ВЕСТНИК

The Journal of Russian and Asian Studies

Issue 8, Volume 1 www.sras.org Winter 2010

VESTNIK: The Journal of Russian and Asian Studies

VESTNIK has been created by The School of Russian and Asian Studies in an effort to effectively encourage the study of Russia and those states formerly a part of the Soviet Union. VESTNIK is a scholarly journal which publishes the best in undergraduate and graduate research on any subject of relevance to that geographic region.

The School of Russian and Asian Studies (SRAS) is a team of consultants and advisers dedicated to education and educational opportunities in Russia and Eurasia. They have studied within the Russian educational system and have worked closely with institutions for several years to identify programs of interest and value to international students. More information about SRAS is available at www.sras.org.

VESTNIK is designed to showcase exceptional work by students of all levels, subjects, and backgrounds who are researching and writing about Russia or those states formerly a part of the Soviet Union. If you are interested in submitting material for future issues, have students that should be encouraged to publish, or would like to participate on our editorial staff, contact us at jwilson@sras.org. *All subjects related to Russia and the Former Soviet Union will be considered*. Submitted papers should include, at the top of the first page, the applicant's name, major, class standing, and a brief description of his/her future plans. Submissions should not be more than 25 pages (longer submission will be accepted, but may be edited for length), should be in 12-point TNR type with one-inch margins, double spaced, and in electronic format (MS Word). Since we are dealing with diverse subjects, we will accept MLA, ALA and Chicago formats. VESTNIK is available for free in HTML and PDF formats at www.sras.org.

Table of Contents
(click on title to jump to document)

Luke Rodeheffer is a senior at Lewis and Clark College, where he studies Russian and History. He plans to pursue research after graduation through Fulbright in Eastern Europe and later graduate studies in History in Germany.

Ordinary Men?

Collaboration and Resistance in Occupied Mogilevskaya Oblast'

By Luke Rodeheffer

The subject of collaboration and resistance in occupied Europe is one of the most controversial issues related to the history of the Second World War. Research in the Soviet Union on the Holocaust and Nazi occupation was hampered by the Soviet system. Access to information was limited by the destruction of the Jewish population in the USSR and because the occupation raised uncomfortable questions about the roles that large portions of the population played in these events. Historical accounts were thus required to align with the official version of events, namely the role of the Communist Party in the resistance to the fascist enemy, and not present a detailed and realistic history of the period.

The focus of this research is to examine these developments in Mogilevskaya Oblast' in eastern Belarus. How the region fell under occupation, the attitudes of the thousands of Soviet citizens who decided to collaborate with the fascist occupiers, and the divisions that developed in the population as a result of collaboration are discussed. At roughly the same time, a resistance movement, made up of partisans and underground urban fighters, developed in these occupied territories. The development, tactics, and effectiveness of these partisans and resistance fighters will be analyzed, along with the reactions of the occupying powers to this insurgency.

The sources used are varied in their character and origin. The inspiration for the research came from the recently published memoirs of Xonya Epshteyn. Epshteyn was a 13-year old Jewish boy living in a village in Mogilevskaya Oblast' when the invasion of the Soviet Union began. The memoirs cover the invasion and occupation, Epshteyn's survival during the destruction of the Jewish community, and his life as a partisan in the forests of eastern Belarus.

Other Russian primary source documents include collections of local economic statistics and the above-mentioned memoirs of Mogilevskaya partisans and underground fighters, which are stored at the Russian National Historical Library and the Russian State Library.[1] These memoirs, although burdened by the confines of Soviet censorship, are rich sources of information typically ignored by Western historians. Several Wehrmacht document collections deal with occupation policy both in Belarus and on the whole Eastern Front, such as *Deutsche Besatzungspolitik in der UdSSR* and *Lebensraum in Osten*, were also researched to understand the occupier's perspective. Also considered in this study are several secondary histories of the Wehrmacht occupation of Belarus and Bogdan Musial's recently published history of the partisan movement.

The Invasion of Mogilevskaya Oblast'

Mogilevskaya Oblast' is one of ten administrative regions that existed in the Belarusian Soviet Republic at the beginning of the war. [2] The east borders with Russia, while other regions of Belarus surround the rest of the oblast'. Minsk, the Belarusian capital, is located 100 kilometers to the west, while Moscow is located 610 kilometers east of the region's capital. Two large cities existed in Mogilevskaya Oblast' at the beginning of the war: the city of Bobruisk and the capital, Mogilev, which was one of the five largest cities in Belarus at the beginning of the invasion.[3] One local historian described the capital as an "important strategic point and developed transportation center"[4] that stood directly in the path to Moscow. The region had

[1] The first of these Soviet-era memoirs is from 1971, a full thirty years after the beginning of the war in the Soviet Union. The dates that the fighters' memoirs and partisan movement document collections began to appear correspond exactly with the post-Khrushchev period, as Brezhnev sought to create a cult of the Second World War to unite the Soviet Union. Immediately following the war, Stalin was hostile toward the writing of memoirs by veterans and discouraged research into the course of the war; for more, see Nina Tumarkin, The Living and the Dead: The Rise and Fall of the Cult of World War II in Russia (New York: Basic Books, 1994).

[2] Bogdan Musial, Sowjetische partisanen 1941-1944: Mythos und Wirklichkeit (Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 2009), p. 20.

[3] Christian Gerlach, Kalkulierte Morde: Die deutsche Wirtschafts- und Vernichtungspolitik in Belaruß 1941 bis 1944 (Hamburg: HIS Verlag, 2000), p. 23.

[4] G. I. Volchok, Oborona Mogileva Letom 1941 Goda (Mogilev: Mogilev State University, 2003), p. 8. (all

experienced massive economic and industrial growth in the 1930s as a result of Stalinist industrialization, with new industrial bases that were important to supply continued military campaigns.[5] The vast majority of the oblast's residents at the beginning of the war lived outside of the major cities in the rural areas that cover most of the territory.

June 22, 1941 was a clear, sunny day in Mogilevskaya Oblast' as the news broke that Germany and its proxy states had broken their Non-Aggression Treaty with the USSR. Hitler's armies launched a surprise full-scale attack. Citizens of the region crowded around radios and loudspeakers in public places in order to hear General Molotov's announcements from the Soviet government about the unfolding events. Xonya Epshteyn recalls that on the way home

> everywhere women cried, men frowned, and young boys didn't understand: why was everyone frowning if the Red Army was unbeatable? Yet the very next day I saw a Nazi war plane with black crosses on its wings—it flew over us but Soviet planes were nowhere to be seen. Something was wrong here...and suddenly long lines of refugees appeared from the west—the Germans had invaded very quickly.[6]

The war's beginning was also a complete surprise for those in Mogilevskaya Oblast' serving locally in the Soviet Armed Forces. In his memoirs, Vagan Agadjanyan, an Armenian soldier in the Red Army and later a partisan, recalls that when he told his commander, a senior lieutenant, that war had broken out, his superior immediately asked, "With whom?"[7]

By July 4, the Wehrmacht had reached Epshteyn's village in the east of the oblast'. He remembers: "An avalanche of German soldiers rode through our village: tanks, motorized infantry...it seemed as though there would be no end to the iron mass. After four days the stream finally disappeared."[8] By July 10, the Wehrmacht had seized almost all of Belarus and marched 450-500 km into the Soviet Union.[9]

---

translations from German and Russian performed by the author).

[5] For statistics regarding the industrialization of the Oblast', see Mogilevskaya Oblast' statisktiko-ekonomicheskii Spravochnik. Ed. L Levkovich and F. Katsman, (Mogilev, 1940) .

[6] X Epshteyn, Privet, Tyozka ili Pic'mo K Prapрapravnuku (Khar'kov: Ukraine, 2008), p. 12-13.

[7] Vagan Agadzhanyan, Dorogi Partizanskie. («Belarus'»: Minsk, 1979) , p. 6-7.

[8] Epshteyn p. 12-13.

[9] Volchok, Oborona Mogileva p. 6-7.

While the Fascist forces moved quickly through the region's eastern territory, the citizens of Mogilev in the west and the Red Army prepared a desperate attempt to defend the oblast' capital from the invaders. The rivers of Dvina and Dnepr, which were the main rivers that stood between the Wehrmacht and Moscow, became defensive positions.[10] The invading troops encountered very heavy resistance and were held back for several weeks by the defense forces in Mogilev, until supplies ran out at the end of July 1941 and the Red Army was forced to pull back.[11] By mid-August, all of Mogilevskaya Oblast' was under the control of the Wehrmacht.[12]

The oblast' population at the beginning of the occupation saw the fight against the invaders as a lost cause, as one saboteur from the city of Sklov' in the north reported in September 1941: "The collective farmers do not believe in our victory. This view is only strengthened by the deserters. I have seen for myself how our soldiers in battle have voluntarily surrendered to German soldiers."[13] He also reported that the farmers felt that the Soviet authorities had abandoned them to the mercy of the Nazi occupiers. This collapse of faith in the Soviet government and military is reflected in a report from a Nazi commander dated August 18, 1941: "The attitude of the population everywhere into the areas of Mogilev, Orsha, and Witebsk is marked by a friendliness to the Germans. A rejection of the Bolshevik rule is viewable everywhere, overwhelmingly, in any event, out of economic and social concerns."[14]

Collaboration with the Nazi Occupation

In order to understand the level of collaboration among the inhabitants of Mogilevskaya Oblast', it is necessary to examine statistics from both sides of the war. According to Soviet

[10]Ibid.
[11]Ibid p. 9-30.
[12]F. O. Popov, Bor'ba Mogilyovichan Protiv Nemetsko-Fashistik Okkupantov. (Mogilev: Belarus', 1958), p. 30.
[13] Report from the head of the operative group in the paion of Sklov, Igor Slepcov, 8.10.1941, and additional report from 11.10.1941. in Musial 44.
[14] Armeeoberkommando 9, Abt. Ic, 18.08.1941, in ibid p. 45.

statistics, in September 1939, less than two years before the invasion, 792 people in the capital of Mogilev worked in the government apparatus.[15] This number likely does not include the number of NKVD agents. According to numbers from the occupation regime, in 1943 approximately 800-2,500 people were working for the occupation in the city.[16] According to the memoirs of the leader of the underground resistance, the number of people working for the Nazis was much larger than the number of resistance fighters in the city, and the total number of people living in the city of Mogilev could not have been higher than 40,000, having shrunk as a result of flight and deportations.[17] This was common in most large cities. In the city of Bobruisk, 1,000 people typically worked for the occupation regime at any given time.[18] Before the war, only 191 people in the same city were employed by the Soviet government.[19]

This does not mean that all those working for the occupation regime did so out of political motivation or voluntarily. In their memoirs, resistance leaders in Mogilev describe frequent collaboration with the resistance among local members of the occupation regime. One German officer at the end of 1942 described the workers as "lazy," "uninterested," "cowardly," and "afraid that Soviet power will hold them accountable for their actions."[20] Prisoners of war were forced to work. In November 1941, for instance, as hunger and cold ravaged the ranks of Soviet POWs at a prison camp, an officer came and offered the prisoners work as police or government employees. "Those who refused faced death by hunger."[21]

---

[15]Mogilevskoye Oblastnoye Upravlenie Narodnovokhozyaistvennovo Uchyota. Mogilevskaya Oblast' statisktiko-ekonomicheskii Spravochnik. Ed. Levkovich, L and Katsman, F., (Mogilev, 1940), p. 83.

[16] Gerlach p. 199. Unfortunately, Gerlach does not explain this quite wide estimate, but is worth noting that the numbers are significantly greater than those said to have worked for the Soviet government.

[17] Ibid., p. 419.

[18] Ibid., p. 199.

[19]Mogilevskoye oblastnoye Upravlenie p. 89.

[20]Oberst Herrose, „Bericht über die Ernährungslage der Zivilbevölkerung in Orscha und Mogilew" 28.11.1942 in Gerlach p. 201.

[21] G. Khramovich, Zarevo nad Sozhem. («Belarus'»: Minsk, 1971), p. 34.

In Mogilev, 500 men served as police officers in the security organ "*Ordnungsdienst*".[22] Every district under the control of the *Heersgruppe Mitte*, the Wehrmacht section that occupied the region, had four to six reserve units of *Ordnungsdienst* with sixty men in each unit, meaning that in Belarus' twenty-one pre-war regions, 5,040 to 6,300 men likely served as police for the Nazi occupation in Mogilevskaya Oblast'.[23] The *Ordnungsdienst* also recruited among the other occupied territories and frequently deployed troops outside their native regions; one Cossack *Ordnungsdienst* division, for example, existed in Mogilev.[24]

Many collaborators voluntarily carried out their duties, however. Xonya Epshteyn's memoirs tell of many people who chose to work as police officers for the occupation regime in order to rob the rest of the inhabitants and the Jewish community in particular. Epshteyn describes a local officer named Shaitanov: "He did everything to live up to his name ("Shaitan" means "devil" in Tartar). Everything that he managed to steal in the villages he took home to (the village of) Stai. His home was filled with sacks of sugar, flour, salt, and crates of matches and tobacco."[25] After the adult Jewish males in Epshteyn's community were killed in the autumn of 1941, the police began to "storm into homes and demand gold and diamonds...they would search and rummage through the home, take the best clothing—this continued every day."[26]

The memoirs of the partisan Agadjanyan also reveal this police plundering. At one point, while hiding from the occupation authorities, he stopped in a house owned by a family with a son in the occupation police and asked the mother if he could stay the night. "At the door rose a tall husky man with a dumb face wearing a new coat made from dog fur of factory quality...it wasn't

[22] Gerlach p. 205.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Ibid. p. 207.
[25] Epshteyn p. 18.
[26] Ibid.

difficult to guess that the woman's son was in the police."[27]

Many police enthusiastically targeted the Jewish community: Agadjanyan writes that one police officer, upon noticing his Armenian features, stopped him and said, "You're a Jew! I should shoot you...I recognize Jews immediately. You aren't allowed on the street!" Agadjanyan was held until he could prove his Armenian ethnicity.[28] Many police were also certain of a Nazi victory on the eastern front. Agadjanyan recalls one instance in the village of Tudorovok, where a police officer frequently announced that the Wehrmacht had already taken Moscow and Sevastopol' and threatened Agadjanyan with arrest when he objected to the officer's claims.[29]

Xonya Epshteyn notes that police officers frequently referred to him and his family with the anti-Semitic Russian term *zhid*, instead of *evrei,* the standard Russian noun to refer to a Jewish person. Once, as a police officer was robbing his family, he said, "Since when do *zhidy* not have gold?"[30] Epshteyn's memoirs also contain one instance that illustrates the unspeakable cruelty of some occupation police toward Jews. Epshteyn's father, a cobbler, was killed by occupation forces during a massacre of Jewish adult males, afterwards stripping the boots from the body. The next day, Epshteyn was sitting in his father's store when policemen arrived with a pair of boots. Epshteyn recognized them as his father's immediately: "I would have recognized those boots out of a thousand pairs." The police demanded that Epshteyn clean them. When Epshteyn refused, the policemen beat him, then terrorized and robbed his family.[31]

The position of the village elders (*starosta*) in Mogilevskaya Oblast' is also a difficult subject when considering the functioning of the occupation apparatus. According to Agadjanyan, the village elder in Tudorovka helped the villagers hide their cattle from occupation raids, gave

[27] Agadzhanyan p. 39.
[28] Ibid., p. 36-37.
[29] Ibid., p. 57.
[30] Epshteyn p. 21, 25.
[31] Ibid., p. 20-21.

partisans weapons, and eventually joined the partisan movement itself.[32] Yet other village elders collaborated with the Nazi occupiers. Epshteyn was a friend of the son of the village elder before the war and often was a guest at his house, yet the elder helped SS troops beat and execute Epshteyn's relatives on December 11, 1941.[33]

The whole system of occupation forced the oblast' population to choose between collaboration or resistance, leading to the destruction of friendships and communities. Former neighbors were forced to kill one another. In his memoirs, Xonya Epshteyn recalls that twice during his time with the partisan brigades, his unit took a prewar classmate prisoner after a battle. The first begged for mercy when Epshteyn recognized him, claiming that he was forced into the position and had to support his mother. The townspeople from his village, however, said he was the most vicious officer in the garrison with "hands up to his elbows in blood." The second, Epshteyn recalls, "had been a guest at our house many times and my mother had fed him delicious Jewish treats!" Epshteyn asked him: "How did you end up with the police?" The friend answered: "Like everyone else." Both acquaintances were executed after a tribunal. [34] The occupation even tore families in half. One *starosta* helped Agadjanyan and then explained to him his situation: "Don't think, friend, that I willfully work for the Germans...three of my sons are at the front. But I am forced to work for those who are fighting against my children."[35]

One individual in Epshteyn's memoirs completes the picture of the often stunning contradictions that emerged in the new system of collaboration. Before the war a man named Sharoiko lived in the area, a Red Army lieutenant, military academy graduate, and tank commander who taught at an elementary school. He was considered a local hero and example for

[32] Agadzhanyan p. 59.
[33] Epshteyn p. 62-4, 23-4.
[34] Ibid., p. 62-3.
[35] Agadzhanyan p. 43.

children in light of his achievements in the Soviet armed forces. Yet as soon as the Wehrmacht reached Epshteyn's region, Sharoiko joined the police and became the local police's most brutal persecutor of the Jewish community. Everyone grew to fear him as he tirelessly hunted down Jews in hiding, who he then dragged to the local ghetto and executed in front of the remaining Jews. When Sharoiko was captured by Epshteyn's partisan brigade, he showed no remorse, sneering at Epshteyn while calling him a "little Zhid."[36]

Those serving the occupation apparatus were not, however, protected from abuse by the Nazi occupiers, who often treated them poorly, as one incident in Agadjanyan's memoirs illustrates. When he was staying in the village of Starie Chemodany, he heard that "at the Shkolovskii commandant's office our village elder was beaten so badly with a belt that he was barely alive when he was taken home." Agadjanyan asked with irony: "How does one beat *svoikh* (one's own)?" and got the reply, "One's own—that's Germans. All the rest of the apes subject themselves to them and fulfill their commands and orders."[37]

These examples support the assertion of Dieter Pohl when he writes that:

> it is obvious that politics often didn't play an important role: only a small portion of the police or those who had family members who suffered under Stalin were very pro-German. More than anything else the police hoped to receive more material benefits than the rest of the population or further on, protection from deportation to Germany. Police received a variety of benefits and promotion was possible.[38]

The Development of the Partisan Movement

Partisan brigades were formed in Mogilevskaya Oblast' at the beginning of the invasion, composed of Red Army soldiers, Communist Party members, and/or the local destruction battalions formed by the NKVD immediately after the beginning of the invasion to sabotage the German advance.[39] Attempting to discern how many partisans were fighting at this point in the

[36] Epshteyn p. 27-28.
[37] Ibid., p. 45.
[38] Pohl p. 175.
[39] See Musial's chapter entitled "Vernichtungsbattalione" in Partisanen: Mythos und Wirklichkeit.

war is a clear example of the difficulties in obtaining a clear picture of the partisan movement in general. Volchok claims that "in the summer and autumn of 1941 forty partisan units already existed."[40] According to one document from the Belarusian Interior Department, dated July 15, 1941, two weeks before the seizure of Mogilev by Nazi forces, 4,000 people were serving in destruction battalions meant to fight the invaders.[41] This number is either a *pripiski* (Soviet vernacular for exaggerated official data) or shows how high the desertion rates were for Soviet forces at the beginning of the war. A report from the head of the Oblast' Communist Party states that in late summer of 1941, nineteen partisan divisions with around 1,400 individuals existed in the oblast'.[42] In any case, the forests quickly became the centers of the partisan movement.

At the beginning of the war the *okruzhentsi*, a Russian term for soldiers cut off from their defeated units, lived in the local forests. Epshteyn explains that, "The police tried several times to organize expeditions into the forest to find and destroy them, but they were always unsuccessful: the *okruzhentsi* were experienced fighters."[43] The occupiers recognized the danger of these Soviet troops and tried to pay the population to help catch them: "Every policeman or village elder who gave a German commander an *okruzhentsi* received as payment 5 German marks, or 50 rubles."[44] The Soviet soldiers in the forests, together with local loyal communists and members of the aforementioned destruction battalions, formed the partisan movement and served as the core of the partisan units. The many remaining local members of the NKVD, provided partisans with training in sabotage and guerrilla warfare.[45]

---

[40], G. I. Volchok, Zapozhdenie I Razvitie Partizanskovo Dvizheniya v Mogilevskoi Oblasti v Godi Velikoi Otechestvennoi Voiny (1941 – 1944 gg.) (Mogilev: Mogilev State University). http://region.mogilev.by/ru/node/8300. p. 5.
[41] Spravka Narkom Vnutrennikh Del BCCP Ob Organizatsii Istrebitel'nykh Batal'onov V Respublike Po Postoyanniyu Na 15 Iyulia 1941 Goda. In: Vsenarodnoe Partizanskoe Dvizhenie, p. 71.
[42] Musial p. 51.
[43] Epshteyn p. 18.
[44] Agadzhanyan p. 40.
[45] Musial p. 54.

In mid-1942, as contacts with the Red Army headquarters increased, the Soviet central government introduced a plan to centralize the partisan command while placing the control of the partisan movement in the hands of party functionaries.[46] At the same time, special divisions were formed in partisan brigades to maintain discipline, prevent desertion, and persecute individuals collaborating with the occupation regime in partisan-controlled areas (these special divisions can be compared to the role of the NKVD and commissars in the Red Army).[47] By summer of 1943, every partisan unit in Mogilevskaya Oblast' had this special division, which served to introduce strict discipline to hinder the widespread theft, drunkenness, and random violence against the general population by the partisans and to ban the arbitrary beating and shooting of civilians.[48]

Xonya Epshteyn managed to hide in a ghetto and later escape to the forests as the rest of his Jewish community was massacred in the spring of 1942. When he joined the partisan movement in the summer of 1942, the partisans had not only managed to connect with the urban resistance movement and the Soviet government, but had received their first planeload of supplies from Moscow.[49] Large portions of the oblast's territory between the major cities began to fall under partisan control. Agadjanyan writes that, "By the end of May 1942, on the left bank of the river of *Soja,* patriots had already completely liberated 100 villages from the enemy... in the heart of enemy territory people were already beginning to live by Soviet laws."[50]

This is reflected in documents from the occupation government itself; the partisan movement by mid-1942 was able to seriously interfere with the daily workings of the occupation regime, especially in rural areas. One official complained in a letter to the field commander in Mogilev that partisans had made tax collection too dangerous and occupation government

[46] Ibid., p. 158.
[47] Ibid 236.
[48] Ibid 248.
[49] Mette p. 73, Volchok p. 8.
[50] Agadzhanyan p. 159.

officials had not been paid in months. He requested more funds from the central governing body while noting, "From the 17 Volost (sub-districts) of the region, work is carried out in only one central Volost, and then only part-time."[51] Epshteyn notes:

> a patriotic spirit arose among the inhabitants, and despite losses, the partisan movement continued to grow. And if earlier the Germans had thought they could manage the fight with the partisans with only small guard units and the police, by the end of 1942 they understood that their strength was not enough and began to send regular units from the front.[52]

Indeed, the staff of General von Schenckendorff wrote in a report dated May 25, 1942, "In the area between Bobruisk and Mogilev the partisans are conducting operations that constitute a serious threat…the corridor between Bobruisk and Mogilev is the site of almost daily attacks on Wehrmacht automobiles."[53] An order from the general written one month later noted that cattle could be seized in regions under partisan control only when the "economic supervisor receives the necessary *heavy* protection. Small teams are not equipped to handle that task." He ordered that "seizure of cattle in agricultural *raions* shall be carried out under military protection. Thus this order extends to the seizure of all other forms of agricultural production...insofar that they are located in *raions* in which it is impossible to function according to plan."[54]

The Nazi occupiers began to react with new tactics: blockades of forests, spy planes, and a much more radical approach, the complete destruction of blockaded villages. Soldiers and police began a new policy of killing multiple inhabitants for the death of one soldier.[55] Wehrmacht units, police battalions, and SS units carried out a series of brutal operations code-named "Bamberg" in Mogilevskaya Oblast' in June 1942 in the area between the two major

---

[51] Dokladnaya Zapiska Nachal'nika Bepezinskovo Raoina Polevoi Komendature Gordoa Mogileva. 3 June 1942. In: Vsenarodnoe Partizanskoe Dvizhenie, p. 185.
[52] Epshteyn p. 46.
[53] Der kommandierende General der Sicherheitstruppen und Befehlshaber im Heersgebiete Mitte (Ia) an das Oberkommando des Heeres am 25.05.1942, Musial p. 95.
[54] Anweisung des Befehlhabers. In: Norbert Müller. Deutsche Besatzungspolitik in der UdSSR: Dokumente (Köln: Pahl-Rugenstein Verlag, 1980), p. 233.
[55] Agadzhanyan p. 32.

cities of Mogilev and Bobruisk. The operation frequently involved the massacre and burning of entire villages. In military reports, the number of "killed enemies" greatly outnumbered the number of weapons seized during the operation, indicating many of the "enemies" were unarmed civilians.[56] This operation reached its peak on June 15, 1942, when SS units and police battalions massacred 2,000 inhabitants of the village of Borkii. These operations were so bloody that even members of the Wehrmacht command began to criticize the tactics.[57]

Xonya Epshteyn and his unit saw the results of these operations in Ukval'skii forest:

> The forest was, without exaggerating, covered with bodies and not simply those of dead partisans: the Germans, it turned out, had burned down all of the villages surrounding the forest, and those villagers who were not able to escape the fires died in the woods—they were simply mowed down, the forest had been combed with machine guns. The village of Gaenka was especially hard hit: 58 villagers were killed, the majority of whom were children.[58]

The German journalists Ernst Klee and Willi Dressen gathered statements from eyewitnesses to the massacres. They reported that there was a clear strategy of destruction of entire villages across the oblast' and systematic destruction of any evidence that pointed to the atrocities.[59]

Some members of the partisan movement also sought collective revenge against those perceived as guilty for the anti-partisan campaigns. The commander of the first division of the brigade "Zvezda" burned down 57 houses in the village of Gulidovka in the east of the oblast' in August 1942 as revenge for the killing of his lover. He was later executed by the partisans for his crimes. Under the pretense that "all Belarusians are traitors," another partisan commander of Russian heritage went on a rampage that was investigated by the head of the communist party in Mogilevskaya Oblast'.[60] Collective revenge became a large enough problem that the Secretary of the Belarusian Communist party wrote to all oblast' partisan commanders in early 1943:

---

[56] Gerlach p. 919.
[57] Pohl p. 287.
[58] Epshteyn p. 46-47, 49.
[59] Ernst Klee and Willi Dressen, „Gott mit Uns": Der Deutsche Vernichtungskrieg im Osten 1939-1945 (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 1989) p. 186-196.
[60] Musial p. 360.

> The central committee of the BCP can no longer tolerate the destructive practice of the burning of entire villages with the justification of retaliation against a few police in the villages or in order to deprive the Germans of the possibility of lodging there. For that reason the villages of Vydryca, Dolgoe with 250 houses and several others were burned down. Additionally we have numerous documents detailing the killing of civilians, rape of women and the plundering of the populace…We have reports that the burning of villages were the result of commands from the operation center (for the region of Klicev).[61]

During this period, the number of partisan fighters increased greatly. Calculating exact numbers is difficult, as different numbers exist in different sources. Two partisan officers from the region assert in a post-war essay that 55,454 partisans served in brigades in Mogilevskaya Oblast' during the war in 109 units that formed 24 brigades.[62] According to another document discussing the partisans' arsenal, 21,205 partisans were serving in the oblast' on October 1, 1943. If we assume that both numbers are true, almost 2/3 of the partisans joined the movement after eastern Belarus again became front lines in September 1943.[63] It could be the case that the officers took reserves into account, while the second document does not. Numbers may have been pushed up in some cases by forced recruitment. At least one unit was practicing forced recruitment in autumn of 1942, though the unit allowed the recruits to return home, where many either deserted or joined the occupation police. [64]

Because of the nature of the movement, "The partisans had a loose organizational structure: they were able to take in almost anyone who wished to join their ranks, or at least anyone with weapons."[65] Because of this, fears of double agents were widespread. According to partisan reports, the Nazis had set up dozens of special schools, including several locally, to train anti-partisan spies to infiltrate the brigades.

These fears led the Oblast' Head of Special Divisions in October 1943 to issue a command placing former collaborators who were joining the partisan movement under

[61] Ibid., p. 362.
[62] Gavrilov, I. I. Soldatami. p. 371-2.
[63] Musial p. 277.
[64] Musial p. 324.
[65] Volchok p. 7.

surveillance and ordering that anyone who had "enthusiastically" collaborated and persecuted the resistance should be tried and shot (the order was supposed to be burned by all those who read it).[66] These fears of spies and agents strained the relations between partisans and Jews. There were stories and written reports of Jews who, blackmailed by the Nazi occupiers, posed as refugees and attempted to poison partisan brigades. Yet it is impossible to tell if these stories are true or an example of widespread anti-Semitism. [67]

Xonya Epshteyn writes that the relations between partisans and Jews were strained because there were rumors that "an idiotic order from Moscow existed that didn't allow partisan units to take Jews" and there were cases when "partisan commanders even shot Jews who fled to them." The reason for the order was Soviet fears that Jews who left partisan units would be quickly caught by Germans and under torture could give away the locations of partisan bases.[68] Regardless, the majority of commanders in his experience ignored the rumors of this order, and several other Jews served alongside Epshteyn in his unit during the war.[69]

The partisan movement was a diverse and highly decorated military contingent. Thousands of women and soldiers from different republics of the USSR served in the brigades during the war. Oblast' partisans received 3,000 medals for bravery in World War II.[70] At least one "Hero of the Soviet Union," the highest military award possible for service during the war, was awarded to a local partisan commander.[71]

The Development of the Urban Underground Resistance

Immediately following the invasion, underground resistance groups began to form in the

[66] Musial p. 268.
[67] Ibid., p. 242.
[68] Epshteyn p. 38.
[69] Ibid p. 39.
[70] Voronenkov p. 22.
[71] Gavrilov p. 372.

cities of Mogilevskaya Oblast'. It is unclear exactly how many of these groups existed, but one document from the Communist Party's youth group in April 1943 names 97 known groups in ten raions; at their peak, likely well over 100 resistance groups functioned in towns and cities across the oblast'.[72] The typical tactics of these groups included posting anti-occupation placards, distributing antifascist literature, manufacturing fake identification, gathering food and medicine for Soviet prisoners of war, liberating prisoners, and sabotaging infrastructure.[73]

In the capital of Mogilev, the "Red Army Support Committee" was active from 1941 through 1943. By autumn of 1942, the movement included forty different groups with more than 400 people; at its peak some 1,000 Mogilevites were involved.[74] The fascists offered 40,000 marks (unclear if this is occupation marks or marks from Germany, as the latter were much more valuable) for the disclosure of a single member of this effective committee.[75] This bounty was apparently effective, as the head of the group, Mette, noted that the biggest danger during the occupation was not the police itself, but "traitors and provocateurs."[76] The committee used rather extreme tactics to remain covert: they used the Typhus ward in Mogilev's hospital as a base of operation, and children frequently moved important documents and information.[77]

The most important task of the resistance, as Mette explained, was "to correctly inform Soviet citizens about the situation on the front and unmask the fascist propaganda."[78] The committee converted a house at the edge of the city into a publishing center for anti-occupation propaganda. Here, resistance members were able to receive broadcasts and orders from the Soviet government via radio. A printing press was also built in the house, and underground

[72] Iz Dokladnoi Zapiski Upolnomochennovo TSK LKCMB Po Mogilevskoi Oblasti. I. A. Matyl'. 12 April 1943. In: Vsenarodnoe Partizanskoe, Document №177 — p. 272
[73] K Ju. Mette, Vernost' (Belarus': Minsk, 1989) , p. 80, 86, 108, 143.
[74] K Ju Mette, Soldatami Byli Vse Ed. Gavrilov, I. I. (Minsk: Belarus', 1972), p. 383.
[75] Ibid p. 389.
[76] Mette p. 391.
[77] Mette, Vernost'. p. 212.
[78] Ibid., p. 127.

newspapers were published, among them the "official" oblast' underground newspaper, *Za Rodinu* (For the Motherland), alongside important announcements and orders from Moscow.[79] The committee also printed antifascist propaganda in German and distributed it among members of the military occupation.[80] *Za Rodinu* existed alongside fifteen other underground resistance newspapers that were printed across Mogilevskaya Oblast' throughout the occupation.[81]

The resistance movement in oblast' cities and rural partisans collaborated with each other in operations and exchanged weapons and information. Police officers sometimes collaborated with the resistance and became important sources of weapons and information, and in at least one case, an entire garrison of recruits.[82] In the capital city of Mogilev, many resistance groups operated in factories and were able to acquire important materials and sabotage the functioning of the occupation regime.

Intelligence efforts were mixed. One report from the Mogilevskaya Partisan Committee in September 1943 complained that the intelligence-gathering was uncoordinated and in one case, an intelligence-gatherer had been mistakenly killed by partisans under the pretense that he was a spy.[83] In another case, intelligence on local German units turned out to be not only false, but about units that did not exist, leading the committee to demand immediate reform of the intelligence-gathering system.[84]

Sabotage of railways was one of the most important tasks of the resistance.[85] Railways ran across Mogilevskaya Oblast' to the heart of the USSR, transporting manpower and materials to the front. The documents of one group, known as "For Soviet Belarus," describe a series of

[79] Mette, Vernost'. p. 37-9.
[80] Mette, Soldatami. p. 887.
[81] Gavrilov. Soldatami. p. 371.
[82] Khramovich p. 46.
[83] Musial p. 234-5.
[84] Ibid.
[85] Popov p. 8, Mette p. 104-118.

attacks between June and October 1942 on railway lines. A single attack sometimes caused hundreds of Nazi casualties, the destruction of dozens of wagons, and the cessation of rail transport for up to 36 hours.[86] Several members of partisan units that specifically attacked railway transportation during the war assert that during the course of the war, the resistance movement destroyed more than 1,800 troop trains and 1,800 locomotives.[87]

These numbers highlight an interesting issue that develops when researching Soviet history during the Second World War. These numbers are surely grossly exaggerated, as is apparently common with partisan claims of railway attacks. Musial notes that "partisans very frequently exaggerated the numbers by reports of attacks against trains" and cites in his study several examples of partisan commanders being caught by their superiors grossly exaggerating or completely falsifying data. [88]

Furthermore, Gerlach notes that falsifying casualty numbers in the Wehrmacht would have been nearly impossible, because they had to be sent through to the appropriate authorities who could cross-reference the numbers. He calculates that a total of 6,000 to 7,000 German soldiers and officers were killed by partisans, making the claims by Mogilevskaya Oblast' partisans that 1,800 troop trains (five to six soldiers per train) were destroyed in one single oblast' in a period of several months seem absurd.[89] Partisan numbers, reprinted by Soviet historians, claim that over 460,000 Wehrmacht soldiers were killed.

The Soviet Union, as Musial notes, encouraged this exaggeration:

> It is noticeable that the numbers of enemy casualties are higher the more high-ranking the author is in the hierarchy. It is a specific element of the Soviet bureaucracy and reporting that official reports more closely correspond with the expectations of superiors than with reality.[90]

---

[86] Deyatel'nosti Otryada Na Zheleznodopozhnykh Kommunikaysiyakh S 25 Iyunya Po 20 Oktyabpya 1942 Goda. In: Vsenarodnoe Patizanskoe. p. 552-553.
[87] Gavrilov p. 371, 373.
[88] Musial p. 112, 293.
[89] Gerlach p. 865-66.
[90] Musial p. 292.

This in no way diminishes the importance of these railway attacks, which were extraordinarily important in the fight against the Nazi occupiers, disrupting supply lines and preventing troop movements.

The Collapse of the Occupation Regime

By the spring of 1943, the battle had turned against the fascist occupiers. The inhabitants had expelled the collaborating village elders and destroyed the local occupation governments in many towns; only the capitals of raions were under occupation control. The Nazis were only able to spread their propaganda by plane in most cases.[91] The partisans had divided the entire oblast' and assigned each brigade an area to use for obtaining provisions.[92] With the help of local resistance fighters, Soviet air power began bombing the city of Mogilev in May 1943.[93]

The occupiers could no longer win new support for their regime. An incident in Tserikovskii raion demonstrates this: one SS officer traveled to villages around the raion and attempted to form an anti-partisan self-defense organization called the "Fighters of the East." He offered inhabitants who possessed weapons to join and receive "estates with large portions of land." No one voluntarily joined. The officer forced all the inhabitants of villages to gather together and then offered them weapons to protect against the partisans. Every male signed up to participate, took a rifle, and then immediately joined the partisan movement instead.[94]

By September 1943, the Red Army had reached the northern border of Mogilevskaya Oblast'. The occupation forces responded by beginning an evacuation of Belarusian civilians from the front lines, including the city of Mogilev, which led to mass death among the fleeing

[91] Khramovich p. 52.
[92] Musial p. 282.
[93] Zhivopistseva, Aza Nikolaevna. Soldatami. p. 490.
[94] G Khramovich, Zarevo nad Sozhem (Minsk: Belarus', 1971), p. 57-58.

civilian population.[95] By the end of August 1944, the Nazi occupation had been driven out.[96]

Conclusion

The partisan and underground movements began immediately after the occupation started, and the majority of the population had begun to side with the resistance by the end of the spring of 1942. Oblast' territory under partisan control increased continuously from this point on. The resistance was initially a homegrown movement undertaken by citizens, not as a proxy of the Soviet Union; only later did the Red Army begin to exercise more influence over it.[97]

The partisans faced a formidable foe, not only in the Nazi army, but also in the occupation regime. This regime won over a large portion of the population, either through coercion, anti-Soviet feelings, or by offering the collaborators the chance to rob the rest of the citizenry. The pre-war Soviet statistics regarding government employment and statistics from the occupation regime show a larger number of citizens collaborating with the Nazis than with the Soviet Union, and this remains a subject that should be examined further.

The partisan movement in Mogilevskaya Oblast' was not perfect, however, and the traditional Soviet portrayal of the partisans was often based on exaggerated data and political myth. The behavior of partisan movements, in their plundering and revenge attacks against the civilians of the oblast', sometimes resembled the policies of the occupiers, albeit on a smaller scale. Attempting to obtain a clear picture of the size and behavior of the partisan forces is difficult in the cloud of exaggerated numbers and statistics.

The physical damage done to the occupation government may have been greatly exaggerated in reports and Soviet historiography, but the partisan movement was remarkably

[95] Musial p. 298.
[96] D. F. Voistrov, V Goretskom Redkoles'e ("Belarus'": Minsk, 1986), p 140.
[97] This attempt by Soviet power to assimilate the Partisan movement into the existing power apparatus continued on into the post-war period, According to Epshteyn, all partisan adults who fought at least two and a half years in the war were given positions of power in Oblast government after the war (Epshteyn 76).

successful as a modern insurgency movement. Although the partisans were not strong enough to take major cities, large swaths of the region fell generally under their control less than a year after the initial invasion. The movement created fear among the Nazi occupation commanders, leading them to avoid leaving the cities to plunder the oblast'. Also, the propaganda of the underground movements continuously reminded the population that resistance to the occupation existed. Thousands of locals willingly lived in unimaginable conditions in the vast forests, and others risked their lives every day in the heavily occupied cities. Their contributions to the Soviet victory in the region and on the eastern front are incalculable.

Works Cited

Agadzhanyan, Vagan. *Dorogi Partizanskie* (Minsk: "Belarus'",, 1979).

Epshteyn, X. *Privet, Tyozka ili Pic'mo K Prapрapravnuku* (Khar'kov: Ukraine, 2008).

Gerlach, Christian. *Kalkulierte Morde: Die deutsche Wirtschafts- und Vernichtungspolitik in Belaruß 1941 bis 1944* (Hamburg: HIS Verlag, 2000).

Khramovich, G. *Zarevo nad Sozhem* (Minsk: "Belarus'", 1971).

Klee, Ernst. Dreßen, Willi. *„Gott mit Uns": Der Deutsche Vernichtungskrieg im Osten 1939-1945* (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 1989).

Volchok, G. I. *Oborona Mogileva Letom 1941 Goda* (Mogilev: Mogilev State University, 2003).

Mette, K Ju. *Vernost'*. ("Belarus'": Minsk, 1989) *Mogilevskaya Oblast' statisktiko-ekonomicheskii Spravochnik* Ed. Levkovich, L and Katsman, F. (Mogilev, 1940).

Müller, Norbert. *Deutsche Besatzungspolitik in der UdSSR: Dokumente* (Köln: Pahl-Rugenstein Verlag, 1980).

Musial, Bogdan. *Sowjetische partisanen 1941-1944: Mythos und Wirklichkeit.* (Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 2009).

Pohl, Dieter. *Die Herrschaft der Wehrmacht. Deutsche Militärbesatzung und einheimische Bevölkerung in der Sowjetunion, 1941–1944.* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2008).

Popov, F. O. *Bor'ba Mogilyovichan Protiv Nemetsko-Fashistik Okkupantov.* (Mogilev: Belarus', 1958).

Shauro, V. F. Ed. *Zapozhdenie I Razvitie Partizanskovo Dvizheniya v Pervyi Period Voiny: Ijun' 1941 – Noyabp' 1942 g* Vol. 1 of *Vsenarodnoe Partizanskoe Dvizhenie Beloryssii v Gody Velikoi Otechestvennoi Voiny: Ijun'1941 - Ijul' 1944 gg. Dokumenty I Materialy.* (Minsk: "Belarus", 1967-1983).

Ed. Gavrilov, I. I. , ed. *Soldatami Byli Vse.* (Minsk: "Belarus'", 1972).

Voistrov, D. F. *V Goretskom Redkoles'e.* (Minsk:"Belarus'",1986).

Volchok, G. I. *Zapozhdenie I Razvitie Partizanskovo Dvizheniya v Mogilevskoi Oblasti v Godi Velikoi Otechestvennoi Voiny (1941 – 1944 gg.).* (Mogilev: Mogilev State University).

Eric M. Souder graduated in 2010 from Dickinson College with undergraduate degrees in History (honors) and Russian Language and Literature. This article is based on a case study from his senior honors thesis. He plans to pursue graduate studies in Russian History and one day teach on the college level. He is a member of the Dobro Slovo Honor Society.

The Pupil of the People

Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy's Peasant Schools at Yasnaya Polyana

By Eric M. Souder

Count Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy is best known as the author of some of the world's most famous literature, specifically the epic novels *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina.* Tolstoy naturally merits this distinction: his works changed the face of Russian literature, allowing for a previously unsurpassed international appreciation of Russia's authors of fiction. As Russian cultural historian James H. Billington states, "Tolstoy was such a formidable figure that transcended the environment in which he lived...by the end of his long life many people spoke of their 'two Tsars': the crowned Tsar in St. Petersburg and the uncrowned Tsar in Yasnaya Polyana."[1] Tolstoy experienced numerous spiritual crises in his life, nearly lost his estate due to bouts of drinking and gambling, and ultimately renounced the Russian Church, state, and before his death, his own family. As a result, throughout nearly his entire literary career, Tolstoy played an active role in the Russian struggle to, as Billington and other historians have stated, "answer life's 'cursed questions'" in both his personal life and society. [2]

One of these "questions" served as a constant source of contention in Tolstoy's Russia: what was the role of the peasants in society? This class encompassed nearly 23 million Russians. By the time of the 1860 Census, when Tolstoy was 32 years old, the peasant class numbered twenty three million – nearly one-third of the entire population.[3] A considerable portion of this

[1] James H. Billington, *The Icon and the Axe: An Interpretive History of Russian Culture* (New York: Vintage, 1966), 221. *Author's Note:* Yasnaya Polyana was Tolstoy's country estate, located a few hours outside of Moscow. Tolstoy spent the majority of his life living and developing this estate.

[2] Billington, 307-309.

[3] The estimated Russian population in 1860 was 71.2 million individuals. See Walther Kirchner, *Studies in Russian-*

peasant class was considered serfs, individuals bound to the property of wealthy landowners.[4] Despite over a century of educational reforms, Russia's peasants remained primarily uneducated. Historian Ben Eklof, in his extensive work *Russia's Peasant Schools* states:

> The history of Russian popular education before 1864 is one of sweeping projects occasionally passed as laws but almost never carried out in practice. [Empress Catherine II] is known to have felt that too much education for the *chern'* (plebes) was dangerous for the social order...there was no provision for the funding of peasant schools.[5]

In the late 1850s, Tolstoy began investigating popular education, as well as contemplating the establishment of his own peasant schools on his Yasnaya Polyana estate. At the turn of the decade, Tolstoy founded his school.[6] While this venture lasted only about three years, it represented the concerted effort of one of the world's most famous literary figures to alter the state of Russia's educational system. Furthermore, this event illustrates the multifaceted nature of Tolstoy himself; even in this early stage of Tolstoy's literary career, he shows signs of radical dissent from the established order in the desire to improve Russian society.

I. Early Life and Philosophy on Education

To understand Tolstoy's views on education, it is important to first examine his own schooling. Tolstoy was the product of neither "popular" education, nor the regimented government or theological schools so prevalent at the time of his youth. As Alan Pinch notes, "Tolstoy never attended a school...his own education was conducted by tutors at home, the usual

---

American Commerce, 1820-1860 (Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill, 1975), 51.

[4] This remained the case until 1861, when Tsar Alexander II issued the Edict of Emancipation, which, in essence, liberated the serfs. Although they were no longer required to work the land of the wealthy throughout Russian, the former serfs still faced considerable repression and financial difficulties due to the unbalanced hierarchy of local official in control of their land.

[5] Ben Eklof, *Russian Peasant Schools: Officialdom, Village Culture, and Popular Pedagogy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 19-24.

[6] Alan Pinch, "Introduction" in Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy, *Tolstoy on Education: Tolstoy's Educational Writings 1861-62,* Edited and Translated by Alan Pinch and Michael Armstrong (London: The Athlone Press, 1982), 13-14.

solution for aristocratic Russian families of his day."[7] This situation continued after Tolstoy's mother and father both died before Tolstoy turned eight – his legal guardians continued to appoint tutors for him. This private educational system hardly limited the young Tolstoy. In his earliest years he attained a level of near-fluency in both French and German, while simultaneously learning the skills of writing, reading, and mathematics. Before entering formal university, Tolstoy was also fluent in English and was "also well-versed in Arabic, Tartar, and Turkish...with the help of several specialized tutors."[8]

Upon entering the University of Kazan in 1844, Tolstoy studied Oriental Languages and Law. The university quickly managed to stoke the already growing fires of Tolstoy's opposition to authority, particularly in the realm of education. Tolstoy stated, "My work on [Catherine the Great's] *Instructions* and [Montesquieu's] *Espirit des lois* opened up for me a new field of independent mental endeavor whereas the university with its demands...hindered me."[9] Tolstoy failed his initial examinations in Oriental Languages — despite his prior grasp of three foreign languages — and left the University after only three years, having never earned a degree. Pinch acknowledges that, "Tolstoy never came to understand what a really good university could give. At Kazan he observed...the backward aspects of an institution still suffering from...the close of [Rector Nikolai] Lobachevsky's patient struggle to animate and organize a true centre of higher learning."[10] Regardless of this lack of understanding, this period laid the groundwork for the earliest development of Tolstoy's theories on education.

Not long after his withdrawal from the University of Kazan in 1847, Tolstoy entered the

---

[7] Ibid, 10.
[8] Ed. Bob Blaisdell, *Tolstoy as Teacher: Leo Tolstoy's Writings on Education,* Trans. Christopher Edgar (New York: Teachers and Writers Collaborative, 2000), 6.
[9] L.N. Tolstoy quoted in Ed. Blaisdell, *Tolstoy as Teacher.* 6.
[10] Pinch, *Tolstoy on Education.* 12.

Russian army with his brother, Nikolai, who was serving in the Caucuses. This period was pivotal in the life of young Tolstoy. At this time he wrote some of his earliest works such as *Childhood* (1852)[11] — a fictional account of his own youth —and *Sevastopol Sketches* (1855)[12] — based on a battle during the Crimean War. Furthermore, his interaction with the various groups of this region would inspire later works such as *The Cossacks* (1863)[13] and *Prisoner of the Caucuses* (1870),[14] as well as offer him a model for interaction with the peasantry. By 1855, Tolstoy began to experience a growing disenchantment with army life. He wrote to his aunt, "Over these last few days the idea of leaving the army had occurred to me more and more often. I see that it would be easy for me."[15] Tolstoy withdrew from the army in 1856, due in part to his previously expressed desire to leave the service.

Following his military service, Tolstoy began writing more, publishing several stories in the most popular Russian periodicals such as *Sovremennik*, which had been started by national poet Aleksander Pushkin, and at that point operated by revolutionary thinker Nikolai Chernyshevsky. He gained a significant amount of popularity at this time, becoming acquainted with the authors Ivan Turgenev, Ivan Goncharov, and the dramatist Aleksander Ostrovskii. Simultaneously however, Tolstoy struggled in his personal life: he rapidly injected himself into Moscow society, drinking heavily and gambling recklessly. In his later work *Confession*, Tolstoy described his lifestyle:

> I cannot think of those years without horror, loathing and heartache. I killed men in war and challenged

[11] L.N. Tolstoy, *Detstvo, Otrochestvo, Yunost'* (Moskva: Nauka, 1978), 5-76.
[12] L.N. Tolstoy, *Polnoe Sobranie Khudozhestvennykh Proizedenii*, Vol. 2 (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatelstvo, 1928), 49-154.
[13] L.N. Tolstoy, *Polnoe Sobranie Khudozhestvennykh Proizbedenii*, Vol. 3 (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatelstvo, 1928), 177-304.
[14] L.N. Tolstoy, *Kavkazskii Plennik* (Letchworth, England: Prideaux, 1982).
[15] L.N. Tolstoy to T.A. Yergolskaya, September 4, 1855, in *Tolstoy's Letters,* Vol. 1, 1828-1879, Ed. R.F. Christian (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978), 52.

> men to duels in order to kill them. I lost at cards, consumed the labor of the peasants, sentenced them to punishments, lived loosely and deceived people. Lying, robbery, adultery of all kinds, drunkenness, violence, murder – there was no crime I didn't commit...so I lived for ten years.[16]

As a result, Tolstoy frequently attempted to redeem himself for these actions in regard to the peasantry. He tried, somewhat unsuccessfully, to liberate the serfs on his Yasnaya Polyana estate. In 1856, he noted in his correspondence: "My business with the peasants is going badly...words about emancipation have reached them with various additions and embellishments, and as a result of their vague idea about whom the landowners' land belongs to, they have rejected my very favourable proposals."[17]

Tolstoy attempted to flee Moscow – as well as Yasnaya Polyana – on an 1857 trip throughout Western Europe. While Tolstoy's lifestyle did not change on the trip, it did spark his interest in the analysis of education.[18] His travels at this point, however, primarily consisted of sightseeing, touring museums, and living as recklessly as he had in Moscow. Tolstoy's sudden desire to educate the peasants on his estate seemed to appear randomly: in a single diary entry in June 1857, he stated, "A strong and distinct idea has occurred to me of setting up a school in my village for the whole district."[19] Tolstoy returned to Moscow and Yasnaya Polyana later that year, and approximately a year and a half later, he established the first Yasnaya Polyana School.

This first school was an experiment, as Tolstoy developed his theories regarding education. In March 1860, he wrote to traveller and geologist Y.P. Kovalevsky:

> I've been busy with a school for boys and girls...progress...has been quite unexpected. [The state-run

[16] L.N. Tolstoy, *Confession,* Trans. by Jane Kentish (London: Penguin Classics, 1987), 23.
[17] This quote combines two of Tolstoy's letters written in early June, 1856. The first: L.N. Tolstoy to M.N. Tolstaya, June 5, 1856. *Tolstoy's Letters.* 58. The second: L.N. Tolstoy to N.A. Nekrasov, June 12, 1856. Ibid, 58*fn.*
[18] After arriving in Geneva in April 1857, Tolstoy wrote to Turgenev: "I spent 1 ½ months in Sodom, and there is a great accumulation of filth in my soul: two whores, and the [witness of an execution], and the idleness and vulgarity" and later to V.P. Botkin, "Alas! I've picked up syphilis in Lucerne...I threw myself at the first woman I came across!" See R.F. Christian, *Tolstoy's Letters*. 97-102.
[19] Pinch, 13.

> academies] are useful but in the same way as dinner at the English Club would be useful if it were all eaten up by the steward and the cook. These things are produced by all 70,000,000 Russians, but are used by several thousand...The most vital need of the Russian people is Public education...[This] hasn't begun, and never will it begin as long as the government is in charge of it.[20]

Tolstoy continued to grapple with the larger problem of spreading public education to the peasantry. He even brainstormed —in the same letter to Kovalevsky —the foundation of a "Society for Public Education." Tolstoy's idea, however, was never presented to the government as would have been required for such a Russia-wide organization to be founded.[21]

In October of 1860, Tolstoy's educational ambitions were temporarily sidelined by the death of his brother, Nikolai, of tuberculosis in France. Tolstoy wrote to the poet A.A. Fet:

> He died, literally, in my arms. Nothing in life has made such an impression on me...The truth I've taken away from my 32 years is that the situation in which someone has placed us is the most terrible fraud and crime...I accept life as it is, as a most mean, detestable and false condition...I'm spending the winter here for the simple reason that I am here, and it makes no difference where I live.[22]

Despite Tolstoy's evident depression, he used that winter to his advantage; beginning in France, he continued travelling abroad researching education throughout Europe.

In an article entitled "On Popular Education," Tolstoy wrote,

> I could write whole books about the ignorance that I witnessed in the schools of France, Switzerland, and Germany. Anyone who cares about education should study schools not from the reports of public examinations, but from extended visits and conversations with teachers and pupils in the schools and outside the schools.[23]

Tolstoy was disturbed by the educational systems that he viewed while travelling throughout Europe. He abhorred the compulsory nature of schools and the intense amount of regimentation in nearly every facet of the West European scholastic system. Tolstoy likely witnessed the implementation of educational philosophies similar to those discussed by Michel Foucault in his

---

[20] L.N. Tolstoy to Y.P. Kovalevsky, March 12, 1860, in R.F. Christian, *Tolstoy's Letters,* Vol.1. 138-9.
[21] R.F. Christian, *Tolstoy's Letters,* Vol. 1. 140*fn.*
[22] L.N. Tolstoy to A.A. Fet, October 17/29. Ibid, 141-2. *Author's Note:* Several of Tolstoy's letters are dated with both the Old and New Russian Calendar dates. Unless otherwise indicated, the Old Calendar Dates will always be listed first.
[23] L.N. Tolstoy, "On Popular Education." In Ed. Bob Blaisdell, *Tolstoy as Teacher.* 178.

classic analysis of disciplinary tactics, both educational and otherwise:

> It was possible to link, to the binary exercises of rivalry, a spatial disposition [of students] inspired by the [Roman] legion, with rank, hierarchy, pyramidal supervision...By assigning individual places it made possible the supervision of each individual and the simultaneous work of all...It made the educational space function like a learning machine, but also as a machine for supervising, hierarchizing, rewarding...Thus the classroom would form a single great table, with many different entries, under the scrupulously 'classificatory' eye of the master.[24]

This standard in government-organized popular education represented – to Tolstoy – an environment counteractive to learning, and more broadly, the centralized, hierarchical exercise of power upon an otherwise voiceless mass.

He contrasted this with France's cafe culture:

> What I saw in Marseilles...takes place in all the other countries: everywhere the greater part of one's education is acquired not at school but in life....The very boy who told me that Henry IV had been killed by Julius Caesar knew very well the story of the *Three Musketeers* and of *Monte Cristo*...Here is the unconscious school that has undermined the compulsory school and has made the latter's substance dwindle down to almost nothing.[25]

Thus, education could not and should not be compulsory, but rather should grow organically from within the life experience of the people themselves. As Blaisdell notes,

> He was revolutionary but nondogmatic. He did not attack the popular *cultural* education of the day, but instead bowed to it and supplemented it with complementary material. At the same time, he eagerly offered children as much education as they desired.[26]

II. The Flourishing School and Its Curriculum

In the spring of 1861, Tolstoy returned to Yasnaya Polyana and resumed his efforts in fostering the growth of his school. He immediately dove into work: "I've been busy...with the school, which had to be placed on a new and better footing right from the start."[27] Tolstoy appointed new teachers, all of whom — at Tolstoy's discretion — taught according to his still-developing pedagogical philosophy: "The more convenient a method of instruction is for the

[24] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* Trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books, 1977), 146-7.
[25] L.N. Tolstoy, "On Popular Education." 179
[26] Ibid, 11.
[27] L.N. Tolstoy to A.A. Tolstaya, May 14, 1861. In R.F. Christian, *Tolstoy's Letters,* Vol.1. 147.

teacher the less convenient for the pupils. The only right way of teaching is that which is satisfactory for the pupils."[28] He found his philosophy easier to employ himself: "[The children] are fonder of me [than of the teachers]. And we begin to chat for 3 or 4 hours, and nobody is bored."[29] Several of his pupils later published reminiscences regarding the school and Tolstoy as teacher. One, Vasily Morozov, wrote in his memoirs:

> We had grown as close to Lev Nikolayevich as the cobbler's wax is to the wax-end. We were miserable without Lev Nikolayevich, and [he] without us...our school was still growing and growing. By now it had become famous not only in our province but even in Moscow and Petersburg. What am I saying? It had become famous abroad, not to speak of Russia. Even then I realized what a centre and meeting-point Yasnaya Polyana had become.[30]

The school at this point was expanding rapidly: it is estimated that as many as twenty "schools" were opened, and over fifty young boys, girls, and some adults attended lessons.[31]

In January 1862, Tolstoy published the first journal of his school, entitled simply *Yasnaya Polyana.*[32] This journal served primarily as a medium through which Tolstoy could voice his opinions regarding education and publicly display the successes and failures of his own efforts. One of his first major articles, entitled "The Yasnaya Polyana School in Months of November and December" offered a broad overview of his growing educational experiment. He stated,

> We have no beginners...like any living organism, the school not only varies with each year, day and hour, but also is subject to temporary crises...We have four teachers...the school is housed in a two-story stone building."[33]

He continued in a style comparable to one of his novels, describing every last detail of the building and its inner workings, down to the amount of mud frequently coating the staircases.

---

[28] L.N. Tolstoy, "The Yasnaya Polyana school in the months of November and December." In Ed. Pinch, *Tolstoy on Education*. 115.
[29] L.N. Tolstoy to A.A. Tolstaya, Beginning of August 1861. In R.F. Christian, *Tolstoy's Letters,* Vol.1. 149.
[30] Vasily Morozov, "Extracts from the Reminisces of a Pupil at the Yasnaya Polyana School: V.S. Morozov." In Pinch, *Tolstoy on Education.* 102-7.
[31] Alan Pinch indicates that "schools" were a broad distinction for Tolstoy, indicating a group of children visiting village officials to learn reading, writing and the like. See A. Pinch, *Tolstoy on Education*. 18.
[32] The initial title had been *A Country Schoolmaster.*
[33] L.N. Tolstoy, "The Yasnaya Polyana School in the Months of November and December," 75-6.

The bulk of this work however, was a detailed description of the school's non-compulsory curriculum, offering a glance not simply into the day-to-day classroom regimen, but also into the depths of Tolstoy's pedagogical philosophy. Tolstoy wrote:

> The youngest class reads, writes, and solves problems in the first three operations of arithmetic, and reads sacred history so that the course of study is divided in the following way: 1) reading mechanics and graded reading; 2) writing; 3) penmanship; 4) grammar; 5) sacred history; 6) Russian history; 7) drawing; 8) drafting; 9) singing; 10) mathematics; 11) natural sciences; 12) religion.[34]

He went to great lengths to explain each one of these subjects, typically offering an anecdote or two about a "typical" day in each of these classes. However, it is important to note that as mentioned in Eklof's extensive work on the peasant schooling system, this curriculum is not unique in structure. An "Abridged Program of Primary Schools," quoted in Eklof's modification of an 1809 English report on Russian education, indicated that nearly all of these subjects were taught, albeit in a perhaps more compact form than listed in Tolstoy's model.[35]

How then did Tolstoy's methods differ? Perhaps the most evident example of the distinctiveness of the Yasnaya Polyana School was found in its writing program. Tolstoy described this in great detail in a short essay entitled, "Are the Peasant Children to Learn to Write from Us?" This essay discussed the responsibility of the peasant children in educating themselves, "for the simple reason that the child stands closer than I do...to that ideal of truth, beauty, and goodness to which I, in my pride, wish to raise him."[36]

The basic method of teaching writing began as follows: "The chief goal in having children write compositions, consists not just in giving them themes but in presenting them with

---

[34] Ibid, 75.

[35] Eklof, "Appendix A: Instruction in Russian Primary Schools." In *Russian Peasant Schools.* 483-6. This is Eklof's modification of Thomas Darlington, *Education in Russian.* Board of Education, Special Reports on Education, Vol. 23 (London, 1909), 296-299.

[36] L.N. Tolstoy, "Are the Peasant Children to Learn to Write from Us?" In Ed. Blaisdell, *Tolstoy As Teacher*. 48.

a large choice, in pointing out the scope of the composition, and in indicating the initial steps."[37] Tolstoy presented his class with a series of ideas and then set the children to work on them. The children found themselves incapable of coming up with a topic and instead demanded that Tolstoy begin it for them. He continued: "In the middle of the lesson I was obliged to leave them. They continued to write without me, and finished two pages that were just as good, just as well-felt, and just as true as the first page."[38] Tolstoy notes, however, that after the children completed the story, the manuscript was left lying unsupervised in the classroom of a fellow teacher. As a result, a group of students turned it into a paper toy, later discarded and burned with a stack of scrap papers.[39] Tolstoy discovered the loss of the manuscript and alerted the student authors, who opted to spend the night at the schoolroom rewriting their story. After several hours of contemplation, one boy named Fedka finished the story, leading Tolstoy to state the following:

> The feeling for artistic measure was stronger in him than in any authors I know...It seemed strange to me that a half-literate peasant boy should suddenly arrive at such conscious artistic powers...It seemed strange and offensive to me that I, the author of *Childhood*, who had garnered some success and earned recognition for artistic talent from a cultivated Russian public...should be unable to teach anything to young Semka or Fedka.[40]

Although Tolstoy's commentary may be viewed as a supportive exaggeration of these two young boys' writing skills, it illustrates the very essence of Tolstoy's philosophy on education. By simply offering his students a minimum number of ideas, they could continue on their own literary path. This non-compulsory method of teaching writing led to several things: the boys not only completed the assignment, but expressed a deep interest in the writing process. As a result, the final product produced — a story entitled "They Feed with the Spoon, Then Poke the Eye with the Handle" —was a story of great magnitude, comparable (in Tolstoy's mind) if not

[37] Ibid, 25.
[38] Ibid, 33.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Ibid, 32.

superior to his own writing.[41] "There could no longer be any doubt," he stated, "that our success was no accident: we had apparently found a method that was more natural and more conducive than anything tried before."[42]

Foucault's eighteenth century concept of an educational "machine" could not be further from Tolstoy's non-compulsory and unstructured pedagogy. Despite the increasing popularity of the school and the positive reviews from its students, lectures were not always well attended. In fact, Tolstoy and the teachers did not even *require* attendance. In his journal, Tolstoy recalled:

> Suddenly without saying a word, two or three boys will suddenly rush into the room during the second or third afternoon class hour, hurriedly collecting their caps... "Going home." And who are these boys who decided to go home, and how did they decide to? God knows...Such occurrences take place once or twice a week. They are aggravating and disagreeable for the teacher...But who will not admit that due to these events the five, six, and even seven lessons a day for each class...take on that much more significance?[43]

He felt therefore, that quantity of attendance was subordinate to quality of learning in his classes, even at the risk of lessons rarely being heard by his students.

In addition, Tolstoy did not view grades as great disciplinary tools. He wrote:

> Grades are, for the students, a measure of their work, and the students express dissatisfaction with grades only when they believe a grade has been given unfairly...Grades by the way, are left with us only from the old ways, and are beginning to fall into disuse.[44]

Disciplinary measures as punishment, to Tolstoy, were equally vestigial:

> Let the people who are themselves punished invent the rights and obligations of punishment. Our world of children —of simple, independent people — must remain pure, free from self-deception and the criminal faith of believing in punishment.[45]

Although Tolstoy quite freely and happily published his journal of pedagogical theories,

---

[41] The title of their story refers to nineteenth century Russian ethnographer Ivan Snegiryov's (1793-1868) rendering of a traditional Russian proverb, "Ложкой кормишь, а стеблем глаз колёшь." (See I.M. Snegiryev, *Russkie v svoikh poslovittsakh: Rasuzhdeniya i isledovaniya ob otechestvennykh poslovitsakh i pogovorkakh, Knihzka 1* (Moskva: V Universitetskoi Tipografii, 1831), 159.) The translation here is from Ed. Blaisdell, *Tolstoy as Teacher,* Trans. Christopher Edgar (New York: Teachers and Writers Collaborative, 2000), 25.

[42] L.N. Tolstoy, "Are the Peasant Children to Learn to Write from Us?" In Ed. Blaisdell, *Tolstoy as Teacher.* 33.

[43] L.N. Tolstoy, "The School at Yasnaya Polyana," 89-90.

[44] Ibid, 87.

[45] Ibid, 86.

he nevertheless knew that his opinions would be contentious. He wrote to Vasily Botkin, "I hope that they kick up a terrible fuss about me in the press, and I hope that as a result of it I shan't cease to think and feel just the same."[46] Rather than receiving outright criticism however, as Blaisdell notes, "his contemporaries —when they bothered to respond —dismissed the ideas and opinions of *Yasnaya Polyana* as unimportant or impractical."[47] Therefore, while the journal continued to broadcast Tolstoy's educational doctrines throughout Russia, it did little to support the growth of the schools themselves.

III. Collapse and Revival

By late May, 1862, Tolstoy had exhausted himself from work at the school. Additionally, he had begun to suffer from symptoms of consumption and was instructed by his doctor to recuperate in Samara province. Shortly thereafter, agents from the Tsarist "Third Department" began a search of Tolstoy's Yasnaya Polyana estate for revolutionary publications written by either Tolstoy himself or his teachers.[48] This group of "secret police" ransacked Yasnaya Polyana, questioned Tolstoy's family and staff, and subjected them to the public reading of his diaries and letters. Tolstoy wrote to his aunt:

> It was fortunate for me and for that friend of yours [a colonel from the ranks of the Third Department with whom Tolstoy's aunt was acquainted] that I wasn't there – I'd have killed him! Charming! Marvellous! That's how the government makes its friends...I've always been completely indifferent to the government. I can't say that now."[49]

This event severely disturbed and depressed Tolstoy. While Blaisdell argues that "Tolstoy never cited [the government's intervention] as a cause for the school's demise," it is clear from

[46] L.N. Tolstoy to V.P. Botkin, January 26, 1862. In R.F. Christian, *Tolstoy's Letters,* Vol. 1. 153.
[47] Ed. Blaisdell, *Tolstoy as Teacher*. 14.
[48] The Third Department was a Tsarist secret police force established during the reign of Tsar Nicholas I.
[49] L.N. Tolstoy to A.A. Tolstaya, July 22-3(?), 1862. In R.F. Christian, *Tostoy's Letters,* Vol. 1. 158.

Tolstoy's letters that it was a major factor.[50] On August 7, he wrote to his aunt:

> All my activities in which I found happiness and solace have been ruined...There'll be no school, the people are laughing up their sleeves, the gentry are gloating, while we think willy-nilly, at the sound of every bell, that they've come to take us away.[51]

Tolstoy thus no longer found himself capable of adequately focusing on the school, but rather preoccupied himself with preparation for another raid of his estate. Furthermore, in defense of his honor following the search —and at his aunt's recommendation —he wrote a pointed letter to Tsar Alexander II, hoping to clear both his and the Tsar's name from blame in this situation.[52]

There were, however, several other events that acted as turning points for the *Yasnaya Polyana* journal, the school, and Tolstoy's life in general. The first of these is made evident in a letter written his aunt Alexandra shortly after his appeal to the Tsar:

> I've been afflicted by every misfortune lately: the gendarmes, such censorship of my journal that I'm only publishing the June issue tomorrow...and the 3rd and chief misfortune or good fortune, depending on which way you choose to look at it: toothless old fool that I am, I've fallen in love.[53]

Tolstoy met and fell in love with Sofia Andreyevna Behrs, the daughter of a high-ranking physician, whom he would marry on October 5, 1862, only months after their acquaintance. For Tolstoy, this fulfilled his long-standing desire to wed and raise a family. Despite its continued operation, over the next several months, Tolstoy made little or no mention of the Yasnaya Polyana School or the journal in his letters, instead focusing primarily on married life and the formation of his family. Vasily Morozov noted Tolstoy's preoccupation, stating that, "Lev

---

[50] Ed. Blaisdell, 15.

[51] L.N. Tolstoy to A.A. Tolstaya, August 7, 1862. In R.F. Christian, *Tolstoy's Letters,* Vol. 1. 160-2.

[52] R.F. Christian notes that "The Chief of Police appended a note justifying his action...on the technical grounds that the student-teachers were living [at Yasnaya Polyana] without residence permits. This explanation appears to have satisfied Alexander...the Governor of Tula (the region in which Yasnaya Polyana is located) was instructed in a subsequent letter from [The Chief of Police] on behalf of the Emperor that Tolstoy was not to be disturbed again for the same reason." In Ed. R.F. Christian, *Tolstoy's Letters,* Vol. 1. 163*fn.*

[53] L.N. Tolstoy to A.A. Tolstaya, September 7, 1862. Ibid, 164.

Nikolaevich rarely visited us and the school began to flag."[54]

The second life-altering event was Tolstoy's resumption of fictional writing. R.F. Christian states that, "The years 1863-9 were, in Tolstoy's literary biography, occupied entirely with the writing and publication of *War and Peace*, and if in one sense this was a momentous period of his life marked by almost continuous hard work, in another sense it was uneventful: there was only *one* literary event."[55]

In January 1871, his labours on the novel behind him, he wrote to Afanasy Fet that "I've stopped writing and will never again write verbose nonsense like *War and Peace.* I'm guilty, but I swear I'll never do it again."[56] As occurred frequently throughout Tolstoy's life, however, this self-deprecating commentary merely indicated a turn toward a nobler goal. He remarked, "There is just one difficulty: there are no good books for the people, not only in our country, but not even in Europe."[57] With this idea in mind, Tolstoy embarked upon the second wave of his educational experiment at Yasnaya Polyana.

As in his first attempts at peasant education, Tolstoy began by focusing on the instruction of children, specifically in the realm of reading and writing. Throughout the early 1870s, Tolstoy focused primarily on the creation of an *ABC Book* and a *Primer* both of which, he hoped, would bring basic, rudimentary skills to the masses. In January 1872, he wrote to Alexandra Tolstaya:

> These last years I've been writing a *Primer*, and now I'm having it published...My proud dreams about this *Primer* are: that two generations of *all* Russian children, from tsars' to peasants', will study with the aid of this *Primer* alone, and will receive their first poetic impressions from it, and that having written this *Primer*, I'll be able to die peacefully.[58]

---

[54] Vasily Morozov, "Recollections of a Pupil of the Yasnaya Polyana School." In Ed. Bob Blaisdell, *Tolstoy as Teacher*, 16.
[55] Ibid, 175.
[56] L.N. Tolstoy to A.A. Fet, January 1-6, 1871. In Ed. R.F. Christian, *Tolstoy's Letters,* Vol.1. 231.
[57] L.N. Tolstoy, "On Methods of Teaching the Rudiments." In Ed. Blaisdell, *Tolstoy as Teacher*. 182.
[58] L.N. Tolstoy to A.A. Tolstaya, January 12, 1872. In Ed. R.F. Christian, *Tolstoy's Letters,* Vol. 1. 240-1.

These books contained a series of basic exercises, serving as a culmination of Tolstoy's educational philosophy. A large portion of the texts included stemmed not only from Tolstoy's own work, but also from folk stories. When released, however, the *Primer* received much of the same criticism incurred by his early educational theories and was ultimately dismissed. Tolstoy noted by 1873 that, "The *Primer* is an inscrutable mystery to me: if I meet anyone with children, I hear genuine praise, and complaints that there's nothing of mine to read, but nobody buys the *Primer*, therefore nobody needs it."[59] His beloved project faded not only from importance in the public sphere, but also in Tolstoy's personal life.

Regardless of this failure, Tolstoy resumed personally teaching at Yasnaya Polyana, reestablishing the peasant schools. Tolstoy maintained the methods and regimen of the first schools, and added a new set of factors more connected with his family life: his children. Although (at the request of Sofia Tolstaya) Tolstoy's then five children were educated in a more traditional style, he often ordered that they participate in the lessons at Yasnaya Polyana on a daily basis. His daughter Tatyana noted that, "We three children taught the absolute beginners their alphabet. Our classroom was the hall, and fat Ilya [Tolstoy, her brother], a big pointer clutched in one hand, would try to teach the alphabet to rows of stolid little children much the same size as himself."[60] His son Ilya recalled the following:

> One day *papa* set me to teaching the alphabet to one of the boys. I tried my best, but he understood absolutely nothing. I lost my temper and began hitting him; we fought and both began to cry. *Papa* came and told me that I could never teach again because I didn't know how..."It's not for us to teach them, but for them to teach us," he remarked.[61]

By late 1873 however, Tolstoy found himself once again preoccupied and forced to close

[59] L.N. Tolstoy to N.N. Strakhov, May 31, 1873. Ibid, 261.
[60] Tatyana Tolstaya, *Tolstoy Remembered*. In Ed. Blaisdell, *Tolstoy as Teacher.* 17.
[61] Ilya Tolstoy, *Tolstoy, My Father: Reminiscences*, Translated by Ann Dunnigan (Chicago: Cowles Book Company, Inc., 1971), 18.

the schools. He gave no direct reasoning for this abrupt close, yet his letters reveal several occurrences which more than likely pulled him away from his efforts at peasant education. In 1874, a famine struck his property in the Samara province, inspiring Tolstoy to begin his first of many attempts at agricultural reform. He stated in a letter to his aunt Alexandra Tolstaya, "This year there was a very abundant harvest throughout the whole Samara province, and as far as I know, the only place in the whole Samara province that was missed by the rains was my estate... [I] suffered a big loss...the disaster would have been terrible if such friendly help hadn't been given to the people there."[62] Furthermore, he noted the loss of his sixth child, and shortly thereafter, the expected birth of another. As his daughter Tatyana recalled, "When summer came, the school was closed, and the next year it didn't reopen."[63]

While education remained one of Tolstoy's interests throughout the duration of his life, the 1870s marked the end of his attempts at organizing schools for the peasantry. In the second half of the decade, he dedicated himself entirely to the writing and publication of his second great novel, *Anna Karenina*. Simultaneously, he became entirely preoccupied with religious ideas and the notion of impending death, culminating with a full spiritual crisis sometime around 1879, which he chronicled in his short work *Confession*. This period changed Tolstoy's outlook on his own existence, society, and his writing, leading him to renounce his old life and begin on a path of religious contemplation lasting until his death. Furthermore, and perhaps most importantly in the context of this study, it awakened him to further issues, both in a social and political context, within peasant society. He developed specific ideals regarding the role of the peasant in the social hierarchy of Russia and supported a notion of peasant self-sufficiency in education. Over

[62] L.N. Tolstoy to A.A. Tolstaya, August 15, 1874. In Ed. R.F. Christian, *Tolstoy's Letters,* Vol. 1. 271-2.
[63] Tatyana Tolstaya, *Tolstoy Remembered*. As quoted In Ed. Blaisdell, *Tolstoy as Teacher.* 17.

the next several years, Tolstoy would turn his attention to these glaring problems, beginning projects in much the same manner as the peasant schools in the attempt to improve the peasant condition in Russia.

IV. Conclusion

Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy frequently proved himself as a man of many abilities. His skills in prose caused him to be ranked not only as one of the foremost authors of his time, but as a timeless author whose extensive works have affected generations. Tolstoy, despite the brevity of his Yasnaya Polyana schools, acted not only as a voice for an ideology, but as a man of action, seeking to help the peasantry through a new form of popular education. Interaction with the Russian government and the balance between his personal and literary life—factors which frequently complicated Tolstoy's remaining years—caused the gradual disintegration of this particular experiment in social change.

Works Cited:

Berlin, Isaiah. *Russian Thinkers.* New York: Viking Press, 1979.

Billington, James H. *The Icon and the Axe*: *An Interpretive History of Russian Culture.* New York: Vintage Books, 1966.

Figes, Orlando. *Natasha's Dance: A Cultural History of Russia.* New York: Picador, 2003.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish.* Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1977

Maude, Aylmer. *The Life of Tolstoy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Tolstoy, Ilya. *Tolstoy, My Father: Reminiscences.* Translated by Ann Dunnigan. Chicago: Cowles Book Company, Inc., 1971.

Tolstoy, L.N. *Confession and Other Religious Writings.* Translated by Jane Kentish. New York: Penguin Classics, 1987.

_____. *Detstvo, Otrochestvo, Yunost'.* Moskva: Nauka, 1978.

_____. *Kavkazskii Plenik.* Letchworth, England: Prideaux Press, 1982.

_____. *Polnoe Sobranie Khudozhestvennykh Proizvedenii, Volumes 2-3.* Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatelstvo, 1928.

_____. *Polnoe Sobranie Sochinenii.* Nedeln: Kraus Reprint, 1972.

_____. *Tolstoy As Teacher: Leo Tolstoy's Writings on Education.* Edited by Bob Blaisdell. Trans. Christopher Edgar. New York: Teachers and Writers Collaborative, 2000.

_____. *Tolstoy on Education: Tolstoy's Educational Writings 1861-62.* Edited and Trans. Alan Pinch and Michael Armstrong. London: The Athlone Press, 1982.

_____. *Tolstoy's Diaries, Volumes 1-2.* Edited and Translated by R.F. Christian. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1985.

_____.*Tolstoy's Letters, Vol.1, 1828-1879.* Edited and Translated by R.F. Christian. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978.

_____.*War and Peace.* Translated by Constance Garnett. New York: The Modern Library, 1931.

_____. *The Works of Tolstoy.* Vol. 14, *What then Must We Do?* Translated by Aylmer Maude. London: Oxford University Press for the Tolstoy Society, 1928-1934.

Venturi, Franco. *Roots of Revolution: A History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in Nineteenth Century Russia.* Translated by Francis Haskell. New York: Knopf, 1960.

Walicki, Andrzej. *A History of Russian Thought: From the Enlightenment to Marxism.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1979.

Melissa Yael Jacobowitz graduated in 2009 from New College of Florida with a B.A. in Russian Language and Literature. For the past year, she has been continuing her exploration of Jewish-Russian literature and identity through a Fulbright grant in Odessa, Ukraine. She will be applying to graduate programs in Slavic Languages and Literatures for the Fall 2011 season. This essay represents a chapter of her undergraduate honors thesis, "Between Two Worlds: Internalized Anti-Semitism in Isaac Babel's Short Fiction."

Mind/Body, Jewish/Russian

Identity Fragmentation in Isaac Babel's "Story of My Dovecote"

By Melissa Yael Jacobowitz

"It is always the dominant people who define what is beautiful."
-Melvin Konner, *The Jewish Body*

One of Isaac Babel's semiautobiographical childhood stories, "Story of My Dovecote" [«История моей голубятни»], explores the process of a Jewish boy growing up in early twentieth-century southern Ukraine among revolutionary reforms, anti-Jewish discrimination, and anti-Jewish pogroms. In "Story of My Dovecote," the child-narrator's experience of his entrance into a Russian gymnasium and the 1905 pogrom in Odessa compels him to face hostile and contradictory ideas about his identity coming from both inside and outside his family and community. In order to enter the Russian world as a Jew, the narrator must attempt to reconcile Jewish, Russian, and popular anti-Semitic images of the Jewish male's intellectualism and resulting powerlessness, physical deformity, and emasculation.

In *Red Cavalry,* Babel's major short story cycle about a Jewish journalist's enlistment in a violent Cossack cavalry unit during the Russian Civil War, the narrator works to distance himself from "Jewish" qualities and a Jewish identity to be accepted by the Cossacks. By contrast, the narrator of "Story of My Dovecote" struggles with simultaneously accepting and rejecting his Jewish identity. While the narrator of *Red Cavalry* often disassociates himself from dominant society's stereotypes of particular, negative "Jewish" characteristics and projects these traits onto others, the narrator of "Story of My Dovecote" both employs popular anti-Semitic imagery and explicitly includes himself in the negative category of "weak Jews." As the boy enters gymnasium, interacts with Russians, and faces violence, he must navigate a society that

allows him in (to an extent) while also presenting him with negative images of himself, his heritage, and his community.

Sander Gilman examines these conflicting dynamics in his work, *Jewish Self-Hatred: Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews* (1986), and argues, "the fragmentation of identity that results is the articulation of self-hatred" (3). Through acceptance of the stereotypes of what Gilman terms "dominant society," in this case to gain a place of respect among Russians while simultaneously identifying as a Jew, internalized anti-Semitism fragments the boy's identity. He is unable to reconcile incompatible worldviews and images to create a singular, workable identity that enables him to live fully in both the Jewish and Russian worlds.

In this paper, I will examine the child-protagonist's identity fragmentation through the original Russian text. I argue that this fragmentation is embodied in three ways. First, through conflicting images and interpretations of Jewish and Russian bodies and intellects, the boy's identity is broken up into mind/body and Jewish/Russian oppositions. These dichotomies gain practical meaning as he learns that the Jewish body, as seen by Russians, renders Jews powerless in Russian society. Second, this fragmentation is exhibited by associations between the narrator and other characters, achieved by the repetition of words and phrases to describe seemingly opposite individuals. These associations effectively splinter the boy's identity into multiple characters. Third, the boy's identity fragmentation is manifested by the text's two narrators, a primary adult-narrator and a child-narrator. The relationship between these two narrators adds another layer of fragmentation to the text, as the primary narrator both separates himself from and identifies with the child-narrator.

Jewish and Russian Bodies, Minds, and Power

"Story of My Dovecote" is the narrator's account of his entrance into the first class of a

Russian gymnasium. Only two Jewish boys are allowed in each year, and the boy's father pushes him to study incessantly, to the point of despair. To entice the child, his father promises to fulfill his most intense desire—to own a dovecote and pairs of doves. After receiving the highest grade possible on the exam, much to the pride of his family and Jewish community, the boy begins to attend the Russian school. He only remembers the promise of the doves after the novelty of his new school has worn off. His mother forbids him from leaving the house to purchase the doves because of the danger outside: the Constitution of 1905 has just been announced and people are giving speeches, celebrating, and protesting in the streets. Against his mother's wishes, the boy sneaks out to the wild game market. As he is buying the doves, he overhears that his grandfather has been killed across town. He hides the doves under his shirt and tries to run home by a back way, but is intercepted by a Russian cripple and his wife. The cripple discovers the doves and smashes them against the boy's face. On the ground, covered in the intestines of his doves, the boy reevaluates his place in the world. After watching the beginnings of a pro-Czarist procession, the boy runs home to find his family's household employee, Kuzma, taking care of his grandfather's dead body. The story ends as Kuzma brings the boy to the house of a local Russian man, where his parents are hiding from the violence that has erupted into an anti-Jewish pogrom.

Alice Stone Nakhimovsky writes:

> The images that adhere to Jews in the childhood stories are similar to images of Jews in *Red Cavalry*. Jews are not at home in the physical world; they are not robust or sexual… 'Story of My Dovecote' [is] about Jewish powerlessness, in part physical and sexual, as perceived by a young boy (103).

Much like the narrator of *Red Cavalry,* the boy wrestles with Jewish intellectual ability juxtaposed to Russian physical strength. In the context of early twentieth-century Russian Odessa, facing both extreme violence and a quickly changing world, he is forced to question the viability of his Jewishness, and with it his mind and body.

While the narrator of *Red Cavalry* as a whole avoids directly describing his body, but

rather only describes the bodies of Cossacks, the narrator of "Story of My Dovecote" explicitly depicts and critiques his own physicality. He writes, "Like all Jews, I was short in stature, weak, and plagued by headaches from too much study" (Babel 604) [«Как все евреи, я был мал ростом, хил, и страдал от ученья головными болями» (Бабель 127)]. This statement is emblematic of the narrator's view of Jewish identity in several ways. First of all, this quotation establishes that the narrator views the Jewish body negatively. Second, the Jew's physical disability is directly tied to his mental aptitude. Cultural historian Daniel Itzkovitz, writing of popular anti-Semitic imagery, notes, "the imagined Jew was thought to have overdeveloped bankbooks and brains at the expense of an underdeveloped (or decaying) body" (190). Third, by saying, "like all Jews," the narrator posits that every Jew embodies this anti-Semitic stereotype and denies any possibility of diversity or individual identity among Jews. In doing so, he employs this anti-Semitic stereotype to its furthest conclusion, "othering" Jews by essentializing them as all being the same and sharing inherent, negative characteristics.

Though the narrator speaks of the Jews as an outsider by employing popular anti-Semitic stereotypes, he simultaneously includes himself in the category of Jews. "Like all Jews," he writes, "*I* was short in stature, weak, and plagued by headaches from too much study." This statement exhibits one of the fundamental tensions of "Story of My Dovecote": in one sentence, the narrator speaks as both an insider and outsider in regard to the Jewish community.

This identification with the "weak Jews" distinguishes Babel's narrator from "self-hating Jews" as described by Gilman. In *Jewish Self-Hatred*, he writes that self-hating Jews mock characteristics that dominant society ascribes to Jews, but that they always employ "mockery directed at a projection of the self rather than at the self" (Gilman 20). Gilman's "self-hating" Jews both accept dominant society's value system and project its characterization of negative,

"Jewish" qualities onto other, "bad" Jews, always working to distinguish themselves from those projections. The narrator of "Story of My Dovecote" complicates Gilman's notion in that he accepts dominant society's characterization of Jews as physically weak and mentally strong, but includes himself among the Jews who share these qualities.

According to the narrator, the healthy development of the Jew's mind and body are placed in opposition to one another; as a Jew, he can never have both a strong mind and strong body. In this way, through the boy's acceptance of dominant society's view of Jews as physically weak and mentally strong, his identity is broken into opposing parts and he is rendered incapable of reconciling mind and body. Internalized anti-Semitism, being forced to reconcile negative images of Jewishness portrayed by dominant society with the hope of gaining a place of respect within that society, further fragments the boy's identity as he speaks simultaneously as an insider and an outsider, a Jew and a Russian.

The narrator's description of short, weak Jews is in direct contrast to his portrayal of Russians. After receiving the highest grade possible on his Russian language entrance exam, the narrator exits the classroom and is immediately surrounded by Russian boys poking him and trying to make him play with them. Scared and unsure, the narrator is saved from the Russian boys by Pyatnitsky, the deputy warden who helped to administer his exam. Pyatnitsky[1] takes a liking to the boy after his emotional performance of Pushkin's poetry during the exam, calling him "my little friend" (Babel 603) [«дружок мой» (Бабель 126)], and tells the Russian boys to leave the narrator alone. The narrator describes Pyatnitsky as having a "large, fleshy,

[1]It is interesting to note that "Pyatnitsky" [«Пятницкий»] comes from the word "five." It is no coincidence that the narrator must receive two five-pluses [пятерок с крестами, lit. fives with *crosses*] on his entrance examination to be admitted to the class. At the end of "Story of My Dovecote," after Grandpa Shoyl is murdered, the narrator must also place two "fivers" [пятаки] over Shoyl's eyes. Fives are therefore associated with both the narrator's initial acceptance into Russian society (i.e. entrance into the gymnasium, Pyatnitsky's protection of the narrator) and Russian society's ultimate destructive invasion into his life (Grandpa Shoyl's murder) and the irreconcilability of the two worlds.

gentlemanly back" (Babel 603) [«Я увидел смятение на просторной этой, мясистой, барской спине» (Бабель 126)] and compares him to a barge:

> A magnificent star shone on his chest, medals tinkled by his lapel, and hemmed in by the murky walls, moving between them like a barge moves through a deep canal, his large, black, uniformed body marched off on rigid legs and disappeared through the doors of the headmaster's office. (Babel 603)
>
> Пышная звезда блеснула у него на груди, ордена зазвенели у лацкана, большое черное мундирное его тело стало уходить на прямых ногах. Оно стиснуто было сумрачными стенами, оно двигалось в них, как движется барка в глубоком канале, и исчезло в дверях директорского кабинета. (Бабель 126)

In the narrator's eyes, Pyatnitsky is the opposite of a Jewish boy. His body is large and powerful and he is decorated with medals, signs of acceptance and prestige in the eyes of other Russians. As Pyatnitsky keeps the Russian boys from bothering the narrator, it becomes obvious that only a man as physically powerful as he is capable of protecting the narrator in the Russian world.

The narrator sees Jewish male bodies in light of the Russian male bodies he experiences outside his home community. Because he believes Russian society highly values physical strength and views Russian men as strong and Jewish men as weak, he sees the men in his family as powerless in the world of dominant, Russian society. The narrator writes, "All the men of our clan had been too trusting of others and too quick to take unconsidered action. We had never had any luck in anything" (Babel 603) [«Все мужчины в нашем роду были доверчивы к людям и скоры на необдуманные поступки, нам ни в чем не было счастья» (Бабель 126)].

His father attributes this ill-fortune to an outside force. "My father believed," the narrator writes, "that his life was governed by a malevolent fate, an inscrutable being that pursued him and that was unlike him in every way" (Babel 604) [«Отец верил поэтому, что жизнью его управляет злобная судьба, необъяснимое существо, преследующее его и во всем на него не похожее» (Бабель 127)]. This fate represents not simply an otherworldly force, but a social force as well. «Преследующее», translated here as "pursued," can also mean "persecute" or "victimize." The narrator's father, therefore, feels that his life is controlled and that he is

victimized by a being that resembles him in no way [«во всем на него не похожее»]. This "being" can be read to represent Russians, who control the Jewish man's fate in a Russian-dominated society. Russians are "unlike him in every way" —he feels that his body and values are fundamentally different from the Russians who govern and pursue him. Therefore, he is unlucky because his Jewish body and values are futile when judged within the value system of Russian society. Russian and Jewish identities are rendered all the more irreconcilable by the boy's father through his view of the absolute difference between the two groups and the Jewish powerlessness that results.

The disparity between the Russian and Jewish worlds is reiterated in the climax of the story, as the narrator faces violence and encounters the physical world as he purchases his doves. Overhearing that his grandfather has been killed, he runs toward home through a back alley, where Makarenko the cripple kills his doves. As the narrator is lying with his face against the earth, he experiences the earth and physicality in a new way. He writes, "My world was small and ugly. I closed my eyes so I wouldn't see it, and pressed myself against the earth that lay soothing and mute beneath me. This tamped earth did not resemble anything in our lives" (Babel 609) [«Мир мой был мал и ужасен. Я закрыл глаза, чтобы не видеть его, и прижался к земле, лежавшей подо мной в успокоительной немоте. Утоптанная эта земля ни в чем не была похожа на нашу жизнь и на ожидание экзаменов в нашей жизни» (Бабель 134)].

This wording parallels his father's view of fate. In the Russian text, the same phrasing is used for the being which was "unlike him in every way" [«и во всем на него не похожее»] and the earth which "did not resemble anything in our lives" [«ни в чем не была похожа на нашу жизнь»]. The earth—this soothing, mute, physical earth—does not resemble the boy's Jewish life just as the force—the Russians—that governs his father's life also does not resemble him.

Through this experience, the narrator reestablishes that the physical, natural world, as manifested in the dirt of the ground, is not a part of the Jew's life. Along with differentiating the natural world from the Jewish world, and reinforcing aforementioned anti-Semitic views of Jews as physically inadequate, the narrator identifies himself with the Jewish world. He writes, "*My* world was small and ugly…. This tamped earth did not resemble anything in *our* lives." At the same time, he "presses" himself against the earth, finding something "soothing" and comforting in this experience of a world that is not his own.

It is important to note that Peter Constantine's widely-used 2002 English translation leaves out a part of the original Russian text. His English translation ends with, "This tamped earth did not resemble anything in our lives," [«Утоптанная эта земля ни в чем не была похожа на нашу жизнь»], but the full Russian text continues, "or the expectation of exams in our lives" [«и на ожидание экзаменов в нашей жизни»]. The original Russian reinforces the boy's contrast between physical and mental worlds and abilities. The narrator spends the first half of "Story of My Dovecote" studying for exams, and in this passage, he defines his life as waiting and preparing for exams. This life, of course, is directly opposed to the physical, earthly world that belongs to others.[2]

While taking the entrance exam for the first time at the beginning of the story, the narrator repeats twice, "I was good at learning" (Babel 601) [«Я был способен к наукам» (Бабель 124)] and speaks of his "mind and sharp memory" (Babel 601) [«у меня ума и жадной памяти» (Бабель 125). However, as he raises himself from the ground at the end of the story, after his violent encounter with Makarenko, the boy comes to realize that these skills leave him

[2]Another level of interpretation is also possible. These "exams" can be read not only as literal entrance examinations, which the boy studies for and takes earlier in the story. "Exams" may also be read as the constant challenges and difficulties of living as a minority. The Russians' world, the earth, is "soothing" and "mute" in contrast to the constant struggles that the narrator and his family must face as Jews.

powerless in Russian society. Efraim Sicher writes:

> Exams and daily existence lose their usual meaning for the boy who is forced to readjust his relationship with the world around him. The usual behavioral boundaries have broken down and, with them, the boundary between the self and the outside world. The boy is brought to reconsider his identity in a gentile-oriented society and to apprehend his adult role as alienated Jew in a dangerous, hostile non-bounded area outside the familiar perception of the closed Jewish home with its joys and troubles, its anxieties and ambitions. (*Style and Structure* 91)

After this realization, the boy describes walking home along a "foreign street" («Я шел по чужой улице» (Бабель 134)], and as Sicher interprets, it is "no longer *his* street, no longer recognizable" (*Style and Structure* 91). The boy is forced to reevaluate a world in which he may attend a Russian school by passing a difficult examination, but where his mind offers no protection against violence committed by Russians against Jews. He is conflicted as he both admires those Russians and fears them.

Biblical Allusions, Character Associations, and Fragmentations

Certain repeated associations between characters in "Story of My Dovecote" further embody fragmentation. For example, the characters of Makarenko and the narrator are connected through repetitions in order to illustrate a splintering of the narrator's identity. Though Makarenko seems, on the surface, to be simply the narrator's enemy and oppressor, I argue that Makarenko actually represents parts of the narrator's own identity. As the narrator struggles to find himself among conflicting worldviews and aspects of his identity, he cannot exist as a singular whole, but rather finds (or projects) parts of himself in others around him. The narrator describes Makarenko and himself in parallel ways in order to illustrate these multiple pieces—the Russian and Jewish parts of himself.[3]

[3]This splitting of features of the narrator's identity among different characters in the narrative can also be seen in the relationship between Grandpa Shoyl, the narrator, and Makarenko. The narrator describes Grandpa Shoyl as having "fat hands…covered in fish scales" (Babel 604) [«толстые его руки…покрыты рыбьей чешуей» (Бабель 127)]. Makarenko suffers from leprosy, which is derived from a Greek word that means scales on a fish. There are other parallels between the scene after the boy has been hit with the doves and the scene describing Grandpa Shoyl's dead body.

Babel's technique of associating characters through the repetition of words and images can be said to be derived from a Jewish source. As Sicher writes, "Babel's prose abounds in references and allusions to the Hebrew Bible, Prophets and later holy scriptures, to what George Steiner has called the 'textual homeland' of the Jewish world" ("Jewishness of Babel" 85). "Story of My Dovecote" is no exception. The text includes allusions to David and Goliath and Noah's doves. However, as pointed out in Zsuzsa Hetényi's *In a Maelstrom: The History of Russian-Jewish Prose (1860 – 1940)*, the text's Biblical motifs go even deeper. She writes:

> The catalogue is a basic poetic feature of the Bible, deeply rooted, first of all, in the paratactic structure of Biblical Hebrew language itself, but it is also an ancient technique or device of poetic imagery. Paratactic structures are usually elliptic, and the coherence is born, as it was mentioned, through association. One of the secrets of Babel's text is its visual nature, things depicted side by side without any textual element of cause and effect, with a hidden logic to be decoded by the reader. This type of 'and…and…and' language is characteristic of the ancient (primitive) structure of Hebrew (allowing multiple explications of the Biblical text), of the poetic language (visual impressions, metaphoric imagery, parallels) and of the child's language, too. (235)

By catalogue, Hetényi is referring to a device such as the description of the contents of Uncle Lev's trunk in "Story of My Dovecote," in which seemingly unrelated or irreconcilable items are placed side by side without any hint of how these juxtapositions might be interpreted.[4] However, images do not have to literally be placed next to one another in the text to be connected through this type of association. By repeating particular words or phrases to describe two seemingly very different characters or their actions (words that are never repeated elsewhere in the text), Babel achieves the same effect: he asks his readers to associate these characters with one another, to imagine them side by side and to question what their connection might mean.

On the surface, the narrator and Makarenko seem to be opposites. The former is a shy, small Jewish boy who spends the majority of his life studying indoors, the latter a Russian man

[4]"In this trunk were dumbbells, locks of a woman's hair, Uncle's *tallith*, whips with gilded tips, and herbal tea in little boxes trimmed with cheap pearls" (Babel 604) [«В этом сундуке были гири от гимнастики, пряди женских волос, дедовский талес, хлысты с золочеными набалдашниками и цветочный чай в шкатулках, отделанных дешевыми жемчугами» (Бабель 127)].

who sells cloth outside the wild game market. Makarenko is described as having a “rough face of red fat and fists and iron” (Babel 608) [«грубое его лицо, составленное из красного жира, из кулаков, из железа» (Бабель 132)], an image that rings of violence and forceful physicality in a way that contrasts sharply with the weak, studious Jews of the narrator’s world. Alice Stone Nakhimovsky interprets the boy’s embarrassment and defeat at the hands of Makarenko to be a sign of just how powerless he is within Russian society. She writes, “In the marketplace, caught in the pogrom, he and his doves are no match even for a Russian cripple” (104). However, linguistic clues and repetitions that connect the narrator with Makarenko suggest that the relationship between these two characters is more complex.

The very fact that Makarenko is described as a cripple [калека] is important and serves to connect him with the narrator. After being accepted to the first class of the gymnasium, the narrator runs home to tell his parents. While his father immediately begins to celebrate, his mother remains reserved. The narrator describes his mother’s response, “My mother was pale, she was trying to foresee my fate in my eyes, and looked at me with bitter pity, as if I were a little cripple” (Babel 603) [«Мать была бледна, она испытывала судьбу в моих глазах и смотрела на меня с горькой жалостью, как на калечку» (Бабель 126)]. Makarenko and the narrator are both described by others as cripples, and this label associates them with one another.

Makarenko’s physical disabilities connect him with the narrator in other ways. Amid the confusion that ensues as the pogrom breaks out, a young woman with “a beautiful, fiery face” (Babel 608) [«женщина с распалившимся красивым лицом» (Бабель 132)] runs away with some of Makarenko’s merchandise. He yells at his wife and business partner, Katyusha, that people are stealing cloth and bonnets from them, “‘Bonnets!’ Makarenko shouted, choked, and made a sound as if he were sobbing” (Babel 608) [«--Чепцы!—закричал Макаренко, задохся и

сделал такой звук, как будто он рыдает» (Бабель 132)]. He struggles to stop the woman, but is unable to because of his disability: "The legless man couldn't catch up with her. His wheels rattled, he moved the levers with all his might" (Babel 608) [«Безногий не поспевал за ней, колеса его гремели, он изо всех сил вертел рычажки» (Бабель 133)]. The woman ignores Makarenko's screams and takes off with the stolen cloth.

This scene bears a striking linguistic resemblance to an earlier scene, in which the narrator recites Pushkin's poetry during his exam. The narrator describes, "I recited the poems in sobs….I, shivering, straight-backed, shouted out Pushkin's verses with all my might, as fast as I could" (Babel 602) [«Я навзрыд сказал эти стихи….торопясь, я кричал пушкинские строфы изо всех сил» (Бабель 125)]. In both scenes, Makarenko and the narrator sob (рыдает, навзрыд) and shout (закричал, кричал) as they struggle to achieve something they are not predisposed to accomplish—legless Makarenko attempts to chase after a physically fit woman, just as the Jewish narrator tries to make the pinnacle of Russian culture his own.[5] Furthermore, the phrase "with all one's might" [«изо всех сил»] is repeated to describe both actions in both scenes. The linguistic parallelism between these two descriptions serves to associate the characters. Just as the narrator's weak, Jewish body and values render him ineffective in Russian society, legless Makarenko is also powerless in a world that privileges physical ability.

Aside from these linguistic repetitions and associations, another Biblical allusion serves to connect Makarenko with the narrator. Makarenko is legless because he suffers from leprosy, and as Sicher points out, by smashing the dove against the boy's face, "he is performing, albeit in reverse, the ritual cleansing of leprosy ordained in Leviticus 13-14" (*Style and Structure* 92).

[5]Of course, "the pinnacle of Russian culture" is a loaded statement. What I mean to say is that Pushkin represents, to many, the birth and height of Russian literary culture. As Zsuzsa Hetényi writes, "The child in this scene has no understanding of the controversial character of the situation: Peter the Great and Pushkin's poems are the foundation stones, the very essence of Russian national culture" (240).

Leviticus 13 and 14 describe how a priest may determine if a person who suffers from a skin disease is clean or unclean. If a person is declared to be unclean, he must live in isolation away from his community. However, if a person who has been isolated heals, he may be cleansed to reenter the community through a ritual involving sprinkling bird's blood on his skin. Yet, if Makarenko is the leper, why should the narrator be the one receiving the ritual cleansing? This appropriation of the Biblical ritual serves to further associate Makarenko and the boy—just as both are cripples, the narrator is also a metaphorical leper.[6] Makarenko's violent acts toward him illustrate the fragmentation of identity that results from internalized anti-Semitism.

Fragmentation, Narration, and Time

Fragmentation can also be found in the structure of the narration of "Story of My Dovecote." The story is narrated not just by the child-protagonist, but rather by two narrators—the primary adult-narrator who looks back on and frames the story, and the child-narrator who relates his action as he experiences it.[7] Examining Jewish-Russian literature as a phenomenon, Zsuzsa Hetényi writes of the importance of examining narrative structure in these works:

> It was fundamentally important to investigate the storyteller's position and the highly complex narrative relationship between the author and his text. The structure of these *narrative layers* is especially intriguing because, owing to their dual identity and uncertainties of self-definition…the narrative layers illuminate the shifting viewpoints of internal and external narrative, the often highly delicate, hard-to-keep balance between staying aloof and accepting identification. One can witness these shifts in the changes of the author's distance from the world portrayed or created, and from its characters. The duality of being both critical and accepting, attracted and repelled, is reflected by the different forms of modality, and in the ambivalence (in the psychological sense of the term rather than in the manner as it was used by Bakhtin) of the viewpoints of 'we'/'us' and 'them.' (xii-xiii)

This is seen in "Story of My Dovecote" through the shifting relationship between the primary and child-narrators. This relationship, consisting of both distancing and identification, further emphasizes and embodies the text's theme of identity fragmentation.

---

[6] For more on popular associations between leprosy, syphilis, and Jews, see Sander Gilman's "The Jewish Murderer: Jack the Ripper, Race, and Gender."

[7] Efraim Sicher also points out this split and names the two narrators in *Style and Structure*.

As the text is written entirely in the past tense, the primary narrator must always be at least implicitly present, framing the boy's experiences through his mature point of view. However, the primary narrator vacillates in his explicit distance from the events described in "Story of My Dovecote." While at some points the two narrators' temporal worlds and viewpoints seem to collapse into one, at other times, the primary narrator pointedly separates himself from his childhood self, overtly distinguishing his time and place from the child-narrator's. For example, in the expository first paragraph of the story, the text reads, "My family lived in Nikolayev, in the province of Kherson. This province no longer exists; our town was absorbed into the district of Odessa" (Babel 601) [«Родные мои жили в городе Николаеве, Херонской гувернии. Этой губернии больше нет, наш город отошел к Одесскому району» (Бабель 124)]. Through this statement, the adult-narrator clearly differentiates his contemporary world from the child-narrator's; he declares that things have changed, that in his time and place, the child-narrator's home province no longer exists. Hence, the primary narrator marks an overt differentiation between the past and present and, in doing so, separates himself from the boy.

Further, the grammar, math, and Russian history textbooks are commented on by the adult-narrator: "Children no longer study these books, but I learned them by heart, line by line…" (Babel 602) [«По этим книгам дети не учатся больше, но я выучил их наизусть, от строки до строки…» (Бабель 125)]. Here, again, the primary narrator overtly separates himself from the child-narrator. The books to which the child-narrator devoted years of studying for his entrance exams have become outdated in the adult-narrator's time.

Yet, even as the primary narrator differentiates himself from the child-narrator, he also identifies with him. The child describes his early love for Grandpa Shoyl and for his tales of the Polish uprising of 1861. The primary narrator notes, "Now I know that Shoyl was no more than

an old fool and a naïve teller of tall tales, but I have not forgotten those little tales of his, they were good tales" (Babel 604) [«Теперь-то я знаю, что Шойл был всего только старый неуч и наивный лгун, но побасенки его не забыты мной, они были хороши» (Бабель 128)]. While the primary narrator explicitly distinguishes his interpretation of Shoyl's stories from the child-narrator's eager acceptance of his grandfather's reported adventures, he also affirms that he still fondly remembers these "good tales." Sicher argues, "…the disoriented child-narrator of 'Story of My Dovecote' is naively unaware of what the primary narrator knows in retrospect" (Sicher, *Style and Structure* 90). Though the primary narrator realizes that Shoyl's stories were likely false, he still loves them, just as the boy does. Within this one statement, the primary narrator both distances himself from and connects with the child-narrator's point of view. These "shifting viewpoints" and marked "changes of the author's distance from the world portrayed or created, and from its characters" further fracture the protagonist's identity between his past and his future.

The boy's struggle to be accepted by Russian society leaves him unsettled, stuck attempting to navigate incompatible worlds. Though his family celebrates his admittance to the Russian gymnasium as a Jewish victory over Russian power—a victory of Jewish brains over Russian brawn[8]—he soon discovers that Russian culture still considers him an outsider. He learns that the same society of which he wishes to become a part, the society that has produced the poetry of Pushkin he so admires, is also capable of committing great violence against him and his family. His identity splinters into the aspects of himself that yearn to become a Russian

[8] During the party his parents hold in honor of his admittance to the school, his Hebrew tutor toasts his victory: "In this toast the old man congratulated my parents, and said that by passing this examination I had won a victory over all my foes, I had won a victory over the fat-cheeked Russian boys and the sons of our roughneck rich. Thus in ancient times had David, the King of the Jews, won a victory over Goliath, and just as I had triumphed over Goliath, so too would our people, through its sheer power of mind, triumph over the foes that surround us, eager for our blood" (605) [«Старик поздравил родителей в этом тосте и сказал, что я победил на экзамене всех врагов моих, я победил русских мальчиков с толстыми щеками и сыновей грубых наших богачей. Так в древние времена Давид, царь иудейский, победил Голиафа, и подобно тому, как я восторжествовал над Голиафом, так народ наш силой своего ума победит врагов, окруживших нас и ждущих нашей крови» (Бабель 128)].

and those that cannot break away from his Jewish home. As this paper has illustrated, this fragmentation structures "Story of My Dovecote" in several ways: through mind/body and Jewish/Russian dichotomies, associations between the narrator and Makarenko, and the identification and distancing between the text's two narrators.

Works Cited

Babel, Isaac. *Red Cavalry*. The Complete Works of Isaac Babel. Ed. Nathalie Babel. Trans. Peter Constantine. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, 2005. 203-333.

_____. "Story of My Dovecote." The Complete Works of Isaac Babel. Ed. Nathalie Babel. Trans. Peter Constantine. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, 2005. 601-611.

_____. «История моей голубятни.» Одесские рассказы. Ред. А.Н. Пирожково. Москва: ЭКСМО, 2006. 124-135.

Gilman, Sander L. "The Jewish Murderer: Jack the Ripper, Race, and Gender." The Jew's Body. New York, NY: Routledge, 1991. 104-127.

_____. Jewish Self-Hatred: Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.

Hetényi, Zsuzsa. In a Maelstrom: The History of Russian-Jewish Prose (1860 – 1940). Trans. János Boris. New York, NY: Central European University Press, 2008.

Itzkovitz, Daniel. "Secret Temples." Jews and Other Differences: The New Jewish Cultural Studies. Ed. Jonathan Boyarin and Daniel Boyarin. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1997. 176-202.

Konner, Melvin. The Jewish Body. New York, NY: Schocken Books, 2009.

Nakhimovsky, Alice S. *Russian-Jewish Literature and Identity: Jabotinsky, Babel, Grossman, Galich, Roziner, Markish*. Johns Hopkins Jewish Studies. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.

Sicher, Efraim. "The Jewishness of Babel." Jews in Russian Literature After the October Revolution. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1995. 71-111.

_____. Style and Structure in the Prose of Isaak Babel'. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, Inc., 1985.

Bradley Gorski holds a degree in Russian from Georgetown University. Since graduation he has been living in St. Petersburg and Moscow, Russia, working in as the Russia Country Coordinator for EducationUSA. He plans to apply for Ph.D. programs in Slavic Studies to start fall 2011. His research interests are Nabokov, post-Soviet literature and the interplay between linguistics and literature.

Nabokov vs. Набоков:
A Literary Investigation of Linguistic Relativity

Bradley Gorski

> *I don't think in any language. I think in images. I don't believe that people think in languages. They don't move their lips when they think. It is only a certain type of illiterate person who moves his lips as he reads or ruminates. No, I think in images, and now and then a Russian phrase or an English phrase will form with the foam of the brainwave, but that's about all.*
> —Vladimir Nabokov, from a BBC television interview, July 1962

Vladimir Nabokov wrote his autobiography in English. He published it piecemeal in *The New Yorker*, *The Atlantic Monthly*, *The Partisan Review*, and *Harper's*. He collected these chapters and published them under the unifying title *Conclusive Evidence* in 1951. In 1953, he published a similar autobiography, reliving many of the same memories—though sometimes in quite different ways. This book was called *Drugie berega* [*Other Shores*], written and published in Russian. In *Speak, Memory* (1967), he used some of the emendations from *Drugie berega* and ignored others. *Speak, Memory* was his last autobiography in any language. Nabokov describes *Speak, Memory* in its foreword as a "re-Englishing of a Russian re-version of what had been an English re-telling of Russian memories in the first place" (12). Nabokov labels none of these inter-lingual changes "translations." Instead, something in the essence of his recollections makes them "Russian memories," and to get those memories into English, he must re-tell or even "re-English" them, while getting them to fit back into the Russian language requires a "re-version." All this from an author who claims he does not think in any language (*SO* 14).

Nabokov's autobiographies in Russian and in English are indeed quite different. Based on the sentence from *Speak, Memory*'s foreword quoted above, we can assume that some of those differences are based on the language of creation. Other factors, such as two very different readerships and a drastic change in Nabokov's reputation (*Lolita* appeared between *Drugie*

berega and *Speak, Memory*), affect Nabokov's writing in each. The present study recognizes this, but offers a framework for identifying which differences are directly related to language.

The impetus behind this investigation arises out of basic questions about the interplay between the language of creation and the literary output. Elizabeth Beaujour in her book *Alien Tongues: Russian Bilingual Writers of the "First" Emigration* asks, for example, why the memoirs of bilingual writers like Nabokov and Julien Green diverge drastically when nothing but the language changes (45). When Green says, "writing in English, I had become another person," what metamorphosis does he have in mind (Green quoted in Beaujour 46)? Though the present study does not answer this question, it does analyze the differences in the English- and Russian-language works of a bilingual author as a step toward an analytical methodology. By keeping the literary mind constant, and isolating the differences caused primarily by language, we can better understand how, if at all, the language of creation influences literary production.

To isolate differences caused by language from those caused by extra-linguistic factors, we must identify those words which have a significant impact on expression of thought throughout that language. The work of theoretical semanticist Anna Wierzbicka provides a methodology toward this goal. In her book, *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words* (1997), Wierzbicka isolates several culturally significant terms from each of five languages. She works with published usages of each word to distill all its shades of meaning down to a set of semantic primitives. Semantic primitives are words or phrases which cannot be further simplified, and whose meaning putatively remains unvaried even when translated, e.g. "I want" is semantically no different from "yo quiero," "je veux," or "ia khochu." Each shade of meaning contained in a key word bears out in its explication, so that the set of semantic primitives that can define *freedom*, for instance, will not be the same set used to define *svoboda*, the Russian translation of

freedom. By exploring the differences in the meanings of the key words used in different languages, we can thus better understand the cultures which use these languages as their primary means of expression.

Using Wierzbicka's methodology, I have isolated and analyzed two key words which define the central themes of both *Speak, Memory* and *Drugie berega*. In my analyses of these words, I have relied on dictionaries, published usages, recognized linguistic corpuses, the reported opinions of native speakers, and my own intuitions. It is my hope that the subtle inter-lingual differences revealed in these analyses will help explain some of the less-than-subtle differences between Nabokov's two autobiographies. The two pairs I have chosen are: (1) homeland – rodina; and (2) childhood – detstvo.[1] Perhaps other pairs could have been chosen, but these are the most relevant to this specific line of analysis.

1a. Homeland

In English, "homeland" is not a key word. It appears only five times in Kučera and Francis's corpus of one million running words of English text (synonyms appear even less frequently: "motherland" appears once, and "fatherland" does not appear at all).[2] To the American English speaker, "homeland," "motherland," and "fatherland" sound like translations.[3] When spoken in English, it seems to refer to "the old country" or the birthplace of an immigrant. Weaker bonds tie Americans and perhaps even the British to their countries than those which tie other nationalities to their homelands. This is the case for two reasons. First, nothing hereditary ties us to our place of birth; second, no history has significantly strengthened that bond.

[1] The original version of this study analyzes a third pair, (sense of) humor – (chuvstvo) iumora.
[2] The *Computational analysis of present-day American English*, by Henry Kučera and W. Nelson Francis, otherwise known as the Brown Corpus, comprises 500 samples, distributed across 15 genres in rough proportion to the number published in 1961 in each of those genres. All works sampled were published in 1961and were written by native speakers of American English.
[3] Since the creation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2002, the word "homeland" has gained a bureaucratic familiarity. But this was not the case for Nabokov nor for his mid-century readership.

The concept of "homeland" as developed in other countries ties together nation (ethnic group) and state (political entity) in a way that seems impossible for Americans. Two essential elements in Wierzbicka's explications of concepts glossed as "homeland" in other European languages are: "I was born here" and "I am like a part of this country" (Wierzbicka 196). These two are rarely as closely tied in English-speaking countries as they are in states with lesser traditions of immigration. In a situation where a German would answer, "I am German," and a Pole, "I am Polish," a person born in America to German and Polish parents is as likely to say, "I am German" or "I am Polish" as he is to say, "I am American." Few Americans will say, "there is a part of me which makes me American;" rather, the American nationality is a coincidence of birthplace. As a nation of immigrants, the place of our birth rarely correlates with a feeling of belonging. Belonging is more likely to spring from a separate identification with a racial, ethnic, or religious subgroup without any immediate correlation to place. Any feeling we might have of being Americans could spring from an identification with political ideologies, a pride in our history, or a simple recognition of our citizenship. Claiming to be an American, however, rarely ties something inherent in the citizen to something intrinsic in the country.

Furthermore, the English language exists on isolated landmasses, with most largely protected from invasion. At no time since the Norman Invasion has any stronghold of the English language been physically invaded. During outside threats, language groups require a name by which to rally behind the defended land. In Russia, World War II, which in that country is known as the Great Patriotic War, caused an increase in the incidence of the terms *rodina* and *otechestvo*, both glossed as "homeland" in English. The United States' experience in World War II was different, however. Without any real threat to American soil, soldiers often fought to "save Europe" or to "protect democracy abroad" instead of dying "za rodinu" [for the

homeland], as Russian soldiers did. Even during the blitzkrieg, the Nazis never threatened to violate England's sovereignty in the same way as they had Russia's borders.

Homeland, then, becomes a muddled concept which evokes translated novels and translated ideas. Rarely is the word applied by native speakers to a country where English is the dominant language spoken. This, at least in part, explains this word's remarkably low frequency. My explication in something approaching Wierzbicka's semantic primitives follows:

homeland

(a) this is a country
(b) someone else was born there
(c) that person is like part of that country
(d) that person no longer lives there
(e) that country is an important part of that person's identity
(f) that person often thinks about that country
(g) when that person thinks about that country s/he feels something good
(h) that person is like other people in that country
(i) that person may not return to that country
(j) that person could not feel this way about any other country

1b. Rodina

In contrast to the English "homeland," the Russian word *rodina* appears frequently in the modern language. According to Zasorina's 1977 corpus based on one million running words, *rodina* has a frequency of 172.[4] The word appears frequently in spoken language as well as in official contexts, especially in Soviet-era propaganda.

The word shares its root *rod-* with *rodnoi* (native or one's own) and with *rodit'sja* (to be born). Indeed, the concept of birth is essential to the word's meaning. In a survey of Khar'kov university students, 72% identified *rodina* as "the country (or territory) where one was born" (qtd. in Wierzbicka 192). In addition, many respondents mentioned the "familiar character of *rodina*, as a place where everything is 'rodnoe, blizkoe, poniatnoe i privychnoe' (that is, roughly speaking, [one's own], close to one's heart, understandable, and accustomed)" (Wierzbicka 192).

[4] The *Chastotnyi slovar' russkogo iazyka* collects approximately one million words from four genres of text published between 1950 and 1965 and written by native speakers of Russian.

Wierzbicka claims that *rodina* carries no implicit duties, which she assigns to the rough Russian synonym, *otechestvo*. However, Russian speakers[5] with whom I have spoken consistently rate their duty to defend their *rodina* as more important than their duty to defend their *otechestvo*. *Rodina* nurtures like a mother and when *rodina-mat' zovet* [mother-*rodina* calls], as she often did from World War II-era Soviet propaganda posters, you are expected to defend her as you would your own mother. This minor disagreement with Wierzbicka has necessitated my addition of point (i) below. The rest of the full explication is Wierzbicka's[6]:

rodina

(a) a country
(b) I was born in this country
(c) I am like a part of this country
(d) I couldn't be like a part of any other country
(e) when I think about this country I feel something good[7]
(f) I think something like this when I think about this country:
(g) this country is like a person
(h) this country does good things for me, like a mother does good things for her children
(i) I should help this country whenever it needs me
(j) I know everything in this country[8]
(k) I am like other people in this country
(l) when I am in this country I feel something good
(m) I couldn't feel like this in any other country

2a. Childhood

OED defines "childhood" primarily as "…the time from birth to puberty." I disagree that childhood starts at birth. English has the word "infancy" to designate the time of the strictest dependence on the mother. Childhood, then, starts at about four years, the time of our earliest memories. The concept of childhood is, in fact, deeply tied to that of memory. When "childhood"

[5] Here and elsewhere when I mention the opinions of native speakers, I am referring to the results of informal surveys and conversations with native-Russian-speaking colleagues.
[6] For a fuller exploration of *rodina*, and justification for the points in this explication, see Wierzbicka, Anna. *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words*. pp. 191-195
[7] While true that many émigré Russians have more conflicted than categorically positive feelings about Russia, Wierzbicka's analysis is based on usage by native speakers across the spectrum, only a small sliver of which would be émigrés. Her reasoning, to me, seems sound, and I think it would reflect a native speaker's understanding of the word *rodina* even if that speaker might feel differently about his country.
[8] Wierzbicka bases this conclusion on the association of *rodina* with *rodnoi*. She makes a compelling case based on linguistic associations of how Russians think about the word *rodina*.

is used as an attributive adjective, it often modifies the word "memories." In fact, "childhood memories" is one of the most common collocations involving childhood (Kjellmer 574). Other attributive phrases like "childhood games" are not equivalent to "children's games." The latter means "games for children," while the former means something closer to "games we remember playing during our childhood." Thus, childhood starts not with birth, but with our first memory.

I would also argue that "childhood" is essentially reminiscent. We understand "childhood" as a concept after we outgrow it. The statement *"I am having a good childhood"[9] seems absurd. Statements like "she died in childhood," though possible, sound like unedited versions of "she died when she was a child," or errors in "she died in childbirth." One cannot "die in childhood," if childhood is a concept that has no meaning until one can reminisce about it.

"Childhood" also belongs to a relatively small class of nouns ending in the suffix -hood. These nouns include "father-," "mother-," "brother-," "sister-," "priest-," "adult-," "woman-," "man-," and "neighborhood." This list provides a few clues to the interpretation of "childhood" in the context of this group. First, it seems that stages of life are important. No life can be monopolized by one of these concepts. In other words, no one can be in fatherhood, priesthood, adulthood, etc. for his entire life. All words in this category are transitory. Second, all terms in this list have positive connotations. Notice the absence of *lunatichood or *villainhood. Third, if we analyze the list's final term, "neighborhood," we understand that the suffix has less to do with interpersonal relations than with a certain collectivization. Everything in the -hood is exclusive from everything outside. All neighbors are in their -hood, just as all children are in theirs, separate from those outside their collective community. "Neighborhood" also points out the physical orientation of this group of words. Almost all of these words can take the physical verb

[9] For non-specialist readers, I should clarify that an asterisk placed before a word or phrase in linguistics texts means "not generally accepted by native speakers."

"to enter into." ("Neighborhood" requires a definite article, while *"to enter into brother-/sister-/childhood" are impossible, because these states of being require no agency from the one entering into them. Notice, however, that we can talk about "the end of childhood" by metaphorical extension as though it were a physical area with a distinct boundary.) This collective aspect of the suffix "-hood" allows us to talk about "their childhood," while *"their childhoods" sounds less than standard without additional context (e.g. the title of a 1979 book, *Growing Up in Minnesota: Ten Writers Remember their Childhoods*, highlights that each writer's childhood experiences were distinct from the others').

An important distinction between "childhood" and nearly all the other "-hoods" illuminates another subtlety. With the exception of "neighborhood," no other word ending in "-hood" can be qualitatively assessed. We can speak of a "bad childhood" or a "healthy childhood," but any qualitative assessment of "fatherhood," "brotherhood," etc. is semantically unacceptable. (Note the exception that when "brotherhood" means fraternity or society, one can speak of a "strong brotherhood.") We can also speak of "my childhood" or of "childhood" as a concept, whereas with the possible exception of "my adulthood" (?)[10] other words from this category work only as concepts. Therefore, "childhood" is both personal and conceptualized. It is rarely used in the plural.

I would further contend that, based on the abundance of family forms ending in the suffix "-hood," we can deduce that "childhood" also has a family component. Childhood is that time when family looks after one's well-being more closely than ever. The end of childhood, as defined by *OED*, is puberty. Puberty seems perfectly logical for two reasons. First, in puberty we are able to reproduce, and in no physiological way are we guaranteed to be the youngest

[10] The parenthesized quotation mark after a word or phrase in linguistics texts indicates that the author questions the acceptability to native speakers.

generation. Once we can physically have children, we can no longer be in childhood. Being the youngest generation in a familial setting seems equally essential to the meaning of "childhood," just as the definitions of many of the other "-hood" words depend on their relations to others, especially to other family members. Second, during puberty we gain an awareness of our sexual nature. In a very important sense, we lose our innocence. (At this point, I would argue, childhood branches into girl- and boyhood, later to become woman- and manhood.) Innocence, then, becomes an essential part of "childhood" as a concept.

All these considerations lead us to the following explication of "childhood:"

childhood

(a) a time in life
(b) this time started with my first memory
(c) this time ended with puberty
(d) I can understand this time only after it has ended
(e) I can talk about this time only after it has ended
(f) at this time I felt like everyone else who was in this time
(g) my experience at this time could have been good or bad
(h) at this time I should have been protected by my family
(i) at this time I should have been innocent

2b. Detstvo

The *Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo iazyka* defines *detstvo* as "from infancy to adolescence." There seems to be no reason based on the meaning of "*detstvo*" to doubt this definition. This definition is similar to that for the English-language term "childhood," although a person's first memory defines the lower boundary of English "childhood," while there seems to be significantly less evidence for such a boundary in the Russian *detstvo*.

The Russian sentence *on umer v detstve* ["he died in childhood"] is preferable to *on umer, kogda on byl malen'kim* [lit. "he died when he was a child"]. Native speakers do not even prefer the more elegant *on umer rebenkom* ["he died as a child"] and feel that dying during *detstvo* in no way precludes an understanding of that time of life as a concept. In other words, *detstvo* exists independently of the reminiscent aspect which is necessary in its English gloss. Furthermore,

Russian derives no adjectival form from *detstvo* and therefore the term cannot be used attributively. Instead it must be replaced by *detskij*, which shares only the root *det-* with *detstvo*. This adjective carries no reminiscent weight and can be translated into English as the attributive "childhood" (*detskie vospominaniia* "childhood memories") or the possessive "children's" (*detskie igry* "children's games"). Thus, we see that the necessary reminiscent aspect of the English term is not as deeply ingrained in the Russian.

However, the Russian word seems to emphasize the collective aspect of this time of life even more than its English counterpart. *Detstvo* ends with a very common *–stvo* suffix. This suffix is one of the two most common endings for abstract nouns and therefore does not allow any of the same types of deductions as the "-hood" suffix allowed in English. One of the peculiarities of *detstvo*, however, is a result of this suffix: nouns ending in *–stvo* do not often take the plural. *Detstvo* is no exception; this word cannot be pluralized. Thus, every child must exist in the same *detstvo* because no matter how different experiences in *detstvo* are, a speaker of Russian cannot separate his *detstvo* from his friend's by using a plural form. For the same reason, native speakers of Russian invariably prefer *u menya detstvo bylo schastlivoe* [lit. "unto me childhood was happy," closer to the English, "for me childhood was happy"] to *moe detstvo bylo schastlivoe* ["my childhood was happy"]. Using a possessive pronoun for *detstvo* strikes the Russian ear as sub-standard, further emphasizing a collective aspect of *detstvo*.

The Russian language judges *detstvo* by a different set of criteria than English judges "childhood." While in English we often talk about a "good/bad childhood" or a(n) "un/healthy childhood," Russian gravitates towards emotional modifiers. The first five collocations listed in the *Uchenyi slovar' sochetaemosti slov russkogo iazyka* are *schastlivoe*, *radostnoe*, *bezradostnoe*, *trudnoe*, *tiazheloe* ["happy," "joyful," "joyless," "difficult," and "trying"]. This

dictionary lists no collocations with *khoroshee* or *plokhoe* ["good" or "bad"], or with any other unemotional qualitative modifier. In my own investigations, native speakers of Russian invariably preferred *schastlivoe detstvo* to *khoroshee detstvo*. A positive *detstvo* seems to depend almost solely on the presence of emotions like happiness or joy.

The *Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo iazyka* says that *detstvo*, like English "childhood," ends at puberty. For the same reasons that this boundary was logical in English, it is logical in Russian. This leads us to consider both family and innocence as necessary features of *detstvo*. Furthermore, the collocation, *lishit' detstva* [to deprive (someone) of childhood], usually means to deprive someone of either innocence or a position as family dependent.

Based on these important distinctions, I explicate the term *detstvo* as follows:

detstvo

(a) a time in life
(b) this time follows infancy
(c) this time ends with puberty
(d) everyone in this time experiences this time
(e) at this time I had a lot in common with everyone else in this time
(f) when I think about my experience at this time I think:
(g) this time was good if I was happy
(h) this time was bad if I was not happy
(i) at this time I was under the protection of adults
(j) at this time I was innocent

Homeland/Rodina

After explicating these two sets of terms, we turn now to Nabokov's two autobiographies, *Drugie berega* and *Speak, Memory*. The first of these was written by Nabokov, the Russian-language narrator; the second by Nabokov, the English-language narrator. In this section, I will select passages in which each of the relevant concepts (*homeland*/*rodina*, or *childhood*/*detstvo*) appears as a major theme. I will analyze these passages in the Russian and in the English (if parallel passages exist) to tease out salient differences. Nabokov's Russian-language narrator and his English-language narrator often tint these and other key themes differently. I will investigate

these differences according to the semantic explications delineated above. A more Russian-language treatment of themes in *Drugie berega* coupled with a more English-language treatment in *Speak, Memory* would suggest that Nabokov's narrators are, at least to some extent, influenced by the language of creation.

Rodina/*homeland* appears often as a theme in both *Speak, Memory* and *Drugie berega*. Both explicit appearances of the word *rodina* and implicit appearances as a concept provide ample fodder for careful scrutiny of the interplay between Nabokov and his creative languages. Because *rodina* is by far the more frequently used term in the pair, I have begun with the 10 phrases where *rodina* appears in *Drugie berega*. For each of these phrases, Nabokov chooses a different English language equivalent. The following table charts the appearances of *rodina* in *Drugie berega* on the left, with their equivalents in *Speak, Memory* on the right:

Table 1

Drugie berega			*Speak, Memory*		
page	chapter.section	Usage	page	chapter.section	Usage
20	1.4	vostorg vozvrashcheniia k rodine	28	1.4	returned to St. Petersburg
61	3.6	toska po rodine	73	3.5	Nostalgia
108	4.8	uterianaia rodina	115	5.7	her own lost homeland
182	10.2	na ego vtoroi rodine	201	10.2	in his adopted country
213	11.4	poteria rodiny	245	12.4	loss of my country
216	11.4	toska po rodine	250	12.5	Homesickness
223	12.2	nyne on u sebia na rodine krupnyi uchenyi	262	13.3	Today he is not unknown among his peers
228	12.3	na rodine futbola	267	13.4	in the England of my youth
232	12.5	tosku po rodine	271	13.5	Nostalgia
236	13.1	na novoi moei rodine	275	14.1	in my adopted country

Only once does Nabokov use "homeland" in English where he used *rodina* in Russian (*SM 115*, *DB* 48) and only to refer to a non-native speaker of English talking about a country where English is not spoken—to Nabokov's French governess as she waxes nostalgic about her time in Russia as if it were "her own lost homeland" (115). Furthermore, the very modifier "lost" for homeland aligns this particular usage with the explication of "homeland" above.

The English concept *country* lacks the personal implications of the Russian *rodina*. Therefore, when Nabokov translates *rodina* as "country" above, he modifies it with the participle "adopted"—from a verb primarily associated with familial relations—to emphasize the familial relationship implicit in the Russian concept of *rodina* (*SM* 201, 275). When he is unable to use "adopted," Nabokov compensates with strong possessive undertones in "loss of my country" (*SM* 245). "Loss" implies past possession, while the possessive pronoun (absent in Russian) approximates the stronger bond implied by *rodina*. On three occasions, Nabokov declines even to attempt an English approximation, and in three others, he translates the stock phrase "toska po rodine" as "nostalgia" or "homesickness;" here I have given the English by location in the text (*SM* 28, 262, 267 and 73, 250, 271).

Nabokov clearly understands how to use *rodina* in Russian, and how to approximate the idea of *rodina* in English. All of his usages in English and in Russian are acceptable in native speech. But Nabokov also understands that the terms are not the same. He understands that when molding his "Russian memories" into English sentences, he cannot use "homeland" in the same way he can use *rodina* when he forms the same memories into Russian. Whether he thinks in Russian or in English (or in images instead of any language at all) matters little here. Once he faces the task of expressing those thoughts in a language, he starts to wrestle with how that language can best approximate his memories. Sometimes, however, Nabokov reaches outside the primary language of expression to capture the particular tint of these recollections.

In *Speak, Memory*, Nabokov's verbal expression breaks free of the English language on more than one occasion. For instance, in describing a childhood return to Russia, Nabokov resorts to the Russian term *rodina*:

> Against the background of winter, the ceremonial change of [train] cars and engines acquired a strange new meaning. An exciting sense of *rodina*, "motherland," was for the first time organically mingled with the

> comfortably creaking snow, the deep footprints across it, the red gloss of the engine stack, the birch logs piled high, under their private layer of transportable snow, on the red tender. (96)

Nabokov's use of the Russian term suggests one of two things: either he remembered feeling a very specific emotion that could only be explained in Russian, or he remembered a prior verbalization of that emotion in Russian, and that verbalization seemed apt. In either case, something in this memory made Nabokov use *rodina* in an English text. Furthermore, Nabokov suggests that while this particular moment might have been the first time he felt a "sense of *rodina*," it was not the first time he considered the emotional implications of this concept. By inserting the adverbial clause, "for the first time," Nabokov presents the "sense of *rodina*" as something he should have felt in the past. The fact that he feels "a sense of *rodina*" for the first time surprises the child Nabokov much more than the feeling itself—which, it seems, he might have internally articulated long before. In these lines, more than in other passages about *rodina*/*homeland*, the reader can see Nabokov retelling a pre-articulated Russian memory in the English language.

Even though Nabokov recalls Russian memories, the fact that he must express them in English affects the formulation of those thoughts. In the passage above, he seems to sidestep this problem by inserting Russian terminology. However, the paragraph's last sentence suggests otherwise. "That particular return to Russia," Nabokov concludes his paragraph, "my first *conscious* return, seems to me now, sixty years later, a rehearsal, not of the grand homecoming that will never take place, but of its constant dream in my long years of exile" (96). These lines express a completely different sense of *rodina* than do those earlier in the paragraph. In fact, the feeling expressed in the last phrases of this concluding sentence aligns almost perfectly with the explication of the English-language "homeland." The nostalgia, the hopeless but necessary

yearning, prevalent in the explication of "homeland" as something left behind, eclipses the familial relationship and the responsibilities contained in the explication of *rodina*.

Significantly, Nabokov focalizes this sentence differently from sentences earlier in the paragraph. As in many of Nabokov's English-language works, the narration in *Speak, Memory* vacillates between two major first-person focalizations. The critic James Phelan finds the same type of dichotomy in *Lolita*. In his work "Dual Focalization, Discourse as Story, and Ethics," Phelan names the two focalizations in first-person narration; the first is the "experiencing-I," and the second, the "narrating-I."[11] We can apply Phelan's distinction to *Speak, Memory* by assigning the "experiencing-I" to young Nabokov (anywhere from his first memory to age 41), and the "narrating-I" to Nabokov, the autobiographer.

Though Nabokov denies it, it seems plausible to think that the experiencing-I—a young Russian boy—would be more inclined to formulate his thoughts in Russian, while the narrating-I—a mature English-language writer—would be more inclined to formulate his in English. The difference in the two sentences analyzed above supports this intuition. The sentence containing the "sense of *rodina*" focalizes through young Nabokov. This feeling excites the child, not the narrator. Yet the paragraph's final sentence explicitly focalizes through the narrating-I, by using the present tense and recording how this return to Russia "seems to [Nabokov] now, sixty years later." The contrast between these two sentences suggests at least the plausibility that Russian tints Nabokov's childhood memories, while English colors his reflections on those recollections.

Nabokov excludes the above passage from *Drugie berega*, but other passages in both works exemplify this dual focalization. If the English language really affects Nabokov the narrator during composition of *Speak, Memory*, then Russian should affect Nabokov the narrator

[11] Phelan, James. *Living to Tell About It: A rhetoric and ethics of character narration*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 2005.

of *Drugie berega* in a different way. Defense of this claim requires close examination of a passage in both languages. The fourth section of the first chapter in both *Speak, Memory* and *Drugie berega* offers a description of the lands around Nabokov's family estate near St. Petersburg. The glowing description of Nabokov's own countryside, as well as the passage's importance in the narrative, correspond to the word pair *rodina*/*homeland*.

In this section, Nabokov's father signs the Vyborg Manifesto, spends three months in prison, and returns triumphantly home. Nabokov (the narrator) describes his own recollections of this return and its surroundings in the Russian and English passages below:

> The Russian passage from *Drugie berega*: […] i vspominaia imenno etot den', ia s prazdnochnoi iasnost'iu vosstanavlivaiu rodnoi, kak sobstvennoe krovoobrashchenie, put' iz nashei Vyry v selo Rozhdestveno, po tu storonu Orodezhi: krasnovatuiu dorogu,—sperva shedshuiu mezhdu Starym Parkom i Novym, zatem kolonnadoi tolstykh berez, mimo nekoshenykh polei,—a dal'she: povorot, spusk k reke, iskriashcheisia promezh parchovoi tiny, most, vdrug razgovorivshiisia pod kopytami, oslepitel'nyi blesk zhestianki, ostavlennoi udil'shchikom na perilakh […] (22)
>
> My literal translation of the Russian passage: […] and remembering that exact day, I, with festive clarity, restore/renew/recollect my native, as my own circulating blood, path from our Vyra [Nabokov family estate] to the village of Rozhdestveno, along that side of the Oredezh [nearby river]: a reddish path,—at first going between the Old and New Parks, then through the colonnade of stout birches, by un-mown fields,—and farther along: the turn, the descent to the river, sparkling through the brocaded mud, the bridge, suddenly having conversed under hooves, the blinding sparkle of a tin can left by a fisherman on the rail […]
>
> The English passage from *Speak, Memory*: […] and it is when I recall that particular day that I see with the utmost clarity the sun-spangled river; the bridge, the dazzling tin of a can left by a fisherman on its wooden railing […] (30)

As Nabokov burrows deeper into this paragraph-length sentence, he also digs deeper into his recollections. By the time I have cut him off in favor of ellipses, his Russian and English run parallel. More interesting, however, is the point at which the Russian and English texts are the most distinct. At the beginning of the passages quoted above, Nabokov writes, "remembering…I…restore/renew/recollect" (*DB*)/"when I recall…I see," (*SM*), and firmly establishes focalization through the narrating-I. This very line affords fascinating differences. Recalling that particular day makes the English-language Nabokov "recall with the utmost

clarity," while his Russian-language counterpart, "s prazdnochnoi iasnost'iu vosstanavliva[et]" [with festive clarity restore[s]/renew[s]/recollect[s]]. Nabokov's choice of two different verbs illuminates his different narrative perspectives. The Russian verb "vosstanovit'" has a much broader meaning than "to recall," encompassing possibilities beyond the scope of memory, including "to recreate," "to resurrect," or even, as "vosstanovit' kogo-libo," "to rehabilitate someone." The fact that Nabokov's Russian-language narrator opts for this word over a more pedestrian equivalent of "to recall" bespeaks his different relationship to this memory. By using the verb "vosstanovit'," the Russian-language narrator emphasizes his close relationship to this memory, and even suggests the possibility of personification. The neutral English-language verb, "to recall," does nothing of the sort.

The respective direct objects of these verbs yield an even more interesting comparison. The English-language Nabokov recalls "the sun-spangled river." Every American associates this particular participle with the title of our national anthem. In fact, this entire phrase—the object of the verb "to recall"—follows the exact verbal rhythm of "The Star-Spangled Banner" down to the syllable. Nabokov, probably consciously, associates this memory with patriotism, and his association communicates itself through an allusion dependent on American associations. Nevertheless, he glides back into the memory, and after the "sun-spangled river," his English text parallels his Russian, and focalization returns to the young Nabokov. However briefly, the description of the river still focalizes through the English-language Nabokov remembering the river, not through the child seeing the river.

Drugie berega, on the other hand, focalizes through its narrator for a bit longer, suggesting a stronger relationship between the memoirist and the memory. Here, the primary direct object of "vosstanovit'" is "rodnoi, kak sobstvennoe krovoobrashchenie, put'…" [my

native, as my own circulating blood, path…]. *Rodnoi* shares its root with *rodina*, and especially in a passage describing the surrounding country, calls to mind this very word. Furthermore, the simile inserted between the adjective "rodnoi" and the noun "put'" acts like a poetic enjambment, suggesting that "rodnoi," the adjective, alone is the true object of "vosstanovit'." The reader wonders what "rodnoi" the narrator resurrects with such clarity. The simile itself, "kak sobstvennoe krovoobrashchenie," brings the recollection much closer to the narrator's physical being than anything in the English language text. This physical closeness aligns with stipulations (c) and (d) of Wierzbicka's explication of *rodina*, "I am like a part of this country," and "I couldn't be like a part of any other country." Nabokov's mind seems to have been hovering around the concept of *rodina* as his Russian-language narrator penned these lines. The lines which differ from their English counterparts show a distinctly more personal relationship to the memory ("vosstanovit'" instead of "recall;" and "kak sobstvennoe krovoobrashchenie").

The remaining Russian lines, which never make their way into the English version, evoke classic symbols of the Russian *rodina*, including a "krasnovataia doroga," a "kolonnada tolstykh berioz," and "nekoshenye polia" [a reddish path, a colonnade of stout birches, and un-mown fields]. Shortly hereafter, the Russian slides back in line with the English, and focalization shifts back to the young Nabokov. Yet the differences apparent in those sections of the text focalized through the narrator cannot avoid conforming to a Russian conception of *rodina*. These lines bring the memory into close personal relationship with the narrator, use a word with the same root, and invoke symbols of the Russian *rodina*.

The fact that the narrators in the two separate languages have the same memory, but relive it in two different ways exemplifies Nabokov's poetic. However, the fact that the way each narrator relives that memory aligns so well with each language's conception of *rodina*/*homeland*

indicates something less intentional, and perhaps linguistically motivated. When taken in tandem, these dual passages—along with the passage from *Speak, Memory* using *rodina* in English—reveal an interesting tendency in Nabokov's two autobiographies. Nabokov's memories remain constant (more often than not, "Russian memories"). The difference lies in those passages where Nabokov records his experience reliving those memories. When the narrative focalizes through the narrating-I, the language of composition sneaks in and Nabokov's narrators seem to relive these memories under the influence of the language of creation.

Childhood/Detstvo

The second pair of terms, *childhood*/*detstvo*, presents a different set of problems when applied to the text. Neither of these words is significantly more common in its own language than the other ("childhood" has a frequency of 55 per million words of running text; *detstvo* 85), and the two memoirs use the terms at almost even rates. Therefore, it is nearly impossible to follow the same methodology as with *homeland/rodina*, which required assigning primacy to one term and tracking equivalents in the other language. Instead, I have listed the instances of "childhood" in *Speak, Memory*, and of *detstvo* in *Drugie berega* independently of one another. A list of the appearances of "childhood" in the first hundred pages of *Speak, Memory* follows:

Table 2

Page	chapter.section	Usage
20	1.1	In probing my childhood (which is the next best to probing one's eternity)
24	1.2	the harmonious world of a perfect childhood
25	1.3	some of my childhood recollections
26	1.3	the English word "childhood"
28	1.4	my childhood calls me back
36	2.2	childhood illnesses
66	3.3	In my childhood
68	3.3	in my childhood
76	3.7	in his childhood
76	3.7	of her Russian childhood
76	3.7	reliving his childhood
95	5.1	a childhood entirely unrelated to my own
97	5.1	of my childhood

The equivalent list of appearances of *detstvo* in *Drugie berega*:

Table 3		
Page	chapter.section	Usage
14	1.2	Klassicheskaia poza detstva
15	1.2	garmoniia moego sovershenneishego, schastliveishego detstva
17	1.3	prostoe angliiskoe slovo “chail’dkhud” (detstvo)
20	1.4	zovet menia moe divnoe detstvo
29	2.2	V detstve
29	2.2	so smert’iu v detstve
30	2.2	s avtorom v detstve
34	2.3	k moemu detstvu zarosshaia plevelami i pogankami
39	2.4	s pamiat’iu sobstvennogo detstva
40	2.4	v rannem detstve
53	3.4	v rannem detstve
55	3.4	v letopisiakh moego detstva
61	3.6	toska po utrachennomu detstvu
65	3.8	v detstve
65	3.8	Perekladyvala svoe detstvo
79	4.5	bez nikh net detstva
85	5.1	meloch’ iz svoego detstva
89	5.2	detstvo geroev
93	5.4	v detstve
99	5.6	v detstve

Though not every instance of “childhood” in English aligns with an appearance of *detstvo* in Russian, when they do coincide, the differences in usage can be illuminating. The “harmonious world of a perfect childhood” from *Speak, Memory*’s first chapter gets an extra adjective “*schastliveishii*” [happiest] in Russian. This appendage bespeaks the importance of happiness to a good Russian childhood. *Drugie berega* speaks of “*smert’ v detstve*” [death in childhood], while *Speak, Memory* will not allow it and instead substitutes “childhood illnesses.” This particular example echoes the semantic parsing of “childhood” and *detstvo* above remarkably well.

These examples taken from the first hundred pages of *Speak, Memory* and *Drugie berega* illustrate that Nabokov’s conception of “childhood” and *detstvo* aligns with those arrived at in the first section of this paper. He uses each word in the way that native speakers expect and that the conventions of the language demand as outlined in the first part of this article. In order to examine the effect that the differences between “childhood” and *detstvo* have on Nabokov’s composition, we must scrutinize some salient examples from the text.

The following passage illustrates, perhaps more clearly than any other, the narrators' different reactions to the same memories. The memory in question is firmly bound to the concepts of "childhood" and *detstvo*. Earlier in this same paragraph, Nabokov uses the word "childhood" three times in *Speak, Memory* and the word *detstvo* or *detskii* three times in *Drugie berega*. The word comes up only about thirty times in each book, so such a high concentration demands attention. We join Nabokov when he finds among his memories some volumes from the *Bibliothèque Rose*, which he loved as a child:

> The Russian from *Drugie berega*: Vizhu nashu derevenskuiu klassnuiu, biriuzovye rozy oboev, ugol izpaztsovoi pechki, otvorennoe okno: ono otrazhaetsia vmeste s chast'iu naruzhnoi vodostochnoi truby v oval'nom zerkale nad kanape, gde sidit diadia Vasia, chut' li ne rydaia nad rastrepannoi rozovoi knizhkoi. Oshchushchenie predel'noi bezzabotnosti, blagodenstviia, gustogo letnego tepla zatoliaet pamiat' i obrazuet takuiu sverkaiushchuiu deistvitel'nost', chto po sravneniiu s neiu parkerovo pero v moei ruke, i samaia ruka s gliantsem na uzhe vesnushchatoi kozhe, kazhutsia mne dovol'no aliapovatym obmanom. Zerkalo nasyshcheno iiul'skim dnem. Listvennaia ten' igraet po beloi s golubymi mel'nitsami pechke. Vletevshii shmel', kak shar na rezinke, udariaetsia vo vse lepnye ugly potolka i udachno otskakivaet obratno v okno. Vsë tak, kak dolzhno byt', nichto nikogda ne izmenitsia, nikto nikogda ne umret. (66)
>
> My literal English translation: I see our wooden classroom, the turquoise roses of the wallpaper, the corner of the tile stove, the open window: it is reflected along with part of the outside drain pipes in the oval mirror above the leather couch where uncle Vasia sits, all but weeping over a tattered pink little book. A feeling of utmost carefreeness, of prosperity, of thick summer warmth floods my memory and forms such a sparkling reality, that in comparison with it, the Parker pen in my hand, and my very hand with luster on already freckled skin, seem to me a rather tasteless fraud. The mirror is saturated with the July day. The shadow of the leaves plays along the white stove with blue windmills. A newly arrived bumblebee, like a ball on elastic, hits itself against all the plaster corners of the ceiling and successfully jumps back out the window. Everything is as it should be, nothing will ever change, nobody will ever die.
>
> The English from *Speak, Memory*: I see again my schoolroom at Vyra, the blue roses of the wallpaper, the open window. Its reflection fills the oval mirror above the leathern couch where my uncle sits, gloating over a tattered book. A sense of security, of well-being, of summer warmth pervades my memory. That robust reality makes a ghost of the present. The mirror binges with brightness; a bumblebee has entered the room and bumps against the ceiling. Everything is as it should be, nothing will ever change, nobody will ever die. (76-77)

The place where "everything is as it should be, nothing will ever change, nobody will ever die" is not the schoolhouse; it is not even the recollection of the school house, the uncle and the bumblebee. This sublimely static place is Nabokov's faculty of memory itself. The young Nabokov would know that things will change, that people will die. Only the memoirist, the retrospective Nabokov can cast his eyes into his memory and see that as the place of eternal

protection against change and mortality. The faculty of memory carries much the same meaning for the Russian as for the English Nabokov. The identical final sentences in the two paragraphs reflect this similarity. Yet in each language Nabokov describes his memory—as affected by this particular recollection—quite differently.

In the second sentence of each passage quoted above, the recollection of these childhood volumes floods Nabokov's faculty of memory with three feelings. (We know this is his *faculty of* memory, and not a memory as synonymous with "a recollection," because the Russian equivalent is *pamiat'* and not *vospominanie*.) The third feeling in each language is one of summer warmth generated by the particular setting of the recollection, but the first two feelings differ significantly in each language. Those that flood the Russian narrator's memory are of "bezzabotnost'" and "blagodenstvie" [carefreeness and prosperity], while the same recollection gives the English-language narrator a sense of "security" and of "well-being." The differences in these descriptions seem almost deliberately to point out the salient differences between the English concept of "childhood" and the Russian concept of *detstvo*.

According to stipulations (g) and (h) of the explication of *detstvo* above, a *detstvo* is only good insofar as it contains joy. This necessary aspect of a happy Russian *detstvo* occupies the Russian narrator's memory, but this ingredient is not necessary in the English term "childhood," which depends more on security and safety. Somehow, Nabokov's English-language narrator manages to garner, from the exact same recollection, the necessary components of a healthy English-language childhood.

Conclusion

In each of these examples, Nabokov's narrators discuss a theme closely tied to one of the explicated pairs; in each the Russian-language narrator treats the theme differently from his

English-language counterpart; and in each the Russian-language treatment aligns more with the Russian-language term, while the English-language treatment aligns more with the English-language term. Though with such sparse evidence, we cannot say with anything approaching certainty that the language of creation significantly influences Nabokov's creative process, we can start to see a pattern emerge. This pattern suggests that the method of investigation used in this paper can successfully isolate linguistic differences between bilingual texts. This method was able to move from an objective analysis of relevant semantic fields toward textual analysis, and it could be expanded to include other concept pairs in further investigation. Beyond that, this same method could be extrapolated to analyze works by other bilingual authors. For now, this article has helped us to further explore the complex interaction between language and experience in Nabokov's autobiographies.

Works Cited

Beaujour, Elizabeth Klosty. Alien Tongues: Bilingual Russian Writers of the "First" Emigration. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.

Denisov, P. N., and Markovkin V. V., eds. Uchebnii slovar' sochitaemosti slov russkogo iazyka. 1 vol. Moskva: Astrel', 2002.

Slovar' Sovremennogo Russkogo Literaturnogo Iazyka. Institut russkogo iazyka. 1st ed. Moskva: Rossiskaia akademiia nauk, 1950-65.

Kjellmer, Göran. A dictionary of English collocations: based on the Brown corpus: in three volumes. Vol. 1. New York : Oxford University Press, 1994.

Kucera, Henry and W. Nelson Francis. Computational analysis of present-day American English With a foreword by W. F. Twaddell, a study by Mary Lois Marckworth and Laura M. Bell, and an analytical essay by John B. Carroll. Providence: Brown University Press, 1967.

Nabokov, Vladimir. Drugie Berega. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis, 1978.

————. Speak, Memory: an Autobiography Revisited. New York: Putnam, 1966.

The Oxford English Dictionary. Apr. 2007 <http://0-dictionary.oed.com.library.lausys.georgetown.edu/entrance.dtl>.

Phelan, James. Living to Tell About It: a Rhetoric and Ethics of Character Narration. Cornell University Press: Ithaca, NY, 2005.

Wierzbicka, Anna. Understanding Cultures Through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German and Japanese. New York: Oxford UP, 1997.

Zasorina, L.M. Chastotnyi slovar' russkogo iazyka. Moscow: Russkii iazyk, 1977.

Eliot Stempf is a Religion major at Reed College. He hopes to pursue research into the Orthodox Christian communities of the Middle East after graduating in December 2010.

Gogol's "The Portrait" and Russian Orthodox Iconography

by Eliot Stempf

Nikolai Gogol's "The Portrait" is a short story about art. First written in 1835 and then significantly revised in 1842, the work explores a central concern in Romantic aesthetics: the role of the artist and his creation. Through a series of ekphrases, i.e. literary representations of visual art, the narrative of "The Portrait" examines the act of representational painting in all of its constituent parts: the psychological condition of the artist, the manner of painting (or its formal qualities), the possible subjects of representation, and, finally, its impact upon the viewer.

Works of art appear successively in the story as objects of amusement, labors of love, vanity props, commodities, and even acts of divine creation. In an effort to help sort through Gogol's complex thoughts on aesthetics, this study will provide historical context for "The Portrait" within contemporary Russian discourse on iconography. Focusing on the similarities between Gogol's portrait of the moneylender and the Russian icon, I will argue that the narrative of "The Portrait" betrays an apprehension over the painted image, which is principally a religious concern that emerged out of the 1666 schism in the Russian Orthodox Church.

The first half of Gogol's "The Portrait" recounts the story of a young, poor but promising artist named Chartkov who purchases a striking portrait from an art dealer in a local market. The next day he miraculously discovers thousands of gold roubles hidden in its frame. Chartkov thereafter abandons his study of art and uses the money to purchase himself artistic fame, surrendering his brush to the popular fashions of the day. Later in life, Chartkov encounters a work of true artistic genius by one of his contemporaries. Seeing that his own youthful talent was lost, he realizes the portrait was to blame and soon after dies an agonizing death. The reader learns in the second half of this work that the portrait was of a notorious moneylender, done by a

pious artist who, in painting this portrait, loses his own artistic ability. Only after living for years as a hermit in a monastery is he able to paint again. The artist asks his son, who narrates much of the second half of the story, to destroy the portrait should he ever come across it.

The inspiration for this study comes from a quote by Robert A. Maguire:

> Another Christian subtext [to "The Portrait"] is hinted at in the portrait of the moneylender, with his prominent eyes and confrontational manner. This reminds of figures in Orthodox icons, through which a divine power (or a demonic one, in Gogol's case) enters the world.[1]

The "prominent eyes and confrontational manner" of icons to which Maguire rightly refers is well described by Father Steven Bigham:

> … artistic techniques, such as inverse perspective, are used to enhance the feeling that the persons painted in icons are looking at us, addressing us, and penetrating us by their looks. How many people do not like icons or do not want to look at them, not for aesthetic reasons, but because they are unnerved by the penetrating look of holiness coming at them through the saints' eyes?[2]

Characters in "The Portrait" react precisely the same way to the portrait of the moneylender. Its eyes draw in viewers and repel them simultaneously. In the opening scene from "The Portrait" in the Shchukin market, for instance, Gogol writes: "A woman who stopped behind him [Chartkov] exclaimed, 'It's staring, it's staring!' and backed away. He [Chartkov] felt some unpleasant feeling, unaccountable to himself, and put the portrait down."[3] A close reading of the story reveals, however, that parallels between the portrait and Orthodox icons extend well beyond those that Maguire identifies. Not only does its appearance "remind" of icons, but its behavior in the story does, as well. Many of the seemingly miraculous events that regularly surround the portrait have parallels to the icon lore circulating in Russia in Gogol's day.

We first learn of the portrait's powers the very night Chartkov brings the painting home. As he falls asleep, Chartkov undergoes three dreams in succession: in the first, the moneylender

---

[1] Robert A. Maguire, *Exploring Gogol* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), 160.
[2] Fr. Steven Bigham, *The Image of God the Father in Orthodox Theology and Iconography and Other Studies* (Torrance: Oakwood Publications, 1995), 159.
[3] Nikolai Gogol, "The Portrait," in *The Collected Tales of Nikolai Gogol*, trans. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (New York: Vintage Classics, 1999), 343.

crawls out from the portrait and unwraps heavy packets of roubles (350); in the second, he finds himself fixed before the portrait, while the features of the moneylender begin to move (351); and in the third, the moneylender begins to pull away with his hands the sheet that Chartkov had thrown over the portrait (351). Such dream sequences are a common motif in icon lore. The seventeenth-century clergyman, Paul of Aleppo, recorded in his chronicle, *The Travels of the Patriarch Macarius of Antioch*, that an important official dreamt three times in one evening of an icon that had been buried in a house. In the morning, he discovered the icon exactly where he dreamt it to be.[4] So too do Chartkov's dreams prove prophetic. When the police inspector and landlord enter Chartkov's room to force him to pay his rent, the inspector clumsily breaks the icon's frame to reveal the very same packets of "1,000 Gold Roubles" (354) that Chartkov had dreamt of, thus saving him from eviction. Stories also existed in Gogol's time about icons giving gold, with the Pecherskaya icon being the subject of many such stories.[5]

Also common from the seventeenth century onward were stories of icons that could "defend" themselves from destruction by fire or the sword.[6] Regularly evading its own demise, the portrait of the moneylender does the same. In one scene, the painter of the portrait "snatched the portrait of the moneylender from the wall, asked for a knife, and ordered a fire made in the fireplace, intending to cut it to pieces and burn it" (387). Yet just as he moves to "hurl it into the fireplace," his friend cries out, "Stop, for God's sake!… better give it to me" (387). The portrait escapes destruction here—and interestingly enough, its savior evokes the name of God in doing so. Again, at the end of the story, the son of the moneylender's portraitist declares to a crowded

[4] Oleg Tarasov, *Icon and Devotion: Sacred Spaces in Imperial Russia*, trans. Robin Milner-Gulland (London: Reaktion Books, 2002), 87.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid., 88.

auction that he swore to destroy the portrait, which was at that moment up for sale (392). Before he does so, however, the painting is suddenly stolen (393).

These similarities between the miracles that surround the portrait and Orthodox icons would not be lost on Gogol's audience; for in Russian devotion and culture, the prominence of miracle-working icons cannot be overstated. Oleg Tarasov recounts the following story—from only a few years prior to Gogol's first draft of "The Portrait"—that displays the ubiquitous nineteenth-century Russian belief in icons and their power to enact changes in this world:

> … any such discovery of an icon in an unexpected place could be taken as a revelation. Thus it was in the 16th century, and also in the 19th. On 10 June 1831 someone placed an image of the Holy Trinity at the window of the Nikolskaya Church in Moscow's Podkopayi district, and already by 5 a.m. a mass of people, growing hour by hour, was observed gathering around it… So that it could be 'reliably observed', the image had to be placed in the cathedral church of the Chudov Monastery in the Moscow Kremlin; no less than twice a month the monks were obliged to report all information about the 'latest events' concerning the icon.

Icons were not only purported to work miracles, but were even expected to do so on a daily basis. The Russian government recognized the presence of miracle-working icons and attempted to control their proliferation in Gogol's time by requiring that clergy report every incident of a miracle-working icon to the Senate for investigation.[7]

The portrait of the moneylender thus exercises the sort of evil power that we come to expect from Gogol's demons (such as those depicted in his story "Viy"), that of deception.[8] The devil in Gogol's works is above all a character who is good in all appearance, but who in reality is evil.[9] After painting the moneylender, the portraitist finds himself helplessly reproducing the

---

[7] Tarasov, 90.

[8] Merezhovsky writes, "The greatest power the Devil possesses [for Gogol] is his capacity to look like something he is not. Though a median, he looks like one of the two extremes or infinites of the world – sometimes the Son made flesh, who rebelled against the Father and the Holy Spirit, who have rebelled against the Son made Flesh. Though a creature, he seems like a creator, though dark, he seems like the dayspring; though inert, he seems winged; though laughable, he seems to be laughing." See Dmitry Merezhkovsky, "Gogol and the Devil," in *Gogol from the Twentieth Century* ed., Robert A. Maguire (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), 59.

[9] Gogol wrote in a letter to S.T. Askasov on May 16th, 1844, "His [the devil's] tactics are well known: having seen he can't incline one to some vile deed, he'll run away full tilt and then approach from another side, in another guise..." See Nikolai Gogol, *Letters of Nikolai Gogol,* trans. Carl R. Proffer (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1967), 138

moneylender's demonic eyes in all of his figures, "as if [his] hand was guided by an unclean feeling" (387), and then inexplicably suffers the death of his entire family (389). Once Chartkov becomes conscious that his youthful artistic talent was lost, he realizes that "this strange portrait, had been the cause of his transformation," for it had "given birth to all the vain impulses in him" (372). Chartkov develops as a result a "cruel fever combined with galloping consumption," loses his sanity and finally dies haunted by the images of portraits (373). It is also noted that another who owned the portrait for a short time was afflicted with insomnia and felt as if "some evil spirit" was strangling him (388).

Contrary to first inclinations, the reader cannot simply attribute these disastrous effects of the portrait to its subject matter of a cruel moneylender. The image of the moneylender was, in its very inception, to be used in a work recently commissioned by a local church (384). Gogol himself de-emphasizes the importance of the painting's subject matter, for while "Christian subjects" are ultimately "the highest and last step of the sublime" (383), ignoble subject matter can also be spiritually uplifting (348).

Fear that a demonic painting could ruin the lives of all unfortunate enough to encounter it is characteristic of the Old Believers, a sect of Russian Orthodoxy that refused to acknowledge Patriarch Nikon's reforms of the church in the mid-seventeenth century. Included in Nikon's extensive reforms were the demands that (1) worshippers make the sign of the cross with three fingers, rather than two, and (2) the name Christ be abbreviated "ИС ХС" instead of "ІС ХС." Icons depicting saints holding their hand toward the viewer with two fingers, or images of Christ labeled with the latter abbreviation were suddenly illegitimate. Leonid Ouspensky remarks, "[symbolism] is essentially inseparable from Church art, because the spiritual reality it represents

cannot be transmitted otherwise than through symbols."[10] In other words, the correct symbols are necessary for believers to participate in the spiritual reality allowed by icons. A disagreement over symbols—in this case, the correct hand gesture and abbreviation of Christ's name—thus was also a disagreement over who were members of the "true" Church.

The entire Russian Orthodox community was confronted after the reforms with the choice between two rival sets of Christian symbolism, that of the older icons retained by the Old Believers and that of the newer icons endorsed by the church ecclesiastical hierarchy and tsar. As a result, all Christian symbolism, once the popular source of consolation in prayer, suddenly became ambivalent. "The refusal of Patriarch Nikon and Tsar Aleksey Mikhaylovich to retain the old symbols," Tarasov writes, "induced in the collective belief system a deep conviction of the gracelessness both of the 'world' of Muscovite Russia and of its new icons."[11] In short, the Church and its symbols no longer offered a certain path to salvation. There was doubt as to whether Russia, once believed by Russians to be the "Third Rome" after the fall of Rome in the fifth century and then Constantinople in 1453, was in actuality the guardian of true Christianity in the world. During the 1870s, this fear over the ambiguity of symbols manifested itself in tales circulated by popular Russian newspapers of "hellishly drawn" icons. These icons had images of the devil on the backside and included such disquieting phrases as "'bow down to me for seven years and you will be mine for eternity.'"[12] For Old Believers in particular, the result of the reforms was catastrophic: "Fear of accidentally encountering an image of the Anti-Christ was strengthened by the difficulty, or even impossibility, of recognizing it."[13]

[10] Leonid Ouspensky and Vladimir Lossky, *The Meaning of Icons,* trans. G.E.H. Palmer and E. Kadloubovsky (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1983), 27.
[11] Tarasov, 123.
[12] Ibid., 167.
[13] Ibid., 166.

With this fear of the Old Believers' in mind, we find that Gogol depicts the portrait as similar to what were the most highly regarded (and widely copied) icons of nineteenth-century Russia: those produced by the iconographer Andrey Rublyov (c.1360 – c.1430), whose work in the first half of the nineteenth century became popularly associated with Old Believer devotion.[14] The Rublyov style was commonly believed to be based on Greek technique, in which the coloration of the icon "had to be dark, 'harsh' and 'obedient to higher goals.'"[15] In Greek countenances, these icons sought "exhaustion, gloominess, and mystery" with facial shading in dark red.[16] Gogol similarly describes the moneylender as having a "swarthy, lean, burnt face" of "a southern origin… Indian, Greek, Persian, no one could say for certain," with a coloration that was "somehow inconceivably terrible" (378). He was "high-cheekboned, the features seem to have been caught at a moment of convulsive movement bespoke an un-northern force. Fiery noon was stamped on them" (343). In sum, the face of the moneylender with his dark coloration and striking features, his Grecian appearance, and the mystery surrounding his visage all suggest the Rublyov icons adored by Old Believers in Gogol's day.

Finally, Old Believers were particularly disposed toward portraying images of demons in their iconography. As has been previously noted, Orthodox icons (Old Believer and New Ritualist alike) were not limited to depictions of Jesus, Mary, and the saints—demons were regularly painted. Yet for the Old Believers, as Tarasov writes, "the essential point is that the image of a hellish monster was often represented on Old Believer religious pictures as an *independent symbol.*"[17] Old Believer churches would include paintings of demons, unaccompanied by any saintly figures, framed and hanging from the wall. Their purpose was to

[14] Tarasov, 341
[15] Ibid., 344.
[16] Ibid, 342-4.
[17] Tarasov, 152.

remind believers of the approaching Eschaton and the vengeance of the Last Judgment, or in Tarasov's words, "to put the conscience yet more on its guard."[18]

There is no evidence that Gogol himself was somehow a furtive Old Believer, and this study does not attempt to suggest as much. To the contrary, his personal commitment to the causes of "Orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationalism"[19] makes any strong relationship between Gogol and the Old Believer sect extremely unlikely. Yet while the Old Believer communities were often set apart in Russian society by their "worship and customs regarding diet and dress," Robert Crummey notes, "The image that Old Believer high culture was hermetically sealed from the outside world… can no longer be maintained."[20] Tarasov, through examining "New Ritualist" polemics against the Old Believers, concludes that "the 'new faith' [regarding icons in particular] was not very easily established in the popular consciousness."[21] We know at the very least that Gogol was interested in and familiar with some Old Believer literature,[22] for in 1837 Gogol asked his friend Prokopovich to "send him copies of the Nestor and Kiev Chronicles, as well as any recent material on the Raskol'niki [Old Believer] sect."[23]

Similar religious literature became extremely important to Gogol by the 1840s, as he came to see his writing as "an extension of religious life"[24] and believed moreover that his growth as an artist was dependent on his spiritual growth.[25] In 1842, for instance, Gogol declared

---

[18] Ibid.
[19] Rosemarie K. Jenness, *Gogol's Aesthetics Compared to Major Elements of German Romanticism* (New York: Peter Lange, 1995), 99.
[20] Robert O. Crummey, "Old Belief as Popular Religion: New Approaches," *Slavic Review* 52.4 (1993): 708-9.
[21] Tarasov, 141.
[22] Crummey notably writes, "In substantial measure, Old Belief was, in Brian Stock's phrase, a 'textual community.' As I have argued elsewhere, the first Old Believer cultural system was the creation of a group of learned men – a conservative 'intelligentsia' if you like – whose rigorously traditional Orthodox Christian views distinguished them from the more cosmopolitan court intellectuals of the late seventeenth century." See Crummey, 707.
[23] Jenness, 94.
[24] Ibid., 99.
[25] Ibid., 95.

in a letter that he desired to study the Bible,[26] and in 1844 he sent his close friends copies (much to their displeasure) of *The Imitation of Christ*, written by the fifteenth-century French monastic Thomas à Kempis.[27] Chizhevsky has also identified the influence on Gogol of the *Philokalia*, a collection of Christian spiritual texts by the Eastern Church Fathers.[28]

The iconographic qualities of the portrait of the moneylender suggest a remarkable connection between Gogol's "central question" of "the ambiguous power of the artistic image itself"[29] and a religious anxiety over the icon that is closely tied to Old Believer devotion. The portrait of the moneylender is an evil iteration of a Rublyov icon, the holiest icons of Old Believer worship, set loose upon the world. It is an exemplar of the very type of painted image that caused the greatest anxiety amongst the devout across Russia, and amongst the Old Believers in particular. To argue for such an eminently religious, even theological concern played out in "The Portrait" is, to be sure, not without precedent. The Slavist Dmitry Chizhevsky, looking over the field of Gogolian scholarship in 1938, declared that:

> Students of Gogol (Zenkovsky, Gippius, Mikolayenko) are gradually becoming aware of the fundamental role that religious problems, problems raised in the writings of the Church Fathers – the "spiritual deed," the heroic feat of "spiritual struggle" – played in the themes of Gogol's fictional work.[30]

My contention is that the religious problems posed by iconography, particularly within the context of the Orthodox schism, should be added to his list.

---

[26] Ibid., 94.
[27] Gogol wrote to his friends Askasov, Pogodin, and Shevyrev, "Devote one hour of your day to concern about yourself; live this hour in an inner life concentrated within yourself. A spiritual book can place you in this condition. I am sending you *The Imitation of Christ...*" See Proffer, 134.
[28] Dmitry Chizhevsky, "About the 'Overcoat'," in *Gogol from the Twentieth Century: Eleven Essays* ed. Robert A. Maguire (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), 314.
[29] Richard Pevear, introduction to *The Collected Tales of Nikolai Gogol*, trans. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (New York: Vintage Classics, 1999), xix.
[30] Chizhevsky, 314.

Works Cited

Bigham, Steven. *The Image of God the Father: Orthodox Theology and Iconography and Other Studies*. Torrance: Oakwood Publications, 1995.

Chizhevsky, Dmitry. "About the 'Overcoat'." In *Gogol from the Twentieth Century: Eleven Essays,* edited by Robert A. Maguire, 298-322. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Crummey, Robert O. "Old Belief as Popular Religion: New Approaches." S*lavic Review* 52.4 (1993): 700-712.

Gogol, Nikolai. *The Collected Tales of Nikolai Gogol*. Translated by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky. New York: Vintage Classics, 1999.

Gogol, Nikolai. *Letters of Nikolai Gogol*. Translated by Carl R. Proffer. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1967.

Jenness, Rosemarie K. *Gogol's Aesthetics Compared to Major Elements of German Romanticism.* New York: Peter Lange, 1995.

Maguire, Robert A. *Exploring Gogol*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.

Merezhkovsky, Dmitry. "Gogol and the Devil." In *Gogol from the Twentieth Century: Eleven Essays*, edited by Robert A. Maguire, 55-102. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Ouspensky, Leonid and Vladimir Lossky. *The Meaning of Icons*. Translated by G.E.H. Palmer and E. Kadloubovsky. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1983.

Tarasov, Oleg. *Icon and Devotion: Sacred Spaces in Imperial Russia*. Translated by Robin Milner-Gulland. London: Reaktion Books, 2002.

Sarah Beckham Hooff was awarded the 2008-2009 SRAS Research award to conduct the research for this paper in Irkutsk and around Lake Baikal. She returned to Irkutsk, Russia with the assistance of a Fulbright Student Research Grant in September 2010 to continue her research. She hopes to pursue a career in international environmental conservation.

Environmental Policy and Politics of Lake Baikal

A review of physical, psychological, and political contexts

Sarah Beckham Hooff

Lake Baikal in Siberia has a rich biological and cultural history. It is highly valued for its aesthetic qualities and rich biological diversity. In addition, the surrounding region is rich in natural resources. Today, several environmental organizations operate in the region's largest city, Irkutsk, which lies not far from the shores of Baikal. Given the diversity of the lake's uses, it is not surprising that these organizations have varied goals: preservationist, conservationist, exploitationist (e.g. ecotourism, resource exploitation), or some mixture of the three.

This paper will describe the physical, political, and psychological contexts of the Lake Baikal environmental debate and how environmental organizations in Irkutsk, Russia have reacted to these contexts. To do so, a wide range of materials will be used, including journalism on local issues, secondary and tertiary texts, and primary documents including internet posts made by activists. The initial results of original field research, which began in 2010 and are ongoing as this paper is being written, will also be presented. Materials collected include a survey and interviews with leaders and members of environmental organizations in Irkutsk.

Section1: Physical

Lake Baikal is remarkable in terms of its watershed and water quality, forest resources, and unique biota. Each is significant in terms of human patterns of resource exploitation, which have shaped the physical context that creates the backdrop for political action and psychological relationships in the region.

Water **-** Lake Baikal is the deepest lake in the world, with a maximum depth of 1,637 meters, and a freshwater reservoir of global significance (Stewart 1991). The huge volume of the lake and its extreme depth create a unique hydraulic situation which makes the waters of Lake Baikal stunningly clear (Rossolimo 1966, cited in Lubomudrov 1978). The lake is fed by a great number of tributary streams and rivers, the most significant being the Selenga River, which enters Lake Baikal from the southeast. The only outflow from Lake Baikal is the Angara River to the southwest (Stewart 1991). Irkutsk is located on this outflow river.

While the waters of Lake Baikal have been utilized and valued by indigenous populations for centuries, the industrial use of Lake Baikal's waters began with the construction of a hydroelectric dam on the Angara River near Irkutsk. Construction began in 1950, and the dam came into operation in 1959. Later, against much public protest, the construction of pulp plants began in nearby Baikalsk in 1966 and in Selegsk in 1974 (Stewart 1991). Soviet officials insisted that the plants needed the pure water of Lake Baikal to manufacture high-quality cellulose products. While this claim was dubious from the outset (Weiner 1999) (Baikal Movement, 9.09.2010), the argument later became superfluous as alternative technologies eliminated the demand for high quality cellulose products, and the plants switched to manufacturing lower-quality paper products (Lubomudrov 1978).

Inadequate environmental standards and lackluster enforcement of regulations resulted in industrial effluent being dumped into the lake during the Soviet period. While later legislation helped to curb pollution somewhat, most scientists still fear that the lake's waters are being compromised (Stewart 1991)(personal interviews 2010). In fact, the loosened environmental regulations of Decree #1 of 2010 (Russian Federation 2010) allowed the Baikalsk cellulose plant to reopen in January 2010, two years after being closed due to environmental concerns. In

general, industrial pollution has been contained to southern Baikal, where major industrial centers and effluent sources are located (e.g. Irkutsk and Baikalsk). Here, polluted waters are discharged via the Angara River relatively quickly, leaving northern waters uncontaminated (Tulohonov 2010).

Another source of pollution in the southern region of Lake Baikal is the Selenga River. The Selenga, which flows across the border of Mongolia into Russia before entering Lake Baikal in the southeast, provides over 50% of Baikal's inflow and thus presents a potential trans-boundary pollution issue as Mongolia develops its industrial sectors (WWF 1990, in Stewart 1991). International agreements have sought to reduce trans-boundary pollution (Woods 1994). However, a large portion of the industrial pollution and municipal waste that is discharged into the Selenga River comes from the *Russian* industrial region centered in nearby Ulan-Ude, rather than from relatively-undeveloped Mongolia (Tulohonov 2010).

The development of polluting industries and the increase in municipal waste from Severobaikalsk, a city located at the northern tip of Lake Baikal, threatens the lake's northern waters. If industrialization accelerates without proper controls, large volumes of Lake Baikal could become polluted as polluted effluent travels along the entire axis of the lake before being discharged (Stewart 1991). Development is likely, as investors are increasingly interested in tourism opportunities based on the region's stunning beauty and natural hot springs.

Forests **-** Lake Baikal is surrounded by extensive forests, many of which are perched on the relatively steep slopes surrounding Lake Baikal. The Baikal region was originally heavily forested by slow-growth conifers (Stewart 1991) and timber exploitation has caused a number of ecological problems. Clear-cutting, for example, has increased erosion rates (Lukov 2010).

Transporting logs to mills by "floating" them is another problem. During transport, some logs inevitably sink, adding biomass to the lake, which negatively affects the chemistry and nutrient content of lake waters. This practice was banned by governmental decrees in 1971, and since this practice was halted, some logs have been recouped from the lake (Stewart 1991).

Biota **-** Lake Baikal's astounding biological resources have attracted both indigenous peoples and modern scientists. The unique chemistry of the lake's waters, partially contributable to its relatively low oxygen content, which may result from the lake's small surface area relative to depth, and its unique tectonic origin (Na 1993) have created an isolated aquatic environment with a unique biological community. Two-thirds of the more than 2500 species and subspecies found in the lake ecosystem are endemic—found only in Lake Baikal (Stewart 1991).

Some of these endemic species have been utilized by humans, and as a result have become increasingly rare. The nerpa (*Pusa siberica*), a unique freshwater seal, has been extensively hunted for its food and skins; several fish species, like the omul (*Coregonus autumnalis migratorius*), have been important food resources (Stewart 1991). Although laws ban the poaching of omul, the fish is still commonly eaten.

Section 2: Political

The Russian political system provides the next layer of relevant context. Increasing federal power has limited public access to political influence, and, as a result, environmental organizations have developed grassroots strategies.

Limited public influence **-** Environmental organizations' power to influence policy has been limited by three factors: (1) a governmental structure which concentrates power at the federal level, which is physically and politically inaccessible, (2) an inability to effectively use

the courts to redress environmental violations, and (3) a tradition of non-compliance with environmental law.

The 1992 Environmental Protection Law, one of the last pieces of legislation passed and ratified before the Soviet Union dissolved, (Bond and Sagers 1992) has continued to form the framework of environmental protection even in the post-soviet period. This type of law provides a federal "framework" that local legislation must conform to and complement (Donahoe 2009). Thus, major environmental decisions are made by high-level bureaucrats who are both socially and physically removed from those affected by these decisions. Local governments are often financially unable to administer and enforce the "complementary" laws, which often remain "unfinished" or unenforced on the local level. This problem, as is applies to the Irkutsk region, was prominently discussed at the 2010 Baikal Economic Forum's Roundtable on Baikal Environmental Issues (e.g. Tulohonov 2010).

The court system is also of limited use to redress environmental wrongs. The Federal Law on Specifically Protected National Areas accords rights to file suits to some officials, but not private citizens or civic organizations. Furthermore, since Russian courts do not rely on precedent, single victories do not translate into sustained court-supported environmental protection (Ostergren 2001). In addition, traditions of "understandings" and bribery promote non-compliance with existing regulations (Levin and Satarov 2000).

Irkutsk activists regularly deal with legal arbitrariness and complications. For example, notice must be given of any planned public meeting, specifying the place, number of participants, and basic outline of activities. Notice must be presented by several individuals at once and cannot be given more than two weeks in advance. Advertising an event before it is approved is forbidden. Complications, holidays, and foot-dragging often leave activists with

practically no time to organize. Few people, let alone volunteers with other professional obligations, have the time, energy or patience to take on this process. While the notification is perhaps reasonable from a logistical perspective, allowing city police and traffic officers to prepare for the event, the execution of the requirement is not.

Prevailing attitude toward civil society **-** The Putin administration has generally been confrontational and hostile toward active civic organizations (Thornhill quoted in Peterson and Bielke 2001) ("progressivepathway" 2008). Further, federal laws, such as the 2006 amendments to the Russian Federation Law on Nonprofit Organizations, have complicated the long-standing federal registration procedures required of civic organizations (Wood 2006).

The Medvedev-Putin administration's vision of the Russian government as the sole "keeper" of Russian lands and people (McFaul and Treyger 2004), coupled with the vision of Russia as a natural resource power (Henry 2009), demands that the government have full control of Siberian resources. As a result, the problems that are faced by Russian NGOs in general are magnified for Siberian environmental organizations.

In an interview conducted in Irkutsk in April 2010, the leader of a small environmental organization in Irkutsk stated that environmental organizations are unable to directly protest against the government because they are "dependent" on favorable relations with government officials and agencies. "Problems" with documentation, and a resulting threat on an organizations right to exist, he stated, can arise when an organization fails to limit itself to "acceptable" activities. As a rule, these favorable relations are extended only to organizations whose work compliments existing government initiatives (personal materials 2010).

Additionally, the 2006 amendments to the Russian Federation Law on Nonprofit Organizations create registration requirements which are not sensitive to NGO regulations in

other countries. Thus, some of the materials demanded by Russian officials simply do not exist for international organizations incorporating in Russia. The international NGOs must petition the Russian agency or make changes to their original legal documents (Wood 2006), a process which can be time-consuming and expensive and discourages the growth of Russian civil society.

In spite of governmental roadblocks, the attitudes expressed by individual leaders of organizations suggest that civic society in Irkutsk is making positive progress. The individual quoted above and several others stated that their personal participation in environmental and/or anti-government protests does not interfere with the professional work of their organizations. At the time these interviews were being conducted, regular protests against the re-opening of the Baikalsk cellulose factory were being held. These leaders cited their personal participation in these protest meetings as an example of their ability to separate personal and organizational politics (personal interviews, April, 2010).

Organizational and emotional reactions - In response to limited political access and legal challenges, environmental organizations have developed strategies to cultivate political influence through non-governmental channels. Through the creative application of grassroots strategies, environmental organizations have occasionally become influential in local environmental politics, and they have gained some substantial environmental victories.

Organizational leaders often feel alienated from the government and express restrained contempt and distrust of governmental leadership (Sopronenko 2009)(Metzo 2009). In Irkutsk, several organizations have completely retreated from "the political front," favoring initiatives which allow them to avoid confrontation with governmental agencies. This is not surprising, since remaining politically potent can result in organizational complications and governmental meddling. For example, activists affiliated with the unregistered Baikal Movement (Байкальское

движение) report that supporters from the neighboring province, the Buryat Republic of Russia, and sympathizers from Baikalsk, the city where the re-opened cellulose factory operates, were detained on two separate occasions under the false pretense of traffic violations while en route to protest meetings. Active members of the Baikal Movement also report that picketers are often detained without charge for several hours (personal communication, April 2010).

Another example of governmental meddling was the 2010 confiscation of nearly all working computers from the office of Baikal Wave (Байкальская Волна), including the server base for the organization's website. The organization, at the time, was planning a protest against the government-supported re-opening the Baikalsk cellulose plant. Officials claimed that the machines were operating on pirated software and needed to be inspected (Tihi 2010). Although Russian law required the computers to be returned within one month, officials held them for several. The capacity of Baikal Wave to coordinate its protest activities was significantly curtailed.

In light of these political challenges, many environmental organizations have remained, at least outwardly, politically neutral. Some have even garnered support and cooperation from government officials and ministries. One, The Great Baikal Trail (Большая Байкальская Тропа), an ecotourism organization, cooperated with officials from the Ministry of Natural Resources in Irkutsk Oblast to offer environmental presentations in Irkutsk universities. The Baikal Ecological Network (Ассоциация Байкальская экологическая сеть) works with teachers and Ministry of Education officials to promote the distribution of Baikal Studies textbooks in schools. Political goodwill helped the animal rescue organization Zoogallery (Зоогалерея) save their extensive bird collection from extermination during the international bird-flu scare (personal communication 2010). In effect, these non-political organizations have

been logistically, and in some cases financially, "rewarded" for their political neutrality and submissiveness.

Grassroots and the media - In 1987, environmentalists effectively mobilized the public to reject a pollution diversion pipeline, which would have channeled pollution produced by a cellulose plant on Lake Baikal to the Irkut River. This grassroots movement, which united under the principle of making no compromises to force the complete closure of the plant with the concerns of drinking water contamination in small regional cities (personal interview 2010), arguably solidified nearly 20 years of relatively unorganized environmental agitation into the Baikal Movement (Stewart 1991). In a second, more recent example of a grassroots ecological success, local activists in the Tunka National Park near Lake Baikal and other locals were instrumental in shaping the public support that encouraged then-President Putin's redirection of oil and natural gas pipelines from near the shores of Baikal (Metzo 2009).

Often, environmentalists use the media to garner public attention to publicize an environmental problem. Lubomudrov (1978) discusses the leading role that newspaper coverage had in highlighting Baikal environmental issues beginning in the 1960s, and Stewart (1991) discusses how agitations in the press can unite public opinion. Metzo (2009) notes that regional newspapers and media were essential in providing those involved in the Tunka pipeline debate with information essential for uniting opposition against federal and private pipeline plans. In that instance, local newspapers were especially effective, since they were perceived as reputable sources of pertinent local information (Metzo 2009).

In Siberia, and in Irkutsk in particular, small organizational publications, usually funded by relatively unreliable one-time grants, also help to spread environmental news to a limited audience. The Baikal Wave, for example, publishes a journal (Волна) which, due to funding

difficulties, is released irregularly. The weekly newsletter "Baikal Siberia," (Байкальская Сибирь), which highlights environmental and social issues in Irkutsk and the surrounding region, is also distributed by the Baikal Wave office. *Nonprofit World* (Некоммерческий мир), a journal featuring information about Siberian nonprofits, is published regularly by Rebirth of Siberian Lands (Возрождение земли сибирской), and the political organization Control by the People (Народный контроль) publishes a newsletter which sometimes features local ecological problems. Other materials, ranging from glossy booklets to black and white flyers, are published on an irregular basis.

In the battle for formal press attention, much relies upon individual players and the specific interests of journalists. For example, the reputation of the newspaper *Eastern Siberian Truth* (Восточная Сибирская Правда) as a good source of environmental news is almost entirely the making of one journalist, Giorgii Kuznetsov. Nearly all forms of public media are under strong governmental influence, and publishing stories that reflect poorly on the government or highlight dissidence is generally avoided. Even when environmental protest events are covered, activists complain that their events are often "skewed" in the media. For example, the press seized on photos of protestors dressed in bear suits at a Baikal Movement protest in 2008 (see Kuznetsov 2008) and used them as mocking symbols to degrade the seriousness of the protest.

Many organizations have turned to the Internet as an uncensored forum for discussion and dispersal of information. Several Irkutsk organizations maintain online newsletters and informative, though not always up-to-date, websites. Great Baikal Trail, for example, keeps volunteers informed through an email distribution list, and the Baikal Movement maintains a very active online Google Groups forum. "Protect Baikal Together" (Защитим Байкал вместе)

updates its website regularly with photos and descriptions of various projects. Zoogallery volunteers keep in touch through the social networking site Vkontakte.ru, Baikal Wave and Great Baikal Trail are both on YouTube, and other online forums are also used, such as Angara.net, a popular site among hikers and outdoorsmen in Irkutsk.

One news forum in particular, Babr.ru, is a significant information hub. The site's creator and director, Dimitrii Tajevski, while not personally active in an environmental organization, provides environmental NGOs with free advertising space for protest meetings and a base for collecting online signatures. After Prime Minister Putin signed the amendment to the law "On the Protection of Lake Baikal" (Federal Law №1 2010), the Baikal Movement advertised its protest meetings with homepage banners and collected more than 40,000 online signatures for a letter of protest on Babr.ru. Demonstrating the effectiveness of Internet resources, only several thousand "paper" signatures were collected during protest events held between February and May 2010.

Cooperation and funding - In Irkutsk, environmental organizations are poorly unified, although the fact that they often pursue similar initiatives makes cooperation a future possibility. For example, among organizations with environmental education initiatives, Great Baikal Trail regularly hosts an environmental education expert and trainer from the United States Forest Service; the Irkutsk Children's Library (Юношеская библиотека именна Уткина) has large meeting room, existing positive relations with teachers from a number of local primary schools, and a large library of environmentally-focused materials; and Baikal Ecological Network has successfully developed relations with the local officials of the Russian Ministry of Education and developed international publication partnerships. However, these organizations are largely

isolated from each other and do not take full advantage of each other's resources to reach common goals.

Most environmental leaders blame this lack of cooperation on the "Russian mentality," saying that Russians by nature work in closed systems without "outreach." An additional explanation is the greatly individualized character and loose organizational structure which characterizes organizations in the highly selective, post-soviet NGO environment. The influx and later dearth of international grant funding for environmental initiatives created a huge swell and later "pruning" of environmental organizations in Irkutsk (Zular 2003). Only flexible organizations that found highly specialized niches in environmental and public spheres were able to remain viable. Thus, many organizations, after being forced to find ways to remain financially viable on their own, have developed unique grassroots financial and organizational structures which make cooperation and integration with other organizations difficult.

Some organizations have found financial support in commercial operations. The Irkutsk State University Botanical Garden, for example, receives very few funds from university coffers and supports its diverse programs through sales of ornamental and garden plants. Other organizations find support through partnerships with local government. "New Squares for Our Favorite City" (Любимому городу новые скверы), a city greening project, created a partnership with the Irkutsk municipal government and a local NGO, "We'll Do It Together" (Сделаем вместе), after the NGO won a government-sponsored contest for the best partner organization.

EcoNationalism and dissidence - Members of various civic movements in Russia have expressed exasperation and suspicion (Sopronenko 2009), as well as helplessness and disillusionment (Metzo 2009) (personal interview 2010), when asked about their dealings with the federal government. These observations bring to mind theories which postulate that

nationalism develops to fill a self-identification void created when citizens feel disillusioned and disconnected with their government (Brown 2000).

Young environmentalists in the 1960s became disillusioned with the communist government they had once idolized after bureaucrats were staunchly unsupportive of environmental projects and initiatives (see discussion of Kedrograd forestry experiment in Weiner 1999). Key Russian nationalists and dissidents arose from this group and propagated nationalistic and anti-government ideas throughout Russia.

Today, those on the political fringe are often those who participate most actively in the politically-focused sector of the environmental movement. There are several reasons for this. Firstly, a radical's already disfavored political position leaves him, so to speak, with nothing to lose by participating in politically unpopular NGOs, and, secondly, nationalistic tendencies make protection of the homeland from outside interests attractive. Examples from the Irkutsk environmental movement may illustrate this "radicalization" trend. Irkutsk anarchists as well as members of the banned political movement National Bolsheviks (НацБол) and the more-tempered Other Russia (Другая Россия) all have active representatives in Irkutsk environmental organizations. Although the percentage of these members is relatively low, anti-Putin slogans, chants and posters were nonetheless conspicuously included at every large protest meeting against the re-opening of the Baikal Cellulose Factory that was organized in Irkutsk from February through April 2010 (personal observation). One particularly memorable banner pictured a baby nerpa (Baikal seal) with the slogan "Don't kill me, Putin." Furthermore, active attendees of the Baikal Movement meetings nearly unanimously agree that the Baikal Movement is both unavoidably political and unavoidably anti-United Russia (Единая Россия, Russia's current party of power).

Instances of foreign partners not offering the help that is anticipated could lend further support to isolationist, nationalistic tendencies. For example, the signatures collected against the reopening of the Baikalsk cellulose plant in 2010, discussed above, were among a total of 125 thousand sent to UNESCO officials and the Kremlin in the spring of 2010 (personal communication, 2010) Lake Baikal and some of the surrounding region is classified as a UNESCO world heritage site. While the silence from Russian officials was more-or-less expected, from the point of view of Irkutsk activists, the impressive fruits of their efforts were met with a disappointing lack of urgency by USESCO officials, who plan to visit the region only in Spring, 2011 and present a report during the 35th UNESCO meeting in Bahrain, June, 2011 (personal email communication, documents still unavailable online). Even as environmentalists took advantage of new, western agitation styles (use of the Internet, for example) and, from their point of view, "played by" all the necessary western "rules," western help was not forthcoming. Feelings of betrayal and disappointment in western partners, which parallel those toward the Russian government, could support the notion that Siberians must protect *their own* lands, setting the stage for a resurgence of eco-nationalist sentiments.

Section 3: Psychological

Commentators and researchers are often unable to contain their wonder at Lake Baikal's beauty, even as they introduce technically-based characterizations of history, geography, or ecology. They often open with normative, emotion-laden introductions, using phrases like "adjectives fail" (Weiner 1999, 356) and "most remarkable" (Pyrde, 84 in Weiner 1999, 356) to describe Lake Baikal. These qualities assert a significant psychological and aesthetic influence over those who are otherwise interested in positivist and evaluative issues. Psychologically-based interactions with nature are significant in the current investigation of environmental politics;

these interactions effect how leaders and members of the environmental movement perceive and interact with nature and, furthermore, how they engage in environmental politics.

Three concepts related to environmental psychology will be discussed: environment-behavior interactions, place attachment, and worldview. Each of these concepts can be applied to better understand humans' interactions with nature and, more specifically, the effectiveness of local environmental organizations, the extent to which relationships with local spaces affect political behavior, and the influence of Western attitudes on the contemporary Russian environmental movement.

Environment and behavior - Interactions between humans and the ecological environment have been interpreted by some as a suite of stimulus-response processes, a proposal which is clearly influenced by the early theories of B.F. Skinner (Skinner 1953). Other researchers have taken a more nuanced view of the stimulus-response relationship, investigating, for example, how the physical environment can affect the frequency of "green" behaviors such as picking up litter or participating in recycling programs (Cone and Hayes 1980). Researchers have sought to apply the knowledge gained from behavioral experiments to advocate for certain urban design plans (Bechtel 1977) or to craft community programs and infrastructure to promote "green" behavior (Cone and Hayes 1980).

This research suggests that environmental organizations' initiatives should be based upon local experimentation. However, Russian NGOs are currently accused of disregarding the needs of communities (Henderson 2003) (Henry 2009) as communication and cooperation with international organizations shifts their attention toward global trends. These assertions may be corroborated by evaluating the degree to which an understanding of environment-behavior interactions is utilized in local NGO-designed programs.

For example, an anti-litter propaganda campaign which does not take into account local infrastructural deficits in waste management could be accused of failing to recognize and properly incorporate existing environment-behavior relationships. Such a program fails to truly meet local needs, and focuses instead on outward propaganda like attractive color posters or on the application of concepts which are ill-suited to the local context.

Such a deficit of localism can be illustrated by a case study of the application of the ecotourism concept in the Baikal region. Tourism officials and others have heralded the Western ecotourism concept as a sustainable development option, but have failed to unite the psychological and infrastructural aspects of this development theory. Russian infrastructure and mentality is, in many important ways, incompatible with the ecotourism models that have been developed in Western Europe and the United States which emphasize long-term cultural development and slow-growth economic gains. The desperate state of the Russian economy, coupled with an exploitationist perception of nature that was nurtured during the long Soviet period, make Western ecotourism initiatives inappropriate for the Russian context. Unsurprisingly, many who have worked in Russia's ecotourism field note that this rapidly growing sector has negatively affected the Baikal ecosystem (personal interviews, 2010).

The misapplication of foreign eco-concepts is also illustrated by "ecological" activities that are used as PR events for organizations and companies. Often, more focus is often placed on the quantity of people who show up at an ecological event, such as a park cleanup day, than on the outcome of the event (was the park cleaned?). For example, a Subbotnik cleanup day in Kayskaja Rosha, Irkusk in Spring 2010 was valued by organizers as a visually attractive TV news spot; they failed to address the prevailing garbage dumping problem which continues to be

a stark local environmental problem. Unfortunately, not all "ecological" initiatives are well-connected with encouraging long-term eco-friendly behaviors and habits.

Sense of place - Other researchers view the environment as a more complex matrix of not only physical, but also social, evolutionary, and symbolic factors which shape attachments, attitudes, and behaviors. They generally refer to the cumulative relationship between an individual and his natural environment as "sense of place." An individual's sense of place refers to that individual's experience living and interacting in the local physical and social environment and how he or she, in turn, feels about this space.

Strong place attachments are particularly notable among native peoples, who often closely associate personal and geographical identity. The Buryat, an indigenous people of the Baikal region, have developed strong attachments to hundreds of sacred sites in the Tunka National Forest, located to the south of Lake Baikal (Metzo 2009) and throughout Irkutsk oblast, including in the Baikal National Park on Lake Baikal (personal communication 2010).

Recently, indigenous peoples have been active in working against governmental initiatives to open up native lands for resource exploitation (Donahoe 2009). Minorities have argued that their places are critical to the maintenance of their cultural and religious integrity (a guaranteed right under the Russian Constitution and the Forest Code). In this case, place, cultural traditions, and history have created a collective social attachment, which provides a salient impetus for political action when these places are threatened (Altman and Wolhill 1983).

Many of the efforts to protect specific places and traditions take place at a markedly local level. For example, in the small village of Bolshoe Goloustnoe, in Baikal National Park, residents have mobilized to preserve their environmental and cultural heritage. Local teacher Faina Petrovna Mangaskina and members of her family actively invite environmental educators

to the village school and have begun developing cultural heritage materials with the help of a western grant. Further, the family coordinates international education projects with the volunteer ecotourism organization Great Baikal Trail (personal communication 2010). Mangaskina feels an urgency to develop sustainable ecological and economic practices, as she witnesses uncontrolled construction deny local residents access to natural and recreational resources that they depend on. While she believes grassroots efforts can help solve these problems, political pressure and inaccessibility often create discouraging and frustrating barriers.

As is the case in Bolshoe Goloustnoe and many other locations, the main strategy used for strengthening the psychological connections between "green" environmental attitudes and "ecological" behaviors is through environmental education programs. The uniting lament of ecologists and NGO leaders is that Russians lack "ecological culture" (экологическое воспитание; экологическая культура). Many local residents know the lake and its ecosystem very well, but they lack an understanding of the negative effects of human activities on the lake ecosystem as a whole; this, coupled with a lack of waste disposal infrastructure, makes dumping and polluting commonplace (personal interviews 2010).

Research suggests that social priming shapes behaviors in certain physical environments (Barker 1968) by altering the experiences that shape place attachments and establish linkages between attitudes and their "objects" (Ajzen 1991). Thus, place attachment (and the resulting *theoretical* desire to protect a certain area) would not necessarily elicit observable "green" behaviors like picking up litter, unless a strong association between attachment and behavior had been created. To create the lasting environment-behavior connections that will help to shape a more ecological society, environmental educators must be careful not to alienate or intimidate

their program participants. Insensitivity towards local habits and traditions can create animosity toward the educator or the subject matter.

Today, environmental education is a popular way to shape ecological worldviews, but it is not the only way. Journalists and literary figures have played an unusually prominent role in framing the Baikal environmental movement and generating public support (Lubomudrov 1978). Authors have used literary images of Lake Baikal beauty to craft "abstract landscape symbols" (Riley 1992), which promoted place attachments to the Baikal region. Writers of "village prose" such as Valentin Rasputin and Vladimir Chivilikhin propagated ideas of protecting nature and images of the threatened natural beauty of Lake Baikal throughout Russia (see discussion of Chivilikhin's work "Sacred Eye of Siberia" in Weiner 1999)(Rasputin 1991). "[J]ust as a flag, slogan, or caricature [can become]…a symbol of a community or nation" (Altman and Wolhill 1983), it is possible that the literary images of Lake Baikal became symbols of Siberian wilderness to which environmentalists, as well as the general Russian public, grew attached.

Lake Baikal continues to be a popular symbol of pure and distinctly Russian nature. Young artists draw on Rasputin's works to create ecologically-motivated art, and excerpts from Rasputin's writings and telegrams are read at environmental meetings (personal observations 2010). To build place attachments in non-residents, environmental organizations, and especially those active on the international level, emphasize natural beauty and encourage protecting the lake for its own sake. The desire to see the "pearl of Siberia" fostered by these long-distance place attachments forms the emotional basis of a growing tourism industry in the Baikal region which, ironically, may foster more environmental damage than protection.

Worldview – Worldview research sees the environment as an abstract object of socially-influenced attitudes, which may or may not influence behavior. Worldview research does not

focus on an individual's experiences in a particular place, but is more interested in discerning broad attitudinal trends, such as the shift from Dominant Social Paradigm (DSP—the traditional, Judeo-Christian-inspired attitude of human dominance over nature) to a more ecologically-friendly worldview which recognizes resource limitations. Several survey indices have been developed to measure this shift, but one scale, the 15-question New Ecological Paradigm (NEP) survey index, has gained prominence (Dunlap et al. 2000). This survey index measures the respondents' degree of agreement with human exceptionalism, professed level of anti-anthropocentrism, assuredness in an emerging eco-crisis, acknowledgement of limits to growth, and the belief that nature exists in a fragile balance.

While the scale has been popular internationally, Oleg Yanitsky, a prominent scholar of Russian environmental attitudes and movements, claims that results from NEP surveys in Russia will produce disputable results, since the NEP scale is designed to measure divergence from a distinctly Western DSP which has never been influential in Russia. Since Russians have a different starting point, NEP scores from Russian respondents may not be comparable to scores from Westerners (Yanitsky 2000) (personal interview 2010).

Despite this, NEP scores from Russian respondents may still be valuable. If scores are interpreted as a level of *current adherence* to the western NEP, rather than a measure of *divergence* from a given traditional environmental attitude, then use of the NEP in non-Western cultures can indicate the degree to which these cultures have been influenced by Western environmental ideology. Meta-analysis of NEP surveying in a variety of international contexts suggests that this (re)interpretation of NEP scores may be valid (Milfont, Hawcroft, and Fischer (unpublished material) cited in Dunlap 2008).

While the Russian environmental movement was well established and relatively isolated before the breakup of the Soviet Union, since then environmental organizations have received copious support from Western funders. In the process, organizational leaders have sought to frame their initiatives in Western-style grant proposals and to coordinate partnerships with Western organizations. For example, Baikal Environmental Wave, Baikal Ecological Network, Great Baikal Trail, Rebirth of Siberian Lands and other Irkutsk environmental organizations have, at some point in their history, all received international grant monies.

Further, leaders of many NGOs (such as Baikal Wave and Rebirth of Siberian Lands) attend international conferences or maintain active partnerships with organizations in Europe and North America. Russian activists sometimes rely on these partners for political leverage when access to the Russian political elite proves unavailable. Baikal Wave, for example, sought support from high-level German officials to block the re-opening of the Baikalsk cellulose plant and collected signatures for a letter sent to international UNESCO officials.

This type of political strategy, based on interactions with international partners, strongly affects the way that Russian and, in particular, Irkutsk environmental activists perceive their role in the Russian environmental debate and in global political and environmental spheres. In part to measure the extent of this "westernizing" effect, the author of this paper conducted a survey of leaders and members of environmental organizations in Irkutsk in the spring of 2010. As a whole, this survey sought to discern how psychological relationships between humans and their ecosystem affect behavior in everyday as well as political arenas. The NEP survey index was included in the survey as a way to measure adherence to Western "ecological" worldviews.

The results of this survey provide support to the hypothesis that those who are active in environmental organizations in Irkutsk have developed attitudes in agreement with the NEP.

Although the target population of active environmental organization leaders and members was limited and, as a result, the sample size was relatively small, respondents on average demonstrated very robust agreement with nearly all of the questions (12 out of 15) included in the NEP index (unpublished personal data 2010). While a lack of longitudinal statistical data complicates interpretation, these results suggest that a re-interpretation of NEP scores relative to Yanitsky's criticism may be valid. In light of the historical context of the environmental movement in Irkutsk, which was very isolated and distinctly Russian before the fall of the Soviet Union and later rapidly Westernized, it may be valid to interpret today's adherence to NEP as a movement toward Western attitudes rather than a distancing from traditional Russian worldviews.

Nonetheless, there is one, perhaps uniquely Russian, peculiarity which may hint at the complex nature of Russian environmental attitudes. The three NEP index questions for which respondents demonstrated the lowest average agreement (less than three points out of five) are all related to the *future* ability of mankind to understand and/or exploit natural resources.

In Irkutsk, special attention to temporal variation among questions can possibly be explained by rapid changes in social, economic, and political norms occurring during respondents' lifetimes. In disagreement with NEP attitudes, Irkutsk respondents are more inclined to believe that the exponential progress that they have observed over the past ten years (see, for example, "Dear Pleasure" 2010) will continue, allowing them to better understand nature, more effectively exploit resources, and effectively correct the environmental problems that could make the world unlivable.

Administration of the NEP in a variety of contexts has shown that members of Western environmental organizations typically have high NEP scores (Dunlap and VanLiere 1978). However, for others, even those who have strong environmental concerns, agreement with

certain question types has wavered (low internal consistency; Gooch 1995). This may be in part because, in regions where sustenance living takes precedence or economic hardship makes day-to-day-survival difficult, some NEP concepts may seem superfluous. For example, an individual who is negatively affected by a polluting factory may nonetheless rely on employment in that factory to feed his family; a person who experiences a rapid increase in his standard of living may fail to sympathize with attitudes suggesting the ultimate limits of human progress (as discussed above for Irkutsk). Still, it is interesting to note that the separation of future-oriented questions in the NEP index is observed for the first time in this data, even though the NEP scale has been applied in many countries.

Nonetheless, Irkutsk environmental activists, like those in the West, report strong overall agreement with the NEP. However, also like their western partners, they often display day-to-day behaviors that are not commensurate with their "green" attitudes. In a separate section of the survey, respondents were asked to identify how often they engaged in various green behaviors (reusing containers, recycling paper and glass, picking up litter, and encouraging others to live "green"). Even though survey respondents professed overwhelmingly "ecological" attitudes, they engaged in very few "green" behaviors. Respondents scored on average only eleven out of a possible twenty points on the green behaviors index included in the survey.

Still more interestingly, the vast majority of respondents indicated that they fail by choice to participate in green activities. Claiming that "the opportunity to do this is not available in my community" was rare. This was the case even when that activity was, in fact, unavailable in the region (e.g. some types of recycling). This nuance may provide some insight into the way that environmentalists in Irkutsk relate to "green" opportunities; even if the choice to act green is not actually available, from their point of view, they regularly choose *not* to participate. While the

learned helplessness and public apathy that has plagued Soviet and post-Soviet society may be partially to blame for this trend, this author is inclined to think that the overwhelming opaqueness of Russian infrastructure has done even more to encourage civic inactivity. Living in Irkutsk for almost a year, I have come across numerous instances of passionate would-be civic leaders being confused and discouraged by the complexities of governmental and non-governmental bureaucracy.

Fishbein and Ajzen's theory of reasoned activities suggests that "associations" between attitudes and the object of these attitudes, in this case the attitudes measured by the NEP index and the Baikal region ecosystem, must be created in order to elicit specific behaviors commensurate with these attitudes, in our case "green" behaviors (Bell et al. 2001). In light of the fact that those with high NEP scores do not always engage in "green" behaviors, environmental organizations need to adopt dynamic, cooperative initiatives which work to demonstrate the importance of each individual's actions for maintaining a level of environmental quality from which all will benefit.

Unfortunately, many of the Western grants available to Irkutsk environmental organizations focus on funding informative publications that are published by isolated organizations (journals, newsletters, textbooks), rather than integrated programs designed specifically to suit the Baikal region and encourage partnerships among local organizations. This author's observations suggest that cooperation between organizations, especially in the less politically charged environmental education sphere, could be fruitful. However, organizational barriers, which have been reinforced by an unstable social and political climate, complicate cooperation efforts, and expectations for productive partnerships may not be realistic.

Conclusion

While personal resolve and dedication to environmental causes is not lacking among the leaders and members of environmental organizations, Russia's current political climate as it relates to environmental organizations is less than supportive, if not outright subversive. Governmental hostility toward civic organizations has limited the ability of civic organizations to function. Many have been driven to the fringes of the Russian political sphere and seek support from the global environmental movement outside of Russia. In light of this ecological and political context, NGO leaders and members have developed unique relationships and impressions of the world around them which, in turn, affect their behavior within their respective organizations.

Westernization supports an ecological worldview, while inadequate social, technical, and political infrastructure has failed to provide the necessary opportunities to realize an ecologically sustainable way of life. Caught between ecological attitudes and destructive behaviors, and discredited by national politics, ecological organizations in Irkutsk must develop dynamic and cooperative programs to unite disparate interests in the environmental movement.

The author welcomes commentary and can be reached by email at sarahbeckham164@hotmail.com

Works Cited

Altman, Irwin, and Joachim Wolhill, eds. 1983. *Behavior and the Natural Environment.* New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50,* 179-211.

Barker, R. G. 1968. *Ecological Psychology: Concepts and Methods for Studying the Environment of Human Behavior.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Bechtel, Robert B. 1977. *Enclosing Behavior.* Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania: Dowden, Hutchinson and Ross, Inc.

Bell, Paul A., Thomas C. Greene, Jeffrey D. Fisher, and Andrew Baum. 2001. *Environmental Psychology.* 5th ed. Fort Worth: Harcourt College Publishers.

Bond, Andrew R., and Matthew J. Sagers. 1992. "Some Observations on the Russian Federation Environmental Protection Law." *Post-Soviet Geography* 33 (7): 463-74 http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sbh&AN=6495&site=ehost-live; http://www.bellpub.com/psge/.

Brown, David. 2000. *Contemporary nationalism: civic, ethnocultural and multicultural politics.* London: Routledge.

Cone, John D., and Steven C. Hayes. 1980. *Environmental Problems / Behavioral Solutions.* Belmaon, California: Brooks/ Cole Publishing Company.

Dear Pleasure (Дорогое удовольствие).2010. January issue. Irkutsk.

Donahoe, Brian. 2009. "The Law as a Source of Environmental Justice in the Russian Federation." In *Environmental Justice and Sustainability in the Former Soviet Union*, ed. Julien Agyeman and Yelena Ogneva-Himmelberger. 1st ed. Cambridge, Massachusets: MIT Press, 21.

Dunlap, R. E. 2008. "the New Environmental Paradigm Scale: From Marginality to Worldwide use." *The Journal of Environmental Education* 40 (1): 3-18.

Dunlap, R. E., K. D. Van Liere, A. G. Mertig, and R. E. Jones. 2000. *Measuring endorsement of the new ecological paradigm: A revised NEP scale.* UNIVERSITY PK, PENNSYLVANIA ed. MALDEN; 350 MAIN STREET, STE 6, MALDEN, MA 02148 USA: BLACKWELL PUBLISHERS.

Dunlap, R. E., and K. D. Vanliere. 1978. "New Environmental Paradigm." *Journal of Environmental Education* 9 (4): 10-9.

Henderson, Sarah. 2003. *Building democracy in contemporary Russia : Western support for grassroots organizations.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Henry, Laura A. 2009. "Thinking Globally, Limited Locally: The Russian Environmental Movement and Sustainable Development." In *Environmental Justice and Sustainability in the Former Soviet Union*, ed. Julien Agyeman and Yelena Ogneva-Himmelberger. 1st ed. Cambridge, Massachusets: MIT Press, 47.

Kuznetsov, G. 2008. "Просительное требование." *Восточная сибирская правда.* 11 September 2008: 1.

Levin, Mark, and Georgy Satarov. 2000. "Corruption and Institutions in Russia." *European Journal of Political Economy* 16 (1): 113-32.

Lubomudrov, Slava. 1978. "Environmental Politics in the Soviet Union: The Baikal Controversy [Involving Government-Sponsored Industrialization in the Lake Baikal Basin Area and the Threat of Pollution from Industrial Wastes]." *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 20 : 529-43.

Lukov, O.C. 2010 lecture 22 September. Siberian Academy of Law, Economics, and Management. Irkutsk.

McFaul, Michael, and Elina Treyger. 2004. "Chapter 6: Civil Society." In *Between dictatorship and democracy : Russian post-communist political reform* , ed. Michael McFaul. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Metzo, Katherine. 2009. "Civil Society and the Debate Over Pipelines in Tunka National Park." In *Environmental Justice and Sustainability in the Former Soviet Union*, ed. Julien Agyeman and Yelena Ogneva-Himmelberger. 1st ed. Cambridge, Massachusets: MIT Press, 119.

Na, Longatchev. 1993. " History and Geodynamics of the Lake Baikal Rift system -- A Review." Bulletin des Centres de Recherches Exploration-Production Elf Aquitaine, 17 (2): 353-70.

Ostergren, David. 2001. "An Organic Act After a Century of Protection: The Context, Content, and Implications of the 1995 Russian Federation Law on Specially Protected Areas." *Natural Resources Journal* 41 (1): 125-52

Peterson, D. J., and Eric K. Bielke. 2001. "The Reorganization of Russia's Environmental Bureaucracy: Implications and Prospects." *Post-Soviet Geography and Economics* 42 (1): 65-76

"progressivepathway" (Youtube user name). 2008. *Marina Rikhvanova's heroic efforts to save Lake Baikal.* sacred-sites.org:http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P7a9DXMbgVc. (1/12/2009).

Rasputin, Valentin. 1991. *Farewell to Matyora.* Evanstown, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

Riley, Robert. 1992. "Attachment to the Ordinary Landscape." In *Place Attachment*, ed. Irwin Altman. New York: Plenum Press, 13.

Rossolimo, L. 1966. Baikal. Moscow: Nauka.

Russian Federation. from 13 January 2010. government decree №1 "О внесении изменений в перечень видов деятельности, запрещённых в центральной экологической зоне Байкальской природной территории."

Skinner, B. F. 1953. *Science and Human Behavior.* New York: The Free Press.

Sopronenko, Igor. 2009. *Russian Feminism: Twenty Years Forward.* Indiana Univ Press.

Stewart, John Massey. 1990. "The Great Lake is in Great Peril." New Scientist (June): 58-62.
_____. 1991. Lake Baikal on the Brink? Oxford, UK: Information Press.

Tihi, Igor. 2010. "Зачем преследуют защитников Байкала?" Baikal Siberia (№ 4 March 6-13): 3.

Weiner, Douglas R. 1999. *A little corner of freedom: Russian nature protection from Stalin to Gorbachëv.* Berkely, CA: University of California Press.

Wood, Audrey. 2006. "Enforcement of the New NGO Law: A deeper look." http://www.sras.org/enforcement_of_new_ngo_law (1/12/09).

Woods, M. Evelyn. 1994. "International Environmental Aid to the States of the Former Soviet Union: A Case Study Focusing on Siberia's Lake Baikal." Colorodo Journal of International Environmental Law & Policy 5 : 459.

WWF. 1990. "Lake Baikal and Water Management." In World Wide Fund for Nature Global Environmental Education Program: What we Consume: Unit 7 USSR Anonymous .

Zulap, Y.A (Зулар, Ю. А). 2003 «К вопросу переодизации имтории Байкальского экологтческого движения общественности» in «Сословное (народное) Представительствщ и самоуправление в России XVI-начала XXI века; Мремьи Щанповские чтения». Иркутск: Издательство «Оттиск».