Господи благослови,

Дом наш благодатный, упованье Божье, прибежище Христово, покровитель Дух Святой, при пути, яко с нами Бог.

Богу нашему слава.

University of Alberta

Flowers and Weeds: Negotiating the Contemporary Doukhobor Diaspora

by

Lena Sherstobitoff 

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts

Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 2005

Abstract

This thesis is an autoethnographic study of the contemporary Doukhobor diaspora, and is based on interviews conducted with Doukhobors from the West Kootenays, British Columbia. The participants' imagined ideas of home and homeland are considered through diasporic discourse, as well as Canadian multicultural policy, in order to understand the complex and often ambiguous relationship these individuals have to their Canadian and Russian identities. The study is further informed by a brief history of the Doukhobor people, as well as the ramifications and rewards of conducting autoethnography within the existing West Kootenay Doukhobor community.

Acknowledgements

I wish to first express sincere thanks to my advisor. Dr. Julie Rak's guidance, patience, and insight were invaluable, and I am grateful to have taken this journey with her. As well, I would like to thank my committee members—Dr. Andriy Nahachewsky, who asked for more, and Dr. Andie Palmer, who saw me through.

This project would not have been possible if not for the individuals who agreed to be interviewed. I deeply thank each of you. Your living rooms and gardens transformed into pivotal learning environments, and these experiences shaped not only my research, but also my outlook. Again, thank-you.

Finally, I wish to thank my family—Peter, Olga, and Pyet. You have taught me what home is, and that makes all the difference.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The following work is the product of a summer's research conducted in the Kootenay region of British Columbia in 2004. The text, however, is the indirect result of my first trip to Russia six years before. I spent three weeks outside of Tula, a city south of Moscow, studying Russian literary masters Tolstoy, Turgenev, and Chekov. The trip was designed to develop an artistic appreciation of the Russian culture, but I used the opportunity to further understand my Doukhobor heritage. Thousands of Doukhobors migrated from Russia during the late nineteenth century, and although the community has resided in Canada for over a hundred years, many Doukhobor children were still raised with the understanding that one day the community will return; my upbringing was no exception. In fact, I felt so connected to Russia that I identified as Russian and gave no real consideration to my Canadian identity. This all changed, however, when I landed in Moscow.

Rather than returning 'home,' I felt alienated from other Russians and could not imagine permanently relocating. Although I appreciated seeing the land my ancestors worked, I did not connect to the nation or its citizens as I imagined I would. Russia was not home—but in that moment, neither was Canada. Who was I, if I was not Russian and never before felt I was Canadian? To the point, how did I find myself in this ambiguous location?

During the following years of study, I began to understand that my reaction was similar to other diasporic persons and I became curious to determine if other Doukhobors of my generation shared these feelings. If we lived within a Doukhobor diaspora, understood generally as living here—Canada—and belonging elsewhere (Clifford 1994; Mishra 1995) what did it look like and how did it affect our individual and collective identities? I therefore interviewed members of the Doukhobor community with the initial intent of drawing a comparative analysis between disparate generations. My hypothesis was that elder community members would feel a stronger connection to Russia, whereas younger generations would feel more tied to Canada. A Canadian identification would, I believe, discount a possible Doukhobor diaspora. I therefore asked interview participants how they understood ideas of home

and homeland, specifically how they felt about Russia and Canada, the Russian language and intermarriage. As I analyzed interview transcripts, I became increasingly aware that while I had gathered excellent information, my current project was restricted by time and space. Rather than cover a broader comparative topic, I instead opted to focus on the contemporary interview participants, using the elder generation to reinforce background information. The analysis shows that although participants demonstrated in their narratives that they felt Canadian, they did not unequivocally feel they belonged within Canada. Their ambiguous identification drew upon multicultural rhetoric and diasporic concepts, which inform and structure my analysis.

In order to best understand how contemporary Doukhobors are affected by nationality, multiculturalism and displacement, I begin with a brief Doukhobor history. I also discuss my methodology, as well as account for my position as Doukhobor researcher. Given the unexpected challenges involved in conducting autoethnography, I have also chosen to examine how I may have affected participants' and how they, in turn, affected me.

Chapter One: History

I: Genesis

Doukhobor children traditionally acquire their cultural history orally through congregational song, psalm recitation, and storytelling. Family histories wind themselves back to eras of Russian persecution where people were guided by divine inspiration and devout faith. Many first-generation Doukhobors have memories of late-night gatherings where their elders shared stories of personal страдание [suffering], which detailed unremitting persecution and relocation. But today fewer individuals can recall Doukhobor oral history than ever before. The inability to rely exclusively on an elder's knowledge, coupled with the modern notion that the printed word is more powerful, more 'correct,' than the spoken, leads contemporary Doukhobors to other sources in order to re-collect their collective past. The following brief Doukhobor history is therefore an intersection of traditional historical sources and compiled personal stories—elders' narratives that have been passed on to and recorded by Doukhobor historian Eli Popoff—in order to blend orally transmitted accounts with documented facts. Doukhobor history is not only that which is recorded, but also that which is remembered by the Doukhobor community and believed by individuals. I have therefore selected specific and pivotal Doukhobor events that are, in my opinion, well known within the Doukhobor community.

The general understanding is that Doukhobor beliefs circulated through Russia's outlying southwest areas (what would now be considered the border region between Russia and Ukraine) in the early sixteenth century. Within the Doukhobor community, however, there is a suggestion that the original Doukhobors were the sons of Israel, Christ's first followers who had made their way into Russia after His crucifixion.[1] Supposition aside, Doukhoborism is best located in the events surrounding the расскол (Great Schism) of 1654 when Archbishop Nikon's reforms created a division within the Russian Orthodox Church. Doukhoborism arose in reaction to the Russian Orthodox Church's increased reliance on intermediaries between God and individuals, as evinced in its use of icons, physical symbols, priests, and other Church officials. Those opposed to the reforms were accordingly labelled

Old Believers or 'рассколники' [rasskolniki], including the People of God sect to which a number of yet unnamed Doukhobors belonged. Doukhobors were differentiated from the rest of the рассколники [rasskolniki] in the mid-eighteenth century (1785) when Archbishop Ambrosius[2] addressed those who "wrestled *against* the church where the holy spirit of God dwelled" (Popoff 31italics mine). Rather than consider their new name as the insult it was intended to be, Doukhobors embraced the notion—they wrestled, not in opposition to, but rather *with* the spirit against "struggles that were in the church and in society, and in this struggle they used only their spiritual force of entreaty and living example" (31). The spirit wrestlers, or 'духо'- [spirit] 'борцы' [wrestlers], were thus identified.

It is believed that an unknown retired military officer from the Kharkov region first advocated Doukhobor philosophy. He taught:

> that for a true Christian, state rulers were not needed; that all people were equal; that priests and 'popes' were a result of social structures created by people themselves, wherein some could live without actual productive toil; that the Church and all its rites and ceremonies was superfluous and not needed; [and] that the church system of having monks, nuns and monasteries was a travesty which warped nature's intended way of life for human beings. (Popoff 11)

Other early Doukhobor leaders such as Sylvan Kolesnikov (~ 1750-65) and Ilarion Pobirokin (~ 1765-1791) carried on these teachings in their respective provinces of Ekaterinoslav and Tambov, south-east of Moscow. Their simple belief systems appealed to many local peasants, and the number of Doukhobor faithful increased. Unfortunately, these Doukhobor peasants were condemned by the Russian Orthodox Church as heretics and punished accordingly. The late eighteenth century is therefore remembered as a period of wide-swept brutal persecution and martyrdom administered by the Church and arrested only through the State's intervention.

In 1801 Tsar Alexander I issued a manifesto that permitted Doukhobors to relocate to Tavria, an area in the Milky Waters region of the Crimea. Alexander I sympathized with the Doukhobor cause, and his authorization freed many Doukhobors from religious persecution; as a result, Alexander I became known as the

'Benevolent One.' Doukhobors resided in Tavria for approximately forty years, during which time they established an experimental social welfare system. The Сиротский Дом [Orphan's Home] provided financial and material assistance to those in need; it also served as the community leader's residence and council area. Unfortunately, Doukhobor lifestyle of peasant farming and spiritual worship was once again disrupted when Alexander's successor Tsar Nicholas I exiled Doukhobors to the Wet Mountains in the Caucasus area. The forced expulsion fragmented the Doukhobor community. Rather than abandon their holdings, many Doukhobors (an exact number is unknown) elected to stay behind and maintain the comfort they had grown accustomed to. The remainder, approximately 5000 (Popoff 1992), were once again displaced, forced to re-establish themselves in a new environment. Under supervision of their leader Ilarion Kalmykov, Doukhobors settled in the Wet Mountains where Kalmykov died during their first winter. Fortunately, Doukhobors' situation improved under Kalmykov's successor, Lukeriya Kalmykova.

Between 1864 and 1886, Lukeriya's strong leadership stabilized the disparate Doukhobor communities. As a result, her reign was a time of "unprecedented economic success and interaction with the peoples and environment of the region" (Breyfogle 34). Within the community, Lukeriya (or Лушечка [Lushechka], as she was fondly called) was known to condemn spousal abuse with public and embarrassing discipline. She was also renowned for her prophetic abilities, including her claim that Doukhobors would one day leave Russia to return at some point in the future[3] (Popoff 1992). Operating within a patriarchal society, Lukeriya felt she might not be strong enough to maintain the accustomed distance between the community and the tsarist government. The Doukhbobors therefore aided passing military units and appeared to work closely with local administrators—two organizations they had traditionally avoided—in order to maintain their relatively peaceful Wet Mountain existence. Although she felt compelled to compromise on certain issues, Lukeriya's influence within, and outside of, the Doukhobor community is nevertheless irrefutable. She instituted a peaceful period in Doukhobor history, and it is because of her guidance and prophetic abilities that the ensuing events, which eventually lead to the Doukhobor migration to Canada, transpired. To this day, Lukeriya is kindly

recollected among the Doukhobor communities for "she had a strict but kindly character and was very soft natured. She was leader the longest of all, and the Doukhobors have the most fond and nostalgic memories of their life with her" (Popoff 62).

II: Peter Verigin

Five years prior to her death, Lukeriya invited a guest into the Orphan's Home. Peter Ilarionovitch Verigin, known amongst Doukhobors as Петушка Господний [Peter the Lordly], moved into the residence after Lukeriya reportedly stated to his parents on several occasions: "bear in mind, that I will be taking Petya from you. I need him for a great mission among the Doukhobors" (Popoff 66). These cryptic messages were compounded by rumours that Verigin was Lukeriya's offspring who, as was commonly practiced, was raised by a different family in order to avoid military conscription and registration. Therefore when Lukeriya died without naming a clear successor, Verigin and his followers (who came to be known as the Large Party) began to advocate his leadership claim. Lukeriya's brother Mikhail Gubanov contested these declarations and during the six-week traditional mourning period, the two parties were known to have 'campaigned' for the coveted position of Doukhobor вождь (leader). Whereas the Small Party argued Gubanov's hereditary claim as Lukeriya's brother, the well-spoken Verigin travelled through the outlying villages gathering supporters. Lukeriya's six-week memorial service on January 26th, 1887 was inevitably tense. After the Lord's Prayer was recited and the traditional three bows[4] were made, the elder Vanya Makhortov made a proclamation:

> Our third bow is to the Holy Spirit of God in recognition that we were guided by It [the Holy Spirit] to this day through our leaders, and we herein place our trust that the Holy Spirit will continue to lead us through His beloved son designated for this position in the person of Peter Vasiliyevitch Verigin. (Popoff 67)

The majority of the congregation bowed in recognition of Verigin's position, but those loyal to Gubanov refused. Coincidently, Verigin was arrested that same day for

failing to produce his passport, which lead to allegations that the Small Party stole the passport in order to remove Verigin from the area (Popoff 1992).

The following years were very unsettled. As party membership dictated personal affiliations, political divisions pushed apart the once-peaceful communities. Parents were separated from children; husbands from wives. Infighting led to vicious rumours of Verigin's debauchery, as well as stories of Gubanov's bribery and government affiliations.[5] On many occasions tsarist authorities became involved in the subsequent custody battles, corruption allegations, and general mêlées that consumed the Doukhobor communities. State authorities opportunistically viewed the infighting as a means by which to permanently disband the sect, whose refusal to conform to Orthodox religious practices subverted the authority of the Russian Orthodox Church. The final division between Large and Small Party, however, occurred on June 29th, 1895 in the Caucus Mountains when three Doukhobor villages collectively burned their weaponry.

III: The Burning of Arms

Дело было за Кавказом,	An action occurred in the Caucusus,
Дело славное, друзья!	A glorious deed, friends!
Наши отцы сожгли оружье	Our fathers burned their weapons
Под знаменем Петра.	Under Peter's banner.[6]

—Г.Н Струков [G.N. Strukoff] (1-4)

The Burning of Arms remains the definitive moment in Doukhobor history because it not only solidified Verigin's position as leader, but it also established the foundation of contemporary Doukhobor beliefs. Verigin's initial arrest at Lukeriya's memorial was followed by subsequent charges in an attempt to distance the Large Party from its leader. Although he was repeatedly relocated to increasingly remote areas, Verigin was nonetheless able to instruct the Large Party through letters and personal decrees transported by his most devout followers. Doukhobors were instructed to stop eating meat for pacifists do not kill other living beings, as well as to quit smoking and drinking, three tenets that have remained within the community in one form or another. Verigin furthermore instructed Doukhobors to live communally. Individual debt was forgiven as villages formed collective economic organizations and residences. One of Verigin's messages, however, significantly altered

Doukhobor history. Verigin brought his pacifist beliefs to their ultimate conclusion when he instructed Doukhobors to no longer carry guns. On Easter Sunday Matvey Lebedov, who was a soldier in the Russian army, became the first Doukhobor to refuse to bear arms. He told his commanding officer:

> that he had placed his gun into the rack for the last time, and would never again take it up, and never use it even for training. All his comrades stepped forward also and, one by one, said that they were of the same faith and of the same opinion...and would not ever take up their guns again. (Popoff 80)

Their commanding officers were outraged and these young men, along with hundreds of other Doukhobors, were taken to the Ekaterinogradskiy Disciplinarian Penal Battalion near the Sea of Azov where:

> they were flogged with the prickly acacia branches; they received uncounted fist blows; blows with the butt ends of guns; they were constantly kicked with heavy army boots into their ribs and often into their stomachs; they were exposed to long periods of cold and hunger. The suffered every imaginable form of punishment from their immediate supervisors, from the administrators of the prison, and from the Church fathers who were ever-present. (Popoff 81)

Mikhail Mikhailovitch Sherbinin was the first of many Doukhobor martyrs to die at the Penal Battalion. The Large Party, under Verigin's directive, proceeded to collect all of their weapons, and on St. Peter's Day—June 29th, 1895—three Doukhobor Caucasus settlements of Kholodnoye, Karakhan and Elizavetpol collectively destroyed their weaponry in massive bonfires. As the fires melted down the arms, the gathered Doukhobors prayed and joined in congregational song. The event would become known and commemorated as The Burning of Arms.

While the conscripted Doukhobors suffered grievously in the Penal Battalion because of their refusals to bear arms, the Caucasus Doukhobors were subjected to their own tortures. The gathered congregation in one area was trampled and whipped by military personnel who had been previously alerted by the Small Party of the intended events. Cossack horsemen were subsequently dispatched to various Doukhobor villages where women were raped and villagers were beaten

indiscriminately. These brutalities were followed by exile to Batum, Georgia where over 4000 Caucasus Doukhobors suffered from not only the malarial climate, but also their inhospitable neighbours; the imprisoned men from the Penal Battalion were subsequently sent to Siberia. The tremendous sacrifices and martyred deaths of the men, women and children who suffered in Siberia and beyond are remembered in the hymn "Спите орлы боевые"[7] [Sleep on, you brave fighting eagles]:

Спите орлы боевые,	Sleep on, you brave fighting eagles,
Спите с покойном душой.	Sleep with peaceful souls.
Вы заслужили, родные,	You have merited, dear kindred,
Память и вечный покой.	Remembrance and eternally peaceful consciousness.[8] (Планидин [Planidin] 1-4)

The pacifist protest and subsequent persecution garnered international attention despite the best efforts of Tsarist officials to keep the events concealed. One of the strongest voices was Lev Tolstoy's who was encouraged by Doukhobors' simple and spiritual lifestyle. Tolstoy believed that in Peter Verigin he had found his combination of "country squire and a Christian anarchist" (Woodcock and Avakumovic 108). Through his communications with Verigin, Tolstoy was prompted to write an appeal on behalf of the Doukhobors that was published in England. His letter immediately catapulted the Doukhobors onto an international stage where they received support from Tolstoyans, as well as American and British Quakers. Political pressure from these groups allowed for the first Doukhobor emigration abroad. Organized by the British Quakers, a contingent of Doukhobors migrated to Cyprus, a British-controlled Mediterranean island. Unfortunately, the tropical climate adversely affected the migrants who were unable to apply their northern farming techniques to the soil. They further suffered the effects of malaria and malnutrition, as "freedom on Cyprus with an annual death rate of about 150 per thousand had proved even more lethal than persecution in the Georgian valleys, where...1,000 out of 4,300 Doukhobors died in over three years" (Woodcock and Avakumovic 129). Fortunately accommodations had been made with Canadian officials to settle in Canada's interior prairie region. By Empress Maria's Royal decree, the Doukhobors were granted

"permission to migrate on the condition that those who left never return to Russia" (Rak 38).

Doukhobor and Tolstoyan representatives arrived in Canada in 1898 to survey potential settlements and discuss necessary arrangements. Clifford Sifton, the Minister of the Interior, was eager to settle the prairies with knowledgeable peasant-farmers in "sheep-skin coat, born on the soil, whose forefathers had been farmers for ten generations" (Sifton, qtd. in Friesen and Verigin 1). Sifton therefore agreed upon three terms: "exemption from military service, no government interference with the internal organization of the sect, and the granting of blocks of land so that Doukhobors could continue to practice communal farming and living" (Rak 38). On December 29th, 1899, the first Doukhobor contingent left Batum, Georgia aboard the *Lake Huron.* Between December 1899 and April 1900, two other ships crossed the Atlantic bringing approximately 8000 Doukhobors to Canada. They were accompanied by a small contingent of Russian-Tolstoyans, medical staff and American Quakers. Their leader, Peter Verigin, would join them from exile two years later.

IV: Canadian Prairie Beginnings

Как счастливые те люди	How fortunate are the people
Что не отстали от вождя;	Who did not leave the leader's side;
На спасителя взирали,	They looked to our saviour,
Из России выходя.	To take leave of Russia.[9]

—Г.В Верещагин [G.V. Vereschagin] (1-4)

The Doukhobors were optimistic that their communal lifestyle and spiritual practice would continue relatively unaltered in their new Canadian environment. They were given three tracts of land in Saskatchewan: the North Colony near Assiniboia, which was settled by the Georgian exiles, the South Colony near Yorkton, which was established by the Cyprus settlers, Elizavetpol and Kars Doukhobors, and the third tract near Prince Albert that was comprised largely of the remaining Kars villagers who arrived on the last of the three ships. During the first year, Doukhobors established more than fifty communal villages. The villages averaged one hundred thirty members who resided within approximately twenty houses. They shared

farming equipment, livestock, and finances. But with little monetary funds and Verigin's continued absence—he was still living in exile in Siberia—the villages gradually drifted towards individualistic management. Moreover, the three colonies experienced extreme economic discrepancies from the onset, and the richer communities resented supporting the poorer. In addition, Canadian resentment and mutual misunderstandings created tense intercultural relations where everyone from ranchers to land-seekers to local merchants was fearful of the sect (Woodcock and Avakumovic 1977). Having suffered grievously in Russia for their pacifist beliefs, convictions that precluded killing animals as well as individuals, Doukhobors "resented the petty persecutions they had to endure...[The Doukhobors concluded] that Canadians—collectively and individually—wished to attack Doukhobor principles, to mock and destroy their pacifism, their vegetarianism, their preference for a communal way of life" (Woodcock and Avakumovic 166). Canadians and Doukhobors alike were therefore relieved when Verigin arrived in Canada in 1902.

Verigin had to contend first with internal divisions that had arisen during his absence. The Dominion Land Act required that landowners register their property and therefore claim title.[10] The growing Independent Doukhobor movement endorsed individual land ownership and land entry, which upset the more devout followers. Calling themselves the Sons of God, this small group argued that individual property violated Doukhobor beliefs. Spurred by Tolstoy's letter in which he stated that "to acknowledge property is to acknowledge violence and murder" (qtd. in Woodcock and Avakumovic 167), the Sons of God staged a protest. During the autumn of 1902, this group freed their livestock, which had thus far been used to work the earth, and made a pilgrimage from the North Colony to Minnedosa, Manitoba. The Sons of God believed Tolstoy and Verigin's decrees were to be followed to the extreme. In their opinion, pacifists should not own or use animals or animal by-products, whereas individual ownership was a form of materialism, which disrespected communal lifestyle. The protestors were eventually returned via rail to their villages, but their actions created a lasting impression on Canadians and set a precedent for future Doukhobor demonstrations.

Verigin's arrival calmed the activists and slowed the Independent movement. He quickly began to establish his idyllic communal society—the Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood. The name was one he proposed in a letter written from exile to his followers in the Caucasus in 1896:

> Dear brothers and sisters, I offer for your consideration that we should in future call ourselves 'The Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood.' The name 'Doukhobor' is not understood by outsiders [as 'spirit wrestler' is a derogatory term']...yet the name [CCUB] will tell more clearly that we look on all men as our brothers. (qtd. in Woodcock and Avakumovic 96)

The CCUB became an affluent organization. Verigin pacified concerns about the land entry act, calling it a "formality; it was the resolution, after entry had been made, to regard the land not as individual property but as owned by all" (Woodcock and Avakumovic 187). He purchased a new tract of land he named Verigin, which served not only as his residence, but also as an administrative centre in a style reminiscent of the Orphan's Home. The CCUB purchased substantial farming equipment and livestock, and through paid labour on the expanding railway, the community began to repay some of its accumulated debt. The struggling pioneer communities were soon replaced by a self-sufficient industry.

Once more, material affluence was met with division, and the newly formed Sons of Freedom attempted to rectify the errors they saw within the greater Doukhobor community. Compelled by their belief that material wealth corrupted the spirit, and to prevent "any backsliding or accommodation by Verigin with the State" (McLaren 123), members of the Sons of Freedom staged protests: they freed livestock, set fire to a grain binder, and during their pilgrimage to Yorkton, disrobed when they encountered authorities. Perhaps due to public reaction to their nudity (the Sons of Freedom understood this as an act of faith that renounced materialism), disrobing became a protest standard. These demonstrations exacerbated existing tensions between Doukhobor and non-Doukhobor settlers, and the Sons of Freedom further stressed the CCUB, which was contending with Clifford Sifton's inflexible successor, Frank Oliver. Oliver promoted anglo-conformity, a term defined by Howard Palmer as a means by which to ensure Canadian national purity (Rak 2004).

Immigrants were in turn hierarchically classified "based on their physical and cultural distance from London, England...'Strange' sects placed low in the migrant hierarchy" (Rak 43). Oliver therefore saw no reason for the Doukhobors, who placed low on the hierarchical ranking, to abstain from taking the Oath of Allegiance in order to retain their land holdings. Protestant clergyman John McDougall, whose commissioned reports on the Doukhobors proved ethnocentric, further reinforced Oliver's decision, as McDougall condemned communal living and recommended that the Doukhobors' land be taken away (Rak 2004). The Doukhobors felt betrayed. During the hastily agreed upon terms of their initial migration, they remained under the impression that their settlement was not contingent on an oath. Historically, the Doukhobors were:

> suspicious of any oath they were called upon to swear. In tsarist Russia, the attempt to impose the oath and the attempt to impose conscription had been closely associated. How could they be sure in Canada also the oath of allegiance would not lead to conscription? (Woodcock and Avakumovic 217)

Compounded by their religious objections to only lend their voices to God, the majority of Doukhobors refused the mandatory Oath of Allegiance and forsook over half of their communal properties. Unfortunately, they were not aware that their land loss was based on a technicality. Rather than swear an oath, "a simple affirmation of truth would have sufficed" (Friesen and Verigin 6). The communal land holdings were subsequently taken, and the event served to reinforce Doukhobors suspicion of government authority. John McLaren best represents this clash:

> Although there is no doubt about government duplicity in dealing with the Doukhobor land issue in Saskatchewan, these events are also explicable in terms of a clash of belief systems about the relationship between land and those working it. In the Canadian mind land was a commodity designed for the succor of and exploitation by individuals or corporations. Power over it was limited only in the sense that it might be subject to renewed control by some or other legal person with a superior right over it, or where it was being used for illegal or immoral purposes. Ranged against this individualistic, market-oriented view of land use, was the Doukhobor article of faith that the

> land belonged to God. It was open to humankind to use and share in an economic and spiritual community, but not for individuals or groups to own or to claim as an exclusive possession. It was, moreover, subject to the obligation of responsible stewardship and respect for its productive capacity while use was being made of it. Both philosophies recognize land's productive potential, but the former ignored its value as a common resource and its use for collaborative effort, while the latter related its husbandry directly to a lifestyle and theology that made no distinction between the economic or social and the religious being. (124)

Dismayed by the land seizures and subsequent land rush by eager settlers, Verigin privately purchased a second settlement area in the interior mountains of British Columbia.

V: British Columbia

Approximately 5000 Doukhobors relocated to British Columbia in 1908. They settled primarily in Grand Forks, Brilliant and Ootischenia near Castlegar, as well as in the village of Glade and smaller communities in outlying areas. Multiple families shared communal houses, and daily chores such as cooking and cleaning were assigned to the residing members. The CCUB became an established business, owning sawmills, a brick factory, orchards, and the profitable KC jam factory. These ventures were paid for in part by Doukhobor labourers who, in practice, worked outside of the community and gave all earned monies to the communal coffers. This was a utopic attempt to forgo currency exchanges within the community (Woodcock and Avakumovic 1977). To this end individual bartering was also discouraged and all supplies, from food to clothing, were to be attained from the CCUB. By the time of Verigin's death in 1924, the Community's estimated worth was over five million dollars, with one fifth of that amount owing in debt (Woodcock and Avakumovic 1977).

The Community's prosperity and willingness to work in a group at reduced wages once again upset local residents. Within a brief period, Doukhobors were encountering verbal derisions initiated by the populace, largely British descendents,

who distrusted the Doukhobors' ethnic origins. The locals saw themselves as 'white' in comparison to their neighbours (Woodcock and Avakumovic 1977), and Doukhobors were even barred until the 1960's from entering public pools on this account (Rak 2003). Doukhobors' military exemption was moreover resented, and World War I veterans were angered by the sect's prosperity during the war effort. These sentiments were perhaps exacerbated by Verigin's exclusionary practices. The Community's self-sufficiency compounded by linguistic barriers kept Doukhobors from significantly interacting with their non-Doukhobor neighbours. While various work parties entered into seasonal labour in the Kootenay area, the groups kept to themselves and returned to their communities once the work was completed. The Community's recent land loss, seen as a government betrayal, only solidified their resolve to remain segregated—Verigin even went so far as to purchase land in Oregon, USA in an unrealized attempt to relocate once again. Unfortunately, British Columbia's conservative government disagreed with the isolationist policies and pressured Doukhobors to execute their civic obligations of "education, registration, and taxation" (Woodcock and Avakumovic 245).

Doukhobors largely distrusted the educational process, arguing that its assimilative constructs would dissolve their communal lifestyle, while its curriculum would advocate militarism. Once their parents were assured of an agreeable programme in the schools, however, Doukhobor children began attending classes in 1911; a school was subsequently constructed in Brilliant the following year. The community, however, remained unyielding in regards to other government requirements. Doukhobors refused to register deaths and marriages, and four men were even arrested for failing to report a death (Woodcock and Avakumic 1977). Authorities responded by exhuming bodies from local cemeteries, and the Community Regulation Act, which decreed that failure to provide vital statistics would result in fines, was implemented. Doukhobors immediately removed their children from the schools. The standoff was neutralized when it was guaranteed "no paramilitary exercises or religious education would be forced...and Verigin [in turn] promised to enrol enough pupils to fill the completely inadequate schools that existed" (Woodcock and Avakumovic 251). The ensuing seven years saw solid

attendance records, but in 1922 parents once again withdrew their children, and over the next few years school buildings were destroyed. As will become evident, tensions concerning education would continue throughout the following decades.

VI: Peter Chistiakov

After effectively uniting the communities and creating substantial communal holdings, Peter Verigin was killed in a train bombing while on his way to Grand Forks on October 29th, 1924. Many within the community believe that government officials planted the bomb in an attempt to disband the community; others argue the bomb was intended for another passenger. At his funeral, Verigin's body was covered in flowers brought by thousands of mourners, as the Community grieved the loss of their leader during a three-day memorial service. Reminiscent of the Caucasus' leadership quarrel, Verigin had not appointed an heir and disputes arose between his wife[11] Anastasia Golubova and those who supported a hereditary leader. While a handful of families followed Golubova to Alberta, the rest awaited the arrival of Verigin's son from Russia. In 1927 Verigin's son, Peter Verigin Чистяков—Chistiakov (the Cleanser)—assumed the leadership role.

Like his father, Chistiakov was charismatic and engaging, but his behaviour was otherwise erratic. He claimed his position was "to divine lies from truth, and light from darkness" (Woodcock and Avakumovic 286), but he was prone to heavy drinking and gambling. His dialogue was often mystical and occasionally coarse. Upon his arrival, he made three powerful statements that established a basis for future Doukhobor thought: sons of freedom cannot be slaves of corruption; the welfare of the world is not worth the life of one child; and let Doukhobors become professors (Woodcock and Avacumovic 1977). The first statement resonated with the Sons of Freedom, and their activities became more frequent as they interpreted Chistiakov's messages for themselves. In an unfortunately vicious cycle, their protests were met with community expulsion on Chistiakov's directive, which in turn increased their activities and led to further persecutions. Events intensified in 1931 when a series of lawsuits between Chistiakov and various individuals lead to the leader's arrest, imprisonment, and attempted deportation (Woodcock and Avakumovic 1977).

During one of his trials, a Sons of Freedom contingent was arrested for public nudity and transported en mass to Piers Island where they were detained for three years. Their children were consequently placed in foster care and orphanages (Woodcock and Avakumovic 1977).

Chistiakov, having inherited sizable debt, disbanded the communal coffers and in their place asked that each man contribute annual fees ranging from three hundred fifty dollars to sixty dollars during the Depression. He raised additional funds by playing upon a familiar theme: he began to discuss possible migrations. Chistiakov's mystical speeches, which metaphorically referred to a white horse, resounded with the Doukhobors (Woodcock and Avakumovic 1977). The community was reenergized (as they had been when Verigin purchased lands in Oregon) by thoughts of moving to Mexico or beyond, and speculations arose as to the white horse's true nature. In their exuberance they contributed substantial personal finances towards this relocation, monies that were in turn used by Chistiakov as loan payments. By his death, he had repaid over half of the CCUB's total debt (Woodcock and Avakumovic 1977).

Although he had succeeded in lowering the debt to approximately three hundred thousand dollars, Chistiakov was unable to prevent the insurance companies from foreclosing over three million dollars worth of CCUB businesses and land (Woodcock and Avakumovic 1977). To prevent massive protests by the displaced Doukhobors, the government allowed them to buy back portions of their land at minimal cost. However, the damage had been done, as the government was once again involved in substantial Doukhobor land loss.[12] Shortly thereafter, Chistiakov dismantled the CCUB and established the basis for the Union of Spiritual Community of Christ, a religious organization based on common Doukhobor beliefs. He died later that year of cancer. When his son Peter Iestrobov was unable to be located in Russia, his grandson John Voikin (who later changed his name to Verigin) was appointed as the honorary chairman of the USCC.

VII: Modern Fractures

At this point Doukhobor history becomes divided again. The Sons of Freedom and Independent groups did not recognise John Verigin as an unequivocal leader or spokesperson, and tension among the three groups culminated in factional segregation. They attended different prayer halls, celebrated festivals independently, and even unofficially discouraged inter-group marriages.

Independent lifestyle was virtually unaltered by John Verigin's ascension, as many had already been living apart from the Community. By the early 1940s, several Independent Doukhobors had learned the English language and received post-secondary education. Their earlier integration into greater Canadian society therefore facilitated intercultural communications, while it increased the assimilative process for Independents.

The USCC experienced greater changes. When they began to use the title of 'honorary chairman,' they officially transitioned away from divine leadership. The organization established a Union of Youth, responsible for an annual celebratory festival, and two USCC publications—*Mir* (a complex word meaning world, peace and community), as well as *Iskra* (the spark). As more youth moved to the Lower Mainland in the sixties and seventies, the Union of Young Doukhobors was created to maintain cultural activities away from the Kootenay community centres. The USCC was moreover instrumental in incorporating Russian language classes in public schools and offered their children Sunday school programs where they could access their historical and spiritual roots. In addition, multiple youth and community choirs flourished in Doukhobor tradition.

Although the Sons of Freedom also established community organizations, their external activities were what captivated the public. The sect continued to employ arson and nudity during public and private protests, and as the group disagreed amongst itself regarding various leadership claims in the late 1940s, these activities increased. A small faction subsequently left the Kootenays and established the Hilliers commune on Vancouver Island. In the Kootenays, local authorities established a special police unit known as the Doukhobor Squad, or D-squad, whose only concern was the Sons of Freedom. They were unable, however, to contain the

group's more aggressive activities. With the 1953 provincial elections concerning to a large degree the 'Doukhobor question,' many Sons of Freedom from Krestova abandoned and set fire to their homes and established a tented community at Perry Siding in the Slocan Valley. One hundred forty eight adults were arrested and sentenced to three years in prison for public nudity (a charge they contested), while their children were taken to a residential school in New Denver. The Sons of Freedom, however, continued their opposition towards the educational system. Their refusal to allow their children to attend schools prompted severe government reaction. The provincially legislated Schools Act decreed that all children were to attend public school, and on this basis, the authorities apprehended Sons of Freedom children and forcibly interred them in the New Denver residential school in British Columbia.[13] For the next six years, many of these children remained in a 'gated community,' visiting with family on Sundays through a chain link fence. Although the Schools Act and subsequent apprehensions were technically legal,[14] they were intended to punish the adults, which raised public concern regarding the statute's cruelty (Woodcock and Avakumovic 1977). Those who lived in New Denver as children are currently nearing the age of retirement and are dealing with the repercussions of their confinement to this day.

Perhaps the most striking event in Sons of Freedom history was the mass trek to Agassiz in 1962. 'Big Fanny' Storgeoff lead approximately six hundred people, primarily women and children, from the Kootenays to the Lower Mainland in order to protest the mass imprisonment of Sons of Freedom men, which took place shortly beforehand. The group eventually established a camp in Agassiz near the prison where over two hundred Sons of Freedom men were held. The makeshift community remained for nearly a decade. No longer segregated in their respective Kootenay communities of Krestova and Gilpin, the Sons of Freedom began working and attending school in Vancouver, British Columbia's largest centre. Their more radical activities were therefore tempered by contact with greater Canadian society. Upon the Agassiz prisoners' release, the Sons of Freedom returned to a calmer Kootenay community. Although there would be brief occurrences of protests by a handful of

dedicated women, the community's radical element largely disappeared in the early 1970s.

VIII: Current Activities

Under the auspice of the USCC, Doukhobor factions met several times between 1974 and 1982 to discuss multiple issues affecting the communities including tensions between factions, migratory and remembered Russian experiences, as well as the reasons for traditional cultural practices. These meetings produced perhaps the most recent text to have represented all factions in some manner, and The Summarized Report from the Joint Doukhobor Research Committee was released in 1997.

Today there are few published academic accounts detailing current Doukhobor culture or lifestyle. Although contemporary texts exist, they look to historic events or specific cultural detail, and there have yet to be any successful attempts to comprehensively encompass the entire community. Julie Rak's text Negotiated Memory, for example, deals with predominantly archived autobiographical materials, whereas articles by Gunter Schaarschmidt and Myler Wilkinson examine Doukhobor dialect and poetry respectively. Koozma Tarasoff has also published texts detailing Doukhobor history and cultural experience, and has recently published a book of photographs portraying individuals from various Doukhobor communities across Canada.

Doukhobors remain active within the Kootenay region where groups and individuals have developed various projects of interest. The Yasnaya Polyana bakery project has garnered much attention, and through community fundraising, intends to open in the summer of 2005 at Lev Tolstoy's estate outside of Tula. There is also the Doukhobor Village Museum, which is located near Castlegar, BC. Operational during the summer months, visitors can tour a replica of a traditional communal village and visit the statue of Lev Tolstoy that was placed on the grounds to commemorate the author's assistance with the community's migration to Canada. Many of the interview participants discussed in the following chapters grew up during

this most recent period in Doukhobor history and may be considered a part of current Doukhobor activities.

Notes

---

[1] This idea implies that Doukhoborism is a superior and devout form of Christianity; some community members would as much as argue that Doukhoborism is the 'true' and purest Christian belief.
[2] See also Svitlana Inikova's contrary view that Archbishop Nikifor of Slovenia was responsible for naming the Doukhobors in 1786.
[3] Within the Doukhobor community, Lukeriya's prophecies are said to predict that when the Doukhobors leave Russia, they will live in glass houses where water runs from the walls (a reference to indoor plumbing).
[4] Doukhobors bow to one another to recognise the spirit of God that dwells within each person. During the reading of the Lord's Prayer, the congregation bows three times.
[5] See Woodcock and Avakumovic for a detailed account of this time.
[6] Translation mine.
[7] The hymn is discussed in chapter four and a complete translation can be found in the appendix.
[8] Translation mine.
[9] Translation mine.
[10] For a detailed account of the land disputes, see Woodcock and Avakumovic, as well as John MacLaren.
[11] Golubova was not his legal wife, but, because Verigin referred to her as such, that is how she is recognized among many Doukhobors.
[12] See John MacLaren's chapter "The Doukhobor Belief in Faith and Conscience and the Demands of the Secular State" from his book Religious conscience, the state, and the law: historical contexts and contemporary significance.
[13] The New Denver children's experience is known as one of the more dreadful eras in Sons of Freedom history. There are stories of children being hidden away in barns and in surrounding forests, only to be hunted down by police dogs and physically carried onto awaiting buses. The BC provincial Ombudsperson has published a report "Righting the Wrong" detailing these events.
[14] The Act's legality has subsequently been disputed.

Chapter Two: Methodology

I: Participants

Contemporary Doukhobors have yet to be represented in academic publications, as current and past Doukhobor research has been focused primarily on historic events. Without the availability of texts that examine how contemporary Doukhobors relate to their diasporic positions, I sought access to the Doukhobor community. My own Doukhobor heritage facilitated contact with potential participants, and I was privileged to have been able to speak with a number of individuals within the community. Since the interview process was once suspect amongst Doukhobors because of perceived misrepresentation,[1] it was important that I establish trust and rapport with my participant group. My autoethnographic position, which assured the likelihood of future encounters, reaffirmed this commitment. I am therefore very fortunate to have interviewed nine participants from the West Kootenay region of British Columbia.

The participant group is comprised of two disparate generations: elders (over the age of seventy) and youth (defined by the community as anyone between the ages of sixteen and forty). I am privileged to have been able to speak with three Doukhobor elders (one woman; two men), as well as six Doukhobor youth (two women; four men). I also spoke with three other individuals but have not included their interviews in the analysis. One participant was excluded because s/he did not represent a youth or an elder, whereas two other interviews were omitted because they were inadvertently not recorded; transcripts were subsequently unavailable. Although the participants are members of various Doukhobor sub-sects, I use 'Doukhobor' as an inclusive term. This decision reflects the larger Doukhobor community's attempts at unification amongst disparate factions; sub-sect membership will be explained when and if such references are required.

Although the nine participants do not comprise a random sample, the group reflects the nature of the interviews where trust and rapport are pivotal determinants. All participants are therefore identified by pseudonyms. Some of the individuals who participated in this research are, as a result, related to me or are close acquaintances.

Others have been referred to me through word of mouth as reputable and possibly interesting potential interview participants. The participants can subsequently be determined by three characteristics 1) being involved to a greater extent with the Doukhobor community; 2) maintaining prominent roles within the Doukhobor community; 3) demonstrating that they are individuals interested in Doukhoborism and Doukhobors' place in greater society; and 4) being willing to be interviewed by me.

II: Interviews

The interviews were loosely informed by Edward D. Ives' The Tape Recorded Interview and were conducted between June 7th, 2004 and August 27th, 2004. Participants were approached in a variety of ways. I directly contacted five individuals via telephone, email or in person; three individuals were suggested to me, who I in turn contacted; and one individual volunteered her/himself. The interviews were conducted in person and averaged seventy minutes. All interviews were recorded on cassettes and transcribed.[2]

The interviews were conducted primarily in English with occasional Russian code switching. Code switching occurred more frequently with the elder participants, given that for the majority of Doukhobor elders, Russian is their dominant language. Among the youth, English is the primary, if not the exclusive, spoken language and was therefore the language of communication between the participants and myself (the interviewer).

III: Interview Questions

Participants were asked a series of closed and open-ended questions relating to three general themes: Russia as 'homeland;' Canada as current residence; and the role Russian (and indirectly English) plays in Doukhoborism and Doukhobor identity.[3] Responses were elicited in a variety of ways. Participants were asked direct questions such as, 'did you speak Russian while you were growing up?' or 'did your grandparents share stories about Russia with you?' Participants were also presented with scenarios and asked to respond. For instance, I asked them to discuss

how they felt about the Festival service,[4] which was explained in English. In addition, I as the interviewer presented my personal experiences as impetus for dialogue. In certain cases, I explained how my perception of Russia changed after I had travelled overseas. The participants were then asked how, or if, their perception of Russia altered after they had personally experienced the country. This latter dialogue reflected the fact that I am also a Doukhobor,[5] while addressing the personal allowed participants to speak of their own experiences within a 'safe' environment of mutual disclosure.

The interviews were ultimately shaped as conversations between two individuals. In other words, the informal atmosphere prompted many participants to ask my opinion on certain matters, while others redirected my questions back towards me. The conversational style, evident in many of the interviews, accommodates what Carolyn Ellis calls "interactive interviews." These interviews demonstrate that "the researcher's story is important in its own right, not as a tactic. The stories play off each other. You learn by interacting with each other" (Ellis 65).[6] Although the traditional interviewer-participant pattern was still evident, it did not supersede a more interactive discourse, which allowed me (the interviewer) to communicate with the participants on various levels. This modification, however, had the possibility of exacerbating digressive tendencies where the topic at hand can be easily mislaid for minutes, if not hours.[7] I accommodated this inclination by first informing my participants of the three general areas I wished to discuss. The participant was therefore permitted a degree of freedom—s/he was able to discuss that which s/he felt was important within a limited rubric. Individuals less inclined to speak openly were prompted by more direct questions, as were those who digressed extensively. This leniency resulted in many of the participants addressing the research concerns without being directly asked to do so.

IV: Transcriptions

The transcription process was three-fold. The recorded interviews were transcribed when I was uninformed of transcription theory or method; they therefore resembled written narratives. These texts, from which excerpts were selected, were

then used in the initial analysis. The identified excerpts were then transcribed again from the original recordings. The second transcription was influenced primarily by Dennis Tedlock's work where "the sheer alternation between sound and silence" (55) was the primary focus of transcription. These transcriptions were developed in order to define speech patterns and personalize the speaker.[8] The result, however, proved to be somewhat distracting and difficult to read—the manner of speech overwhelmed the speech's content. The third and final transcription, I believe, maintains the speaker's integrity without distracting from the content. Moreover, the transcriptions respect Doukhobors' oral history by deferring to the participants' spoken communications.

The following transcription method is inflected by Tedlock's work, as well as by work of John Gumperz and Norine Berenz. As alluded to, Tedlock argues that previously transcribed and translated Zuni narratives are flawed because they neglect features "such as voice quality (tone of voice), loudness, and pausing" (45). Although these traits heavily influence narrative delivery, they also impact orally recounted histories and general recorded conversations. Tedlock's attention to pauses within speech is valid; his method of line spacing to indicate pausing, however, is not. Gumperz and Berenz conversely focus on the minutiae within speech patterns—ums, ahs, stuttering, syllable length, intonation, overlap etc... (1993). This detailed account is not required for content-based analysis, and I have therefore selected portions from both methods to best transcribe my interview recordings.

The excerpts in this paper are transcribed according to the following model. The speakers' volume, the frequency and length of pauses in their speech,[9] and repeated words are all indicated. UPPER case letters stress an increase in the speaker's volume/intonation. Volume diminution is shown by a smaller font size. A standard pause, such as a breath inhalation, is indicated by a coma, whereas longer pauses are shown by a — line. Completed thoughts or statements are indicated by a period. The speech pattern is therefore maintained without distracting the reader. If either the interviewer or a third party interrupts the speaker, the interruption and new speaker's identity will be *italicised* and enclosed in [square brackets]. The participant's speech will be separated by several space breaks, while the interruption

will appear on the line below. The transcribed speech patterns therefore facilitate, but do not supersede, content. A transcription key is included in the appendix to expedite the reading process.

V: Analysis

The interview transcripts were qualitatively analysed. This analysis focused on code switching, self-referencing, nationality construction, uses of 'home' and 'homeland,' conflation between Doukhobor and Russian, multicultural rhetoric, and individual self-perception. Participants also considered intermarriage and how that has affected community and individuals, discussing current and previous relationships, difficulties in family dynamics, and having to make lifestyle choices contrary to cultural traditions. Participants also shared their personal belief system, how they perceive Doukhoborism is affecting the world at large, individual and cultural goals, Russian's role within the culture and its connection to spirituality, and their struggles with maintaining Doukhobor tenets such as vegetarianism. I do not currently possess the tools to conduct a sensitive analysis of such an array of topics, but I do recommend that one or all be considered for future research.

Prior to examining my interview analysis, I must first address a significant aspect of my methodology. As the sole interviewer, my Doukhobor background inevitably affected the participants' responses. The subsequent chapter will therefore introduce my autoethnographic position.

Notes

[1] Various publications arguably damaged relationships between observers and community members. See chapter three.
[2] A detailed account of the transcription process is dealt with in section IV.
[3] My question sheet is included in the appendix. However, not all questions were asked of all, or any, of the participants.
[4] The Festival refers to the USCC Youth Festival that occurs during the May long weekend. In recent years, all three sub-sects have been actively participating, making the prayer service on Sunday morning very well-attended.
[5] My autoethnographic position will be discussed in greater detail in chapter three.
[6] See Carolyn Ellis' chapter 'Autoethnography in Interview Research' in The Ethnographic I (2004).
[7] During previous interviews conducted in 1998, I found that Doukhobor elders were especially prone to digress in order to share experiences they felt were important either to me personally or to the community in general. This tendency could be a reflection of a time when the Doukhobor community was predominantly illiterate and oral traditions substituted written media.

[8] An example of the second-stage transcription:

I

would call myself a Canadian Doukhobor.

Interviewer [okay]

So it's interesting that I would say CANADA
Canadian
Doukhobor without saying
you could say Doukhobor I probably ten years ago I would have said Doukhobor
Canadian. (Mark 6)

[9] For a detailed account on the importance of pauses, see Norma Mendoza-Denton's article, "Pregnant Pauses: Silence and Authority in the Anita Hill-Clarence Thomas Hearings."

Chapter Three: Autoethnography

I: Autoethnography—A Theoretical Preface

As a self-identified Doukhobor, I realize that my autoethnographic position is privileged. I not only understand traditional customs, but I am also sensitive to Doukhobors' inherent distrust of the documentation process. Some previous publications, which sensationalized activities and individuals, have misrepresented and damaged the community. As a Doukhobor researcher, I am perhaps better prepared to evade these prejudices and conduct a sensitive ethnographic project. I am moreover aware that "the voice of the insider is assumed to be more true than that of the outsider" (Reed-Danahay 4), lending credibility to me both inside and outside of the Doukhobor community. Doukhobors are also a traditionally oral people. By grounding my study in spoken interviews, my position once again facilitates the ethnographic process, as:

> [o]ral testimonies are very different from archival documents and are never easily accessible to outsiders. They are cultural documents in which much is implicit, in which metaphor and symbol play a role in how ideas are presented.
>
> (Cruikshank 3)

As a community 'insider,' I do not require a cultural translation—interviewer and participant share the same subtext.

I have discovered that autoethnographic work is substantially more involved, "partly because of the multiple, shifting identities, which characterize our lives" (Reed-Danahay 4). It is possible to be objective, but it is nevertheless challenging, due in part to the personal interactions between the participants and myself. My academic role is complicated because, as Carolyn Ellis asks, how does an autoethnographer address "the 'I' of the researcher, the part that not only looks but is looked back at, that not only acts but is acted back upon by those in [her] focus[?]" (xix). Fortunately, autoethnographic scholarship:

> stands at the intersection of three genres of writing which are becoming increasingly visible: (1) 'native anthropology,' in which people who were

> formerly the subjects of ethnography become the authors of studies of their own group; (2) 'ethnic autobiography,' personal narratives written by members of ethnic minority groups; and (3) 'autobiographical ethnography,' in which anthropologists interject personal experience into ethnographic writing.
>
> (Reed-Danahay 2)

Within the autoethnographic rubric, I am able to address my self in relation to participants who recognize me as someone's daughter, sister, friend, colleague, or acquaintance. This recognition automatically questions "the binary conventions of a self/society split, as well as the boundary between the objective and the subjective" (Reed-Danahay 2). As a Doukhobor researcher, my identity remains fluid, negotiating boundaries between academy and community.

Although autoethnographic texts blur conventional boundaries, they are nonetheless indicative of sociocultural evolution. This emergent genre confirms that "we are in the midst of a renewed interest in personal narrative, in life history, and in autobiography among anthropologists" (Reed-Danahay 1). Autoethnographic Doukhobor scholarship is moreover important because in order to "interpret an orally narrated life story, we need enough sense of the speaker's cultural background to provide context for hearing what is said" (Cruikshank 4). My multiple positions consequently compound my responsibilities.

I was once informed that the mark of a capable researcher is her ability to accommodate change. The ensuing chapter is therefore evidence of that accommodation, as I attempt to compose "good autoethnographic writing [that is] truthful, vulnerable, evocative, and therapeutic" (Ellis 135). In the following section, I will position my life in the context of my research in order to best understand the complexity inherent in my fieldwork.

II: Krestova Beginnings

A person is not directed to Krestova; a person is lead. Unless the road is a familiar one, landmarks, sharp turns and unmarked gravel roads have no reference. The untouched forests do not lead to backyards; the worn migratory paths of elk and

deer do not form familiar walking trails; the prayer halls and cemetery do not house memories and family. When greeting first-time visitors, my parents would (and continue to) drive down the mountain road in order to meet our guests in the river valley. Like a caravan, we would proceed home, not trusting the ability of a tourist to navigate this alien terrain. "It's easier this way," my mother would explain. I agree. A person requires proper guidance to truly understand this journey and arrival, as Krestova is not located on any road map. The small community sits atop an isolated plateau that many, even those who have resided in the Kootenays for years, are unaware of. Therefore when I was asked where I lived, I would vaguely respond, "the valley." If pressed, I would allude to Crescent Valley, the unofficial entrance to the Slocan Valley. My reply was honest, if not necessarily accurate. Krestova was an answer reserved for friends and community members, a small group sensitive to the inherent implications in my response. Krestova is home. It is therefore a challenge for me to assimilate the Krestova I know with the Krestova that is known.

According to a variety of sources, Krestova accommodated an active, radical organization, the Sons of Freedom Doukhobors. It was a place associated with nudity, arson, bombing, and a form of anarchy. In some circles, these associations persist. Sons of Freedom were often misrepresented within the media and extending communities for their reaction to, and against, official pressures. Doukhobor Daze, a text produced by schoolteacher Hazel O'Neil, is a brief xenophobic narrative detailing the short period O'Neil had spent in the Kootenays instructing Doukhobor children. A second example is Terror in the Name of God by journalist Simma Holt. Holt, a Vancouver Sun reporter in the nineteen sixties, received much attention for her best selling expose of this group. Photos of the Krestova community in the early sixties provided a visual counterpoint to her biased accounts, and unfortunately, Holt's viewpoint became the standard by which Sons of Freedom are perceived. These popular texts, compounded by partial local reporting, informed the public. Certain facts, however, are irrefutable. Individuals associated with or belonging to the Sons of Freedom organization did engage in illegal activities. Houses were burned. Buildings were bombed. Sons of Freedom did employ nudity in their protests as a form of religious expression. For the most part, the rate of these

activities declined in the late seventies, and individuals belonging to my generation have little to no recollection of this period. Nonetheless, these actions have inflected all Sons of Freedom, and to an extent, all Doukhobors.

I am a Sons of Freedom.[1] The significance of my identity within the Doukhobor community became apparent to me when I conducted interviews in the Kootenay region in the summer of 2004. Although my research topic was politically neutral, I realised that within the Doukhobor communities, I am not. It is therefore important that I introduce myself in order to maintain the dignity of my research. In some respects, I can be considered the fundamental research variable. Although I did not originally intend to address my autoethnographic presence in this manner, I will nevertheless reply to a basic Doukhobor question: 'а ты чья?' [and to whom do you belong?]

My paternal family is descended from Sherstobitoffs and Pereversoffs of Glade, an original Doukhobor settlement on the banks of the Kootenay River. My maternal family is comprised of Zmaeffs (alternately spelled Jmaeff) and Pankoffs from Krestova. My immediate family continues to be relatively active within the Krestova community. We have attended prayer services, community-organized Russian schools and festival celebrations. My mother was instrumental in facilitating weekly youth spiritual workshops, as well as implementing the Russian language in local elementary and secondary schools. For a number of years my father co-directed community youth choirs and currently participates in local Doukhobor men's choirs. Singing and choral participation is a vital and fundamental Doukhobor tradition, and as will be evinced by my баба [grandmother] Sherstobitoff, talented individuals are esteemed.

My paternal grandmother is recognized as a pre-eminent Sons of Freedom vocalist. Her vocal and aural abilities, coupled with her remarkable memory, have made her the definitive authority on correct choral structure, harmony, and lyrics within the Sons of Freedom community. I cherish our relationship and recognize that she has become invaluable to my research and my private journey. Her personal and collective history has influenced my own understanding of self, as it is within our discussions that I discovered my familial roots. The Russian landscape became alive

as she recounted her father's tales of being a seven-year-old shepherd taunted by wolves. The communal villages in Glade took on a persona, as the elders I knew became barefooted children assisting the harvest and raiding the root cellars for midnight snacks. My history was brought to life, and although in my younger years I was not always an enraptured audience, my grandmother's passion nevertheless captivated me.

My maternal grandmother has been a more elusive presence. For the greater part of my lifetime, she had been interned in various prisons in British Columbia serving numerous arson charges. Tina Jmaeff was a Sons of Freedom activist whose arrests and activities occurred long after the majority of Sons of Freedom ceased to use arson and nudity in their demonstrations. I developed a relationship with her through letters and phone calls, but for the most part, she was not a physical presence. On one of the rare instances she was responsible for taking care of my brother and me after school, I remember feeling uneasy as the bus dropped me off that afternoon. I was listening for sirens and trying to see if the clouds above my home resembled smoke. As I walked up the driveway, my aunt met me outside and asked that I go to my other grandparents' house next door and wait there until my parents came home from work. "Baba Tanya," she said, "has been arrested." It was a precautionary measure, as her companion Mary Braun had just broken parole. The police had come to my home only hours before to take Tina away. I believe I was in grade two. This brief account cannot fully convey Tina's role my life; neither does it diminish the effect her activities had, and continue to have, on my immediate family. In the greater Doukhobor community I am therefore not only a Sons of Freedom from Krestova, but I am also Tina Zmaeff's granddaughter. I occupy a marginal position: within the non-Doukhobor community I am recognized as a minority, but I am also marginalized within the Doukhobor community because of who my grandmother—Tina—was.[2] When I answer 'а ты чья?' [and to whom do you belong?] I am ever aware of the potential responses and inherent connotations in my reply.

III: Locating Community

When I was seventeen years old I wished my last name were Smith. Simple. Common. More importantly, Smith would never be mistaken for a Doukhobor name. Although there were several other Doukhobors in my high school, and many of my close friends were also of Doukhobor background, I still longed to be like my 'English' friends whose history, personal or collective, did not precede them. When asked about my surname, I quickly explained my ancestors were Russian; I would admit to being a Doukhobor only when if directly asked, "are you a Doukhobor?" My college and university years were somewhat better, as I quickly discovered that my GPA improved when Russian courses appeared on my transcripts. What began as an academic advantage, however, gradually evolved into a personal pursuit. I was fortunate to have travelled to Russia on a literary excursion with my college professor. The trip centred on a visit to Lev Tolstoy's estate in the Tula region, and a great part of our lectures touched upon Tolstoy's contribution to the Doukhobor migration to Canada. This trip inadvertently directed me to my first summer job as amateur Doukhobor ethnographer where, I now realize, I had the privilege of meeting many first-generation Doukhobors. Many have now passed on. I returned to school and continued my Russian studies. However, the more I learned about Russia and the Russian language, the more interested I became in the Doukhobor aspect of my self. I ultimately realized that I would never be able to understand *who* I was unless I accepted *what* I was.

There were multiple reasons as to why I decided to work and locate my research within the Doukhobor community. As a Doukhobor, I felt we lacked self-representation; the non-Doukhobors willing to write our story greatly outnumbered the Doukhobors engaged in the same task. Moreover, the frustrations within the community after a new film or text was published mirrored my own resentment at what I often believed (perhaps inaccurately) to be cultural distortion. The aforementioned misrepresentations (Holt and O'Neil) created a virtual imprint upon the Doukhobor psyche; it was as if non-Doukhobor depictions were permanently unacceptable. Although contemporary texts have communicated a sensitivity

unexpressed by previous works, I still believed that external research needed to be balanced by internal study.

By working within the community, I felt I would be working with (and for) relatives, friends, and mentors. I also felt that my position as Doukhobor scholar would facilitate my research and access to possible participants. I would be aided not only by my ability to speak the Doukhobor dialect, but also by my understanding of cultural nuances. The position of cultural minority (re)writing history further intrigued me. Our culturally oral traditions have made Doukhobor history unlike its Western counterpart. Community members are encouraged to know their roots, individual and collective, which goes partly to explain why, when meeting for the first time, one is asked, 'а ты чья?' ['to whom do you belong?'] This is not an invasion of privacy but rather an embrace of the familial and of the historical. One is asked, in a sense, to tell their own story, share their small history.

Writing from the margins furthermore intrigues me. My academic career has introduced me to many writers, but those who resonate with me are likely to be ethnically marked, racially identifiable as 'Other,' oppressed by a dominant authority, or a combination of the above. Moreover, they find themselves situated within a culturally foreign landscape where the notion of belonging is questioned. It soon became clear that my literary path was leading me towards diasporic writers. Reading authors who explored displacement, of living here and belonging elsewhere (Clifford 1994; Mishra 1995), I came to the realization that I as a Doukhobor am a displaced person. I commiserated with Gilroy, Mishra, and Brand not because I knew their personal suffering, but because I felt my identity was also beyond location.

These feelings in turn allowed me to formulate a research topic: 'Negotiating the Doukhobor Diaspora.' The topic not only related to personal feelings of displacement, but it also precluded politically determined issues.[3] The various Doukhobor factions have only recently begun inter-community dialogue, and focusing on one group, I felt, would be reaffirming differences as opposed to emphasising similarities. In other words, I did not want to be perceived as an impediment to the unification process. Only towards the end of my fieldwork did I

come to the realization that because of my personal history, because of who I am and those I represent, no issue I addressed would ever remain apolitical.

IV: Discovered Collective

I returned to Krestova to begin my fieldwork in late April 2004. After a frenzy of activity prior to my departure from Edmonton, things became even more confused with the unexpected arrival of two friends from Quebec. It was agreed that during their few days off (they had been working in a nearby town) they would drive with me back to BC. We arrived in Krestova at three a.m. Although our journey along the Banff highway was hazardous because of the hundreds of deer we encountered, my immediate response as we began the ascent to Krestova was to caution the driver. I unexplainably felt the seven kilometres leading to my home would be the most treacherous and unexpected. We pulled into the driveway and were greeted by the porch light my neighbour, a cousin, left on for us. The neighbourhood was otherwise dark and the three of us looked up at the stars while the family dog Pasha demanded attention and a belly scratch. A friend who slept during our ten-hour drive remarked, "I can't wait to see what this place looks like." I agreed. I had just arrived at the most familiar place I know with two individuals who had never before seen the Kootenays, much less Krestova. In the dark was the perfect place to start.

My arrival allowed me to explore my backyard with fresh vision. I saw the mountains as my friends saw them—as unexplored adventures. When we hiked the back trails, I found myself explaining how the acreage had been purchased as a communal piece of land and that the majority of my entire family lived within five square kilometres. I was never pressured for historical facts, and I found myself free to elaborate or overlook as I saw fit. We laughed over attempted pronunciations of my name—'Shershtabeeetoff'—but I felt proud that they identified me as a Doukhobor and not necessarily an English-speaking Canadian. My interactions with these friends reminded me that I possess a unique heritage that not many beyond British Columbia's borders are aware of. Moreover, I had not only returned home; I had returned to a community. These feelings fortified and reinvigorate me after

almost eight months in Alberta. I had developed an academic distance in Edmonton that allowed me to discover how I wished to examine the Doukhobors. This cultivated distance, however, vanished as I was once again, and immediately, immersed in my culture.

Although I returned to the Kootenays as an academic with responsibilities and goals, I was welcomed as a Doukhobor. This position is not one I take lightly, and I am ever aware that my work, despite the best intentions, extends far beyond my grasp. I belong to this community and will therefore remain located within that space. The fieldwork I conducted reaffirmed this position, as time and again, I was reminded that the stories, opinions, and dreams shared with me during the interview process belonged to a people—my people.

Within the Doukhobor community, I found I was welcomed into a variety of homes and spaces. Individuals were excited not necessarily about my work, but for the simple reason that I was working within *our* culture. My relatively young age elicited comments about fading youth involvement within the communities, and my willingness to share personal experiences prompted some to conduct their own informal questionnaires. Apart from my research, I was asked how I felt about inter-marriages, language issues, youth involvement, my personal history, and future or current obstacles facing the Doukhobor people. I was challenged, but ultimately sustained, by these communications. Participants allowed me to transgress the boundary between interviewer—subject, as many interviews became conversations. And it was these conversations, which shaped my research.

After conducting my research, I confirmed what I knew to be true—these conversations have been taking place in hundreds of living rooms over countless generations. I am simply part of a continuum of voices. In our traditionally oral culture, and perhaps because of that fact, the individual voice retains power, but the collective retains authority. I belong to a tradition shared by every Doukhobor in history, which begs the question: "just how is the self of personal narrative, as it works towards self-formation, engaged in affiliation as well? To what degree is the "us" [...] the subject of autobiography?" (Goldman xxiv). Writing within the Doukhobor canon carries with it what Genaro M. Padilla calls "the heavy burden of

collective representation" (9). I, as a Doukhobor researcher, am not only responsible for my own account but also for how my text will accommodate the existing Doukhobor continuum. I speak from an individual perspective, but cultural circumstances subvert my distinctiveness; although I may write 'I,' the pronoun may be conceivably interchanged with a collective 'we.' These apparent polarities do not comprise a dichotomy for:

> rather than fix the subject of a given text as either illustrative of a privileged self, distinguished from others in bold relief, or as an example of the 'We' that is metonymic of a collective, identity might more effectively be appraised with reference to a continuum. This flexible model has the advantage of supporting multiple self-positionings. (Goldman xxiv)

To better understand the singular-collective dialogue, I must look to Doukhobor orality and cultural representation.

Doukhobor oral traditions are embedded in the culture's Russian peasant origins. As historically evinced, the group was largely critical and wary of educational institutes, an attitude which only preserved their illiterate population. Written materials were disapproved of, as all prayer services and singing were conducted without notation or script; individuals capable of lengthy recitation were widely esteemed. Exceptional memory was, and remains, highly valued.

Poet-composer is one of the rare, recognizable written genres in Doukhobor tradition. However, a preponderance of Doukhobor hymns and folksongs do not indicate authorship (Сборник [Collection]1978). One of the by-products of Verigin and Chistiakov's attempts at creating a self-sustained commune (Woodcock and Avacumovic 1977) was honouring the community above all—and everyone—else. When an author is identified, his/her position is communally recognized as secondary to the text. Therefore in a community where "the individual could not in any positive way be imagined to stand outside or against his society" (Krupat 11), writers/composers *as individuals* were rarely esteemed. Community singing is an analogous notion. A hymn is lead by a soloist (where s/he begins singing the first few words) only to allow the congregation to join in—the group eclipses the soloist

illustrating through metaphor how the collective is understood to be valued above the individual.

Authority is also traditionally subverted. Doukhobor historian Eli Popoff has been known to use materials gathered through conversations he conducted with Doukhobor elders throughout the twentieth century. Although Popoff creates his own text, his authority is subverted, for, like the First Nations poet, he is not "the originator of his material but merely the conveyor. Either he has heard it from an elder or he has received it from a supernatural power" (Bierhost, qtd in Krupat 11). This latter, mystical element is also observed within the Doukhobor community, as revered and talented singers absolve themselves of any responsibility for their gift. By deferring to a higher source (as evinced by one interview participant [an elder] who claims she received her musical talent 'for free'), a person relinquishes individual power to, in this case, God. Here the collective reaches its ultimate aspiration—union with the divine.

Doukhobor orality and communal focus has moreover produced a continuum where individuals are located in relation to their predecessors, as well as contemporaries. As I have previously argued, the standard community inquiry is 'а ты чья ?' [to whom do you belong] Answering this statement immediately repositions the 'I,' for I belong to a group, an inherent 'we.' On the macro level, this continuum/group refers to all Doukhobors, but on a detailed micro level, 'I' is positioned in relation to my Doukhobor sub-sect, as well as extended and immediate family. When I respond with the names of my grand/parents, a Doukhobor audience will inherently determine where I am located by positioning 'they/we' on this continuum. My Sons of Freedom community and my familial past will supplant Lena Sherstobitoff. 'I' therefore represent (and am represented by) 'we.' When members of my community and family read this text, I need to ascertain that I have satisfied all of my positions. Within the Doukhobor community, some individuals may perceive my work as "a communal utterance, a collective tale, rather than merely an individual's autobiography" (Gates Jr. 2). I am therefore accountable to many, as my voice is "at once individual and collective" (Krupat 15).

Perhaps this collectivity is the unnamed essence that defines all Doukhobors, the reason why so many of us claim kinship and community to unfamiliar faces carrying a Doukhobor past. As brethren, we have access to the same ancestral pool, and while communal consciousness may no longer be at the forefront of Doukhobor dialogue, it is not something easily overlooked. It is because of this collective memory, I believe, that I was able to transgress boundaries and connect with (virtual) strangers. I heard stories and opinions from people I had never before seen, and yet when we spoke, I commiserated with them and connected to their words, if not their experiences.

I will undoubtedly encounter each and every interview participant at some point in the near future. These individuals agreed to share their thoughts with me based on my word, or in some cases, the word of a mutual acquaintance, that the information gathered was to be used in a constructive, respectful manner. However, I am responsible to these individuals in a way that surpasses a more detached researcher—participant relationship. All of the participants were, to a greater or lesser extent, part of my community. Our families pray together; our children play together. To do harm to these individuals is to harm myself. Moreover, as evinced by previous discussions regarding the importance of personal history, I am interacting not only with an individual, but also with her entire history. The reverse is also true. A participant engages in dialogue with me and therefore indirectly with my family, my future, and my past. This process has made me acutely aware that although I am accountable for my own actions, to a lesser degree, everyone connected to me may also be held responsible. I am bound to the continuum.

Doukhobor individuals cast long historical shadows, which provide a means for the rest of the community to locate, recognize, and know them. A person's family and history equips me in understanding who that individual is and where s/he fits into my realm of experiences. I am able to locate her or him and understand how and why our paths have intersected not only today but also historically. This process is not always positive, and many individuals can attest to the often stifling and judgemental environment created by such recognition.

My history and background were discussed on numerous occasions. Either in passing or through direct questioning, I was made aware that the individual across from me was cognisant of who I was. S/he would mention the names of my grandfather's brothers, the Russian village my great-grandparents were from, the instances s/he visited my grandmother Tina in prison, a Krestova landmark, relatives within Krestova or the Sons of Freedom community, and almost without fail, the Sons of Freedom role in 'defiling' Doukhoborism. I appreciated, for the most part, questions about my upbringing and the challenges I may have faced as a Sons of Freedom Doukobor both within and without the Doukhobor communities. In some cases, I had never considered the extent to which my heritage influenced my social position and welcomed the dialogue this reality invited. In other instances, individuals were contemplating their personal Sons of Freedom connections and were curious to share in my experiences. I was most fascinated by these conversations because they illustrated how others operated within our unusual heritage. Stories were shared as we asked how the other dealt with inevitable scenarios: explaining a family history that included mass incarcerations, public misconception, and reactions of non-community members to our presence in certain social scenarios. The majority of this time was spent laughing, as jokes were exchanged to mask perhaps the uncertainty of these bizarre situations. It was agreed that outside of our community, we had yet to encounter another generation of young people who have had to explain to their date/friend/co-worker exactly why their grand/parent has been, or is, in jail. However, after my ethnographic experiences within the community, I am bolstered by the knowledge that many are moving beyond what *has* happened and are looking towards what *has yet* to transpire. Although we will be considering the past for many years to come, I do not perceive this consideration as altogether negative. It is perhaps even necessary in order to restructure and anticipate a Doukhobor future.

V: Placements

The community for all intents and purposes is surreptitiously hierarchical. If I were to be 'ranked' via conventional Doukhobor standards, as an educated, single, young (according to the community), Sons of Freedom, I undoubtedly occupy a lower

social position than my elder, male, Community counterpart. In my particular case, I would assume an even lower rank because of my relation to Tina. Although men may have assumed dominant public roles, Doukhobor history is shaped by women's actions in the field, home, and family. Doukhobor women have been pioneers, community leaders, heads of organizations and committees, as well as healers and teachers. Although my attitude is undoubtedly influenced by my personal upbringing and encounters, as the community evolves, women's continuous engagements are evident in all aspects and strata of Doukhobor society.

My age and educational background also dictated which language the respondents used when conversing with me. There were instances of code switching between English and Russian, but English was used to convey most opinions and philosophical ideas. English is the primary communicative language within the community, and perhaps because I belong to a younger generation of Doukhobors, it was assumed that my Russian skills were not sufficient to conduct this type of work. This assumption could very well be correct. I converse in English when I am among my Doukhobor friends and with most members of my family. Russian, in speech, is used to communicate culturally specific notions; the language is otherwise relegated to prayer or other traditional Doukhobor services. I possess intermediate language skills where my understanding is stronger than my communicative abilities. However, one of the elder participants felt comfortable speaking predominantly in Russian to me, and I was able to use both languages to communicate my ideas to that participant. Although this type of communication is common within the community, where Russian and English substitute each other or form hybrid words that are neither English nor Russian, the overall interview process nevertheless made me uncomfortable. In some instances, I felt I was less of a Doukhobor because I was incapable of conducting all of my research in my native dialect. In other cases, it was not my language skills that impeded Russian dialogue. Many individuals belonging to my generation are no longer able to sustain any type of conversation in Russian, and they may have declined to participate if I had insisted on speaking exclusively in our mother tongue.

VI: My Self Considered

During a conversation with a friend this summer, the topic turned to my thesis research. I explained the autoethnographic portion of my work and tried to convey why it was important for me to be working in that particular field. As we drank our coffee and watched people pass by the little corner shop, he asked if there was any way he could tell if the people outside our window were Doukhobors. I responded by asking him if I looked 'Doukhobor.' He looked at me for a moment and then laughed. I have no identifiable external markers that would label me anything other than 'North American.' I do not wear my cultural dress outside of community engagements, my English speech carries a slight accent but nothing overt, and my Russian appears to be 'native' but rural and Southern, as opposed to urban and Northern. It is so easy for me to slip into the general population that I am not cognisant of its occurrence (one of the participants joked that Doukhobors should have identity tags or tattoos just so we could recognise one another on the street). The reverse however is not true. The instant I walk into a Doukhobor centre, museum, or home, I immediately recognise the shift within myself. I become a grand/daughter, sister, and choir member, master of ceremony, psalm-reader, song leader, and community member. My culture overrides all external factors, and I take the place allotted me. Processing my summer's research has made this latter fact all the more apparent.

Until this work, I never considered my position within the Doukhobor community. My status was something I was innately aware of and therefore did not feel the need to necessarily discuss it. Moreover, there was a never an available venue for this discussion to occur because as Doukhobors, we are aware of the 'who's who' in our society. Only when we are asked to explain our circumstances to non-Doukhobors (as is the case with this paper), do we engage in formal discourse. I was fortunate to engage individuals who are relatively active within their respective communities, and our dialogues appeared to traverse familiar issues. However, my discussions with those who were not involved with committees or cultural programs were also valuable, perhaps more so. These discussions showed that regardless of

personal involvement within the community, everyone I spoke with had an opinion about her or his culture.

This project has substantially evolved, and I could not have predicted such results a year ago. The actual process has moreover proved invaluable. This educational experience extended beyond university grounds to only return to the place I started from. As a result, I have gained a greater awareness of my culture and community, as well as my self.

Notes

---

[1] I prefer the term Sons of Freedom to Freedomite. Freedomite may be a better translation of свободник [svobodnik] and is gender-neutral, it is a term I rarely heard (and rarely hear, although the plural term свободники [svobodniki] is more frequently employed).

[2] Audre Lorde, a "Black, lesbian feminist scholar" (114), discusses marginality in her essay 'Age, Race, Class and Sex.' She argues that within feminist criticism, black women are marginal, while within black feminist criticism, lesbians are marginalized (Lorde 1980). Black lesbians are therefore doubly marginalized.

[3] Doukhobor political issues are intra-cultural topics that focus on factional divisions. A perceived political topic may therefore be one that deals with the New Denver residential school, a primarily Sons of Freedom matter.

Chapter Four: Negotiating the Doukhobor Diaspora

I: Introduction

My initial research goal was to further understand how Doukhobors of my generation negotiate their position within the Doukhobor diaspora. Although I initially constructed interviews around imaginatively understood notions of home and homeland that I thought Doukhobors might have, I found that upon examination, participants addressed an array of topics during our discussions. To this end, the following analysis is prompted by the interview participants' communications.

To best comprehend the contemporary Doukhobor diaspora, I opted first to introduce a comparative perspective and examine the diaspora of first-generation Doukhobors, as seen in previously published work and recorded interviews. This examination in turn illustrates how younger generations' understanding of displacement has developed. I go on to discuss what the contemporary Doukhobor diaspora is like, and I look at the changing notion of diasporic belonging in light of current thinking about nationality, multiculturalism, and displacement or 'otherness.' In conclusion, I demonstrate that although contemporary Doukhobor participants have an ambiguous relationship to ideas about nationality and place, their thoughts reveal an ongoing connection to a sense of cultural belonging that could be called diasporic. This notion is complicated by participants' use of multicultural rhetoric, which provides them with tools to feel 'at home' in Canada.

II: Diaspora Considered

In Negotiated Memory, an exploration of non-traditional autobiographical forms of the Doukhobor culture, Julie Rak situates Doukhobor autobiographical texts of the early to mid-twentieth century by means of diasporic discourse. Rak demonstrates that multiple modern contacts exist between Russia and Doukhobors within Canada, as seen in letters to *Iskra* from Russian travellers and citizens, financial assistance to projects at Yasnaya Polyana, as well as repeated attempts at negotiating a Doukhobor return to their land of origin.[1] Archived recordings of first-generation and Doukhobors who were part of the migration to Canada, [2] as well as

various Doukhobor publications, further articulate a communal desire that many Doukhobor groups have had to resist Canadian cultural assimilation, which they enact in part by remembering that Doukhobors are spiritually connected to their Russian homeland. Rak provides substantial support that Doukhobors are a diaspora, "particularly since they were forced to migrate to Canada and, for many years, were expected to return to Russia" (60). Her examination, however, illustrates that Doukhobors retain ties to their Russian homeland primarily through recollection and recitation, rather than literal contact with Russia. Remembrances of personal life stories, as well as the recitation of psalms, folksongs and hymns, serve as reminders of severe persecution and sacrifice that ultimately led to Canadian migration (Rak 2004). These remembrances in turn function as a 'diasporic imaginary' for, as Rak notes, Doukhobor hymnology correlates cultural identity with the migratory experience (Rak 2004). Rak therefore demonstrates that the imagined consequences of displacement have a greater affect on the Doukhobor community than does the physical reality of living 'here.'

Various scholarly treatments of diaspora inform Rak's application of the concept, including the work of William Safran. Safran's definition of the term, however, is substantially more literal than Rak's treatment, as he proposes that migrant groups are only diasporic if they retain active connections to their land of origin. Safran therefore defines members of the diaspora as being:

> 1) dispersed from a specific original 'center' to two or more 'peripheral,' or foreign, regions; 2) they retain a collective memory, vision, or myth about their original homeland...3) they believe that they are not—and perhaps cannot be—fully accepted by their host society...4) they regard their ancestral homeland as their true, ideal home and as the place to which they or their descendents would (or should) eventually return...5) they believe that they should, collectively, be committed to the maintenance or restoration of their original homeland...and 6) they continue to relate, personally or vicariously, to that homeland in one way or another. (83-84)

Safran constructs an ideal model of diaspora that, although popular, has nevertheless been criticized for perhaps unfairly limiting the term's applicability. His desire to

maintain definitional integrity, however, is echoed by Khachig Tölölyan who agrees 'diaspora' has been theoretically weakened because of extensive, unstructured use. In Tölölyan's words:

> A diaspora is never merely an act of birth, a clump of individuals living outside their ancestral homeland, each with a hybrid subjectivity, lacking collective practices that underscore (not just) their difference from others, but also their similarity to each other, and their links to the people on the homeland. Without some minimal stringency of definition, most of America...would just as easily be a diaspora. (30)

Tölölyan subsequently modifies and elaborates upon Safran's six characteristics, bringing particular attention to the distinction between ethnic and diasporic communities. The latter is distinct in that it consciously and consistently sustains ties with the homeland. In contrast, an ethnic community's homeland connections are "absent, weak, at best intermittent, and manifested by individuals rather than the community as a whole" (Tölölyan 16).

Safran and Tölölyan's definitions have subsequently become templates against which diverse cultural communities are measured. I therefore found (as did Rak) that Safran and Tölölyan's perception of diaspora is one effective means by which to examine how Doukhobor groups have seen themselves as diasporic. However, my application is not as literal as Safran and Tölölyan may prefer. They advocate a real and consistent connection to the homeland, which limits the use of their model to a very small global sample.[3] So although Safran and Tölölyan's theories are useful when discussing how a people are influenced by migration, their method becomes more widely applicable when read through imagined consequences of displacement and return, rather than literal negotiations with the homeland. This approach is supported by interviews I conducted with first and second-generation Doukhobor elders when we met to discuss their understanding of homeland and migration.

III: Participants' Diasporic Insights

The interviews occurred in the summer of 2004, and while the participants appeared comfortable with me (their interviewer), the participants often took an instructive role when talking with me. As Rak demonstrates, memories among Doukhobors are shared so that others may learn from—and not forget—these experiences (2004). It was therefore natural in the interviews I conducted for a participant to quote a Doukhobor leader's speech, recite a psalm, or share an old story in order to pass along knowledge to another generation because I am a member of that generation. Russia, in turn, played a prominent role in our discussions. In particular, two participants (first-generation Doukhobors) showed a determined connection to their homeland. For one individual, this bond was introduced in childhood and maintained today:

> And I remember my dad, he said, IF ONLY I could go and look at all those mountains, hills and mountains, где он пас овец, [where he shepherded sheep] a seven-year-old—овец, стадам овец пас [sheep, shepherded a flock of sheep]. (Helen 3)

Helen's connection to her land of origin is introduced in part by her father's emotive recollections and reinforced through the repetition of prophetic declarations, which stated Doukhobors would leave Russia and later return:

> *[Interviewer] Do you think that that prophecy is still...*
>
> I believe—IT WILL WORK, one day—I believe so—because I know many other people do, I couldn't say about the young people too much but there are some, there still are some young people that DO believe in that—that the day will come, How? Under what conditions? That I don't know, and that was never said—but—она как бы сказать, Лушечка говорила только что
>
> *[Interviewer] Aха [Aha]*
>
> это ты не будишь им говорить [how would I say this, Lushechka said, only you won't be able to tell them].
>
> *[Interviewer] That's true—It's HARder to convince people now I think—that that's going to happen.* (Helen 3)

Here the 'myth of return' is not contained to cultural legends given that this individual believes that the Doukhobor future is in Russia; the homeland connection is real because if *feels* real. Her diasporic position is furthermore reiterated on a linguistic level through code-switching. Helen quotes Lukeriya Kalmykova (a prominent Doukhobor leader of the past who made prophecies) in Russian and this specific language shift suggests to the interviewer that something as important as a leader's words cannot (or should not) be translated. The authenticity of the message is therefore maintained by using the original—Russian—language. Helen's conviction that the Doukhobors will eventually return to their homeland is furthermore based on faith. Helen explains:

> Да она говорила придут—вернуться назад [Yes she said they'll come, return home] but at, small, groups суды шли большая группа [A large group came here], seven and a half thousand, от цель пойдут очень мало [From here very few will leave].
>
> *[Interviewer] Was this an idea that was, talked about a lot in the community or in your family?*
>
> Oh yes, always.
>
> *[Interviewer] So it was it was very open that all the Doukhobors that the Doukhobors knew that they were going to return.*
>
> Oh yes. Oh yes—well some people right from the beGINning—они не верили [they did not believe], WHO knows, теперь как на Молошних ВОдах как [now like in the Milky WAters how] like I said, что туды всякий, туды когда [there all kinds, there when] this amnesty был [was], when the amnesty was, like I said—everybody who, claimed to be a Doukhobor was—permitted to LEave—пересилялись [resettled]—but, так и было скажено что, у Духоборцев там тоже много и драков было и ВСЕ было [like it was said that, the Doukhobors also had a lot of fighting and EVERYTHING] and, like и сюды когда перешли [and here when they moved] even Толстой, написал, если сюды все по веры пришЛИ—не было бы на Саскачеване что одни хомстеды забрали а другие нет [Tolstoy, wrote, that if everyone MOVED here because of faith—

> it wouldn't have happened that in Saskatchewan the homesteads were taken away and others were not]—не кто бы не взяль хомстед если он по веры сюды шел [—no one would have taken a homestead if they had come here in faith], кто по веры шел, а эти шли люди не по веры [some came in faith, but these people came not in faith], some, то за батки, то за братом, то [some followed their father, others followed their brother, or] you know—он идет и я пойду [—he's going and I'm going too], а веры не было [but there was no faith] no understanding—so that's what HAppened, за то, на Саскачеване одни хомстеды взяли других, а других у все отобрали [that's why, in Saskatchewan some homesteads were taken while others, others everything was taken from them]. (Helen 4)

Helen substantiates Lukeriya's prophecy by juxtaposing faithful Doukhobors against the unfaithful. She correlates this argument with two other historic events—the Milky Waters exile and the mass Saskatchewan land loss—where she suggests the unfaithful caused general turmoil for the entire community. The implication is that this pattern will be repeated: those who will choose to remain in Canada when the time comes to migrate will lack faith. Helen corroborates these observations by referring to Lev Tolstoy, whose communications with Doukhobors in Canada suggest he was disappointed with some of the community's lifestyle choices.[4] Helen's argument is especially compelling because of the manner in which she invokes the community's collective memory. She grounds personal beliefs in general understanding, seen in the above passage as allusions to renowned Doukhobor figures, as well the omission of first-person narrative. Instead, she speaks as if she were repeating statements heard many times before. This collective tendency, according to Tölölyan, is a diasporic characteristic that demonstrates how "memories...are assumed to preserve the qualities of wholeness and purity associated with...an originary identity" (Tölölyan 14). Helen furthermore reinforces the importance of her statement by speaking predominantly in Russian, understood in this context as an authoritative language.

The combination of Helen's specific rhetorical strategies would appeal to a Doukhobor audience and are not exclusive to her speech. George, another elder

interview participant, demonstrates similar rhetorical patterns when speaking of Russia. Unlike Helen, however, he discusses the immediate possibility of return:

> To me, myself if I was just faced with that question [of returning to Russia], I said I'd put my hat on, and take maybe a small suitcase and I'd go because, to ME, I'd choose that life, it would be satisfactory to me because I could save something that canNOT be saved here—and I'd be HAPPY in my SUFFering, that's to ME—but I says, you need a group of the SAME dedication to do it, but if I'M going to go thinking well чи лучше там будить чи хуже чи може тут оставатсья чи, [will it be better there or worse, or will it be better to stay or] you can't do that anymore, it has to be so that's why a group has to gather together. (George 14)

George clearly demonstrates that he regards his "ancestral homeland as [his] true, ideal home and as the place to which [he]...would (or should) eventually return" (Safran 83). Returning to Russia therefore appears to be a literal possibility, and George's convictions go so far as to abandon what he sees as a comfortable Canadian life in order to fulfil Lukeriya's prophecy and, he argues, preserve Doukhoborism. While he suggests that a Russian life would be difficult, it is known that suffering is a familiar Doukhobor trope which requires, as I say during this interview, "extreme faith" (George 15). It was extreme faith that preserved Doukhoborism during multiple Russian hardships and convinced thousands of Doukhobors to leave their homeland; Helen would say it was extreme faith that allowed a majority of Doukhobors to leave Saskatchewan and establish new communes in British Columbia. I therefore ask George:

> *[Interviewer] Do you think we have that same faith to bring us back?*
>
> It's not I don't see it, but I mean, CAN'T you logically understand what I'm saying that that's what would have to happen, I'm not saying how to bring that faith about, how to do, now Bill[5] keeps saying and this is...even in his [writing] was saying that если берегой кнут ДАСТЬ нам хорошен, [if a coastal whip HITS us strongly] then maybe we'll wake up, but otherwise, you see that's what we're thinking of if things get, you know pressing that it looks, the doom is right HERE, then you have to do something. (George 15)

Although George maintains that a return is essential, he also reminds his audience that Doukhobors have alternatives: if the situation in Canada becomes troublesome, if a 'coastal whip' hits them[6], Doukhobors may have to leave. This allusion to a forced migration serves as a subtle reminder that the majority of Doukhobor resettlements occurred under extreme duress, although George is hopeful it will not have to come to that point. George's statement further reaffirms that Doukhobors are not permanently fixed to their Canadian location, which reinforces the indeterminacy of living in a diaspora.

George also speaks of returning to Russia in order to reclaim the spiritual essence of Doukhoborism. The following statement begins with an allusion to Peter Chistiakov, a Doukhobor leader whose physical presence and clothing "symbolize[d] the Russianness of Doukhobor identity" (Rak 65). Although Chistiakov left Russia to be among the Canadian Doukhobors, he always spoke of the entire community returning:

> HIS [Chistiakov's] vision was, MY vision STILL remains the same, whether it's a big group or a small group, that their [Doukhobors'] place of evolvement into a better source of spiritual living, would be in Russia rather than here. (George 7)

Referring to Chistiakov not only validates George's personal beliefs, but this rhetorical strategy moreover reminds the Doukhobor community of a once-unshakeable loyalty to leadership where if a leader instructed the Doukhobors to migrate, a migration *would* occur. In addition, faith once again factors into a Russian future, only now Russia is called upon to restore and maintain Doukhoborism. In this respect, a return to Russia is no longer a possibility but rather a necessity.

George is acutely aware of community discourse that reinforces and forms his position and, like Helen, he uses the information to appeal to his audience on a collective basis. However, while his diasporic position appears to be literal, two of his statements appear to contradict one another. George has considered the impact migration may have on his lifestyle, but he claims that a *group* must return—a near impossibility—in order for a relocation to be successful. This suggests that the return he speaks of might be symbolic rather than literal, which serves to connect the

community and reinforce displacement, without requiring a literal passage to the homeland. George's symbolic connections to Russia, however, are also evident in a participant who does not necessarily agree with the idea of an eventual Russian migration.

Mike, (a second-generation Doukhobor), commented on the connection he felt while he was traveling in Russia. He shares his experience of being at a Russian-Doukhobor village:

> I could connect with the older people saying their псалмы [psalms] and—and singing their hymns—matter of fact there was a, one woman that greeted us there...in Архангельская [the village of Archangel] and she was a sort of a master of ceremonies and she greeted us—saying something like— чужие и не чужие— чужие и родня, но мы все Духоборцы у нас душа одна—мы все Духоборцы у нас душа одна, so she was welcoming us...although we have we are strangers and we're not relatives maybe or whatever but we have one Doukhobor soul, and I thought that was...so relevant and it hit me. (Mike 1)

The connection he feels is a spiritual bond that appears to transcend borders and is reinforced by traditional Doukhobor practices. What more, Mike's bond is echoed by a Russian-Doukhobor who reminds her guests that Doukhobors are not limited to nation or by nation; they are all connected through the soul. Her statement redefines the Doukhobor collective, as in this case an emotional bond determines the group. Mike conceptualizes this relationship when he speaks of two elements that bind him to otherwise strangers: singing and prayer.

IV: Diaspora in Song

Congregational singing is indisputably the foundation of Doukhobor faith and worship. Even in Russia, song is something one can expect "to hear over and over again" (Nikitina 274).[7] Singing is a form of prayer that occurs during Sunday моление [prayer meeting] and funeral services, while traditional hymns are sung at weddings and other formal occasions (e.g. blessing engaged couples). Hymns, psalms, and folksongs not only function as meditative and spiritual media, but they

also communicate Doukhobor history.[8] Doukhobor oral tradition is thereby transformed into a choral tradition. These orally transmitted historical accounts best comprise what Tölölyan refers to as "collective memory" (13) where the entire community re-enacts or retells Doukhobor history during traditional singing. The frequency with which this occurs (customarily every Sunday) reinforces Doukhobor practices and lifestyle.

The three elder interview participants are demonstrative of a generation that integrated Doukhobor singing into daily life. Like Mike, George discusses the importance of song and illustrates how it was incorporated it into his family's routine:

> One of the things I think that HELPED within our family is that—well, right from the time we had our first pickup...and then every time we'd sit down we'd be singing all the time, and this sort of passed on there that they were singing right from and, in order to sing and all the, know the Russian songs and hymns and whatever, they had to have the Russian language. (George 4)

George sees singing as a vehicle that has passed on the Russian language to another generation of Doukhobors, which suggests that lyrical content was observed and, in turn, was felt to be important to the singers. Singing moreover brought George's family together and encouraged equal participation from all ages. Helen also argues the importance of traditional Doukhobor song:

> Петушка Господный говорил так, каждый Духоборец, если ты бы хочешь Духоборцам быть, необходимо должен знать ТРИ псалма, спеть, и прочитать, самый мало. [Peter the Lordly said, every Doukhobor, if you want to consider yourself a Doukhobor, it is necessary that you must know THREE psalms to sing, and recite, the absolute minimum]. (Helen 7)

Alluding to the words of Doukhobor leader Peter Verigin, Helen places singing as the central component to Doukhoborism where, quite simply, a Doukhobor *must* know how to sing and recite psalms.[9]

Given the importance these participants place on singing, the correlation between a diasporic imaginary and song is not coincidental. Traditional Doukhobor songs reinforce what many Doukhobor leaders have advocated for generations: it is imperative to maintain a connection to the homeland and harbour hope for an

eventual return to Russia. The diasporic imaginary is therefore most consistently maintained through the imagined consequences of displacement evinced in the Doukhobor song repertoire.[10] The following analysis of two songs echoes some of the participants' statements and highlights themes existent in the larger Doukhobor canon.

In "О край далекий, край родимый[11]" [O distant land, homeland[12]], the homeland is not idyllically constructed. It is a place "где скорбь и радость прожита" [where sorrow and happiness were endured] (4), and where even the current circumstances are not good, as it is "там, где народ, терпя, страдает,/ под гнетом тягостным труда" [there, where the people, endure, struggle,/under burdensome, oppressing toil] (5-6). Nonetheless within the first stanza, the speaker expresses a longing for his homeland—"к тебе стремлюсь, мой край любимый" [towards you, I yearn, my beloved land] (3). This sentiment is echoed: "туда меня любовь святая/влечет, изгнанника—туда" [it is over there that my sacred love/draws me, an exile—over there] (7-8). This repeated position alludes to the speaker's inability to resist the homeland's allure. His desire to return is beyond his control, and, given his land of origin's current unfortunate state of affairs, suggests it is inherent. This attraction for a less-than idyllic homeland is explained, as it is there on his native soil that "правду начал позновать я" [I began to know truth] (9). The native country is his spiritual birthplace and will therefore remain his "край родимый" [homeland] (1).

Although the homeland location has religious connotations, the presence of spirituality does not extend to the current residents. The "народ родной, народ любимый" [dear people, beloved people] (21) are caught within a dream. They have not been spiritually awakened and only "когда проснешься ты от сна,/ тогда поймешь что силой дивной/полно учение Христа" [when you wake from dream,/will you then understand that wonderful strength/is the full teaching of Christ] (22-24). The image of home in this psalm is therefore what Vijay Mishra has called a damaged idea (7) because the people who remained are not only suffering, but they have yet to reach the moment of divine consciousness. In this sense, 'damage' extends beyond the physical notion of suffering into the imaginary (and unacceptable)

realization that the spiritual birthplace can no longer sustain its religious creation. This loss is fundamentally evinced by the speaker's refusal to name his place of origin—'Russia' remains unuttered. The euphemisms "край далекий, край родимый" [distant land, homeland] (1) are juxtaposed and therefore reinforce the dislocation. There remains, however, a vague possibility that the speaker's homeland can be regained. If the inhabitants have a spiritual awakening, if "проснешься ты от сна" [you awake from dream] (22), a return is more probable. The reality of returning is understandably doubtful, but it is "the desire to *return* to the homeland [that] is considered a necessary part of the definition of 'diaspora'" (Tölölyan 14 italics in original).

Russia is also remembered by historical events which occurred on its soil. This country is the site of persecution, suffering, and Doukhobor martyrdom. To remember Russia is to therefore recall these events and further imbue memory with suffering. "Спите, орлы боевые" [Sleep on, you brave fighting eagles] recounts the torments of Doukhobor martyrs who endured Siberian prison camps on account of their refusal to bear arms.[13] Whenever this particular piece is sung, members of a congregation inevitably weep, for the singers are being asked to honour through remembrance those who prepared their path:

Нам все готовой тропою	Our path is prepared
Легко теперь идти,	It is now easy to walk,
Столь дорогой ценою	So at a dear price,
Нам вы ее обрели.	You have cleared the way for us.

(Планидин [Planidin] 5-8)

The present is directly attributed to the past, and a Doukhobor cannot contemplate her or his current position without bringing to mind these historic travails. These brave eagles, as they are metaphorically recounted, have merited "память (sic)[14] и вечный покой" [remembrance and eternally peaceful consciousness] (4). The allusion here is to the Doukhobor notion of вечная память [literally translated as eternal memory].

Вечная память [eternal memory] is a statement made at Doukhobor funerals and acts as a blessing for the deceased. The phrase evokes the dual notions of eternal

memory, as well as eternal consciousness, and it is because of this living memory (remembrance and recitation) that the soul lives while the body dies. One form of this remembrance occurs during the reading and rereading of the deceased's biography (Rak 2003); another means is through congregational song. When "Спите, орлы боевые" [Sleep on, you brave fighting eagles] is sung, the Russian martyrs' are remembered and are therefore granted eternal consciousness in the Kingdom of Heaven. Remembrance is spiritual in that it aids departed souls, but it is also impacts present-day Doukhobors. With every death, with every hymn, Doukhobors enact and re-enact history. Вечная память [Eternal memory] therefore becomes "a historical recounting, a sacred interpretation of migration, [as well as martyrdom], and an exhortation to keep the faith" (Rak 62).

As evinced, Doukhobor hymnology is permeated with diasporic perceptions, and the underlying messages within these pieces are therefore fundamental to understanding why and how the diaspora has affected these elder (and perhaps various other) Doukhobor participants. Doukhoborism was, and continues to be, based in diasporic hymn. It is therefore fitting to suggest that these diasporic tendencies have permeated general Doukhobor thought, and as long as these songs remain within the Doukhobor canon, Doukhobors will be reminded of their diasporic position.

V: Diaspora Reconsidered

As I have thus far established, Safran and Tölölyan's approach is appropriate when discussing the elder Doukhobor diaspora. I find, however, that in order to best realize the diasporic position of contemporary Doukhobors, alternative understandings need to be integrated with Safran and Tölölyan's method. This is not to disregard the duo's contribution. On the contrary, many of the youth participants demonstrate substantial inclinations that support Safran and Tölölyan's arguments. However, younger Doukhobor generations are not predominantly concerned with 'where they're from;' rather, they are trying to understand 'where they're at' (Ang 1994). This new challenge requires that other models of diaspora, as well as nationality, be examined. Therefore, in order to best comprehend the discrepancies

within diasporic discourse, the debate need be outlined for, as R. Radhakrishnan suggests, "there are diasporas and diasporas" ('Introduction' xiv).

The ongoing contention in diaspora studies centres on what, and therefore who, constitutes a diaspora. Safran and Tölölyan's aforementioned concerns were primarily based on the term's popularity. Diaspora was initially a negatively connoted Greek expression used in fifth century BC to imply "processes of dispersion and decomposition, a dissolution into varying parts (e.g., atoms) without any further relation to each other" (Baumann 316). Originally employed by classical philosophers, it was appropriated by Jewish translators working with Hebrew Scriptures. Diaspora became inherently connected to Judaism, and for centuries the term referred "to Jews who lived outside the 'Promised Land[15]'" (318). In the nineteen sixties African scholarship developed the term in its discussion of the transatlantic slave trade. The forced migration of thousands of Africans revealed that "diaspora is not always voluntary" (Braziel and Mannur 2). The innovative application of diaspora as a term unrestricted by its customary Jewish association facilitated twentieth century discourse, which was—and is—discerning and contemplating a century of migration, exile, and other general displacements. The contemporary preoccupation with ethnicity, nation, and belonging, moreover illustrates diasporic dialogue can be found in an array of disciplines including, but not limited to, cultural studies, literary criticism, anthropology, queer theory, film studies, and sociology, to name but a few. Safran and Tölölyan (among others) therefore responded to the extensive application of the term. They argued that diaspora is not merely "that segment of a people living outside the homeland" (Conner 16) and have, as a result of (perceived) misuse, developed definitional boundaries.

Although the academic community at large does not contest a call for terminological integrity, Safran and Tölölyan's definitions have been increasingly challenged. The primary contention with their diaspora model is that the homeland fixation, in a real or mythic form:

> [privileges] the geographical, political, cultural, and subjective spaces of the home-nation as an authentic space of belonging and civic participation, while devaluing and bastardizing the states of

> displacement or dislocation, rendering them inauthentic places of residence. (Braziel and Mannur 6)

Diaspora, detractors argue, is not fixed to geographical locales, and in turn, is not restricted to nostalgic patterns of suffering and loss. Rather, this diaspora appears to echo what Stuart Hall describes as an old, imperial, hegemonic form of ethnicity where "identity can only be secured in relation to some sacred homeland" ('Cultural Identity' 244). Safran and Tölölyan's model is therefore perceived as a binary construction: authentic/inauthentic; belonging/not belonging; homeland/host nation; and diaspora/ethnicity. Critics argue that this construction reinforces the "distorted images of diasporic identities as linear, static, and homogenous, [as well as the] false ideas that migrations create unity or homogenous groups" (Novio 258). Although origins are important to diaspora members, ongoing communications with the homeland should not supersede connections created within the present location. According to James Clifford:

> the centering of diasporas around an axis of origin and return overrides the specific local interactions (identifications and "dis-identifications," both constructive and defensive) necessary for the maintenance of diasporic social forms. The empowering paradox of diaspora is that dwelling *here* assumes a solidarity and connection *there*. But *there* is not necessarily a single place or an exclusivist nation. (322 italics in original)

Clifford is a principal figure in this debate. When he states that diasporas do not need to privilege an 'axis of origin and return,' he is suggesting that homeland lose its hierarchical importance, as 'there' (homeland) is not always of primary significance for diasporic people who are 'here' (host nation). Diasporic groups building a future in their immediate surroundings can therefore acknowledge, but do not have to continuously seek, the possibility of return (an understanding that this is unlike Safran and Tölölyan's definition). This practice, I would like to suggest, is what Clifford refers to as "decentered, lateral connections" (306). Lateral connectivity maintains origins not only through contemporary global dialogues with the 'home' nation, but moreover, recollected myth and story told within and amongst host nation communities. These communications recollect origins, but also use stories of cultural

history, migration, and past traumatic experiences to better understand the present location. Familial and communal intra-cultural dialogues are therefore equally valid diasporic markers. In this case, origins are considered but are not privileged; rather, they work towards constituting "a creative tension between 'where you're from' and 'where you're at'" (Ang, 'On Not Speaking' 16). As many diaspora members increasingly believe their future is located 'here' rather than 'there,' Safran and Tölölyan's detractors restructure the apparent diaspora hierarchy in order to avoid seemingly hegemonic constructs and exclusive binaries.

The diasporic debate is also influenced by the juxtaposition of ethnicity and diaspora in many discussions about migration. Both terms implicate an awareness of origins or histories in another location, with the primary difference between the two being the question of belonging—members of an ethnic group feel they belong within a nation, whereas members of a diaspora feel they do not. The differences are, as Smaro Kamboureli states, "semantic and political...[and] although they are different, their genealogies overlap" (viii). Nevertheless, the minor distinctions have fuelled an argument where diaspora appears privileged, whereas ethnicity requires justification.

The following analysis of interviewed contemporary Doukhobor participants is based to some extent on Safran and Tölölyan's work. In the following pages, I will illustrate how the participants corroborate the duo's ideas of diaspora where 'home' is located elsewhere, the myth of return is strong, and 'here' is problematic. However to fully understand the contemporary Doukhobor diaspora, I must also incorporate other texts on diaspora, discussed to some extent in the preceding passages. The interplay will reveal the participants' understanding of diaspora where diaspora and diasporic individuals will be recognized by their connection to multiple origins (home-land and host-land), which may in turn account for their ambivalent sense of belonging.

VI: The Contemporary Doukhobor Diaspora

A definitive diasporic characteristic is the cultivation of, or a physical connection to, a homeland. This characteristic is maintained by many of the interview participants who travelled to Russia and shared their experiences with me:

Second trip—it felt—like being home. (Peter 2)

I felt like I was home—and then I spent a week there and we were travelling, and I felt like, wow, like I felt finally in my life—that I came—home.

Interviewer: [That's really interesting]

I never, ever thought in my life that I'd experience that but the feeling that—this is homeland.—And is it because I was raised with the, perspective, that one day the Doukhobors would go back you know that or, is it because the language felt so close to my soul that I, felt like I was enveloped in this—warmth, even if I didn't know anybody it felt like

[daughter] Mom can I have some Cheerios?

—speaks with daughter for a moment—

So what I felt was that self, a real feeling of—I just really felt, it felt like I was in a place I was really safe. (Carol 8)

I remember GOING there and feeling very attached...But I remember feeling an attachment just to where I was in KIEV, which was you know the capital of the Ukraine—and saying oh yeah like just feeling that oh my ancestors you know they could have been from HERE you know and whatever ...because the Doukhobors originated sort of on the borders of the Ukraine, and Russia and so there was that—and even our dialect has Ukrainian IN it so it's like they could have been HERE you know at one point and feeling that—that

[interviewer] Yeah it totally does.

was important. (Mark 8)

I went to Russia for the first time in 1995 which was a very significant year because the hundred years since the Doukhobor Burning of the Arms and although we didn't visit that site until four years later on a separate tour, I still felt very connected with that country and I can very honestly say that having gone back there twice I—I feel a connection with THAT specific place in the world, that I never felt anywhere else including in CANada and I've always

> felt the couple of times that I've BEEN there that—it wouldn't be very difficult—for me to just stay. (Richard 8)

These participants discuss their emotional connection to their ancestral homeland. The fourth excerpt is especially poignant, as the speaker's voice drops to a whisper in a gesture of disclosure; Richard's connection to Russia appears profound, where perhaps the bond takes even him by surprise. Although the participants individually experienced different cultural climates, separately having travelled to Georgia, Ukraine, or Moscow during and after the Soviet period, they exhibited similar reactions to their journeys, likening 'how they felt' with a sense of homecoming. This suggests that the participants shared a concept of Russia prior to departure, one that may have developed within the community in response to the lack of an identifiable connection to their homeland.[16] As Tölölyan states, diasporic communities:

> exhibit a communal will to loyalty, keeping faith with a mythicized idea of the homeland...it makes more sense to think of diasporan or diasporic existence as not necessarily involving a physical return but rather a re-turn, a repeated turning to the concept and/or reality of the homeland and other diasporan kin through memory...et cetera. (14-15)

The participants' similarities may therefore be a result of communal imaginings. They would arguably have a similar perception of what Russia should 'feel' like if they were exposed to the same stories which valorized their land of origin.

Awareness of a Russian heritage, passed down through the generations amongst family members and within the community, is therefore significant and evidently affected how these participants understood their connections to place. Two participants subsequently share how this knowledge impacted their upbringing:

> And meanwhile at the same time there's all this notion that you know well don't get, too hung up on on this Canadian lifestyle and I'm trying to fit in with these people because, you know—our destiny is to move back to RUSSia and so for ME specifically it's—it's unique because I I was—I came from an extended family that was at the forefront of that, notion, that was, SPEARheading the whole migration MOVEment and it began like in the late

> 80s and early 90s, right around the time that I was—you know getting to be more aware as a CHILD and as a youth and adolescent—and a YOUNG ADULT. (Richard 8)

> So—you then, became aware that you were from, RUSSIA, and almost to the point of where—RUSSIA was—depicted as this great place this grandiose—place that we're only here as visitors and that that's still our homeland, but that eventually we will be moving back and I remember as a child and it's like yeah, don't get too attached 'cause I'd say 'Oh I just love it here' and I we live in a BEAUtiful place—this mountain in front of us and it's like OH, and I couldn't IMAGINE ever LEAving it., You know it just seemed like but yet I remember—the talk always came of how—that we'd move one day you know don't get attached and how, they'd reminisce my grandparents would reminisce how when my MOTHER was born—and they had, theirs сумки [bags] everything was ready to move., They thought—'watch it we're going to be moving soon any DAY now.' And there was that, they were ready to move and they had, every family every child or every person had a сумка [bag] that was packed, in case they had to grab something it's like we're moving now it was seen as almost it would be that immediate. (Mark 7)

These participants saw how members of their family and community perceived the myth of return as a reality. People not only had their bags (literally) packed, but up until the late 1990s, there was an official USCC Migration Committee, which actively researched the possibility of relocating to Russia. Even though these participants were not directly involved in the negotiations, the possibility of return nonetheless impacted them. They not only questioned their efforts at 'fitting in' (Richard), but they also became emotionally distraught at the thought of leaving (Mark). Belonging is therefore particularly confused because these participants were "involved in trying to face (at least) two ways at once" (Gilroy 3). Reacting to their circumstances, they (as children) believed that 'here' was temporary whereas 'there' was unknown.[17]

The 'myth of return' is also not limited to a particular generation. Community leaders have manipulated the myth to unite the community, or in the case of Peter

Chistiakov, procure funds to pay off CCUB debt. The myth's endurance is also due in part to Lukeriya's prophetic declaration that the Doukhobors will leave Russia to eventually return.[18] Although none of the youth participants were actively working towards its realisation, each participant expressed her or his awareness of the prophecy. More significant is the fact that no one discounted the possibility of Lukeriya's prediction being realised:

> I'm AWARE of it. It's interesting to me it's intriguing. Am I working towards it absolutely not.
>
> *[Interviewer] Okay.*
>
> It's something that sits there that I'm aware of. Should that come to pass, then it would be REALLY interesting. (Darren 4)

Darren's adamant denial that he is 'absolutely not' working towards a prophetic realization signifies that he, like others of his generation, is primarily concerned with navigating his present Canadian location. However, by even accepting the *possibility* of a return, it demonstrates that while weak, a diasporic connection to Russia persists.

VII: Contemporary Russian Imaginings

Although the participants expressed a connection to Russia irrespective of the era, those who happened to travel during the Soviet regime made specific comments regarding their bond to the Russian culture. In particular, one participant felt her connection was based on cultural similarities between Doukhobor and communist societies:

> My experience is most people were, genuinely caring and giving because the whole government was different society was different., Now it's the, all for yourself the democracy, get more for me that I can, whatever it TAKES...We're actually at a different, I don't know—maybe на колхозы [on the collective farms] you'll get the same feeling? (Carol 8)

The speaker alludes to an idea expressed by many Doukhobors: the belief that Soviet Russia had achieved a communal and equal society. This notion resonates among many Doukhobors, in part because of Doukhobors' historical tie to communal lifestyle. Moreover, many individuals who experienced these communes[19] (as well as

some who have not) still speak very highly of their benefits. This idyllic perception of communist Russia, however, obscures the reality that was the USSR. The Soviet Union was plagued by corruption where proletarian equality, while championed, was never realized. Rather, Soviet society was faced with violent revolution, intellectual genocide, secret police, labour camps, forced famine etc...the list is tragically long. Cultivating the homeland as an idealized communal society therefore ignores "the realities of the home country. By this token, anything and everything is [the homeland] according to our parched imagination: half-truths, stereotypes, so-called traditions, rituals, and so forth" (Radhakrishnan, 'Ethnicity' 128). What Radhakrishnan suggests is that in an effort to connect to some type of origins, diasporic communities and individuals may not take into account the reality of their homeland, especially if circumstances in their host nation are unfavourable.

Stuart Hall also warns of the dangers of retaining a suspended understanding of the homeland. In 'Negotiating Caribbean Identities,' he discusses Africa's role in relation to Jamaican Rastafarian and suggests to this group that:

> Africa is not waiting there in the fifteenth or seventeenth century, waiting for you to roll back across the Atlantic and rediscover it in its tribal purity, waiting there in its prelogical mentality, waiting to be awoken from inside by its returning sons and daughters. (11)

Like Africa, Russia has evolved and is no longer the same nation the Doukhobors originally left. Post-Soviet Russia now appears alien in relation to an idealized, static perception of the homeland. Doukhobor ideals subsequently appear out of place for some of the younger interviewees, like Mark:

> What was happening in Russia—at the time and even now STILL today—made me question of whether that was—a place to go it didn't seem—for what in terms of what the Doukhobors stood for that I found the pacifism wasn't there, as much as people here are more, OPEN to it, it seemed like our Doukhobor principles are, people are more willing to accept them HERE. (Mark 8)

Mark is unable to position a pivotal Doukhobor belief—pacifism—within a great Soviet or post-Soviet rubric. In a literal sense, he is saying that Doukhobors cannot

be incorporated into conventional Russian society where military conscription is a norm.[20] The participants therefore recognize that Russia is not, and perhaps never was, a Doukhobor haven. Images of contemporary Russia are subsequently not as romantically constructed as, for example, the Soviet era, for the present nation is evidently unprepared for the Doukhobors' return.

The participants' reluctant imaginings are indicative of a changing diasporic perspective. Although many of them romanticized and connected to communist lifestyle, contemporary Russia—the Russia they could arguably return to—is undesirably imagined. Diasporic identity, however, does not disappear when an individual "cannot or does not want to look back [to the homeland] for political or economic reasons" (Braziel and Mannur 9). So although Safran and Tölölyan advocate maintaining literal connections to the homeland, James Clifford argues the contrary:

> transnational connections linking diaspora need not be articulated primarily through a real or symbolic homeland—at least not to the degree [implied]. Decentred, lateral connection may be as important as those formed around a teleology of origin/return. And a shared, ongoing history of displacement, suffering, adaptation, or resistance may be as important as the projection of a specific origin. (306)

Collective and personal histories, together with their emotional implications, are arguably instrumental to diasporic identity formation. Within the Doukhobor community, Clifford's 'decentred, lateral connections' appear as stories that are orally recounted so as to facilitate coming to terms with life in a new landscape. In this manner, various Doukhobor groups have drawn upon reminders of Russian persecution to sustain them through Canadian hardships.[21] Clifford specifically focuses on a shared emotional history, which he argues is formative to diasporic identity.

A participant indicates how similar emotional bonds help construct her perception of Doukhobor identity. In this excerpt, Carol discusses a popular Doukhobor conundrum: whether or not someone needs to be born a Doukhobor to be a Doukhobor. She explains her position:

> I don't judge people for not being [Doukhobor], but I don't really feel that they could really feel what I feel because of all the—stories of страДАЛЬство [SUffering], and all of the, who we ARE and—oh вот видишь как мы делаем [see look how we do things] you know, you know and you think—it's like our—all of us. (Carol 4)

Suffering, in Carol's opinion, is an inherent component to being a Doukhobor; it cannot be learned, as it must be lived or remembered. Remembrance, however, is not necessarily limited to personally experienced events, as communities may recollect historic periods of trauma and circumstance as their own without ever having personally experienced them. When Carol therefore refers to periods of suffering, it is all together probable that she is addressing a collective, rather than a personal, memory. Doukhobor identity consequently embodies collective emotional and historical ties (lateral connections) that are expressed in, as she says, 'all of us.' Her language is also interesting, in part because she communicates what she perceives to be the important aspects of Doukhobor identity—suffering and stories—in Russian. These instances of code switching occur when Carol specifically addresses how Doukhobor history and Doukhoborism are maintained. The linguistic conflation reaffirms that Russian remains entangled in contemporary Doukhobor identity.

Specifically, one of the most significant recollected events that accounts for much of the remembered struggles is the 1895 Burning of Arms, which resulted in mass incarceration, Siberian exile, and ultimately, migration. The 'canon of suffering,' however, extends to other travails including the 1899 migration, hardships of prairie farming, as well as material shortages in communal residences. These stories are undeniably influential and continue to be passed down from generation to generation. One participant, a mother who teaches Sunday school, describes the children's reaction to studying Doukhobor history:

> We we review our history and and whenever one of the помонки[22] [memorial services] come up we review, review that again and I mean the kids, in our Sunday school they all know it it's like OH NO not this again
>
> *laughter*

we heard it already.

laughter

So we try to put a twist on it but, YEAH definitely it's important and especially when it comes to the Burning of Arms. (Sara 4)

Despite the fact that the children have 'heard it already,' the stories are repeated. One could argue, in fact, that suffering and hardship are possibly overstated, as the community (collectively and individually) visits and revisits these particular leitmotifs. The emotional connections and repercussions therefore extend to the entire community, suggesting that Doukhobor страдание [suffering] is part of the cultural and, according to Clifford, diasporic foundation.

VIII: National Identification(s)

The diasporic connection to a Russian homeland has evidently conflated cultural and national identity for many of the participants where a number of them interchange 'Doukhobor' with 'Russian:'

Are you, a Doukhobor because you're mother and father are RUSSIAN? (Mark 5)

I'm now working and I, and I hire, PEople—And I know the feedback we're getting oh there's nothing like the quality of the Russian workers we hire Russian, and there's nothing like it. (Carol 9)

Identifying as Russian means that Mark and Carol reinforce the homeland connection for themselves as Doukhobors and suggests that the speakers connect the idea of Russia as a national identification to being Doukhobor. This literal understanding of Russian nationality has meaning for these speakers, but what may not be immediately obvious is the underlying cultural assumption they are making: the speakers do not clarify their conception of 'Russian' because they presuppose that I (the interviewer) recognize which 'Russian' group they are referring to. As a community member, I understand that the reference is not national (i.e. neither speaker is a Russian passport holder) but cultural (Doukhobors are Russian by ancestral association). These

Doukhobors demonstrate that there is a significant difference between the two and are markedly hesitant to accept an understanding of 'Russian' as a literal nationality:

> We talk about homeland, I DON'T WE don't talk about homeland being Russia—homeland is Canada we're Canadian, we grew up here we are Canadian, I am a Canadian—but I, I was a, my roots are Russian....Well HOW can I be RUSSIAN? I was BORN here. (Carol 9)

> I wouldn't call myself a RUSSian I'm, I'm CaNADian, in that sense I was born in Canada when I go anywhere in the world I say I'm Canadian but I always state—very quickly after that but my ancestors are ALL from Russia, ALL of them and so I have a very STRONG, Russian identity. (Richard 1)

By nationally identifying as Canadian with strong Russian ancestry, these participants bypass their diasporic position. They may assume a position within Canadian multicultural discourse, which suggests individuals can be Canadian *and* culturally distinct; displacement and its repercussions, according to multicultural policy, are no longer a concern.

Canada's official multicultural policy, adopted in 1971, arose from the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission of 1965. Given the violent events and protests in Quebec the preceding decade, the B&B Commission was established to mediate between French and English Canada. Multiculturalism therefore surpassed the previous emphasis on duality and incorporated national pluralism (Padolsky 2000). Pierre Trudeau proposed four objectives when he introduced multicultural policy to the nation. He suggested multiculturalism would:

> assist all Canadian cultural groups with the desire and effort to continue to develop a capacity to grow and contribute to Canada...to [overcome] cultural barriers...to promote creative encounters and interchange...and to assist immigrants to acquire at least one of Canada's official languages in order to become full participants in Canadian society. (Zwicker 150)

After Trudeau's introduction in 1971, multicultural policy was officially recognized in the Charter of Rights in 1982, and again in 1988 as the Canadian Multiculturalism Act (Kamboureli 2000). Multiculturalism, in essence, deals with

national identity (Young 2001) and unity. Individuals and groups remain Canadian, even as they retain their cultural differences via traditional celebrations and activities. In this manner, national identity incorporates and, moreover, commemorates difference. Furthermore, the official policy is a good foundation on which to challenge racism, promote cultural survival, and incorporate previously excluded minorities, as "both the policy and the *Act* are about inclusion into Canadian society on an equal basis and 'fair terms'" (Young 94 italics in original). Increased funding to ethnic groups and minority artists helps facilitate the latter goal (Young 2001). According to multicultural policy, an individual can therefore retain one and the other, national and cultural identity.

Doukhobor participants' dialogue demonstrates awareness of multicultural policy, an arguable attribute given that the participant group grew up during and after the Trudeau era. Rather than appear alien to the Canadian landscape, Doukhobor practices and beliefs are subsequently positioned comfortably within Canada:

> So, I think that the country, CANada is a place that we were, US and other, other societies cultures were able to—find—PEAce and, continue to practice their ways without being discriminated—as long as we were there to contribute to, to what we are, to contribute to the nation right?
>
> *[Interviewer] Yeah.*
>
> So I guess I think, I'm really, I feel that we're really really blessed to be in a country that, that's accept us, and let us let us continue to practice the way we are I think we're very fortunate. (Carol 9-10)

> On the one hand I thought wow like, there's maybe a reason why they LEFT here [Russia] because THEY it wasn't so easy for them to be those type of people living here and OBVIOUSLY because they're persecuted and that, so I thought NOW we want to come BACK to this I mean they haven't gotten UP with the times, whereas back home in Canada yeah there might have been conflict and throughout the, the years but people are MORE they don't QUESTION that you are a pacifist that you wouldn't want to go to WAR

> because there's MORE people here that would ALSO stand up WITH you. (Mark 8)

In these excerpts, Canada is depicted as a nation willing to accept disparate cultural identities almost exclusively. With this understanding, Doukhobor beliefs may be maintained without the threat of persecution. This freedom stands in contrast to Doukhobors' history of prolonged discrimination in Russia, and (as evinced in the last example), the belief that this discrimination persists.

The multicultural policy has furthermore allowed these contemporary Doukhobor participants to write themselves into Canadian history:

> When the Doukhobors came to Canada, we also served a purpose, for for Canada, in that they they wanted, immigrants, who'd be able to you know be tough and work the prairies and work the land and and help Canada get established—we tended to fit the role...in some respects it, it it helped them. (Darren 3)

> *[Interviewer] That's interesting, you say you're Canadian what, what does that mean to you?*
>
> Being Canadian?
>
> *[Interviewer] Yeah.*
>
> Well I was I think we, our family and I, our ancestors, worked to build the country we live in today. We came into a, a nation at a time when the country, was vast and there was not a lot of development and the government they accepted us in to try and build the country to what it is—and we worked hard across, across the provinces to try to, have freedom in a nation, and yet practice our beliefs. And I think that, I think the Doukhobor community as a whole group, contributed a great deal to Canada. (Carol 9)

The interview participants are aware that their ancestors were the first to settle large tracts of the Saskatchewan prairies and contribute substantial work parties to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The literal construction of the nation is therefore formative to the self-perception of at least some of these Doukhobor participants, as Canadian national considerations are reinforced through physical

evidence. Others have also observed the success of multiculturalism within the Doukhobor community. Nina Olson argues that, thanks to official policy, Russian is now taught in public school and Doukhobor prayer halls are awarded the same status as religious churches (2000), whereas Koozma Tarasoff highlights multiple opportunities and recognitions awarded to the cultural group (1998). Multiculturalism moreover allows Doukhobors the opportunity to identify as Russian and Canadian (or Russian Canadians) because according to multicultural policy, Russian is a cultural—not a national—distinction. Canadian identity is a collective foundation shared by everyone within Canada upon which individuals' distinct cultural characteristics are positioned.

Although multiculturalism creates space for disparate minority groups, it has yet to be universally accepted. A participant even asks:

> Are we, TRULY, everyday Canadians part of the MULTIcultural mosaic that Canada is—particularly even more so than any of the hundreds of thousands of millions of people that have emigrated to Canada SINCE 1899? (Richard 6)

The participants' Canadian assertions in the above excerpts are therefore substantially more involved, and it could be they are suffering from what Smaro Kamboureli refers to as multicultural fatigue—the "comfortable assumption that multiculturalism, through implementations of the official policy and the proliferation of discussions and forums about it, has already fulfilled, if not exceeded, its mandate" (83).

VIV: Multicultural Challenges

Trudeau's multicultural introduction, upheld by some as a pivotal moment in Canadian history, is condemned by others as a vaguely disguised attempt to appease—and in turn acquire—white, non French or English Canadian, ethnic voters (Zwicker 2001). Rather than deal with the realities of pluralism, "a number of commentators saw the advent of multiculturalism as merely an attempt to co-opt, buy off and neutralize real minority demands on Canadian society" (Padolsky 144). In other words, policy was seen as a replacement of political action. Ien Ang, when discussing Australia's multicultural concerns, takes this criticism further by declaring

that multiculturalism represents "nothing more and nothing less than a more complex form of nationalism, aimed at securing national boundaries in an increasingly borderless world" ('Introduction' 16).

The historical repercussions of multiculturalism are also substantial. As Kamboureli notes,[23] "it seems that...Canadian history began in 1971" (84). By celebrating cultural 'song and dance,' detractors argue that Canada is absolved of its historical deeds—periods of internment and persecution based exclusively on race, ethnicity, and culture, are conveniently elided. Clearing the slate in this manner indicates, "today a more enlightened Canada can embrace the people it dispossessed in a gesture of unproblematic inclusiveness designed to undo the past and thereby smooth the nation's trajectory into the future" (Zwicker 151). Belonging, however, is not so easily constructed or felt. It is particularly problematic for individuals and communities who do not forget their history and are asked, instead, to preserve in memory their deprivation (Rak 2004).

Many of the participants' aforementioned statements regarding Canadian identity show they partially base national identification on the fact that Doukhobor migrants worked on the CPR. These external labour forces, however, were self-interested, as Doukhobors were not constructing the Canadian nation at that time; they were availing themselves of the opportunity to further their own—separate—community. Any Canadian benefits were therefore economic coincidences. Therefore when the participants extol Doukhobor involvement in early twentieth century Canada, they overlook the reason for this participation, consequently demonstrating the success of Canada's multicultural policy. As multiculturalism welcomes Doukhobors as part of the Canadian landscape, Community hardships and hostile political climates are forgotten.

Being Canadian, moreover, is not merely "an act of birth" (Tölölyan 30), for if it were, participants would not be left asking, "are we ENOUGH Canadian now?" (Mark 4). National identity must be more involved. In the words of M. Nourbese Philip:

> I carry a Canadian passport; I, therefore, am Canadian. How am I Canadian, though, above and beyond the narrow legalistic definition of being the bearer

> of a Canadian passport...It is only in *belonging* that we will eventually become Canadian. (16 italics mine)

If Philip is correct, there is more to Canadian nationality than its legal classification. An individual must feel s/he belongs, which is a difficult realisation for members of a diaspora. The participants therefore facilitate belonging by suggesting they embody two separate understandings of self: a national (Canadian) and a cultural (Doukhobor or 'Russian') identity:

> We have very CaNADian aspects to our lives now and we have very RUSSIAN aspects to our lives. (Richard 9)

> I—would call myself a Canadian Doukhobor.
>
> *[Interviewer] Okay.*
>
> So it's interesting that I would say CANADA, Canadian, Doukhobor without saying, you could say Doukhobor I probably ten years ago I would have said Doukhobor Canadian (Mark 6)
>
> It was in, 1984—and—I know that there is Russian you that there is still Doukhobors there, but I don't feel, a connection myself—and yet, I don't FEEL, like yeah okay I'm a Canadian because I was BORN in Canada, a Canadian Doukhobor, but—the way I remember what I remember learning in Sunday school is, no country belongs to any ONE people. The world belongs to everybody. And so that's how I feel like—Russia's home Canada's home any anywhere should be home and you should feel FEEL like you're at home when you go there. (Sara 3-4)

The self-named 'Canadian Doukhobor' demonstrates the participants' hybridity where they are both one and the other. Hybridity, however, is not always a comfortable construction, as a participant demonstrates during a discussion about his reaction to police officers:[24]

> The Canadian part of me goes okay yes, they're there for this this and this and they're here to protect, they have a job this is their job but I still—why subconsciously, even if I know I've done nothing wrong get the jitters when I, am around cops—you know

> *[Interviewer] So is the non-voting coming from...is it coming from your Canadian, self, or is it coming from your Doukhobor, self—and can I even separate the two?*
>
> Yeah. I don't I don't, I mean I guess you CAN separate the two I guess there is a Canadian me and a Doukhobor me, they're the same, kind of person—but, in essence, when I'm—you know, in Krestova, I'm the Doukhobor me, when I'm out here [Nelson, BC] I'm probably the Canadian more the Canadian me. (Peter 8-9)

The participant is able to understand via the 'Canadian part of him' the police's function within the community. This Canadian knowledge, however, is unable to assuage his fears; his Doukhobor 'subconscious' cannot consolidate the juxtaposition between law enforcement as protectors and law enforcement as possible threats because of the associations within the Sons of Freedom community; the police were feared, as they were the ones who imprisoned community members and were seen to threaten Doukhobor identity and tradition. The interview question, by asking for clarification regarding the separation between Doukhobor and Canadian, further reveals the importance of locality. 'Here' (understood in this instance as Krestova) helps construct identity.

The speaker points to the Krestova community as his Doukhobor identification site.[25] Krestova[26] is known within the extended Doukhobor community as a Sons of Freedom village and has been historically recognized as a largely anarchistic district.[27] Krestova's isolated location and previous disregard of local authority compounded the Sons of Freedom already strong sense of disconnection from greater Canadian society. For all intents and purposes, the Sons of Freedom strove to maintain Peter Verigin's isolationist policy: Doukhobors were to remain separate from greater Canadian society (Woodcock and Avakumovic 1977). In essence, Verigin had attempted to create a nation within a nation,[28] which provided the Sons of Freedom with a model for existence. Krestova largely disregarded any external governance (e.g. federal Canadian law) and could arguably be considered the final vestige of the Doukhobor 'nation' within Canada. When the participant therefore returns to Krestova, his Doukhobor identity becomes paramount and

supersedes his Canadian self. He has crossed the border into 'Doukhoboria,'[29] a location that has historically rejected Canadian involvement. Conversely, when he leaves the community, the participant becomes more 'Canadian'. This transformation is perhaps necessary because his Krestova-influenced Doukhobor identity, as evinced by his distrust of authority figures, may be unable to navigate the Canadian landscape because Canadians are seen by this group to be law-abiding. His hybrid identity therefore allows him to negotiate both Canadian and Doukhobor circumstances.

Hybrid identities, however, are complex. As expressed by R. Radhakrishnan in his article 'Ethnicity in an Age of Diaspora:'

> how could *someone* be both *one* and something *other*? How could the unity of identity have more than one face or name...How do these two selves coexist and how do they weld into one identity? How is ethnic identity related to national identity? Is this relationship hierarchically structured...or does the relationship produce a hyphenated identity, such as African American...What if identity is exclusively ethnic and not national at all? Could such an identity survive[?] (120 italics in original)

Radhakrishnan's concerns are valid. If the participants feel they are Canadian Doukhobors, which aspect of self dominates? Or conversely, can cultural identity truly balance national identification? If his argument is interpreted in a multicultural space, national identity supersedes cultural affiliation because 'Canadianness' is perceived as the great social equalizer—we are 'all' Canadian (with cultural distinctions). This perspective, however, is largely criticized for equality is not so easily achieved. In fact, critics take issue with such generalizations, arguing that multiculturalism "does not respond to the dynamism that occurs when different groups come to live and interact together...It is an all too ordered and well-organized image of society as a unity-in-diversity" (Ang 'Introduction' 14).

While multiculturalism is an orderly manner by which to bureaucratically organise heterogeneous groups, it remains controversial. The primary contention with the multicultural policy is its ethnic focal point, which serves to foreground the minority status of ethnic groups. This official policy allows dominant society to regulate difference (Kamboureli 2000) and, in effect, restructure margin and centre.

Therefore while multiculturalism positions everyone equally within Canada's mosaic, individuals still experience various levels of discrimination.

X: Exclusion

Although these participants associate Canada with 'home' and consider themselves to be Canadian, they nevertheless experienced difficulties with their cultural identity. As the following excerpt shows, growing up Doukhobor carries with it levels of discrimination and displacement:

> I felt, even MORE kind of, displaced within my own, social sphere and and through school and the people because I'm like, I'm this, you know young Canadian Doukhobor that is, is so so DIFFERENT from just these normal Canadians that you know play video games and play sports and don't go to church, and have families that eat meat and, and just have friends that are LIKE THEM and and, here I'm trying to fit IN and yet meanwhile I go to Sunday school and I'm a PACIFIST and so I don't want to get into FIGHTS and yet I'm being made FUN OF all the time. (Richard 8)

Difference, in this account, is emphasised through comparison. The participant does not feel like a 'normal Canadian' who, in his opinion, plays video games, does not attend church, eats meat and has other 'Canadian' friends. The participants' Doukhobor beliefs do not correspond, in his opinion, to standard Canadian lifestyle. He sees himself as 'other' to the rest of his classmates, and it is this 'otherness' that complicates belonging. It is therefore not surprising that participants use 'Canadian' to discuss other groups or individuals:

> Not to mention because we DIDN'T want to have to do what the Canadians did you know, with the schooling—voting and registering births and deaths and all that. (Peter 8)

> Like I know there's, one friend he's going out with—a Canadian. (Mark 2)

> There's a lot of Canadians, out there, who THINK, along the same way that Doukhobors do. (Richard 4)

These statements distance Doukhobors from Canadians, complicating identification. A participant further illustrates this notion when he states: "in your head somewhere it never feels like this [Canada] is where you should be" (Peter 3). Canada is an uncomfortable place to be partially because "'home' is only available to those passport holders, those citizens whose bodies signify an unproblematic identity of selves with the nation-state" (Mishra 8). Doukhobor bodies, signified by beliefs, customs, and traditional dress, separate Doukhobors from Canadians and complicate belonging. As I have already pointed out in another context, 'home' is a damaged idea (Mishra 1995) for these Doukhobors, as it is the site of suffering and displacement. It is a space where Doukhobors still do not always feel they belong.

Although some participants occasionally disassociate themselves from 'Canadians,' the greater Doukhobor community employs a specific term that signifies non-Doukhobor people. This word is 'англик' (pronounced 'ankhlik'), loosely translated as English-speaker or Anglo, and it positions non-Doukhobors in a way that relates them to Doukhobor communities in terms of their difference. Англик [Non-Doukhobor] is therefore used within the community to refer to any English-speaking non-Doukhobor and is occasionally interchanged with 'не наш' [not ours]. By using this expression, Doukhobors reaffirm their diasporic identity and complicate multicultural discourse because англик [non-Doukhobor] is based upon exclusion. It illustrates that the community largely defines greater Canadian society as English-speaking and implies that Doukhobors do not belong to Canada's English majority. Англик [Non-Doukhobor] further distances Doukhobors from everyone else, in part because the community has traditionally communicated in Russian.

The continued prevalence of англик [non-Doukhobor] amongst contemporary Doukhobors therefore invited possible explanations for the term's prevalence within Doukhobor discourse:

> I think, well I think number one that stems from, the NON-spiritual, aspects, of our culture and history. I think that stems from the fact that—to preSERVE, that spiritual identity this is how interesting it gets, to preSERVE that spiritual significance of the Doukhobor understanding—we wanted to

> make sure that it was not, DAMaged by, other PEOPLE—other events, we became very untrustworthy through experiences. (Darren 8)

> It really was something that developed in the first fifty years because it was still so new, for these, older Doukhobors to come into this country, AND you know have all these—foreign people to them—say the things that they did or, or just act differently and it was in their already their minds, better to kind of—try to live with them as peacefully as possible but not to—to mix with their culture, to still preserve the Doukhobor the RUSSIAN culture, amongst themSELVES and so it was obviously—a major thing, they had to you know constantly you know, tell their children you know those people не наши [not ours] or they're англики [non-Doukhobors] you know—DON'T deal with them more than you have to or whatever. (Richard 6)

Англик [non-Doukhobor] therefore arose in Doukhobor groups as a response to greater Canadian society. By locating Canadians as 'other' to Doukhobors, the Doukhobor community was better able to resist assimilation. The community therefore inverted the hegemonic structure—Doukhobors became the centre, while all others were marginalized. The term, however, is still in the contemporary Doukhobor vocabulary and more than one participant employed the word or its various substitutions[30] before s/he was even asked to speak about it. One participant's observation is therefore pertinent:

> a hundred years later now or whatever I mean that's, that's so old and so passé—of course, between ourSELVES we can still say it from time to time kind of as a JOKE—BUT—in some respect—how much are we still even ourselves joking? (Richard 6)

Англик [non-Doukhobor] can in turn become an emotional response to hurtful situations:

> Elementary school, because there was a a significant amount of Doukhobors in elementary school but there was—a more proportionate amount of англики [non-Doukhobors] and stuff, and we actually—we were the DOUKS and they were the англики [non-Doukhobors], you know and they called us Douks and

> I mean, that's when you kinda felt out of place I mean I even had a TEACHER call me a DOUK.
>
> *[Interviewer] Oh.*
>
> Like a DIRTY Douk—in fact at one point I remember, and THAT HURT—like—what right did this АНГЛИК [non-Doukhobor] have to tell ME who I am, you know—he doesn't know SHIT ALL about me, or ABOUT my people or who we are—you know, that that that was, I've never had it any more overt than that. (Peter 10)

The prevalence of англик [non-Doukhobor] in contemporary Doukhobor discourse indicates that the 'us' and 'them' boundaries remain defined, although as Sara states, "I USE IT but I I don't LIKE using it, sometimes it just comes out though" (8).

Although exclusion can be hurtful, I would like to emulate Nourbese Philip and argue from both sides of my mouth (1992). While equality upsets power hierarchies, prolonged displacement ensures survival (Young 2001). Groups that are 'othered' maintain to an extent their cultural traditions and community cohesion because they are marginal to dominant society; their displacement has the potential to preserve their cultural identity. This experience can be observed within the Doukhobor community: when Doukhobors felt unwelcome in Canada, their cultural practices were strong. Conversely, once Doukhobors integrated into Canadian society, many traditions, including knowledge of the Russian language, weakened. Англик [non-Doukhobor] can therefore be seen as not only a direct response to 'Douk,' but also a means by which the community could curb assimilation. As long as Doukhobors felt they did not belong to the greater social landscape and maintained a vocabulary that reinforced this idea, individuals were discouraged from wanting to leave the community. In this respect, Doukhobors experienced both the discomfort of exclusion as well as the reward of solidarity.

X: Conclusion

The Doukhobor community has experienced a multitude of changes since its migration to Canada in the late nineteenth century. Although the community

implemented various practices to curb assimilation, practices that kept Doukhobors comparatively apart from greater Canadian society for over fifty years, Doukhobors eventually moved away from their self-sufficient lifestyle. Their connection to a Russian homeland, however, remained.

For many displaced people, connecting to a land of origins maintains distinct cultural identity and honours historical passages and traditions. This connection may also distance displaced individuals from their current location where belonging is felt to be problematic. Some scholars have labelled this homeland connection, and its resulting challenges, diasporic. I would therefore argue that first-generation Doukhobors and Doukhobors who were part of the migration to Canada are members of what Safran and Tölölyan consider a diaspora. These Doukhobors maintained a spiritual and emotional connection to their land of origins through song and prayer, which preserved the Russian language as well as the remembrance of historic Doukhobor struggles. Conversations with these Doukhobor elders furthermore illustrate their connection to Russia, as current and archived interview transcripts show that these individuals believed the Doukhobor future was in this homeland. These beliefs are substantiated by longstanding prophecy and community discourse.

But the case is different for my participant group who are contemporary (or third and fourth generation) Doukhobors. Participants in my study are currently negotiating a complicated relationship with their understanding and treatment of nationality that marks their experiences as different from those of their elders. Multicultural rhetoric facilitates this negotiation, as substantiated by participants' use of 'Canadian' where the literal application is when one is born within Canada and has contributed to some aspect of Canada's history. When understood in this light, all six participants agreed that they are in fact Canadian, something previous generations of Doukhobors would not have said. They also spoke of being 'Russian,' but they did so in an ambivalent manner—more often than not, they used 'Russian' as a term when they referred to Doukhobors who live in Canada. The way in which these participants make use of 'Russian' in their discussions with me shows that the idea of Russia, for them, forms a cultural connection to the Russian homeland through positive and romanticized social characteristics that participants believe existed there.

Participants' connection to the contemporary Russian nation, however, is contrary to their image of Russia as an idealized place. They in turn avoided forming any literal connection with Russian nationality, which indicates that the speakers perceive Russia's current political and social climates as incongruous in terms of the present Doukhobor lifestyle and worldview. Consequently, connections to the contemporary Russian nation were absent when these respondents talked about Russia.

While these participants did not feel connected to a contemporary Russian identity that was tied to Russia's current political and social structures, I have already illustrated that they did identify with a certain understanding of 'Canadian.' In their responses, participants understood Canada as being a multicultural nation that does not discriminate against groups with disparate ethnic and cultural backgrounds, but rather provides them with the opportunity to practice and maintain cultural traditions. The participants therefore say they are Canadian because they believe Canada is a multicultural country, which allows Doukhobors (and other ethnic groups) to circumvent the discomfiture of being 'other' without losing an imagined connection to the homeland. Dependant on circumstance, however, participants' understanding of Canadian retained an alternate meaning that did not fit into multicultural rhetoric. On many occasions, participants did not see themselves as Canadian and used the term англик [non-Doukhobor] to discuss non-Doukhobor groups. Although англик [non-Doukhobor] was used occasionally as an emotional response to being called a 'Dirty Douk,' many participants acknowledged that the term is used casually in conversations between Doukhobors in order to quickly identify a third party. Some participants, however, also described non-Doukhobors as 'Canadians.' This substitution (of англик [non-Doukhobor] with Canadian) suggests that the speakers' still identify individuals as being Doukhobor or non-Doukhobor, regardless of whether or not they use англик [non-Doukhobor] as their descriptor. And while this language affirms that 'us' and 'them' categories exist, it also implies that minority groups (like the Doukhobors) have an imagined idea of 'Canadian' that is unlike its multicultural definition. While participants used 'Canadian' to refer to their nationalist feelings and to say they belong in Canada, they also used the term as a response to cultural pressures when difference (and being different) is neither

celebrated nor supported. 'Canadian' as non-Doukhobor therefore demonstrates the breakdown of multicultural rhetoric. Although the Canadian Multiculturalism Act, according to section three of the Department of Canadian Heritage's website, "reflects the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society and acknowledges the freedom of all members of Canadian society to preserve, enhance and share their cultural heritage," it fails to address the complexities inherent in hybrid identities. So when participants use 'Canadian' to reaffirm feelings of dislocation and division, they are also resisting the impulse to be positive and celebrate diversity. Situations like these demonstrate that multicultural rhetoric provides ethnic and cultural groups with tools to claim Canada as a homeland but does not always address ongoing problems of belonging, which is why terms such as 'Canadian,' 'Russian,' and 'Doukhobor' change as they are used. And while these participants may be Canadian passport holders, they arguably remain in negotiation with their national identity.

Part of this negotiation is based on experiences of displacement and disconnection, which are neither random nor coincidental. These encounters instead suggest that participants' ambiguous and complex relationship to place and nationality is diasporic. Unlike Safran and Tölölyan's understanding of diaspora as a historical condition of a group who actually plans to return to the homeland, the participants' diasporic connection is symbolic because a return to the homeland is not only unlikely, but moreover, unwelcome by them. James Clifford and other theorists argue that a homeland fixation and a desire to return are not necessary diasporic characteristics. Instead, diasporic groups may cultivate lateral bonds—connections between members within a diaspora—based on shared emotional and historical travails. The participant group exhibited this tendency by focusing on communal страдание [suffering], as well as stories that maintain an emotionally charged community discourse. Russia in turn does not disappear but rather stands as a symbolic gesture of spiritual and cultural difference.

Although I would argue that these participants are members of a diaspora, where diaspora is seen as a symbolic connection to homeland sustained through stories and emotional bonds expressed within the community in order to understand what it means to be 'here,' I would also stress that these participants are not fixed to a

diasporic location. In other words, the diaspora informs their position but does not determine it because, as I found in the analysis, participants' feelings of belonging within Canada complicate such unilateral assertions. Rather, there is a tension between belonging and not belonging, feeling one is Canadian and not, that creates space for further dialogue. This allows identity to remain unfixed, to be neither flower nor weed,[31] open to future and further negotiations. I would therefore recommend investigating how Doukhobors perceive their role within Canada in order to determine how multicultural policy has influenced the contemporary community. At that point, diaspora's role can be re-examined through alternate and original understandings of placement and displacement.

Notes

[1] The USCC Migration Committee is and has been primarily responsible for this task.
[2] First generation refers to the first generation born in Canada.
[3] Safran and Toloyan's work is primarily concerned with the Armenian diaspora.
[4] Tolstoy specifically criticized what he saw as a shift towards materialism and notably wrote that "to acknowledge property is to acknowledge violence and murder" (qtd. in Woodcock and Avakumovic 167).
[5] A pseudonym has been used to preserve anonymity.
[6] The coastal whip may be a reference to an act of God.
[7] For greater detail about Doukhobor oral traditions within Russia, see Nikitina's article 'The Oral Tradition of the Dzhavakhetiia Doukhobors' in Spirit-Wrestlers' Voices.
[8] It is known within the Doukhobor community that the drawn out psalms (vowels are extended, complicating the structure of words) in particular communicated Doukhobor philosophy and understanding at a time when the group was being severely persecuted in Russia. Through song, Doukhobors were able to communicate with each other, as well as identify one another, without endangering themselves with formal declarations.
[9] Younger generations appear to be losing interest in this aspect of Doukhorbism, a reality substantiated by diminishing youth choirs and general youth involvement.
[10] Rak discusses this idea in Chapter 3 of Negotiated Memory.
[11] The poem in its entirety is included in the Appendix.

[12] This and all subsequent translations are mine. The complete translation of "*Oh distant land, homeland*" is included in the Appendix.
[13] See chapter one where the Burning of Arms and subsequent persecutions are discussed.
[14] (Sic) indicates that Doukhobors pronounce the word память [remembrance] as память, a distinction that has transferred to written record.
[15] For a detailed etymology, see Martin Baumann's "Diaspora: Genealogies of Semantics and Transcultural Comparison." International Review for the History of Religions (2000).
[16] Doukhobors in general did not begin travelling to Russia until the 1960s; extensive travel among community members did not occur until the 1980s.
[17] This is not to suggest, however, that contemporary Doukhobor identity is located between Canada and Russia. Paul Gilroy, conversely, locates black identity on the middle passage between Africa and elsewhere. See "The Black Atlantic as a Counterculture of Modernity" from The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness (1993).
[18] See Popoff (1992) as well as Woodcock and Avakumovic (1977).
[19] There were a number of Doukhobor communes in Saskatchewan and in various areas of British Columbia.
[20] There are conditions where military service is waived; for instance, if the candidate is enrolled in university.
[21] The Sons of Freedom perhaps best illustrate this notion. During periods of Canadian incarceration, they often sang traditional Doukhobor hymns which (originally) remembered Siberian exile and honoured the Burning of Arms' martyrs.
[22] Помонки refer to the annual memorial services of the Doukhobor leaders Verigin and Chistiakov.
[23] This comment is made in reference to Gina Mallet's article 'Multiculturalism: Has diversity gone too far?'
[24] Many Sons of Freedom express an inherent distrust of all authority figures, associating them largely with times of incarceration and distress.
[25] My intention is not to concentrate on participants' group affiliation. In this circumstance, however, the speaker's association with the Sons of Freedom community is imperative to the analysis of his comment.
[26] I will extensively discuss Krestova's importance in chapter three.
[27] See Woodcock and Avakumovic (1977) and The Doukhobors of British Columbia (1955) for more details.
[28] Communal villages were all but self-sufficient; Doukhobors did not vote; Russian was the primary communicative language.
[29] I thank my non-Doukhobor friends who refer fondly to various Doukhobor settlements as 'Doukhoboria.'
[30] Англичались [became Anglo-cized]; не наш [not ours].
[31] Heather Zwicker, in her article 'Joy Kogawa's Ambivalent Antiphony,' uses this metaphor to discuss the function of the hybrid Japanese Canadian identity. She argues that the hybrid is beyond classification, which makes it more resilient than its classified counterpart.

Works Cited

Ang, Ien. "Between Asia and the West (In Complicated Entanglement)." Introduction. On Not Speaking Chinese: Living Between Asia and the West. By Ang. London: Routledge, 2001. 1-17.

--- "On Not Speaking Chinese: Postmodern Ethnicity and the Politics of Diaspora." New Formations Winter (1994): 1-18.

Baumann, Martin. "Diaspora: Genealogies of Semantics and Transcultural Comparison." International Review for the History of Religions 47:3 (2000): 313-337.

Braziel, Jana Evans, and Anita Mannur. "Nation, Migration, Globalization: Points of Contention in Diaspora Studies." Theorizing Diaspora: A Reader. Eds. Jana Evans Braziel and Anita Mannur. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2003. 1-22.

Breyfogle, Nicholas B. "Building Doukhoboriia: Religious Culture, Social Identity and Russian Colonization in Transcaucasia, 1845-1895." Canadian Ethnic Studies 28:3 (1995) 24-51.

"Canadian Multiculturalism Act." Department of Canadian Heritage. 1985. 4 April 2005. <http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/multi/policy/act_e.cfm>.

"Carol." Personal Interview. 3 August 2004.

Clifford, James. "Diasporas." Cultural Anthropology 9:3 (1994): 302-338.

Conner, Walker. "The Impact of Homelands Upon Diasporas." Modern Diasporas in International Politics. Ed. Gabriel Sheffer. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986. 16-46.

Cruikshank, Julie. "Life History and Life Stories." Introduction. Life Lived Like a Story. By Cruikshank. 2nd Edition. Vancouver, University of British Columbia Press, 1992. 21-36.

"Darren." Personal Interview. 16 August 2004.

"Дом наш благодатный." Сборник: Духоборческих Псалмов, Стихов, и Песен. Grand Forks, BC: The Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ, 1978. 86.

Ellis, Carolyn. The Ethnographic I: A Methodological Novel About Autoethnography. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2004.

Friesen, John W., and Michael M Verigin. The Community Doukhobors: A People in Transition. Ottawa: Borealis Press, 1989.

Gates Jr., Henry Louis. Introduction. The Classic Slave Narratives. By Gate Jr. Ed. Henry Louis Gates Jr. New York: New American Library, 2002. 1-14.

Gilroy, Paul. The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.

"George." Personal Interview. 20 August 2004.

Goldman, Anne E. "Autobiography, Ethnography, and History: A Model for Reading." Introduction. Take My Word: Autobiographical Innovations of Ethnic American Working Women. By Goldmna. Berkeley: University of California Pres, 1996. xv-xxxv.

Gumperz, John J., and Norine Berenz. "Transcribing Conversational Exchanges." Talking Data: Transcriptions and Coding in Discourse Research. Eds. Jane A. Edwards and Martin D. Lampart. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1993. 91-121.

Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." 1990. Theorizing Diaspora: A Reader. Eds. Jana Evans Braziel and Anita Mannur. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2003. 233-246.

--- "Negotiating Caribbean Identities." New Left Review 209 (1995): 3-14.

"Helen." Personal Interview. 7 June 2004.

Inikova, Svetlana. "Spiritual Origins and the Beginnings of Doukhobor History." The Doukhobor Centennary in Canada. Eds. Andrew Donskov, John Woodsworth, and Chad Gaffield. Ottawa: Slavic Research Group, 2000. 1-21.

Kamboureli, Smaro. Scandalous Bodies: Diasporic Literature in English Canada. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Krupat, Arnold. "An Approach to Native American Texts." For Those Who Come After: A Study of Native American Autobiography. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985. 1-27.

Lorde, Audre. "Age, Race, Class, and Sex: Women Redefining Difference." 1980. Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches. Trumansburg, New York: The Crossing Press, 1984. 114-123.

"Mark." Personal Interview. 6 July 2004.

McLaren, John. "The Doukhobor Belief in Individual Faith and Conscience and the Demands of the Secular State." Religious Conscience, the state, and the law: historical contexts and contemporary significance. Eds. John McLaren and Harold Coward. Albany: State University Press, 1999. 117-135. 10 October 2004. <http://www.netlibrary.com/summary.asp?ID=5575>

Mendoza-Denton, Norma. "Pregnant Pauses: Silence and Authority in the Anita Hill-Clarence Thomas Hearings." Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self. Eds. Kira Hall and Mary Busholtz. New York: Routledge, 1995. 51-66.

"Mike." Personal Interview. 10 June 2004.

Mishra, Vijay. "Postcolonial Differend: Diasporic Narratives of Salman Rushdie." Ariel 26 (1995): 7-45.

Nikitina, Serafima. "The Oral Tradition of the Dzhavakhetiia Doukhobors." Spirit-Wrestlers' Voices: Honouring Doukhobors on the Centenary of Their Migration to Canada in 1899. Ed. Koozma J. Tarasoff. Ottawa: Legas, 1998. 272-287.

Novio, Edite. "Towards a Cartography of Portugueseness: Challenging the Hegemonic Center." Diaspora 11:2 (2002): 255-276.

"О край далекий, край родимый." Сборник: Духоборческих Псалмов, Стихов, и Песен. Grand Forks, BC: The Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ, 1978. 453.

Olson, Nina. "'No Foe, No Show': Multiculturalism, the Gentle Assimilator." The Doukhobor Centennary in Canada. Eds. Andrew Donskov, John Woodsworth, and Chad Gaffield. Ottawa: Slavic Research Group, 2000. 217-230.

Padilla, Genaro M. My History, Not Yours. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1993. 8-10.

Padolsky, Enoch. "Multiculturalism at the Millenium." Journal of Canadian Studies 35:1 (2000): 138-160.

"Peter." Personal Interview. 28 June 2004.

Philip, N. Nourbese. "Echoes in a Stranger Land." Introduction. Frontiers: selected essays and writing on racism and culture. By Philip. Stratford: Mercury Press, 1992. 9-25.

Планидин, И.И. "Спите, орлы боевые." 1931. Сборник: Духоборческих Псалмов, Стихов, и Песен. Grand Forks, BC: The Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ, 1978 (544-545).

Popoff, Eli. Stories from Doukhobor History. Trans. Eli Popoff. Grand Forks, BC: The Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ, 1992.

Radhakrishnan, R. "Ethnicity in an Age of Diaspora." 1996. Theorizing Diaspora: A Reader. Eds. Jana Evans Braziel and Anita Mannur. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2003. 117-131.

--- Introduction. Diasporic Mediations: Between Home and Locations. By Radhakrishnan. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996 (xiii-xxix).

Rak, Julie. Negotiated Memory: Doukhobor Autobiographical Discourse. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2003.

--- "Pain and Painting: William Kurelek and Autobiography as Mourning." Mosaic 37:2 (2004): 21-39.

Reed-Danahay, Deborah E. Introduction. Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social. Ed. Deborah E. Reed-Danahay. New York: Berg, 1997. 1-17.

"Richard." Personal Interview. 18 August 2004.

Safran, William. "Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homelands and Return." Diaspora Spring (1991): 83-99.

"Sara." Personal Interview. 13 July 2004.

Сборник: Духоборческих Псалмов, Стихов, и Песен. Grand Forks, BC: The Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ, 1978.

Струков, Г.Н. "Дело было за Кавказам." 1930. Сборник: Духоборческих Псалмов, Стихов, и Песен. Grand Forks, BC: The Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ, 1978. 293-294.

Tarasoff, Koozma J. "Multiculturalism and the Rise of a New Spirit." Spirit-Wrestlers' Voices: Honouring Doukhobors on the Centenary of Their Migration to Canada in 1899. Ed. Koozma J. Tarasoff. Ottawa: Legas, 1998. 329-345.

Tedlock, Dennis. "On the Translation of Style in Oral Narrative." Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1983. 31-61.

Tölölyan, Khachig. "Rethinking *Diaspora(s)*: Stateless Power in the Transnational Moment." Diaspora 5:1 (1996): 3-36.

Верещагин, Г.В. "Как счастливые те люди." 1922. Сборник: Духоборческих Псалмов, Стихов, и Песен. Grand Forks, BC: The Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ, 1978. 364-365.

Woodcock, George, and Ivan Avakumovic. The Doukhobors. 2nd Edition. Ottawa: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1977.

Young, Judy. "No Longer 'Apart?' Multiculturalism Policy and Canadian Literature." Canadian Ethnic Studies 33:2 (2001): 88-117.

Zwicker, Heather. "Multiculturalism: Pied Piper of Canadian Nationalism (And Joy Kogawa's Ambivalent Antiphony)." Ariel 32:4 (2001): 145-76.

Appendix I: Questions and Prompts

(Russia) Before I travelled to Russia, I always considered myself to be a Russian, or a Russian-Canadian. However, after being in Russia, I know consider myself Canadian.

I was wondering if you had had a similar experience?

Did your parents/grandparents share stories about Russia with you? Are there any pesni or stikhi that you know which talk about Russia?

Many cultural groups originated elsewhere—Do you feel that Russia is the Doukhobor homeland? What does 'home' mean to you?

Do you feel that Doukhobors are connected to Russia today? (ex. Yasnaya Polyana bakery) Is this connection important?

What do you think of the prophecy that states that the Doukhobors will one day return to Russia?

(Language) I attended the Sunday prayer service during the Festival weekend. I found it interesting that they conducted and explained much of the service in English.

(3) How do you feel about this practice? Are Doukhobor traditions evolving or is this the beginning of the end?

(2) How important is the Russian language to Doukhoborism? Can a person be a Doukhobor without knowing Russian?

(1) Do you speak Russian/is Russian your first language? Have you ever taken any classes on Russian language or culture? What prompted you to do so? Have/would you encourage your children to speak Russian? Why?

(Non-Doukhobor interaction) Through school and other activities, I've always maintained contact and friendships with non-Doukhobors.

How would you describe your past and current interactions with people outside of the Doukhobor community?

Has your upbringing/Doukhobor background influenced your interactions with non-Doukhobors?

What is it like to be a Doukhobor in Canada?

I've always described the Doukhobor community as an extended family. How would you describe your relationship/interaction with other Doukhobors?

How do you personally maintain your Doukhobor identity and Doukhobor traditions? What type of future do you envision for the Doukhobor community?

Appendix II: Transcription Key

UPPER CASE: an increase in speaker's volume

Smaller font: a decrease in speaker's volume

Comma (,): a pause the approximate length of a breath

Long dash (—): a long break in speech

Interrupted speaker: speaker's dialogue

[New speaker] Interruption

—the space between the first speaker's words shows where the interruption occurred
—new speaker's identity appears in italics

Ellipsis [...]: segment of the speaker's speech has been removed

Appendix III

О край далекий, край родимый,
Где юность светлая прошла;
К тебе стремлюсь, мой край любимый,
Где скорбь и радость прожита.

Там, где народ, терпя, страдает,
Под гнетом тягостным труда;
Туда меня любовь святая
Влечет, изгнанника—туда.

Там правду начал позновать я,
Узрев страдания людей,
Свой дух и силы отдавая—
Служить хотел до конца дней.

Прощай, мой край, народ родной,
Мне не видать вас никогда,
Но издали пусть голос мой
Звучит приветом вам всегда.

Пусть песень любви и песнь свободы,
Труда и братства всех людей
В одно сольет сердца народа
Освободит всех от цепей.

Народ родной, народ любимый,
Когда проснешься ты от сна,
Тогда поймешь что силой дивной
Полно учение Христа.

O distant land, homeland,
Where bright youth was spent;
Towards you, I yearn, my beloved land,
Where sorrow and happiness were endured.

There, where the people, endure, struggle,
Under burdensome, oppressing toil;
It is over there that my sacred love
Draws me, an exile—over there.

There I began to know truth,
Saw the people's struggle,
My soul and strength, I gave away—
I wanted to serve until the end of days.

Forgive me, my land, my dear people,
I will never see you again,
But my voice release, if only,
A resounding greeting to you always.

May a song of love and song of freedom,
Work and brotherhood for all people
Together join in their heart
Free everyone from chains.

Dear people, beloved people,
When you wake from dream,
Will you then understand that wonderful strength
Is the full teaching of Christ.

Appendix IV

Спите, орлы боевые, Спите с покойном душой, Вы заслужили, родные, Память и вечный покой.	Sleep on, you brave fighting eagles, Sleep with peaceful souls. You have merited, dear kindred, Remembrance and eternally peaceful consciousness
Нам все готовой тропою Легко теперь идти, Столь дорогой ценою Нам вы ее обрели.	Our path is prepared It is now easy to walk, So at a dear price, You have cleared the way for us.
Долго и тяжко страдали Вы за отчизну свою, Много вы тундрах прожили, В холодном сибирском краю.	Long and hard you struggled For your motherland, You endured life in the tundra, In the cold Siberian land.
Ныне вспомним былое: Ваши страданья, труды, И соединимся в едину, Тесно сомкнемся в ряды.	Today we remember what happened: Your suffering, toil, And united as one, Tightly close together in rows.
Спите ж, орлы боевые, Спите с покойном душой, Мы все победим, дорогие, Христовой пойдем мы тропой.	Sleep on you, brave fighting eagles, Sleep with peaceful souls, We will overcome everything, dear ones, Walking on the path to Christianity.
И.И Планидин	I.I. Planidin