

## SUMMARIES

### A SOCIAL ADAPTATION AND IDENTITY OF RUSSIAN ETHNIC GROUP IN LITHUANIA (1918–1940)

ANDRIUS MARCINKEVIČIUS

To date, Lithuanian historians have mostly focused on the activities of single segments of Russian minority or Russian public figures. Yet, analyzing one segment fails to reveal the overall Russian social adaptation in the interwar Lithuania. Furthermore, the interaction between different segments of Russian minority should be included in analysis. Did this interaction contribute to higher consolidation of Russians? Or perhaps, social differences posed significant obstacles to aspirations of increased unity? This article attempts to avoid ethnocentric interpretations of Russian social situation in Lithuania by taking into account not only the social attitudes of ethnic majority, but also of Russian minority. Such analysis of events and processes enables a better understanding of how visions of state's social development are generated by revealing that ethnic minorities, as well as the ethnic majority, have particular aspirations and draw on particular measures to achieve them. The novelty of this article is that Russians are not treated as a homogenous community. Differences in legal and social status, education, political views, and motivation for social adaptation are taken into account. One of the important motives of the article is to demonstrate that images of ethnic minorities in the contemporary Lithuanian society are not always factual. Historical experiences of ethnic majority and ethnic minorities are often used to construct various ideological stereotypes. Critical rethinking of such stereotypes has taken precedence. In order to achieve this goal, this article discusses demographic issues, education in Russian language, Russian labour and economic activities, activities of Russian public organizations, and issues of Russian social adaptation.

Russians consisted of three migration flows that caused various social and cultural differences among them. There were descendents of Old Believers, who had lived in the territory of Lithuania since the end of 17<sup>th</sup> Century. Migration of Russians to Lithuania continued during the Russian Empire rule in 19–20<sup>th</sup> Century. A part of them had never returned to Russia, preferring to stay with their descendents in Lithuania. Lithuania also hosted refugees, who emigrated from Russia after the October Revolution in 1917. In total, more than 50 thousand Russians lived in Lithuania according 1923 census data. By religion, they consisted of Old Believers and Orthodox. Mutual relations of these religious communities were complicated due to historical reasons until 1940 and later. The Russian ethnic group could be described as one of poorly educated farmers and of exceptionally gifted intelligentsia that had prestigious jobs in the military, in the State Theatre, or at Vytautas

Magnus University. Situation of Russians in the labour market was exceptional, since it illustrated how an ethnic minority group that was once the titular ethnic group adapted to radical political changes. The integration of Russians into the Lithuanian labour market was dependent on their level of education and ability to apply their skills. Individuals who were able to change their qualification had greater chances in the labour market. Some Russians who lacked professional skills or were not able to compete with members of other ethnic groups were disappointed about the prospects of improving their own social status and considered the possibility of emigration to other countries. Possibilities for the integration of ethnic minorities into the Lithuanian labour market to a large extent depended on the interests of the ethnic majority. The ability to understand and adapt to the requirements of the ethnic majority, as well as knowledge of the Lithuanian language, eased the integration of ethnic minorities into the labour market. The development of the network of Russian public organisations reflects the collective action of this ethnic group. The results of these activities can be evaluated in two ways. First, they demonstrate that Russians successfully cooperated for achievement of common goals. On the other hand, the potential of this network and of interaction with other ethnic groups remained largely unrealised. The establishment of cultural, educational, charitable, religious or economic organisations helped cater to narrow ethnocultural needs and solved some social problems.

It has been concluded that Russian social adaptation cannot be simply evaluated as successful or failed integration. The history of the Russians in interwar Lithuania illustrates the fact that social adaptation is a dynamic process, and its outcomes tend to fluctuate. Political, economic, social, and cultural changes in the state of Lithuania influenced the relationship between the ethnic majority and ethnic minorities. The strengthening of the Lithuanian ethnic group led to changes in the possibilities of ethnic minorities to express their identity and to achieve desired legal and social status. Developments in these three dimensions (legal status, social status, and ethnic identity) to a large extent determined the type of social adaptation of the community: integration, assimilation, marginalisation or separatism. It must be noted, however, that individual social adaptation depended on personal priorities, religion, social and legal status, etc. Current evaluations of historical Russian social adaptation do not take into account individual variability and therefore are not able to provide a complete picture of the process. The social adaptation of Russians in Lithuania was a multifaceted process. Successful adaptation to a large extent depended on the individual efforts of Russians and interpretation of those efforts by Lithuanian society. Integration in society is hardly possible without positive identification. The image of Russians in Lithuanian society was largely shaped by the activities of professionals from the Russian imperial period (state officials, colonists, priests, etc.). An invisible obstacle to integration was the negative identification of Russians with conquerors and colonists, despite their efforts to demonstrate loyalty to the state of Lithuania. The permanent need to deny association with the former regime and to demonstrate loyalty to the state was a sign of the problematic aspect of Russian integration in Lithuanian society. Russians rarely voiced discontent with their civic status, but this should not lead to the conclusion that Russian integration in Lithuanian society was successful. As this article demonstrates, social adaptation is a complex and dynamic process that rarely brings unequivocal results.

## ANCIENT LITHUANIA IN RUSSIAN LITERATURE AT THE INTERWAR PERIOD

PAVEL LAVRINEC

Literary works of Lithuanian topic create options of historical continuity, historical and national identity, relationship of Russians with Lithuania and its history. The image of ancient Lithuania and Lithuanians in Russian literature conformed to certain rules and was designed using limited set of components. It was used in works of art at the beginning of the XX century and included the realities of pagan culture, exotic way of life, simplicity and directness of feelings, closeness to nature, rejection of the Catholic faith, hostility to the Germans and the Poles.

The new socio-historical and political context of forming of the Lithuanian state foregrounded subjects of the medieval Lithuanian history, romanticized images of statesmen and military leaders of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, exoticism of the pagan culture. Poets and writers living in the Baltic countries or related to Lithuania by real or mystified biography and practical interests naturally turned to the Lithuanian topic. Construction of image of ancient Lithuania and Lithuanian characters in the books of poems *Lietuva golden name* (1927) by Eugeny Shklyar (1893–1941) and *Northern Lights. Poems about Lithuania and Russia* (1931) by Konstantin Balmont (1867–1942), in novels *The Genius of the Peace* (1931) by L. Kormchiy (born Piragis; 1876–1944) and *Eagle taking off* (1932) by Sergei Mintslov (1870–1933), is also symptomatic.

In poetry of Shklyar and Balmont modern Lithuania is portrayed as an inheritor and successor of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Its picture combines exotic, historical depth, folk singing poetry and paganism as the signs of Lithuanian cultural traditions, image of forest growing into symbol, state power associated with paganism and power embodying princes, simplicity, hospitality, chastity of Lithuanians.

In the novel *The Genius of the Peace* by Kormchiy a common set of Lithuanian exotic components is used - unusual names, details of everyday life and social structure, in which the huge role is played by druids with clearly defined functions. The defining feature of Lithuanian life is paganism with many gods, unusual beliefs and rituals. Lithuanians are depicted as naive, trustful, simple-minded people, yet brave patriots who heroically defend their homeland and faith against cruel and selfish Germans.

The novel *Eagle taking off* by Sergei Mintslov was written for the competition for the best novel, story or poem about Duke Vytautas the Great. Landscapes and descriptions of the characters trips create an image of an area rich in forests, animals, in which an internecine struggle between Jogaila and Vytautas and “the struggle of the gods of different faiths” take place. Mintslov used a repetitive set of components of Lithuanian exoticism (unusual names, paganism, details of everyday life). The opposition of Vytautas and Jogaila, Lithuanians and Poles, the notions of proximity and affinity of Lithuanians and Russians are traditional.

Image of ancient Lithuania in the works of Russian writers have formed a positive attitude towards the country, its past and its people. In Lithuania, the romantic myth of the “glorious antiquity” with idealized images of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was the basis of an ideology that unites a nation which acquired statehood. The image of the ancient Lithuanians in the works of Russian writers followed this myth. This is evidenced by translations into Lithuanian.

RUSSIANS IN LITHUANIA IN JULY OF 1944 TO 1953:  
RUSSIAN MIGRATIONS AND MEMORY  
OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA

GRIGORIJUS POTAŠENKO

This paper aims to empirically investigate the different Russian outward migrations in July of 1944 to 1953 in the soviet Lithuania and their influence on Russian quantitative changes. Russian outward migrations has been analyzed on the ground of major modern theories of international migration. However, examining the specific political system in the past – the totalitarian regime of the USSR in the post-war Lithuania – these migration theories require some adaptation.

The investigation revealed that in 1944–1953 dominated two large migrations of Russians in Lithuania: the mass repatriation to the east and the massive immigration to Lithuania from other Soviet republics and regions. At the same time took place also the four smaller Russian migrations and population displacements.

In addition, this paper examines and shows the different groups of Russian post-war Lithuania memory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, applying the theory of cultural memory. Russians in the post-war Lithuania who came from other regions of the USSR could have not had an authentic memory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and in that reason they more easily obeyed to the Soviet russocentric interpretation of history and the Soviet' memory culture.

Therefore, the Soviet politics of memory and the major quantitative change in the Russian community encouraged fragmentation, marginalization, and oblivion the image of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania among the majority of Russians (particularly immigrants) in the post-war Lithuania.

At the same time communicative and cultural memory of the native-born Russians in the post-war Lithuania kept in their own way fragmented, tolerant and far more favorable to the Russians, in particular, the Old Believers, the image of late Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

## CONSTRUCTING IDENTITY OF RUSSIANS IN SOVIET LITHUANIA: POLICY, POPULATION CENSUSES, AND HISTORICAL MEMORY

ANDRIUS MARCINKEVIČIUS

This article analyses the aspects of identity of the Russian ethnic group in Lithuania during the first and second Soviet occupation (1940–1941/1944–1990). Obviously, Russians more often than any other ethnic group are identified by Lithuanian academic discourse and Lithuanian society (especially elder people) with controversial political events of the Soviet period. Massive repressions and deportations of population, as well as armed resistance, forced collectivization, and industrialization of Lithuania, immigration of Russians to Lithuania from the other regions of the Soviet Union after the II World War should be mentioned primarily. Because of the consequences of all stated processes, the image of Russians in Lithuania during the period of the Soviet occupation was negative. It usually included the worst selected patterns of their individual characteristics or collective activity (for example, violence against other-minded people, a lack of good skills and education, irresponsibility, drunkenness and etc.).

Similar images of Russians still exist in contemporary Lithuanian public and media discourse. Incomparably, less attention is paid not only in this, but also, academic discourse, to the research of social development of Russian ethnic group in Lithuania during the Soviet period. It is also necessary to add that images of Russians as a socialistic nation or “elder brother” by Communist authority of the Soviet Union in 1930s were constructed for political and ideological reasons. Political attitudes of Joseph Stalin were most decisive in building the so called socialistic nations and their hierarchy. Moreover, the population censuses in the Soviet Union that took place in 1926, 1939, 1959, 1970, 1979, and 1989 were important sources of the nations’ identity building. Soviet political authorities developed in a large scale ethnic composition statistical data reflecting their interests.

It is concluded in this article that the identity of Russians in Soviet Lithuania should be considered in a wider historical and social research context than it is now. Clearly, this ethnic group consisted of Russian immigrants who came to Lithuania from the other regions of the Soviet Union and who are usually identified by Lithuanians as communists, officers, industry specialists, workers, and so forth. Undeniably, there were different subgroups, also. So-called Old Russians and their descendents after the II World War in Lithuania possibly constituted not less than 1/3 of all Russians until the 1959 census. In this subgroup were supporters of the Soviet regime (especially peasants in rural areas), who congratulated the invasion of the Red Army in 1940. Otherwise, it is also important to acknowledge that there was also anti-Soviet intelligentsia in this subgroup that shared the fate of many Lithuanians who were repressed or deported by the regime in 1940s or emigrated from Lithuania to Western Europe and the United States in order to escape arrests. The loss of most prominent persons (officers, scientists, lawyers, ballet artists, priests, etc.) made prolific damage to the identity and intellectual potential of this Russian ethnic group. Those, who had stayed and lived in Lithuania during the Soviet period, could be described as an “invisible” part of Russian society. The Soviet regime did not trust most of them despite their Russian origin and tried to isolate them from public activity by, for example, thwarting occupational opportunities.

Politics toward collectivization, industrialization and urbanization that took place in Lithuania after the Second World War made a big influence in the disintegration of Old Russians, which moved them from their historical places of living to urban areas. Before moving to towns, most of them worked in agriculture and lived in the countryside. As a result, old religious communities of Russian

Orthodox and Old Believers lost most of their members. Old Russians (especially the descendents) could not escape contacts with Russian immigrants from other regions of the Soviet Union and the influence of the Soviet ideology. At the same time, they maintained a different historical memory, which was hidden until the 1990s for their safety and their children's.

Russian and Russian-speaking immigrants of other nationalities (mostly Byelorussians and Ukrainians), who came to Lithuania after the II World War from other regions of the Soviet Union, did not constitute a homogenous population group. On the contrary, they differed by such markers as their arrival time to Lithuania, social status, education level, professional and language skills, and etc. Many were members of the Communist Party, officers and soldiers of the Soviet Army, representatives of NKVD/KGB, who were going to build communism and a "bright future" for the Lithuanian nation. Many local collaborators, who were not Russians, also joined these structures and supported the political regime. The presence of these groups in Lithuania during all of the Soviet period made a huge impact on the formation of a negative image of Russians.

As a result of industrialization in Lithuania, many specialists as well as unskilled labor force intensely migrated until 1990. Most of them resided in Lithuania's largest cities, but Sniečkus (now Visaginas) city and atomic station in Eastern Lithuania represents a specific example of Russian colonization. In the 1970s, Russians made up 2/3 of its population. In addition, many people reached the territory of Lithuania just after the II World War not for building communism, but in hopes of escaping famine, which was wide spread in other regions of the Soviet Union. Also, there was a group, primarily of Old Believers, that resettled in Lithuania in 1941 from the occupied Nazi German territories of Poland. A sector of Russian intelligentsia of highly-qualified specialists, who had good relations with Lithuanian intellectuals, lived in small-scale; therefore, they did not influence the collective image of Russians.

In general, Russians constituted a well integrated group in the social sense. Many of them were delighted with their jobs and material wealth, and Lithuania because of its high standards of living was evaluated among them as "West Europe" inside the Soviet Union. Yet at the same time, they were not keen on learning local language and culture.

## THE CONSTRUCTION OF HISTORICAL IDENTITY IN THE SOVIET RUSSIAN LITERATURE OF LITHUANIA

PAVEL LAVRINEC

The study analyzes the construction of historical identity through thematic implementation, specific selection of historical events reflected in the texts, mentioned or depicted historical figures in prose, dramatic, poetic works in Russian, created by writers who were living at the time or lived in Lithuania earlier since the mid-1950s to the late 1990s. The analysis showed that the works that were published before the mid-1980s, reflect the Soviet model of history of Lithuania, in which periods of Sovietization are highlighted (the so-called socialist revolution of 1940s, marked by rallies and bitter struggle against internal enemies - the kulaks and priests) and World War II (the Great Patriotic War as a struggle of Lithuanians with Russians and other peoples of the USSR together against external enemies – the German fascists). Examples include stories and novels by Igor Kashnitskiy, Leonid Vaisberg. Only documentary essays reveal an appeal to the inter-war period of the Republic of Lithuania. This dark “bourgeois period” is used as a contrast to the bright socialist present. In the poems, stories, novels by Vladimir Ustinov, Yury Kobrin, Georgy Metelsky real figures of the past are featured – heroes of the national liberation struggle of the XIX century (Konstanty Kalinowski, Zigmas Serakauskas), the carriers of progressive social and artistic ideas (Adam Mickiewicz, Philomaths, Joachim Lelewel, Taras Shevchenko). They are the forerunners, like-minded allies and leaders of the communist movement of the early XX century (Felix Dzerzhinsky, Yakov Smushkevich, Juozas Vareikis in poems by Vladimir Ustinov, in play by Gregory Kanovich and Oleg Khaneev, story by Pavel Gelbak), which in turn are an example for their contemporaries. The present serves as the natural result and in some ways as the final of the class and national struggles.

A special kind of historical identity design is formed by two types of narratives. The first, presented by numerous works in prose and poems, consists of those that are devoted entirely to the events of the past (the collectivization in the Soviet Union, the Great Patriotic War) or include episodes of the past, but the action takes place outside of Lithuania. These are the stories and novels of the largest Russian writer from Lithuania – Konstantin Vorobyov, as well as works by Georgy Metelsky, Vladimir Konovalov and others. Historical and biographical novels and stories by Metelsky about the Soviet party and state leader Pyotr Smidovich (1976), Russian musical figure of the XIX century Alexandr Rubets (1983), Russian member of the revolutionary movement Ivan Fioltov (1984), Russian millionaire industrialist Sergei Maltsov (1995), Russian poet Fyodor Tyutchev (1995), Russian poet Alexey Tolstoy (1995) are not connected to Lithuania. Another type is formed by stories and novels by Grigory Kanovich, which composed a kind of historical saga of Lithuanian Jews, beginning with the first story (1959). Novels by Kanovich construct historical identity of Lithuanian Jews, covering the period from the end of the XIX century to the postwar years.

Since the second half of the 1980s, images of the past and its heroes are starting to change. An example of a departure from previous ideological schemes of relations with the past is the story of Yuri Grigoryev “Cinderella After the Ball” (1987), in which usual for Russian Soviet prose retrospection from the modern era to the past refers to a non-trivial for the works of Russian writers Lithuania era of the First World War, and then to the XIX century and is complicated by the appearance of the ghost of King Zygmunt August. Topics of Lithuanian history and legendary stories appear in poems by Vitaly Asovsky. In the stories and novels by Vasily Baranovsky, which are associated with the dramatic history of the Russian Old Believers, confessional accented version of Russian historical identity takes place. Documentary novels by Grigory Ozerov about the princes Dovmont (Daumantas) and Olgierd (Algirdas) indicate an attempt to combine the Russian national cultural historical identity with the Lithuanian historical identity, to give Russian historical consciousness Lithuanian color (or vice versa).

THE RETURN OF RUSSIAN CULTURE  
OF LITHUANIA FROM OBLIVION

PAVEL LAVRINEC

During the Soviet period Russian culture figures and Russian culture, the press, public and literary associations in Lithuania in the XIX century and during interwar period were ignored and due to ideological taboos could not become the object of scientific research. Exceptions were made for individual members, institutions or events that were of interest as a local version of the all-Russian phenomenon or because they had a positive impact on the development of the Lithuanian culture: the language and folklore of the Old Believers, Ivan Trutnev and Vilnius drawing school, Vilnius theatre in the XIX century, Vilnius University professor Ivan Loboyko, philosopher and historian Lev Karsavin. The radical change in the social status of the Russian population in Lithuania, the changes in the socio-political life of the country, in the hierarchy of cultural values and in the paradigm of humanitarian studies led to the returning of Russian culture in Lithuania from oblivion.

The socio-political atmosphere of the late 1980s actualized the issue of national, cultural and state self-identity, the historical continuity of the Russian minority in Lithuania and the Baltic countries. Lithuanian public and political discourse of the Renaissance was based on several myths: the myth of the Lithuanian society as extremely tolerant towards ethnic minorities (this myth could have been illustrated by Old Believers, and such figures as Lev Karsavin, Mstislav Dobuzhinskiy and others who have found refuge from persecution in Lithuania), the myth about interwar Republic of Lithuania as the apogee of Lithuanian state and Lithuanian nation development, the myth of Russians as a foreign segment of society to Lithuania.

Finding the most appropriate and psychologically comfortable options for self-identity of Russians was supported and promoted by the first of these myths, especially since it had a prospect of implementing the new historical conditions. At the same time the third myth was strongly refuted, an opinion on the nature of imported Russian culture in Lithuania was denied, long-standing presence of Russians in the country and a significant contribution to the development of its culture were supported. Construction of ideas about Russians as a national segment of the Lithuanian society began, starting with Ruthenians of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Russian wives of Lithuanian princes and distribution of Orthodoxy, and the succession of Russian society and Russian culture. Imagined community of Lithuanian Russians or Russians in Lithuania include modern Russian minority, Kaunas ballet dancers and scientists of the first half of the XX century, artists and officials-litterateurs of the XIX century, the Old Believers of the XVIII century. "Battle for autochthony" was conducted mainly in the press, radio and television programs, accompanied by a variety of exhibitions, conferences and other events to promote and memorialize individual figures.

Old Believers tradition enjoyed increased attention, because it was not enforced by the authorities, evidenced the presence of Russian culture in Lithuania for a long time, and its existence forms brought extra touch of authenticity. Compilative publications about the Orthodox churches, caused by changes of the church position in society, also contributed to the discourse of continuity. The study and promotion of Russian culture and its figures during the interwar period were particularly important, as the independent Republic of Lithuania in 1918–1940 was a reference point for reviving Lithuanian state, served as proof of the possibility of the existence of Russian population and the development of Russian culture in terms of the independence of Lithuania, was a model of relations between minority and society, minority and state in the new situation.

At the same time, studies of Russians abroad were developed in the mid-1980s, in which the history of Russian culture in Lithuania was considered as a part of Russians in foreign countries, usually in the context of the Baltic countries. Meanwhile, in the academic research of Lithuanian scientists, history of Russian culture as a segment of the cultural history of Lithuania got free from methodological enforcement and ideological limitations. By the mid-1990s, the first period of the returning of Russian culture from oblivion and the construction of cultural and historical continuity was over. The signs of it are the socio-political and academic legitimacy of individual figures of Russian culture in Lithuania and Russian culture in Lithuania in general, and the memorialization of most prominent figures of Russian culture in Lithuania. It has resulted in the establishment of memorial tables, naming several schools after Russian culture figures and formation of school museums, gradual shifting of Russian cultural history and historical continuity from the mass media to the area of academic research.

## CONSTRUCTION OF THE COLLECTIVE MEMORY AND IDENTITY OF THE RUSSIANS IN THE LITHUANIAN PRESS IN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

MONIKA FRĖJUTĖ-RAKAUSKIENĖ

The article presents the construction of the collective memory and identity of the Russian ethnic group in the mass media (press) revealed in the frame of the qualitative press in Russian language research.

Three newspapers („Советская Литва“, „Эхо Литвы“ and „Литовский курьер“) of the years that were supposedly crucial for Lithuanian state development (1990, 2004 and 2010) were studied. An overview was done of the issue numbers published in January, May and September, except 1990, when issue of March was studied.

History (historical period, events, personalities, culture events, personalities and aspects of religion) is identified as the main sign of the group identity. Interpretations on these issues are being investigated in the public discourse (press).

The theoretical perspective of the article is based on the approach that the concept of ‘history’ or history in general is influenced by the different collective memories (Halas 2008) because of growing role of the mass media and disappearing the difference between popular collective memory and legitimated historical memory. In order to reveal who constructs the collective memory and identity of the Russian group, the analysis of the sources of the articles and the predominant context of the articles’ content (local, national, Russian, European) was done.

The results of the research reveal that mass media generally and specifically studied Lithuanian press in Russian language are seen as the field of the symbolical battles or conflict of historical, collective memory and the representation of the past. The most important elements in constructing the collective memory of Russians in the press in Russian language are the Second World War (WWII) and the interpretations of this War termination. The WWII and victory of Russians in that war – is the main conflict and historical event that is represented in the discourse of the articles, which unity of interpretations of War termination (the presentation of description of the event, accents, arguments) helps to construct the identity of Russians or Russian speaking group by dividing „self“ and „other“ group.

Regarding the analysed content of the press in Russian language about the historical, cultural events, personalities and the aspects of religion, it could be stated that a dual identity of Lithuanian Russians is constructing. From the one side – national identity (with Lithuania) and local (with the place where mostly the representatives of Russian ethnic minority (Vilnius, Klaipėda) live, and from the other side – with their historical motherland (Russia). It should be, also mentioned that priorities in constructing these identities are changing depending on the year, when in particular period some of them become dominant and some are pushed away to the second stage.

In the 1990 it is dominated a different historical thematic, related with different historical periods, meanwhile the content of the articles directs to local, national identity related with Lithuania constructed in Lithuanian press in Russian language. This statement could be confirmed by the using informational sources in the published articles which are prepared by the local journalists. From 2004 it is started to dominate topics related with the WWII and termination of this War and the content of the articles convey very ‘clear’ position regarding the war course, events and its termination interpretations. The discourse of that articles contents could be grouped into the scheme: those to whom the termination and commemoration of WWII is important vs. those to whom the termination and commemoration of WWII it is not important.

In the 2004 and 2010 the articles, reprinted from Russian press, about the Russian popular culture, their representatives (singers, actors, who were popular also in the Soviet period), less about the Russian classical culture and their representatives, predominate the articles presenting Lithuanian popular or classical culture (events, personalities). Similar tendencies are seen when describing the political topics (aspects) in the press in Russian language. In 1990 there is noticeable the lack of 'clear' position of the editor reporting about the events, related with the declaration of Lithuanian independence. Whereas in 2004 the editor position regarding some questions (especially about the Lithuanian integration into the EU and membership in NATO) mostly captured from the position predominating in the Russian press, as more and more articles are reprinted from Russian newspapers („Известия“, „Независимая газета“, „Московский Комсомолец“ and other). Predominating topics are more connected with Lithuanian and Russian interstate relations regarding political questions, especially Lithuanian foreign policy. The informational sources of these articles become the view of Russian policy analysts, experts and journalists. Thus the content of the articles of the press in the Russian language shows the construction of identity with the Russian Federation. Regarding the content of the articles about religion, during all investigated years the press in Russian language is paying attention to the Orthodox religion and these articles are oriented towards the Orthodox confessors and community in Lithuania. It is essential to remark that the orientation to the Russian or Russian speaking auditorium in the press in Russian language is the most visible by describing the activities (mostly cultural) of Russian non-governmental organizations. The most actual question for Russian minority reflected in the press in Russian language – the education of ethnic minorities.

## REPRESENTATION OF THE RUSSIAN ETHNIC GROUP IN LITHUANIAN PRESS. NON-HEALING WOUNDS OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR

MONIKA FRĖJUTĖ-RAKAUSKIENĖ

The analysis of the data of the Lithuanian Press (April 2011-April 2011) on the Russian ethnic group qualitative research is presented in this article. Research data analysis revealed the predominate discourse (topics) in the press, printed in Lithuanian language, related to Russian ethnic group. The potential threats (economic, cultural and social) are named in this article, following the scheme of the thematic and cognitive organization of ethnic prejudice (van Dijk 1987; 61).

The commemoration of Second World War (WWII) termination, as the most frequently mentioned social event and the representation of the participants (agents) of the event in the press in Lithuanian language are compared with the representation of the same social event and social actors of the same event in the press in Russian language of the same period. Thus, the research reveals what (predominating discourse (social event) and the participant of the the discourse (social agents), how (presented arguments) and which groups opinions and attitudes about Russian ethnic group are constructed in the press in Lithuanian language. The differences and similarities of the representations of the termination of WWII commemoration (the elements of the event, the description details, provided explanations, reasons, goals and portrayal of the participants of the event) are revealed in the press in Lithuanian and Russian language as well.

The analysis of the survey data showed that Russian ethnic group in the analyzed press in Lithuanian language is mostly associated with historical themes (the termination of WWII and its commemoration), also with the theme of the political activity of ethnic minority: coalition of Polish and Russian political parties and its victory in the Municipality Council's elections. The big part of themes are related with the description of the different initiatives of Lithuanian Russians Union (LRU) political party – the commemorative march of 9<sup>th</sup> of May, the translation of election bulletins into Russian language before the Municipality Council's elections, the building of the monument for the „personality of Russian nationality or Russian symbol“.

According to the scheme for the thematic and cognitive organization of ethnic prejudice (van Dijk 1987; 61) the articles about Russian ethnic group are mostly expressed the cultural threats – interpretations of the termination of WWII and their differences in the consciousness of majority society and ethnic minority group. The (in)ability of ethnic minority group to integrate (ethnic minorities' knowledge level of the state language is questioned in the press articles) could be named as the cultural threat too.

The social threats expressed in the press are connected with the interpretations within public discourses of the termination of WWII and the negative response of the majority society to these interpretations, which can provoke different protest actions and unrests. The aspirations and interests of ethnic minorities are seen as provocative, conflicting and raising the tensions in the society. Social threats reflected in the press articles are also related to the social disorder: from the side of Lithuania's Russians (named as „anti-Lithuanian“ actions of Lithuania's Russians who participate in the conferences for the compatriots, organized by Russian Federation; „anti-Lithuanian“ actions of the LRU political party representatives), and from the side of the Russian Federation representatives (the actions of representatives of the Embassy of the Russian Federation in Lithuania, the Russian Federation influence on the compatriots with help of mass media). The decision of the LRU political party's leaders to translate, print and distribute the electoral bulletins without the permission of

Seimas, as well as the ethnic minorities, demonstrating against the Educational reform could be seen as social threats expressed in the press. Positive attitudes towards Russian group, related to the social aspect – the absence of the civic society in Lithuania and the manifestations of ethnic intolerance in the society – are also expressed. Press in Lithuanian language does not pay lots of attention on the economic threat (only stated that 9<sup>th</sup> of May commemorative march in the Gediminas Avenue interferes with the events of European Day celebration). Economic threat is also expressed by questioning the funds, needed to build the monument for the Russian personality or Russian symbol. The discussions about integration processes of ethnic minorities and focus on the funding of the ethnic minority schools from the state budget in press in Lithuanian language could be also seen as economic threat.

Mostly the opinions of the LRU political party leaders are presented in the Lithuanian press.

While comparing the representations of WWII termination as a social event and the representations of participants (agents) of that event in the press in Lithuanian and Russian languages, it's possible to state that two different informational spaces are created, when information targets two different linguistic audience groups. Thus, it presumes, that press is encouraging the conflict between two ethno linguistic groups, reading in Lithuanian and Russian languages. The threats expressed in the press in Lithuanian language, which are seen from the side of the representatives of Russian Federation or the Russian ethnic group, also contribute to the development of the conflict. The division between „they“ and „us“ groups in the discourse of the analyzed press in Lithuanian and Russian languages is created.

According to the representation of Russian ethnic group in press in Lithuanian language, it's possible to conclude that this group is seen as the Soviet period immigrants, who have no relations with the period of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania or any other historical period or with the heritage and the historical memory of these periods.

Such representation of Russian ethnic group focusing exclusively on the problems of WWII and its termination, the identification of the group entirely with the political initiatives of LRU leaders, unwillingness to seek the common ground of historical interpretations in the press in Lithuanian and Russian language, will continue to form the sources for the topics, related to the Russian ethnic group and will reproduce the presentment schemes and will create the prejudices towards this ethnic group.