Introduction: growing research on youth in Siberia

Joachim Otto Habeck

Abstract

This special issue of *Sibirica* comprises a selection of papers presented at the conference “‘Everything is still before you’: being young in Siberia today” (Halle, November 2003). This introduction opens with a short review of the conventional social-sciences approach toward youth (especially indigenous youth) as an ‘object of concern’. A brief summary of the subsequent papers follows, highlighting several crosscutting themes: (1) the concept of youth, the process of becoming an adult and the expectations connected with it; (2) acquisition of knowledge within and outside formal education; and (3) sports, music and games as meaningful and creative spheres of social interaction. The introduction concludes with the argument that the ambit of ‘Siberian’ anthropology can be significantly enlarged through the integration of sociological and cultural studies approaches and methods into ethnographic inquiry.

Keywords: Russia, Siberia, youth, education, anthropology, sociology, cultural studies.

“‘Everything is still before you’: being young in Siberia today’ was the title of a conference at the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology (MPI) from 13–15 November 2003, and the articles in this issue of *Sibirica* are all based on papers presented on that occasion. The conference constituted an important step in the development of the MPI’s Siberian Studies Centre. The event marks the transition, so to speak, from a juvenile state to adulthood in the institutional memory of the Siberian Studies Centre. Before going into the reasons for choosing youth as the key theme, I should mention that the task of organising the conference and editing this selection of papers was made a very pleasurable experience by the contributors, who offered a wide range of exciting topics and case studies. The conference papers presented here should inspire scholars to venture from well-trodden paths in anthropological scholarship on Siberia and to visit conceptual approaches pursued in other disciplines.

My colleagues and I decided to spotlight 'youth' because we realised that young people, despite being a very visible and vigorous group within the communities where we have been conducting fieldwork, have been conspicuously absent from the bulk of ethnographic work on Siberia. If they turn up at all, they appear as an undifferentiated, silent aggregate of bystanders rather than as protagonists. This picture is in stark contrast to how we have experienced young people in those communities, and we hold that it is also in stark contrast to their self-perception.

Youth as an object of concern – and as an agent of change

Some general comments about anthropological scholarship on Siberia are appropriate here. To date, the indigenous peoples (*korennyye narody*) of Siberia, and especially the small-numbered indigenous peoples (*korennyye malochislennyye narody*) usually living in rural 'ethnic' communities, have attracted the most scholarly interest from anthropologists. In this respect, anthropological research on Siberia differs significantly from sociological research, for which the rural/urban divide is an important frame of reference.

Research on traditional forms of land use, particularly hunting and reindeer herding, has constituted the main contribution of Siberian studies to general anthropology in recent years (Gray, Vakhtin, and Schweitzer, 2003). Over the last 15 years, anthropologists have documented a dramatic loss of traditional knowledge and practices of land use among the indigenous peoples of Siberia alongside attempts at restoration of indigenous land use and cultural revival (*vozrozhdenie*). Anthropological analyses of *vozrozhdenie* have operated with the implicit axiom that indigenous elders, who have presumably retained a certain array of traditional knowledge and practices, pass these on to the younger generation. The younger generation have become alienated from the traditional ways of life through Soviet education and need to reincorporate such knowledge and practices in order to attain a 'healthy' indigenous identity and self-esteem. Members of the younger generation were seen as the recipients of such knowledge and practices. Yet little attention was paid to the ways in which young people go about 'receiving' and applying traditional knowledge in their own lives and how they think about traditional ways of life. Likewise, hardly any research has been done in rural communities in Russia on how young people see their own place in local communities, how they describe their own expectations and how they picture their own futures. In other words, young people have been viewed as an object of concern rather than active participants in the processes of cultural revival.¹

The perspective on indigenous youth as an object of concern is embedded in a wider context of academic and political discourse on youth in the Russian Federation. The question of how to raise a child properly is a concern not only of parents but also of society at large and thus is frequently debated in public (Rotkirch, 2000, pp. 115–8). The widespread tendency to see adolescence as inherently problematic, and youth as a group at risk (e.g. in conventional sociological approaches, compare Zdravomyslova, 2004) results from a preoccupation with 'proper' upbringing, and simultaneously feeds back into it.

While ‘youth’ potentially generates anxiety, it also inspires hope – at least it did so in previous decades. David Anderson, who presented the keynote address at the conference, discussed the symbolic meaning of ‘youth’ as a collective agent in the progress of Soviet society, and other speakers frequently expanded on this notion. The Communist Party entrusted youth with important tasks such as transforming the countryside and creating the (infrastructural) preconditions for a bright future. Many of the *komsomol'skie stroiki* (large-scale construction sites with Young Communist League members as labourers) were located in Siberia, for example the Baikal-Amur Railway. Siberia itself has, and has had, the reputation of being a ‘youthful’ country, a region of possibilities as seemingly endless as its expanses, a sleeping land that needs to be awakened, and a resource base that requires appropriation (*osvoenie*). Young people could direct their enthusiasm and energy to the development of Siberia. In official Soviet discourse, youth (*molodezh*) appeared as a unified whole. Individual interests were to yield to collective ones and individual aspirations could only exist on the margins of large-scale social projects.

Lost in individualism? Young people’s expectations and obligations

Against this background, the aim of the conference was to explore young people’s active role in supporting and challenging, constructing and modifying the social norms, collective expectations and material conditions that frame their lives. Obviously, this entailed the unpacking of ‘youth’ as a concept, and the recognition of substantial differences, in regional and many other terms, of young people’s experiences and strategies. The conference papers reflect young Siberians’ personal interactions on various levels: on the level of age mates (particularly, peers and friends, people with a shared interest in music, sports and games), and on an inter-generational level (e.g. between young individuals and their parents).

The oft-heard dictum ‘everything is still before you’ (*‘u tebia vse eshche vpered’*) illustrates the latter kind of interaction: it is the parent (teacher, social worker, politician) who is commenting on the young person’s future. The phrase carries the ambivalence of hope and anxiety portrayed above; its import can swing from hopeful optimism about taking the (collective) future into one’s own hands, to woeful sympathy for those who are about to embark on a life of uncertainty and hardship. Both directions of thought are accompanied by complex and ambivalent understandings of life and fate in Russian mainstream society (Boym, 1994; Ries, 1997). The 1990s as a decade of instability have tipped the balance towards woeful sympathy; elder people now speak more often about contemporary youth as a ‘lost generation’.

However, the papers presented have shown that young people would not generally support this point of view. What *they* say is lost is rather the possibility of a viable future in rural communities, and many rural youth thus envisage moving to the city. The individuals whose voices are rendered in the collection of papers in this volume appear to be clear-minded about their chances and pragmatic in their search for opportunities. These papers testify to a diversity of

alliances within the family, at school and in other, so-called informal, environments. Importantly, these alliances and networks show a high degree of resilience and continuity when transposed from the village to the city. Notwithstanding the growing tendency to re-establish conservative norms and patriotic 'virtues' in Russian society, urban settings as spaces for the interaction and conscious self-expression of young people have retained much of the volatility and fuzziness that were considered characteristic of the ideological break-up of the late 1980s and early 1990s. However, the assumption that, with the end of socialism and the advent of a new diversity of lifestyles, youth in Siberia would gradually succumb to growing tendencies of consumerism and individualism (Chuprov *et al.*, 2001) cannot be confirmed.² At any rate, several of the authors represented in this volume state that the great majority want to build stable and clearly defined familial relationships through marriage and the raising of children. Family is the central life project, but it is burdened with unrealistically high expectations. Idealistic notions of family life constitute a remarkable contrast to many 'actually existing' patterns of parenthood and upbringing, such as single mothers (Kay, 2000, pp. 65–82) or children in institutional care.

Ten conference papers were selected for publication: eight are included in this issue, and the remaining two papers (Vladimir Dmitriev; Elena Khlinovskaya Rockhill) will appear in *Sibirica*, vol. 4, issue 2. These shall also be included in this brief introduction because they too examine living conditions and livelihoods of young Siberians from novel perspectives. A comparison between Dmitriev's and Khlinovskaya Rockhill's papers is perhaps the best illustration of how differently individual agency and constraint figure in the lives of young people. Dmitriev's description of indigenous entrepreneurs renders them as resourceful and inventive individuals. He thereby stresses the broad scope for personal agency and the personal accountability that comes along with it. Khlinovskaya Rockhill's study of children and youth in institutional care (so-called 'social orphans'), however, draws a disturbing picture of marginalisation and delinquency, absence of choice and failure to conform to social norms. Here we find that in addition to the children themselves, their biological parents are disenfranchised, too: they are classified as irresponsible and their children are taken away by a state agency. This example points once again to the state's pervasive concern with 'good mothering' and 'proper upbringing'. The state is the ultimate parent; parents' rights to exert parental care are granted or denied at the state's discretion. Like the papers on residential school education discussed below, Khlinovskaya Rockhill's example of 'social orphans' reveals education policies as an unavoidable and crucial field of negotiation between state agencies, pedagogical staff, parents and the 'inmates' themselves.

Becoming an adult, building a family: aspects of a 'solid' life

David Anderson has developed his keynote address into a paper of wide-ranging conceptual scope. By analysing different occurrences of the slogan 'everything is still before you' in the changing contexts of everyday narrative and public

representation, Anderson documents how this slogan has turned from a political promise into an eerie prophecy. The saying has become part of a vast corpus of evocative laments (Ries, 1997), of 'the dirge', as Anderson calls it. It mirrors the elder generation's apprehensions about the contingencies and imponderables of life. Here I would add that post-socialist experiences have generally made the over-50 age cohort especially apprehensive. Many of the elderly speak of today's youth as a 'lost generation', but – as mentioned above – those whom they refer to usually do not share this opinion. Prior to looking at how those being 'young' describe their being 'young', we need to dwell for a moment on the question of how to define 'young'. Anderson shows that the idea of 'being young', as well as that of 'youth', defies any correlation with a specific age cohort; instead, these ideas are tied to familial and kinship obligations resulting from generational succession. Becoming a parent, i.e. establishing one's own family; is an essential step in the process of leaving one's youth behind, but it is not the most decisive step. The process of upbringing does not stop there; rather, parental care now extends even further, to the subsequent generation. But '[o]nce the flow of intergenerational mutual aid reverses, young people become "solid" (*solidnye*), as it is often said in Russian'. '*Solidnye*' refers to a person who has finally left his or her childhood behind and who has become fully accepted as an adult. The reciprocity of intergenerational support is also a topic of concern for those who are 'young'. As early as at the age of 15, most youth appear to be fully aware of the responsibilities that they will take on in later family life. (This is an attitude that I personally witnessed many times and which has strengthened my impression that young people in Russia seem to be more 'grown up' and 'serious about life' than people of the same age in the UK or Germany.) The high degree of attentiveness towards familial needs and the 'overwhelming desire to build families' among both rural and urban youth are not consistent with the hypothesis that globalisation and the transition to a market economy always lead to increasing individualisation, to the detriment of the family structure. Anderson rounds off his contribution with the remark that '[t]he study of Siberian youth culture offers a good opportunity to stretch our concepts away from possessive individualist models, to experiment with ideas that combine household, generation, and nation in interesting ways'.

Both Anderson's paper and the one by Anthony Glendinning, Ol'ga Pak and Iurii Popkov are based on a joint research project among urban and rural youth in and around Novosibirsk. The project combined survey techniques of a comparatively large scale with semi-structured interviews and sought to assess the pertinence of 'Western' notions of youth to a Siberian setting (Pilkington, 2002). Anderson takes a more theoretical look at the tenets and assumptions about youth underpinning this project, whereas Glendinning, Pak and Popkov put more emphasis on its methodological aspects. They also point out that the examination of 'subjective components' in young people's well-being distinguishes their approach from earlier sociological research among Siberian youth, which has generally not acknowledged their respondents' views and aspirations.

Thus, Glendinning, Pak and Popkov describe young peoples' assessments of their future prospects and perceptions of the community in which they live.

Against the background of socio-political debates about increasing ‘individualisation’, the authors state that youth – rural as well as urban – none the less rely strongly on their familial and local social networks for support. For most who took part in the interviews, parents and the family are the main frame of reference and the most important social resource (notwithstanding the fact that youth prefer to talk about their worries and anxieties with friends and peers – *odnoklassniki* – rather than with family members). The majority of rural youth state that their future prospects of leading a ‘normal life’ are dependent on moving to a town or city, to find a good job or to receive higher education. However, not everybody is actually able to go to town. ‘To support their children’s studies – living costs, accommodation, food, clothes and travel, and sometimes education fees – the village-based family either have to “enlarge” the land available for production or find extra work. In this respect all sorts of capital acquires value, especially social networks. This is allied to the idea of reciprocity of responsibilities within the family. . .’. The authors also point to a comparatively high degree of social cohesion in rural communities, which may account for rural youth reporting less frequently symptoms of depression and low self-esteem than youth in urban settlements. In short, while there is a stark contrast between the evaluation of the standard of living in the town and in the village – the village is perceived as dirty and ‘uncivilised’ – this does not imply that village youth feel less confident in their personal capabilities and social capital. It is in this sense that youth are embedded in the ‘local’ community.

Knowing, learning, teaching: different modes of pedagogy and their application

The second set of articles, by Marina Hakkarainen, Jarosław Derlicki, and Elena Liarskaya, examines different modes of acquisition of knowledge, both within and outside the formal educational system, and illustrates the gradual appropriation of Soviet educational institutions by local communities. Despite many elderly natives’ traumatic experiences associated with residential schools, many a school now constitutes a ‘social hub’ for the local indigenous community (compare Derlicki) and has a ‘certain place’ in local culture (compare Liarskaya). However, the knowledge taught at school proves to be insufficient – or even irrelevant – in the individual’s negotiations with the local environment. There is a different kind of knowledge, which is appropriated at a later stage of life and which makes the individual feel ‘truly’ embedded in the local environment.

The central theme of Hakkarainen’s case study from Markovo (Chukotka) is this special knowledge, or mode of knowing, perceived as ‘traditional’ by both those who are knowledgeable – the elders – and those who lack this mode of knowing – the youth. While her informants see the notion of ‘traditional’ knowledge in contrast to knowledge received through school education, and contrast the vulnerability of young people to the healing capacity of their elders, they see the relationship as cyclical rather than simply oppositional; it is through reincarnation

that the cycle is completed. According to this understanding, youth find themselves at the lowest level of command of this special, traditional knowledge. They acquire it gradually in later stages of life. Becoming a parent appears to be an essential step, particularly for women, who are initiated into ways of knowing and healing so intensively that they come to perceive and remember their life before childbirth as a time of 'complete ignorance'. Hakkarainen shows convincingly how the discourse about tradition and local knowledge among the inhabitants of Markovo is not simply directed to outsiders as a construction of local identity with political and economic intentions; rather, the discourse has relevance for how individuals negotiate their own social position and that of others within the community.

Derlicki uses his research among the Yukaghir in northeastern Sakha (Yakutia) to discuss the role of the residential school (*internat*) in indigenous children's upbringing. He holds that the teaching methods and content at the residential schools have created 'a "lost" generation which has a problem with finding its place in life'. Derlicki's special focus is on the introduction of 'ethno-pedagogy' into the curriculum, with the effect that the school – the very institution which once disrupted the indigenous community's identity, language and traditional knowledge in the first place – is now engaged in the 'invention of tradition'. The so-called traditional knowledge taught at school is artificial inasmuch as it is not taught in an informal, contextual manner and has little practical relevance. Similar to Hakkarainen, Derlicki draws an opposition between traditional knowledge and knowledge taught at school, yet his concern is rather to problematise the uneasy adaptation of the former into the latter – a process which results in the creation of pseudo-traditional knowledge.

Liarskaya's analysis of the role of the residential school in Nenets life and ethnic identity provides a different perspective on the influence of Soviet pedagogy on indigenous communities. From her point of view, the one-sided argument that the residential schools have led to the destruction of indigenous 'traditional culture' is insufficient; moreover, she argues, this argument is based on the idea that indigenous culture is passive, vulnerable and unable to respond. Liarskaya questions this notion and sets out to examine how Nenets parents and youth have integrated the residential school into their social networks, their social security strategies and their everyday lives – a process that she calls the inscription of the residential school into ethnic cultures. The first generation of Nenets enrolled in the residential school experienced this mode of pedagogy as a shock because the residential school was an 'alien, externally imposed reality'. Subsequent generations of pupils suffered less because they obtained some guidance from their older siblings and relatives, who had already experienced this educational system. Nenets parents in the tundra agree to have their children educated in the residential school on the condition that the school is embedded in the family's social network, which is constituted by their sedentary relatives in the 'settlement'. They accept the residential school as a place where their children can learn 'to step from one world to another' – from everyday life in the camp to everyday life in the village or town.

Both Derlicki's and Liarskaya's papers point to the centrality of education in the study of youth in Siberia – not merely for the reason that education has a central place in young people's daily activities but also in view of Soviet and post-Soviet pedagogy's role in the 'formation' of ethnic identities. Both contributions illustrate Alexia Bloch's (2003) insight that individuals evaluate their residential-school experiences in ambivalent ways, covering the whole range from resistance to acceptance and lasting incorporation of the officially promoted ideals into one's one identity. This ambivalence makes it questionable to distinguish between 'those in power vs. those victimized by power' (ibid., p. 116). When Bloch interviewed elderly Evenki women who had been educated in the residential school of Tura, some of them were not lamenting but 'instead affirming the way the state inscribed them with a collective sense of belonging' (ibid., p. 95). The great importance and endurance of peer-to-peer contacts in Siberian youths' social relations comes to the fore in most contributors' articles in terms of (1) acquisition of a collective identity at school; (2) networking and social mobility; and (3) 'leisurely activities', as the next set of articles demonstrates.

Contemporary music, games and sport: new fields of inquiry

The third set of articles in this issue comprises fascinating ethnographies of young Siberians playing music (Aimar Ventsel), participating in sportive competitions (Stefan Krist) and engaging in role-playing games (Tat'iana Barchunova and Natal'ia Beletskaia). It is the element of play and the 'leisurely' character of these activities that kept them from attracting anthropologists and sociologists in earlier times. The Marxist approach to anthropological research in Siberia, with its pronounced commitment to identifying modes of production, offered little to account for non-work-related human activity (compare Barchunova and Beletskaia's discussion of the *animal laborans*). Yet it is in the sphere of art and playing that people express themselves and communicate with others in the most creative ways, as the risks of retribution and social exclusion are comparatively low. In the Soviet period, sports and music provided greater freedom for the expression of 'national culture' and indigenous identities than other spheres, even though the possibilities for stretching the rules were limited and forms of artistic expression highly formalised. The authors of the papers presented here explore the shifting relations between the players (artists) and the social actors surrounding them, with very different outcomes.

Ventsel argues in his paper on Sakha ethnic music that, for a significant number of rural youth music is a potential way of getting out of the remote village and into town, a key to upward social mobility. Although 'making music' has many playful elements and artistic creativity is greatly appreciated, it is hard work for those who want to make a living at it. This is evident in Ventsel's description of the economic mechanisms of music production and performance. Artists who have managed to move from an *ulus* (district) to the capital city, Yakutsk, act as representatives of their home district in the cultural life of the republic; but

by the same token, they also become entangled in an intricate network of shady economic and political obligations.

Similarly, Krist writes on a topic that has long been neglected as insufficiently 'serious' for anthropological enquiry. His description of Buriat sportive competitions and the dynamic changes in how they are performed points to a symbolic arena where such powerful actors as the government, the Lamaist clergy and big companies encounter each other in the negotiation of ritual actions and political meanings conveyed by such an event to the wider public. Sport competitions are central, not peripheral, to the realm of officially promoted Buriat culture.

The papers by both Krist and Ventsel reveal a number of conspicuous peculiarities in the function of sport and music in the creation and affirmation of ethnic and regional identities. Both authors speak about the state's role in the staging of sportive/musical events and about the performers' role in adapting the stage at their discretion and creating parallel spaces for creativity. Both also mention that these events provide the opportunity to express not only ethnic identities but also local ones. Youth from the rural regions try to maintain their personal contacts with kin, peers and friends upon arrival in the republic's capital through sportive (and other social) events, and they act as cultural ambassadors of their rural home areas by participating in concerts and competitions. Music, sports, games and other forms of play appear to be important activities for the continuation and utilisation of rural social networks in the urban sphere. The extension of rural social networks to the town is a process that deserves more attention in future research on indigenous youth's migrations and the expression of indigenous ethnic identities.

The importance of sports, games and play in social relations and social change has obviously been underestimated. As Krist states, 'sports, games and play ... contain innovative power. Games and play combine collective experiences with a relative individual freedom. ... Games thus provide opportunities for discovering and creating new forms of social interaction within a new socio-economic context'. Although discussing an entirely different kind of 'game', the authors of the final paper in this issue, Barchunova and Beletskaja, give a similar assessment: 'The game world sometimes is the only sphere where players can perform their agency without fear of being misunderstood and punished'.

Barchunova and Beletskaja's field of research is probably the most unexpected one, and the one most secluded from the public gaze: they analyse role-playing games, such as 'big field games', where dozens of adolescents and young adults participate in the playful reconstruction of historical events, or dungeons-and-dragons-like fantasy games. According to Barchunova and Beletskaja, many youth would rather exert their creativity and energy in such role-playing games than in non-governmental organisations or other social movements. The attraction of role-playing games derives from the fact that the rules and norms valid in the game appear to be much more coherent and appealing than those of the 'real world'. Unlike the preceding examples – Sakha music and Buriat sportive competitions – the role-playing games neither enact nor sustain officially promoted images of society or identity. The game world exists completely separate

from the public sphere. It clearly operates on a higher moral plane than the 'real world', yet role players do not see how to impress these higher moral standards on the outside world, and so choose instead to simply avoid getting involved 'in open conflict with this world'. The game world itself, however, is not free of problematic situations. One of the main challenges is 'to get one's role right' without forgetting the distinction between the game world and the real world. Conflicts with the 'outer world' cannot always be avoided; many non-playing family members see role-playing games as a form of deviant behaviour.

Outlook

Evaluating the results of a previous workshop of Siberianists in Halle, Gray, Vakhtin and Schweitzer (2003) urged anthropologists to take a more analytical approach to Siberian ethnography: 'what is needed is not mere description, but analytical study of the practices of people' (ibid., p. 203). They also argued 'that non-indigenous and even urban populations in Siberian cities should become the subject of anthropological research to no less a degree than indigenous and rural populations' (ibid., p. 204). The conference "Everything is still before you": being young in Siberia today' has followed this recommendation. Here I return to a point that I made earlier: anthropology has focused so narrowly on 'traditional' ways of life in rural settings that it has failed to recognise the relevance of the urban.

It is here that neighbouring disciplines, such as sociology and cultural studies, can provide remedy. In turn, anthropology increasingly informs other disciplines through its methodological strengths: comprehensive ethnography and long-term participant observation. I see great potential in combining approaches and methodologies from anthropology, sociology and cultural studies, particularly when exploring everyday life and everyday practices, or examining 'categories' that crosscut ethnic affiliations. Research on young people's lives and livelihoods provides a good example. When studying occupational and educational conditions, rural-urban migration processes and rural-urban networks, anthropologists can benefit from sociological experience with tracking large-scale processes and techniques of investigation in urban settings. Cultural studies, however, provides the means to analyse the historical background and construction of such concepts as 'youth', 'adulthood', 'education', 'civilisation' and 'culture'. This is important in an academic context that has tended to treat cultures as discrete entities (Hann, 2002, p. 260), and to perceive some peoples as more 'civilised' than others (Slezkine, 1994). I am convinced that, by rendering the diversity of meanings that our informants ascribe to these concepts, we are able to modify the gaze that sees youth merely as an object of concern. The articles that follow describe the constraints and limitations confronting young people in Siberia, yet they also document young people's awareness of their situation, their willingness to make a change, and the possibilities they have to do so.

While it is fair to conclude that the conference in Halle 2003 has widened the scope and broken new ground in 'Siberian' anthropology, it was not the only

conference on youth in Siberia in recent years. Regional branches of the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North and other organisations have organised more than one conference pertaining to this topic.³

Closest in many respects to the 2003 conference in Halle was the conference, 'Generation P in the Tundra' (8–10 October 2004 in Tartu, Estonia; organised by Aimar Ventsel), which also took a predominantly anthropological perspective and revisited many of the issues raised in the discussions in Halle. The range of presentations there covered extensive ground, from the (by now 'traditional') themes of tradition, authenticity and invention, to identity and globalisation, and on to agency, acquiescence and resistance. Selected papers from the Tartu Conference will be published during 2005. More such events will no doubt follow. The intensity of anthropological research on young people in Siberia will continue growing in conjunction with researchers' willingness to learn from neighbouring disciplines and their recognition of young Siberians' active participation in shaping their own futures.

Acknowledgements

For their comments on earlier versions of this text, I am grateful to Brian Donahoe and Chris Hann at the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology in Halle, and to Alexander King at Aberdeen University.

Notes

1 Erich Kasten's edited volume *Bicultural education in the North* (1998) documents a gradually changing perspective toward children's and young people's roles in the process of cultural revival and language training.

2 See the contributions by Barchunova and Beletskaja and by Glendinning, Pak and Popkov, in which the positions of Chuprov *et al.* (2001) are explicitly criticised.

3 I am aware of at least two such conferences: the seminar *Molodezh' korennykh narodov Rossii v sovremennykh usloviakh* (Youth of the indigenous peoples of Russia under present-day conditions) on 10 December 1999 in Moscow, and an international youth conference with the title *Korennye narody i okruzhaiushchaia sreda rossiiskogo Severa* (Indigenous peoples and the environment in the Russian North) from 4–6 September 2000 in Tomsk. In addition, the International Conference 'CHUM-4' with the subtitle *Molodezh' Severa: traditsionnye tsennosti i perspektivy razvitiia* (Youth of the North: traditional values and prospects for development) took place in St Petersburg from 23–25 November 2004, co-organised by Vladimir Dmitriev. CHUM is a network of indigenous representatives from the Russian North and NGOs and researchers working with indigenous peoples.

References

- Bloch, Alexia (2004) *Red ties and residential schools: indigenous Siberians in a post-Soviet state*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
 Boym, Svetlana (1994) *Common places: mythologies of everyday life in Russia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Chuprova V. I., Iu. A. Zubok and C. Williams [K. Uil'iams] (2001) *Molodezh' v obshchestve riska* [Youth in a risk society]. Moskva: Nauka.
- Gray, Patty, Nikolai Vakhtin and Peter Schweitzer (2003) 'Who owns Siberian ethnography? A critical assessment of a re-internationalized field'. *Sibirica* 3(2): 194–216.
- Hann, Christopher M. (2002) 'All Kulturvölker now? Social anthropological reflections on the German-American tradition'. In Richard G. Fox and Barbara J. King, eds, *Anthropology beyond culture*, pp. 259–76. Oxford: Berg.
- Kasten, Erich, ed. (1998) *Bicultural education in the North: ways of preserving and enhancing indigenous people's languages and traditional knowledge*. Münster: Waxmann.
- Kay, Rebecca (2000) *Russian women and their organizations: gender, discrimination and grassroots women's organizations, 1991–96*. Basingstoke: MacMillan.
- Pilkington, Hilary (2002) 'Conclusion'. In: Pilkington, Hilary, Elena Omel'chenko, Moya Flynn, Ul'iana Bliudina and Elena Starkova, eds, *Looking West? Cultural globalization and Russian youth cultures*, pp. 216–26. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Ries, Nancy (1997) *Russian talk: culture and conversation during perestroika*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Rotkirch, Anna (2000) *The Man Question: loves and lives in late 20th century Russia*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Department of Social Policy.
- Slezkine, Yuri (1994) *Arctic mirrors: Russia and the small peoples of the North*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Zdravomyslova, Elena (2004) 'Russian Transformation and the Study of Youth Culture'. Unpublished manuscript (paper presented at the Department of European Ethnology, Humboldt University, Berlin, 9 November 2004).