

The concept of “other” and the problem of tolerance in the Russian public discourse on migration to Siberia in the 1850-1890’s (based on publicistic materials)

Irina Aizikova¹ and Irina Matveenko^{2,a}

¹Tomsk State University, 634050 Lenin Avenue, 36, Tomsk, Russia

²Tomsk Polytechnic University, 634050 Lenin Avenue, 30, Tomsk, Russia

Abstract. Based on publicistic materials of the second half of the 19-th century, the article analyzes the interpretation of Siberian colonization in the Russian public discourse in the form of a crossroad of a “civilization frontier” and entrance into the space of “other”. Following M. Bakhtin dialogue theory, the dialogue between “own self” and “another”, accompanying the migration to Siberia, was thought to be not an “introduction” to identification, but identification itself. In this aspect, the Russian discourse on migration to Siberia developed in accordance with the polyglossia law. The issues of the colonization process idealization of Siberian land and its participants were at the top of the discourse. The idea of Siberia colonization was commonly considered as a way to discover a new better life for the given territory and the central Russia. There was an idea of Siberia as “a Promised Land”, which was opposed to another tendency in the public discourse, i.e. demythologization of Siberia and development of “own self” and “another” dialogue. The conclusion is made concerning the fact that the research material presented can be interpreted as an important stage in the complex history of identification and self-identification in Siberian region in the form of a special territory both geographically and culturally.

Introduction

Today, the problem of the migration as well as migrants’ adaptation and identification is seen as highly topical which is reflected in numerous contemporary research [1-3]. In this context consideration of the Russian migration to Siberia in the second half of the 19-th century is relevant and timely. Its different aspects connected with the beginning of migration processes, development of laws on this issue, statistics, degree and progression of colonization in Siberian areas are presented in works by N.F. Yemel’yanov [4], V.A. Lipinskaya [5], T.S. Mamsik [6], D.Ya. Rezun, M.V. Shilovsky [7], O.N. Shelegina [8], I.A. Ayzikova [9] and some others. These studies, in their turns, are based on the research made by historians and statisticians made in the second half of the 19-th century (I.A. Gurvich [10], A.A. Kaufman [11], N.M. Yadrintsev [12] and others), when the question was intensively discussed in the literature and mass media. Nevertheless, the background of the problem mentioned in the title of the paper in the Russian periodicals of the second half of the 19-th century has not only been studied yet but also not been really stated. At the same time, the themes of migrants’ crossing Ural Mountains as a border between the central

Russia and Siberia, acquaintance of new voluntary and constrained occupants with Siberian land and Siberians, opening new “other” space were thoroughly conceptualized in the Russian journalism of the given period in both capital and provincial press. The issues mentioned above were inevitably connected with multi-aspect reflection of “own self” and “another” in the process of self-identification and tolerance development to “another” based on those issues.

According to M. Bakhtin, understanding each other appears at point where two minds meet, i.e. existence of “another” is a necessary condition for identification and self-identification of participants as a complicated, dramatic, large-scale, social and historic phenomenon involving the whole country, as the migration to Siberia was. In fact, the dialogue between “own self” and “another” accompanying the migration to Siberia was not anticipation of identification, but identification itself. It did not disclose the ready-made specificity of a migrant and old-timer, but this specificity manifested itself in the dialogue, and, moreover, “it became specificity for others and for itself” [13]. The concept of “another” was approached dialogically, mutually initiating self-disclosing in cross-cultural traditions. Thus, the journalism, we are interested in, arranged a

^a Corresponding author: mia2046@yandex.ru

kind of polyglossia in public discourse on migration to Siberia (simultaneously, the theme was arranged by them) that was being developed not according to the dialectic laws, but in terms of the law of different voices' co-existence and interaction, as a result of which the definite themes, concepts, images, chronotope were discovered to their full extent.

Results and discussion

Nearly in all publications the central concept became that of "another" and connected the problem of migration process – the problem of self-identification of Siberian population, relations of new-comers and local people. The theme is known to be always closely connected with the basic notions of an individual's world perception, his/her behavior in the society, development of tolerant relationship with others, multi-aspect reflection in relationship of "own self" and "another". However, before considering the mentioned problem, let us note one more point: as is known, self-identification is always closely connected with social stereotypes. One of them is the image of Siberia intensely provoking the Russians' aspirations to that land. On the one hand, there was a myth about Siberia as a Promised Land in public consciousness of the European part of Russia. At the end of the 19-th century the majority of Russians had a very vague idea of the far Siberian lands that was often built on a stereotypical model of "other country" hosted by asylum seekers, with vast fields belonging to no one and harsh climate, but which a man could and had already partially conquered. Such an idea was peculiar to the book by folk expert, ethnographer, poet D. Sadovnikov – "Our explorers" [14]. On the other hand, by the middle of the 19-th century, Siberia, firstly, had already been demythologized. Secondly, it was densely populated in the western part and could be considered as a kind of transit point for further migrants' travelling to the East, to the areas, about which a grim legend had been invented describing hell environment of exile and penal servitude. But it did not frighten the potential newcomers virtually not inclined to identify themselves with convicts. Besides, an image of a Siberian convict that had been thoroughly described by the Siberian journalists was not still formed in the mass conscious, being quite abstract and sometimes romanticized.

Increase in depth and a multilevel nature of the issue on Siberia colonization typical for the second half of the 19-th century is clearly seen in the essay "Siberia along the highway" (1863) by famous journalist N.V. Shelgunov. He depicted migrants as absolutely lost people due to immediate destruction of their identification and self-identification occurring in the new place and depending mostly on their social circumstances and professional qualification. Shelgunov described cooks and valets, servants and maids coming to Siberia and knowing nothing but the life in a manor house, without any ability to become Siberian farmers even in the most favorable conditions. At a new, "other" home, those people with occupations unknown to aboriginal people were not in demand – with all that it

implied. Whereas peasants, according to Shelgunov, coming to promising "suitable for arable farming land", very often faced the reality where the majority of Siberian lands were in practice unsuitable for farming, but suitable ones had been already colonized by old-timers. Such a circumstance formed the grounds for bloody conflicts and mutual hostility between the newcomers and local people. Aboriginal people helped migrants only under enforcement of authorities or wishing "to prevent the troubles", i.e. cruelty and violence from hungry migrants and tramps. "A Siberian frowned at "a Russian man", and "a Russian man" did at a Siberian, but both disliked each other", – wrote Shelgunov. The word "Siberia" in their mouth, which was particularly typical for exiled people, sounded like a curse word, as well as a Siberian used only dirty definitions for migrants. Shelgunov described the case evidenced by himself: a convict, being through with his lag, cried to a Siberian bitten by him: "Don't call me varnak, I am not varnak for you", but the bitten man answered: "A lie! I will always call you varnak, – varnak, varnak!" [15].

Famous Siberian journalist S. Chudnovsky echoed Shelgunov. Considering the problem he did not search for rights and wrongs among the conflicting parties. "One cannot help but being hardened at heart, – he wrote about Siberians in his famous article "Colonization significance of Siberian exile" (1886), – when settlements are crowded with ascribed exiles" who appeared to be "robbed all his fortune" by old-timers "settling the notorious "varnak" accounts with them" [16]. N.M. Yadrintsev wrote about the same phenomenon in his historical essay "Correctional role of Russian exile" (1871): local people "are in constant fear for their life and property, as a result of which local peasants arm themselves: there is a hard fight in the forests of Siberia <...>" [17].

The article by N.A. Gorny "On the life at the Ural factories. Personal Memoir" stands in row with the above mentioned writings. His story is told by a migrant who came from the central region of Russia to Siberia searching for happiness, having worked "at the Ural gold diggings", descended into platinum mines, got out lead in Zmeinogorsk, evaporated salt at the salt pans in Solikamsk, inhaled the coal dust in Yekaterinoslavsk okrug [18]. Judging by his inner monologues, the narrator is an educated man and a writer. The story tells about the narrator's work at the lead-bleaching plant where his good health helped him to live a year, during which he was taken to the hospital four times. It was only his will, high standard of culture, and continuous moral self-analysis and self-discipline, deep reflection that prevented the protagonist-narrator, who appeared in "the other" conditions, from destruction of the professional level of personal identification, which was the most dependable on the society. But it was a rare exception to the rule. The protagonist tells about his friends in need, the same migrants as he is, found his vacancies just at the bleaching plant and working in the unbearable conditions, quickly losing their human images. The narrator underlines that the plant employers hired migrants readily, independently on their

professional skills, because bleach production is not a profession of high qualification, it is an exhausting manual job lapsing a man to the animal, resulting in his complete degradation, supporting his ignorance, developing the most trashy feelings and longings: aggression, desire for more food and vodka.

The family level of migrants' self-identification was destroyed with not less dramatic consequences than that of professional. It is no coincidence that the authors of the articles underline that workers lived at the plants without wives and children. In such circumstances every one survives as he can. Men support their families neither with money nor help. The reverse aspect of the problem was considered by professor of Tomsk Emperor University I.A. Malinovsky [19] in his public lectures in the late 1890's. He said about "moral poison" that was spilt by the migrants, especially exiled-penal women, onto Siberian youth, engraining to them cynical attitude towards family, children, and elder people. The image of poison spreading from migrants, particularly "involuntary" ones, and corrupting even "virtuous houses of peasant families", was also used by Yadrintsev in his essays.

The same problems, but based on the facts of the Western-Siberian mining peasants, were raised by a famous historian and public figure, journalist V.I. Semevsky (1849-1916). His article "Mining peasants in Ural in the 1760-1764" (1877) [20] studies the living conditions and anxiety of mining peasants living in the mentioned period in Trans Urals. He regards the study of this topic as a very important aspect for understanding Pugachev's rebellion. Based on the historical material, the article is aimed at contemporary problems, at the same time it poses the key questions of self-identification, its crisis affecting nearly half of the Russian population living in the Siberian territory and having effect on the central Russia. Its threat is seen by Semevsky, first of all, in possibility for a destructed structure of self-identification to be quickly replaced by a new one – immoral, losing integrity and consistency of own "self" through alcohol, "carouse", and aggression.

Against the background of public discourse on migration to Siberia, the publications about schismatic migrants exiled or run to Siberia like people of other faith are distinguished. As a rule, the people lived in large, but very rare settlements-communities "with massive constructions, with different fret works on the blinds, with paved yards, with interior decorations" are described as an oasis in desert. Those settlements "have a character of old-fashion", there is climate of "safety and security" in them, the dwellers of those settlements represent "a specific tribe". They are also distinguished by "appearance" – "fresh women in colorful neat sarafans, tidy respectable old men, handsome young men" in "both character and way of life" [15]. In this way N.V. Shelgunov described schismatic migrants in his essay "Siberia along the highway".

The religious level of migrants' and old-timers' self-identification seemed to be more stable in comparison with those considered above, though in this case it built the additional barriers in the relationships, which was mentioned as one of the most urgent problems in

migration by a number of journalists in the second half of the 19-th century. For instance, thirty years later, A.F. Dukhovich (1863-?) exiled to police overt surveillance to Western Siberia stated in his essay "On the question of taiga colonization" (1896) that schismatics, being persecuted by the old-timers, either went to the deep taiga or moved to other places, leaving their acquired lands for weeds [21].

Politically exiled S.L. Chudnovsky, a public figure, ethnographer, economist, memoirist (1849-1912), in his essay "Colonization significance of Siberian exile" [16] developed one more ideal image of a migrant and a kind of migrants' Utopia, a model of the route, in which migrants' motion to Siberia could develop provided it did not destroy the family self-identification level of the motion members. He describes the life of the so called "stonemasons" living in just more than two tens of settlements in the South-Eastern part of Tomsk Province. Established as soon as the beginning of the 18-th century, "the community", first comprised Old-believers and lived its separate life, was engaged in arable farming, fishing and hunting, fostered the family and religious values.

One of the most significant in the migration public discourse is the theme of new-comers' and old-timers' national-territorial self-identification. Let us take, for example, "The tales of a traveller about his journey to Trans-Volga, Ural and along the Volga" by P.I. Nebol'sin. Chapters X-XII are devoted to Bashkirs and Kirghizs as well as their relations with the Russian population of Perm, Yekaterinburg, and Orenburg provinces. The aboriginal Bashkirs, as the author puts it, lived with Russians "interracially". The motif of voluntariness when Russia was conquering Bashkirs and their incorporation is proved by the historical evidences, according to which it happened in the 17-th century. Bashkirs, according to Nebol'sin, still live "by their own rules": their settlements consist of yurts, they are run by Yurt aldermen, and solicitors are appointed from the local Russian public officials only to perform court proceedings, to defend the Bashkirs' rights. However, the objectively existing psychological, mental, moral-ethic, cultural dialogue of the Russians coming from central Russia and settling there during the two centuries and local people (though they also counted themselves to be migrants, but with older Siberian roots) conditioned the involvement of both sides into interaction. So, in the course of his historical journey, Nebol'sin writes about the fact that the large sites in the outskirts of Ufa were allocated and given to Russians "in the form of compensation" or simply taken from Bashkirs. In 1849 in Bashkir lands "outside settlers" amounted nearly half of Bashkir population. Among them there were also unauthorized settlers plowing up the soil of the local people "at their sole discretion" [22].

Nebol'sin described in detail the following Bashkir traditions, common until the mid of the 19-th century (the period of the author's journey) during summer nomadic movement: life in wagons or kosh (portable houses), Bashkir villages, structure of Bashkir yards and houses, appearance of Bashkir women and men, their clothes and shoes, everyday activities and holiday

entertainments. Nebol'sin often compares his impressions with the Russian customs and traditions, focusing on differences in habits, way of life and etc., recalling a number of curious scenes (e.g., tells about Bashkirs not accustomed to drive a horse from trestle and mount the horse as soon as he has a chance). Besides, the author is especially interested in everything that demonstrates the intercultural dialogue of Bashkirs and Russians. For instance, describing one of his stops as "to have a rest at one of the Bashkir nomadic sites", he writes about its host who impressed him by his European suit, good knowledge of Russian (both oral and written), but especially by the fact that he shaved his beard and grew his hair. But the most striking and significant details for the author are that this "honorary Bashkir" "still wore a skullcap, over which wore an official hat. Sometimes, instead of it he wore "a burk" – an ordinary Tartar fur hat - with the uniform" [22]. Similarly, his name was multi-layered as well: the name "Muhammad Abdurrahmanovich" was overlapped with two Russian ones: "Matvey Romanovich" and "Trifon Lukich". The only things, which this man remained to be committed to in his pure national tradition, were food and living with two wives.

While travelling, Nebol'sin faced the cases of incorporation of the religious assimilation into transformations of self-identification that made the international dialogue even more complicated, at the same time, extending its opportunities. He describes his meetings with christened Bashkirs, Tartars, and Kirghizs. Remaining devoted Buddhists or Moslems, they decorated their houses with Christian holy images without speaking or understanding Russian language.

Nebol'sin's essay "The Kirghizs" is of not less interest, as its empire idea is included in the following words: "... Kirghizs, due to the close neighborhood with the Russian Cossack settlements, day by day acquire more and more basics of our public life and, under the influence of the Russian civilization, gradually become russified. The result is great, well seen by Kirghizs themselves. The only pity: they are guided not just by the desire to learn the values of Russian culture, but the only need, extreme poverty, and necessity to earn their piece of daily bread at Russians" [22]. This idea of submission, conquering, which the literature on Siberian migration is saturated with, is spoken out by Nebol'sin. Cultural assimilation approved by P.I. Nebol'sin only in one aspect – russification of local population - can be evaluated in different ways, including that of dramatic delusion. But in this case another conclusion is significant: in the second half of the 19-th century many authors interpreted the migration of peoples into "another" land (Siberia, in particular) as a very important multi-aspect problem.

Along with Nebol'sin, A.A. Kaufman (1864-1919), a Russian economist, the author of works on land management and land ownership in Siberia as well as on migration issues, participated in the public discourse on migration to Siberia. His essays "Along the new places" (1901-1903) allows understanding a number of aspects of the problem discussed in the article. The first of them – "Uralsk" introduces the theme of migration. The town

is described as an entirely Cossack village, the picture is marked by a special semantic sign of "raspberry bands" being a symbol of the Ural Cossacks. Those first migrants over the Ural, in the author's opinion, did not become "men in uniform caps", keeping their martial spirit, poise, traditional activities (such as fishing by means of gaffs in crew in accordance with old community rules). The picture of Uralsk town is replaced by description of the Ural steppe populated with Kirghizs long ago. Their yurts, according to the narrator's observation, can be decorated with the portraits of Russian writers, one can see the books in their chests, the yurt dwellers speak Russian, study in progymnasiums. For example, the narrator saw a young Kirghiz girl met by him in the steppe in the following way. Her image was added with some details showing extraordinary complexity and tension of cultural dialogue existing at the crossroads of Russia and Siberia: having received education this girl was sold by her father to the yurt host as a second wife: "She, as they say, has drowned in the river and run from her husband. Here came the governor ..., she rushed to him with a petition publicly: you, said, taught me at school, so I cannot live in the old way. And what? I cannot offend against your law" [23]. The situation with Adaevets is presented as a real tragedy, "a sore point" for both Kirghiz and Russian migrants, as well as for the authorities of the middle Ural region. The cause for "the sore point" is seen by the author in "collision of two cultures: primeval nomadic culture represented by its typical nation – Adaevets is opposed to sedentary-agricultural one making great achievements in the North and in the middle part of Ural Oblast" [23]. Besides, the author also writes about salutary, in his opinion, influence of the Russian migrants' culture and living conditions, the ways of household management on the local inhabitants. The process of salutary influence of one culture on another is estimated by Kaufman as an objective slowly occurring multi-staged transition from one state to another. He demonstrates it by the example of the Russian tradition introduction into Kirghiz cuisine.

The most interest is attracted by the essay "Vagrant Rus". The central event of it is the conversation of the narrator with the dwellers of the migrants' settlement, in which the whole set of problems concerning Russian migration to Siberia is raised. Among them, along with bad condition of the settled (including unauthorized taken) lands there is an issue on relations of the Russian dwellers with the local people. The heroes of the essay "Vagrant Rus" notice that even in case of good neighborhood they feel deep language communication barriers. There are some other obstacles, at first sight, not only affecting everyday life, but also having deeper roots: a Russian migrant claiming to be more educated, but now and then trying to deceive Kirghiz; whereas a Kirghiz, having high opinion of himself not less than Russian, "rent his land" to a migrant, "in this case one cannot get rid of him: either treat him or give something..."[23].

Conclusion

To sum it up, all the facts presented above are certain to be the evidence of crisis in self-identification affected nearly half of the Russian population. Both capital and local journalists saw its threat, first of all, in abrupt division of Siberians into “friends” and “foes”, accompanied with crisis of their moral values, which made difficult their self-identification of both, precluding it nearly completely. There was a very strong sense about uselessness of state acts directed at improvement of colonization process in Siberia and adaptation of its participants. Both figures in the articles and the word pictures of migrants led the readers to the awareness of the fact that self-identification of migration participants was a situation of not only and not just a social character, when it was hard to make a choice, but also their inner personal one. As a way out of the crisis the journalists revealed its sorest, moral-esthetic points, focused on turning of Siberian migrants and old-timers to the eternal motifs and values, archetypes, concepts, in particular, the concept of “Other”. This process contributed to consideration of urgent questions concerning the reason, why Russia moves to “the other”, Siberian space. This peoples’ migration in physical space is interpreted by many authors as an attempt of Russian people’s to self-identify themselves, which is of a dramatic character, but necessary for further historical development of the multi-national country.

References

1. D. H. Kaplan, E. Chacko, JCG, February (2015)
2. N. Halstead, *Journal of Material Culture*, **7(3)** (2002)
3. P. Gilroy, *Third Text*, **13(3)** (1991)
4. N.F. Yemel’yanov, *Russian colonization of the Middle Ob in the feudal epoch (XVII – first half of the XIX century)*. (Tomsk, TSU press, 1981)
5. V.A. Lipinskaya, *Old-timers and migrants. Russians in Altay. XVIII – beginning of XX centuries* (Moscow: Nauka, 1996)
6. T.S. Mamsik, *Economic exploration of the South Siberia: Mechanisms of formation and functioning agricultural structure* (Novosibirsk, Nauka SO RAN, 1989)
7. D.Ya. Rezun, M.V. Shilovsky, *Siberia, the end of the XVI – beginning of XX century: frontier in the context of ethno-social and ethno-cultural processes* (Novosibirsk, Sova, 2005)
8. O.N. Shelegina, *Adaptation of Russian population in the condition of Siberian land exploration. Social-cultural aspects. XVIII – beginning of the XX century* **2** (Moscow, Logos, 2002)
9. I.A. Ayzikova, Ye.A. Makarova, *The theme of migration to Siberia in the literature of the center and Siberian region of Russia of the 1860-1890’s: the problem of dialogue* (Tomsk, TSU press, 2009)
10. I.A. Gurvich, *Migration of peasants to Siberia* (Moscow, Tipographia A. Levenson and K^o, 1889)
11. A.A. Kaufman, *Migration and colonization* (Saint-Petersburg, Tipographiya tovarishchestva Obshchestvennaya pol’za, 1905)
12. N.M. Yadrintsev, *Vestnik Yevropy*, **8** (1891)
13. M.M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota, 1989)
14. D.N. Sadovnikov, *Our explorers. (Stories about colonization of Siberia). 1581-1712* (Moscow, Izdatelstvo V.D. Karchagina, 1905)
15. N.V. Shelgunov, *Siberia along the highway*, **1** (Saint Petersburg, Russkaya knizhnaya trgovlya, 1871–1872)
16. S.L. Chudnovsky, *Russkaya Mysl’* **X**, 52 (1886).
17. N.M. Yadrintsev, *Delo*, **2** (1871)
18. N.A. Gorny, *Vestnik Yevropy*, **8** (1904)
19. I.A. Malinovsky, *Exile to Siberia: Public lectures read in Tomsk in November 1899* (Tomsk, Parovaya tipo-litographiya P.I. Makushina, 1900)
20. V.I. Semevsky, *Vestnik Yevropy* **1, 2** (1877)
21. A.F. Dukhovich, *On the question of taiga colonization* (Tomsk, 1896)
22. P.I. Nebol’sin, *Otechestvennye zapiski*, **11**, 25 (1853)
23. A.A. Kaufman, *Along the new places (Essays and notes of traveller). 1901-1903.* (Saint Petersburg, Tipographiya tovarishchestva Obshchestvennaya pol’za, 1905)