried out by the Institute for European Research (Riga). The main conclusions of the survey – *“the ethnic majority as well as ethnic minorities in Latvia identify themselves with the Latvian political identity, which is a positive prerequisite for national consolidation”*.

Apparently, the research on Russian minorities in the Baltic states is characterised by various aspects of analysis – historic, historiographic, cultural, political and sociological. And as a rule, the authors of the reports tend to analyse Russian minorities as bearers of already established or establishing collective ethnic identity which is orientated on various procedures of recognition in pluralistic civil societies in the Baltic states. The content of the reports proved the necessity for further intensive exchange of opinions on the issues of the policy of recognition of Russian minorities in the Baltic States with more active attracting conceptual theoretic approaches to this issue.

Nadezhda Pazukhina

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE OLD BELIEVERS' CULTURE STUDIES IN LATVIA FOR CREATING THE CONCEPT OF "LOCAL RUSSIANS": HISTORIOGRAPHY MATERIALS FROM 1990-S AND THE BEGINNING OF 21st CENTURY

After Latvia regained its independence the question of ethnic and cultural self-identity is returned for the Russian minority as a problem about the common historic memory of the Russians in Latvia. The Russian minority in Latvia nowadays is not a homogeneous one, both in social and in cultural aspect, partly it is the result of the Soviet period, but in part it is the historical peculiarity. The Old Believers' communities exist on the territory of Latvia since the middle of the 17th century, so the identification with the common past and with the cultural heritage of the ancestors in this ethno-religious group is more distinct when compared to other Russian residents in Latvia today. The purpose of this article is to show the Old Believers' culture studies in Latvia as an attempt to construct the image of the ideal "Others" voluntarily remaining separated from the dominating majority and tolerantly accept the national self-determination idea of the titular nation. Especially in the last decade, implementation of the Old-Believer studies in the academic circles has contributed to the existence of scientific research publications in Latvian, thus, firstly attracting attention of professional scientists and students in a way that a wider audience of readers has had an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the Old-Believer culture as one of traditional cultures in Latvia. The accent laid on research of the Old-Believer history and studies on the Old-Believer cultural heritage marks a politically neutral vector, which allows us to perceive Old Believers with less suspicion about their disloyalty than other Russians.

Nadezhda Pazukhina,

Dr. art., Institute of Philosophy and Sociology
of University of Latvia, researcher

Key words: Old Believers, identity, cultural self-identity, historical memory, cultural heritage, minority, historiography

INTRODUCTION. HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN MINORITY AS A CURRENT ISSUE IN THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF LATVIA

After Latvia regained its independence and the political situation changed in the first half of 1990-s, representatives of the Russian intelligentsia in Latvia started paying special attention to the historical experience of the Russian community in Latvia. In this respect, the period between the two World wars seemed especially important. Life of the Russian diaspora during the first years of Latvian independence attracted special attention as parallels could be drawn with the modern life. In any case, many authors were willing to find those parallels: feelings of Russians, which, according to some authors, in 1920-s and 1930-s had to realize their minority status (even the status of emigrants) outside their ethnic motherland could be emotionally compared to the feelings of Russians (any Russian-speaking inhabitants) in the newly restored Republic of Latvia¹. With the help of professional historians, philologists and simply enthusiastic people in 1990-s, we found out about the diverse ways of life of Latvian Russians in the period between the two World wars². However, it was a part of the general interest during the early post-Soviet period about “a different” history, especially about Russian emigration and the fate of the Russian diaspora in the first half of the 20th century (see, Кости́ков 1990, Раев 1994). Researches carried out in 1990-s on Russians in the period between the two World wars, are dominated by systematic descriptions of the archive documents available during the Soviet time. Researchers also tried to re-read pre-war Russian periodicals to be able to build the picture of the social life, first of all, the Russian social life in Latvia (see, Абызов 1990-1991; Флейшман, Абызов, Равдин 1997; Фейгмане 2000).

At the same time, attention was paid to the 19th century history, to be more precise, to the role of the Russian intelligentsia in those Baltic provinces (*Ostseeprovinzen*), where the leading role had belonged to Baltic German nobility (see, *От Лифляндии – к Латвии...* 1993-1999; Ковальчук 1998).

For the first time, activities of the Orthodox Church on the territory of Latvia in the 19th century were looked deeply into. It introduced aspects of religious politics into the academic discussion (see, Гаврилин 1999; Гаврилин 2004). Results of such studies were published not only in collec-

tions of scientific articles but also in some popular publications and periodicals (magazine *Даугава*, newspapers *СМ-Сегодня*, *7 секретов*, *Вести*, *Час*, *Телеграф*). These publications were meant for Russians of Latvia to create self-confidence of a united ethnic group which would be based on special historic roots helping to distinguish between the Russian culture in Latvia (the Baltics) and the Soviet or the culture in Russia. It seems to have been the way of creating common historic memory for all the Russians in Latvia, opposed to the existing political rhetoric on the Russian-speakers as strange (or even evil) elements in the society of Latvia. Moreover, when describing the situation of the Russian minority in Latvia and in the Baltics, intentionally or not, analogy was drawn with the sense of “mission” of the Russian “intellectual” emigration after the revolution. They were trying to preserve “the real” Russian culture outside their ethnic motherland. Nowadays, we must admit, that this analogy has been more emotional than factual. However, it should be pointed out that the ethnic identity topic or, to be more precise, the question of ethnic and cultural self-identity, really returned in 1990-s, same as in the situation of 1920-s.

CULTURE OF LATVIAN OLD BELIEVERS AS AN OBJECT OF HISTORIOGRAPHY

Latvian Russians, Old Believers among them, were searching for a common background during the period between the two World wars. Probably the Latvian Old Believers, during the time of the First Republic could feel that they had benefited a lot, at least, considering their political rights. At that time, the Old Belief was included into the list of traditional religions, giving Old Believers all the legal and political rights as well as the state financing like other traditional confessions received .

Between the two World wars, many enthusiastic people belonged to Old-Believer congregations. They spoke about the problem of Russian self-confidence, thinking of them as an ethnic group; they initiated thoughts about the necessity to save the Russian culture in Latvia, to promote Russian cultural values at different events, in periodicals, even in the sphere of education. Here, we should remember words by two Latvian Old Believers Ivan Zavoloko (1897-1984), the founder and the leader of the “Group of Zealots of the Ancient Russian Tradition”, editor and publisher of the magazine «Родная Старина», a teacher, gatherer and specialist of ancient Russian manuscripts; Ivan Iupatov (1865-1944), a deputy at the 2nd Saei-

ма (Parliament of Latvia), head of the Russian School Department of the Ministry of Education (1925-1934). Work of these two men was connected not only with the strictly religious Old-Believer community, but also, with the whole Russian community, possibly, even wider – with all the society (Барановский, Потащенко 2005, р.173-181, 457-458).

Characterizing bibliography on the Latvian Old-Believer history and culture, one should mention that it was between the two World Wars when this very theme was first touched upon by researchers; Ivan Zavoloko's outstanding personality has contributed greatly to it. The early publications about Old Believers in Latvia, for example, in the 2nd half of the 19th century, contained, either socially polemical, or philosophical thoughts – Old Believers being not the main “object of research” but a thematic reason to speak about another topical problem. Therefore, publications by I.Zavoloko, even though they were only popular scientific works, created interest about the special cultural traditions of Old Believers in Latvia and the Baltics.

It should also be noted that, I. Zavoloko's articles and activities in general, were permeated by “the Enlightenment ethos”, resp., his passion for collecting and studying ancient manuscripts, ethnographic and archeographic expeditions to Old Believers' villages in Latvia and outside it (in Estonia, Lithuania, East Prussia, at the foot of the Carpathian mountains, etc.), first of all, were connected with education of Old Believers themselves. He was trying to implement the ancient traditions (ancestral heritage, or, using his own words – “ancient commandments” [заветы старины]) into modern Old Believers' cultural practices.

Therefore, at that time, I. Zavoloko and his confederates, as their most important task, chose to reconstruct authentic national costumes (and to wear them), to take notes and learn the old melodies of “character singing” (as well as to sing them, not only during church services, but also at public concerts). They chose to publish albums on embroidery, to print spiritual poetry and music, so that they could be used practically by the younger generation of Old Believers (see, Заволоко 1929; Заволоко 1939; *Духовные стихи старинные* 1933, 1937). Strictly speaking, it was not yet a scientific research on Old Believers' cultural heritage, but rather its compilation and systematization. However, these were the first serious attempts to understand the value of the Old Believers' cultural heritage and to find a possibility to save these values for future generations which already were growing up in a different cultural environment. It is not a coincidence that some of I. Zavoloko's publications have been reprinted nowadays by Old-

Believer organizations (Заволоко 1991, Заволоко 1998, *Духовные стихи старинные* 2006).

During the Soviet period the Old Belief was viewed as one of the characteristic expressions of the folk culture attributed to this particular community and connected with the so-called “popular conservatism”. This approach included the point of view that the main Old-Believer value was maintaining the peculiar patriarchal order of life; inter alia, preserving the Old Russian material cultural heritage³.

Another aspect which some Soviet historians studied was persecutions of Old Believers in the Russian Empire, thus, finding a reason to call Old Believers “protestors against the Czar’s regime”⁴. Perhaps, such Old Believers’ “ideological” interpretation contributed to the tolerant attitude while studying this phenomenon, even within the official historiography.

Assessing the situation with historiography in Latvia, we can conclude that relatively few Latvian authors have contributed to subjects on the Old Believers’ community. For example, Arnold Podmazov’s works written during the Soviet period and published in 1970-s (Подмазов 1970; Подмазов 1973), are still the most important studies on Latvian Old Believers, despite the fact, that modern researchers can rather use them for studying the Soviet policy regarding religious denominations. However, despite the over-ideologization, these were the first and the only Soviet books on the history of Latvian Old Believers, in which archive materials had been used. Latvian Old-Believer cultural issues were indirectly addressed in one of the few studies, carried out in the second half of 1980-s, on Russian citizens in the Eastern Latvia (Заварина 1986). This work was the first one to clarify and specify statistics on the Russian population in Latgale, and to emphasize the ethnographic aspect of “local Russians” culture. In general, it pointed to the “tangible” cultural objects, as well as the originality of traditions and dialects, characteristic to Old-Believer villages in the Eastern part of Latvia.

In 1990-s and during the last decade of the 20th century, A. Podmazov continued working with archive materials on Old Belief’s early stages. He also paid his attention to the development of the Old Belief in the 20th century (Подмазов 2003, p.173-182; Подмазов 2005, p.333-342). Given the fact, that the author had actively worked on this theme since 1960-s and 1970-s, had participated in sociological research, for many years had personally known a number of Old-Believer spiritual fathers, the author’s conclusions about the Old-Believer parish activities at that time, can be re-

garded as eyewitness's testimony and, therefore, should acquire additional value (Podmazovs 2006, p. 401 – 405; Podmazovs 2009, p. 208 – 216). A. Podmazov has been the first one to make an attempt to systemize and explain the Old-Believer history in Latvian (Podmazovs 2001). This monograph is rich in historical materials and can be characterized as very factually descriptive one. The author's main goal was to eliminate the "white spot" in Latvian historiography, and, it explains the wish to avoid discussing difficult questions within this study.

In the second half of 1990-s Old-Believer research centers gradually appeared the Baltics – Old-Believer cultural research groups were formed at Vilnius and Tartu Universities. Members of these groups were mainly dealing with ethnographic and linguistic studies. Collections of articles reflect the results of their research work and scientific seminars. Their value is mainly in the fact that they represent a variety of methodological approaches to learning about Old Believers. These articles help to create a notion and an image of the Old Belief as a single cultural model, revealing the universal cultural mechanisms within it (*Старообрядцы Литвы... 1998; Русские староверы за рубежом 2000; Очерки по истории и культуре староверов в Эстонии 2004*).

As for the Latvian professional researchers of the Old Belief, the older generation of scientists, who, unfortunately, have already passed away, should be mentioned first: Arnold Podmazov (1936-2010), a senior researcher of the Sociology and Philosophy Institute who had devoted all his academic life to historical research of the Old Belief; Edward Meksh (1939-2005) and Iosiph Trofimov (1947-2007), professors from Daugavpils University, who studied the Old Believers' folklore and revealed their culture through, both, fiction and periodicals. In the works of Boris Infant'ev (1921-2009), the Old Believers' image in the Russian and Latvian literature should also be mentioned.

Interested but non-professional researchers are mainly the Old Believers themselves. Many of them are true enthusiasts, careful gatherers and classifiers of materials. Their contribution to Latvian Old-Believer studies is very important, especially, we should mention Vladimir Nikonov, Chairman of Rezekne Old-Believers' Community; Zinovija Zimova, a parishioner from Jekabpils; Tatyana Kolosova, President of Preili Slavonic Society.

Unfortunately, research on Old-Believer history and culture in Latvia at that time was carried out without a single research strategy. However, no one can deny the contribution made by the group of researchers-enthusi-

asts, which was formed in Riga in 1990-s. It happened, thanks to the co-operation between the Old Believers' Society of Latvia and professional representatives of Russian humanitarian sciences. Humanities Research and Education Center (Fund) VEDI organized a theoretical workshop "Russian History and Culture in Latvia" (conducted by Ilarion Ivanov; Boris Infantyev was the scientific adviser until the last days of his life, scientific secretary was Arnold Podmazov). Participants of the seminars developed a systematic research program and tried to do their utmost to implement it⁵. On the whole, the work of the seminars is to be assessed very positively. During the period from 1993 until 2010 a number of important scientific conferences have been organized, materials from which have been published in collections of scientific articles. The fact, that reviews of these conferences were published in the press, is not insignificant. The positive publicity, caused by the above-mentioned measures, increased public interest about the Old-Believer culture, in contrast to the unhealthy interest (caused by the same mass media) about disagreements and disputes within the Riga Grebenshikov Community in mid-1990-s, 2002 and 2007. Unfortunately, it is clear that in the "regular" newspaper readers' minds Riga Old Believers are likely to be associated with that scandalous publicity⁶.

Since 1990-s regular studies on the Old-Believer culture and history are taking place also in Latgale. There, this religious community historically accounts for almost one half of all Russian citizens. Thanks to co-operation of local history researchers (Raymond Olehno, Chairman of the Board of Rezekne Local History Association; Vladimir Nikonov, local history researcher and Chairman of Rezekne Old-Believer Community), professional researchers (E. Meksh, I. Trofimov from Daugavpils University) and Old-Believer representatives (Alexy Zhilko, spiritual father of the First Old-Believer Community in Daugavpils, President of Latvian Old Orthodox Pomorian Church Council) scientific workshops and conferences are being organized⁷.

It should be noted that studies on the Latvian Old-Believer culture became popular within the context of social integration, both, Old-Believer unions and individual researchers got involved in various projects (including the ones funded by Latvia and the European Union), focusing on studies and conservation of the Old-Believer cultural heritage⁸. In order to study and preserve cultural heritage, representatives of Old-Believer organizations, in collaboration with professional researchers, began to actively participate in project competitions, focused on preservation and promotion of national minorities' culture.

Publications on Old Believers in Latvia, which appeared during the last decade, have widely described their activities in the interwar period, both, within their communities and when working with other organizations and governmental institutions. However, attention has also been paid to the Old-Believer cultural potential in the long-term historical perspective, the self-organization ability and the ability to provide their parishes with relatively autonomous existence within the community, has been especially stressed. The idea of special Old-Believer unity has been the leading-motive of many studies; it is also underlined in the efforts to reconstruct the Old-Believer cultural genealogy (For example, *Vectīcībnieku kultūrvēsturiskais manojums Latgalē* 2006; Иванов, Бучель, Гаврилова 2007; *Староверское кладбище*).

Such publications contribute to formation of similar idea about the modern Old-Believers community. Its 350-year long history on the territory of Latvia is used as a clear example for the possibility to successfully preserve one's cultural identity in the environment dominated by people of different nationalities and religions. In addition, looking from outside, the Latvian Old Believers represent a stable ethno confessional group with a fairly distinct cultural identity based on religious practices and stable social traditions that have remained in the daily life of Old Believers until nowadays (Apine 2006, p. 388-393). Moreover, it is logical, that the Old-Believer political views are not highlighted, because, from the very beginning, their religious belief has made them oppose the "worldly" ("secular") society. But this opposition is not revolutionary in its nature, which is why, it is not considered undesirable by the official discourse on political correctness.

Over the past decade, the studies of Latvian Old-Believers' culture have conquered their own stable position in the academic research context, namely, chapters of scientific articles of the national research program "Lettonika" (intellectual and cultural heritage research program) have been devoted to the Old Belief in Latvia („Krievu vecticība kā etnokonfesionāla kopība Latvijas sabiedrības struktūrā” 2006; „Reliģiskās idejas Latvijā: vecticībnieki jaunajā un vecajā Eiropā” 2008).

OLD-BELIEVER PERIODICALS AND INTERNET RESOURCES

Over the last twenty years Old-Believer periodicals and the self-made resources on the Internet have constituted a specific part of historiography. On the one hand, Old-Believer periodicals are some of the most important sources to be used in studies on their culture, because these periodicals re-

flect the Old-Believer self-presentation tactics best of all. On the other hand, despite the fact that the Old-Believer periodicals are mainly meant for the Old-Believer audience itself, with its specific thinking and life perception, these periodicals are also available to wider audience, and to people, probably, having very little connection with Old-Believer religious experience. Thus, they represent a certain image of the Old Belief and the Old Believers outside their own audience, and they are the main media, giving the public an idea about the Old Belief on the basis of its tradition. In addition, Old-Believer periodicals pay great attention to the Old-Believer history; they publish not only religious materials, but also articles written by professional researchers.

Old-Believer periodicals, already in the first half of the 20th century, played a significant role in the consolidation and in strengthening the new social status of Old Believers. To some extent, they balanced out the historical autonomy of Old-Believer congregations, becoming mediators (media) between Old Believers and the rest of society. Old Believers' publications and internet resources have created a special kind of "Old-Believer archive", which includes (after some selection) the texts representing (in a broader sense) authority and viability of the Old Belief. Furthermore, media does not always reflect the "real life" of Old Believers in the proper sense of the word for it frequently concentrates at the most important events and activities only, as to demonstrate the Old Believers' special cultural mission. Once again, the general criteria for selection of the materials were not the particular correlation of the latter with a kind of reality i.e. the daily practices of believers, but in fact the way these materials reflected idea how reality corresponds to "examples of the Old Belief". In this respect, it can be said, that Old Believers' editions explicate their understanding of the Old Belief's nature and its mission in today's culture. Thus, Old-Believer media is primarily focused not on the present-day situation, but on reconstruction of the past, finding samples to determine the present and future values of modern Old Believers' life. Old-Believer editions mostly try to "reveal" important texts to the modern reader. It is important to emphasize a historical source as a value which reveals itself to the reader.

On the whole, thinking of the Latvian Old-Believer periodicals, we can conclude that they mark a certain type of discourse that includes the topics, problems and solution techniques characteristic to the Old Belief. The published articles can be divided into, at least, three thematic categories: 1) authoritative texts, the authors of which are significant personalities in

the Old Believers' world, founders of the Old-Believer doctrinal base and honored authors, especially, in the priestless trend (for example, brothers Denisovs *Виноград Российский*¹¹); 2) essays on the Old-Believer history in Latvia and in the Baltics¹², articles on the history of particular Old-Believer denominations (they are usually connected with anniversaries or other important events¹³), 3) interviews, which reflect Old Believers' personal experiences in the daily and spiritual life. The interviewed people belong to different age groups and have different social status. (Both, Old-Believer spiritual fathers and popular people in the society have been interviewed. They are all Old Believers who have succeeded in their professional life¹⁴). This division reflects the attempts of Old Believers to present their belief from the diachronic and the simultaneous point of view.

Articles, the authors of which are scientists who do not necessarily belong to the Old-Believer faith, (and are not always religious) regularly appear in Old Believers' periodicals¹⁵. This trend, on the one hand, reflects the Old-Believer spiritual heritage's "return" from archives and libraries, where it was kept during the Soviet era, on the other hand, the "scientific point of view" now embodies the ideologically "impartial" position, which objectively reflects the "objective" Old-Believer values. This confidence in the facts, rooted in the Old-Believer scribe, today expresses itself as confidence in the religiously neutral scientific vision.

Main motivation for Old Believers that made them collaborate with researchers in the Soviet times was exactly the hope of preserving the material evidence of their cultural heritage¹⁶. That motivation has changed nowadays – Old Believers believe that the scientific credibility is likely to strengthen the Old-Believer clout in the "secular" society and in Old Believers' milieu (*Русские в Латвии...*2003, p. 8-9; *Староверие Латвии* 2005, p. 13-14).

The dimension of the Past in the Old-Believer culture is important not only in the sense of the "great" historical narrative (split of the Russian Orthodox Church and the spiritual opposition history of the first followers of the Old Belief), but also on the micro level – within the family history. Although, the canonical understanding of a marriage in the priestless trend is quite controversial, a family as a social institution maintains its status of a stable value among Old Believers.

Religious identity forms in the family; such skills are obtained, which are specifically characteristic to Old-Believer church practices. Besides, family is thought to save the real linkage to ancestral experience, both, in the daily

life (family manners and habits) and on the discursive experience level (stories and memories about the past, as well as exposure of folklore codified in the language – sayings, phraseologies, individuality of pronunciation). Old-Believer literature usually implies the theme of family genealogy on the subject of a rather wide range of problems. Mostly it is mentioned in the biographical essays about prominent Old-Believers. Publications about birthday children and necrology always stress the family role in the process of human mental growth¹⁷.

In the late decade Old Believers themselves have started to acknowledge that it is necessary to maintain historical memories about the private life – history of the family. Composition of the family genealogy was even mentioned as a special part in the working program of Latvian Old-Believer Society¹⁸. Theme of genealogical memories reflects a very important problem in the Old-Believer culture overall. Underground activity of Old Believers was affected by their successful adaptation to the Soviet ideological political context, that is – Old Believers were forced to hide their family traditions and their origin for almost fifty years. It caused withdrawal of the youngest generation from those traditions, which were handed over within the family in the form of cultural praxis – as natural involvement in traditions. The youngest generation has not received this knowledge in a natural form; at best, it recognizes only the outer form of the ritual or feels the value of material carriers (books, icons and other cultic things). Nowadays the oldest and the middle generation of Old Believers feel the threat of condition, when the natural link between all generations becomes weaker inside the family. Emotionally and psychologically the youngest generation does not feel belonging to the same chain anymore and it means that all traditions of Old Believers could be perceived as being on the way of disruption. While estimating the situation nowadays, Old-Believers' intelligence believe that moral problems and mental indifference are explainable with the disappearance of historical memories¹⁹.

That is why publications of Old Believers, as much as possible, try to motivate others to become interested in their past and readers are called to search for materials, construct the genealogy of their family by themselves. Publication materials regularly include articles about ancient Old-Believer generations in Latvia. These materials stress the need for different generations to live friendly inside the family, as well as strong moral educational family rules, which bring respect from people around and distinguished life for every next generation²⁰. With assistance of each Old-Believer family,

these works reconstruct an archetypical model of Old-Believer life, which does not change at the root in the course of time or under impact of political conditions. This scheme is based on the strong moral educational family rules, authority recognition of the oldest generation and pragmatism in life-forming (education, choice of profession, establishing a family is mostly based on the criteria of “distinguished life”: sufficient (but not exaggerated) welfare, square deal towards people, strong self-disciplined morality).

Regularly published Old Believers’ printed periodicals try to cover wide range of readers. At the turn of the 20th – 21st centuries Old Believers from Latvia and other countries tried to achieve it with the help of Internet. Very often distribution of publications is difficult. Periodical publications of Latvian Old Believers have quite serious financial problems, because of the small circulation and low purchasing capacity. In this respect, the Old-Believer resources in the Internet is not only a good way of sharing information with a lot of computer users about the originality of the Old-Believer culture, but also a good opportunity to conduce the youngest and the middle Old-Believer generations to rouse interest about stream of events in the Old-Believer society with intention to facilitate partnership. It should be remarked that from time to time, society of Old Believers has doubts about the usage of Internet – if it corresponds to the canon demands of the Old Belief, nevertheless, during last decade the Old-Believer Association has had a pragmatic approach and the network has been used as an instrument, as a tool to testify that the Old Belief is viable in the modern times²¹. All periodical publications of Latvian Old Believers can be found on the WebPages: newspaper *Меч Духовный* [*Spiritual Sword*] (publisher: I. N. Zavoloko Old-Believers’ Society, published since 2000), newspaper *Щит Веры* [*Shield of the Faith*] (publisher: 1st (New Built) Old-Believer Community of Daugavpils, published since 2000, the last edition in 2005) and magazine *Поморский Вестник* [*Pomorian Herald*] (publisher: Riga Grebenshchikov Old-Believers’ Community, Old-Believers’ Society of Latvia, published since 1999). The number of Internet users, who keep up with the information in Old-Believer homepages is pullulating and Old Believers themselves get much wider picture about what is happening in other Old-Believer communities all over the world and all that can be considered advantages of the Internet.

Materials in mass media indicate that in public self-presentation Old-Believers bring to the forefront “material” trace of their knowledge, which tangibly prove the antique Old-Believer culture – ancient worship books,

icons, ancient forms of singing, ancient worship rituals, ancient stitch craft and everyday manners in life; even a specific dialect of the Russian language, which comprises speech individualities of ancestral lands. Where, on the one hand, the modern Latvian Old Believers try to develop the image of united society by accenting the historical roots of Old Believers on this territory and their tolerant attitude towards Latvia, which has provided them with civic rights and freedom since this country has been established. On the other hand, Old Believers recognize those problems, which traditional culture faces today, in modern times, and they try to consolidate the power to maintain the natural heritage of traditions for the sake of the youngest Old-Believer generations. The most active part of Old-Believers mostly concentrates on the enlightenment of religion and education with a desire to renew the interest of young people about the Old Belief. Seeing that Sunday Schools are not worried about this problem, Old Believers are trying to get involved in creating the secular education system and in developing programs for religion lessons, which can be taught in comprehensive schools.

APROPOS CONCLUSIONS

In short, we might indicate a double problem, which characterizes the Old Believers as an ethno-confessional group of self-confidence in the contemporary Latvia. On the one hand, there is an attempt within the framework of Old-Believer community to understand by the way of reflection, how it is possible to keep “alive” the ancestral traditions and, how the traditional cultural practices are compatible with today’s cultural realities. Therefore, the Old-Believer intelligentsia is knowingly seeking for answers within experiences from 1920-s and 1930-s, when these issues, for the first time, were not only clearly articulated, but solutions were offered as well. For example, how to integrate the traditional learning into school education? On the other hand, Old Believers as a part of the Russian minority within the framework of the whole Russian community are quite controversial, because the uniting and the distinctive exists together and that still makes us perceive the Old Believers as a “separate” group on the background of Russian-speaking people. These are important issues if we think of the Russian attitude to the Soviet power, attitude to Orthodoxy, of course, attitude to the historical and modern Russia as to the ethnic homeland, too. Also, if we think of their attitude to Latvia as homeland and their ancestors’ land. Old Believers are mostly those Russians, who have deeper

roots in this country than those who arrived in Latvia after the war (although, many of those people have originated from Old Believers). Today, solidarity of Old Believers with the rest of Russians is mostly based on the common native language – the Russian language is a major determinant that brings Old Believers closer to other Russian-speaking people.

Especially in the last decade, implementation of the Old-Believer studies in the academic circles has contributed to existence of scientific research publications in Latvian, thus, firstly attracting attention of professional scientists and students in a way that a wider audience of readers has had an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the Old-Believer culture as one of traditional cultures in Latvia. Accent on research of the Old-Believer history and studies on the Old-Believer cultural heritage marks a politically neutral vector, which allows us to perceive Old Believers with less suspicion about their disloyalty or chauvinism than other Russians who are, unfortunately, still considered the “carriers” of the Soviet “imperial” thinking. From this point, Old Believers are perceived as the “local Russians”, whose ethnic minority status is being legitimized by their significantly long (for more than 300 years), permanent residence on the territory of Latvia and it is important that they have had very loyal attitude towards Latvia during the inter-war period and today as well. The Old-Believer opposition against the Soviet regime has been quite strong. Thus, in the eyes of Latvians, Old Believers embody the ideal “Others” who voluntarily remain separated from the dominating majority and tolerantly accept the national self-determination idea of the titular nation.

Recently one part of Latvian Old Believers tried to consolidate with other national minorities, quite paradoxically, for instance, one Old-Believer organization (I. N. Zavoloko Old-Believers’ Society) as a representative of “the Old-Believer dialect” has joined the Livs and Latgale representatives in the Latvian union of regional and less-used languages (LatBLUL), which was founded in 2009. It is clear that it is only the choice of a small group of people, but it marks an interesting trend – Old-Believer efforts to unite not with other Russians, but with other ethnic groups, which have a similar marginal status legitimated to the dominating majority. In this example, representatives of the Old-Believer society are not even positioning their language as Russian, but as completely different, specific and valuable “Old Believers’ dialect”.

NOTES

- 1 Collection of articles *Русские в Латвии: история и современность*. (1992) Отв. Ред. И.И. Иванов / Науч. Ред. Б.Ф. Инфантьев. Рига: ЛАД, published already in 1992 is typical of that period. The authors in the very beginning have pointed out the succession of the collection: it continued the collections *Русские в Латвии*, published in 1933 and in 1934. In fact, the new collection mainly contained articles published in 1933; there was only one new article. (See: Федоров А.Н. Национальный состав населения Латвии за 110 лет в зеркале статистики. Р. 54-73.). The main goal of the collection was to renew discussion about the history of Russians as ethnic group in Latvia.
- 2 In 1992 the first research dedicated to the history of Russian minority came out. It was the first publication to reveal the picture of the work of Russian social organizations in Latvia between the two World wars: Фейгмане, Т. (1992) *Русские общества в Латвии, 1920-1940 гг.* Рига: Латвийский университет. 63 с. The Latvian publication was like an overview as well, Zeile, P. (1994) *Nacionālo minoritāšu kultūra Latvijas Republikā (20.-30.gadi)*. Rīga: Izglītības, kultūras un zinātnes ministrija. 95 lpp. Memoirs were equally important, for instance: Плеханов, Б.В. (1993) *Русские в Латвии и в Эстонии: материалы к истории Русского студенческого христианского движения*. Париж: Ymca-Press. 311 p.
- 3 According to the decision of the Cabinet of Ministers, the Department of Religious Affairs at the Ministry of Interior granted financial support to five traditional religious groups (the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the Catholic Church, the Orthodox Church, Old Believers and Jewish congregations) for construction of new buildings or restauration of the old ones. The amount of financing depended on the number of believers. See: LVVA, 1370 f., 1. apr.; 1880 l.
- 4 To compare, for example, Лесков, Н.С. (1863) *О раскольниках г. Риги, преимущественно в отношении к школам*. Санкт-Петербург: Министерство народного просвещения. (Лесков, Н.С. (1996) *Полное собрание сочинений в 30-ти томах*. Т.3. Сочинения 1862-1863 гг. Москва: Терра. С. 384-459.) Розанов, В.В. (1899) «Федосеевцы в Риге.» *Новое время*, 27 августа, № 8440. С.2. (Розанов, В.В. (1995) *Около церковных стен*. Т.1. Москва: Республика. p. 22-28.)
- 5 An example of the historically ethnographic approach, a factually rich study; in a way, predecessor of the 1990-s study: Заварина, А.А. (1986) *Русское население Восточной Латвии во второй половине XIX – начале XX века*. Рига: Зинатне. 247 p.
- 6 Soviet historians' approach to the Old Belief as a popular "protest movement" is well reflected in the researcher's A. Klibanov's works, for example, Клибанов, А.И. (1977) *Народная социальная утопия в России: Период феодализма*. Москва: Наука. 335 p.
- 7 Thanks to activities during the seminar, a number of scientific papers were

- prepared, which contained, both, works by Old-Believer authors, as well as, by non-religious professional historians: *Памяти Заволоко Ивана Никифоровича* (1999) Рига: Центральный совет Древлеправославной Поморской церкви Латвии, Старообрядческое общество Латвии. 168 р. *Русские в Латвии. Из истории и культуры староверия* (2003) Редактор-составитель Ил.И. Иванов. Вып.3. Изд. 2-е. Рига: ВЕДИ. 416 р. *Староверие Латвии*. (2005) Отв. ред.-сост. Иванов Ил. И. Рига: Старообрядческое общество Латвии. 440 р.
- 8 To compare also references of some Latvian journalists regarding the disagreement: Barkāns, E. (2007) „Desmitiem miljonu vērti ticības kari.” *Nedēļa*, 12. marts. Available at http://www.tvnet.lv/zinas/latvija/215981-desmitiem_miljonu_verti_ticibas_kari (viewed on 23.11.2010).
 - 9 Examples of such conferences, “Ivan Zavoloko: Life and Fate” (Rezekne, 1997), “The Old Belief in Latvia: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow (Readings by Bodrov)” (Rezekne, 1998, 1999, 2000), “Russian Old Believers in Latgale During the Processes of Society Integration” (Luznava region, Kraslava, Daugavpils, 2001, 2002), in 2003 scientific readings, dedicated to 140-years anniversary of Rezekne Old-Believer Community, and to 125 years anniversary of Jekabpils Old-Believer Pokrov Church, took place. Also, the Scientifically Practical Conference in memory of the fall of Byzantium 500 years ago was organized in Daugavpils, two workshops took place within the project “Latvian Old Belief: Historical Experience, Culture and Modern Processes in Society” (Riebini region, Daugavpils).
 - 10 For example, the project worked out by Old-Believers’ Society of Latvia called “Old Belief in Latvia: its History, Culture and Social Processes Nowadays” was supported by the Society Integration Fund (2004-2005). In 2006 another project was carried out. It was called “Old-Believer Cultural Heritage in Latgale” and was supported by the EU and the Society Integration Fund. Jekabpils History museum and Old-Believers’ Society “Belovodije” participated in it. (See: http://www.bdaugava.lv/?kat=37&news_id=3344, viewed on 23.11.2010)).
 - 11 «Виноград Российский.» *Меч Духовный*, 2000-2005, №№ 1-17.
 - 12 See, «История староверия. Хронограф, сиречь Летописец Курляндско-Литовский.» *Поморский Вестник*, 2000, № 2 -3. р. 10-11.
 - 13 See, for example: Никонов, В. «Из истории режицкой кладбищенской старообрядческой общины.» *Меч Духовный*, 2003, №3. р. 1, 10. Колосова, Т. «К 275-летию Москвинской старообрядческой общины.» *Ibid.*, 2004, №12. р. 9. Барановский, В. «Две знаменательных даты. Из истории старообрядчества Литвыю» *Ibid.*, 2005, №16. р. 16
 - 14 Judging by the interviewed personalities, one can think that the main criterion for selection of “lay persons” is successful career and a respectable way of life. See, for example: Колосова, Т. «Отец Максим Волков «Моя война была короткой...» *Меч Духовный*, 2005, №16. р. 10. Позняк, Т. «Афанасий Кузьмин «Вне спорта я себя не мыслю» *Ibid.*, 2004, №13. р. 16.

- 15 See, for example: Подмазов, А. «Первые старообрядческие общины в Латвии.» *Поморский Вестник*, 2001, №1 (8). p. 13-14. Гаврилин, А. «Отношение духовенства Люцинского (Лудзенского) благочиния к старообрядцам во второй половине XIX – начале XX вв.» *Поморский Вестник*, 2004, №1 (13). p. 35-37. Романова, М.В. «Христианская символика в народной культуре литовских старообрядцев.» *Поморский Вестник*, 2004, №2 (14). p. 29-33.
- 16 See, for example I. Zavoloko' letters to Employees of Pushkin's House, Archive of the Institut for the Russian Literature (Pushkin's House), Zavoloko collection, №162.
- 17 For example: Ягодкин, А. «Вечная память. Стефан Родионович Кириллов. Увеналий Александрович Селушинский.» *Меч Духовный*, 2000, №1, с. 7. «Памятные даты. Апрель – июнь 2004 г.» *Поморский Вестник*, 2004, №2 (14), p. 42-43. «Поздравления юбилярам.» *Старообрядческий Церковный календарь на 1999 год*. Даугавпилс, 1999, p. 72-73.
- 18 Nikolay Ivanov writes about his motivation to study the history of Old-Believer families (the author comes from the ancient Old-Believer generation). He presents a pattern of how to do genealogy work, as well as stresses that maintenance of family history is a moral responsibility of each Old Believer. Thus, traditions of Old-Believers can be continued through all generations. See: Иванов, Н.Т. «Из истории старообрядческих родов (опыт составления родословных).» В: *Русские в Латвии. Из истории и культуры староверия / Редактор-составитель Ил.И. Иванов. Вып.3. Изд. 2-е. Рига: ВЕДИ, 2003. p.235-239.*
- 19 Compared to the bright citation by modern Old-Believer author, “If grave fogs and all roads back home are forgotten, if there is no understanding about the value of genetic experience through generations, role of religion in one's life, penitence and forgiveness – veins of the soul, break. [...] Constrainedly or at ease, everything collapses: from the values of Christianity to atheism, then, to a sect or religion that has developed in absolutely strange lands”. Иванов, Н.Т. «Из истории старообрядческих родов (опыт составления родословных).» В: *Русские в Латвии. Из истории и культуры староверия / Редактор-составитель Ил.И. Иванов. Вып.3. Изд. 2-е. Рига: ВЕДИ, 2003. p. 236. Similar thoughts by P. Alekseyev (editor of the newspaper Меч Духовный): “Under the influence of the 21st century we can see greater indention from our own radices, our history, our past. [...] While we have time, we need to find the way out of this situation and keep our faith, originality... heritage from the past, which exists only inside all Old Believers.” Алексеев, П. «Колонка редактора.» *Меч Духовный*, 2004, №12. p. 2.*
- 20 Examples of Old-Believer genealogical constructions: Емельянов, А. «Родословная старообрядческой семьи. Род Кудрячевых.» *Поморский Вестник*, 2001, №1 (8). p. 15-17. Грязнова, З. «Родословная старообрядческой

семьи. Стариковы и Плотниковы из Арканской общины.» *Поморский Вестник*, 2004, №1 (13). p. 21-23. «История старообрядческих родов. Родословная Ермолаевых.» *Поморский Вестник*, 2005, №2 (17). p.28-35.

An interesting example of a study on Old-Believer Jemelyanov family by a schoolgirl from Livani secondary school No 2. Емельянова, Е. «Уклад жизни русского человека в Латвии в первой половине XX века (по материалам староверческого рода Емельяновых).» *Меч Духовный*, 2004-2005, №№ 14-17.

- 21 For example, see P. Alekseyev's opinion about the way the Old Believers are using Internet in an interview with an Old-Believer editor in Samara in 2005: <http://www.samstar.ru/document/373/?XTORESID=816aebbb2310c340be2e8e67c7797e2f> (viewed on 20.08.2006.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apine, I. (2006) «Vecticībnieku vieta Latvijas vēsturē un sabiedrības integrācijas procesā.» In: *Modernitāte: filosofija, kristīgās vērtības, mutvārdu vēsture Latvijā. Letonikas I kongress. Rīga: Latvijas Zinātņu akadēmija, LU Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts. Pp.388.-393.*

Barkāns, E. (2007) «Desmitiem miljonu vērti ticības kari.» *Nedēļa*, 12. marts. http://www.tvnet.lv/zinas/latvija/215981-desmitiem_miljonu_verti_ticibas_kari (2010.23.11.)

«Krievu vecticība kā etnokonfesionāla kopība Latvijas sabiedrības struktūrā.» (2006) In:

Modernitāte: filosofija, kristīgās vērtības, mutvārdu vēsture Latvijā. Letonikas I kongress. Rīga: Latvijas Zinātņu akadēmija, LU Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts. Pp. 388.-472.

Podmazovs, A. (2006) «Vecticības veidošanās par etnokonfesionālo kopību.» In: *Modernitāte: filosofija, kristīgās vērtības, mutvārdu vēsture Latvijā. Letonikas Pirmais kongress. Rīga: Latvijas Zinātņu akadēmija, LU Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts. Pp. 401.-405.*

Podmazovs, A. (2001) *Vecticība Latvijā. Rīga: LU Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts.*

Podmazovs, A. (2009) «Vecticībai Latvijā – 350 gadu.» In: *Intelektuālais mantojums Latvijā: filozofija un reliģija. Rīga: Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts. Pp. 208.-216.*

«Reliģiskās idejas Latvijā: vecticībnieki jaunajā un vecajā Eiropā.» (2008)

In: Nacionālā mutvārdu vēsture. Reliģiskās idejas Latvijā. Letonikas II kongress. Rīga: Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts. Pp. 157.-254.

Vecticībnieku kultūrvēsturiskais mantojums Latgalē (2006) Jēkabpils: Jēkabpils Vēstures muzejs.

Zeile, P. (1994) *Nacionālo minoritāšu kultūra Latvijas Republikā (20.-30.gadi)*. Rīga: Izglītības, kultūras un zinātnes ministrija.

Абызов, Ю. (1990-1991) *Русское печатное слово в Латвии 1917-1944 гг. (Био-библиографический справочник)*. В 4 т. Stanford: Stanford University.

Барановский, В., Поташенко, Г. (2005) *Староверие Балтии и Польше. Краткий исторический и биографический словарь*. Vilnius: Aidai.

Гаврилин, А.В. (1999) *Очерки истории Рижской епархии: XIX век*. Рига: Филокалия.

Гаврилин, А. В. (2004) *Люцинское (Лудзенское) благочиние Полоцко-Витебской епархии во второй половине XIX – начале XX века*. Рига: Филокалия.

Духовные стихи старинные. (1933, 1937) Сост. И.Н. Заволоко. Вып. 1. Рига: Рижский кружок ревнителей старины. Вып. 2. Рига: Дидковский.

Духовные стихи старинные (2006) Собрал И. Н. Заволоко. Рига: Староверческое общество им. И.Н. Заволоко.

Заварина, А.А. (1986) *Русское население Восточной Латвии во второй половине XIX – начале XX века*. Рига: Зинатне.

Заволоко, И.Н. (1929) *Альбом старинных русских узоров*. Рига: Саламандра.

Заволоко, И. Н. (1939) *Древнерусская вышивка*. Рига: I. Zavoloko izdevums.

Заволоко, И.Н. (1991) *История Церкви Христовой*. Рига: Центральный совет Древлеправославной поморской церкви Латвии. (1-е изд.: Рига, 1937)

Заволоко, И.Н. (1998) *Учебник по Закону Божию для старообрядцев*. Рига: Центральный совет Древлеправославной поморской церкви Латвии. (1-е изд.: Рига, 1932).

Иванов, Н., Бучель, Т., Гаврилова, С. (2007) *Родословные росписи*. Даугавпилс.

Клибанов, А.И. (1977) *Народная социальная утопия в России: Период феодализма*. Москва: Наука.

Ковальчук, С. Н. (1998) «Взыскуя Истину ...» *Из истории русской религиозной, философской и общественно-политической мысли в Латвии: Ю. Ф. Самарин, Е. В. Чешихин, К. Ф. Жаков, А. В. Вейдеман. (Середина XIX в. – середина XX в.)*. Рига: Институт философии и социологии Латвийского университета.

Костиков, В.В. (1990) *Не будем проклинать изгнание... Пути и судьбы русской эмиграции*. Москва: Международные отношения.

Меч Духовный, 2000-2009, №№ 1-29. Online: <http://www.starover-pomorec.lv/starover/newspaper.php> (2010.22.12.)

От Лифляндии – к Латвии. Прибалтика русскими глазами. (1993-1999) Сборник. Сост. Ю. Абызов. В 2 т. Москва: Аркаюр.

Очерки по истории и культуре староверов в Эстонии (2004) Сб.ст. под ред. Кюльмоя И.П. Тарту: Издательство Тартуского университета.

Памяти Заволоки Ивана Никифоровича (1999) Рига: Центральный совет Древлеправославной Поморской церкви Латвии, Старообрядческое общество Латвии.

Плюханов, Б.В. (1993) *Русские в Латвии и в Эстонии: материалы к истории Русского студенческого христианского движения*. Париж: Умса-Press.

Подмазов, А. (1970) *Старообрядчество в Латвии*. Рига: Лиесма.

Подмазов, А. (1973) *Церковь без священства*. Рига: Лиесма.

Подмазов, А. А. (2003) «Старообрядчество в системе экономического развития (к вопросу о религиозной детерминированности хозяйственной деятельности).» In: *Русские в Латвии. Из истории и культуры староверия* / Редактор-составитель Ил.И. Иванов. Вып.3. Изд. 2-е. Рига: ВЕДИ. Рр. 173-182.

Подмазов, А. (2005) «Вселатвийские старообрядческие съезды (1920-1933 гг.)» In: *Староверие Латвии. Отв. ред.-сост. Иванов Ил.И.* Рига: Старообрядческое общество Латвии. Рр. 333-342.

Поморский Вестник, 1999 – 2010, № 1- 23. Online: <http://www.starover-rec.lv/index.php?a=pomor&m=127&l=1> (2010.22.12.)

Раев, М. (1994) *Россия за рубежом: История культуры русской эмиграции*. / Пер. с англ. Москва: Прогресс-Академия.

Русские в Латвии: история и современность. (1992) Отв. Ред. И.И. Иванов / Науч. Ред. Б.Ф. Инфантьев. Рига: ЛАД.

Русские в Латвии. Из истории и культуры староверия (2003) Редактор-составитель Ил.И. Иванов. Вып.3. Изд. 2-е. Рига: ВЕДИ.

Русские староверы за рубежом (2000) Ред. Кюльмоя И.П. (Труды по русской и славянской филологии: Лингвистика. Новая серия, т. IV) Тарту.

Старообрядцы Литвы. Материалы и исследования. 1996-1997. (1998) Vilnius: Vilniaus Universitetas.

Староверие Латвии. (2005) Отв. ред.-сост. Иванов Ил.И. Рига: Старообрядческое общество Латвии.

Староверское кладбище. http://www.belovodije.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&id=5&Itemid=8 (2010.22.12.)

Старообрядцы Литвы. Материалы и исследования. 1996-1997. (1998) Vilnius: Vilniaus Universitetas.

Старообрядческий Церковный календарь на 1999 год. (1999) Даугавпилс.

Странник идущий в гору. (2004) Сб. статей И. Н. Заволоко. Ред. П. Алексеев. Рига: ЕІра-2.

Фейгмане, Т. (1992) *Русские общества в Латвии, 1920-1940 гг*. Рига: Латвийский университет.

Фейгмане, Т. (2000) *Русские в довоенной Латвии. На пути к интеграции*. Рига: Балтийский Русский институт.

Флейшман, Л., Абызов, Ю., Равдин, Б. (1997) *Русская печать в Риге: из истории газеты «Сегодня» 1930-х годов*. В 4 кн. Stanford: Stanford University.

Щит Веры, 2000 – 2005, № 1 – 13. Online: <http://www.staroverrec.lv/index.php?a=gazeta1&m=33&l=1> (2010.22.12.)

Tatyana Feigmane

LATVIAN RUSSIANS IN HISTORIOGRAPHY OF LATVIA FROM 1990 UNTIL 2010

Problems related to history and culture of Russians in Latvia have not been much looked into during the last 20 years. One can understand that there is interest about these problems because:

1) researchers have got access to the broad archives and literature, unavailable to them earlier;

2) working conditions have completely changed: the ideological censorship has vanished (which was a big obstacle); investigating many themes, including ethnic history was impossible, because, in the opinion of those who were steering the history science in the Soviet period, it was contrary to the postulates of the Party principles and class differentiation;

3) the interest of Latvia's Russians themselves about their history has noticeably increased, because they were facing the task of forming a new model of existence outside their ethnic Motherland, and the historical experience here was very important.

Key words: historiography, Latvian Republic, Russians in Latvia, Russian intelligentsia of Latvia, old believers.

Historiography of the last twenty-year period was not formed out of nothing. Contemporary researchers have inherited the works of historians and publicists of the Tsarist, the Republic and, in some cases, the Soviet time. (Dribins 2008; Фейгмане 1997) **And, this all is in spite of the fact,** that Latvia has never had a noticeable amount of Russian humanitarian intelligentsia (before the World War I on the territory of Latvia there was

Tatyana Feigmane,

Dr.hist., Scientific editor of the Project

"Russians of Latvia" (<http://www.russkije.lv/>)

only one higher educational establishment – Riga Polytechnic Institute; on its basis in 1919 Latvia University was founded, where, due to quite understandable reasons, priority was given to students of the Latvian ethnos).

Among the researchers of the pre-revolutionary epoch, Evgraf Cheshikhin (1824-1888) must be marked out. (ЧЕШИХИН 1884, 1885, 1887; ЧЕШИХИН 1884; ЧЕШИХИН 1877, 1879, 1880, 1882) At the beginning of 1860-s he was transferred to Riga to take the position of a clerk at Riga district engineering administration. His life was changed dramatically after he got acquainted to Riga and the local Russian society. E.Cheshikhin dedicated himself to social, political life and publicism. In particular, he turned to sources on the history of ancient Livonia and, for the first time, translated “The Chronicles of Henry of Livonia” into Russian. In his works E. Cheshikhin (not being a historian) wrote about the political influence of Russian principalities in the Baltics. However, he was not impartial in his descriptions, as he frankly expressed the moods of minds of his time. Chauvinistic passages occurred in his publications very frequently. (ЧЕШИХИН 1884, 1885, 1887, Vol.1, p. 25-26) And yet, it is not worth denying completely the significance of his works: he was the first to speak of Baltic – Slavonic ties in the pre-historic period, about the moving of Russians to the Baltic lands, about Riga old-believers; he studied very many archive documents. A great deal of work in local historiography was done also by Yury Samarin (1819-1876). His mission in Riga resulted in 6-volume work “Outskirts of Russia”, where he substantiated the necessity of Russification of the Baltic provinces. (Самарин 1868, 1871, 1874, 1875, 1876) **The detailed analysis and evaluation of works of the mentioned authors, have found reflection in the monograph of the contemporary researcher Svetlana Kovalchuk. (Ковальчук1998) A number of works were dedicated to the history of Orthodoxy. (Историко-статистическое описание ...1893, 1894, 1895, 1902; Лейсман 1908; Синайский 1910) Still, notable for today remain articles of the writer Nikolay Leskov, evoked by his mission to Riga with the aim to get acquainted to the life of old-believers in order to open a school for them. (Лесков1863; Лесков1882)**

A remarkable contribution into historiography of the question under consideration was made during the time of the first Latvian Republic (1918-1940). Nevertheless, even having a remarkable amount of literature, printed during that period, we do not find any academic or strictly scientific editions. Popular-scientific literature and publications prevail. The most significant editions are collections “Russians in Latvia”, three issues of “Rus-

sian Annual” and a book by Sergey Sakharov, a teacher and a public figure, the Director of Daugavpils Belorussian secondary school (1880-1954) about the higher Orthodox clergy of Riga Episcopasy (later –archiepiscopate) in the course of a century and about orthodox churches in Latvia. (Православные церкви... 1939; Русские в Латвии 1933; Русские в Латвии 1934; Русский ежегодник ...1937; Русский ежегодник ...1938; Русский ежегодник 1939; Сахаров 1937) Archeography, enlightening and publishing activities of Ivan Zavoloko (1897-1984) have been of great significance for studies on the history of old-believers. (Заволоко 1933) Returning to Riga after 16 years of penal servitude and exile (end of 1956 or beginning of 1957), Zavoloko continued his archeographical researches and gained recognition of the most outstanding specialists in this sphere. (Маркелов 1999; Пазухина 1999; Поздеева 1999)

Some publications appeared even during the Soviet period. In particular, in the magazine “Voprosi Istorii” (“Questions on History”, Moscow) the article “Moscow Trading Quarter in Riga in the 17th Century” written by the Latvian researcher and archivist Georg Yensh (1900-1990) was published, and, until now, it has been the most significant research in this field. (ЕИИ 1947) **Partly, the problem of Russian merchantry found its reflection in the monograph of Vasily Doroshenko (1921-1992) “Trade and Merchantry of Riga in the 17th Century”. (Дорошенко 1985) V.Doroshenko is the author of more than 200 scientific works and is considered to be one of the best historians of the Soviet time, whose works have not lost their significance even with the dramatic changes in the political course. In 1985 came out Antonina Zavarina’s monograph “Russian Population in Eastern Latvia in the Second Half of the 19th and Beginning of the 20th Century”, which was prepared at the History Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the LSSR. (Заварина 1986) This work has not lost its importance up to nowadays. Andris Caune must be specially marked out. (Caune 1992) According to this Latvian researcher, already in the 12th century, at the confluence of a small river Ridzene and the river Daugava a traditional trading place was formed, where, in summers during navigation period, Russian wax and fur traders met local citizens and foreign merchants. With reference to the data of archeological excavations and archive documents, the author gives a detailed description of the “Russian quarter”, which existed in Riga from the 13th until the 16th century. (Caune 1992, p. 87 – 107) The book of A.Caune was one of the first works in Latvian historiography of post-Soviet period on “Russian footsteps” on the territory of Latvia in the**

period of early Middle Ages. This theme was successfully continued at the beginning of 2000-s by Alexander Ivanov and Anatoli Kuznetsov, researchers from Daugavpils. (Ivanovs 2004; Ivanovs, Kuzņecovs 2006) The photographs of Latvian geographer and ethnographer Yury Novoselov published by A.Caune are also of great interest. (Caune 2006)

During the Soviet period, the “centre of gravity” in the studies of “Russian themes” moved to philologists, to be politically more neutral. Ivan Fridrikh (1902-1975), having come back from exile in the middle of 1950-s, continued collecting Russian folklore, the work which he had started in 1930-s. (Фридрих 1936; Фридрих 1980) **The so called “Fridrikh`s Readings”** (2002), organized by the Centre of Russistics at Latvia University, dedicated to the birth-centenary of Ivan Fridrikh can be regarded as a sign of acknowledgement of his merits. As a result of these readings, a collection of articles with an opening article by Y.Abyzov “Marginal Notes of the Second Book by I.Fridrikh” was published. (Фридриховские чтения 1977) **High** appreciation of I.Fridrikh`s works is shown by his folkloristics colleague B.Infantyev in his article “The Contribution of Ivan Fridrikh to Comparative Folkloristics”. A very notable publication was written by Y.Kursite-Pakule called “Peter the First in Latvian Folklore”. Among the authors of this collectaneum, there are names of such famous philologists and folklorists as L.Sproge, S.Olyonkin, N.Kononova, D.Nevskaya and others.

In the scientific circles, a very high appreciation was given to the works about Russian-Latvian language ties by Maria Semyonova (1910-1988). (Семенова 1966; Семенова 1972) **Very popular, both, during the Soviet and the post-Soviet periods** were the Russian language textbooks for the national schools, prepared by Yelena Franzman (1912-1996). Rather many books about Riga Russian Drama Theatre and some of its leading actors came out during the Soviet time. (Вахрушева 1958; Вахрушева 1957; Власова 1982; Пярн, Берсенев 1950; Рижский театр русской ...1958; Рижский театр ...1974; Рижский театр ... Фотоальбом 1983; Рижский театр ... Очерк 1983; Рижский театр...1883-1983 1983) **However, most of them, alongside the rich factual material, demonstrate unnecessary ideological pathos, which reduces their value.**

In 1970 the book by Arnold Podmazov (1936-2010) “Old-believers in Latvia” written from the positions of governing that time atheistic ideology, was published. (Подмазов 1970) **However, for that moment of time, it was a certain step forward in the studies of this problem. It is worth marking out, that A.Podmazov in 1990-s critically reviewed his earlier estimates,**

and his new works were appreciated, both, by clergymen and parishioners of the Old Orthodox Pomorian church of Latvia and by scientific circles. (Podmazovs 2001; Подмазов 2002; Подмазов 2005; Подмазов 2006; Подмазов 2010) **The work, started by him, is being successfully continued** by Nadezhda Pazukhina. (Пазухина 1999; Пазухина 2005; Pazuhina 2008; Pazuhina 2007; Pazuhina 2006 (1); Pazuhina 2006 (2))

Two articles written by Dmitry Levitsky (1907-2007) who emigrated to the West in 1944 have stimulated formation and development of the post-Soviet historiography. (Фейгман 2007) **These were „On the Status of Russians in the Independent Latvia”** and **“Nationality of a Victim is not Essential to Communist Authorities”**. (Левицкий 1980; Левицкий 1990) **These** articles gave a good start to the researchers, who undertook status studies of the Russian national minority in the period between the two World Wars, which had been a taboo during the Soviet time.

A number of centers appeared in Latvia in 1990-s. They studied and promoted the history and culture of Russians in Latvia:

1) Yury Abyzov and the Latvian Society of Russian Culture led by him;
 2) “The Russian Community of Latvia” – later its functions were adopted by the centre of humanitarian researches and enlightenment “Vedi”, then this work was joined by “Old-believers` Association of Latvia”, which was founded in 1908 and renewed its activities in 1994. Illarion Ivanov was the initiator of these actions;

3) Latvian Orthodox Church (father Oleg Pelevin, Nadezhda Demina, the newspaper “Vinogradnaya Loza”/ “The Vine”);

4) Faculty of History and Philosophy of Latvia University (LU) (Alexander Gavrilin);

5) The Centre of Russistics at the Faculty of Philology of LU (Ludmila Sproge and others);

6) The Ethnic Research Centre of the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of LU (Ilga Apine, Vladislav Volkov, Leo Dribin);

7) Svetlana Kovalchuk, Arnold Podmazov (The Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, LU);

8) Magazine of the Institute of Latvian History, LU („Latvijas vēstures institūta žurnāls”), as well as magazines “Latvijas vēsture / “History of Latvia” and “Latvijas arhīvi” / “Archives in Latvia”;

9) Daugavpils University (Eduard Meksh, Iosif Trofimov, Fyodor Fyodorov and others);

10) Sergei Zhuravlyov (society “Ulyei”/ “Beehive”);

- 11) Society of Slavic Historians (Oleg Pukhlyak);
- 12) journalists of the Russian-language Press (Yulia Alexandrova, Igor Vatolin, Alexander Gurin, Ilya Dimenshtein, Natalya Lebedeva, Alexander Malnach, Natalya Morozova, Elina Chuyanova and others);
- 13) The magazine “Clio” (Igor Gusev);
- 14) Researchers, who cannot be included into any of the mentioned groups.

The framework of the article does not allow characterizing all the works on history and culture of Russians in Latvia published during the last 20 years. That is why only the publications considered by the author to be the most significant will be examined. To get a better understanding of historiography of national minorities in Latvia (not only the Russian minority), reading the article by Leo Dribin in the magazine “The Magazine of the Latvian Institute of History” is suggested. (Dribins 2009)

Analysis of contemporary historiography of the “Russian question” in Latvia is inconceivable without the analyzing the contribution of two outstanding scientists Yury Abyzov (1921-2006) and Boris Infantev (1921-2009). Their creative activities can be relatively divided into two periods: the Soviet and the post-Soviet, the most significant works have been created by them during the last years of their lives. However, it does not mean, that the early period of their creativity must be forgotten. During the most stagnant years Abyzov and Infantev accumulated the potential, which, to a considerable degree (unfortunately, not completely because of financial problems), they managed to realize.

Undoubtedly, the historiography of the “Russian question” in Latvia would not be developed so fast without Yury Abyzov’s “Russian Printed Word in Latvia: 1917-1944”, which was created in 1970-s and 1980-s, under such conditions with almost no hope to publish it. The work was successfully (secretly) taken out of the USSR, and in 1990-1991 the Stanford University (USA) published it. (АБЫЗОВ 1990, 1991) **If not for the bibliography** of Yury Abyzov, researchers would have to spend much more time doing the routine research work. This opinion of mine is based on my own experience while working at the monograph “Russians in Pre-war Latvia”, which covers three aspects: Russians in the political life of Latvia, Russian societies and Russian education. (Фейгмане 2000) **Y. Abyzov has not only completed** the bibliographical listing of all the periodical editions and books, printed in the Russian language in Latvia in the period from 1917 till 1944 (and preserved by libraries), but also given short biographical data about

authors and has unveiled many pseudonyms. The work turned out to be outstandingly well-timed, because Yuri Abizov has even managed to meet a number of former editorial workers of the pre-war editions (A. Formakov, A. Perov, K. Verhovskaya and others) and to receive invaluable information from them. Most probably, a great deal of the most interesting and valuable information Y. Abyzov has got from Ivan Zavaloko, whom he kept in touch with after the latter had returned from exile. The work was well-timed also due to the fact, that its publication coincided with the large-scale political changes: the collapse of the USSR, formation of new independent states, including reestablishment of the independence of Latvia, and, as a result, a splash of interest about life in the pre-war Latvia.

The next important stage in the creative work of Y. Abyzov began when he found copies of the pre-war newspaper "Segodnya" / "Today" in the depository of the Latvian State Historical archives. However, there was only correspondence of "Segonya" editorial board from 1930 until 1937 (the newspaper was being published from 1919 until 1940), it did not diminish the value of the published documents. Boris Ravdin worked side by side with Yuri Abizov. The so-called "intellectual centre" was led by the former resident of Riga, professor of the Stanford University, Lazar Fleishman. Some years of intensive work resulted into 5-volume edition "Russian Press in Riga: From the history of the newspaper "Today" of 1930s". (Флейшман, Абызов, Равдин 1997) **For today, it is the largest of scientific researches** in Russian historiography of Latvia, which has contributed greatly to the source-research base and has let us look at many problems from a completely new aspect breaking the existing stereotypes. The significance of this work obviously exceeds the national limits. The introductory article of the authors gives an idea not only about the conditions, under which the editorial board of "Segodnya" / "Today" had to work in Latvia, but also shows the role of this newspaper in the culture of the Russians abroad.

"Our publication included a numerously insignificant part of documents," noted the authors. "We were considering, both, the scientific significance of documents for the history of Russian press in Latvia and for the history of Russians abroad in general. We had an opportunity to compare the published frame of documents with fragments from the working archives of the Parisian "Poslednie novosti" / "Latest News" editorial board, preserved by B. Nikolayevski. Among them, there were casual, isolated materials of the beginning of 1930-s and, only relying on them, it is impossible to form the notion about conditions of functioning of the Russian press

abroad. As a contrast, the materials gathered by us, allow to depict – with sufficient completeness – the history of Russian public life and culture in dispersion in 1930-s, as well as dynamics of Latvian and international political situation of that time.” (Флейшман, Абызов, Равдин 1997 (1), p.199) The editorial board of “Segodnya” not only used the best from the available local journalists’ personnel, but actively involved notable Russian journalists and writers living abroad. Among the correspondents of “Segodnya” there were: Mark Aldanov, Alexander Amfiteatrov, Konstantin Balmont, Nina Berberova, Ivan Bunin, Georgy Ivanov, Zinaida Gippius, Leonid Zurov, Alexander Kuprin, Vladimir Nabokov, Vasily Nemirovich-Danchenko, Igor Severyanin, Teffi, Marina Tsvetayeva, Sasha Chyorny, Ivan Shmelyov and many others. This correspondence shows not only the acknowledgement of the authority of the newspaper and its editors. This correspondence gives the reader a broad spectrum of views about prominent figures of Russian emigration in the period between the two World Wars, all the correspondence being commented in detail by the authors of this fundamental edition. From that editorial correspondence we can also notice the striving of the editorial board to influence political processes in Latvia, in particular, to influence Russian deputies (naturally, before the May 15, 1934). In 1993, thanks to the efforts of Yuri Abizov and the Latvian Society of Russian Culture, founded by him, the first volume of “From Livland to Latvia”, including mainly articles of journalists from the pre-revolutionary “Rizhsky vestnik”/ “Riga Herald” and the above-mentioned newspaper “Segodnya”/ “Today”, saw the light. (От Лифляндии... 1993) As to their content, the articles of the first volume cover the epoch from the Middle Ages until the New Times, but, as to the time of writing -- from 1880 to 1935. The collection contains a broad selection of articles by Boris Shalfeyev (1891-1935): “St.Christofer”, “About the Goblet Thrown Down from St.Peter’s Church Tower”, “Peter the First in the House of Dannenshtern”, “How Riga Residents did not Notice Wagner”, “The Oldest Ancient Russian Cemetery in Riga” and others. Fyodor Pavlov (1872-1933) with the pen-name Spectator, is also among the authors. He has written the following articles: “Grandiose Public Merry-making in Olden Times”, “Russian Merchantry in Riga in the Past”, “New Year’s Celebration in Riga in Olden Times”, and others; there are also articles by others – not less famous “pen- sharks”. The second volume of “From Livland to Latvia” is a collection of articles, published in the period from 1917 until 1938. (От Лифляндии...1999) As mentioned in the foreword by the compiler, “It is impossible not to be impressed, that along-

side the historically proved facts, the reality is given also in the “author’s interpretation: myths, legends and frank fiction, i.e. derivative from the historical reality, stipulated by the “state of minds””. (От Лифляндии...1999, p.3) The two-volume work “From Livland to Latvia” does not claim to be scientific. This edition was meant for ordinary readers. Moreover, in the situation of temporal lack of the profound scientific researches, books of such a type promoted development of interest about the past of the Russian community in Latvia. Among the authors of the second volume Boris Shalfeyev (known also as B.Pomorsky) must be repeatedly marked out. Sketches about the Moscow suburb of Riga (forshtadt) were left by Georgy Ivanov (1894-1958) – one of the most prominent men of letters among the Russians living abroad, who was a frequent guest in Riga, where father of his spouse Irina Odoyevtseva (1895-1990), the advocate Gustav Heinike owned a house in the Moscow Suburb. Articles by Yanis Sudrabkalns (1894-1975), a Latvian poet, were also included into that collection. There are also works by Sergey Mintslov (1870-1933), a popular writer in the pre-war Riga, a journalist Henrich Grossen (Neo Silvester) (1881-1974), writers Yury Galich (1877-1940), Leonid Zurov (1902-1971) and others. The second volume includes also interesting illustrative material, selected by Y.Abyzov. General public can be interested in the lists of former and contemporary names of towns, settlements and rivers of the Baltics, as well as the names of streets in Riga, districts and localities, mentioned in the book. As it is known, toponymics of the Baltics has undergone many changes due to political cataclysms.

Y.Abizov was one of the initiators of the anthology “The Baltic Archives”, in which materials on the history of the Russian culture of the three Baltic states – Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia – would be printed. The first three volumes of “The Baltic Archives” came out in mid-1990-s in Tallinn, edited by professor Irina Belobrovtsseva. Among the first publications, which appeared in “The Baltic Archives” and were related to Latvia, we must mark out MARTIROLOG by representatives of Russian intelligentsia of Latvia, who had undergone repressions, compiled by Y.Abyzov, B.Plyukhanov, G.Tailov; memoirs of Boris Engelgardt (1877-1962) – the former chamberpage of the Empress-mother Maria Fyodorovna, deputy of the 4th State Duma, an active participant in the February Revolution, the first commandant of Petrograd, a participant of the White Movement, an emigrant (first in Paris, then in Riga). Also, the reminiscences by Sergey Sidyakov (1893-1965): “Chronicles of Refugee-life” telling about the afflictions of a Russian

merchant family during the years of the Civil War. The 4th – 6th volumes of “The Baltic Archives” were published already under the supervision of the international editorial board. Irina Belobrovtsseva was joined by Pavel Lavrinets (Lithuania) and Yuri Abizov (Latvia). In comparison with the previous volumes, the new ones were thicker and had illustrations. The most interesting were the articles by V.Doroshenko “Inhabitants of Old Riga in 1786” and by Y.Abyzov “The Concept of Euroasianism and Latvia’s Russians”, the publication by Y.Abyzov and T.Feigmane “Unjust Justice over the Lawyer Yakoby”. Memoirs of Pyotr Pilsky were also extremely popular. The seventh volume was edited in Vilnius. Here we can mark out – one of the articles on the Russian-Latvian theme – “The Novel by Austra Ozolin-ya-Krauze about the Russian Emigration” written by Lyudmila Sproge and Vera Vavere. The eighth volume was again edited in Riga. Here again one can find reminiscences of Boris Engelgardt, but, this time, they are about the years of “hard times” and emigration, as well as reminiscences of the former colonel of the General Staff Boris Yordan (1888-1956): “My Family Chronicles”, where he, by the way, recalls his childhood spent in Riga. Moreover, the last, 10th volume, came out also in Riga, thanks to the untiring work of Y.Abyzov (at that time already very ill) and to the work of the editorial board of the magazine “Daugava”. Extracts from reminiscences of the artist Eugene Klimoff (1901-1990) were included into this volume. His artist’s career had started in the pre-war Riga. During the war, he emigrated to the West. The reminiscences offered to the reader tell about the first stage of his life as an artist. The letter selection of Tatyana Erenstein-Litvina (for 1938-1939) is also of great interest. She has been an active participant of the Orthodox Union of Russian Students, working in Riga from 1928 until 1934. Being a member of the “Union”, she was keen on icon painting. At the end of the 1930-s she had the luck to perfect herself in icon-painting in the Holy Land, to be more precise, she took part in decorating the temple on the Eleon mountain in Jerusalem. In the presented letters, the reader gets in touch with her personal perception of the holy places and events connected with them. The last volume of “The Baltic Archives” for now came out in Tallinn in 2006. (**Балтийский архив 1999-2006**) Eleven volumes of “The Baltic Archives” have filled many lacunae, that have existed before concerning the history and culture of Russians in the Baltics. “The Baltic Archives” have introduced into scientific usage a considerable number of earlier unknown sources, have helped to draw together scientists, working in this field in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. In 2003, a bibliographical directory

“The Russian Book of Latvia. 1990-2001”, was prepared and edited by the Latvian Society of Russian Culture and the magazine “Daugava”. (Русская книга 2003)

Historiography of the last 60 years is inconceivable without Boris Infantev. Ivan Mikhailov who had studied his biography and creative work, characterized him as follows, “A folklorist, a specialist in literature, a linguist, a pedagogue, a cult urologist, a historian, a regional specialist, a public figure, a holder of the Three Stars order. A man with encyclopedic knowledge and amazing capacity for work. A professor, an honored doctor of pedagogics, candidate of philological sciences. His name is put down in the history of Latvian folkloristics, in the history of Latvian pedagogics, in the history of Latvian culture, as well, he is on the list of the outstanding representatives of Russians in Latvia. He was a man, symbolizing the entire epoch in scientific, public, spiritual and cultural life, a patriarch and authority of the intelligentsia of Latvia and the Russian community of Latvia.” (Михайлов 2004) B. Infantev is the author of more than 500 scientific publications. The first stage of his creative activity was mainly connected with studies of the Latvian and Russian folklore, Russian-Latvian cultural ties, pedagogics (B. Infantev had worked at the Institute of Scientific Researches in Pedagogics for more than 35 years). „We can surely say that, starting with 1955 and up to 1991, no study program, no text-books, no methodological hand-books on the Russian language and literature, were edited without active participation of Boris Infantev – the author, the leader of the authors’ body, reviewer”. (Михайлов 2004, p. 20)

Among the works of B. Infantev written during the Soviet time, the following ones can be mentioned: “Questions of the Methods of Teaching the Russian Language in Latvian Schools” by Beikman E., Infantev B., and Tsitovich V. Frantsman E., Infantev B., Vilan O., Semyonova M.; “The Russian Language for Forms IX-XI at Schools with Latvian Language of Instruction”; “Book on Latvian Literature for Forms V-VIII at Schools with Russian Language of Instruction”. (Бейкман, Инфантьев, Цитович 1957; Францман, Инфантьев, Вилан, Семенова 1962; Инфантьев 1963) B. Infantev has written many works in co-authorship with A. Losev. They are such works as, “Storm Petrels”, “Rainis’s Riga”, “Through the Distance of Times (Fonvizin in Latvia)”, “Fishermen’s Semi-precious Stones”, “Friendship of two Literatures. 100 Years of the Book (Lev Tolstoy’s “War and Peace” and Latvian Readers)”, “The Russian Word” – a text-book for forms IX-XI of evening-shift schools as well as many others. (Инфантьев,

Лосев 1965 (1); Инфантьев, Лосев 1965 (2); Инфантьев, Лосев 1965 (3); Infantjevs, Losevs 1967; Infantjevs, Losevs 1969; Инфантьев, Лосев 1978, 1983; Михайлов 2004)

After 1990, a new stage began in Boris Infantyev's the creative work. His creative potential was fully revealed. The creative union of Boris Infantyev and Alexander Losev was continued by preparing the textbooks for secondary schools: "Latvia in the Destiny and Creativity of Russian Writers" (folklore, Russian-Latvian literary relations at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th century) as well as "The Lines Addressed to Latvia" (Russian-Latvian literary ties, 2nd half of the 19th century). Among the numerous articles by professor Infantyev we can mark out "Latgalian Old-believers with the Eyes of Latvian Writers", "The Image of a Russian in Latvian Folklore", "The Russian Language and Literature in Latvian Schools in 20-s and 30-s", "Russians on the Land of Latvians" (in pre-Livonian times), "Pages of Reminiscences about Ivan Zavoloko", "The image of Latvia of 20-s and 30-s in the Creative Works of Russian Writers Abroad" and many others. (Инфантьев 1997(1); Инфантьев 1997(2); Инфантьев 1997(3); Инфантьев 1997(4)) **Инфантьев 2002)** In 2007, the society "Vedi" published the fundamental work of B.Infantyev "Baltic- Slavonic Cultural Ties". (Инфантьев 2007) **Unfortunately, the work has never been finished., therefore, only one volume was published.**

At the beginning of 1990-s, during the wave of "Perestroika", The Russian Community of Latvia was established. It tried to unite all the Russians under their aegis. The Community chose scientific and enlightening work to be one of the directions of their activities. However, the society failed to do a lot in this field. In 1992, a collection "Russians of Latvia" was published. (Русские в Латвии 1992) **However, three out of four articles in this collection were taken from the collectaneum "Russians in Latvia" published in 1934.** Only one article by A.Fedotov "Statistics on National Composition of Latvian Population during 110 Years" showed materials based on the latest statistical data and analysis. In 1997, the second number of "Russians in Latvia" was published. (Русские в Латвии 1997) It turned out to be not only more significant in comparison with the first one, but also different in quality. The collection contained specially prepared materials: Y.Abizov "20 Years of Russian Press in the Independent Latvia", T.Feigmane "Russian Societies in Latvia (1920-1940)", "Russian Professors at Latvia University (1919-1940)", B.Infantyev "The Image of a Russian in Latvian Folklore", "The Russian Language and Literature in Latvian Schools in 20-s and 30-s".

In 2002, the third number of the “Russians in Latvia” came out. (Русские в Латвии 2002) **The new edition differed substantially from the previous ones.** The edition had become bigger in volume and contained illustrations. The quality of the articles had increased, as well as their scientific significance. Among the authors of the third number we can mention: A.Zavarina “Russian Population of Latvia (on the history of settlements)”, V.Nikonov “From the History of Rezhitsa Churchyard Old-believers’ Community (1858-1940)”, A.Zhilko “Spiritual Verses in an Old-believers’ Family of Latvia”, I.Miroljubov “On the History of Spiritual Education of Old-believers in the Baltics”, T.Feigmane “Old-believers as Deputies in the Government of Latvia”, B.Infantyev “Russian Writers about Old-believers in Riga and in Latgale Region” and “Latvian Old-believers in the Works of Latvian Prose-writers” and others. The third number of the “Russians in Latvia” became the sign of changing accents – from other Russian themes to the theme about Old-believers. It can be explained, both, by the increased activity of Old-believers themselves and their rooting on Latvian land.

In 1999 a collection of articles and materials, dedicated to birth-centenary of Ivan Zavoloko came out. (Памяти Заволоко 1999) **Editing the collection “Old Belief in Latvia” was the next logical step.** (Староверие Латвии 2005) **A notable fact is , that not only the society “Vedi” and “The Old-believers’ Society”,** but also Riga Grebenshchikov Old-believers’ Community and the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of Latvia University took part in preparing and editing this collection.

Thus, the theme of the research on the Old Faith got support from the academic circles of Latvia, in particular, from the director of the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology Maya Kule. The collection was compiled from materials of the International conference, which took place in Riga, on April 29-30, 2004. Among the authors of the collection should be mentioned: father Alexei Zhilko, B.Infantyev, I.Apine, V.Volkov, N.Pazukhina, E.Meksh, S.Olyonkin, I.Trofimov, A.Zavarina, A.Gavrilin, O.Pukhlyak, S.Kovalchuk, A.Rakityansky, T.Feigmane (Latvia), as well as such foreign scientists as: N.Bubnov (Russia), G.Ponomaryova, T.Shor (Estonia), G.Potashenko (Lithuania), V.Dorn (Germany).

In 2006 a collection of “International Zavoloko’s Readings”, prepared for editing by I.N.Zavoloko Old-believers’ Society in co-operation with Baltic International Academy (former Baltic Russian Institute), was published. (Международные... 2006)

In 2008, Vladimir Nikonov, a researcher from Rezekne, published his

book “Old Beliefs of Latgale”. (Никонов 2008) **This was an attempt to carry out the first profound research on the history of Latgalian Old-believers. Relying on archive documents, the author has presented the history of Latgalian Old-believers’ communities, starting with the second half of the 17th century.**

Svetlana Kovalchuk, the leading scientific worker of the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of LU, has been one of the first researchers who undertook the studies of the history of Russian philosophic thought in Latvia. In 1998 her monograph “Searching for the Truth ...” came out (from the history of the Russian religious, philosophic and public(ly)-political thought in Latvia from the middle of the 19th until the middle of the 20th century: Y.F.Samarin, E.V.Cheshikhin, K.F.Zhakov, A.V.Veideman). (Ковальчук 1998) It was the first important attempt of contemporary scientists to evaluate the abovementioned public figures, historians and philosophers. In particular, almost nothing was known before about such philosophers as Veideman and Zhakov. During her further work, the author managed to substantially deepen and broaden her knowledge about Kallistrat Zhakov and about traditions of Russian philosophy in Latvia. (Ковальчук 2008, p.182-210; Ковальчук 2002) **S.Kovalchuk has carried out an outstanding study on the life and creative work of Vasily Sinaysky (1876-1949) – one of the most famous legal scientists and public figures among the Russians living abroad. (Ковальчук 2010) The above-mentioned author continued her deep studies of the Russian culture in Latvia based on archive sources. S.Kovalchuk has written an article saturated with interesting facts about Igor Chinnov, a poet and a former resident of Riga. In her scientific work, S.Kovalchuk has also touched the theme of the Old-Faith. (Ковальчук 2005; Kovaļčuka 2003; Ковальчук 2009)**

A special attention must be paid to the works, prepared by the Centre of Ethnic Studies of the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of LU. These are works by Ilga Apine, Leo Dribin and Vladislav Volkov, based on ethno-sociology and published in the Latvian language. In the second half of 1990-s, the Centre prepared and edited a series of works dedicated to Russians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Jews, Poles, Lithuanians and other people living in Latvia. In particular, Vladislav Volkov prepared the work “Russians in Latvia”. (Volkovs 1996) At that time it was the first edition in which an attempt was made (from contemporary scientific positions) to analyze the state and development of self-consciousness of the Russian population in Latvia at different stages of historic development: during the

Russian Empire time, in the independent Latvia, under the circumstances of annexation of 1940-1941, in the period of German occupation, in the Soviet time and in Latvia after reestablishment of independence. An experimental methodological handbook on the history of national minorities of Latvia, recommended for usage by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Latvia was printed in 1998. The section dedicated to Russians was prepared by V.Volkov. (Volkovs 1998) Compared to the previous work, in this article, the author has given a more detailed analysis of the situation, in which Russians had found themselves in the period from 1945 until 1990, and has managed to show the reasons of their weak integration into Latvian society.

Analysis of Russian public and political life during the first years after reestablishment of Latvian independence is very interesting. The monograph by Ilga Apine and Vladislav Volkov "Slavs in Latvia" (an essay on the ethnic history) was published in the same year. (Apine, Volkovs 1998) The authors of the monograph, following strictly the scientific approach, have studied the process of Slavs' appearance on the territory of Latvia as well as their interrelations, at first, with the Baltic tribes, and, later, with the Latvian ethnos. Exceptionally important is the chapter on Russians in Latvia in the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century: on the development of the Russian public life, formation of the local Russian identity and Russian national self-consciousness in multicultural environment, as well as the civic consciousness. The monograph also deals with problems of the Ukrainian and the Belorussian national identity on the territory of Latvia. For today, the mentioned monograph is one the deepest studies of the Slavic factor in the ethnic history of Latvia.

In 2007, the Centre of Ethnic Studies published one more book about national minorities in Latvia (compiler L.Dribin). (Dribins 2007) The section on Latvia's Russians was again written by professor Vladislav Volkov. Besides the already mentioned themes, V.Volkov has touched upon the painful question about the attitude of Latvia's Russians to establishment of Stalin's and Hitler's repressive regimes. There is also analysis of contemporary Russian societies' activities, their role in preserving and strengthening the national, the cultural and the language identity. The author also speaks about formation of the political consciousness of Latvia's Russians, gives characteristics of parties, which declare themselves defenders of the "Russian interests". Special scientific interest was aroused by the last monograph written by Ilga Apine and Vladislav Volkov "Identity of Russians in Latvia:

Historical and Sociological Essay”. (Apine, Volkovs 2007) With the help of this monograph the authors have made the studied themes more vivid. Among the questions raised in their work, there are the following ones: historical preconditions of the collective identity of Russian inhabitants, the Russian theme in the works of Latvian authors, the influence of the Latvian legislation on the identity of the Russian minority, linguistic identity as an object of social sciences, the Russian minority of Latvia in search of its linguistic identity and structurization, the social role of the linguistic collective identity of Russians in Latvia, peculiarities of ethnic behavior of Latvia’s Russians. I wish the above-mentioned works of the Centre of Ethnic Studies could be translated into Russian, thus getting a wider reading audience (both, in Latvia, in Russia and in the world in general).

The book by Boris Plykhanov (1911-1993) “RSChM in Latvia and Estonia.” has been one of the first books about the Russian spiritual and public life during the period of the first independence. (Плюханов 1993) The book was written in the years, when nobody could dream about publishing it in Latvia. That is why the author gave the manuscript to YMCA-Press, which published the book. The author of this book was an active member of the Russian Student Orthodox Unity (RSOU) in Riga, which was a constituent part of the Russian Student Christian Movement (RSChM). B.Plyukhanov has thoroughly depicted all the events connected with foundation of RSChM and its work in Latvia and Estonia. In his opinion, “The movement is not a party, neither political, nor national, or clerical. It is something different – much deeper. It is a new flow in the spiritual life of Russian youth; a Russian, Orthodox way of thinking and life of the Russian youth, both, the emigrant youth and that born, growing up and living in their natural places, within the newly established independent states on the territory of the former Russian Empire”. (Плюханов 1993, p.91) However, presentation of materials in the book is very dry, in the way of reports. Rather often, we can notice the author’s wish to by-pass the “inconvenient” questions, such as relations of RSOU with Archbishop Ioann Pommer . All this reduces the value of the book.

Coming of the post-Soviet epoch raised interest about the history of the Orthodox Church, reduced the ideological clichés imposed by the earlier atheistic ideology. The main and a very scrupulous researcher of this theme is professor of Latvia University Alexander Gavrilin. In 1999, his monograph “Essays on the History of Riga Eparchy” was published. (Гаврилин 1999) This work, based on broad source-researches, became an important

contribution into the history of the Latvian Orthodox Church. In 1993, A.Gavrilin edited the first collection "Orthodoxy in Latvia". Today, we have 8 numbers of this collection. (Гаврилин 1993,1997, 2001, 2004, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2010) Among the most interesting publications are: A.Kulis "The Question of Autonomy of the Latvian Orthodox Church in the 30-s of the 20th Century", N.Feldman-Kravchyonok "Russian Student Orthodox Unity in Latvia", K.Obozny (Russia) "Orthodox mission in the Baltics in 1941-1944" and "Collaborationism and Church Rebirth on the German Occupied Territories in 1941-1944: Activities of the Pskov Mission and the Baltic Exarchat", the memoirs of father Georgy Tailov, architect Vladimir Shervinsk and others. In 2009, a monograph of A.Gavrilin about the archbishop Ioann (Garklavs) (1898-1982) was published in St.Petersburg (Russia). (Гаврилин 2009)

At the end of 1990s a book by Nadezhda Dyomina (1921-2008) "Holy Trinity and St. Sergey Women's Convent" appeared. (Демина 1999) It was the first research of such type on the history of an orthodox temple in Latvia. In addition to it, the mentioned author prepared small brochures on the history of Riga orthodox temples: "Johann the Baptist Church", "The Church of St. Alexander Nevsky", "The Archangel Michael Church" and others.

In 2006, the Synod of the Latvian Orthodox Church edited a beautifully illustrated album with description of the history of Riga Orthodox Cathedral of the Nativity of Christ (in Russian, in Latvian and in English.). (Рижсий Кафедральный 2006)

From September 1997, with blessing of Alexander – Head of the Latvian Orthodox Church, a monthly newspaper "Vinogradnaya Loza" ("The Vine") is being printed. It does not only introduce its readers to the basic postulates of Orthodoxy and tell about church holidays, but also gives the opportunity to get acquainted to history of Orthodoxy in Latvia, to destinies of clergymen, to the history of temples. In particular, of great interest to the readers may be the article written by father Oleg (Pelyevin) about Vladimir Lunsky, a synod architect, published in "Vinogradnaya Loza". (Виноградная лоза 2008)

It is noteworthy, that history of Orthodoxy in pre-Livonian period got within the sight of Indrikis Shtern, a Latvian historian-emigrant who published a series of articles on this theme in the magazine of Latvia University "Latvian History". (Šterns 1995, 1996) The article "Latvians and Russians in the Medieval Riga" also belongs to the same author. (Šterns 1996)

The book “Pokrov Churchyard. Fame and Oblivion”, prepared by Svetlana Vidyakina and Svetlana Kovalchuk has substantially contributed to historiography of Russians in Latvia. (Покровское кладбище 2004) Pokrov cemetery is the oldest orthodox cemetery in Riga (excluding the one in the medieval “Russian Quarter”), which appeared in the 18th century. Many prominent inhabitants of Riga have found their eternal peace there. Unfortunately, time is pitilessly doing its work. The majority of burial places have suffered from decay, and some of them have disappeared completely. For a very long period of time nobody paid any attention to this cemetery, vandals were doing their dirty work without any punishment. S.Vidyakina and S.Kovalchuk have conducted a remarkable research work and have brought out of oblivion the names of many Riga residents buried at the Pokrov cemetery. The book has not only added to the “money-box” of knowledge about our predecessors, but has also agitated public opinion after which reconstruction works of the decayed cemetery began.

One of the pioneers studying history of Russians in Latvia was Sergei Zhuravlyov and the society “Ulyei”, founded by him. S.Zhuravlyov is the author of many popular scientific publications. (Журавлев 1990, 1990, 1997, 1999, 1995)

In 1999, a collection of articles and reminiscences “Riga City Russian High School” (former Lomonosov’s), with materials not only about the best Russian school of the pre-war Latvia and its teachers, but also with description of the general situation, in which Russian schools found themselves during the years of the first independence. (Рижская городская 1999) The collection was compiled with participation of M.Saltupe, T.Feigmane and D.Levitsky (USA).

In 2002, the book of Eugene Klimoff (1901-1990) “Russian artists” came out in Riga. (КЛИМОВ 2002) **First, this book was published in New York in 1974 and was not available to Latvian readers. Only, thanks to the selflessness of E.Klimov’s former pupil, Margarita Saltupe, it became possible to publish the book in Latvia. The book is remarkable also because of the fact, that two articles about the artist himself are included into it. These are the articles by V.Sergeyev (Russia) “Three Loves of the Artist Klimoff” and by R.Polchaninoff (USA) “The Artist E.Klimoff”. Next step was publishing the selection of works by Eugene Klimoff done by his son Alexis Klimoff (USA). (КЛИМОВ 2006)**

In 2003, thanks to the efforts of Anatoly Rakityansky “Riga’s Bibliophile” saw the light. (Рижский библиофил 2003) Among the materials

related to Latvia there are the following ones: A.Rakityansky "Remembering S.Mintslov", Y.Abyzov "Riga's Publishing Houses of 1920-1930s", V.Eikhenbaum "Photo-report on the Days of Peter the First in Riga", F.Talberg "Portrait of the Legendary Hero (about Yakov Kulnyev)" and others.

In the same year, Felix Talberg published a nicely illustrated album with descriptions dedicated to Michael Barklay-de-Tolly in which readers can get acquainted to life and activities of the outstanding general and our compatriot. (Талберг 2003)

Nina Lapidus, an art historian and critic from Riga has actively worked studying the creative life of such Russian artists as Sergey Vinogradov (1869-1938) and Nicolay Bogdanov-Belsky (1868-1945). In 2001 N.Lapidus (the author-compiler) published the book of reminiscences of Sergey Vinogradov "Former Moscow". (Виноградов 2001) The same author has recently published in St.-Petersburg (Russia) several new works about the creative life of the mentioned artists.

In 1990-s Russian historians of Latvia were joined by talented youth – the graduates of History Department of LU. In 2003, Oleg Pukhlyak and Dmitry Borisov published a textbook for regular schools "Russians in Latvia". (Пухляк, Борисов 2003) **Even though the book had many values,** it was not used by majority of Russian schools. As for its character, the book is more like a popular-scientific edition, not a handbook for pupils. O.Pukhlyak continued his fruitful work: spoke at different conferences reporting on various themes. His articles are included into many of the above-mentioned collections. One of the latest O.Pukhlyak's works "100 Russian Portraits in the History of Latvia" became a popular-scientific edition. (Пухляк 2007) **However, somehow doubtful is the selection of personalia** (including some persons with no concrete ties with Latvia, which have never lived and worked here). The book does not include any references. Analogical edition "Outstanding Russians of Latvia" (the project coordinator Igor Gusev) came out almost at the same time. (Гусев 2008) **This book, in contrast to the previous one, was created by a group of authors.** Moreover, as for its scientific significance, its level is much higher. Speaking about the drawbacks of this edition, we can mention the absence of references in concrete articles.

In the recent years a number of collections of articles by Ilya Dimenshtein, a journalist and collector from Riga, appeared. (Дименштейн 2004; Дименштейн 2007 (1); Дименштейн 2007 (2)) **Beautiful illustrations and**

very easy language make these books popular among general readers. However, most articles are based on publications from the old Russian press (before 1940), and sometimes bear the compilation character.

One of the latest publications is collection "Russians in the Baltics: History in the Monuments of Culture (1710-2010). (Гапоненко 2010) Alexander Gaponenko's idea to collect under one roof all the materials about monuments of Russian culture in the Baltics, deserves great respect. The group of authors and the editorial board have done a substantial work. However, not all the articles meet the contemporary requirements. Not all editorial correcting has been useful. In addition, the quality of illustrations could have been better. Perhaps, the authors of this collection should have followed the principle "better less but better". Nevertheless, the book has filled one more gap in the history and culture of the Baltic Russians.

The reminiscences, in which the historical facts are seen through the prism of concrete people's destinies are invaluable sources of information. Our historiography does not stand out with the number of memoirs. In the emigration, the reminiscences about the life in Riga, were written by Henrich Grossen (1881-1974) – a well-known journalist, teacher and public figure in the pre-war Riga. Latvian readers got access to these reminiscences only in 1994, when they were published in the magazine "Daugava". (Гроссен 1994) **While reading Grossen, one becomes utterly engrossed by the social and political atmosphere of 1920-s and 1930-s. The reminiscences are full of subjective evaluations given by prominent Russian public figures of that time, with which we cannot always agree. The reminiscences of Natalia Sinaiskaya – the daughter of professor Vasily Sinaisky, were written in emigration (but edited already in Riga). (Синайская 1998, 2001) Her reminiscences, in general, refer to the life and daily routine of people from academic circles. Compared to H.Grossen's memoirs, the work of Natalia Sinaiskaya is more impartial and objective. The reminiscences of Natalia Sinaiskaya were highly appreciated by the magazine "History of Latvia". (Zemribo1999) Two books were published by Dmitry Anokhin. (Анохин 1998; Анохин 1998)**

However, absence of personal evaluation of the historical events, which he managed to live through, is the weak point in his works. Very often reminiscences substitute retelling or citing materials from educational and scientific literature. Perhaps, the most valuable from all the memoirs is the book by Tamara Nikiforova, telling about her childhood in Riga, about deportation on June 14, 1941 and her life in Siberian exile. (Никифорова

2006) In 2006, a book by Igor Zakke “About the People Around, Relatives and I” was published. It included only a segment of family’s chronicles, written by him. (Закке 2003-2004) In 2008, **reminiscences of Galina Petrova-Matis (1914-2000)** about her husband Vladimir Petrov, the famous chess grand-master in the pre-war Latvia, saw the light. (Петрова-Матиса 2008) The author failed to complete her work, and only some years after her death, the grandson of Galina Petrova-Matis found the manuscript and prepared it for publishing. From the reminiscences related to the recent past, the book of Vladlen Dozortsev “The Present Past Time”, written in good literary language and reflecting the life of creative intelligentsia (from the author’s point of view) during the Soviet decades and in the years of downfall of the Soviet system, must be marked out. (Дозорцев 2009) In 2006, the magazine of the Institute of History, was published in Latvian as a segment of the reminiscences by Vasily Savchenko – a History doctor who has worked at the Institute for a long period of time. (Savčenko 2006)

Close to reminiscences in spirit and in content is the book “Ruthenia in Riga and Abroad”, edited by the Latvian Society of Russian Culture. A number of articles were written specially for this book, the other part consists of reminiscences of the Russian student corporation “Ruthenia” (founded in Riga in 1929) members. («Рутения» 2005) **The book gives the history of the origin of Russian student corporations in the Baltics** (it is not characteristic for Russia) as well as tells about the first years of existence of the Corporation in Riga. Nevertheless, perhaps, the sections, related to the activities of the Corporation and the corporates in dispersion, are more interesting for contemporary readers. The book opens to its readers the previously unknown pages related to the second wave of emigration.

A considerable number of articles, related to the history of Russians in Latvia, was published in the magazine “Daugava” (1977-2008). During several decades, the magazine has been the megaphone of the local humanitarian Russian intelligentsia. Such sections as journalism, culturology and memoria became especially interesting at the beginning of “Perestroika” (reconstruction). Among the articles, published in the “Daugava”, we can mark out Y.Abyzov “Pyotr Pilsky. Experiments of Metropolitan and Provincial Biography” (1993, No 5), T.Feigmane “Russian Schools in Latvia: (1919-1940)” (1993, No 3), “Fyodor Ern. 40 Years of Life of a Russian Intellectual”, a publication by Y.Abyzov (1993, No 2), Y.Abyzov “Russians in Latvia” (1994, No 6), I.Apine “Integration or Assimilation?” (1996, No 4), Y.Abyzov “Provincialities or Marginalia?” (1996, No 6), V.Volkov “National

Self-consciousness of the Russian Youth in Latvia” (1996, No 1), B.Ravdin. “E.Tichonitsky. The Enlightener at the Cross-roads of Epochs.” (1997, No 3), B.Infantyev “Curriculum Vitae” (2000, No 3), B.Ravdin “Is Yury Abyzov 80?” (2001, No 6), D.Levitsky “Mystery of Investigation of the Murder of Archbishop Ioann (Pommer)” (2003, No 6), T.Feigmane “Whether the Unjust Rule will Come after the Strong Power” (2003, No 5), R.Polchanonoff “Riga. February-July 1944)” (2004, No 2), L.Obolenskaya-Flam “Tasya” (2004, No 2), M.Altemente “My Destiny – I Have Two Mothers.” (2005, No 3/4), I.Zakke “In Memoriam of the Russian Ivanov Library in Riga” (2005, No 1), V.Volkov “Russians in Riga” (2006, No 1) and many others. Unfortunately, due to financial problems, the magazine “Daugava” with its peculiar charm fostered by its editors and authors, has stopped its work. To mark the 30th anniversary of the magazine a listing was carried out. It not only gives the opportunity to find the necessary articles, but also shows the permanent importance of this magazine. (Дaugava 2007)

Russian journalism did not die with the “death” of “Daugava”. In 2004, Sergey Mazur founded the almanac SEMINARIUM HORTUS HUMANITATIS. By the end of 2010, already 23 almanacs will have been published. For example, volumes XIV and XXI, prepared by professor Yury Sidyakov, are dedicated to archbishop Ioann (Pommer), a number of articles in volume XIX are in memoria of Boris Infantyev, and some are dedicated to the book by Marina Kostenetskaya “A Clown for Sale, Cheap”, etc. For the time being, it is the only Russian language periodical regularly published in Latvia on humanitarian themes.

In 1999, The Old-believers’ Society of Latvia edited the first number of the magazine “Pomorsky Vestnik”/ “Pomorian Herald”. Until today, (November 2010) 23 numbers have seen the light. Number by number, the magazine edited by Illarion Ivanov, has changed, both, visually and content wise. Publications, on not only spiritual themes, but also scientific ones, connected with the history of Old-Faith, appear in the magazine regularly. Documents and articles on genealogical trees of old-believers’ families in Latvia (the Ivanovs, Krasnopyorovs, Starikovs, Plotnikovs, Yermolayevs, Nikonovs, Isayevs-Lavrentyevs and others) are published as well. The article by B.Infantyev “Ivan Fridrikh (1902-1975)” was published in No 1, 2003. The article by A.Gavrilin “The Attitude of Lutsin (Ludza) Piety Priesthood to Old-believers in the Second Half of the 19th and the Beginning of the 20th Century” was published in No 1, 2004. Such researchers as A.Gurin, B.Meksh, A.Podmazov, A.Rakityansky, I.Trofimov and others

published their works in "Pomorsky Vestnik". Many articles are dedicated to the history of old-believers' praying houses and to old-believers' communities today.

Examining historiography of Russians in Latvia, it is difficult not to notice some gaps. A number of works, especially related to the pre-historic period and to the Middle Ages, can hardly be considered scientific. We lack scientific works, which would give integral panorama of the life of Russians in the Baltic provinces during the 18th and 19th centuries. The role of Russians in the period of modernization (the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century) has not been sufficiently studied. One of the few serious attempts to study that period was undertaken by Irina Kruminya in the article "Russian Society and the Process of Formation of Political Parties in Latvia from 1905 until 1907". (Krūmiņa 1994) **Due to some reasons**, this theme has not been developed further. Only some weak attempts were made to comprehend the position of Latvia's Russians during the German occupation, Latvian researchers being the pioneers of this study, in particular, Uldis Neiburgs, a scientific employee of the Museum of Occupation. (Neiburgs 2003; Neiburgs 2007)

The Soviet period has remained almost uninvestigated. The only exception are activities of the Soviet repressive institutions. It is worth mentioning, that not only Russian, but also Latvian historians have spoken about repressions against the Russian population of Latvia. A good example is the article by Irene Shneidera "Soviet Repressions against the Russians of Latvia in the Summer of 1940", where she has marked out, that the largest number of arrested people during that period were Russians. First of all, public and political figures were repressed, especially from the emigrant circles. Besides, the "class approach" during repressions did not play any principal role. (Šneidera 2005)

The time has come to give objective evaluation to the post-Stalin's period in the history of Latvia as well, moreover, to show impartially the role and the place of Russians during that period in the history of our country.

As we can see, during the last 20 years a considerable amount of works on the history of Russians in Latvia have been written. They are written, both, in Russian and in Latvian. There are also works in foreign languages. Among the authors, there are Russians, Latvians, Jews and representatives of other nationalities. As to the quality, not all of them are of high value. Nevertheless, each of them, to a lower or higher degree, adds to the mosaic on the history of Latvia's Russians. To a certain degree, the work of his-

torians assists in rapprochement and increases the understanding, both, between different groups of Russian people (depending on the rooting in Latvia, on the ideological postulates) and between Russians, Latvians and other nationalities, living in our country.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apine, I., Volkovs, V. (1998) *Slāvi Latvijā (Etniskās vēstures apcerējums)*. Rīga.

Apine, I., Volkovs, V. (2007) *Latvijas krievu identitāte: vēsturisks un socioloģisks apcerējums*. Rīga: Latvijas Universitātes Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts, Īpašu uzdevumu ministra sabiedrības integrācijas lietās sekretariāts, Daugavpils Universitāte.

Caune, A. (1992) *Pati Rīga ūdenī.. Arheologa stāsts par zudušo Rīdzināšu upi, par pirmo ostu, kuģniecības līdzekļiem un amatiem senajā Rīgā*. Rīga: Zinātne.

Caune, A. (2006) «Jurija Novoselova 20. gs. 20. gadu etnogrāfiskas fotogrāfijas.» *Latvijas vēstures institūta žurnāls*. Nr.3: 139-150

Dribins, L. ed. (2007) *Mazākumtautības Latvijā. Vēsture un tagadne*. Rīga.

Dribins, L. (2008.) «**Latvijas nacionālo minoritāšu historiogrāfija**». *Latvijas vēstures institūta žurnāls*. Nr.3:117.-139.

Dribins, L. (2009) «Latvijas nacionālo minoritāšu historiogrāfija atjaunotajā Latvijas Republikā 1990. – 2008. gads.» *Latvijas vēstures institūta žurnāls*. Nr. 2: 95-117.

Infantjevs, B., Losevs, A. (1967) «Divu literatūru draudzība.» *Skolotāju Avīze*, 5.jūlijs.

Infantjevs, B., Losevs, A. (1969.) «Grāmatai 100 gadu. (Ļ.Tolstoja “Karš un miers”)» *Skolotāju Avīze*, 17. decembris.

Ivanovs, A. (2004) «Kompleksa “Moscowitica –Ruthenica” ieviešana zinātnes aprītē: arheogrāfisks apskats.» In: *Latvijas arhīvi*. Nr. 2: 47.-85.

Ivanovs, A., Kuzņecovs, A. (2006) «Senākie līgumi ar Smoļensku Latvijas Valsts vēstures arhīvā: datēšanas un atribūcijas jautājumu.» In: *Latvijas arhīvi*. Nr. 2: 51-118.

Kovaļčuka, S. (2003) «Baltijas ģenerālgubernators kņazs A.A.Suvorovs un

vec ticībnieku vajāšana 19. gs. 40. -50. gados.» *Latvijas vēstures institūta žurnāls*. Nr. 2: 22-34.

Krūmiņa, I. (1994) «Krievu sabiedrība un politisko partiju veidošanās process Latvijā 1905. –1907. gados.» *Latvijas vēstures institūta žurnāls*. Nr. 2: 69-96.

Neiburgs, U. (2003) «Ģenerālis Vlasovs un krievu atbrīvošanas kustība: ieskats historiogrāfijā.» *Latvijas vēsture*. Nr.4: 90.-99.

Neiburgs, U. (2007) «Latvijas krievi Vācijas bruņotajos spēkos Otrajā pasaules karā». *Latvijas vēstures institūta žurnāls*. Nr.1:159.- 164.

Pazuhina, N. (2006 (1)) «Tradīcijas saglabāšanas un aktualizācijas problēma Latvijas vec ticībnieku kultūrā». In: Letonikas Pirmais kongress. Modernitāte: filozofija, kristīgās vērtības, mutvārdu vēsture Latvijā. Rīga: LZA, LU Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts. Pp. 442. – 451.

Pazuhina, N. (2006 (2)) «Krievu vec ticībnieki Latvijā: savējie vai svešie?» In: Mīti Latvijas vēsturē. Rīga. Pp.39.-48.

Pazuhina, N. (2007) «Cita citādība: Latvijas vec ticībnieku kultūrsociālā pieredze 20. gadsimtā.» In: Reliģiskā dažādība Latgalē. Rīga: Latvijas Bībeles biedrība. Pp. 133.-160.

Pazuhina, N. (2008) «Latvijas vec ticībnieku kultūras prakses mūsdienās». In: **Nacionālā mutvārdu vēsture. Reliģiskās idejas Latvijā. Letonikas Otrais kongress**. Rīga. Pp. 169.-192.

Podmazovs, A. (2001) *Vec ticība Latvijā*. Rīga: LU Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts.

Savčenko, V. (2006) «Krass pavērsiens vēsturē.» *Latvijas vēstures institūta žurnāls*. Nr. 2:144-155.

Šneidere, I. (2005) «Padomju represijas pret Latvijas krieviem 1940. gada vasarā.» *Latvijas vēstures institūta žurnāls*. Nr.1:109.-131.

Šterns, I. (1995, 1996.) «Pareizticība Senlatvijā.» *Latvijas vēsture*. Nr.4: 9.-11.lpp.; Nr.1: 3.-7., Nr.3: 3.-6; Nr.4: 20.-23; Nr.5: 70-72.

Šterns, I. (1996.) «Latvieši un krievi viduslaiku Rīgā.» *Latvijas vēstures institūta žurnāls*. Nr. 2: 22 -54.

Volkovs, V. (1996) *Krievi Latvijā*. Rīga: LZA Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūta Etnisko pētījumu centrs.

Volkovs, V. (1998.) «Krievi.» In: Mazākumtautību vēsture Latvijā. Eksperimentāls metodisks līdzeklis. Rīga. Pp. 83 -116.

Zemribo, G. (1999) «Profesors Vasilijš Sinaiskis.» *Latvijas vēsture*. Nr. 2: 121-124.

Абызов, Ю. (1990, 1991) Русское печатное слово в Латвии. 1917-1944 гг. Био-библиографический справочник. Stanford.

Анохин, Д. (1998) Как мы жили в довоенной Риге. Рига: Улей.

Анохин, Д. (2004) Незабываемое прошлое и настоящее. Рига: Улей.

Балтийский архив. Русская культура в Прибалтике. (1999-2006) Vol. 1- 11. Таллинн: Авенариус; Рига: Даугава; Вильнюс: Русские творческие ресурсы Балтии; Вильнюс: Издательство Вильнюсского университета.

Бейкман, Э., Инфантьев, Б., Цитович, В. (1957) «Вопросы методики преподавания русского языка в латышских школах». In: **Русский язык** в национальной школе. Nr. 5: 68-74.

Вахрушева, Е.А. (1958) *Дорога исканий*. Рига.

Вахрушева, Е.А. (1957) *Юрий Юровский*. Рига.

Виноградная лоза. (2008) Nr. 9 (123).

Виноградов, С. (2001) *Прежняя Москва. Воспоминания*. Рига: Multi-centrs.

Гаврилин, А. (1999) *Очерки истории Рижской епархии (19 век)*. Рига: Филокалия.

Гаврилин, А. (2009) *Под покровом Тихвинской иконы. Архипастырский путь Иоанна (Гарклавса)*. Санкт-Петербург: Аллаборг.

Гаврилин, А. ed. (1993,1997, 2001, 2004, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2010) *Православие в Латвии. Исторические очерки*. Issue 1. Рига: Балто-славянское общество культурного развития и сотрудничества; Issue 2. Рига: Благовест; Issues 3- 8. Рига: Филокалия.

Гапоненко, А.В. ed. (2010) *Прибалтийские русские: история в памятниках культуры (1710-2010)*. Рига: Институт европейских исследований.

Гроссен, Г.И. (1994) «Жизнь в Риге. Извлечение из семейной хроники и воспоминаний Генриха Ивановича Гроссена (Нео-Сильвестра).»

Даугава. Nr. 1: 156-187; Nr. 2: 167-192; Nr. 3: 169-192; Nr. 4: 165-192.

Гусев, И. ed. (2008) *Выдающиеся русские латвийцы. Библиографический справочник*. Рига: (IK ZORIKS).

Даугава. 1977-2006. *Роспись*. (2007) Рига: Даугава.

Демина, Н. (1999) *Рижский Свято-Троице-Сергиев женский монастырь*.

Дименштейн, И. (2004) *Русская Рига. Исторические очерки*. Рига.

Дименштейн, И. (2007 (1)) *Рига и рижане 100 лет назад*. Рига.

Дименштейн, И. (2007 (2)) *Имена русской Латвии*. Рига: Polaris.

Дозорцев, В. (2009) *Настоящее прошедшее время*

Дорошенко, В.В. (1985) *Торговля и купечество Риги в XVII веке*. Рига: Зинатне.

Енш, Г. (1947) «Московское торговое подворье в Риге в XVII веке». *Вопросы истории*. Nr. 12: 75-79.

Журавлев, С. (1990) Покровское кладбище – памятник рижской старины; Журавлев, С. (1990) «...Ливонские я проезжал поля...». *Русские писатели в Риге, Митаве, Динабурге и других городах Остзейского края (16 в. – 1-я пол. 19 в.)*. Рига: Улей.

Журавлев, С. (1997) Венок Собинову. Сборник материалов к 125-летию со дня рождения Л.В.Собинова. Рига: Улей.

Журавлев, С. (1999) Федор Иванович Шаляпин и Латвия. Мемориальный сборник к 125-летию со дня рождения (1873-1938). Рига: Улей.

Журавлев, С. (1995) Русские писатели в Лифляндии и Курляндии (2-я половина 19-го века). Рига: Улей.

Заварина, А.А. (1986) *Русское население восточной Латвии во второй половине XIX – начале XX века. Историко-этнографический очерк*. Рига: Зинатне.

Заволоко, И.Н. (1933) *О старообрядцах г.Риги*. Рига

Закке, И. (2003-2004) *О близких, родных, и о себе*.

Инфантьев, Б. (1963, 1964-1968, 1970-1973, 1981;) *Латышская*

литература. Книга для чтения в V – VIII классах с русским языком обучения. Рига: Латгосиздат.

Инфантьев, Б. (1997(1)) «Латгальские староверы в видении латышских писателей.» In: **Русские Прибалтики: механизм культурной интеграции** (до 1940 г.) Вильнюс. Рр. 75-88;

Инфантьев, Б. (1997(2)) «Образ русского в латышском фольклоре». In: **Русские в Латвии. Issue 2.** Рр. 74-105.

Инфантьев, Б. (1997(3)) «Русский язык и литература в латышских школах 20-х – 30-х годов». In: **Русские в Латвии. Issue 2.** Рр. 106-116;

Инфантьев, Б. (1997(4)) «Русичи на земле латышей. Доливонский период». Сборник научных трудов Балтийского русского института. № 3: 90-136.

Инфантьев, Б. (2002) «Образ Латвии 20-30-х в творчестве русских зарубежных писателей». *Диаспоры.* Москва. Nr. 3: 28-45.

Инфантьев, Б. (2007) *Балто-славянские культурные связи. Лексика, мифология, фольклор.* Рига: Веди.

Инфантьев, Б., Лосев, А. (1965(1)) «Буревестники (Горький и Райнис).» *Советская молодежь*, 7 апреля.

Инфантьев, Б., Лосев, А. (1965(2)) «Рига Райниса». *Ригас Балсс*, 19 июня.

Инфантьев, Б., Лосев, А. (1965(3)) «Сквозь даль времен» (Фонвизин в Латвии), *Советская молодежь*, 12 декабря.

Инфантьев, Б., Лосев, А. (1978, 1983) *Русское слово. Учебник для IX-XI классов вечерних сменных школ.* Рига: Звайгзне.

Историко-статистическое описание церквей и приходов Рижской епархии (1893, 1894, 1895, 1902) . Issue 1 – 4.

Климов, Е. (2002) *Русские художники.* Рига.

Климов, Е.Е. (2006) *Избранные работы.*

Ковальчук, С.Н. (1998) «Взыскуя истину...». *Из истории русской религиозной, философской и общественно-политической мысли в Латвии: Ю.Ф.Самарин, Е.В.Чешихин, К.Ф.Жаков, А.В.Вейдеман. Середина XIX в. – середина XX в.).* Рига: Институт философии и социологии Латвийского университета.

Ковальчук, С. (2002) «Традиции русской философии в 20-30-х годах 20 столетия в Латвии». *Даугава*. №12.

Ковальчук, С. (2005) «Рижские староверы в период гонений в 40-е – 50-е годы XIX века». In: *Староверие Латвии*. p. 280-289.

Ковальчук, С. (2008) «Рижский архив Каллистрата Жакова.» In: Россия и Балтия. Войны, революции и общество. Issue 5. Москва: Наука.

Ковальчук, С. (2009) «И мелкий щебень радостей и бед ...» (о поэте Игоре Чиннове). In: Информационно-аналитический сборник о русском зарубежье. Санкт-Петербург.

Ковальчук, С. (2010) «22 года из жизни ученого: цивилист Василий Синайский в Латвии». *Альманах общества SEMINARIUM HORTUS HUMANITATIS*. XXI. Pp.61-72.

Левицкий, Д. (1980) «О положении русских в независимой Латвии». *Новый журнал*. Нью-Йорк. №. 141: 206-233.

Левицкий, Д. (1990) «Национальность жертв не существенна для коммунистической власти..» *Родник*. Рига. №. 3: 52-57.

Лейсман, Н.А. (1908) *Судьба православия в Лифляндии с 40-х до 80-х гг. XIX века*. Рига.

Лесков, Н.С. (1863) *О раскольниках г.Риги преимущественно в отношении к школам*. Санкт-Петербург.

Лесков, Н.С. (1882) «Русские деятели в Остзейском крае (свои и чужие наблюдения, опыты и заметки)»; «Иродова работа (русские картины в Остзейском крае)». *Исторический вестник*. №8.

Маркелов, Г.В. (1999) «Изограф из Причудья.» In: «Памяти Ивана Никифоровича Заволоко». Сборник статей и материалов, посвященных 100-летию И.Н.Заволоко. Рига. Pp. 98-113.

Международные Заволокинские чтения. (2006)

Михайлов, И. Я. (2004) *Борис Федорович Инфантьев. Жизнь и труды. Био-библиографический указатель*. Рига: Веди.

Никифорова, Т. (2006) *Баржа на Оби. Новеллы по памяти*.

Никонов, В. (2008) *Староверие Латгалии. Очерки по истории староверческих обществ Режицкого и Люцинского уездов (2-ая половина*

XVII – I-я половина XX вв.). Резекне: Издание Резекненской кладбищенской старообрядческой общины.

От Лифляндии – к Латвии. Прибалтика русскими глазами. (1993). Vol. 1. Москва: Аркаюр.

От Лифляндии – к Латвии. Прибалтика русскими глазами (1999). Vol. 2. Рига: Insight.

Пазухина, Н.В (1999) «И.Н.Заволоко: вехи жизненного пути.» In: «Памяти Ивана Никифоровича Заволоко». Сборник статей и материалов, посвященных 100-летию И.Н.Заволоко. Рига. Рр.28 – 97.

Пазухина, Н. (2005) «Культурные традиции латвийских староверов в 20-30 гг. XX века». In: *Староверие Латвии.* Рига. Рр. 119-126.

Памяти Заволоко Ивана Никифоровича. Сборник статей и материалов, посвященных 100-летию И.Н.Заволоко. (1999). Рига.

Петрова-Матиса, Г. (2008) *Звезда, погасшая до срока.*

Плюханов, Б. (1993) *РСХД в Латвии и Эстонии. Материалы к истории Русского Студенческого Христианского движения.* Париж: Умса-Press.

Подмазов, А.А. (1970) *Старообрядчество в Латвии.* Рига.

Подмазов, А (2002) «Старообрядчество в системе экономического развития (к вопросу о религиозной детерминированности хозяйственной деятельности).» In: *Русские в Латвии. Из истории и культуры староверия.* Рига: ВЕДИ. Рр.172-182.

Подмазов, А. (2005) «Вселатвийские старообрядческие съезды (1920-1933).» In: *Староверие Латвии.* Рига. Рр. 333-342.

Подмазов, А. (2006) «Современное старообрядческое общество в Латвии. In: *Свобода совести в России: исторический и современный аспекты.* Москва: Российское объединение исследователей религии. Рр. 31-45.

Подмазов, А. (2010) *Рижские староверы.* Рига: Институт философии и социологии ЛУ. Рр. 6-56.

Поздеева, И.В. (1999) «Иван Никифорович Заволоко и комплексные исследования культуры русского старообрядчества.» In: «Памяти Ивана Никифоровича Заволоко». Сборник статей и материалов, пос-

вященных 100-летию И.Н.Заволоко. Рига. Рр. 16-27.

Покровское кладбище. Слава и забвение. (2004) Рига: Multicentrs.

Православные церкви в Латгалии: Историко-статистическое описание (1939) Рига.

Пухляк, О. (2007) *100 русских портретов в истории Латвии.* Рига: D.V.I.N.A.

Пухляк, О., Борисов, Д. (2003) *Русские в Латвии. Со средневековья до конца XIX века. Учебное пособие для общеобразовательной школы.* Рига: Argads "SI".

Пярн, М., Берсенев, Л. (1950) *50 лет сценической деятельности народной артистки ЛатвССР Лидии Никитичны Мельниковой.* Рига.

Рижская городская русская гимназия (бывшая Ломоносовская). 1919-1935. (1999). Рига.

Рижский Кафедральный собор Рождества Христова. Rīgas Kristus Piedzimšanas Pareizticīgo katedrāle. Orthodox Cathedral of the Nativity of Christ in Riga (2006). Синод Латвийской Православной церкви.

Рижский библиофил. (2003) Рига: Библиофил & Коллекционер Анатолий Ракитянский.

Рижский театр русской драмы 1883-1958. (1958) Рига.

Рижский театр Русской драмы (альбом). (1974) Рига.

Рижский театр русской драмы. Очерк истории (1983) Рига.

Рижский театр Русской драмы. Фотоальбом. (1983) Рига.

Рижский театр русской драмы 1883-1983. (1983) Рига.

Русская книга в Латвии. 1990-2001. Материалы к указателю (2003). Рига: Даугава.

Русские в Латвии. Issue 1 (1933). Рига.

Русские в Латвии. Issue 2 (1934). Рига.

Русские в Латвии. История и современность (1992). Issue 1. Рига: Русская община Латвии.

Русские в Латвии. История и современность. (1997). Issue 2. Рига:

Центр гуманитарных исследований и просвещения «Веди».

Русские в Латвии. Из истории и культуры староверия (2002). Issue 3. Рига: Старообрядческое общество Латвии, Фонд гуманитарных исследований и просвещения «Веди».

Русский ежегодник на 1938 год (1937) Рига.

Русский ежегодник на 1939 год (1938) Рига.

Русский ежегодник на 1940 год (1939) Рига.

«Рутения» в Риге и на чужбине. Рижская русская студенческая корпорация «Рутения» (2005). Вашингтон-Рига.

Самарин, Ю.Ф. (1868, 1871, 1874, 1875, 1876) *Окраины России*. Issue 1-2. Прага. Issue 3- 6. Berlin.

Сахаров, С.П. (1937) *Рижские православные архипастыри за 100 лет: 1836-1936*. Краслава.

Семенова, М.Ф. (1966) *Сопоставление грамматики русского и латышского языков*. Рига.

Семенова, М.Ф. (1972) *Русско-латышские языковые связи: Учебное пособие*. Рига.

Синайская, Н. (1998, 2001) *Круг жизни профессора Василия Ивановича Синайского. Воспоминанич дочери Н.В.Синайской, восстановленные по записям и памяти*. Рига.

Синайский, П. (1910) *Исторический очерк Рижского кафедрального собора*. Рига.

Староверие Латвии (2005) Сборник статей. Рига.

Талберг, Ф. (2003) *Барклай де Толли и Балтийский край*. Рига.

Фейгман, Т. (2007) «Дмитрий Александрович Левицкий (17.02.1907 – 9.01.2007).» *Даугава*. Nr. 1: 158-160.

Фейгмане, Т. (1997) «История и культура русского населения Латвии: краткий библиографический указатель.» In: *Русские в Латвии. История и современность*. Выпуск 2, Рига. Pp. 117-131.

Фейгмане, Т. (2000) *Русские в довоенной Латвии*. Рига: Балтийский русский институт.

Фридрих, И.Д. (1936) Фольклор русских крестьян Яунлатгальского уезда. Рига.

Флейшман, Л., Абызов, Ю., Равдин, Б. (1997) *Русская печать в Риге: из истории газеты Сегодня 1930-х годов*. Stanford.

Францман, Е., Инфантьев, Б., Виллан, О., Семенова, М. (1962, 1964, 1966-1971) *Русский язык для IX-XI классов школ с латышским языком обучения*. Рига: Латгосиздат.

Фридрих, И.Д. ed. (1980) *Русский фольклор в Латвии: песни, обряды и детский фольклор*. Рига.

Фридриховские чтения. (1977) Рига: Латвийский университет, Центр русистики.

Чешихин, Е.В. (1884, 1885, 1887) *История Ливонии с древнейших времен*. В 3-х томах, Рига.

Чешихин Е.В. (1884) *Краткая история Прибалтийского края*. Рига.

Чешихин, Е.В. ed. (1877, 1879, 1880, 1882) *Сборник материалов и статей по истории Прибалтийского края*. Рига.

Elina Vasilyeva

IMAGE OF A RUSSIAN IN THE TEXTBOOKS ON LATVIAN LITERATURE

Any kind of academic programme embodies a socio-cultural norm sanctioned by the national government. In this regard it seemed interesting to investigate two sets of textbooks of different time periods that to a different degree provide the presentation of Russian or world literature (in the latter case Russian literature is included into the context of the world literature) in Latvian culture space. The specific situation of Russian literature is also related to its peculiar status of the “big brother”. The textbooks bring out in their content the idea of the necessity and justification of a separate and profound consideration of Russian literature as the oldest and most fundamental literature of “our country”. At the given moment there are two sets of textbooks, yet recently one of them has been preferred and we will base our analysis on the material provided by it. The set of textbooks “Literature”. The set of textbooks cannot be characterized as ideological, yet a certain kind of Russo-phobia is sensed throughout it, first of all manifested in the reduction of the Russian literature material represented in the textbooks and modelling Russian culture with an emphasis on the Soviet period (with regard to nineteenth-century Russian literature, the Soviet element is replaced by that of the tsarist regime that partially reminds of the textbooks of the Soviet epoch). What has happened is switching the poles – now the Soviet is that which should be avoided. The question is whether there will be no projection of the Soviet on Russian.

Key words: literature, textbook, Russian, stereotypes

Elina Vasilyeva,

Dr. phil., Associated Professor, Daugavpils
University (Latvia)

Any system of texts (whether those of mass media or those related to the professional or social orientation of a human), to a greater or lesser degree facilitate the formation of one's notions about other humans including notions of a certain culture, the culture of an ethnic group. In the sphere of studying stereotypical ideas and notions in the cultural space of Latvia, the publication by Ilze Shulmane and Sergey Kruk's article "Stereotypes in the Latvian Press" turned out to be especially significant. The article provides a comprehensive analysis of the periodicals issued in the Russian and Latvian languages aiming at "concluding to what extent the representation of 'others' facilitates the readiness of ethnic community members for dialogue and cooperation" (Shulmane 2001, p. 11). One of the conclusions drawn in the article is that the press, in fact, lacks any publications that would regard the peculiarities of interrelations in a multicultural environment (in pre-school educational establishments and schools). This is exemplified by texts related to the school curriculum. Any kind of academic programme embodies a socio-cultural norm sanctioned by the national government. This has been investigated in the research work by Vladimir Shalak called "Stereotypes of National Characters" (Vladimir Shalak has published tripartite series of articles under the given title: the first article is based on the content analysis of the school curriculum, the second one – on that of newspaper publications, the third – on a fragment drawn from the Internet) that is based on the content analysis of the compulsory programme requirements in literature for applicants of higher education establishments in Russia (Shalak). The results of this analysis turned out to be rather unexpected that creates an impression that its authors introduced in their field of study not only texts from fiction but also the existing system of public opinions on the specific nature of national characters and their interaction in the present-day public and political life in Russia. The content analysis of a text from a fiction work (more particularly, texts of different epochs) supposedly demands a certain historic-cultural commentary. The selection of texts is undoubtedly subjected to a certain ideological doctrine, but, nevertheless, the national stereotypes provided in the texts from fiction works should be accounted for, taking into consideration the specific historic-cultural situation in which the author has been plunged.

In this regard, it seemed interesting to investigate two sets of textbooks from different periods of time which, to a different degree, provide the presentation of Russian or world literature (in the latter case, the Russian literature is included into the context of the world literature) in Latvian cultural space. One set entails textbooks on Russian literature for Latvian school of

the Soviet period (since 1968); it includes textbooks and readers for forms 9-11 (since 1988 – forms 10-12) designed by Vladimir Svirskiy and Yelena Frantsam. This set of textbooks and readers has lived up to 6 editions. In Latvian school the subject called “Russian literature” coexisted with the course “Literature” which, first of all, familiarized learners with their native (Latvian) literature, simultaneously introducing within the course episodic insights into the history of the world literature. Besides, the Russian literature is not just a compulsory subject but one part of a shared, familiar culture. Hence, the opposition of ‘one’s own – alien’ which is needed for dealing with stereotypes is cancelled. The material of Russian literature is not something to be introduced anew but familiar material for consolidation.

However, the history of Russian literature is treated as the history of the fight for liberty and equality and, thus, all the authors representing this literature are people of ideal conduct and understanding of the historical moment. The history of literature is subjected to the history of liberation movement. The insight into the past is constructed with regard to the current moment. The idea of fight in all its manifestations becomes the dominant of both biographical excerpts and the interpretation of literary texts. The definition of literature as focused on the issues of fight is provided in the introduction to the textbooks, “The whole history of Russian literature is the history of the fight for happiness of people, fight against ignorance and exploitation of one human by another.” (Svirsky 1987, p.4, 5) The statement ‘fight against’ is telling a lot. The idea of opposition, negation, defining something by negation assumes an emblematic significance. This negation concerns everything that belongs to the past, the old order, the tradition. The topic of negation becomes quantitatively dominant, both, in the selection of documents and citations as well as in the historic-biographical commentary. Negation assumes features of stylistic marker. To define the specific position of a Russian writer, the authors of the textbooks have chosen a quotation by Korolenko (who, in fact, is missing on the list of compulsory literature and whose name is provided just in a small reference, “a well-known Russian writer – democrat”), “When a Russian writer dies ... he, like any defendant at court, is most probably, first of all, asked in the nether world, ‘Have you been convicted to penal servitude? Have you been convicted to Siberia? Charged against? Imprisoned? Administratively deported? Or, at least have you been under police surveillance, open or secret?’ And there are just few of us who could answer with clear conscience: I have never been convicted, charged against or kept under open and se-

cret surveillance.” (Svirsky 1987, p. 5) Korolenko’s quotation is a concise summary of the basic and most recurrent facts of the biographies of Russian writers regarded in this set of textbooks. Each writer’s fate is first and foremost a fight and opposition to the existing social and political order, campaign for the interests of the common people.

The specific situation of Russian literature is also related to its peculiar status of the “big brother”. Textbooks in their content bring out the idea of the necessity and justification of a separate and profound consideration of the Russian literature as the oldest and most fundamental literature of “our country”. The Russian literature is treated as the driving impulse for the development of many national literatures, “The Russian literature has played a great role in the development of literatures of the nations in our country. The fruitful influence of the Russian literature has been experienced by the great Ukrainian poet T. Shevchenko, Latvian poet Rainis, Georgian author I. Chavchavadze, Ossetic writer K. Khetagurov, Tartar writer G. Tukai and a great many of other writers and poets of our multinational country” (Svirsky 1987, p. 5).

Let us consider some model episodes from Russian writers’ biographies. Childhood is an important component in the formation of a Russian writer’s personality. The notion of childhood occurs most often in the description of the first biographical period of a writer. The writer’s world is initially suggested to be the world of his family with compulsory descriptions of relations between the writer’s parents. Besides, in most cases, a kind of opposition between the parents is marked. In some cases one of the parents has absolutely contradictory character. Yet, in any case, this has a major impact on the character formation and the development of the world view of the future writer.

As a variety of the writer’s childhood description, his communication with peasants may be mentioned (with his parents’ permission or against their will) as well as the formation of the future writer’s attitude towards class inequality that is known by the textbook authors in advance.

An essential stage of a writer’s biography entails his love history and the description of his beloved. Individual chapters of biographies are dedicated to these relations.

The definition of a Russian person as a specific type of human is extremely important, though, unobtrusive in writers’ biographies. Two tendencies stand out in this respect. On the one hand, there is a whole range of statements concerning the supreme mission of the Russian people in

future. "All stories of the collection are saturated with the idea expressed by Turgenev already in 1846, 'A Russian holds and grows the germ of the future great deeds, great national development.'" (Svirsky 1988, p. 29, 30) On the other hand, there are also numerous accusing and negative characteristics that are, however, not aimed at total negation but summon to change, awakening, like the writers' works are also "acts of accusation".

An attempt to establish a scale of dominants of Russian character brings out the following picture. The dominant position on this scale is occupied by independence (powerful, fighter), followed by intellect (intelligent, enlightened), then comes kindness, activity, persistence (domineering). However, one should keep in mind that the given model is set up according to the principle of opposition to another model that is also intrinsic to the Russian character, just positioned in relation to monarchy. Yet, with respect to such writers, the textbook authors very rarely apply the notion 'Russian', belonging to the Russian culture.

In fact, authors of the textbooks do not set a task to focus their attention on the Russian character in particular or form a certain positive stereotypical notion. As concerns evaluation of textbooks from the standpoint of national ideology, they may be characterized as neutral and rather impartial (with regard to the functioning ideological doctrine). Though, they do not promote any national stereotypes, there is a kind of emphasis on the generally accepted model of the Soviet type of community.

Nowadays the school syllabus in literature in Latvia is construed according to a different principle and the conception of textbooks differs accordingly. The subject "Russian language and literature" is taught at schools for national minorities while the subject "Literature" is compulsory for all. At the given moment there are two sets of textbooks, yet, recently one of them has been preferred and we will base our analysis on the material provided by it. The set of textbooks "Literature" (compiled by L. Silova, A. Vevers, I. Vidusha, D. Auzane, D. Luse, M. Maurmane, M. Milzere published by Zvaigzne ABC) for forms 10-12 has been published in two editions, the first – in 2003, the second – in 2009 (updated and is contemporary as stated on the book cover). Both sets do not differ conceptually except for a few abridgments which, among other things, also concern representation of the Russian language (these abridgments bear both, positive and formal character). The textbook for form 10 deserves special attention (in the old edition it consists of two parts, but in the new edition it has been reduced to a single book) as thematically this textbook concerns issues of aesthetics ("Aesthetics and

Literature”), the Ancient Greek and Roman literature and the Medieval and Renaissance literature. This thematic and chronological block may be considered to be the least marked from the point of view of national adherence (meaning the universality of the literature of antiquity for the European tradition and the early formations of the political map of Europe that directly affects understanding of national literature). From the point of view of literary theory, the attempt to draw parallels with Latvian literature seems too far-fetched and inappropriate (however, this is not the object of our present study). Actually, in the first two chapters of the textbook (“Aesthetics and Literature” and “The Origin of European Literature”) all national traditions are presented by exemplifying them with names of famous writers, philosophers, literary scholars. Quantitatively, these examples are distributed as follows (in the new edition of the textbook): French – 13 name references, German – 4, Italian – 4, English (of the pre-Renaissance period) – 3, American and Spanish literatures represented by 1 name reference each. In the new edition of the textbook the Russian component has disappeared, while it was represented in the first edition (though not very successfully from the literary studies point of view) by Gorky (providing the textual analysis of “The Song of the Hawk” as an example of the romanticist tradition) and Vampilov (“The Story of a Maker-Up” (textual analysis with abundant illustrations of scenes from staging a play at Riga Art Theatre) exemplifying the comic). Taking into consideration that these chapters provide the idea of the world literature as a continuous process, it becomes obvious that the Russian component is deliberately exempted from it (testified to by the selection of the material of literature for the repeated edition of the textbook). Besides, in the subchapters referring to mythology, there are repeated references to Nikolay Kun (his works being the only source of adapted myths available for a wide audience) without any mention that he is a Russian historian (cf. Roland Barthes is referred to as a French philosopher, Immanuel Kant – as a German philosopher, Umberto Eco – as an Italian writer and philosopher, etc.).

The textbook for form 11 provides a presentation of various national models; each chapter supplied by enumeration of countries stating which authors represent this or that tradition. The percentage ratio of the name references is constructed as follows: Latvia 47% (21 name references) – 46% (60), Russia 10% (9) – 12% (16), France 20% (17) – 13% (17), Britain 10% (9) – 15% (20), Germany 9% (8) – 8% (11). The given ratio brings out certain logic. The textbook and the subject of literature as such, are aiming at providing a deeper insight into the specific character of Latvian literature; hence, the

abundance of references to Latvian authors (almost one half) is completely justified. However, the selection of particular authors and the characteristics presenting a certain model of a Russian writer are more exemplary.

Authors who are included in the subject syllabus with monographs (referred to as Russian writers and poets) are the following ones: Blok (transferred to the discussion of the nineteenth-century Romanticism, without providing any facts of his biography, just mentioning the years of his birth and death, yet, Byron is introduced according to the same scheme), Dostoevsky (presenting also his biography, illustrations, "Crime and Punishment"), Chekhov (with biography, illustrations, "The Man in a Case", "Three Sisters") – exempted from the new edition of the textbook, Bulgakov (with biography, illustrations, quotes from the New Testament, "Master and Margarita"), Akhmatova (with biography, illustrations, poems and a dedication to Akhmatova by Amanda Aizpuriete).

In accordance with the general conception of the textbook, biographical information of the authors is maximally reduced and, yet, there is an outline of a certain scheme in presenting it. First of all, the superlative degree of adjectives characterizing authors is significant, e.g. the greatest, the most popular, one of (functioning as a cliché). Secondly, the relation of Russian writers with the sphere of medicine becomes a recurrent motif of their biographies (though, this concerns just selected names, yet, a stereotype is formed that, with rare exceptions, Russian writers, either were doctors by profession themselves (Chekhov, Bulgakov) or their parents had been such (Dostoevsky)). Another compulsory component of Russian authors' biographies is their bonds with Latvia. A classic example is provided in the biographical note on Chekhov (the first sentence of the note), "The first translations into Latvian of the short stories by the Russian writer Anton Chekhov appeared in 1890 and very soon he became the most translated and popular foreign writer in Latvia" (Auzane 2002, p. 306). Biographies are devoid of consistent biographical perspective, the only focus being on repressions (inflicted by the tsar or the Soviet regime). Like in textbooks on the Russian literature for Latvian schools, a model of oppositional behaviour (acting "against") is facilitated in this way.

Colour association makes, yet, another recurrent factor in Russian writers' biographies: the grey colour is associated with the dullness of the life above which the author must rise (Chekhov), which he must resist (Bulgakov), the only exception being Akhmatova whose texts give rise to associations with the white colour.

Both, Russian writers' biographies and historical commentaries provide

a certain spatial image of Russia. The space of Russia as spatial signification of Russianness is represented by two cities – Moscow and St. Petersburg. Both cities very rarely appear as spatial coordinates in the context of the whole set of textbooks, thus, their few mentions gain a special significance. There is practically no specifying as concerns the problem of both cities being considered the capital cities. St. Petersburg and Moscow are either places of action (as in Dostoevsky's "Crime and Punishment" and Bulgakov's "Master and Margarita") or geographical spaces somehow related to Latvian cultural figures, e.g. "Peterburgas Avizes" (St. Petersburg Papers) published in St. Petersburg, Moscow Society of Friends of Natural Sciences, Anthropology and Ethnography that appeared in relation to the collection of folk songs. Besides mentioning of the paper, St. Petersburg is represented as a grim place in the textbook (it must be noted that there is not a single illustration of St. Petersburg unlike the abundance of illustrations on Corsica in relation to "Mateo Falkone" by Merime). The novel "Crime and Punishment" is emblematic in constructing the image of St. Petersburg; questions and tasks about this novel are supplied with Karlis Zarinsh's citation, "Already in my childhood Petersburg depressed me by a kind of feeling of fear and uncertainty it aroused. Later, reading Dostoyevsky, I found the same air in his "Devils" and "Crime and Punishment"; hence, the depressing feeling about St. Petersburg is objective" (Auzina 2003, p. 186). Actually this citation and the respective task (find justification for this in the text) testify to the subjectivity and total refusal of any historic-cultural commentary.

Another issue in the statistics concerning a Russian person is related to analysis of Ezerinsh's novella "The Lighted Head". This, in fact, is the only example when a reference to a Russian person appears not in relation to the writer's biography or a historical event but in the text of a fiction work: the main hero meets a representative of Russian aristocracy, a woman called Natalya Grigoryevna Mai, and this encounter becomes the basis of the narrative of love, parting and impossibility of happiness. Quantitatively, in the text of the novella, there is much more signification concerning a Russian person than in the rest of the textbook (Russian words with comments, the heroine speaking Russian (this is pointed out in the authorial narrative), references to Russian Orthodox religion and its particular features). Besides, the questions and tasks concern just the structure of the narrative. This novella by Ezerinsh is an evidence of the historical contacts of Russian and Latvian cultures and the authors of the textbook have not tried to find in this any kind of ideological subtext. A different situation arises concerning the outline of the historical situation and individual examples of the use of illustrations.

Unlike the Soviet textbook on Russian literature for Latvian schools, the present-day textbooks are conceptually saturated with different kinds of illustrations, charts and diagrams. The visual range, also in this case, is aimed at forming certain notions. We will leave out of our analysis writers' portraits (just to note that, in this respect, Akhmatova has been most markedly illustrated; the text on her is supplied with 5 portraits and 2 photographs showing her personal environment (museum and her study)). The following ranges of illustrations cause a major interest. In the old edition of 2003 of the textbook for form 10 (part 1) on the first page of chapter 1, "Aesthetics and Literature" 6 illustrations are provided with the task to state which of them arouse pleasant emotions and memories (sic!) and which – negative. The illustrations are the following ones: a pedestal monument with a tank, a view of the House of the Blackheads, a character from "Adams Family", a caterpillar in a close-up, contemporary industrial scene with shining metal pipes, and a view of a dumping ground in the wood. The first of them appears to be quite ambiguous (in fact, it has been exempted from the new edition of the textbook). The ambiguity follows from the fact that the authors invite to a negative evaluation of the Soviet legacy, while there are no guarantees that the learners (especially those of schools with Russian as the language of instruction) would not provide this with a completely opposite characteristics. Yet, an important point of the overall conception of the textbook (it has been marked, both, in the academic standard and the teacher's book) – negation of the Soviet legacy – has been provided on the very first page of it.

Another example of an emblematically used illustration appears in the same textbook for form 10 (part 2 of the old edition preserved also in the new one), in the chapter dedicated to the Ancient Roman drama epitomized by Seneca's tragedy "Medea". Respectively, the preliminary task concerns the demonic interpretation of feminine images and a woman as an embodiment of all the evil. The introductory set of questions again concerns the illustration range: "Merlin" by Andy Warhall (Andrey Vorkol), "Madonna" by E. Munk and "Swan Princess" by Vrubel. In fact, the textbook authors' intentions are quite clear except for the contradiction in the interpretation of Vrubel's painting. The artist's name is not included in the range defining the ethnic origin of authors; this is the case when artists are just enumerated without emphasizing their belonging to a particular culture, while the image of the Swan Princess is clearly marked by the Russian national decorous *kokoshnik* and the braid. Besides, just a fragment of the painting has been provided, thus, distorting the colour scheme of the painting in the print: as a result, the image is represented as a mixture of dark-blue, black,

and dirty-white colours, black hair, black eyes with dark circles under black eyebrows; the magnificent white wings which, in the original painting occupy almost half of the whole composition, have been omitted. An important cultural and ethnographical image, despite its original interpretation, has been included into the range of demonic ones.

The set of textbooks cannot be characterized as ideological, yet, a certain kind of Russo-phobia is sensed throughout it, first of all, manifested in the reduction of the Russian literary material represented in the textbooks and modelling the Russian culture with an emphasis on the Soviet period (with regard to the nineteenth century Russian literature, the Soviet element is replaced by that of the tsarist regime which, partially, reminds of the textbooks of the Soviet epoch). What has happened is switching the poles – now the Soviet is to be avoided. The question is whether there will be no projection of the Soviet time on a Russian person.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Свирский, В. Д., Францман, Е. К. (1987). *Русская литература. 9 класс*. Рига.

Свирский, В. Д., Францман, Е. К. (1988). *Русская литература. 10 класс*. Рига.

Свирский, В. Д., Францман, Е. К. (1985). *Русская советская литература. 11 класс*. Рига.

Auzāne, D., Lūse, D., Maurmane, M., Milzere, M. (2002) *Literatūra 11.klasei : Eksperimentāla mācību grāmata*. Rīga: Zvaigzne ABC.

Dubiņa, I., Silova, L., Vēvers, A., Vīduša, I. (2003) *Literatūra 10.klasei : Eksperimentāla mācību grāmata*. Rīga: Zvaigzne ABC.

Auziņa, I., Dalbiņa, D. (2003) *Literatūra 12.klasei : Eksperimentāla mācību grāmata*. Rīga : Zvaigzne ABC.

Šulmene, I., Kruks, S. (2001) “Stereotipi Latvijas presē”. In: *Latvijas mediju analīze (Daudzveidība III.)* Rīga. Pp. 11-50.

Шалак, В. «Стереотипы национальных характеров». <http://www.vaal.ru/show.php?id=91> (15.11.2006)

Triin Vihalemm

TO LEARN OR NOT TO LEARN? DILEMMAS OF LINGUISTIC INTEGRATION OF RUSSIANS IN ESTONIA

The language-centred liberal integration policy of the Republic of Estonia that avoids any collective demands has been a rather “neutral” albeit not a very effective solution in a situation where structural conditions and cultural inertia do not support political regulations. The reflection of calls for the Estonian Russians to learn the national language as the main means of integration into (post-Soviet) Estonian society is analysed by using qualitative data from in-depth interviews and a focus group discussion. The analysis focuses on the question how the competence in the national language is used by an ethno-linguistic minority group in symbolic boundary drawing, and how it, thereby, shapes the process of integration. The main conclusion is that learning the national language is interpreted as a personal choice, an individual strategy of competing for resources such as a well-paid job and an opportunity to choose the employer; it is also explored how this is defined in rational terms. The symbolic exclusion is drawn when the members’ adaptation practices come in touch with collective cultural values – children’s education, language “purity”, political preferences and collective memory. In this context the change of the integration policy paradigm introducing collective demands such as teaching majority of upper secondary courses in Estonian may also change the groups’ response patterns.

Key words: language learning, integration, Estonian Russians, identity, symbolic boundary

Triin Vihalemm,

PhD, Associated Professor, University of
Tartu (Estonia)

EMPIRICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

The central object of Estonian integration policy so far, has been the Estonian language acquisition which enabled every individual to be active in the public sphere and in the social life in general (State Integration Programme a, b). The aim was to meet ethno-cultural maintenance and liberalism criteria, theorized also by social scientists. E.g. Kaufmann argued that the symbolic boundary-maintenance of ethnic communities need not contravene the tenets of liberalism, 'The cultural imperative behind ethnicity seeks to increase the symbolic density ... it is the entry criteria, which must be thinned to a minimum' (Kaufmann 2000, p. 1106-1107).

Some of the language requirements like the Language Law were passed even before the Republic of Estonia was restored. The first Language Law was established in ESSR in 1989 and was later replaced by a new language law in 2005. Citizenship and public sector jobs were linked with the language knowledge requirement. Official language knowledge levels were established in 1999 and changed in 2008. Today there are six levels (C2 being the highest and A1 the lowest). An intensive period of language teaching began in the second half of 1990-ies (with support of PHARE and other international actors). The official line of integration has been rather instrumental stressing the individual obligations and rights and carefully avoiding any initiation of collective claims (see e.g. Kõuts 2002, Vihalemm and Masso 2007). This might be an optimal choice because of the unfavourable structural conditions (2), and also cultural inertia – certain suspicion between the majority and the minority (e.g. Estonian Human Development Report 2007). However, the main reason for setting the Estonian language acquisition as a priority is certainly the *de facto* considerably lower linguistic competence of Estonian (and Latvian) Russians compared to the countries with a smaller share of ethno-linguistic minorities (see table 1). There are many reasons for that – starting with the big share of Russians and the relatively short time for formation of Estonian as the state language and ending with the majority's micro strategies inherited from the Soviet time such as linguistic convergence (Giles 1978) – switching over to Russian in order to retain symbolic divergence with regard to Estonian.

Table 1.

**Knowledge and use of national languages
by ethno-linguistic minorities
(100 per cent = minority sub-sample in the relevant country)**

	Is able to communicate	Uses almost every day	Self-estimated level of knowledge		
			Very good	Good	Basic
Estonian Russians	73	64	23	50	26
Latvian Russians	81	67	24	48	28
Lithuanian Russians	90	81	49	41	10
minorities in Germany	90	87	45	49	6
minorities in France	90	78	70	25	5
minorities in UK	88	85	64	26	10
minorities in Sweden	91	89	72	26	2

It is quite difficult to evaluate the success of language-centred integration policy in terms of language adoption. Masses of Russians have attended language courses, the usage of Estonian in the everyday interactions in the public sphere has increased but still a vast majority of Russians do not follow the local (even Russian-language) mass media regularly and have developed networking strategies to obtain important local information like warnings against natural or technological threats (Vihalemm, Kiisel, Harro-Loit).

Table 2 shows some changes in the level of competence in Estonian among Estonian Russians during the last two decades. However, it should be kept in mind that the linguistic and communicative experience of Russians was not uniformed in the Soviet time. Approximately one-fourth of Russians had acquired the Estonian language skills to the point where they could communicate. There is data only about the self-reported competence asked about in the surveys. Today Russians may estimate their language competence more critically (comparing the self-estimation of fluent and active knowledge at the end of the Soviet time in 1989 and immediately before the restoration of the Republic of Estonia in 1991). However, it is clear that general language competence has improved during the two past decades.

Table 2.

**Self-estimated competence in Estonian language
among Estonian Russians 1989-2008
(100 per cent = sub-sample of Russians in the given year)**

	1989	1991	2008
Do not know Estonian	23	22	19
Mainly passive knowledge: understand but do not speak or speak very little	47	56	49
Active knowledge: understand and speak	27	20	17
Fluent knowledge	12	8	15
NA	3	2	-

Sources: 1989 – Survey 'Life in Estonia', Tartu University; 1991 – Survey 'Estonia in March', Mainor; 1995 – author's doctoral research; 2008 – Integration Monitoring.

Based on the self-reported indication of the language of communication in interethnic conversations there has been a significant shift towards frequent usage of Estonian at the expense of Russian. One reason for the change of code is the poor knowledge of Russian among Estonian youth but also the status of the language in the public sphere.

Table 3.

The usage of languages in communication with Estonians

	1995	2008
In Estonian	13	33
In Russian	51	34
In turns: Russian, Estonian (English)	36	33

Source: 1995 – Authors' doctoral survey carried out by Emor Ltd; Integration Monitoring 2008

The empirical analysis presented below will focus on the intra-group perceptions and practices in relation to the Estonian language knowledge. The study is partly based on the concept of symbolic and instrumental aspects of language (Edwards 1985). The instrumental or communicative value of a language refers mainly to the language as the main medium through which communication between the members of a group and the transmission of cultural information occurs (Kim 1988). The symbolic value of a language is connected with the feeling of group-belonging; e.g., Benedict Anderson (1983) describes language as a symbolic border between com-

munities. Edwards (1985) also distinguishes two types of motivation to learn the dominant language. The language of the dominant group can be acquired by instrumental motivation as a means of political and economic success. The instrumental value of another language is mostly connected with perception regarding achievement of personal aims so that language is acquired for rational reasons. The language of the dominant group can also be acquired for emotional reasons, springing from the desire to belong to another group (integrative or symbolic motivation) (see also Gardner 1985).

The trend from 1990 to 2008 presented in Table 4 reflects the fact that the Estonian language gained its job market value quickly in the first half of the 1990-ies, although, the alternative possibilities to gain a good job – favouritism, deficit speciality or well-developed skills have been acknowledged as well. In 2008, these alternative routes to compete in the job market lost some credibility; it was connected with economic recession. The instrumental motivation is reflected in the statements “Once you know the Estonian language, it makes no difference whether you are an Estonian or not” and “Learning Estonian increases the mutual trust with Estonians”. The instrumental motivation has risen step-by-step from the restoration of the Republic of Estonia, but, by now it has been replaced by a more sceptical attitude. The conflict over the WW II monument of Bronze Soldier and the economic recession are most likely to be reasons for the drawback of instrumental motivation to learn Estonian.

Table 4.

Thoughts about learning Estonian among Russians 1990-2008

	1990*	1995	2005	2008
One needs to know Estonian first and foremost in order to get a good job	9	66	75	79
If you are a good specialist or if you are well-connected, you will get a good job regardless of your language skills	38	43	53	37
Once you know the Estonian language, it makes no difference whether you are Estonian or not	29	49	64	23
Learning Estonian increases the mutual trust with Estonians	na	na	68	38
So far I have not had problems in communicating only in Russian	65	56	na	9

Sources: 1990, 1995 – author’s doctoral research; 2005 – Survey ‘Me. The World. Media’, 2008 – Integration Monitoring. The data of 1990 are comprised of the retrospective answers of respondents who participated in the 1995 survey. na – not asked

At the same time, the integrative motivation favours the Estonian language acquisition and encourages its use. Table 5 shows the data in breakdown of groups of different communication competences in the Estonian language. The instrumental motivation is similar but the integrative motivation increases together with linguistic competence.

Table 5.

Attitudes towards learning the Estonian language in different groups of people depending on their communication competences

	Do not know Estonian	Passive knowledge, limited or no use of Estonian in conversation*	Active knowledge, prevailing usage of Estonian in conversation
One needs to know Estonian first and foremost in order to get a good job	59	83,5	88
If you are a good specialist or if you are well-connected, you will get a good job regardless of your language skills	38	38	36
Once you know the Estonian language, it makes no difference whether you are an Estonian or not	16	22,5	32
Learning Estonian increases the mutual trust with Estonians	27	37	53
The importance of Russian will increase in Estonia in the future	36	47	40

* Includes also Russians with active knowledge of Estonian who reported speaking only Russian in conversations with Estonians.

Source: *Integration Monitoring 2008*

The rise of scepticism is noticeable in several surveys. The majority of Russians feel that ethnic Estonians have better opportunities for jobs and education and for participating in the political and local community life

(Saar 2007) not because of citizenship or knowledge of the national language, but because of their ethnic origin (Hallik 2006).

There are very few studies dealing with objective inequality between ethnic Estonians and other ethnicities but those studies indicate implicitly that ethnic background may limit opportunities to make a career. For example, Trumm and Kasearu (2008) find that the considerably weaker representation of non-Estonians in the highest income groups may indicate that there are barriers for educated non-Estonians to get best-paid jobs. Lindemann and Saar (2008) conclude (based on the Estonian labour market study) that a non-Estonian is much less likely (1.82 times less likely) to get a top position than an Estonian even if he/she is an Estonian citizen and has good command of Estonian (1.55 times less likely). Young non-Estonians who are proficient in Estonian and are Estonian citizens are 1.61 times less likely to be on the top of the career ladder (op cit). Russian employers believe that ethnic origin is as important as skills, abilities and good education (according to the Integration Monitoring nearly 50% of them agree with that statement). In this situation, it is very difficult not only to heal the broken relations between the Russian community and the state but also to proceed with linguistic integration (4).

The aim of the empirical analysis was to open up the micro level processes behind the numerical data trends about the Estonia language acquisition and the accompanying attitudes. In addition, Estonia faces the paradigm of change of language and integration policy. In the earlier policy individual choices and responsibilities were stressed despite the institutional setting of language requirements. Now, the choices of acculturation will be somewhat more determined on the institutional level. Estonian as the language of instruction is made compulsory in the secondary schools where, so far, Russian has been the language of instruction. The Government decided in 2002 that secondary schools should adopt development plans and gradually introduce courses in Estonian. The symbolic start was in 2007 when the requirement was adopted that at least Estonian literature must be taught in Estonian. Secondary schools should guarantee teaching 60 per cent of subjects in Estonian by 2011/2012. Compulsory courses in Estonian are Estonian literature, civics, music, Estonian history and geography; other subjects can be chosen by each school.

The educational policy is an important prerequisite for the emergence of the above mentioned 'competitive assimilation' hypothesised by David Laitin (1998) as an indicator of adoption of individual or collective adapta-

tion strategies: “People who rely principally on Russian must work to add Estonian to their repertoire and seek education for their children in Estonian. They will, of course, keep a careful eye on the choices made by fellow Russian speakers. If all Russian speakers feel that all others will remain monolingual in Russian, they will see little need to learn Estonian. But if they fear that many others are already adjusting to the new language regime by learning Estonian, they will feel pressure to join the cascade.” (Laitin 1998, p. 25).

As a micro-level prerequisite for that process, Laitin stresses expected lifetime earnings and in-group status and out-group status on the micro or individual level (op cit, 29). This chapter focuses on the micro-level prerequisites – expected benefits of the Estonian language and in-group status of those Russians who have adopted the language requirement and know and use Estonian actively during the inter-group contact.

The questions of the Study were the following:

- How the national language competence is interpreted by the Russians who have good and poor command of it? What instrumental and integrative elements are used to construct the value of the use of the national language?
- Is the command of the national language used in subjective symbolic boundary drawing between those who have successfully adopted the state language requirement and those who have “dragged” the linguistic adaptation? What are the mutual representations of “adopters” and “sceptics”?

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Interpretation of empirical data from the Study is supplemented by conceptualization of symbolic boundary drawing developed by Michèle Lamont who defines subjective symbolic boundaries as conceptual distinctions that people make to categorize objects, people, practices, time and space (Lamont 1992, p. 9), as well as, general patterns of likes and dislikes. We discuss the possible boundary drawing by the members of one ethno-linguistic group in order to explain the possible identity processes and development of the sense of group membership. Lamont stresses that boundary work is an intrinsic part of the process of constituting the self, used to reinstate order within communities by reinforcing collective norms (Lamont 1992, p. 11). Thus, we as-

sume that a way of constructing symbolic boundaries when categorizing likes and dislikes refers also to how an imagined in-group membership is defined, either on the collective basis of the name of (Estonian) Russians, or as an individual, acting within the same social space.

The aim of the analysis is to establish whether the respondents' arguments, narratives and explanations include elements of such categorization of Russians living in Estonia. Lamont argues that the symbolic boundaries presuppose elements that are appreciated and serve as a basis of inclusion into imagined group; elements that are tolerated and, therefore, indifferent and elements that are not tolerated because they are seen as repulsive, impure, etc. and which may serve as a basis for exclusion from the imagined in-group. The analysis searches references to these elements in the respondents' comments and narratives concerning their communication partners, acquaintances or imagined prototypes of certain behaviours. The elements may be represented in a manifest form like "spoiling the Russian language" which indicates that the respondent does not tolerate this practice and considers it to be something that is harmful to the "purity" of the Russian language. Sometimes the elements are represented in a more latent form, using narratives and metaphors. For example, a narrative about a child attending a secondary school where the language of instruction is Estonian who considers her parents to be occupants was used in order to show the repulsive aspect of sending children to Estonian schools. The analysis revealed that respondents expressed this kind of opinion quite often. So, Lamont's notion that exclusive behaviours are experienced as repugnance, discomfort, embarrassment by the excluder and as snobbery, distance, and coldness by the excluded (Lamont 1992, p. 10) was of great help in the analysis.

Lamont (1992) outlines two general schools of theorizing and interpreting symbolic boundary constructions: exclusion as generated by conflicting with communal values of the group is, thereby, meant to protect internal bonds within a community (based on Durkheim); and exclusion is constructed in a struggle over scarce resources to justify the monopolization of resources by high status groups (based on Weber, later Bourdieu). The analysis of discourses looks at whether collective group values or individual benefits and risks are used in constructing the meaning for (non)adoption of the linguistic requirements and which other means are used to make people feel well in today's Estonian society.

Texts from six in-depth interviews with people who know and actively use Estonian are used in the study. For comparison, eight interviews were

conducted with people who do not speak Estonian at all or have mainly passive knowledge of the language and do not use it in communication. In addition, one focus-group was conducted with representatives of both above-mentioned sub-groups. The sample was formed of 12 male and 10 female respondents of different social status aged 18-45. All respondents considered themselves Russians or semi-Russians. There were several persons from mixed ethnic families (one parent being Russian and the other Estonian); two persons were of multi-ethnic origin (both or one parent being of mixed ethnic origin). Their ethnic self-determination is based largely on the Russian language which they use as their mother-tongue or their first language. The focus group and eight interviews were conducted in Tallinn; six interviews were conducted in the towns of the North-Eastern part of Estonia (Kohtla-Järve and Narva). Focus-group discussion was used because this technique enables participants to interact and to present their opinions in a latent form without the researcher having to ask direct questions. The format of answering the questions urges people to rationalize; the discussion reveals more implicit presumptions. The interviews were partly semi-structured and partly conversational. At first, everyday communication partners and networks were discussed and respondents were encouraged to express their opinions in the form of a longer narrative when inter-ethnic contacts were spontaneously mentioned. The theme of perceptions and practices concerning the Estonian language and its usage was covered in the conversational format and, also by using projective techniques (associations, personalization) in order to deter normative answering. The topic of symbolic bordering was introduced by asking to group Estonian Russians and, then, the competence in Estonian was probed if it had not been mentioned spontaneously. The real-life prototypes were probed (is there anyone you know...) when discussing people who do not and do know Estonian well. The topic of "estonization" was probed in interviews and it was mentioned spontaneously in discussions. In general, the focus-group discussions give valuable additional information as less and more "integrated" Russians debated the topic by themselves and the role of the researcher-moderator remained modest. The interviews and the focus group were conducted by the author's colleague, Valeria Jakobson, who herself has Russian ethnic background.

At first, thematic analysis was conducted, using simple descriptive and interpretative codes like values associated with the Estonian language, feelings towards in-group members, etc. The thematic codes were taken under

close scrutiny using also some means of discourse analysis.

In our analysis the quotes are identified by the Estonian language competence, gender (male or female) and social status. The aim is to distinguish between individuals without attempting to make any conclusions regarding their socio-demographic background.

FINDINGS

As it was already said above the state integration policy treats the Estonian language acquisition as a matter of individual responsibility albeit the supporting framework is also offered institutionally (various stimulation programs). Interviews echoed this liberal idea. For example, a woman who has learned Estonian and uses it intensively stresses also the importance of structural factors in the linguistic advancement but still believes in individual choice and responsibility:

- *...this is a vicious circle – to learn Estonian you need money. If a person does not work, he has no income and no possibility to pay for his studies... Our generation is required to know Estonian. However, I went to school in Tapa; Estonian was not taught in our school. (---) It is a private matter of everybody...if a person does not want to learn it is up to him...If he does want to learn, he might teach himself the language or find a friend who could help him or whatever else... And he has to overcome the barrier of derision, etc. (active knowledge of Estonian, F, 35, unemployed).*

The respondents who do not have good (active) command of Estonian refer to the structural factors associated with the poor knowledge of Estonian, for example, those who live in the North-East of Estonia said that they did not need the language as the few local Estonians are fluent in Russian. As one respondent, a 30 years old construction worker from Kohtla-Järve jokingly said, “*We have the wrong Estonians here. When you speak to them, they quickly switch to Russian*”. The language acquisition is considered when discussing a job in Tallinn or abroad. For example, the same respondent did not express any doubt that he could manage the task of learning the language if the motivation and real contacts with the target language speakers were sufficient:

- *I am ready to communicate in Japanese or Chinese if it is needed....*

if I work together with them, for example. Language is important in relations.

Thus, the knowledge of Estonian is seen as a rather “neutral” element which does not participate in the boundary-making between the members of the in-group (Russians). For those respondents who live in Tallinn learning Estonian is associated with appreciated materialistic values, mainly, a well-paid job. The modernistic values such as income and stability were mentioned by respondents:

- *If I knew Estonian better I could probably find a better job or have more clients, know more about opportunities to make extra money. (An acquaintance who speaks Estonian)... her salary is not very high but she has never been unemployed and has never had to live on benefits. (passive knowledge of Estonian, F, 38, employee in a beauty salon).*

Learning Estonian can also be associated with desirable emancipatory values such as independence and mobility. For example, the following quotation represents good command of Estonian as a means of achieving independence from the existing social structures (an opportunity to choose an employer) or, at least, a means of keeping the illusion of having a choice:

- *If I knew Estonian better I would have a wider choice of organizations where I could work. (About an acquaintance who has a good command of Estonian T.V.) He received phone calls from his Estonian friends all the time...He sent his CV to Eesti Energia (the national energy company); did not get the job he wanted but then he sent his CV to Tele2 (a telecommunications company) and was invited to an interview.... These two organizations are beyond my reach.... No sense even to send a CV... that is why I actually envy him... He has an opportunity to try (passive knowledge of Estonian, M, 36, programmer).*

For the respondents good command of Estonian served mainly as a rationally appreciated element but some people also expressed strong dislike of the language. For example, the above-quoted respondent said that he would avoid conversations in Estonian because of the strong negative emotions, although, he admitted that this would be “beneficial” in a rational

sense. At the same time, he uses his passive knowledge of the language to achieve control over the ethnic “other”. The following quotation expresses the emotional and rational considerations concerning the usage of Estonian in a very dynamic relationship:

- *If I know that they (Estonian partners) know English, then I speak English with them ...It is not beneficial but I have certain “natural” reluctance (to speak Estonian)... I have never revealed that I understand some Estonian. And it is convenient to know what they are saying behind my back. Sometimes you hear really unpleasant things. But, in general, this is very useful.*

Thus, the Estonian language might be a neutral or (rationally) positive element which is, at least partly, tolerated as “useful”. Does it serve also as an element of drawing symbolic boundaries within the group? The analysis of the interviews conducted in the North-East Estonia and in Tallinn revealed that the signs of boundary construction showed in cases when knowing Estonian was appreciated to some extent – which is quite a “logical” outcome.

The respondents who had no or poor command of Estonian said that they felt that Russians who had good command of the language were superior. For example, in the following excerpt the respondent doubts that this superiority has an “objective basis”, that those Russians are better accepted by ethnic Estonians; however, he refers to the (imagined) emancipation as a reason for unconscious higher self-evaluation:

- *A Russian is seen as a Russian, anyway; it does not matter that he has a good knowledge of Estonian... But a person who knows Estonian well and has entered into Estonian society positions himself higher ...because he has more opportunities ...he feels that he is more free and he unconsciously positions himself higher (passive knowledge of Estonian, M, 34, welder).*

The feeling that Russians who have good command of Estonian express arrogant, superior attitude towards those who speak only Russian is sometimes expressed in a more colourful and emotional way. As seen from the following quotation, this (shared) feeling can feed the creation of an “in-group” by those who are excluded:

- *Some people who have made a career because they know Estonian*

position themselves somewhat higher ...they put themselves on a higher position and look down on us (does not know Estonian, M, 32, manual worker).

The feelings that refer to latent processes of (situational) boundary drawing were also expressed by some Russians with good command of Estonian. They expressed the feeling of discomfort and certain embarrassment as can be seen from the following quotation:

- *(Acquaintance T.V.) ...has created a kind of his own world... and he is boiling in it... in his hatred... However, he could take a step and learn the language which gives you self-confidence and all this... but he does not want... he misses out a lot in his life... I feel uneasy when talking to him (active knowledge of Estonian, F, 28, works customer service).*

While, in the above quotation, the last sentence referred to some collective, shared feelings by using the term “us”, the Russians who have good command of Estonian represented themselves as individuals and projected the collective features to the imagined “other”. For example:

- *It seems to me that the feeling of communality is more characteristic of Russians who do not speak Estonian. This might be expressed in some kind of envy or so...I have felt some aggression from their side (active knowledge of Estonian, F, 35, unemployed).*

As it was said, the Estonian language acquisition as such, is a neutral or appreciated element, associated with job-related materialistic and emancipatory values. This signification resonates with the instrumental value of language explained in the theoretical part of this article. However, good command of Estonian as a means of achieving one’s aims, which coincides more with the integrative aspect of the national language is more arguable (as the interviews have revealed). Three categories characterizing the integrative value of the national language were identified: informational space (mass media), power relations and (individual) acceptance by ethnic Estonians.

Some Russians who had good command of Estonian considered the informational space of monolingual Russians to be too narrow and expressed

certain exclusionary embarrassment because they were better informed. For example:

- *Those who know Estonian and associate with the Estonians they are more ..., I cannot say that they are more educated but they know more about what is going on. It is very important; they are informed; they know what is happening in the country. People who do not receive information in Estonian are uninformed because only very basic information is being translated into Russian. This also determines their relations with the state and national policies and with Estonians. (active knowledge of Estonian, F, 35, accountant)*

In the following quotation a young man agrees that the instrumental aims can be achieved without knowing Estonian, stressing, however, that the national language has an integrative value and gives access to the informational space:

- *...the builders who renovated my flat... they were young, of my age... they did not know Estonian despite the fact that they were born here and have lived here all their lives... perhaps, they are good at what they are doing... they can tile... I think they do not even know who the president of Estonia is... they speak only about Russia.... about Russian football team, Putin.... Maybe, this depends on their level of education, on their personal horizon.... the informational space is very important (active knowledge of Estonian, M, 26, project manager).*

However, the local mass media transmitted in Estonian can also be used for purely instrumental aims. For example, a young woman from Tallinn was watching the Estonian television in order to learn the language but then switched back to Russian channels. She explained, “*Well, I thought that this would be sufficient to improve my knowledge of Estonian, to add to the lexical reserve that I had. I thought that it would be good to see what was going on in the world.*”

Russians who have no or poor command of Estonian do not appreciate this aspect of the national language acquisition, both, for instrumental and emotional reasons. Instrumentally, they consider that the necessary local information is to be provided in Russian as well (there are several radio stations and newspapers and news portals issued in Russian). They do not feel

a need to follow the media in Estonian. One respondent also referred to the ethno-political bias of the Estonian-language media which does not appeal to her (see the narrative below about the “lost daughter”).

The argument of private (non)acceptance by ethnic Estonians was raised mainly as negative reference by Russians with poor command of the Estonian language. The Russians with good command took rather instrumental position here, pointing to satisfaction of the basic social needs. For example:

- *It can be that I have not been completely accepted by Estonians... this is for them to decide, whether to open themselves to me or not. On the social scale I have all that I need. I do not feel that something is missing. Estonians talk to me about personal things and it is sufficient, often it is their own initiative (active knowledge of Estonian, F, 35, accountant).*
- *Estonian is needed not to feel humiliated. When you understand what the other person (Estonian) is saying you do not have the feeling that he is disparaging you (active knowledge of Estonian, M, 35, engineer).*

In the focus group a spontaneous discussion about the linguistic integration as a means of getting into Estonian society began between a man who resisted the language requirement and a woman who used the language actively when working together with ethnic Estonians. This revealed an extremely pragmatic attitude towards linguistic integration with allusions to ethno-cultural self-marginalization:

- ...*for me, integration means the Estonian passport and the knowledge of the Estonian language that helps me to get a good job with good salary: That is all I am interested in here, in the Republic of Estonia!*
- ...*But you are not integrated into the society!*
- ...*I spit at that society! And I spit at the Russian society, (in Russia T.V.) as well. It is my private life!*

The question about acceptance by ethnic Estonians was also discussed in the context of power relations. A young man admitted that Estonian is used as a means of competing for resources also by Estonians. He also referred to the positive impact of the Soviet period that ethnic Estonians and Russian-speaking settlers once shared (albeit he has very few personal

memories of the time) and which, in his words, indirectly showed the importance of the Soviet-time micro-strategies for interethnic communication to the today's linguistic processes. A quotation:

- *They start to correct your errors. This is not nice if you have not asked for permission. Let me speak with errors! For example, during business meetings At first, everything is OK but when they (Estonian colleagues) feel that they are inferior they begin to point out that you are not proficient in Estonian. They begin to correct your mistakes and, thus, they make you weaker. If you are corrected once, then again and again you start to hesitate, you begin to lose the thread of thought... Older generation Estonians do not correct. And with them, although they do not like the Soviet time and they badly relate to the Russians, it is still somehow easier to communicate. Young Estonians do not know the Russian language; they are prejudiced against the Russian language. And they express themselves by constantly correcting your Estonian (active knowledge of Estonian, M, 26, project manager).*

Russians with poor command of Estonian have doubts about the efficiency of learning the national language as a means of self-establishment in power relations. In the following narrative a respondent refers to the additional means one has to use – either by protesting, or by changing the Russian surname:

- *My friend's son studies at university in Tallinn. He knows Estonian well. There are free of charge places and places for students who pay the study fee. He was not accepted to a budget place, those places were given to ethnic Estonians... there was a conflict... a commission was convened they had to prove that it was not because of his (Russian) surname... So, you have to learn the language at first, and then change the (unwritten) rules (does not know Estonian, F, 27, unemployed).*

The following narrative shows an alternative way for using Russian to establish power relations by the logic of the free market. Here the “artificial” state regulations and “natural” market regulations which favour the real values, such as good skills, are opposed latently:

- *(My acquaintance is) a mechanic. He has never learned and will not learn Estonian... He does not need it... He earns money anyway... All*

Estonians who come to him with their broken cars speak Russian... they have to speak Russian... because other garages cannot fix their cars... my acquaintance has his own service station, he is self-employed... he is fully booked.... he is a very good specialist (passive knowledge of Estonian, M, 30, manual worker)

In general, the knowledge of Estonian is represented as an instrumental means and its integrative aspects are questioned by the Russians who have no or poor command of Estonian. The border construction, if it takes place, follows the line of competition for resources (a good job) and the discussion goes on about who is “smarter” – those who have followed the language requirement or those who have not taken it so seriously.

However, also discourses referring to the potential boundary drawing on the basis of group’s shared values, which would result in symbolic exclusion from the group (Russians), were represented. This was seen in the discussion concerning extreme cases when a Russian has gone “too far” with “estonization”. Both sub-groups indicated the scarce group values which should not be violated.

The Russian language is quite central in defining the collective values. First, the “purity” of the language not “spoiled” by an accent. Also, mixed vocabulary was mentioned as violation of collective resources:

- *I know many people....precisely several women... who use unnecessary Estonian words when talking to me ...they use those words continuously...I feel that those people are not “ours” (passive knowledge of Estonian, M, 36, technical director).*

Language is also connected with children’s education and Russian surnames which are considered scarce resources and, the violation of which is considered a sign of assimilation:

- *In our case, assimilation is when a child is born in a Russian family; he goes to an Estonian kindergarten, then, an Estonian school, then, an Estonian college, institute, university. Eventually, he will change his surname to an Estonian one. And he speaks Russian with an accent, at best. This is complete assimilation (passive knowledge of Estonian, F, 27, unemployed).*

In the following narrative the negative impact of Estonian schools and

Estonian-language media is shown, using the metaphor “losing the child” which, in this case, had a happy end (“the child returns”) due to the critical situation (the Bronze Soldier conflict) united the family:

- *A Russian family. Their middle daughter studied at an Estonian school. She lived within Estonian society. She considered her parents to be occupiers. She perceived Russians through that prism. And then, the “Bronze Soldier revolt” happened; I quote the mom word for word, “this event returned the child to the family”.... after arriving from school after all these events, she was sitting and switching between Russian and Estonian channels. She could compare the news, the reality and what was told. And then, as if a shroud fell from the eyes. And she saw that Russians were not as bad as they were painted.*

The Bronze Soldier conflict, as already mentioned in the beginning of the article, carries a significant identifying message and is used also for boundary-drawing. The following quotation shows that the in-group members are expected to condemn its removal – this is the “privilege” of ethnic Estonians:

- *(Assimilated T.V.) It can be that the woman with whom I had an argument over the monument.... she considered that the monument should have been removed long time ago. She is a Russian woman, speaks Russian but does not love the Russians, does not love Russia. And here it seems to me that she fawns on the Estonians. (passive knowledge of Estonian, M, 36, technical director).*

It was considered possible but not necessary that good command of Estonian would result in violation of these values. All the negative prototypes who were mentioned in the interviews know Estonian well.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

One aim of the analysis was to open up the micro-level processes behind the numerical data trends about the Estonian language acquisition and the accompanying attitudes (described in the empirical framework). The other aim of the analysis was to elaborate the dilemma of individualistic and collective adaptation strategies and the potential of collective identity development.

Estonian integration policy which has predominantly focused on the national language learning and accentuated the individual obligations and benefits is reflected on the micro-level in predominantly instrumental signification of the Estonian language. The adoption of the language requirement is interpreted by Estonian Russians as an individual matter of choice, leaving also the freedom of rejection if one doubts the associated benefits advertised publicly. At present, Estonian lacks the power to generate in-group competition for better acquisition, although, some status borders might be constructed between the members of ethno-linguistic minority group on the basis of linguistic competence. However, the in-group competition for desired resources like a well-paid job and wider opportunities in the labour market is interpreted differently. While Russians with good command of Estonian represent it as a rational “investment”, it might not be internalized by those who lack this skill, who, either consider other means being more “direct”, or suspect that after the language acquisition the further acculturation is latently demanded until the “unacceptable depth” (like changing one’s surname). The integrative aspects of the Estonian language acquisition which feed the feeling of security and comfort of Russians with good command of Estonian were opposed by Russians with poor command of Estonian. When one is enjoying the integrative benefits of Estonian language acquisition, it is interpreted as a matter of personal smartness in both subgroups, whereas, the dysfunctions are interpreted rather as a system error (there will always be some “historical hatred” from the side of ethnic Estonians). In a sense, it prevents people from evaluating critically their linguistic skills and discourages them from improving their skill, which, in turn, can hinder applying for jobs which require a higher level of language skills. On the one hand, the relatively “liberal” discourse, surrounding the Estonian language acquisition may raise less public dissatisfaction, but, on the other hand, it may strengthen the feeling of personal inefficiency and hopelessness when the language learning is slower and harder than expected and, in general, discourage the acquisition process.

In general, the competition within the group is about being most rational in order to achieve individual independence and status. Special treatment is demanded rather on the basis of market relations, not on the basis of collective political rights. Thus, the instrumental-individualistic (even voluntaristic) interpretation of the national language learning, which prevails on both, the macro and micro levels of the Estonian society, could be an optimal choice in considering the absorption capacity of Estonian

society, but it, certainly, has its limits and side-effects, especially in the circumstances of economic recession.

The analysis revealed that symbolic borders may be constructed when the linguistic integration accompanies other elements which are signified as violation of scarce collective values. Russian surnames, collective representation of the past (especially the unambiguous image of the Soviet victory in the WW II symbolized locally by the Bronze Soldier) are also important elements which form the collective cultural resources and feed in-group bounds.

The Russian language is also considered needing protection by excluding symbolically those who “spoil” Russian with an accent or (Estonian) vocabulary. The children’s educational choices are defined as an ethno-linguistically delicate topic following the protectionist logic (Estonian school will “spoil” the child and family relations). From the latter aspect introduction of collective solutions into the integration policy – compulsory Estonian as the dominant language of instruction on the gymnasium level – would have a rather positive effect because it may slow down moving of Russian youngsters to Estonian secondary schools. The surveys have revealed parents’ and pupils’ fear concerning the academic advancement. On the other hand, this lets them socialize in the ethno-culturally less demanding environment where the Estonian language will be used for a while mainly as external instrumental means (school system is inertial and the Russian secondary schools are not an exception). As one part of educational choices are now limited institutionally, the prior secondary choices may be barred out from the imagined pool of collective values or *vice versa* and can obtain more significance in the group’s self-regulation. Time will show. It is likely that regulations will strengthen the already existing trend that the linguistic competence will accompany also the higher level of education. Thus, the social distance between young Russians who have finished secondary school and hopefully have good command of Estonian and young Russians who have only lower secondary education and poorer command of Estonian will increase. Feeling the distance can sow the seeds of certain resistant identity formation among those who feel excluded. Thus, there are prerequisites for reactive (ethnic) identification but the non-selective or symbolic ethnic differentiation (Brown and Bean 2001) are less likely to occur.

NOTES

- 1 In the article the terms “Russians” or “Estonian Russians” are penetrated in order to indicate the people who have ethnically determined themselves as “Russians”. The quantitative data are analysed in the breakdown of the variable of ethnic self-determination. The qualitative data is collected by using the ethnic self-determination as a filtering question – if the interviewed person considered herself or himself Russian or partly Russian.
- 2 During the Soviet time the social structure of Estonia was largely segregated – there were schools with Estonian as the language of instruction as well as with Russian as the language of instruction, Estonian and Russian-language mass media. New residential districts were built for the people who had come to Estonia as industrial workers. Thus, the places of work and residence were also segregated. Today some restructuration process is slowly taking place. Also, separation has regional aspect – a considerable part of Russians live in the North-Eastern Estonia where the share of ethnic Estonians is minimal.
- 3 The methodology was slightly different. In 1995 there was a general question about the choice of languages. Variables offered: Both, Estonian and Russian; try to start the conversation in Estonian, but still mainly speak Russian; Estonian; Russian. The 2008 survey included the question: If you have recently had a longer conversation with an Estonian, which language did you speak? The variables were: Russian, Estonian, both, Russian and Estonian, mixed Russian, Estonian and English.
- 4 Many Western European countries enjoying considerably better command of the national language by non-titular population still face similar challenges: how to diminish the (feeling of) exclusion of members of ethnic minority groups. Several studies indicate that the lower social position of immigrants is reproduced in subsequent generations via family socialization (Inman et al. 2007; Tsolidis 2001), as well as institutionally (immigrant neighbourhoods in cities and separate schools) (*On Integrating Immigrants in Germany* 2006; Rumbaut 1997). It seems that emphasis on the civic dimension does not solve the problems (Haddad & Balz 2006: 23). Also, the ideas of multi-culturalism are met with hesitation and suspicion in public discussions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This Study is financed by the Grant of Estonian Science Foundation No 8347

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, B. (1983/1991) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London & New York: Verso
- Brown, S., Bean, F. (2001) *Assimilation Models, Old and New: Explaining a Long-Term Process*. University of California Press.
- Edwards, J. (1985) *Language, Society and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gardner, R.C. (1985) *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*, London: Arnold.
- Giles, H. (ed) (1978). *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Hallik, K. (2006) «Multiple Citizenship and Self-Determination in Estonian Society.» In: *Estonia: Interethnic Relations and the Issue of Discrimination in Tallinn*. Tallinn: Legal Information Centre for Human Rights.
- Haddad, Y. Y. & Balz, M. (2006) «The October Riots in France: A Failed Immigration Policy or the Empire Strikes Back?» *International Migration*. Vol. 44, Nr. 2.
- Inman, A. G., Howard, E. E. & Beaumont, R. L. (2007) «Cultural Transmission: Influence of Contextual Factors in Asian Indian Immigrant Parents' Experiences.» *Journal of Counselling Psychology*. Vol. 54. Nr 1.
- Kim, Y.Y. (1988) *Communication and Cross-cultural Adaptation*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Kolstø, P. (2002) *National Integration and Violent Conflict in Post-Soviet Societies: The Cases of Estonia and Moldova*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Inc.
- Kõuts, R. (2002) «Riikluse tõlgendusmallid eesti ajakirjanduses enamuse-vähemuse suhete taustal.» Unpublished Master's thesis, Tartu: Department of Sociology, University of Tartu, 2002.
- Lagerspetz, M. (2001) «Consolidation as Hegemonization: The Case of Estonia.» *Journal of Baltic Studies*. Vol. 32, Nr.4.
- Lagerspetz, M., Rikmann, E. & Ruutsoo, R. (2002) «The Structure and Resources of NGOs in Estonia.» *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary*

and Nonprofit Organizations Vol. 13, Nr.1.

Laitin, D. (1995) «Identity in Formation: the Russian-speaking Nationality in the Post-Soviet Diaspora.» *Archives européennes de sociologie*. Vol. 36, Nr. 2: 281-316.

Laitin, D. (1998). *Identity in Formation: The Russian-speaking Populations in the Near Abroad*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.

Lamont, M. (1992) *Money, Morals, and Manners. The Culture of the French and the American Upper-Middle Class*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lauristin, M., Heidmets, M. Eds. (2002) *The Challenge of the Russian Minority: Emerging Multicultural Democracy in Estonia*. Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Lindemann, K., Saar, E. (2009) «Non-Estonians in the Labor Market.» In: Estonian Human Development Report. Tallinn: Eesti Ekspressi Kirjastus. Pp. 95-99.

Masso, A. (2008) «General Life Satisfaction Among Europe's Majority and Minority Groups.» In: Estonian Human Development Report. Tallinn: Eesti Ekspressi Kirjastus. Pp. 81-86.

«On Integrating Immigrants in Germany.» (2006) *Population & Development Review*. Vol. 32, Nr. 3.

Pettai, V., Hallik, K. (2002) «Understanding Process of Ethnic "Control": Segmentation, Dependency and Co-optation in Post-Communist Estonia.» *Nations and Nationalism*. Vol. 8, Nr.4.

Rumbaut, R. (1997) «Paradoxes (and Orthodoxies) of Assimilation.» *Sociological Perspectives*. Vol. 40, Nr. 3.

Saar, A. (2007) «Rahvussuhted & integratsioonipoliitika väljakutsed pärast Pronkssõduri kriisi.» www.erl.ee/index.php?doc_id=206 (15.12.2010).

Smith, D. (2003) «Minority Rights, Multiculturalism and EU Enlargement: The Case of Estonia.» *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 1.

State Programme (a). «Integration in Estonian Society 2000-2007»

http://www.kul.ee/webeditor/files/integratsioon/state_programme111.pdf (31.10.2010).

State Programme (b). «Integration in Estonian Society 2008-2013»

http://www.kul.ee/webeditor/files/integratsioon/Loimumiskava_2008_2013.pdf Internet (31.10.2010).

Trumm, A., Kasearu, K. (2008) «Eestlaste ja mitte-eestlaste aineoline olukord ja eluga rahulolu.» In: Integratsiooni Monitooring 2008

www.kul.ee/.../integratsioon/Eesti_ja_venekeelse_elanikkonna_aineline_olukord_ja_eluga_rahulolu.pdf Internet (15.12.2010).

Tsolidis, G. (2001) «The Role of the Maternal in Diasporic Cultural Reproduction – Australia, Canada and Greece.» *Social Semiotics*. Vol. 11, Nr 2.

Vihalemm, T. Jakobson, V. «Presentations of the Past in Estonian Russian-language Press: “own” or diaspora Memory?» Submitted manuscript

Vihalemm, T., Kiisel, M., Harro-Loit, H. «Citizens’ Response Patterns to Warning Messages. » Submitted manuscript

Vihalemm, T., Masso, A. (2007) «(Re)Construction of Collective Identities after the Dissolution of the Soviet Union: The Case of Estonia. » *Nationalities Papers*. Vol. 35, No.1: 71 – 91.

Grigorijus Potashenko

RUSSIANS OF LITHUANIA (1990-2010): INTEGRATION IN CIVIL SOCIETY

The purpose of this paper is to answer two questions:

1. What has happened with civil society in Lithuania during the last 20 years? It seems that majority of people who accept the concept of a civil society as a value, would agree with such a simple opinion, that civil society in the present-day Lithuania is far from perfect. Besides, certain people consider that during last five or six years, when contemporary Lithuania entered the European Union, we have noticed a slowdown and stagnation of the civil society.

2. What are the results of adaptation of the Russian minority in Lithuania after 20 years? First pessimistic answer would be as follows (in my understanding, it has some justification): as a result of the successful enough political integration/ civil assimilation of Russians into the Lithuanian society and significant diminution of their numbers, the Russian minority in the country faces difficult challenges and hard problems of social and cultural adaptation. Second conclusion is more optimistic, thus, means more idealistic one: contemporary problems are problems of the growth. Moreover, the following political integration of Russians and other minorities (as it is taking place, as well), the difficult and ambiguous process of social integration, norms and principles, which express the conception and understanding of a legal state, democracy and civil society, is taking place in Lithuania. In the terms of cultural pluralism and tolerance of minorities in Lithuania and the European Union, Russians will find a worthy place in the Lithuanian society.

Grigorijus Potashenko,

Dr. hist., Faculty of History, Vilnius University
(Lithuania)

After the collapse of the Soviet Union occurred not only civil assimilation of Russians of Lithuania, but also important changes of their cultural identity. It appeared in evident ethnization / russification, modernization and, partial, but not complete, desovietization of identity. Stratified approach to identity allows us to speak about four forms of identity of Russians of Lithuania: 1) conservative and especially ethnical; 2) more open and transparent ethnical elements of civil identity; 3) archaic ethnical with soviet and/ or imperial elements; and 4) postmodern, cosmopolitan. Russians of Lithuania still possess all different forms of identity. Lithuania for them is a laboratory for their different forms of identity.

Key words: Russians of Lithuania, minority, civil society, ethnic politics, adaptation.

As Lithuania celebrated 20 years since proclamation of its independence, some conclusions appeared. Modern Lithuania has the right to be proud of their achievements – Lithuania has become a full member of the European Union and world community. Lithuania has entered the network of global relations, which gradually, involve our Eastern neighbours, as well. Nevertheless, Lithuania is facing new historical phenomena – growing inequities, new complicated corruption, world- wide economic crisis and, in connection with it, rising frustration of consumers' aspirations; in addition to it, xenophobia and new subtle discrimination of separate ethnic minorities (Roma people, Poles, partly Russians).

Especially in this context, during the last few years, in Lithuania we have observed exacerbation of national sensitivity, moreover, splash of categorical and non-reflective nationalism from the side of Lithuanian majority and explicit ethnic mobilization from the side of minorities, in particular, Poles and Russians of Lithuania. In few words, it could be called “cult of ethnic groups”, a desire to immortalize provincialism and insularity¹.

In this article, we will try to answer two questions, expounding main thesis and short comments on it: what has happened with civil society in Lithuania during the last 20 years? What are the results of adaptation of the Russian minority in Lithuania after the last 20 years?

WHAT HAS HAPPENED WITH CIVIL SOCIETY IN LITHUANIA DURING THE LAST 20 YEARS?

According to Ernest Gellner, we could say, that civil society is a much more crucial concept than, for example, “democracy” (Gellner 1995, p. 214; more on civil society see: Seligman, B. Adam 1992). Democracy embodies in itself important message of preference for consent over violence, at the same time, it says little about social conditions, which lets us realise that very consent and our participation in decision-making. An essential question appears, if democracy as a political system itself, is capable of solving important problems from inside, while public opinion has expressed reasonable and serious anxiety about the situation in the society, so, the urge for the changes of the social life may come out from the same social environment – individuals and groups, i.e. the civil society in the narrow sense. In this case, civil society by itself represents a social residue, which comes from the deduction of the state as such. Such an instrumental attitude towards the state appears as an important condition for the civil society. The state, conscripted to control extreme manifestation of individual interests, comes under control of institutes, which have economic and social bases.

It seems that majority, accepting the concept of the civil society as a value, would agree with such a simple opinion, that the civil society in the present-day Lithuania is far from perfect. Besides, certain people consider, and we can agree with them, that during last five or six years, after the contemporary Lithuania entered the European Union, we have noticed a slowdown and stagnation of the civil society (see more: Kuolys 2005; Laurenas 2003, p. 5–22; Laurenas 2006, p. 85–109; Shiliauskas 2006; *Neatrastagalija. Lietuvos pilietinės visuomenės žemėlapis*, 2006; *Lietuvos tauta: būklė ir raidos perspektyvos*, 2007; “Pavogta demokratija” 2010, p. 26–29).

The modest hopes and optimism that after Lithuania’s accession to the European Union the situation of minorities will be improved – that was shown by sociological inquiries as well (Shutiniene 2004, p. 28) – are replaced by sobering and bitter disappointment. Liberal rhetoric of Lithuanian authorities at the beginning of 1990-s was strengthened by concrete solutions in the area of vesting the rights for minorities: zero option of the citizenship law, establishing the Department of National Minorities in the government, good law on national minorities, relieving the threshold for parties of national minorities in Parliamentary elections (till 1996), public schooling system in the languages of national minorities, training teachers

for these schools at state universities etc. (Kasatkina 2007, p. 18–40; Potashenko 2008).

The current situation is far from the attractive image of 1990-s: there is no more 5 percent threshold for the parties of minorities from 1996, the new law on the citizenship (2003) caused huge criticism on the direct and indirect discrimination of minorities, the Department of National Minorities and Lithuanians Living Abroad was closed this summer (2010), it is impossible to get the higher education in the Russian language, only philologists for schools of national minorities are prepared and trained, Russian schools are being closed, despite the fact, that the number of Polish schools has increased, the content of the teaching process is Lithuanized etc.

Another example, discussed for a very long time, draft of the law on the national minorities, which seems to have beaten all the records – the term of the previous law expired in 2001 (adopted in 1989, and then again in 1991), since then, it has been extended annually until January 1, 2010. At the moment it does not function anymore. The essence of the question: if there will be any new law contributing to the expansion of fundamental rights of minorities or if it will be simply a declarative document, set of promises, which are practically not applicable, as can be seen in the case of the right to use a language of minorities in the public sphere. This right was established by the former Law on National Minorities in Lithuania, but it was reduced to nothing by the “more important” Law on the State Language. At the moment, a court action is already taking place because the Polish of the South-Eastern Lithuania raised the question of bilingual signs in the streets or bilingual tablets in the intercity buses (Vilniaus rajono valdžia nenukabina nelietuviškų gatvių pavadinimų; Narbutis 2010).

The Lithuanian society considers it just a formal side of the case. There is the Law on the State Language, and there is no need to break it, despite the fact that this law contradicts with the Law on National Minorities and recommendations of the European Union, and the principle of cultural diversity. It is considered an attempt to influence Lithuania and even a potential threat to the Lithuanian culture. In reality, it is just realization of the rights of citizens of other nationalities to use their language in public life on the municipal level.

Russian activists practically keep silent about this issue, although, morally they are on the side of the Polish. They do not see it necessity to raise the question about bilingualism to the level of municipality or simply do not dare proclaim it publicly because it may provoke inadequate reaction

of Lithuanian nationalists, and, even possibly, the rejection in Lithuanian society. There are still strong memories about the Russian language as an instrument of Sovietisation and, partially, Russification during the Soviet period, and we cannot argue about it. On the other hand, 20 years have already passed; therefore, stereotypes as well as traumatic memories of normal/civil society should not act as a pretext for the ban of the language rights of Russians, if the Russians themselves had expressed such desire.

In Lithuania, there are about 300 non-governmental organizations of national minorities, among them, more than 60 (according to other data about 100) Russian (Frejute-Rakauskene 2007, p. 96). The problem is that they not only unite just a small part of Russians, but also, rarely act as a united force, which has common political and moral vocabulary, common, at least, concerning the most important matters for themselves. Idea of a civil society among Russians of Lithuania, first of all, among activists, seems to be not very popular. Furthermore, the concept of a civil society is completely absent from the vocabulary of the activists, programs of political parties and public organizations.

Therefore, an important obstacle on the way to a civil society in Lithuania is not only the narrow and primitive nationalism, but also, the idea of unlimited state system, which is put on the level of the absolute and primary value (psychological complex – fetishism of independence). Another relevant obstacle comes from other things, as well. It is the illegible historical memory of the “rights” and majority of people in Lithuania perceive the Soviet period only negatively, moreover, comparing and relating the term “Soviet” to Russians. Escalation of the deep cultural trauma from the times of the Soviet totalitarian regime makes an image of Russia as a dangerous state or even “eternal enemy” and the leaders of the Russian minority are treated almost as the “fifth column”, which, at the moment, creates real obstacles for the development of civil society in Lithuania. In such a context Russians seem to be something like second class untrustworthy citizens.

Older generation of Russians is paying with the same coin. In the case of historical memory of Russians in Lithuania, we can speak about a rather new phenomenon – fetishisation of the Victory Day. Struggle against fascism and the victory over Nazism and fascism – it is a great thing. The victory over Hitler’s Germany on May 1, 1945, possibly, was “sacred” for the winners and for the released ones, the problem is, how we remember that day now, and why that event in contemporary Lithuania is becoming a dissonant factor for different groups of people. Naturally, it is difficult to agree with those who

claim that Russians of Lithuania have become passive objects of the political propaganda of Kremlin, and their feelings are not entirely sincere. That question is much more complicated. Obviously, we are dealing with the reaction of Russians to the gradual distrust of Lithuania concerning Russia and the multiple focuses on the Soviet occupation. The majority of Russians (and not only them) became importunate after the attempts to settle accounts with Russia and to demonstrate the wounds of Lithuanians, their deep cultural trauma caused by the Soviet totalitarian regime.

Moreover, celebration of the Victory Day became bright and unifying as any other symbolic part of the identity of Russians of Lithuania. In such a case, we find an attempt to overcome one psychological complex of Russians of Lithuania and the Baltic States, as a whole – “complex of the occupier”. Thus, in my opinion, the problem is not that local Russians wish to remember the victory on May 9, according to Russia’s model of 2000-s, but that Victory Day is ranked as a “sacred” value, which cannot be compared to democracy, common sense and, even if it sounds strange, to humanness as it smoothes or simply does not let us notice the tragedy of the three Baltic States in 1940-s. Although, nowadays, the Victory Day is always celebrated. The complex of “the occupier” is being compensated by the image of “the winner”.

WHAT ARE RESULTS OF ADAPTATION OF THE RUSSIAN MINORITY IN LITHUANIA AFTER 20 YEARS?

In my opinion, it is not so easy to give a definite answer to this question. In general, we have to say that situation of minorities in the official and public discourse, as well as in academic sphere of Lithuania it is not given enough attention, as it is done in Latvia or Estonia.

First pessimistic answer would be the following one (in my understanding, it has some justification): as a result of the successful enough political integration/ civil assimilation of Russians in Lithuanian society and significant diminution of their numbers, the Russian minority in the country is facing difficult challenges and hard problems of social and cultural adaptation. Thus, the small and dispersed Russian minority in Lithuania, where the strong categorical nationalism still exists, distrusts Russia and has double feelings towards Russians who are connected with the official rhetoric of protection of minorities’ rights. The Russian minority in Lithuania gradually retreats to the margins of public life and its future does not seem very happy, if not unattractive.

According to sociological research at the beginning of 2000-s, there were two bright tendencies in the process of adaptation of Russians in Lithuania – integration and assimilation, although, marginalization, and less pronounced segregation were also noticeable (Kasatkina, Leoncikas 2003, p. 125–188, 199–207). Nonetheless, assimilation of Russians in Lithuania is not the result of ethnic politics; it is soft enough, although, we can notice nationalistic signs. It is the outcome of adaptation of Russians, following the systemic integration. It was facilitated by intermarriage, preference for Lithuanian schools; it may be explained by the idea, that the future of being a Lithuanian offers better carrier opportunities in Lithuania. What is more, the process of adaptation of Russians has been taking place during all the 20th century, as we can notice in the case of Russian Old Believers or other old habitats. The number of Russian Old Believers in Lithuania decreased by 50% or even more after 1945 (Potashenko 2005, p. 372–377).

Another important factor and result of assimilation – sharp decrease of Russian schools and pupils, Lithuanization of the teaching content. Number of Russian schools decreased more than twice during 20 years: from 85 in 1996 till 33 in 2009. Even faster rate of decrease of pupils: if in 1996 there were 52 thousands, so in 2009 – 17634 (see: Lietuvos švietimas skaičiais. Bendrasis lavinimas 2010; Lietuvos švietimas. Tik faktai 2010; The Russian Language in Lithuania). At the moment in some cities (Panevezhys, Kedainiai) Russians are left without schools at all.

All these events happened in the context of massive repatriation or emigration of Russians at the beginning of 1990-s, firstly to Russia (approximately 60 thousand or 20 percent of Russians departed), then, their emigration to the Western Europe, the USA and Russia in 2000-s (approximately 60 thousand or almost 25 percent of Russians departed; see: Gyventojų skaičius metų 2010 m. pradžioje).

Second conclusion is more optimistic, thus, it means, more idealistic one: contemporary problems are problems of the growth. Moreover, political integration of Russians and other minorities (as it is a process as well), the difficult and ambiguous process of social integration of norms and principles, which express the conception and understanding of a legal state, democracy and civil society, is taking place in Lithuania. Concerning the terms of cultural pluralism and tolerance of minorities in Lithuania and the European Union, Russians will find a worthy place in Lithuanian society.

Social integration of Russians remains a poorly expressed tendency, but two factors should be considered – both are not very favourable for inte-

gration – obvious decrease of Russian population and Russian schools in Lithuania, as well as (it may sound paradoxical for a Russian), depreciation of the status of the Russian culture in Lithuanian society, although the great Russian culture is appreciated enough in Lithuania. However, an important condition and impulse for the integration is the presence of local Russians and Russian media, still widespread existence of the Russian language in Lithuania³ and development of Lithuanian – Russian cultural relations, desirable in the context of improvement of good relations between Lithuania and Russia (Hogan-Brun, Ozolins, Ramoniene, Rannut 2009, p. 112).

The level of growth in the cultural field and social success is impossible without systemic integration or structural assimilation⁴ that means entry to the social body. As soon as systemic integration occurs, all other types of adaptation (in such way the social theories inform us) will naturally follow it.

Sociologists admit that it is difficult to measure precisely the level of social integration of ethnic groups, as it is much easier to tell what is wrong. General sociological outcome of 2005 was as follows: inequity of social resources leads to differentiation of relations between ethnic groups, which may be seen in the context of discrimination (Beresnevičiute 2005, p. 112–116). Otherwise, the comparatively high percentage of the unemployed among Russians, absence of Russians in higher echelons of authorities etc., may be considered as a less formal or a non-institutionalized way of discrimination. The formal act of civil assimilation was issued at the beginning of 1990-s, but, in reality, numbers of Russians in the political and social elite of Lithuania is very small and do not respond to the percentage of them in the Lithuanian society – nowadays (2010) the population consists of 4.8 percent of Russians (161.7 thousand Russians; see: *Gyventojų skaičius 2010 metų pradžioje. Požymiai: tautybė*), and not even one Russian is represented in the Sejm. By the way, in 1990-s in the Constituent Sejm there were 19 non-Lithuanian deputies (15 percent), 9 Russians among them.

Furthermore, the tendency to implement the mono-ethnic entities is noticeable in the society (it consists of social or non-governmental organizations and private enterprises), which also induces limiting of positive integration in the social context (Kasatkina, Leoncikas 2003, p. 199–207; Beresnevičiute 2005, p. 112–116).

That means, it is not only naturalization of citizenship for Russians of Lithuania, lack of their activity, or lack of civil consciousness of Russians, that is important as well. More sophisticated situations of social interaction of ethnic groups in the context of systemic assimilation should be taken into

account. Moreover, it is taking place in a national state which has its particular character. Lithuanians compose the significant majority (more than 83 percent of the population; Gyventojų skaičius 2010 metų pradžioje). It leaves the impression of homogeneous social atmosphere, where ethnicity becomes a condition and, at the same time, an invisible category, first of all, in the public and less in the private or the non-governmental sector. Despite the rhetoric of a democratic state and its commitment to social justice, adherence to mono-ethnic society still clearly dominates in Lithuania.

Social inequity has ethnic dimension in the seemingly prosperous Lithuania, where all citizens are formally equal and where comparatively soft politics on relations of national minorities is being implemented, except for some cases like the relations with local Poles (i.e. question about bi-lingual signs in the streets). Furthermore, and it is very important to underline – social rights of minorities and cases of discrimination or ethnic intolerance in different spheres of contemporary life in Lithuania are considered to be a private matter, instead of a menacing problem, which has real influence on the process of integration of the society.

Finally, we have arrived to the question about cultural adaptation of Russians. Firstly, transformation of their identity appears. After the collapse of the Soviet Union not only civil assimilation of Russians of Lithuania occurred, but also important changes of their cultural identity. It appeared as evident ethnization / russification, modernization and partial, but not complete de-sovietisation of identity. The stratified approach to identity allows us to speak about four forms of identity of Russians in Lithuania: 1) conservative and especially ethnical; 2) more open and transparent ethnical elements of civil identity; 3) archaic, ethnical with Soviet and/ or imperial elements; and 4) post-modern, cosmopolitan.

These four forms of the Russian identity are characterized by various styles of social behaviour, in particular, different manifestations of Lithuanian citizenship and different attitudes towards the concept of civil society. More open and post-modern identity (2 and 4) may demonstrate not only a stronger position than the multinational Lithuanian culture and show great civil activity in the Lithuanian society, but also be placed in the frames of ideals of the civil society. More open and clear ethnic identity – an example of many leaders and activist of Russian organizations and majority of Russian youth. At the same time, these identities appear to be more tolerant to assimilation. The impulse for assimilation comes from them.

Furthermore, the conservative ethnic identity will be closed in cultur-

al and religious interests of its minority. Folklorization of minority identity and/or underlying important relations between religion and ethnicity comes from the conservative attitude. Such an approach explains the myth about Russian Old Believers as loyal citizens of Lithuania, which is basically true. Otherwise, exposing them as a good example for all Russians of Lithuania means lack of consideration for their traditional conservatism and prudence concerning innovations and modernization.

From the archaic ethnical identity we may expect expressive nostalgia for the Great Russia and the “eternal” unity of three East Slavic nations (today we can say – Russian-speaking nations), as well as non-critical attitude towards the Soviet system and confrontation because of almost historical memories.

In conclusion, we may say, that Russians of Lithuania still possess all different forms of identity. Lithuania for them is a laboratory for their different forms of identity.

NOTES

- 1 See, for example: Venclova 2010, p. 18–21. He wrote about the categorical nationalism as a feature of consciousness of Lithuanians in 1994: Venclova 1994, p. 17; Donskis 1994, p. 54–56; Valantiejus 1994, p. 148–149.
- 2 Sides of the Second World War and its results for the Baltic States – losing their statehood and Stalinist mass repressions.
- 3 According to 2001 census, two thirds of Lithuanians and three quarters of Poles use Russian as their second language. English as a second language, in general, is in the second place: 16.9 % of population use English.
- 4 Structural assimilation is a massive entry to the acceptance of the primary groups of the society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beresnevičiute, V. (2005) *Etninių grupių socialinės integracijos dimensijos šiuolaikinėje Lietuvos visuomenėje*. Vilnius.

Donskis, L. (1994) “Kalbos įkalinta kultūra.” *Metmenys. Kūryba ir analizė*, Nr. 67: 51–75.

„Gyventojų skaičius 2010 metų pradžioje. Požymiai: tautybė.“ <http://db1.stat.gov.lt/statbank/selectvarval/saveselections.asp?MainTable> (2010.09.07-10)

Hogan-Brun, G., Ozolins, U., Ramonienė, M., Rannut, M. (2009) *Language Politics and Practices in the Baltic States*. Tallinn.

Kasatkina, N., Leonchikas, T. (2003) *Lietuvos etninių grupių adaptacija: kontekstas ir eiga*. Vilnius: Eugrimas.

Kuolys, D. (2005) "Tautinės mažumos ir pilietinė visuomenė šiuolaikinėje Lietuvoje" [report at the International Conference on "Weakest Minorities: Reconstructing Europe of Local Cultures" in Vilnius University, May 13-14, 2005]

Laurenas, V. (2003) „Pilietinės visuomenės dilemos Lietuvoje.“ *Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmas*, Nr.1:5–22.

Laurenas, V. (2006) "Pilietinės visuomenės diskursas Lietuvoje." In: Grigas, R., ed. *Tautiškas ir pilietiškas. Atskirtis ar dermė*. Vilnius: Vilniaus pedagoginio universiteto leidykla. Pp. 85–109.

Lietuvos tauta: būklė ir raidos perspektyvos (2007). Vilnius: Pilietinės visuomenės.

Lietuvos švietimas skaičiais. Bendrasis lavinimas. Vilnius, 2010 // http://www.smm.lt/svietimo_bukle/docs/apzvalgos/Bendrasis%20lavinimas_2010.pdf

Lietuvos švietimas. Tik faktai. Metinis pranešimas 2010 m. Vilnius, 2010 // http://www.smm.lt/svietimo_bukle/docs/apzvalgos/Lietuvos%20svietimas%202010.pdf (2010.09.07)

Narbutt, M. (2010) „Lietuvių ir lenkų brolybės nebeliko nė pėdsako.“ <http://www.lrytas.lt/-12883459471288...C4%97dsako.htm> (2010.09.05)

Neatrasta galia. Lietuvos pilietinės visuomenės žemėlapis: kolektyvinė monografija (2006). Vilnius: Versus aureus.

“Pavogta demokratija” (2010). *IQ*, spalio (07): 26–29.

Potashenko, G. (2008) *Multinational Lithuania: History of Ethnic Minorities*. Kaunas: Šviesa.

Seligman, B. Adam (1992) *The Idea of Civil Society*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Shiliauskas, S., ed. (2006) *Pilietinė visuomenė: politikos įpildinimo projekcijos. Kolektyvinė monografija*. Klaipėda: Klaipėdos universiteto leidykla.

Shutiniene, I. (2004) „Lietuvių ir tautinių mažumų europinio identiteto paieškos.“ In: *Etniškumo studijos 2004. Europos integracijos suvokimai*. Vilnius. Pp. 21–32.

Valantiejus, A. (1994) Modernus lietuvių nacionalizmas: II.” *Metmenys. Kūryba ir analizė*, Nr. 67: 137–160.

Venclova, T. (2010) “Aš dūstu”. *IQ*, liepa (4): 18–21.

Venclova, T. (1994) “Penktieji laisvės metai.” *Metmenys. Kūryba ir analizė*. Nr. 67:14–40.

„Vilniaus rajono valdžia nenukabina nelietuviškų gatvių pavadinimų.“ <http://www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/vilniaus-rajono-valdzia-nenukabina-nelietuvisku-gatviu-pavadinimu.d?id=20833620> (2010.09.05)

Геллнер, Э. (1995) *Условия свободы. Гражданское общество и его исторические соперники*. Москва.

Касаткина, Н. (2007) „Русские в современной Литве: меньшинство, диаспора или часть гражданского общества.“ In: *Etniškumo studijos*, 2007/2: Baltijos regiono rusai: mažuma ir valstybė / Русские в странах Балтийского региона: меньшинство и государство. Vilnius, Pp. 18–40.

Поташенко, Г. (2005) “Староверие в Литве.” In: **Барановский, В.**, Поташенко, Г., *Староверие Балтии и Польши: краткий исторический и биографический словарь*. Вильнюс, **Aidai**. Pp. 372–377.

„Русский язык в Литве.“ <http://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/> (2010.09.05)

Фреюте-Ракаускене, М. (2007) „Неправительственные организации русских Литвы: основные социальные характеристики.“ In: *Etniškumo studijos*, 2007/2: Baltijos regiono rusai: mažuma ir valstybė / Русские в странах Балтийского региона: меньшинство и государство. Vilnius. Pp. 93–115.

Frejute-Rakauskene, M. (2007) “Russian NGOs in Lithuania: Main Social Characteristics.” In: *Etniškumo studijos*, 2007/2: Baltijos regiono rusai: mažuma ir valstybė / Russians in the Baltic Countries: Minorities and the State. Vilnius. Pp. 93–115.

Olga Popova

**POLITICAL SCIENCE IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION:
SCIENTIFIC RESEARCHES ON RUSSIAN-SPEAKING
MINORITIES IN THE BALTIC STATES**

This article gives detailed analysis of five basic stages of development of the Russian political science researches works on the rights of the Russian-speaking minority living outside the Russian Federation. The author displays asynchrony of the development of foreign policy of the Russian Federation concerning the Baltic States and actualization of the theme of ethnic minorities in the countries of the former Soviet Union.

This article also offers the typology of the Russian research centers which are engaged in this work. Work of structural divisions of the Russian Academy of Sciences, analytical structures at classical universities, formally independent non-commercial research centers, actively supported by the state structures of the Russian Federation, as well as work of independent analytical centers existing mainly at the expense of Western grants, activity of which is connected with projects on ethnic minorities in the Baltic states, is analyzed.

Key words: Russian political science, ethno-political science, ethnosociology, Russian-speaking minority, equality of rights, national policy of the state.

Olga Popova,

PhD, Professor of Political Sciences, Head of the Department of Political Institutions and Applied Political Studies of the Faculty of Political Science, St. Petersburg State University, editor of scientific journal «Political Expertise: POLITEKS»

Analysis of ethnopolitical processes in the post-Soviet space is objectively, exclusively significant for the modern political science in Russia. The purpose of the article is to review the basic directions of research works, within the limits of the Russian political science, political position of the Russian-speaking minority in the Baltic States after 1991; to designate the spectrum of centers, projects, publications, and also development of the ideas connected with position of the Russian-speaking minority in these states, reflecting the knowledge of political science as much as possible. We deliberately refuse to discuss the degree of politicization of the position of the native authors and estimation of quality of theoretical research on the given theme.

First of all, it is necessary to point out the interdisciplinary character of political science research works devoted to problems of Russian-speaking minority in the Baltic States. They are political not only in connection with policies of their own states, other countries (Russia) or supranational organizations (EU).

In fact, all researches carried out on the subject, combine visions and strategies for several scientific disciplines: political science (where the ethnopolitology, ethnic identity, international relations theory, civil rights, political regimes are of special significance), political sociology, political psychology and political anthropology. Integrated and interdisciplinary approaches to the conceptualization of the theme of ethnic minorities are applied. The most interesting political science studies of Russian-speaking scientists outside Russia are held at the Russian Academy of Sciences by researchers who are status-related to ethnology, ethnography, sociology.

Indirect evidence of the dominating interdisciplinary nature of the research is the fact that among a considerable amount of scientific publications on political science during the last 13 years, only 4 defended master's theses (in 1997, 2004, 2008 and 2009) have been on the Russian-speaking minorities in the Baltic states (Гнедкова 1997; Селиванов 2004; Сазонова 2008; Ризванова 2009).

It is important to note that Russian scientists' wave of interest in this subject does not completely coincide with periods of changes in Russian policy regarding these states. It is impossible to assert that the interest of political scientists in these subjects is a simple consequence of actualization of interstate policy. If we talk about the nature of modern Russia's foreign policy regarding the Baltic states, it is possible to allocate 5 periods:

a) 1990-1993; period of extremely little attention to these states because

of economic and social plight in Russia, when the Russian Federation had lost the majority in its positions in these countries;

b) 1993-1995; the period of comprehension of losses, real intensive development of mutually beneficial economic contacts with extremely sharp, rude, loud political statements about the possible return of the Baltic states into the sphere of influence of the Russian Federation;

c) 1995-2003 (Till the entry of the Baltic states into the EU), the attempt to hold differentiated, even get-tough policies against the three independent Baltic states, in some cases, with the use of economic sanctions and noisy political media campaigns;

d) 2003-2007; the period of intensive wavy change of contacts' character with Latvia and Estonia (concerning the first state as a whole, a general tendency of improvement was observed, concerning the second, on the contrary, — sharp deterioration); relations with Lithuania during this period can be characterized as neutrally alienated (Карабешкин 2004, p.208); since 2008 until present; general decrease in intensity of political contacts of the Russian Federation and the Baltic states; character of relations is defined, first of all, by economic safety of the Russian Federation and general humanitarian, cultural interest in our compatriots.

Three stages of development of the topics on the exclave ethnic minority in the domestic political science literature are clearly traced:

1. The beginning — the end of 1990-s. The basic research direction performs the role of Russian national policy and international organizations in the field of national minorities' rights. (Абдулатипов 2001; Абашидзе, Ананидзе 1997; Абашидзе 1996; Глотов 1999; Дробижева 1996; Калинина 1993; Полоскова 1998; Сикевич 1996; Тишков 1993). Development of processes of *ethnocratization* in the Baltic republics are stressed (Проблемы становления... 1998). As a whole, all analysts converge in belief that the Russian Federation's national policy should stretch over all post-Soviet territories (Ломагин 2002, p. 65–85). Besides, questions of adaptation of ethnic minorities, features of transformation of the ethnic identity, reasons for conflicts in these processes are actively discussed (Здравомыслов 1996; Тишков 1996; Станчинский 1994). Necessity to pass from ethnic nationalism to the general civil identity model is actually postulated.

2. The beginning 2000 – 2007. Discussion between researchers describing Russian-speaking minority as diaspora (Арутюнов 2000; Аствацатурова 2010; Зайцева 2006, p. 38–45; Зимовец 2006, p. 64–65; Крупнов 1998;

Лебедева 1995; Полоскова 1999; Попков 2003; Сидоренко 2005; Тишков 2003, p. 160–183; Тощенко, Чаптыкова 1996), and those considering them an immigrant type of minority, national minority¹, ethnic minority, new subethnos “EuroRussians”, Russian linguistic minority (Градировский 2000, p. 40–58), just Russian-speaking citizens² (Sazonov 2007, p. 64, 66) which are united not on the basis of the general model of identity, but on the basis of generality of traditions and coincidence of many meaning-of-life values, is actively carried on.

Some researchers suggest distinguishing only the formed proto-diasporas (in consciousness of these people such concepts as the Fatherland and the Native land coincide (it is the Russian Federation)) and enclaves — «the Russian Islands» (for their representatives the Native land is a region of present dwelling, the small native land, and the Fatherland — Russia (strictly speaking), the image of which is not always identical to the Russian Federation) (Градировский, 2000, p. 40–58).

In the scientific literature Russian-speaking minority is treated as integrated into the host country, and, therefore, acquiring new identity. Unlike this community, the “diaspora” (group in dispersion) psychologically gravitates towards the historical native land (Сафонова 2007, p. 69). It is declared that for Russians there is only one way — integration, both, into Latvian society, and into the new all-European space at the same time.

We have researched both models – model of the policy of identification conducted by authorities as well as self-identification of the Russian-speaking population on the post-Soviet territory (Хотинец 2000). Russian researchers analyze features of personal self-identification of representatives of Russian-speaking minority and treat intercultural dialogue in this case as functioning of consciousness in abnormal (“pathological”) conditions connected with the contrast between consciousness images, thinking stereotypes and behavior of different ethnic groups. Discrepancy of communicative behavior stereotypes and linguistic features of communicants causes mutual misunderstanding and leads to interpersonal and interethnic conflicts.

The works devoted to efficiency of mechanisms of psychological and sociocultural adaptation of the Russian-speaking population in a situation of legal and economic inequality have been published (Симонян 2004, p. 98–105; Симонян 1997, p. 54–61; Симонян, Кочегарова 2003, p. 78–86; Симонян 2005, p. 101–116; Симонян 2007, p. 50–73; Симонян 2003, p. 59–66; Тишков 2007). On the basis of empirical data the researchers prove

the presence of specific features of economic, social and political position of ethnic communities due to clear differentiation on the ethnic grounds. Russian-speaking communities and representatives of the title nations have different representation in political and social processes of the state. Because of poor knowledge of the state language the Russian-speaking citizens cannot be competitive in the labor market, and, because of the specific legal status cannot fully participate in political life of the country that, in turn, strengthens their feeling of alienation and being discharged from the society and the state power. One of the consequences is formation of actually isolated community and information field (see, for example: Зайцева 2006, p. 38–45).

There are fundamental works devoted to general questions of construction of civil society and formation of democratic tendencies in multiethnic societies (Дробижева 2003; Пивоваров 2008; Маргания 2007).

3. 2008 – 2010. The key topic remaining until today is the topic of intergroup perception and intergroup relations (Иванова, Лебедева, Штроо 2009). For example, comparative empirical researches prove that, from the point of view of the system, political values and attitudes of Russians and Russian-speaking inhabitants of Latvia are similar (see also: Руднев 2009)³. It is necessary to notice that the theme on the situation of Russian-speaking population rises mainly in periodicals⁴. Not only the subject-status level of discussion of this problem is decreasing, but also its subjects have narrowed. At the moment, the nature of the apparent defects of Russian publications describing position of the Russian-speaking minority in the Baltic states are frequently politicized in articles and non-fiction works.

The importance and status of the language (Катунин 2009) and its role in preserving the uniqueness of the Russian minority (Фоменко 2008, p. 30–51) are widely emphasized. For example, in 2007 Sociological service “Zircon” conducted a survey on the degree of knowledge and features of usage of the Russian language in the former USSR republics ordered by two organizations: «The Eurasian Monitor» and «The Heritage of Eurasia». The research «Russians in the Newly Independent States» is actually the first attempt of a Russian non-governmental organization with off-budget means to audit condition of the Russian language in the newly independent states. Results have shown sharp intergenerational rupture of knowledge of the Russian language. If in Latvia 59%, Estonia – 39%, in Lithuania – 24% of respondents admitted that they speak Russian absolutely freely, then, for the next generation, their children, rates declined sharply (34%, 24% , 6%,

respectively).

Analysts suggest Russia to try to influence governments of the Baltic states; continue to raise the issue of official bilingualism. If equilibrium of status for the Russian language is accepted, then Russia, according to these recommendations, should maintain two forms of self-determination of culturally distinct minority: an ethno-territorial form through federalization of series of post-Soviet states with homogeneous areas of residence of Russians, or an ex-territorial form through the establishment of national-cultural autonomy. It is proposed to form international public opinion on responsibility of the states with Russian-speaking population, to ensure the status and support of the Russian language. Russia should protect this category of population in the neighboring states, where such a category is defined as compatriots. Protection of language rights and minority rights is one of the international obligations of Russia.

Thus, there are the following crosscutting themes in Russia's political science related to the situation of Russian-speaking minority in the Baltic states:

- a) human and civil rights, estimation of the character of political mode in the context of refusal to define it as democratic because of discrimination of Russian-speaking minority;
- b) the range of possible actions of national minorities in the context of the rights to national self-determination;
- c) ethnic identity of Russian-speakers in a multicultural society outside the Russian Federation;
- d) evaluation of the influence of RF on the internal policy of the Baltic states in the context of confrontation of interests of three modern "power centers" – The United States, the Russian Federation, the European Union.

It should be emphasized that in The Russian Federation the work on ethnic minorities' problems is focused not only on analysis and publishing. Problems connected with preserving the rights of Russian-speaking diaspora in the Baltic states are reflected in the following training courses, formally entering into the State Standard for university students: for sociologists – «Ethnosociology», for students of political sciences – «Ethnopolitology», «Geopolitics», and «International Relations and Foreign Policy of Russia».

Governmental programs for support of compatriots living abroad are being actively implemented (from 2002 till 2004 in Moscow (Международный опыт защиты... 2002) and from 2008 till 2010 in St.

Petersburg). Analysts have pointed out that projects on the development of relations among selected regions of the Russian Federation and the Baltic states in 2000-s have shown indirect consequence – improvement of life for Russian-speaking diaspora (see, for example: Региональное измерение российско-балтийских отношений 2004). Web-based projects are launched to influence public opinion, such as “Russian Archipelago” – a network project of the “Russian World” (http://www.archipelag.ru/ru_mir/). There are regular seminars, round tables and conferences, which along with scientists involve representatives of highest level authorities (State Duma and the Federation Council deputies, members of the Public Chamber of Commerce) and media⁶.

With regard to political scientists’ manifestation of interest about the position of Russian-speaking population of the Baltic States, here, in our opinion, the situation is determined by three main formal circumstances:

a) scientific interest of individual researchers about ethnic identity theories, civil and national minorities’ rights, to peculiarities of foreign policy of Russia;

b) profile of the approved long-term scientific research topics of structural units;

c) availability of financial support from grantors, i. e., the interest in the topic of foreign funds, supranational institutions⁷ and public authorities in the Russian Federation. Quite logically, these factors lead us to another phenomenon — numerous research centers of different types.

Institutionalization of the study on Russian-speaking minorities’ position in neighboring countries is sufficiently high. Nowadays, in Russia there are several research centers actively analyzing the situation of the Russian-speaking population in the neighboring Baltic states. They can be divided into 4 groups in terms of formal membership status, nature and characteristics of scientific production: first, structural units of the Russian Academy of Sciences (the most important, we believe, the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, Institute of Europe, Institute of Sociology, IMEMO (The Institute of World Economy and International Relations)), and, secondly, the analytical framework, working at classical universities (e.g., Department of Political Science at Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO)), Faculty of Political Science and Faculty of International Relations, St. Petersburg State University), and, thirdly, formally independent non-profit research centers with good governmental support in Russia (for instance, the Institute of CIS (the Institute of Diaspora and Integration)),

and, fourthly, independent analytical centers mainly subsidized by Western grants (e.g., Carnegie Moscow Center).

Analysis of scientific publications shows that, at present, the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Григорьева 2009; Устинова 2009; Рыжакова, Завьялова 2008; Тишков, Филиппова 2004 (2005), Тишков, Филиппова 2005 (2006), Тишков, Филиппова 2006 (2007), Тишков, Степанов 2007 (2008); Филиппова, Ле Коадик (2005); Тишков 2005; Толерантность в межкультурном диалоге 2005; Филиппова, Ле Коадик 2005; Губогло 2004; Тишков, Филиппова 2003 (2004); Тишков 2001) is the most effective, the structure of which contains the Ethnosociological Research Group (Yu. V. Arutyunyan, M. N. Guboglo) and the Center of Ethnopolitical Research Group (V. A. Tishkov). Since 2004 the institute has been preparing and publishing annual reports “Ethnic Situation and Conflicts in the CIS and the Baltic States” within the program “The Network of Ethnological Monitoring and Early Warning”. Since 1990 a series of “Studies in Applied and Emergency Ethnology” has been published by the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology (six projects on the topic were implemented during this period)⁸.

Though the strategic plan of the Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences is focused on researching different processes within the Russian Federation, there is a structure connected directly with studies of the topic of interest — the Center of Research of International Relations (headed by L. M. Drobizeva) a sub-structure of which is the Russian-Baltic Center (headed by R. H. Simonyan) (Симонян, Кочегарова 2001; Симонян 2005).

The Center of Comparative Social, Economic and Sociopolitical Research is opened at IMEMO (the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Russian Academy of Sciences). In its structure there is a Group dealing with problems of political sociology the researches of which are devoted to theoretical sociological problems of transition from authoritarianism to democracy, and also to the comparative analysis of trends of development of political culture and mass consciousness in the Western countries, Japan and Russia (headed by V. I. Pantin). The project called “National Interests of Russia, Formation and Realization of its Foreign Policy and Security Policy” is one of the most interesting (the direction of “Russia and the Post-Soviet Territory”). A monthly journal “Economics and Politics of Russia and the CIS” was published by IMEMO from 1993 until 2008. This journal covered all major issues and events of internal po-

litical and economic life of the CIS and the Baltic States, although, the ethnic minorities' problems were not specifically described.

The Institute of Europe at the Russian Academy of Sciences publishes the quarterly magazine "Modern Europe". Its structure includes the Department of Eastern European Researches (including the Baltic Region assigned) and the Sector of Ethno-political and International conflicts. The following projects: "Russia in the Variety of Civilizations" (2007), "Study of Nationalism in Europe and Eurasia: New Aspects" (2004) and "Post-Soviet States in Europe of the 21st Century" (1999) may be noted as the most significant. Same as IMEMO, the Institute of Europe at the Russian Academy of Sciences presents all the estimates through the prism of implementation of public interest of modern Russia.

The Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO (U) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation), is an educational institution, nevertheless, it has the Institute of International Researches in its structure. As part of this institute, the Center for Post-Soviet Studies (CPSS), which traditionally deals with complex interdisciplinary study of issues and trends in the former Soviet Union and the Center for the Nordic and Baltic Studies, established in 2008 within the framework of the Scientific Coordinating Council on Foreign Studies to do research on economics, politics, history, culture, international relations and language policy in the Nordic and Baltic countries. In addition, "Policy Briefs of the Institute of International Studies" are published by MGIMO.

At St. Petersburg State University (SPSU), the Faculty of International Relations, the Department for European Studies and Information Center of the EU are actively working. Head of the Department of International Political Relations of SPSU V. A. Achkasov deals with problems of ethnic identification of different groups within ethnopolitology (Ачкасов, Бабаев 2000; Ачкасов 2005; Ачкасов, Мутагиров 2007; Ачкасов, Мутагиров 2008).

Institute of CIS Countries (Institute for Diaspora and Integration) is an autonomous non-profit organization established in 1996 by K. F. Zatulin. The Institute is focused on implementation of Russian interests in the former USSR, which involves studying political processes in the former Soviet republics, forecasting their internal and external policies, developing models of economic, political, military and cultural integration. Human rights activities, support for the Russian language, collecting objective information on the situation of Russian-speaking citizens in the neighboring countries, keeping contacts with the Russian diaspora and emigration abroad,

monitoring ethno-social and militarily-political conflicts in the former USSR and working out recommendations for their resolution and prevention are declared to be the most important areas of work.

Some interesting analytical projects are taking place at the institute, such as information analysis of activities of civilian communities in the Republic of Latvia, presenting interests of the Russian-speaking community (project of 2004). From the year 2000 analytical bulletin "CIS Countries. Russians and Russian-speakers in the Newly Established Foreign Countries" is being published where political events are discussed and interviews are published, associated with the problems of Russian-speaking population of the Baltic States. In fact, the discussion concerns 3 main themes: preservation of the cultural identity of Russian-speakers, implementation of norms and civil rights for national minorities and efforts to change the language policy.

In this case, it is more likely a question of forming an ideal image of solving problems of the Russian-speaking population in the Baltic States, than scientific analytics. For example, the head of the Institute K. F. Zatulin constantly makes analytical statements underlining that position of the Russian diaspora is directly defined by the policy of the state of their residence. In particular, he speaks about open course of Latvian authorities concerning assimilation of compatriots, shown, both, by a number of laws and by governmental programs (for example, "Integration of Society in Latvia").

At the turn of the years 1990 and 2000 the Carnegie Center showed certain interest in the subject of the Russian-speaking population outside Russia (Михеев 1998), following the liberal tradition, i.e., condemning the ongoing foreign policy of the Russian Federation on the basis of its characteristics as "neo-imperial impasse". Experts of the Carnegie Center in the early 2000 analyzed situations in the context of ethnic conflicts (Брилл Олкотт, Семенов 2001). **They have collaborated with scientists from RAS** (mostly philosophers and sociologists). In the center of attention was analysis of legal norms, as well as forms of symbolic violence and lawlessness experienced by Russian-speaking minorities, manifested in political dis-course of citizens and politicians.

With all the variety of activities of research centers there are 3 themes appearing in the projects regularly.

Firstly, for nearly 20 years a significant scientific object in Political Studies has been: development of civil society and formation of political systems directly related to the democratic regime with the rights and freedoms guaranteed regardless of ethnicity, religion, etc., that is not always

practiced in the former Soviet republics. In this regard, the example of the three Baltic states, which are very successfully integrated into the European Community has been especially actively discussed. And, although, according to experts of various independent international organizations, such as Freedom House, the Baltic states definitely fall into the category of democratic regimes, many Russian analysts call these estimates into question by focusing on violations of the rights of the Russian-speaking minorities (Гордиенко 2008, p. 82).

The key motive is discussion about the ethnocentric nature of political regime in the Baltic States by most Russian analysts. The purpose of the states' policy is to achieve absolute domination of the titular nation in political, socio-economic and cultural-linguistic areas, despite the fact that the non-titular nations form a substantial group of people in these countries. The policy of the states is focused on formation of mono-ethnicity, which is defined as "expropriation of rights" of other ethnic groups, with subsequent redistribution in favor of the single ethnic group ".

Secondly, analysts have been actively discussing a possible change in the nature of inter-ethnic conflicts in the region. Although, the society has been divided into "us" and "them" since the collapse of the Soviet Union, the inter-ethnic conflict has mostly existed in the latent phase. For example, collision of the Russian-speaking population with police during demonstrations against transferring the monument to soldiers-liberators of the Great Patriotic War was interpreted by many as an obvious possibility of the conflict's transition into the open phase. The theme of potential conflict as a result of interaction between state authorities and one of the groups appears in this context.

Thirdly, such issues as formation of newly independent republics in the Baltic region and their role in relations between Russia and the European Union are mainstreamed in scientific discussions. The problem of the Russian-speaking population in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, is still considered one of the major problems of domestic and foreign policies of these republics as well as significant aspect of Russian foreign policy.

NOTES

- 1 PACE Recommendation № 1201 as most important criteria that form the national minority, refer to the following: a) accommodation in the state and possession of a status are essential for its citizens, and b) preservation of long-

lasting ties with this state, and c) the presence of particular ethnic, cultural, religious or linguistic characteristics d) a significant amount, though less than the number of the remaining population of the state, and e) interest in the joint preservation of what constitutes their common identity, including their culture, traditions, religion or language. The category of “non-citizens” in this case excludes a significant part of Russian residents of Latvia from the category of “national minority”.

- 2 It is noticed that Russian and Russian-speaking inhabitants are crossed categories, but do not coincide completely, and in the early nineties there was a change of hierarchy of linguistic groups.
- 3 The Report of V. S. Magun and M. G. Rudnev made at the joint seminar of the Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences and The Higher School of Economics (HSE) on December, 4th, 2008.
- 4 See publications in liberal weeklies “Kommersant-Vlast” and “Russian Newsweek”. In October, 2010 publishing “Russian Newsweek” has been stopped in the Russian Federation.
- 5 Position of V. A. Tishkov (director of the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology at the Russian Academy of Sciences). Stated in the report of the Institute of Ethnology and Ethnography at the Russian Academy of Sciences in 2008.
- 6 For example: “Round Table” in 2007 conducted by scientists from the Higher School of Economics (HSE) where the chairman of the Expert Council of The Federation Council Committee on the International Affairs M. V. Margelov took part; the conference “Is the Russian Language Needed in the Newly Independent States?”, February 29, 2008, Moscow; “Round Table” “Russian Information Space in the Countries of The Baltic Sea Region”, held in 2008 by the Committee on Foreign Relations of St. Petersburg City Government within the regional program implementing the state policy of the Russian Federation concerning compatriots abroad in 2008-2010; “Round Table” “Russian World as Civilization”, held in December 22, 2009.
- 7 For example, the research project «Experience of Ethnological Monitoring» under the supervision of V. A. Tishkov, funded by the EU in 2004.
- 8 The following reports on the researches connected with the Baltic states have been published in a series «Researches on Applied and Urgent Ethnology»: №21. Grigorieva R. A. Some Features of Ethno-cultural processes in Eastern Latvia (Latgale) (1991); № 52. Tishkov V. A. Russian as Minority (the Example of Estonia). (1993); № 121. Rizakova S. I. Dievturiba. Latvian Neo-paganism and Origins of Nationalism (1999); № 136. Rizakova S. I. Пomyba. Ethnic Religiosity in Lithuania (2000); № 166. Ustinova M. Ya. Civil Society in the Republic of Latvia (1980-ies. – Beginning of the XXI century) (2003); № 195. Ustinova M. Ya. The Republic of Latvia after Joining the European Union: New Challenges (2007).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Абашидзе, А. Х. (1996) *Защита прав меньшинств по международному и внутригосударственному праву*. Москва: Права человека.
- Абашидзе, А. Х., Ананидзе Ф. Р. (1997) *Правовой статус меньшинств и коренных народов. Международно-правовой анализ*. Москва.
- Абдулатипов, Р. Г. (2001) *Управление этнополитическими процессами: вопросы теории и практики*. Москва.
- Арутюнов, С. (2000) «Дiaspora – это процесс.» *Этнографическое обозрение*. №2.
- Аствацатурова, М. А. «Возможности и пределы толерантности диаспор (теоретический аспект).» http://ippk.edu.mhost.ru/elibrary/elibrary/uro/v6/a6_18.htm (2010.10.09.)
- Ачкасов, В. А. (2005) *Этнополитология : учебник для студентов вузов, обучающихся по специальности «Политология»*. Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во СПбГУ.
- Ачкасов, В. А., Бабаев, С. А. (2000) «*Мобилизованная этничность*»: этническое измерение политической культуры современной России. Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во С.-Петерб. филос. о-ва.
- Ачкасов, В.А., Мутагиров, Д.З. ed. (2007) *Ксенофобия и другие формы нетерпимости: природа, причины и пути устранения*. Международная научно-теоретическая конференция. Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во СПбГУ.
- Ачкасов, В.А., Мутагиров, Д.З. ed. (2008) *Ксенофобия в современном мире*. Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во СПбГУ.
- Брилл Олкотт, М., Семенов, И. ed. (2001) *Язык и этнический конфликт*. Моск. Центр Карнеги. Москва: Гендальф.
- Плотов, С. А. (1999) *Конституционно-правовые проблемы сотрудничества России и Совета Европы в области прав человека*. Саратов.
- Гнедкова, И. И. (1997) *Проблемы русских в Латвии и Эстонии: Этнополитический аспект*: Дис. ... канд. политол. наук: 23.00.02. Москва.
- Гордиенко, П. В. (2008) «Проблема «неграждан» в Латвии.» *Обозреватель – Observer*. №7.

Градировский, С. (2000) «Россия и постсоветские государства: искушение диаспоральной политикой.» *Диаспоры*. №.2-3: 40–58.

Григорьева, Р. А. (2009) «Становление и трансформация этнической идентичности славянских групп в Латгалии (Восточной Латвии).» In: Европейская интеграция и культурное многообразие. Ч. 1. Идентичность и миграции. Москва. Рр. 202–266.

Губогло, М. Н. (2004) *Концептуально-понятийное переоснащение этнической проблематики в научных исследованиях и политической практике*. Москва.

Дробижева, Л. М. (2003) *Социальные проблемы межнациональных отношений в постсоветской России*. Москва: Центр общечеловеческих ценностей.

Дробижева, Л. М. (1996) *Толерантность и рост этнического самосознания: пределы совместимости*. Москва.

Зайцева, Ю. Н. (2006) «Основные тенденции развития современной русской диаспоры в Латвии.» *Вестник СамГУ*. №. 10/1 (50): 38–45.

Здравомыслов, А. Г. (1996) *Межнациональные конфликты в постсоветском пространстве*. Москва: Аспект Пресс,

Зимовец, С. Н. (2006) «Диаспоры как передний край гуманитарных проблем современности.» *Внешнеэкономические связи*. Март. №. 1: 64–65.

Иванова, Н. Л., Лебедева, Н. М., Штроо, В. А. (2009) *Идентичность и организация в меняющемся мире: Сборник научных статей*. Москва: Издат. дом ГУ-ВШЭ.

Калинина, К. В. (1993) *Национальные меньшинства в Российской Федерации*. Москва.

Карабешкин, Л. А. ed. (2004) *Региональное измерение российско-балтийских отношений*. Санкт-Петербург.

Катунин, Д. А. (2009) «Государственный и официальный язык в конституциях стран бывшего СССР.» *Вестник Томского государственного университета. Серия «Филология»*. №. 4(8).

Крупнов, А. (1998) «Русская диаспора как форма этнонационального определения: Сетевой проект организации русской диаспоры.» *Современные диаспоры*. Москва.

- Лебедева, Н. (1995) *Новая русская диаспора: социально-психологический анализ*. Москва.
- Ломагин, Н. (2002) «Новые независимые государства как сфера интересов России и США.» *Pro et contra*. Т. 5. №. 2: 65–85.
- Маргания, О. ed. (2007) *СССР после распада*. Санкт-Петербург: Экономическая школа.
- Михеев, В. (1998) «Потенциал вражды потенциал сотрудничества.» *Pro et contra*. Т. 3. №. 2: 53–67.
- Мурадов, Г.Л. (2002) *Международный опыт защиты соотечественников за рубежом*. Москва: Дрофа
- Пивоваров, Е. И. (2008) *Постсоветское пространство. Альтернативы интеграции*. Санкт-Петербург: Алетейя.
- Полоскова, Т. В. (1999) *Современные диаспоры. Внутриполитические и международные аспекты*. Москва: Научная книга.
- Полоскова, Т. (1998) *Диаспоры в системе международных связей*. Москва.
- Попков, В. (2003) *Феномен этнических диаспор*. Москва.
- Ризванова, Л. З. (2009) *Государственная политика в отношении русскоязычного населения в Латвии, Литве и Эстонии*. Казань.
- Руднев, М. Г. (2009) «Влияние «русскоязычности» на жизненные ценности.» *Социология: методология, методы и математическое моделирование*. №. 28.
- Рыжакова, С. И., Завьялова, М. В. (2008) *Этнические образы и стереотипы: по результатам сравнительного исследования среди молодежи Латвии и Литвы (1999–2003)*. Москва: ИЭА РАН. №.
- Сазонова, Д. (2007) «Латвия: этнополитическая напряженность.» *Обозреватель – Observer*. №. 11.
- Сазонова, Д. П. (2008) *Этнополитический аспект в Российско–Латвийских отношениях на современном этапе*: Дис. ... канд. полит. наук: 23.00.02: Москва.
- Селиванов, А. В. (2004) *Государственная политика Российской Федерации в отношении соотечественников за рубежом (На примере русской диаспоры в Латвии)*: Дис. ... канд. полит. наук: 23.00.02: Москва.

- Сидоренко, И. (2001) *Социологический анализ положения российской диаспоры*. Москва.
- Сикевич, З. В. (1996) *Русские: «образ» народа*. Санкт-Петербург.
- Симонян, Р. Х. (2004) «Балтийские масс-медиа: динамика последнего десятилетия.» *Социологические исследования*. Nr. 2: 98–105.
- Симонян, Р. Х. (1997) «Бизнес по-русски и по-латышски.» *Социологические исследования*. Nr. 11: 54–61.
- Симонян, Р. Х. (2005) *Россия и страны Балтии*. Москва: Институт социологии РАН.
- Симонян, Р. Х. (2005) «Россияне в Балтии.» *Общественные науки и современность*. Nr. 2: 101–116.
- Симонян, Р. Х. (2007) «Сравнительный анализ экономических реформ в России и странах Балтии.» *Мир России*. Т. XVI. Nr. 3: 50–73.
- Симонян, Р. Х. (2003) «Страны Балтии: этносоциальные особенности и общие черты.» *Социологические исследования*. Nr. 1: 59–66.
- Симонян, Р. Х., Кочегарова Т. М. (2003) «Новые варяги (российская диаспора в странах Балтии).» *Вопросы экономики*. Nr. 2: 78–86.
- Симонян, Р. Х., Кочегарова, Т. М. (2001) «Российская община в государствах Балтии.» In: Ядов, В. А., ed. *Россия трансформирующееся общество*. Москва: Изд-во «КАНОН-пресс-Ц». Pp. 373–388.
- Станчинский, Г. А. (1994) *Русские и балты: этносоциологический очерк*. Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во СПбУЭФ.
- Тишков, В. А. (1996) *Миграция и новые русские диаспоры в постсоветских государствах*. Москва.
- Тишков, В. А. (2007) *Русский язык в странах СНГ и Балтии*. Москва: Наука.
- Тишков, В. А. (2003) «Увлечение диаспорой (о политических смыслах диаспорального дискурса).» *Диаспоры*. Nr. 2: 160–183.
- Тишков, В. А. (1993) «Этничность, национализм и государство в некоммунистическом обществе.» *Вопросы социологии*. Nr. 1, 2.
- Тишков, В. А. (2001) *Этнология и политика*. *Научная публицистика*. Москва: Наука..

Тишков, В. А. (2005) *Этнология и политика: статьи 1989-2004 гг.* 2-е доп. изд-е. Москва: Наука.

Тишков, В. А. (2005) *Этнология и политика: статьи 1989–2004 гг.* Москва: Наука.

Тишков, В. А., Степанов, В. В. ed. (2007 (2008)) *Этническая ситуация и конфликты в странах СНГ и Балтии.* Ежегодный доклад Сети этнологического мониторинга и раннего предупреждения конфликтов. Москва: ИЭА РАН.

Тишков, В. А., Филиппова, Е. И. ed. (2003 (2004)) *Межэтнические отношения и конфликты в постсоветских государствах.* Ежегодный доклад. Москва: Авиаиздат.

Тишков, В. А., Филиппова, Е. И. ed. (2004 (2005)) *Этническая ситуация и конфликты в государствах СНГ и Балтии.* Ежегодный доклад Сети этнологического мониторинга и раннего предупреждения конфликтов. Москва: ИЭА РАН.

Тишков, В. А., Филиппова, Е. И. ed. (2005 (2006)) *Этническая ситуация и конфликты в странах СНГ и Балтии.* Ежегодный доклад. Москва: ИЭА РАН.

Тишков, В. А., Филиппова, Е. И. ed. (2006 (2007)) *Этническая ситуация и конфликты в странах СНГ и Балтии.* Ежегодный доклад Сети этнологического мониторинга и раннего предупреждения конфликтов. Москва: ИЭА РАН.

Тощенко, Ж. Т., Чаптыкова, Т. И. (1996) «Диаспора как объект социологического исследования.» *Социологические исследования.* №. 12.

Устинова, М. Я. (2009) «*Латвийская Республика после восстановления государственной независимости: проблемы национальной интеграции.* Европейская интеграция и культурное многообразие.» Европейский образ жизни. Москва. Ч. 2: 134–218.

Филиппова, Е. И., Ле Коадик (2005) *Диалоги об идентичности и мультикультурализме.* Москва: ИЭА РАН.

Фоменко, А. (2008) «*Прибалтика как русская проблема.*» *Международная жизнь.* №. 5: 30–51.

Хотинец, В. Ю. (2000) *Этническое самосознание.* Москва: Алетея.

Sergey Mazur, Aleksey Romanov

**RUSSIAN CULTURE PROBLEMS DISCUSSED BY
SEMINARIUM HORTUS HUMANITATIS SOCIETY IN THE
ALMANAC “РУССКИЙ МИР И ЛАТВИЯ”**

The central point of the article is Russian culture in modern Latvia. Mainly we are concerned about the nature of Russian culture in multicultural society of Latvia today. There is a question whether nowadays Latvian Russian culture depends on: historical roots of Russians in Latvia from pre II World War period; the Soviet period in Latvia or from modern Russia. Research on those questions provided by an intellectually active group of people called SEMINARIUM HORTUS HUMANITATIS in its quarterly edition Almanac “Russian World and Latvia” suggests that we have two tendencies in the Russian culture in Latvia today, namely, marginalization and appearance of a new person in the Russian culture. After carrying out this research we may believe that Russian culture in Latvia can survive only as a social phenomenon with its own nature, not influenced from outside which requires new representatives of the Russian culture in Latvia, namely, the new Russian intelligentsia.

Key words: Russian culture in Latvia, national culture, SEMINARIUM HORTUS HUMANITATIS, intelligentsia, nature of culture.

In Latvian media SEMINARIUM HORTUS HUMANITATIS is known as a humanitarian seminar of the Russian intelligentsia in Latvia (Винник 2007, Авотиньш 2008, Бикбов 2010). **The Humanitarian seminar gives reports and discusses the situation with the Russian culture in Latvia and publishes its conclusions in the quarterly Almanac “Russian World and Lat-**

Sergey Mazur,

historian, Seminarium Hortus Humanitatis Society President (Riga, Latvia)

Aleksey Romanov,

student of PhD programm in Russian State University for the Humanities (Moscow), Science Editor of Almanac “Русский мир и Латвия” (Riga, Latvia)

via". From 2004 till 2010 the society SEMINARIUM HORTUS HUMANITATIS has published 23 issues of the Almanac.

The publishing program developed by a research group led by Aleksey Romanov, who is working at his doctor's degree at the Russian State Humanitarian University and is editing the Almanac and by Sergey Mazur; consists of five subtitles.

The first one is dedicated to a distinguished folklore researcher, historian of the Russian culture in Latvia Boris Fedorovich Infanyev's studies. The last, the XXIII issue of the Almanac "Russian World and Latvia", contains S. Mazur's article "Interpretation Problems in a Dialogue of Sociocultural Paradigms" and B. Infanyev's manuscript "Peter the Great in Russian Folklore". It is actually the first generalized work looking into some of B. Infanyev's materials in the spheres of folklore, study of literature, mythology, philology and linguistics as parts of his unified cultural-linguistic conception. XXI issue of the Almanac "Russian World and Latvia": Russian intelligentsia presents an article by S. Mazur "B. Infanyev's Biographical Essay" that ends the cycle of biographical essays on the life and fate of the Russian intelligentsia in Latvia in the 20th century. In the next issues of the Almanac it is planned to publish a critical essay about the unpublished book by B. Infanyev "Latvian Literary Myth about Russians".

The second chapter is on the Russian intelligentsia in Latvia – phenomenon of philosophic cognition. This discussion chapter is led by Aleksey Romanov. Different views in understanding interrelations of culture and humans in the light of humanitarian situation in Latvia are opposed in articles "Who Represents Intelligentsia", "Petty Hooliganism Philosophy" (issue XXI), "Why a Sociologist is not a Humanitarian? Reply to the article on the Russian culture in Latvia by A. Bikbov", etc.

The third chapter is managed by Latvia University professor, Ph.D. Yury Sidiyakov. The Almanac has been publishing the archives of Archbishop John (Pommer) for six years. These archive materials are like an authentic encyclopedia of the Russian church, cultural, social, political life in Latvia in the 20-s and 30-s of the 20th century.

In the frames of the fourth chapter managed by Aleksey Romanov the leading Russian philosophers talk about contemporary humanitarian cultural issues discussed during SEMINARIUM HORTUS HUMANITATIS seminars in Riga. The issue XXIII of the Almanac dedicated to the interpretation problems in a dialogue of sociocultural paradigm published an ar-

ticle by a famous researcher-interpreter V. Bakusev “Tongue Touches Flesh. Artistic Translation in the Cultural Dialogue”.

The fifth chapter is dedicated to the research on contemporary Russian culture in Latvia. Till 2010 the first phase of the research has been completed, the results can be seen in the issue XI of the Almanac “Russian World and Latvia. Russian Culture outside Metropolis” (Riga 2007). 32 experts in their articles explain why the Russian humanitarian culture in Latvia has marginalized. The final report presented by SEMINARIUM HORTUS HUMANITATIS society at the World Philosophic Congress in Moscow last year is published on the web site of Humanitarian Seminar (SEMINARIUM HORTUS HUMANITATIS). The second phase of the research “Who Creates the Russian Culture in Latvia” started in April 2010. On April 10 at the “Russian Centre” of the Baltic International Academy a musicologist Boris Avramets, a writer Irina Tsygalskaya, a poet Yury Kasyanich, a philosopher Aleksey Romanov presented their reports on subjectivity of the Russian culture published in issue XXIII of the Almanac.

The researchers have made their conclusions that the Russian culture outside Russia has created its own world crossing the modern national borders.

The Russian culture irrespective of the place where it manifests itself – in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia or in Russia does not lose its isomorphism. But the first efforts of self-description of the culture outside Russia (we mean the Russian culture in Latvia mainly) definitely show that the criteria used to describe the Russian culture in Russia might not suit when describing the Russian culture abroad.

So, what is the Russian culture in Latvia, how authentic a social phenomenon is it? This question along with some others was considered in the research taken by SEMINARIUM HORTUS HUMANITATIS society in summer-autumn 2007. The initiative of the Russian intelligentsia (Questions to the Internet conference) from Latvia, Russia and other countries gave the start to the research “Russian Culture outside Russia – Latvian Experience”.

The most important questions of the discussion are divided into the following groups:

Mother Country – Colony:

- Why the Russian culture in Latvia as it relates to the “mainland” culture is seen as provincial, marginal, but not as its part? (Garry Gaylit – theatre critic, Latvia).
- If you consider the subject of studies “Cultural Situation outside

the Mother Country”, I might be interested to discuss the opposition “*mother country – colony*”. The basic difference between them is the notion of “creating impulse”. “The mother country creates a “colony” bringing into it patterns of behavior and lifestyles, cultural models and stereotypes of institutional activity (what else should be brought to a new place to create a “mother country” itself in relation to it?) (Mark Meyerovich – professor, PhD International Academy of Architecture, Jerusalem).

- The Russian culture in the 20th century is basically metropolitan culture. In diasporas (Latvia, Germany, France), as a rule, only users need it. What circumstances are needed to give diaspora a chance to equalize its culture up to the capital? (Boris Ravdin – historian, Latvia)

Preserving the Russian Language

- How would you assess the role, the place and the fate of the Russian language in nowadays Latvia? (Igor Koshkin, Ph.D., Latvia University of Latvia).
- I am, of course, interested in the status of the Russian language in Latvian culture. Until some time ago I was sure that a culture is preserved thanks to its language. But recently I learned about Ireland, where, as it reported, the English banned the Irish language and hampered its development. Only the English language was developed. But the Irish culture was preserved. As they lived on their own land, the soil, blood and kin were the things that assisted the development of the Irish culture. There are such good examples as Joyce, Swift, Conan Doyle, Lennon, Rourke (actor), etc. So, I can ask general questions: what is the status of the Russian language in modern Latvia? Are there any other means to reproduce the Russian culture and how well do they work? (Leonid Chernov, Ph.D., Urals Academy of Public Service, Yekaterinburg).

Russian Culture and the Orthodoxy:

- Are there any reasons for looking at the Russian culture as at a phantom of the Orthodox (Christian) culture that has been lost, as “nostalgia” that feels like phantom pains of an amputated limb? (Pavel Tyurin, academician, Ph.D. Baltic International Academy, Riga).

Russian Culture and Latvian Culture:

- Is the Russian culture a reflection to the Latvian culture? (Vladimir Sokolov – public worker, Latvia).

Russian Culture as National Culture:

- What are the prospects and the borders of any national culture? How important is it today to keep these borders and to be inside them? May the essence of the modern cultural situation overcome national limits and return to itself, especially after the nationalistic intoxication that created the bloodbath of the 20th century? (Dmitry Matsnev, entrepreneur, Latvia.)
- What is the Russian culture today? Does anyone know it at all? As our subject puts down the relations of the Russian culture here, in Latvia and over there, in the mother-country, so, we may need to make it clear what relates to what, e.g. what the Russian culture means over there and what it means here. (Harijs Tumans, historian, professor, University of Latvia)
- To be able to talk about the problems of the Russian culture in Latvia, it would be good to understand what KIND of Russians live here and what they want apart from good health, prosperity and happiness in their personal life. (Andrey Petrov, journalist, Latvia)
- Could Russia do without the cultural input of foreign “compatriots”? (Nikolay Gudanets, poet, Latvia)

‘Russian’ and ‘Soviet’ in Latvian Culture:

- Do we need to differentiate the Russian culture in Latvia from the Soviet culture? What is this difference?
- The research program was divided into two phases. The results of the first phase were published in the Almanac “Russian World and Latvia”. Respondents (32 people) can be divided into three groups:
 1. The first group is made up by the researchers of the Russian culture and language in Latvia (Boris Infantyev (1921-2009) – philologist, Ph.D.; Alexander Gavrillin, professor, University of Latvia, Latvian Orthodoxy researcher; Igor Koshkin, professor, University of Latvia, and others);
 2. The second group is made up by specialists competent in various spheres of culture (Boris Avramets, Ph.D., musicologist; Stanislav Buka, professor, Senate chairman of Baltic International Academy; Sergey Kruk, Ph.D.; Sylvia Pavidis, associated professor, University of Latvia, and others);
 3. The third group is presented by experts able to deliver expanded assessment of tendencies in the Russian culture in Latvia (Yuris

Rozenvalds, politologist, professor, University of Latvia; Irina Markina, director of culture management program at Baltic International Academy; Mikhail Gruzdov, artistic director of theatre "Dailes", a poet Vladimir Frenkel (Israel), and others);

The second phase of the research program called "Three Centuries of the Russian Culture in Latvia" was supported by the "Russian World" foundation. The results of this program were subject discussions during seminars in 2009 and publications in the Almanac (issues 17-20).

Now we will tell in short about the main subjects of these discussions.

Mother Country – Colony.

Research "The Russian Culture outside Russia – Latvian experience" in 2007 did not touch upon this subject, which is why our main conclusions were based on the works of B. F. Infantyev, a Russian culture historian.

The methodology of territorial division into a mother country and colonies, transfer of values from the centre to the colonies is hardly applicable to the Russian culture in Latvia.

If we distinguished two types of the Russian culture: the traditional culture (we understand the traditional culture as autochthonous traditional society culture and folk culture) and the modern Russian culture (modern Russian culture in Latvia was formed 100-150 years ago), we could not apply the opposition *mother country – colony* to any of them. B. Infantyev has explored the traditional Russian culture, mainly folklore, comparing it to the traditional Latvian culture. In his works he preferred to use the term "Balto-Slavic culture", including into it elements of Russian, Belarusian, Polish, etc. traditional cultures. It is obvious that nobody could transfer metropolitan values to the traditional cultures of this region, because the time when the Russian Empire expanded to these lands was the time of Peter the Great, that is the 17th century, but the traditional Balto-Slavic culture is more than one thousand years old.

Modern Russian culture in the time of the First Republic (1918-1940) was opposed to the Soviet culture, which was mentioned by B. Infantyev in his complete autobiography (the complete B. Infantyev's biography is planned to be published in issue XXI of the *Альманах «Русский мир и Латвия»* in the beginning of 2010).

The question in what circumstances a province could get a chance to be culturally equal with a capital city can also, in our mind, be applied to the modern realities, but not to 20-s and 30-s of the 20th century, that was the time when the modern Russian culture was formed in Latvia. B. Infan-

tyev was born and raised in Rezekne (Rezhitsa), a provincial Latvian town. Later Rezekne became one of the centres of the Russian culture in Latvia. The town is famous for such personalities as a writer Tynyanov, a historian and folklorist B. Infantyev, a distinguished representative of “the old Orthodoxy” I. N. Zavoloko.

Preservation of the Russian Language.

The Almanac pages have revealed numerous discussions about the problem of preservation of the Russian language in Latvia.

The question “How would you assess the place and future of the Russian language in modern Latvia” was answered differently by the participants of the discussion. So, I. Koshkin, professor from Latvia University, showed a linguistic optimism and stated that, “from the sociolinguistic point of view we are dealing with the variant of the Russian language on the Latvian territory, in many aspects analogous to the time of the First Republic of Latvia, taking into account the fact that then there was different social structure, different level of interaction, linked to different contact experience. Sociolinguistic variant of the Russian language is a good sign, because the Russian language apart from the metropolitan form in Russia has got various forms in diasporas” (Кошкин 2007, p. 24).

A different assessment of the modern role and future of the Russian language in Latvia was given by Irina Dimante, a professor of the Baltic International Academy, in her article published in issues VIII and IX of the Almanac (2007) – “Linguistic Contacts: Bi- and Trilingualism on the Latvian Territory in the 18th – 21st Centuries”. The situation with the Russian language for Irina Dimante has been historically conditional. Irina Dimante thinks that the growing number of variations of the Russian speech in Latvia in comparison to the speech of the people living in Russia has been influenced by political processes connected with introduction of the Act on the State Language and with transition of schools and higher educational establishments to the Latvian language, that has inevitably led to losing the knowledge of literary forms and has forced the Russian language with its dialectal and popular language forms into the lower sphere. “The written literary Russian language in Latvia will be downgraded to passive usage” (Диманте 2007, p. 18-19).

The present and the future status of the Russian language in Latvia has been widely presented in the Almanac “Russian World and Latvia” and here we can mention a survey article by S. Mazur “On the Language Situation in Latvia” reflecting the polemics around the Russian and Latvian

languages. Also, the article by Svetlana Ryzhakova, a research assistant of the Ethnology and Anthropology Institute at the Russian Academy of Sciences “Latvian Language: Historic Transformation and Sociocultural Aspects of Being” and publication by Pavel Tyurin “Latvian Laconism of the Russians or “My Tongue is My Enemy”. Critics on S. Ryzhakova’s and P. Tyurin’s attitudes in the article ‘On the Language Situation in Latvia’ has led to negation about the hypertrophic role of politics in the fate of the Russian language.

Russian Culture and Orthodoxy.

The question “are there any reasons for looking at the Russian culture as at a phantom of the lost Orthodox (Christian) culture” was discussed in the Almanac articles and during seminars in Riga.

In the research program of 2007 the leading Latvian Orthodoxy history specialist, Professor Alexander Gavrilin in his article “Russian Culture and the Orthodox Church in Latvia” answered all the questions in the negative. In A. Gavrilin’s opinion correlating Orthodox values only with the culture of Russian people in Latvia is not right. “Apart from this, there have always been representatives of other congregations – Catholics, Baptists, etc.”

Before the World War I there were only urban Russian Orthodox parishes on the territory of Latvia. First – these were parishes formed mainly by officials, merchants and the military, starting with the second half of the 19th century, with the beginning of industrialization, the urban parishes were joined by factory workers. Representatives of the Russian humanitarian intelligentsia in the 19th century, with rare exceptions, would not have chosen to live in Latvia permanently. Of course, one can remember Eugraph Cheshihin who dedicated his life to publishing of the first Russian newspaper “Riga Messenger”, to translations and publications of the Baltic history sources, to writing his “History of Livonia”. One can name representatives of the Orthodox priesthood who were sent over here from the centre of the Empire: the vicar bishop of Riga Filaret (Gumilevsky), the author of the first history of Russian Orthodox church, the first volumes of which were first published in Riga; a theologian, archbishop of Riga and Mitava Filaret (Filaretov); archbishop Arseny (Bryantsev) – a wonderful preacher and history lover; archbishop Agafangel (Preobrazhensky) and many others. Each one of them was, first of all, a missionary sent to preach to the local native population e.g. Latvians and Estonians. That is why it is hard to speak about some proper Russian culture on the territory of Latvia till the independent republic was established.

It is believed that Orthodoxy played an important role in creating the Russian humanitarian culture in Latvia in the 20-s and 30-s of the 20th century. Almost every Russian public organization in the time of the First Republic of Latvia was more or less based on the Orthodox values; the task to preserve the Russian culture was included into their Statutes. In fact, they started every activity with a prayer. As a rule, their organizational committees had one representative of Orthodox clergy. But those were people with absolutely different cultural background, having little in common with the culture of the modern Latvian society.

Firstly, the modern Russian community in Latvia is mainly secular, having only vague notion about the Orthodox values. Secondly, the Russian humanitarian intelligentsia in Latvia in 20-30-s of the 20th century (predominantly emigrant) were orientated to the high mission of being the last keepers of the Russian culture, the keepers of the Holy Orthodoxy, and when the Bolshevism (Communism) fell they would come back, bringing those sacred keepings back to the ruins of the devastated Russia. Hence those efforts of the Russian intelligentsia to preserve their national culture as well as the faith of their forefathers, despite the fact that they could hardly find a common language with most Russian people living in Latvia – the peasants of Latgale and Jaunlatgale (Abrene).

Nowadays Russian intelligentsia does not have that kind of mission. Today it is not a problem to cross the Russian border, but only few of the Russians in Latvia dream to return to their “historic fatherland”. We can conclude that they feel more comfortable over here. It is not a secret that the humanitarian culture in Russia is developing fast right now, and the part of it outside Russia – the culture of the diaspora is not the reason for its development and, of course, it does not aim at preserving the culture of multimillion Russia. And we can't forget that most Orthodox believers in Latvia today are neophytes, having been baptized only recently – in the 90-s of the last century. That is why we leave the question about the Orthodox values in the lives of the Russian population of Latvia open (Гаврилин 2007, p. 28-29).

The final part of XLVIII containing readings of archbishop's John's (Pommer) memories on November 12, 2009 was dedicated to this question. Archbishop John (Pommer) is the first Latvian saint canonized by the Orthodox Church in 2001. To some extent, he is the key figure in understanding the 20-30-s period in the history of Latvia, especially the part connected with Russians. Nevertheless the thesis of the Orthodoxy as the principal cause of

the Russian culture was criticized in XLVIII memory readings, because several phenomena in the Russian life in Latvia have not been connected with Orthodoxy. For example, Old Belief in the 20-30-s was one of the sources of formation of the Russian culture as well. The Russian literature and language are other sources of the Russian culture of those times.

Russian Culture and Latvian Culture.

In fact, B.F. Infantev, up to his death in 2009 has been the only researcher interested in interrelations of the traditional and the modern Russian and Latvian cultures. The Almanac "Russian World and Latvia" since 2009 has been publishing his book "The Myth about Russians in the Latvian Literature". The book by B. Infantev is a unique source of understanding how the Latvian culture of the 18th-21st centuries has perceived Russians. This book allows us to trace the Russian world in Latvia through the changes in the attitudes of Latvian writers.

An interesting discovery by B. Infantev is also the fact that the disagreement among Latvian writers in their attitude towards the Russian issue happened, in fact, in 1944 (but not in 1940 as it is normally presented in the media). Another B. Infantev's merit is detaching the factors assisting the deviation from the prior respectful attitude towards Russians in the pre-revolution Latvia.

Understanding the peculiarities in attitudes towards Russians might change the so called national self-consciousness of Russians in Latvia. It is actually ignorance of their own as well as Latvian culture that has led to the present disintegration in Latvian society, to the manifestation of alienation and intolerance, both, in politics and domestic life.

Russian Culture as National Culture. Conclusions.

One of the results of 2007 research "Russian Culture outside Russia – Latvian Experience" is the question about subjectivity of the Russian culture in Latvia and its consistency in historic continuity.

The problem of consistency in continuity of the Russian culture is best seen when comparing the 20-30-s period and the modern Latvia. B. Infantev was the last thread that united the Russians of the first Republic with the Russians living here now; his death destroyed it.

The same problem of discretion is important for interrelations of modern Russian cultures outside Russia internally and with Russia itself. The cultures outside Russia (first of all, we mean Latvia) exist in a situation where participation of the State education system in its reproduction is excluded. That is why the peculiarity of the present phase (since 1991)

is, apart from interpretation of the connection of culture and “ethnic authenticity”, intensification of cultural connections with Russia and Russians from Western Europe with the aim to develop their own Russian intelligentsia in Latvia, which would not depend on Russia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Авотиньш, В. (2008) «Русский мир в ожидании лидеров.» *7 секретов*. 9 октября.

Бикбов, А. (2010) «Ситуация в Латвии и России по отношению к русскому вопросу принципиально отличаются.» *Альманах “Русский мир и Латвия”*. Nr. 23: 159-160.

Винник, И. (2007) «К вопросу о самоопределении гуманитарного семинара.» *Альманах “Русский мир и Латвия”*. Nr. 8: 4-61.

Гаврилин, А. (2007) «Русская культура и православная церковь в Латвии.» *Альманах “Русский мир и Латвия”*. Nr. 11: 28-29.

Диманте, И. (2007) «Языковые контакты: дву- и трехязычие на территории Латвии.» *Альманах “Русский мир и Латвия”*. Nr. 9: 18-19.

Кошкин, И. (2007) «Судьба языка и культура.» *Альманах “Русский мир и Латвия”*. Nr. 11: 24.

NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

«Ethnicity» publishes original research papers on the problems of social sciences (sociology, political sciences, linguistics, social psychology, law, history), as well as review articles, information on conferences and scientific life. The Editorial Board accepts articles in Latvian.

The Editorial Board consists of both, scientists of the Institute of Social Investigations of Daugavpils University and researchers from Latvia, the USA, Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, and Russia.

The articles submitted to the Editorial Board are reviewed by two reviewers and the editor. The Editorial Board observes mutual anonymity of the authors and the reviewers. The authors have the right to get acquainted with the reviews and the critical remarks (comments) and, if it is necessary, they may make some changes, coming to an agreement about the terms with the editor. The Editorial Board has the right to make the necessary stylistic corrections, change the layout of the scientific paper in order to uniformity of the layout. Corrections made by the Editorial Board will be agreed about with the author.

The articles are evaluated according to the adopted scientific criteria: correspondence of the research to the present-day theoretical level in the domain of the chosen problem; sufficient empirical basis; originality of empirical material; originality of hypotheses, conclusions and recommendations; topicality of the subject investigated. Logics and clearness of the exposition is evaluated as well. Preference is given to fundamental studies.

The Editorial Board does not pay royalties; manuscripts and diskettes (or CDs) are not given back.

Layout of Manuscripts

Articles, which do not have an appropriate layout, will not be accepted.

Volume of article: 30,000–60,000 characters with spaces.

Manuscripts should be submitted in two Word-processed and fully formatted copies of A4 paper, attaching a diskette (CD) or sent via e-mail. The Text should be composed using *Times New Roman* font (*WinWord 2000/XP*); font size – 12, line spacing – 1.5. Text should be aligned 3.5 cm – from the left side, 2.5 – from the right side, 2.5 cm – from the top and the bottom. If special computer programmes are used, they should be submitted together with the article.

Annotation: in the beginning of the article (after the heading), the informative annotation (800–1,500 characters) is located. The purpose and tasks of the paper are underlined, the research problem is formulated, the novelty of the research is marked and the main conclusions are represented in the annotation. The key words (terms, with the essence of questions considered) should be given in a separate paragraph.

Language of article: literal, terminologically precise. If author prepares an article in a foreign language, he/she should take care of the linguistic correction of the written text consulting a specialist of the corresponding branch of social sciences – a native speaker. *Articles, which have spelling mistakes, will not be accepted and reviewed.*

Layout of article (references and notes, bibliography, tables, schemes, diagrams, charts, etc.). References should be placed in a text according to the example: (Turner 1990, p. 140); (Миллс 1998, с. 10); (Bela 1997, 112. lpp.). Explanations and comments should be given in the endnotes. Tables, charts, schemes, diagrams, etc. should have an indication of the source of the material and, if necessary, the method of making the table, the chart, the scheme (calculations, data gathering, etc.) should be marked. These materials should have ordinal numbers and titles.

Bibliography should be compiled according to the given samples:

Monographs (books, brochures):

Turner, J. H. (1974) *The Structure of Sociological Theory*. Homewood (Illinois): The Dorsey Press.

Миллс Ч. Р. (1998) *Социологическое воображение*. Москва: Стратегия.

Articles in collections:

Turner, R. H. (1990) «A Comparative Content Analysis of Biographies.» In: Öyen, E., ed. *Comparative Methodology: Theory and Practice in International Social Research*. London, etc.: Sage Publications. Pp. 134–150.

Articles in magazines:

Bela, B. (1997) «Identitātes daudz balsība Zviedrijas latviešu dzīvesstāstos.» *Latvijas Zinātņu Akadēmijas Vēstis*. A, 51, Nr. 5/6: 112–129.

Шмитт К. (1992) «Понятие политического.» *Вопросы социологии*, Nr. 1: 37–67.

Articles in newspapers:

Strazdiņš, I. (1999) «Matemātiķi pasaulē un Latvijā.» *Zinātnes Vēstnesis*, 8. marts.

Materials from the Internet:

Soms, H. «Vēstures informātika: Saturs, struktūra un datu bāze Latgales dati.» <http://www.dpu.lv/LD/LDpublik.html> (2002. 20. 10).

Bibliography should be compiled in the alphabetic order according to the authors' names or to the titles (at the beginning – in the Latin alphabet, at the end – in the Cyrillic alphabet).