IDEOLOGIES *of* RACE

Imperial Russia and the Soviet Union in Global Context

EDITED BY

DAVID RAINBOW

IDEOLOGIES OF RACE

Ideologies of Race

Imperial Russia and the Soviet Union in Global Context

Edited by
DAVID RAINBOW

McGill-Queen's University Press
Montreal & Kingston • London • Chicago

© McGill-Queen's University Press 2019

ISBN 978-0-7735-5897-7 (cloth)
ISBN 978-0-7735-5898-4 (paper)
ISBN 978-0-2280-0036-5 (ePDF)
ISBN 978-0-2280-0037-2 (ePUB)

Legal deposit third quarter 2019
Bibliothèque nationale du Québec

Printed in Canada on acid-free paper that is 100% ancient forest free (100% post-consumer recycled), processed chlorine free

Funded by the Government of Canada | Financé par le gouvernement du Canada | Canada

Canada Council for the Arts | Conseil des arts du Canada

We acknowledge the support of the Canada Council for the Arts.

Nous remercions le Conseil des arts du Canada de son soutien.

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Title: Ideologies of race : imperial Russia and the Soviet Union in global context / edited by David Rainbow.
Names: Rainbow, David, 1979– editor.
Description: Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: Canadiana (print) 20190131225 | Canadiana (ebook) 2019013125X | ISBN 9780773558977 (hardcover) | ISBN 9780773558984 (softcover) | ISBN 9780228000365 (PDF) | ISBN 9780228000372 (EPUB)
Subjects: LCSH: Russia—Race relations. | LCSH: Soviet Union—Race relations. | LCSH: Minorities—Russia—Social conditions. | LCSH: Minorities—Soviet Union—Social conditions.
Classification: LCC DKJ33 .I34 2019 | DDC 305.00947—dc23

This book was typeset by True to Type in 10.5/13 Sabon

Contents

Acknowledgments vii

Introduction: Race as Ideology: An Approach 3
David Rainbow

PART ONE BEYOND EXCEPTIONAL

1 Constructing Race, Ethnicity, and Nationhood in Imperial Russia: Issues and Misconceptions 29
Vera Tolz

2 The Matter of Race 59
Alaina Lemon

3 Race and Racial Thinking: A View from the Atlantic World 77
Aisha Khan

PART TWO THE LIMITS OF UNIVERSALISM

4 Racial Purity vs Imperial Hybridity: The Case of Vladimir Jabotinsky against the Russian Empire 103
Marina Mogilner

5 The Racialization of Soviet Gypsies: Roma, Nationality Politics, and Socialist Transformation in Stalin's Soviet Union 132
Brigid O'Keeffe

6 Russia, Germany, and the Problem of Race 160
Eric D. Weitz

PART THREE EMPIRES MIXING

7 Racial “Degeneration” and Siberian Regionalism in the Late Imperial Period 179
David Rainbow

8 Children of Mixed Marriage in Soviet Central Asia: Dilemmas of Identity and Belonging 208
Adrienne Edgar

9 Race, Regions, and Ethnicities: A Brazilian Perspective 234
Barbara Weinstein

PART FOUR RUSSIA AND THE GLOBE

10 Occidental Bullyism? Russia, Yun Ch’iho, and Race in the Early Twentieth-Century Pacific 247
Susanna Soojung Lim

11 Was Soviet Internationalism Anti-Racist? Toward a History of Foreign Others in the USSR 284
Anika Walke

12 Pan-Mongolism to Anti-Racist Internationalism: Perspectives from US History 312
Gunja SenGupta

Contributors 339

Index 343

Acknowledgments

This book project began as a two-day workshop at the Jordan Center for the Advanced Study of Russia at New York University. The workshop brought together scholars from the United States and Europe whose current work in the Russian and Soviet fields is related to the question of race, as well as scholars who study parts of the world in which race has been a matter for academic inquiry much longer. Many people contributed to the development of the ideas explored in this book by participating in the workshop, reading and commenting on drafts, challenging arguments, sharing insights, and in some cases all of the above. I would like to thank all of the participants who contributed to the conversations and debates, especially Brinton Ahlin, Betty Banks, Jaime Berthe, Edyta Bojanowska, Herrick Chapman, Karl Hall, Chia Yin Hsu, Nathaniel Knight, Anne Lounsbery, Jaime Philips, and Caterina Pizzigoni.

I am also grateful for a number of other people and institutions who provided vital support for this project. From its conception, the idea for the project benefited from the steadfast encouragement and searching questions of Yanni Kotsonis, the founding director of the Jordan Center. Jane Burbank, as always, contributed great ideas and practical support. Timothy Frye, who was the director of the Harriman Institute for Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies at Columbia University during my year there as a postdoctoral fellow, supported the project at an early stage. Fiona Neale-May and Heather Janson did a tremendous amount of logistical work to make the workshop a success. Generous financial support for the workshop came from the Jordan Center, Harriman Institute, NYU History Department, NYU Provost Global Research Initiative, and the NYU

Institute for the Humanities. Richard Ratzlaff, my editor, has been enthusiastic about the idea for this volume since before chapters were written and gave sound advice at each step along the way. At the University of Houston, the dean of The Honors College, William Monroe, continues to encourage and support all manner of Russia-related affairs. The publication of this book was supported by grants from the UH Honors College's Jane Morin Cizik Endowment and Ron and Jane Lerner Family Fund, as well as NYU's Jordan Center, now under the direction of Joshua Tucker. I am very grateful for all of this support.

IDEOLOGIES OF RACE

INTRODUCTION

Race as Ideology: An Approach

David Rainbow

The history of race, a complicated topic in any context, is particularly challenging to understand in Russia. In Russia, the term "race" has never been an official or legal category the way it was, and is, in many other modern countries. The Russian Empire's nineteenth-century census takers asked respondents about their religious confession, but they did not ask about race (*rasa*), ethnicity (*narodnost'*) or nationality (*natsional'nost'*). Later, Soviet officials favoured the new and all-important categories of class and nationality over race, a fact touted as one of the marks of communism's superiority over its race-obsessed rivals in the fascist and capitalist west. Today in Putin's Russia, even as tensions have grown between Russian nationalists and the country's non-Slavic minorities, race is not included among the most basic demographic categories counted by the state. When it comes to the history of race, a critically important concept for understanding the history of the modern world, it is not obvious where Russia or the Soviet Union fit in.

This book is about the history of race in the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It explores the significance of race at different points in time and in various circumstances. It argues that despite the fact that "race" was not codified in law, the concept of race had important consequences for how human difference was understood by many imperial subjects and Soviet citizens. As it did in other empires around the world, the "concept of race" in Russia and the Soviet Union evolved over time and was understood in terms of biology, inheritance, phenotype, civilization, culture, environment, geography, or some combination of

these, often with little indication of where one ended and the next began. No one consensus emerged about exactly what race was or what it meant. Its meanings were contested, multifarious, and sometimes difficult to decipher. And no dominant criteria for defining, let alone ascribing, race gave coherence to the concept. Race in Russia and the Soviet Union was understood very differently than in places like the United States, South Africa, and Nazi Germany, countries that rigidly codified phenotypic racial hierarchies and are often taken as "typical." Therefore, rather than approaching the topic with a particular concept in mind of how race ordinarily works, our goal has been to understand Russian and Soviet ideologies of race, or ideas about human diversity articulated in racial terms, and their affects on social and political perspectives and behaviour. Ideas about race manifested in multiple ways and influenced a variety of social and political aspirations, only some of which resembled the paths taken in Germany and the US. An approach to race as ideology helps to register what is distinctive about the Russian and Soviet cases.

Ideologies of race in Russia and the Soviet Union, for all of their particularity, are nevertheless integral to the global history of race. There were, to be sure, distinctive elements in the development of ideas about race in the Russian Empire, which have had consequences lasting to the present. Not least among them is the lack of a legally reinforced racial regime. However, race "science" emerged in Russia at about the same time as it did in Western Europe, with scholars across the globe sharing fundamental concepts and research agendas. In other words, ideologies of race in Russia and the Soviet Union were distinctive variations on a global theme, but not exceptional.[1] The argument here is not merely that an understanding of Russia and the Soviet Union benefits from considering their places in a broader history of race but also that our understanding of the global history of race benefits from a consideration of Russia and the Soviet Union.

The structure of the volume helps to make this case. Contributions come from scholars of history, anthropology, and literature and are divided into four thematic sections. Each section contains a chapter on imperial Russia, a chapter on the Soviet Union, and a chapter engaging the theme from the perspective of another part of the world (the Caribbean, Germany, Brazil, or the United States) and the scholarship connected to it. The Russian and Soviet chapters draw extensively upon archival, literary, and ethnographic research. The third chapter in each section responds directly to the previous chapters and

takes the issues they raise in new directions. The volume is not organized chronologically, but it nevertheless advances important arguments about when race became a concept relevant to Russian social and political life relative to the more familiar Western European cases. The comparative structure of individual chapters and the volume as a whole highlights what is particular about the Russian or Soviet case and also argues for the value of inclusion of Russia and the Soviet Union in the global history of race.

WHY RACE IN RUSSIA AND THE SOVIET UNION IS SOMETIMES HARD TO SEE

The marginal role of race in the field of Russian and Soviet studies has not prevented scholars from examining the significance of human diversity across Russian and Eurasia. Innovative studies have considered the importance of nationality (*natsional'nost'*) from the late imperial through the Soviet period, especially during the 1917 Revolution and early Soviet years.[2] In 1922, the Soviet Union presided over an extraordinarily diverse human population. It was, however, anything but a foregone conclusion how all of that diversity would fit into the new regime. Nationality became, for the first time, a legally defined category, though it retained a sufficient amount of malleability and historical contingency to satisfy Marxists, who were more concerned with transforming people into proper workers than with perpetuating particularistic national identities. Early on, there was an explicit understanding among Soviet planners (including Stalin, who was named Commissar of Nationalities immediately following the October Revolution), that national identities would eventually dissolve, making way for what was considered to be a more fundamental identity: class. One of the puzzles scholars have grappled with is that nationality never went away. In fact, there is reason to see nationality as becoming less malleable over time, which, according to some scholars, helps to explain how and why the dissolution of the Soviet Union was followed by the emergence of several nationalist states.

Scholars have also explored the significance of *narodnost'* (ethnicity or nationality) as a category that increased in importance over the course of the nineteenth century for how Russians understood the human diversity in the empire.[3] *Narodnost'* is difficult to translate into English since it can mean ethnicity or nationality. Its root, *narod*, could refer to "the common people" as well as "the nation." During the

reign of Nicholas I (1825–55), *narodnost'* was firmly ensconced in the centre of the political and social debates about the nature of Russianness thanks to the slogan, "Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and *Narodnost'*," coined by the tsar's minister of education, Sergei Uvarov.[4] The slogan encapsulated the ethos of Nicholas I's reign. As the prominent literary critic Vissarion Belinsky put it at the time, "*Narodnost'* is the alpha and omega of the new era."[5] *Narodnost'* continued to represent an important element of the empire for some segments of Russians, including proponents of a new kind of nationalism that emerged under the reign of Alexander III (1881–94), the tsar who was thought of by many as "Most Russian of Russians."[6] By then, Uvarov's triad was known as "Official Nationality (*narodnost'*)."[7] In the last decades of the imperial period, the concept of ethnicity became increasingly important to the state as a supplement to the primary legal markers of difference among the population, religion, and estate.[8] People were asked about their ethnicity more often when resettling to the borderlands; settlers of Russian origin (*korennogo russkogo proiskhozhdeniia*) were preferred.[9] And ethnicity became a critical component of the new electoral politics conceded to by Tsar Nicholas II in the wake of the 1905 Revolution. The tsar cited the non-Russian makeup of the first two Dumas as the reason he dissolved them.[10]

There are good reasons for the prevailing scholarly view that the concept of race had relatively little bearing on Russian and Soviet political and social development. By the end of the nineteenth century, Western Europe's empires and the overseas colonies they had built had propagated racial thinking and institutionalized racial practices in a variety of ways. Russia had not. One prominent and oft-cited example of Russia's distinctive relationship with race was the great writer Alexander Pushkin. Pushkin was the great-grandson of an African prince, Hannibal (who rose to a high position in the court of Peter the Great), and, at the same time, Russia's greatest national poet.[112] The poet's lineage was known during his lifetime, and he embraced it. Later in the nineteenth century, glowing reports by African-American visitors to Russia drew a stark contrast between Russia and the United States when it came to race. As one scholar describes it, people of African descent from the United States and the West Indies voluntarily immigrated to Russia because it "offered them a chance to gain a good and prosperous life that was singularly devoid of discrimination and humiliation because of their color."[12] African origin or descent did not automatically trigger an apparatus of state-

sanctioned racial discrimination in the Russian Empire, as it did in many other places. This has contributed to the view that race was not a significant category for classifying human diversity.[13]

The Soviet Union energetically cultivated a reputation for colour blindness and antiracism, establishing close ties with countries in Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East, educating thousands of students from those countries, and hosting famous artists, musicians, and activists from abroad.[14] As these particular cases suggest, race in Russia differed markedly from race in places such as the United States or Nazi Germany. Even someone like the Soviet historian Lev Gumilev, famous for his theories of Eurasianism, ethnogenesis, and antisemitism, nevertheless took great pains to distance himself from the race sciences of the West. Gumilev differed sharply from other Soviet ethnologists in that he stressed the "natural" rather than "social" origins of ethnicity. Ethnicity, in his view, was an "immutable part of the very persona of all individuals" and biological in character.[15] This left him vulnerable to accusations from the mainstream of Soviet anthropology in the 1960s and 1970s that he was practising "race science," a serious accusation in the country that had brought down European Fascism. Yet Gumilev denied the accusation of practising race science, insisting that his focus on the inherently biological character (*biologichnost'*) of ethnicity was entirely different than the "biologism" (*biologizm*) that characterized research in "foreign countries." Not everyone bought this esoteric distinction.[16] Even if we were to accept Gumelev's or any other Soviet protests against the charge of trafficking in race (and there are reasons not to accept them), we would still need to explain the ideas about race that account for such claims. "Antiracism" stems from a particular ideology of race, too.

Some scholars outside the Russian field have challenged the idea that Russia and the Soviet Union took their own path when it came to race. For example, the prominent historian of race George M. Fredrickson, while conceding that Russia did not have an "overt racist ideology," claimed nevertheless that "the closest approximation to a full-blown racist regime among pre-Nazi European states was Czarist Russia, which anticipated aspects of South African apartheid by attempting to confine Jews to particular geographical areas."[17] Focussing on the Soviet period under Stalin, Eric D. Weitz, a historian of Germany and contributor to this volume, argued in a 2002 *Slavic Review* forum on the topic of race that Stalin's massive deportations of certain

groups during the 1930s and 1940s – Cossacks, Chechens, Koreans, and others – constituted a "racial politics without the concept of race."[18] This approach inserts Russia and the Soviet Union into the history of race by arguing that a conception of race akin to Nazism lurked beneath a facade of antiracism. Russia, in this view, is not an aberration from the norm.

The more typical scholarly view is that race played a very different role, if any, in imperial Russian and Soviet politics and society than it did in Western countries.[19] Francine Hirsch rejected Weitz's argument that Soviet politics operated according to any kind of "racial logic."[20] Instead, she argued, Soviet justifications for discrimination were based on sociological categories of class difference rather than race. The Soviet Union (and imperial Russia before it) did have an elaborately constructed conception of race, Hirsch pointed out, according to which racial difference was understood in terms of "degrees of kinship" rather than rigid, immutable characteristics. The Soviet concept of race was therefore ill suited to justify Stalinist repression of particular groups; that task was left to the Soviet commitment to "class." To explain Soviet atrocities as a form of racial politics, Hirsch warned, would be to risk obscuring "important differences between Soviet and Nazi regimes."[21] Along similar lines, Nathaniel Knight has argued that ethnic rather than racial categories were dominant among "vocabularies of difference" in the Russian Empire and Soviet Union and that efforts to emphasize the prominence of race run the risk of overemphasizing the similarities with other historical cases.[22] He suggests that in order to properly understand how "imported ideas [about ethnicity and race] were transformed" in the Russian context, "Russianists must overcome the fear of exceptionalism, reject the accusation of *Sonderweg*, and embrace the recognition of specificity."[23] Another scholar articulates this argument about Russia's specificity succinctly: "The Russian Empire defined its others by estate and religion; western empires defined them by geography and race."[24] According to this view, comparing Russian and Soviet regimes to other European regimes in terms of race would not make any sense.

Both of these opposing views about whether Russian and Soviet race was or was not like race in the West measure the significance of race in Russia, or lack thereof, in terms of its resemblance to the ostensibly more "typical" race-regimes in Western Europe and its colonies. The United States, Nazi Germany, and apartheid South Africa have demanded – and for good reason – a great deal of analytical attention

as some of the most overtly racist social and political systems in history. However, one of the effects of this attention has been the view, sometimes implicit and other times explicit, that these racial regimes are "ideal types," in that in them racist logic was "fully realized."[25] The manifestations of racial thinking and politics in these cases have been treated as definitional standards against which other racial regimes are evaluated, in spite, or perhaps because, of the fact that the political and social effects of race were so stark and extreme. Scholars for the past forty years have emphasized the socially and politically constructed nature of race.[26] But this emphasis has not always prevented the view that historical constructions of race developed along a teleological line, often leading towards 1945.[27] In other words, constructivist approaches to the history of race have at times exchanged one anachronistic premise – that race is a primordial category of human difference – for another – that race in Western Europe and the places around the world it colonized is the analytical norm.[28] This might help to explain why Russia's experiences with race have been difficult to understand and compare.[29]

RACE AS IDEOLOGY

The goal of this book is to understand and compare by asking how race worked in Russia and the Soviet Union. It builds upon a growing body of scholarship that has challenged the prevailing views.[30] Alaina Lemon, whose work was path breaking in this regard, examined in the 1990s how people in post-Soviet Russia made inferences about internal biological essence based on external "signs," sometimes physical (e.g., faces) and sometimes not (e.g., dances).[31] Lemon located these patterns in "discursive practices," which include "specific articulations of ideology as actions."[32] Her approach highlighted the possibility of evaluating race absent legal codification or explicit racial categorization. Yuri Slezkine showed how the practice by physical anthropologists from the late nineteenth century on of using ethnonyms to label "racial types" blurred the boundaries between language, nationality, ethnicity, and race. The blurring persisted in spite of scholars' efforts, especially during the Soviet period, to disentangle nationality, ethnicity, and race. Slezkine describes the "terminological disarray" that resulted and an inability or unwillingness on the part of Soviet scholars and policy makers to eliminate the significance of race. ("The grand obituary to 'biologism' consisted of mostly biological meta-

phors."[33]) Scholars have since pointed to similar overlaps among categories of human difference in the earlier imperial period[34] and, furthermore, to the significant amount of attention in imperial Russia given to the category of "race" itself.[35] Not only were practices of race more prevalent in Russia and the Soviet Union than previously thought, so too were explicit vocabularies of race.[36]

In this volume, we approach the history of race in Russia and the Soviet Union by looking at how historical actors conceptualized race, racialized themselves and others, and attempted to deploy (or deny) racial categories for social, political, or diplomatic advantage. This is what I refer to as an approach to race as ideology. "Ideology" is not taken here in a narrow sense to mean an illusion about reality, or false consciousness, which is the meaning popularized by influential work on ideology by Marx and Engels.[37] Ideologies of race taken in that sense might imply that the point of our analysis is to strip away ideas about race to arrive at a more fundamental or true aspect of human identity. But the challenge to studying race in the Russian and Soviet field is not that race has been obscured but that it was difficult to see in the first place. Ideology is instead taken in a broader sense to mean those configurations of ideas that both constitute a view of the world (or some aspect of it) and also matter to, and in, society.[38] An approach to race as ideology allows us (to draw upon Karl Mannheim's formulation) "to show how … certain intellectual standpoints are connected with certain forms of experience, and to trace the intimate interaction between the two in the course of social and intellectual change."[39] Our objects of analysis are the meanings of race in a given context, and the social and discursive practices with which those meanings are intertwined. "Ideologies of race" are plural, since ideas about race are a function of the person or group who holds them and their social milieu – true no less for us than for subjects of the Russian Empire.[40] This is also why we resist a priori definitions of race. It is an effort to move beyond the potentially endless debates over taxonomies and the cul-de-sac of what Rogers Brubaker has called "definitional casuistry."[41] Authors move beyond the question of *whether* race mattered in the Russian case, to consider *how* and *why* it mattered. It is a central argument of this volume that race mattered in imperial Russia and the Soviet Union not only because of its impact on domestic affairs but also because of its impact on the development of race globally. The goal, then, of this volume is to better understand the ideologies of race in Russia and the Soviet Union and their relationship to historical transformations in ideologies of race around the globe.

BEYOND EXCEPTIONAL

The first chapter, by Vera Tolz, addresses several enduring misconceptions about the relationships among the categories of race, ethnicity, and nationhood that have contributed to the difficulty of situating Russia within the larger history of race. Tolz reconstructs Russian discourses on race in the nineteenth century in order to understand how Russian actors understood and applied concepts of collective identity. Biological characteristics of human difference were seldom divided strictly from cultural characteristics, and culture was not necessarily considered any less deterministic than biology. In other words, race in Russia cannot be explained with a rigidly biological definition of race, one that sets it apart from cultural factors typically associated with ethnicity or nationality. Taxonomical precision often favoured by scholars of race can make it more difficult, not less, to understand how race worked in the past. By looking at Russian ethnographers and others engaged in racial discourses – discourses happening simultaneously in Western Europe – Tolz points to the limits of racial categories typically deployed by scholars.

This argument leads to another important one developed in Tolz's chapter. The hitherto dominant view that Russia is historically an outlier when it comes to race is based upon the assumption that in Western Europe race has always been clearly distinguished from ethnicity and nationality. But this is a straw man argument. Drawing upon recent work by scholars such as Ann Laura Stoler, Tolz argues that in fact there were always "conflicting European trends in interpreting 'groupness' and belonging." Russia's putative exceptionalism, then, turns out to reflect the fluidity and complexity of racial "science" that characterized other European countries at the same time. In Russia and the West, race, ethnicity, and nationhood were constructed as a "single, integrated conceptual field." In addressing the misconceptions about race, ethnicity, and nationhood in Russia, Tolz is not arguing for a new one-size-fits-all taxonomy of the concepts that will thereby allow Russia into the larger European and global discourses on race. On the contrary, she is arguing for an approach that takes the three categories to be "discursive constructions in specific places and historical periods." Among other things, this valuable approach helps us more easily see through the claims of exceptionalism made by our historical informants and the particularity of different historical cases.

Alaina Lemon also challenges "exceptionalist thinking" among scholars of Russia and the Soviet Union when it comes to the history

of race. Comparing Soviet Russia and the United States during the Cold War, she suggests that the exceptionalist thinking that characterized Soviet and American self-perception with respect to policies to do with race has been absorbed and reproduced by scholars. In the Soviet case, where race was not an official category, communism was seen to have eliminated the problem of inequality, racial or otherwise. In the American case, capitalism was seen as having preserved citizens' freedom even as the US continued to face lingering and deep inequality. Lemon shows, however, the extent to which "race" became a "key term" during the Cold War, central to each side's self-perception, prosecution of proxy wars, and view on decolonization taking place across the so-called "third world." Along with Tolz and several other contributors to this volume, Lemon argues that scholarly accounts of racial categories must go beyond state boundaries. She makes a compelling case for the extent to which racism and repression in the United States and the Soviet Union were mutually constituted over the course of the Cold War.

Lemon's innovative methodological approach allows her to explain the differences between how race worked in the US and the USSR. She considers how race was constructed and practised by looking at the "interfaces of race with matter." She argues that the physical segregation of people, in the American case, and the lack thereof in the Soviet case, is crucial to explaining the differences between how race was mediated in the two countries. For instance, in some cases information about poverty among nonwhites in the US was cordoned off from mainstream perceptions by concrete walls lining the interstates that run through impoverished cities. Another potent example is Lemon's comparison of Greyhound buses, which were (and are) largely used by socioeconomically disadvantaged classes, and Soviet trains, which were used by elites and nonelites alike. Lemon argues that attention to the differences in physical segregation in the US and the USSR is a key to explaining the differences in how race is mediated in the two countries. Lemon's own earlier research on Roma made a pioneering and compelling case for analyzing race in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia. Here, too, she shows the way to new directions for future research that might uncover what is distinctive about the Russian case without resorting to longstanding tropes of Russian exceptionalism.

As Tolz and Lemon both show, examining race in Russia contributes to a fuller understanding of race around the globe. Aisha

Khan, an anthropologist of the Atlantic world, further develops this idea through her consideration of Tolz's and Lemon's arguments from the perspective of the American and Caribbean fields. Drawing on several major theorists of race, Khan focuses on what she considers to be two of the major characteristics of the category of race addressed in Tolz's and Lemon's respective studies of Russia and the Soviet Union: race as a "floating signifier" in transnational discourse and race as "heritable identity" understood in both biological and cultural terms. Khan argues that the discursive and transnational approaches to the study of race in Russia developed by Tolz and Lemon are beneficial for understanding how concepts and categories take on significance only in their deployment.

Most comparative studies of race, Khan points out, consider Western European colonial or postcolonial histories as paradigmatic. Particular notions of race are then universalized as a way of interpreting race in the rest of the world. As Tolz argues, these notions are often misconceptions or oversimplifications in the first instance, but they nevertheless play powerful roles in affecting how scholars have understood the histories of race ever since. As a powerful challenge to this view, and as an illustration of Tolz's argument that historical conceptualizations of race were not nearly as simple or Manichean as have often been supposed, Khan offers a number of examples from important Caribbean theorists of race from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries who argued for very different conceptualizations of race. In 1885, for instance, the Haitian anthropologist Anténor Firmin took aim at the influential racist essay from 1855 by Joseph Arthur de Gobineau, rejecting not the concept of race but its supposedly inherent hierarchical nature. Khan joins Tolz and Lemon in demonstrating the contingent nature of the contest over the meanings of race in the modern world. The specific ways race has been conceptualized and practised in Russia is evidence of the multiple and varied ways race developed across the modern world, not of Russia's exceptionalism.

THE LIMITS OF UNIVERSALISM

One of the most productive sets of questions in the Russian and Soviet fields over the past decades has had to do with how imperial and Soviet regimes managed human difference. The Russian Empire, a kaleidoscopically diverse country in terms of religion, language, eth-

nicity, and culture, did not fit neatly into a single dimension of national or racial identity. Civic identity was never synonymous with ethnic, national, or racial identity, even for the ethnic Russian majority. Russians (in an ethnic sense, *russkie*) were not the only Russians (in a civic sense, *rossiiane*). As Marina Mogilner demonstrates, however, there was hardly consensus in the late imperial period over whether this ought to be the case. She argues that debates about the relationship between ethnonational identity and the political order constituted "the key Russian public debate of the early twentieth century." In tracing the early twentieth-century career and thought of the Russian Jewish Zionist Vladimir Jabotinsky, Mogilner considers the question posed by the historian of imperial China, Peter Purdue: why was the passage from empire to nation so racist? The position eventually staked out by Jabotinsky demonstrates how a certain strain of anti-imperialism came to equate racial purity with the survival of nationality, as such. As a character in one of Jabotinsky's novels put it, "I want all people living on their own islands." Racist ideologies were a natural conclusion from this equation. Yet if Jabotinsky's nationalism-cum-racism strikes a familiarly ominous tone from this side of the twentieth century, Mogilner shows that its main ideological rivals understood the anthropological diversity of the empire in a very different way, namely, as a massively complex web of "mixed racial types." These structuralists set out to identify the "elemental parts" of the web and then study the relationships between them. In other words, there was more than one "modern" way to conceptualize race.

Mogilner's argument is crucial for understanding the contingency involved in the development of the concept of race in the early twentieth century, as well as the particular meanings of race in Russia. The contest between advocates of national purity (Tsar Nicholas II was among them) and exponents of imperial complexity was not "resolved" in Russia with the end of the Great War and dissolution of the Russian Empire. But its effects could be seen in the new Soviet empire that emerged with commitments to both realizing national self-determination and transcending it. In her study of Roma in the Soviet Union, Brigid O'Keeffe zeros in on this core tension. She argues that Soviet nationality policy was based as much on the principle that human identity was malleable as it was on the "categorical tethering" of people to "nationality." In other words, Soviet nationality policy

promised to transform Gypsies into Soviet citizens but had the effect of deepening their "gypsiness" in the process. It failed to overcome, in the end, what O'Keeffe calls the "historic unthinkability of a Soviet Gypsy" freed from the old stereotypes linked to the country's Roma population, a failure that leads her to describe the racialization of Soviet Gypsies as a process "accomplished *in the full spirit* of Soviet nationality policy."

This argument makes a significant contribution to one of the key questions about the history of race in the Soviet Union: how do we account for state sanctioned racist practices in an antiracist state? As O'Keeffe explains, her argument contributes to the debate begun by Eric D. Weitz in 2002 about whether it is possible the Soviet Union practised "racial politics" even though it did not have a "concept of race." O'Keeffe addresses the methodological challenge by evaluating the case of Soviet Gypsies. She looks at practices among Soviet officials and Roma themselves and convincingly demonstrates that the Soviets approached Gypsies through the "prism of racial logic" and that race was operative even if "race" was not what it was called at the time.

Eric D. Weitz responds with a chapter from the perspective of the history of the German Empire. Weitz offers a consideration of three significant factors that contributed to the development of race in Germany, which he argues is a useful point of comparison with Russia because of its geographical proximity and similarities in political and social order compared to the plantation economies of the Americas. He points to Germany's process of "internal colonization," its acquisition of overseas colonies beginning in 1884, and the evolution of its academic disciplines and intellectual life. Weitz's consideration of the German experience leads him to reflect on the core tension between race and malleability that O'Keeffe analyzes and he concludes that it offers a useful challenge to previous assumptions about race. "Perhaps," he suggests, "we look for coherence where none is to be found." When it comes to the "purity and simplicity" of racial identity that Jabotinsky seeks, Weitz helps us to see that the tension between race as malleable and race as fixed was present within Russian discourses, even as it distinguished between Russian and German notions of racial difference. Weitz leaves us with important questions, namely those having to do with Russian and Soviet internal colonization and the role that race played in it.

EMPIRES MIXING

The next three chapters explore the significance of racial "mixing" in the Russian and Soviet cases. I examine the role race played among several Siberian "regionalists" in the late imperial period who strove to convince imperial officials of Siberia's unique and pressing needs. Initially, the intellectuals made the case that governmental mismanagement or neglect and underdevelopment paved the way for racial "degeneration" among Slavic settlers in the region. Intermarriage, acculturation, and environmental influences had conspired to make ethnic Russians (*russkie*) into racial mixtures, lower on the civilizational scale than they were supposed to be, according to Iadrintsev. This reasoning made sense according to the discourses of race then emerging in Russia and elsewhere, as Tolz and others in this volume discuss. For most Siberian regionalists, the concept of race pointed to human differences that were malleable. Russian settlers to the region, they argued, were turning into a different race.

But this Siberian view leaves us with a puzzle: why would activists for regional autonomy work so hard to demonstrate the supposedly inferior, degenerate status of the people they insisted should take care of themselves? Here I argue that looking through the lens of race allows us to understand something larger about the nature of Russian imperial power. The Siberian ethnographer and publicist Nikolai Iadrintsev suggested in the 1870s and '80s that ethnic Russians (*russkie*) who had settled in Siberia had "gone native," in part because they were of such lowly cultural stock to begin with. His goal was to prompt imperial officials to action. Failures of imperial governance, the argument went, were responsible for racial degeneration in Siberia. Effective imperial governance was the solution. I argue, furthermore, that the appeal to fears of racial degeneration through mixing of Russians and non-Russians is an indication of Russia's involvement in the broader nineteenth century discourses about race.

In her chapter on the children born between the 1950s and 1970s of mixed marriages involving husbands and wives from different ethnic groups in Central Asia, Adrienne Edgar explores a tension similar to the one O'Keeffe considers. Many of the more than eighty children of mixed marriages Edgar interviewed for her oral history wanted their identities to transcend nationality. However, this desire was continually undermined by Soviet nationality policy, which required (as well as incentivized) citizens to select a single national

identity. Children of mixed marriages were faced with a "dilemma of belonging." They were ideal emblems of Soviet progress since they could be seen as having transcended national particularism. For many, as Edgar shows, it indeed felt most natural to claim a "Soviet" identity. At the same time, state bureaucracy made it difficult if not impossible to "be" Soviet. No one, for instance, could name herself "Soviet" on her passport. The result in many cases was for people to select a nationality based on factors other than what they thought about themselves.

Although Soviet elites resisted the language of race, Soviet citizens nevertheless increasingly came to see themselves in primordial terms from the 1930s on. Edgar's study offers important insights into the relationships that emerged during this process among nationality, race, and gender. She stops short of arguing that nationality and race can be taken as synonymous in the Soviet case. But she does argue that Soviet thinking about nationality was "racialized." People struggled when they looked like one nationality but felt like another because they feared others would not believe their claim to national belonging. Gender was another determining factor in how people navigated their dilemmas of belonging. Soviet nationality, according to Edgar, was effectively patrilineal, even when this contradicted a person's subjective feelings about national belonging. Edgar's study is an important contribution to our understanding of the history of gender in Soviet Central Asia and the racialization of nationality in Eurasia today.

Edgar and I both explore cases that blur distinctions between racial and national categories. Comparing the two cases with Brazil, Barbara Weinstein helps us to see more particularly where the development of race in Russia and the Soviet Union merged with and diverged from developments at the same time elsewhere in the world. Beginning from Benedict Anderson's influential notion that modern nations emerged as imagined communities bound by "deep, horizontal comradeship," Weinstein argues that race provided "the dominant idiom" to express fitness for self-governance within nations. This helps to explain why in some places, such as the US, "advanced" racial groups sought to prevent racial mixing so as to maintain their dominant position. But it also helps to explain why in colonial settings in the nineteenth century it was possible for "backward" races to value or promote racial mixing as a viable way toward "improvement" or "progress." Weinstein compares the Siberian regionalists to analysts of Brazil's northeastern region, who made strikingly similar cases that

racial mixing had inadvertently resulted in a new regional type uniquely fit for self-governance.

Brazil is a useful comparative case in the twentieth century, as well. Brazil shifted in the 1930s from policies promoting whitening and eugenics towards policies of fostering or preserving the multiracial character of the population. At the time, the USSR provided one model of many for incorporating a racially diverse population into one country. However, Brazil differed from the Soviet case in important ways. For one thing, there was no requirement in Brazil to declare one's identity in racial terms similar to the Soviet requirement to self-identify nationality that Edgar describes. The process of passing from black to white that scholars have described happening in Brazil, which was probably not uncommon, similarly had no analogue in the Soviet Union. Finally Weinstein agrees with Edgar that we cannot collapse the two categories of nation and race into one. Rather, she suggests that examining the ways Brazilians and Soviets dealt with racial mixing point to a common problem: nationality's inherent exclusivity is a challenge that has to be overcome one way or another by modern states.

RUSSIA AND THE GLOBE

In the first section of the book, "Beyond Exceptional," all three authors make the case that it is not possible to adequately understand the conceptions of race during the past two centuries without attention to the ways ideas moved throughout the world. In this final section, the authors continue in this vein by examining historical interactions between Russians (or Soviets), on one hand, and people from other countries, on the other, as formative moments in the constitution of what race meant at different points in time. These last three chapters, then, bring us full circle in our effort to understand more about Russia's participation in what Howard Winant calls the "globality of race."[42] Race in Russia is best understood as it relates to race in the rest of the world.

Susanna Soojung Lim's approach is novel in that she sheds light on Russia's contribution to racial thinking at the beginning of the twentieth century through an examination of the diaries of Korean intellectual Yun Ch'iho. Yun, a pro-Japanese, Pan-Asianist critic of Russian policies in East Asia at the turn of the twentieth century, offers a uniquely revealing perspective on Russian race thinking. He depicted

Russian mistreatment of Korean migrants and aggression towards East Asian countries as racially motivated and fully integrated into "a trans-Pacific network of white racial domination." Yun was in a particularly advantageous position to do so, having travelled extensively around the Pacific, from Korea to China, Japan, and the US. Lim argues that considering Yun's view of Russia helps us revise the image of Russia as exceptional by revealing Russia's contributions to the constructions of racial hierarchies that emerged around the Pacific in this period, something that Russia's loss in the Russo-Japanese War in 1905 and consequent absence from the US-led "White Pacific" has, until now, obscured.

Considering the transition from the Soviet to the post-Soviet period, Anika Walke's chapter asks what we might learn about the increase in racially motivated violence in Russia in recent years by looking at the history of Soviet internationalism from the 1960s on. As do several other authors in this volume, Walke considers the tension inherent in a society built upon the promise of egalitarianism that nevertheless practised discrimination. What she finds is that large-scale and concerted efforts to promote the "friendship of peoples" beginning in the 1950s, rather than furthering egalitarianism, had the effect of fixing national identities and reinforcing existing racial hierarchies. She focuses on the campaigns to recruit and support Africans to study in the Soviet Union at the University of the Friendship of Peoples "Patrice Lumumba," established in 1961 for this purpose, as well as the daily encounters between Soviets and Africans that resulted.

Walke's approach is similar to Edgar's in that both authors combine substantial archival research with oral histories recently conducted with former Soviet citizens and, in Walke's case, former students from Africa. In both cases, the authors paint a vivid portrait of memory and experience of national and racial identity. Walke argues that interactions between African and Soviet students, living and studying conditions, and admissions and travel policies point to discriminatory structures and practices based on racial bias. Walke suggests that the effects of the structures and practices she uncovers help to explain racial conflict in the post-Soviet space today.

Concluding the volume, Gunja SenGupta examines several of the questions raised by Lim's and Walke's studies from the perspective of American and transnational history. SenGupta cites several African American perspectives on race in Russia or the Soviet Union as exam-

ples of how the meanings of racial categories in the US were affected by this particular transnational context. In the case of Peter Bensé, a freed slave who travelled to St Petersburg in the eighteenth century and received a warm welcome, Russia served as a counterpoint to the United States, where he continued to face discrimination because of his skin. Bensé's favourable view of Russia as a land in which race is not the basis for discrimination was reprised famously in the twentieth century by African Americans, including famous individuals such as Langston Hughes, who received a royal welcome to the Soviet Union in the 1920s and '30s. Experiences such as these contributed to the notion that race did not matter in the USSR like it did in the US. Yet, as several others in this volume contend, SenGupta argues that this notion itself was less the product of disinterested observation than of the dynamic interaction of national and transnational contexts that formed new meanings of racial categories. The mid-twentieth-century anticommunist African American writer Zora Neale Hurston underscores this point. She challenged the perception among other African Americans that communism could solve the problem of racial oppression and instead asserted that Soviet "love" for black Americans was part of a cynical global campaign to include nonwhite populations in the communist fold. SenGupta's point is to highlight the transnational context in which nationally inflected conceptions of race are constituted, in Russia and the Soviet Union no less than in the United States.

CONCLUSION

Ideologies of race in imperial Russia and the Soviet Union emerged as part of a larger global history of race in the modern world. Concepts and categories of racial difference moved across borders and reflected an inter-imperial context, as much as they reflected the particularities of the Russian imperial and Soviet regimes. Building on a growing body of scholarship on the importance of race for understanding imperial Russia and the Soviet Union, this book offers a way to account for particularities without falling into exceptionalism. It shifts the question from being about *whether* Russia and the Soviet Union exhibited race and racism that was similar to the "classic" racialized regimes, to being about *how* race worked in Russia and the Soviet Union at various points. It approaches race as ideology, which helps to uncover the complicated and sometimes contradictory ways

racial ideas and practices affected Russia and the Soviet Union. Race in Russia and the Soviet Union was not a singular thing or idea that can be easily defined. Rather, race consisted of multiple and competing sets of ideas about human difference, essence, biology, culture, and inheritance that emerged from – and simultaneously shaped – social, political, and discursive practices over time.

NOTES

I would like to thank Brigid O'Keeffe, Mark Bassin, the participants of the colloquium at the Jordan Center for the Advanced Study of Russia, and two anonymous reviewers for reading and offering valuable criticism on earlier drafts of this introduction.

1 For a challenge to the notion of Russian exceptionalism, see David L. Hoffmann and Yanni Kotsonis, eds., *Russian Modernity: Politics, Knowledge, Practices* (New York: St Martin's Press, 2000).

2 See, for example, Richard Pipes, *The Formation of the Soviet Union: Communism and Nationalism, 1917–1923* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964); Ronald Grigor Suny, *The Baku Commune: 1917–1918, Class and Nationality in the Russian Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972); Yuri Slezkine, "The USSR as a Communal Apartment, or How a Socialist State Promoted Ethnic Particularism," *Slavic Review* 53, no. 2 (Summer 1994): 414–52; Terry Martin, *The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923–1939* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001); Francine Hirsch, *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005); Theodore R. Weeks, *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia: Nationalism and Russification on the Western Frontier, 1863–1914* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008); Adeeb Khalid, *Making Uzbekistan: Nation, Empire, and Revolution in the Early USSR* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015).

3 Nathaniel Knight, "Science, Empire, and Nationality: Ethnography in the Russian Geographical Society, 1845–1855," in *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*, ed. Jane Burbank and David L. Ransel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998), 108–41; Nathaniel Knight, "Ethnicity, Nationality and the Masses: *Narodnost'* and Modernity in Imperial Russia," in *Russian Modernity: Politics, Knowledge, Practices*, ed. David L. Hoffmann and Yanni Kotsonis (New York: St Martin's Press, 2000), 41–64; Mark Bassin, "Nurture *Is* Nature: Lev Gumilev and the Ecology of Ethnicity," *Slavic Review* 68, no. 4 (Winter 2009): 872–97; John Slocum, "Who, and When, Were the Inorodtsy? The Evolution of the Category of 'Aliens' in Imperial Russia," *Russian Review*

57, no. 2 (1998): 173–90; Juliette Cadiot, *Le Laboratoire impérial: Russie-URSS, 187–1940* (Paris: CNRS Éditions, 2007); Andreas Kappeler, *The Russian Empire: A Multiethnic History* (New York: Routledge, 2013).

4 Cynthia H. Whittaker, *The Origins of Modern Russian Education: An Intellectual Biography of Count Sergei Uvarov, 1786–1855* (Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2011).

5 Quoted in Knight, "Ethnicity, Nationality and the Masses," 41.

6 Nicholas Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825–1855* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969); R. Vortman (Richard Wortman), "'Ofitsial'naia narodnost' i natsional'nyi mif rossiiskoi monarkhii XIX veka," in N.N. Mazour, ed., *Rossiia/Russia*, vyp. 3 (11): *Kul'turnye praktiki v ideologicheskoi perspective: Rossiia, XVIII-nachalo XX v.* (Moscow: O.G.I., 1999), 233–44; Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy from Peter the Great to the Abdication of Nicholas II* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015).

7 The *Large Soviet Encyclopedia* cites an article by the well-known ethnographer and academic A.N. Pypin as the first use of "Official Nationality" in 1873–74. "Ofitsial'noi narodnosti teoriia," *Bol'shaia sovetskaia entsiklopediia*, vol. 19 (Moscow: Sovetskaia entsiklopediia, 1975).

8 Charles Steinwedel, "Making Social Groups, One Person at a Time: The Identification of Individuals by Estate, Religious Confession, and Ethnicity in Late Imperial Russia," in *Documenting Individual Identity: The Development of State Practices in the Modern World*, ed. Jane Caplan and John Torpey (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 67–82. On the importance to the state of religious confession and estate, respectively, see Paul W. Werth, *At the Margins of Orthodoxy: Mission, Governance, and Confessional Politics in Russia's Volga-Kama Region, 1827–1905* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002) and Gregory Freeze, "The *Soslovie* (Estate) Paradigm and Russian Social History," *The American Historical Review* 91, no. 1 (February 1986): 11–36. For a fascinating examination of the strength of estate over racial identity see, Susan Smith-Peter, "Before Race: The Russian Empire and Creoles in Russian America in the Early 19th Century," *Istoriia* 7, 4 (48) (2016) and Susan Smith-Peter, "Creating a Creole Estate in Early Nineteenth-Century Russia," *Cahiers du Monde Russe* 51, nos. 2–3 (2010): 441–59.

9 Steinwedel, "Making Social Groups, One Person at a Time," 79.

10 Ibid. Also see, Alexander Semyonov, "'The Real and Live Ethnographic Map of Russia': The Russian Empire in the Mirror of the State Duma," in *Empire Speaks Out: Languages of Rationalization and Self-Description in the Russian Empire*, ed. Ilya Gerasimov, Jan Kusber, and Alexander Semyonov (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 191–228; Rustem Tsiunchuk, "Peoples, Regions, and Electoral

Politics: The State Dumas and the Constitution of New National Elites," in *Russian Empire: Space, People, Power, 1700–1930*, ed. Jane Burbank, Mark Von Hagen, Anatoly Remnev (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007), 366–97.

11 Catharine Theimer Nepomnyashchy, Nicole Svobodny and Ludmilla A. Trigos, ed., *Under the Sky of My Africa: Alexander Pushkin and Blackness* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2006); Frances M. Somers Cocks, "The African Origins of Alexander Pushkin," in *Africa in Russia, Russia in Africa: Three Centuries of Encounters*, ed. Maxim Matusevich (Africa World Press: Trenton, 2007), 13–35.

12 The quote is from Albert Parry's "Foreword" to Allison Blakely, *Russia and the Negro: Blacks in Russian History and Thought* (Washington, DC: Howard University Press, 1986), xii. For experiences of Africans and African Americans living and travelling in Russia, see also Allison Blakely, "African Imprints on Russia: An Historical Overview," in *Africa in Russia, Russia in Africa: Three Centuries of Encounters*, ed. Maxim Matusevich (Africa World Press: Trenton, 2007), 37–60; Maxim Matusevich, "Blackness the Color of Red: Negotiating Race at the US Legation in Riga, Latvia, 1922–33," *Journal of Contemporary History* 53, no. 4 (October 2017): 832–52.

13 Knight, "Ethnicity, Nationality and the Masses," 57–8; Charles Steinwedel argues that "Nationality was not racial in the Russian Empire," even as nationality came to be seen as increasingly ethnic and durable. Steinwedel, "Making Social Groups, One Person at a Time," 82.

14 Masha Kirasirova, "The 'East' as a Category of Bolshevik Ideology and Comintern Administration: Students of the Arab Section of the Communist University in the 1920s," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 18, no. 1 (2017): 7–34; Maxim Matusevich, "Expanding the Boundaries of the Black Atlantic: African Students as Soviet Moderns," *Ab Imperio* 2 (Summer 2012): 325–50.

15 Mark Bassin, *The Gumilev Mystique: Biopolitics, Eurasianism, and the Construction of Community in Modern Russia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2016), 23, 33.

16 Ibid., 33.

17 George M. Fredrickson, *Racism: A Short History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), 103. This view has been widespread among nonacademic observers outside of Russia, as well. See, United Nations, *Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, Doudou Diène: Mission to the Russian Federation*, A/HRC/4/19/Add.3 (15 March 2006), paragraph 71, available from http://undocs.org/A/HRC/4/19/Add.3.

18 Eric D. Weitz, "Racial Politics without the Concept of Race: Reevaluating Soviet Ethnic and National Purges," *Slavic Review* 61, no. 1 (2002): 1–29. For a critique of the resistance within the Russian and Soviet fields to characterizing the Soviet Union as a racial regime, see J. Otto Pohl, "Socialist Racism: Ethnic Cleansing and Racial Exclusion in the USSR and Israel," *Human Rights Review* (April–June 2006): 60–80.

19 Neil MacMaster, *Racism in Europe: 1870–2000* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001); Nathaniel Knight, "Chto my imeem v vidu, govoria o race? Metodologicheskie razmyshleniia o teorii I praktike rasy v rossiiskoi imperii," forthcoming article in *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*; Knight, "Science, Empire, and Nationality"; Nikolay Zakharov, *Race and Racism in Russia* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015). Physical anthropologists in Russia today share the view that "race is not favored as a formal taxon within *Homo sapiens*" (Leonard Lieberman et al., "The Race Concept in Six Regions: Variation without Consensus," *Collegium Antropologicum* 28, 2 [2004]: 910).

20 Francine Hirsch, "Race without the Practice of Racial Politics," *Slavic Review* 61, no. 1 (2002): 30–43. In the same forum, Amir Weiner also rejected the notion that the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany could be compared in terms of racial politics (Amir Weiner, "Nothing but Certainty," *Slavic Review* 61, no. 1 [2002]: 44–53). Alaina Lemon's response, which takes a different approach, is discussed below (Alaina Lemon, "Without a 'Concept'? Race as Discursive Practice," *Slavic Review* 61, no. 1 [Spring 2002]: 54–61). Also see Brigid O'Keeffe's consideration of the forum in her chapter in this volume.

21 Hirsch, "Race without the Practice of Racial Politics," 37.

22 Nathaniel Knight, "Vocabularies of Difference: Ethnicity and Race in Late Imperial and Early Soviet Russia," *Kritika* 13, no. 3 (Summer 2012): 667–83.

23 Ibid., 683.

24 Alexander Etkind, *Internal Colonization: Russia's Imperial Experience* (Cambridge: Polity, 2011), 252.

25 Fredrickson, *Racism*, 101.

26 On the "racial formation thesis" see Michael Omi and Howard Winant's *Racial Formation in the United States*, first published in 1986 and updated twice, in 1994 and 2015. As Omi and Winant point out, however, challenges to the idea that race is biologically determined had already begun in the eighteenth century. Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States*, 3rd edition (New York: Routledge, 2015), 60.

27 For an argument about pre-Nazi race in Germany that cuts against the teleology of 1945, see Andrew Evans, *Anthropology at War: World War I and the Science of Race in Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010).

28 For a critique of reifying particular historical understandings of race, see

Douglas A. Lorimer, "Race, Science and Culture: Historical Continuities and Discontinuities, 1850–1914," in *The Victorians and Race*, ed. Shearer West (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996), 12–14. On the constructivist approaches to the history of race that nevertheless continue to reify the category, see Rogers Brubaker, *Ethnicity without Groups* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006).

29 For many of the reasons discussed above, Russia and Eurasia are typically left out of comparative studies of race. Two exceptions to this are: Vera Tolz, "Discourses of Race in Imperial Russia, 1830s–1914," in *The Invention of Race: Scientific and Popular Representations*, eds, Nicolas Bancel, et al. (London: Routledge, 2014), 133–44; Susanna Soojung Lim, "Pan-Mongolians at Twilight: East Asia and Race in Russian Modernism, 1890–1921," in *Race and Racism in Modern East Asia: Western and Eastern Constructions*, eds, Rotem Kowner and Walter Demel (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 153–76.

30 In addition to the other works cited, see, for example, Marina Mogilner, *Homo Imperii: A History of Physical Anthropology in Russia* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2013); Karl Hall, "'Rasovye priznaki koreniatsia glubzhe v prirode chelovecheskogo organizma': neulovimoe poniatie *rasy* v Rossiiskoi imperii," in *"Poniatiia o Rossii": K istoricheskoi semantike imperskogo perioda*, eds, D. Sdvizkov, I. Schirle, and A. Miller (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2012), 194–258; Vera Tolz, "Diskurs o *rase*: imperskaia Rossiia i Zapad v sravnenii," in *"Poniatiia o Rossii,"* eds, D. Sdvizkov et al, 146–93.

31 Alaina Lemon, "'What Are They Writing about Us Blacks': Roma and 'Race' in Russia," *Anthropology of East Europe Review* 13, no. 2 (Autumn 1995): 34–40; Alaina Lemon, "Your Eyes are Green Like Dollars: Counterfeit Cash, National Substance, and Currency Apartheid in 1990s' Russia," *Cultural Anthropology* 13, 1 (1998): 22–55; Alaina Lemon, *Between Two Fires: Gypsy Performance and Romani Memory from Pushkin to Post-Socialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000).

32 Alaina Lemon, "Without a 'Concept'?," 54.

33 Yuri Slezkine, "N. Ia. Marr and the National Origins of Soviet Ethnogenetics," *Slavic Review* 55, 4 (Winter, 1996): 826–62. Quoted at 829 and 844.

34 Hall, "'Rasovye priznaki koreniatsia glubzhe v prirode chelovecheskogo organizma'; also see Vera Tolz's chapter in this volume. For an argument in favour of collapsing the "anachronistic" distinction between ethnicity and race in favour of talking about "ethnoracial history" see David A. Hollinger, "American Ethnoracial History and the Amalgamation Narrative," *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 25, 4 (Summer 2006): 153–9.

35 Eugene M. Avrutin, "Racial Categories and the Politics of (Jewish) Differ-

ence in Late Imperial Russia," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 8, 1 (2007): 13–40; Mogilner, *Homo Imperii*; Tolz, "Diskurs o *rase*"; Edyta Bojanowska, *A World of Empires: The Russian Voyage of the Frigate Pallada* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2018), especially chapter five, "Russians Confront Human Diversity," 213–61.

36 Lemon calls these "referential lexicons" of race ("Without a Concept?," 57).

37 Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The German Ideology* (New York: International Publishers, 1970).

38 This is a paraphrase of Michael Freeden's useful discussion in, "Ideology and Political Theory," *Journal of Political Ideologies* 11, 1 (February 2006): 3–22. See pp. 14–15.

39 Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1954), 72.

40 Ibid., 50.

41 Brubaker, *Ethnicity without Groups*, 11. Brubaker critiques studies of ethnicity, nationality, and race for frequently representing "the social and cultural worlds as a multichrome mosaic of monochrome ethnic, racial, or cultural blocs," even when monochrome blocs are difficult to find, a pitfall this volume seeks to avoid (Brubaker, 8).

42 Howard Winant, *The World Is a Ghetto: Race and Democracy since World War II* (New York: Basic Books, 2001), xiv.

PART ONE

Beyond Exceptional

1

Constructing Race, Ethnicity, and Nationhood in Imperial Russia: Issues and Misconceptions

Vera Tolz

In the last few years, a growing body of scholarship has been challenging the hitherto dominant view that, in the age of modern imperialism, race played a much less prominent role in explaining human diversity in Russia than in Western Europe.[1] Instead, recent research has convincingly demonstrated that interest in racial theories was far greater in imperial Russia than previously recognized.[2] This article argues that despite recent important advances in the study of race in Russia, the field is still influenced by a series of misconceptions. First, the Russian case is often compared with a simplified and ultimately inaccurate account of developments in Western European racial thought, which overstates the clarity and consistency with which the term race was defined and applied.[3] Secondly, whereas recent studies on Western European discourses of race demonstrate how race, ethnicity, and nationality were often treated in an undifferentiated way,[4] in Russian Studies, race (*rasa*) and ethnicity/nationality (*narodnost'* and *natsional'nost'*) tend to be treated as separate and even contrasting conceptual domains.[5] Yet, as we will see, in Russian discourses these concepts were very closely intertwined too. Thirdly, claims of the Russian elites themselves about how Russian imperial policies were not motivated by the issue of race in contrast to other European colonial empires seem to have inadvertently influenced contemporary scholars' analysis of the role of race in imperial Russia.

In addressing these three misconceptions, the article will argue that ambiguities in interpreting the relationship between physical fea-

tures, innate moral and behavioural characteristics, and culture, which marked discourses of human difference in Western Europe, were replicated in Russia, and they shaped the ways in which not only race but also ethnicity and nationhood were understood. In other words, in imperial Russia, biological factors were often seen as directly relevant to defining *narodnosti*, *natsional'nosti*, *narody*, and *natsii*, whereas definitions of race included references to cultural attributes. So, in Russia's imperial discourse of collective identities, the boundary between biology and culture was very blurred indeed. The broader historical implications of this trend should be spelled out and reflected upon to a greater extent than is often the case.

Focusing above all on race, ethnicity, and nationhood as discursive constructions in specific places and historical periods, the article will start with a discussion of the conceptual and terminological confusion in interpreting what race meant in nineteenth-century Europe and Russia. It will then review a range of influential Russian publications and debates, which used various interpretations of race, ethnicity, and nationhood to divide people into groups, put them into hierarchies, and propose policies in relation to these groups on the basis of ascribed characteristics. It will further explore a clash, which emerged in the early twentieth century, between two opposing trends. One was a further biologization of nationhood; the other, in contrast, reflected a new understanding of the nation as a modern sociopolitical construct. Finally, the article will critically review the discourses of exceptionalism that Russian actors formulated about the role of race in their empire's policies. In conclusion, the article will reflect on the intellectual legacy the Soviet regime inherited, when introducing new, unprecedented nationalities policies. Overall, this article should be read as an investigation into how Russian actors themselves understood and applied concepts of collective identity, rather than an assessment of Russian imperial thought through the prism of contemporary critique of European race (pseudo)science.

CONCEPTUAL AND TERMINOLOGICAL CONFUSION

In relation to how race was understood in Western Europe in the age of empire, recent scholarship has challenged a common misperception that "old racism" rested on "the shared biological model of race, that some notion of 'immutability' was crucial to it, and that race was a concept unproblematically conceived as 'natural.'"[6] It is only in com-

parison with this misperception that the Russian case appears as a significant outlier. Criticizing simplified representations of "old racism," a leading historian of European colonial policies, Ann Laura Stoler, has stressed instead the ambiguity and fluidity of West European discourses of race throughout the nineteenth century.[7] She has demonstrated that at the time race was defined not only, often not even predominantly, through visual distinctions between human bodies but also through "cultural competencies, moral civilities and affective sensibilities."[8] Empirical studies of specific West European national traditions of racial thinking provide further evidence to support Stoler's broad conclusions.

As Nicholas Hudson has demonstrated, for example, throughout the nineteenth century in Britain, "no edition of either Webster's or Chamber's *Dictionary* defines 'race' in a modern way, despite the popularity of the term in Victorian science and ethnography."[9] Instead, these dictionaries continued to utilize eighteenth-century definitions of race as breeds of animals and through using words normally applied to family lines. It is only in 1910 that the *Oxford English Dictionary* offered the definition of race in "our familiar modern sense of this word."[10] In turn, Carole Reynaud-Paligot has highlighted a remarkable terminological imprecision in French scientific discourses which defined race not only through physical but also moral, intellectual, and cultural attributes, all of which were believed to be transmitted through blood and heredity.[11] As race appeared to be a broad umbrella term, it embraced all sorts of groupings. Not only were Celts, Gauls, Semites, Finns, and Slavs defined by French authors as races but also Germans and Chinese. Some of these groupings could simultaneously be called nations.[12]

This pattern of conceptual confusion was replicated in Russia, where the discourse of race until the late nineteenth century tended to be largely derivative. This is hardly surprising. Throughout the nineteenth century, many scholars in Russia were of Western European origin, who maintained close ties with their home countries where racial theories were gaining in popularity. When in the second half of the century a pan-European international scientific community began to take shape, Russian scholarship became part of it. The "scientific" discourse of race developed through the transnational circulation of ideas within this community.[13]

From the time the actual term *rasa* started to appear in the Russian press in the 1830s it was applied to define a wide range of groupings.

Alongside an emerging understanding of race as a group of people with shared physical characteristics, such as skin colour, older understandings of race as lineage, stock, or linguistic group continued to persist. We also find examples of races being defined as geographical communities or even by the areas of work in which many community members were involved, such as "races of shepherds and seafarers" (*rasy pastushech'i i morekhodnye*).[14] Moral and cultural characteristics were habitually used as the basis for defining "races" as being "proud," "treacherous," "spineless" (*beskharakternye*), and "hospitable."[15] Such highly evaluative labelling as "free races and those destined for slavery" (*rasy svobodnye i nevol'nicheskie*) was also applied.[16]

Adding to the terminological confusion, from the late eighteenth century and throughout the nineteenth, two Russian words, *plemia* (tribe) and *poroda* (breed or stock), were also utilized to mean race. As late as the 1860s, even though the word *rasa* was already widely used in Russian intellectual discourses, Vladimir Dal's dictionary included only a very brief definition of *rasa* as the French-derived equivalent of the words "*plemia, poroda*."[17] *Plemia* as race was defined in Dal's dictionary in greater detail: "There are five main human *plemena*: white (the Caucasus and Europe), yellow (China, Asia), red (America), brown (Polynesia), black (Africa)."[18] Significantly, the dictionary pointed out that both *plemia* and *poroda* could also mean nationality. One of the cited meanings of *plemia* was "*narod*, language (*iazyk*), [and] a local community."[19] One of the meanings of *poroda*, Dal' noted, was *narodnost'*, as in the expressions "German, English race" (*nemetskaia, angliiskaia poroda*).[20]

In the last decades of the nineteenth century, various scholars both in Europe and in Russia began to criticize terminological sloppiness of discourses of human diversity, arguing that the terms race and nationality should be more clearly separated. Yet scholars, often including the critics themselves, found it difficult to maintain terminological order and clearly to distinguish between the groups defined by physical features and those defined through language and other cultural characteristics.[21] And so, at the turn of the twentieth century, we also witness across Europe, including Russia, a trend opposite to that desired by the critics of the conceptual confusion. Rather than achieving a clearer separation of the concept of race from the most important notion of community belonging – the nation – the understanding of the latter began to be further racialized (biologized).[22]

RACE, ETHNICITY, AND NATIONHOOD AS A SINGLE CONCEPTUAL FIELD

This terminological confusion points to the fact that race, ethnicity, and nationhood in nineteenth-century Europe and imperial Russia were not treated as clearly separate categories but, rather, were conceived by actors of the time as a single, integrated conceptual field. Biology and culture particularly clearly came together in the widely used term, borrowed from French and German intellectual traditions, of "national or tribal character" (*natsional'nyi /plemennoi kharakter* or *nrav naroda*). This was perceived as primordial, stable, and transmitted from generation to generation by heredity and referred to in discussions of ethnicity and nationhood, as well as race. As Moscow historian Stepan Eshevskii claimed in 1864, the "tribal character" has an "amazing stability" and can "incorporate foreign customs and beliefs without changing its core."[23]

The stability of the "national character" and its rootedness in the very nature of people had already been articulated in the 1780s by an important eighteenth-century figure, historian Ivan Boltin. In line with thinking about the origins of human diversity across Europe, Boltin postulated the impact of the climate on the people's "body and soul" (*telo i dusha*), which, he argued, "are closely related to each other" (*tesno sopriazheny*). He further followed Voltaire's protopolygenic argument.[24] According to Boltin, all peoples and tribes, such as Russians, Sarmatians, and Goths, have their own *poroda* (stock) and he further suggested that Hottentots and Negroes, on the one hand, and whites (*Albiny*), on the other, had different origins (*proiskhozhdenii raznykh*). He postulates the same difference in relation to the Russians and the Kalmyks.[25] The latter had featured as representative of an inferior race in European literature since the eighteenth century.[26] Boltin's writings offer one of the first examples of emergent modern racial thinking in the Russian tradition.[27]

The actual word "race" entered the Russian language from French in the 1830s. As was the case in West European intellectual traditions, race in Russia began to be defined by a set of physical, cultural, and moral characteristics. In 1838, for example, Aleksei Lovetskii, professor of natural sciences at Moscow University, began to teach a survey course on contemporary European racial theories. His audience was informed that

> Humankind … belongs to a single species (*vid*) "Homo sapiens," but it is fragmented … into several colored varieties (*tsvetnykh raznovidnostei*). This has given grounds for dividing people into several groups according to the color of their skin. These groups are called *plemena* (races).[28]

The word *rasa* was still little known in Russia and so Lovetskii decided to use the more common term *plemena*, followed by the French term in brackets. While asserting a monogenic view of the origins of race, which would continue to predominate in Russian thought throughout the imperial period, Lovetskii did not believe in the equality of "races." Whereas Lovetskii's main definition of races referred to skin colour, his detailed table of human *plemena* included "moral characteristics" (*svoistva moral'nye i nravstvennye*) to accompany the description of phenotypes. In line with the views of Western European racial theorists, whom Lovetskii abundantly cited, his table implied the placement of *plemena* on a civilizational ladder, reflecting a by then common view of blacks being at the bottom of that ladder and Europeans at the top. Particularly favourable "moral characteristics" were assigned to Slavs in Russia, as representatives of the "white *plemia*." Russian Slavs, according to Lovetskii, "were rapidly moving toward the state of perfection."[29]

The next decade, marked by intensified debates about the meanings of Russian identity, witnessed the appropriation of an earlier coined term *narodnost'* as a conceptual tool of the new academic discipline of ethnography.[30] *Narodnost'* as an ethnographic term was predicated on the perception of a close link between people's physical features, innate cultural and moral characteristics, and their way of life, formed under the impact of climate and natural environment; thereby, it reflected dominant European thinking about human diversity at that time. Such an understanding of *narodnost'* was outlined in the influential lecture "On Ethnographic Study of the Russian *Narodnost'*," delivered at an annual meeting of the Russian Geographical Society in 1846 by the founding father of Russian ethnography, Nikolai Nadezhdin.[31] The text of the lecture suggests that, rather than inaugurating the use of the category of *narodnost'* as largely a cultural entity, thereby encouraging a nonracial and less hierarchical interpretation of human diversity than was the case in the West, Nadezhdin restated the existing European perception that race and nationality were deeply interconnected. In the lecture, the link was emphasized

over and over again: "'races' ('*porody*')," Nadezhdin argued, "even if they are far from being exactly the same as *narodnosti*, nevertheless undoubtedly more or less closely relate to them." Later on, he restated the same point more firmly:

> As I noted before, even though "people" ("*narody*") are not the same as "races" ("*porody*"), nevertheless in their [people's] differences one can notice physical, bodily-animalistic [features]. These, therefore, even if partially, are also part of the "national" ("*narodnoe*").[32]

Therefore, in Nadezhdin's view, the study of somatic features, including "color of the skin, hair, eyes … the shape of the skeleton and particularly of the skull" should "undoubtedly … be the domain of ethnography," alongside "the entire way of life [*byt*] of the people." It is this simultaneous effort of what he termed "physical" and "psychological" ethnographies that would help scholars assess "the relative [*udel'nyi*] capacity of the national mind (*narodnyi um*) and national morality (*narodnaia nravstvennost'*)."[33] Again, in line with the established view of his time, Nadezhdin postulated the innate nature of mental and moral characteristics of the *narod*, as primordial and emanating from "the inner self" (*razvita narodom iz samogo sebia*).[34] Despite mixing with various "*inorodtsy*" groups, the Russians, according to Nadezhdin, preserved their "natural physiognomy" and "did not transform into 'white-eyed' Finns" (*ne vyrodilsya v Chud' "beloglazuiu"*).[35] In this context, Nadezhdin's definition of the main aim of ethnography as exploring "the true appearance (*oblik*) of the Russian *narodnost*'" can only be understood as a reference to the combination of physical, cultural, and moral characteristics.[36]

Finally, Nadezhdin cautiously agreed that a link between biology and culture allowed the placing of people into hierarchies, even if these were not fixed but could be altered under the impact of education:

> It has been noted that public enlightenment or what is usually called "civilization" has the power to homogenize physical differences among people into one common type, that which is common among the dominant population of Europe and which therefore seems to constitute the "exemplary appearance," which is destined to be a shared property of humankind as it is being refined by education.[37]

Nadezhdin argued that language was a particularly important marker of *narodnost'* and thus should be of particular concern to ethnographers. At first glance this suggests that the main focus of Russian academic studies of the different *narodnosti* of Russia would, after all, be largely cultural. Yet Nadezhdin's argument that language "reflects the unity [physical and psychological] of human nature" complicates the matter.[38]

In fact, by the time Nadezhdin outlined his position, the study of languages in Europe had begun to be racialized.[39] Two academic trends converged to ensure such a development in the course of the nineteenth century – the centrality of linguistics to European scholars' search for the original homeland of Indo-Europeans or Aryans, which dates back to the first decades of the century, and the appearance in the middle of the century of *Völkerpsychologie* as an academic field which considered language to be primarily a psycho-physical activity.[40]

Both trends were prominently represented in Russia, whose scholars, such as for example leading orientologist Vasilii Grigor'ev, attempted to locate the homeland of the Aryans in the regions conquered by the Russian empire, such as Central Asia and Crimea. Grigor'ev argued that it was the combination of linguistic research and efforts to reconstruct the physical features of the ancient population of Central Asia through available old Chinese sources that allowed him to conclude that the Aryan, rather than the Turanian, race originally populated the region.[41] Russian experts further drew explicit political conclusions from their findings, suggesting that they showed that Russian imperial expansion into Central Asia signified the restoration of the original Aryan rule.[42]

Further publications developed arguments that a language constituted "the very foundation" not only of *narodnost'*, but also race because "the development of languages [is] linked to the physical structure of the brains of the people who speak them."[43] Writing in *Otechestvennye zapiski*, literary critic Nikolai Solov'ev argued, for example, that differences between languages were "determined by different trajectories of brain activities, and therefore characteristics which are taken from the linguistic sphere are sufficient for the anthropological categorization [of people] according to races (*rasy*) and tribes (*plemena*)."[44]

In line with a pan-European trend, in the 1850s and the 1860s, interest in the relation between physical and psychological characteristics of peoples further grew in Russia, with works of Western Euro-

pean racial theorists being regularly translated into Russian. They were debated by such prominent figures, representing both the Slavophile and the Westernisers' camps, as historians Timofei Granovskii and Mikhail Pogodin, philosopher and poet Aleksei Khomiakov, orientologist Il'ia Berezin, and literary critic Nikolai Dobroliubov.[45] Thus, as with the situation in Europe, in Russia, racial discourse could easily be harnessed to support both conservative and progressive-reformist agendas.[46]

Russian authors postulated "the stability of race (*rasa*), which is transmitted from generation to generation, as reflected in the physical character of the body, as well as in the way of life and many other features"[47] and argued that "the characteristics of great human races, which are given by nature … are manifested in the unfolding of historical events."[48] The standard view of the time that, in the case of black people as well as women of all races, the nature of their skulls and brains ensured that their mental faculties were "incomparably inferior to those of men of the Caucasian race" was disseminated by *Sovremennik*, a leading "progressive" heavyweight journal, originally founded by Pushkin.[49] Not only were blacks and whites defined as races, but also Slavs, Anglo-Saxons, Gauls, Celts, and Jews. At a time when environmental explanations of human diversity started to be questioned under the impact of Darwin's theory of natural selection, the claim that "a Jew remains a Jew" whatever the environment began to be articulated.[50]

Meanwhile, the works whose titles placed race at the centre of scholarly inquiry failed to clearly differentiate the term *rasa* from *narodnost'*, *natsional'nost'*, and *narod*, instead using these words interchangeably. Historian Stepan Eshevskii's university course on "The Role of Race in History" (1864) is a good case in point. In Eshevskii's work, Slavs are called *plemia* and *narodnost'*, whereas Anglo-Saxons are referred to as *plemia* and *rasa*. Various human collectives, according to Eshevskii, "differ from each other not only in terms of their external manifestations which are for everyone to see, but also in terms of the peculiarities of their moral [and] spiritual nature, peculiarities of their character and mentality (*sklad uma*)."[51]

Eshevskii was a liberal, as was the historian of the next generation, Nikolai Kareev, who, between the 1870s and the 1890s, published a series of works on the role of race in history. Reflecting a pan-European trend toward establishing increasingly rigid racial hierarchies, Kareev argued that, "it is the racial and national (*natsional'nykh*) speci-

ficities that, in the context of the same psychological and sociological laws, explain the variety that humankind represents in different places and in different times." Races, Kareev finally concluded in 1897, "are differently gifted in the sphere of spirituality." At the same time,

> The people (*narod*) is ... a collective individuality. Each such individuality has its own character, which is as innate (*stol' zhe prirozhdennyi*), as it is in the case of a person, and is similarly unchanging. Neither external environment, nor history can destroy this character ... It looks as if we have to admit that this view is correct.[52]

In the post-Darwinian period, major debates concerning Russian identity could not avoid explicit consideration of the relationship between biology and culture. This was the case, for example, in the discussion of the composition of "the *Russian narodnost'*," with its subdivision into Little Russians (*malorussy*), Great Russians (*velikorussy*), and White Russians (*belorussy*). In 1892, summarizing this debate that had begun in the 1860s, a leading Russian anthropologist, Dmitrii Anuchin, noted how biology was linked with culture in the attempts of participants to distinguish Little Russians from Great Russians. For Nikolai Kostomarov and Mikhail Maksimovich (Mykhaylo Maksymovych), Anuchin pointed out, "present-day *malorussy* are direct descendants by blood (*po krovi*), as well as by language, of the ancient South Russian-Slavic tribes." Anuchin went on to criticize Polish intellectuals for suggesting that *velikorussy* were not Slavs at all, so great was the impact of Tatar and Finnish blood in their creation. As Anuchin noted, for these authors the corruption of Slavic blood by a mixing with Finns and Tatars went hand in hand with "the corruption" of "the Slavic language of *moskali*."[53]

In this context, it is not surprising that the issue of miscegenation (*metisatsiia*), so central to European colonial discourses, strongly resonated in Russia and was similarly racialized and politicized. Prior to the 1870s, a benign view of miscegenation as an important and largely positive aspect of the creation of the Russian *narodnost'* predominated among Russian thinkers. It was commonly argued that the Russian *narodnost'* had appeared as a result of a peaceful merger (*sliianie*) of Slavic settlers with the Finnish and Mongolian tribes (*plemena*). As Eshevskii noted in 1864, the Finn and the Mongol had absorbed "all the specificities of European Christian civilization, at the same time as making their own contribution to the creation of a

new tribal type (*plemennoi tip*)." Yet "it is not Slavs who turn into Finns and Mongols, but a Finn and a Mongol will take over the dominant features of the Slavic tribe and proudly call himself a Russian." While Eshevskii noted with approval a "crossbreed nature" (*pomes'*) of the Russian *narodnost'*, his interpretation nevertheless reflected the hierarchical, Eurocentric view of culture, which was dominant in his time. In the process of merger (*sliianie*), Slavs, as representatives of the European race and civilization, always preserved their cultural and physical predominance, he argued.[54] This view that did not see "racial mixing" as a threat to Russian identity continued to be reproduced later on, most notably in Vasilii Kliuchevskii's *The Course on Russian History*.[55]

Yet in the 1870s a new, largely negative, interpretation of miscegenation was also articulated.[56] One of the first proponents of this new interpretation was Anatolii Bogdanov, a precursor of the Moscow anthropological school. For Bogdanov *narody*, such as the French, Germans and Russians were not "exclusively … political, linguistic, national and territorial unions," but also groups distinguishable in the "anthropological sense." The term "Russian physiognomy, Russian beauty," he maintained, was not "only something imagined, but real."[57]

In 1878 Bogdanov registered an emerging concern among Russian observers about the physical fitness of "groups of people with mixed blood" (*osobi smeshannoi krovi*), in cases where the mixing was with tribes commonly regarded as inferior. This led him to insist that, rather than actively mixing with various Finnish, Turkic, and Mongolian tribes, as had been hitherto commonly assumed, Russian settlers in Siberia and the lower Volga region demonstrated "a kind of aristocratic revulsion toward female aliens" (*inorodki*), whereas "Novgorodian and Kievan colonizers systematically preserved the purity of their family blood." In Bogdanov's view, in terms of mixing with the natives, Russians were no different from other "Western producers of the mixed population" in colonial settings.[58]

In the 1880s–90s, paralleling developments in Western Europe, and amidst increasing pessimism among liberal and conservative observers alike about the effectiveness of government policies aimed at integrating "*inorodtsy*" into the Russian *grazhdanstvennost'* framework, some interpretations of miscegenation became particularly alarmist. Being explicitly informed by the belief in the existence of "more or less able" *narodnosti*, tribes, and races, these interpretations offered conclusions about miscegenation that at times were diametrically

opposed to the earlier more positive view. As a suggestive example of this negative interpretation we can cite the analysis of the phenomenon by a well-known public figure, specialist in Siberian ethnography and one of the founders of Siberia's regionalism movement, Nikolai Iadrintsev. In his 1882 book *Sibir kak kolonia*, Iadrintsev dwelled at length on how

> the Slavic race (*slavianskaia rasa*), while mixing with *inorodtsy*, quite often has made little impact [on them] and suffered from lowering its own qualities, thus leading to the degeneration of the Russian *narodnost'*… In the process of getting close to and mixing with *inorodtsy* in the East, the Slavic-Russian nationality (*natsional'nost'*) has been often unable to resist physical and physiological changes …[59]

Iadrintsev, in common with other participants in the debate about the integration of "*inorodtsy*" in the last decades of the nineteenth century, continued to emphasize a close relationship between biology and culture. As Iadrintsev put it:

> We cannot avoid noticing that culture and the way of life of *inorodtsy* fit quite well with their racial peculiarities and differences. Therefore, all the tribes who move to higher cultural levels change their distinguishing [physical] features.[60]

Thirty-five years earlier, Nadezhdin had already tentatively suggested a similar connection between culture and biology.

Iadrintsev was guided by the view that

> the mixing with different tribes and races leads to different consequences. The least advantageous in this case is the mixing with the lowest races, whereas with those which are equal or higher it is either neutral or beneficial.[61]

In Iadrintsev's view, because many Siberian "*inorodtsy*" belonged to "lower races," it was important for the Russian state to take measures "against the degeneration of the Slavic race in Siberia."[62] Iadrintsev's interpretation was not a rare aberration but a well-represented trend during his time. All the terms he used – *rasa*, *natsional'nost'*, and *narodnost'* – were understood to include biological and cultural dimen-

sions. How the Slavic race (*rasa*) differed from the Slavic-Russian nationality (*Slavino-russkaia natsional'nost'*) and Russian *narodost'* was never explained; in fact, the terms seemed to have been used interchangeably.

A related debate centred on the means by which the state could integrate conquered non-Russian "tribes" into the pan-Russian imperial framework. At least since Pavel Pestel's *Russkaia pravda* of the 1820s, supposedly innate features or "the national character" of various peoples were evoked to determine whether they could or could not be re-educated, assimilated, or otherwise integrated. Given the widespread belief in the temporal endurance and inheritability of "the national character,"[63] the ascription of highly negative characteristics to a particular group could lead to suggestions that the only way of dealing with those belonging to it would be through what we call today ethnic cleansing. This was Pestel's proposal regarding those tribes (*plemena*) in the Caucasus that he classified as a single group of "unruly" (*buinye*) people. In Pestel's view, while "speaking different languages [and] having different customs," they all displayed an unchanging inclination toward "rioting and robbery" (*buistvo i grabetel'stvo*). As it was "impossible to pacify these people (*narody*) by soft and friendly means," he insisted, they should all be "resettled in inner regions of Russia, being dispersed in small groups around Russian *volosti*."[64]

Throughout the century these ideas continued to be articulated.[65] As Peter Holquist has argued, from the 1860s onwards governments in Europe, including Russia, began to rely on the work of statisticians, ethnographers, and other experts who classified peoples in Europe's imperial domains according to ethnicity and race.[66] In these classifications, which became central to implementing new policies of population management, some minorities were ascribed highly negative characteristics, which would determine their categorization as "unreliable elements." This categorization was then used to justify "ethnic cleansing" operations, which were carried out by late imperial and then Soviet governments.[67]

Only briefly does Holquist note that imperial experts tended to essentialize minorities as having innate features.[68] Holquist calls the experts' definitions of these "innate features" prejudices and stereotypes. Of course, this is what they were. Yet it is important to acknowledge that the ascribed characteristics were not seen as such by imperial experts and policy-makers themselves. The ascribed characteristics and behavioural traits were regarded as manifestations of "national"

or "tribal (*plemennoi*) character," which since the 1880s was notably also occasionally called "racial," and in whose "stability" and inheritability most representatives of the Russian educated elites believed at the time.[69] Russian scholar M.V. Leskinen rightly argues that "[i]t is precisely the [perceived] 'innate nature' (*vrozhdennost'*) of the [national] character and its transmission 'through blood' (*po krovi*) that made [the term] seem scientific and objective."[70]

Culture (references to the way of life and customs) and biology (references to the innate nature of various characteristics) were inseparable in the process of ascription. Significantly, "culture" in this context was seen not as a flexible category, defining multiple changing local practices, as a result of interaction with practices of the other, not as a contingent and a situational attribute. Instead, "culture" tended to be seen by experts and practitioners, whom Holquist cites, as a rigid, clearly bounded phenomenon, a feature which was rooted in people's collective psyche, inheritable, requiring centuries to change, and determining behaviour of the community members. It thus was seen as allowing policy-makers to predict the community's actions. In other words, culture could also do work similar to that of biological categories.[71] Such a conceptual framework, perceived to be based on scientific considerations, encouraged the view that every member of a particular community, whose "national character" was defined in negative terms, could potentially pose a threat to state interests and security, and it undermined the Russian elites' confidence in the possibility of "re-education."

A further increase in racialization (biologization) of social issues became apparent in Europe, including Russia, in the early twentieth century. Figures such as psychiatrist Ivan Sikorsky, publicist Mikhail Menshikov, and anthropologist Ivan Pantiukhov might not be particularly representative in the extremity with which they insisted on defining nations as above all biological categories and on drawing a deterministic link between people's physical features and their collective behaviour.[72] Yet they were the product of their time, when racial theories, with application to various minorities, particularly Jews, were regularly invoked by medical and military experts, criminologists, anthropologists, and even Christian missionaries, who argued that these theories should be taken into account in policy-making.[73]

In this context, the concept of race also unsurprisingly became a new tool of agency and self-representation in the hands of intellectuals from the empire's peripheries in their articulation of counter-

narratives that aimed at challenging Russian and European imperial hegemony. Georgian, Jewish, Polish, Tatar, Ukrainian, and other "minority" scholars and religious leaders started utilizing the concept of race and referring to racial studies of the cephalic index and anthropological type. These were perceived as providing a solid scientific basis to buttress narratives of national distinctiveness and to oppose influential anti-Semitic and anti-Islamic views of leading European and Russian intellectuals.[74]

At the same time, we should remember that the early twentieth century also witnessed a countertrend of the explicit questioning of biological determinism of the previous century and a simultaneous recognition of the nation and nationality as modern, sociopolitical categories.[75] Some Russian authors began to argue that the patterns of mutual influences in the course of the interactions between Russian settlers and minorities were determined not by some innate characteristics of the people but exclusively by local social and economic conditions and peoples' numerical predominance.[76] Others began disputing the oft repeated trope that peoples from the Caucasus were naturally predisposed to being "bandits and robbers," arguing instead that developments in the region were to be explained by socioeconomic conditions and administrative practices.[77]

In relation to conceptual matters, Dmitrii Anuchin's Moscow school of anthropology strove to introduce a clear conceptual separation of races and nations.[78] In turn, such leading scholars as historian Pavel Miliukov and orientologist Vasilii Bartol'd rejected the relevance of racial theories to the understanding of the concept of nationality and to the study of specific cultural traditions.[79] In his *Essays on the History of Russian Culture*, Miliukov criticized the hitherto dominant view that "national consciousness (*narodnoe somosoznanie*) … is something unchanging, given from the beginning, inseparably linked with the flesh and blood of the people (*narod*), with its physical organization." "[W]e should recognize," he insisted, "that the time when the unchanging foundation of 'nationality' (*natsional'nost'*) could be sought in the nature-based historical (*estestvenno-istoricheskoi*) concept of 'race' is gone forever." In contrast, he continued, contemporary scholarship had demonstrated that "modern 'nationality' is the most recent product of history." Rather than being a racial or anthropological concept, nationality was "a purely sociological one."[80] In the same period, historian Aleksandr Pogodin suggested that the concept of the "national character" should not be used as a tool of scholarly analysis

at all because definitions of that "character" were based on "a subjective judgment" and prejudices.[81] In turn, the idea of a nation as a modern sociopolitical construct was also promoted by Marxists, and it was reflected in Stalin's well-known definition of a nation in 1913.[82] These were new approaches to interpreting human diversity, which reflected wider revisionist trends in the European intellectual tradition of the early twentieth century, challenging dominant historical narratives and scientific modes of inquiry of the previous century.[83]

RUSSIA'S SPECIFICITY?

In view of the above discussion, let us revisit the question of whether the role of race in Russia was distinctly different from what we find in Western Europe. My own study of the topic suggests that the argument about Russia's *Sonderweg* in this area is a questionable proposition for three reasons.[84] First, as we have seen, the term *rasa* was regularly evoked by imperial Russian thinkers from the 1830s onwards, whereas the terms *poroda* and *plemia*, with the same meaning, had been utilized in racial interpretations of human diversity since the late eighteenth century.[85] Furthermore, the concept of nationality, often perceived as heritable identity, was also racialized and utilized to draw boundaries, create hierarchies, and justify colonial policies.

It is true that, as it has been pointed out, "race" did not feature in Russian imperial legislation nearly as often as in contemporary North American or Western European laws.[86] However, this does not mean that race did not inform Russian colonial policies. As argued above, the use by military experts of racial or racialized theories and concepts influenced the way policy-makers would understand security threats. From the second half of the nineteenth century these threats were increasingly associated with specific groups of people within the imperial borders. In the "expert" definition of these groups, culture and biology simultaneously performed the same job of othering. It is, after all, difficult to clearly separate colonial discourse and practices, given the strong performative power of colonial discourse, and, therefore, it should be acknowledged that references to race in legal documents are not the only reliable measure of the importance race plays in the political and social dynamics of a particular society.

Secondly, the reasons usually cited for the supposed marginality of the concept of race in the Russian tradition are unconvincing. Those contemporary scholars who regard race as being downplayed in Russia refer to the Russian elites' awareness of their empire's "racial het-

erogeneity," uncertainty about Russia's own identity, and the appreciation of a huge gap between the upper and lower estates and classes as the reasons preventing the Russian imperial elites from engaging significantly with European racial thought.[87] In fact, as I have argued elsewhere, similar anxieties were shared by the Western European elites and, in both Western Europe and Russia, these anxieties could at times facilitate, rather than hinder, the use of the category of race in defining national and imperial peculiarities and explaining social and cultural differences in the imperial and national spaces of European states. Local specificities in Russia, as elsewhere in Europe, rather than leading to the rejection or neglect of racial theories, could also influence the ways in which the concept of race was interpreted and utilized.[88]

As for the problem of "racial heterogeneity," in the second half of the nineteenth century, most European race scientists began to agree that, among the different peoples of the world who had been scientifically studied, the Europeans themselves were the most racially mixed and heterogeneous. Rather than being a problem, this could be seen as a sign of their civilizational superiority.[89] It is against the background of such a perception, widely held in Western Europe, that some Russian intellectuals could continue positively assessing the mixing of East Slavic settlers with various non-Slavic minorities at a time when a negative view of miscegenation in colonial settings came to the fore.[90]

Uncertainties about one's own identity, particularly when it came to the issue of race, rather than being a specifically Russian feature, were ripe in Europe as a whole. If anything, these uncertainties inspired further studies of the racial composition of individual nations, with the result that, by the late nineteenth century, inhabitants of Europe, including European parts of Russia, became the most intensively anthropologically studied people in the world. For example, the German anthropologist Rudolf Virchow's famous study of the physical features of six million German schoolchildren was a response to the French naturalist Jean Louis Armand de Quatrefages' claim that the Prussians belonged not to the Germanic but to the "destructive Mongolian race."[91] Moreover, in the early twentieth century, non-Russian intellectuals from the empire's borderlands themselves began to use the concept of race in their counter-narratives in order to challenge Russian imperial and European discriminatory frameworks.

The perception of an insurmountable gap between the elites and the masses, again rather than being a particularly distinctive feature of Russian society in the imperial period, was in fact a pan-European

phenomenon. Alexander Herzen's statement about "two Russias" had a direct parallel in the British prime minister Benjamin Disraeli's description of Britain as "the two nations." Democratizing political reforms and modernization in Western Europe, leading to the gradual integration of representatives of the "lower orders" into the public space, from which they had been hitherto excluded, did not always facilitate a bridging of the gap between the elites and the masses. The opposite trend of reifying and discursively widening social divisions was also in evidence in Europe. This happened through the increasing application by social scientists in the post-Darwinian age of the analytical apparatus of race science to the study of European societies, with the conclusion that social divisions were also rooted in biology.[92]

Finally, claims that the Russian intellectual tradition, as well as colonial policies, were far less racially charged are a reflection of the discourse of exceptionalism, which various actors in Russia itself have been historically utilizing in order to promote particular collective or individual agendas. Discourses of exceptionalism are not specific to Russia but have been employed intensively by national and imperial actors in Europe and beyond. At times such discourses influence the approaches of contemporary scholars who are studying specific national contexts. As we will see below, Russia's own discourse of exceptionalism in relation to the utilization of the concept of race was contradictory and often unconvincing. Yet it might have coloured our own perception of this issue.

The Russia–West dichotomy, articulated by Russian authors, was based on the idealized perception that "in his ability 'to live side-by-side harmoniously with any nationality,' the Russian person … differs from the German, the English or the French."[93] Westerners, the English in particular, were condemned by Russian authors for practising racial discrimination in their colonies, with such practices denied in relation to Russia's policies in its imperial borderlands. And yet paradoxically, and tellingly, the same Russian authors would at times slip into evoking with approval racial theories, without noticing any contradiction.

Eshevskii's position appears quite typical. In the context of his discussion of how miscegenation in a colonial setting can be understood with the help of racial theories, the historian contrasted the plight of "the natives" when they confronted Russian and Western European colonists. In both cases, Eshevskii admitted, the native population

became much reduced in number or disappeared altogether. Without citing any evidence, Eshevskii offered entirely different reasons for the same development in the Western European and Russian contexts. In the former case, he concluded, "the natives" tended to die out because of their treatment by the colonizers as racially inferior. In the Russian colonial setting, in contrast:

> *Inorodtsy* tribes do not die out, when they are confronted with Russians. They naturally transform (*pretvoriaiutsia*) into Russians, absorbing specific qualities of the European-Christian civilization.[94]

In the second half of the nineteenth century, such juxtaposition became a regular trope. For example, Mikhail Veniukov, a military geographer and orientalist, often contrasted the methods of Russian colonization, which he alleged were noncoercive, with "the terrible treatment" by Britain and Spain of their colonial subjects, suggesting that this treatment was rooted in the perception of the colonized as inferior races: "[T]he Spanish colonization … as well as the English, was accompanied by the bloody annihilation of entire races and the enslavement of many millions of people … There is nothing comparable in the Russian colonization."[95] Of course, Veniukov failed to acknowledge Russian ethnic cleansing operations in the Caucasus and avoided discussing the use of military force in the Russian conquest of Central Asia, at the same time utilizing racial arguments to justify it:

> From the point of view of national history, this movement [of Russia into Central Asia] can be called the restoration … of the rule of the Aryan race in the countries which for a long time had been under the mastery of the people of the Turkic and Mongolian races … Thanks to its higher culture [Russia] can exercise and is already exercising a strong impact on changing the physiognomy of the country [Central Asia].[96]

The most striking example of the contradictory arguments are to be found in the writings of another military orientalist, Andrei Snesarev, who published a range of works on Russia's imperial rule in Central Asia, comparing it favourably to British rule in India. He regularly lambasted British imperialism for its racist nature:

> The English rule over India is a rapacious, trade-centered rule of foreigners, who think that the people whom they have subjugated are a race that is inferior mentally, morally and physically.[97]

The fifty-page-long chapter 4 of his *India as the Main Factor in the Central Asian Question* was devoted to criticizing British policies, which were based, he argued, on racial prejudices toward dark-skinned people.[98] And yet elsewhere in the book, Snesarev readily agreed with those British authors who

> note that in the character and the very racial nature of the Indian population there is a kind of radical shortcoming [that explains why for the last two thousand years peoples of India had been subjected to a foreign rule – VT] … This shortcoming of the Indian people one could legitimately describe as a lack of political ability. This trait is very puzzling in descendants of the Aryans and, among other things, one wants to explain it with reference to a strong ad-mixture of Dravidian blood among North Indians, as well as a long-term softening impact of India's climate on them.[99]

In Snesarev's writings yet again culture, biology, and environment merged together as important factors in shaping human behaviour and actions.

This is not to say that the engagement with the concept of race in Russia did not have any specificity. Specificity was certainly evident. As elsewhere in Europe, local national and colonial contexts framed specific instances of engagement with the concept of race.[100] In the case of Russia, this context helped strengthen environmental explanations of racial difference, significantly limited the popularity of polygenism, introduced a particular complexity into the discussion of the so-called miscegenation and stimulated intensive debates over the notions of the norm and deviance, which lay at the basis of racial hierarchies.[101]

CONCLUSIONS

Discourses of race, ethnicity, and nationhood in imperial Russia developed as part of the pan-European transnational circulation of knowledge, and they closely reflected contemporary European interest in and understanding of the relationship between biology and culture. Theoretical concepts and interpretative frames circulating across

borders of European imperial states were adopted and adapted to reflect the specificity of Russia's imperial context. In nineteenth-century Europe, including Russia, race, ethnicity, and nationhood were constructed as a single, integrated conceptual domain. Both "culture" and biology were evoked simultaneously to put people into groups and hierarchies and to explain people's individual and collective behaviour. Cultural determinism was not necessarily less rigid than biological. In fact, the two were so closely intertwined that where cultural determinism stops and biological begins is usually impossible to determine. Consequently, references to "national character," as much as those to racial distinctions, underpinned discriminatory colonial policies. Significantly, both were widely perceived as inheritable.

In the early twentieth century, race and nationhood, biology and culture became particularly closely intertwined. Yet an opposite trend of separating race and nation and questioning biological determinism in the analysis of social issues also emerged. It is this contradictory legacy of the entangled understanding of race, ethnicity, and nationhood, alongside a deep uncertainty regarding the actual relationship between biological and culture, that the Soviet regime inherited. When making sense of the complexity and ambiguity of Soviet nationalities policies we should fully account for the conflicting European trends in interpreting "groupness" and belonging that crossed the 1917 divide.

NOTES

1 Neil MacMaster, *Racism in Europe: 1870–2000* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), 107; Hans Rogger, *Jewish Policies and Right-Wing Politics in Imperial Russia* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 37; Nathaniel Knight, "Science, Empire, and Nationality. Ethnography in the Russian Geographical Society, 1845–1855," in *Imperial Russia: New History of the Empire*, ed. Jane Burbank and David Ransel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998), 108–41.

2 Marina Mogilner, *Homo imperii: Istoriia fizicheskoi antropologii v Rossii* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2008); Eugene M. Avrutin, "Racial Categories and the Politics of (Jewish) Difference in Late Imperial Russia," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 8, 1 (2007): 13–40; Karl Hall, "'Rasovye priznaki koreniatsia glubzhe v prirode chelovecheskogo organizma': neulovimoe poniatie *rasy* v Rossiiskoi imperii" and Vera Tolz, "Diskurs o *rase*: imperskaia Rossiia i Zapad v sravnenii," both in *"Poniatiia o*

Rossii". K istoricheskoi semantike imperskogo perioda, ed. D. Sdvizkov, I. Schirle, and A. Miller (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2012), 194–258 and 146–93 respectively. See also I.A. Levinskaia, "Evreiiskii vopros v gody Pervoi mirovoi voiny," in *Pervaia mirovaia voina i konets Rossiiskoi imperii*, vol. 1 (St Petersburg: Liki Rossii, 2014), 519–50.

3 Eli Weinerman, "Racism, Racial Prejudice and Jews in Late Imperial Russia," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 17, 3 (1994): 44–95; Knight, "Ethnicity, Nationality and the Masses," 41–64.

4 See, for example, Carole Reynaud-Paligot, *De l'identité nationale. Science, Race et Politique* (Paris: PUF, 2011); Carole Peynaud-Paligot, "Construction and Circulation of the Notion of 'Race' in the Nineteenth Century," in *The Invention of Race: Scientific and Popular Representations*, ed. Nicolas Bancel, Thomas David, and Dominic Thomas (New York: Routledge, 2014), 87–99.

5 For the treatment of ethnicity as a cultural category, without considering its attribution by imperial actors with a biological dimension, see for instance Juliette Cadiot, *Le laboratoire impérial. Russie–URSS 1870–1940* (Paris: CNRS Éditions, 2007) and Charles Steinwedel, "To Make a Difference: the Category of Ethnicity in Late Imperial Russian Politics, 1861–1917," in *Russian Modernity*, ed. Hoffman and Kotsonis, 67–86. In contrast, Avrutin, "Racial Categories and the Politics of (Jewish) Difference" and Madina Tlostanova, *Gender Epistemologies and Eurasian Borderlands* (London: Palgrave Macmillam, 2010) adopt a broader definition of race, as subsuming the category of ethnicity. However, those two scholars do not systematically consider how the relationship between race, ethnicity, and nationhood was conceived by actors in imperial Russia, as it is done in this article.

6 Ann Laura Stoler, "Racial Histories and Their Regimes of Truth," in *Race Critical Theories, Text and Context*, ed. Philomena Essed and David Theo Goldberg (Malden, MA and Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 2002), 370–84 (see 382).

7 Stoler, "Racial Histories and Their Regimes of Truth," 382 mentions that already in the 1960s, George Stocking in his *Race, Culture, and Evolution. Essays in the History of Anthropology* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968), 234–69 pointed out that the Lamarckian understanding of the inheritability of acquired traits and the environmental explanation of human variation were "as much a part of nineteenth-century racial thinking and practice" as those interpretations that were "focused more squarely on the immutable and permanent traits."

8 Stoler, "Racial Histories and Their Regimes of Truth," 372.

9 Nicholas Hudson, "From 'Nation' to 'Race': The Origin of Racial Classifica-

tion in Eighteenth Century Thought," *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 3 (1996): 247–64, see 247 and 259n3.

10 Ibid.

11 Reynaud-Paligot, "Construction and Circulation of the Notion of 'Race' in the Nineteenth Century," 87–99.

12 Ibid., 90–3.

13 Ibid., 95–7.

14 Hall, "'Rasovye priznaki," 194–258 and Tolz, "Diskurs o *rase*," 145–93.

15 See, for example, A.L. Lovetskii, *Kratkoe rukovodstvo k poznaniiu plemen chelovecheskogo roda* (Moscow: Tipografiia Moskovskogo universiteta, 1838), reprinted in *Russkaia rasovaia teoriia do 1917 goda*, vyp. 2, ed. V.B. Avdeev (Moscow: FERI-V, 2004). It should be noted that the 2004 edition is produced by a prolific author on the history of racial thought, who himself uncritically subscribes to racial theories in their crudest form and advocates their application in current policy making. The cited characteristics of "races" were given by the St Petersburg orientologist, I'ya Berezin, in his article, "Metropoliia i koloniia. Stati'a pervaia," *Otechestvennye zapiski*, vol. CXVII, issue 1, 1858, 82–96, (see 90).

16 Berezin criticized V. Speranskii's *Osnovy psikhologii* for adopting such a classification of races (Berezin, "Metropoliia i koloniia," 90).

17 Vladimir Dal', *Tolkovyi Slovar' zhivago velikorusskogo iazyka*, second edition, vol. V (St Petersburg-Moscow: Tipografiia M.O. Vol'fa, 1882), 59 (first published in 1863–66).

18 Dal', *Tolkovyi Slovar' zhivago velikorusskogo iazyka*, vol. III, 124. See a similar definition of the word *rasa* as *plemia* in *Nastol'nyi slovar' dlia spravok po vsem otrasliam znaniia*, vol. III (St Petersburg: Izdanie F. Tollia, 1863), 269.

19 Dal', *Tolkovyi Slovar' zhivago velikorusskogo iazyka*, vol. III, 124.

20 Ibid., 319.

21 D. Anuchin, "Rasy i porody chelovechestva," in *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, ed. F.A. Brockhaus and I.A. Efron (St Petersburg: Brockhaus-Efron, 1899), vol. 51, 356–60 defined "race" as a purely physical category and insisted that "racial characteristics do not overlap (*ne sovpadaiut*) with tribal (*plemennymi*) and national (*natsional'nymi*) (language, faith, way of life, and belonging to a particular state); people of different racial types can belong to the same *narod*, whereas representatives of the same race can belong to different tribes and nationalities (*narodnostei*)." (The quote is on 359.) N. Kareev, *Osnovnye voprosy filosofii istorii*, book III (St Petersburg: Tipografiia M.M. Stasiulevicha, 1897), 300–3, adopted Ernest Renan's separation of "linguistic" and "anthropological races." See also a discussion of intellectual problems arising from the terminological disarray surrounding the concepts

of race, ethnicity, and nationhood at the 5th Archaeological Congress in Tiflis in 1881, *Trudy V-go Arkheologicheskogo s'ezda v Tiflise*, vol. I (Moscow: Tipografiia A. I. Mamontova, 1881), xlv.

22 Tolz, "Diskurs o *rase*," 178–83, and A.I. Miller, "Istoriia poniatiia *natsiia* v Rossii," in *Poniatiia o Rossii,* ed. Sdvizhkov, vol. II, 40.

23 S.V. Eshevskii, "O znachenii ras v istorii," in his *Sochineniia*, Part I (Moscow: Izdanie K. Soldatenkova, 1870), 13–122, particularly 19, 31, 40–3.

24 In 1765, Voltaire claimed that, "Only a blind man could doubt that the Whites, Negroes, Albinos, Hottentots, Laplanders, Chinese and Americans are entirely different races." See Tzvetan Todorov, *On Human Diversity. Nationalism, Racism, and Exoticism in French Thought* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 100–1.

25 I.N. Boltin, *Primechaniia na istoriiu drevniia i nyneshniia Rossii G. Leklerka*, vol. I (St Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Lan', 2013), 8–9, 20–21 (first published in 1788).

26 For example, Peter Simon Pallas, the German zoologist who was invited to Russia by Catherine the Great, offered such a representation of Kalmyks. See Nancy Stepan, *The Idea of Race in Science: Great Britain 1800–1960* (London: Macmillan, 1982), 38. A similar view of the Kalmyks was expressed by the Dutch anatomist and anthropologist Petrus Camper. See Francesco Panese, "The Creation of the 'Negro' at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century: Petrus Camper, Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, and Julien-Joseph Virey," in *The Invention of Race*, ed. Bancel et al., 49.

27 For later references to the stability of the "national character" see, for example, Eshevskii, "O znachenii ras v istorii," 31, 40–3; P.P. Semenov, "Znachenie Rossii v koloniazatsionnom dvizhenii evropeiskhikh narodov," *Izvestiia, IRGO*, 28, 24, (1892): 356; Kareev, *Osnovnye voprosy filosofii istorii*, 310. Danilevskii similarly defined his "cultural-historical types" through unchanging characteristics, such as tolerance or tendency towards violence, which were understood to have come "from nature" (*samoi prirodoi*). N. Danilevskii, *Rossiia i Evropa*, 2nd edition (St Petersburg: Tipografiia brat. Panteleevykh, 1895), 190, 201. On the uses of "national character" as an analytical concept in Russian imperial ethnography, see M.V. Leskinen, "Kontsept 'natsional'nyi kharakter/nrav naroda' v iazyke rossiiskoi nauki vtoroi poloviny XIX veka," *Dialog so vremenem*, 39, (2012): 148–69.

28 Lovetskii, *Kratkoe rukovodstvo k poznaniiu plemen*, reprinted in *Russkaia rasovaia teoriia*, ed. Avdeev, 70–1.

29 Ibid. For other examples of similar racial hierarchies, putting Europeans at the top and blacks at the bottom, see Hall, "'Rasovye priznaki,'" 220 and Tolz, "Diskurs o *rase*," 173–4.

30 The term *narodnost'* was first coined by Piotr Viazemsky in 1819. See Miller, "Istoriia poniatiia *natsiia* v Rossii," 18–19.
31 N.I. Nadezhdin, "Ob etnograficheskom izuchenii narodnosti russkoi," *Zapiski Russkogo Geograficheskogo obshchestva*," kn. 2 (St Petersburg: 1847), 61–115. The text of the lecture was reprinted in *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*, nos. 1 and 2, 1994. All the references here are to the 1994 reprint. This lecture was earlier analyzed in great detail in the insightful works by Knight, including in his "Science, Empire, and Nationality," "Ethnicity, Nationality and the Masses," and "Seeking the Self in the Other: Ethnographic Studies of non-Russians in the Russian Geographical Society, 1845–1860," in *Defining Self: Essays on Emergent Identities in Russia, Seventeenth to Nineteenth Centuries*, ed. Michael Branch (Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 2009), 117–38. My reading of the lecture is somewhat different from Knight's, as I attribute a greater significance to Nadezhdin's insistence on the racial (*porodnoe*) dimension of *narodnost'*.
32 Nadezhdin, "Ob etnograficheskom izuchenii narodnosti russkoi" (Chast' 1), *Otnograficheskoe obozrenie*, 1 (1994): 112, 113.
33 Ibid., 114.
34 Ibid., 115.
35 Ibid., 116.
36 Ibid., 117.
37 Ibid., 114.
38 Ibid., 110–11.
39 Tuska Benes, "Comparative Linguistics and Ethnology: in Search of Indo-Germans in Central Asia, 1770–1830," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, 24, 2 (2004): 117–32, particularly 117–18, 124–8. Benes details one of the first studies that focussed simultaneously on the relationship between linguistic and physical similarities of ethnic groups by German linguist and ethnographer Julius Klaproth, who conducted research for the Russian Imperial Academy of Sciences in the Caucasus and Central Asia in the first decade of the nineteenth century.
40 Craig Brandist, "The Rise of Soviet Sociolinguistics from the Ashes of Völkerpsychologie," *Journal of the History of Behavioural Sciences* 43, 3, (2006): 261–77; Vera Tolz, "Rossiiskie vostokovedy i obshcheevropeiskie tendentsii v razmyshleniiakh ob imperiiakh kontsa XIX – nachala XX veka," in *Imperium inter pares: Rol' transferov v istorii Rossiiskoi imperii (1700–1917)*, ed. Martin Aust, Ricarda Vulpius, and Aleksei Miller (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2010), particularly 279–83; Marlène Laruelle, *Mythe aryen et rêve impérial dans la Russie du xixe siècle* (Paris: CNRS Éditions, 2005).

41 V.V. Grigor'ev, ed., *Trudy Tret'ego mezhdunarodnogo s'ezda orientalistov v S.-Peterburge. 1876*, vol. 1 (St Petersburg: Tipografiia brat'ev Panteleevykh, 1879–80), LVI. For other relevant Russian publications, see N.K. Zenger, "Preniia v parizhskom Antropologicheskom Obshchestve o proiskhozhdenii indoevropeitsev," *Izvestiia Antropologicheskogo otdeleniia obshchestva liubitelei estestvoznaniia*, 1 (1865): 17–23; O.I. Sen'kovskii, "Indo-Evropeizm (Po povodu sochineniia: O srodstve iazyka slavianskogo s sanskritom A. Gel'ferdinga)," in *Sobranie sochinenii Sen'kovskogo (Barona Brambeusa),* vol. 7 (St Petersburg: Tipografiia Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk, 1859), 525–55.

42 See, for example, M.I. Veniukov, *Rossiia i Vostok* (St Petersburg: Tipografiia V. Bezobrazova, 1877), 135–7; V. Bartol'd, "Zadachi russkogo vostokovedeniia v Turkestane,"in his *Sochineniia*, vol. IX (Moscow: Nauka, 1977), 529.

43 Nikolai Solov'ev, "Iazyk, kak osnova natsional'nosti," *Otechestvennye zapiski*, February, kn. 1 (1866): 481–99.

44 Ibid., 490.

45 Tolz, "Diskurs o *rase*," 163–5 and Hall, "'Rasovye priznaki,'" 209, 214, and 220.

46 On this specificity of European discourses of race, see Stoler, "Racial Histories and Their Regimes of Truth," 375 and Jennifer Pitts, *A Turn to Empire. The Rise of Imperial Liberalism in Britain and France* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).

47 Berezin, "Metropoliia i koloniia," 89–90.

48 T.N. Granovskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. II (St Petersburg: Izdanie N. F. Mertza, 1905), 223.

49 "Organicheskoe razvitie cheloveka v sviazi s ego umstvennoi i nravstvennoi deiatel'nost'iu," *Sovremennik*, 5 (1858): 1–30. (In the original publication, the article was signed only by the author's initials.) Also published in N.A. Dobroliubov, *Izbrannye filosofskie proizvedeniia* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1948), 72–103.

50 Berezin, "Metropoliia i koloniia," 89–90. Notably, Berezin's claim was not aimed at stirring anti-Jewish sentiments. Arguing that, "the stability of race (*rasa*) is transmitted from generation to generation through the physical characteristics of the body, as well as through the way of life (*obrazom zhizni*)" he concluded that races should not be divided into superior and inferior. As his main examples he used the Jews, as well as the English. See also Eshevskii, "O znachenii ras v istorii," 31.

51 Eshevskii, "O znachenii ras v istorii," 40–3. See also Berezin, "Metropoliia i koloniia."

52 Kareev, *Osnovnye voprosy filosofii istorii*, 310.

53 D.N. Anuchin, "Velikorussy," in *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, ed. F.A. Brockhaus

and I.A. Efron, vol. X (St Petersburg: Brockhaus-Efron, 1892). http://bibliotekar.ru/bev/98.htm (accessed 22 February 2016).

54 Eshevskii, "O znachenii ras v istorii," 40–3.

55 V.O. Kliuchevskii, "Kurs russkoi istorii. Chast' I" (Lecture XVII), in his *Sochinenie v deviati tomakh*, vol. I (Moscow: Mysl', 1987), 295–317. (First written in 1879.)

56 For a detailed analysis of the changing views on miscegenation in late imperial Russia, see Willard Sunderland, "Russians into Iakuts? 'Going Native' and Problems of Russian National Identity in the Siberian North, 1870s–1914," *Slavic Review* 55, 4 (1996): 806–25.

57 A. Bogdanov, *Antropologicheskia fisiognomika* (Moscow: Tipografiia N.M. Lavrova, 1878), 17, 18, 21–2.

58 Ibid., 20–1.

59 N.M. Iadrintsev, *Sibir kak koloniia* (St Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo M.M. Stasiulevicha, 1882), chapter 1, (the quote is on 30 and 32).

60 Ibid., 31.

61 Ibid.

62 Ibid.

63 See note 27.

64 Pavel Pestel', *Russkaia pravda* (1823–1824), chapter 2, "O plemenakh, Rossiiu naseliaiushchikh, Narody Kavkazskie," http://vivovoco.astronet.ru/VV/LAW/VV_PES_W.HTM#2_11 (accessed 22 October 2018).

65 See, for example, V. Grigor'ev, "V oproverzhenie nekotorykh mnenii, vyskazannykh v poslednee vremia o prepodavanii vostochnykh iazykov v Rossii i ob izuchenii u nas Vostoka voobshche," part II, *Den'*, 34, 25 (September, 1865): 793; Semenov, "Znachenie Rossii," 356.

66 Peter Holquist, "To Count, to Extract, and to Exterminate: Population Statistics and Population Politics in Late Imperial and Soviet Russia," in *A State of Nations. Empire and Nation-Making in the Age of Lenin and Stalin*, ed. Ronald G. Suny and Terry Martin (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 111–44. For example, instructions for ethnic map making, published by the Imperial Russian Geographical Society in 1876 used the terms *rasa* and *natsional'nost'* to identify groups which should be recorded on the proposed map by different colours. *Izvestiia IRGO* 8, 7 (1876): 198–9.

67 Holquist, "To Count, to Extract, and to Exterminate."

68 Ibid., 116.

69 For a detailed discussion of this issue in relation to the peoples of the Caucasus, see also V.O. Bobrovnikov and I.L. Babich, eds., *Severnyi Kavkaz v sostave Rossiiskoi imperii* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2007), 312–17.

70 Leskinen, "Kontsept 'natsional'nyi kharakter/nrav naroda," 150.
71 See a similar argument made by Alaina Lemon in relation to the post-Soviet period, Lemon, "Without a 'Concept'? Race as Discursive Practice," *Slavic Review* 61, 1 (2002): 54–61.
72 I.A. Sikorskii, *Psikhologicheskie osnovy natsionalizma* (Kiev: Kievskii klub russkikh natsionalistov, 1910); M.O. Men'shikov, *Natsional'naia imperiia* (Moscow: Imperskaia traditsiia, 2004); I.I. Pantiukov, *Znachenie antropologicheskikh tipov v istorii* (Kiev: Prosveshchenie, 1909), particularly 59, 70, 74–84. See Tolz, "Diskurs o *rase*," 178–83.
73 N.P. Ostroumov, *Koran i progress* (Tashkent: Izdatel'stvo A.L. Kirsnera, 1901–03), 188–99. On the impact of racial theories on human and medical sciences in late imperial Russia, see Laura Engelstein, *The Key to Happiness. Sex and the Search for Modernity in Fin-de-Siècle Russia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992); Daniel Beers, *Renovating Russia: The Human Sciences and the Fate of Liberal Modernity, 1880–1930* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008). On the use of racial theories in debates over the "Jewish question" in this period, see Rogger, *Jewish Policies and Right-Wing Politics in Imperial Russia*; Avrutin, "Racial Categories and the Politics of (Jewish) Difference"; and Levinskaia, "Evreiiskii vopros v gody Pervoi mirovoi voiny."
74 See, for example, M. Grushevskii, *Istoryia Ukrayni-Rusi* (Kiyv: Drukarni Pershoi Spilki: 1913), vol. 1, 8–9, 46–7, 59, 64, 65, 309; Ataulla Baiazitov, *Otnoshenie Islama k nauke i k inovertsam* (St Petersburg: Tipografiia "Nur," 1906), 20 and 22. See also Mogilner, *Homo imperii*, 284–95; Marina Mogilner, "Russian Imperial Contexts of the Search for the 'Jewish Race,'" in *Imperial Victims–Empires as Victims: 44 Views*, ed. Andrzej Nowak (Warsaw: Institute of History, PAN, 2010), 130–7.
75 For a discussion of this trend in France, see Reynaud-Paligot, "Construction and Circulation of the Notion of 'Race' in the Nineteenth Century," 95.
76 N. Kharuzin, "K voprosu ob assimiliatsionnoi sposobnosti russkogo naroda," *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*, kn. XXIII, 4 (1894): 43–78.
77 Konstantin Ponomarev, "Nasazhdenie russkoi grazhdanstvennosti stredi kavkazskikh gortsev," *Sovremennik (prodolzhenie zhurnala Russkoe bogatstvo)*, 1 (March 1907): 73–87 (see, particularly, 74).
78 See Mogilner, *Homo imperii*, particularly chapter 5.
79 Bartol'd, "Zadachi russkogo vostokovedeniia v Turkestane," 529.
80 P. Miliukov, *Ocherki istorii russkoi kul'tury. Chast' tret'ia. Vypusk pervyi. Natsionalizm i obshchestvennoe mnenie* (St Petersburg: Izdanie redaktsii zhurnala "Mir Bozhii," 1901), 2–3.
81 A.L. Pogodin, "K voprosu o natsional'nykh osobennostiakh," in his *Sbornik*

statei po arkheologii i etnografii (St Petersburg: Tipografiia Berezhlivost',' 1902), 87–99 (see particularly 86).

82 See Terry Martin, "Modernization or Neo-Traditionalism? Ascribed Nationality and Soviet Primordialism," in *Stalinism: New Directions*, ed. Sheila Fitzpatrick (London: Routledge, 2000), 348–76 (see 348).

83 Vera Tolz, *Russia's Own Orient: The Politics of Identity and Oriental Studies in Late Imperial and Early Soviet Russia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 85–110; Suzanne Marchand, "German Orientalism and the Decline of the West," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 45, 4 (2001): 465–73.

84 Tolz, "Diskurs o rase," and Vera Tolz, "Discourses of Race in Imperial Russia (1830–1914)," in *The Invention of Race*, ed. Bancel et al., 130–44.

85 Many prominent European theorists of race from Buffon and Blumenbach, through Renan to Le Bon and G.V. de Lapouge, were translated, often quickly, into Russian, and debates around their publications featured in Russian periodicals.

86 Weinerman, "Racism, Racial Prejudice and Jews in Late Imperial Russia."

87 Knight, "Science, Empire, and Nationality," 108–41; A. Etkind, "Bremia britogo cheloveka, ili vnutrenniaia kolonizatsiia Rossii," *Ab Imperio*, 1 (2002): 265–99; Weinerman, "Racism, Racial Prejudice and Jews in Late Imperial Russia"; Jeff Sahadeo, *Russian Colonial Society in Tashkent, 1865–1923* (Indiana University Press, 2007), 85–7.

88 Tolz, "Diskurs o rase."

89 Joseph, Deniker, *The Races of Man: An Outline of Anthropology and Ethnography* (London: W. Scott Ltd., 1900).

90 Kliuchevskii, "Kurs russkoi istorii," 295–317; A.P. Shchapov, "Estestvenno-psikhologicheskie usloviia umstvennogo i sotzial'nogo razvitiia russkogo naroda," in his *Sochineniia*, vol. III (St Petersburg: Tipografiia M. V. Pirozhkova, 1908), 83–127.

91 Paul Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism. 1870–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 48–9.

92 Ibid.

93 A.N. "Pypin, Russkaia narodnost' v Sibiri," *Vestnik Evropy*, 153 (1892): 302, quoted in Hall, "'Rasovye priznaki," 241.

94 Eshevskii, "O znachenii ras v istorii," 40–1.

95 Veniukov, *Rossiia i Vostok*, 114–15.

96 Ibid., 135 and 144.

97 A.E. Snesarev, *Indiia kak glavnyi faktor v Sredne-aziatskom voprose* (St Petersburg: Tipografiia A.S. Suvorina, 1906), 70.

98 Ibid., 128–73.
99 Ibid., 71.
100 Bancel et al. eds., *The Invention of Race*; Stepan, *The Idea of Race in Science.*
101 See Mogilner, *Homo imperii*, 358–98.

2

The Matter of Race

Alaina Lemon

COLD WAR AND THE RACIAL TRANSNATIONAL

Even quite disparate systems of racialization connect: the matter of race is global as it is visceral. Practices making "races" travelled circuits of Atlantic and Ottoman slave trade and moved beyond them as racializing economies and institutions unfurled across state borders, touching ground in different ways. Across the Russian Empire, for instance, racial categories emerged not through encounters between European landowners and forced African labour, but otherwise, insofar as serfs were understood to share origins with landowners and aristocrats (an understanding we likewise cannot take for granted, given Russian aristocratic kinship connections to Europe). Others in this volume address the emergence of racial thinking peculiar to Russian imperial and Soviet spaces, as I also do in previous work.[1] In this essay, however, I address what happens *because* racialization moves across political borders and does so to different effects. These effects are difficult to trace because we rarely attend to the ways racialization affects even domains and people not usually considered racially marked. Moreover, while many scholars and activists have long denaturalized and renaturalized race in conflicts around causes like emancipation, civil war, suffrage, fair housing, and representation, we pay little attention to what discourse *about* race and racism has afforded. Both racialization and discourses about racism torque vectors of geopolitical and social conflict.

One way they do so most obviously is by buttressing competing claims to freedom against accusations of forced thought or labour.

And so, to address these issues, this essay suggests that we attend more broadly to how the institutions and structures that produce race – prison systems, neighbourhoods – intertwine with material channels for knowledge, be they mediated or face-to-face interactions.

"Race" became a key term in Cold War ideological struggles and proxy wars during decolonization in the mid-twentieth century.[2] Rivals aligned with the respective super powers framed racialized events and violence – Soviet repression of Jews, American lynchings – to political ends. They competed to depict racial equality at home and to ascribe racism to the enemy: would capitalism or communism better furnish human "freedom" and "equality"? In other words, race mattered to both Americans and Soviets, and the fact that the USSR did not use "race" as a legal category does not mean that race did not affect ideas or material realities.[3]

Moreover, practices of competitive contrast between the United States and the Soviet Union have led us to avoid discussing phenomena that were, in fact, entwined. For instance, while both territories measured civilizational advance in terms drawn from Hegel's crystallization of a human urge to freedom, such inconvenient affinities are denied.[4] To counter exceptionalist thinking, this essay moves back and forth, from the US to the USSR. It does so less to compare or to contrast a single imagined object, such as "race," but rather to probe the implicit political grounds of contrasts that cut global assemblages that racialize into disparate objects in the first place. Once we do this, we can better discern the ways material and imaginative processes tangle across borders and see what comparative claims *about* race have done.

Attention to processes that cross institutional, material, or social lines has shaped recent scholarship on racialized peoples.[5] In Romani studies – which has been well situated to compare and contrast capitalist and socialist systems – such attention has revealed that Eastern European Romani migration to Western Europe during the late nineteenth century did not manifest some innate "Gypsy wandering spirit" but followed economic shifts after emancipation laws swept the globe, freeing Roma previously enslaved in Ottoman and Wallachian lands.[6] More recently, attention to ways Roma take up images of Martin Luther King or quote Harlem Renaissance poets has shown how discourses on racial inequality and political agency are both local *and* cosmopolitan. For Roma, the rise and fall of empires and nation states has both constituted racial experiences and vexed them. Perhaps no

account of racial categories can begin or end at the bounds of any state: indeed, as Tolz shows in this volume, meaning of race in nineteenth century Russia evolved at the same time, and in similar ways, as it did in Western Europe.

Nor should such accounts end with the effects of racialization on minorities. Both racializing practices *and* debates about racisms frame majority experiences too. They even shape the perspectives of scholars working to understand the making of racial categories. Such phenomena are easiest to illustrate when looking at how extreme majoritarian groups take up race – as when Moscow "*skinhedy*" align with white supremacists farther west and recruit over the internet, circulating lore, symbols, and strategies across linguistic and state borders. Things begin to become more difficult when we try to discern how local-seeming versions of "whiteness" depend upon the transnational manufacture of race. Even more striking are the ways we begin to see that even domains that majority groups engage as if they were racially neutral, "not about race," are in fact also imbricated in racializing circuits.

CHANNELS, MATTER

Racial distinctions are made and remade not only through definitions of categories but in the ways people interact with bodies and materials. Bourdieu saw gender made across repetitions of different actions at different times: habitus acted for the women in the village like an unspoken instinct to avoid the water well when the men were gathered there but was in fact instilled over time in divisions of labour that also channel interaction with matter – it is the man who handles the keys, holds the steering wheel.[7] Similar divisions are central everywhere to the ways race is forged and thus, because material and infrastructural worlds diverged during the Cold War, even the most similar of racialization processes led to *various* conjunctures with matter.

Elsewhere, I have written about how race in late Soviet and post-Soviet Russia was made through practices joining and separating bodies and material objects (clothing, cash, tools) on the Metro, in shops, on theatre stages, at the city limits. These practices lead people to read race not from corporal signs such as complexion or bone structure but from kinds of contact with inanimate objects – those with gold teeth or those tucking dollar bills into their shirts are not white: "Aha, *there* is a Gypsy!" – reading material objects even tenuously attached

to bodies as if they demonstrated that body's eternal essence.[8] Just as much as any other, this mode of racialization affects the material possibilities of people in Moscow such as Roma, Korean, or African students or Central Asian workers to move safely through the city.[9]

During the twentieth century, whether in Moscow or Detroit, persons raced as "white" encountered material structures differently than those who were not. We might say that American Jim Crow, the Russian imperial Pale of Settlement, and the Soviet *propiska* (residence permit) system share logics. Each of them also concatenated with other institutions such as housing authorities, educational boards, medical clinics, publication boards. Here, however, is where the effects of racialization begin to diverge. Race produced similar but not the *same* social effects because racialization was mediated through different interfaces, as it were. Materials themselves – buildings, furniture, tools, decorations, documents – as well as divisions of access to materials and structures differed. For instance, African American automakers in Detroit and Romani metro builders in Moscow may have faced similar labour discriminations but different housing regulations: Moscow never came to be understood as a city divided by racial territories while Detroit did.

In fact, such differences bring into relief the fact that no such object as race or racialization exists on its own to be compared *à la* apples to apples. What we can compare and contrast are those assemblages of material and meaning that mobilize race – while we also track connections and rifts among them. Such realism is messy and impossible to conduct without moving back and forth across geopolitical and epistemological boundaries: "matter" matters not only in making races and in structuring racialized experience but also in mediating or channelling knowledge of material experiences – and claims about them.[10]

In focussing at the interfaces of race with matter and knowledge during the Cold War, at issue are not the well-worn debates about which economic system, capitalism or communism, produced better concrete or tea or blankets of higher quality, thereby to afford its citizens better living conditions. We will need, in addition to comparing and contrasting how bodies related to materials, to also follow how assemblages of such relations have been taken up, by whom, and to what ends. To sketch what such a path might look like, I will first outline ways race differently figured in divisions of access to material

things and built spaces, and ask how these divisions layer into *divisions of knowledge about* material relations. Who knows what about who lives in what conditions, and how do they know it? Lived divisions of people, things, and spaces affect the movements of such information.[11] This last point is crucial to understanding race under the Cold War because judgments about movements of information – "freedom speech" vs "censorship" – have long served as key ideological terms whereby politicians, journalists, and scholars justify geopolitical competition.

Competing promises of both infrastructural development *and* racial equality after World War II were deployed by both the United States and the Soviet Union to court former colonies.[12] Following the breaking up of European empires, images of a peaceful and prosperous future were painted not only for American or Soviet citizens, but for decolonized people across the world; [13] mechanized irrigation, moving sidewalks, talking computers, rapid space travel would save not just Europeans from war and from toil, but *all* humanity.[14] By the 1950s, mainstream Soviet and United States science fictions alike peopled the future as cosmopolitan. Interstellar crews were international: on board the SS *Tantra* (*Andromeda Nebula*, Ivan Efremov, 1959) we meet the African man, Mven Mass, while on board *Star Trek*'s Starship *Enterprise*, we find African Uhura handling the communications hardware and Chinese Sulu steering the ship and shooting its weapons. Tarkovsky's *Solaris* (1972) opens with African faces at a high-level conference. While many area scholars are well aware that the US and the USSR projected similar promises for modernity, the parallels vanish in journalistic and political projections onto the past. In the twenty-first century, American media forgets that Soviet and US PR shared a common theme –it was not only Coca-Cola that "would like to teach the world to sing." "Perfect harmony" rang through the 1960s and '70s versions of the Soviet future, too (at least sometimes: the 1967 film version of *Andromeda* bleached the cast pale and blond).

Here is where matter enters the fantasy: in capitalist as in communist fictions, divisions of labour[15] and segregations of bodies based on race (less gender, at least for Uhura in her micromini) were obviated not only by enlightenment but by the achievement of perfect automation. On the Starship *Enterprise*, a machine delivers meals; one supposes that women no longer wield sponges and toilets clean themselves.[16]

MODERNITY AND BREAKDOWN

Eventually both socialist and capitalist states increasingly faced a similar problem: neither one actually achieved automatically distributed meals or self-cleaning latrines for all. Neither reached either "full development" or "world communism." The infrastructures that each had built – the dams, reactors, bridges – all started, soon enough, to fall apart. Matter posed contingencies and crises that contradicted modernist dreams, in first and second world alike: be it in Gary or Sverdlovsk, Chicago or Perm, flights crashed and roofs collapsed, public telephones busted, housing towers slowly crumbled, nuclear reactors leaked and imploded. While since the 1990s, victorious Western observers have captured images of Soviet breakdown, in fact, everywhere they are built, not only under socialism, material infrastructures and mechanical objects break down. In the Urals and in Arkansas, I have seen people improvise engine belts with string, in Detroit and in Moscow, entire car panels held on by duct tape. Similar material crises provoked similar doubts about the capacity of either economic system or philosophy to deliver smooth, clean infrastructures – infrastructures that would, in turn, clear paths to social equality, justice, or freedom.

All the same, similar material ruptures afforded differing social effects. In both the US and in the USSR, elites encountered them in ways different from those of others. But within that similarity, the differences differ – and they led to different, albeit connected, effects. In the United States during the height of the Cold War, racial segregations ran along lines demarcating proximity to material, infrastructural breakdown, while in the USSR, categories understood as racial or national transected such material lines. Soviet policies and practices did shape ethnic, national, and racial identities and access to many spaces and resources,[17] but those spaces did not circumscribe those points where Soviet modernity fell apart. Put in another way, the US was able to gerrymander knowledge, to manage impressions of systemic failure along lines of systemic racism. The USSR could not do this.

The Soviet Union and the United States did not channel *knowledge* of material failure along the same kinds of networks nor by the same media infrastructures. In the United States, the experience of matter in ruin was racialized in ways that it was not in the Soviet Union. To be sure, there are plenty of poor white people in the US who know breakdown, live near defunct factories or prisons, and know America

as cracked concrete blocks and garbage bags over the window frames, and certainly many American people of colour maintain lovely mid-century segregation, and real estate discrimination still means that it is black and brown and native people who live surrounded by neglected train tracks and poisoned waterlines. Moreover, white elites rarely sustain relations with white poor. Granted, journalists publish stories *about* black, brown, and white material struggles, sometimes to expose the injustice of the minimum wage, sometimes to sell titillating glimpses of meth moms and cat hoarders. All the same, however, even the most intrepid white elite investigators do not convey knowledge of material conditions in the same ways as do those who know poverty by smell and by touch, by haptic means.

For such people, knowledge is not only *haptically* but also *socially* mediated. We might learn about a hole in the roof and a cousin in jail through family or neighbourhood lines of communication or both. While all knowledge is mediated, even face-to-face interactions, not all mediations are the same, and people have access to different kinds of mediations that combine in different ways. In the US, social lines for communication, communicative infrastructures, merged and diverged along the same institutions that carved out race, those that made neighbourhoods and planned mass transit. For instance, some 1980s Chicago dwellers could avoid passing through the Cabrini Green housing project, seeing only its outside walls from the windows of the train: they had access only to published or broadcast media of life within, lacking social or haptic knowledge, while residents might access all such mediations and even discern contradictions among them.

Soviet Moscow saw different configurations and separations of bodies, spaces, and mediations. To be sure, the Soviet-era "100-kilometre rule" around major metropoli kept many poor non-Russians, such as Roma, from acquiring legal residence registrations in the cities, living in ill-heated shacks instead of warm apartments, they kept company not only with ex-convicts but also exiled former elites. Within the cities, elites might frequent special stores or clinics, but reaching them required them to move through the same common spaces of breakdown as anyone else. Late Soviet *Nomenklatura*, even those dwelling in solid Moscow Stalinist buildings with majestic windows and parquet floors, visited school friends living in dilapidated structures or attended ramshackle schools. Even decades later, city powers have not banished the nonelite from the centre, and penniless friends still socialize with schoolmates who have moved up. This means that "class,"

too, is not exactly the "same thing" in Russia as in the US and that the only responsible comparisons we can make are not between objects (e.g. Class Type A vs Class Type B; Race Western vs Race Eastern, etc.) but rather clusters of processes.

COLD WAR CLAIMS: OTHER RACISMS, OTHER CENSORSHIPS

The nodes of the clusters that concern me next pop up where claims about racisms overlap claims to freedom of speech versus totalitarian censorship. I argue that in the United States, because racializing material process also segregated channels for knowledge about material failures of modern materials, knowledge gaps achieve censorship effects without recourse to identifiable censors or media bans. By contrast, in Soviet Russia racialization intersected knowledge of ruin in ways that made acts of censorship more visible, often while obscuring racism. Lead in the water in Flint, Michigan. Explosions at Chernobyl. All involve abuses of authority and corruption; these are systemic disasters, structural cruelties. In the US, knowledge of such conditions has successfully been restricted to people whose connections and kin have little access to the means of media production. Even now, with cell phone cameras, key media infrastructures are bounded like Chicago neighbourhoods: information about the textures of poverty is clogged by racializing borders that separate experiences and their mediations alike.

When such knowledge does move to elites as "information," it is reduced to reference: images and words. Those who experience a lack of transit or rusty water catch such references too – but layered to echo haptic or social knowledge. The American poor know their poverty via more, and different, channels of mediation than do American elite reading publics, who face little imperative to *contrast* a newspaper account of, say, conditions in the infantry with family experience. Readers of exposés may cultivate the impression of being informed about material suffering but without knowing that there is more to know and more ways to know about it.

A few years ago, I led a class of American students to Moscow. Our group included two students of colour who were shocked by the racially inflected comments that they encountered (*and* by the cheerful ways such comments were offered). They were just as shocked during a meeting with Russian students when their white fellow stu-

dents, asked whether, "In the US, are you afraid of your own police?" replied, "Of course not, we are free." One of the students of colour interjected, "Are you kidding! Maybe that is how it is in YOUR family!" Even having taken this in, I made a similar error of omission a few years later when, while driving Moscow friends through South Dakota, after being issued a gentle warning by a white state patrolman instead of a ticket, I answered the same question with the same forgetful "no" and "we."

In the US, spatial, media, and legal structures align to limit the exposure of affluent and white citizens to spaces where collapsing street plumbing or cracked roads deny the clean lines of the modern. Along I-80, I-94, along any interstate really, windbreaks and grading – concrete walls through the environs of, say, Detroit – channel the view of those who venture forth, windows up, keeping out imagined danger or dirt. And information. Information "about" how nonelites live is ever more available (even white people now worry about internet surveillance). But still, those who never lived on the excluded sides of segregation either never see or learn to unsee the very infrastructural conditions that others have learned through mediations that are both visceral and social.

Social connections among people irrigate informational fields; segregations wither them. Not only wires and paper but *people*, too, are media, form "infrastructures" that move and shape knowledge.[18] Elementary school teachers know this: this is why they separate friends, to keep them from talking in class. On a larger scale, the workings of race in the US meant that segregations of people could channel, dampen, stop knowledge from moving *without seeming to*. In the US, for instance, in 1967 Detroit, civil disturbances and police raids from 23 to 27 July left forty-three dead, more than a thousand injured, and 2,000 buildings destroyed. However, there was little need in the decade or so after to actively censor historical accounts since the people who had lost the most had the least access to media to broadcast their recollections or to the presses that manufactured high school textbooks.

Of course, "knowledge" is not simply divisible between recorded and haptic, distant and intimate, as if the haptic or intimate were not also mediated – just as it is a truism that to read a newspaper account of a prison is not the same thing as to live in one. My point is rather that *kinds* of mediation – especially in regard to knowledge of material breakdown – were distributed and connected differently across the

United States than they were across the Soviet Union. American white elites read about prison conditions while other people knew them through experience or through family bonds. Soviet elites did not just read about prisons conditions without also knowing them through more visceral and social forms of mediation. Even Soviet elites could taste rust in the water – and could further contrast that knowledge to reports in the papers, to triangulate.

If, in Cold War-era United States, pockets of material lack, decay, and violent rupture contradicted the American version of modernist dreams in ways that ran disproportionately through racialized spaces, infrastructures, and social networks, in the USSR rupture and decay appeared more evenly spread, known to more "kinds" of people in viscerally haptic and socially mediated terms. Solzhenitsyn's parents, for instance, had been wealthy landowners before the Revolution, he had gone to university, had served as an officer during WWII, and in prison made friends with lawyers and future publishers. In the USSR, first-hand accounts of prison conditions included texts by elites, or at least those whose kin and friends managed papers, who knew how and where to print, and who to ask to access radio time. Their social location meant that efforts to censor such people rarely went unremarked – elite social networks buzzed with the scandal, passed on through international connections to French, German, American writers and presses, the networks that passed *samizdat*.

It is difficult to imagine an American analogue: it was not elite white Americans who passed along the unpublished works of Angela Davis. Nor is it easy for the elites to see infrastructural breakdown, as it was in the USSR. Infrastructural breakdown is as easy to miss from the I-80 as it is from the air. Driving through Nebraskan prairie, it is easy to believe the land is flat when it actually undulates – near the interstate it has been graded – or that the state is all "white" when Lakota and Winnebago Sioux know otherwise. If anything works well across the US, it is the interstate highways, moving people swiftly through identical truck plazas and rest stops. The interstates do not advertise which exits lead to "Sundown towns," places where blacks should not be caught after dark, and of whose existence many white elites remain unaware.

In Soviet Russia, the catastrophe of WWII, among other causes, meant that *everyone* was raised around material ruin. And if, later in socialist times, Moscow boulevards could seem utopian compared to muddy village streets, city elites were never naive to material shortage and breakdown – Moscow had its own problems, and elites rode the

same trains to visit village grandparents as did everyone else. Contrast this to the ways wealthy Americans speak of never having ridden a Greyhound bus (or even the New York subway), leaving those places and infrastructures to those without property or cars. Soviet "soft" train cabins might separate *Nomenklatura* from third class passengers, but the station latrines were the same for everyone. Registration permits, limited telephone lines, censorship all certainly buffered communications, but they could not *sever* talk across entire categories of people – as was possible in the US via spatial exclusions. The great infrastructures of each state, the American interstate networks and the Soviet train system, each mediated race and knowledge, but in different ways, producing different effects, different perceptions of material rupture, of the failures of modernity.

Let me rephrase these points in a few more ways before concluding. While Soviet and imperial Russia restricted access to urban capitals through pales of settlement and residence permits, denying residence to ex-convicts and others (such as "Gypsies"), while people labelled non-European did face exclusion, racialized violence, and occupational discrimination, their experiences with shortage or material, infrastructural breakdown were in line with those of other Soviets. Conversely, information about prison conditions was mediated through elites, not only racialized minorities. Few late-Soviet elite families went untouched by repressions or prisons. In the US, elites famously manage still to avoid incarceration, while in the USSR and in imperial Russia such people were just as famously exiled or assigned punitive work in the provinces. It was common for well-placed people to count as relatives or friends those who had done time. A broad demographic – one divided not by "race" – knew the material conditions of prison and knew them through family, friends or experience, and well before Solzhenitsyn published print accounts in the 1960s. It is difficult to imagine how contradictions to Soviet modernist fantasy could have been contained in "bad neighbourhoods." All "kinds" of Soviets knew crumbling walls or poor ventilation.

Both the US and the USSR saw comparable rates of incarceration, and both used forced labour. However, the American prison system *racialized* both incarceration and labour, while Soviet prison camps did not, although racial categories might come into play inside them. Consequently, Soviet-era knowledge of prison conditions moved through social and human infrastructures that were both not segregated racially and that were connected to media producers. Soviet

knowledge of the ways people live, of their material conditions, could more broadly diffuse. Its diffusion through social networks even evoked talk about censorship in other media – talk that was further mediated and amplified beyond the borders, especially since prison conditions are topics that muckrakers or dissidents in both superpowers struggle to bring to light. Additionally, because social knowledge of prison conditions was not already muffled by lines of segregation as it was in the US, attempts to suppress it could not go unremarked.

CONCLUSION: ILLUSIONS OF FREEDOM AND EQUALITY

Both Cold War superpowers inherited discourses on "freedom" and "equality" from movements of emancipation and suffrage begun in the eighteenth century. Even in competition, both drew from moral and political philosophies of "democracy" that developed as actual governments defined free citizens through exclusions such as land ownership or literacy tests. Sharing this genealogy, Soviet and American blind spots overlapped. Twentieth-century Americans invested in believing that "we are free," calling out censorship elsewhere while struggling to acknowledge domestic legacies of slavery; Soviets invested in believing that "we are equal," calling out racism elsewhere while ambivalently struggling to acknowledge domestic censorship.

These differences among differences – including the ways differences in racialized encounters with material rupture overlapped both social mediations and social barriers to media – all have shaped competitive Cold War judgments about censorship and freedom of speech, even before McCarthy, have affected policy decisions since Kennan advocated "containment" of the USSR and were deployed by both sides to justify proxy wars in Asia and Africa.

In the US, muckraking reportage notwithstanding, haptic and social knowledge was much more smoothly segregated by family and neighbourhood – and thus also by race. Americans never imprisoned are simply not likely to glean details from an uncle on parole: such connections are not dispersed evenly across social categories, class or racial. Moreover, even after 1964, when the Voting Rights Act finally began to enforce some semblance of demographic representation, access to other forms of media still follows lines channelled by race and class. People incarcerated in the US inhabit different relationships

to informational media than did aristocratic Solzhenitsyn.[19] To put it more bluntly: what "need" to censor black, brown, or "white trash" voices if they are already filtered out by materially segregating media, educational and social networks and spaces?[20]

Firsthand complaints disrupt narratives of modern progress, but for all of America's vaunted spatial mobility, the freedom to move North and work for Ford never meant freedom to join the golf club and discuss, face-to-face, conditions in the factory (or even, for a successful black dentist to chat about cars). In towns where black people could not swim in white pools, what need to monitor communications? Those who rarely experienced infrastructure as broken hardly spoke to those who did. And even financial success did not mean black families could move into white neighbourhoods. Many Cold War Americans were able to "black box" those processes that achieved the effects of censorship – to not see how human phatic infrastructures (those that make communication possible, opening channels among some, but not others) limited movements of knowledge and did so *without explicit censorship*. This allowed some Americans to imagine that "we" had more and better free speech than did our enemies. Such people could look at the USSR as if *it* were the source of all that is zoned, walled, and censored.[21] Conversely, Soviets were able to believe that they lived without "racism" while abandoning illusions of living without censorship.

Dominant stories about the USSR emphasize breakdowns that compromised the material promises of Soviet modernism.[22] They blame the socialist system and stress the overbearing force of censorship – especially censorship of information *about* breakdowns (e.g. Chernobyl). To add racialization to these stories has been difficult, and not only for scholars. In the US, powerful forces (most easily identified on the senate floor, in television networks, and among textbook publishers but not ending there) also work hard to deny racism, blaming poverty and shattered windows on essential character rather than on the system. Simultaneously, we lionize muckraking journalism that occasionally brings such topics above water – even while eliding the social structures that, during the Cold War if not still, afford ways to avoid recourse to overt censorship.

Americans could believe in "freedom of speech" because social separation did the work that censorship did elsewhere. Divided we stand. Conversely, the USSR could pretend to racial and social "equality" – but at the cost of leaving its acts of censorship visible. Racial segrega-

tion in the US obviated direct censorship, and produced conditions in which Americans of privilege could imagine themselves as more free than those poor, brainwashed, Soviet robots, and could evade exposure of modernist failure just a bit longer.

Both countries generated troubling contradictions. *Neither* country, it turns out, has *consistently* championed either freedom or equality. If we cannot acknowledge this, we will remain trapped in competitive distortions, unable to sort out how our racisms and repressions have fed upon each other's.

NOTES

1 It has taken some doing to argue that racial categories mattered in Soviet or imperial Russian practices, against charges that seeing them there amounted to orientalist imposition. On the utility of "race" in Soviet-era scholarship, see the 2002 discussion of Eric Weitz's "Racial Politics without the Concept of Race: Reevaluating Soviet Ethnic and National Purges," *Slavic Review* 61, 1(2002): 1–29. My stance was articulated there in "Without a 'Concept'? Race as Discursive Practice," 54–61. See also, Alaina Lemon, "'What are they writing about us blacks': Roma and 'race' in Russia," *Anthropology of East Europe Review* 13, 2 (1995): 34–40. For the imperial era, see Nathaniel Knight, "Science, Empire and Nationality: Ethnography in the Russian Geological Society," in *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*, ed. Jane Burbank and David Ransel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998); Marina Mogilner, "Russian Physical Anthropology of the Nineteenth–Early Twentieth Centuries: Imperial Race, Colonial Other, Degenerate Types, and the Russian Racial Body," in *Empire Speaks Out: Languages of Rationalization and Self-Description in the Russian Empire*, ed. Ilya Gerasimov et al. (Leiden, 2009), 155–89; K. Hall, "'Rasovye priznaki koreniatsia glubzhe v prirode chelovecheskogo organizma': Neulovimoe poniatie rasy v Rossiiskoi imperii," in *'Poniatie o Rossii': K istoricheskoi semantike imperskogo perioda*, ed. D. Sdvizkov, I. Schierle, and A. Miller (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2012); Vera Tolz, "Discourse of Race in Imperial Russia (1830–1914)," in *The Invention of Race*, ed. Nicholas Bancel, Thomas David, and Dominic Thomas (London: Routledge, 2014), 130–44. See also Nikolay Zakharov, *Race and Racisms in Russia* (Palgrave, 2015).

2 See Kesha Fikes and Alaina Lemon, "African Presence in Soviet Spaces," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31 (2002): 497–524. Penny Von Eschen, *Satchmo blows up the world: jazz ambassadors play the Cold War* (Cambridge: Har-

vard University Press, 2004); Julie Hessler, "Death of an African student in Moscow," *Cahiers du monde russe* 47, 1 (2006): 33–63; Maxim Matusevich, "Expanding the Boundaries of the Black Atlantic: African Students as Soviet Moderns," *Ab Imerio* 2 (2012): 323–50. See also Philip E. Muehlenbeck, ed., *Race, Ethnicity and the Cold War: A Global Perspective* (Nashville: University of Vanderbilt Press, 2012) and Ann K. Johnson, *Urban Ghetto Riots, 1965–1968: A Comparison of Soviet and American Press Coverage* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).

3 Alaina Lemon, *Between Two Fires: Gypsy Performance and Romani Memory from Pushkin to Post-Socialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000).

4 For discussion of how Hegel's world spirit, the urge to freedom, both drew from and then erased his knowledge (via reading newspapers) of *actual* slave rebellions in the colonies, see Susan Buck-Morss, "Hegel and Haiti," *Critical Inquiry* 26, 4 (Summer, 2000): 821–65.

5 See, for example, the works of Stuart Hall or Paul Gilroy.

6 Concerning Russian institutions in the racialization of Gypsies, see Lemon, *Between Two Fires* and Brigid O'Keeffe, *New Soviet Gypsies: Nationality, Performance, and Selfhood in the Early Soviet Union* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013).

7 See Carroll Pursell, *A Hammer in Their Hands: Documentary History of Technology and the African-American Experience* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2005); Nelson, Tu, and Hines, eds., *Technicolor: Race, Technology and Everyday Life* (New York: New York University Press, 2001); Raneta Lawson Mack, *The Digital Divide: Standing at the Intersection of Race and Technology* (Durham: Carolina Academic Press, 2001).

8 They are read "as if" they are pure icons, if we use the terms of Peircean semiotics. See also Alaina Lemon, "Your Eyes are Green Like Dollars: Counterfeit Cash, National Substance, and Currency Apartheid in 1990s' Russia," *Cultural Anthropology* 13, 1 (1998): 22–55; "Talking Transit and Spectating Transition: The Moscow Metro," in *Altering States: Anthropology in Transition*, ed. Daphne Berdahl, Matti Bunzl, and Martha Lampland (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000); (with Kesha Fikes), "African Presence in Soviet Spaces," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31 (2002): 497–524; and "Without a 'Concept'? Race as Discursive Practice," *Slavic Review* 61, 1 (2002): 54–61. On various understandings of "blackness," see Stuart Hall, "Cultural Identity and Diaspora," in *Identity, Community and Difference*, ed. John Rutherford (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990). On the "elastic" qualities of colour as ambiguous sign in racial hierarchies, see also Aisha Khan, "'Caucasian,' 'Coolie,' 'Black,' or

'White'? Color and Race in the Indo-Caribbean Diaspora," in *Shades of Difference: Transnational Perspectives on How and Why Skin Color Matters*, ed. Evelyn Nakano Glenn (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009), 95–113.

9 Lemon, *Between Two Fires*; "'Dealing Emotional Blows': Realism and Verbal 'Terror' at the Russian State Theatrical Academy," *Language and Communication* 24, 4 (2004): 313–37; Madeleine Reeves, "Clean Fake: Authenticating Documents and Persons in Migrant Moscow: Documents and Persons in Migrant Moscow," *American Ethnologist* 40, 3 (2013): 508–24.

10 On materials in *colonial* racializing encounters, see John L. Comaroff and Jean Comaroff, *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1992).

11 See Julia Elyachar, "Phatic Labor, Infastructure, and the Question of Empowerment in Cairo: Phatic Labor," *American Enthologist* 37, 3 (2010): 452–64; Paul Kockelman, "Enemies, Parasites, and Noise: How to Take Up Residence in a System Without Becoming a Term in It," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 20, 2 (2010): 406–21; Paul Manning, *Strangers in a Strand Land: Occidentalist Publics and Orientalist Geographies in Nineteenth Century Georgian Imaginaries* (Brighton, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2012).

12 See also E.A. Alpers, "Recollecting Africa: Diasporic Memory in the Indian Ocean World," *African Studies Review* 43 (2000): 83–99; A. Blakely, *Russia and the Negro: Blacks in Russian History and Thought* (Washington, DC: Howard University Press, 1986); W. Davis, "How Negros Live in Russia," *Ebony* 15 (1960): 65–73; H. Haywood, *Black Bolshevik: Autobiography of an Afro-American Communist* (Chicago: Liberator, 1978); Y. Changa, *Soul to Soul: a Black Russian American Family, 1865–1992*, trans. S. Jacoby (New York: Norton, 1992); D.C. Moore, "Local Color, Global 'Color': Langston Hughes, the Black Atlantic, and Soviet Central Asia, 1932," *Res. African Literature* 27, 4 (1996): 49–70; P. Robeson, *The Negro People and the Soviet Union* (New York: New Century, 1950).

13 See Lemon, "Your Eyes are Green Like Dollars"; Susan Buck-Morss, *Dreamworld and Catastrophe: The Passing of Mass Utopia in East and West* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000); Kate Brown, "Gridded Lives: Why Kazakhstan and Montana are Nearly the Same Place," *The American Historical Review* 106, 1 (2001): 17–48.

14 Matusevich gives us a wonderful Soviet example: a poster of Africans commanding the means of production as Sputnik sales in orbit behind them (Matusevich, "Expanding the Boundaries of the Black Atlantic").

15 But see Kevorkian, who argues that the "black technocrat" or computer geek

is a new manifestation of a fictional racialized division of labour across Hollywood representations (Martin Kevorkian, *Color Monitors: The Black Face of Technology in America* [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006]).

16 Conversely, there could be more to say about intersections of social categories and depictions of viscous detritus in later science fictions, from the puddles of *Stalker* and *Blade Runner* through all the different textures of shit in Aleksei Yur'evich German's recent *Trudno byt' bogom* (2013).

17 See Francine Hirsch, "The Soviet Union as a Work-in-Progress: Ethnographers and the Category Nationality in the 1926, 1937, and 1939 Censuses," *Slavic Review* 56, 2 (1997): 251; Terry Martin, *Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923–1939* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001); Yuri Slezkine, *Arctic Mirrors: Russia and the Small Peoples of the North* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994); Lemon, *Between Two Fires*; Eric D. Weitz, Francine Hirsch, Amir Weiner, and Alaina Lemon, "Discussion of Eric D. Weitz's 'Racial Politics without the Concept of Race: Reevaluating Soviet Ethnic and National Purges'" *Slavic Review* 61, 1 (Spring 2002): 1–65.

18 Manning puts it this way: "In Tbilisi, after all, Georgian generals and journalists might mingle together at a face-to-face society function like a supra (ritual feast), but in Ottoman Georgia, the anonymity of the imperial spy and the professional journalist, and the local hospitality their work depends on, are very different. In both these different understandings of society, the category of hospitality plays a crucial role as a kind of *infrastructure* of circulation alongside, for example, roads" (Manning, *Strangers in a Strange Land*, 111). Nancy D. Munn, *The Fame of Gawa: A Symbolic Study of Value Transformation in Massim (Papua New Guinea) Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

19 Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's grandparents owned a large estate in the Caucasus. His parents attended university in Moscow before the Revolution; he earned a degree in mathematics and physics before fighting in WWII. In prison for eight years after the war, upon release he took up writing, publishing stories while teaching math.

20 Here a critical engagement with Habermasian notions of public speech might be welcome. Interventions, relevant here include Susan Gal, "Language and the 'Arts of Resistance,'" *Cultural Anthropology* 10, 3 (1995): 407–24; Jane Burbank, "Political Cultures of Advanced Autocracy: Can the Russian Historian Speak?" *Russian History* 31, 4 (2004): 465–75; Frank Cody, "Public and Politics" *Annual Review of Anthropology* 40, 1 (2011): 37–52. Michael Warner, *Publics and CounterPublics* (New York: Zone Books, 2002).

21 Along these lines, see Kate Brown, *Plutopia: Nuclear Families, Atomic Cities, and the Great Soviet and American Plutonium Disasters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).
22 See Krisztina Fehérváry, *Politics in Color and Concrete: Socialist Materialities and the Middle Class in Hungary* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013).

3

Race and Racial Thinking: A View from the Atlantic World

Aisha Khan

Since its entrance into Western epistemology's ways of knowing the other, the concept of race has been a key feature in the ways that unequal relations of power have been structured in modern human societies. Race and its categories may, on the one hand, confirm the inevitability of hierarchy through ideas about inherent inequalities among peoples. On the other hand, race and its categories may be viewed as a means by which inequality can be averted, challenged, or reconfigured if conceptualized in nonhierarchical terms. Race, then, is a floating signifier: its plasticity allows it to pose as a universal category, but at the same time it has, like all concepts, a specific history in accordance with the particular context of power relations from which race and racial thinking emerge. I think that we can approach the concept of race in the same vein as what Michel-Rolph Trouillot terms "North Atlantic Universals" or as parts that come to represent the whole.[1] He identifies such ideological, ersatz universals as "development," "progress," "democracy," and "modernity" as "particulars that have gained a degree of universality, chunks of human history that have become historical standards."[2] Universalist concepts offer prescriptive visions of the world that reflect, among other things, cultural assumptions about what it means to be human. As merely a simulated universal (and Trouillot would argue that all "universals" are simulacra), race is a symbol that is never static or uniform but instead both shapes and is shaped by the contexts in which it becomes significant.

Given the salience and plasticity that race and racial categories possess, it is noteworthy that race has undergone less comparative study

on a global scale than one might expect. The evolutionary schema that characterized Western science since about the seventeenth century was global in its comparative objectives insofar as those objectives involved establishing universal stages of human developmental progress largely through identifying racial types around the world. But this area of (pseudo)science was highly predictable in its valuations of human worth, which were based on the ranking of races into degrees of greater and lesser accomplishment, desirability, and potential. Since the contemporary era, notably post-WWII, this kind of model-building quest, one that relied on prefigured types, has been supplanted in scholarly discourse, and in popular discourse to some extent, by the study of *process*: the social construction of types and the relational (or intersectional) connections that are generated in the course of construction. Due in part to the at best misguided and at worst pernicious efforts of earlier approaches, the post-War global scope of theories of developmental stages narrowed and shifted, from generalized (and speculative) abstraction to greater attention to specific, circumscribed, and empirically reliable subject matter. Today the comparative study of race generally focuses on intrasociety and intraregional relations of power, often within geographical areas that share Euro-colonial or postcolonial histories and power structures. Thus, while there is a substantial literature on comparative race relations, it typically focuses on the US, Brazil, Cuba, and South Africa. What remains more novel is to draw a broader range of territories, histories, and cultures into conversation and inquire into the workings of power/knowledge among as well as within them.

This more encompassing optic helps us better understand the processes by which race is socially constructed, but it also underscores the necessity of thinking about Russia itself as another kind of social construction, an example of the interpolated relationship between race and place – a staple, for example, in the pantry of anthropological theory. Empires, states, and nations are also social constructions, belonging both to the imaginary and to haptic experience. This prompts the question of not just when but also where and how "Russia" begins, how the consolidation known as "Russian culture" emerges and congeals, and recongeals. This is not only a question of periodization: we can trace over historical time the various forms of self-identification that Russians produced about themselves. But the idea of *a* "Russia" also emerges in connection to the perceived culture of a place, where preset (anticipated) recognitions of race gain partic-

ular association with places and the traditions of those who reside in them. Identities, whether national, cultural, or racial, etc., begin as ideas that then can become understood to be self-evident, as situated fact rather than floating concept. To borrow from Karen and Barbara Fields' notion of "racecraft," race performs the conjuror's imaginative trick of transforming a place (whether empire, nation, or neighbourhood) into an ostensibly prefigured racial(ized) site.[3] I am not suggesting that Russia emerged from race/racism as did the Caribbean and much of the Americas, given the foundations of slavery on which their post-Columbian histories began. But scholars have argued that a continuous, cohesive discourse on race began to take shape, in part, as Russia's imperial peripheries, internal Jewish population, and other "others" were helping Russia know itself. In this sense, Russia shares the Caribbean's "colonial mirror," a metaphor for Euro-colonialism's projection and attribution of its own phantasmagorical "truths" back onto the colonized.[4] Russia also possesses the metropolis's "imperial eyes" that "produced the rest of the world" for European readerships through its "obsessive need" to "constantly display its margins and its others to itself."[5] Both Michael Taussig's "mirror" and Mary Louise Pratt's "imperial eyes" illustrate the relational interplay between creating the other by projecting oneself outward and creating oneself by absorbing the other. This encircling – the simultaneous projection of oneself and the absorption of another – is the story of racialization in the Americas. As a general principle of power relations, it also seems entirely applicable to the Russian context. These are the dialectics of power, no matter where they may take place.

Following the lead of this volume, Vera Tolz and Alaina Lemon look at race in Russia comparatively, in relation to interlocutors with whom Russians and Soviets imagined themselves, defined their worlds, and evaluated others. Rather than taking "race" as a given, a preconceived rubric whose guiding analytical question is *whether* or not the concept of race is relevant in the Russian context, Tolz's and Lemon's approaches analyze *how* race works there: what the meanings and practices of race in Russian history are, emphasizing comparative contexts that change over time. Going against the grain of "Russian exceptionalism" in scholarship and politics (which works much like "US exceptionalism"), important questions that arise are what an "exceptional" case means, and how might such putatively exceptional cases like Russia be better understood in comparative terms? Both Tolz and Lemon make it clear that "comparative" work does not sim-

ply mean establishing "similarities" but also unearthing the contradictions and deviations that can arise even when two or more phenomena are mutually constitutive. As Lemon asks, what are the most productive ways to contrast racialization practices while at the same time charting how racisms feed off and create connections among them? In other words, how might we see differences while at the same time recognizing the linkages that can give rise to them?

Similar questions can be raised about the Caribbean's concept of "creolization," which refers, most broadly, to cultural transformations under unequal relations of power. These transformations are linked to the struggles between colonizers and colonized, as the former attempt to impose their will onto colonized lifeworlds. With little divergence,[6] scholars treat creolization as a phenomenon specific to the Caribbean, as what, in a sense, makes the region an exceptional space. As Stuart Hall argues, creolization cannot be applied "loosely all over the place"; instead, it must be associated with Europe's entry into the Americas "somewhere around 1492."[7] Thus creolization specifically involves the racial worldviews of Euro-colonials toward New World indigenous, African, and Asian peoples. The common denominators that define creolization as unique to the Caribbean are less precise, as are the criteria on which common denominators are based.

Race and racial thinking are themselves put to these tests of comparative analysis: the workings of power as general or as exceptional, and according to what perspective? Scholars understand the cultural transformations that are charted by creolization to occur within larger structures of racial hierarchy, where colonized cultures, evaluated according to colonial values and agendas, accommodate or resist them, and transform their cultures in the process. Because creolization means that we are looking at consequences, it can only be registered in hindsight, as scholars have argued.[8] While we want to be wary of presentist perspectives that create anachronisms, recognition of something, including race, must always superimpose a kind of hindsight. Historicist perspectives avoid imposing preconceived, present-inflected frameworks, but they cannot mine meaning from sources without bringing to them already formed ways of thinking about them. Being mindful of what these ways of thinking are and then deciding how to treat them in our analyses may perhaps be the most crucial part of our charge.

The challenge of how best to undertake comparative work in the study of race and racial thinking also requires that we consider the extent to which we need to know "race" already, in order to be able to recognize it. The concern among some scholars about a tautology – that racial discourse can only be identified if there is a preexisting concept of what that discourse would look like – has given rise to other sorts of competitive debate. Applying the term "race" to historical narratives may indeed impute racism to those narratives when it is not necessarily appropriate. At the same time, no concept has meaning outside of its past and present contexts. There is no such thing as neutral meaning or a future meaning unhinged from a past in exploring race as a concept.

Tolz and Lemon tackle these issues by exploring the distinction between "exceptional" and "particular." They argue that Russia is not exceptional in terms of the work of race. Rather, Russia constitutes a particular, or special, moment in the nineteenth-century imperial context and the Cold War. The long engagement of Russians in cross-cultural and transnational dialogues, along with the elasticity of the concept of race, emplace Russia within a much broader intellectual, geographic, political, and cultural world. With these considerations in mind, Lemon examines the notions of "freedom" and "equality" prominent in both US and Russian discourse, showing that they have been differently deployed while being derived from shared moral and political philosophies about "democracy." In the same vein, Tolz argues against confidence in "West European racial thought" being clear and consistent. To the contrary, ideas about race were not defined or applied with standard precision either in the west or in Russia. In the Russian case, this slipperiness, or ambiguity, meant that discourses about biology ("race") and culture ("ethnicity" and "nationality") were more interwoven than the usual contrasts between Russian exceptionalism and Western European thought allow. In the discussion that follows, I explore from the perspective of the Caribbean key issues I see raised by Tolz's and Lemon's analyses of Russia's races: race as a floating signifier in transnational dialogue and race as heritable identity. Each exemplifies the value of comparative study as a way to understand the circuits and flows of racial thinking over place and time, and the particular implications that such thinking has for the lives of those variously subject to it.

TRANSNATIONAL DIALOGUES

Until the late nineteenth century Russian ideas about race were largely derived, as Tolz points out, from Western European worldviews and the growing "scientific" studies of race that characterized the times. The work of Western European race theorists was commonly translated into Russian (including the word *race*, which the Russian language adopted rather late, in the 1830s, from French), and Russian scholars joined Western European scholars living in Russia and in their home countries to exchange information and engage in debate. This "transnational circulation of ideas" created a "pan-European scientific community" (Tolz chapter 1) that gradually developed a common language for interpreting racial types that was based on hierarchically arranged physical, moral, and cultural features. As is arguably the case with all intellectual and philosophical movements, at least in the modern era, these dialogues were necessarily and inevitably transnational, drawing together a vast territory of ideas as they grew. While these pan-European ideas never became internally standardized or uniform, they attained common fundamental elements that affirmed the racism that vertically ranked "types" and attributed distinct privileges and forms of subordination.

These human hierarchies were meant to substantiate and defend a common ideological core and, in being mutually constitutive of one another through ongoing dialogue, served similar purposes across Russia's imperial and Europe's colonial world. But the architecture of substantiation and defence were particular to a given context. In other words, race cannot be held as a constant variable not only because it is a floating signifier but also because its consequences are unpredictable. For example, a side-by-side comparison of race in the US and in Russia may tell us that racial thinking was integral to the unequal relations of power in both places but it will not tell us why or how unless race is treated not as a constant variable but instead as an epistemological tool. For this we need a comparative approach that is interpolated or interactive. For example, Lemon argues that racial thinking and practices in the US and Russia are comparable in their mutual defining of one another through Cold War competition over claims to moral imperatives like equality, freedom, and modernity. Although both inheritors of pan-European race "science," Cold War Russia claimed its own superiority through the state-promotion of equality and deflected from its own forms of oppression vis-à-vis the

US's still-animated legacies of slavery and Jim Crow. For its part, the US could promote its options for liberty and the pursuit of happiness (as its founding fathers inscribed in the Constitution) vis-à-vis Russia's history of domestic censorship (including, I would add, its continuing international association with dictators who have global ambitions). If equality remained an equivocal claim for Cold War America, then freedom was a challenge for Cold War Russia to realize. On the one hand, racism in the US belies its claims to freedom of speech because racism has its own modes of censorship. On the other hand, Russian classism belies its claims to freedom from race, so to speak, because class has its own modes of racialization – e.g., the experiences of Roma, Korean, African, and indigenous Siberian peoples.

In thinking about these issues, we want to make sure that in asking what kinds of unspoken things block free (movement of) speech, we are also not confirming race, reifying it by assuming its defining habitus. It is an astute and tricky question about how the incorporeal can identify race without preconfirming it. Censorship can be interpreted as suppression of information and ability to convey it, as in Russia. But it can also be interpreted in terms of a kind of Orwellian "newspeak," limiting freedom of thought but through distortion rather than silence, inference rather than denial, communicating one thing and having it mean another. This latter kind of suppression travels through segregated space in the form of presupposition and fantasy. What comes to mind is the apparently quite sincere conclusion of former First Lady Barbara Bush in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina: being jammed into the steaming and unsanitary Superdome stadium in New Orleans was not a bad deal for the evacuees because "so many of the people in the arena here, you know, were underprivileged anyway," she said, "so this is working very well for them."[9] Thus, a lack of knowledge (or understanding) is never a blank; absences still cast shadows that convey information, even if distorted or unjust.

Shadows are still subject to debate, however. Scholars' assertions that racial categories mattered in Soviet and imperial Russia have been countered with a contrary charge that seeing race in these contexts amounts to looking through a misplaced orientalist lens. Within this argument is a deeper issue about how power is imposed and channelled, and which particular modes of knowledge are at stake – paradigms developed from local contexts or from more capacious analogies? What, then, are the most productive ways to contrast practices of racialization while still tracking connections among them?

(Lemon chapter 2, n1). Resonating with Trouillot's point about the limits of universalism, Tolz's and Lemon's arguments unpack the hazards attached to taking North Atlantic concepts of race as universal, revealing, instead, their malleability as floating signifiers.

Even in parts of the world where racial distinctions are assumed to be empirically obvious – notably the former slave plantation societies of the Atlantic world, where African, European, Asian, and indigenous genealogies defined the social landscape – the meaning and effects of racializing practices do not enjoy a consensus among analysts. Focussing on Brazil as their case in point, Pierre Bourdieu and Loic Wacquant argue that cultural imperialism relies, in part, on "the power to universalize particularisms linked to a singular historical tradition by causing them to be misrecognized as such." They contend that the US, notably its universities, foists topics specific to the American context, yet in reality are dehistoricized, onto other, allegedly comparable situations elsewhere over "the whole planet." With this hyperbolic imagery Bourdieu and Wacquant mean to critique what they see as the privileging of certain perspectives as if they are far more broadly explanatory. The cost of this hubris, as they see it, is that race is lost as a historical representation particular to time and place and becomes boilerplate analysis for everywhere else.[10]

In the Brazilian case this misrecognition means that Brazil's "infinitely more complex social reality" is truncated into the "rigid dichotomy between whites and blacks," which is the legacy of American and other scholars trained in the US.[11] As the specific history of the American Civil Rights movement became the universal standard for race relations, Bourdieu and Wacquant argue, Brazil's abiding description of itself as a "racial democracy" was overshadowed. In Brazil's self-portrait, racism does not, indeed cannot, exist because of the number and negotiability of racial identities that derive from colonial Brazil's more porous boundaries separating white and black (masters and enslaved included). A "racial democracy," therefore, intentionally represents the opposite of social hierarchy based on the North American "rule of hypodescent" or "one-drop rule." In this binary opposition model, two racial categories exist in the vertical power dynamic of a "white"/"black" binary, where one "drop" of "black blood" places an individual into the "black" racial identity category. Scholars who critique the "racial democracy" model (in Brazil and elsewhere in the Americas) do not take issue with the idea that race is an idea that belongs to particular imaginaries but approach "racial democracy" as an ideal (albeit a

historically situated one) and explore relations of power expressed through race in terms of real (lived) experience. These relations, as this point of view argues, reveal the racism masked by its public denial (another kind of censorship) and "deceptions and betrayals" of what is, in fact, a myth.[12]

Essentially this debate is unresolvable, an absolutist (universal) vs relativist (particular) standoff, with each side, ironically, claiming the relativist stance. To my mind, "racial democracy" is an ideology that serves as a "useful fiction" in support of Brazil's claim to an aptitude for modernity and progress, notably through the absence of racial thinking, which is ostensibly negated by Brazil's numerous and imprecise categorical types of person.[13] (That Brazil is often referred to as "the Country of the Future" rests in part on claims to modernity through racial democracy.) In the process, however, this fiction, or myth, as it is called by its critics, reiterates the superiority of whiteness and impedes the process of democratization.[14] The myth of racial democracy also silences the very real impacts that racializing practices have on Afro-Brazilians.

The myth's broader relevance to Russia's races is twofold. One is that charges of orientalism (in the case of Russia) or of North American epistemological hegemony (in the case of the US, or the Caribbean for that matter) share a basic concern about the power of ideas – to be channelled, imposed, or exposed.[15] There is no epistemology without relations of power; some ways of knowing will always be at stake in any given moment. This is a key consideration that complicates the notion of "exceptionalism" – whether Russian, Brazilian, American, or otherwise. The circulation of ideas, as Tolz well argues, involves a complex and recursive network of exchange. When a set of ideas takes hold in shaping worldviews, paradigms, and practices, it does not follow that those ideas function alone or that other ideas are not reverberating on the margins. There is always a reason for the receptivity to certain kinds of knowledge, whether it is "race science" or the effort to debunk that "science." The fact that reception is always unevenly empowered means that paradigms emerge from local contexts that are always and already motley ground; local knowledge may be organic but it is never pure. It seems to me that exceptionalism requires a premise of purity that does not hold. The most productive way to contrast practices of racialization while still tracking connections among them, returning to Lemon's productive question, is to treat those practices as partial exchanges of

larger bodies of knowledge, tracking them in terms of the shifting relations of power that allow some practices, for a certain moment in time and place, greater force than others. The next step is to investigate how and why.

The second way that Bourdieu's and Wacquant's argument is relevant to thinking about Russia's races is that it asks us to consider by whom power/knowledge is imposed. Their focus is on the sway exercised by the (American) scholarly academy, in these authors' treatment if not language, an unequivocally "etic" or outsider point of view. The flip side of "etic" is "emic," or the local, insider point of view. Since its coining in the 1950s, the etic/emic distinction has been a familiar methodological tool in linguistics, anthropology, and other social sciences. It has more or less outlived its usefulness today, however, due to the problems of determining who is "outside" and who is "inside," whether such a clear demarcation can exist, and whether a single perspective should be privileged within one domain – in other words, whose voice, respectively, represents "etic" and "emic" and can there be more than one voice for each? Although Tolz does not employ the etic/emic binary, her analysis thoughtfully illustrates the imprecision of this distinction and its potential to misguide. She argues that misconceptions in the Russian study of race are to a significant extent attributable to Russian scholars being unduly influenced by Russian elites' denial that imperial policies were driven in part by racial thinking. The question here is how to interpret contrasting views when everyone is a local "insider"?

Few would deny that the lived experience of race varies among peoples, times, and places. But underlying this variation are power structures that share common purposes and goals for maintaining racial hierarchies. This association between race and inequality makes it difficult for observers, scholarly and otherwise, to conceive of race in other than negative terms. In the West today, racial thinking carries with it a kind of self-monitoring system, where public discourse is generally careful not to appear as unadulterated racism and to appear, ideally, as forward thinking, universalist, and tolerant. This orientation certainly was reinforced by post-WWII condemnation of Nazism. It is common among scholars today to contend that "race is often an ascribed identity imposed through mechanisms of power on multiple levels … to order social reality and maintain hierarchical structures of inequality."[16] This understanding of race is associated with top-down forms of agency, which is to be expected given the history of racial for-

mations and practices in the west, not least in the Caribbean, which have served the self-interest of those in power.

But the Caribbean has taught us something else, too, and that is that precisely because race is a reflection of power, it is a key ingredient in *self*-identity in service to counternarratives that pose diverse forms of agency and alternatives to structural inequality. For example, we see this in critiques of race (panregional and more localized) such as the US's and Caribbean's respective Black Power movements, whose refrain, "Black is Beautiful" was a powerful assertion of race, yet on terms other than those defined by antiblack racism, and inclusive of peoples not of African ancestry. As these New World examples show, and as Lemon argues in her essay, there are other important kinds of materiality, or substance, to race that are not ascriptions of racial identity based on the phenotypic markers of the body. Bodily markers are perhaps the most palpable indicators of social status within societies structured by racial hierarchies. This tangibility may telescope, and thereby emphasize, top-down subordinating aspects of racial thinking, eclipsing or sidelining other ways that racial thinking might work.

However, race is also characterized by interiority, that is, forms of consciousness, whether as part of political movement, such as Black Power, or intellectual debate, such as Anténor Firmin's rejoinder to Joseph Arthur de Gobineau. Numerous other thinkers in the Americas have approached race through forms of consciousness and the formation (and deformation) of the self. Outstanding examples include American intellectual W.E.B. Du Bois, whose notions of "soul" and "spiritual strivings" were crucial to his analysis of what he identified among African Americans as "double consciousness" or the "sense of always looking at oneself through the eyes of others" in "a world which yields [African Americans] no true self-consciousness."[17] Another leading figure is Martinique's Frantz Fanon, whose concern with the "sphere of psycho-affective equilibrium" in the Francophone colonial world drew him to conclude that the colonized, particularly "native intellectuals," are torn between two worlds: their own and that of the colonizer.[18] These critiques focus on the impact of racism as a debilitating force but from "bottom-up" rather than "top-down" forms of agency. Focussing on the internal domains of mind and thought, scholar-activists like Du Bois and Fanon were able to draw from the concept of race more nuanced forms of agency than simply its being imposed from without and something that is categorically uniform

and uniformly pernicious. Race in the Americas cannot be broached without this key consideration. It would be fascinating to learn more about how "bottom-up" perspectives might look in Russia: what kinds of critiques of racial thinking and its practices do they contain? Even without Fanon's "two worlds" of colonialism or the "twoness" that Du Bois argues African Americans always feel, the racialized body takes on, and produces, internal as well as external meaning and significance, which can be most obvious to those who most acutely and directly experience the injuries of racial thinking and its practices. Moreover, and perhaps counterintuitively, among these peoples "race" is not necessarily always an expletive to be deleted.

A fascinating example of the objective to recuperate race in service of antiracism comes from another corner of the Francophone Caribbean over three-quarters of a century earlier. In 1885 Haitian anthropologist Anténor Firmin wrote an important (and still insufficiently studied) rebuttal to Joseph Arthur de Gobineau's influential *Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races*, published in 1855. Firmin's lengthy tome, *The Equality of the Human Races (Positivist Anthropology)*, sought to discredit the pseudoscientific racism propounded by de Gobineau and his contemporaries, along with the larger legacy of racism that Firmin saw as not legitimately a part of, or necessary to, the empirical (as he saw it) existence of race. Firmin's agenda was not to reject the concept of race but, rather, to approach it outside of social hierarchy.[19] As scholars have observed, Firmin viewed what he called "positivist anthropology" as an objective, science-based means of studying human difference without the bias of structural hierarchies or ranking.[20] His reenvisioned concept of race was based on a belief that the race concept had potential for asserting racial equality as well as, for example, reclaiming pan-African history – such as the Egyptian basis of Greek and Roman cultures (long preceding Martin Bernal), which, Firmin thought, would provide an optimistic roadmap for the future of, as he termed it, the "Black race."[21]

Firmin's work is not simply an example of a subaltern point of view in the historical discourse of race. His efforts and philosophical position beg the question of whether there is a difference between rac*ial* thinking and rac*ist* thinking. Both involve agency in that they are social constructions – ways of thinking conceived by human beings within particular historical, social, and cultural contexts. But precisely because they are social constructions, the question is can hierarchy be extricated from the framework of race? Can racial iden-

tity have explanatory value that does not reinforce prefigured and inevitable characteristics? Race, like all epistemological categories, is a process of certain forms of agency (ideas, practices). Can these – and science in general – ever be neutral, as Firmin interpreted "positivism"? Over a century after Firmin's work had slid toward the margins of the academic canon, the philosopher Audre Lorde expressed this conundrum metaphorically, as the impossibility of dismantling the master's house with the master's own tools. Yet most natural scientists today assume the objective, unbiased bases of their models and hypotheses. For Firmin, "race" was an empirical, self-evident fact, although, importantly, not a self-evident truth, due to the biases that inflected the pseudoscience of his contemporaries and predecessors, de Gobineau included.

Firmin drew his ideas about positivism from the work of August Comte; that is, "scientific inquiry guided by factual evidence."[22] Crucially for him, then, "the case for racial equality is to be built upon facts, not simply philosophical rebuttal."[23] He characterized de Gobineau as being "a man blinded by passion,"[24] while he, conversely, believed that "the truth somehow meanders its way to the light."[25] The "cult" of Science, the "unknown god" is growing "day by day, governing Man's mind, controlling his spirit, subjugating his heart while dominating his reason."[26] Facts are reached through the teleological progress that propels science toward truth, revealing truth not as predetermined opinion but as reason. Firmin also focussed on his contemporary Paul Broca, another influential member, like de Gobineau, of Europe's community of scientific racists. An enthusiastic proponent of craniology and anthropometry, Broca promoted the idea that human intelligence is connected to brain size and that "superior races" have larger brains than "inferior races." To this presumption Firmin responded that "Scientific progress and our steadily increasing understanding of phenomena will no doubt deal a death blow to all the conclusions he [Broca] reached."[27] This kind of unreasoned science became all the more unscientific with its dubious premise of "pure" races, given that "human beings have always interbred wherever they have come in contact with one another."[28] Even more unscientific were the numerous, competing, and contradictory racial typologies. For example, "a given group will be classified among the white race in a particular naturalist's classification, among the yellow race in another's system, and among the black race in still another's model."[29] Classifying peoples differently, without consistent criteria,

these typologies were key evidence of the "arbitrary and idiosyncratic principles," and thus scientific illegitimacy, upon which racial classification was based.[30] A fact can be declared "scientific" only empirically: "by assigning it distinct characteristics within a natural grouping, only when one is certain that the phenomenon is consistent and that its aspects are identified as belonging only to it."[31]

Yet in spite of, or because of, his trenchant critique of the dominant racial classificatory systems of his day, Firmin did not reject the concept of race itself. The reason is perhaps suggested in his book's dedication:

> To Haiti. May readers of this book meditate on its content, and may it help to accelerate the movement of regeneration in which my race is engaged under the limpid blue skies of the Caribbean! May it inspire in all the children of the Black race around this big world the love of progress, justice, and liberty. In dedicating this book to Haiti, I bear them all in mind, both the downtrodden of today and the giants of tomorrow."[32]

The progress of science means the progress of people – where science is what measures development – and cultures and societies are what substantiates that development. Both advance along an evolutionary path that keeps the premise of race necessary and indispensable. For example, his contemporary, geographer Elisée Reclus, opined that, "'true beauty is rarely found among Negroes'…"[33]; Firmin rebutted that "beauty, as everything else, is not the exclusive preserve of any particular race." He continued, however, that if beauty were to be the perspective from which races are evaluated, then focus should not be on "Black populations living in a savage state and in Africa." More reasonable would be to seek comparisons "among Blacks living in milder environments than the torrid zones of the Sudan and Guinea and enjoying a higher degree of civilization." Not surprisingly, perhaps, his comparative population of choice was in Haiti, "where the African race, transported to a relatively mild climate, evolved from a slow beginning to a higher intellectual and moral life as a result of a change in environment." Although Firmin confirms that one finds indubitable examples of beauty among "the White race of Europe," he says that this has not always been the case. The "same evolutionary forces now at work among the Black race of Haiti manifested themselves in the past among the European populations and are still pursuing their slow and persistent action."[34]

Thus, according to Firmin, all races have potential to improve, in the form of evolutionary progress that primarily entails adaptation to environment over time – for example, the "debilitating heat of the tropical sun" in equatorial Africa, whose societies may not yet have "produced anything that would bring them glory or earn them the admiration of the civilized nations who are so difficult to impress"; still, there is reason to hope for their future.[35] Humans differ according to skin colour and physical features, but "they are all brothers … equal in intelligence and thought."[36] The idea of racial types is still at work, but they do not constitute fixed rankings based on Firmin's look askance at bias and presumption. Hierarchy is contingent on context and eventually (teleogically) changes for the better. Racial types are snapshots of lifeways in progress. However, given Firmin's commitment to combat racism that parades as science, the "actions of the Blacks of Haiti" – i.e., the Haitian Revolution – "offered the most complete refutation of the theory according to which the Negro was a being incapable of grand and noble actions, incapable especially of standing up to White men."[37] In other words, one need not repudiate race when making a case for pride, value, and achievement within the historical (empirical) realities of unequal relations of power that are structured by racial hierarchies. Hierarchy was the problem, not race.

In a sense, Firmin was critiquing precisely what makes race a floating signifier: a slipperiness that evades the scientific method and thus the ability to control the arbitrary and idiosyncratic nature of symbolic representation – that is, the biases of a misguided "science" that conflated fact and presumption. The contrast between what is symbolic and what is material is a problem of meaning and, hence more broadly, of culture. Foreshadowed by Firmin, as twentieth-century Western epistemology transformed its views on racial (and ethnic, cultural, and religious) "types," phenotype and purportedly innate behavioural traits increasingly became distinguished from what was "cultural" to what was "biological."[38] The "biological" consisted of empirical facts which are self-evident irrespective of interpretation and whose realities, therefore, are not influenced by modes of representation or "culture" (in short, slant or bias). Through the influence of the early twentieth-century ethnographer Franz Boas, for example, North American anthropology's basic premise is that human behavioural variation is a consequence of cultural differences that are learned and shared, rather than innate biological tendencies. Like Firmin, Boas (a physicist by training) did not reject the concept of race, and like

Firmin, he saw biology and culture as distinct. For Boas, biology consisted of scientific truths, and it was a moral imperative to recognize culture as manifestly different from biology. By implication, social hierarchy and bias were the problem rather than the concept of race per se. Resonating with Firmin's general sentiments, Boas's writings aimed toward antiracist instruction about the differences between biology and culture.

The idea that distinguishing "culture" from "biology" discourages the intrusion of racist preconceptions into classifications of racial type is a familiar part of contemporary Western racial discourse. It has not, however, taken hold uniformly and remains an ambiguous and debated distinction today. In imperial Russia, as well, the "boundary between biology and culture was very blurred" (Tolz chapter 1). Influence from Western European discourses of human difference contained "ambiguities in interpreting the relationship between physical features, innate moral and behavioural characteristics, and culture," where "biological factors were often seen as directly relevant to defining [ethnicity and nationality], whereas definitions of race included references to cultural attributes" (Tolz). By the end of the nineteenth century, both Russian and European scholars were noting the "terminological sloppiness" of human diversity discourses, where groups were defined in terms of physical features, language, and other cultural factors (Tolz).

This evasive or absent meticulousness in terminology was what Firmin was targeting as key to enabling scientific racism and the perpetuation of arbitrary hierarchies. In imperial Russia, the issue was not about promoting antiracist methodology; at stake, rather, was the meaning of Russian identity. Establishing ethnic and national character became, by the mid-nineteenth century, the special domain of the emerging academic discipline of ethnography. As Tolz explains, the ethnography of the day assumed that physical features, innate cultural and moral characteristics, and ways of life were closely linked and were moulded by various natural environments and climates. The forebear of Russian ethnography Nikolai Nadezhdin cemented these (Western European-derived) views by theorizing that mental and moral characteristics are innate, primordial, and emanate from the "inner self" (Tolz). Thus biology and culture needed to be linked if hierarchies were to be established. At the same time, Nadezhdin granted that hierarchies were not fixed because education had the potential to reconfigure them. Nonetheless, the conjunction of biolo-

gy and culture meant that "national or tribal character" was construed as primordial, stable, and transmitted from generation to generation by heredity (Tolz). Other Russian scholars also proposed the generational transmission of race, evident in both phenotype and way of life. As Tolz observes, according to nineteenth century Western European and Russian worldviews, where cultural determinism stopped and biological determinism began was difficult to decipher. Culture was treated similarly to biology: as rigid, intractable, clearly bounded, and inheritable.

HERITABILITY

A consistent thread in these discourses of race, biology, and culture – both in the Russian and the Caribbean and Americas contexts – is the complex issue of heritability. The idea that something can be passed down indefinitely over time, from person to person, family to family, community to community, generation to generation, irrespective of social context or conditions, is arguably what makes "culture" and "biology" analogous, doubly able to perform the same "race work" – Rebecca Chiyoko King-O'Riain's shorthand for the political and cultural effort that is required to institutionalize racial meanings and their putative biological and cultural linkages.[39] As anthropology teaches, culture is learned and shared, and, as such, lies outside the domain of the natural and innate. But it turns out that the mechanisms of learning and sharing are not self-evidently within one distinct domain, if the learning and sharing operate according to biological models. Heritability functions much like race does: both are floating signifiers, subject to the sway of various circumstances yet shaping those circumstances at the same time.

In what Diane Austin-Broos calls a "discourse of heritable identity" in Jamaica, inheritance is the "operative word that subsumes both notions of racial difference grounded in biological being, and also notions of cultural difference produced by environing historical experience."[40] Ideas about the inheritance of social and cultural environment are crucial because Jamaicans – like other Caribbean peoples, I would add – for the most part do not view races as inherently hierarchical. Heritable identity in Jamaica refers to biological inheritance or heritable difference "constituted and reproduced through the sustaining of distinct environments."[41] Although diminished relative to cultural conceptions of race, the biological view of race is still present in

the Caribbean, an abiding legacy of Euro-colonialism. What might be called a cultural view of race connects identity and its transformations to the particular conditions of one's social environment. However, this view is not a counternarrative to the biological sense of race in the Caribbean because, as Austin-Broos points out for Jamaica, it can be "naturalized through the view that environmental effect in fact becomes internalized."[42] Environmental conditions are categorized in class terms, so that class possesses its own forms of heritable identity. Classes are ranked along hierarchical lines and, accordingly, express themselves through associated cultural practices and worldviews. In this way, race can become a "cultural" phenomenon and "class" a natural one. "Culture" and "biology" become, as Tolz argues, difficult if not impossible to distinguish, and divisions of space, such as spatial segregation, as Lemon argues, channel knowledge about material relations, in the process creating or reinforcing racial identities and the class attributes that represent those identities. In Jamaica (and the wider Caribbean), social class is a commonly recognized feature of daily life and what explains the dynamics of privilege and disprivilege, in the past and in the present.[43] In Russia (imperial and Soviet), the realities of social class have been a more diffuse or denied aspect of daily life, experienced, as Lemon and Tolz show, in ways other than directly acknowledged in official or popular discourse. In both the Caribbean and Russian cases, however, environmental effects are internalized; class and race are idioms that are culturally interpreted as heritable in some fashion and thus are naturalized into a condition that blurs the boundaries between what is "cultural" and what is "biological."

The relevance of the discourse of heritability for thinking about the relationship between race and class, culture and biology, and the particularities of Western European epistemologies about human difference is also found in what is known as the "culture of poverty" concept. This concept emerged from postwar America, a time when social inequality, social unrest, racism, and immiseration shaped the mood of the country (and much of the world). It gained prominence in the 1960s primarily through anthropologist Oscar Lewis's cross-cultural studies of poverty and the work of sociologist and politician Daniel Moynihan on urban poverty, race, and ethnicity. The concept's fundamental premises, if not its name per se, also have had a major and lasting effect on the characterization of Caribbean societies, particularly the British West Indies, largely through the 1936 publication of

Thomas Simey's *Welfare and Planning in the West Indies* and the 1945 publication of the *West India Royal Commission Report*, known more commonly as the *Moyne Commission Report* after its author Lord Moyne (Walter Guinness). These reports were commissioned by the British Colonial Office to investigate the various forms of unrest (particularly labour unrest) that increasingly riddled Caribbean colonies during and after the Great Depression. Adopting a model of what Christine Barrow calls the "social pathology" approach, the reports zeroed in on the Caribbean family as the core of the alleged dysfunction, specifically identifying the so-called "matrifocal," or female-centred, male-absent family, as the root cause of the threats to social and moral order.[44] The debilitations responsible for these societies' disorganization and malfunction were attributed by observers (policy makers, scholars) to the deprivations and lack of opportunity in the colonial and postcolonial Caribbean. At the same time, it was thought that alleged cultural deficiencies like matrifocality would remain ingrained as long as the social conditions that perpetuated and channelled them generationally were not alleviated.

The culture of poverty concept emerged as a new attempt to understand poverty not as a momentary condition but as an encompassing way of life, a "subculture with its own structure and rationale."[45] A number of scholars have argued that the culture of poverty is best thought of as an approach rather than a theory per se because it consists of an "arbitrary, ethnocentric, and psychologically reductionist" bundle of 70 traits decided by Lewis.[46] At its crux was the premise that this subculture is self-perpetuating, "passed down from generation to generation along family lines" – that is, learned and shared, as defines all cultures, according to anthropological frameworks.[47] Although the populations that Lewis saw as afflicted with the culture of poverty were not race-specific, under the influence of Moynihan's focus on what he saw as the pathology of the black family, the culture of poverty became largely associated with urban African Americans. In this sense the concept acted as a racializing metonym, akin to "meth moms" vis-à-vis whiteness (Lemon chapter 2). The premise subscribed to by Lewis and Moynihan, among others, that the culture of poverty tends to perpetuate itself generationally, resonates with Lemon's reminder that there are numerous kinds of materiality connected to race and racial identity that go beyond the material body. Culture is the general inheritance of all human beings; subculture, at least in the form of the culture of poverty, is the specific inheritance

of community and family. Today the culture of poverty approach carries little scholarly weight, due to subsequent decades of dedicated critique. But it remains pervasive in popular wisdom as an explanation of what appear to be unchangeable expressions of inequality and the poor's assumedly intractable responses to it. As Lemon demonstrates, the division of space and the movements within them can express race without words. One could argue that the discourse of equality in the Soviet Union is one of heritability. Heritability is an agent that similarly permits voiceless yet abiding and powerful messages.

CONCLUSION

The comparative study of race necessarily involves a number of thorny questions. How do we identify race without preconfirming it; i.e., how do we avoid finding what we are looking for even before we have started to look, thereby superimposing a presentist or ethnocentric lens onto phenomena that require a more relativist or historicist approach? The processes by which race is socially constructed similarly require consideration of the realities of "exceptionalism" (for any region or nation state). It also requires examination of the ways and contexts in which local ideas and worldviews disseminate outward across the globe and, conversely, how ideas and worldviews that began as capacious objectives (e.g., Western European race science and its critiques) take on particular meaning and significance in local contexts and how this particularization, if you will, maintains enough distinctiveness to be comparable on a transnational or global scale. We need to identify patterns among ideas, worldviews, and practices while at the same time recognizing their dissimilarities. In his analysis of anthropology's historical engagement with the concept of culture, Trouillot considered the difference between words and concepts. One word can express numerous conceptualizations, he explained, and a conceptualization can live beyond the expiration of the word that once captured it. "Conceptualizations, whether or not encapsulated by a single word, take full significance only in the context of their deployment"; therefore, theories are "built on words and with words, but what ties those words together is always a specific moment in the historical process."[48] Trouillot's insight and Tolz's and Lemon's model case studies seem to me productive anchors from which to advance our continuing inquiries, discussions, and debates about the comparative study of race.

NOTES

1 Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Global Transformations: Anthropology and the Modern World* (New York: Palgrave, 2003).
2 Ibid., 35.
3 Karen Fields and Barbara Fields, *Racecraft: The Soul of Inequality in American Life* (New York: Verso, 2012).
4 Michael Taussig, "Culture of Terror – Space of Death. Roger Casement's Putumayo Report and the Explanation of Torture," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26, 3 (1984): 467–97.
5 Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 5–6.
6 But see Aisha Khan,"Journey to the Center of the Earth: The Caribbean as Master Symbol," *Cultural Anthropology* 16, 3 (2001): 271–302.
7 Stuart Hall, "Creolization, Diaspora, and Hybridity in the Context of Globalization," in *Créolité and Creolization Documenta 11 Platform 3*, ed. Okwui Enwezor, et al. (Ostfildern, Germany: Hatje Cantz, 2003), 193.
8 E.g., Michel-Rolph Trouillot, "Culture on the Edges: Creolization in the Plantation Context," *Plantation Society in the Americas* 5 (1998): 8–28.
9 "Barbara Bush Calls Evacuees Better Off," *New York Times*, 7 September 2005.
10 Pierre Bourdieu and Loic Waquant, "On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason," *Theory, Culture & Society* 16, 1 (1999): 41.
11 Ibid., 44.
12 Robin Sheriff, *Dreaming Equality: Color, Race, and Racism in Urban Brazil* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2001), 4; Michael G. Hanchard, *Orpheus and Power: The Movimento Negro of Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paolo, Brazil, 1945–1988* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994); France Winddance Twine, *Racism in a Racial Democracy: The Maintenance of White Supremacy in Brazil* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1998); John D. French, "The Missteps of Anti-Imperialist Reason," *Theory, Culture & Society* 17, 1 (2000): 107–28.
13 Renato Rosaldo, *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989).
14 E.g., Barbara Weinstein, *The Color of Modernity: Sao Paolo and the Making of Race and Nation in Brazil* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2015).
15 Aisha Khan, *Callaloo Nation: Metaphors of Race and Religious Identity among South Asians in Trinidad* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004).
16 Nathaniel Knight, "Chto my imeem v vidu, govoria o race? Metodologicheskie razmyshleniia o teorii I praktike rasy v rossiiskoi imperii," forthcoming article in *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*. Thank you to the author for sharing an

English-language version of this paper ("What Do We Mean When We Talk About Race? Methodological Reflections on the Theory and Practice of Race in Imperial Russia"), which was presented at the Jordan Center for the Advanced Study of Russia in 2015.

17 W.E.B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007 [1903]), 34.

18 Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press, 1963), 210.

19 Anténor Firmin, *The Equality of the Human Races (Positivist Anthropology)*, trans. Asselin Charles (New York: Garland, 2000 [1885]).

20 E.g., Carolyn Fleuhr-Lobban, "Introduction," in *The Equality of the Human Races (Positivist Anthropology)*, Anténor Firmin (New York: Garland, 2000), xi-xlvi.

21 Martin Bernal, *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1987).

22 Fleuhr-Lobban, "Introduction," xvii.

23 Ibid.

24 Ibid., lviii.

25 Firmin, *The Equality of the Human Races*, 204.

26 Ibid., 2.

27 Ibid., 40.

28 Ibid., 64.

29 Ibid., 19.

30 Ibid.

31 Ibid., 187.

32 Ibid., li.

33 Quoted in ibid., 186.

34 Ibid., 187.

35 Ibid., 401.

36 Ibid., 404.

37 Ibid., 399.

38 Fleuhr-Lobban, "Introduction."

39 Rebecca Chiyoko King-O'Riain, *Pure Beauty: Judging Race in Japanese American Beauty Pageants* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006), 3–4.

40 Diane J. Austin-Broos, "Race/Class: Jamaica's Discourse of Heritable Identity," *New West Indian Guide* 68, 3–4 (1994): 218.

41 Ibid., 220.

42 Ibid., 230.

43 Ibid., 213.

44 Christine Barrow, "Anthropology, the Family, and Women in the Caribbean," in *Gender in Caribbean Development*, ed. Patricia Mohammed and Catherine

Shepherd (Cave Hill, Barbados: University of the West Indies Press, 1988), 157.

45 Oscar Lewis, "The Culture of Poverty," in *On Understanding Poverty: Perspectives from the Social Sciences*, ed. Daniel P. Moynihan (New York: Basic Books, 1968), 187.

46 Philippe Bourgois, "Poverty, Culture of," *International Encyclopedia of the Behavioral and Social Sciences* (2001), 11905. www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii.

47 Lewis, "The Culture of Poverty," 187.

48 Trouillot, *Global Transformations*, 98.

PART TWO

The Limits of Universalism

4

Racial Purity vs Imperial Hybridity: The Case of Vladimir Jabotinsky against the Russian Empire

Marina Mogilner

> Natural factors produce *race*. A complex, roaring mishmash of economic factors distorts and changes racial traits to such an extent that the impact of race historically disappears; [its influence becomes so negligible] that modern science almost completely ignores race. However if progress eventually brings some order into this maelstrom of multiple and diverse economic interests … then the race principle, which hitherto has been overshadowed by other influences, will draw itself up and blossom.[1]

This pronouncement of Vladimir Jabotinsky (1880–1940), the internationally best-known and most passionate Russian Zionist of the twentieth century, was made in 1903, literally at the entry point of his career as a Jewish politician and a Zionist. In this statement, completely ignored by his numerous students, Jabotinsky not only explicitly indicated the nature of his Jewish nationalism but also effectively summarized – using the "race" trope – the key Russian public debate of the early twentieth century. This was the debate between advocates of traditional imperial complexity and modernists and nationalists striving, just as Jabotinsky, for postimperial simplicity and purity.

The complexity of the old empire was often understood as a consequence of its archaism or traditionalism, as reflected in the under-systemized diversity of its population and territories, the "legal pluralism" of imperial law, or the overlap of multiple identity categories (of social estate, confession, native language, etc.) in the official popula-

tion politics. In other words, this complexity resulted from the coexistence and partial overlap of incongruent categories and practices of difference, each capturing or dealing with only one type of diversity. Together, these semi-isolated classifications (based on either social status, culture, or political leaning, economic function, etc.) produced a matrix of numerous multidimensional social niches and contextual identities.[2] The Great Reforms of the 1860s stimulated social and geographical mobility, rapid urbanization, and the rise of the mass society, which only exacerbated the structural imperial situation of heterogeneity. For the majority of the population existing largely beyond the sphere of public discourses, the conflict between the multiplicity of social interactions and the government's attempt to impose a rationalized and unified institutional framework was experienced through confusions of everyday experiences. The same urge to rationalize that was behind the Reforms and the growing complexity of the imperial situation presented a major challenge to the discursive communities of "educated society." Their political weight and intellectual reputation depended on the ability to produce a coherent worldview based on the rational episteme of modern social science. The coherent logic of social analysis offered two possible answers to the challenge of a heterogeneous society: to consciously embrace the "complexity" of the lived reality of the empire and develop a new metalanguage of science and politics that accepted complexity as the norm, or to radically reject it in favour of the modern, nationalized ideal of "pure forms" and "simple things."

Both strategies received their political and epistemological realizations in the early twentieth century. Politically, the Russian parliament, the State Duma, created in 1905–06 in response to exponentially mounting societal pressure, legitimized empire as a space of irregular diversity and complexity. The Duma brought together deputies representing "metropolitan" and "colonial" nations, specific regions, religious groups, political parties, and social estates (or, rather, each of them identified with a few "constituencies" at the same time).[3] A still more comprehensive embrace of imperial complexity occurred beyond the sphere of conventional politics, in the form of the late imperial epistemological revolution. It took shape in fields of modern knowledge as diverse as soil studies, linguistics, geography, archaeology, and physical anthropology. Leading representatives of these fields, who were also actively engaged if not always in direct politics then in debates about politics and the strategies of imperial modernization, developed a dis-

tinct metalanguage of "hybridity" or, rather, its equivalents at the time – "mixing" (*smeshenie*) and "crossing" (*skreshchenie*) (insofar as "hybridity" had not yet entered the Russian vocabulary). In the process, they elaborated the methodological approach that would later be called "structuralism." Early Russian structuralism was based on broad comparative analysis that identified "elemental parts" of any complex system and studied their mutual relationships, beyond any preexisting hierarchies of "supreme" and "subaltern" elements. In linguistics, for example, this meant parting ways with the classical Humboldtian paradigm of pure types and direct genealogies.[4] In race science, this meant an exclusive focus on a "mixed racial type" as the only plausible anthropological reality, a classificatory approach based on establishing degrees of sameness between anthropological indicators (not "races"), and a critical problematization of the principle of "pure form."[5]

At the opposite extreme of this trend one finds examples of the modernism of "pure forms" and "simple things," represented by anti-imperial nationalist politics, nationalist and even racist science, and diversity-blind, universalizing projects of social engineering. Naturally, the latter was a "learned ignorance" that deployed itself in a broad ideological range, from conservatism to socialism.[6] The last Russian emperor, Nicholas II, partook in this anti-imperial-complexity turn, as he stubbornly insisted that his empire was a nation-state of "true Russian people." Locked in the virtual reality of an "imagined community" of a nonexistent homogeneous and obedient Russian ethnoconfessional nation, the regime of Nicholas II ceased to rely on a traditional repertoire of imperial rule, while refusing to consistently adopt any of the modern scenarios of hybridity and complexity.[7] He thus undermined the mechanisms of checks and balances of the old imperial situation and did not offer a new workable alternative, which led to the collapse of the historical Russian Empire.

The anti-imperial-complexity paradigm was as broad as its counterpart and similarly signified the departure from the classical Humboldtian view. In particular, culture was not always central to this primarily neopositivist discourse, and "purity" was not something organic and uninterrupted. Rather, it was imagined as having been endangered and distorted by the empire, whether perceived as a colonial state, an unjust political regime, or a state of irregular diversity that prevented Russia from ripening and maturing as a modern nation-state. Hence, "purity" was something that had to be reclaimed and even reengineered with the help of modern science, experts, and

political entrepreneurs equipped with modern visions of progress. In this sense, the late imperial discourse of "pure forms and simple things," just as the discourse of hybridity, in many ways anticipated mid-twentieth-century postcolonial critique.[8]

As one of the most eloquent participants in this public debate, Jabotinsky made the categories that he used (such as "race," "racial mixture," "pure blood," "empire") and a concern for the postimperial return to original pure forms central to the construction of Jewishness as a modern national identity. Not accidental or rooted in some specific and isolated Jewish political discourse, these terms typified "a range of tropes for imperial, multinational, multiethnic entanglements of the imperial situation."[9]

This is not to deny that Jewishness in and of itself presented an archetypal case of imperial "complexity." Jews' multilingualism, composite identities, and multiple loyalties, their symbolic role as quintessentially modern/capitalist and equally quintessentially archaic/degenerate, their assumed mutual differences and at the same time imagined mutual sameness and universal recognizability made Jews difficult material for modern champions of purity. The very self-definitions – Russian Jew, German Jew, or assimilated Jew – conveyed a sense of multilayered and contextual "imperial" identities rather than a sense of national purity. The streamlining of these identities in terms of modern racial purity and exclusive nationality represented simultaneously "another, though less well-known, side of modern Jewish thought"[10] and a specific instance of the larger global trend to steer away from imperial complexity.

"Why did the passage from empire to nation produce such a violently racist ideology?"[11] This question, fully applicable to the case of Jabotinsky's Zionism, was articulated by Peter Perdue, a student of Chinese history, in the context of his study of "re-racing" of the Chinese nation by early twentieth-century Chinese (Han) intellectuals, who advanced a neopositivist understanding of purity and racial superiority in their struggle against Manchu political and ideological hegemony.[12] In a broad comparative perspective that Perdue's question helps to set, the case of Vladimir Jabotinsky emerges as the case of an anti-imperial intellectual against the empire as a polity and an epistemological order.

FINDING THE TRUE POST-IMPERIAL SELF

Vladimir Jabotinsky was born in 1880 to an integrated Jewish family in the cosmopolitan port city of Odessa that had preserved the feel of a borderland and the somewhat uprooted existence of its diverse population up until the end of the old empire.[13] After the death of Vladimir's father in 1886, his mother still found the means to send him and his sister first to a Russian elementary school and later to the best secondary educational establishment in Odessa – the Richelieu gymnasium. As a boy, he never attended heder and his home language was Russian. Jabotinsky's multilingualism and his preference for Hebrew came later, after his self-reinvention as a Jew and Zionist politician. Regardless of his retrospective attempts to present his life story as a version of the Jewish *Bildung*, it is accurate to say that he actively and consciously began studying Hebrew and Yiddish only in late 1903, after his trip to (but not yet actual participation in) the Sixth Zionist Congress in Basel.[14] By that time he was twenty-four years old and a successful journalist at the leading Odessa newspaper who aspired, not very successfully but nonetheless very vigorously, to become a recognized Russian playwright and writer. At sixteen, he embarked upon translating into the Russian language the texts of stars of modernism and their precursors such as Paul Verlaine, Sándor Pétofi, and Edgar Allan Poe. And naturally, he composed original literary works himself. He would send them to leading Russian writers seeking their approval and support. Jabotinsky believed that his true place was among them and progressive-minded Russian intelligentsia in general.[15]

Michael Stanislawski describes this early Jabotinsky as a cosmopolitan intellectual who could have called his spiritual motherland Russia or Italy and easily combined European liberalism with Russian populism. Stanislawski's deconstruction of the normative Zionist narrative of Jabotinsky's life reveals the image of a man whose national identity dissolved itself in cosmopolitan European culture, in which the meaning of terms such as "nation" or "race" was fluid, never precisely defined and fixed, regardless of the language (Russian or one of the European languages) in which the young Vladimir Jabotinsky might have discussed them.[16] It is important however to remember that before he actually got a taste of the short-lived fin-de-siècle European cosmopolitanism, he had experienced imperial Russian "cosmopolitanism" of the kind that promised integration into the imperial nation through adopting the Russian cultural idiom. And this idiom

was anything but ethnonational. Especially in a place like Odessa, secular intellectuals such as Jabotinsky carried out their Jewishness primarily as an external stigma almost unrelated to their actual upbringing, religion, education, and linguistic limitations or preferences, and thus their belonging to the Russian imperial discursive ("imagined") community never connoted the betrayal of some inborn identity of the colonized in favour of the ethnically Russian colonizer.[17] In other words, this was not a classical subaltern dilemma informed by the binary vision of the imperial society. Integration into the Russian imperial idiom meant reaching out toward a higher and a-national culture for people like Jabotinsky. This culture was universalist, modern, and dynamic, and it engendered an imagined "complex" supra-ethnic community of people – the Russian intelligentsia – who shared common values, social ideals, and a language of political and cultural self-expression and communication.

Rising anti-Semitism was only one factor leading to the crisis of this worldview. On a more fundamental level, Jabotinsky reacted to the general nationalization of politics in the empire. The drift away from imperial "complexity" and the narrowing and simplification of the meaning of Russianness motivated him and intellectuals like him to embrace a radical postimperial national agenda that did not recognize the legitimacy and reality of hybridity and the fluidity of social and cultural forms. The individual and social-political planes of this transformation are impossible to separate: as we shall see, when the young Jabotinsky talks about Jewish nationality as being based on race or discusses the danger of biological contamination in an imperial situation, he always keeps in mind his own belated Jewishness, compromised by the imperial complexity.

Jabotinsky's earliest attempt to find a Jewish national idiom of purity can be dated to April 1903, when he published the newspaper article "An Apocryphal Story." This was a parable about a man and his two wives, Mirra and Mira. The underlying gender code of his social imagination revealed itself in full force in the portrayal of the Man/Husband/God as embodying the will and wisdom of the nation. Similarly to the way that Man perceived Mirra and Mira, his two wives, all nations were equal before the God – Jabotinsky taught – but he valued most their unlikeness and distinctiveness: "a Greek has always remained a Greek, and a Jew [has always been] a Jew – as for me there is neither Greek nor Jew."[18] The inversion of the meaning of this famous line (Galatians 3:28) is obvious here: instead of quoting a

canonical "for you are all one in Christ Jesus," Jabotinsky added a prescriptive statement about cultivating national differences. The biblical allusions in this story, as well as its "Jewishness," seem to be only superficial stylistic instruments for conveying a pseudo-Jewish wisdom. In reality, this was a story about the old imperial diversity (you are all one to the dynastic authorities) redefined in the light of a modern postimperial nationalism: you have always been distinct and different and should remain so. Your distinctiveness and purity should be reestablished and preserved.

Jabotinsky believed that empires had distorted the natural frames of social formations (and individual selves such as his own). But in a harmonic and justly organized postimperial world, the return to these natural frames and principles of social existence was inevitable.[19] In the years of the first Russian Revolution (1905–07), when the wave of mass politics shook the foundations of the traditional imperial order, Jabotinsky began propagating the idea of *Nationalitätenstaat* "for all tribes and all regions." He singled out two empires as the probable champions of this transition: the Russian and the Ottoman (under the Young Turks).[20] These contiguous polities with hybrid cultural and social formations were objectively destined to disappear, and revolutions were to speed up this process. In 1907 Jabotinsky appealed to the deputies of the State Duma with a plea to embrace one simple principle of political representation, that is, to regroup according to a single criterion of nationality. The only type of politics he deemed legitimate in the Duma was the anti-imperial politics of voluntary and mutual differentiation. "In our political narrow-mindedness (*obyvatelshchina*) this is called nationalism, sometimes even 'narrow' nationalism … I have never been ashamed of this label."[21]

THE TROPE OF "PURE BLOOD"

"The sense of national specificity is in the man's 'blood,' in his physical-racial type, and only there," wrote Jabotinsky in 1904, and continued, "it is not in one's upbringing that we should look for the source of the sense of national."

> That is why we do not believe in spiritual assimilation. For a Jew who is born without any admixtures into generations of Jewish blood to adopt the psyche of a German or a Frenchman is physically as inconceivable as for a Negro to cease being a Negro. It is

> even more inconceivable, because the nucleus of one's psyche is a much more inseparable and irremovable race feature than the color of skin, facial index, or skull form. A Jew reared among Germans may adopt German traditions, words, and habits, [he can] be soaked to the bone with German fluid [*nemetskoi zhidkostiu*] – but the nucleus of his psyche would remain Jewish because his blood, his body, and his physical-racial type are Jewish.[22]

If such a culturally Germanized yet "pure-blood" Jew marries a "pure-blood" Jewess, Jabotinsky continued, "their son again will be incontrovertibly Jewish to the very marrow of his bones."[23] This unusually deterministic reasoning is striking, coming from someone who had never before doubted his own ability to participate in the imperial Russian, or indeed in some cosmopolitan European, "psyche" if not body. The story of a pure-blood Jewish couple that was culturally assimilated into another high(er) culture, producing a *son* who was Jewish only by virtue of his inherited blood, was a version of Jabotinsky's personal family history reduced to its biological essentials. This interpretation made Jabotinsky's belated national awakening resemble something scientifically predetermined and objectively inevitable.

Since 1904, the theme of "pure blood" was firmly established in Jabotinsky's understanding of self and in his political rhetoric. Obviously, Jewish concerns with assimilation played their role in this developing fixation. However, on a deeper level, cultural hybridity as a false and passing phenomenon that would be washed out together with other debris of the imperial past, disturbed Jabotinsky's less than biological hybridity – this almost inevitable imperial legacy, at least in the Russian imperial situation. His personal rebellion against the cultural, discursive, imperial domination seemed to yield real results, or so he thought. Biological colonialism, on the other hand, was irreversible.

> It is not in the power of a human being to assimilate with the people of a different blood. For true assimilation, one has to change the body: to become their kin by blood, that is, through a sequence of mixed marriages, over the course of many dozens of years, to produce such a great-grandson, who would have only a negligible admixture of Jewish blood … There is no other way. As long as we remain Jews by blood, the children of a Jew and a Jewess, we may be subject to threats of persecutions, disdain, or degra-

> dation, but assimilation in the proper sense of the word, assimilation as the complete disappearance of our psychological specificity – is of no danger to us.[24]

The purity of race was the only guarantee against assimilation and the real disappearance of the Jewish nation. "The prevalence of mixed marriages – this is the only unmistakably efficient means to exterminate nationality as such,"[25] concluded Jabotinsky as early as 1904. He fused these biological arguments with political ones in the polemics with Russian Jewish autonomists, who advanced the "Habsburg" model of cultural-administrative autonomy for Jews in the Russian Empire. Autonomy in the imperial framework was absolutely unacceptable to Jabotinsky, who claimed that it would only contribute to the proliferation of mixed marriages:

> [B]eing myself a brunet, who has nothing against blonds, and living in a city with 15 percent of dark-haired population and 85 percent of light-haired people, I would encounter and befriend blonds at least three times more often than with brunets. And if a Jew socialized among non-Jews three times more intensively than among Jews, it would be only natural (taking into consideration their complete mutual agreement and respect) that in 75 cases out of 100 he would feel attracted not to a Jewish woman, but to a woman of another kin (*inoplemennoi*).[26]

All the major themes of Jabotinsky's early nationalism of "pure forms" can be traced in this passage: the male as the main actor on the marriage market and hence the one responsible for reproduction of the nation with pure blood (the proverbial "son"); the danger stemming from the urban imperial "mating pot"; the menace of hybridity; the meaningless and even counterproductiveness of the struggle for collective Jewish rights within the imperial setting; and the belief in the biological foundation of social phenomena.

JEWS AS A (EUROPEAN) PHYSICAL RACE

The very first Zionist journalistic project with Jabotinsky's participation was the Russian-language Zionist weekly *Evreiskaia zhizn'* (Jewish Life), founded in St Petersburg in 1904. The first thing the weekly did was to commission the translation of a fundamental study by the

Polish race scientist Ignacy Maurycy Judt, *Żydzi jako rasa fizyczna* (Jews as a Physical Race).[27] The editors of *Evreiskaia zhizn'* did not even bother to adapt the Russian translation of Judt's work for a nonacademic audience. It came out in installments in five consecutive issues in 1904[28] and introduced the reader to a respectable international academic tradition of studies of the Jewish race. The work considered Carl Vogt, Bernhard Blechmann, Josef Deniker, Constantine Ikow, and many other leading European anthropologists. Judt analyzed an impressive amount of anthropometrical and historical material to support the idea of the Jews as a single race that had been formed in the times of ancient Israel through the process of racial mixing. Since then, the Jews had preserved their racial wholeness and uniformity and did not mix. There was, however, a revisionist element in Judt's theory, compared to the then Zionist mainstream (for which "race was a necessary component"[29]): he did not consider the Jews to be Semites (except for the language). For him, they were Europeans, a Mediterranean race, for, as his data demonstrated, their racial type was made up of the same racial elements that participated in the formation of European race families.

The theme of Europeanness – both the Europeanness of Russians and Russia and the Europeanness of Eastern European Jews – loomed large in contemporary debates about Russia's historical destiny as well as the Jewish future. Russian-Jewish race scientists made their original contribution to this debate by claiming that racial indexes of the Russian Jews corroborated those common to other "cultural peoples" of Europe[30] or by stressing mixed racial basis of the Jews of the Russian Empire and interpreting this as an essentially European feature.[31] Moreover, one of the leading Russian-Jewish physical anthropologists, Samuel Weissenberg, implied that because the claimed mixing had occurred in the Caucasus, Russian Jews were intimately linked to Europeans by having been racially transformed on the model of the Caucasian race.[32] For Jabotinsky, as for many of his Russian-Jewish contemporaries, Europeanness had always been an essential part of their Russianness as a fundamentally modern identity, and it remained so for their newly embraced Jewishness.

More than twenty years after Judt's publication in *Evreiskaia zhizn'*, Vladimir Jabotinsky – then the leader of revisionist Zionism – almost verbatim reproduced quotations from *Żydzi jako rasa fizyczna* in his exemplary Zionist novel *Samson* written in Russian (published in installments in the Zionist journal *Rassvet* in 1926 and as a separate

edition in Berlin in 1927).[33] To me, this is the best proof of the profound influence of Judt's anthropology on Jabotinsky. In *Samson*, Jabotinsky combined Judt's anthropological gaze with his own fixation from the early 1900s on the purity of blood, thus indirectly pointing to the original context of formation of his Zionism. One of the main themes of the novel is racial mixture: the dilution of "local races" of Canaan in the "savory and dense blood of the gloomy [Jewish] colonizer." When one of Samson's fellow Jews remarked, "our blood is chosen … it is like spring water; it cannot be poured into street puddles," Samson corrected him: "We are not water, we are salt. They are water; hit water with your hand – and it will scatter. Now, throw a handful of salt into a cask with water. It is not that the salt will disappear, but that the whole cask will become salted."[34]

Racial mixing was not an even process, it was rather conceptualized as a hierarchical racial colonization – justified in ancient times and in the case of Jews as colonizers but unacceptable as a modern imperial practice and especially with Jews as the colonized. Samson in the novel symbolized not the mixing/colonization but its proud and self-conscious result. His unhappy relationships with two Philistine women, Semadar and her sister Elinoar (Delilah), permeated with treason and deception, were highly instructive warnings against any further racial mixing. Except for these complicated relationships, Samson was an ideal self-conscious Jew with the eye of a professionally trained race scientist, who

> not once visited towns and villages of the Jebusites, the Girgasites, [and] the Hivites, and could distinguish between them at first sight, while he recognized Hittites by their backward-sloping foreheads, and narrow-lipped Amorites by their proud stature even from afar.[35]

On a town square, he would observe

> numerous aborigines (*tuzemtsev*), residents of Tzora. From their [spatial] arrangement, poses, and mood an attentive observer could reconstruct a complete picture of relationships between the two races … Within a circle of women-Danites one could notice quite a few typical Canaanite profiles: these were second and third wives, concubines, mothers-in-law, sisters-in-law – harbingers of the beginning dissolution of the careless aboriginal race in the sultry and dense blood of the gloomy colonizer.[36]

Samson made his choice in favour of the Jewish nation following the call of his "dense blood," being aware of his particular racial origin and his connection to a particular land where his race had been formed. This Samson had no right to intermix.

Jabotinsky knew the clear sociological definition of the nation of Samsons well before he wrote the novel. In one of his newspaper columns in 1911 ("Beyond the Waiting Line") he wrote:

> It [the ideal nation] should possess an original racial spectrum, drastically different from the racial nature of its neighbors. It should occupy continuous and clearly bounded territory from time immemorial; it is best if on this territory there are no alien minorities that would thin out its national unity. It [the nation] should have an original language, a native language that is not borrowed from anyone – at least, the fact and moment of borrowing would be impossible to trace … It should possess a national religion – not a borrowed one, but a native, home-made one, like the religion of the Hindus or, at least, of Jews. Finally, it is supposed to have a single historical tradition, common to all its parts, that is a complete commonality of historical emotional experiences from the most immemorial antiquity.[37]

Only the purity of blood, the reproduction of race (the "substance of nationality" in Jabotinsky's words) could guarantee the realization of this ideal of modern European nationalism.

JEWISH RACE VERSUS RUSSIAN RACE

The sociological model of the "nation of Samsons" was unattainable in the imperial situation and not necessarily only for the Jews. Modern Russian nationalists of the early twentieth century struggled especially hard to reframe the complex imperial Russianness in such restrictive normative categories. Lacking a coherent, or at least uncontested in purity, Russian "national body" and struggling to "simplify" the overlap between the contiguous imperial territorial possessions and what could have been imagined as the Russian national "heartland," they equally felt that empire in many ways had distorted the natural order of things.

One of the most outspoken among these modern Russian nationalists, the psychiatry and neurology professor of Kiev St Vladimir Univer-

sity Ivan Sikorsky (1842–1919), was in some sense a mirror image of Jabotinsky.[38] He actively participated in nationalist politics and in polemical wars against hybridity and tried to educate his readers about the phenomena of race and nationality. In terms of its open advocacy of the modernity of "simple things and pure forms," Sikorsky's message was close to the postimperial message of Jabotinsky, only it was advanced on behalf of a different national project that had more reasons and more resources to claim its hegemonic status vis-à-vis other nationalisms in Russia. Sikorsky believed that the time had come to do away with archaic "imperial life and the independence of particular peoples." Russia had to start living a truly national life – the life of the "Russian people and the state created by this people."[39] Similar to Jabotinsky, Sikorsky acknowledged the fact of "racial mixing" in antiquity that had led to the formation of modern races, including the Russian race. Both of them shared the vision of human history progressing from the racial to the national stage. At the latter stage, race functioned as the basis for modern nations consciously developing themselves and professing "national individualism" (Jabotinsky's term). Sikorsky explained that a genuinely fruitful racial mixture, one enhancing the qualities of races, was achievable only as the result of voluntary convergence of mutually complementary races.[40] In his view, this was the case of the Russian race that resulted from the "correct" convergence of the Slavic and Finnish races: the latter voluntarily physically dissolved in the Slavic race, changed religion, and embraced a better "instrument for expressing thoughts," that is, Slavic language.[41] Similar to Jabotinsky's racial history of Jews in Canaan, Sikorsky's Russian racial history presented the story of a race-colonizer absorbing inferior races. The resulting stable formula of the Russian race ensured the durability of the modern Russian nation.[42]

If Jabotinsky suggested the rejection of any sort of (imperial) hybridity, cultivation of a pure race and colonization of Palestine as the two main strategies of forging the Jewish nation, Sikorsky insisted that the ability of the Aryan-Russian race to absorb the lower yet complementary races without losing its racial purity could turn the Russian empire into the Russian state, and the imperial society into the Russian nation.[43] Similar to Sikorsky's construction of Russians and Jews as the only historical subjects in the empire, Jabotinsky also stressed the symmetry between them:

> I consider Russia an amazing country: the best Slavs and the best Jews live there. Best in the sense that they are entirely whole,

> entirely devoid of that superficiality that Ahad Ha'am decried in western "Israelites" as "Slavery in freedom."[44]

Sikorsky and Jabotinsky were definitely partners in the postimperial dialogue and, regardless of their strong political differences, stood together in the clash between imperial complexity and the nationalized modernity of "simple things and pure forms."

In 1911, Jabotinsky literally played out their uneasy dialogue in the feuilleton *Exchange of Compliments: Conversation*, in which two interlocutors, a Russian and a Jew, discussed racial differences.[45] The Jew started with a statement that humanity was divided into races, but they were all equal. To a sceptical remark from the Russian, "How come? Chukchees and Hellenes are equals?" he replied that if put in conditions similar to those of ancient Hellenes, Chukchees would have produced values equal to those that the Hellenes gave to the world.[46]

The very opposition of Chukchees and Hellenes was not incidental. In the discourse of new Russian nationalism, Russians stood for a nation that belonged to the Western civilization rooted in the ancient Greek and Roman heritage. The traditional themes of the mysterious prehistoric Slavic past played little role in this discourse. Chukchees in this model exemplified the primitive stage of development, civilizational and historical deadlock. On the other hand, in the Russian fin-de-siècle debates about nationalism, Chuckchees rhymed with Jews, as both were described through the powerful trope of primitivism. Gabriela Safran has shown how the fashionable idea and aesthetics of primitivism could encompass the Chukchees alongside the Jews as communal and traditional peoples, unspoiled by capitalism and colonial interventionism.[47] Well-known Russian Jewish ethnographers and activists (Populists and Autonomists) such as Shloyme Zanvl Rappoport (S. An-sky) and Lev Shternberg hold such views.[48] Nathaniel Deutsch picked up on Safran's observations in his exciting and innovating study of the primitivization and nationalization of the Pale in the Russian-Jewish ethnographic discourse of the early twentieth century. He called it "an unspoken paradox":

> Jews were at once civilized and semi-savage, ethnographers and potential objects of ethnography … By the beginning of the twentieth century, the Pale of Settlement had produced numerous intellectuals, artists, political activists, and ethnographers, but An-

sky suggested that its Jewish residents were still somehow akin to "Buryats, Yakagirs, Giliaks, Chukchis, and others."[49]

The Jew in Jabotinsky's feuilleton exhibited the same "paradoxical" logics, and most probably Jabotinsky's informed readers shared in this same imperial discourse of primitivism. The Jew's fictional opponent was definitely capable of recognizing it: it is tempting to suggest that he was intentionally painted based on someone like Professor Sikorsky, knowledgeable in race science and broadly read in academic fields such as ethnography, anthropology, and history.

> I cannot say that I completely agree with [Houston Stewart] Chamberlain, although he is a very intelligent and very thoughtful thinker. I also cannot completely agree with your own [Otto] Weininger, although he cites many striking, profound arguments that prove that the Jewish race is defective, so to speak. Then, I read something written from your side as well – by [Heinrich] Graetz, who discards race altogether, and by a new author [Ignaz] Zollschan, who thinks that the Jewish race is superb.[50]

Besides giving us a glimpse into what Jabotinsky himself read on Jewish race, this statement offers a quite precise intellectual frame to interpret the fictional debate that appears to be rooted in contemporary European racialized thought, from overtly anti-Semitic (Chamberlain) to nationalist Zionist (Zollschan). The United States as a testing ground for racial politics was also part of the frame. The Russian interlocutor in particular insisted on the importance of the American case for exposing the inability of democracy to accommodate the objectively existing fact of racial inequality. Sikorsky made such an argument more than once, directly connecting racial Jewish otherness with the African American ("Negro") otherness in American society:

> There, the predatory sensuality and erotic boldness of Negro elements present a danger for each white woman who finds herself near a colored fellow. Separate coaches in railway trains, special halls in restaurants, and the very fact of a profound segregation of whites from blacks cannot be explained only by the Negro's odor or his skin color. To an even greater degree, this segregation is caused by the danger of the wild instinct. Defending against it, a

> cultured American cannot restrain himself from pogroms and lynch law.[51]

In his turn, Jabotinsky also liked to comment on the race problem in the United States, trying to show that racial hatred knew no boundaries and did not depend on a political regime or a level of civilization of a given society. In one of his newspaper columns from 1910, "Homo Homini Lupus," he explicitly compared US racism with the "Jewish question" in Europe and Russia. For him, this was essentially the same politics of racial discrimination, with antiblack racism presenting its most extreme version: "A Russian Jew, if he cannot bear it anymore, after all, can convert. American Negroes were Christians long ago, and they have no further resort. Race cannot be washed out."[52]

Formally, the Jewish interlocutor won the fictional debate but only by giving away his racial egalitarianism and accepting the hierarchical racist worldview. Not unlike the fictional Russian, who referred to the authority of Graetz in his speculations about Jewish historical failures as being reflective of their racial inferiority, the Jew in the story used the empire's most popular Russian school history textbook by Dmitry Ilovaiskii to speculate about the Russian national character. He interpreted the foundational story of the "invitation of the Varangians" to rule over the "Russian" tribes or the subsequent submission of Russian princes to Mongol rule as evidence of the weakly developed Russian national self-consciousness and hence their inferior racial basis.

> [S]hould we begin measuring one against the other, all will depend on the yardstick, and I … will insist then on a yardstick of my own: one is higher who is more adamant, who can be exterminated but cannot be "taught a lesson"; those who never, even when oppressed, would give away their inner independence. Our history begins with the words "you are a *stiff-necked people.*" And today, after so many centuries, we are still struggling, still rebelling, we have not given up. We are an indomitable race forever and ever. I do not know a higher aristocratism than this one.[53]

Aristocratism – a favourite word in Jabotinsky's writing on nationalism – connoted dignity, but like any aristocratism it had to be based on the exclusivity of origins. The Jews may have been colonized externally, but they preserved their "aristocratic" purity of blood and dig-

nified perception of the self. This uncompromising stance made empire and colonialism historically irrelevant and brought closer the positions of Jabotinsky and ideologists of racial anti-Semitism such as Sikorsky, who advocated the complete exclusion of Jews from Russian life.

"On Mimicry and Man" and Instincts

Jabotinsky loudly declared his position in the discussion triggered by the 1908 article "Jews and Russian Literature," by his close friend and fellow-Odessian, popular literary critic Kornei Chukovsky (born Nikolai Korneichukov). Chukovsky instigated a huge scandal in intelligentsia circles by openly articulating what had already been in the air – the idea of Jewish organic otherness.[54] Jabotinsky did not wait long to reiterate the "sad conclusion" that Jewish participation in Russian literature had yielded no useful fruit and that Russia should be left for Russians.[55] He accused the Jewish intelligentsia of abandoning their own people and putting themselves into the service of the colonial culture. In the late Russian imperial context, such accusations sounded neither original nor uniquely Jewish. Rather, it referred to the typical imperial dilemma of many intellectuals of various nationalities, whether Ukrainian, German, or Jewish. Jabotinsky understood it only too well when he articulated his accusation in a specific Jewish and at the same time general anti-imperial polemical mode, in which provincialism, nature, and purity were opposed to urbanity, centrality, and hybridity. He compared Jewish culture to a village, a remote provincial nook, and the act of abandoning this village – to migration to a big colonial urban metropolis. He even gave this metropolis a precise name: "every mediocre man prefers Rome to a village."[56] Rome, as the archetypal empire's centre and the favourite European destination of the pre-Zionist Jabotinsky, connected his personal and impersonal anti-imperial iconoclasm on a higher generic level.

Presented in such a demonstratively straightforward way, Jabotinsky and Chukovsky's position in the debate on Jews and Russian literature mobilized the entire spectrum of late imperial society, keenly attuned to understand all the nuances of their message. The Zionist Russian-language periodical *Rassvet* (Dawn) found an especially intuitive way to convey the sense of mimicry, embedded in his critique of Jewish self-betrayal:

> You [the Jews] are very able, but any village boy can dance the *Kamarinskaya* [Russian folk dance] better than you. Hence, here is my advice for you: *do not grimace, stay true to yourself the way nature and your long history created you.* [emphasis added][57]

This metaphor carried all the main ideological connotations of the anti-imperial and antihybrid position: non-Russians' participation in Russian culture was no more than superficial mimicry (grimacing, aping); Russianness itself was an ethnonational rather than an imperial complex identity; being a natural product of his racial base and national soil, the dancing Russian village boy embedded cultural creativity – unlike the most sophisticated Jewish mimic man. The main target of this pronouncement was not modern Russian ethnocultural nationalism but all forms of living imperial complexity. It is in response to Jabotinsky and Chukovsky (not to the anti-Semitic Sikorsky!) that Vladimir Tan (Bogoraz), a well-known Populist, writer, and ethnographer with multiple cultural and social loyalties fervently protested (also invoking neopositivist rhetoric): "I cannot reject my double nature. To which extent I am Jewish, and to which I am Russian – I myself do not know. If you want to find out, carve out my heart and weigh it."[58]

Only very few participants in the debate were able to perceive with irony the discrepancy between the personal biographies and complex cultural contexts of Jabotinsky and Chukovsky and their militant call for "purity":

> Ah! Stick to your race!
> Ah! A Jew only for the Jews!
> A Papuan only for the Papuans!...
> But where are Korney's [Chukovsky's] roots?[59]

Much less effective were ritualized reminders coming from representatives of the old-type Russian intelligentsia about the danger of racism for the Russian empire: "sharp-toothed kids are already opening up their jaws and are preparing to squabble in the Macedonian style."[60] The collapse of the imperial order was precisely Jabotinsky's goal!

The provocative debate about the Jews and Russian culture was followed by a literary provocation: in June of 1912, the newspaper *Odessa News* published Jabotinsky's most controversial story, "Edmee," which seemingly had nothing to do with Russian culture and Russian Jews.[61] It told the story of the platonic love of a fifty-

year-old German-Jewish doctor for a twelve-year-old girl. This much less famous predecessor of Nabokov's *Lolita* was only stylized as a psychological and ethical exploration. In fact, it was an ideological conversation about the organic rejection of Jews by Western culture and about Jewish compromised Europeanness. As long as Jews postponed their becoming an independent nation in a separate nation-state, their Europeanness remained a hollow attribute (an element of Jewish false consciousness).

Today "Edmee" may be read as an illustration of Said's *Orientalism*, but one must not forget Jabotinsky's conscious and masterful manipulation of the languages of difference and distance. The story opens with the following remark of the main protagonist:

> The Orient! It is entirely foreign to my soul. Here you have a living refutation of your theories about race and the call of blood. I was born a westerner regardless of the treacherous form of my nose.[62]

The hero travelled to the East, having been upset in the West, where he, a distinguished scholar and successful doctor, was denied a university chair. He rejected conversion as a way of obtaining the position but solely due to an aesthetic aversion to such a solution. His escape to the East was motivated by an "unconscious protest of the race feeling. You offended me, so in turn, to spite you I am going to the native land (*rodnuiu storony*) of my race."[63]

Stanislawski has shown how deeply the doctor in "Edmee" depended on European mental geography: the East for him begins in Constantinople, at this imagined border of European civilization. His "native land" is not directly associated with Palestine but coincides with everything that European civilization rejected as tasteless, uncultured, lacking individuality and sophistication. On the island of Prinkipo the doctor meets the daughter of the French consul, twelve-year-old Edmee. Although she grew up in Constantinople and had no recollections of her early European childhood, Edmee bore "the stamp of the West" and symbolized "refined Western culture in *partibus infidelium*."[64] For the professor, she literally embodies the pure Western body and beautiful and delicate Western soul.

As Edmee's family was preparing to leave the island, she told the doctor that she would miss her "only friend in Prinkipo." He was flattered and puzzled: "Am I indeed your only friend in Prinkipo, Edmee?

What about girls with whom you play? Say, Cleo?" And with Edmee's reply the story ends:

> Oh, Cleo … You know, she is a Jewess and this tells it all. In general, what I hate about Prinkipo is that there are always many Jews around. They are so vulgar, I cannot stand them. Can you? [65]

This "cannot stand" was not a product of Edmee's European upbringing, which she never had; the repulsion of Jews was dissolved in her blood. Jabotinsky's most decadent story was thus reducible to one simple argument about the instinctive anti-Semitism of Western culture.

Its real semantics, however, was more complex and firmly entrenched in the specific offshoot of the Russian late imperial debate about hybridity and purity. During the public reading of the play *White Bone* by Sholom Asch in 1909 in a Moscow private salon, someone in the audience critically commented on the play's main female protagonist. Sholom Asch remarked in response that only a Jew knowledgeable about Jewish everyday life could understand her. The writer Evgenii Chirikov, who happened to be among the guests that evening, turned the same accusation against Jews who, he claimed, were equally incapable of understanding Russian life and psychology. This, however, never prevented them from active participation in Russian literature and literary criticism. This seemingly insignificant story found its way to the pages of mass periodicals and generated heated polemics, which reached a peak in March of 1909 after the leading Russian liberal politician and intellectual Peter Struve had published his article, "Intelligentsia and the National Face," in the newspaper *Slovo* (Word).[66] By that time Struve had completed his evolution from legal Marxism to the criticism of intelligentsia revolutionarism, to liberal imperialism of the "Greater Russia" and new Russian nationalism.[67] He subscribed to the liberal agenda of providing equal rights to individual citizens of the empire but demanded that the Russian intelligentsia become self-consciously "nationally Russian," defending its right to feel and publicly express elementary and natural "repulsions" of non-Russians, Jews in particular. Struve revised the old thesis that "nationality is race":

> Once they thought that nationality means race, that is, the skin color, the width of nose ("nasal index"), etc. But nationality is

> something much more apparent and at the same time delicate. It is spiritual attractions and repulsions. To become aware of them, one does not have to use anthropological instruments or genealogical studies. They live and tremble in our soul. [68]

And he continued:

> The Russian intelligentsia has always regarded Jews as their own, as Russians, and this was not something accidental, something granted for nothing or as a "misunderstanding." A conscious initiative to reject Russian culture and establish Jewish "national" specificity belongs not to the Russian intelligentsia, but to that Jewish movement known under the name of Zionism … I do not sympathize with Zionism, but I understand that the problem of Jewish nationality exists, and that at the moment this is probably even a growing problem. And at the same time, in Russia there are no other aliens (*inorodtsy*) playing the same role in Russian culture as the Jews. And another complication: they play this role while remaining Jewish.[69]

Jabotinsky, who was implicitly addressed in this passage, called Struve's ambivalent position vis-à-vis Jews "a-Semitism," which was not yet anti-Semitism but a transitional stage in the Russian intelligentsia's postimperial transformation.[70] In 1910, he explained it by an analogy with US racism, which, in his view, was based on "something elemental, like the 'national repulsions' of Mr Struve. That is why they, the white people, in fact cannot bear the presence of a Negro."[71] In 1911, Jabotinsky called "repulsions" the "abnormal life expressions of a nation," which, nevertheless, revealed the presence of "national instincts" that were always healthy. They prevailed over reason if a nation was denied other means of self-expression.[72] In "Edmee," Jabotinsky developed this argument further by questioning the localization of "attractions and repulsions" in some ephemeral national "soul." Instead, he located them in something more real and tangible – in the nation's blood. Jabotinsky in fact sided with Struve and other Russian modern nationalists who called for recognition and rationalization of the "repulsions and attractions" as legitimate political categories corresponding to the natural order of things.

SACRIFICIAL POSTCOLONIALITY

In his last and probably the most accomplished novel, *The Five*, published in Paris in Russian in 1936, Jabotinsky offered a postfactum interpretation of his "case" against the Russian empire.[73] Scholars who have studied *The Five* believe that it is "best classified as an autobiographical novel, with its fictional overlay giving Jabotinsky the freedom not just to indulge in nostalgia for a lost past, but also to offer a deeply felt commentary on the telling matters of the day that came to determine his future direction."[74] Stanislawski even argued that the book provides a more nuanced account of Jabotinsky's spiritual and ideological development than the Hebrew-language autobiography that he had written a few years earlier.[75] If so, *The Five* is the most tragic account of the transition from imperial complexity to postimperial simplicity and purity. The novel is set in an imperial city – a topos so central for Jabotinsky's crusade against hybridity, interracial marriages, and cultural assimilation. The city is of course the beautiful and vibrant Odessa. The narrator, often identified with Jabotinsky, tells the very sad story of five deaths, five suicidal choices of members of the Russian-Jewish Milgrom family, who followed the hopeless path of assimilation and along the way lost their organic connection with the Jewish collective body and soul, while gaining nothing in exchange. The Milgrom children either die literally (Marusya and Marko) or turn into helpless invalids (Serezha) or become baptized (Torik) or disappear in the revolutionary underground (Lika). Jabotinsky equated the last two choices to death.

In the last paragraph of *The Five* Jabotinsky dreams about settling peoples on islands ("I don't want neighbors; I want all people living on their own islands"). He was already living in the postimperial world. The collapse of the Russian, Austro-Hungarian, and Ottoman empires, as well as Jabotinsky's experience in rapidly nationalizing Poland and in Palestine, where the British exposed the worst aspects of the camouflaged colonial politics and the Arab-Jewish confrontation intensified, confirmed his deep belief that the road toward "recovery" should lead through disintegration. The island utopia may thus seem the most extreme expression of this motto.

However, from the vantage point of *The Five* – a novel about the disintegration of modern empires (the metaphorical multifaceted "Odessas") – the appearance of the "national island" on the ruins of the former mainland was not a moment of postcolonial triumph but

rather a social catastrophe and personal tragedy, a sacrifice on the altar of the future nation. Culture was sacrificed to nature ("race") and complexity – to simplicity. Hybridity was replaced with purity and irresponsible, even immoral yet wonderful, freedom – with the grim determinism of race. Instead of seductions of glamourous megapolises came self-isolation on small national islands. Jabotinsky's anti-imperial nationalism turned out to be a sacrificial postcoloniality that dwelled on "race" as the strongest positivist explanation and the impersonal, objective justification of the painful self-reductionism that he and many intellectuals like him had agreed to endure in the name of their modernity of "simple things and pure forms."

NOTES

1 Altalena, "Vskolz': O natsionalizme," *Odesskie Novosti* no. 5874 (30 January 1903): 4. Altalena was one of Vladimir (Zeev) Jabotinsky's pennames.

2 On the description of the "imperial situation" and its applicability as an analytical concept, see Ilya Gerasimov, Sergey Glebov, Jan Kusber, Marina Mogilner, and Alexander Semyonov, "New Imperial History and the Challenges of Empire," in *Empire Speaks Out: Languages of Rationalization and Self-Description in the Russian Empire*, ed. Ilya Gerasimov et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 3–32; on the "imperial rights regime," see Jane Burbank, "An Imperial Rights Regime: Law and Citizenship in the Russian Empire," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 7, 3 (2006): 397–431.

3 Alexander Semyonov, "The Real and Live Ethnographic Map of Russia": The Russian Empire in the Mirror of the State Duma," in Gerasimov et al., *Empire Speaks Out*, 191–228; Rustem Tsiunchuk, *Dumskaia model' parlamentarisma v Rissiiskoi imperii: etnokonfessional'noe I regional'noe izmerenie* (Kazan: Fen, 2004); idem, "Peoples, Regions, and Electoral Politics: The State Duma and the Constitution of New National Elites," in Jane Burbank, Mark von Hagen, and Anatolyi Remnev, eds., *Russian Empire: Spaces, People, Power, 1700–1930* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007), 366–97; Diliara Usmanova, *Deputaty ot Kazanskoi gubernii v Gosudarstvennoi Dume Rossii: 1906–1917* (Kazan: Tatknigoizdat, 2006).

4 On the "late imperial epistemological revolution," see the thematic cluster in *Ab Imperio* 17, 1 (2016): Ilya Gerasimov, Sergey Glebov, and Marina Mogilner, "Hybridity: Marrism and the Problems of Language of the Imperial Situation," 27–68; Ekaterian Pravilova, "Contested Ruins: Nationalism, Emotions, and Archaeology of Armenian Ani, 1892–1919," 69–101; Louise McReynolds, "Nikolai Marr: Reconstructing Ani as the Imperial Ideal,"

102–24; Alexander Dmitriev, "Philologists-Autonomists and Autonomy from Philology in Late Imperial Russia: Nikolai Marr, Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, and Ahatanhel Krymsky," 125–67; Michael Kunichika, "Hybridity: A Comment," 168–77.

5 Marina Mogilner, *Homo Imperii: A History of Physical Anthropology in Russia* (Critical Studies in the History of Anthropology series) (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2013).

6 "Learned ignorance" is Ann Stoler's term. She traces it to "deliberately educated ignorance," coined by W.E.B. Du Bois, "cultivated ignorance" by Foucault, and "sanctioned ignorance" by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, in which Stoler emphasizes the linguistic-aphasic rather than cognitive elements of occlusion of knowledge. See Ann Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009), 247. Such learned ignorance characterized, for example, the nineteenth-century Russian populism that was blind to the diversity and interconnectedness of the social space of empire because it interiorized the perception of society as a holistic social order. For a more detailed discussion, see Ilya Gerasimov, Marina Mogilner, and Alexander Semyonov, "Russian Sociology in Imperial Context," in *Sociology and Empire*, ed. George Steinmetz (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013), 53–82.

7 Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy from Peter the Great to the Abdication of Nicolas II* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).

8 Ilya Gerasimov, Sergey Glebov, and Marina Mogilner, "The Postimperial Meets the Postcolonial: Russian Historical Experience and the Postcolonial Moment," *Ab Imperio* 14, 2 (2013): 97–135.

9 Kunichika, "Hybridity," 171.

10 Mitchell B. Hart, "Jews and Race. An Introductory Essay," in *Jews and Race. Writings on Identity & Difference, 1880–1940*, ed. Mirchell B. Hart (Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2011), xix.

11 Peter C. Perdue, "Erasing the Empire, Re-racing the Nation. Racialism and Culturalism in Imperial China," in *Imperial Formations,* ed. Ann Laura Stoler, Carole McGranahan, and Peter C. Perdue (Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press, 2007), 141–72, here 145.

12 Ibid., 141–69.

13 On the history of Odessa, see Steven Zipperstein, *The Jews of Odessa: A Cultural History* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1986); Patricia Herlihy, *Odessa: A History, 1794–1914* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991); Anna Makolkin, *History of Odessa, the Last Italian Black Sea Colony* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004); Tanya Richardson, *Kaleidoscopic*

Odessa: History and Place in Contemporary Ukraine (Anthropological Horizons) (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008); Charles King, *Odessa: Genius and Death in the City of Dreams* (New York: Norton, 2011); Ilya. V. Gerasimov, "The Subaltern Speaks Out: Urban Plebeian Society in Late Imperial Russia," in *Spaces of the Poor: Perspectives of Cultural Sciences on Urban Slum Areas and Their Inhabitants*, ed. Hans-Christian Petresen (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2013), 147–70.

14 Jabotinsky's father, Evgenii, was originally from Novorossiya (New Russia). He worked as a commercial agent for a Russian sea trade company. He was not an observant Jew and did not speak Yiddish. Jabotinsky's mother, Chava (Eva) Zak, grew up in a well-to-do family in Berdichev. She knew Yiddish but was assimilated and culturally oriented toward German and Russian cultures. Among the best known biographies of Jabotinsky, see Joseph B. Schechtman, *Rebel and Statesman: The Vladimir Jabotinsky Story* (New York: Yoseloff, 1956); idem, *Fighter and Prophet: The Last Years* (New York: Yoseloff, 1961). Schechtman was Jabotinsky's comrade-in-arms and wrote his biography as hagiography; Shmuel Katz, *Lone Wolf: A Biography of Vladimir (Ze'ev) Jabotinsky*, 2 vols. (New York: Barricade Books, 1996); Hillel Halkin, *Jabotinsky: A Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014), in which he faithfully follows Jabotinsky's autobiography. Jabotinsky produced two strictly autobiographical narratives that were published during his life: *Story of My Life* (originally written and published in Hebrew as *Sipur yamai* in 1936), roughly covering the period until the end of the World War I, and *Story of the Jewish Legion*, first published in Russian in 1928. The very first English translation of the *Story of My Life*, with commentary, came out only in 2016: Vladimir Jabotinsky's *Story of My Life*, ed. Brian Horowitz and Leonid Katsis (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2016). As Brian Horowitz states in the introduction to this publication, Jabotinsky wrote his autobiography with a "political purpose: to provide the reader with a portrait of a charismatic leader who has acquired his right to lead by virtue of his biography – his family, spiritual origins, and practical experiences." Horowitz, "Introduction: Muse and Muscle. *Story of My Life* and the Invention of Vladimir Jabotinsky," in ibid., 1. On the constructed nature of this version of the Jewish *Bildung*, see Michael Stanislawski, *Autobiographical Jews: Essays in Jewish Self-Fashioning* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2004).

15 The analysis most sensitive to Jabotinsky in his Russian context in regard to his upbringing, his family background, linguistic situation, and aesthetic preferences is offered in Michael Stanislawski, *Zionism and the Fin de Siècle: Cosmopolitanism and Nationalism from Nordau to Jabotinsky* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), esp. 121–7.

16 Ibid., 116–49.

17 In this sense he was quite a typical representative of the third and second generation of Jewish urban bourgeoisie residing outside the Pale of Jewish Settlement: entrepreneurs and free professions. In these families, Jewish languages, education, and religion had been reduced to a minimum. On the social analysis of this milieu (on the basis of questionnaires distributed among Jewish students in the early twentieth century), see A.E. Ivanov, *Evreiskoe studenchestvo v Rossiiskoi imperii nachala XX veka. Kakim ono bylo? Opyt sotsiokul'turnogo portretirovaniia* (Moscow: Novyi khronograf, 2007), 77–164.

18 Altalena, "Vskol'z'. Apokrif," *Odesskie Novosti*, no. 5937 (6 April 1903): 7. Translations are the author's unless otherwise specified.

19 Altalena, "Vskol'z': O natsionalizme," *Odesskie Novosti*, no. 5874 (30 January 1903): 4.

20 Vl. Zhabotinskii, "Sionizm i Turtsia (Nakanune IX Sionistskogo kongressa)," *Odesskie Novosti*, no. 7990 (12 [25] December 1909): 4.

21 Vl. Zh., "Nabroski bez zaglavia: VIII. Rol' oppozitsii v III Dume," *Odesskie Novosti*, no. 7351 (11 [24] October 1907): 2.

22 Vladimir Zhabotinskii, "Pis'mo ob avtonomizme," *Evreiskaia Zhizn'* 6 (1904): 117.

23 Ibid.

24 Ibid., 118.

25 Ibid.

26 Ibid., 119.

27 The original: Dr J.M. Judt, *Żydzi jako rasa fizyczna. Analiza z dziedziny antropologii. Z 24 rysunkami, mapa i tablicami w tekscie* (Warsaw, 1902); idem. *Die Juden als Rasse* (Berlin, 1903).

28 I.M. Judt, "Evrei kak fizicheskaia rasa (Antropologicheskoe issledovanie)," *Evreiskaia Zhizn'* 1 (1904): 125–49; 2 (1904): 120–45; 3 (1904): 95–128; 4 (1904): 151–77; 5 (1904): 132–50. Now, English-language readers can get a feel of the text thanks to the translation project by Mitchell Hart: J.M. Judt, "The Jews as a Race," in Hart, *Jews and Race*, 60–70.

29 Hart, *Jews and Race*, xxviii.; Efron, *Defenders of the Race*; Raphael Falk, "The Zionist Men of Science: Between Nature and Nurture," in *Jews and the Sciences in German Context*, ed. Ulrich Charpa and Ute Deichmann (Tubingen; Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 129–54; Dafna Hirsch, "Zionist Eugenics, Mixed Marriage, and the Creation of a 'New Jewish Type,'" *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 15, 3 (2009): 592–609.

30 A.D. El'kind, "Evrei (Sravnitel'no-antropologicheskoe issledovanie, preimushchestvenno po nabliudeniiam nad pol'skimi evreiami," *Izvestia IOLEAE* 104 (1903): 1–458.

31 For a detailed discussion, see Marina Mogilner, "Between Scientific and Political: Jewish Scholars and Russian-Jewish Physical Anthropology in the Fin-de-Siècle Russian Empire," in *Going to the People: Jews and the Ethnographic Impluse*, ed. Jeffrey Veidlinger (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2016), 45–63.

32 On Samuel Weissenberg and his Jewish anthropology, see Mogilner, *Homo Imperii*, 217–50; John M. Efron, *Defenders of the Race: Jewish Doctors and Race Science in Fin-de-siècle Europe* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994), 90–116.

33 Zeev Zhabotinskii, *Samson* (Berlin: Slovo, 1927).

34 Translations are mine. The Russian text that I use comes from a reprint: Vladimir Zhabotinskii, *Samson Nazorei* (Moscow: Tekst, 2006), 118.

35 Ibid., 9.

36 Ibid., 39.

37 Vl. Zhabotinskii, "Vne ocheredi," *Odesskie Novosti*, no. 8398 (21 April 21 [May 4] 1911): 2.

38 The best critical biography of Sikorsky as a psychiatrist is by Vadim Menzhulin, *Drugoi Sikorsky: Neudobnye stranitsy istorii psikhiatrii* (Kyiv: Sfera, 2004). Sikorsky as a race scientist is discussed in Mogilner, *Homo Imperii*, 167–200 and Marina Mogilner, "Racial Psychiatry and the Russian Imperial Dilemma of the 'Savage Within,'" *East Central Europe* 43 (2016): 1–35.

39 Ivan Sikorsky, *Chto takoe natsiia i drugie formy etnicheskoi zhizni?* (Kiev: Litotipografiia S. V. Kul'zhenko, 1915), 52.

40 Ibid., 2–8.

41 Ibid., 7.

42 Ibid., 9.

43 Ibid., 21, 20.

44 Vl. Zhabotinskii, "Basel'skie vpechatleniia: Gertsl' i Neinsager'y," *Odesskie Novosti*, no. 6062 (23 August 1903): 3.

45 Vl. Zhabotinskii, "Obmen complimentov. Razgovor," in Vl. Zhabotinskii, *Fel'etony* (St Peterbsurg: Gerol'd, 1913), 181–94, here 181. First published as: Vl. Zhabotinskii, "Obmen komplimentov," *Odesskie Novosti*, no. 8546 (16 [29] October 1911): 2.

46 Ibid., 182.

47 Gabriella Safran, "Jews as Siberian Natives: Primitivism and S. An-sky's *Dybbuk*," *Modernizm/Modernity* 13, 4 (2006): 635–55.

48 Ibid.; Sergei Kan, *Lev Shternberg: Anthropologist, Russian Socialist, Jewish Activist* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009).

49 Nathaniel Deutsch, *The Jewish Dark Continent: Life and Death in the Russian Pale of Settlement* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011), 29.

50 Zhabotinskii, "Obmen complimentov," 183.

51 I. Sikorsky, *Antropologicheskaia i psikhologicheskaia genealogia Pushkina* (Kiev: Tipografiia S. V. Kul'zhenko, 1912). Quotations are from the reproduction of this text in *Russkaia rasovaia teoriia do 1917 goda: Sbornik original'nykh rabot russkikh klassikov*, ed. V.B. Avdeed (Moscow: FERI-V, 2002), 309.

52 Vl. Zhabotinskii, "Homo Homini Lupus," in Zhabotinskii, *Fel'etony*, 101–14, here 103.

53 Zhabotinskii, "Obmen complimentov," 194.

54 Kornei Chukovsky, "Evrei i Russkaia Literatura," *Svobodnye Mysli* (14 [27] January 1908): 3.

55 Vl. Zhabotinskii, "Pis'mo (O "Evreiakh i russkoi literature"), *Svobodnye Mysli* (24 March 1908): 3.

56 Ibid.

57 Emes, "Evrei i Russkaia literatura," *Rassvet* 3 (1908): 8–10; See especially, Ibn-Daud, "Zametki," *Rassvet* 5 (1908): 16–18, here 16.

58 V.G. Tan, "Evrei i literatura," *Svobodnye mysli* (18 February 1908): 3; See also O.L. D'Or, "Lichnye nastroeniia. Otvet Vl. Zhabotinskomu," *Svobodnye Mysli* (31 March 1908): 3.

59 N. Teffi, "Evrei i russkaia literatura," *Zritel'* (10 February 1908): 10.

60 A. Gornfel'd, "Literaturnye besedy: Chukovsky," *Stolichnaia pochta* (3 February 1908): 4; V.G. Tan, "K voprodu o natsionalizme," *Svobodnye mysli* (7 April 1908): 3.

61 I am using the following edition: Vl. Zhabotinskii, "Edmee. Rasskaz pozhilogo doktora," in Vladimir Zhabotinskii, *Piatero: Roman, rasskazy*, introduction by E. Golubovskii (Moscow: Nezavisimaia Gazeta, 2002), 254–64.

62 Ibid., 255.

63 Ibid.

64 Ibid

65 Ibid., 264.

66 Peter Struve, "Intelligentsiia i natsional'noe litso," *Slovo* (10 March 1909): 3

67 Richard Pipes, *Struve: Liberal on the Left, 1870–1905* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970); idem, *Struve: Liberal on the Right, 1905–1944* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980); Alexander Semyonov, "Russian Liberalism and the Problem of Imperial Diversity," in *Liberal Imperialism in Europe*, ed. Matthew P. Fitzpatrick (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 67–90.

68 Struve, "Intelligentsiia i natsional'noe litso," 3.

69 Ibid.

70 Vl. Zhabotinskii, "Asemitism," in *Po Vekham... Sbornik statei ob intelligentsii i*

"natsional'nom" litse, ed. F. Muskablit (Moscow: Obshchestvennaia Pol'za, 1909), 28–32.

71 Zhabotinskii, "Homo Homini Lupus," 105.

72 Zhabotinskii, "Urok Ubileia Shevchenki," *Odesskie Novosti*, no. 8355 (23 February [12 March] 1911): 3.

73 Now available in English: *Vladimir Jabotinsky, The Five: A Novel of Jewish Life in Turn-of-the Century Odessa* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005).

74 Barry P. Scherr, "An Odessa Odyssey: Vladimir Jabotinsly's *The Five*," *Slavic Review* 70, 1 (2011): 94–115.

75 Stanislawski, *Zionism and the Fin de Siecle*, 228.

5

The Racialization of Soviet Gypsies: Roma, Nationality Politics, and Socialist Transformation in Stalin's Soviet Union

Brigid O'Keeffe

In his memoirs, N.S. Khrushchev shared an anecdote that he regarded as a jolly reflection on "the plight of the consumer" in Soviet society. Khrushchev's joke narrated a Gypsy's pursuit of entrance to the Communist Party:

> "May I become a member of the Party?" he [the Gypsy] asks.
> "Yes," he's told, "but first you must fulfill certain requirements. First, work hard. Second, stop stealing, drinking, and chasing after women."
> The gypsy [*sic*] throws up his arms in despair and cries, "If I can't do those things, what's the point in living?"

Khrushchev explained, "Of course, the person who made up this story somewhat oversimplified the character of gypsies [*sic*], but the joke still makes a good point: people want to enjoy life. It's not enough to have just the bare essentials. As they say, 'man shall not live by bread alone' … We've come to the point now when there should be enough butter to spread on the bread."[1]

Khrushchev wanted his bread and his butter too – and not just in the literal sense of Soviet foodstuffs. Khrushchev wanted the enjoyment of this populist joke, reliant as it was upon an ethnic stereotype, but he also wanted to acquit himself as a good Soviet citizen who recognized that the very same joke "somewhat oversimplified" the osten-

sible "character" of an entire nationality. In this way, Khrushchev's anecdote captured one of the core tensions inherent in the Soviet politics of nationality. Khrushchev's joke essentialized Gypsies as incorrigible thieves, cheats, drunks, and oversexed ne'er-do-wells. Yet Khrushchev hastily followed up with a corrective to it – a tacit acknowledgment of the Soviet ideological tenet that all human beings could be "improved" and "remade" – even Gypsies. In this way, Khrushchev's comedic maneuver demonstrates a commonplace reality of Soviet political culture's approach to ethnicity and race. It highlights how, in practice, the Soviet ideological premise of human malleability coexisted, and often operated in tandem, with quotidian Soviet understandings of so-called "national character" as something fundamentally immutable, eternal, innate.

The Soviet nationality regime was premised as much upon the philosophical principle of the malleability of all human beings as it was the categorical tethering of Soviet citizens to nationality itself. All Soviet citizens were required to identify themselves as having a nationality. While the significance of minority status fluctuated and evolved over time, nationality mattered in the lives of Soviet citizens in ways both mundane and profoundly consequential. Soviet citizens, Khrushchev included, navigated a Soviet nationality regime that relied as much upon visions of humans' plasticity as it did upon crudely essentialist visions of the "culture" and "character" of the individual nationalities that were bonded to one another by the supranational culture of their shared Soviet citizenship. A clear tension inhered in these two visions' ideological pairing in the Soviet Union – a productive tension that worked, often simultaneously, to empower and racialize minority peoples like Roma.

Soviet nationality policy was designed with the distinct goals of socialist transformation in mind. "National in form, socialist in content" was the well-worn slogan of a nationality regime that, in its most robust guise in the 1920s and 1930s, guided nation-building efforts oriented toward transforming members of "backward" nationalities into integrated Soviet citizens. According to Bolshevik designs for how nationality policy would work in practice, minority citizens of the Soviet Union could not be passively transformed or opt out from the urgent demands of Sovietization. So-called "backward Gypsies" and their minority brethren were required to participate actively in their own Soviet refashioning, their own triumph over ethnic backwardness and historic oppression. As I have argued elsewhere, this

nationality regime did empower minority peoples to engage profitably in the performance of both nationality and Soviet citizenship. Early Soviet nationality policy facilitated the transformation of so-called "backward Gypsies" into conscious, integrated citizens.[2] Yet, to return to Khrushchev's joke, we must recognize that "the Gypsy" in the Soviet Union could, indeed, join the Party. But he could not escape the stereotype of Gypsies as thieving charlatans, drunken carousers, aimless wanderers, and unrepentant libertines.

Understanding why this is so requires an examination of the quotidian dynamics of the Soviet nationality regime. As this chapter will demonstrate, Soviet officials typically approached the wide-ranging task of making Gypsies Soviet through the prism of long-standing Gypsy stereotypes. The early Soviet public – like its prerevolutionary equivalent – craved Gypsy music and other Gypsy "exotica" that in Russia had long entertained and titillated audiences. Non-Roma, in other words, played a powerful role in the Soviet entrenchment of essentialized visions of Gypsies. In Stalin's Soviet Union, however, Roma also, and pivotally, fuelled the racialization of Soviet Gypsies via their often exemplary engagement of the Soviet nationality regime. In making their bids for the varieties of "affirmative action" to which Soviet nationality policy theoretically entitled them, Gypsies needed to justify their claims by relentlessly invoking the pernicious "backwardness" that supposedly inhered in their "national character."[3] Malleability and essentialism were the two sides of the same coin – the ostensible currency of minority status in a Soviet state committed to "state-sponsored evolutionism" for "backward" non-Russian nationalities.[4] In this way, and as this chapter will explore, early Soviet nationality policy guaranteed that no matter how successfully integrated into the Soviet economy and culture, Romani citizens of the Soviet Union could not escape their "Gypsy" nationality and the racializing discourse that vividly reinforced Gypsy stereotypes. In their daily Soviet lives, Roma often found themselves participating in and thus perpetuating that very same racializing discourse. They typically did so as a means of defining themselves as worthy Soviet citizens.

With a focus on the discursive practices of Roma and non-Roma alike during the Stalin era, this chapter will explore the historic unthinkability of a Soviet Gypsy unencumbered by the prevailing essentialized vision of Gypsies as swindlers, illiterates, marginals, parasites, nomads, and lusty sex objects.[5] Given that Soviet nationality policy was premised on both human malleability and essentialized

visions of the nationalities that it was designed to usher through state-guided socialist transformation, it is no surprise that this hyperreal vision of "the Gypsies" persisted well beyond the heyday of Soviet nationality policy in the 1920s and 1930s. This chapter demonstrates how, in the Stalin-era Soviet Union, Roma and non-Roma alike variously sought answers to the so-called "Gypsy question" and, in the process, reproduced the very same Gypsy stereotypes that they ostensibly sought to overcome. The Soviet nationality regime made it possible both for Roma to refashion themselves as New Soviet Gypsies *and* for crude essentialist visions of "the Gypsies" to flourish. Given the premises of the Soviet nationality regime, New Soviet Gypsies could not flourish without recourse to the delegitimizing essentialist visions of "Gypsies" that ostensibly justified their claim to Soviet nationality policy in the first place. In fashioning themselves as New Soviet Gypsies, Roma inescapably participated in the mobilization and maintenance of a racializing discourse that insisted upon Gypsies' supposedly unique modes of timeless ethnic backwardness.

The racialization of Soviet Gypsies was thus as much a byproduct of Soviet nationality politics as were the various Gypsy institutions that emerged in the 1920s and 1930s. The Soviet racializing discourse regarding Gypsies developed hand-in-hand with the institutional sites of Gypsy nation building as well as New Soviet Gypsies themselves. Understanding this dynamic illuminates not only the question of race in the Soviet Union but also the ways in which nationality policy impacted the lives of minority citizens and the Soviet culture that they helped to create. It reminds us, too, that reckoning with the history of race in the Soviet Union need not, and should not, be a search for conceptual absolutes and all-or-nothing propositions.

RACE, SOVIET NATIONALITY POLITICS, AND HISTORIOGRAPHICAL RETICENCE

Scholars of Soviet nationality policies and politics, including myself, have until recently proven reticent to deploy race as an analytic category in their analyses. This has not gone without notice. In 2002, *Slavic Review* published a pioneering forum in which several leading scholars debated the question of the applicability of race as an analytic category in understanding Soviet approaches to nationality and population management more generally.[6] Eric Weitz, a specialist in German history, expressed frustration with scholars of Soviet history

who resisted discussion of how, in Weitz's view, "racial politics crept into Soviet nationalities policies, especially between 1937 and 1953." Homing in on Soviet deportations of national groups and the Stalinist state's repression of "potentially dangerous expressions of nationalism," Weitz concluded that, "under Iosif Stalin, the Soviets practised – intermittently, inconsistently, to be sure – racial politics without the overt concept and ideology of race."[7]

Weitz's respondents – Francine Hirsch, Amir Weiner, and Alaina Lemon – variously challenged Weitz's provocative appraisal of the Soviet Union as a state that practised "racial politics without the concept of race." All readily acknowledged that the Soviet Union prided itself on its rejection of the "zoological" ideology of the Nazis, not to mention the racism in the United States that the Soviets were only too happy to decry. Hirsch, Weiner, and Lemon nonetheless were quick to note that the Soviets did conceptualize race in ways that, theoretically at least, could well ideologically comport with both their professed belief in the malleability of human beings *and* their avowed commitment to ethnic particularism in the service of socialist transformation. Only Lemon, however, suggested a workable methodological approach to account for sanctioned racist practice in a self-declared antiracist state like the Soviet Union. It was Lemon, too, who urged scholars to resist all-or-nothing approaches to conceptualizing and thinking historically about race.

Hirsch's response to Weitz was as markedly narrow in its approach as it was emphatic in its rejection of Weitz's interpretation. In the 1930s, Hirsch argued, Soviet anthropologists defined races as "groups of people" who shared "physiological" traits as a result of historical development, rather than an inescapable biology.[8] Most importantly for Hirsch, the Soviet Union rejected and repudiated Nazi-style racial politics. No doubt, the Soviets persecuted certain nationalities. Yet, Hirsch insisted, they did not do so with a view of those nationalities as biological inferiors in mind. Rather, they sought to diffuse what were perceived as unruly, virulent nationalisms. "To call Soviet population politics 'racial,'" Hirsch worried, "is to obscure important differences between the Soviet and Nazi regimes and their projects."[9]

Weiner joined Hirsch in refusing to accept Weitz's suggestion that Soviet nationality politics resembled Nazi racial politics. He demanded accounting for the fact that the Soviet Union never sought to eradicate or to deny national identity even to those nationalities that it tar-

geted with horrific deportations and other measures of persecution. Like Hirsch, Weiner underscored that the Soviets did conceptualize and study race. Weiner conceded that, "the Soviets never resolved for themselves the tension between social and biological categorizations."[10] Yet it is imperative, he argued, to recognize that in the Soviet Union, "at no point were racial concepts allowed to carry the day in politics or science."[11]

Of all participants in the forum, Lemon pushed the discussion in its most productive directions. Notably, Lemon's scholarship had already, prior to Weitz's intervention, called the field's attention to racial politics in modern Russia and in the post-Soviet 1990s in particular.[12] Crucially, Lemon demanded that scholars account for the fact that, in exploring the question of race and racial politics, Nazi Germany is not the only available option for historical comparison with the Soviet Union. Lemon's essay further demonstrated how a refusal to obey conceptual absolutes and historiographical norms could open analytic windows for seeing how "racial logic lives not only in the terms that refer to things but in the various ways people use language to *index relations* in specific contexts."[13] She insisted that scholars need to be attentive to how race may have been operationalized in the Soviet Union not only in national purges or deportations but also in everyday discursive practices like the ascription of ethnic identity. Lemon challenged scholars of Soviet history to consider that one need not espouse a racial ideology or subscribe to an explicitly articulated "concept" of race or even explicitly reference skin colour and phenotype in order to deploy race as a discursive practice. "Races exist only insofar as people deploy racializing criteria of difference to organize social relations," Lemon argued.[14]

Inspired by Lemon's methodological challenge, this chapter charts the racialization of Soviet Gypsies through an examination of everyday engagement of the so-called "Gypsy question" in the Stalin-era Soviet Union. It shows how Roma and non-Roma alike repeatedly described, represented, and acted upon Soviet Gypsies as a nationality that was wily, nomadic, and stubbornly resistant to assimilation. In their varied efforts to remake backward Gypsies into New Soviet Gypsies, Roma and non-Roma alike liberally reproduced negative stereotypes of Gypsies (and the rare positive stereotypes too). They developed policies, institutions, and even theatrical repertoires on the basis of these same stereotypes. In effect, they constructed and deployed a racializing dis-

course in the very name of liberating (that is, Sovietizing) a so-called "backward" minority people. The racialization of Soviet Gypsies was accomplished *in the full spirit* of Soviet nationality policy.

BACKWARDNESS AS SOVIETNESS: THE ALL-RUSSIAN GYPSY UNION[15]

In 1926, the People's Commissariat of Enlightenment (Narkompros) conceded that Gypsies posed serious challenges to socialist transformation. Narkompros singled out Gypsies as a people so peculiar, perplexing, and "backward" that they had thus far escaped the focussed attention of political-enlightenment workers. "This nationality," Narkompros officials explained, is

> extremely scattered – it leads a nomadic way of life and for now has settled only in small part. It lacks … a written language and is almost universally illiterate; it is isolated from surrounding nationalities; as a consequence of economic needs and poverty, a number of Gypsies tend to such antisocial pursuits as horse-stealing, thievery, begging, and the like.

Yet despite their overwhelming "backwardness" and subversive tendencies, Narkompros declared, Gypsies were "still another people (*narodnost'*) that has begun to awake to conscious civic life and to lay their claim to cultural-enlightenment activity."[16]

That the Soviet Union's Gypsies were undergoing a national awakening initially came as encouraging news to Narkompros and other officials. In the first years of Soviet rule, few officials expected "backward Gypsies" to step forward and demand that the Soviet state fulfill its promises to all nationalities and to Roma in particular. Some had difficulty believing that an organization by the name of the All-Russian Gypsy Union and led by a group of Romani intellectuals could be anything more than a characteristic Gypsy swindle. For a brief moment, however, Soviet officials welcomed the All-Russian Gypsy Union and its Romani activists as a potential answer to the empire's "Gypsy question." The short-lived All-Russian Gypsy Union provides an opportunity to explore nationality policy in practice in the 1920s, no less than the foundational discursive practices that came to dominate early Soviet approaches to "the Gypsy question" among Roma and non-Roma alike.

Established in 1925, the All-Russian Gypsy Union (Gypsy Union) was the brainchild of youthful Romani activists who seized upon the "affirmative action" that Soviet nationality policy promised them as members of a nationality that was officially categorized as "backward." Most of these activists descended from Romani families who had gained wealth and status in late imperial Russia as popular stage performers. In tsarist Russia, Gypsy music was a lucrative show business. Imperial Russia's elites regarded the employ of Gypsy choirs for entertainment at lavish celebrations as a marker of high status. They celebrated the fashionable Gypsy choirs for the ostensibly intoxicating "wildness" of their singing, dancing, and appearance. The choirs' performance of Russian folk songs and so-called "Gypsy romances" often fetched a high price. As "Gypsy mania" ensnared late imperial Russia's nobles, intellectuals, and merchants, the popularity of the choirs soared and so, too, did their profits.[17]

It was within this context that a Romani elite emerged among tsarist Russia's Gypsy choirs. These Romani elites strove to define themselves against the "uncivilized" Gypsies of the popular Russian imagination. In their performances and in daily life, they signalled their own respectability with their well-groomed, "European" appearance. In spite of complaints from patrons that they did not "dress like Gypsies" on stage, Russia's Romani elites wore expensive evening gowns and tuxedos. As Ivan Rom-Lebedev, one of the Gypsy Union's founders, explained in his memoirs, Russia's "choir Gypsies considered themselves to be close to high society." So saturated were their lives with the ways of elite society, Rom-Lebedev maintained, that "choir Gypsies involuntarily 'acquired polish,' assimilated good manners, knew how to behave themselves at a table, knew how to eat, drink and dress finely."[18] They outfitted their children in expensive clothing, enrolled them in elite schools, and employed domestic servants to tend to their needs.

In the wake of the October Revolution, the Gypsy choirs were deemed ideologically suspect and most collapsed under the combined weight of revolution and civil war. Yet the children of the tsarist-era Romani elite quickly adapted to the emerging Bolshevik culture. They variously worked to integrate themselves into the Bolsheviks' dictatorship of the proletariat.[19] They also sought to create their own institution, one specifically designed to spread Soviet enlightenment among so-called "backward Gypsies." In January 1924, a small group of Romani activists proposed the creation of the Soci-

ety for the Organization of the Proletarian Backward Gypsy Masses. These activists committed to battling with Gypsies' immeasurable "backwardness" – their nomadism, aversion to labour, and illiteracy. The society proposed to open schools for Romani children and literacy programs for adults. It sought to establish clubs, libraries, and industrial workshops where Roma could learn trade skills. The activists also promised to prepare nomads for "the transition to a settled way of life."[20]

In their initial appeal for state support, the activists explicitly embraced the goal of integrating Roma into Soviet culture and socialist labour but did so by implicitly playing on Gypsy stereotypes. While they focussed on Roma's education and adaptation to a productive and settled way of life, they did not speak directly of illiteracy or nomadism as endemic to Roma. The Romani activists proposed the creation of industrial workshops without specifically mentioning begging, black-market speculation, fortune telling, or other subversive professions associated with "backward Gypsies." They also made no explicit claims on Soviet nationality policy. Whether for these reasons or others, Soviet officials ignored the activists' proposal.[21]

The Romani activists' initial failure to obtain state support for their Gypsy mutual aid society proved profoundly instructive for them. In subsequent months, they busily reorganized their society and refined their approach to Soviet officialdom.[22] In the summer of 1924, the activists submitted a revised proposal for a "Gypsy Proletarian Society." By this time, they had learned how best to capture the attention of Soviet bureaucrats. In particular, they had recognized the utility of emphasizing "Gypsy backwardness" and invoking the ideological underpinnings of nationality policy. They recognized the advantages of embracing the tension between malleability and essentialism that inhered in the early Soviet nationality regime. With increasing frequency and heightened rhetorical urgency, they demanded the socialist transformation promised Gypsies as an oppressed nationality and hyped an essentialist vision of Gypsies as exceedingly "backward" to bolster their pleas. Theirs was a racializing discourse.

Thus, the activists justified the need for their Gypsy Proletarian Society by itemizing the dangerous afflictions of "the Gypsy proletarian masses." Romani choral performers, the activists explained, practised a debauched art and slavishly catered to the needs of the despicable bourgeoisie. The "Gypsy proletarian masses" were not integrated into the labour force, thus lending themselves to "defects

such as robbery, thievery, fraud, and prostitution." Given their "nomadic way of life," Gypsies threatened "the peasant and working population" with their deviant ways.[23] Thus, the main goal of their society would be "the raising of [Gypsies'] cultural level" – a task the activists sought to achieve through the creation of schools, a club, industrial cooperatives, agricultural communes, and a Romani-language literature.[24]

In late 1925, the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs (NKVD) approved the establishment of the Gypsy Union.[25] The roster of the Gypsy Union's board members easily could have been mistaken for an advertisement for imperial Russia's Romani choirs. Nearly all of the Gypsy Union's leaders descended from Russia's prerevolutionary choral dynasties.[26] Confidently, this self-declared "group of cultured, toiling Gypsies" set out to civilize their "backward" brethren.[27]

Their brief organizational experience had taught the Gypsy Union's founders that their own purported "Gypsy backwardness" was their most reliable source of bargaining power vis-à-vis Soviet bureaucrats. Therefore, in their work plans and funding petitions, Gypsy Union members relentlessly invoked backwardness and marginality when describing and claiming to speak for Gypsies. Whereas earlier the Romani activists had serenely expressed the desire to open schools, the Gypsy Union now militantly committed itself "to struggle with universal illiteracy" among Roma.[28] Soon enough, Gypsy Union activists declared that "the most radical method for uniting, organizing, and raising the cultural level of toiling Gypsies living throughout the USSR is their transition from a nomadic way of life … to productive agriculture."[29] Recognizing that Soviet officials primarily imagined Gypsies in terms of a uniquely subversive, irrational, and unruly form of nomadism, Gypsy Union activists painted their nationality with broad essentialist brushstrokes as frightfully aimless in its wandering.[30]

In its first two hectic years of existence, the Gypsy Union spared no effort in describing their nationality as exceptionally "backward" and profoundly deviant. Its members trumpeted Gypsy backwardness in every one of their petitions for material and other help in organizing Gypsy schools, industrial workshops, agricultural collectives, a Romani alphabet, and a Romani-language journal. In so doing, they were fulfilling the very logic of Soviet nationality policy as the much-celebrated aid the Soviet state promised to those nationalities it categorized as afflicted by historic backwardness.

Given the cash-strapped circumstances of the Soviet Union in the 1920s, however, the Gypsy Union's leaders continually found Soviet promises to be far more generous than were the actual funds that Soviet bureaucrats delivered in the name of nationality policy. The Gypsy Union was in an obvious bind; their task was to transform "backward Gypsies" into Soviet citizens and to do so in the pitiable absence of adequate state funding for their efforts. Constantly hobbled by insolvency, the Gypsy Union by 1927 also faced the threat of forcible closure as officials began to question whether it was capable of fulfilling its ambitious mission.[31] The Gypsy Union's efforts, no less than its ledger books, came under increasing scrutiny.[32]

Gypsy Union leaders responded to Soviet officials' threats and scepticism the best way they knew how. They openly blamed the state bureaucracies for refusing to aid "backward Gypsies" in their transformation into settled, cultured Soviet citizens. They sought to shame Soviet officials into complying with nationality policy itself. In shaming the state, the activists defined Gypsies as "backward" citizens whose Soviet self-realization was being stymied by bureaucrats who were still blinded by bourgeois anti-Gypsyism.

In fall 1927, the Romani activists thus amplified their rhetoric once again. In refusing the Gypsy Union adequate funding, Romani leaders explained, the state had robbed them of the ability to save the Soviet Union's Gypsies from nomadism, illiteracy, and an unparalleled marginality. In their refusal to finance the Gypsy Union's work, they insisted, Soviet officials had not only contradicted Bolshevik nationality policy but also mirrored the tsarist regime's bourgeois, chauvinistic approach to governing Gypsies.[33] For nearly three years, the Gypsy Union testified, activists had agitated among Gypsies only to have their efforts frustrated by intolerant state officials. The greatest obstacle to the Gypsy Union's work, its leaders claimed, "has been Soviet and Party organs' distrust towards us." Soviet officials had regarded Gypsy Union activists "with irony and mistrust," never taking them, as Gypsies, seriously. "We, of course, knew," the activists continued, that such an attitude was "an inheritance from a bourgeois order that had taught the population to look upon Gypsies as inveterate tramps from whom nothing good could ever be expected except for thievery, begging, and various other human vices."[34]

Here, the Romani activists strategically shamed Soviet officials for adopting racist, anti-Gypsy attitudes from the tsarist bourgeoisie and perpetuating the racism of the prerevolutionary era in Soviet times.

The activists were "subtle" enough, however, to not call tsarist-era (let alone Soviet-era) racism by its name. It seems clear that the activists understood the import of this fine-lined shaming strategy. The idea of blithely perpetuating a racist worldview inherited from the tsarist bourgeoisie would have been at the very least unnerving for any self-respecting Bolshevik fluent in the theoretical basis of Soviet nationality policy. Therein lies the activists' strategic savvy. Tacitly, the Romani activists were acknowledging what several scholars in this volume suggest: the Bolsheviks inherited a legacy of race-based thinking and governing from the tsarist era.[35]

While leaving this last point open to interpretation, the Gypsy Union activists did argue that the result of the tsarist-era's anti-Gypsy legacy was the entrenchment of Gypsy backwardness in the very same Soviet Union that promised to liberate Gypsies. "How do Gypsies live today?" the Romani activists asked, "Cold, filth, poverty, and hunger are their constant life companions." It was unacceptable, Romani activists railed, for "Soviet power" to neglect a "backward" nationality "that, because of its illiteracy, isolation, and darkness, cannot by itself realize the necessity for a change in its own way of life." Before it was too late, the state needed to help the Gypsy Union save Gypsies from themselves. Officials could not afford to liquidate the Gypsy Union.[36] To do so, the activists argued, would be not only fatal to the cause of Sovietizing "backward Gypsies" but also a flagrant violation of the spirit of nationality policy itself. Nationality policy entitled all "backward" minorities the opportunity to advance under Soviet tutelage, and it was Gypsies' very backwardness that obliged the state to help the Gypsy Union "make Gypsies into citizens."[37]

Despite their rhetorical prowess, the Gypsy Union's Romani activists failed to convince Soviet officials of their arguments. The activists were accused of having failed to adopt "concrete measures in the struggle with the Gypsies' conservative style of life" and in particular with "fortune-telling, begging, gambling, drunkenness, and other particularities of the Gypsy population."[38] In the eyes of Soviet officialdom, the Gypsy Union, though perhaps a worthwhile experiment, was a complete failure. The Gypsy Union's liquidation was formalized in February 1928.[39]

Although short-lived, the Gypsy Union accomplished far more than Soviet officials recognized at the time. For one thing, Gypsy Union activists established a discursive template for all Soviet discussions of the "Gypsy problem" in the Stalin era. Although ultimately unsuc-

cessful in obtaining sufficient state subsidies for their work, Gypsy Union activists demanded that the state redeem the guarantees it offered to Roma in the form of nationality policy. In the process, they defined themselves as integrated Soviet citizens as much as they characterized Gypsies as a woefully "backward" nationality. The Gypsy Union activists fashioned themselves as New Soviet Gypsies – a status that was evidenced by their sharpened skills as political entrepreneurs who insisted that nationality policy be mobilized in the service of their "backward Gypsy" brethren. Realizing that the essentialist vision of Gypsies as dangerously backward was their most valuable political tool, they liberally reproduced disparaging Gypsy stereotypes. In engaging the tension between malleability and essentialism, they adroitly demonstrated their mastery of nationality policy's logic. They also helped to shape and authorize a Soviet racializing discourse about Gypsies.

Having gained a valuable crash course in Soviet political education via their Gypsy Union, Romani activists nimbly pursued their mission to civilize the Soviet Union's "backward Gypsies" well after the dissolution of their Gypsy Union itself. Many Gypsy Union members joined in the formal work of the Soviet bureaucracy and several emerged as nationality-policy careerists. Though deprived of the Gypsy Union's institutional framework, Moscow's Romani activists helped to establish Romani schools, collective farms, and industrial cooperatives in the late 1920s and 1930s. They oversaw the creation of a Romani-language literature and of the world's first Gypsy theatre. In all of these endeavours, the activists deployed the political, cultural, and social skills obtained in their tenure as Gypsy Union leaders. Experience had shown them that there was political currency in trumpeting Gypsies' exceptional backwardness in their claims on Soviet nationality policy; this racializing discourse would continue to prove their most relied-upon lobbying tactic. Taking Moscow's Gypsy Theatre "Romen" as an illustrative example, the next section of this chapter will explore how, in the 1930s, Roma and non-Roma alike collaborated in the energetic reentrenchment of Gypsy stereotypes via their deployment of the racializing discourse that had already become standard in the 1920s. They did so in the name of fulfilling nationality policy's purpose of guiding "backward Gypsies" through socialist transformation.

PERFORMING GYPSINESS ON THE EARLY SOVIET STAGE[40]

Moscow's State Gypsy Theatre "Romen" was established in 1930. Its purpose was to produce an ideologically correct staging of the New Soviet Gypsy, no less than to fashion New Soviet Gypsies of the theatre's Romani artists themselves.[41] The initiative to create the Theatre Romen came, unsurprisingly, from the activist alumni of the All-Russian Gypsy Union. That these Romani activists succeeded in establishing the theatre during the first five-year plan with state support, however, was no small feat. In lobbying for the creation of the world's first Gypsy theatre, the activists faced the hurdle of not only the state's limited coffers during Stalin's ambitious industrialization drive but also the perceived "bourgeois decadence" of Romani traditions of stage performance.

So-called "Gypsy music" figured in the Bolshevik imagination as the beloved, counter-revolutionary intoxicant favoured by both tsarist-era elites and class enemies who had ostentatiously enjoyed the market-based reprieve of the New Economic Policy (NEP, 1921–28).[42] The Theatre Romen's artists, therefore, faced the slippery task of replacing the "bourgeois decadence" of prerevolutionary and NEP-era Romani stage traditions with "socially useful" and "ethnographically authentic" representations of Gypsies. Throughout the 1930s, Romen's artists adapted to both changing definitions of ethnographic authenticity and revised Soviet values. In so doing, they ultimately earned praise for their performances and developed the only Romani institution to survive both shifting nationality policies in the Stalinist 1930s and the Soviet Union's collapse. On stage at the Theatre Romen in the 1930s, Romani artists wore garish "Gypsy" costumes while fashioning themselves as socially useful and cultured Soviet citizens. They made careers for themselves as Soviet actors while, at the same time, they authorized stereotypical images of Gypsies as thieves, illiterates, nomads, and temptresses.

In late 1931, Romen premiered its first play, *Life on Wheels*. Written by A.V. Germano, a former Gypsy Union leader and an ambitious author of Romani-language literature, *Life on Wheels* dramatized the Soviet battle to transition nomadic Roma to sedentary life. Its stage and costume design was said to be "formed from the colorful rags and tatters of the Gypsies."[43] Germano's play featured the typecast Gypsy characters of the Soviet imagination: horse-dealers, fortune-tellers,

and nomads. Yet *Life on Wheels* focussed on the changes introduced to nomadic Gypsy life when the play's hero, Kalysh, returns to his native camp as the New Soviet Man. Having served in the Red Army, Kalysh reintroduces himself as a Gypsy Union plenipotentiary and explains the Soviet promise of land and work for Gypsies. It is time, he declares, "to show our backward people the healthy, cheerful path of Lenin."[44] The play ends with the nomadic camp rising up against their *kulak* exploiter and celebrating their Soviet rebirth. Their pitiable "life on wheels" is over. They begin "to live as people."[45]

The Soviet press greeted *Life on Wheels* warmly, albeit paternalistically.[46] Romen's actors and administrators hurried to expand their repertoire. Yet a critical tension threatened to undermine the ideological purpose of the theatre itself. While the theatre's plays were to represent how far Roma had progressed on the evolutionary timeline since the revolution, Soviet audiences seemed to delight most of all in staged scenes of "backward" Gypsies' prerevolutionary past. Audiences still craved "Gypsy romances" more so than triumphant depictions of New Soviet Gypsies. Thus, the theatre faced a serious challenge. It needed to be mindful not to satisfy the impolitic cravings of its audience so much so that the plays' political message was lost, nor to stress ideology to the point that audiences lost interest. As one critic had pointed out in response to *Life on Wheels*, the theatre was already in danger of crossing the line from ethnographic authenticity to crude exotica.[47]

Romen's artistic director reasoned that a safe way to disabuse the theatre of any further charges of peddling exotica was to reorient Romen's repertoire toward the classics. In 1934, the Theatre Romen premiered its interpretation of *Carmen*, hyping this repertoire choice as an ethnographic portrait of an era in which "the Spanish merchant bourgeoisie exploited the backwardness and benightedness of the Gypsy masses."[48] Critics refused, however, to accept this tortured logic. One complained, "Instead of a serious social analysis of the reasons that gave rise to the past everyday life of Gypsies and that made smugglers, thieves, and murderers of Gypsies, shades of admiration for the peculiar 'exotica' of [Gypsies'] outmoded past … dominate the play."[49] *Carmen* was a critical flop, prompting Narkompros officials to question the Gypsy theatre's viability.[50] Narkompros worried that the theatre had still not reconciled its urge to embrace Gypsies' "exotica" with its need "to show that Gypsies can be useful in our socialist construction."[51]

Yet Romen's artists had their own complaints. Primary among them was the fact that Romen's administration had been staffed, from its very inception, by non-Roma. One artist complained: "Is it normal that in the five years of the theater's existence, not one Gypsy has been included in the theater's administrative personnel?"[52] Another protested Romen's artists' paltry salary, highlighting that they were paid much less than performers at other theatres in the capital, not to mention Romen's non-Romani administrative staff.[53] Other artists expressed outrage when Narkompros officials accused Romen's troupe of poor hygiene. When one of these officials lectured that "the question of cleanliness is also a question of the education of a new person, of a new Gypsy actor," Romen's artists bristled at the hypocrisy. If they worked in filthy conditions, the troupe argued, it was not because they were "backward Gypsies" but rather because Narkompros undervalued them as actors and failed to invest in their struggling theatre.[54]

With these troubles in mind, the Theatre Romen next sought to acquit itself by producing a play based on A.S. Pushkin's classic, *The Gypsies.* Pushkin's poem was the melodramatic tale of Aleko, a young Russian who, disenchanted with society, seeks haven in a wild and freedom-loving nomadic Gypsy camp and falls disastrously in love with Zemfira, a hot-blooded Gypsy temptress.[55] That the play was "national in form" was obvious. As for the play's purported socialist content, Romen's non-Romani artistic director explained that Pushkin "knew Gypsy everyday life well, studied it in depth, and described it objectively."[56] Pushkin's classic, he argued, would allow the theatre "to show a positive image of Gypsies."[57]

Narkompros officials supported the choice but urged Romen's artists to remember that the theatre's task remained "to preserve [Gypsies'] authentic, national distinctiveness, authentic national form."[58] Yet at least one of Romen's actors scoffed at the very notion of an "authentic national form." When a Narkompros official spoke of Gypsies' "national color" and "national sound," the actor protested, "There is no such coloring … Gypsies sing as all people do."[59] His insightful protest, however, was ignored. Narkompros clung stubbornly to essentialist visions of Gypsies and dismissed the actor's astute rejection of the very same.

While the Theatre Romen's first iteration of *The Gypsies* flopped, a revised version of the performance signalled, in 1938, the celebrated rebirth of the struggling theatre.[60] Directed by a revered Russian actor

and performed entirely in the Russian language, the Theatre Romen garnered enormous praise for *The Gypsies* in 1938. The performance embodied the dictum, "national in form, socialist in content" – at least in its late-1930s variant. In other words, Romen's actors sang and danced in the ostensible Gypsy style, while bringing to life the immortal words of Russia's greatest poet. The actors' "national color" was interpreted in their movements and costumes while their acting skills and stage direction owed to their apprenticeship under Russian artists.[61]

What no one mentioned was that Pushkin's *The Gypsies* had returned Romen's actors to performing Russian favourites for Russian audiences in a style altogether similar to the so-called "bourgeois decadence" of late imperial Russia's Gypsy choirs. Romen's actors were praised for performing a Pushkin-authored image of Gypsies as hot-tempered, exotic, innocent, uncivilized, and licentious. Performance of this type of stereotypical "Gypsiness" was not considered debauchery or even philistinism. Instead, Romen's dramatization of essentialized Gypsiness was hailed as ethnographic authenticity, as exemplary Soviet art.

Thanks in large measure to its 1938 performance of *The Gypsies*, the Theatre Romen survived as a testament to early Soviet thinking not only about Gypsies but also about nationality in the broadest sense. Established with the express purpose of eradicating the "bourgeois decadence" of so-called Gypsy music and replacing it with didactic folk art, the theatre throughout the 1930s served as the site of multiple reimaginings of stereotypical Gypsiness as ethnographically authentic Soviet entertainment. Long after its creation in 1930, Romen persisted as the dependable, state-sponsored site of performances of Gypsies as fiery, excitable, tantalizing lovers of liberty – poetic, peculiar, quintessentially "other," yet capable of integration, *as Gypsies*, into the Soviet "Friendship of Peoples."

Moscow's Gypsy theatre exemplifies the spirit of Soviet nationality policy incarnated. When the Bolsheviks mandated the importance of nationality in the lives of Soviet citizens, they facilitated both the fetishization of "authentic" national cultures as well as minority peoples' Soviet self-fashioning. As is seen in the case of the Theatre Romen, the mobilization of Soviet nationality policy mandated the essentialization (strategic and otherwise) of so-called national cultures. Yet Soviet nationality policy also potentially empowered minority citizens like Romen's artists to profitably engage in the perfor-

mance of both nationality and Soviet citizenship. For decades after its inception, the Theatre Romen birthed New Soviet Gypsies as reliably as it reproduced old Gypsy stereotypes.

RECONSTRUCTION? THE PERSISTENCE OF RACIALIZING DISCURSIVE PATTERNS IN THE POSTWAR ERA

In the 1920s, Romani activists in the Soviet Union awakened to the opportunities made available to them as a so-called "backward" nationality entitled to Soviet "affirmative action." By the start of World War II, they had seen many of those same opportunities wither and disappear. Already by 1938, Romani-language schools had been shuttered and Romani-language publishing had been discontinued. Romani collective farms and industrial collectives had been merged with larger, typically Russian institutions. Those Romani *kolkhozes* and industrial cooperatives that had managed to survive into World War II did not survive the war itself. Of the Romani institutions established in the interwar prime of Soviet nation building, only the Theatre Romen survived intact into the postwar period.[62]

In WWII's aftermath, Roma in the Soviet Union became increasingly aware that the breadbasket of opportunities afforded them *as Gypsies* in the 1920s and 1930s had been all but emptied. The relative political currency of Gypsiness – valuable, in the 1920s and 1930s, precisely because Gypsies' ascribed "backwardness" theoretically entitled them to nationality policy's transformative benefits – had already dwindled by the eve of World War II and continued to dwindle all the more precipitously during and after the war.

According to the Soviet Union's newly revised, postwar history, the Soviet "first among equals" – the heroic Russian nation – had already civilized the empire's "backward" Gypsies and other needy minority peoples.[63] While "Gypsy" remained an official nationality in the Soviet Union, much had changed. Though still entitled to claim special status as Gypsies, Romani citizens of the postwar Soviet Union confronted a political and social reality strikingly different from that of the interwar peak of Soviet nation building. No longer even a theoretically abundant source of advancement or aid, Gypsy nationality now largely functioned as a state-recognized signifier of Roma's primordial uniqueness.[64] Gypsy nationality continued to spell Roma's exotic and potentially dangerous alterity in the overlapping popular and bureaucratic imaginations.[65] Roma were expected to fulfill their

obligations as Soviet citizens, now with relatively scarce allowance for their purported "peculiarities" as a nationality. Yet they remained tethered to the presumed "essence" of Gypsiness, to Gypsies' supposed "national character."

In the immediate postwar period in the Soviet Union, Roma and non-Roma alike were tied up not only in the challenges of reconstruction but also in the discursive practices that had prevailed during the efforts of the 1920s and 1930s to guide "backward Gypsies" through socialist transformation. Discussions of the so-called "Gypsy question" remained reliant upon stereotypes of Gypsies as nomads, marginals, and parasites; they continued to serve a racializing function. The perpetuation of the racializing discourse that had prevailed in the interwar period is seen, for example, in a collective letter written to Stalin by self-declared "representatives of Soviet Gypsies" and dated 4 May 1946.[66] The authors of the letter were actors and playwrights at the Theatre Romen, distinguished Romani veterans of WWII, and other Romani activists who had come of age as New Soviet Gypsies during the interwar prime of Soviet nationality policy. The Romani activists began by detailing the successes of Soviet nationality policy in the 1920s and 1930s in "raising [Gypsies'] national culture and art." Thanks to these efforts, "it was no longer a rarity" to encounter Gypsies who were members of the Communist Party. Yet, they explained, the Nazi invasion had destroyed the institutional and personal gains made by Soviet Gypsies in the 1920s and 1930s; their schools, homes, and collective farms had been laid to waste. The Romani activists made no mention of the fact that the Soviet state itself had shuttered many of the Romani institutions born of nationality policy on the eve of World War II. Their rhetorical focus was on the annihilationist Nazi regime and its efforts to exterminate the Soviet Union's Romani population.[67]

The activists displayed their extensive prewar training in the political maneuvers of Soviet ethnic particularism in their pleas to Stalin for renewed help for Gypsies. As they had in previous decades of nationality-policy lobbying, they hyped the extremity of Gypsies' ostensible backwardness and marginality. They represented Gypsies, as a nationality, as still so benighted that they could not reasonably be denied an extension of nationality policy's "affirmative action," designed as it was to transform such afflicted minorities into modern Soviet citizens. When lamenting the postwar circumstances of Soviet Roma who were homeless, jobless, and moving in search of a viable

postwar standard of living, the activists painted such circumstances as quintessentially "Gypsy," rather than, as was the case, emblematic of the challenges faced by countless Soviet citizens whose homes, livelihoods, and families had been devastated by the war's horrors. Their petition spoke of Gypsies who had survived the war only "to return to their ruined households" without acknowledging that this was a scenario being played out in the millions throughout the Soviet Union by members of all nationalities and not just by Gypsies.

In language reminiscent of the Gypsy Union's repeated requests for material support for political-enlightenment work and institution building for Gypsies, the activists complained that regional and local officials refused to adopt a tailored approach to "the peculiarities of the Gypsy nationality." They failed, the Romani activists argued, to take a cue from the "special measures" that "the Party and State" had adopted in previous decades in pursuit of integrating Gypsies into the socialist economy and Soviet culture. Given that "cultural-enlightenment work among the backward Gypsy masses has been suspended," they warned, it was no surprise that "needy Gypsy families" had reverted to nomadism. Again, in amplifying the essential deviance presumed of Gypsies generally, the activists did not highlight such a purported "return to nomadism" as a symptom of a wider, postwar "nomadism" that afflicted dislocated Soviet families in general during these hungry, traumatized times. Arguing for aid for Gypsies required an essentialized representation of Gypsies as uniquely deviant, marginal, and backward – such was what the experience of early Soviet nationality policy had taught these Romani activists.

The Romani activists who authored this letter to Stalin also requested the creation of an official "Gypsy cultural representation" within the Soviet of Nationalities. This so-called "Gypsy Representation" would, much in the style of the former Gypsy Union, take responsibility for furthering "the employment of Soviet Gypsies, the raising of their cultural level, [and] the flourishing of authentic Gypsy art." It would "offer positive results in the integration (*priobshchenie*) of Gypsies into socialist society."[68] While naming themselves as "representatives of the leading segment of the Gypsy population," these activists proved, as ever before, reliant upon an essentialized, overwhelmingly negative vision of Gypsies in their engagement of a nationality politics.[69] They sought to productively deploy what had proven their most advantageous tool of nationality politics during the interwar period – a racializing discourse premised on Soviet

nationality policy's simultaneous commitment to human malleability and essentialized ethnicity.

Faced with the enormous tasks of postwar reconstruction, Soviet officials did not approve the proposal for a "Gypsy Representation" within the Soviet of Nationalities. While this rejection signalled where the "Gypsy question" was located on officials' list of priorities, it did not stop Romani activists from continuing to lobby for special aid for Gypsies in the time-honoured fashion that had proven strategically useful to them in the 1920s and 1930s. In another letter dated 21 July 1948, three Romani activists prefaced their plea for a renewal of Romani-language publishing in the Soviet Union with insistent reference to Gypsies as a people fundamentally defined as nomads, deviants, and marginals. "It should never be forgotten," the activists moralized, "that the majority of Gypsies continue to wander across the entire Soviet Union." Nor should it ever be forgotten, the activists claimed, that Gypsies had been particularly persecuted under tsarism as a people who were "hunted, oppressed, universally illiterate, and mired in parasitic occupations – speculation, fortune telling, begging, superstition." These, the activists claimed were "the typical traits of this nationality (*narodnost'*)." Gypsies, they argued, still required "extensive cultural-enlightenment work."[70]

The strategy of these activists is clear. They energetically deployed negative stereotypes of Gypsies so as to justify their claims for material and other state support for institutions and cultural programming for Gypsies. This strategy was reasonably premised on the idea that Soviet officialdom, no less than the wider Soviet public, viewed Gypsies through the prism of longstanding and profoundly negative stereotypes. Bureaucratic documents concerning the so-called "Gypsy question" in the late Stalinist period suggest that the Romani activists' strategy, while not necessarily successful in obtaining them the subsidies and other support they sought, was not misguided in its premises. These, after all, were the very premises of Soviet nationality politics.

Consider, for example, a draft report composed in 1951 by S.D. Ignatiev, minister of State Security, "on the situation of nomadic Gypsies and the condition of criminality among them." The experience of Soviet police, he explained, "shows that the majority of the adult Gypsy population, and a significant number of adolescents, make a living by criminal means: they engage in theft, livestock-stealing, fraud, and they not infrequently commit daring murders, robberies,

and other serious criminal offenses." Ignatiev lamented that even "a significant portion of the settled Gypsies periodically roams."[71] After inventorying a list of specific instances of Gypsies' criminal activity in the USSR, Ignatiev concluded with the following appraisal of the Gypsy nationality:

> Taking into account that the majority of nomadic Gypsies, and a number of settled Gypsies also, do not engage in socially useful labor, support themselves by criminal means, beg, and tell fortunes, and, considering that ordinary measures in the struggle against criminality among Gypsies do not achieve the desired results, it should be considered necessary to move those nomadic and settled Gypsies who are not engaged in socially useful labor to remote regions of the Soviet Union as special settlers.[72]

While Ignatiev's vague resettlement plan did not move past the draft form, similar claims about Gypsies as unrepentant criminals and parasitic nomads were repeated in other documents authored by Soviet bureaucrats tasked with policing the postwar Soviet Union.[73] In 1954, security officials wrote a collective letter complaining that "the majority" of Gypsies "did not engage in honest labor" – this, "despite a range of measures carried out by the party and state in pursuit of the settled employment of Gypsy nomads and the improvement of the cultural and economic lives of settled Gypsies."[74]

More than three years after Stalin's death, Soviet officials adopted a new strategy to what was considered the state-security problem of Gypsy nomadism, parasitism, and refusal to integrate as "socially useful" Soviet citizens. In October 1956, the Supreme Soviet issued its decree, "On the Introduction of Vagrant Gypsies to Labor." As in a series of policies adopted in the 1920s and 1930s, Soviet officials were vaguely obliged to aid nomadic Roma in their "introduction" and "transition" to a working, settled way of life. This law, however, departed from its antecedent decrees of the 1920s and 1930s in that it specifically criminalized Gypsy nomadism (*brodiazhnichestvo*). It stipulated that any Gypsy who "intentionally" deviated "from socially useful work" would be punishable to as many as five years of exile and "corrective labor."[75] This law ultimately failed to solve the Soviet Union's "problem" of immobilizing so-called "vagrant Gypsies."[76] It did, however, help to cement in both the popular and bureaucratic imagination the essentialist view of Gypsies as stubborn marginals, parasites,

and wanderers. In this regard, the 1956 decree was built on a Soviet tradition, now three decades in the making, of representing, administering, and policing Roma through the prism of stereotyped nationality – the prism of racial logic.

CONCLUSION

Roma's practised engagement of Soviet nationality politics mobilized, reinforced, and reentrenched a core tension at the heart of Soviet nationality policy itself. Soviet nationality policy was designed to transform "backward" minority peoples through socialist transformation; it was premised on both human plasticity and ethnic stereotypes. As the Romani activists who forged the short-lived Gypsy Union quickly learned, the reliable path to self-Sovietization available to them *as Gypsies* was the persistent delegitimization of themselves, and their nationality, as profoundly backward and, therefore, worthy of nationality policy's advertised aid and benefits. In the case of Gypsies, becoming Soviet required pronouncing one's Gypsy self and one's Gypsy nationality as fundamentally backward – as essentially "Gypsy." Roma could and did acquit themselves as New Soviet Gypsies who had successfully integrated as Soviet citizens. Yet they could not escape the stigmatizing vision of Gypsies as a people who were nomadic, stubbornly marginal, swindling, and ambiguously exotic – a vision that they themselves discursively reinforced. With an understanding of how Soviet nationality policy operated in practice during its interwar prime – promising "affirmative action" for the "backward" – it is easy to imagine why some Romani activists in particular may not have wanted to fully escape that very same stigmatizing vision.[77] It is also easy to understand why, for example, the Romani activist A.V. Germano sought after the war to trade his status as the Soviet Union's premier Gypsy writer for the more favoured status as a member of the Russian nationality.[78]

Consider also the non-Romani officials who were tasked with variously managing the "Gypsy question." They, too, approached their duties in the spirit of Soviet nationality policy thus obliging its inherent tensions. They, too, officially worked to fulfill nationality policy's mission of socialist transformation while at the same time imagining and discussing "Gypsies" through an essentialist prism. Non-Romani officials joined Romani activists in nodding rather reliably in agreement with the ideologically appropriate notion that "backward Gyp-

sies" *could* be transformed and integrated as Soviet citizens – that all human beings were plastic, malleable. Thus, even the 1956 Supreme Soviet decree that outlawed "Gypsy nomadism" was justified, in the very text of the decree, as having the aim of assimilating "Gypsy vagrants" to a socially useful, sedentary way of life.

Despite their professed ideological allegiance to the core Soviet belief in humans' malleability, Roma and non-Roma alike engaged in racializing discourse that rendered Gypsies, in composite fashion, as marginals, nomads, and deviants. The very same nationality policy that made possible nation building and the integration of New Soviet Gypsies encouraged, even demanded, a commitment to essentialism as a mechanism for seeing and representing ethnic groups; speaking and acting on behalf of them; and organizing social relations. In pursuit of socialist transformation, identities were ascribed to entire nationalities in the name of eradicating their so-called "backwardness." The case of Roma in the Soviet Union reveals that these ascribed identities did not wither away even when socialist transformation was achieved. Indeed, one might argue that the essentialized, the *racialized* "Gypsy" came, over time, to occupy an ever more stalwart position in the Soviet imagination as a result of the mobilization of Soviet nationality policy. Consider again the tension captured in Khrushchev's joke about the Gypsy who wanted to join the CPSU. In the Soviet Union, Gypsies could and did join the Party. Yet a racial logic, fuelled by the intended "liberation" of nationality policy itself, insisted that Gypsies were hot-blooded wanderers whose peculiar, inherent, and at times even tantalizing essence rendered them permanently, inescapably "Gypsy."

Scholars of Soviet nationality politics who have not discussed race in their analyses have offered compelling reasons for their decision. Prominent among them has been the recognition that race was not Soviet policymakers' category for understanding, discussing, and formulating policy for ethnic groups; nationality was. Yet the fact that race was not the operative category for Soviet citizens engaged in nationality politics does not disqualify race as a productive category for analyzing Soviet nationality politics. Indeed, the case of Roma in the Stalin-era Soviet Union underscores Alaina Lemon's caution that "to overemphasize semantics and reference over ways speech indexes social relations is especially misleading when looking for race 'concepts' because races are not things to be named."[79]

Disavowing racism and racial politics, Roma and non-Roma alike participated in Stalin-era nationality politics in their varied efforts to

solve the Soviet version of the "Gypsy question." In alignment with Bolshevik nationality policy, they embraced both the ideological principle of human malleability and the organizing principle of essentialized ethnicity. They engaged, reinforced, and normalized the tension between these two seemingly mismatched principles. Their collaborative efforts produced not only Soviet Gypsy institutions and New Soviet Gypsies but also racialized discourse about Gypsies. Accounting for this tension-fuelled dynamic makes visible the operationalization of race as discursive practice in a state ideologically opposed to racism and proud of its rejection of racial politics. In turn, such an accounting affords us another important dimension for understanding how Soviet nationality policy worked in the short and long term – and, not least, how it may have worked both *for and against* Soviet citizens who inescapably confronted the Soviet nationality regime as ethnic minorities.

NOTES

1 Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, *Khrushchev Remembers. The Last Testament*, trans. and ed. Strobe Talbott (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1972), 141. As an official nationality in the Soviet Union, Roma were categorized as Gypsies (*tsygane*). Roma self-identified and were identified by the state as Gypsies. The ethnonym "Roma" was scarcely employed in the Soviet Union. In this chapter, I consciously deploy both ethnonyms: Gypsies and Roma. In order to accurately reflect contemporaries' vocabulary as well as the stereotypes of Roma that prevailed in the USSR, I reproduce the grammatical variants of "Gypsy" when reporting direct speech, referencing official state categories, and describing the documented perspectives of historical actors. When speaking for myself, I employ the terms "Roma" (nominative plural) or "Romani" (adjective).

2 Brigid O'Keeffe, *New Soviet Gypsies: Nationality, Performance, and Selfhood in the Early Soviet Union* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013).

3 On Soviet nationality policy as ethnicity-based "affirmative action," see Terry Martin, *The Affirmative-Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923–1939* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001).

4 "State-sponsored evolutionism" is Francine Hirsch's apt term for describing the intended transformative logic of Soviet nationality policy. See her *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005), especially 7–10.

5 On "Gypsy" stereotypes in European history, see Katie Trumpener, "The

Time of the Gypsies: A 'People without History' in the Narratives of the West," *Critical Inquiry* 18, 2 (1992): 843–84. On their construction and deployment in Russian and Soviet history, see Alaina Lemon, *Between Two Fires: Gypsy Performance and Romani Memory from Pushkin to Postsocialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000); O'Keeffe, *New Soviet Gypsies*.

6 *Slavic Review* 61 (spring 2002): 1–65.

7 Eric D. Weitz, "Racial Politics without the Concept of Race: Reevaluating Soviet Ethnic and National Purges," *Slavic Review* 61, 1 (2002): 3.

8 Francine Hirsch, "Race without the Practice of Racial Politics," *Slavic Review* 61, 1 (2002): 33.

9 Ibid., 37.

10 Amir Weiner, "Nothing But Certainty," *Slavic Review* 61, 1 (2002): 52–3.

11 Ibid., 50.

12 Lemon, *Between Two Fires*; Lemon, "'What are they Writing about Us Blacks': Roma and 'Race' in Russia," *Anthropology of East Europe Review* 13, 2 (1995): 34–40; and Lemon, "Your Eyes are Green Like Dollars: Counterfeit Cash, National Substance and Currency Apartheid in 1990s Russia," *Cultural Anthropology* 13, 1 (1998): 22–55.

13 Alaina Lemon, "Without a 'Concept'? Race as Discursive Practice," *Slavic Review* 61, 1 (2002): 56.

14 Ibid., 58.

15 Portions of an earlier version of this section were previously published as Brigid O'Keeffe, "'Backward Gypsies,' Soviet Citizens: The All-Russian Gypsy Union, 1925–28," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 11, 2 (2010): 283–312. A fuller analysis of the Gypsy Union can be found in O'Keeffe, *New Soviet Gypsies*, chapter 1.

16 Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (State Archive of the Russian Federation, henceforth GARF), f. 1235 o. 120 d. 27 l. 63.

17 I.V. Nest'ev, *Zvezdy russkoi estrady (Panina, Vial'tseva, Plevitskaia). Ocherki o russkikh estradnykh pevitsakh nachala XX veka* (Moscow: Sovetskii kompositor, 1970), 20.

18 I.I. Rom-Lebedev, *Ot tsyganskogo khora k teatru "Romen"* (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1990), 15.

19 See, for example, GARF f. A-259 o. 9b d. 4333 ll. 21–2.

20 GARF f. 1235 o. 119 d. 9 ll. 3–4.

21 GARF f. 1235 o. 119 d. 10 ll. 13–14.

22 GARF f. 1235 o. 119 d. 9 l. 8.

23 Ibid., l. 7.

24 GARF f. 1235 o.119 d. 10 l. 52.

25 GARF f. 1235 o.120 d. 27 ll. 89–91.

26 Ibid., ll. 181–2.
27 N.A. Pankov, as quoted in Efim Druts and Aleksei Gessler, *Tsygane: ocherki* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1990), 281.
28 GARF f. 1235 o. 120 d. 27 l. 94.
29 GARF f. 1235 o. 121 d. 31 l. 240.
30 See, for example, GARF f. 1235 o. 120 d. 27 l. 63.
31 GARF f. 1235 o. 120 d. 27 l. 49ob.
32 GARF f. 1235 o. 123 d. 27 ll. 186–7ob.
33 GARF f. 3316 o. 20 d. 653 ll. 13–22, 80.
34 Ibid., ll. 19–20.
35 On this formative imperial Russian intellectual and political tradition, see especially those contributions to this volume by Mogilner, Rainbow, and Tolz.
36 GARF f. 3316 o. 20 d. 653 ll. 19–20.
37 Ibid., ll. 16–17.
38 GARF f. 1235 o. 120 d. 27 ll. 47–47ob.
39 GARF f. 1235 o. 140 d. 752 ll. 25–25ob.
40 This section has largely been extracted from O'Keeffe, *New Soviet Gypsies*, chapter 5.
41 Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva (Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, henceforth RGALI) f. 645 o. 1 d. 240 l. 57; RGALI f. 645 o. 1 d. 241 l. 18; GARF f. 1235 o. 123 d. 27 l. 227.
42 Lemon, *Between Two Fires*, esp. 140–3; O'Keeffe, *New Soviet Gypsies*, 194–204.
43 Marie Seton, "The Evolution of the Gypsy Theatre in the USSR," *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* third series, 14, 2 (1935), 70.
44 RGALI f. 656 o. 1 d. 754 l. 9.
45 Ibid., l. 46.
46 RGALI f. 2928 o. 1 d. 65 l. 10; Rom-Lebedev, *Ot tsyganskogo*, 177.
47 RGALI f. 2928 o. 1 d. 65 l. 10.
48 RGALI f. 2928 o. 1 d. 68 l. 24.
49 RGALI f. 656 o. 1 d. 1610 ll. 2–3.
50 RGALI f. 2928 o. 1 d. 69 ll. 8, 10; f. 2310 o. 1 d. 99.
51 RGALI f. 2310 o. 1 d. 98 l. 22
52 RGALI f. 2310 o. 1 d. 99 ll. 17–18.
53 Ibid., ll. 4–7, 9–14.
54 RGALI f. 2928 o. 1 d. 478 ll. 25–25ob.
55 Alexander Pushkin, *The Gypsies and Other Narrative Poems*, trans. Antony Wood (Boston: David R. Godine, 2006).
56 RGALI f. 2928 o. 1 d. 473 l. 11ob–12.
57 "'Tsygany' Pushkina v teatre tsygan," *Literaturnaia gazeta* 4 (October 1935): 5.

58 RGALI f. 2928 o. 1 d. 473 l. 31ob.
59 Ibid., l. 29.
60 E. Sholokh, "Tsyganskii teatr 'Romen,'" *Narodnoe tvorchestvo* 5 (1938): 51.
61 RGALI f. 2928 o. 1 d. 76 l. 2.
62 On the fates of these Romani institutions, see O'Keeffe, *New Soviet Gypsies*.
63 David Brandenberger, *National Bolshevism: Stalinist Mass Culture and the Formation of Modern Russian National Identity, 1931–1956* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002).
64 On the gradual turn from constructivist to primordial understandings of nationality in Soviet ideology, see Slezkine, "The USSR as a Communal Apartment," and Terry Martin, "Modernization or Neo-Traditionalism? Ascribed Nationality and Soviet Primordialism," in *Stalinism: New Directions*, ed. Sheila Fitzpatrick (New York: Routledge, 2000): 348–67.
65 See Lemon, *Between Two Fires*.
66 E. Iu. Zubkova and T. Iu. Zhukova, eds., *Na 'kraiu' sovetskogo obshchestva. Sotsial'nye marginaly kak ob"ekt gosudarstvennoi politiki 1945-1960-e gg* (Moscow: Rosspen, 2010).
67 Ibid., 406–7.
68 Ibid., 408.
69 Ibid.
70 Ibid., 411.
71 Ibid., 419.
72 Ibid., 421.
73 See, for example, ibid., 417–18; 421–2; 425–6; 429–35; Paul Hagenloh, *Stalin's Police: Public Order and Mass Repression in the USSR, 1926–1941* (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center, 2009), 304–5.
74 Zubkova, *Na "kraiu,"* 429.
75 Ibid., 435. On Soviet efforts to settle "nomadic Gypsies" in the 1920s and 1930s, see O'Keeffe, *New Soviet Gypsies*, especially chapter 4.
76 David Crowe, *A History of the Gypsies of Eastern Europe and Russia* (New York: St Martin's, 1996), 188; Druts and Gessler, *Tsygane*, 306–7. See also Zubkova, *Na "kraiu,"* 436–52.
77 Or, as Lemon suggests in discussing Roma in the 1990s: "Perhaps it is not only Russians who found 'praise and power' in racial traits." Lemon, "Without a 'Concept,'" 60.
78 On Germano's "self-edited life as a sometimes Gypsy," see the epilogue of *New Soviet Gypsies*.
79 Lemon, "Without a 'Concept,'" 56.

6

Russia, Germany, and the Problem of Race

Eric D. Weitz

By the turn of the twentieth century, in Europe and the Americas, race had become the predominant way of understanding human difference. The origins of race thinking were diverse and have been well explored by scholars. Most – though certainly not all – see race as modern and its development deeply entwined with three factors: New World slavery, which for the first time in human history made the benighted condition of slavery a characteristic of one and only one phenotype; scientific thinking and the drive to categorize the human population that accompanied deeper and wider encounters with different peoples after 1500; and imperialism, which made Europeans and North Americans the lords of the world, dominant over Africans, Middle Easterners, and Asians. Race permeated every aspect of society in the West around 1900, from scientific research and intellectual discourse to the severe inequalities that accompanied the rise of global capitalism and Western colonialism.[1]

But where do Russia and the Soviet Union fit into this model? Imperial Russia had its serfs, but it was certainly not a slave society as were the United States, Brazil, and the Caribbean islands. Russia's intellectual and scientific discourses were Western-influenced but also had their own dynamic. Many have described Russia's expansion east and south as a colonial enterprise, but there were some major differences between Russia's expansion into the Caucasus, for example, and British, French, German, and Portuguese colonialism in Africa. Neither imperial Russia nor the Soviet Union ever fostered an explicit

politics and ideology of race, as was so clearly the case in the European overseas colonies and in the US Jim Crow states.

Germany is perhaps the critical point of comparison here, close at hand geographically and not as far removed from Russia's political and social order as were the slave societies and plantation economies of the Americas. Together, the two histories show just how complex is the matter of race, how it can emerge out of the most varied circumstances and ring different tones and tempos. Still and despite the differences, race is always an ideology that divides and categorizes the human species in hierarchical fashion. Some races are seen as superior, others as inferior; those at the bottom rungs are depicted as somehow deficient and often threatening. The advocates of race strive to bring the political order in line with these supposedly essential features of different groups, as the chapters in this volume by Brigid O'Keeffe and Marina Mogilner depict so well. They also show that racial thinking can be but is not necessarily exterminatory; it can also entail the effort to "civilize" those deemed subordinate by their racial characteristics.

Three elements contributed to the development of race in Germany: its internal colonization efforts in the East; acquisition of overseas colonies starting in 1884; and, partly connected to these other two factors, the evolution of its academic disciplines and general intellectual life.

In the 1880s Prussia, unified Germany's most powerful state, established a settlement commission designed to encourage Prussians to move eastward. The intent was to promote economic development in the sparsely settled, noble-dominated areas of Pomerania, Mecklenburg, and East Prussia, the old core lands of the Junker nobility. But a strong ethnic-national dimension was intrinsic to these plans as well. These areas had significant Polish populations. During harvest season, itinerant Polish labourers crossed over from Congress Poland and Galicia (the Russian- and Austrian-ruled parts of Poland) to work on Junker (Prussian noble) estates. Many Germans raised the alarm bells of a Slavic and Catholic "horde" taking over parts of Prussia and Germany and overrunning the supposedly fine, upstanding German population.[2] Settlements of Germans would presumably ease the need for itinerant Polish labour. No one less than Max Weber, in a number of articles in the 1890s, expressed these fears. Weber's rather extreme nationalist posturing in this decade makes for sober reading, though he did later moderate his views.

Despite all sorts of incentives offered to Germans to resettle in the east, the settlement commission had scant success. Few were enticed to enter a region still dominated by noble estates. Even efforts to create new lands by swamp drainage did little to foster the internal movement of Germans.

The settlement efforts were marked by a deep-seated nationalism and a xenophobic attitude toward Poles. But it is hard to see race thinking or racial policies at work here. Race most often means ascribing indelible, transgenerational traits to a population. Yet there were Polish Protestants (Masurians) who were, for the most part, accepted in Prussia and Germany, and the tens and hundreds of thousands of Poles who migrated to the Ruhr coalmines and steel mills from the 1890s to World War I largely became integrated into German life. One only needs to consult phone directories (or phone books as they once were!) to see the many Polish names in towns and cities like Essen, Dortmund, and Bochum to note this reality.

A stronger case can be made for the development of German race thinking by examining Germany's overseas colonial empire. Germany, starting in 1884, came to possess five colonies – Southwest Africa (today Namibia), East Africa (with only a few border changes, Tanzania today), Togo, Cameroon, and Samoa. The time span was brief – Germany lost all of its colonies with the Versailles Peace Treaty in 1919. A mere thirty-five years bears little comparison to the centuries-long Spanish, Portuguese, French, British, and Dutch colonial enterprises. Still, the impact internally on Germany was significant, especially from its prime settlement colony, Southwest Africa.

For German imperialists, Southwest Africa was the prize colony. Sparsely populated with huge tracts of open land, it was envisioned as the settler colony par excellence, a German Australia, Argentina, or America. Southwest Africa conjured up the classic colonial vision of open lands and vanishing peoples, a place where Germans could live free and prosper and escape the stifling conditions at home while contributing to Germany's economic development and global power. In Southwest Africa, a man could be a real man – a trope that shows up continually in colonial literature and memoirs.[3]

Paul Rohrbach, for example, led the Settlement Commission and, after the Herero-Nama revolt, directed the Restitution Commission designed to compensate primarily German farmers for their losses during the war. He wrote home about the money it was possible to save; the lovely house one could build for little expense that enabled

the children to run around in freedom; the servants. "In Europe, only notably wealthy people can live this way." He and his wife Clara had "complete freedom of space ... something very lovely." And he could work independently. "The freedom of work, with a good salary and a halfway independent character, is much greater here in Africa than at home."[4] Typically, the natives were most often invisible in the letters he and his wife Clara wrote home, except when they caused problems either in the household or, more seriously, when they had taken up arms in revolt.[5]

The bucolic, utopian vision of Southwest Africa could only become reality if Germans had rights over the land and unquestioned political domination. The Herero, Nama, and other Africans would be transformed from pastoralists to a technically free (and thereby civilized) but subordinate labour force available to work on German farms, on the infrastructure of docks, roads, and railroads that Germans had begun to build, and, after 1908 when they were first discovered, in the mines and sands where diamonds were to be found. But until the Namibian War, the Herero and Nama still controlled large tracts of land through which they herded their cattle, even though their leaders had sold off a considerable amount to the German authorities. The two indigenous groups also exercised a great deal of independence. Under Governor Theodor Leutwein, who had assumed the position in 1894, the colony was governed in indirect fashion through agreements with leaders like Samuel Maherero, the paramount chief of the Herero, and Hendrik Witbooi, the leader of the Nama, which only sustained the pastoralist life of both groups. Rohrbach's vision of a gentler but deeply repressive colour line society could not, therefore, be implemented under the conditions existing up until 1904. It only became possible once the Herero and Nama had been killed in huge numbers, their way of life destroyed, and a new labour and property rights regime instituted. In the process, race thinking and racial policies became formalized and disseminated, in the colony and at home in Germany.

The Herero and Nama took up arms because of German land seizures, both those legally contracted and the many wild claims of German settlers, and because of the exercise of arbitrary and brutal violence by both officials and colonists.[6] Under Governor Leutwein, the initial military campaign went poorly, to the intense ire of the general staff, the kaiser, and the colonial lobby back home. The general staff assumed command of the campaign and then appointed

Lieutenant General Lothar von Trotha as Leutwein's military replacement. Trotha arrived in the colony on 11 June 1904 and quickly put into play a policy of ruthless suppression, for which he had the support of the kaiser and the general staff. More so than his infamous annihilation orders (*Vernichtungsbefehle*), Trotha's military strategy of deliberate, mass killings, along with the horrendous conditions in the concentration camps that the authorities established, led to the huge death toll.[7] The last sentence of the army's official history captured the point best: "The Herero had ceased to be an independent people [*Volksstamm*]," as if fate (or perhaps nature) alone, not German soldiers and officers and their superiors in Berlin, had sent the Herero and Nama, combatants and civilians, to their doom.[8]

For six months, Trotha had the complete support of those crucial loci of power, the monarchy and the general staff, along with the colonial lobby. Complaints about his brutality and ineptness from missionaries, Social Democrats, and the chancellor himself, Bernhard von Bülow, went unheeded. From the economic vantage point, Trotha's ideas were untenable. As Bülow, Rohrbach, and many others pointed out, where was labour to be obtained if the natives were annihilated? And if the natives were totally deprived of their cattle and land, they would become the wards of the German state, making the colony not a source of riches but a drain on the German treasury.[9] Moreover, missionaries and some German officials and settlers envisaged not "streams of blood," as Trotha wrote, but subordinate yet "civilized" Christian Africans who respected German discipline and German mores.[10]

After tens of thousands of Herero and Nama had been killed, German authorities pulled back from Trotha's genocidal policies. They wanted, above all else, stability and economic development. Settlers wanted that too and demanded that their rights as Germans living in a white people's *Rechtstaat* be confirmed. Together, the authorities and the settlers drew a new colour line that defined rights and repressions in a racial, hierarchical order. The key arenas of the colour line entailed property, labour, and citizenship, and they were all related.

The first step toward the new system came on 8 December 1904, when Kaiser Wilhelm II rescinded Trotha's first annihilation order. This was followed in 1907 by a comprehensive reform program. A free standing Colonial Office with its own state secretary was established. Bernhard Dernburg, appointed its first head, pursued the line

advocated by Rohrbach: technically free black labour under German domination, German settlement, strict separation of the races, state-subsidized economic development, and forms of representation for white people.[11]

As numerous scholars have documented, three imperial decrees that same year sealed the fate of the Herero and Nama. The first decree confiscated their remaining land and cattle, which constituted a huge transfer of real and moveable (literally – cattle) assets to German settlers. The authorities debated at length how the land would be disposed. Ultimately, most of the land was taken by the German state, then sold at incredibly low prices to settlers. At the same time, the Reichstag, after long debates, authorized compensation to German farmers who had suffered losses during the war. The Rehe-both Bastar, who had largely supported Germany in the war, also received compensation, though at a lower rate than Germans. Both provisions, the sale of land and compensation, confirmed the rights of German settlers over property. To the present day, a very large proportion of Namibia's arable land is in the hands of the descendants of German settlers.

With their assets fully expropriated, the Herero and Nama had little choice but to seek wage labour, primarily on German farms. With the fortuitous (for Germans) discovery of diamonds in 1908, the sands along the Atlantic coast, along with the associated expansion of rail lines and docks, became another venue for wage labour. The authorities wanted a regularized, not an arbitrary, system of labour exploitation, and that meant contracts, a clear marker of capitalist labour relations and "civilization."[12]

Race was made in the course of the genocidal war in Namibia and the creation of a new political economy in the colony. In other words, while Germans certainly had racial prejudices in regard to Africans prior to 1904, a full-blown concept of race and the formation of a racial state and society occurred only in the context of the fierce, deadly repression of the Herero and Nama and its aftermath.[13] Beforehand, numerous sources remarked on the "freedom-loving Herero" and their significant military capabilities, while the missionaries extended great and increasingly successful efforts to Christianize members of both groups. The Herero and Nama could not easily be written off, in a total and uniform manner, as a race incapable of accomplishments.[14]

TOWARD THE CONCEPT OF RACE IN GERMANY

The development of German racism in regard to Southwest Africa intersected with intellectual developments. No example is more revelatory than that of the anthropologist Eugen Fischer, who conducted research in Southwest Africa on the mixed-race Reheboth Bastar, the offspring of Dutch male settlers and Nama women. Fischer's major study, *The Reheboth Bastards and the Bastaridzation Problem* (to give its title in English) was published first in 1913.[15] In it Fischer argued that race mixing led inevitably to the degeneration of the race. For decades, even into the 1960s, Fischer's work was considered of great scientific value, and his textbook on heredity was widely used in university biology curricula.

Fischer went on to lead the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity, and Eugenics in the 1920s and 1930s and to hold a prestigious professorial chair at the University of Berlin. He trained many students in eugenics, among them Josef Mengele's mentor, Otmar Freiherr von Verschuer. Fischer and most of his students joined the Nazi Party, which they viewed as the perfect vehicle for their own deeply racist views.

Fischer was hardly exceptional. By the turn of the twentieth century, "race science" had come to dominate virtually all the academic disciplines, including medicine, biology, anthropology, and psychology. In this regard, Germany was simply in step with intellectual developments all across the Western world.[16] After all, it was a British statistician, Francis Galton, who, in 1881, coined the term "eugenics." In the last two decades of the nineteenth century and on into the twentieth, the word was bandied about with ease in lecture halls and parliaments, newspaper columns, and scientific journals. Learned societies were founded to promote eugenics, mass organizations to popularize it.

Eugenics means the selective breeding of favoured characteristics and the breeding out of those traits deemed dangerous. Scientists discussed the possibilities with the cool tones appropriate to their disciplines in the austere pages of journals, including, in Germany, the *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-Biologie* (*Journal for Racial and Social Biology*), in seminars and laboratories at the Francis Galton Laboratory for National Eugenics, in lectures to the British Eugenics Education Society and the German Racial Hygiene Society, all of them founded between 1904 and 1907. Just beneath their cool veneer of science lay a rough-hewn hysteria, the fear that the poor and ignorant were

breeding at fantastic rates, while the "better" classes practised family limitation. The gene pool (admittedly, a term invented later) would be swamped by deleterious traits, leading to the decline of the race. In yet another memorable phrase, Theodore Roosevelt mused aloud about the dangers of "race suicide." With eugenics, race thinking reached an apex of sorts, a merger of anthropology, Darwinism, and medicine – a fateful collusion termed by the Germans, "racial and social biology."

Karl Pearson, the leading British eugenicist after Galton, was a tireless campaigner for the cause. His German counterpart, Alfred Ploetz, was no less forthright in his calls to place race at the centre of national policy.[17] The founder of the *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-Biologie* in 1904, Ploetz argued that science had now proven the inextricable intertwining of body and spirit, physical and mental characteristics. "All spiritual and intellectual (*geistige*) developments are tightly bound up with our physical development." This was an "iron law" from which no human power can diverge.[18] These developments are themselves inseparable from "race," a grouping with similar life patterns, similar descent, and similar reproduction. A biological race is nothing less than the "maintenance of life in its entirety" (*Erhaltungseinheit des Lebens*) and the "development of life in its entirety" (*Entwicklungseinheit des Lebens*).[19] Morality, art, literature – these are the products of particular racial constitutions that are transmitted through the generations by heredity.

Ploetz, too, was keenly alive to the lurking dangers that threatened to dissipate the purity and quality of the inheritance matter that Aryans had passed on for generations. Race-mixing, the protection of the feeble minded and the criminal, the limitation on family size practised by the "better" elements – these were the dangers that Ploetz and his collaborators identified in their stream of research, writings, and lectures. Contributors to Ploetz's journal described a menagerie of well-endowed individuals, the finest elements of the race – lawyers, physicians, artists, scientists – who limited the number of their children or failed to reproduce altogether. Not rarely, they succumbed to a life of dissipation, their fine hereditary material destroyed by syphilis and gonorrhea.[20]

Like Pearson, many of the authors in the *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-Biologie* advocated state policies to promote births among the better elements, to restrict births among those poorly endowed by inheritance. Should these measures not suffice, then more drastic

ones, like compulsory sterilization of the unfit by castrations and ovarectomies, were required.[21] Progressive public health measures would round out the program. Underlying these state policies was a general science of racial biology. Ploetz proved positively inflationary in his advocacy of new, subsidiary disciplines. Along with "race biology," there would be race anatomy, race physiology, race pathology, race hygiene.[22] Race psychology and race sociology could not be far behind. Yet the presumed science of all this often degenerated into a collection of crass prejudices – the musical genius of Mozart and Beethoven rooted in their Aryan racial constitution, the formation of archery clubs as a means of reviving the vitality of the race.[23]

Ploetz also advocated an ethics of race that was derived from science.[24] The code mandated careful selection of one's partner, especially for the superior ones, and the couple's obligation to propagate. Racial ethics meant the promotion of state intervention in the very intimate realms of sexuality and reproduction to foster "the widest possible dissemination of social virtues and the weeding out [*Ausjäte*] of persistent, debilitating characteristics [*dauernd Schwachen*]."[25] Ominously, he wrote:

> the elimination of existing incurable diseases could occur only by extermination or expulsion [*Vernichtung oder Ausstoßung*] … The deficient and defective individuals [*fehlerhaften und defekten Individuen*] that still emerge could only be removed by extermination or expulsion.[26]

Ploetz had imagined the fateful move: extermination of those with unwanted traits.[27]

THE NAZI DIFFERENCE

The social and historical sciences were also infused with race thinking by the 1920s. Since the late 1970s historians have researched every academic discipline and discovered their complete integration into the policies of the Third Reich. The last discipline historians researched was their own – and came to the same conclusion.[28] Economists, sociologists, historians, and others were deeply involved in "Ostforschung" – research on Eastern Europe – that became aligned with Nazi plans for the complete restructuring of Central and Eastern Europe, including, of course, the annihilation of the Jews.[29] Many

renowned academics in the Federal Republic of Germany in the 1950s, including many historians, had happily participated in SS research institutes and projects on Eastern Europe. The Herder Institute, the major research centre on Eastern Europe, did not have a serious house cleaning of the personnel and ideological relics of the Third Reich until the 1990s.

Yet it is always important to remember that the complicity of the professions with the Third Reich was based on the ethnic and political purges that took place in the first years of Nazi rule. Jewish, left-wing, and liberal academics were forced out of their positions, creating homogeneous professions for the first time – to the great benefit of American cultural and intellectual life. As dominant as race thinking had become in Germany, it was never complete until the Nazis took power.

The same can be said at the popular level. The manifestations of race thinking were everywhere around 1900. In *Völkerschauen*, essentially human zoos in which Africans were put on display, in advertising that used erotic images of black women to sell cigarettes and chocolate and much else besides.[30] A casual, everyday racism was widespread, even though most Germans had probably never even seen a black person.

Yet here too there were cracks and fissures. A common prejudice regarding the inferiority of African or Asian people is not quite the same thing as rock-hard racism that believes the characteristics of racial populations lie in the "blood" and are therefore immutable. People may be seen as inferior yet capable of acquiring civilization – a point that segues into the issue of race in Russia and the Soviet Union.

RACE IN RUSSIA AND THE SOVIET UNION

Around the turn of the twenty-first century, the concept of race was virtually absent from scholarly discussion on the history of Russia and the Soviet Union, even though signs of race thinking and racial practices certainly existed in daily life. For scholars, race was one prominent factor among others that seemed to mark Russia's distinctiveness from the West, so much so that it was hardly ever mentioned let alone analyzed. There was no need for a veil of silence because there was nothing to cover over.

Yet this volume and the two chapters by Brigid O'Keeffe and Marina Mogilner show how the landscape has changed markedly. Research

into the most varied aspects of Russian and Soviet history have shown how deeply race thinking and racial politics were at work even when official ideology claimed Russia's distinctiveness in the matter of race.[31]

O'Keeffe demonstrates the predominance of race as the Soviets tried to figure out what to do with the Gypsy population. Everything about Gypsy life was anathema to the Soviets. They were mobile as opposed to sedentary, the latter a fundamental marker of civilization. According to prevalent belief, they robbed, begged, and deceived and followed some strange religious practices. When they had become prominent, it was as singers and dancers to bourgeois and noble audiences prior to the Bolshevik Revolution, a degenerate spectacle for all involved, performers and audience. Gypsy lives had to change in order for Gypsies to become good Soviet citizens.

As O'Keeffe shows so well, Soviet policymakers and Romani activists from the 1920s onward both essentialized the Gypsies in racial terms *and* believed that they could be transformed. Their prevalent characteristics were a result of bourgeois deformations, and everything about communism would remake them into productive, class-conscious members of the Soviet "family of nations." Gypsies had learned to "speak Soviet." Their leaders, almost all heirs to the prominent Gypsy performing families of the tzarist era, talked about the bourgeois deformations of Gypsy behaviour as they petitioned for recognition and funds. As was so often the case, official policy zigzagged. Sometimes, the state opened its meagre coffers and actively promoted the recognition of Gypsies as an official Soviet nationality. At other times, it attacked leading Gypsies, defunded their theatres and schools, and left the larger Gypsy population in a no man's land without any clear direction forward.

O'Keeffe presents all this in a most effective manner. She demonstrates the "racial logic" at work by both protagonists, the Soviet state and Romani activists, and how that logic coexisted with a belief in the malleability of people. She shows that Soviet policymakers sometimes argued that Roma could become good Soviet citizens. They were malleable, but they had to give up Roma customs that stood in direct opposition to the Soviet model of the new man and new woman. With the belief in malleability (for the most part), the Soviets at least stopped shy of full-blown racism.

That dichotomy, existent in Soviet history, also comes across in O'Keeffe's analysis. Was there simply an unresolved tension between race and malleability? Or was a concept of race at work in the Soviet

Union that was different from race in Germany or elsewhere in the Western world, one that could accommodate the ability of people to change? Perhaps we look for coherence where none is to be found, that diametrically opposed understandings of human difference coexisted without anyone really recognizing the unresolvable tension.

Mogilner takes up a different topic, namely, the Revisionist Zionist founder and leader Vladimir Jabotinsky. Mogilner's chapter fits right in with something of a scholarly boom underway regarding Jabotinsky. He is reviled by many, not least because of the Israeli Likud party's lineage back to him. But Jabotinsky was a complex intellectual as well as an activist capable of revising his own viewpoint. For all of his fierce Zionism, he recognized the right of Palestinians to the same land that he claimed as a Jew.

Mogilner rightly places Jabotinsky in the context of Russian imperial debates about human difference. As she nicely phrases it, Jabotinsky sought "post-imperial simplicity and purity" in opposition to the acceptance of multiple nationalities and religions within the empire. Mogilner describes these debates well, which involved science as well as politics. By no means were all advocates of complexity reactionaries. Like the Austro-Marxists, many Russian liberal and socialist thinkers envisaged a progressive future that retained at least the multinationality of the imperial past.

Not Jabotinsky, or at least not as he evolved. In Mogilner's telling, Jabotinsky at first embraced both fin-de-siècle and Russian imperial cosmopolitanism. But he soon abandoned such views for a politics of "pure forms," that is, of the racial differentiation of peoples that was eternal and unbending. Jabotinsky's racial views were also gendered. It was the task of men to defend the purity of the race; they were responsible for marrying in and not out to guarantee the bloodlines for the future. Hybridity was a danger to be avoided at all costs.

Mogilner relates all this through a close reading of a number of Jabotinsky's novels and other writings. She also depicts well his similarities with the Russian nationalism of the psychology and neurology professor Ivan Sikorsky. But one is left wondering about the intellectual influences on Jabotinsky and his conversion from a cosmopolitan to a race advocate.

A number of big questions remain outstanding. Just how do we account for the existence of race thinking in Russian and Soviet history? As I noted at the outset, we can explain the hegemony of race thinking in the West. Germany provides a good example of the emer-

gence of race thinking through multiple factors, including overseas imperialism and a war of extermination along with scientific and intellectual developments. But in Russia? Is it simply that Russia, too, was – obviously enough – a part of the West, so much so that its distinctiveness starts to fade when we consider the overwhelming power of race? Or is it that race is really not as modern a concept as some of us would like to think, and the encounter with difference almost inevitably leads to a form of race thinking and racial politics? Perhaps the Russian and Soviet internal colonizing efforts were, indeed, just that, and as they encountered Circassians, Kazakhs, and Siberians the travellers, scientists, government officials, and army officers who headed out from Petersburg and Moscow could not but think in the hierarchical terms of race. Or were there other, internal dynamics at work in Russian and Soviet history?

Moreover, examining race in Russia and the Soviet Union from the perspective of Germany highlights the variety of ways race can be constructed. Germany offered a "classic" form of race thinking around 1900 and afterward, one firmly integrated into the general Western thinking on race and eugenics. Jabotinsky's views also fit into prevailing Western patterns. The Nazis then vastly radicalized the politics of race, throwing off all the limits of liberalism, religion, and socialism through its exterminatory policies. The Soviets had an understanding of race that was somewhat more open than others because it posited the possibility that individuals and groups could change. Their characteristics were malleable, not fixed for all time. These are the issues that still need exploration as the research on race in the Russian and Soviet past, so prominently displayed in these two chapters, advances.

NOTES

1 Among those who would argue differently, that a concept of race already existed in the ancient world, are Benjamin Isaac, *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004) and David M. Goldenberg, *The Curse of Ham: Race and Slavery in Early Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).

2 See Robert Nelson, ed., *Germans, Poland, and Colonial Expansion to the East: 1850 through the Present* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009) and Scott McNeill Eddie, *Landownership in Eastern Germany before the Great War: A Quantitative Analysis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008). Generally on Germans and the East, see Gregor Thum, "Imperialists in Panic: The Evoca-

tion of Empire at Germany's Eastern Frontier around 1900," in *Helpless Imperialists: Imperial Failure, Fear and Radicalization*, eds. Maurus Reinkowski and Gregor Thum (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2013), 137–62; Thum, "Megalomania and Angst: The Nineteenth-Century Mythicization of Germany's Eastern Borderlands," in *Shatterzone of Empires: Coexistence and Violence in the German, Habsburg, Russian, and Ottoman Borderlands*, eds. Omer Bartov and Eric D. Weitz (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 42–60; Kristin Leigh Kopp, *Germany's Wild East: Constructing Poland as Colonial Space* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012); and Thum, *Traumland Osten: Deutsche Bilder von östichen Europa im 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2006).

3 See, for example, Birthe Kundrus, *Moderne Imperialisten: Das Kaiserreich im Spiegel seiner Kolonien* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2003); Kundrus, ed., *Phantasiereiche: Zur Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2003); Sara Friedrichsmeyer, Sarah Lennox, and Susanna Zantop, eds., *The Imperialist Imagination: German Colonialism and its Legacies* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998); and John Noyes, *Colonial Space: Spatiality in the Discourse of German Southwest Africa, 1884–1915* (Philadelphia: Harwood Academic, 1992).

4 Rohrbach to his brother Fritz, 6 February 1906, Bundesarchiv Koblenz (hereafter BAK)/NL1408/69. Some of the material on Southwest Africa is drawn from my book, *A World Divided: The Global Struggle for Human Rights in the Age of Nation-States* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019).

5 Clara Rohrback to her parents and sister, Windhoek, 15 November 1905, BAK/NL1408/68.

6 See *"Words Cannot Be Found": German Colonial Rule in Namibia. An Annotated Reprint of the 1918 Blue Book*, ed. Jan-Bart Gewald and Jeremy Silvester (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

7 See Isabel Hull, *Absolute Destruction: Military Culture and the Practices of War in Imperial Germany* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005), 13–30. For a careful weighing of the always incomplete statistics, see ibid., 88–90. See also, Großer Generalstab, Kriegsgeschichtliche Abteilung I, *Die Kämpfe der deutschen Truppen in Südwestafrika. Auf grund amtlichen Materials*, vol. 3: *Der Entscheidungskampf am Waterberg. Der Untergang des Hererovokes* (Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler und Sohn, 1906), 193. Numerous other statements confirm the German military's deliberate strategy of driving the Herero into the desert where they would die of thirst and starviation. See also, ibid., 137–8, 203, 211. The older accounts of the war remain valuable. See Horst Drechsler, *Südwestafrika unter deutscher Kolonialherrschaft: Der Kampf der Herero und Nama gegen den deutschen Imperialismus (1884–1915)* (Berlin:

Akademie, 1966); Helmut Bley, *Kolonialherrschaft und Sozialstruktur in Deutsch-Südwestafrica 1894–1914* (Hamburg: Leibiniz-Verlag, 1968); and Jon Bridgman, *The Revolt of the Hereros* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981). Among the important more recent publications are Gesine Krüger, *Kriegsbewältigung und Geschichtsbewußtsein: Realität, Deutung und Verarbeitung des deutschen Kolonialkriegs in Namibia 1904 bis 1907* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1999); Jan-Bart Gewald, *Herero Heroes: A Socio-Political History of the Herero of Namibia, 1890–1923* (Oxford: James Currey, 1999); Jürgen Zimmerer, *Deutsche Herrschaft über Afrikaner: Staatlicher Machtanspruch und Wirklichkeit im kolonialen Namibia* (Münster: Lit, 2002); and Hull, *Absolute Destruction*.

8 *Kämpfe der deutschen Truppen*, 3: 218.

9 Paul Rohrbach report, 16 August 1904, Bundesarchiv Lichterfelde, Reichskolonialamt (hereafter RKA)/R1001/1139 (film 110)/87–159, 64–7 (of report), quote 64. In fact, the settlers and the colonial administration did sieze the Herero's cattle, but the issue of granting them some livestock continued to be strongly debated for the rest of the colony's existence. See also, for example, the views of Colonial Secretary Bernhard Dernburg, "Bericht über die Besprechungen Seiner Exzellenz des Herren Staatssekretärs Dernburg mit den Referenten des Gouvernements," Windhuk, 12 August 1908, RKA/R1001/2086 (film 205)/22–48, especially 22–3.

10 Trotha wrote that colonial wars had to be conducted with "streams of money and blood." Quoted in Krüger, *Kriegsbewältigung und Geschichtsbewußtsein*, 65. Hence, whether or not Trotha planned total annihilation from the outset is not so much the issue. What is critical is the way his policies opened up new possibilities for the future. See Hull's discussion about whether or not there was a preexisting plan, 28–33.

11 About the character of settlement and development there were serious disputes, with Governor Lindequist, for example, advocating small German farms and limited state involvement, and Rohrbach arguing for large ranches and a more active role for the state. See the account in Daniel Joseph Walther, *Creating Germans Abroad: Cultural Policies and National Identity in Namibia* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2002), 1–27. On colonial policies after the genocide, see Bley, *South-West Africa*, 149–279 and Zimmerer, *Deutsche Herrschaft*.

12 See generally on the directives regarding labour contracts, Kaiserlicher Gouverneur (Lindequist), Windhuk, 18 August 1907, National Archives of Namibia (hereafter NAN)/BRE 27/E.2.a, Bd. 1/-15, and on their violations, 5RS; and Kaiserliches Bezirksamt to Herrn Gouverneur, Reheboth, 21 Octo-

ber 1912, NAN/BRE 27/E.2.a, Bd. 1/43–44. See also Zimmerer, *Deutsche Herrschaft*, 176–211.

13 See Adam A. Blackler, "Heathens, 'Hottentots,' and *Heimat*: Colonial Encounters and German Identity in Southwest Africa, 1842–1915" (PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 2017) and Blackler, "From Boondoggle to Settlement Colony: Hendrik Wittbooi and the Evolution of Germany's Imperial Project in Southwest Africa, 1884–1894," *Central European History* 50, 4 (2017): 449–70.

14 Here I differ with George Steinmetz, *The Devil's Handwriting: Precoloniality and the German Colonial State in Qingdao, Samoa, and Southwest Africa* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), who argues that the Germans viewed the Herero as an unrelentingly debased race. Among other matters, he ignores the fact that missionaries had made great headway with the Herero elite (and the Nama as well). Maharero was educated in missionary schools and spoke and wrote German.

15 Eugen Fischer, *Die Rehobother Bastards und das Bastardierungsproblem bei dem Menschen: Anthropolgische und ethnographische Studien am Rehobother Bastardvolk in Deutsch-Südwest-Afrika* (1913; Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1961).

16 I draw here on Eric D. Weitz, "Race and Nation: An Intellectual History," in *A Century of Genocide: Utopias of Race and Nation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 16–52.

17 See Paul Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 120–33.

18 Alfred Ploetz, "Die Begriffe Rasse und Gesellschaft und die davon abgeleiteten Disziplinen," *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-Biologie* (hereafter *AfRGB*) 1 (1904): 1–26, quotes 3.

19 Ibid., 7, 8.

20 See for example, Karl Munn, "Tatsachen zur Frage der ungenügenden Fortpflanzung der Intellektuellen und ihrer Ursachen," *AfRGB* 13 (1918–21): 171–5.

21 Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics*, 100–1, 181–6. German eugenicists followed with great interest American legislation that allowed the compulsory sterilization of the mentally and physically handicapped. See, for example, G. von Hoffmann, "Das Sterilisierungsprogramm in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerkia," *AfRGB* 11 (1914–16): 184–92.

22 Ploetz, "Begriff," 11.

23 Alfred Ploetz, "Neomalthusianismus und Rassenhygiene," *AfRGB* 10 (1913):

166–72; Albert Reibmayr, "Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der wichtigsten Charaktere und Anlagen der indogermanischen Rasse," *AfRGB* 7 (1910): 328–53; and Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics*, 153.

24 See Alfred Ploetz, "Ableitung einer Gesellschafts-Hygiene und ihrer Beziehungen zur Ethik," *AfRGB* 3 (1906): 253–9, and Gustav Ratzenhofer, "Die Rassenfrage vom ethischen Standpunkte," *AfRGB* 1 (1904): 737–48.

25 Ploetz, "Ableitung einer Gesellschafts-Hygiene," 256.

26 Ibid., 255.

27 Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics*, 131, provides a somewhat more cautious interpretation of Ploetz's position before World War I.

28 Representative works are Michael Fallbusch and Ingo Haar, eds., *Völkische Wissenschaften und Politikberatung im 20. Jahrhundert: Expertise und "Neuordnung" Europas* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2010) and Ingo Haar, *Historiker im Nationalsozialismus: Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft und der "Volkstumskampf" im Osten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2002).

29 See the pioneering study of Michael Burleigh, *Germany Turns Eastward: A Study of Ostforschung in the Third Reich* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988) and, for one major biographical work, Eduard Mühle, *Für Volk und Deutschen Osten: Der Historiker Hermann Aubin und die deutsche Ostforschung* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2004).

30 See David Ciarlo, *Advertising Empire: Race and Visual Culture in Imperial Germany* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011).

31 See also Eric D. Weitz, "Racial Politics Without the Concept of Race: Reevaluating Soviet Ethnic and National Purges," *Slavic Review* 61, 1 (2002): 1–29, with comments my response, "On Certainties and Ambivalences: Reply to My Critics": 62–5.

PART THREE

Empires Mixing

7

Racial "Degeneration" and Siberian Regionalism in the Late Imperial Period

David Rainbow

In 1874 Nikolai Mikhailovich Iadrintsev, twenty-eight-year-old son of a Siberian merchant, published in one of St Petersburg's most prestigious journals a two-part scientific study of the condition of "Russian ethnicity" in the empire's eastern provinces. The condition, he concluded, was dismal. As any traveller to the region would agree, he argued, the Russians in Siberia, or *sibiriaki*, had suffered "obvious regression" and "degeneration" through interaction and interbreeding with Siberia's *inorodtsy* or indigenous peoples. Even *sibiriaki* themselves recognized this situation, referring to themselves as "mixtures, a mixed people, and half-breeds (*vyrodki*)." In short, according to Iadrintsev, Russian settlers east of the Ural Mountains had become a new, degenerate race.[1]

Iadrintsev's characterization of Siberians was not unique. Other intellectuals and imperial elites shared his anxiety about Russians in the Siberian hinterland "going native."[2] What is remarkable about Iadrintsev's view, indeed even puzzling, is that he was a passionate Siberian "patriot," *the* great champion of Siberians, their interests, and their right to autonomously govern their own affairs. A largely self-taught ethnographer, Iadrintsev was a trenchant critic of autocracy and a vocal admirer of American-style federalism. He became one of the most important exponents of Siberian regionalism (*oblastnichestvo*), a sociopolitical movement for greater regional autonomy and distinctiveness.[3] According to one fellow Siberian writing after Iadrintsev's death, his writing was "political gospel for patriotic Siberians."[4]

It is not obvious, then, why Iadrintsev harboured such a low view of Siberians, much less why he expounded it in such great detail in a prominent journal in the capital. It is a strange kind of hero who insists on the racial degeneration of his compatriots.

Iadrintsev's argument about race in Siberia was part of a larger effort to critique Russian imperial politics in Siberia by *oblastniki* or regionalists. The "scientific" study of race, to which his article was meant to contribute, ostensibly promised to show which races had mixed with which, to what extent, and, most importantly, what that indicated about the level of "progress" and "civilization" in the region. Race mixing was not itself the problem. According to a widely held view at the time, races were always mixtures or amalgams created through a variety of biological, historical, and environmental influences.[5] The problem, rather, was that Russians were becoming like *inorodtsy* as much as the other way around. Along with nearly all educated Russians, Iadrintsev and the other Siberian regionalists took for granted that ethnic Russians (*russkie*) stood atop a civilizational hierarchy within the empire. Iadrintsev's assumption was that this meant Russians were supposed to be more resistant to assimilation than were less civilized *inorodtsy*. To evaluate race in Siberia, therefore, was to evaluate the health and strength of both Russian (*russkie*) civilization and the Russian (*rossiiskaia*) empire responsible for spreading it.[6]

This chapter examines the place of race in Siberian regionalist thinking from the 1860s on. It identifies two distinct arguments related to race that regionalists made in their extensive scholarly and popular writing. In the 1860s and '70s, Iadrintsev and other regionalists claimed that racial degeneration in Siberia was evidence of the failures of Russian imperial governance. After three centuries of sending "inferior" imperial subjects to settle Siberia – illiterate peasants, degenerate criminals, and avaricious traders – the Russian population there was "going native." Once Russia's underqualified colonizers arrived, Siberia's inadequate administration and infrastructure rendered them even less civilized. Roads, hospitals, laws, officials, and, above all, educational institutions, were too few and too poor thanks to centuries of neglect. In other words, ineffective colonial policies, not least of which was the sending of déclassé colonizers, were to blame for racial degeneration.

The second argument, which became more prominent over time, was that racial mixing between Slavic settlers and *inorodtsy* in Siberia

was not simply deleterious but had in fact helped produce a new kind of racial type – a Siberian – that was *better* equipped than either parent race for self-governance in the region.[7] As the state paid more attention to developing Siberia, which it did especially beginning in the late 1870s, Iadrintsev and others became cautiously optimistic about the benefits of Siberians' unique characteristics. The Siberian, according to this view, was better able to take care of himself and of the region than Russian settlers were. Increasingly towards the end of the nineteenth century, Russians from the western part of the empire were seen as outsiders. For Iadrintsev, in particular, the mixed-race Siberian became an ideal. The tension between seeing Siberians as uncivilized, on one hand, and Siberians as ideal, on the other, was a tension inherent in Siberian regionalism, a movement that sought more government intervention as a means to greater regional autonomy.[8]

The tension was never resolved, at least not by Siberian regionalists. By the 1890s the imperial government was dumping unprecedented resources into railroad construction and the resettlement of millions of peasants from European Russia to Siberia.[9] While some regionalists welcomed these developments as long overdue civilizational progress, others feared it threatened to wash away the distinctive and positive racial attributes that made Siberians unique and that had by then come to be seen as part of the justification for seeking greater autonomy from the imperial centre. Constructing Siberian identity in racial terms had helped to attract imperial attention to the region's need of "development," but it left that identity vulnerable when the state at last began to "civilize" Siberia for its own purposes.

Examining the place of race in Siberian regionalist thinking is a way to better understand what the concept of race could mean in Russia during the period and also how race related to imperial politics. Regionalist thinking reflected a contemporary understanding of race as a fundamentally malleable category of human difference; it took for granted that the intended audience, chief among whom were imperial officials and policy makers, shared this understanding. Furthermore, this critique of the state's colonial policies in Siberia was based on the premise that human bodies defined in racial terms reflected the success or failure of imperial power. It is therefore a useful case to consider in order to better understand how the politics of race were developing in Russia as compared to other empires around the world.

RACE AS CIVILIZATION

In 1863, taking inspiration from the Polish uprising then underway in the empire's western borderlands, several young Siberians studying in St Petersburg, Kazan, and Moscow composed two secret manifestoes. The documents, entitled "To Siberian Patriots" and "To the Patriots of Siberia," declared the need for Siberian independence based on a litany of grievances against the tsar's failure to properly care for the region. Ignored by reformers and government officials, exploited by industrialists, and polluted by exiles, Siberia would only progress if it threw off the yoke of Russian rule. The manifestoes were neither published nor signed, though we have a good idea that their authors included three of the most prominent among the fledgling but energetic Siberian intelligentsia: Grigorii Nikolaevich Potanin, Serafim Serafimovich Shashkov, and Iadrintsev.[10] Born in Siberia but studying at universities in the "centre" of the empire, these three were typical of a new generation of young intellectuals throughout the empire in that they came from middling families.[11] The discovery of the manifestoes by local officials in Omsk in the Spring of 1865 set off a several-year-long investigation ending in the trials of more than forty Siberians and the exile of Potanin, Iadrintsev, Shashkov, and several others. Several dozen more were convicted of having "intentions toward the overthrow of the existing order."[12] The ringleaders, including Potanin, Iadrintsev, and Shashkov, were exiled, fittingly, *out* of Siberia.

The separatist manifestoes did not include race or ethnicity as bases for their call to establish a "United States of Siberia." This indicates that they saw something other than race as the basis for Siberian unity. They took for granted that "Siberians" were ethnic Russians who had settled east of the Ural Mountains. Their calls for separation were justified strictly in geographic and political – not racial or ethnic – terms.[13] However, regionalists' views changed after Siberia's most prominent intellectual at the time, the populist historian and ethnographer Afanasii Prokop'evich Shchapov, published a pair of articles in 1864 and 1865.[14] Shchapov's articles considered the Siberian population in racial terms and explicitly called for other Russians to do the same. Shchapov effectively provided a "scientific" basis for a critique of Russia's colonial failures from a Siberian perspective and also for a new conception of Siberianness racially distinct from Russianness.

Shchapov had already proved himself a trenchant critic of tsarist politics by the time he turned his attention to the study of race. Sent from his home in Irkutsk to the western part of the empire in 1852 to attend the religious academy in Kazan, he quickly distinguished himself as a scholar of Russian history and was made professor at Kazan University by 1860. His work emphasized regional difference and local self-government instead of the imperial state and autocracy as the driving forces behind historical change in Russia. This put him at odds with the dominant historiographical views at the time but cemented his prominence in both populist and regionalist movements that followed.[15]

After running afoul of authorities in Kazan, Shchapov was forced to return home to Irkutsk in 1864, where he took up work with the Imperial Geographical Society and embarked on the study of ethnography and colonization in the Russian empire. His articles on the "ethnographic organization" of the population in Siberia were published in two widely read St Petersburg journals shortly thereafter. The articles called for the Russian educated elite to develop a domestic race science, to "uncover the very laws and processes of the physiological development of the Russian population," which he understood to include biological, historical, and environmental factors.[16] This also necessarily required racial analysis of Siberia's *inorodtsy*, since it was their "blood that was in us and in our children" – a claim with special significance coming from Shchapov, himself the son of a Russian man and Buriat woman.[17] In reading Shchapov's articles, it become clear that his ostensibly academic concern was in service to his political critique of Russian imperial expansion and colonization, in general, and its policies in Siberia, in particular. He mobilized the concept of race in order to criticize the imperial state's policies in Siberia. His goal was to change the way elites in the imperial centre viewed and treated the region.

For Shchapov, the contemporary racial organization of Russia had to be viewed in historical perspective. Drawing upon the work of European scholars, Shchapov described how in ancient times, people had descended from the mountains of Central Asia to populate northern Siberia and northeastern Europe. Russia was a crossroads between Asia and Europe that came to be populated by "four principle races (*rasy*)": Slavic (sometimes referred to in the article as "Slavic-Russian"), Finnic, Turkic, and Mongol. Because of the unique expansiveness and location of Russia, these races were subjected to the "most extensive

and uninterrupted miscegenation [*metisatsiia*], crossbreeding, and mixing of tribes and peoples on the Russian land."[18] Every racial type was the product of the flows and interactions among different peoples over the centuries, but Russia's geographical location, according to Shchapov, meant that it had developed a uniquely brackish racial mixture. Shchapov claimed that race could be seen changing in real time most conspicuously in Siberia as a result of ongoing "blood-mixing" and the region's uniquely severe environmental conditions. Siberia was a veritable laboratory of racial transformation.

According to Shchapov, racial mixing was evident in everything from how people dressed and spoke to whom they married and how they looked, and was categorized according to "nationality" (*natsional'nost'*), "ethnicity" (*narodnost'*), "race" (*rasa*), and "tribe" (*plemia*). Shchapov used these categories interchangeably with very little appreciable distinction among them, which was not unusual in mid-century race thinking, either in Russia or Western Europe.[19] He gathered evidence from historical, travel, and ethnographic writings by Europeans and Russians to make his case that "blood mixing" was the rule. He wrote: "There is scarcely a state in Europe where there is not to a greater or lesser degree the mixing of tribes and races. But it is possible to say with certainty that in all of Europe no state will be found that contains within itself such diverse ethnographic (*etnograficheskie*) elements as in Russia."[20] If race mixing was typical for European states, then Russia was the most European of all. Europe had its race theorists, but Russia was still waiting for its own scientists to make sense of its "particularly extensive and uninterrupted mixing of tribes and peoples (*narodov*)."[21] Shchapov's articles were meant to provide a start.

The fact that races for Shchapov were neither primordial nor immutable did not mean that they were not hierarchical. Different races could be identified based on their relative health, strength, intelligence, social organization, and political dominance, among other markers of "civilization." Race and civilization were integrally related: race determined a group's level of civilization, and civilization at the same time determined race, a supposition that lay at the base of Shchapov's efforts to get the empire to civilize Siberia's population.[22] Shchapov cited some of the latest in European race science that claimed a direct correlation between brain size and level of civilization. Research on "the capacity of the skull in different races explains to us why and according to what law one nationality (*natsional'nost'*)

gained a decisive advantage over another, and subjugated and civilized it, and shows the extensive capacities and successes in colonization and culture [of one group], and then how a different tribe is incapable even to assert its own tribal independence."[23]

The implication of Shchapov's articles was not only that race and civilization were intimately intertwined but also that evaluating race was, in effect, a way to measure the success of Russian imperial expansion into Asia and the health of the empire as a whole. Russians, who according to Shchapov were civilized and racially superior to the people they encountered, were degenerating in Siberia. This was the opposite of what was supposed to happen. Russians, Shchapov wrote, "not only should have thrived themselves, but also should have cultured and civilized the Ostiaks and Samoeds, or made [the *inorodtsy*] into their own flesh and blood."[24] The problem was that for three centuries the empire had confronted *inorodtsy* with peasant missionaries, tobacco, and vodka – "cleverness and deception" – when it should have welcomed them into the empire with affordable goods, effective schools, "Russian bread and salt," and "humane relations." This was the way "we should win them over and attract them to ourselves, to our race (*rasa*)."[25] The fact that this had not happened indicated to Shchapov a failure in imperial strategy and the poor quality of settlers sent to the east. Civilized Russians would have made Russians out of the *inorodtsy*, whereas lower orders of Russians were themselves "going native." In this conception, race was more malleable than social class. The "scientific" discussion of race of the articles served as the basis for Shchapov's critique of imperial policies, which was that Siberia's lack of development was the government's fault.

Shchapov's populist political views and criticism of the government got him in trouble with tsarist officials in Kazan where he taught Russian history, but they also earned him a loyal following of young Siberian university students studying outside of their "homeland" and receptive to his teaching on federalism and the idea that the empire's many regions ought to enjoy autonomy within a decentralized state. Siberian regionalists took up Shchapov's views on race. Race provided a means of articulating their critique of the failures of Russian colonization and advocating regionalism within the Russian empire. Quickly, however, they moved beyond Shchapov's critique and began to imagine how the Siberian regional type might be held up as an ideal.

SIBERIAN REGIONALISTS TAKE UP RACE

During the police confiscations and interrogations that followed the discovery of the separatist manifestoes in 1865, regionalists expounded upon their new conception of Siberians in racial terms. Investigators discovered letters, for instance, that revealed plans to unify all of the Siberian students in St Petersburg and Moscow and "to bring into existence a special ethnicity (*osushchestvlenie osoboi narodnosti*) in Siberia,"[26] which was particularly worrisome to the Moscow chief of police who passed on his concern to the main investigators in Omsk.[27] Shashkov told his interrogators, "At the present time the strongest mixing of tribes, the most active preparation of the organization of the future of humanity is taking place in America and Siberia." Siberian settlers "mixed with native women," which created a population that was "*no longer Great Russian, but a Siberian population that noticeably differed from it*" (emphasis in the original police report). Shashkov told the investigating commission that this conclusion was "the product of the new method of historical research according to the principles of natural science" derived from Shchapov's articles.[28] Potanin weighed in, too, with a theory that the region's climate had contributed to the formation of what he call a "common mixed type of Siberian."[29]

The incorporation of racial change into Siberian regionalist thinking was an innovation. It developed in the context of increasing attention to ethnography as a discipline as well as the rising importance of national movements in Ukraine and Poland. To intellectuals grasping for ways to define a collective notion of Siberianness, the concept of race, coupled with geography, provided an ostensibly empirical basis for criticizing the state in hopes of prompting reform and at the same time for claiming the cohesiveness of Siberia and therefore its distinction from the rest of the empire.

Incarceration and exile did not stop "Siberian patriots" from pointing out what they viewed as the failures of imperial policies in the provinces. Potanin and Shashkov continued researching while in prison in Omsk. Iadrintsev was hired by the regional officials responsible for overseeing him in Arkhangelsk province almost immediately upon his arrival to work for them studying, of all things, the negative effects of the exile system on local communities.[30] By the mid-1870s, at which point Siberian regionalists had served their terms of exile, they had established themselves as expert contributors to

Russian ethnography and geography. Iadrintsev had distinguished himself as one of the most articulate spokesmen for the autonomist movement. Over the next two decades of prolific research and writing, Iadrintsev wove the concept of race into his larger mission to bring about "progress" in Siberia.

In 1874 and 1875 Iadrintsev published his two-part article on racial degeneration in Siberia entitled "The Russian Ethnicity (*narodnost'*) in the East."[31] The article documented the effects of 300 years of colonization on Russians who had settled in Siberia in ethno-racial terms. Iadrintsev drew conclusions about physiological, cultural, social, intellectual, and other qualities of the "Russian ethnicity" in Siberia based on ethnographic studies by European travellers from the seventeenth century on and more recently by ethnographers such as Shchapov, Mikhail Ivanovich Veniukov, and Pavel Apollonovich Rovinskii. The articles were clearly meant to contribute to uncovering the universalistic "laws of miscegenation" called for earlier by Shchapov and reflected an enduring assumption that culture, biology, and environment conspired to effect "racial particularity."[32]

As for the process of national and racial change, Iadrintsev described it this way. Russians began settling in Siberia during the sixteenth century along a narrow corridor near what became the southern border of the empire. The resulting "column" of Russians (*russkie*) ran through the middle of Siberia's "Asian *inorodtsy*."[33] The centre of the column, steadily replenished with new Russian settlers, remained "a pure Russian population," whereas mixing occurred along the edges.[34] The proportion of Russian to indigenous peoples decreased the farther one travelled away from the column in either direction. The amount of mixing also increased as the column made its way east. His description of the ethnic map of Siberia mirrored the work of other researchers addressing similar questions at the time. Iadrintsev calculated the degrees of mixture by measuring facial features, eye shapes, height, "ways of life," levels of "blood kinship," cultural-linguistic exchange, and even sexual preferences based on hair colour.[35] Siberian men (it turns out) increasingly prefer brunettes.[36] In short, Iadrintsev was providing new "empirical" evidence for the fear, long held among imperial officials by then, that Russians were "going native." In the far northeastern region of Iakutiia, Iadrintsev reported, Russians were "turning into Iakuts."[37] Approaching the city of Irkutsk coming from the west, Russians began to look more and more like "the Mongol race."[38] Just east of Lake Baikal where the Mongolian

descended Buriats lived, some Russians, Iadrintsev claimed, had become "nearly completely buriatified."[39]

Iadrintsev's constructivist view of race allowed him to level a critique of Russian colonization of Siberia in racial terms. Siberia was "a living anatomical segment of an old historical map," Iadrintsev wrote, which was his way of saying that Siberia was "behind."[40] The region was a time capsule of civilizational development from a bygone age. Researchers could study there which characteristics "the Russian population in the east has for the preservation of its racial particularity, and also the impacts and significance of our colonial movement."[41] Colonization was meant to spread civilization. Civilization, and therefore the success of Russian colonization, could be measured through an analysis of race mixing.

The problem, according to Iadrintsev, was that race mixing was going both ways. Russians were becoming like *inorodtsy* even as *inorodtsy* were becoming like Russians. "Mixing and degeneration in the east is happening along two paths: by means of blood kinship and admixture of the native (*inorodcheskii*) element to the Russian ethnicity (*narodnost'*), and also because of *inorodtsy* themselves taking on the Russian language and way of life, merging (*smeshenie*) with Russians, [which leads to their] complete fusion (*slitie*) and disappearance among the Russian ethnicity." This was evident in what Siberians called themselves ("mixed people and half-breeds") and in the culture they had developed (individualistic, materialistic, and unconcerned with "social consciousness").[42] As if to remind his reader that racial degeneration was not simply a matter of biology, Iadrintsev claimed that "indigenous blood has colored Russian ethnicity (*narodnost'*) even in places where [Russians] were not in direct contact with *inorodtsy*."[43] The likely reason for the rapidity of all of this "mixing" in the Siberian case, Iadrintsev surmised, was that "the colonizers and the colonized in that epoch [of the early Slavic settlement to the region] stood at nearly the same level of culture and development."[44] Iadrintsev made central to his critique of Russian colonization the notion that uncivilized peasants, criminals, and vagabonds from Russia were not adequate to build civilization in Siberia. The social class of the colonizers had a direct bearing on the racial transformation taking place.

The political implications of Iadrintsev's "scientific" findings were clear. If the steady stream of Russian peasants and exiles colonizing Siberia were becoming even *more* backward instead of enlightening

the natives as they were supposed to, then the need for "development" in the region was urgent. Iadrintsev's premise was that the goal of state action was to "preserve Russian nationality in the east" and "pass on Russian culture to Siberian *natives*." His study was a documentation of how the goal was not being met. This was the result of failed colonial policies, which he concluded had left degenerate Russians, declining culture and egotistical individualists untroubled by the interests of society.[45] The solution, then, was to pursue several concrete steps: end centuries of administrative neglect, curtail the exile system and replace it with peasant resettlement, and build schools and universities. In short, the solution was to pursue "rationally organized colonization."[46] As long as the empire neglected to spread "enlightenment and civilization" in the east, Russian nationality in Siberia was in danger.[47] The article was, in effect, a policy paper.

Iadrintsev's colonial critique, however, left open the potential for drawing two very different conclusions from the story of racial degeneration. The first, which echoed Shchapov, was that the government needed to do a better job of civilizing, understood as russifying, the native population. This required not only better policies and more resources but better people, as well. Not every member of the Russian race was sufficient to spread civilization, least of all criminals who made up a conspicuous portion of settlers to the region. The second, was that the merger of Siberia's two "primordial races (*rodonachal'nye rasy*) – Slavic-Russian and Asian-inorodtsy" had generated something new, a new Siberian racial type that had emerged out of "the unification of the mixture of different races."[48] Iadrintsev's rendering of Shchapov's racialized picture of Siberia opened up the possibility that Siberians were not simply degenerate Russians, but had potentially positive characteristics, too. The Siberian "regional type," Iadrintsev wrote, possessed "an entrepreneurial spirit, and strives toward freedom, equality, novelty, and the capacity for progress" and "a realistic direction of thinking."[49] The oppression of Siberia and the stream of déclassé settlers had overwhelmed these traits, which as a result morphed into "narrow egoistic motivations," a "perversion" of what they should have been.[50]

These two conclusions were somewhat at odds. On one hand, Iadrintsev was suggesting Siberia needed better representatives of the Russian race who were less malleable to settle the region. On the other hand, he was suggesting that racial malleability made possible the emergence of something new and better. In the best-case scenario,

the distinctive qualities of Siberians that had evolved as a result of intermarriage and environmental influences would flourish and serve as the basis for a new Siberian racial ideal.

SIBERIAN MESTIZOS AS THE IDEAL

Over the next several years following the publication of Iadrintsev's articles on race, the tension between these two conclusions became even more pronounced. If Russification were too slow or ineffectual, Siberia risked perpetual cultural stagnation and backwardness. If Russification were too rapid or effective, Siberia risked losing its racial distinctiveness and therefore an important element of its regional identity. This was a delicate balance that Iadrintsev sought to strike, as he mobilized the concept of race in service of Siberian regionalism.

Change was dramatic in Siberia beginning in the late 1870s. Some of what Siberian regionalists considered the region's greatest needs were beginning to be met. Iadrintsev and several other regionalists opened the first private newspapers in Siberia, the imperial administration paid careful attention to reforming the exile system, and the government opened schools.[51] An exceptionally capable and reform-minded governor general, Nikolai Gennad'evich Kaznakov, who took up his post in western Siberia in 1875, was responsible for much of the relative optimism that took hold in Siberia during this period – one, incidentally, that was characterized by severe political and social crises in the empire as a whole.[52] Among other things, Kaznakov incorporated local experts into his regional administration (a common practice among the most successful regional governors), including Iadrintsev, whose lectures and writing on education and exile attracted the new governor general's attention.[53] In 1882 – celebrated throughout the empire as the 300-year anniversary of Siberia's union with Russia – Kaznakov helped Iadrintsev secure permission to open and edit a private newspaper in St Petersburg that dealt with Siberian affairs called, *Eastern Review*. The same year Iadrintsev published his magnum opus, *Siberia as a Colony*, a nearly 500-page study of the region that would become a veritable bible of the Siberian regionalist movement.[54] A new course was being set, it seemed, toward a brighter Siberian future. This sense was reflected in Iadrintsev's shifting evaluation of the Siberian regional type, which he cast in a more positive, if still cautious, light in *Siberia as a Colony*.

For all the measured hope in the future among Siberian regionalists, *Siberia as a Colony* cannot exactly be characterized as an optimistic book. As historians have noted, the book levelled a blistering assessment of the empire's history in the region and secured Iadrintsev's place as an articulate and informed critic of Russian colonial policies.[55] However, what is typically overlooked is that Iadrintsev's critique, sharp as it was, did not take aim at colonization, per se, but at the way Russia had carried it out. His complaint was not that Siberia was a colony but that it was a poorly run colony. To get his readers to view the region as a *colony* of Russia – which was the central goal of the book – was to get them to see the problem *and* the solution. "The colonization of Siberia," he wrote, "is a fact that is far from completed."[56]

Iadrintsev's answer to the "colonial question" outlined a historical path of development along which Siberia would become the country it ought to be. The was precarious but promising: Siberia needed better policies and better settlers coming from European Russia, just not too many of either. Government intentions to dramatically expand the number of resettlers to the region were widely discussed in the press at the time. At the same time, efforts were underway to mitigate the negative effects of the exile system on local populations. The state was paying attention. Iadrintsev's book insisted on the distinctiveness of Siberia. In his book, Iadrintsev argued that as the land-hungry population in European Russia grew as a result of the 1861 emancipation of the serfs, sparsely populated land (e.g., Siberia) would "play an enormous role in the future of humanity."[57] More Russians moving to Siberia provided the backdrop for his study of "the influence on the person" (i.e., the Russian settler) of the social and environmental "particularities" in Siberia.[58] "There is no doubt," he assured his readers, "that here among virgin nature the character of the population should become more original and more distinctive (*samobytnee*)."[59] The story of racial degeneration was giving way to a story of racial transformation.

Iadrintsev's book began with two chapters that were similar to the two articles from 1874 and 1875, though with significant revisions. The chapters reiterated the earlier alarm that racial mixing was happening "in two directions"[60] (i.e., *inorodtsy* were being russified *and* Russians were going native) and that the region therefore demanded attention from the state. Now, however, Iadrintsev elaborated on

something that was only alluded to in the earlier articles: namely, that Russians in Siberia were taking on *positive* traits through racial mixing, in addition to negative ones. Racial hierarchy still stood, and Russians were still on top, but Iadrintsev now allowed for the idea that the new racial type being generated through "the contact and miscegenation of the Russian population with indigenous tribes" could effectively result in an amalgam of the best characteristics of each. He continued:

> During its mixing with *inorodtsy*, the Slavic race frequently had a very weak influence and became lower in quality. This resulted in the degeneration of the Russian ethnicity. At the same time, it is impossible not to mention that in different cases the Russian ethnicity, assimilating with indigenous tribes, did not acquire a single negative attribute, but diversified its abilities and borrowed several positive qualities of sophisticated abilities and feelings. However, whatever the new positive qualities acquired through race were, the phenomenon is a visible warning and shows the need for taking some kind of measure against the lowering of the Slavic race in Siberia.[61]

The results of race mixing varied and depended on a variety of factors. In Iadrintsev's view, it was still a real possibility that the Russian race could degenerate due to the government's failings. His reinterpretation of racial mixing, however, allowed for the possibility that it could be a good thing.

The revisions to the articles were in part updates of conditions in Siberia based on new evidence and in part new interpretations of the existing conditions. So for instance Iadrintsev claimed that the "wildness" of the Siberian was decreasing as he become more aware of, and confident in, his particularities.[62] "Intellectual life" was progressing in the region thanks in part to the fact that there were more schools in Siberia than there had been seven years before.[63] Iadrintsev also introduced a line of argument similar to the famous Slavophile argument developed earlier in the century that Russia was at an advantage for having been "left out" of Europe's enlightenment since it could now more rapidly advance to the next stage.[64] For Iadrintsev, the simplicity of Siberian life coupled with Siberians' unique "curiosity" and "entrepreneurial spirit" meant that progress would in fact be "easier" there than anywhere else in the empire.[65] "It is necessary to note," he

wrote, "that the receptivity of the Siberian population was more alive and – thanks to the freedom of life and equality – was able to achieve more easily [than elsewhere in the empire] the progress of material relations and living conditions." He added that new cultural characteristics were also assimilated "unusually quickly" in Siberia, and that, moreover, "all of the cultural borrowings and norms of civilization in Siberia spread more widely among the mass of the population and are made into common property."[66] The fact that Siberians had been mixing for so long had prepared them to take on modern civilization and at the same time unified them into a singular "regional type."[67]

But the advantages of backwardness only went so far. The state now needed to change its policies, and stem the tide of déclassé settlers, in order to promote progress in the region. Iadrintsev argued in the book that for 300 years state-sanctioned "classes of traders, monopolists, kulaks and parasites" hindered Siberian development and left Siberians themselves passive and thus incapable of achieving development themselves.[68] Siberian backwardness, in Iadrintsev's interpretation, was a result of exploitative colonization that failed to encourage the kind of "striving toward the social ideal" that was necessary to civilize the region. He quoted Shchapov to say that "social consciousness itself is little developed in the East, [which is] an individualistic society par excellence, formed by a life of vagabondage and peculiarity in the forests and steppes having acquired and lost the prior social ties in a new country."[69] This was part and parcel of the racial "degeneration" Iadrintsev had been describing as a real problem. Siberia's "chaotic mixtures" of people included "microcephalics, cretins, idiots and in general 'little fools.'" As Shchapov had before him, Iadrintsev attributed these extreme forms of racial degeneration to the exiles and drunks that the empire continued to dump into the region.[70] Russian settlers were supposed to be enlightening Siberia's natives. But because they were uncivilized themselves, they could not encounter the natives "without the loss of their racial characteristics and without a change in their type, physiological constitution, abilities, and even cultural characteristics and ways of life."[71] It was the state's fault, so the state needed to help fix it.

Each of the first two chapters of *Siberia as a Colony* concluded with an extended description of Iadrintsev's proposed solutions. The first broad solution was to increase "cultural development" through education, which was meant to counteract the process of racial degeneration he had been describing. "The greater the role played by physio-

logical degeneration and lowering of the race, the more there should be a guaranteed raising of culture."[72] Because he defined race as a conglomerate of biological *and* cultural characteristics (again, race, ethnicity, and nationality blended into each other), it could be affected through both intermarriage and enlightenment. Put another way, biology affected culture *and* culture affected biology. So the empire, Iadrintsev argued, could and should promote the "Slavic race" "through the path of colonization" that would bring "enlightenment" and education to Siberia's benighted (native *and* settler) population.[73] It was not difficult to see, he claimed, that the farther one travels to the east, the fewer institutions there were that could serve as "representatives of European civilization and promote racial advantages by raising the intellectual level."[74] Iadrintsev adopted the category of race here as a way of trying to convince the state to build new schools.

The second broad solution he offered was for the state to support small-scale agricultural collectives, peasant communes (*obshchina*), as the primary unit of self-governance in the region. As with building schools, the successful implementation of the peasant commune required government reforms. But unlike building schools, promoting the commune rested on the premise that Siberians *were* advanced enough along the path of civilization to self-govern, at least at this local level. According to Iadrintsev, the peasant commune (which had been introduced in European Russia in the 1830s) was Siberia's preeminent need.[75] Iadrintsev and others were convinced that it would rejuvenate Siberians' stilted "social consciousness" (*obshchestvennost'*) and that this would lead to progress in the region. He wrote: "The free course of the life of the peasant commune and [its] calling forth of communal energy and spontaneous action is the only pledge of prosperity for the local Siberian population."[76] Siberian peasants, he now argued, were capable of running communes, but at the same time communes would serve to further develop social consciousness. Considering how "rude and backward" Iadrintsev (and just about everyone else) insisted Siberian peasants were, this was a significant shift. It was a shift made possible by a particular way of conceptualizing race.

In fact, Iadrintsev's revisions in 1882 made clear a new emphasis on the positive or productive potential of Siberian particularities measured in racial terms. Instead of fighting against the racial "convergence and fusion (*sblizhenie i slitie*)" of Russians and *inorodtsy* (which was in any case an "unavoidable and irresistible [*neizbezhnyi i neotrazimyi*]" process), the empire should embrace and make the most of

it. "Preventing through artificial means miscegenation and the troubles it brings about will scarcely bring about the goal [of civilizing the region], and is scarcely rational, since we should be striving not to differentiate ourselves from *inorodtsy*, but toward union with them." The right kind of integration would benefit *inorodtsy* and "the Russian race, in terms of preserving its higher racial characteristics and abilities." Iadrintsev evidently had in mind that contact with Siberian natives would have the effect of stripping away the ill-effects of peasant life in European Russia, most obviously through the institution of serfdom, and at the same time of imparting to Russians "the refined [physical] abilities (*izoshchrennoe sposobnosti*)" that he "received from the *inorodets*," such as "sensitive hearing and sharp-sightedness."[77] However, in order to achieve "the renovation and strengthening of the higher races through the path of colonization," the empire needed to focus on "the quality, not the quantity" of the Russian population.[78] He offered anecdotal evidence as "proof" this renovation was already happening: "[A]ll who are familiar with [Siberia] are aware of the fact that in general the Siberian peasantry according to traditions and development stands higher than its fellow peasantry in European Russia."[79]

In short, Iadrintsev envisioned proper colonization in Siberia as generating a new racial type capable of self-administration through peasant communes. Iadrintsev was a careful student of European empires and their methods of "civilizing" their colonies. He scoured, as he put it, "all of the negative sides of European colonization" to come up with his own "positive ideal of a colony" that Siberia could someday achieve. His letters and writing were strewn with references to colonies all over the world, from Tasmania to Ireland to Madagascar to Peru to Africa to Brazil to India to Australia.[80] *Former* colonies held a special place in his affection because he was convinced that they represented Siberia's future. Siberian regionalists had always taken inspiration from the US case, in particular, which was cited in the 1863 manifestoes as a precedent for Siberian independence. In Iadrintsev's book, however, the Americans were not simply model federalists but also examples of a successful and distinctive colonial racial type. Among numerous other references to foreign ethnographers and anthropologists, Iadrintsev cited the French ethnographer Charles Étienne Brasseur de Bourbourg, whose research in the New World had produced an argument that the "English [anthropological] type" in America had quickly turned into "the Yankee type." For

Iadrintsev, there was no doubt that Russians in Siberia were subject to this same "general law."[81] Eventually, he intimated, Siberian Yankees would enjoy independence, too.

Ten years after the first publication, Iadrintsev published an expanded edition of *Siberia as a Colony* (now 750 pages long) in 1892. Like the earlier version, the second edition was based on the premise that bringing Siberian needs to the attention of imperial elites in European Russia would lead to the changes the region needed for progress and eventual autonomy. While it was true that after 1882 the government's attention to Siberian affairs had increased (evident in, among other things, plans for railroad construction, efforts to make peasant resettlement more efficient, and a greater number of new schools in the region including the first university, opened in 1888), there was still a long way to go. As far as Iadrintsev was concerned, an updated report on conditions in the region was necessary in order to outline how an ideal future might be achieved. He based his update on the vast quantity of new ethnographic and anthropological research that had been carried out in the region since 1882. Much of this new work had been published in Iadrintsev's own newspaper, *Eastern Review*, including that of the up-and-coming anthropologist and professor at Moscow University D.I. Anuchin.[82] This new research, which he discussed in detail, was given as evidence that Siberia was on the brink of a major developmental breakthrough. Scholars were documenting distinctive national and cultural traditions[83] and peasants' capacity to organize themselves into communes despite government neglect, thus proving their characteristic independence and supposed aversion to private ownership.[84] As he wrote in the new edition's foreword, "We have in mind to show that this region under better conditions could be a country of contentment, wealth, and happiness."[85] Iadrintsev's task was to reveal Siberian deficiencies while conceiving of a way they could be overcome.

The 1892 edition began with four entirely new chapters on the geographic and climatic conditions in Siberia, presenting a more holistic picture of Siberia that was not merely a backward version of Russia but a country unto its own. The discussion of race which had occupied the first and second chapters of the 1882 edition, was revised and condensed into chapter 5 (of sixteen) in the new 1892 edition. Iadrintsev reiterated his earlier account of how environment and intermarriage had resulted in racial mixtures of various sorts throughout Siberia, including what he now referred to as "a new national-

regional type." Iadrintsev retained warnings of racial degeneration (about which, still, "very little had been done" by the state), but he moved more quickly than before to his discussion of the unique strength and health that centuries of miscegenation and environmental influences had imparted.[86]

Siberia was slowly making Russian peasants into resourceful and self-reliant people, a new "national-regional type."[87] Siberians were a fusion of the better qualities of Russian and indigenous races, transformed by the region's unique physical environment, climate and history.

> Far from running wild because of all of the disadvantageous living conditions, distance, and isolation, the Siberian population maintained its connections, preserved culture, and gives no reason to doubt in its future or its abilities … In order to provide for the preservation in the East of the best blood (*luchshaia krov'*), best racial characteristics and qualities, in order to stave off degeneration, and to assist the healthy development of life, it is very desirable that the population be updated with healthy elements in the persons of free resettlers, and not the outcasts and dregs of society (*otverzhentsy i podonki*), who in the form of criminal exiles lower the physical as well as moral quality of the population.[88]

In the 1870s Iadrintsev described Siberians as wild, backward, and in need of salvation. In the 1880s he began to recast them as independent, self-confident, proud, and, moreover, fully conscious of these particularities.[89] Now that "progress" seemed to be underway, Iadrintsev shifted his evaluation of Siberian race mixing so that Siberian mestizos could be seen as an ideal. Remarkably, he ended up painting a scenario, as in the passage above, in which the threat to Siberians' racial development was not the region's Asian peoples but the "dregs" of the imperial metropole. The claim that the Siberian "type" was a positive alternative to Russians who were inadequate, according to regionalists, to the task of properly colonizing the empire's eastern borderlands, was an affront to the insecurities of Russianness that continued to plague late imperial officials and elites. "The Siberian," he wrote, was beginning to look at the Russian settler "as a person completely different from himself and [was] dubious of his [the settler's] Russian nationality (*russkaia natsional'nost'*)."[90] Indeed it would not have been difficult to conclude from Iadrintsev's work that the *sibiriak* had become more "Russian" than the Russians themselves.

TOO MUCH OF A GOOD THING?

The social and economic changes that took place in Siberia after Iadrintsev's death in 1894 were far more sweeping than anything that had taken place up to that point. Two changes in particular highlighted the dilemmas regionalists faced: the completion of the Trans-Siberian railroad in 1903 and the proliferation of national movements during the 1905 Revolution. The Trans-Siberian railroad enabled a dramatic increase in the number of Russian peasants resettling in Siberia, particularly beginning in 1896.[91] Regionalists had long advocated for more Russian peasant settlers, as opposed to criminals. Now that it was happening, however, the flood of peasants that came with the railroad threatened to overrun the Siberian mestizo who had emerged over so many centuries. It seemed more like this "great migration" was turning Siberia into Russia than that it was reinforcing the particularity of Siberia.

The other change that posed regionalists with a dilemma was the increasing importance of national movements during the first decade of the century throughout the empire, including among Siberia's larger indigenous nationalities.[92] Regionalists had long advocated for the rights of Siberian *inorodtsy* (which did not preclude advocating for civilizing them). However, as Buryats and Iakuts, for instance, began to advocate for their own autonomy, the question of how to maintain the coherence of Siberian identity was further complicated. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the "Siberian type" was caught between Russification, on one hand, and indigenization, on the other. The dilemma led to a split within the movement between Potanin, who was now its most prominent figure, and Ivan Popov, who had taken over as editor of the newspaper *Eastern Review* (now published in Irkutsk) after Iadrintsev died in 1894. The issue was whether or not Siberians constituted a distinct type of person and whether, therefore, this ethnographic distinction was a legitimate basis for regional patriotism.[93]

At stake in the debate was the continued relevance of regionalism in contemporary Russia. Popov claimed that the time for the old version of Siberian regionalism was over. Since the time of Iadrintsev, Popov pointed out, "a lot of water has flowed under the bridge."[94] Over the previous decades, Popov argued, Siberians (*sibiriaki*) had become *more* like Russians, not less. Iadrintsev's notion that racial mixing had generated a new kind of person was an outdated depiction of reality.

Popov acknowledged that perhaps Siberia had been distinctive a few years before, but the Trans-Siberian railroad, and several million Russian peasant settlers, had since fused Siberia to the rest of Russia. As he put it, Siberia had become "located in an unbroken and deep connection with Russia's core."[95] In any case, Siberians, unlike Ukrainians, Buriats, or Iakuts, did not have their own language. Reflecting broader European national politics, Popov insisted this was a necessary element for constituting a distinctive ethnographic type. Regionalists were presumptuous, he argued, to compare themselves with Ukraine (which they often did), since

> Little Russia has its own history, its own traditions … its own poems, its own language. That is why in spite of the close political and civic integration with Great Russia, Little Russia cannot lose its uniqueness, and the impact there of regional self-consciousness will never end.[96]

Siberians spoke Russian, and whatever national particularities they had acquired over the centuries of living in Siberia had been washed away in one short generation. This was not an abandonment of Iadrintsev's original goals for Siberia, Popov insisted, but an indication of their partial fulfillment.

Popov's overarching point was that the new social and economic transformations that had taken place meant that regionalists needed to think in more universalistic terms. The real goal of social activism, he argued, was not to develop Siberia for its own sake but to develop new human beings. "Neither geography nor ethnography have provided or are providing substance to the ideology of humanity!" He was frustrated that Potanin and the other "old regionalists" insisted on the "old program" of regional issues when the real questions of the future had to do with the "possibilities for the thorough and complete development" of "a human subjectivity (*lichnost' cheloveka*)."[97] Others in the *Eastern Review* camp were even more willing than Popov to cut ties with regionalism completely. As one put it: "There is no life in regionalism (*oblastnichestvo*) now. Life is now where classes and nations, not regions, struggle for the very same ideals!"[98]

At the same time Russian ties to Siberia were strengthening, there was also taking place a process of national differentiation *within* Siberia that was equally as problematic for Iadrintsev's story of Siberification. Popov put it this way:

> There is also a different process [as opposed to Russification] of development taking place: the separation of the parts of a single region on the basis of individual particularities. The Iakutsk region, a Buriat from Transbaikal, and a Kirgiz from the steppe cannot be poured into a single form.[99]

This then was the dilemma. On one hand Siberia was being more tightly linked to Russia through resettlement, changes in living conditions, and economic integration. Development meant integration and levelling, as Popov saw it, rather than differentiation. The fact of living in Siberia was not enough to constitute a basis for affinity or social cohesion. On the other hand, national movements increasingly divided ethnographically and racially defined groups within Siberia. Iakuts, Buriats, Kirgiz, Popov argued, were developing their own national consciousness, which did not align with the ideal of the Siberian mestizo.

Faced with Popov's challenge, Potanin stressed the significance of Siberian nationality by universalizing it in its own way. He did not completely abandon the biological markers of Siberianness documented by Iadrintsev.[100] But he did shift the primary focus of Siberianness to its supposedly supraethnic qualities. Sure, Siberians did not speak their own language like Ukrainians did, but Siberians had developed "solidarity" among themselves *and* with every other national group living in Siberia, a solidarity that was based on "common economic and cultural interests alone, void of national (*natsional'naia*) elements."[101] The goal all along for Siberian regionalists had been to establish regional "self-determination" (*samoopredelenie*).[102] Potatnin was effectively saying that if racializing Siberian identity hindered this goal, then it was no longer a useful means to achieving it. In Potanin's effort to reassert this larger goal in the face of the rising tide of ethnonational politics, he depicted Siberian regionalism as a movement that transcended race even as it had been built upon it. Siberians were uniquely suited to preserve Siberian solidarity precisely *because* of their racial and cultural mixture. In a way, then, Potanin brought the idea of the Siberian nation back to the 1860s view that distinctiveness was based on space and environment. While this was new, it was also a reconfiguration of environmental and historical influences that had long been considered central to what made Siberians into Siberians.

Yet the concept of the Siberian as seen through the lens of race that Shchapov had first described in 1864 did not go away. As more Russ-

ian peasants poured into Siberia, long-time residents of Siberia continued to see themselves as a distinctive ethnographic type. This view continued into the early Soviet period and has again found a receptive audience in recent years.[103]

CONCLUSION

Race was an important concept in late imperial Russia and could be deployed, as it was by Siberian regionalists, for a variety of purposes. For Siberian regionalists the concept became less important at the beginning of the twentieth century, ironically, just as physical anthropology was growing in institutions and academic centres in the European part of the empire. This reflected the extent to which race served Siberian regionalists as a means rather than an end. Race allowed for the Siberian colonial critique at a time when the state was paying little attention to the region (racial degeneration bespoke the need for civilizing efforts). Then it allowed for the construction of a positive Siberian identity uniquely equipped to see to its own affairs. However, these same racial formulas also left open the possibility that the particularity upon which future autonomy was to be (partially) based could be wiped out through massive peasant resettlement. When this seemed to be happening, regionalists shifted away from race as a core component of Siberian identity and refocused on geography and cultural experience as keys to the generation of Siberianness. These changes over time point to the malleability of the concept of race in the late nineteenth century and indicate some of the intellectual and political configurations that the concept could take in the Russian imperial context.

NOTES

1 I would like to thank Nathaniel Knight, Brigid O'Keeffe, and the participants in the University Seminar on Slavic History and Culture, Columbia University, for their comments on earlier versions of this chapter. N.M. Iadrintsev, "Russkaia narodnost' na vostoke," *Delo* 11 (1874): 297–340; "Russkaia narodnost' na voskoke," *Delo*, no. 4 (1875): 167–98. Quoted at: (1874) 309, 315, 323; (1875) 184.

2 On these anxieties, see Willard Sunderland, "Russians into Iakuts? 'Going Native' and Problems of Russian National Identity in the Siberian North, 1870s–1914," *Slavic Review* 55, 4 (1996): 806–25.

3 On Siberian regionalism see, M.V. Shilovskii, *Sibirskoe Oblastnichestvo v Obshchestvenno-Politicheskoi Zhizni Regiona* (Novosibirsk: "Sova," 2008); Stephen D. Watrous, "Regionalist Conception of Siberia, 1860–1920," in *Between Heaven and Hell: The Myth of Siberia in Russian Culture*, ed. Galya Diment and Yuri Slezkine (New York: St Martin's Press, 1993), 113–27; Stephen D. Watrous, "Russia's Land of the Future: Regionalism and the Awakening of Siberia, 1819–1894," PhD diss., University of Washington, 1970.

4 N. Koz'min, "Vvodnaia stat'ia," in *Sbornik Izbarnnykh statei, stikhotvorenii I fel'etonov Nikolaia Mikhailovicha Iadrintseva* (Krasnoiarsk: Eniseiskogo Gub. Soiuza Kooperativov, 1919), v.

5 Marina Mogilner, *Homo Imperii: A History of Physical Anthropology in Russia* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2013).

6 On the difference between the ethnic (*russkii*) and civil (*rossiiskii*) meanings of "Russian," see Andreas Kappeler, *The Russian Empire: A Multiethnic History* (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2001).

7 Of the scholars recently examining the category of race in Russia, Eugene Avrutin comes the closest to examining how it was used "positively" to contribute to a sense of collective identity by looking at the case of Jewish difference in late imperial Russia, Eugene M. Avrutin, "Racial Categories and the Politics of (Jewish) Difference in Late Imperial Russia," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 8, 1 (Winter 2007): 13–40. Also see Marina Mogilner's chapter in this volume.

8 David Rainbow, "Siberian Patriots: Participatory Autocracy and the Cohesion of the Russian Imperial State, 1858–1920," PhD diss., New York University, 2013.

9 Steven Marks, *Road to Power: The Trans-Siberian Railroad and the Colonization of Asian Russia, 1850–1917* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991); Donald Treadgold, *The Great Siberian Migration: Government and Peasant Resettlement from Emancipation to the First World War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957).

10 M.V. Shilovskii, "Ob avtorstve i vremeni napisaniia proklamatsii "Sibirskim partiotam" i "Patriotam Sibiri," in *Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskie otnosheniia i klassovaia bor'ba v Sibiri dooktiabr'skogo perioda*, ed. L.M. Goriushkin (Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1987), 98–109.

11 Iadrintsev, Potanin, and Shashkov were the sons of a merchant, a Cossack and a priest, respectively. Elise Kimerling Wirtschafter, "The Groups Between: Raznochintsy, Intelligentsia, Professionals," in *The Cambridge History of Russia*, vol 2, ed. Dominic Lieven (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 245–63.

12 Quote taken from the Ministry of Justices' description (Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv [Russian State Historical Archive, RGIA], f. 1151, op. 7 (1868), d. 1 (III, A), l. 2).
13 "Sibirskim patriotam," in *Delo ob otdelenii Sibiri ot Rossii*, ed. N. V. Serebrennikov (Tomsk: Izdatel'stvo Tomskogo universiteta, 2002), 129.
14 A.P. Shchpaov, "Etnograficheskaia organizatsiia russkogo narodnaseleniia," *Biblioteka dlia chteniia* 1 (1864), 1–42; "Istoriko-etnograficheskaia organizatsiia russkogo narodo-naseleniia: Etnograficheskoe razvitie sibirskogo naseleniia," *Russkoe slovo* 1 (1865): 1–38; 2, 81–107; 3, 166–217. Articles reprinted in A.P. Shchapov, *Sochineniia*, vol. 2 (St Petersburg: Izdanie M.V. Pirozhkova, 1906). Citations refer to *Sochineniia* version.
15 A.S. Madzharov, *Afanasii Prokop'evich Shchapov: Istoriiia zhizni (1831–1876) i zhizn' "istorii"* (Irkutsk: V.M. Posokhin, 2005), 296–324. On Shchapov as populist thinker see Abbot Gleason, *Young Russia: the Genesis of Russian Radicalism in the 1860s* (New York: Viking, 1980), 180–225.
16 His suggestion to the contrary notwithstanding, Shchapov was not the first in Russia to construe human diversity in racial terms. See, Karl Khol [Karl Hall], "'Rasovye priznaki koreniatsia glubzhe v prirode chelovecheskogo organizma': Neulovimoe poniatie rasy v Rossiiskoi imperii," in *Poniatie o Rossii: K istoricheskoi semantike imperskogo perioda*, ed. D. Sdvizkov, I. Schierle, and A. Miller (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2012), 194–258. See also Vera Tolz's chapter in this volume.
17 Schapov, "Etnograficheskaia organizatsiia," 369.
18 Ibid., 369–70.
19 See Vera Tolz's chapter in this volume. Also see, Marina Mogilner, "Beyond, Against, and with Ethnography: Physical Anthropology as a Science of Russian Modernity," in *Empire of Others: Creating Ethnographic Knowledge in Imperial Russia and the USSR*, ed. Roland Cvetkovski and Alexis Hofmeister (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2014), 81–120; Vera Tol'ts [Vera Tolz], "Diskursy o rase: imperskaia Rossiia i Zapad v sravnenii," in *Poniatie o Rossii: K istoricheskoi semantike imperskogo perioda*, ed. D. Sdvizkov, I. Schierle, and A. Miller (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2012); Khol, "'Rasovye priznaki koreniatsia glubzhe v prirode chelovecheskogo organizma.'"
20 Shchapov, "Etnograficheskaia organizatsiia," 365.
21 Ibid., 384.
22 Ibid., 370.
23 Ibid., 380.
24 Ibid., 393
25 Ibid., 367.

26 “Secret Report from Moscow Gendarme, 29 May 1865,” in *Delo ob otdelenii*, 110. The letter was discovered in the apartment of a Siberian student at Moscow University, Alexander Dmitriev Shaitanov.
27 “Secret Report from Omsk Gendarme, 11 June 1865,” in ibid., 115.
28 *Delo ob otdelenii*, 203–4.
29 G.N. Potanin, “Klimat i liudi Sibiri,” *Tomskie gubernskie vedomosti*, 12 (26 March 1865): 13 (2 April 1865). Cited by Shilovskii, 49.
30 The result of Iadrintsev’s work for the governor of Arkhangelsk was a seven hundred page report on the deleterious effects of the exile system on local populations, a none too thinly veiled continuation of his critique of policies in Siberia (N.M. Iadrintsev, *Russkaia obshchina v tiur’me i ssylke* (St Petersburg, 1872).
31 N.M. Iadrintsev, “Russkaia narodnost’ na vostoke,” *Delo*, 11 (1874): 297–340; N.M. Iadrintsev, “Russkaia narodnost’ na vostoke,” *Delo*, 4 (1875): 167–98).
32 Iadrintsev, “Russkaia narodnost’” (1874), 309.
33 Ibid., 299.
34 Ibid., 304
35 Ibid., 302, 315.
36 Ibid.
37 Ibid., 319.
38 Ibid., 301.
39 Ibid., 309.
40 Ibid.
41 Ibid.
42 Iadrintsev, “Russkaia narodnost’” (1874), 309; (1875), 181–4.
43 Ibid., 167.
44 Iadrintsev, “Russkaia narodnost’” (1874), 301–2.
45 Ibid., 198.
46 Ibid., 198, 184 (quote from 189–90). Iadrintsev did note, however, that given their lack of culture Russian peasants in Siberia were not as “rude and backward” as they could have been (Iadrintsev, “Russkaia narodnost’ na Vostoke” [1874], 338).
47 Iadrintsev, “Russkaia narodnost’ na Vostoke” (1874), 340.
48 Ibid., 300.
49 Ibid., “regional type,” 167–8; “an entrepreneurial spirit,” 175. For a particularly thorough adumbration of Siberians’ bad qualities, see ibid., 183–4.
50 Ibid., p. 185.
51 A.V. Adrianov, *Periodicheskaia pechat’ v Sibiri, s ukazatelei izdanii v 1918 godu* (Tomsk: Masharovskii, 1919).

52 P.A. Zaionchkovskii, *Krisis samoderzhaviia na rubezhe 1870-1880-kh godov* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1964).
53 RGIA, f. 948 (Kaznakov papers), op. 1, d. 74, l. 4. On Iadrintsev's employment see, Istoricheskii arkhiv Omskoi oblasti [Historical Archive of the Omsk Region, IAOO], f. 3, op. 10, d. 17051, l. 45 (Formuliarnyi spisok Iadrintseva).
54 N.M. Iadrintsev, *Sibir kak koloniia. K iubileiu trekhsotletiia. Sovremennoe polozhenie Sibiri, ee nuzhdy i potrebnost, ee proshloe i budushchee* (St Petersburg, 1882). On the empire-wide recognition of Iadrintsev's academic expertise see, A. Kaufman, "Pereselenie krest'ian v Rossii," in *Entsiklopedichiskii slovar'*, I.E. Andreevskogo, et al., eds. (St Petersburg: Brokgauz i Efron, 1890–1907).
55 Marks, *Road to Power*.
56 Iadrintsev, *Sibir kak koloniia* (1882), 50. On the significance of the absence of an official "colonial" office in the Russian empire, see Willard Sunderland, "The Ministry of Asiatic Russia: The Colonial Office that Never Was but Might Have Been," *Slavic Review* 69, 1 (2010): 120–50.
57 Iadrintsev, *Sibir' kak koloniia* (1882), x.
58 Ibid.
59 Ibid., ix.
60 Ibid., 17.
61 Ibid., 30–1.
62 Ibid., 63.
63 Ibid., 66.
64 On Slavophiles see Andrzej Walicki, *A History of Russian Thought: From the Enlightenment to Marxism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1979), 92–114.
65 Iadrintsev, *Sibir' kak koloniia* (1882), 64, 67.
66 Ibid., 64.
67 The revised version of the 1875 article was also renamed to emphasize this point: "The Regional Type of the Russian Nationality in the East."
68 Ibid., 71.
69 Ibid., 72.
70 Iadrintsev, *Sibir' kak koloniia* (1882), 55–6; (1892), 99–100.
71 Ibid., 44.
72 Ibid., 49.
73 Ibid., 46.
74 Ibid., 48.
75 Ibid., 78.
76 Ibid., 82. Discussion of *obshchina* gets detailed treatement in the 1882 version (75–80).

77 Iadrintsev, *Sibir' kak koloniia* (1882), 57, (1892): 102.
78 Ibid., 46.
79 Ibid., 67 (1892), 111–12.
80 For example see "Iadrintsev to Potanin, 16 August 1872," in *Pis'ma Nikolaia Mikhailovicha Iadrintseva k G.N. Potaninu* (Krasnojarsk: Tipografiia Enis. Gub. Soiuza Kooperativov, 1918), 80–91.
81 Ibid., 52. Also see Iadrintsev, "Russkaia natsional'nost'" (1875), 168–9.
82 1892, 135–6. On Anuchin see, Mogilner, *Homo Imperii*, 133ff.
83 Ibid. (1892), 131.
84 Ibid. (1892), 133, 136–7, 143.
85 N.M. Iadrintsev, *Sibir' kak koloniia, v geograficheskom, etnograficheskom i istoricheskom otnoshenii* (St Petersburg, 1892), ix.
86 1892, 102.
87 Ibid. (1892), 87–145.
88 Ibid. (1892), 144–5.
89 Ibid. (1892), 133.
90 Ibid. (1882), 61; (1892), 105.
91 The average annual number of immigrants to Siberia rose from 61,000 (1886–95) to 134,000 (1896–1900) enabled by the railroad. The number dropped from 1901 to 1905 and then spiked to 200,000 per year from 1906 to 1914 (L.M. Goryushkin, "Migration, Settlement and the Rural Economy of Siberia, 1861–1914," in *The History of Siberia: From Russian Conquest to Revolution*, ed. Alan Wood [London: Routledge, 1991], 141). By the start of World War I, four million people had resettled east of the Ural Mountains, three million of whom arrived between 1907–14 alone (Anatolii Remnev, "Colonization and 'Russification' in the Imperial Geography of Asiatic Russia: From the Nineteenth to the Early Twentieth Centuries," in *Asiatic Russia: Imperial Power in Regional and International Contexts*, ed. Uyama Tomohiko [London: Routledge, 2012], 105).
92 On the growing importance of nationality and ethnicity in Russia see Charles Steinwedel, "To Make Difference: The Category of Ethnicity in Late Imperial Russian Politics, 1861–1917," in *Russian Modernity: Politics, Knowledge and Practices, 1800–1950*, ed. Yanni Kotsonis and David L. Hoffmann (New York: Macmillan, 1999), 67–86. On national movements among the Siberian indigenous population see, for example, Robert W. Montgomery, *Late Tsarist and Early Soviet Nationality and Cultural Policy: The Buryats and Their Language* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2005).
93 Iadrintsev became rather pessimistic about how long it would take for Siberian independence after visiting the Chicago World's Fair in 1893. Amazed at the examples of American industry and culture he witnessed, he

was convinced the US embodied Siberia's future. Yet he surmised that Siberia would achieve the same level of development only after another 1,000 years (M.V. Shilovskii, "Otsenka opyta kolonizatsii Sibiri i SShA v otechestvennoi obshchestvenno-politicheskoi mysli XIX v." in *Frontir v istorii Sibiri i Severnoi Ameriki v XVII – XX vv.: obshchee i osobennoe*, eds. D. Ia. Rezun, V.A. Lamin, T.S. Mamsik, and M.V. Shilovskii (Novosibirsk: Izdatel'stvo IDMI, 2001), 101).

94 *Vostochnoe obozrenie*, 174 (1905).

95 Ibid. On the idea of the Russian national core growing outward, see Leonid Gorizontov, "The 'Great Circle' of Interior Russia: Representations of the Imperial Center in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries," in *Russian Empire: Space, People, Power, 1700–1930*, ed. Jane Burbank, Mark von Hagen, and Anatolyi Remnev (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007), 67–90. On the idea of bringing Russia into Siberia see A.V. Remnev, "Vdvinut' Rossiiu v Sibir': imperiia i russkaia kolonizatsiia vtoroi poloviny XIX-nachala XX veka," in *Novaia imperskaia istoriia postsovetskogo prostranstva: sbornik statei*, eds. I.V. Gerasimov, S.V. Glebov, and A.P. Kaplinovskii (Kazan': Tsentr issledovanii natsionalizma i imperii, 2004), 135–58.

96 *Vostochnoe obozrenie*, 174 (1905): 2.

97 *Vostochnoe obozrenie*, 143 (1905); 174 (1905).

98 *Vostochnoe obozrenie*, 143 (1905).

99 *Vostochnoe obozrenie*, 174 (1905).

100 He did at times downplay the significance of Siberians' national difference from Russians. G.N. Potanin, "Nuzhdy Sibiri" in *Izbrannye sochineniia v 3-kh tomakh*, vol. 2 (Pavlodar: Eko, 2005), 356.

101 Ibid., 357.

102 *Sibirskii vestnik*, 130 (22 June 1905).

103 Francine Hirsch, *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005), 129. "Tipichnyi Sibiriak," *Sib.fm* (15 June 2012), http://sib.fm/stories/2012/06/15/tipichnyj-sibirjak (accessed 22 October 2018).

8

Children of Mixed Marriage in Soviet Central Asia: Dilemmas of Identity and Belonging

Adrienne Edgar

> In general, my parents were very happy together, a happy couple! They lived for love, that is, they loved each other very much. But I think life is very hard for the children of such marriages.
>
> Sazhida Dmitrieva[1]

Sazhida Dmitrieva, born in 1959 to a Russian–Tatar couple in northern Kazakhstan, viewed mixed marriage with ambivalence. Her Tatar father and Russian mother, having fallen in love and married across ethnic lines in the early 1950s, rather thoughtlessly – in her view – created problems for their future children. Sazhida grew up estranged from relatives on the Russian side, who disapproved of her parents' marriage; hated her "foreign-sounding" Tatar name, a source of embarrassment at the Russian-language school she attended; suffered from confusion about her ethnic identity; and ultimately faced a dilemma, in the post-Soviet era, over where to bury her parents, who were of different faiths but had asked to be buried together.[2]

Did mixed children in the Soviet Union really pay the price for their parents' nonconformity? If so, what did this mean in the Soviet context, where the state officially welcomed such couples as living manifestations of the "friendship of peoples" and bearers of Soviet modernity? In Central Asia, with its extremely diverse population, mixed families came in many flavours: Tatars married Tajiks and Russians, Kazakhs married Koreans and Ukrainians, and Armenians

married Russians and Uzbeks. With the Soviet state and broader society generally supportive of mixed marriage, mixed children did not face official segregation or widespread social ostracism as they might have done in other countries. Yet the problems described by Sazhida were real.

This essay focuses on individuals born between the 1950s and the 1970s whose parents had crossed – or believed that they had crossed – significant cultural and identity boundaries in order to form a family. The arguments here are based on more than eighty in-depth oral history interviews with members of ethnically mixed married couples and their adult offspring in Kazakhstan and Tajikistan.[3] While there is immense variation among intermarried families, certain themes and patterns do emerge repeatedly in the recollections of the offspring of ethnically mixed marriages. Despite Soviet-era surveys suggesting widespread public acceptance of such unions in principle,[4] many families privately opposed ethnic intermarriage for their own children. Even if parents eventually accepted the couple, the conflict could leave lingering resentments and emotional distance in family relationships. Mixed children sometimes faced prejudice and ethnic slurs at school and in the neighbourhood, occasionally because of their mixed heritage but more often as non-Russians within a social context where Russianness was highly valued.

The problem that most bedevilled mixed people, however, was the need to reconcile their multiple identities with the Soviet requirement that each citizen possess a single "official" nationality. While the official Soviet attitude toward mixed marriages was celebratory, the Soviet nationality system in fact placed the offspring of these unions in an awkward position. Each Soviet citizen had to declare a single nationality at the age of sixteen, which was recorded in his or her internal passport. For individuals of mixed background, this meant choosing either the mother's or the father's nationality. It was not possible to declare a "mixed" identity or to claim multiple nationalities.

The challenges faced by racially and ethnically mixed people in North America, Latin America, and Europe have been described and analyzed in a vast literature. Two British scholars recently catalogued the distinctive experiences faced by mixed people:

> Falling outside dominant racialized categories; facing distrust and suspicion from both 'sides' of their family; being profoundly and hurtfully misrecognized by others; enduring the 'what are you?'

question; and finally, enjoying the potential for multiple allegiances and identities.[5]

Studies of mixed people in the United States have shown that they have various ways of solving their identity dilemmas. Some identify with the race of just one of the parents; some claim a hybrid identity, belonging to neither race or both; some claim a supraracial or "transcendent" identity, refusing to accept any sort of racial designation (identifying themselves, for example, as "American" or "part of the human race").[6]

Until now, there has been no comparable research on the subjective experiences and allegiances of ethnically mixed people in the USSR. My own oral history evidence suggests that mixed people in the Soviet Union faced many of the same challenges as their counterparts in other parts of the world. Like multiracial and multiethnic people everywhere, they enjoyed "multiple allegiances and identities," yet were constrained by the need to choose one "official" nationality, as well as by the deep-rooted emphasis on the importance of nationality within the Soviet system. Falling outside or between accepted identity categories, Soviet offspring of mixed marriages were nevertheless forced into a single ethnic box, unable to embrace and integrate all the various components of their identity. Many respondents described a painful mismatch between "official" and subjectively experienced identity. Often, individuals officially belonged to a nationality with which they had little real connection, linguistically or culturally – a source of social awkwardness and psychological discomfort that followed them throughout their lives. Many of them, accordingly, yearned for a broader identity that would transcend nationality – a Soviet identity. Yet the consolidation of a Soviet identity in the USSR was consistently undermined in practice by the commitment to ethnically conceived nationality, and "Sovietness" was often conflated with "Russianness" – increasingly, a closed category based on descent or "blood."

SOVIET INTERMARRIAGE IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

For all the challenges they faced, the children of Soviet mixed marriages were unquestionably better off than their counterparts in many other parts of the world. The child of a mixed African American and white couple in the United States who married in the 1950s, the same

decade as Sazhida's parents, would have faced severe discrimination in employment, housing, and education. (That is, assuming the family lived in one of the states where interracial marriage was not actually outlawed.) He or she would have been considered African American regardless of his/her own feelings. That child's white parent would have been ostracized by his or her relatives, in many cases cut off for life – indeed, interracial marriage was long considered a form of "social death" for white people.[7] Mixed children in the Soviet Union, by contrast, were not isolated or stigmatized. They led normal lives as ordinary Soviet citizens and were free, within certain limits, to choose their own "nationality." Some even felt that being mixed was advantageous, since they enjoyed broader horizons and greater freedom to maneuver between the demands and norms of two (or more) nationalities. Knowing that official ideology celebrated their very existence was also a source of satisfaction for mixed individuals.

Superficially, the Soviet nationality system resembled the US racial classification system throughout most of the twentieth century, when individuals were obliged to choose a single racial category for the census. But this phenomenon had very different historical roots in the two countries. In the United States it was the product of the so-called one-drop rule, in which a person with even a small fraction of African ancestry or "blood" was considered black. Only an individual without a discernible amount of "black blood" could claim to be white.[8] In the Soviet Union, there was no one-drop rule – a person who was half-Russian and half-Kazakh was theoretically free to choose either nationality. Yet the tradition of state-ascribed identity in Russia dated back to the tsarist period, when individuals were categorized by estate and religion. In the Soviet era, people were categorized by class and nationality, but the basic principle remained the same; one could not have multiple nationalities any more than one could belong to more than one estate, religion, or social class.[9] Moreover, the choice for individuals was somewhat illusory, since the Soviet state itself had defined and in some cases created the acceptable nationality categories. In Central Asia, in particular, the state had radically transformed the way people identified beginning in the 1920s, creating new "national" categories and institutionalizing them at the expense of older kinship, religious, and regional loyalties.[10]

Apart from its rejection of multiple identities, the other salient feature of the Soviet classification system was its use of the category "nationality" rather than "race." Leninist and early Stalinist "national-

ity policy" conceived of nationality explicitly in cultural and historical not biological or genetic terms; the word "race" was virtually absent from Soviet nationality discourse of the 1920s and 1930s, and the racial and eugenic theories of the West were rejected. Yet as time went on, the absence of "race" became largely semantic. The postwar period saw a de facto racialization of the Soviet discourse of ethnicity and nationality. Titular groups within Soviet-created "national" republics came to see their nations in primordial terms, as "pure-blooded" populations that were the eternal possessors of a particular piece of territory.[11] The "ethnos," a term adopted by Soviet ethnographers beginning in the 1960s, was increasingly seen as a primordial, biological organism rather than as a social or cultural construction. [12] These shifts had a discernable impact on how mixed people were viewed – and how they viewed themselves.

"CHOOSING" A NATIONALITY IN SOVIET CENTRAL ASIA

In declaring their official or passport identity, multiethnic individuals in the Soviet Union ostensibly had a choice between the father's and the mother's nationality. For many mixed children in Central Asia, however, there was no real freedom of choice. They selected their official nationality on the basis of community expectations and external criteria, with their subjective feelings playing little or no role in the process.

Mixed adolescents were often most concerned about pleasing one or both parents. For children with Muslim fathers, this generally meant taking the father's nationality. Because of the patrilineal norms of Central Asian communities, in which nationality and status were determined by one's father, mixed individuals faced parental or societal disapproval if they did otherwise. Respondents frequently mentioned the need to declare their father's nationality in order to "respect" and "not offend" their fathers. Marina Abdrahmanova (b. 1957), an architect of mixed Russian–Kazakh parentage living in Almaty, recalled that she and her sisters never considered taking anything other than their father's Kazakh nationality: "It's generally accepted among us that nationality comes from the father. So the question didn't even arise."[13] In Tajikistan, similarly, Jamilia Rahimova, born in 1953 to a Russian mother and Tajik father, felt she had no choice but to declare herself a Tajik. "Well, I'm a Tajik because of my dad, out of respect for my dad. Mom always told me, you have to

respect your father, take only his last name, and his nationality."[14] In many cases, mixed children felt little affinity with the nationality of their Central Asian or Muslim fathers. The fact that in mixed Russian–Central Asian families it was often the Russian mothers – and sometimes grandmothers – who spent the most time with their children, speaking Russian to them and telling them Russian fairy tales and nursery rhymes, also heightened the contrast with the father's "official" nationality. Use of Russian as the primary language was especially common among those mixed families with one Russian-speaking parent, and throughout the Soviet period that parent was almost always a woman. This is one major reason for the frequent discrepancy between official and subjective identity among mixed individuals. Children adopted their Central Asian fathers' official nationality but identified more with the culture and language of their mother.

Timur Sergazinov (b. 1976), son of a Kazakh father and Russian mother, officially registered as Kazakh at sixteen. Nevertheless, he always identified more with the maternal side of his family heritage. "We all [my sisters and I], since we are Russian-speaking, our internal cultural specificity was formed by that … we still feel more like Russians, no matter what."[15] Tatiana Salibaeva (b. 1953), a Russian woman married to a Tajik in Tajikistan, noted that her children were officially registered as Tajiks. "Yet the only thing Tajik about them is that we had [the boys] circumcised, and gave them national names, and the fact that their father is a Tajik. Otherwise, everything about them is Russian."[16]

For some offspring of interethnic marriages, these problems went beyond a mismatch between official nationality and subjective identity to an alienation from one parent's culture. "Liudmila Davidova" (b. 1954), a Russian–Ingush mixed woman from Kazakhstan, felt uncomfortable with her father's culture when the family visited the North Caucasus: "Oh, you know, we lived there half a year, and I didn't like it there." Her relatives accepted her immediately as one of their own, but "they tried to compel me, by force, to love their nation and recognize all of their traditions." Her father's relatives apparently assumed that her Ingush "blood" would automatically translate into an affinity for all things Ingush, even though she had had little exposure to her father's culture while growing up in Kazakhstan. [17]

Susanna Morozova (b. 1973), half Armenian and half Ukrainian, decided early in life that she did not want to marry a man from the Caucasus, despite her love for her gentle, witty Armenian father. She

freely admits that she was afraid of such men, who would sometimes approach her because of her Armenian appearance.

> In general I was always certain that I would marry a Russian man. I didn't want to marry a Caucasian, a representative of a Caucasus nationality, I was actually kind of afraid of them. Even though my own father was an Armenian, if I saw a man of Caucasian nationality on the street, I would cross to the other side, they would even yell something at me in their own language. I was terribly afraid and would try to avoid them. I wanted to be married to a Russian.[18]

Along with the mandate to take the father's nationality, respondents also took for granted that it was important for a person's "official" nationality to somehow match up with external indicators such as name and phenotype. Ideally, one's first and last names, patronymic, appearance, and nationality would all match. If a person "looked Asian," for example, it would be odd for him or her to claim to be a Russian. Similarly, with a name, patronymic, and last name that were all Slavic it would be odd to claim Armenian or Kazakh nationality. Thus, Yerzhan Baiburin (b. 1959), a Kazakh man married to a Russian woman, pointed out that his daughters really had no choice but to register as Kazakhs: "You see, they have my last name. And Asian [vostochnoe] first names. It probably wouldn't have made sense for them to do otherwise."[19] Interestingly, an inability to speak Kazakh was not an obstacle to claiming Kazakh identity; genealogy, especially paternal descent, was a much more important determinant of identity than language.

Yet "looking Asian" and declaring an Asian nationality did not necessarily mean one identified with being Asian. "Nadya Kim," a mixed Ukrainian–Korean woman resident in Kazakhstan, always considered herself more Ukrainian than Korean, having spent much of her childhood in Ukraine with her grandmother. Yet she nevertheless declared Korean nationality for her passport. According to her mother, Nadya hesitated to call herself Ukrainian because of her physical appearance.

> I know that Nadya said that she is Korean … Because Nadya said to me, "Mama, How can I write that I'm Ukrainian, when I look like this? What kind of Ukrainian am I?" When I told her, in principle you can choose, she said, "Mama, are you kidding me, or

> what? How am I going to choose? How can I be Ukrainian, when I look Korean?"[20]

Falling outside accepted identity categories, then, was a common experience for the offspring of mixed marriages, as was the inability to relate to one's "official" nationality. What was the impact of these experiences on the lives of ethnically mixed people in Soviet Central Asia?

BEING MARGINAL IN SOVIET CENTRAL ASIA

Soviet social scientists decisively rejected the negative view of mixed people that long prevailed in Western literature on racial and ethnic intermarriage. In the United States the dominant view for many years was that racially mixed individuals were tragically confused about their identity. Scholarly as well as popular accounts of multiracial people showed them as disturbed, pathological, and seething with resentment about their failure to find a place in the world. Studies of racial hybrids moved from a largely biological approach in the late nineteenth century, in which "racial experts" documented the presumed physical inferiority and the infertility of mixed race people, to social and psychological research in the first half of the twentieth century.[21] Yet the highly negative view of racially mixed people remained. As David Parker and Miri Song have written, "An antipathy to racial mixture was a constituent element in the development of the human sciences."[22]

In the early part of the twentieth century, scholars of race relations in the United States saw mixed people as potential troublemakers and racial agitators. Such people were said to be uncomfortable with "their own people" and resentful about not being permitted to socialize on an equal level with whites.[23] In the interwar period, sociologists Robert Park and Everett Stonequist coined the term "marginal man," referring primarily to racially mixed people but more generally to any individual without a secure attachment to a culture and racial or ethnic group. The assumption behind all these arguments was that mixed people's problems are inherent in their psychology rather than due to racism and social inequities. "The condition of hybridity was understood to inspire irresolvable personality problems." [24] Not only mulattos but also Anglo-Indians, Eurasians, and other racially mixed people were neurotic and maladjusted. These ideas, widespread in the 1930s and 1940s, were not seriously challenged until the 1960s.[25]

Soviet social scientists utterly rejected the view of mixed offspring as psychologically damaged or maladjusted. Rather, they saw such people as the vanguard of Soviet society, better adjusted socially and more politically progressive than their monoethnic peers. Soviet social scientists in the 1930s had taken a partially biological approach, seeking to refute eugenicist arguments about the physical unfitness of mixed offspring.[26] By the 1960s, a time when most white Americans were still strongly opposed to racial intermarriage, Soviet scholars were emphasizing the sociological and psychological benefits of ethnic mixing. Yet the idea of mixed people as "marginal" or troubled was not unknown in the Soviet Union, a consequence of the increasingly essentialist approach to nationality in the postwar era. Despite the public acclamation of interethnic marriage, there was an undercurrent of distaste for ethnic "impurity."

The impact of these negative attitudes toward ethnic mixture can be seen in the life story of "Aliya Ahmetova," who was born in Kazakhstan in 1958 to a mixed Kazakh–Tatar couple and later married a Russian man. For Aliya, growing up ethnically mixed was a highly negative experience. She has had trouble finding her place in the world and explicitly blames her problems on the lack of a clear ethnic identity. The common multiethnic experiences of "falling outside dominant racialized categories" and "being profoundly and hurtfully misrecognized by others"[27] echo through Aliya's life history.

Aliya's mother was a russified Tatar originally from the Volga region, whose parents had suffered in the Stalinist repressions of the 1930s. In the late 1950s, while studying in Moscow, Aliya's mother found herself under investigation by the KGB as a "child of enemies of the people." She fled to Kazakhstan, believing that she could hide among the masses of people moving there as part of the "virgin lands" movement. In the village where she settled, she became a teacher at the local school. Eventually she married a Kazakh village boy, five years younger, who had been her pupil. Aliya, one of two daughters, was born in a village in the Karaganda oblast and spent her early childhood living with her Kazakh grandmother.

Aliya's views of ethnicity and identity were shaped by her childhood experiences and the troubled relationship between her parents. Early on, she developed negative feelings about the Kazakh part of her background. Having spent her early childhood in a Kazakh village, she did not speak any Russian when she began attending first grade at a Russian-language school. The other children mocked her for

speaking Russian with a Kazakh accent, giving rise, she said, to a lifelong hatred of all things Kazakh.[28]

She was also influenced by the behaviour of her mother, who considered Tatars superior to Kazakhs and often denigrated her husband in front of their two daughters.

> I remember, in general, that she was very … very condescending … she came, like a ray of light, projector of enlightenment, and picked up this little Kazakh boy … raised him, washed him, put him in clean clothes. I remember in my childhood, that's how she talked about him to her girlfriends … cleaned him up, taught him, set him on his feet … it was as if she created him as a person, though she considered the Kazakhs to be an unworthy nation.[29]

Aliya believes that her mother's dismissive attitude toward Kazakhs poisoned her marriage and affected the children's views of Kazakhs. The marriage was precarious and the couple lived separately for a time; they would have divorced were it not for pressure from party officials to stay together. Aliya's mother was a party member who held "responsible positions" and was expected to set a good example. "One fine day," Aliya recalled, "she was called in by the party and they said, either give up your party card and get divorced, or get back together with your husband and live as a family." Aliya noted that the communist party did not approve of divorce among party members in general, but it was considered particularly bad for mixed couples. "They were forming the Soviet person and, of course, let's just say they were probably not indifferent to whether a mixed couple stayed together or not."

Aliya's alienation from her father's nationality strained her social life as she grew older. Her mother, despite her disdain for Kazakhs and poor relationship with her husband, had raised her to believe that Muslims always take their father's identity, so Aliya registered as a Kazakh in her Soviet passport at sixteen. As she recalled, "This wasn't even discussed in our family, who I want to be, a Tatar, or a Kazakh." And yet her official nationality did not correspond to her internal feelings. As a university student in Moscow in the late 1970s, she found it difficult to make friends with her Kazakh compatriots, who did not perceive her as one of them. "Many Kazakh guys who were interested in me … ultimately things ended very quickly because they felt that I was actually not a Kazakh. By mentality, by psychology." What made

someone a real Kazakh? For Aliya, it meant familiarity with certain behavioural norms, ways of socializing with people, knowledge of certain traditions, and, for girls especially, the ability to offer "Kazakh-style" hospitality and food at social gatherings. She had not learned any of this in her family, which was exclusively Soviet/Communist and did not celebrate Muslim holidays. "People expect certain behavior from a Kazakh girl. Then this expectation is not justified. And the other person either loses interest or becomes aggressive."[30] Aliya saw being Kazakh as a kind of performance, an external demonstration of traits and behaviours intrinsically belonging to a certain ethnic group. "A certain nationality, after all, has certain characteristics. We somehow determine, 'you're a Kazakh, you're Russian, you're a Greek, you're German,' and so on. This is connected specifically with your individual culture, how you present yourself, how you identify yourself to the surrounding world. And if you can't distinguish yourself from other nationalities, how will other people do so?"[31]

Culturally Russian, Aliya did not identify with being either Kazakh or Tatar, yet could not claim Russian identity because of her "Asian" descent and and phenotype. She met and married her husband, an ethnic Russian who was born and raised in Almaty, in 1981, soon after graduating from an institute in Moscow and being sent to work in Almaty. Aliya's mother was opposed to the marriage, reminding Aliya that she herself had been unhappily married across ethnic lines. She urged Aliya to think seriously before making the same mistake. Aliya responded by pointing out her own dilemma as a mixed person; no matter whom she married, she would be entering a mixed marriage. "Who should I marry, Mom? I'm not a Kazakh, not a Russian … then who?" Unfortunately, Aliya's marriage to a Russian did not solve her identity problems. On the contrary, she had chosen a man who "really did not like Kazakhs." He referred to Kazakhs routinely by rude epithets and yet, Aliya recalled, "for some reason he didn't consider me a Kazakh." Being married to a Russian man who despised Kazakhs was not an ideal situation; despite her alienation from things Kazakh, Aliya naturally felt offended by some of his comments. Aliya and her husband divorced after seven years.

Convinced that she had suffered because of her ambiguous identity, Aliya was determined to make sure that her daughter "Nina" avoided such problems. Though divorced and without contact with her Russian former husband and his relatives, Aliya tried to forestall identity confusion in her daughter – a mixture of Tatar, Kazakh, and Russ-

ian backgrounds – by instilling in her exclusively a sense of Russian nationality. This, however, created distance between her daughter and Aliya's own relatives – the only people who might have formed an extended family for the girl. Aliya recalled,

> I remember there was a time when she visited my mother, her grandmother, and when she was introduced to someone – everyone tells this story – she said, "I'm Nina. I'm Russian." She's Russian! And here comes her mother, Aliya Kalievna.[32]

Not surprisingly, given her insistence on her Russian identity, young Nina grew up not particularly close to her mother's side of the family. Moreover, like her mother, Nina developed a negative attitude toward her Kazakh heritage. In raising her daughter solely as a Russian – without, of course, actually being Russian herself – Aliya was encouraging her daughter to repeat her own experience of being unable to "perform" the Kazakh national culture that was supposedly her birthright. Her daughter, Aliya decided, would have no such confusion about her nationality. For Aliya, her own lack of a clear national identity was due to her "mixed blood," not to other aspects of her background that might have played a role (for example, her mother's early loss of her parents – and with them her Tatar identity – because of Stalinist repression). In line with the increasingly primordial views in Soviet discourse of the time, she regarded nationality as something singular, essential, and inherent in the individual.

If Aliya's story shows the difficulties faced by a mixed person who struggles with the lack of a clearly defined nationality, "Maria's" story shows the difficulty of having a subjective identity that is not externally validated. "Maria Iskanderova" (b. 1960), half Azerbaijani and half Russian, did not identify with her Azerbaijani side despite having had a warm relationship with her father. She grew up in northern Kazakhstan, speaking Russian and identifying with Russian culture. As she says, "I'm Russian. I simply don't know anything else." Her father's attempts to acquaint her with Azerbaijani language and culture, through half-hearted language lessons and visits to relatives in his home republic, were not very successful. She read some works of Azerbaijani literature – in Russian translation, of course – but found them uninspiring. Her family even lived in Azerbaijan for a year during her childhood, but neither she nor her Russian mother felt comfortable there:

> There is an absolutely different culture there, and if you're not used to it, it's hard. For me, too. You know, Oriental music, on the one hand it's interesting, curious, but on the other hand, it's alien to me and quickly becomes tedious. There is nothing familiar, and you begin to get bored.[33]

And yet, Maria resembled her father physically, and she bore his patronymic and last name. This discrepancy between external markers of nationality and her subjective feelings of identity brought unwelcome comments from strangers.

> I really got sick of the attention that was always directed toward me in particular. I look like my father. I don't resemble my mother at all. And so everybody would go, "Oh! Is that your mom? Oh! But you don't look like a Russian! And who's your father? And how? And what?" and so forth. [laughter] Somehow these questions were not very pleasant.

In addition to facing intrusive questions, Maria encountered the assumption, based on her name and appearance, that she would speak broken or accented Russian:

> My brother had it easier. He looked like both our dad and our mom. He's a little dark, of course, but he has blue eyes. And he looked more like a Russian. The only thing was, he had black hair. But there are some Russians like that. So people didn't react to him with the same curiosity as they did to me … Like, I would start speaking and "Oh! You speak without an accent! What nationality are you?" [laughter] Well, for goodness sake, why *should* I speak with an accent?

Maria's childhood experiences – the unwelcome attention, the awkward questions – are familiar aspects of the life histories of mixed-race people. The "hurtful misrecognition" of Maria as a non-Russian-speaking "foreigner" is reminiscent of those second or third generation Asian Americans who are told, with surprise, that they "speak English very well." Maria noted resignedly that she could never have declared her nationality to be Russian, despite her internal conviction that this was her true identity, because it would have made her a laughing stock: "I had thought about this and decided that registering Russian nation-

ality in my passport, with my external appearance, would be ridiculous. Who would believe it? 'Is this a joke?'"[34]

Why would it have been "ridiculous" or "a joke" for Maria to declare herself a Russian? True, she had an Azerbaijani patronymic and last name, and she looked more Azerbaijani than Russian, yet Maria's use of such strong words suggests a powerful emotion behind her statements. After all, she was half Russian, and within the Soviet nationality system perfectly entitled to claim Russian identity. Her fear of ridicule suggests that she did not feel entitled, despite her maternal "blood," to claim Russian identity – a prize that others would see as not rightfully belonging to her.

A common trope in early twentieth-century Western literature on racial hybrids suggested that they had a strong desire to mimic Europeans and attempt to pass for white. In the interwar period, the American writer Gertrude Marvin Williams wrote disdainfully about the mixed-blood Anglo-Indians in South Asia, who wore European clothes, preferred to socialize with British people, and would "speak of England as 'home' though they may never have been there." She, like many others, found it absurd and pathetic that people of mixed heritage would try to pass themselves off as white.[35] In the Soviet Union, there was no one-drop rule or expectation that only someone of "pure" ancestry could claim Russian identity. In fact, this had been far from the case in multiethnic imperial Russia, where people of many backgrounds had come together to make the Russian nation. A well-known ditty emphasized the conglomerate, hybrid nature of the Russian people. "Papa turok, Mama grek – a ia russkii chelovek." "Papa is a Turk, Mama is a Greek – and I'm a Russian person."[36] Yet Maria's experience suggests that Russianness, too, had come to be exclusively associated with a certain phenotype and descent.

In the racialized societies of the West, it has long been common for individuals to be categorized by others based on their physical appearance. Studies have shown that mixed people of black/white and Asian/white background are influenced, in their feelings of identity, by their perceptions of how others see them.[37] As Maria also found growing up in Soviet Kazakhstan, it is difficult to claim an identity that is not validated by society. Recalling a film she had seen as a teenager in the 1970s, about a black man who had been raised in Russia, she eloquently expressed the discomfort of mixed individuals whose name and external appearance don't match their cultural affinities. Maria strongly identified with this man and his dilemma –

that the Russian culture with which he identified would not accept him as one of its own.

> I remember I felt something so familiar, I had a feeling like "My God! How difficult for him to live!" I even thought about myself, how lucky I am, people accept me more, somehow, but as for him … he is fundamentally Russian, by education, but then his external appearance … how I understood him. How must it be for him? That is, he belongs to this culture and doesn't know any other, and yet people expect that he's going to pull a banana out of his pocket, start to peel it, and bang on a tambourine.[38]

This vivid image shows the extent to which "national culture" in the late Soviet Union had come to be seen as something innate. In the land where Pushkin, one-eighth African (an "octaroon" who would have been a slave in the pre-emancipation American South), was hailed as the greatest national poet, Maria believed that a Russian-speaking African would be viewed exclusively through the lens of the most heinous of stereotypes. In this worldview, an individual's cultural identity was no longer malleable, learned, or even a matter of choice, as Soviet scholars and officials had insisted it was in the 1920s and 1930s. Even if "nationality" had not exactly become "race," Soviet thinking about nationality had become racialized.

TRANSCENDING NATIONALITY: SOVIET AND MÉTIS IDENTITIES

The Soviet nationality system, designed to match each Soviet citizen up with a nationality and corresponding language and territory, was deeply problematic for mixed people in the Soviet Union. As we have seen, identifying with multiple nationalities or with none at all were not realistic options. In an effort to avoid being forced into a single identity box, some offspring of mixed couples reached for a supraethnic identity that would transcend nationality. For many of them, what felt most natural and authentic was to claim a Soviet identity. In the 1960s and 1970s, Soviet officialdom heralded the emergence of a single "Soviet people," which allegedly would form a "new historical community of people." The "Soviet people" (*sovetskii narod*) had some features of a nation – a single territory, a common culture, a shared history, and even a common language: Russian.[39] Yet Soviet citizens

were not allowed to name "Soviet" as their nationality on identity documents or the census. Nevertheless, many members of mixed families in Tajikistan and Kazakhstan report that they strongly identified with the "Soviet people" and fervently believed in the concept of the "friendship of peoples." For mixed people, identifying as "Soviet" placed them in the political and social vanguard: instead of being marginal, an incomplete human being lacking a nationality, they were special.

Svetlana Vizer (b. mid-1950s), child of a Tatar father and Russian mother, declared herself to be Russian at age sixteen in defiance of convention. And yet she would have preferred another choice. "Though I was only sixteen, I thought to myself, well, if only there were a nationality called 'Soviet.' No, really, I didn't have such a firm identification, so as to say that I was a Russian, raised in Russian culture."[40] "Liudmila Davydova," Ingush and Russian, agreed that if it had been possible to write "Soviet" in one's passport, she and many others would have done so.[41] Susanna Morozova, half Ukrainian but officially registered as an Armenian like her father, did not grow up speaking Armenian and felt little connection to that nation: "No, of course I don't feel like an Armenian, there is nothing Armenian in me except perhaps in my external appearance. I really feel like a 'Soviet' person."[42]

There is no way of knowing what percentage of the population would have chosen Soviet for their census or passport nationality had they been given the option. We might get some sense of this by looking at Yugoslavia, where it was possible to select Yugoslav as one's nationality in the censuses of 1961, 1971, and 1981. Only a small percentage of the population selected this option, ranging from 1.7 percent in 1960 to 5.4 percent in 1981. Yet those who did so were concentrated in certain parts of the population: children of mixed marriages, younger people, urban residents, Communist Party members, and members of minority nationalities within each republic.[43]

In the Soviet Union, it may have been more difficult than in Yugoslavia to separate the supraethnic identity from that of the dominant nation. As many scholars have pointed out, "Soviet" identity overlapped considerably with Russianness, in that those who identified strongly with being Soviet also tended to be attached to a common Russian language along with its literature, historical traditions, and popular culture.[44] In the Brezhnev era, scholars and party officials placed an increasing emphasis on the spread of Russian language knowledge as evidence that a common Soviet culture was emerging. Particularly for members of mixed families who did not belong either

to the titular nationality or to the Russian nation, claiming Soviet identity was a way of being Russian when an ethnic Russian background was lacking. The conflation of Soviet and Russian emerges frequently in interviews with mixed respondents in Kazakhstan and Tajikistan. In the words of Irina Klimenko (b. 1981), a mixed Russian–Armenian woman raised in southern Kazakhstan,

> In my childhood … I never thought about who was from which nation – for me everyone was the same … I had the feeling that everybody was Russian. I don't know why … Though, when I think about it, what kind of Russians were they really? This one was a Kazakh, the other a Tatar! And yet it seemed that they were all Russians![45]

These "Russians" – who were actually Kazakhs and Tatars – were Russian-speaking people who all participated in a common Soviet culture. In Tajikistan, similarly, Ilhom Babaev (b. 1957), a Tajik man married to a Tatar woman, recalled that their family culture was neither Tatar nor Tajik but Soviet. But, he explained, "'Soviet' really meant 'Russian.'" "Soviet culture could not be based on anything other than Russian culture," he said, since "the land of the Soviets was a Russian land."[46]

Even those without a Russian parent and therefore with no possibility of officially claiming Russian identity could feel the pull of Russianness. Susanna, a mixed Armenian–Ukrainian respondent from Kazakhstan, at one point in her childhood told her mother that she felt Russian: "And she said, 'how can you possibly be Russian?' I told her, well, I speak perfect Russian, I got an 'A' in Russian class. [laughs] She said, 'No, honey, you have to know your roots, where you're from.'" People like Susanna understood Russianness as arising out of language and culture, not ethnicity. In Susanna's words: "I felt like a Russian, I wanted to be Russian … because I loved Russian literature and felt a close connection above all to Russian culture."

> Although I lived in Kazakhstan and was content with this, I felt that Moscow was my own capital (*rodnaya stolitsa*), that Russians are my own people (*rodnye liudi*). And by "Russians," I meant everybody who spoke Russian … not those who have Russian roots and are blond-haired and blue-eyed, but specifically those who speak the same language as I do. They are all Russians for me.[47]

Yet it wasn't possible for Susanna to make the leap from belonging to a Russian-speaking Soviet community to actually claiming a Russian nationality. If even half-Russian "Maria Iskanderova" felt uncomfortable claiming Russian identity, how could someone without a Russian parent claim to be Russian? Susanna continued: "I simply can't bring myself to call myself Russian. I am Russian speaking, that's how I identify myself. I am a Russian speaking métisse … I don't feel in myself any one nationality, any strongly expressed nationality."[48] Susanna, like Maria, perceived being Russian as a matter of descent or "blood."

For those seeking to escape the tyranny of Soviet nationality classification, attempts to transcend nationality by claiming a Soviet identity were just one way of solving the identity problem. A few mixed people sought another way out of the nationality trap, by claiming and taking pride in an embryonic "mixed" identity. Susanna is one of those who revelled in a diverse background:

> In my childhood I perceived myself as a trilingual, trinational girl. I really liked this because I was the only one. Armenian, Ukrainian, and Russian – and at the same time living in Kazakhstan![49]

Kazakhstan today is a country that stresses its mixed Eurasian heritage along with purely Kazakh national traditions, so it may not be surprising that people living in Kazakhstan would view being mixed in positive terms. Yet in contemporary Tajikistan, too, where there is much more emphasis on national or ethnic "purity," some still see advantages in a mixed background. Bahriniso Abdurahmanova, a mixed Tajik/Kirgiz/Uzbek woman born in 1953, twice married interethnically, relished in the diverse background she has bequeathed to her only son Farhad:

> [When] my son asks, "Mama, what's my nationality?" I say, you know, Farhad, first of all you're an inhabitant of the earth. Second, nobody else has a nationality like yours. I call him a "Caspian." There's no such nation – I'm inventing a new nation for you. [laughs] He has four grandparents, each of a different nationality.[50]

Those who were mixtures of Central Asian nationalities with Europeans argued that they had greater personal freedom than those

who were purely Central Asian. This was particularly true for mixed women, who were less subject to the restrictions of a patriarchal society. Nargiza Nazarova (b. 1979), an ethnically mixed woman from Tajikistan, shared this attitude. "I think I found it to be an advantage. I stood out; I'm mixed; I liked it." With her mixture of Uzbek, Tatar, Tajik, and Russian ancestry, she thinks that she felt positive about being mixed "maybe because I had more freedom." She recalled that her mother encouraged her to go out with boys and find her own husband. Purely Tajik girls, by contrast, were expected to stay home and let their parents do the matchmaking; "going out" with young men was unacceptable behaviour.

Rustam Iskandarov (b. 1955), product of a Tajik–Russian marriage, stressed the relative freedom of mixed people to choose their marriage partner. While "traditional" Tajiks, he noted, had to abide by the wishes of their relatives and were often expected to marry within their clan, sometimes even a close relative, "We were more free. People like me, they were freer in the choice of their life partner. We didn't have such strict limitations." He explained, "In our case, maybe it was partly that we always spoke Russian at home in the family, had Russian culture, etc." Also, his appearance was not very Tajik "and that's why there wasn't any pressure on me to marry one of our own."[51]

Another advantage to being mixed was the opportunity to act as a bridge between different ethnic communities. Some respondents maintained that mixed people were more tolerant, less nationalistic, and more understanding of different points of view. Dilbar Hojaeva's (b. 1961) comment was typical: "When they insult Tajiks, I'm for Tajiks. When they say something about Russians, I can speak up for the Russians."[52] Yet this feeling of "in-betweenness" could be perceived in a negative way as well. There were those who saw mainly disadvantages in being mixed: prejudice from "purebloods" and a feeling of not belonging anywhere. Jamilia Rahimova (b. 1953), said, "You don't feel like a Tajik among Tajiks, and you don't feel like a Russian when you're among Russians."[53] Rano Nazarova (b. 1956) recalled, "According to my passport I'm a Tajik. But I always felt like a métisse, because among Tajiks I felt like a Russian, and among Russians like a Tajik." Liudmila Davydova joked that a mixed person is a "traitor" to both sides:

> I can laugh at Russians. It's forgivable for me – my mother is Russian and I lived for many years among Russians. But when other

> nationalities start to insult them, I stand up for them. Because I also know that they have positive qualities. The same with people from the Caucasus … [W]e make fun [of them], and sometimes we tell jokes. But when people start saying really bad things, I also start sticking up for them. Once someone said to me: people like you, half-bloods, should be killed – you're traitors! [laughs][54]

The double-edged sword of multiple belonging described by respondents in Central Asia is familiar to mixed-race and ethnically mixed people everywhere. Some enjoy the ability to move back and forth between two cultures, while others lament that they are not full members of the ethnic communities of either of their parents. Interviews with biracial people in the United States and the United Kingdom reveal a similar ambivalence. Like their counterparts in Soviet Central Asia, they may not feel fully accepted by either of their parents' ethnic communities. As a US woman of Korean–Scottish ancestry said, "I feel that both sides of the family seem to regard me as a member of the opposite race." One scholar has referred to this as the "dual silencing" of racially and ethnically mixed people.[55]

A particularly painful aspect of social rejection in Central Asia was the difficulty some mixed people experienced in finding a marriage partner. Especially in Tajikistan, where "ethnic purity" was prized (rather ironically, since prior to 1925 hardly anyone actually claimed to be a Tajik[56]), some "pure-blooded" Tajiks did not want their children to marry an individual of mixed background. Rano Nazarova experienced this rejection personally:

> I remember once I was going out with a Tajik guy, we liked each other and he wanted to marry me, but his mother was categorically opposed. She said, "I will never agree to your marrying her." And I told him, "then go find yourself a Tajik girl." After that, I understood that I have to find someone like me, someone mixed.[57]

As a result of such prejudice, and also in the hope of finding a life partner with similar life experiences and worldview, mixed people in Soviet Central Asia often sought other mixed people as marriage partners. Larisa Mamadzahirova (b. 1958), half Russian, half Tajik, recalled that her future husband wooed her precisely because he was also mixed – in his case, half Tatar, half Tajik.

> We met when we both worked for the "Torgmash" factory. He learned that I was mixed and started courting me. Because I didn't look like a mixed girl, everyone thought that I was Russian. When he found out that I am an Usmanova, that's when he started trying to date me. You know, my name is Larisa and everyone thought that I was Russian. My sister and I, somehow it turned out that we don't look like our father's side and so everyone thought that we were Russian – even though in our passports we are both Tajiks.[58]

Ultimately, trying to transcend nationality by claiming a "Soviet" or "mixed" identity was only a partial solution to the problems faced by mixed people. In a nationality-obsessed society like the Soviet Union, an individual lacking a clearly defined national identity was somehow perceived as less than a whole person.

Here we return to the question posed by Sazhida at the beginning of this essay. Did mixed children pay the price for their parents' decision to marry across ethnic lines? Sazhida is not the only respondent to think so. Lola Tuichibaeva (b. 1964), daughter of a Tajik–Russian couple, believes her parents erred in marrying across ethnic lines:

> I somehow didn't approve of this marriage. [laughs] It's not my business, but look, I'm not purely Tajik and not Russian. It was unpleasant for me that I was mixed. I was always, as they say, a "bulldog mixed with a rhinoceros." [laughs] Even when I have conflict with my husband, it's, "well, you don't understand, you're a bulldog with a rhinoceros, you're not Tajik and not Russian." Well, today I have reconciled myself to this but in my youth … I felt that it was better to be either Russian or Tajik.[59]

Similarly, "Aliya Ahmetova," the mixed Tatar–Kazakh woman discussed at length above, is "categorically against interethnic marriage." She has concluded that "ethnically mixed marriage, in and of itself, is very destructive, because you have two energies, two positive energies, and they collide, and they necessarily destroy something."[60] Even Susanna Morozova, who spoke of her childhood pride in being a "trinational girl," thinks mixed marriage is problematic. For a small child, Susanna argued, having a mixed background can be enriching. "But when [the child] leaves the house and goes to preschool, school, he'll have to decide the question 'who is he?' Who is he by nationality? Who

is he by religion? Then he'll start to have problems." Susanna herself has long struggled to define her identity. "Up until now I've been suffering and asking myself, 'Who am I really? Armenian or Ukrainian? Russian or Kazakh?'"

CONCLUSION

Jean Toomer, a mixed-race American author often identified with the Harlem Renaissance, was known for his vocal rejection of racial categories; he frequently spoke about the rise of a new race in America and called himself an "American, neither White nor Black." Yet scholars have shown that the author was conflicted about his identity and for much of his life sought to pass as white. Despite his rejection of the binary racial categories of segregated America, Toomer found that it was impossible in practice to be just an American, neither white nor black.[61]

The harsh binaries that characterized US racial thinking were absent in the Soviet Union, and the Soviet state was generally supportive of ethnic mixing and intermarriage. Yet as I have tried to show in this essay, mixed people in the USSR found it equally difficult to be "simply Soviet, not belonging to any particular nationality." Nationality categories were deeply entrenched and became increasingly primordial and essentialized as time went on. The idea that every Soviet citizen had to have a single "national" identity went unchallenged. The "Soviet people," whose imminent appearance was discussed so extensively on a theoretical level and believed in by many ordinary Soviet citizens, lacked any institutional existence. Intermarried and mixed people had a great deal to lose from this failure to create a meaningful Soviet identity, since they identified most closely with the USSR and were less attached – almost by definition – than other Soviet citizens to a single national identity. In some cases mixed people might have wished to identify as Russians because of their attachment to the Russian language and culture, even if they were not Russian by "blood." Yet "Russian," like other nationalities, had become an ethnic or descent-based category; only those with at least one officially Russian parent could claim Russian identity on their passports, and even they did not always feel comfortable doing so. A "mixed" or multiethnic identity was present only on the most embryonic level and was not supported by state policy.

Would it have made any difference to the ultimate outcome of the Soviet multinational experiment if individuals had been permitted to

declare "Soviet" as their passport identity? Probably not; after all, having a "Yugoslav" category on the census did not save Yugoslavia. Still, the failure to allow Soviet citizens, even those of mixed background, to transcend the narrow confines of official "nationality" must in retrospect be viewed as a missed opportunity. Moreover, the incipient racialization of nationality categories in the late Soviet period, so evident in the life narratives of mixed individuals, may have helped to pave the way for the narrow nationalism and xenophobia we see in post-Soviet Eurasia today.

NOTES

1 Interview with Sazhida Dmitrieva, Öskemen, Kazakhstan, 7 April 2010.

2 Ibid.

3 The interviews for this project were conducted between 2008 and 2012 in various regions of Kazakhstan and Tajikistan. Most respondents permitted the use of their real names; those using pseudonyms are identified with quotation marks.

4 For Soviet public opinion surveys on this topic, see Wesley Fisher, *The Soviet Marriage Market: Mate Selection in Russia and the USSR* (New York: Praeger, 1980), 205–6 and Rasma Karklins, *Ethnic Relations in the USSR: The Perspective from Below* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1986), 163–5. Subsequent scholarship has questioned the reliability of these Soviet-era surveys. See A.A. Susokolov, "Etnosi pered vyborom," *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniia* 6 (1988): 3; Florian Mühlfried and Sergei Sokolovskiy, eds. *Exploring the Edge of Empire: Soviet Era Anthropology in the Caucasus and Central Asia* (Vienna/Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2011), 29.

5 David Parker and Miri Song, eds., *Rethinking "Mixed Race"* (London: Pluto Press, 2001), 7.

6 Peter J. Aspinall and Miri Song, *Mixed Race Identities* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 20.

7 See, for example, Renée C. Romano, *Race Mixing: Black–White Marriage in Postwar America* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003), 109–10, 143.

8 Kimberly McClain DaCosta, *Making Multiracials, State, Family, and Market in the Redrawing of the Color Line* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007), 1–2. Prior to 1910 the category "mulatto" was included in the US census. See Melissa Nobles, "Racial Categorization and Censuses," in *Census and Identity: The Politics of Race, Ethnicity and Language in National Censuses*, David Kertzer and Dominique Arel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 49–53.

9 Ronald G. Suny, "Constructing Primordialism: Old Histories for New Nations," *Journal of Modern History* 73 (December 2001): 867; David Abramson, "Identity Counts: the Soviet Legacy and the Census in Uzbekistan," in *Census and Identity*, eds. Kertzer and Arel, 176–7.
10 Thus, in 1989 there were only 128 officially accepted "nationalities" on the Soviet census out of more than 823 "ethnonyms" that people volunteered to the census takers. Abramson, "Identity Counts," 183–5. On the elaboration of categories and their internalization by Central Asians in the early Soviet period see Francine Hirsch, *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005).
11 Terry Martin, "Modernization or Neotraditionalism? Ascribed Nationality and Soviet Primordialism," in *Stalinism: New Directions*, ed. Sheila Fitzpatrick (New York; London, 2000). Marlene Laruelle, "The Concept of Ethnogenesis in Central Asia: Its Political Context and Institutional Mediators, 1940–1950," *Kritika* 9, 1 (Winter 2008): 169–88.
12 On the concept of ethnos, see V.A. Tishkov, *Rekviem po etnosu. Issledovaniia po sotsial'noi I kul'turnoi antropologii* (Moscow: Nauka, 2003); Iu. V. Bromlei, *Etnos i etnografiia* (Moscow, 1973).
13 Interview with Marina Abdrakhmanova, Almaty, Kazakhstan, 15 April 2010.
14 Interview with Jamilia Rahimova, Sugd region, Tajikistan, 23 October 2010.
15 Interview with Timur Sergazinov, Öskemen, Kazakhstan, 5 April 2010.
16 Interview with Tatiana Salibaeva, Khujand, Tajikistan, 9 October 2010.
17 Interview with "Liudmila Davydova," Almaty, Kazakhstan, 15 April 2010.
18 Interview with Susanna Morozova, Öskemen, Kazakhstan, April 10, 2010.
19 Interview with Yerzhan Baiburin, Öskemen, Kazakhstan, 19 September 2011.
20 Interview with "Darya Kim," Öskemen, Kazakhstan, 14 February 2008.
21 Frank Furedi, "How Sociology Imagined Mixed Race," in *Rethinking "Mixed Race,"* Parker and Song, 29.
22 David Parker and Miri Song, "Introduction," in *Rethinking "Mixed Race,"* Parker and Song, 3.
23 Furedi, "How Sociology Imagined Mixed Race," 28.
24 Ibid., 33.
25 Ibid., 28–9, 33–4, 37–8. More recently, scholars have stressed the fluid and socially constructed aspects of mixed race identity and argued that social attitudes and structural racism, rather than some kind of inherent psychological conflict, cause stress for racially mixed people. See Maria Root, ed., *The Multiracial Experience: Racial Borders as the New Frontier* (London: Sage, 1996); J.O. Ifekwinigwe, *Scattered Belongings: Cultural Paradoxes of Race, Culture, and Nation* (London: Routledge, 1998); Jill Olumide, *Raiding the Gene Pool: The Social Construction of Mixed Race* (London: Pluto Press, 2002).

26 Hirsch, *Empire of Nations*, 253–8, 265.
27 Parker and Song, *Rethinking "Mixed Race*," 7.
28 Interview with "Aliya Ahmetova," Öskemen, Kazakhstan, 14 April 2010.
29 Ibid.
30 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
32 Ibid. "Aliya Kalievna" is an obviously non-Russian name and patronymic combination.
33 Interview with "Maria Iskanderova," Öskemen, Kazakhstan, 3 April 2010.
34 Ibid.
35 Cited in Furedi, "How Sociology Imagined 'Mixed Race,'" 37.
36 A slightly different version of this saying is cited in David Layton, *Identity in Formation: The Russian-Speaking Populations in the Near Abroad* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), 191.
37 Paul Spickard, "The Subject Is Mixed Race: The Boom in Biracial Biography," in *Rethinking Mixed Race*, Parker and Song, 78–80.
38 Interview with "Maria Iskanderova."
39 Gerhard Simon, *Nationalism and Policy Toward the Nationalities in the Soviet Union* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1991), 307–12
40 Interview with Svetlana Vizer, Almaty, Kazakhstan, April 2010.
41 Interview with "Liudmila Davydova."
42 Interview with Susanna Morozova.
43 On Yugoslavia, see Dusko Sekulic et al., "Who Were the Yugoslavs? Failed Sources of a Common Identity in the Former Yugoslavia," *American Sociological Review* 59, 1 (February 1994): 83–97.
44 On the interplay of Russian and Soviet, see Geoffrey Hosking, *Rulers and Victims: The Russians in the Soviet Union* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2009), introduction, chapter 3.
45 Interview with Irina Klimenko, Shymkent, Kazakhstan, October 2012.
46 Interview with Ilhom Babaev, Khujand, Tajikistan, July 2011.
47 Interview with Susanna Morozova.
48 On the category of Russian speakers, see David Layton, *Identity in Formation*.
49 Interview with Susanna Morozova.
50 Interview with Bahriniso Abdurahmanova, Karakum, Tajikistan, 2 August 2011.
51 Interview with Rustam Iskandarov, Khujand, Tajikistan, July 2011
52 Interview with Dilbar Hojaeva, Khujand, Tajikistan, July 2011.
53 Interview with Jamilia Rahimova, Sugd region, Tajikistan, 23 October 2010.
54 Interview with "Liudmila Davydova."

55 Laurie Mengel, "Triples – the social evolution of a multiracial pan ethnicity: an Asian American perspective," in *Rethinking "Mixed Race*," Parker and Song, 108–10.
56 On the differentiation of Uzbeks from Tajiks, see John Schoeberlein-Engel, "Identity in Central Asia: Construction and Contention in the Conceptions of 'Ozbek,' 'Tajik,' 'Muslim,' 'Samarqandi,' and Other Groups," (PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 1994); also Adeeb Khalid, *The Politics of Muslim Cultural Reform: Jadidism in Central Asia* (Berkeley: UC Press, 1999), chapter 6.
57 Interview with Rano Nazarova, Khujand, Tajikistan, 1 October 2010.
58 Interview with Larisa Mamadzahirova, Khujand, Tajikistan, July 2011.
59 Interview with Lola Tuichibaeva, Khujand, Tajikistan, 1 October 2010.
60 Interview with "Aliya Ahmetova."
61 Rudolph P. Byrd and Henry Louis Gates Jr., "Jean Toomer's Conflicted Racial Identity," *The Chronicle Review*, 11 February 2011, B5–B8.

9

Race, Regions, and Ethnicities: A Brazilian Perspective

Barbara Weinstein

The two intriguing chapters that serve as inspiration for the comments below – David Rainbow's discussion of debates among intellectuals about Siberian regional identity in the second half of the nineteenth century and Adrienne Edgar's examination of ethnonational classifications in the mid-twentieth-century Soviet Union based on the experience of children of mixed marriages – may seem too distant from each other in space, time, theme, and methodology to offer a foundation for a set of coherent comparative remarks. But both chapters allow us to consider the tension between the modern state's drive for formalistic homogeneity and its simultaneous reproduction of hierarchy and difference. And I would argue that the central questions in both chapters can be further illuminated by drawing parallels and contrasts with the case of race/ethnicity in Brazil.

It is hardly a coincidence that the nineteenth century witnessed both an escalation of "scientific" racial thinking and an intensification of national imaginings. Whereas the imperial form could accommodate sharply varying regions and subject populations with relatively little friction, the nation – to use Benedict Anderson's well-known phrase – was imagined as a sort of "deep, horizontal comradeship" and as a geopolitical form that required self-governing "populations" worthy of citizenship in a modernizing nation.[1] As I have argued in my own work on regional identity in Brazil, the rise of nation thinking, rather than suppressing regionalism, could serve to animate regional loyalties as provincial elites struggled to assert their political claims and articulate local cultures to emerging (and constantly contested)

national identities.[2] And typically it was race that provided the dominant idiom in which to express concerns about the fitness and capacity for modern self-government of a local population so that intellectual and political elites in apparently very diverse locations – such as the Russian empire's Siberia and Brazil's *Nordeste*/Northeast – could end up constructing arguments about regional populations that, with slight alterations, were virtually interchangeable.

It also meant that regional "patriots" (*oblastniki*), such as the Siberian intellectual Nikolai Iadrintsev, had limited room to maneuver in constructing a regional "type." Embedded in the race thinking of that era was a particular narrative that, as Rainbow argues, allowed for a certain degree of malleability but did not easily lend itself to radical reimaginings. Trapped in webs of racial thinking, regionalists in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries enjoyed few options in their efforts to profile the problems and potential of the provincial population, and to secure resources, political and material, for their home territories.

For example, Iadrintsev could hardly claim (even if he wanted to) that the indigenous Siberian people (*inorodtsy*) were already fit and fully prepared for "modern" life – such an assertion would have been dismissed out of hand by anyone he valued as an interlocutor. But to simply advocate supplanting the native population with Russian settlers would have eroded any prestige he might have drawn from his status as a man of Siberia. Within the racial lexicon – in Siberia, as in Brazil – the solution seemed to be "miscegenation," or mixture, a process that would possibly elevate the indigenous population both biologically and culturally. But how and whether this would work were serious matters of contention. In Brazil, the self-styled anthropologist Raymundo Nina Rodrigues, pessimistic about his homeland's capacity to become a successful nation given its large population of African and Amerindian descent, argued in an 1899 study that miscegenation, far from elevating the "inferior" peoples, would result in the degeneration of superior Brazilians. In other words, mixture would only make matters worse. Nina Rodrigues's work, however, though pioneering in its attention to the African diaspora in Brazil, never became the dominant perspective.[3] Despite the apparent popularity of racialist theories in that nation's intellectual circles, historians have noted symptomatic "misreadings" by Brazilian literati of racialist theories, readings that consistently rendered these ideas less deterministic and fatalistic.[4] Perhaps the best-known historical argument

to this effect is Nancy Leys Stepan's rethinking of the eugenics craze in Brazil and elsewhere in Latin America, in which she explains the enduring influence of Lamarckian notions of heritability in the region as reflecting the disposition to view human "defects" as remediable through environmental modifications, rather than genetic engineering.[5] The notion that race mixture leads to degeneration may have been the prevailing view among the North Atlantic "experts" on racial science, but its implications were excessively pessimistic for intellectuals and public figures in those corners of the world where the colonial or ex-colonial populations were regarded as in need of "improvement." This typically produced, not a wholesale rejection or embrace of mixture, but rather debates over precisely what ethnoracial combinations might yield a better human "stock."

Indeed, David Rainbow's analysis demonstrates how consistently Siberian regionalists, writing in the second half of the nineteenth century, blamed the inferiority of the Russians who settled, forcibly or voluntarily, in Siberia for the region's defects. But by the latter decades of the nineteenth century, writings by Siberian regionalists reflected some broader trends in thinking about race and environment, so that they not only decried the substandard Russians pouring into Siberia but started to celebrate the character of the indigenous population, now deemed hardy and robust as demonstrated by their ability to survive in the harsh Siberian environment. At this juncture a Brazilianist can easily detect resonances with *Os Sertões* (translated as *Rebellion in the Backlands*), the masterwork of Brazilian journalist and civil engineer Euclides da Cunha, first published in 1902.[6] Da Cunha chronicled the 1896–97 military campaign mounted by the newly installed republican government of Brazil against a millenarian community, Canudos, in the interior of the arid and impoverished northeast. Before recounting the tragic story of the multiple assaults and eventual massacre of the Canudenses, da Cunha devoted several hundred pages to analyzing the land and the "man" of the Nordeste. Although he had no doubt that the mixed-race figure of the *sertanejo* (backlander) was not (yet) prepared to deal with the demands and strains of modernity, he did see him as uniquely equipped to survive in the harsh environment of the sertão and dubbed him "retrograde" rather than "degenerate." Like the Siberian regionalist Afanasii Prokop'evich Shchapov, writing in the 1860s, da Cunha saw the backlands as a veritable laboratory of racial transformation. Indeed, not only did he reject the blanket denunciation of race mixture emerging from North

American "racial science" but declared the sertanejo "the very core of our nationality, the bedrock of our race."[7] The incorporation of culture, biology, and environment closely paralleled Iadrintsev's discussion of "racial particularity." Moreover, the designation of the sertanejo as the "bedrock" of Brazilian nationality – making him a national–regional type – echoes Iadrintsev's revised image of the Siberians as potentially more Russian than the Russians.

The enormous and enduring impact of da Cunha's work has been explained in a variety of ways, but perhaps most relevant in this comparative context is his engagement with a problem that we might today call "uneven development." From Euclides' point of view, Brazil was facing a double challenge during the first decade of republican rule: a barely civilized hinterland and an overly civilized (in the sense of Europeanized/derivative) coastal society, with the latter incapable of understanding or valorizing its compatriots in the nation's interior. And what marked da Cunha's work as especially insightful and provocative was his bold assertion that the "man of the backlands" was the more authentic Brazilian. At the same time, he reinforced a widespread but relatively recent perception of the Brazilian backlands as somehow frozen in time, so that even as he was chronicling one of the most dramatic episodes in the history of the Brazilian nation, he was rendering the problem of Brazil's "dualism" – what French sociologist Jacques Lambert would later call "The Two Brazils" – as a natural/ahistorical phenomenon.

Brazil, however, offers us other examples of racialized regional narratives that emerged during this period, which could be deployed to address seemingly entrenched "backwardness" or explain an aptitude for "modernity" and which adopted more explicitly *historical* perspectives. In the case of the up-and-coming province of São Paulo, in southeastern Brazil, regionalist historians such as Alcântara Machado and Alfredo Ellis Júnior attributed the region's "exceptional" capacity for progress to its colonial forebears, the *bandeirantes*.[8] They readily acknowledged that the typical member of the *bandeiras* that traversed the interior of colonial Brazil in search of new lands to claim and new indigenous peoples to enslave, was a "mameluco" or half-breed but alleged that the combination in this case was an especially fortuitous one that brought together a superior Amerindian strain with a particularly robust Iberian type to produce a "race of giants." The virile and vigorous Portuguese who settled in São Paulo thus mixed with the indigenous inhabitants but absorbed only their most positive quali-

ties, and as European women became more available over time, they gradually sloughed off any lingering undesirable traits or attachments.

Again, this was a historical narrative that emerged at a moment when São Paulo was becoming the leading economic and political powerhouse in Brazil, so it was an explanation for regional *success*. Iadrintsev and other Siberian regionalists writing in the late nineteenth century, faced with their homeland's failure to thrive (at least by their estimation), assumed that the solution lay in mixture since the indigenous Siberians, on their own, could not be imagined as a modern citizenry, and mixing had been going on long enough to make it a fait accompli. But they argued, as did their regionalist predecessors, that thus far imperial policies – which had filled Siberia with the supposed dregs and cast-offs of Russian society – had made it impossible to hit upon the right combination. Mixing seemed to be leading to degeneration, not because that was an automatic consequence of miscegenation but rather because the quality of Russian settlers in Siberia was so poor.

These multifarious, and often contradictory, discourses about the nature of race and the impact of miscegenation further validate David Rainbow's argument regarding the "malleability of the concept of race in the late nineteenth century." But perhaps one element that needs to be added is "history." The regionalist gaze in the case of Siberia or the Brazilian Nordeste was primarily an anthropological one that operated on the assumption that observable traits would arrange themselves to reveal a particular regional "type" – "The Man of the Northeast" or "The Siberian Man." In contrast, the architects of Paulista regional identity were self-styled historians, not anthropologists, writing about a process of racial and cultural fusion that had occurred centuries earlier and that had long ago produced a regional "type" who had forged a complex civilization on the Paulista plateau that now transcended simple anthropological classifications – one could no longer speak of "the man of São Paulo."

Their writings also had wide resonance precisely because the "outcome" of the ethnic fusion they described was already evident – São Paulo's growing economic and political dominance may have incited criticism from other regional elites but almost no one contested the claims of its exceptionalism or derided the Paulistas' self-projection as the "povo bandeirante." Euclides da Cunha himself had declared that, "today, same as 200 years ago, the progress of São Paulo can still be seen as the progress of Brazil."[9] Moreover, by acceding to the claims of

the "Paulista chauvinists," Brazilians from elsewhere implicitly endorsed the image of the "Nordestino" (northeasterner) as the embodiment of backwardness. As São Paulo surged ahead of the rest of Brazil by almost every economic indicator and consolidated its dominant political position during the First Republic (1889–1930), Paulista exceptionalism, and its flipside, the backward Nordeste, became the discursive framework for naturalizing the increasing lopsidedness of the Brazilian economic landscape. By linking regional identity to modernity, progress, and whiteness, Paulista chauvinists turned the question of Brazilian authenticity into a matter of folkloric curiosity.[10] And political bosses in the Nordeste found themselves reduced to accentuating the poverty and misery of their region as the most efficacious means of wresting resources from the clutches of the centre–south elites.[11]

If the early decades of the twentieth century in Brazil, and Latin America more generally, saw an emphasis on race mixture as a route to whitening (or, a bit later, eugenicizing) the national population, by the 1930s there were signs of a new discursive direction that valorized the multiracial character of Latin American societies and treated it as something to be fostered or preserved, not erased.[12] There were many different factors and influences that informed this trend, among them the model offered by the Soviet Union and its policy of self-determination for the numerous "nationalities" of the former Russian empire. This brings me to Adrienne Edgar's fascinating discussion of the process of nationality selection by children of "mixed marriages" in the former Soviet Union and the insight her research gives us to the formation of ethnoracial subjectivities, something that historians have typically found extremely difficult to access, particularly with regard to those whose identities straddle certain lines of difference. But the Soviet case, where the state obliged children of parents with different nationalities (a "mixed marriage") to declare themselves one or the other by age sixteen, lends itself to the kind of investigation that has been frustrated in other locales.

Despite the Soviets' apparent rejection of racial categories and the emphasis on choice and self-determination, Edgar's research demonstrates that nationality in the Soviet context assumed many of the features we associate with race, and the hierarchies of national identities could approximate what we mean by racism. In a sense, the Soviet "model" prefigured the multiculturalism that became a cornerstone of liberal discourse on "ethnicity" in the 1970s and with the same

implicit flaws. It treated ethnonational identity as stable and clearly bounded; hence the refusal to allow anyone over a certain age to be of mixed nationality. And it adopted a pluralistic veneer of horizontal equality, even as certain national identities promised status and privilege not available to others. Thus individuals she interviewed with one Russian parent readily acknowledged the advantages associated with that core nationality. Nevertheless, this did not mean that they automatically opted for the more "advantageous" of their two choices; in some cases, they felt that the way they looked or the way they spoke the Russian language made it impossible for them to assume a Russian nationality. They even feared it would make them an object of derision, a "laughing stock," rather than a privileged member of Soviet society. Here we can see the repercussions of a process of formal classification that makes one's identity fixed and public.

By contrast, the many Brazilians of mixed race who, over the centuries, have migrated in the direction of whiteness, given the absence of official racial categories (sometimes even in the census) or Jim Crow-like segregation, have been able to "lighten" their identity without formally declaring themselves white or deliberately trying to "pass" and therefore have been able to evade frontal challenges to their assumption of a whitened persona. Precisely because the lines between different racial categories are so imprecise, and can be shaded one way or the other depending on a variety of physical features and bodily performances, it may only be in retrospect that the individual who has ceased to be a "person of colour" becomes aware of his or her self-transformation. This also means that we have little means to calculate just how common such self-whitening may be but there is ample ethnographic and anecdotal evidence that it has not been at all uncommon.[13]

If the fear of ridicule among some of Edgar's interview subjects deterred them from opting for the Russian nationality, it is noteworthy that several indicated a "positive" consideration that impelled them to choose a nationality that placed them in a less prestigious category. Here gender, and the way it articulated with religious faith, seems to have been the crucial category of analysis, with several interviewees mentioning that they would have been regarded as dishonouring their father if they had declined to choose his nationality (and this seemed especially the case when the father was Muslim and the alternative was a non-Muslim identity). It is interesting to see the way the patriarchal imperative overruled a choice that might have been

more advantageous with regard to Soviet society as a whole. But it is also worth noting that the sons and daughters who adopted their father's nationality in such cases did not necessarily feel that it was a "natural" choice and lamented their inability to "perform" the national identity regarded as their birthright. As is evident in the quote that opens chapter 8, it was not uncommon for them to feel quite bitter about their divided loyalties and weakly defined affinities, with a number of interviewees concluding that mixed marriages may have been celebrated as a mark of ethnic openness in the former Soviet Union but that the consequences for the children of these unions were chiefly negative. While some expressed their criticism with a degree of jocularity, at least one insisted, without a hint of levity, that she was "categorically against interethnic marriage." Feeling themselves to be neither fish nor fowl (or to quote one subject, "neither bulldog nor rhinoceros"), these offspring of mixed marriages ended up questioning the decisions made by their parents and implying that the problem was not so much the formal strictures of the Soviet state but the cultural traditions and demands of the different ethnonational groups.

In light of this, it is interesting to consider the recent controversies in Brazil related to the implementation of programs known there chiefly as "quotas" and akin to what is called in the US "affirmative action." These programs are largely the result of popular movements that have sought to ensure that Brazilians of African and Amerindian descent have access to government positions and institutions of higher learning and are intended to address and redress Brazil's very long history of racial discrimination, one that has coexisted with its enduring image as a "racial democracy." But of course such programs require that their beneficiaries declare a specific racial identity; thus, in Brazil, where historically one could avoid formal classification as belonging to a particular race or ethnicity, it has now become necessary in certain circumstances to declare oneself as being of African or indigenous descent. This has provoked a stream of anxious objections from Brazilian pundits and academics who fear that the result will be more sharply drawn colour lines and an intensification of racial animosity.[14] They do not deny that Brazilians of African and indigenous descent have suffered discrimination but feel that the fluidity of racial identities has served to temper the kind of day-to-day racial friction they associate with the US and its "harsh binaries," to quote Edgar's apt description. Meanwhile, Afro-descendant and indigenous activists

rebuff such concerns by accentuating the human and societal costs of racism in Brazil; in effect, they argue that this self-classification simply acknowledges identities that already disadvantage a very large portion of the Brazilian population and insist that claims about Brazilians' special capacity for blurring lines of racial difference is merely another element of the "myth of racial democracy" that has obfuscated the very real impact of racial hierarchies.[15]

For much of the past decade, the "activist" view appeared to be in ascendance in Brazil, and there were multiple signs of a "reverse migration" in self-identification towards blackness, especially on university campuses and within rural movements.[16] However, the recent extreme right-wing turn in Brazilian politics presages an erosion of programs that address race-based inequalities and the enduring injuries of slavery, and the current president is likely to pay lip-service to the threadbare idea of Brazil as a racial democracy even as he articulates positions that are nakedly racist. These sobering developments remind us that trends we regard as "progressive" do not advance in any continuous or straightforward way, and sometimes they do not advance at all.

In short, it is too early in this process of formally redressing the long legacy of Brazilian racism even to imagine what the attitudes of the next generation might be, but I would venture that the trend toward formal self-classification will not obliterate the informal recognition and valorization of mixture. Several of Edgar's interview subjects felt that a Soviet identity was inseparable from Russianness, but it would be difficult to conceive of Brazilian national identity – even recognizing the advantages that have historically accrued to those of mainly European descent – as inseparable from whiteness. In the Soviet context, it is easy to understand why someone like Susanna, who revelled in being a "trilingual, trinational girl," would seem relatively rare, but the longstanding celebration of racial and cultural mixture in Brazil makes it unlikely that such sentiments will become similarly atypical there. It is also interesting to consider what difference it makes when the requirement for self-classification emerges as a top-down fiat from the state *versus* it emerging from popular struggles and demands. Although social movements may produce their own strictures of "political correctness," the very process by which those "norms" are constructed makes them susceptible to challenge and alteration in ways that the dictates of the Soviet state certainly were not.

Finally, Edgar argues quite convincingly that "Soviet thinking about nationality had become racialized," but she also recognizes that the category "nationality" cannot be simply collapsed into "race." So to understand the different fates of people of multiple (potential) identities, we may need to go back to Benedict Anderson's concept of the nation as an imagined community "that inspires love, and often profoundly self-sacrificing love" and consider whether "nationality" is a category that is especially inhospitable to mixed loyalties.[17] If such devotion is the expectation, then a divided nationality smacks of infidelity. In the Soviet case, the solution was to require all individuals to declare a single nationality; in the Brazilian case, the solution was to construct a powerful myth of racial democracy that, at the level of the nation, blended, and thereby erased, competing identities.

NOTES

1 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London and New York: Verso Books, 1991), 7.

2 Barbara Weinstein, *The Color of Modernity: São Paulo and the Making of Race and Nation in Brazil* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2015), 9.

3 On Nina Rodrigues as a foundational figure in the field of anthropology in Brazil, see Mariza Corrêa, *As ilusões da liberdade: Nina Rodrigues e a antropologia no Brasil* (Bragança Paulista: Universidade de S. Francisco, 1998).

4 See, for example, Lilia M. Schwarcz, *The Spectacle of the Races: Scientists, Institutions, and the Race Question in Brazil, 1870–1930* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1999).

5 Nancy Leys Stepan, *"The Hour of Eugenics": Race, Gender, and Nation in Latin America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991).

6 Euclides da Cunha, *Rebellion in the Backlands*, trans. Samuel Putnam (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944).

7 Ibid, 464.

8 The output of the "bandeirologistas" was enormous, but probably the two most widely read and cited works were Alfredo Ellis Júnior, *Raça de gigantes: a civilização no planalto paulista* (São Paulo: Ed. Helios, 1926); Alcântara Machado, *Vida e morte do bandeirante* (São Paulo: Ed. Revista dos Tribunais, 1929).

9 Cited in Nicolau Sevcenko, *Literatura como missão* (São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1983), 140.

10 Weinstein, *The Color of Modernity*, 32–46.

11 On the quandary of Nordestino elites in the face of the declining political and economic status of the region, see Durval Muniz de Albuquerque Júnior, *The Invention of the Brazilian Northeast* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014).
12 On changing trends in racial discourse in Latin America, see "Introduction: Racial Nations," in *Race and Nation in Modern Latin America*, eds. Nancy Appelbaum, Anne Macpherson, and Karin Rosemblatt (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 1–31.
13 A recent study that uses census data to calculate rates of intermarriage in Brazil, which are high when compared to the US or South Africa (though mainly because of the intermediate "brown" category), see Edward E. Telles, *Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 173–93.
14 Peter Fry et al., *Divisões perigosas: políticas raciais no Brasil contemporáneo* (Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2007).
15 On the shift from racial democracy to affirmative action, see Telles, *Race in Another America*, 47–77.
16 On the tendency of younger members of agrarian communities in rural Maranhão to organize and demand rights on the basis of their identities as *black* Brazilians, see Sean T. Mitchell, *Constellations of Inequality: Space, Race, and Utopia in Brazil* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017), especially 115–35.
17 Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 141.

PART FOUR

Russia and the Globe

10

Occidental Bullyism? Russia, Yun Ch'iho, and Race in the Early Twentieth-Century Pacific

Susanna Soojung Lim

In 1902, the Korean intellectual Yun Ch'iho wrote in his diary:

> A Russian may kick, beat and kill a Korean without running the least risk of being called to justice. A Cossak's favorite diversion is to aim, and fire, at the forehead of a Korean in a solitary place … Mr Yi's account of the savage conduct of the Russian toward Koreans opened my eyes to one fact … that is, Japan, with all her faults, is a better friend than Russia.

This striking anti-Russian, pro-Japanese statement, by a reform-minded figure who had hitherto spent most of his life agonizing over the problem of Korean national sovereignty, was prompted by stories of the Korean immigrant situation in the Russian Far East as told to Yun by a visitor from Vladivostok. My article attempts to use these words by Yun Ch'iho (1864–1945) as a starting point from which to examine Russia's role in the development of race thinking and racial constructions in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in a trans-Pacific and transnational framework. I argue that non-Russian voices such as Yun's – as a matter of fact, *especially* those of individuals like Yun whose native Korea was being, and would be, directly impacted by Russian actions in the Far East and the Pacific – afford us an invaluable window from which to evaluate the significance of Russia in the early twentieth-century global development of ideas on race.

As many of the writers in this volume have pointed out, despite its active participation in the development of racial ideas and practices, Russia's role and significance in relation to race, as opposed to those of Euro-America, have largely been viewed as somewhat exceptional. Our rethinking of this conceptual blind spot is especially pertinent to Russia in the early-twentieth-century Pacific. Although the Russo-Japanese War (1904–05) was widely perceived at the time as the world's first "racial" war, and the racist attitudes animating both Russian and Japanese war propaganda have received scholarly attention,[1] scholars have yet to properly recognize Russia's participation in the racial constructions and hierarchies that emerged in this crucial period of Northeast Asian and Pacific history, to fully consider the much broader racial implications of Russia's defeat in the Russo-Japanese War. Perhaps it is precisely Russia's defeat in this war – its failure to partake in the subsequently US-led "White Pacific" which, in effect, it had helped set the tone for by its eastward expansion at the turn of the century – that has obscured our understanding of Russia's significance for the rise of race in the trans-Pacific, which culminated in the immediate years before, during, and after its war with Japan.

Nowhere is the Russian presence more evident than in the perceptions of and responses to Russia on the part of non-Russian and non-white individuals such as Yun Ch'iho. Imperial Russia's eastward expansion and its Far East/East Asia policies provoked very real responses from Korean, Japanese, and Chinese thinkers, many of whom came to imagine Russia as being at the forefront of a "White Peril." Yun's race-based and pro-Japanese "Pan-Asianism" was significantly shaped by his perception of Russia's impact on Korea and East Asia in the context of a trans-Pacific network of white racial domination. The first section of this article will attempt to make better sense of Yun's startling outburst. To do so we will need to examine, firstly on a historical and national level, the unfolding of Russo-Korean relations in the years 1896–98, the peak of Russian influence in Korea. As a high-ranking official in the Korean court, Yun worked closely with the Russian representatives in Korea. Secondly, on the level of individual history, we will trace the transnational route travelled by this Korean intellectual and its impact on his ideas on race. Yun's words on Koreans in the Russian Far East marked the culminating point of his thinking on race that had been developing from his experiences studying in Japan, China, and the US during his youth. A key text in question is Yun's diary, extensive records which constitute not only an

invaluable document of Korean history but also shed fascinating light on his personal interactions with the race workings of the West and the details of Russian activity in Korea.

Students of Russian culture will be familiar with "Pan-Mongolism," an idea developed by late-nineteenth-century Russia's foremost religious thinker, Vladimir Solovyov (1853–1900), as part of his apocalyptic narrative of the final unfolding of Russia's destiny in world history – a denouement long anticipated by proponents of Russian messianic nationalism like Fyodor Dostoevsky (1821–1881).[2] Here, Solovyov depicted the Japanese, whose sudden rise on the world stage he attributed to their shallow imitation of the material progress of the West, as heading a movement he called "Pan-Mongolism," in which they "gathered under their leadership all the races of East Asia, with the goal of waging a war against … the Europeans."[3] According to Solovyov's apocalypse, this racial union of Asians was a precursor of Antichrist, the archnemesis over whom messianic Russia, despite great sacrifice, would ultimately triumph. "Pan-Mongolism" was essentially a Russocentric, and in part anachronistic, recasting of the Euro-American discourse of a "Yellow Peril" invading the West which, in its turn, had been prompted since the second half of the nineteenth century by the integration of East Asia into the Western-dominated world system of imperialism and capitalism, the wave of Chinese and Asian immigration to the US and the West, and Japan's international ascendancy. Neither a tsarist policy-maker, explorer, nor scholar closely involved with the East, Solovyov was, by all appearances, an unlikely contributor to a Russian fin-de-siècle racial discourse on Asians. And yet, in addition to deeply influencing key figures of Russian modernism (Andrei Bely, Alexander Blok, Dmitrii Merezhkovsky, and Boris Pilniak), his "theory" anticipated the Yellow Peril imagery unleashed in popular and mass culture during the war with Japan. Cartoons, posters, and Russian woodblock prints called *lubki* routinely portrayed the Japanese foe as yellow-skinned, slant-eyed, puny monkeys or subhuman beings easily quashed by a single stroke of a Cossack's whip.

Its fantastic and high-flown elements notwithstanding, Solovyov's apocalyptic and racial vision had its historical and geographical counterpart. Beginning in the last decades of the nineteenth and into the early twentieth centuries, Russia's central government, regional authorities, and intellectuals became preoccupied with the "yellow question" (*zheltyi vopros*) of the Russian Far East (the Amur-Ussuri region), by

which was meant the problem of the competition (economic, demographic, racial, cultural) presented to Russian settlers by the inflow of Chinese and Korean migrants to the empire's easternmost border. In the period following the Russo-Japanese War, regional authorities like Pavel Unterberger, the governor general of Priamurskii krai (1905–10) was adamant in his conviction that, as far as the Russian Far East was concerned, he "would prefer a Russian desert to a cultivated Korean region." For Unterberger, Korean migration and labour represented the "plunder of the Russian land by yellow-faced foreigners."[4]

Keeping this Russian context in mind, this paper examines Yun's ideas on race and the development of his pan-Asianism as a counterpoint to such Russian racial and national self-perceptions. Had Russia in its relation to Asia – as writers from Pushkin to Dostoevsky to Solovyov had believed – always been a passive victim of a Yellow Peril, a messianic absorber of non-Christian influences sacrificing itself for the West? Beyond serving as objects of white racial fears and fantasies, how did Asian or nonwhite individuals or groups respond to such Western or Russian ideas of race? How did East Asian intellectuals like Yun perceive and use race in relation to their own national and international concerns? Little did Russians like Unterberger or Solovyov imagine – whether in their efforts to control the Asian population in the eastern borderland or to create a cast of "Pan-Mongolians" as a racial and religious "other" in an apocalyptic narrative – that Korean intellectuals had developed their own ideas of a White Peril threatening the East, led by none other than a Russia represented by savage and drunken Cossacks.

Although they did not directly influence each other, a bringing together of the Russian and Korean discourses helps us better see what Howard Winant has called the "globality of race,"[5] a globalization of race that emerged as nationalist ideologies interacted with international and transnational forces to shape ideas about racial difference, competition, and solidarity. In particular, these Russian and Korean constructions of race developed against the backdrop of the rise of the Pacific region in the mid-nineteenth century as a new site of imperial rivalries, expansive nationalism, migration, and changes in the relationship of East and West. The emergence of Japan as a nonwhite imperial power came to present a challenge to both Russia's eastward and America's westward expansion in the Pacific. Yun's native Korea, which for centuries Japan had eyed as a steppingstone to expansion in China and the Asian continent, was the direct target of

Japan's imperial ambitions. And on both sides of the Pacific in the mid-to-late nineteenth century, Asian immigration to the Americas (East Asian and South Asian migrants) and the Russian Far East (Chinese and Korean migrants) provoked national and racial anxieties and resulted in immigration policies of restriction and exclusion in both Russia and the US.[6]

Against this background of unprecedented global change, when theories of national or racial solidarity and conflict, inclusion and exclusion, abounded, the examples of Solovyov and Yun reveal that each, in different ways, called for an ideal union in relation to the racial self, which was catalyzed by fears of a supposed, superior, form of unity achieved by the racial other. Whereas the Russian philosopher called for a much hoped for reconciliation between Russia and Western Europe to defend white Christianity from the spiritual and military threat of pan-Mongolism (Yellow Peril), the Korean Yun urged his compatriots to join Japan in a union of the yellow race against the imperialist aggression and arrogance of a "White Peril."

YELLOW PERIL OR WHITE PERIL? RACE IN EAST ASIA AND THE RISE OF PAN-ASIANISM

In the late nineteenth century, the discourse on race itself had become interracial. The period saw the contemporaneous emergence of multiple ideas and theories on race wherein, on the one hand, Euro-American or Russian fears of the "Yellow Peril" and calls for a white (or Russian/Slav) unity came to coexist with, on the other hand, East Asian notions of a "White Peril" and pan-Asian commonality. Ideas of pan-Asianism emerged in Japan in the 1880s, in the notion that the Japanese shared common cultural and racial (physical) traits with their continental neighbours the Koreans and the Chinese.[7] From Japan, pan-Asianism went on to exert considerable influence on intellectuals in China, Korea, and other parts of Asia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The sense of regional and racial identity promoted by pan-Asianism was essentially a modern phenomenon, one which would not have been possible without a growing awareness of the "other," the West, as well as the introduction of Western discourses on nation and race. Beginning in the 1850s, both China and Japan were forcibly integrated into a new, Western-dominated, world system through a series of "unequal" treaties signed with Western powers. Unique among the Asian states, Japan successfully adapted to

the challenges posed by the advent of the West. Fourteen years after the country's "opening" by the United States, Japan's leaders implemented radical reforms that catapulted, in the space of less than three decades, this hitherto feudal polity into a Western-oriented, modern, nation-state (the Meiji Restoration, 1868).

The introduction of Western theories and classifications of race stimulated Japanese awareness and discussions of the concept, expressed in the Japanese term for race, *jinshu*.[8]

Japanese, and later other East Asian, reactions to Western ideas of race and white racist views was more complicated and ambiguous than a straightforward position of antiracism or anticolonialism. In their groundbreaking volume on race and racism in modern East Asia, Rotem Kowner and Walter Demel speak of a "spectrum of reactions" characterizing early East Asian encounters with the race-based ideas from the West, which variously consisted of ignoring such ideas, rejecting them, accepting them, or reacting against them.[9] They also point out that "[a]mong late-nineteenth-century East Asian nations, Japan was exceptionally prominent in its collective readiness to adopt and emulate Western racial theories."[10] Such Japanese acceptance of the Western race-based worldview was inseparable from the question of power: in Japanese eyes, the military and technological superiority of the West validated the latter's racial superiority, and adopting Western theories of race was part and parcel of adopting what the Japanese termed the superior *bunmei kaika* (civilization and the enlightenment) of the West.[11] In ways that recall the anticolonial and Pan-Africanist writer Frantz Fanon's (1925–1961) analysis of the feelings of pain and inferiority experienced by black people living in a white-dominant world, Japanese individuals in this period often internalized Western ideals of racial and physical superiority or beauty, which led them to adopt attitudes of inferiority and self-denigration toward their own Asianness. For example, the novelist Natsume Soseki (1867–1916), who studied in London (1900–03), commented, "We Japanese are like small monkeys with an earth-like skin color, so it is understandable that the Westerners deride us."[12] As we will see later, a similar adoption and internalization of the Western racial worldview would begin to mark Yun Ch'iho's thinking in the process of his westernization and modernization.

At the opposite end of the spectrum from the adoption and emulation of Western racial theories was racial "backlash," the most representative form of which was the idea of Pan-Asianism.[13] The first Pan-

Asianist organization, *Koa-kai* (興亞會; "Raise Asia Society"), was established in 1880 by Sone Toshitora (1847–1910), a navy lieutenant who had served as a China Hand for the Japanese government and military.[14] But as Torsten Weber has shown, it was in the aftermath of the Sino-Japanese War (1894–95), against the backdrop of a postwar flourishing of Sino-Japanese interactions, that ideas of Asian commonality began to have a real impact.[15] One of the earliest calls for an Asian and racial alliance came from no less a figure than Li Hongzhang, China's leading statesman, while the two countries were still at war (March 1895). Li addressed Ito Hirobumi, Japan's prime minister at the time and one of the most important figures of Meiji Japan, with the following words:

> In Asia, our two countries, China and Japan, are the closest neighbors, and moreover have the same language. How could we be enemies? Now for the time being we are fighting each other, but eventually we should work for permanent friendship … [W]e ought vigorously … to establish perpetual peace and harmony between ourselves, so that our Asiatic yellow race will not be encroached upon by the white race of Europe.[16]

In this period, a key stimulus for the growth of Sino-Japanese exchanges was the transfer of people and ideas across the two nations occasioned by the new regional order, most notably seen in the thousands of Chinese students, often sponsored by the Chinese government, who went to Japan not only "to learn from Japan" but also to "learn about the West through Japan."[17] As Weber points out, rather than feeling humiliated by China's defeat in the war, many reform-minded Chinese intellectuals began, on the contrary, to look to Japan as a model of successful modernization.[18] And, most significantly for our discussion, turning to Japan meant *not* turning to Russia, Japan's regional rival and China's supposed new ally.

As the Li–Ito exchange demonstrates, the Sino-Japanese War was a turning point in the emergence of racial thinking and the globalization of race in the trans-Pacific. It provoked a chain of responses and counterresponses represented, in the West, by the German Kaiser Wilhelm's notorious "Yellow Peril" painting and, in the East, by pro-Asianist activists' counterargument concerning a "White Peril." Shocked at Japan's victory over China in 1895, Wilhelm commissioned a drawing that depicted seven female warriors, symbolizing the powers of Europe, pro-

tected by the Christian cross and the archangel Michael, preparing for battle against a Buddha glimmering in the distant east. As for the "White Peril," the term was in fact popularized not by a Japanese or Asian intellectual, but by Sydney L. Gulick, an American missionary and lifelong advocate of Japan, in a treatise written during the Russo-Japanese War.[19] Before Gulick, similar notions had been voiced by pro-Asianist activists and circulated in the Japanese and Chinese media in the years between Japan's two wars.[20] A striking example is a 1900 parody sketch of Wilhelm's Yellow Peril image by the Japanese daily *Yomiuri Shinbun*. Here, Wilhelm's image of European nations led by the archangel is replaced by a group of Asian warriors led by Confucius. Threatening them in the distance is not a "Yellow Peril" of the Buddha but a "White Peril" symbolized by a large approaching ship and a cross. In invoking these symbols of European imperialism and its accomplice, Christian proselytism, the Japanese daily suggested in no uncertain terms that, between the two peril narratives, it was *their* White Peril version that was closer to historical reality.[21]

In this period between the Sino-Japanese and the Russo-Japanese wars, Russia played an essential role in East Asian imaginings of the White Peril. The pro-Japanese Gulick, for instance, singled out the "northern bear," by which he meant "Russian greed and aggression supported … by German and French ambitions," as the "real peril today to Japan and to eastern Asia."[22] Gulick was referring to the Triple Intervention (1895), in which Russia had led France and Germany to force Japan to return to China the Liaodong peninsula it had won in the war, only to thereafter lease the peninsula from China and use it to establish a Russian naval base in Port Arthur (Chinese: Lüshun). The alliance of 1902 concluded between Japan and England as a response to these Russian moves played a role in injecting English Russophobia into the Japanese media. As the possibility of Japan's clash with Russia became more imminent, Japanese and Chinese intellectuals who had been searching for a common ground in the notion of racial unity and developing their anti-Western discourses found a real opponent in Russia.

RUSSIA AND KOREA

It would be difficult to understand Russia's full impact on turn-of-the-century East Asia without an examination of its relations with

Korea, the catalyst and battleground for both the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War. In the second half of the nineteenth century, Korea faced a deep crisis. In 1876, Japan, exactly twenty-two years after American gun diplomacy forced its opening to the West, repeated the same feat against Korea. Thereafter the peninsula became the arena of fierce imperialist competition between Japan, China, Russia, and (to a lesser extent) the United States, France, and Germany, in a situation often described proverbially by Koreans as "the breaking of a shrimp's back when caught between fighting whales."[23] Russo-Korean relations began, unofficially, when Russia's acquisition of the Amur and Ussuri regions from China (1858–60) led it to share a border with the northeastern tip of what is now North Korea along the Tumen River (Korean: *Tumangang*). As we will examine, the new condition quickly gave rise to a phenomenon of mass Korean migration into the Russian Far East. Officially, the two countries signed the Russia-Korea Treaty of 1884, which followed on the heels of similar treaties concluded by the other Western powers with Korea. As we will examine in Yun's diary, the years 1896–98 witnessed a short-lived but remarkable peak of Russian influence in Korea's domestic affairs. These two dimensions of late nineteenth-century Russo-Korean relations – the issue of Korean migration into Russia, on the one hand and Russian interactions with the Korean court, on the other – did not directly influence each other. We will see, however, that they come together in Yun's diary in his final assessment of the Russian impact on Korea.

To be sure, imperial Russia's interest in this (from a Russian standpoint) remote northeast Asian kingdom was at most peripheral. Most historians note that Russia in this period adopted a passive, reactive, wait-and-see approach toward Korea aimed chiefly at maintaining the regional status quo and keeping the other powers in check (Japan, China, US, England).[24] Nevertheless, Russia's sudden territorial bordering with Korea beginning in the 1860s gave it an access to this oft-called "hermit kingdom" not available to the Euro-American powers and, significantly, also not available to Japan, for whom, unlike Russia, Korea *was* the cornerstone of its imperial ambitions. This meant that Russian actions, however passive or lukewarm they may have been from a Russian perspective, had, or were perceived to have, a direct impact on Korea by Koreans and East Asians.

"MIGHT IS RIGHT": YUN CH'IHO'S RACE-BASED WORLDVIEW

The life and career of Yun Ch'iho (1864–1945), a crucial figure in late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Korea, defy easy summary. The various identities and intellectual and ideological positions associated with him – including those of anti-Confucian reformer and proponent of "civilization and enlightenment," nationalist, Christian advocate, educator, editor of Korea's first modern newspaper, advisor to the Korean court, Korean international student in the US, and, after the Japanese takeover of Korea, pro-Japanese collaborator – are symptomatic of the turbulent vicissitudes of Korean history as well as the dilemmas and contradictions that faced many turn-of-the-century Korean intellectuals.

For centuries, Korean elites had considered themselves members of a larger Sinocentric order. This sense of belonging had little to do with notions of racial or ethnic similarity, centred as it was on a reverence for Chinese (primarily neo-Confucian) traditions based on the knowledge and use of the Chinese script. With the beginning of a new regional order centred on Japan and the West, the concepts of race (*injong*, translated from the Japanese word *jinshu*) and racial hierarchy, together with other Western discourses such as nationalism and social Darwinism, were introduced to Korea.[25] Yun's use of race, similar to and perhaps even to a greater extent than the pan-Asianist voices mentioned above, reveals that East Asians were not merely objects of Western discourses on race. Exposed to and keenly aware of such ideas, they engaged with them, appropriated them, and were themselves producers of race-based worldviews.

Yun Ch'iho was born in 1864, the son of a prominent military official in a wealthy aristocratic (*yangban*) family.[26] The East Asian phenomenon of learning from Japan, mentioned previously in relation to China, also impacted Korea in the late nineteenth century. In 1881, when Yun was sixteen, he traveled to Japan as a member of the Korean "Inspection Mission" sent by Korea's King Kojong to observe the transformation of Meiji Japan. As part of the first generation of Koreans who were able to travel and study abroad, Yun was one of the earliest examples of the "international student" (*yuhaksaeng*) whose exposure to and learning from the West and Japan would play a crucial role in the modernization of Korea.

In Japan, Yun immersed himself in a Western-style education, learned Japanese and English, and made contacts with Meiji-era elites like Fukuzawa Yukichi and Inoue Kaoru. Returning to Korea in 1883, he worked as Korea's first English interpreter for America's first envoy to Korea, Lucius Foote. In the following year, a group of Japanese-supported young radicals killed conservative officials and took over the government in a coup attempt that failed after three days. Although Yun was not involved in the plot, his close ties to the radicals induced him to go into a self-imposed exile in Shanghai. There, Yun enrolled in the Anglo-Christian College, a school founded by Young John Allen, a Methodist minister from Georgia, under the auspices of the American Methodist Episcopal, South (MECS).

On 3 April 1887, a day he called "the most important" in his life, Yun was baptized in Shanghai.[27] His conversion was one example among many that demonstrated the unusual success of Protestant Christianity in Korea in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Scholars who have examined the exceptional role of Protestantism in modern Korea have shown how Korean reformers welcomed the new religion of the American missionaries as a tool of nation building and national empowerment.[28] With the backing of Methodist missionaries, from 1888 Yun went on to spend six years in the United States, studying theology first at Vanderbilt University (Nashville, Tennessee) and then at Emory University (Oxford, Georgia), before returning to Korea in 1895.

Yun is the author of an extensive diary, which he kept for sixty years (1883–1943). Written in Chinese, Korean, and English in various phases of his life, the diary functioned as a key site wherein Yun strove to articulate his self-evolution and self-transformation from a scion of Korea's traditional aristocracy to a Western-educated Korean Christian. It also reveals how, in the context of his experience of studying abroad (Japan, China, US), Yun's nationalist and Christian ideas overlapped and interacted with an increasingly racial and social Darwinist view of history as consisting of an endless "struggle for survival" between races and nations who were either "strong" or "weak," "fit" or "less fit." Yun's diary from his period in Japan and China (1883–88) reveals the formation of his ideas on racial and civilizational hierarchy under the strong influence of Japanese intellectuals and American missionaries. Like many Japanese elites, Yun accepted Western notions of a hierarchy of races, which placed the white race at the top, blacks

and other darker-skinned peoples at the bottom, and Asians (the "yellow" races) in the middle. He also racially classified the three East Asian peoples according to the degree of their success in adopting Western civilization and adapting to the Western world order.[29] Yun's entries are dotted with expressions of envious praise for the "advanced," "civilized," "westernized," and "clean" Japanese, on the one hand and of contempt and vexation for the "backward" and "dirty" Chinese, on the other. Yun's conversion to Christianity in Shanghai (which made him Korea's first Southern Methodist Christian convert) became an act of shedding the Confucian past represented by China, a legacy which, according to Yun, had inflicted nothing but the greatest harm on Korea.

But no matter how contemptuous, Yun's descriptions of the Chinese are shot through with the implication that his own people – the Koreans as a race – were just as inferior. After visiting an American missionary with Japanese friends he recorded, "The conversation this evening was filled with praise for Japan. Of my own country, there is only much to censure and nothing to boast of. It is pathetic, and it makes me want to die of envy of Japan" (29 December 1880). A decade later in Tennessee, when invited to speak on Korea at a missionary meeting in a Presbyterian church, Yun again expressed his sense of shame at what he perceived was the civilizational and racial inferiority of the Koreans, "Corea [*sic*] is the subject I hate most to talk about. There is not a single thing, either in the past history or the present condition or the future possibility of Corea, that can warm me up with national pride … or enthusiastic hope. Poor Corea!" (7 February 1890). Contempt and shame, combined with pity and a burdened sense of his own responsibility towards Korea – such was the mixed bag of feelings Yun entertained in relation to the Korean race. At the same time, his grim diagnosis and acknowledgement of the present inferiority of Koreans in fact reflected a hopeful determination to improve the Korean race by means of a racial, national, and Christian renewal.

Yun's acceptance of the Western racial worldview and his hopes for a racial and national uplift for his own people were, however, profoundly complicated by his period in America (1888–93), where he was exposed to the stark realities of US race relations in the late nineteenth-century, from the disenfranchisement of black voters and other efforts to exclude them from citizenship to the barring of Chinese and Asian immigrants. Yun's firsthand experience of the bewildering contradic-

tions of race and religion in the postbellum American South provoked and sharpened his own racial thinking and complicated his newfound sense of identity as a Christian convert.

Andrew Urban has examined the ways Yun's racial and social experiences in the US shaped his critique of American and Christian liberalism. As Urban shows, American missionaries' recruitment and patronage of Asian student-converts like Yun reflected the global and imperial agendas of southern missionary and academic culture at the turn of the century, which in turn was based on the missionaries' sense that the rise of the US to global prominence was linked to the "cultivation of its Christian conscience."[30] In coming to the home country of the missionaries who had guided him to his new faith, Yun, too, fully accepted their vision of American exceptionalism in relation to Christianity. Nowhere is this keen acceptance epitomized more clearly than in his choice of English (rather than Japanese, as in the case of many other Korean intellectuals) as the language of self-expression.[31] Going hand in hand with his acceptance of white superiority, Yun's privileging of English was symptomatic of turn-of-the-century Korean elites' association of the language (which would be further cemented in the twentieth century) with enlightenment, Christianity, Anglo-American power, and whiteness. Later, while in Russia as a member of the Korean delegation to the coronation of Nicholas II, the chief comment Yun made concerning the Russian emperor after an audience was that the latter spoke "good and clear English" (22 May 1896).

The American portions of Yun's diary testify to his growing sense of alienation, shock, and dismay at white Americans' attitudes towards and treatment of other races, including and especially those pertaining to his personal encounters with professors, missionaries, and students. An entry from his days at Vanderbilt (6 February 1890) expresses the indignation he felt when, after completing a successful examination in theology, he discovered that the professor in question had published the following comment concerning him in a newspaper: "the fact [that] a Corean can present such an examination … answers the question, 'Is a heathen worth educating?'" The realization that, in the eyes of many Americans, he was still a "heathen" regardless of his Western education, English acquisition, and Christian conversion prompted Yun to further reflect on the deceptive nature of American liberalism as seen in its history of race. A week later, speaking of the "persecution of the Chinese in the West, the treatment of the Negro in the South, and the dealing with the Indian by the whole

nation," he concluded: "[I]f you want to enjoy the so-called inalienable right of man in this "*Land of Freedom*," you must be white" (14 February 1890).

Nevertheless, Yun's disillusionment and cynicism regarding US race relations did not stop him from exhibiting an equally strong sense of admiration and envy in regards to the advanced political and cultural institutions of this "strong" white race. Again, similar to the Japanese elites, Yun's experiences in the US, far from leading him to morally question or resist the social Darwinist or racist worldviews, led to their deeper internalization and earnest application. This is seen in his position on the American exclusion of Chinese immigrants. Chinese immigration was a particularly troubling issue for East Asian students like Yun living in America, who, to their chagrin, found themselves frequently categorized as belonging to the same yellow race as the Chinese labourers, regardless of their very different social and cultural backgrounds. While exposing the pretenses of American liberalism, Yun, all the same, made it clear that he did not "blame the Americans" for their acts of discrimination. He wrote: "Let theorists … say what they may, the principle that practically and actually rules this world is not right but might. 'Might is Right' is the god of this world. Now, has China the might to support the right of the Chinese in America? Then do it." The social Darwinist principle of "Might is Right," "the god of this world," upending and replacing the standards of the Christian God, laid the responsibility of exclusion not on the Americans who excluded but on the Chinese who were being excluded. "For a nation no crime is greater than weakness," Yun reiterated in a later entry (27 November 1891).

YUN CH'IHO AND RUSSIA

Yun's return to Korea towards the end of the Sino-Japanese War (1895) coincided with Russia's growing influence in his home country against the backdrop of increasing Japanese encroachment and the crumbling of the Korean monarchy. In the wake of Japan's victory over China, Korea's Queen Min adopted a pro-Russian policy aimed at counterbalancing Japan and developed a particularly close relationship with Karl Waeber, the Russian envoy to Korea (1885–97). Queen Min's pro-Russian turn provoked the ire of the Japanese, who, in October of 1895, invaded the royal palace and brutally assassinated her. The following year, fearing for his own life and at the behest of

Waeber and pro-Russian members of his court, King Kojong escaped to the Russian Legation in Seoul, in an incident Korean historians refer to as "Akwanp'ach'ŏn" (the king's relocation or refuge to the Russian legation).

For about a year from 1896 to 1897, the Russian Legation functioned as the de facto seat of the Korean government. At once a chief advisor to the Korean court and its most critical observer, Yun was often in the thick of unfolding events. His diaries of this period offer a fascinating and detailed glimpse into the exchanges between the Korean court and the foreign representatives, including the Russian Waeber and his successor, Aleksei Shpeier (Speyer). Most importantly, outside the court, Yun worked actively to promote Korean sovereignty through reform. A few months after the king's relocation, Yun, together with another reformist and US-educated intellectual Sŏ Chaep'il (Philip Jaisohn), formed the Independence Club, the first civic organization in Korea committed to transforming the monarchy into a modern nation-state and fostering the growth of parliamentary democracy (1896). The Independence Club's modernization efforts included the founding of *The Independent*, the country's first modern daily written in vernacular Korean (with a page in English) and the construction of the Independence Gate (or Arch), built to symbolize the end of Korea's tributary status to China.

Yun's perception of the Russians in the first few days following the king's escape to their mission appears initially to have been positive. He wrote, in a perhaps uncharacteristically hopeful tone, "the Russian Ministers act as wisely as the Japanese did unwisely … The Japanese wanted everything, but the Russians ask for nothing" (25 February 1896). But this brief impression of Russian benevolence quickly turned into concern and disillusionment. Already on the day of the move, although relieved that the king would be safe with the Russians, Yun expressed concern lest the king, whom he perceived as a weak and cowardly figure mainly preoccupied with his own personal safety, would rest content in his (current safe) position rather than actively pursuing reform for "the real welfare of the country" (11 February 1896). Concerned that the king's dependency on the Russians would compromise Korean sovereignty, he urged the king to move out of the Russian legation as soon as possible (14 February 1896). Nevertheless, there seems to have been other reasons for Yun's eventual falling out with the Russians, which sheds further insight into his diary entry a few years later on the state of Korean immigrants in Rus-

sia by which we began this article. This was the growing influence of Kim Hongriuk, Korea's only interpreter of Russian at the time, who had gained the absolute trust of King Kojong and the Russians during the king's flight. Kim was born in Hamgyŏng Province, the northernmost region of the peninsula bordering Russia (and from which, we will see, most of the Korean migrants to Russia originated). By birth a member of the *ch'ŏnmin*, the lowest social class, Kim owed his meteoric social rise to the fact of his Russian proficiency, which he had acquired by moving to Vladivostok. The Russian interpreter appears in Yun's diary soon after the flight:

> Yi Pom Chin, Yi Chai Soon and Kim Hong Niuk [Hongriuk] will ruin the country or rather finish up Corea. Kim is the Russian Interpreter. He is a sneaky rascal. The worst of it is that he has the perfect confidence of Waeber and Spyers … As a matter of fact this rascal is perhaps richer than any officer in the Cabinet – he takes bribes from any and all parties. He tells lies to the King in the name of the Russian Ministers … (25 February 1896)

Yun's damning portrayal of Kim seems to be corroborated by the few Korean sources on the Russian interpreter.[32] But notwithstanding the facts, Yun's intense hostility towards Russian Koreans like Kim (and later Kim Toil, another younger interpreter of Russian) reveals how his ideas on race intersected with even more deeply rooted class assumptions and, in addition, complicates his commiseration with Russian Koreans expressed in 1902.

Traditionally, interpreters (*yeokgwan*) and translators occupied an interesting place in the Korean social hierarchy. Selected exclusively from the middle (*chungin*) class, their expertise in foreign languages (Chinese, Japanese, Mongolian, and Manchu) made them indispensable in diplomatic and trade exchanges and missions with China and other countries in the premodern period. In the late nineteenth century, interpreters' language acquisition (now shifted to Western languages) and experience abroad made them the leading agents of modernization and social mobility.[33] Yun had himself been Korea's first English interpreter; yet the sudden rise of Russian Koreans like Kim, who were not even of the middle but of the lowest class, seems to have been a source of deep shock for him. He emphasizes their lack of proper training and education, describing them as "wretches whose only merit is a few Russian words picked up in the streets of Vladi-

vostok," "dirty rascals" at whose hands "the King suffers all sorts of insults and indignities" (14 July 1897). Of Kim Toil, the Russian interpreter who participated in the 1896 Korean mission to Russia, he writes that a decision was made not to use Kim on account of his very poor Korean, the coarseness of which scandalized the mission's aristocratic members (22 May 1896).

In 1896, Russo-Korean relations were further cemented by a Korean delegation sent to Russia on the occasion of the coronation of Nicholas II, in which Yun took part. Arriving in Moscow on May via Shanghai, New York, London, and Warsaw, Yun and his colleagues attended the coronation ceremonies (26 May 1896), then spent seventy-two days in St Petersburg (June–August), before Yun parted ways with the mission for a personal three-month stay in Paris to learn French. Like his US entries, Yun's record of his Russian experience is characterized by critical observations on nation and race. Despite some strange features (the architecture and costumes in Moscow, for example, strike him as being "Asiatic" or "grotesque," 24 May), the overall impression of Russia in Yun's diary is that of a big and powerful country fully belonging to the Western and international order. He is thoroughly awed by the pomp and ceremony presented by the Russian monarchy, at the same time as he is struck by the Khodynka stampede, which hints ominously at the backwardness and lawlessness lurking underneath the brilliance of the royal festivities and which prompts him to quote the French diplomat Talleyrand's famous words on Russia: "In Russia the Sovereign is civilized but the people are not" (30 May 1896).[34] In their meetings with the tsar and leading Russian officials, the Koreans delivered Kojong's request for Russian assistance, which included continued Russian protection of the monarch and the dispatching of Russian military instructors to train the Korean army. Korea also requested Russian advisors for the king and his cabinet, as well as for the development of railroad and mines (5 June 1896).

As an event that occasioned the gathering and exhibition of the world's nations, the coronation served for Yun as a microcosm of the international order and Korea's standing in it. Much more than the coronation itself, these Russian entries serve to highlight Yun's national anxieties and acute self-consciousness regarding the fact that he and his Korean colleagues were performing their national and racial identities in the eyes of a Western world. Constantly embarrassed by his Korean colleagues, whose manners and behaviour he considered

hopelessly lagging in terms of Western, civilized, standards, Yun speculates that he and his Korean colleagues in their "strange costume," were "objects of ridicule and contempt" wherever they went (23 May 1896). When Min Yŏnghwan, the head of the mission and a relative of the late queen, refused to remove his *kat* (the traditional hat worn by Korean male aristocrats) and for this reason was barred from entering the Cathedral of the Dormition, where the coronation took place, he tried unsuccessfully to persuade Min (24 May). The Russian trip was furthermore soured by the presence of the Russian interpreter Kim Toil who, Yun stressed, could not read a word of Korean or Chinese, having spent most of his life in Vladivostok and who had been "but a month ago an interpreter for the Russian sailors in the Legation" (1 May 1896).

The unprecedented advantage Russia came to enjoy in Korea throughout 1896 did not, however, outlast King Kojong's stay in the Russian Legation, which ended in early 1897. For a brief period, the prospect of Russian aid gave rise to, in the words of Vladimir Tikhonov, an "unusual partnership between [the Russian] absolutist monarchy and Korea's earliest admirers of Western parliamentary institutions."[35] The fact that reformists had placed much hope on Russia as a modernizing agent for Korea is seen in the editorials of *The Independent*, the main organ of the Independence Club. Led by the staunchly pro-American Sŏ Chaep'il (who shared none of Yun's criticism of US and Western racial practices) Russia was presented, together with the other powers, as a Western "teacher" whose aid and know-how would benefit Korea's modernization. The paper was particularly sanguine about the prospects of modernizing the Korean military through the expertise of Russian military instructors and – at its most pro-Western (including pro-Russian) and pro-imperialist moments – welcomed Western and Russian concessions in China and Korea as civilizing forces, referred favourably to Prince Esper Ukhtomsky's imperialist and orientalist vision of Russia's destiny in Asia, and reported warmly on the visit to Seoul of Julius Brynner, the Swiss-born merchant from Vladivostok (and future grandfather of the actor Yul Brynner), the Russian agent of the timber concession in northern Korea along the Yalu River (Korean: *Amnokgang*) that Russia had acquired from the Korean government.[36]

Nevertheless, this honeymoon period in Russo-Korean relations began to wane in early 1897, and, in March 1898, the Independence Club, whose paper had supported Russia only a year prior,

led a massive anti-Russian protest in the centre of Seoul to debate on and protest Russia's involvement in Korean affairs. Interestingly, the chief target of these open-air debates, which are remembered as the earliest example of the development of civic movements and democracy in Korean history, was Russia. As Tikhonov notes, it seems that for the Independence Club, "independence" was understood as meaning "independence from Russia."[37] Although Yun does not directly speak of his role in the club in his diary, he became its leader after Sŏ left for the US (May 1898). His diary nonetheless testifies to the growing rift between the Russians and the Independence Club: he describes the Russians as being unsupportive and dismissive of the organization, particularly with regard to its leaders' attempts to introduce Anglo-American notions of liberal democracy to Korea. Aleksei Shpeier, Waeber's successor since 1897, did not hide from Yun his strong dislike of what he called the "American party" and its "American paper" (20 September 1897). Yun also mentions unflattering rumours which claimed that Russian military instructors were "beat[ing] and kick[ing] the Corean soldiers under their instruction," a fact that surely would not have helped the Russians' image in Korea (24 February 1897). Although Yun's relations with Waeber appear on the surface to have been cordial, he became increasingly distrustful of the Russians' willingness to help his country achieve the necessary reforms. This loss of faith was also connected to his dismay at the Russians' (Waeber's) support of the Korean interpreters of the Russian Legation. Frustrated at Waeber for turning a deaf ear to his complaints about the interpreters, he wrote, "What a fool I was in trying to convince the Waebers of the villainy of Kim Hong Niuk! I should have remembered that they would and will sacrifice every interest of Corea to the good of Russia" (31 May 1897).

In late 1898, the Independence Club was disbanded by King Kojong, who came to perceive its support of a parliamentary democracy as a threat to the monarchy. Yun wrote that it was pro-Japanese and pro-Russian advisors in the court who had crushed what he believed had been "the last hope of Korea" (5 November 1898). And again, he brings up the corrupting influence of the Russian interpreter Kim Hongriuk in his final appraisal of the Russians. Of Waeber's actions in Korea he wrote: "Waeber's obstinate and blind confidence in Kim Hong Niuk in the face of all evidence … has damaged Corea beyond calculation. Had Waeber been as firm and wise in advising the King as Brown [the British finance commissioner] …

Corea might (would) have, by this time, gained a considerable ground in the direction toward reformation" (15 September 1897). As for Shpeier, Yun states that he himself had never been against Russian instructors and advisers but that "the way in which [Shpeier] bullied [the king] through Kim Hong Niuk and the dishonorable means by which he forced the instructors on Corea turned against him" (18 March 1898). In short, Russia, in the eyes of Yun, had spoiled a golden opportunity for Korea to achieve reforms.

KOREAN IMMIGRATION TO RUSSIA

Our discussion so far allows us to better grasp the context underlying Yun's anti-Russian words by which we began this paper. One final dimension to consider is the late nineteenth-century phenomenon of Korean migration into Russia.[38] This is because Yun's anger here, interestingly, is related not to any of his actual experiences with the Russians at the Korean court detailed above but is instead quite suddenly provoked by a hearsay account of Korean immigration to Russia. Despite his consistent accusation of Koreans from Vladivostok of poisoning Korea's chances for reform, as well as his involvement in the development of Russo-Korean relations, the question of Korean migration into Russia had never been a matter of direct concern for Yun. Korean migration into the Russian Far East began in the early 1860s when peasants in the aforementioned bordering Hamgyŏng Province crossed into Russian territory in their attempts to flee from the burdens of taxation, famine, and the abuses of the local authorities. By the end of the century, Koreans formed one of the largest non-Russian groups in the Maritime Province (Priamurskii krai).[39]

The Koreans were part of a larger pattern of Asian migration impacting Russia, as well as the Americas, on both sides of the Pacific. In circumstances interestingly parallel to those of the United States, Asian immigration to Russia was spurred in the last two decades of the nineteenth century by the construction of the Trans-Siberian Railway (1891–1916) and the discovery of gold deposits in the Amur-Zeia valley. In her study of anti-Asian exclusion in the Americas in the nineteenth century, Erika Lee draws attention to the transnational extent of the debates over Chinese immigration, which reached from the US to Mexico and Peru. She writes, "We have yet to ask the question of how or if Asian exclusion in one country relates to Asian exclusion in another country."[40] Anti-Asian backlash and leg-

islation, well documented by Asian American studies scholars with regard to Chinese immigration in the US, were comparably less characteristic of the Russian case. (In fact, prior to the 1880s the Russian government encouraged the settlement of non-Russians in remote areas.) Lee's question on the impact across countries, nevertheless, is relevant to Russia from the 1880s onwards, for the passing in the US of the first Chinese Exclusion Act (1882) coincided with increased debates among officials in the Russian Far East, the central government, and the press on the problem of their Korean and Chinese immigration. Indeed, Sergey Glebov, in his recent study of Chinese immigration to the Russian Far East in this period, argues that, "Russian officials routinely referenced American debates about Chinese emigration and saw their own efforts to control the border as aligned to the racially inspired US legislation."[41]

Russian attitudes and policies towards Korean immigration reflected a diversity of positions that shifted over time, in interaction with national and local needs, the appointment of each governor general in the Priamurskii krai, and changes in the Korean situation. These positions ran the gamut from an initial tolerance and even welcoming of Koreans, based on the practical necessity of cultivating inhospitable areas and the heavy dependence of Russian military posts on Chinese and Korean agricultural products and cattle, to (especially after the Russo-Japanese War) the belief that the "yellow" labour of Koreans posed a competition that was harmful to the Russian settlement of the region. Russian perceptions tended to distinguish between the Koreans and the Chinese and were perhaps more sympathetic towards the former. In contrast to the Chinese migrants, who were mostly single men working as seasonal labourers, Koreans arrived with their families and were therefore more associated with settled agriculture. They were also viewed as being less threatening and, importantly, more accepting of Russian sovereignty and therefore more malleable to Russification than the Chinese. For these various reasons, prior to the twentieth century, Koreans faced slightly fewer limitations than the Chinese in receiving land or becoming Russian subjects.[42] Nevertheless, increased efforts to manage, control, divide, and restrict populations applied as much to the Koreans as to the Chinese. The first Russia-Korea treaty of 1884, signed by Waeber and the Korean foreign minister, Kim Yunsik, divided the Korean population in the Russian Far East into three categories: those who had arrived on Russian soil before 1884, those who arrived after 1884

and wished to become Russian subjects, and Koreans who were temporary workers. Only the first group was granted the right to become Russian subjects and acquire land.[43] The following year, Baron Andrei Korf (Korff), the governor general of the newly established Priamurskii krai, convened a conference in Khabarovka to discuss the problem of Asian immigration in the Russian Far East. Concerning the Koreans, authorities decided to prohibit further Korean immigration and to relocate the current residents deeper into the interior regions. The lands cultivated by the Koreans were to be handed to the Russian settlers.[44]

Initially not a dominant factor in Russian perceptions of Koreans, race began to cast an increasingly ominous shadow in the lives of Russian Koreans following Russia's defeat by Japan in 1905, as the idea became entrenched that the Koreans – no matter the degree of their successful Russification (and later Sovietization) or loyalty to the prerevolutionary monarchy (and later the Soviet state) – were in collusion with the Japanese due to their racial and cultural ties. As we will further discuss, the Russian view of an Asian racial solidarity between Koreans and Japanese, carried over into the Soviet period, was to have dire consequences for Russian Koreans in the twentieth century.

Korean immigration to Russia also drew the attention of Western observers in the late nineteenth century. The English traveller and writer Isabella Bird Bishop (1831–1904) devoted a section to the Koreans in the Russian Far East in her well-known book *Korea and Her Neighbors* (1898), having travelled to the region in order to investigate "the vexed question of the condition of those Koreans who have found shelter under the Russian flag." Bishop described the lives of Korean immigrants in glowing terms and considered Russian influence to have effected a racial transformation of the Koreans. She observed, for instance, that in Russia Korean indolence and servility had given place to an "independence and manliness of manner rather British than Asiatic." Lauding the Russian administration for its success in creating "an orderly … agricultural population" out of the "nomadic and predatory tribes" of Central Asia, Bishop writes: "[Russia's] success with the Korean immigrants is in its way remarkable, for the material is inferior."[45]

In his striking diary entry, Yun – who would likely have agreed, albeit painfully, with the famous Victorian traveller concerning the "inferior material" presented by the Koreans – provides a drastically opposing picture of Korean immigration in Russia. This passage has

often been partially quoted in studies of race and nation concerning Korea or East Asia that introduce Yun as a leading Pan-Asianist.[46] These brief references, however, fail to do full justice to the significant context that shaped his final position regarding a global racial struggle, namely the story of Korean migration in Russia in its interaction with Yun's experiences in the US and his desire to affiliate himself with the growing power of the Japanese through race. Yun's interlocutor was Yi Kangho, a teacher from Wŏnsan, a port in southern Hamgyŏng Province, who had moved to Vladivostok. Yun was serving a post in Wŏnsan at the time, having been sent to the northern periphery since 1899 after falling out of favour at the Korean court with the dissolution of the Independence Club. His stay in the northern region bordering Russia and interactions with border-crossing Koreans like Yi may have provided Yun with new insights on the Russian-Korean situation not afforded to him previously.

In their study of the northern region of Korea as a Russo-Korean "contact zone" in the late nineteenth century, German Kim and Ross King stress the active mobility of Koreans travelling to and from Vladivostok and other areas of the Russian Far East, as well as Koreans' familiarity with the Russian language.[47] The following description by Pavel Delotkevich, a merchant and traveller to Korea in the 1880s, allows us to get a better picture of the historical and transborder context that enabled the rise of individuals like Yun's much-abhorred interpreter Kim Hongriuk:

> I met a Korean with the surname of Chuprov, called Petr, and in Korean Kim-tu-shej. Chuprov lives in [northern Korea], but spends most of his time in Ianchikhe, our Korean village close to Novokievsk. Chuprov served as interpreter … with our border *komissar* in the South Ussuri krai, Mr Matiunin, and reads, speaks, and writes Korean and Russian very well … Chuprov wants to find work as an interpreter in Seoul with our chargé d'affaires, Mr Veber.[48]

As Kim and King have noted, late-nineteenth-century travel narratives of Russian explorers, researchers, and officials to Korea frequently emphasized Koreans' goodwill towards Russia, expressed in their hospitality towards Russians or their eagerness to learn the Russian language or come under Russian tutelage. But the shocking story Yun hears from his visitor about a Cossack's "favorite diversion" ("to aim,

and fire, at the forehead of a Korean in a solitary place") suggest that cross-cultural openness and goodwill coexisted with brutality and violence in the Russo-Korean contact zone.[49] Yun's description also evokes a disturbing early-twentieth-century practice on the part of Cossacks and Russian peasants, reported by explorers and researchers of the Russian Far East like Vladimir Arsenyev and Semyon Anosov, of "hunting" down Koreans and Chinese miners or labourers (mostly the former) in remote forests. The Cossacks dubbed their Koreans as prey "white swans."[50]

From Yi, Yun hears that "the brutality of the Russian in his treatment of Koreans was sickening." Yet no less than Russian brutality, his visitor's comments on the Koreans in Russia do nothing to improve Yun's hopes for the prospect of Korean national or racial uplift: "[Yi said] that the thousands of Koreans in the Russian port don't care a fig what their native land may become; that the few Koreans naturalized, looked up on their former compatriots with greater disdain than the Muscovite himself" (7 May 1902). Yun continues in his diary:

> If there were half as many Russians in Korea as Japanese, they – the Russians – would soon make themselves intolerable by their brutality and beastliness. The meanest Japanese would be a gentleman and a scholar compared to a vodka-drunk, orthodox Russian. Between a Japanese and a Korean there is community of sentiment and of interest based on the identity of race, religion, and written characters. Japan, China, and Korea must have one common aim, one common policy, one common ideal – to keep the Far East the permanent home of the yellow race, and to make that home as beautiful and happy as nature has meant it to be. White Australia! White Philippines! White America! What an amount of arrogance, of unfairness, of downright injustice in these words! The white race forces itself into the land of other races, enslaves them or exterminates them or robs them of their homes. Then turns around and says, "This shall be white country; all other races keep hands off!" Yet, indignation or rage will not help us. Seek to be mighty first: then all other things, right, justice, and property (other people's) shall be added unto us.

Yun's angry and emotional outburst at the Korean condition in the Russian Far East provides interesting comparison to his excoriation of the Chinese immigrants in the US during his student days. Inject-

ing a transnational, Asian American, perspective into the condition of Koreans in Russia at the turn of the twentieth century, Yun perceives Russian discrimination as part and parcel of a trans-Pacific, transnational, network of white racial domination stretching from Vladivostok to California; from Australia to the Philippines ("White Australia! White Philippines! White America!"). His construction of a "yellow" identity and solidarity, directly responding to the global system of white domination – and at the same time placing Russia squarely at its centre – appealed to the common experience of racism of diverse groups of Koreans and Asians from America to Russia. As for his Christian faith, Yun demonstrated that he had learned the lessons of his American experience. Far from abandoning the religion of the "arrogant" white race, his cynical recasting of the biblical passage of Matthew 6:33 ("Seek to be mighty first ...") shows that Yun's Methodism was actively incorporated into his race-based social Darwinism in the making of a new and empowered yellow race.[51]

IS BLOOD THICKER THAN WATER?: RUSSIA AS WHITE PERIL AND YUN'S PAN-ASIANISM

The Russo-Japanese War and the immediate years preceding it were turning points in Yun's Pan-Asianism. Invited to a garden party in Seoul to celebrate Japan's first land victory over Russia on the Sino-Korean border (Yalu River), Yun writes that he could not help the tears that filled his eyes as he thought of his country and that he left the event "sick in body and mind" (6 May 1904). Nevertheless, despite fully knowing that Japan's "every victory [was] a nail in the coffin of Korean independence," Yun could not hide his excitement over this historical military victory achieved by a yellow race over a white race. Japan's victory not only validated Yun's social Darwinist worldview and the ability of a nonwhite race to succeed in it, it also served as a personal vindication of sorts for the racial struggles and humiliations he had experienced in the US. He wrote:

> What a glorious campaign this had been to Japan! As a Korean, I have no special reasons for rejoicing over the uninterrupted successes of Japan ... Yet as a member of the Yellow Race, Korea – or rather I – feel proud of the glorious successes of Japan. No braggart American, no arrogant Briton, no vain glorious Frenchman

> will be, from now on, able to say that the Yellow man is incapable of great things. (2 June 1905)

As for the Russians fighting in Korean soil, he spoke of them in terms of how his countrymen were made to bear the direct brunt of their defeat:

> Russians in the North and West provinces commit outrages wherever they go. Their cursed tracks are marked with burnt villages, murdered women and children, destroyed fields. Fire and blood are Russians' favorite means of war. Beaten by the Japanese, the savages wreck their impotent wrath on the helpless Koreans. (27 May 1904)

Yun was not alone in his observations of Russian "savagery." Even after Russia's defeat by Japan, the idea of Russia as a White Peril continued to hold in the minds of several Korean intellectuals and activists. Another leading Japan- and US-educated reformist, Yu Kilchun (1856–1914), tended to condone the imperial ventures of the Western nations, viewing them as unavoidable steppingstones in the spread of civilization to other parts of the world.[52] He was scathingly critical, however, of Russia's expansionist goals. In his preface to a 1908 translation of a volume on the Crimean War, Yu Kilchun drew the attention of his Korean readers to "greedy tiger-like Russia," "always grind[ing] its hawkish claws" and seeking to satisfy its "unlimited avarice" through the conquest of Constantinople and the enslavement of the entire Muslim East. Another significant example is offered by An Chunggŭn (1879–1910), whose assassination of Ito Hirobumi, who had become the first resident general of Korea after the country became a protectorate of Japan (1905), in Harbin (Manchuria) in 1910, has made him an iconic symbol of anti-Japanese resistance in Korean nationalist discourse. It would come as a great surprise to many Koreans, therefore, to hear that An was not anti-Japanese but instead a Pan-Asian enthusiast who regarded Russia, not Japan, as the greatest threat to peace in East Asia. According to An, the Russian desire to expand in Asia "bla[zed] hot like a fire" and was as "unstoppable as the tide."[53] A proponent of racial solidarity among the three Asian nations, An believed that Japan had not won its war against Russia alone but that its victory had been enabled by the cooperation of the yellow race (Korea and China). In the eyes of An, Ito, in work-

ing towards greater Japanese control over Korea, had betrayed the principle of racial solidarity.[54]

In these Korean notions of a White Peril, Russia is the object of simultaneous inclusion and exclusion vis-à-vis the West. They show that, at the same time as it was viewed to be a part of the West, the white race, Russia could also be made to stand for the worst excesses of Western aggression, a "second-class" imperialism in its most uncivilized and uncontrolled manifestations whose actions, interestingly, the Koreans felt more at liberty to criticize (as shown in the anti-Russian demonstration of 1898). The epithets Yun uses for Russia in his diary ("savage," "brutality," "beastliness," "vodka-drunk," "orthodox") not only posit it against an East Asian, Confucian, civilization of "gentlemen" and "scholars," they also place Russia outside the civilizational bounds of the Anglo-Saxon West. Russia's orthodoxy, furthermore, appears to have made it strange in Korean eyes: this was the case not only for the protestant Yun but also for An, a Catholic convert. For Korean intellectuals, then, Russia appears to have been a different kind of white power, one less tied to the civilization, democratic institutions, and benevolent missionaries they had come to associate with the Anglo-American West, as it was a White Peril of brute aggression and military threat.

To be sure, neither Yun's anti-Russian stance nor his pro-Japanese turn are as straightforward or unproblematic as they may at glance appear to be. His censure of Russia is also combined with an overall cynicism regarding the social Darwinist principles he believed to be at work on a universal level. "How often I have heard a German or Russian," Yun writes, "who … pours sarcasms on the land-grabbing propensity of the English, quite forgetting the Kio-chou Bay, or Port Arthur or Manchuria. The truth is that every nation is a thief and liar, only its critic is a shade worse" (22 November 1902). In the same entry where he spoke of the atrocities committed by the retreating Russians, Yun also noted that the "Japanese are treating Koreans pretty much as whites treated Indians in America … and still treat blacks in Africa at present" (27 May 1904). Still, in such a white-dominated, social Darwinist jungle, he could not help but admire the efficient way by which the Japanese, as fellow Asians, dealt with "occidental bullyism." In an entry written while in mourning for his recently deceased wife, he confessed that the state of Korea had of late made him "shun the company of the overbearing Foreigner with a morbid sensitiveness." He continues:

> By the way, Darling, do you think any of the Foreigners, except missionaries possibly, whom I know here would condescend even so much as to give me a nod if I were to meet them in, say, Shanghai or Yokohama? They are so haughty when not patronizing and so patronizing when not haughty in their behavior. Yet, from Hayashi and Hasegawa down, there is not a Japanese whom I know in Seoul who would not be polite and kind to me if I met him anywhere. Blood is thicker than water? (20 June 1905)

IN LIEU OF A CONCLUSION

What were some of the immediate racial implications of Russia's defeat in its war with Japan across the Pacific? Russia's defeat did not quite result in the humbling of "white arrogance" or "occidental bullyism" that Yun had hoped for. Rather, it paved the way for the ascendancy of another new power in the Pacific: the US. As Colleen Lye writes, although the Russo-Japanese War did not involve the US directly, it was "nonetheless crucial to the staging of America's identity as a world power through its brokerage of a new political order in East Asia." [55] The Russo-Japanese conflict had an immediate effect on the US treatment of its Asian immigrants: one year after the war, the San Francisco Board of Education ordered the segregation of Japanese American students in the city's public schools. The decision sparked a diplomatic crisis between Japan and the US and even led to tabloid rumours of an impending war between the two nations.

In the immediate aftermath of the war, American mediation was key to the establishment of a new order in the Pacific. In August 1905, at the behest of President Roosevelt, representatives of Russia and Japan, led respectively by former Finance Minister Sergei Witte and Foreign Minister Komura Jutaro, met in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, to negotiate the terms of peace. The Portsmouth Treaty earned Roosevelt the Nobel Peace Prize (1906). One month previous to Portsmouth, a bilateral agreement between the US and Japan had procured American consent of Japanese interests in Korea, in return for Japan's recognition of US claims over the Philippines (Taft-Katsura Memorandum). As several scholars have shown, the "Great White Fleet," the US navy's sixteen-battleship Pacific tour dispatched by Roosevelt (1907), was a symbolic event that served multiple purposes. While allaying Japanese fears of American hostility, it simultaneously aimed to pressure Japan into solving the issue of Japanese immigration in the US. Above all, in

mapping out a "new imaginary international space" that would variously be called the "American Pacific" or the "Pacific Rim," the tour signalled the rise of the US as a new power on the world stage.[56] Having recognized Japan's rights over Korea, Roosevelt now sought to counter the Yellow Peril of Japanese imperialism and immigration by promoting a message of US-led white solidarity and supremacy in the Pacific.[57] In the wake of Russia's defeat, the "Great White Fleet's" symbolic playing out of the region's racial and imperial tensions was built on the lessons of Russia's failure in the war. Poised to rise in the Pacific at the turn of the twentieth century was not a Japanese-led empowered yellow race supported by the likes of Yun nor a Russian-European Christian union of the white race envisioned by Solovyov but a union of white, English-speaking, Anglo-Saxon peoples that excluded both.

During the Russo-Japanese War, Solovyov's Pan-Mongolism was viewed by Russian writers as having been prophetic; was Yun, also, prophetic in his thoughts on race? The idea of the unity of the yellow race against white imperialism, embraced by Yun, was indeed a main ideological tool used by the colonial authorities during Japan's rule of Korea (1910–45). In the last decade of colonial rule, "Japan and Korea as One Body" (Japanese: *naisen ittai*; Korean: *naesŏn ilch'e*) was the official slogan of a policy of forced assimilation by which hundreds of thousands of Koreans were mobilized in Japan's war efforts as soldiers, factory labourers, and sex slaves.[58] In his seventies in the late 1930s, Yun actively assisted in the colonial government's campaigns by urging young Koreans to volunteer for the imperial army and participating in ceremonies commemorating war victories.[59]

How did the idea of an Asian racial unity play out in Russia and the Soviet Union in the twentieth century? Russia's defeat in 1905, the influx of Koreans to the Russian Far East following Japan's colonization of Korea in 1910, and the subsequent Japanese intervention in Siberia during the Russian Civil War (1918–22), all combined to strengthen an image of the Koreans in the far eastern borderland as being an ambiguous and unreliable population willing to assist the Japanese. On 21 August 1937, Joseph Stalin, general secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Viacheslav Molotov, foreign minister, signed a resolution ordering the forced relocation of more than 170,000 Koreans from their homes in the Russian Far East to Central Asia. The purported reason for what scholars agree was the first total, full-blown deportation of an entire ethnic group in Soviet history was the "suppression of the infiltration of Japanese espionage

in the Far Eastern region." In the early twentieth century, the charge of being a Japanese spy, based on a perceived racial closeness or indistinguishability of the Koreans in relation to the Japanese, combined with border anxiety, wartime paranoia, and xenophobia to become the most common, and deadly efficient, Soviet means by which to control its Korean population. This could only have been the greatest, and most tragic, irony for the Koreans of the Russian Far East, many of whom who had settled in Russia with their families for four or more generations and, moreover, had in fact played leading roles in the Korean anti-Japanese resistance movement. Repressed during the Soviet period, the Stalinist deportation of Koreans only began to be revealed and studied in recent decades with the advent of *glasnost'* and the opening of archival documents.[60] Furthermore, the racial dimension of this history has only begun to be considered in recent years.[61] Although it is difficult to claim their direct influence, an examination of the tremendous – and chilling – potentiality of the Pacific-centred, racially infused visions being proffered by the likes of some of Korea's and Russia's leading intellectual lights at the very beginning of the twentieth century might help us better consider the role of race in Russian, Soviet, Korean, and Pacific histories.

NOTES

I would like to thank David Rainbow and Gunja SenGupta for their insightful comments and suggestions, which greatly helped me refine and revise the essay.

1 For studies of the racially inspired images of Russian and Japanese wartime propaganda, see Stephen Norris, *A War of Images: Russian Popular Prints, Wartime Culture, and National Identity, 1812–1945* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2006); Iu. Mikhailova, "Japan and Russia: Mutual Images, 1904–39," in *The Japanese and Europe: Images and Perceptions*, ed. Bert Edström (Richmond: Japan Library, 2000), 152–71.

2 S. Lim, "Between Spiritual Self and Other: Vladimir Solov'ev and the Question of East Asia," *Slavic Review* 67, 2 (Summer 2008): 321–41; S. Lim, *China and Japan in the Russian Imagination, 1685–1922: To the Ends of the Orient* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 109–19.

3 Vladimir Solov'ev, "Kratkaia povest' ob antikhriste" [A Short Tale of Antichrist] in *Sobranie sochinenii Vladimira Solov'eva*, 10 vols, eds. S. Solov'ev and E. Radlova (St Petersburg, 1911–14; reprint edition with two additional volumes, Brussels, 1966–70), 10:193.

4 Unterberger's words are cited in V.V. Grave, *Kitaitsy, koreitsy i iapontsy v Priamur'e* (St Petersburg, 1912), 137. On the Russian Yellow Peril ("yellow question") discourse in the late nineteenth century, see Lewis Siegelbaum, "Another 'Yellow Peril': Chinese Migrants in the Russian Far East and the Russian Reaction before 1917," *Modern Asian Studies* 12, 2 (1978): 307–30; A. Lukin, "Russian Views of Korea, China, and the Regional Order in Northeast Asia," in *Korea at the Center: Dynamics of Regionalism in Northeast Asia*, eds. Charles Armstrong et al. (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2006), 32; Eva-Maria Stolberg, "The Siberian Frontier between 'White Mission' and 'Yellow Peril,' 1890s–1920s," *Nationalities Papers* 32, 1 (2004): 165–81.

5 Howard Winant, *The World is a Ghetto: Race and Democracy since World War II* (New York: Basic Books, 2001), xiv, 2–3, 19, 21, 136–7.

6 On Asian immigration and exclusion in the US, see Sucheng Chan, ed., *Entry Denied: Exclusion and the Chinese Community in America, 1882–1943* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994); Bill Ong Hing, *Making and Remaking Asian America Through the Immigration Policy, 1850–1990* (Stanford University Press, 1993); Erika Lee, "The 'Yellow Peril' and Asian Exclusion in the Americas." On Asian (Korean) immigration in the Russian Far East in the late nineteenth century, see pages 326–8 in this chapter.

7 Kuroki Morifumi, "The Asianism of the Koa-kai and the Ajia Kyokai: Reconsidering the ambiguity of Asianism," in *Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History: Colonialism, Regionalism, and Borders*, eds. Sven Saaler and J. Victor Koschmann (London: Routledge, 2007), 36.

8 Yuko Kawai, "Japanese as Both a 'Race' and a 'Non-Race': The Politics of *Jinshu* and *Minzoku* and the Depoliticization of Japaneseness," in *Race and Racism in Modern East Asia: Interactions, Nationalism, Gender and Lineage*, eds. Rotem Kowner and Walter Demel (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 370.

9 Rotem Kowner and Walter Demel, "Modern East Asia and the Rise of Racial Thought: Possible Links, Unique Features, and Unsettled Issues," in *Race and Racism in Modern East Asia: Western and Eastern Constructions* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 23.

10 Kowner and Demel, "Modern East Asia the Rise of Racial Thought," 25.

11 Ibid., 24–5.

12 Cited in Ayu Majima, "Skin Color Melancholy in Modern Japan: Male Elites' Racial Experiences Abroad, 1880s–1950s," in *Race and Racism in Modern East Asia*, eds. Kowner and Demel, 396.

13 Kowner and Demel, "Modern East Asia the Rise of Racial Thought," 29, 31.

14 Morifumi, "The Asianism of the Koa-kai and the Ajia Kyokai," 36; Vladimir Tikhonov, "Korea's First Encounters with Pan-Asianism Ideology in the Early 1880s," *The Review of Korean Studies* 5, 2 (2002): 201.

15 Torsten Weber, "Same Race, Same Fate? Theories of Asian Commonality and the Shift of Regional Hegemony in East Asia after the First Sino-Japanese War," in *Imperial Co-operation and Transfer, 1870–1930: Empires and Encounters* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015).
16 Cited in Weber, "Same Race, Same Fate?" 157.
17 Paula Harrell, *Sowing the Seeds of Change: Chinese Students, Japanese Teachers, 1895–1905* (Stanford University Press, 1992), 6.
18 Weber, "Same Race, Same Fate?" 159.
19 Sydney Gulick, *The White Peril in the Far East: An Interpretation of the Significance of the Russo-Japanese War*, ed. Daniel Metraux (Writers Club Press, 2003).
20 See Jing Tsu, *Failure, Nationalism, and Literature: The Making of Modern Chinese Identity* (Stanford University Press, 2005), 250, n43.
21 For the cartoon, see Weber, "Same Race, Same Fate?" 164.
22 Gulick, *White Peril*, 76.
23 Kyung Moon Hwang, *A History of Korea* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 132.
24 Alexander Lukin, "Russian Views of Korea, China, and the Regional Order in Northeast Asia," in *Korea at the Center: Dynamics of Regionalism in Northeast Asia*, eds. Charles Armstrong et al. (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2006), 22–3.
25 Gi-Wook Shin, *Ethnic Nationalism in Korea: Genealogy, Politics, and Legacy* (Stanford University Press, 2006), 10–11, 30–1.
26 To be completely accurate, Yun's great grandfather and father were illegitimate sons, a fact that placed them in a lower social standing in pre-modern Korean society. But it seems that the family's transition to *yangban* status had been completed during Yun's father's time, and, for all intents and purposes, Yun received an upbringing and education befitting the oldest son of a *yangban* family.
27 All citations from Yun Ch'iho's diary are from the electronic database, "19-jip Yun Ch'iho Ilgi" ("The Yun Ch'iho Diaries, 19 vols.") provided by the National Institute of Korean History (*Kuksapyonch'anwiwonhoe*). http://db.history.go.kr/search/searchResultList.do?sort=&dir=&limit=20&page=1&pre_page=1&setId=22&totalCount=22&kristalProtocol=&itemId=sa&synonym=off&chinessChar=on&searchTermImages=%EC%9C%A4%EC%B9%98%ED%98%B8%EC%9D%BC%EA%B8%B0+&brokerPagingInfo=&searchKeywordType=BI&searchKeywordMethod=EQ&searchKeyword=%EC%9C%A4%EC%B9%98%ED%98%B8%EC%9D%BC%EA%B8%B0&searchKeywordConjunction=AND (accessed 15 August 2018). I have also consulted the Korean translation of the 1896 (Russian mission) portion of Yun's diary: Yun Kyungnam, *Min Yŏnghwan kwa Yun*

Ch'iho, Rŏsia e kada (Sinangkwachisŏngsa, 2014). Yun Kyungnam is the grandniece of Yun Ch'iho.

28 Kenneth Wells, *New God, New Nation: Protestants and Self-Reconstruction Nationalism in Korea, 1896–1937* (University of Hawaii Press, 1991).

29 Yun's distinction of the three East Asian peoples was a common notion during this period. See Rotem Kowner, "'Lighter than Yellow, but Not Enough': Western Discourse on the Japanese 'Race,' 1854–1904," *The Historical Journal* 43, 1 (2000): 103–31.

30 Andrew Urban, "Yun Ch'iho's Alienation by Way of Inclusion: A Korean International Student and Christian Reform in the 'New' South, 1888–1893," *Journal of Asian American Studies* 17, 3 (October 2014): 309.

31 Having written his diary first in literary Chinese and then in vernacular Korean, Yun switched to English a year after arriving in America. In stressing the importance of English as a language of self-presentation for Yun, Henry Em notes that "[v]ernacular Korean in the 1880s … did not have the kind of literary conventions that English developed after the eighteenth century, that could interpellate Yun as author and narrator of a self-narrative." Henry Em, *The Great Enterprise: Sovereignty and Historiography in Modern Korea* (Duke University Press, 2013), 63. In my view, for Korean intellectuals like Yun, the expressive possibilities of English were inseparable from their sense of English as the new global language of power.

32 I was unable to find academic writing that focussed on Kim Hongriuk. Histories and online sources that briefly mention him state that the interpreter, taking advantage of his sudden political and social rise and the trust he gained from King Kojong, engaged in widespread bribery and extortion, and perhaps had begun to have an effect at the Korean court reminiscent of that of Grigorii Rasputin. Kim Hongriuk's historical fame rests mainly on his reputed attempt to poison King Kojong on his birthday (12 September 1898) by putting opium in the king's coffee, after the decline of Russian influence in 1898 led to his falling out of favour at the court. The incident was reported by *The Independent* (13 September 1898). The plot failed, and Kim was executed in the same year. See Kang Chunman, *Hankuk Kŭndaesa Sanch'aek 3* (Sŏul: Inmulkwasasangsa, 2007); http://encykorea.aks.ac.kr/Contents/Index?contents_id=E0011083 (accessed 15 August 2018); https://ko.wikipedia.org/wiki/%EA%B9%80%ED%99%8D%EB%A5%99 (accessed 15 August 2018).

33 For a study of social class in Korea, see Kyung Moon Hwang, *Beyond Birth: Social Status in the Emergence of Modern Korea* (Harvard University Asia Center, 2004). For specific references to the middle class, including interpreters, see Eugene Park, *A Family of No Prominence: The Descendants of Pak Tŏkhwa*

and the Birth of Modern Korea (Stanford University Press, 2014), 49; Kim Kyung-ran, "Foreign Trade and Interpreter Officials," in *Everyday Life in Joseon-era Korea: Economy and Society*, ed. Michael Shin (Leiden, Netherlands: Global Oriental, 2014), 105–14.

34 The Khodynka stampede (or tragedy) was an incident that occurred on 26 May 1896, during the festivities following Nicholas's coronation. At a celebration organized for the common people at Khodynka Field, more than 1,300 people were crushed to death and an equal number injured as the crowd attempted to receive gifts bestowed by the tsar.

35 Vladimir Tikhonov, "The Experience of Importing and Translating a Semantic System: 'Civilization,' 'West,' and 'Russia' in *The Independent*," *Hangukminjokundongsayŏngu* 32 (2002): 93.

36 Tikhonov, "Experience of Importing and Translating," 71, 79–83, 88, 91. This timber concession was subsequently purchased by the Russian government at the behest of Aleksandr Bezobrazov, a businessman and political adventurer. From 1898 up until the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese War, Bezobrazov exerted great influence on Nicholas II and urged the tsar to adopt an aggressive policy toward Korea and Manchuria. On the timber concession and the Bezobrazov affair (*Bezobrazovschina*), see A. Lukin, "Russian Views of Korea," 27–8; Rotem Kowner, *The A to Z of the Russo-Japanese War* (Scarecrow Press, 2009), 70.

37 Tikhonov, "Experience of Importing and Translating," 93–4.

38 On Korean immigration to Russia, see Boris D. Pak, *Rossiia i Koreia* (Moscow: GRVL, 1979), *Koreitsy v Rossiiskoi imperii* (Moscow: MGU, 1993), 106, and *Koreitsy v Sovetskoi Rossii* (Moscow: Diplomaticheskaia akademiia MID Rossii; Irkutsk: Irkutskii gos. pedagogicheskii in-t., 1995). German N. Kim has written numerous books and articles on the subject in Russian, Korean, and English. See, for example, *Istoriia immigratsii koreitsev*, 2 vols. (Almaty: Daik Press, 1999 and 2006) and "Pereselenie v Rossiiu i prosveshchenie koreitsev v dorevoliutsionnyi period," http://world.lib.ru/k/kim_o_i/ch2rtf.shtml (accessed 15 August 2018). Noteworthy is a special issue by German Kim and American scholar Ross King, "Koryo Saram: Koreans in the Former USSR," in *Korean and Korean American Studies Bulletin* 12, 2 (2001): 1–141. See also note 61 of this article.

39 As scholars have pointed out, it is extremely difficult to get accurate population numbers of the Korean or Chinese immigrants in the Russian Far East of this period due to the high mobility of the migrants, as well as Russian officials' lack of knowledge and confusion regarding them. Stolberg, "Siberian Frontier," 168; Sergey Glebov, "Between For-

eigners and Subjects: Imperial Subjecthood, Governance, and the Chinese in the Russian Far East, 1860s–1880s," *Ab Imperio* 1 (2017): 96–7. One figure, given by Boris Pak, sets the Korean population at 10,761, compared with 67,708 Russians and Ukrainians in 1882. B. Pak, *Koreitsy v Rossiiskoi imperii*, 106.

40 Lee, "The 'Yellow Peril' and Asian Exclusion," 539, 546–7.

41 Glebov, "Between Foreigners and Subjects," 90, 113.

42 Glebov discusses the greater degree of exclusion from Russian subjecthood for the Chinese. "Between Foreigners and Subjects," 90, 101, 112, 113. See also Stolberg, "Siberian Frontier," 171, on the greater degree of Korean assimilation to Russian life.

43 Pak, *Rossiia i Koreia*, 68; Lukin, "Russian Views of Korea," 31.

44 Nadarov, *Materialy k izucheniiu Ussuriiskogo kraia* (Vladivostok: 1886), 26.

45 Isabella Bird Bishop, *Korea and Her Neighbors; A Narrative of Travel, with an Account of the Recent Vicissitudes and Present Position of the Country* (New York and Chicago: F.H. Revell & Co., 1898), 17–18.

46 Shin, *Ethnic Nationalism in Korea*, 32; Vladimir Tikhonov, "The Race and Racism Discourses in Modern Korea, 1890s–1910s," *Korean Studies* 36 (2013), 45; Kowner and Demel, *Race and Racism in Modern East Asia*, 32.

47 German Kim and Ross King, "The Northern Region of Korea as Portrayed in Russian Sources, 1860s–1913," in *The Northern Region of Korea: History, Identity, and Culture*, ed. Sun Joo Kim (University of Washington Press, 2015), 280–1.

48 Pavel Delotkevich, *Dnevnik Pavla M. Delotkovicha iz Seula v Pos'et cherez severnuiu Koreiu, s 6 Dekabria 1885 g. po 29 Febrialia 1886 g* (1886). Cited in Kim and King, "The Northern Region of Korea," 280–1.

49 Glebov in his article also discusses the widespread violence against the Asian populations of the Russian Far East. "Between Foreigners and Subjects," 86–7.

50 This practice is mentioned in Semyon Anosov, *Koreitsy v Ussuriiskom krae* (Khabarovsk, 1928). This text is available on https://koryo-saram.ru/s-anosov-korejtsy-v-ussurijskom-krae-1928/ (accessed 14 August 2018). See also Jon K. Chang, *Burnt by the Sun: The Koreans of the Russian Far East* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2016), 26–7, 206 and Eva-Maria Stolberg, "The Siberian Frontier between 'White Mission' and 'Yellow Peril,' 1890s–1920s," in *Nationalities Papers* 32, 1 (2004): 172. The main source used by both Chang and Stolberg is the Polish traveller and geologist Ferdinand Ossendowski's 1923 book. I quote Ossendowski's chilling account of this Cossack sport, from a conversation he had with a Cossack while traveling in the Ussuri region, at length:

> "A White Swan passed here, and I overtook him," chuckled an old Cossack as he deftly skinned the bear. "It was two years ago. With my cousin, a Cossack from Iman, I came here to look for White Swans as I knew that lots of them wander this way."
>
> "What do you mean by White Swans?" I asked.
>
> "Koreans, sir, Koreans," he replied gaily. "They come from the Amur gold mines … and carry on their backs a lot of precious things: gold dust, ginseng, mushrooms … sables, ermine, and marten skins. How could we allow them to take all this when it could be of good use to us Christians?"
>
> …
>
> "How do you do this?" I inquired, guessing the truth.
>
> "It is a very simple thing … When the Cossacks hear the noise of steps … they creep up on the White Swan and take from him what he has in his pack. [A] bullet quiets him forever. If he weeps and curses, the Cossack kills him anyway, for what is life to a feelingless Swan? In any case he must die sooner or later." (F. Ossendowski, *Man and Mystery in Asia* [London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1924], 92–4)

The exact origin of the trope of the swan for Koreans is not clear. But, as Kim and King show, it is a dominant image used by writer and traveller Nikolai Garin-Mikhailovsky in the preface to his collection of Korean folktales (1899). Garin-Mikhailovsky writes: "They call the Koreans cowards. Because of their white attire and their timidity the Russians call the Koreans white swans … Yes, like white swans, they are incapable of fighting … of spilling blood … To take everything from them, even life itself, is as easy to do as the same with children or swans – all one needs is a trusty rifle and a good eye." Cited in Kim and King, "Northern Region of Korea," 287, 293–4. See also N. Garin-Mikhailovsky, *Sobranie sochinenii* (Moscow: Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry; 1957–58).

51 The original biblical passage reads, "But seek ye first the *kingdom of God, and his righteousness*; and all these things shall be added unto you." Matt 6:33, KJV. Italics mine.

52 Minjok munhaksa yŏn'guso, eds., *Kŭndae Kyemonggi-ŭi haksul, munye sasang* (Seoul: Somyŏng, 2000), 235–8.

53 Cited in Franklin Rausch, "Visions of Violence, Dreams of Peace: Religion, Race, and Nation in An Chunggun's *A Treatise on Peace in the East*," *Acta Koreana* 15, 2 (December 2012): 274–5.

54 Rausch, "Visions," 276. For other examples of Korean views of Russia as a White Peril, see also Tikhonov, "The Race and Racism Discourses," 36–41.

55 Colleen Lye, *American's Asia: Racial Form and American Literature* (Princeton University Press, 2004), 18.

56 See Charles Neu, *An Uncertain Friendship: Theodore Roosevelt and Japan, 1906–1909* (Harvard University Press, 1967), 216; Lye, *America's Asia*, 19; Margaret Werry, "The Greatest Show on Earth: Political Spectacle, Spectacular Politics, and the American Pacific," *Theatre Journal* 57, 3 (October 2005): 355–82; Erika Lee, "The 'Yellow Peril' and Asian Exclusion in the Americas," 554–6.

57 As Erika Lee has shown, Roosevelt's promotion of an international "White Pacific" connected the US with the white settler colonies of Australia and New Zealand, as the latter countries eagerly welcomed the arrival of the White Fleet and looked to the United States for protection against the Yellow Peril. Lee, "The 'Yellow Peril' and Asian Exclusion in the Americas."

58 Mark Caprio, *Japanese Assimilation Policies in Colonial Korea, 1910–1945* (University of Washington Press, 2009).

59 Mark Caprio, "Loyal Patriot? Traitorous Collaborator? The Yun Ch'iho Diaries and the Question of National Loyalty," *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 7, 3 (2006), https://muse.jhu.edu/ (accessed 11 August 2018).

60 Since the late 1980s, a considerable body of writing has emerged by Russian, Korean, and English-speaking scholars on the history of the Russian/Soviet Koreans, centred on the 1937 Stalinist deportation. An early study is by Ko Songmu, *Koreans in Soviet Central Asia*. Studia Orientalia, v. 61 (Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 1897). See also Suh Dae-sook, ed., *Koreans in the Soviet Union* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1987). Scholars of Russian Korean background have been the most active group to study this history. They include works by Boris Pak and German Kim, mentioned previously in note 37 of this article. See also German Kim and Ross King, "Koryo Saram: Koreans in the Former USSR," in *Korean and Korean American Studies Bulletin* 12, 2 (2001): 1–141. Several documentaries, in English and Korean, have been dedicated to the history of Russian/Soviet Koreans, the deportation, and their subsequent history in Central Asia and beyond in the post-Soviet period. An example is Y. David Chung and Matt Dibble, *Koryo Saram: The Unreliable People* (2006).

61 For a recent English-language monograph that addresses the question of race in the 1937 deportation of the Koreans in the Russian Far East, see Jon K. Chang, *Burnt by the Sun: The Koreans of the Russian Far East* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2016).

11

Was Soviet Internationalism Anti-Racist? Toward a History of Foreign Others in the USSR

Anika Walke

"Where do you come from? Where did you get burned like that? Can I touch your hair? Such horrible questions. I had a hard time there."[1] Frustration and anguish are palpable as Tefera Vasie describes in an interview his experiences of living in Tol'iatti, an industrial town in the Samara oblast. The young man had come from Ethiopia to study in the USSR and, after graduating in the early 1990s, moved with his Russian wife to her hometown in the new Russian Federation. Finding the exoticization unbearable, the couple returned to Moscow and has lived there ever since.

Roughly ten years later, Lamzar Semba, who had left Senegal to study in Russia, was shot and killed in St Petersburg in April 2006.[2] Since then, violent acts against blacks are committed with increasing frequency: 177 since 2010.[3] In addition to beatings, dark skin solicits street harassment, discrimination in employment and housing markets, as well as institutional hostility. Such experiences are widely shared not only by foreign students but also by asylum seekers and refugees who enter the Russian Federation.[4]

These two responses to foreigners, exoticizing the "other" and racist violence, seem to belie Soviet efforts to implement ideas of "internationalism" and "friendship of the peoples" that, among others, guided the invitation and recruitment of international students, especially from African countries, to the USSR. Are the experience of othering and violence after the breakup of the Soviet Union the result of the

breakdown of the Soviet framework or are they indicative of an inherent failure of Soviet policies?

Non-Europeans and nonwhites had represented the most exploited and most discriminated against populations in the Marxist-Leninist framework and were invited to the Soviet Union to overcome this status in the late Soviet period. Looking at their experiences and how Soviet citizens perceived their encounter with these foreigners may help us understand the lived reality of internationalism and people's friendship and whether these two central tenets of Soviet ideology helped destabilize racialized hierarchies or curb racial violence.

Encounters between Soviet and foreign students are frequently portrayed as problematic and emphasize tensions, but foreign students' memories of their experience in the Soviet Union are often positive.[5] Similarly, people born in the USSR, among them the adults with whom Vasie and Semba would have interacted, were brought up in the spirit of internationalism and often identify as "internationalists." Political and media discourses in many formerly Soviet countries, however, feature a widely accepted anti-immigrant rhetoric riddled with racist stereotypes, xenophobia, and violent imagery.

These contradictory tendencies raise the question of whether internationalism, as discussed in the USSR, was or could be antixenophobic or antiracist and thus offer a different way of addressing human difference and inequality. To be antiracist would include a prohibition of discrimination against people based on their difference but also actively work against the self-set task of creating a "general idea of man," of establishing a universal standard for humanity that can only result in a hierarchization of human beings ranked in relation to the universal ideal.[6] Etienne Balibar's emphasis on the inextricable links between differentiation, universalism, and racism proposes to look for practices and structures that presuppose and reinforce difference, operating on images of superiority and inferiority. This lens will be productive to analyze late Soviet policies on intercultural education and integration and to see whether there truly was an effort to create relationships of equality that would allow for true friendship to emerge.[7]

One may argue that the recently observed hostility against dark(er)-skinned people is likely related to racism within the former Soviet Union that targets people originating from the so-called Caucasus Republics or Central Asian regions.[8] Scholars explain the rise

of xenophobia by referring to a popular portrayal of people from the Transcaucasian republics and states as "savage" and "uncivilized." These stereotypes are rationalized by the relationship of dependence established between Russians and non-Russian peoples in imperial and Soviet periods. In the popular mind, the end of the USSR and respective centre-periphery relationships has returned the peripheral societies to a state of underdevelopment and savagery (which is furthermore confirmed by the recent and ongoing violent ethnic conflicts).[9] Other analyses suggest that recipients of Soviet development aid, especially in the so-called Third World, are blamed for the downfall of the Soviet Union.[10] People personifying this relationship, including foreign students or asylum seekers, become the target of antiblack racism.[11]

I evaluate Soviet policies and practices on the invitation and inclusion of students from African countries with a focus on how race – the category that figures prominently, albeit implicitly, in all these analyses – operated and whether it can serve as a useful tool to measure Soviet policies against their stated goal to create a society of equals. Drawing on a variety of sources including institutional records, memoirs, and interviews with alumni of Soviet universities, I analyze the daily life of young men and women who came to the USSR to study, far away from home and in a new cultural and linguistic environment, as well as the lives of Soviet citizens who lived, learned, and worked with people from areas of the world that they would never see. This inquiry allows us to trace the dynamics of an encounter that was, by all intents and purposes, overdetermined by a geopolitical and ideological agenda, yet which was also intensely personal and offers a lens into how individuals interacted with each other and negotiated complex institutional frameworks in public and private. My research indicates that, contrary to the commitment to egalitarianism, forms of differential treatment in terms of housing, stipends, and even education created new hierarchies and resentment that stood in the way of truly antiracist friendship, replicating Soviet concepts of fixing national identities and collectives that, in turn, enabled hierarchies and marginalizations.[12] In tandem with popcultural representations of "Africa" as a place of seduction and laziness, but also carefreeness (which sharply contradicted the lives of Soviet citizens), these policies helped maintain a problematic relationship.[13] Tendencies to claim superiority and victimhood, identified for the

post-Soviet context, are visible already in this stage and operate against ideas of internationalist solidarity.[14]

INTERNATIONALISM FROM BELOW

The October Revolution in 1917 provided Soviet activists and citizens with an opportunity to reimagine Russia as a cultural space distinct from other parts of the world. The concept of proletarian internationalism, of transnational cooperation among workers to achieve universal liberation, was foundational for a self-understanding as non-biased toward cultural or racial/national difference. The cultural space envisioned by communist revolutionaries was defined by the active implementation of equality and peaceful cohabitation, suggesting a renunciation of colonialist and imperialist racism that had been used to subjugate individuals and peoples.

In the 1930s, the larger goal of proletarian internationalism to enable a world revolution was quickly abandoned and replaced by the inward turn to promote multinational brotherhood within the USSR.[15] Yet, vestiges of the aspiration to redefine relationships between peoples and states on a global level continued to determine state policies until the end of the USSR. For instance, foreigners – students, activists, or workers – from around the world were invited or recruited to the Soviet Union. Notably, Comintern debates and campaigns of the 1920s and 1930s actively promoted antiracism and culminated in the invitation of foreign party activists and scholars to the USSR.[16] The Communist University of the Toilers of the East (KUTV, 1921 to the late 1930s), providing largely ideological training, was part of the Soviet push for proletarian internationalism, the global solidarity of the working class in the struggle against capitalism. World Festivals of Youth and Students, organized in 1957 and 1985 in Moscow, served similar purposes.

Beginning in 1958, the Central Committee of the USSR Communist Party began to strategize on how to "increase the influence of the Soviet Union in the countries of Asia and Africa … and support the ideological struggle against imperialism and colonialism in these countries."[17] On one hand, the Soviet State Department was to disseminate information about Soviet life and culture in the above-mentioned countries and, vice versa, spread the word about the situation in Africa and Asia among the Soviet population.[18] On the other

hand, the Ministry of Higher Education was to help increase the number of students and doctoral students from Asia and Africa at Soviet universities.[19]

Following this decree, a new form of student exchange was instituted that complemented political instruction with technical skills necessary for developing economies. The Khrushchev government explicitly encouraged citizens of newly decolonized countries to come to the USSR, receive specialized higher education in medicine, oil production, and other specialties, and return to their home countries with skills useful to build new, socialist societies. In 1960, the Presidium of the Central Committee reaffirmed the commitment to expanding ties to the "Negro Peoples of Africa" by allocating, for instance, an increased amount of funding for scholarships to be distributed via the Ministry of Higher Education, the Komsomol, and the Association of Organizations for the Friendship and Cultural Exchange with Foreign Countries (Association for Friendship).[20] This association (1958–92), headquartered in Moscow, over the years would assume a central role in the organization and implementation of both student exchange and cultural–educational activities in the USSR.[21] Strengthening relations with the so-called developing world was motivated not solely by the urge to support anticolonial and national liberation movements for their own sake but also to spread Marxist-Leninist ideology and the principles of scientific socialism.[22] The establishment of the University of the Friendship of the Peoples "Patrice Lumumba" (Universitet Druzhby Naraodov im. Patrisa Lumumba, UDN) in 1961 marks these efforts most explicitly. From the standpoint of political history, this recruitment was part and parcel of Soviet development aid, and it can be understood as a form of cultural diplomacy aimed at forging alliances in the context of the Cold War.

Yet, the resulting encounters between foreigners and Soviet citizens also had the potential to turn the vision of international solidarity and intercultural exchange into lived reality, albeit on a small level. Thus, underneath the layer of geopolitical history is the history of foreigners living in the Soviet Union with mostly young Soviet citizens. What did this encounter look like? Was this encounter built on the foundations of internationalism and friendship, both notions that presuppose a relationship of equals? My effort to make ideological frameworks – internationalism, friendship of the people's – operable as objects of analysis relies on asking seemingly banal questions about

the organization of admission and travel, living and study conditions in dormitories and universities, interactions between foreign and Soviet students, but also about efforts by Soviet authorities to facilitate intercultural understanding or about problems and challenges that occurred. Initial findings from archival sources and some interviews with alumni of Soviet universities reveal information about the everyday lives of students from various sub-Saharan African countries.[23] Focussing on the level of the everyday, I suggest, enables a reconstruction of the very conditions under which foreign students and Soviet citizens interacted. This reconstruction has the potential to explain the success or failure of internationalism to have a lasting impact on relationships of difference.

STUDENT EXCHANGE: MOTIVES

The selection, arrival, and (temporary) integration of students from countries including Somalia, Ghana, Nigeria, Kenya, and others was embedded in the fierce competition between West and East, between capitalist and socialist powers during the Cold War, and in the desperate attempts of colonial powers to maintain their influence. For several students the reach of the colonizers made the very fact of travelling to the Soviet Union difficult, even impossible: In 1959, prospective students from Tanganyika (now part of the Republic of Tanzania) were denied passports and travel documents that would allow them to leave their home country.[24] Sudanese students were similarly hindered when their home government refused to issue exit visas.[25]

These restrictions flew in the face of young citizens of newly liberated or soon-to-be decolonized countries who welcomed the possibility to study in the USSR. Letters to organizations such as the Association for Friendship evidence the attraction. The phrasing of these letters echoes official Soviet speech, though it is hard to believe they resulted from official requests. In part, the language of the letters, in English, appears unpolished and clearly reflects the style of an English learner. Moreover, several letters from men were addressed to the Association of Soviet Women, i.e. not the correct place for such inquiries. Rather, the letter writers must have found out about the organization and contacted them independently. For instance, Mr Adamako, from Ghana, reasoned

> having read more books and News papers (Moscow News) about Russia, through the above mentioned Society, it has been my great ambition to be educated in Russia as regards to Medicine and general Soviet life. For I cherish the hope that it is in Russia that I could gain such a precious experience which could be useful to my country – Ghana.[26]

Ms Achiampong, also from Ghana, wrote

> I am interested in pursuing my professional future, preferably in economics, in a Soviet educational institution. As a young girl from a developing country, I recognize the need for a training in economics that will equip me with tools so I will be able to help my country fight strongly against imperialist and neocolonialist control of our destiny … For the Soviet Union, a progressive country, is the most suitable country.[27]

Many such inquiries were sent by people who lived in countries that were still deeply immersed in the struggle for independence and where governments run by colonial elites actively tried to prevent uncontrolled Soviet influence. To circumvent government control of students' enrolment in Soviet universities, application and admission procedures were handled by nongovernment agencies such as the Association for Friendship and often relied on locals establishing contact by individual mailings.[28] Several states protested the activities of Soviet organizations in recruiting students and allocating stipends, insisting that respective governments conduct the selection of candidates.[29] Others requested that Soviet universities release the names of students who had come without or against governmental permission. Frequently, students asked university officials not to release their names. A group of Congolese students, for instance, was concerned that the embassy's efforts to assemble lists of students who had come to the USSR by way of communist solidarity would endanger them; the embassy had approached UDN shortly after Antoine Gizenga, head of the Congolese State in Rebellion, was arrested, as most of the students had been recommended by him for study abroad.[30]

The Soviet approach to bypass the official route reflects the desire to support communist or other anticolonial organizations in their struggle against colonial or collaborating governments. In addition, it is likely that the informal recruitment opened up avenues to educa-

tion for people who were members of lower social classes who had had little access to education (and thus were, by government standards, often ineligible for study abroad) or did not have the financial resources to travel abroad.[31]

Even after the students' arrival in the USSR, however, Western states such as the USA, West Germany, France, and others tried to undermine the efforts of the Soviet government, organizing cultural events such as dances or movie screenings at their embassies that specifically targeted students from former colonies and during which students were often encouraged to transfer to the countries hosting the gatherings.[32] Soviet authorities saw these efforts as Western attempts to stir anti-Soviet sentiments or even recruit spies among foreign students, suspicions that were supported by officials from sending countries such as Kenya or Ghana.[33] Subsequently, several students were expelled for espionage.[34]

Finally, foreign students feared that diplomas issued by Soviet universities, in particular by the UDN, would not be recognized in their home country.[35] For several students from Syria and Algeria this fear became reality; word arrived in Moscow that they would not be able to find employment based on their training in the USSR. Rather, they were interrogated by the national security service about their time in the USSR.[36] Despite these challenges and obstacles, thousands of students from African countries went to the USSR: more than 500 between 1959 and 1961, 5,000 by the end of the 1960s, and in 1980 more than 15,000.[37]

In the following years, the impact of the Cold War lessened and students often chose their destination country based on the desire to earn a degree in higher education rather than on ideological grounds.[38] While numbers were smaller, some found post-Soviet Russia a place to stay even after perestroika and the break up of the USSR. Among them were Tefera Vasie and Rex Essenobo who attended universities in the Soviet Union in the late 1980s. At that time, 27,400 students from African countries were enrolled in the USSR; since then that number has decreased steadily, with a renewed rise around 2007/08.[39] Both Vasie and Essenobo thus participated in the student exchange at its height but also when it began to lose significance: when they graduated, in 1992 and 1993 respectively, the number of students from Subsaharan Africa had dropped to about 6,000.[40] However, both men remained to live in Moscow (where I interviewed them), a fact that, in itself, indicates that alongside the Soviet charac-

ter of their education other factors may have impacted their choice of relocation for study. Simultaneously, their description of student life in the USSR suggests that internationalism had limited value in determining how Soviet citizens related to the foreigners, an assessment that is corroborated in archival documentation of administrative and social processes related to foreign student's presence at Soviet universities, as I will discuss below.

Tefira Vasie arrived in Moscow in 1986. He chose to study in the Soviet Union because he "always wanted to go abroad … I'd always said that I would marry a white woman"; in other words, "I wanted to live abroad." Vasie applied to the University of the Friendship of the Peoples because "chances were higher to be admitted here, higher than at a German or Hungarian university." He did not know much about the Soviet Union, and he did not apply for political or ideological reasons. Vasie chose to study mining because "I thought that would give me good prospects to find a job upon returning to Ethiopia," since local universities did not offer degree programs in this discipline.

Rex Essenobo, in contrast, chose his place of study somewhat more in line with the motives of Soviet leadership. "I came out of curiosity … this was the biggest country of the world, but it was closed, and there was no other way to get in."[41] In his youth, he had attended events such as film screenings and Russian classes at the Soviet Cultural Center in Lagos, Nigeria. "I heard about Yuri Gagarin, the cosmos, the Soviet people … I was intrigued by the idea of the friendship of the peoples." At the same time, he remembers, he was curious and sceptical about how people could live without cars, without a home of their own, "there were all these rumors." In a way, one can discern, the activities of the Soviet Cultural Center had the desired effect; it provided information and increased attraction for locals to study abroad in the Soviet Union.

Vasie and Essenobo identify various motives for studying in the Soviet Union, some in line with the ideological foundation of the exchange program, others intensely personal and determined by personal aspirations that reflect the interplay of constructions of racial identity with access to economic and cultural resources.[42] Similarly, the living and studying conditions for the two men, and for those who came before them, reflected varying degrees of accordance with the tenets of Soviet ideology and show how access to and allocation of resources shaped perceptions of foreigners and, implicitly, race.

STUDENT EXCHANGE: CONDITIONS

Soviet authorities typically organized the incoming students' travel – from issuing visas to procuring airfare to welcoming them at the airport – and, once accepted, the students entered a well-organized system. Upon their arrival, officials from respective universities were to pick them up, guide them to the assigned dormitory, and help them register.[43] Subsequently, students underwent medical exams, a component that saved the lives of some USSR exchange students. A student from Mali, for instance, arrived with health problems and was in need of care, and a Nepalese man arrived with tuberculosis that required immediate treatment.[44]

Students wishing to alleviate potential shortcomings in terms of familiar food or other things were allowed to ask relatives at home to send packages. In doing so, students from faraway countries had to follow strict rules: Like all other students, they were allowed to receive one postal package per quarter, weighing a maximum of 10 kg, and only if it had been disinfected and inspected by customs. Students had to produce a permission slip from the university where they had enrolled, in this case from UDN, when picking up their package at the one particular post office assigned to them.[45] In essence, these regulations were designed to limit the import of foreign goods, presumably in order to avoid scepticism about the Soviet economy among Soviet students via their exposure to commodities unavailable in the USSR. Simultaneously, Soviet authorities aimed to create a more or less equal playing field in terms of material possessions. Allowing foreign students to import goods and belongings on a larger scale might have created discontent between foreign and local students or hindered the foreigners' adaptation to local conditions.

Integration, from the Soviet perspective, relied on regular interaction between foreign and Soviet students. One of the ways to facilitate such encounters was to place them together in dormitories; this placement, the logic went, would foster multicultural understanding and language learning.[46] In addition, Vasie suggests, mixed housing fulfilled functions of control and surveillance, an observation confirmed by others including Onesphor Kyara, a student from Tanzania, who attended Donetsk State University in the mid-1970s.[47]

Dorm placement was thus a highly meaningful practice, for both foreign and Soviet students. Only students who were successful and respected members of either the Party or the Komsomol were allowed

to move in with foreigners, as only they could be trusted to be "immune" to Western influences.[48] The Cold War environment, in which opposing poles vied for the hearts and minds of those in newly developing countries, put not only foreigners at risk but created potentially unsettling experiences for Soviet students as well – not least through the foreigners' import of jazz and other cultural forms deemed "decadent" and undermining of Soviet culture.[49]

In reverse, being able to live alone as a foreigner was a privilege and limited to a few who had shown loyalty and enthusiasm by participating in university related political activities. Rex Essenobo stated that, after sharing rooms with other students throughout his first three years of study, he was granted a single room for his last year "because I was chair of my *zemliachestva* [the national student group] people came to see me regularly to talk about problems." Allegiance to the Party and participation in the established structures of governance was directly rewarded, a pattern familiar for Soviet citizens.

As suspicious as the placement of Soviet students may have been, Tefera Vasie also recalled that the practice had a good side: "They were the only people who talked to us … and they helped us go shopping." While motivated by the desire of Soviet authorities to control communication, shared housing had the potential to break up the isolation and segregation foreign students may have otherwise felt, an experience that contradicted the supposedly warm welcome offered them.

On the other hand, living in dorms regularly caused frustration or was accompanied by tensions. Entrance to dormitories was by ID only, and probably more than once this lead to conflicts when students did not have their documents with them.[50] Alongside the strict regulation of entry and exit, use of TVs, etc., the emphasis on collective housing itself proved problematic: in October 1962, Ms Wairimu asked to be transferred to a different dorm as she felt that there was no room for privacy where she'd been housed initially:

> I came [to] this country in 1960 September, and since then I have never been happy with the way of living. I have lived with many girls in one room from different countries and now I'm tired of living with any girl at all. I have quarreled with many girls and now I have made my decision that I can never and will never live with anybody together. I have never lived with anybody at home

> and it has become quite difficult to me in this country to live together with girls from different countries. I have lived [in] more than 6 rooms since I came to this university and now I can't bear …
>
> What does the university think, when people are mixed together, can three people have the same behaviors, the same way of thinking? This is impossible, when a student is not happy with life, he or she cannot study well … I am sure that nobody would like to live unhappy even the Russians themselves.[51]

A similar complaint by PhD students from India was brushed aside because it was deemed that students should expect to encounter challenges and not expect better treatment than Soviet students.[52] Other students bemoaned the lack of hot water or familiar foodstuffs.[53] Tefera Vasie and others went to great lengths to acquire ingredients and spices they valued, asking embassy staff to import those or returning from home visits with large quantities of necessary items. In sum, foreign students' housing in dormitories came with minor conflicts and tensions that every student would experience, some caused frustration, others required students to be creative.

In several instances, however, exchange students were housed on designated floors or even in separate buildings and at times under better conditions than their Soviet peers. Elsewhere, foreign students' rooms were better equipped than those of Soviet students: Students in Leningrad complained that African students had new furniture in their rooms while they slept on camp cots.[54] It seems that there was no general policy on housing foreign students in better conditions than Soviet students, and at this point a systematic pattern cannot be identified. What is clear, however, is that if and when there were distinctions, Soviet students characterized them as unfair, and, together with other privileges, saw themselves at a disadvantage worthy of critique.

Other policies proved contentious as well. Exchange students received higher stipends. Rex Essenobo, for instance, recalls that he received a monthly stipend of 120 rubles whereas the regular stipend for his Soviet peers' was between 77 and 90 rubles. In addition, the host universities were also responsible for equipping students with clothing and shoes appropriate for the Russian climate.[55] Tefera Vasie recalls that in addition to the 50 rubles he received upon arrival to purchase basic items, he was also offered clothing. He chose a suit,

"because [he] had always wanted one." Supplying incoming students with clothing often posed a challenge for the respective institution. The rector of Leningrad University, A.D. Aleksandrov, complained in 1964 that, by decree, LGU was required to procure clothing and shoes for incoming students (rather than handing out cash to them), but, according to Soviet law, stores are forbidden to "sell" goods without payment. For three years, Aleksandrov suggests, only personal agreements with store managers allowed the university to fulfill the requirement, albeit in illegal ways that may have put in danger staff members conducting the transactions.[56]

Alongside such support, exchange students benefitted from Soviet policies that provided opportunities for recreation and vacation. In 1961, approximately 2,000 students from "capitalist, low-developing and colonial countries" and 3,500 students from socialist countries remained in the country during the summer break. More than 1,800 of them spent at least parts of the break in so-called recreational camps of work and relaxation in Georgia, near Krasnodar, and elsewhere. For three to four hours a day, the students would help out in nearby *kolkhozes* (collective farms) or *sovkhozes* (cooperative farms), tending to vines or harvesting fruits and vegetables, and spend the rest of the day by themselves. In several of these camps, a report stated, opportunities for recreation were lacking or poorly organized, students were especially disappointed that only a few Soviet students participated. About 3,000 students utilized vouchers issued by trade unions and spent the summer in sanatoria, hundreds went on organized tours to various destinations within the USSR. Funding for such trips was to be provided by their host universities, though several apparently failed to allocate funds on time or devote sufficient resources to organize the trips, which caused distress among participants.[57]

Soviet universities struggled to provide the resources requested for making foreign students feel at home, unable to overcome the permanent shortage of consumer goods and other materials. At the same time, better housing conditions, unequal stipends, and special efforts to supply foreign students with clothing and other necessities reflected inherent tensions of Soviet policies toward foreigners. The contrast between stated integration and equal treatment, on one hand and special privileges on the other culminated in the fact that foreign students were allowed to travel outside of the Soviet Union, in particular, to Western European countries. This privilege clearly separated the

foreign students from their Soviet peers and exacerbated tensions, both between governmental efforts to curb Western influences and students' exposure to the West, and between foreign and Soviet students.[58] Granted, while some students requested that the Soviet government pay for such trips or for trips home during school break, these requests were typically turned down and students had to come up with travel funds themselves.[59] In the end, only students from well-off families were able to travel internationally, which facilitated further conflicts between Soviet students and students considered to be of bourgeois background.

Overall, African students in the Soviet Union benefited from Soviet authorities' efforts to provide an environment conducive to education and well-being far from home. In some cases, these efforts produced differential treatment that extended the more general pattern of privileged access to housing, consumer goods, or vacations accessible to the *nomenklatura* and others who actively participated in Party work and other valued activities. Among their Soviet peers, this was seen as problematic and resulted in animosity.

STUDENT EXCHANGE AS AN INTERCULTURAL ENCOUNTER

In an effort to facilitate friendship with the peoples of Africa, Soviet authorities relied on a number of nongovernmental organizations (of course, the word "nongovernmental" must be taken with a grain of salt), chiefly the above-mentioned Organization for the Friendship with the Peoples of Foreign Countries. Part of the task to facilitate cultural exchange was accomplished by introducing the African public to life in the Soviet Union, through publications, radio programs, exhibitions, etc., often via partner organizations of African-Soviet friendship.[60] The Organization for the Friendship with the Peoples of Africa was not the only contact and reference for partner organizations in countries of prospective recruitment; its umbrella Association for Friendship also played a key role in welcoming incoming students and providing encouragement and support. Materials of the Association for Friendship convey the impression that staff members were sincerely committed to making the exchange work, responding to students' concerns to an extent that would have been unimaginable for Soviet citizens.

Once the students who were funded by a scholarship from the organization had arrived in the USSR, the organization contacted them,

welcomed them with letters, and encouraged students to be in touch about their experiences and problems.[61] They responded with encouragement when students wrote about struggles to adjust or to learn Russian. Students reciprocated and sent postcards congratulating the leadership on 1 May, Labour Day. Some thanked them for the medical care they received.[62] One student was particularly grateful because, as he wrote, receiving treatment and staying at a sanatorium for free would be "unimaginable in a capitalist country."[63]

The Association for Friendship tried to solve daily life problems. For instance, the director approached the Ministry of Higher Education on behalf of a student from Mali and requested that he be transferred to a different dormitory. The student suffered from diabetes and needed access to insulin and a better diet.[64] Other times, students requested books, journals, or text books in English or other languages. (Students directed similar requests at UDN, asking, for instance, for access to news in their language as they felt their Russian language skills were insufficient. In response to a request by Indonesian students, the library subscribed to three journals in English that would allow the students to remain informed.[65]) Both leadership of the UDN and the Association for Friendship remained – at least in writing – courteous while displaying a serious commitment to supporting the exchange students in their endeavours.[66] Simultaneously, the Association for Friendship strove to foster rapprochement between Soviet and foreign students as a means of promoting intercultural understanding. A group trip to Leningrad not only exposed exchange students to important sites of Soviet history and culture, it also helped build friendly relationships among participants, which included students from UDN and a number of students from different Moscow-based universities.[67]

The Association for Friendship also spearheaded the foundation of the "Seminar: USSR and the New Africa," a cycle of cultural and education events that were to provide insights into the history and culture of various African countries for Soviet citizens while also facilitating foreign students' knowledge of Soviet history and life. Beginning in 1962, this seminar was a sincere attempt to spread knowledge among Soviet and foreign students. Its implementation, however, faced serious problems: several seminar meetings took place without translators, meaning that African students could not participate fully; African students were informed too late about events and meetings, resulting in their underrepresentation as organizers and

participants in some events.[68] All of these problems were discussed during leadership meetings but for the most part remained unresolved – largely in part because of requirements for students to organize in national groups (*zemliachestva*), which often overrode political disagreements and, eventually, alienated African students from participating in Association for Friendship activities.[69]

Tensions and stumbling blocks on the road to internationalist friendship occurred also when incoming students approached university or Association for Friendship officials with individual requests. In contrast to the friendly support signalled in letters and official statements, officials appeared affronted and offered only pat responses to complaints or unexpected requests, though at times disapproval turned into outright aggression and hostility. During a trip to Yalta during the summer of 1963, Iussuf Baro lost his wallet and all remaining funds. When he asked for help, especially in the form of an advance so that he could pay for a hotel and travel onward, he was told he would receive only limited support and would have to repay the advance from his stipend. Baro was upset with the support he received and asked to be sent home to Senegal. In response he was told that he should reconsider his approach to the situation. Rather than dropping out, he should be thankful for the support he received from Soviet citizens, which enabled him to study in the USSR, and return and focus on his studies.[70]

The academic training of students itself did not proceed without problem either. Most incoming students took preparatory courses in Russian, mathematics, etc. during their first year. These courses were, in large part, designed to remedy many students' poor preparation for university level education. Often, these insufficiencies were related to an overall poorly developed education system but, especially in the case of former colonies, were also the result of class-based systems where only members of the well-off middle class could afford an education.[71] Soviet officials confirmed that students came with unequal educational backgrounds and discussed the ensuing challenges with regard to including foreign students in Soviet classrooms; the preparatory courses were seen as the solution of choice.[72]

Some students, however, found their education in the Soviet Union lacking and complained especially about the preparatory courses. Students from Congo, for instance, indicated that they felt under-challenged, as they had taken university level classes at home but were now confined to preparatory instruction. Their training at UDN, they

observed, would be shorter than at regular universities, and they requested to be moved to other, regular Soviet universities. Some of them were hoping to move to warmer climates, which suggests that the dissatisfaction with the level of instruction was only one side of the story.[73]

Requests for transfer were also directed at the Association for Friendship. A student placed in Baku, for instance, wrote that there were insufficient resources and equipment for the study of oil production, and he asked to be transferred to Kiev, L'vov, or Leningrad.[74] A group of students from Kharkov argued that there were "obvious reasons" for a necessary transfer but did not elaborate these.[75] Students' requests for transfer were mostly denied. As in the case of the student in Baku, for instance, the local Organization for the Friendship and Cultural Exchange was tasked with contacting the student, essentially to help him integrate better by including him in social and cultural activities.[76]

Academic and integrationist efforts were closely linked, as Vasie and Essenobo suggest. When they studied in the USSR, students were generally well prepared academically. In Tefera Vasie's assessment, students would not have been admitted, and not been successful, without a strong foundation in these late years of the student exchange. At the same time, he admitted that he sometimes struggled, particularly in learning the Russian language. His specialty, mining, was difficult as well, and he "did not always finish his homework," and new subjects that he had not encountered before especially posed a challenge. But, he recalls, instructors "sometimes came to the dorm in the evening to help us." While confirming this practice, Essenobo puts the impression of good will among these instructors into perspective, suggesting that they only did so "because instructors were blamed when students failed their exams." In other words, foreign students were expected to succeed, even if it required some extra help. The Party line, one may conclude, had a major impact on the way in which foreign students fared.

In a similar way, Essenobo indicates, one ought to consider the success of the "friendship of the peoples." On one hand, he suggests, "there really was a friendship of the peoples, at least in my world, the part of the USSR that I saw – the world of students. Scandals were unacceptable, humiliations and racism were ruled out. Students were expelled for it … And people did want to meet us, they wanted to learn about our countries." The InterKlub, the International Club

under the auspices of the Association for Friendship he helped run, was an important venue for cultural events to provide information about foreign students' home countries. But Essenobo also noted, "the friendship of the peoples was a party program, there was a goal and one ought to implement it." Some students, he says, may have "unhappy memories," but that is more likely because they had a bad experience or failed academically. "Overall, everybody did their best, students and instructors."

Prompted to elaborate on relationships during the Soviet period, including contacts off campus (beyond the boundaries of the university) Essenobo reveals little. Responding with the phrase "to each their own" and noting, "some went to the harvest in the villages" during summer break, he implies that there was not much interaction with the wider Soviet public. Relating a description of relations within the Soviet Union, between different national groups, to those within a family, I asked if he saw himself as part of the family. "No," he replied, "perhaps as a friend of the family … because they did good things for us even though they were not obliged to do so." I understand this to mean that despite all efforts and emphasis on inclusion, a distance remained.

In addition to the at times suspicious, at times well-meaning yet divisive treatment, there were other moments of hostility and attempts to override student interests that facilitated divisions between foreign students and Soviet students, instructors, and officials. A group of students from Ceylon protested against unfair accusations. Two of the students, Sumith Dennuwara and Yatagama Amaradasa, had travelled to London without permission to visit a relative who had fallen ill, and an instructor named Kokov harshly criticized them for that and denounced the two as "cheaters and deceivers." When the students brought the issue to UDN leadership, officials tried to calm the waters, arguing that there must have been a translation error, but it is likely that Kokov intentionally used the words he was accused of. The students were especially outraged because Kokov could not prove that they had, as he claimed, forged entries in class sign-in sheets and combined his outburst with an appeal to other students not to follow Dennuwara's "bad example" by growing a beard.[77] The student group further complained that senior instructors had interrupted their general meeting on 10 September 1962 and tried to override the students' meeting agenda. The letter signals the students' dissatisfaction with a denigrating and patronizing attitude among Soviet

officials that they are unwilling to accept yet which officials may not recognize as problematic.

Outbursts in the form of biased accusations are also documented in the case of a number of students from Ghana who had demanded a thorough and transparent investigation of the death of one of their compatriots, Edmund Asare-Addo. Asare-Addo's body was found in the outskirts of Moscow. He had frozen to death, but it remained unclear why and how he was found in that particular place. Students suspected a hate crime and even staged an unsanctioned demonstration in Red Square, an action unheard of in the Soviet Union of 1963. During the demonstration, several hundred students held banners with statements like "Russia is not Alabama," suggesting that Asare-Addo had been killed in a manner reminiscent of the Jim Crow South.[78] Julie Hessler documented the tensions and highlighted how Soviet officials reacted to these students' protests: "Venting their feelings of outrage," they posed humiliating rhetorical questions, demanded gratitude from the students for the Soviet people's efforts to train them, and accused them of complete moral failure rather than to show compassion with the students' fear or address their larger concerns of not feeling safe.[79]

Soviet authorities frequently denied that Soviet citizens mistreated foreign students, but a report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party USSR of November 1962 freely admits "Soviet citizens' incorrect behavior toward foreign students," listing a number of beatings and assaults on students from Panama, Iraq, Mali, and Sierra Leone in Moscow as well as Leningrad, Kiev, and Kharkov. According to the report, exchange students were also humiliated by being called "darmoedy" (loafers), "chimpanzees," "chernomazy" (niggers), and "bezdel'niki" (idlers).[80] Such verbal abuse often combined with physical violence, for instance when Soviet students disapproved of cross-racial romantic relationships, especially those involving Soviet or other white women, and beat up the male foreign students (in this case, from sub-Saharan Africa) in response.[81]

Irina Kudakova, a former student of Leningrad State University, however, recounts that some women deliberately developed romantic relationships with foreign students, potentially for pragmatic reasons: They could offer things that their Soviet peers could not. She recalled how one female student from Czechoslovakia served as an example "for us to determine which of the guys had money (be it an Arab or a Black guy)" because she liked to go out and that was how she chose

her companions.[82] Others were drawn to men who "were tender, paid attention to them, were charming to these female beings" and were "not rude, didn't fight."[83] Statements such as these suggest that the women's choices were problematic for Soviet men on various levels: alongside feelings of jealousy and insecurity we can assume that frustration over their own lack of means to impress their female peers compounded racist resentment as expressed in the derogatory terms mentioned above – classism aligned with racism in physical assaults on those who are better-off.

The frustration was, perhaps, even greater given widespread ideas about "people from Africa" that the young foreigners challenged. Where Soviet citizens expected "oppressed, beaten down, suffering" people, participants during the 1957 World Festival and incoming students proved to be smart, educated, and well groomed.[84] Irina Katagoshchina, then staff at the recently founded Institute for African Studies at the Soviet Academy of Sciences, recalls her own astonishment at a graduate student from Botswana. The man for her not only personified "the real Africa" but impressed her because of "his intellect, he was a surprisingly smart person, surprisingly capable, gifted, talented."[85] The student himself was less impressed with such reactions and articulated his perception of wide-eyed responses such as Katagoshchina's and her colleagues during a birthday party as hostile: "If you would have seen how they looked at me, when I walked in. It was written all over their faces that they thought 'How can this black monkey speak such good English?'"[86] In fact, Katagoshshina's narration itself betrays a similar fascination rooted in bias and stereotypes, highlighting the unexpected level of education and mannerism alongside "typical African" behaviours and features such as a "sinuous body," "walking half-dancingly, not as straightforward as ourselves."[87] While impressive and attractive, people such as this graduate student would always perceive "white people as exploiters that oppress them" and always "remain Africans."[88] They were surprisingly human and cultured, and at the same time bound to a limited self that inhibited them from ever overcoming the stage of underdevelopment and otherness and, because of this otherness, becoming knowable and not threatening.

PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT AS RACIALIZATION

Tefera Vasie's account of trying to build a life with his wife in Tol'iatti, the exoticization but also verbal and nonverbal harassment he expe-

rienced there, mirror this logic. Prejudice and bias were deeply engrained in the minds of Soviet citizens despite years of education in internationalist ideals and the vision of people's friendship:

> People kept asking me questions, where are you from, how did you end up here? … Or when I got on the bus or the tram, they got scared, grabbed their bags … A little while ago, a woman [who had a dacha near ours] told me, that neighbors used to ask her whether Anna [Vasie's wife] had rented me, from Africa, to work for her … That hurt.[89]

Vasie's Ethiopian origin, signalled through his hair and skin colour, made him an exotic attraction and a suspect of dangerous behaviour, and it placed him in a position of dependence and servitude. What we see here on the level of interpersonal interaction describes the tenuous context that students from various African countries had to negotiate in the Soviet Union, despite official attempts to offer opportunities for equal development.

An earnest effort to support the so-called developing world and anticolonial liberation guided the actions of many Soviet officials on different levels, from the Central Committee of the CP USSR to the leadership of the Association of Organizations for the Friendship and Cultural Exchange with Foreign Countries to staff at UDN. Confirmed by Ghanaian students in the wake of their public demands for a thorough investigation into their compatriots' death and by alumni who later moved to the US, "education and government personnel [were guided by] an enlightened attitude."[90] However, while they refrained from blatantly racist abuse, actions and ideas betray the longevity of stereotypes and problematic conclusions. Similar to Katagoshchina's perception of black inferiority, the rector of UDN, Rumiantsev, suggested that the "national character" of Africans ought to be taken into account in the university's attempts to counter racist behaviour that targeted Senegalese students.[91] In particular, Rumiantsev alluded to the students' "slave mentality" resulting from centuries of oppression, which ought to guide the compassionate, yet firm work of the educators.[92] The road to nonracist behaviour is through reeducating the foreign students, not Soviet citizens – a typical, yet problematic viewpoint that places responsibility for hostility on those who are targeted by it by assuming wrongdoing or failure on their part.

Does the help offered to these students, in the form of invitations to study in the USSR as a whole but also concrete assistance in the form of special courses or instructors offering extra-tutoring after hours to secure academic success or attempts to create a comfortable environment, have to be understood in a similarly problematic way? Not necessarily. They became problematic when they were presented as benevolent gestures for which the foreign students ought to be thankful for and when they were used to justify instructors' or officials' intervention into student organizations or activity outside the classroom. These reminders display a patronizing attitude among officials reminiscent of carrying the "white man's burden" in educating the citizens of the developing world, a problematic relationship that does not bode well for solidarity and internationalist friendship.[93]

The supplies of extra funds, good housing, clothes, medical care, and travel opportunities became problematic when and where they created animosity among Soviet students who did not receive the same benefits and thus felt they had missed out as compared to their foreign peers. In essence, conflicts between foreign students and locals reflected the competition for resources in Soviet society more generally. The hope to implement internationalist attitudes among the Soviet population was dashed, not least by differential treatment that privileged party functionaries and the nomenklatura and coloured the everyday life of non-Soviet students. The production of a system of deliberate inequality, which fuelled jealousy, verbal abuse, and even physical violence, stood in contrast to the goals of the communist movement. Some activists feared that these experiences might undermine their project by producing anti-Soviet or even anticommunist attitudes among the incoming students. Notably, the general secretary of the APN in Senegal mused that his party would rather stop sending students to the USSR than have to deal with the anticommunist propaganda of the alumni of Soviet institutions upon their return.[94] The very policies designed to overcome systems of injustice reproduced new ones and failed to make good on the promise of international solidarity and the friendship of the peoples.

Furthermore, the wrath of Soviet students and officials was compounded by the fact that privileges were allocated to those who, the students who roomed with them and everybody else knew, were permanently suspicious, perhaps even dangerous – why else would they

need special observation? As well, the favoured treatment was given to people who might never benefit anyway due to their natures, which limited the effects any educational or material efforts may have. In other words, the differential treatment both reproduced the otherness of the foreign students and was limited by racial categories themselves, even if they were not directly marked as such. Race, we can analyze with David Theo Goldberg, worked as the "unspoken subtext"[95] in officials' references to suppressed and to-be-educated subjectivities. Particular types of human bodies – former African slave bodies as conjured by the rector of UDN (or, in the 1990s, the formerly civilized but now again barbaric Caucasians vs consistently civilized Russians) – are the object of different economic and cultural policies requiring support and education, while others – Soviet society – have these resources and set the standard for necessary development. Michael Omi and Howard Winant have described this linkage of interpretation, representation, and respective allocation of resources as a process of "racial formation."[96] Education required resources, and to many Soviet students and officials it appeared that they were allocated at their own expense. The claim of superiority exists alongside that of victimhood, in the past as in the present. An analysis of how foreign students, especially those from Ethiopia, Senegal, Ghana, or Botswana, experienced Soviet life shows how easy individuals could reframe well-meaning institutional support as indicative of inferiority and threat and how thus the category of "race" became instrumental in making meaning of the world.[97] Rather than destabilizing racial categories, ideological frameworks, Soviet practices, and personal conflict reinforced them and proposed hierarchical relations rather than equality, thus failing to develop a truly antiracist practice or vision.

NOTES

1 Tefera Vasie and Anna N. Marchenko, interviewed by author, Moscow, 30 May 2015.

2 "Russia: African Student Killed in St Petersburg in Possible Hate Crime," Radio Free Europe/ Radio Liberty, 7 April 2006, http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1067491.html (last access: 30 August 2015).

3 Ann M. Simmons, "African Migrants in Russia Describe 'Hell on Earth,'" *Los Angeles Times*, 2 November 2014, web version: http://www.latimes.com/world/africa/la-fg-russia-africans-20141102-story.html#page=1.

4 See, for instance, Vladimir Mukomel', "Zakonodatel'stvo rossiiskikh regionov: Narushenie prav bezhentsev," in *Rossiiskije Bezhentsy* (Berlin: DRA: 1998); Erika Dailey/Human Rights Watch, Russia, *Crime or Simply Punishment? Racist Attacks by Moscow Law Enforcement* (New York: Human Rights Watch/Asia, 1995); Amnesty International, *Russian Federation: Violent Racism Out of Control* (London: AI, Internatonal Secretariat, 2006).

5 Tobias Rupprecht, "Gestrandetes Flaggschiff: Die Moskauer Universität der Völkerfreundschaft," *Osteuropa* 1 (2010): 107.

6 Etienne Balibar, *Masses, Classes, Ideas: Studies on Politics and Philosophy before and after Marx* (New York: Routledge 1994), 198f.

7 Since Aristotle, friendship is understood as a relationship that is built on volition, commitment, and affection. Furthermore, in his political philosophy, friendship relies on the equality and similar status to the greatest possible extent. See Danny Kaplan, "What can the concept of friendship contribute to the study of national identity?" *Nations and Nationalisms* 13, 2 (2007): 233.

8 John Russell, "Terrorists, Bandits, Spooks and Thieves: Russian Demonisation of the Chechens before and since 9/11," *Third World Quarterly* 26, 1 (2005): 101–16; Mikhail A. Alexseev, "Societal Security, the security dilemma, and extreme anti-migrant hostility in Russia," *Journal of Peace Research* 48, 4 (2011): 509–23; Caress Schenk, "Open Borders, Closed Minds: Russia's Changing Migration Policies: Liberalization or Xenophobia?" *Demokratizatsiya* 18, 2 (2010).

9 Meredith L. Roman, "Making Caucasians Black: Moscow since the Fall of Communism and the Racialization of Non-Russians," *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 18, 2 (2002): 1–27.

10 Maxim Matusevich, "An Exotic Subversive: Africa, Africans and the Soviet Everyday," *Race & Class* 49, 4 (2008): 57–81.

11 Further analyses of racism and antiracism in post-Soviet Russia are, for instance, Konstantin Dmitriev, "Migratsii, novye diaspory i rossiiskaia politika," *Neprikosnovennyi Zapas* 5, 25 (2002); Aleksandr Osipov, "Sovremennyi antirasizm: reshenie problemy ili chast' problemy?," electronic document, http://www.igpi.ru/info/people/osipov/1225617426.html; Victor Voronkov and Oksana Karpenko, "Trudno ne byt' rasistom (vmesto vvedenia)," *Rasizm w iazyke obrazovanija*, pod. red. V. Voronkova et al. (St Petersburg: Alteia, 2008); Oksana Karpenko, "Teaching 'national' differences: 'narod' in Russian school textbooks," in *Paradoxes of Diversity in the Contemporary World: Discussions of 'Culture' and 'Tolerance' after the Soviet Union*, eds. Michele Rivkin-Fish et al. (Washington: Woodrow Wilson ICS, 2010); El'vira Mingazova,

"Formy bytovania rasizma v Rossiiskoi Federatsii," *Obshchestvo: Filosofia, istoria, kul'tura* 1 (2012).

12 Eric D. Weitz, "Racial Politics without the Concept of Race: Reevaluating Soviet Ethnic and National Purges," *Slavic Review* 61, 1 (2002): 1–29; Sergej Damberg, "Die anderen Russen – die Ethnisierung gesellschaftlicher Prozesse durch Rückgriff auf „ethnisches Wissen," in *Auf der Suche nach Eurasien: Politik, Religion und Alltagskultur zwischen Russland und Europe*, ed. M. Kaiser (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2003), 284–312.

13 See Matusevich, "An exotic subversive," for a succinct analysis of popular Soviet imagery of Africa.

14 Processes of reethnicization in the aftermath of the demise of the Soviet Union are central for the simultaneous occurrence of these perceptions, see, for instance, Ingrid Oswald, *Die Nachfahren des "homo sovieticus": Ethnische Orientierungen nach dem Zerfall der Sowjetunion* (Berlin: Waxmann, 2000).

15 David Brandenberger, "Proletarian Internationalism, 'Soviet Patriotism' and the Rise of Russocentric Etatism during the Stalinist 1930s," *Left History* 6, 2 (2000): 80–100; Gleb J. Albert, "From 'World Soviet' to 'Fatherland of All Proletarians.' Anticipated World Society and Global Thinking in Early Soviet Russia," *InterDisciplines* 1 (2012): 85–119.

16 Allison Blakely, *Russia and the Negro: Blacks in Russian History and Thought* (Washington: Howard University Press, 1986); Kate Baldwin, *Beyond the Color Line and the Iron Curtain: Reading Encounters between Black and Red, 1922–1963* (Durham: Duke, 2002); Joy G. Carew, *Blacks, Reds, and Russians: Sojourners in Search of the Soviet Promise* (Rutgers: Rutgers University Press, 2008); Meredith L. Roman, *Opposing Jim Crow: African Americans and the Soviet Indictment of US Racism* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2012); Maxim Matusevich, "Africans and Black Americans in the Comintern Schools, 1925–1934," *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 26 (1993): 371–90.

17 Rossiiski gosudarstvennyi arkhiv noveishei istorii (Russian State Archive of Contemporary History, henceforth RGANI), 4/16/469, l. 73–5, in *"Vozvratit' domoi druziami SSSR": Obuchenie Inostrantsev v Sovetskom Soiuze, 1956-1965. Dokumenty*, eds. T.Iu. Krasovitskaia, Z.K. Vodop'ianova, T.V. Domracheva (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnyi Fond Demoktaria, Moskva, 2013), 81.

18 Ibid. 80.

19 Ibid. 81.

20 RGANI 3/14/354, l. 1, 73–7, in *"Vozvratit' domoi druziami,"* 137ff.

21 RGANI, 4/16/469, l. 73–5, in *"Vozvratit' domoi druziami,"* 82.

22 See K. Katsakioris, "Afrikanskie studenty v SSS: Ucheba i politika vo vremia dekolonizatsii, 1960-gody," *Sotsial'naia Istoria: Ezhegodnik* 2008, ed. N.L. Pushkareva et al. (St Petersburg: Aleteia, 2009), 211.

23 Please note that I try to be as specific in my analysis as possible and do not assume that "Africa is a country." Should I use "Africa" to identify the origin of specific individuals, this is due to Soviet documentation. Whenever possible, I offer more specific details, but at times sources do not differentiate. A telling practice of indifference itself, this approach poses a challenge for careful research.

24 Arkhiv vneshnei politiki Rossiiskoi Federatsii (Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation, henceforth AVP RF), 591/2/1/36, 1–4, in *"Vozvratit' domoi druziami,"* 132f.

25 Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv goroda Moskvy (Central State Archive of the City of Moscow, henceforth TSGAM), 3061/1/12, l. 4, 15 August 1960.

26 Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (State Archive of the Russian Federation, henceforth GARF), 9576/14/81, l. 32.

27 GARF 7928/3/3220, l. 7f.

28 Katsakioris, 216; Julie Hessler, "Death of an African Student in Moscow: Race, politics, and the Cold War," *Cahiers du Monde Russe* 47, 1 (2006): 40.

29 TSGAM, 3061/1/1249, l. 1–37, 1961–1970 (India, Guinea, Nigeria, Saudi-Arabia, Birma, Mali, Ghana, Nigeria, Senegal, Tunis, Libya, Kenya, Central African Republic, Uganda, Laos, Cameroon).

30 TSGAM, 3061/1/85, t. 2, l. 32, 10 May 1962

31 TSGAM, 3061/1/12, l. 21–4, 25–6.

32 TSGAM, 3061/1/12, 10–12, 7 June 1960 (Kenya); GARF, R-9606/2/127, l. 32–9, in "*Vozvratit' domoi druziami*," 499.

33 TSGAM, 3061/1/12, l. 10–12; GARF R-9606/2/127, l. 32–9, in *"Vozvratit' domoi druziami,"* 496–501.

34 TSGAM, 3061/1/187, l. 2, 4–5.

35 TSGAM, 3061/1/159, l. 4–8, var. 1963/1964; TSGAM, 3061/1/160, l. 88, 10 October 1963.

36 TSGAM, 3061/1/930, l. 17–19, 21 November 1966.

37 Katsakioris, "Afrikanskie studenty," 213. See also Maxim Matusevich, "Journeys of Hope: African Diaspora and the Soviet Society," *African Diaspora* 1 (2008): 70

38 Katsakioris, "Afrikanskie studenty," 227; Svetlana Boltovskaia, *Bildungsmigranten aus dem subsaharischen Afrika in Moskau and St. Petersburg: Selbst-und Fremdbilder* (Herbolzheim: Centaurus, 2014), 57.

39 See Boltovskaia, *Bildungsmigranten*, 102.

40 Ibid.

41 Rex Essenobo, interviewed by author, Moscow, 28 May 2015. All following quotes by Essenobo are from this interview.

42 See Matusevich, "An exotic subversive," 69.

43 TsGAM, 3061/1/16a, l. 3–4.
44 TsGAM, 3061/1/159, l. 1; TsGAM, 3061/1/84, l. 9, 1 October 1965; TsGAM, 3061/1/416, l. 35.
45 TsGAM, 3061/1/16a, l. 7–8.
46 GARF R-9606/2/26, l. 19–23, in *"Vozvratit domoi druziami,"* 148–51.
47 Onesphor Kyara, *An African Student in Russia-Soviet Union* (Parker, CO: Outskirts Press, 2014), 34, 39.
48 Boltovskaia, *Bildungsmigranten*, 74.
49 See Matusevich, "An exotic subversive," 73.
50 RGANI, 5/55/94, l. 190–2, in *"Vozvratit' domoi druziami,"* 579–80.
51 TsGAM, 3061/1/1087, l. 24f.
52 TsGAM, 3061/1/160, l. 79, 24 September 1963.
53 GARF, 9576/14/81, l. 119l; GARF R-9606/2/127, l. 32–9, in *"Vozvratit' domoi druziami,"* 496–501.
54 RGANI 5/55/94, 1. 71–175, cf. *"Vozvratit' domoi druziami,"* 580–3. See also Matusevich, "Journeys of Hope," 25f.
55 TsGAM, 3061/1/16a, l. 3–4; conversation with Bashir Obasekola, Moscow, 17 June 2013.
56 RGANI 5/55/94/134, in *"Vozvratit' domoi druziami,"* 565.
57 GARF, R-9606/1/869, l. 66–70, in *"Vozvratit' domoi druziami,"* 261ff.
58 Katsakioris, "Afrikanskie studenty," 226; Matusevich, "Journeys of Hope," 78.
59 TsGAM, 3061/1/160, l. 88, 10 October 1963.
60 The Institute for African Studies at the Soviet Academy of Sciences was also founded in 1960, ostensibly to showcase the long tradition of Russian/Soviet interest in the African continent, though the foundation is closely linked to Soviet efforts of strengthening ties to the newly decolonized world.
61 For instance GARF, 9576/14/81, l. 3.
62 GARF, 9576/14/81, l. 5, 7–9.
63 GARF, 9576/14/81, l. 34.
64 GARF, 9576/14/81, l. 9.
65 TsGAM, 3061/1/40, l. 7–9, 9 January 1961.
66 TsGAM, 3061/1/160, l. 88f, 10 October 1963; GARF, 9576/14/81, l. 157–8.
67 GARF, 9576/14/106, l. 129, 212–28.
68 GARF 9576/14/106, l. 10–13, 16 December 1963. Similar criticism is in ibid., l. 31f, 125.
69 See also Hessler, "Death of an African Student," 43–5.
70 GARF, 9576/14/81, l. 84–109.
71 TsGAM, 3061/1/12, l. 55.
72 GARF R-9606/1/869, l. 53–61, in *"Vozvratit' domoi druziami,"* 269–72.

73 TSGAM, 3061/1/1249, 13 March 1969. See also TSGAM, 3061/1/84, l. 19, 17 April 1962: A professor from India visited UDN and conveyed discontent among Indian students, who felt that the level of instruction at UDN was too low to be beneficial. In particular, they resented the poor preparation among African students that held them back and wanted "to think for themselves" rather than regurgitating what instructors taught them.
74 GARF, 9576/14/81, l. 119–24.
75 GARF, 9576/14/81, l. 12.
76 GARF, 9576/14/81, l. 121.
77 TSGAM, 3061/1/1087, l. 9–15, 10 October 1962.
78 *Chicago Tribune*, 20 December 1963, 19.
79 Hessler, "Death of an African Student," 59.
80 RGANI 5/33/194, l. 99–101, in *"Vozvratit' domoi druziami,"* 378–80. See also GARF R-9606/2/77, l. 187, in *"Vozvratit' domoi druziami,"* 377f., GARF, R-9606/2/83, l. 136–41, in *"Vozvratit' domoi druziami,"* 412–15.
81 Hessler, "Death of an African Student;" Matusevich, "Journeys of Hope."
82 Irina Kudakova, interviewed by author, St Petersburg, 22 December 2015.
83 Irina Katagoshchina, interviewed by author, Moscow, 27 May 2015.
84 Ibid., see also Matusevich, "Journeys of Hope," 69.
85 Irina Katagoshchina, interviewed by author, Moscow, 27 May 2015.
86 Ibid.
87 Ibid.
88 Ibid.
89 Tefera Vasie and Anna N. Marchenko, interviewed by author, Moscow, 30 May 2015.
90 Hessler, "Death of an African Student," 57.
91 TSGAM, 3061/1/84, l. 15.
92 Ibid.
93 See also Matusevich, "An Exotic Subversive," 67.
94 TSGAM, 3061/1/84, l. 14f, 7 December 1962.
95 David Theo Goldberg, "Racial Europeanization," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29, 2 (2006): 335.
96 See Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States* (New York: Routledge 1994), 55ff.
97 Goldberg, "Racial Europeanization," 334.

12

Pan-Mongolism to Anti-Racist Internationalism: Perspectives from US History

Gunja SenGupta

From the vantage point of United States history, let me launch my reflections on the passage from Pan-Mongolism in tsarist Russia to anti-racist internationalism in the Soviet Union as narrated by Susanna Lim and Anika Walke, with an anticommunist jeremiad published at the height of the Cold War by the iconoclastic African American writer Zora Neale Hurston. The year was 1951. Fascism had been defeated abroad, decolonization was under way in Asia and Africa, and the Soviet Union was seeking to build moral capital against the West through outreach to intellectuals, artists, and activists of colour. Meanwhile, even as red-baiting entered high gear in the US, the "long civil rights movement" wound its way through alliances with labour and the American communist party in the 1930s to arrive at the threshold of a multipronged struggle for black equality across a spectrum of locales – from local communities, courthouses, and unions, to national associations and the halls of government.[1]

In this milieu, Hurston published a piece titled "Why the Negro Won't Buy Communism" in the pages of a literary icon of American nationalism, the *American Legion*.[2] Positioned in a moment of promise and peril for race relations in the United States, the essay illustrated "the dialectic between assignation and assertion," the dynamic between received identities and the will to engage/subvert them, that gave meaning to racial categories in interaction with the national, transnational, or international contexts in which they emerged. The very globality of this dialectic, as Hurston articulated it, gives

it resonance in the histories of Russia's "races."[3] And so I quote Hurston at some length below:

> It has been around twenty-five years since certain Negroes of my acquaintance picked up their doll-rags and headed for Russia …
>
> My active curiosity was aroused when around 1930 Langston Hughes and Louise Thompson led a group of some twenty odd Negroes to this same Russia. It was beginning to look like a trend … When I asked questions, I was told that the Kremlin was extremely interested in the American Negro …
>
> The press of the world was reporting actual starvation and nakedness in parts of Russia. So I knew that there was some kind of a bug under that chip when I was told that the "People" of the Soviet Union were terribly distressed over the "horrible conditions" existing among American Negroes … People who are hungry and cold just do not worry about things like that thousands of miles away.
>
> I just could not conceive of Uncle Sam letting Stalin sit in on, say a Cabinet session … I tried hard to visualize armed Russians invading our Georgia and dealing with a mob that had been a little hasty with a brother in black.
>
> So what the hen fire could Russia do for us?
>
> I soon saw that they did not love us just because our skins were black. The USSR was bent on world conquest through Asia. They saw in us a shoe-string with which they hoped to win a tan yard. A dumb, but useful tool.
>
> In spite of the world brotherhood propaganda, it was obvious that Soviet Russia was bent on carrying out the Czarist Russian plans to be master of Asia … It must be repeated … that [the USSR's] passionate love of the non-whites did *not* apply to Japan, for obvious reasons.

Hurston went on to attribute the failure of an African American communist peasant party to materialize, to the alleged fact that "The Negro is the most class-conscious individual in the United States … Good groceries, fast cars, and fancy shoes, yes indeed! … The dear peasant in the Soviet Union in his shapeless felt boots and slurping his cabbage soup meant exactly nothing to us. Just the thing we are striving to get away from."

Decrying the Soviets' relegation of African Americans to a static vision of eternal oppression in the land of their birth, rejecting the

USSR's denial of the possibility of black upward mobility within the framework of American nationalism, Hurston went on to complain that the Soviets "simply will *not* see us as Americans, nourished on the same ideals as other Americans, and so headed in the same direction. So why would we want to swap freedom for bondage?"[4]

Interpretations of Hurston's politics have run the gamut from "republican, libertarian, radical democrat, reactionary conservative, black cultural nationalist, [and] anti-authoritarian feminist" to consistently anticolonial.[5] Whatever meanings we read into her writings, it is worth noting the international perspectives that framed Hurston's sense of identity as a black *American* nationalist. As the passages quoted above suggest, Hurston was spurning what she judged to be cynical overtures of the Soviet state to the world's nonwhite populations, in terms that voiced her own longing to participate in the optimistic glow of American national belonging, defined against attributes she assigned to its Cold War adversary (despotic, imperialistic, patronizing, hypocritical, manipulative, and heir to tsarist racial attitudes toward Asia). She asserted the dynamism of her concentric identities of race within nation – of black within American, bounded by freedom and mobility, in relation to her construct of the Russian peasants' hopeless state of stasis under Stalin's suzerainty, their "shapeless felt boots " and dining etiquette signifying demoralizing dead ends of poverty and autocracy. The narrative of American exceptionalism that Hurston articulated was, however, a heavily contested one; its very essence woven from vigorous debate about the racial meaning of American identity. It rested upon a version of civic nationalism that offered – at least in theory – equality of opportunity and freedom to all citizens irrespective of race or creed. Yet, colour blind civic equality and the success ethic that for Hurston distinguished the American ideal of citizenship, had always existed in tension with a tradition of racial nationalism, which in progressive America where she came of age, moulded President Theodore Roosevelt's imaginary of a masculinized, racialized nation of various "white" peoples forged in the crucible of war and acculturated to American norms – a white republican imaginary that had always fuelled arguments over what "white" meant and who qualified as such.[6]

Against this backdrop, Hurston's seemingly uncomplicated embrace of American nationalism and hostility to Soviet internationalism, injects an unconventional African American perspective into Cold Wars over race. But the very iconoclasm of her position raises

issues that echo in the accounts of international identity politics offered by Lim and Walke. The two pieces focus on different moments in Russian history: exclusion and reaction in Czarist Russia, on the one hand and inclusion and ambiguity in the Soviet Union, on the other. Yet both illuminate the dynamism and contingency of race as a global paradigm, exploring between them the shifts in Russian imaginaries of race, nation, and Russia's place in the world in relation to ideas about Europeans, Asians, and Africans over time. Moreover, they illustrate not simply how Russians constructed race but the ways in which others, especially Asians and Africans, in turn racialized or otherwise responded to Russians in tune with individual experiences or the exigencies of international politics. As such, the essays by Lim and Walke are grounded in overlapping conceptual realms common to comparative and transnational scholarship on race. These include the "relational matrix of identity formation" in which "multipositional" individuals and groups forge their senses of racial affiliation at the intersection of various other discourses of power, structured around privileges or disabilities of nationality, class, gender, and religion among other variables; the ways in which nation states develop ideas about difference in relation to and in interaction with transnational contexts, imperial connections, and international power politics; the policies, institutions, and rituals that states craft in order to invent, name, classify, represent, and institutionalize these differences; the role of cross-border migrations – the circulation of people and products, and culture and communications – in making the meanings of race; and the role of competing nationalisms – of religion, language, ideology, and civic identity, to name a few – in mediating, muddying, and even fracturing the coherence of public discourses and private experiences of race. As this litany suggests, comparative and transnational histories of identity are scaffolded by the braided refrains of "structure and agency" – the interplay of power and the everyday politics of assimilation, appropriation, affiliation, engagement, and resistance by racialized actors.[7]

We have much to gain by reflecting on these issues within a dialogical framework that incorporates insights from the Americas, where race not only emerged as what the literary scholar Henry Louis Gates once described as the "ultimate trope of difference"[8] but helped shape profound contests over the boundaries of nation and the meaning of citizenship. I discuss below some of the key revisions suggested by our interdisciplinary, cross-field consideration of global connec-

tions in this volume, while fleshing out in greater detail themes and concepts in US history that intersect with understandings of race in Russia.

FORMATION OF RACE AND ETHNICITY ACROSS BORDERS

Rather than limiting her perspective to the Pacific littoral of tsarist Russia and East Asia, Lim analyzes Pan-Mongolism and Pan-Asianism within a much broader trans-Pacific frame of reference bounded by the Americas at the other end. She thus illuminates, connects, and compares the intercontinental contexts of politics and cultural exchange within which the racial outlooks of the Russian philosopher Vladimir Solovyov and the Korean intellectual Yun Ch'iho evolved. Lim's narrative of Pan-Mongolism and Pan-Asianism coincides with the high tide of Asian exclusion politics in the Americas, the globalization of "yellow peril" imagery, and the internationalization of Anglo-Saxon "whiteness" in relation to an Asian "other" as symbolized by the US navy's famous sixteen-battleship Pacific tour to signal Anglo-American unity against the threat of Japanese immigration and power in 1907–09. This configuration of circumstances made the case for evaluating Russian meanings of whiteness, Solovyov's conjuration of a Pan-Mongol spectre, as well as Yun's conversion to a vision of Pan-Asian solidarity, from what Eric Foner, in his 2000 presidential address to the American Historical Association, called a "Pacific World perspective," shaped in part, as Mae. M. Ngai has written, by "Asian American histories of migration and colonialism."[9]

This broad perspective adopted by Lim, moreover, facilitates cross-field discussions of the conceptual tools of racial formation. We might, for instance, apply the notion of a "relational matrix" of racial formation premised upon a dialectic of inclusion and exclusion by one party and of assimilation, engagement, and resistance by an "other," to examine local variations of transnational tropes of difference. In this context, it is instructive to consider examples of the ways in which US scholars in different subfields have defined and historicized the concepts of "race" and "ethnicity" in relation to the making of an American "nation." A rich corpus of scholarship on slavery has shown that the Atlantic slave trade and African slavery in the Americas established white republican citizenship as a cardinal relation of difference from black dependence. Meanwhile, historians of immi-

gration and "ethnicity" have moved beyond binary constructs of "black" (associated with "race") and "white" (historically linked with "ethnicity"). Works that problematize the meaning of "whiteness" or explore the experiences of Asian and Latino migrants to North America illustrate not only the shifting boundaries between "race" and "ethnicity" but also intersections among race making, the idea of nation, and imperial expansion. I discuss these themes at some length in the paragraphs that follow, both for their conceptual insights in understanding racial formation as well as for the transnational frames of reference they provide to help us contextualize the dynamics of "white"-Asian relations in the Russian Pacific.

Race is, as we know, an axis of identity, which interdisciplinary theorists have long defined as a relation of difference, anchored in power structures, in which one party depersonalizes or objectifies an allegedly inferior "other" by attaching to it the "mark of the plural … an anonymous collectivity ('They are this'; 'They are all the same')."[10] In other words, it is now conventional wisdom that there is nothing "natural" or transhistorical about race. Rather, the notion of race in the modern world, as connoting categories of innate attributes signified by physical features that might be arranged in hierarchical social orders emerged as European explorers, borrowing from natural history, sought to represent and classify the "exotic" peoples they encountered in faraway lands. In North America, for instance, the first European colonists identified religious difference with the phenotype of "race." Early colonial charters called upon communities to bring "savage" Indians into the civilizing fold of Christianity.[11]

It was African slavery in the Atlantic world, however, that forged the most enduring "metalanguage of race," in the Americas, as the historian Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham called it. Institutionalized in language, law, and political economy, this meme signified and foregrounded power relations between master and slave and helped shape "white" identity as a decisive relation of difference from blackness. The dynamics of inclusion and exclusion in this process of racial formation emerge, for instance, in the historian Thelma Foote's argument that when the English wrested the port that became New York from the Dutch in 1664, imperial authorities used black slavery and antiblack racism as a "disciplinary mechanism" to pacify a volatile settler population divided by nationality, religion, language, and economic status and to unite them around a sense of entitlement to the "English rights" of liberty, now cast as a prerogative of "white" men.[12]

This paradox of black bondage and white freedom lay at the heart of the "white republic" that emerged from the American Revolution, in which the capacity for self-government was thought to rest upon economic independence that guaranteed freedom from the political will of others. "Republican citizenship" not only excluded enslaved African Americans from its purview but also fused American nationality with the ostensibly immutable attribute of race. A 1790 law restricted the right of naturalization to "free white persons," thus envisioning, as Dana Nelson has written, a "symbolic and functional" fraternity in which white identity would override gathering conflicts rooted in class, cultural, and sectional differences. When states enacted universal adult white male suffrage in the nineteenth century, the idealization of democracy as an American norm unfolded, as I have written elsewhere, in tandem with the construct of the colour "white" as normative, rendered especially potent by its "structured invisibility," "defined against the aberration of slavery and its all too visible, equally aberrational marker, blackness."[13]

In this context, the contingent character of racial formation within and across national borders becomes evident when we compare Lim's analysis of Solovyov's anti-Asian thinking with the contrasting Russian and American experiences of a nineteenth-century freed slave of African descent named Peter Bensé, who visited the court of St Petersburg as the valet of a British official. A custodian of the Colored Home in antebellum New York, where he spent his last days, recorded Bensé's recollections that Russian courtiers had seen him as "a curiosity" because of his complexion but treated him "with marked kindness and favor." He reportedly spoke of "the Empress Catharine with strong expressions of respect and esteem, and even of affection, on account of her great kindness and attention to him." The former bondsman recalled that on one occasion, during his master's absence from St Petersburg, he served the palace royal as valet and coiffeur. While in Russia, he married a Russian woman and had two sons but had to leave them when his master was recalled to England. Having learned that his family had moved to New York, Bensé eventually obtained permission to join them there but confronted a racialized world far less hospitable than a Russian palace. Failing to track his family, he secured a position as a waiter with the hope of saving money for a passage back to Russia. Instead, he fell into penury and ill health. At the point of his entry into the archives of New York history, Bensé's Russian dreams had been foiled, and, excluded in the US

from both naturalization and most trades by his African descent, he had been forced to seek public relief.[14]

The gulf between this former slave's American and Russian experiences highlights the formalization of antiblack racism in the early American Republic on a level that apparently did not prevail in a tsarist Russia with few African-descended populations, whether enslaved or not. But in light of Lim's interpretation of Solovyov's anxieties over Pan-Mongolism, it also reveals the importance of context in shaping meanings of race. Solovyov's imaginary of a "white" Russian sense of self, premised upon identification with Christian Europe and defined against the anti-Christ, "locust"-like "Pan-Mongol" hordes of the East, tapped into historical memories of Mongol invasions and the contemporary debacle of the Russo-Japanese War. In the US, by comparison, African slavery rendered whiteness a relation of difference from black unfreedom above all. At the same time, even as Solovyov was raising the alarm about Pan-Mongolism and Yun was moving toward Pan-Asianism following visits to the US, American whiteness was in the process of being negotiated in relation to a variety of nonblack "others" at home and the internationalization of Anglo-Saxon triumphalism abroad. Besides offering comparative perspectives, these developments illuminate the transnational circuits along which ideas about race might have travelled, as well as the ways in which these ideas may have mutated in transit.[15]

PACIFIC EMPIRES AND THE INTERNATIONAL/ TRANSNATIONAL POLITICS OF RACE

Lim's incorporation of some of these larger contexts enriches our understanding of the ways in which the local meshed with the global to shape particular visions of exclusion and solidarity. Her reading of Pan-Mongolism and Pan-Asianism intersects intriguingly with scholarship that has unsettled the borders between race and ethnicity in North American historiography by writing Asians into contests over whiteness within the US and its manifestations abroad. At the same time, Lim links the idea of a racialized nation with imperial politics. Let us illustrate these intersections by first considering very briefly, the historiographical career of the term "ethnicity" in relation to "race" and "nation" before pondering how their uses in US history might help us to flesh out the story that Lim tells within a Pacific world paradigm.

The sociologist Ruben G. Rumbaut, writing in a special issue of the *Journal of American Ethnic History* that marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of that publication's birth, defined "ethnicity" begot by immigration as "collectivities who perceive themselves and are perceived by others to differ in language, religion, 'race,' national origin or ancestral homeland, cultural heritage, and memories of a shared historical past." As originally applied in US history, however, the term "ethnic" reflected a Eurocentric bias, having emerged, as David Roediger observed in the same forum, "before the middle of the twentieth-century … as a way to rename intra-European divisions and hierarchies formerly termed 'racial' even as the new terminology accepted that there were 'black,' 'brown,' 'red' and 'yellow' races." In the last couple of decades, scholars like Virginia Yans and Rogers Brubaker have recognized that we can have ethnicity without ethnic groups, which may well be categories created by the state, such as the very heterogeneous classification of "Hispanic" that appears in the US census. Moreover, ethnicity may be contested along lines of class, gender, generation, and so forth, so that one way of avoiding the trap of essentializing ethnicity is to think of it as "networks, cognitive states … and organizations" that coalesce in pursuit of some form of activism or in response to shared historical experiences. The realization that "groups are recognized as groups" through processes that are historically contingent, prompted David Hollinger to advocate that we reject the "anachronistic race–ethnicity distinction" in favour of an "amalgamation narrative" of "ethnoracial history" that addresses groups defined by descent while keeping track of the dynamism of identity formation through the interaction of "state power and prejudice" with "solidarity-affirming impulses." In this context, Indian Americans' successful campaign to change their census classification from "white" in 1970 to "Asian" in 1980 is a good example of the porous borders between official markers of race and ethnicity as well as the complicated configuration of politics and experience that shape the relationship between assignation and assertion.[16]

How do these theoretical insights resonate in Lim's "cross-fertilized," comparative analysis of Pan-Mongolism and Pan-Asianism? Yun's US sojourn coincided with the emergence of a transnational conversation about Asians against the backdrop of massive "new immigration" to the US from Asia and southern and eastern Europe, the high tide of Western imperialism in Afro-Asia, Jim Crow in the South, Indian wars in the West, and the influence of social Darwinism in

reform. Depicting Asians as contaminated, immoral aliens who would take away jobs while never assimilating, it circulated, as the historian Erika Lee has shown, from the US to Canada, Hawaii, Mexico, and other parts of Latin America. Moreover, according to Eiichiro Azuma, the Issei Japanese launched projects of settler colonialism in the Spanish borderlands, which fuelled cross-hemispheric anxieties that linked Japanese immigrant land purchases in northern Mexico with Japanese imperialism in the Pacific. What emerged in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was the globalization of "yellow peril" imagery, dramatized by the racial theorists Madison Grant and Lothrop Stoddard in the wake of the Russo-Japanese War as the most imminent threat to the primacy of the "white tide" in world civilization. Key US strategists like Alfred Thayer Mahan argued for the annexation of Hawaii as a counterweight against China and Japan. These developments established a new context for understanding the US navy's 1907 performative tour of "white" might in the Pacific against emerging Japanese power. And as Lee has shown, enthusiastic crowds in Australia cheered the notion of a free "Anglo-Saxon Pacific." But as the labour historian Kornel Chang has argued, Euro-Americans invented the imperial Pacific not simply through material and symbolic devices such as Roosevelt's "white fleet" but also by creating intercolonial networks of labour activism that transmitted ideas about white workers versus "coolie labor" from the Pacific American/Canadian Northwest through South Africa to Australia and New Zealand. An "empire of extraction" in the Pacific Northwest based on fur, timber, and mineral resources attracted a motley and polyglot crew of settler colonists and immigrants from Europe and the eastern US who sought stability amid flux by building walls around "whiteness," defined against Asian "coolies" contracted to labour seasonally in railroad construction, fishing, and salmon canning, who allegedly threatened the egalitarian promise of a white republic. Animated by the spectre of "Asian hordes overwhelming the white settler world" that circulated through "webs" of transoceanic empire crisscrossing much of the anglophone world, Canadian and US Northwest labour organizations rioted against Asians to consolidate white group solidarity, excluded Asians from their unions, and mobilized politically to halt Asian immigration to North America.[17]

This internationalization of white identity politics in relation to an Asian "other," helps us to contextualize ideas about Pan-Mongolism and Pan-Asianism within a Pacific world system. Lim opens up rich

possibilities for exploring the ways in which trans-Pacific "yellow peril" imagery originating in the anglophone West may have influenced Solovyov's conflation of China and Japan into a unified "Pan-Mongol" threat and for differentiating among the various regional incarnations of that construct. She has made it possible, for example, to juxtapose the history of Asian migration and exclusion in the US against shifts in Russian policy toward Chinese and Korean workers brought in to work on railroads and mines. In light of Western rhetoric about an "Anglo-Saxon Pacific," Lim's account also sheds light upon the meaning of whiteness as an ethnoracial construct in Solovyov's vision of Pan-Mongolism by explaining how Slavic Russians – much maligned as lower order "ethnic" whites in a great deal of WASP American thinking about race, ethnicity, and democracy – and the Anglo-Saxon West could both be considered "white." Solovyov's conception of Russians was as a messianic, self-sacrificing saviour of a Christian Europe against Mongol invasions, standing in sharp relief against intrawhite hierarchies and the triumphalist narrative of Anglo-Saxon progress celebrated by Americans like Grant. Moreover, the Russian spectre of swarming Asian pillagers may have resembled anglophone workers' anxieties over advancing hordes of "coolie" labour and translated into similar impulses to regulate, if not prohibit, inbound Asian population flows but tapped into much longer and very different historical memories of Mongol depredations and current angst over military defeat at Japanese hands.

Lim's account of Yun's meandering path to Pan-Asianism resonates especially clearly within the shifting, permeable boundaries of "race" and "ethnicity" in Asian American scholarship. In the United States, the historical association of whiteness with citizenship set the template for the exclusion of nonblack "others" from the full privileges of American belonging, but it left the meaning and parameters of whiteness fluid enough to allow for their renegotiation by successive groups of immigrants seeking to "acculturate" to the community of privilege that white racial markers defined. Work on the "morphing" of Asian Americans "from race to ethnicity" has emphasized the dialectic of complicity and contest that marked their quest for citizenship and civil rights within the "framework of the existing national binary of black and white." This dialectic, in operation during Yun's visit to the United States, might offer a useful prism through which to understand his positioning of Koreans and Russians within a taxonomy of Asian and white identities. If we use the concept

of hegemony (of whiteness in this case) as the Latin Americanist William Roseberry has proposed, to understand not consent but "struggle," "the ways in which the words, images, symbols, forms, organizations, institutions, and movements used by subordinate populations to talk about, understand, confront, accommodate themselves to, or resist their domination are shaped by the process of domination itself" and if we accept that "what hegemony constructs, then, is not a shared ideology but a common material and meaningful framework for living through, talking about, and acting upon social orders characterized by domination" then it becomes easy to see why early twentieth-century Asian Americans were navigating the racialized field of US naturalization law, claiming citizenship on grounds that they were white. Susan Koshy has argued that naturalization attempts implicitly endorsed the "myth of white civilizational superiority," but, following Roseberry's formulation, we can say that such endorsement served as a vehicle for turning nonwhites into citizens in a "white republic." The case law that emerged established a hierarchy of Asian groups, each judged on the scale of civilization by its proximity to whites. The Japanese, represented as more politically powerful and "modern" than the Chinese, remained candidates for American citizenship longer than other Asians, who were rejected not only on the grounds of their "Mongolian" heritage but also for their allegedly innate lack of enlightenment or tendency toward despotism. This logic perpetuated the practice of conflating phenotype with political culture, of race constructs with national belonging. Other Asian strategies for achieving mobility in a white republic similarly turned on appropriating the symbols and language of whiteness. Thus a Chinese American merchant sued to have his daughter attend a segregated white school in Mississippi by asserting that she was not black and by claiming that the equal protection clause of the US Constitution affirmed Chinese rights to separation from "degraded" African Americans.[18]

These cases, like Yun's early quests to acculturate to Western modernity through conversion to Christianity and the adoption of the English language, illustrate the workings of the hegemonic prism of whiteness – of the conflation of colour, culture, and civilization that it subsumed – in mediating identity, in blending "ethnicity" into "race" or vice versa. They also help us to place Yun's perceptions of Korean and Chinese inferiority vis-à-vis not just the West but the Japanese as well, in the context of a trans-Pacific taxonomy of Asian races. But I

would suggest that Yun's American encounters also suggest that racial identities and solidarities arise from as well as react to common experiences of racism. In the Americas, the historical memories and experiences of the Middle Passage and slavery acculturated very diverse peoples of African descent to think of themselves in racial terms as "black." Yun's self-consciousness as a member of a transnational "yellow race" bound by identities of race, religion, and written characters appears to have been similarly anchored in Korean experiences with both American and Russian racism. Yun's lamentation, "White Australia! White Philippines! White America! What an amount of arrogance, of unfairness," was a response to the emergence of an international rhetoric of the Anglo-Saxon Pacific – a rhetoric that resonated in Asian Americans' everyday experiences of racial disabilities from one oceanic littoral to another.

At the same time, however, Lim illustrates that Asians racialized Russians in response to the exigencies of international politics. Yun's representations of Russia oscillated from a model of Christianity, enlightenment, and Western civilization as long as it was perceived as an ally against Japanese imperialism in the 1890s to a "white peril" of avaricious expansionists and lower-order Europeans diminished by the Russo-Japanese War. Pan-Asianism then, by the very contingent nature of its coalescence, conforms to definitions of "ethnoracial groups" as "networks" of descent that can be harnessed to contradictory ends – exploitation, solidarity, resistance, and consolidation all at once.

COLD WAR, CIVIL RIGHTS, AND THE RACIAL POLITICS OF DIPLOMACY

Lim's reference to Korean experiences of Russian racism sets the stage for a dialectic that Walke highlights in her account of African student experiences in the Soviet Union, namely, that between the institution of Soviet anti-racist internationalism, on the one hand, and popular ambiguity on race matters, on the other. She reflects on the connections, if any, between Soviet outreach to African students during the Cold War and the outbreak of racial violence in post-Soviet Russia. From the comparative perspective of US history, Walke's essay evokes an overarching theme: the role of the state in establishing or mediating the racial politics of diplomacy and the tensions – or synergies – that arise between the state, civil society, and/or popular masses as a

result. These tensions and synergies played out differently in the US than they did in the Soviet Union because of contrasts between these nations' political structures, the workings of ideology, and the role of civic activism and political protest. In the US, the historical friction between civic and racial nationalism centred anti-racist internationalism on nonstate actors, sometimes in adversarial relationships with particular public authorities in a federal system but at other times in alliance with the federal government. These and other points of comparison and contrast emerge not only in works on Cold War era foreign students in the US but also in disparate historiographies of the "long civil rights movement," on the one hand and US policy on decolonization abroad, on the other.

At first glance, the Soviet Union's explicit rejection of race appears to stand in sharp contrast with the institutionalization of white supremacy in politics, law, and public policy in large parts of the United States at least until the middle of the twentieth century. Yet, as Eric Weitz has argued, "racial politics crept into Soviet nationalities policies, especially between 1937 and 1953." The Soviets envisioned every individual as the "carrier of a prescribed nationality," which in turn was a vehicle for becoming Soviet. The Soviet state came to construct some of these nationalities in essentialist terms that smacked of racialization, deporting entire nationalities for their alleged resistance to socialism while holding up Russia as a cultural and political model.[19] In Walke's essay, I see the Soviet logic of promoting socialism through implicitly racialized nationalities in the domestic realm, translated in the foreign, into policies to advance the cause of world revolution through the socialist acculturation of more explicitly racialized groups of international students. On one level, the state's overt rejection of white supremacist edifices of Western imperialism must have carried an inherent appeal for Afro-Asian international students, as becomes clear from some of the correspondence that Walke cites. Yet, entire groups of foreigners were represented by sweeping markers ostensibly stamped upon their "national" character by tragic twists of history – such as the Senegalese defined by a "slavish mentality" – instilled by Western oppression and ostensibly targeted for unlearning in Soviet hands. The practice of conferring special and very visible privileges on groups easily recognized as foreign – by the way they looked, the languages they spoke, and the food they preferred – linked phenotype with particular "rights" to create racialized relations of group difference. Yet, such privileges did not trans-

late into equal treatment, choice, or power. As Walke's work suggests, the project of benevolence inherently "racialized" the Soviet state, setting up patron client relationships that appeared to reproduce unequal power relations by another name, a Soviet variation on the "white man's burden," generous in intent, and kind in form but lordly in spirit. Moreover, the racialization of the Soviet state's objects of benevolence also apparently turned such objects into targets of popular wrath against foreign privilege – wrath that may have tapped into preexisting prejudices but was exacerbated by the appearance of special treatment accorded to some groups over others. Works that illustrate the patronizing portrayal of Africans in Soviet popular culture confirm Walke's account of popular antagonism toward non-Western international students.[20]

As such, Soviet internationalism presents an interesting case study of comparison with what the US scholar Paul Kramer has described as a "corporatist configuration of state and private agencies" in shaping US policy toward international students in the post–World War II era and the dialectic of consensus and conflict that attended this partnership. This period brought a tremendous spike in foreign student migrations to the US amid heightened state participation in the "sponsorship, supervision, and institutionalization" of educational initiatives and a growing sense that international students could play a critical role in the "global politics of the Cold War and decolonization." The US government operated through the existing decentralized infrastructure of private entities and universities that had served four earlier waves of student flows. These flows, according to Kramer, included foreign nationalists in search of "self-strengthening" educational and military programs (such as the Chinese Educational Mission of the late nineteenth century); aspiring colonial elites from places like the Philippines, training to serve as colonial bureaucrats; evangelical missionaries preparing to proselytize foreign realms upon their return to their home countries; and "corporate internationalists" consisting of intellectual, business, and philanthropic elites from Europe, the US, and Latin America seeking to promote world peace through cross-cultural interaction in the halls of US academia. The vision of "corporate internationalism" was channelled through the Institute of International Education (IIE), established in 1919, and networked into institutions like the Carnegie Endowment for Peace and the Rockefeller Memorial and Foundation. Following World War II, the ideas and agencies that shaped these earlier waves of stu-

dent migrations endured in partnership with the greatly enlarged role of the US state seeking to promote the ideals of democratic capitalism as well as shore up its influence around the world through exchanges of people. The most significant of these was the Fulbright program, launched in 1945 at the behest of Senator J. William Fulbright and funded through the sale of "war junk" abroad to win "international goodwill through the exchange of students in the fields of education, culture and science." Moreover, as Jason Parker has noted, amid anxiety over the Soviet Union's Sputnik launch, Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). In an attempt to improve US achievement in science and technology, this measure filled the coffers of American universities with funding from both government and private philanthropic sources for the inauguration of non-Western academic programs including area studies and foreign language education.[21]

Unlike the Soviet Union, however, universities and private sector institutions had the option to baulk at serving as vehicles of state propaganda, lobbying to extricate "informational" initiatives from educational ones, at least in theory. Their efforts materialized in the separation of the "educational" Division of International Exchange of Persons from the "informational" Division of Libraries and Institutes within the State Department's Office of Educational Exchange. A more important difference with the Soviet system centred on the influence of shifting political winds on the government's support of student exchanges. There was no political consensus on the diplomatic value of non-Western, especially African, students. Rabid red-baiting politicians of the Joseph McCarthy stripe were inclined to withdraw funding from international exchange programs for fear that they would bring radical students to US shores. Racist university regents and pressures to accommodate domestic students following the passage of the GI Bill produced further ambivalence toward such visitors. The Kennedy administration, on the other hand, buttressed allies in Congress who passed the 1961 Fulbright-Hays Act, which expanded government support of broad populations of international students.[22]

The everyday experiences of international students in the Soviet Union expose tensions between state goals and popular attitudes that present another metric of comparison and contrast with the US. Walke makes clear that Soviet support of international students of colour may have placed the state at odds with the popular sensibilities

of the citizens it governed, in part because foreign students enjoyed special privileges that Russians did not. Thus ironically enough, Soviet internationalism appeared to institutionalize differences between citizens and foreigners in their lived experiences of race even as it rejected racism. In the US by contrast, the traditions of "*herrenvolk* democracy" (democracy for a white, master race) brought civic authorities and local populations in concert within institutionalized regimes of overt racial discrimination in certain parts of the country. Thus, Nigerian students in McPherson, Kansas, in 1951, were relegated to segregated seating in a local theatre, others faced housing discrimination in parts of the country, and in 1961, 27 percent of respondents in a student survey identified racism as the Achilles heel of American democracy. Nor was the federal government prepared to flex an overtly anti-racist muscle in the face of popular discrimination within local US communities, as the Soviet Union was apparently more likely to do.[23]

Instead, diverse streams of scholarship, suggesting the heterogeneity of voices on race, the Cold War, and civil rights in the US, locate American anti-racist internationalism less in a unified state than in the pluralistic babble of civil society. Histories of the racial politics of the Cold War, on the one hand and works on the "long civil rights movement," on the other underscore the complicated relationship between state and society that international student experiences demonstrated. Scholarship on the racial underpinnings of US diplomacy may be viewed as the obverse of the Soviet Union's professions of an anti-racist foreign policy. Along a different historiographical vein, the connections of the "long civil rights movement" in the United States with labour and decolonization help us to put Soviet overtures to the African diaspora in international perspective. Several scholars have argued that US foreign policy, by prioritizing communist containment over decolonization in Africa, gave white supremacy "a new lease of life." Others have shown that the conflation of anticolonial nationalism with communism abroad translated at home into segregationist quests to discredit the struggle for black equality by tarring it with the brush of communism.[24]

The rise of massive resistance to civil rights in the US is at the heart of a relatively new understanding of the movement that envisions "its decisive first phase" – in the words of historian Jacqueline Dowd Hall – as shaped by "an alchemy of laborites, civil rights activists, progressive New Dealers, and black and white radicals, some of whom were

associated with the Communist party" – a coalition informed by a social democratic vision that sought economic justice as well as legal and political equality, embraced men and as well as women, and was attentive to the intersections of race, class, and gender, and to connections between struggles for equality at home and imperialism abroad. More recently, historians have drawn upon the declassified Verona decryptions of Soviet espionage to debate the extent of Soviet domination of the American communist party, and the impact of its demise and the red-baiting surrounding it, on the radicalism of the civil rights message. The CP's sectarianism and zealous defence of the Soviet Union, coupled with anticommunist repression by the US government, prompted civil rights organizations like the NAACP to reject their former radical allies. Whatever the scholarly disagreements over the impact of these developments on the configuration of class and race in civil rights agenda and outlook, what many historians agree on is that civil rights groups developed a diasporic consciousness, with activists ranging from Medgar Evers to the Freedom Singers, an SNCC ensemble, hailing Kenyan nationalists, and the noncommunist American Committee on Africa forging ties with the African National Congress, despite that body's communist connections. African Americans urged upon their government a foreign policy that connected anti-imperialism abroad with racial justice at home as a strategy to counter Soviet propaganda. When the federal government embraced civil rights, it was at least partly to salvage the image of democratic capitalism abroad at the height of the Cold War.[25]

This motley corpus of scholarly literature, suggesting an assortment of voices on the politics of the Cold War, anticolonial nationalism, and civil rights, establishes a context for appreciating where the impulses of anti-racist internationalism in the US lay: not with the state but rather in civil society represented prominently by historically black colleges and universities, among other institutions. By the 1920s, many such institutions of higher learning had discarded earlier, paternalistic attitudes toward Africa and embraced a black Atlantic vision of racial justice that linked desegregation with decolonization. Institutions like Howard University in Washington DC or Lincoln University in Pennsylvania brought anticolonial nationalists like the Nigerian Nnamdi Azikiwe (Zik) into contact with African American luminaries like the historian Carter Woodson and NAACP lawyer and future Supreme Court justice Thurgood Marshall, and nurtured student recruitment networks that channelled a Kwame Nkrumah to

Lincoln. Financial support for diaspora-conscious programs, such as Howard's African Studies program, came not from the state but from private agencies like the Ford Foundation. [26]

On the other hand, the Cold War also created opportunities for noncommunist Afro-Asians to forge alliances with the US state against Soviet influence at home and abroad. Thus, as Jason Parker has written, the Kenyan labour leader, educator, and nationalist Tom Mboya lobbied public and private funders, including the State Department, the Reverend Dr Martin Luther King and his iconic Southern Christian Leadership Council, and the singer-activist Harry Belafonte, to bring Kenyan students to the US. The so-called Kenyan airlifts in 1959 and 1960 – supported by John F. Kennedy – introduced hundreds of Kenyan students to the US including one Barack Obama Sr. The US state's plea for "national security and international understanding" also offered black colleges leverage to offset enrolment losses thanks to the desegregation of higher education by seeking public support for foreign students. African leaders like Lincoln alum William Fitzjohn of Sierra Leone and Mboya of Kenya helped persuade the Kennedy administration of the role that black colleges played in shaping anticolonial, anticommunist nationalism.[27]

These African diasporic relationships in the Atlantic world open up the comparative possibilities of a discussion about the many meanings that the ostensible beneficiaries of Soviet internationalism may have taken away from their experiences in Soviet universities and factories. Historians like Kate Baldwin and Meredith Roman have written about African American intellectuals and cultural icons who "spoke Soviet anti-racism" to further their goals of racial equality at home. Yet, others, like Hurston, resented what she saw as the Soviet imposition of a mantle of eternal degradation upon blacks as a condition for supporting them. The previous two chapters raised the question of the ways in which the objects of Russian race rhetoric – in their role as victims or benefactors – challenged, utilized, or negotiated with received identities of race or racialized nationalities. Might private sources – letters, diaries, etc. – offer unfiltered insights into popular attitudes toward foreigners? Moreover, might a comparative framework – one that perhaps juxtaposes the experiences of Africans against those of foreign students belonging to other continents – yield insights into official as well as informal hierarchies among different groups of foreigners? In this context, Walke's present essay makes clear that in their applications for scholarships African students in the Soviet

Union may have appropriated the language of a revolutionary internationalism that their patrons found congenial, using the opportunities that flowed to acquire specialized education or medical aid. But they were not all prepared to accept negative stereotypes of their "national" characters passively, mounting complaints and protests against a host of issues from amenities and allowances to racist treatment by their host society.[28]

Ultimately, the historical figures considered in Lim and Walke's papers shared with Americans the will to engage or challenge prescribed identities in response to oppression or in solidarity. These protagonists in distant lands forged and articulated their senses of self, and their perceptions of "others" than themselves, at the intersection of multiple discourses of power and interest. Meanings and practices of race, mediated by nationality, class, and gender (among other variables) unfolded and shifted in interaction with developments outside the boundaries of nation states. Thus Lim and Walke offer further illustration of not simply the workings of intersectionality and multipositionality in identity formation but of what Howard Winant calls the "globality of race." They show that race constructs are forged as much at the crossroads of national borders as within them. They touch compacts and conflicts among ostensibly race-neutral nations as much as they filter intergroup exchanges inside them.

NOTES

1 For a classic early synthesis of the "long civil rights" perspective, see Jacqueline Dowd Hall, "The Long Civil Rights Movement and the Political Uses of the Past," *The Journal of American History* 91 (March 2005): 1233–63. This interpretation revises the master narrative of the twentieth-century struggle for black equality by stressing its roots in the labour movements and radical politics of the 1930s and 1940s; its flowering through grassroots communities – North and South – as much as its shaping at the hands of national organizations and leaders; and the diversity of its methods, goals, and perspectives along parallel time lines – self-defence alongside nonviolent direct action, economic justice combined with desegregation campaigns, and local concerns coexisting with Pan-African consciousness and international solidarities. See for instance, Thomas Sugrue, *Sweet Land of Liberty: The Forgotten Struggle for Civil Rights in the North* (New York: Random House, 2008) and Kevin Gaines, "The Civil Rights Movement in World Perspective," *OAH Magazine of History* 21 (January 2007): 57–64. These insights, in turn, have

shaped debates over the impact of red-baiting, the Cold War, and connections between Soviet and American communism on the civil rights movement's relationship with the American Left. For overviews of these discussions, see Eric Arnesen, "Civil Rights and the Cold War at Home: Postwar Activism, Anticommunism, and the Decline of the Left," *American Communist History* 11 (April 2012): 5–44 and responses in the same forum, among others, by Alex Lichtenstein, "Consensus? What Consensus," 49–53; Judith Stein, "Why American Historians Embrace the 'Long Civil Rights Movement,'" 55–8; and Dayo F. Gore, "'The Danger of Being an Active Anti-Communist': Expansive Black Left Politics and the Long Civil Rights Movement," 45–8. A useful historiographical discussion of some of these issues occurs also in Jeff Woods, "The Cold War and the Struggle for Civil Rights," *OAH Magazine of History* 24 (October 2010): 13–17.

Examples of studies on Soviet overtures to African Americans include Kate A. Baldwin, *Beyond the Color Line and the Iron Curtain: Reading Encounters between Black and Red, 1922–1963* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002) and Meredith Roman, *Opposing Jim Crow: African Americans and the Soviet Indictment of US Racism, 1928–1937* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2012).

2 Zora Neale Hurston, "Why the Negro Won't Buy Communism," reprinted with the permission of the *The American Legion Magazine*, June 1951 (www.legion.org), in the *The Journal of Transnational American Studies* 5 (2013): acgcc_jtas_19735. Retrieved from: https://escholarship.org/uc/item/47f1c8tc.

3 Quotation from Susan Koshy, "Morphing Race into Ethnicity: Asian Americans and Critical Transformations of Whiteness," *boundary 2: An International Journal of Literature and Culture* 28 (Spring 2001): 158. For a discussion of the "globality of race," see Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s* (1986, repr. New York: Routledge, 1994).

4 Hurston, "Why the Negro Won't Buy Communism," 2, 3, 4, 8.

5 Quotation from Ernest Julius Mitchell II, "Zora's Politics: A Brief Introduction," *Journal of Transnational American Studies*, 5 (1): acgcc_jtas_19732. Retrieved from: https://escholarship.org/uc/item/38356082, 1. Offering a useful review of contemporary scholarship on Hurston, this piece focusses on the transnational and comparative prisms through which Hurston viewed the world, suggesting that her representation of the US may have been shaped by her perception that the US was not a colonial power in the same sense as Europe.

6 On America's competing nationalisms of race and civic equality, see Gary

Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001). The literature on "whiteness" is vast. On whiteness's qualities of "normativeness" and "structured invisibility," see Ruth Frankenberg, *White Women, Race Matters* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 6. Other invaluable examples include Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998); Dana D. Nelson, *National Manhood: Capitalist Citizenship and the Imagined Fraternity of White Men* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998); David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (London and New York: Verso, 1991, repr., 1999), *Towards the Abolition of Whiteness* (London: Verso, 1994); and *Colored White: Transcending the Racial Past* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Grace Elizabeth Hale, *Making Whiteness: The Culture of Segregation in the South, 1890–1940* (New York: Vintage Books 1998); and Ronald Takaki, *Iron Cages: Race and Culture in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979). On popular culture, see Linda Frost, *Never One Nation: Freaks, Savages, and Whiteness in US Popular Culture, 1850–1877* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005); Eric Lott, *Love and Theft: Blackface Minstrelsy and the American Working Class* (New York, 1993); Michael Rogin, *Blackface, White Noise: Jewish Immigrants in the Hollywood Melting Pot* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); Daniel Bernardi, ed., *The Birth of Whiteness: Race and the Emergence of US Cinema* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1996); Jesse Algeron Rhines, *Black Film/ White Money* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1996); Susan Gubar, *Racechanges: White Skin, Black Face in American Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997). On gender, see Michael Moon and Cathy N. Davidson eds., *Subjects and Citizens: Nation, Race and Gender From Oroonoko to Anita Hill* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995); Angela Woollacott, "'All This Is the Empire, I Told Myself': Australian Women's Voyages 'Home' and the Articulation of Colonial Whiteness," *American Historical Review* 102 (October 1997): 1003–29. See also Mike Hill ed., *Whiteness: A Critical Reader* (New York: New York University Press, 1997); John Hartigan, Jr, *Racial Situations: Class Predicaments of Whiteness in Detroit* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999); Alexander Saxton, *The Rise and Fall of the White Republic: Class Politics and Mass Culture in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Verso, 1990); Theodore W. Allen, *The Invention of the White Race: Racial Oppression and Social Control* Vol. I (New York: Verso, 1994); Matt Wray and Annalee Newitz, eds., *White Trash: Race and Class in America* (New York: Taylor and Francis, 1997); Saidiya

Hartman, *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); Ian Haney-Lopez, *White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race* (New York: New York University Press, 1996). On historiography, see Peter Kolchin, "Whiteness Studies: The New History of Race in America," *Journal of American History* 89 (June 2002): 154–73.

7 On the "relational matrix" of "multipositional" identity formation, see Earl Lewis, "To Turn as on a Pivot: Writing African Americans into a History of Overlapping Diasporas," *American Historical Review* 100 (June 1995): 783. I combined these insights with "subaltern" perspectives from South Asian, Latin American, and African history in Gunja SenGupta, "Elites, Subalterns, and American Identities: A Case Study of African-American Benevolence," *American Historical Review* 4 (October 2004): 1104–39. On "structure and agency" in the study of race in Soviet history, see Eric D. Weitz, "Racial Politics without the Concept of Race: Reevaluating Soviet Ethnic and National Purges," *Slavic Review* 61 (Spring 2002): 1–29. A recent piece that adopts the paradigm of migration – both voluntary and coerced – to understand and relate formations of race and ethnicity across national borders is Adam Goodman, "Nation of Migrants, Historians of Migration," *The Journal of American Ethnic History* 34 (Summer 2015): 7–16. George J. Sanchez called for thinking about race and nation in relation to colonialism in "Race, Nation, and Culture in Recent Immigration Studies," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 19 (Summer 1999): 67–84. An influential take on race, nation, and ethnicity is Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States*. A tiny sample of the voluminous literature on race in the US that is especially relevant to the construction and representation of African Americans includes Barbara Fields, "Slavery, Race, and Ideology in the United States," *New Left Review* 181 (May–June 1990): 95–118; Nell Irvin Painter, "Of Lily, Linda Brent, and Freud: A Non-Exceptionalist Approach to Race, Class, and Gender in the Slave South," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 86 (Summer 1992): 241–59; George M. Frederickson, *Difference and Power: A Short History of Racism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002); David Brion Davis, "Constructing Race: A Reflection," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 54 (January 1997): 7–18; Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, "African American Women's History and the Meta-language of Race," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 17 (1992): 251–74; Thomas Holt, "Marking: Race, Race-Making, and the Writing of History," *American Historical Review* 100 (February 1995): 1–28; Henry Louis Gates Jr, *Loose Canons: Notes on the Culture Wars* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Kenan Malik, *The Meaning of Race: Race, History and Culture in Western Society* (New York:

New York University Press, 1996); Derrick Bell, *Faces at the Bottom of the Well: The Permanence of Racism* (New York: Basic Books, 1992); Dominick La Capra ed., *The Bounds of Race: Perspectives of Hegemony and Resistance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991); Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein eds., *Race, Nation, and Class: Ambiguous Identities* (London: Verso, 1991); Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983); Pierre L. Van den Berghe, *Race and Ethnicity: Essays in Comparative Sociology* (New York: Basic Books, 1970); Thomas F. Gossett, *Race: The History of an Idea in America*, revised edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), and George M. Frederickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on the Afro-American Character and Destiny* (New York: Irvington Publishers, 1971); Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998); Michael A. Gomez, *Exchanging Our Country Marks: The Transformation of African Identities in the Colonial and Antebellum South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998). Thelma Wills Foote, *Black and White Manhattan: The History of Racial Formation in Colonial New York City* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004) and Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: Norton, 1975), show how black slavery and white freedom emerged in tandem with each other. On the role of shared historical experiences in shaping identity, see Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone*. On critical race theory, see Eileen Boris, "Gender, Race, and Rights: Listening to Critical Race Theory," *Journal of Women's History* 6 (Summer 1994): 111–24.

For examples of scholarship thinking through the relationship between "race" and "ethnicity" in US history, see the essays in the forum, "Future Directions in American Immigration and Ethnic History," in *The Journal of American Ethnic History* 25 (Summer 2006), including John J. Bukowczyk, "Introduction," 68–73; David Roediger, "A Half-Jubilee: Twenty-Five Years of Multiracial Scholarship at the *Journal of American Ethnic History*," 43–52; Matthew Frye Jacobson, "More 'Trans-,' Less 'National,'" 74–84; Mae M. Ngai, "Asian American History-Reflections on the De-centering of the Field," 97–108; Joe Trotter, "African American History, and the *JAEH:* The First Twenty-Five Years," 109–18; Virginia Yans, "On 'Groupness,'" 120–9; David A. Hollinger, "American Ethnoracial History and the Amalgamation Narrative," 153–9; Ruben G. Rumbaut, "On the Past and Future of American Immigration and Ethnic History: A Sociologist's Reflections on a Silver Jubilee," 160–7. See also Rogers Brubaker, *Ethnicity without Groups* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004).

8 Gates, "Loose Cannons," 49.

9 Erica Lee, "The Yellow Peril and Asian Exclusion in the Americas," *Pacific Historical Review* 76 (November 2007): 537–62; Ngai, "Asian American History-Reflections on the De-centering of the Field," 102.

10 Ania Loomba, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* (London: Routledge, 1998), 137; Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson eds., *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), 15.

11 I have taken some of this discussion from my book, *From Slavery to Poverty: The Racial Origins of Welfare in New York, 1840–1918* (New York: New York University Press, 2009), 30. On European constructions of American Indians, see Kathleen M. Brown, "Native Americans and Early Modern Concepts of Race," in *Empire and Others: British Encounters with Indigenous Peoples, 1600–1850*, eds. Martin Daunton and Rick Halpern (London; Philadelphia: UCL Press, 1999), 79–100; Patricia Seed, *American Pentimento: The Invention of Indians and the Pursuit of Riches* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001); Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian: Otherness and Authenticity in the Assumption of American Indian Identity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999); Robert E. Berkhofer Jr, *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978).

12 Higginbotham, "African American Women's History and the Meta-language of Race," 251–74; Thelma Wills Foote, *Black and White Manhattan: The History of Racial Formation in Colonial New York City* (New York, 2004), 52–158; Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*.

13 On the racial meaning of republicanism, see Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*; Nelson, *National Manhood*, 6; SenGupta, *From Slavery to Poverty*, 5.

14 Mary W. Thompson, *Broken Gloom: Sketches of the History, Character, and Dying Testimony of the Beneficiaries of the Colored Home, in the City of New York* (New York, 1851), 68–70.

15 For overviews of transnational history, see C.A. Bayly, Sven Beckert, Matthew Connelly, Isabel Hofmeyr, Wendy Kozol, and Patricia Seed, "*AHR* Conversation: On Transnational History," *American Historical Review* 111 (December 2006): 1440–64; and the essays by Nancy F. Cott, Stephen Tuck, Jean Allman, and Matthew Pratt Guterl in "*AHR* Forum: Transnational Lives in the Twentieth-Century," *American Historical Review* 118 (February 2013): 45–139.

16 Rumbaut, "On the Past and Future of American Immigration and Ethnic History"; Rodeiger, "A Half-Jubilee," 45; Rogers Brubaker, "Ethnicity without Groups," *Archives Europeenes des Sociologie* 42 (2002), cited in Yans, "On 'Groupness,'" 162; Hollinger, "American Ethnoracial History and the Amalgamation Narrative," 156–57; Koshy, "Morphing Race into Ethnicity," 158.

17 Lee, "The 'Yellow Peril'"; Eiichiro Azuma, "Japanese Immigrant Settler

Colonialism in the US–Mexican Borderlands and the US Racial Imperialist Politics of the Hemispheric Yellow Peril," *Pacific Historical Review* 83 (May 2014): 255–76; Amy Hanser, "Yellow Peril Consumerism: China, North America, and an Era of Global Trade," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36 (2013): 632–50; Gerald Horne, "Race from Power: US Foreign Policy and the General Crisis of 'White Supremacy,'" *Diplomatic History* 23 (Summer 1999): 443–4; Kornel Chang, "Circulating Race and Empire: Transnational Labor Activism and the Politics of Anti-Asian Agitation in the Anglo-American Pacific World, 1880–1910," *The Journal of American History* 96 (December 2009): 685, 696.

18 Koshy, "Morphing Race into Ethnicity," 154, 167–8; William Roseberry, "Hegemony and the Language of Contention," in *Everyday Forms of State Formation: Revolution and the Negotiation of Rule in Modern Mexico*, eds. Gilbert M. Joseph and Daniel Nugent (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994), 360–1.

19 Weitz, "Racial Politics," 2–3.

20 See for instance, Maxim Matusevich, "An Exotic Subversive: Africa, Africans and the Soviet Everyday," *Race and Class* 49 (April 2008): 57–81.

21 Paul A. Kramer, "Is the World Our Campus? International Students and US Global Power in the Long Twentieth Century," Bernath Lecture, *Diplomatic History* 33 (November 2009): 775–806; quotations on 783, 796; Jason C. Parker, "'Made-in-America Revolutions'? The 'Black University' and the American Role in the Decolonization of the Black Atlantic," *The Journal of American History* 96 (December 2009): 593. See also Margaret O'Mara, "The Uses of the Foreign Student," *Social Science History* 36 (Winter 2012): 583–615.

22 Kramer, "Is the World Our Campus?"; Parker, "'Made-in-America Revolutions.'"

23 Kramer, "Is the World Our Campus?," 803.

24 Gerald Horne, "Race from Power"; for an overview of some of this literature, see Jeff Woods, "The Cold War and Civil Rights."

25 Hall, "The Long Civil Rights Movement," 1245; Kevin Gaines, "The Civil Rights Movement in World Perspective," 57–64; Alex Lichtenstein, "Consensus? What Consensus," 51. See also the references cited in note 1 of this essay.

26 Parker, "'Made-in-America Revolutions?'"

27 Ibid.

28 On Baldwin, Roman, and Hurston, see the discussion in note 1 of this essay. See also Allison Blakley, *Russia and the Negro: Blacks in Russian History and Thought* (Washington, DC: Howard University Press, 1986).

Contributors

ADRIENNE EDGAR is associate professor of history at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and author of *Tribal Nation: The Making of Soviet Turkmenistan* (2004). She is completing a book on ethnic and racial mixing in Soviet Central Asia and is coeditor of a forthcoming volume on ethnic intermarriage in Eastern Europe and Eurasia.

AISHA KHAN is associate professor of anthropology at New York University. Her publications include *Callaloo Nation: Metaphors of Race and Religious Identity Among South Asians in Trinidad* (2004), *Empirical Futures: Anthropologists and Historians Engage the Work of Sidney W. Mintz* (2009), *Islam and the Americas* (2015), and *A Rogue's Gallery: The Troubled Inheritance of Race and Religion in the Making of the Modern West Indies* (forthcoming).

ALAINA LEMON is professor of anthropology at the University of Michigan. She is the author of *Between Two Fires: Gypsy Performance and Romani Memory from Pushkin to Post-Socialism* (2000) and *Technologies for Intuition: Cold War Circles and Telepathic Rays* (2017).

SUSANNA SOOJUNG LIM is associate professor of Russian, East European, and Eurasian studies, and of Korean studies at the University of Oregon. She is the author of *China and Japan in the Russian Imagination, 1685–1922: To the Ends of the Orient* (2013). Her current research concerns the literature of the Korean diaspora in the former Soviet Union and Commonwealth of Independent States.

MARINA MOGILNER is associate professor of history at the University of Illinois at Chicago and an affiliated scholar at Tyumen State University, Russia. She is the author of multiple articles and two books: *Mythology of the "Underground Man:" Russian Radical Microcosm in the Early Twentieth Century as an Object of Semiotic Analysis* (Moscow: New Literary Observer, 1999) and *Homo Imperii: A History of Physical Anthropology in Russia* (2013). She is currently working on a book project, *A Race for the Future: The Scientific Visions of Modern Russian Jewishness*, dedicated to Jewish race scientists and intellectuals who, for different reasons and in different contexts, insisted that Jewishness was based on race.

BRIGID O'KEEFFE is associate professor of history at Brooklyn College, CUNY. Her book, *New Soviet Gypsies: Nationality, Performance, and Selfhood in the Early Soviet Union*, examines how, during the first two decades of Bolshevik rule, Soviet nationality policy enabled Roma to fashion themselves as integrated Soviet citizens. She is at work on a second book that examines Esperanto and internationalism in late imperial Russia and the early Soviet Union.

DAVID RAINBOW is instructional assistant professor of history in the Honors College at the University of Houston. He is currently writing a book on the history of Russian and Soviet imperial power in Siberia from the mid-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century.

GUNJA SENGUPTA is professor of history at Brooklyn College and the Graduate Center, City University of New York. She is the author of *From Slavery to Poverty: The Racial Origins of Welfare in New York, 1840–1918* (2009) and *For God and Mammon: Evangelicals and Entrepreneurs, Masters and Slaves in Territorial Kansas* (1996).

VERA TOLZ is Sir William Mather Professor of Russian Studies at the University of Manchester. She is the author of *Russia's Own Orient: The Politics of Identity and Oriental Studies in the Late Imperial and Early Soviet Periods* (2011) and (with Stephen Huchings) *Nation, Ethnicity and Race on Russian Television* (2015).

ANIKA WALKE is associate professor, Department of History; Department of Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (affiliate); and International and Area Studies Program (affiliate), at Washington Univer-

sity in St Louis. She is the author of *Pioneers and Partisans: An Oral History of Nazi Genocide in Belorussia* (2015) and *Jüdische Partisaninnen. Der verschwiegene Widerstand in der Sowjetunion* (2007).

BARBARA WEINSTEIN is Silver Professor of History at New York University and past president of the American Historical Association. Her publications include *The Amazon Rubber Boom, 1850–1920* (1983), *For Social Peace in Brazil: Industrialists and the Remaking of the Working Class in São Paulo* (1996), and *The Color of Modernity: São Paulo and the Making of Race and Nation in Brazil* (2015).

ERIC D. WEITZ is distinguished professor of history at City College of New York. His most recent book is *A World Divided: The Global Struggle for Human Rights in the Age of Nation-States* (2019).

Index

Africa: Atlantic world and, 330; Cold War and, 70, 83, 324–30; Congo, 290, 299; Ethiopia, 284, 292, 304, 306; European colonial empires and, 80, 84, 160, 162–6, 169, 195, 287, 317; representation in film, 63; Ghana, 289–91, 302, 304, 306; Hannibal, 6, 222; Kenya, 289, 291, 329–30; labour, 59, 165; Mali, 293, 298, 302; Nigeria, 289, 328–9; Senegal, 284, 299, 304–6, 325; Sierra Leone, 302, 330; South Africa, 4, 7–8, 78, 244n13, 321; USSR and, 7, 19, 222, 284–306, 324–9; theories of race about, 32, 88–92, 166–8, 315. *See also* university
African Americans: Black Power movement, 87; "double-consciousness," 87–8; Jews compared to, 117; mixed-race relationships, 210–11, 229; "one-drop rule," 211, 222; relationship to class, 62, 95, 313; slavery and, 160, 316–19, 324; USSR and, 6, 19–20, 312–14, 318–19
Alexander III (tsar), 6
Anderson, Benedict, 17, 234, 243
anthropology, physical, 9–10, 104–5; in the nineteenth century, 13, 36, 38–9, 201; in the twentieth century, 7, 9, 42–3, 112, 136; contemporary theory, 24n19, 78, 86; "positivist," 88; European, 112, 195
antisemitism, 7, 43, 108, 117, 119–20, 122–3
Anuchin, Dmitrii, 38, 43, 196
Austin-Broos, Diane, 93
Australia, 162, 195, 270–1, 321, 324
Austro-Hungarian Empire, 124, 161, 171
Azikiwe, Nnamdi, 329
Azuma, Eiichiro, 321

Bensé, Peter, 318–19
biology: academic discipline of, 166–8, 215–6; "biological colonialism," 110–14; challenge to race as, 24n26; concept of nationality and, 30–2, 108; concept of race and, 3, 21, 180, 183, 188, 200;

difference between culture and, 91–4, 212; heredity, 93–6, 108, 166; in imperial Germany, 167; Nazi vs Soviet, 136–7; relationship between culture and, 11, 13, 29–30, 33, 35, 38, 40, 42–3, 48–9, 81, 111, 187, 194, 237; USSR and, 7, 9. *See also* miscegenation
Boas, Franz, 91–2
Bogdanov, Anatolii, 39
Boltin, Ivan, 33
borderlands: discrimination in, 46; European, 121; interimperial competition, 12, 250, 255, 262, 271; internal, 66, 161–2; provinces and exiles, 69, 186; settlement to, 6, 187, 266; theories of race and, 20, 79, 107, 179, 237, 267, 269, 315–20, 331; threat to empire from, 42, 45, 119, 182, 197, 234–5, 250, 275–6, 286, 321
Bourdieu, Pierre, 61, 84, 86
"breed" (*poroda*), race as, 31–3, 39, 44, 166–7, 179, 184, 188, 237
Brubaker, Rogers, 10, 26n41, 320
Buddhism. *See* religion

capitalism, 3, 60, 62; American, 12, 327; Cold War and, 289, 296, 298, 329; colonialism and, 160, 249; labour, 63–4, 165, 287; modernity and, 106, 116
Canada, 321–2
Caribbean, 13, 79–81, 85, 90, 93–5, 160; Afro-Brazilian, 84–5, 235, 241; Afro-Caribbean, 87–8; Cuba, 78
Carnegie Endowment for Peace, 326
Catherine II (tsar), 318
Caucasus (region): Armenia, 216, 221–2, 231–3, 237; Azerbaijan, 219, 221, 300; Chechens, 8; discrimination against, 285–6, 306; Georgia, 43, 75n18, 296; north, 213–14; perceived as inferior, 41, 43, 285; as racially white, 32, 37; racial mixing in, 112; Russian conquest of, 47, 160
Central Asia, 16–17, 47–8, 268; labour, 62; origin of races, 36, 183; post-Soviet, 285; Russian conquest of, 268; USSR and, 208–33, 275
Chicago, 64–6
China, 36, 106, 253–8, 261–4, 321–2; intellectuals' view of Russia, 248; migration from, 250–1, 258, 270; nationalism in, 14; as racial type, 31–2, 62, 251, 253, 270, 272; Sinocentrism, 256; Sino-Japanese War, 253, 255, 260; travel to 19
Christianity, 256, 260, 271, 275, 281n51, 317; American, 118, 259–60, 317, 320, 330; European civilization and, 38, 42, 47, 164–5, 251, 254, 317, 319, 322, 323; Russian Orthodoxy, 6, 270, 273. *See also* religion
civil war: Russian (1918–20), 139, 146, 275; United States (1861–65), 59
class, 64–6, 287, 299, 320, 329, 331; Caribbean, 94; Germany, 166–7; Korea, 262; Russian Empire, 45, 180, 185, 188–9, 193, 199; United States, 12, 70, 83, 313, 318; USSR,

3, 5, 8, 94, 145, 170, 211, 291–2, 303
Cold War, 12, 59–72, 81–3; Africa, 70, 83, 324–30; African Americans, 312–14; anticommunism, 20, 305, 312–14, 328–30; civil rights, 324–9; "containment," 70, 328; cultural diplomacy during, 288–92, 294, 326–7, 330. *See also* communism
communism, 3, 12, 20, 63, 170; vs capitalism, 60, 62; Communist Party, 132, 150, 217–18, 223, 275, 287, 302, 329; global movement, 64, 287, 290, 305; Russian Revolution, 287. *See also* Marxism

da Cunha, Euclides, 236–8
Dal', Vladimir, 32
Darwinism: cultural debates and, 38; environmental determinism, 37; race science and, 46, 167; social, 256–7, 260, 271–3, 320
Davis, Angela, 68
Detroit, 62, 64, 67
Du Bois, W.E.B., 87–8, 126n6
Duma, 6, 104, 109

Engels, Friedrich, 10. *See also* Marxism
Eshevskii, Stepan, 33, 37–9, 46–7
ethnic cleansing, 24n18, 41, 47, 161
ethnicity, 3, 5–9, 11, 29–49, 81, 92, 161, 179, 184, 187–8, 194; Brazil and, 234, 240–1; as ethnographic concept, 34; Official Nationality, 6; transnationality and, 316–20; USSR, 133, 152, 156, 212, 224. See also *narodnost'*
eugenics: Latin America, 18, 236, 239; Soviet rejection of, 212, 216; Western Europe, 166–7, 172
Evers, Medgar, 329
exceptionalism, 4, 8, 11–13, 18–20, 44, 85, 96; Brazilian, 237–9; Caribbean, 80; imperial Russian, 30, 46, 248; Romani, 141, 144; Soviet, 60, 81; United States, 79, 259, 314

Fanon, Frantz, 87–8, 252
Firmin, Anténor, 13, 87–92
Fischer, Eugen, 166
Foner, Eric, 316
France: Asia and, 121, 254–5, 263, 271; Cold War, 68, 291; empire, 160, 162; theories of race, 31–4, 45, 82, 195
Freeden, Michael, 26n38

Galton, Francis, 166–7. *See also* eugenics
genocide, 164–5, 167–8, 172. *See also* ethnic cleansing
Germany: Federal Republic of, 68, 169, 291–2; imperial, 15, 45, 110, 160–72, 253–5; Nazi, 4, 8, 86, 136–7, 150, 166, 168–9, 172
Gobineau, Joseph Arthur de, 13, 87–9
Grant, Madison, 321
Great Britain, 221, 268; in Asia, 254–5, 268, 273; empire, 46–8, 94–5, 124, 160, 162, 221, 265–6, 317; England, 32, 46, 195; nationality, 46; theories of race, 31–2, 166–7, 271, 275

Great Reform era (Tsar Alexander II), 104, 182, 191
Great War. *See* World War I
Grigor'ev, Vasilii. *See* orientology
Gumilev, Lev, 7
Gypsies. *See* Roma

Haiti, 13, 88, 90–1. *See also* Caribbean
Hannibal (Pushkin's great-grandfather), 6, 222
Harlem Renaissance, 60, 229
Hirsch, Francine, 8, 136–7
historians: in the eighteenth century, 33; in the nineteenth century, 33, 37; and ethnicity, 320; Nazi, 168–9; as regionalists, 182, 237–8; rejection of race and study of, 43; Soviet, 7
Holquist, Peter, 41–2
Hudson, Peter, 31
Hughes, Langston, 20, 313
Hurston, Zora Neale, 312–14, 330
hybridity, 103–25, 171; "marginal man," 215. *See also* miscegenation

Iadrintsev, Nikolai, 16, 40, 179–82, 186–201, 235, 237–8
India: colonialism, 48, 95, 195; Indian Americans, 320; USSR and, 295
inorodtsy (indigenous Siberians), 35, 39–40, 47, 123, 179–98, 235
Islam, 212–13, 217–18, 240, 272; anti-Islamic views, 43. *See also* Middle East

Jabotinsky, Vladimir, 14–15, 103–25, 171–2. *See also* Zionism
Japan, 18–19, 247–76, 313, 316; Russo-Japanese War, 19, 248, 250, 254, 255, 267, 271, 274–5, 319, 321, 324; Sino-Japanese War, 253, 255, 260
Jews, 103–25; assimilation, 106–7, 111; European, 37, 42, 109–14; Nazis, 168–9; Pale of Settlement, 7; Russian, 14, 43, 79; Soviet, 60. *See also* Zionism
Jim Crow, 62, 161, 242, 302, 320. *See also* United States
Judt, Ignacy Maurycy, 112–13

Kazakhs, 172, 208–9, 211–14, 216–30
Kennan, George F., 70
Kennedy, John F., 327, 330
Khomiakov, Aleksei. *See* Slavophile
King, Martin Luther, Jr, 60, 330
King-O'Riain, Rebecca Chiyoko, 93
Kliuchevskii, Vasilii, 39
Knight, Nathaniel, 8, 53n31
Koreans, 8, 18–19, 247–83; mixed marriages, 214–15, 227, 316; in Russia/USSR, 62, 83, 208. *See also* Yun Ch'iho
Kostomarov, Nikolai, 38
Krushchev, Nikita, 132–4, 155, 288

La Cuheo, Euclides, 236–8
language, 289; as characteristic of difference, 36, 108, 187, 210, 279n32, 286; race and, 9, 32, 39, 257, 259, 303, 323. *See also* linguists
Latin America, 7, 209, 236, 239, 317, 321, 323, 326; Argentina, 162; Brazil, 4, 17–18, 78, 84–5, 160,

195, 234–43; Mexico, 266, 321; Panama, 302; Peru, 195, 266
Lemon, Alaina, 9, 136–7, 155
linguists: search for origins of Aryans, 36, 53n39; theories of race, 51n21, 104–5. *See also* language
literature: Azerbaijani, 219; colonial, 162; Jewish, 107–8, 119–22, 124–5; race and, 167; Romani, 141, 144–5; Russian, 119, 122, 223–4
Lovetskii, Aleksei, 33–34

Mahan, Alfred Thayer, 321
Maharero, Samuel, 163
Maksimovich, Mikhail (Mykhaylo Maksymovych), 38
Mannheim, Karl, 10
Marshall, Thurgood, 329
Marx, 10. *See also* Marxism
Marxism, 5, 10, 122; cultural diplomacy and, 285, 288; nationality and, 44, 171. *See also* communism
McCarthy, Joseph, 70, 327
Middle East, 7, 124, 302; and European empires, 160; Iraq, 302; Palestine, 115, 121, 124, 171; Syria, 291
Miliukov, Pavel, 43
miscegenation: Brazil, 235, 239–42; Central Asia, 240, 242; in European colonial discourses, 38, 48; India, 215, 221; Russian views of, 14, 16–18, 35, 38–9, 105, 112, 166; in Siberia, 39–41, 45–7, 184, 187, 192, 195, 197, 235, 238. *See also* hybridity
Nadezhdin, Nikolai, 34–6, 40, 92
narod. See *narodnost'*
narodnost', 3, 5–6, 29–49, 138, 152, 184; as ethnographic concept, 34; *narod*, 5, 32, 35, 37–8, 43, 222; Official Nationality, 6. *See also* ethnicity
nationalism, 3, 6, 14, 250; in Africa, 329–30; German, 161–2; Korean, 256–8, 272; Polish and Ukrainian, 186; Russian, 198, 200, 249; Soviet, 226; United States, 312–15, 325. *See also* Zionism
nationality (*natsional'nost'*), 3, 5, 9, 16; concept of, 29–30, 33, 37, 40–1, 43; vs empire, 14; as imagined community, 234–43; and internationalism, 286–7, 304, 331; nationhood, 11, 29, 247, 260; religion and 257, 263; self-determination, 14, 200, 239, 288; in Siberia, 79, 81, 184, 189, 196–7, 199–200
Nationality Question, 14, 30; Soviet policies, 64, 133–56, 170–1, 209–30, 325
Native Americans, 235, 237, 241, 259, 273, 317, 320
Nazism. *See* Germany
Ngai, Mae M., 316
Nicholas I (tsar), 6
Nicholas II (tsar): coronation of, 263; Duma and, 6, 14, 105; Korea and, 259, 280n37; nationalism under, 14
Nina Rodrigues, Raymundo, 235

Orientalism, 72n1, 83, 85, 121, 264
orientology, 36–7, 43, 47
Ottoman Empire, 59–60, 109, 124

Pale of Jewish Settlement, 62, 69, 116, 124
Pan-Asianism, 18, 248, 250–4, 256, 269, 271–4, 316, 319–24
Pan-Mongolism, 249–51, 275, 312, 316, 319–22
passport: designation of nationality in USSR, 209, 212, 214, 217, 221, 223, 226, 228–30; for travel abroad, 289
Pearson, Karl, 167
Pestel', Pavel, 41
Peter the Great, 6
phenotype, 18, 20, 87; advertising and, 169; Asian Americans, 322–4; in Brazil, 84, 242, 257; classifications of colour, 89–90; in Haiti, 90–1; imperial Russia, 32, 34–5, 37; Soviet/post-Soviet Russia, 220–1, 284–6, 302–4, 313; in United States, 65, 71, 95, 117–18, 258, 317–20. *See also* miscegenation; White Peril; Yellow Peril
Ploetz, Alfred, 167–8. *See also* eugenics
Pogodin, Aleksander, 43
Poland, 124, 161, 186, 263
Popov, Ivan, 198–200
Potanin, Grigorii, 182, 186, 198–200
poverty, 71, 94–6, 138, 143, 238–9, 314–15. *See also* class
psychologists: and ethnography, 35; "laws" of, 38; and literature, 121–2; and race, 111, 166, 168; and racial mixing, 215–17; Ivan Sikorsky, 171; *Völkerpsychologie*, 36, 53n40
Pushkin, Alexander, 6, 37, 147–8, 222, 250
race: as immutable characteristic, 7–8, 15, 19, 30, 33, 35, 50n7, 133, 184, 222, 318; as malleable characteristic, 14–16, 35, 91–2, 107, 136, 155, 170, 172, 181, 185, 189, 267; law and, 3–4, 9, 44, 60, 267; nationality vs race, 3, 14, 17–19, 29–49, 92, 138, 154–6, 167, 184, 187, 211–12, 222, 250, 314, 320, 323; Nazi, 169; transnational theories of, 48–9, 59–61. *See also* ethnicity
railroads: Siberian, 181, 196, 198–9, 206n91, 266, 322; German, 163; Korean, 263; United States, 117, 321
regionalism, 16–18, 40, 87; in Brazil, 234–5, 237–9; in Central Asia, 211; in East Asia, 251–2, 322; in Siberia, 179–201. *See also* Pan-Asianism
religion, 315; Buddhism, 254, 270, 324; conversion, 115, 121, 124, 164–5, 257–9, 319, 323; Hinduism, 114; Judaism, 108, 114, 128n17; nationalism and, 114; in Nazi Germany, 172; in Russia, 6, 8, 13, 115, 171, 211, 250, 275, 322, 324; in USSR, 211, 229. *See also* Christianity; Islam
Renan, Ernest, 51n21
research institutions: British, 166; Chinese, 326; German, 166, 169; Soviet, 303, 310n60; United States, 327. *See also* university
Reynaud-Paligot, Carole, 31
Rockefeller Memorial and Foundation, 326
Rohrbach, Paul, 162–5

Roma, 12, 14–15, 60–1, 65, 69, 83, 88, 132–56, 169–70
Roosevelt, Theodore, 167, 274–5, 314, 321
Rumbaut, Ruben G., 320
Russian Orthodoxy. *See* Christianity
Russian Revolution (1905–07), 6, 109, 198
Russian Revolution (1917), 5, 49, 68, 139, 287
russkie (ethnic Russians), 14, 16, 187, 221; vs *rossiiskie* (civic Russians), 14, 180, 202n6

Shchapov, Afanasii, 45n90, 182–7, 189, 193, 200, 236
Siberia, 16–17, 39–40, 179–201, 234–8; foreign intervention in, 275; indigenous population, 40, 83, 172; Russian Far East, 247–51, 255–70, 275–6; settlement to, 39; Vladivostok, 247, 262, 264, 266, 269, 271. *See also* railroads
Sikorsky, Ivan, 42, 115–17, 119–20, 171
slavery: Atlantic, 47, 59, 79, 84, 304, 306, 316–19, 324; Brazil, 84, 237, 242; East Asian views of, 270, 272; Japan, 275; Jews and, 116; Ottoman, 59–60; Russian views of, 20, 32, 47; United States, 70, 83, 160–1, 222
Slavophile, 37, 192
Slezkine, Yuri, 9–10
Snesarev, Andrei, 47–8
sociology: and empire, 126n6; "laws" of, 38; Daniel Moynihan, 94–5; nationality as category of, 43, 114; in Nazi Germany, 168; and race, 168, 215, 231n21; Soviet use of, 8
Solov'ev, Nikolai, 36
Solov'ev (Solovyov), Vladimir, 249–51, 275, 316, 318–19, 322
Solzhenitsyn, Alexander, 68–9, 71
Sonderweg thesis, 8, 44. *See also* exceptionalism
Sputnik, 74n14, 327
Stalin, Joseph, 5; architecture, 65; deportation/repression, 7–8, 216, 219, 275–6; direct appeals to, 150–2; industrialization under, 145; on the "nationality question," 5, 44, 134, 136, 211–12; United States and, 313–14
Star Trek, 63
Stoddard, Lothrop, 321
Stoler, Ann Laura, 11, 31, 126n6

Tajiks, 208–9, 212–3, 223–8
Thompson, Louise, 313
transnational: approach to history of race, 13, 81, 96, 315–17; discourses of race, 19–20, 31, 48, 59–61, 63, 82–93, 96, 247, 250–1, 266, 271, 275, 312, 319–24; movement of people, 248; proletarian internationalism, 287–9
Trotha, Lieutenant General Lothar von, 163–4, 174n10
Trouillot, Michel-Rolph, 77, 84, 96

Ukraine, 208, 302; foreign students in, 300, 302; intellectuals, 38, 43, 119, 186; intermarriage, 213–15, 223–5, 229; Kievan Rus, 39; lan-

guage, 199–200; university in, 114–15
United States, 4, 7–8, 60–72, 312–31; capitalism in, 12; colonial, 195; on the Pacific, 19, 248, 252, 255, 274–5; race, 6, 12, 17, 20, 78–85, 117–18, 123, 136, 210–11, 215, 227, 229, 241, 258, 260, 264; travel/immigration to, 249, 251, 256–7, 259–61, 263, 265–7, 269–72, 304. *See also* Cold War; exceptionalism; Jim Crow; slavery
university: Berlin, 166; in Brazil, 242; Communist University of the Toilers of the East, 287–8; Donetsk State U, 293; Ethiopian, 292; of the Friendship of Peoples, "Patrice Lumumba," 19, 288, 290–3, 298–302, 304, 306, 311n73; historically black universities (US), 329–30; in Hungary, 292; Kazan University, 183; Leningrad State University, 296, 302; Moscow University, 33, 196, 217; in Russia, 53n39, 201; St Vladimir University (Kiev), 114–15; in Siberia, 185, 189, 196; Soviet, 286, 288–9, 327, 330; students, 19, 37, 62, 68, 84, 121, 182, 284–311; in the United States, 84, 86, 257, 326–7, 329–30
Uvarov, Sergei, 6
Uzbeks, 209, 225–6

Veniukov, Mikhail, 47, 187
Virchow, Rudolf, 45
Voltaire, 33, 52n24

Wacquant, Loic, 84, 86
Weber, Max, 161
Weiner, Amir, 136–7
Weitz, Eric D., 7, 8, 15, 135–7
White Peril, 248, 250–1, 253–4, 271–3, 324
white supremacists, 61, 325, 328
Winant, Howard, 18, 306, 331
Witbooi, Hendrick, 163
Woodson, Carter, 329
World War I, 14, 162, 206n91
World War II, 68, 75n19, 78, 86, 149–50, 326

Yellow Peril, 249–54, 258, 260, 267, 275, 316, 321–2, 324
Yun Ch'iho, 18–19, 247–76, 316, 319–20, 322–4

Zionism, 14, 103, 106–8, 111–14, 171. *See also* Jews