

Prairie Centre for the Ukrainian Heritage, St. Thomas More College,
University of Saskatchewan, Canada

Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна

Східний інститут українознавства ім. Ковальських

Українська асоціація усної історії

Міжнародна наукова конференція
**«У пошуках власного голосу:
усна історія як теорія, метод та джерело»**

Харків, 11–12 грудня 2009

Матеріали конференції

International Scholarly Symposium
**“In Search of Voice:
Oral History as Theory, Method, and Source”**

Kharkiv, 11–12 December 2009

Conference Program and Proceedings

11 грудня / 11 December

Ауд. II-49 (Головний корпус) / Room II-49 (Main Building)

09:00–09:30 Реєстрація / Registration

09:30–10:00 Відкриття конференції / Welcome address

10:00–12:00 Пленарне засідання (1) / Plenary Session (1)

Взаємини та конвергенції: усна історія та її суб'єкт Relations and Convergences: Oral History and Its Subject

Голова: **Гелінада Грінченко** (м. Харків, Україна)

Наталія Ханенко-Фрізен (м. Саскатун, Канада)

У пошуках суб'єкту: усна історія, суспільство, ідеологія

Alexander von Plato (Stade, Germany)

The Problems of Oral History and Biographical Research after World War II:
The West and East German examples

Елена Рождественская (г. Москва, Россия)

Статус события и статус субъекта: фигура остарбайтера на фоне

12:00–12:30 Перерва на каву / Coffee break

12:30–14:30 Пленарне засідання (2) / Plenary Session (2)

Аспекти й дихотомії: усна історія та владні відносини Aspects and Dichotomies: Oral History and Power Relations

Голова: **Наталія Ханенко-Фрізен** (м. Саскатун, Канада)

Наталья Пушкарёва (г. Москва, Россия)

Устная история: гендерный аспект

Оксана Кісь (м. Львів, Україна)

Гендерні аспекти усної історії: до питання фемінізації дослідницького поля

Наталія Сурева (г. Санкт-Петербург, Россия)

Устная история повседневного социализма: возможности и перспективы

Гелінада Грінченко (г. Харьков, Украина)

Презентация «голосов»: рассказчик(и) vs исследователь(и)

14:30–16:00 Обід / Lunch

16:00 – 17:15 Денна сесія (3) / Afternoon session (3)

**Усноісторичні проекти: досвід організації та проведення
Oral History Projects: Research Design and Organization**

Керівник: **Олена Стяжкіна** (м. Донецьк, Україна)

Алексей Голубев (з. Петрозаводск, Росія)

Проект «За спичками» или устная история советско-финляндского туризма в 1960–1980-е гг.

Machteld Venken (Lewen, Belgium)

Participant Observation or Interviews? Gathering collective or personal memories? A case-study from Belgium

Виктория Куделя-Свѣнтэк (з. Краков, Польща)

Свои среди чужих, чужие среди своих... По материалам проекта «Z ziemi kazachskiej do Polski», посвященного коллективной памяти репатриантов из Казахстана в Польшу

17:15–17:30 Перерва на каву / Coffee break

17:30–19:30 Вечірня сесія (3) / Evening session (3)

**Круглий стіл: усна історія як метод та джерело дослідження
Round Table: Oral History as Research Method and Source**

Ведучий: **Наталія Ханенко-Фрізен** (м. Саскатун, Канада)

I.

Усна історія — метод дослідження чи окрема наукова ділянка?

Чи можна вважати усну історію окремим напрямом соціогуманітарного знання, якщо так — чим саме окреслюються її «галузеві» межі та в чому полягає її специфічність? Яким чином можна провести лінію розподілу між усною історією як методом та усною історією як напрямком дослідження?

Oral history: a separate scholarly discipline or a research method?

If it is possible to assert that Oral History is a scholarly discipline of its own, what separates it from other sisterly branches of scholarship such as history, anthropology, ethnology, sociology and so on? What constitutes its unique core and sets it aside from others?

II.

Методи аналізу усних історій.

Чи має усна історія власний інструментарій аналізу записаних історій, чи вона вимушена послуговуватися методичними напрацюваннями інших дисциплін? Де пролягає межа між переказом усних історій та їхнім аналізом?

Methods of analysis of recorded evidence.

Does oral history have its own set of analytical tools to approach the study of recorded evidence or its methods of analysis have to be borrowed from other disciplines? Where is the line between an interview analysis and interview retelling?

III.

Проблема авторства та співавторства в усноісторичних дослідженнях.

Кінцевою науковою продукцією в дослідженні усних істориків традиційно виступатимуть інтерпретації та власне наратив дослідника, який, як правило, бере на себе повну відповідальність за створену наукову продукцію. Але наскільки єтичним та моральним присвоєння, субординація, а часом і повне інкорпорування наративу та голосу людини, історія та життєпис якої лягли в основу наукового тексту? Чи «заганяння» голосу оповідача у формат «цитати» є достатнім та відповідним способом визнання його внеску у науковий процес?

Authorship, co-authorship, and authority in oral history interview.

When it comes to the scholarly outcome of oral historical research, oftentimes it the scholars' own interpretations of interview and of recorded stories that become the final product of the scholarly analysis. In addition, it is the scholar, who takes upon herself or himself the full responsibility for the outcoming scholarly narrative. How ethical is this subtle appropriation of another person's story as well as the subjugation the voice of the informant, whose stories are cited, incorporated, built into the scholar's narrative? Are current practices of citation enough to acknowledge the informant's contribution into the scholarly process?

IV.

Оприлюднення результатів усноісторичного дослідження.

Які форми введення результатів усноісторичного дослідження в публічний простір є, на ваш погляд, найбільш репрезентативними? Які форми найбільш повно транслюють «голос» дослідника, а які — «голоси» оповідачів? Чи відрізняються форми оприлюднення усноісторичних проектів у залежності від аудиторії: академічної спільноти чи широкого публічного загалу?

Presentation of oral history research.

What are the most representative and effective ways to present the results of oral historical research? What forms of research presentation are most effective in conveying the voices of the researcher and of the informant? What are the differences in how oral historical research is presented to different audiences, academic v.v lay audience?

V.

Яке місце зараз займає усна історія в академічному середовищі вашої країни?

What is the reception of oral history in the academic environments of your own country?

19:30–21:00 Фуршет / Reception

12 грудня / 12 December

Ауд. II-49 (Головний корпус) / Room II-49 (Main Building)

8:30–9:00 Організаційні збори / Organizational meeting

9:00–11:00 Ранкова сесія (1) / Morning session (1)

Інституціоналізація усноісторичних досліджень
Institutional Development of Oral Historical Research

Керівник: Тетяна Пастушенко (м. Київ, Україна)

Олена Стяжкіна (м. Донецьк, Україна)

Усна історія: інституціоналізація напрямку у дослідницьких практиках істориків Донбасу

Константин Козлов (г. Белгород, Россия)

Институционализация устной истории в отечественной исторической науке в XX веке

Людмила Афанасьєва, Людмила Глинська (м. Мелітополь, Україна)

З досвіду вивчення соціокультурних процесів в Запорізькому Приазов'ї лабораторією соціологічних досліджень МДПУ

Ирина Реброва (г. Краснодар, Россия)

Организация и деятельность СНО по устной истории Кубанского технологического университета

11:00–11:30 Перерва на каву / Coffee break

11:30–13:30 Ранкова сесія (2) / Morning session (2)

Долаючи кордони: усна історія на перехрестях дослідницьких практик
Crossing the borders: oral history at the intersections of scholarship

Керівник: Ирина Реброва (м. Краснодар, Россия)

Liisa Avelin (Turku, Finland)

Mission Impossible?: Oral Historian and the Blog

Олександр Пригарін (м. Одеса, Україна)

Між етнографією та усною історією: досвід використання біографічного методу у практиці науковців Одеси початку XXI ст.

Олеся Бріццна (м. Київ, Україна)

XX сторіччя в усній історії українців (нотатки до питання про історизм фольклору)

Ирина Романова, Ирина Маховская (г. Минск, Беларусь, г. Вильнюс, Литва)

«Мир: история местечка, рассказанная его жителями» (опыт изучения локальной истории методами устной истории)

Тарас Нагайко (м. Переяслав-Хмельницький, Україна)

Міждисциплінарний діалог гуманітарних студій у практиці роботи навчально-наукового Центру усної історії ДВНЗ «Переяслав-Хмельницький державний педагогічний університет імені Григорія Сковороди»

13:30–15:00 Обід / Lunch

15:00–16:30 Денна сесія (3) / Afternoon Session (3)

Проблема пам'яті в дослідженнях історика
Problem of memory in historical research

Керівник: Олексій Муєсздов (м. Харків, Україна)

Розалія Черепанова (г. Челябинск, Россия)

«Маленький человек» и «большая история»: опыт интерпретации устных биографических рассказов

Тетяна Пастушенко (м. Київ, Україна)

Life History та Life Story у біографічному інтерв'ю одного «киянина»: зміна життєвих пріоритетів

Оксана Товарянська (м. Київ, Україна)

Українсько-німецькі взаємини у пам'яті колишніх вояків дивізії «Галичина»

16:30–16:45 Перерва на каву / Coffee break

16:45–19:00 Вечірня сесія (4) / Evening session (4)

Інтерв'ю, інтерпретація, історія — дослідницька практика та відповідальність науковця
Interview, Interpretation, History: Research Practices and Responsibilities

Презентації проектів молодих дослідників
Project Presentations by Graduate Students

Модератор: **Юрій Волошин** (м. Полтава, Україна)

Юлія Стуканова (м. Донецьк, Україна)

Джерельна база з проблеми культурної еліти Донбасу в 1953–1964 роках: матеріали особистого походження

Сергій Таборанський (м. Київ, Україна)

Проблеми та методи усної історії на XV Міжнародному конгресі історичних наук в Бухаресті (1980 р.)

Алексей Ростовцев (г. Белгород, Росія)

Воспоминания ветеранов-педагогов Белгородского государственного университета в исторических исследованиях

Яна Комар (м. Горлівка, Україна)

Проблема достоверности устноисторической информации на примере изучения болгарской диаспоры восточной Украины и Российской Федерации

Ірина Реброва (м. Харків, Україна)

Досвід включеного спостереження та інтерв'ювання членів Харківського обласного товариства борців антифашистського опору

19:00 Закриття конференції / Closing address

ABSTRACTS

Liisa Avelin

MISSION IMPOSSIBLE? THE ORAL HISTORIAN AND THE BLOG

We usually consider “oral history” to be knowledge based on informants’ spoken memories, not on literary sources, although we often study the informants’ speech through transcripts. Oral history is translated in Finnish as *muistitieto* (memory-based data) instead of *suullinen historia* (spoken memories, oral history). The Finnish oral history tradition highlights the nature of remembering, instead of the way the memories are produced or edited. I see oral history as a method of historic documentation, using interviews but also other methods with living “survivors” of the time being investigated. Not to forget all the benefits that the ICT tools provide for the researcher.

This study suggests ways of how to use a blog for collecting the so-called “baby boomers” oral history. Members of my target group were able to share memories, participate in the research and also follow the progress of the research through blogs. Although the main purpose was to collect oral history data, through the blog people also reconnected with old friends that they thought they had lost. It was a place where people met new friends, networked, reminisced and shared memories, fell in love, yearned for someone, suffered from sleepless nights, got frustrated, shared words of sympathy, and relieved depression. In the other words, the blog writers opened up to each other as they used to do almost 40 years ago.

Reminiscing through a blog is not much different than recalling the past in other ways. My presentation describes the idea of the web-blog, its structure and methodological objectives, as well as thoughts on the further development of the method. It is possible to combine oral history research and the blog, but understanding the internet as a dangerous place, and social networking sites as places of socially-unacceptable behaviour, there are hindrances with the use of this technology. For some people, the blog is too public. A researcher has to respect the respondents’ concerns and give them a chance to decide whether to take part in the research or not. One way for researchers to dispel respondents’ feelings of caution and to increase trust is to be as open as possible about the purposes and processes of the research. It is also important to note that the more individuals know about each other in a virtual community like the blog, the more likely it is that trust, satisfaction, and a sense of being in a safe communication environment will ensue.

**Liudmila Afanasieva,
Liudmila Glinskaia**

**THE STUDY OF SOCIAL AND CULTURAL PROCESSES
IN ZAPORIZHZHIA-AZOV AT THE LABORATORY OF SOCIAL RESEARCH,
BOHDAN KHMEL'NYTS'KYI STATE PEDAGOGICAL UNIVERSITY
OF MELITOPOL**

Current and future events of every society are always reflected in the past. Therefore, the assessment of social memory is very possible. Social memory is the intellectual and spiritual heritage of a people, aimed at defining the future of a socio-cultural, ideological, philosophical, and nation-building society. Given this fact, the need for solving societal problems in the context of the historical experience of past generations' and their philosophical orientations, and their influence on history and culture in general, should be carefully studied.

The ethno-cultural life of Ukrainians became the subject of thorough research as Ukrainian society faces the problem of combining the processes of state development and the progressive cultures of all its inhabitants. This is a necessary task, so as to fully involve all ethnic groups in the process of nation-building, turning the current unstable factors of a multi-national state into its strength and power. On the other hand, considerable attention on the multi-directed development of the ethno-cultural life of Ukrainians has to also demonstrate the reality of the state and the aspirations of a democratic civil society.

Generally speaking, Ukraine is considered to be a state whose population is multi-ethnic, however, it is not a typical multi-ethnic country, as Ukrainians (with the exception of some regions) comprise more than 3/4 of the population.

The object of our research is just one of these unusual multi-ethnic regions of Ukraine — Zaporizko Pryazov'ya. During the long history of economic development in the territory of Zaporizhzhia, the Azov was inhabited by numerous people who have left traces of their stay, now becoming a significant part of the cultural heritage of Ukraine.

Today, there are more than 60 cultural groups in the Zaporizhzhia region. It should be noted, that in the Melitopol area there are nearly 100 residents and representatives of different nationalities comprising 19 cultural groups, whose members are respectful to each other. In 2008, The Council of Europe declared the Year of Intercultural Dialogue, and Melitopol represented Ukraine in the European intercultural forum.

The Laboratory of Social Research at the Melitopol State Pedagogical University has dedicated many years to the study of ethnicities in the Zaporizhzhia-Azov region. Within this research the laboratory conducted numerous ethnographic expeditions into ethnic

Bulgarian, Mennonite, Czech, Dukhobor, and Molokan settlements. This long-term work was reflected in several scientific and educational books. (Another task of the laboratory is to establish friendly relations among the various ethnic groups in the city and region.)

The first attempt at a creative search regarding this issue was the educational book *Tribes of the Northern Azov: The ethnic composition and peculiarities of the consumer's culture*, and the monograph *Ethno-cultural and ethno-anthropological factors in a regional context: The example of the Zaporizhzhia region of XIX–XX centuries*.

The next book, entitled *The ethno-social being of the Zaporizhzhia—Azov inhabitants in a geo-cultural context*, is an attempt to analyze the complete picture of ethno-cultural life of the residents through the prism of the Azov geo-cultural space.

Within the research, based on the description of actual memories of the events, the study of customary institutions, folk traditions and the lifestyles of different generations during a period of time can be conducted. We have concluded that this oral history research project will provide an opportunity to highlight areas of social life which were outside the official history, to highlight the diversity of interpretations of the past, to hear the voices of all parts of the social process, and to clarify the peculiarities of historical memory and collective identity.

To clarify such characteristics, the transformation processes in the Zaporizhzhia, PreAzov, Berdyansk, Melitopol, Preasov, Primorsk, Tokmak, Chernihiv, Yakymivka regions and territories of municipal councils in Berdyansk, Melitopol, Tokmak are presented.

The leading foci of the research are:

- the culture and ethnic identity of the Zaporizhzhia-Azov ethnicities: development of a new space;
- ritual and folk culture;
- the sub-culture as the unit of national and ethnic identity analysis;
- the universe of contemporary mentality;
- then origin of proper names in the socio-cultural space;
- standard deviations in philosophical orientations;
- the perspective of folk art.

Empirical studies of landscapes, ethnic and religious elements of the socio-cultural structure of the Zaporizhzhia region include:

- 1) the content analysis of historical and legal documents;
- 2) the study of national society organizations' histories;
- 3) the carrying out of ethnographic expeditions;
- 4) the fixation of certain memory descriptions;
- 5) the study of customary institutions, folklore, traditions, and lifestyle management;
- 6) research of applied art in the distinctive communities of different generations over a definite period of time;

- 7) the peculiarities of everyday life in the study of the ethno-cultural context;
- 8) the photographing, interviewing, and review of traditional consumer cultural elements.

Olexandra Britsyna

THE ORAL HISTORY OF UKRAINIANS IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY (FOLKLORE AND HISTORY)

Oral history is often treated as a historical source, though extremely rarely as folklore data. Therefore, this problem needs an appropriate theoretical background, based on the comprehension of the nature of folklore itself.

The problem of the reflection of history in folklore has, for a long time, been a matter of discussions among folklorists. It is a pity, however most often, simplified solutions have won this battle. Thus, folklorists often search for the “real facts” which were described in *dumy*, *bylyny*, and other genres. However, historical realities in folklore are often reinterpreted. In the case of oral history, the question is even more complicated.

Narrators verbalize their personal impressions, based on their own memory. Therefore, memorates are considered to be the stories of eyewitnesses, rather than the phenomena of tradition which has its own laws. But together with the truth of real facts, more or less precisely reflected by oral history, oral history also reflects the more essential truth — this truth is the people’s understanding of history, and people’s beliefs and aspirations. Thus, in the study of oral history, anthropological methods are most appropriate. They allow researchers to investigate the phenomena from “within,” opposite to point of view of the “outsiders,” as is usual in the formation of beliefs of a historical science, which strives for objectivity. (Compare the opposition of “emic” and “etic” approaches.)

Studies of different thematic cycles, which reflect the pre-revolutionary years, the period of collectivisation, the famine of 1932–1933, war times, national movements, the “good” and “bad” times during the XX-th century, the *remolal* caused by Chernobyl tragedy, family histories and so forth, making evident the traditional features in these narratives.

Individual experiences of different narrators are also embodied in various texts, which have a lot of common features on many different levels. Worldview stereotypes cause the similarity of opinions concerning these different periods of history. These stereotypes are “supported” by the stability of motives, which is quite impressive, taking into account the differences between the individual experiences of different performers. The verbalization of personal experiences also demonstrates the presence of verbal stereotypes.

These narratives are not mere information — to a greater or lesser extent, they are also works of art. In the process of repeated reproduction, these texts can achieve

perfect artistic features or, on the contrary, they can degrade over time.

Such interpretation of oral history allows researchers to stress the possibility of studying mainly the person, the person’s worldview, and their inner world, instead of the facts and realities of history, which are often more exactly reflected in various historical sources.

Rosalia Cherepanova

“SMALL PERSON” AND “BIG HISTORY”: AN EXPERIENCE OF INTERPRETATION OF ORAL BIOGRAPHIC STORIES

The 2006 project results that I would like to share consist of records of oral biographic interviews of representatives of provincial (South Ural) areas. The project’s purpose was to study the collective memory of the Soviet past. In two years, 132 interviews (97 female and 35 male) were collected.

Throughout last several decades, the psychological component in memory studies paled in insignificance as compared with the cultural and social dominant factors. Addressing an oral history, researchers hoped to find traces of a picture of the world seen from the point of view of “suppressed” and “silent” public groups, from the perspective of “the small person.” The post-Soviet territory has waited for the chance to study Soviet vernacular culture from such oral history projects. Some interesting particularities waiting to be studied are the mentality and inner world of a 20th century individual, the reconstruction of how “simple people” perceived changes and traumatic events in their lives, social transformations, inter-ethnic interactions, among others. Oral history can provide the researcher with such information. However, the information remains at a superficial level, as the researcher is subjected to the limits external analysis and external criticism of the source. Limits to this level are established by an ethical obstacle: in the course of the dialogue between the interviewer and the informant, there is a certain trust and certain personal relations, after which it seems inappropriate to subject the respondent to a deep analysis them, as a stranger. The horizons of oral history begin to seem too narrow, when it is realized, to what an extent the expectations of the interviewer actually end up influencing the informant. However, the biggest disappointment of oral history consists of the fact that, against expectation of the interviewer, the communicative memory of an informant is influenced, in a most powerful way, by those “official versions” of the past. These “official versions” serve as antidotes for oral history, as suggested by P. Thompson. Thus, it is necessary to consider that the official discourses on Soviet and post-Soviet territory varied often and considerably. Which style will be acquired by the respondent, directly depends on the individual’s personal biographic scenario.

Apparently, history remains the same — it is a field of human subjectivity. Studying the collected biographic stories, I have come to a conclusion about the necessity to consider, in each specific case, the individual scenario of the person. All so-called “big” histories which story-tellers would recollect, appeared no more than a background for deep personal histories of the individual as the loser or as the lucky person, the hero or the victim. In H. White’s famous classification, any subject line can be presented in four possible forms: as the novel, as tragedy, as the comedy, or the satire. It depends on the chosen form as a complete set of “events,” as to which form will appear in the narration as “fact.” The account of the individual life-scenario of the person allows researchers to encourage oral history as a more direct and effective technique.

Alexey Golubev

THE ORAL HISTORY PROJECT OF SOVIET-FINNISH TOURISM IN THE 1960S—1980S

In summer of 2009, the staff of the Oral History Centre of Petrozavodsk State University started a project on the oral history of Soviet tourism to Finland during the 1960s—1980s. This project arose from earlier oral history projects, two of which were addressed international and inter-ethnic research fields (the Finnish occupation of Karelia during the WWII, and the immigration from North America to Soviet Karelia during the early 1930s), while another focused on the transformations of everyday culture in Soviet Karelia and Belarus, and the interaction between the Soviet state and the populations of these regions during the pre-WWII and post-WWII decades. Our project on Soviet tourism to Finland is, thus, rooted in both fields. Tourist trips to Finland were, perhaps, the most remembered and influential experience of cross-cultural contacts that the inhabitants of Soviet Karelia could have during the 1960s—1980s. It was these trips, as well as stories about them, which circulated in Soviet society through their relatives and friends. They served as one of the main sources through which the image of Finland (and of the West, in general) was shaped, and on which the Soviet official propaganda had only limited influence. At the same time, the history of Soviet tourism to Finland is a part of the history of the dialogue between the state and society during the Soviet period. Through a number of methods and instruments, state institutions tried to control the overall organization of trips to the Western states, to secure the ‘ideologically correct’ selection of participants, as well as to shape the very experience that Soviet people received abroad and their ensuing representation of this experience. On the other hand, the experience gained abroad often changed the way how Soviet people evaluated the Soviet regime, making their attitude towards Soviet policies, the economy, etc. more critical.

Thus, the study of Soviet tourism to Finland (as a part of a wider process of the Soviet tourism to the West) allows researchers to address such subject areas as cross-cultural communication during the Cold War, the use of international tourism for the representation of the socialist system in the West, methods of state control over the experience and impressions of Soviet tourists in foreign trips, the factor of knowledge (and sometimes, of myths) about the West in the critical evaluation of Soviet realities, etc.

Oral history seems to be the most appropriate method for the study of Soviet tourism to Finland due to a number of reasons. Firstly, official documents related to Soviet tourism to Finland (and to the West, in general) are stored in restricted archival collections. Secondly, many aspects of this tourism, such as the comprehension of Finnish realities, unofficial contacts with Finns, etc., are not reflected in written sources at all, and can be studied only through oral history. Finally, one of the primary goals of our research is a study of how the stories about trips to Finland (and with them — information and myths about the West) circulated in Soviet society. Thus, the potential respondents of our project are not only former tourists to Finland, but also their friends and relatives, since their interviewing allows us to study the ‘information field’ which emerged as the result of tourist trips to Finland.

During the summer and winter of 2009, we have already collected twelve interviews, which allows us to test some of our preliminary hypotheses that our project is based on. In particular, the story-telling of tourist trips to Finland includes many myths, and even a common pattern is preliminarily distinguished in the collected interviews. A special emphasis is placed on the interaction with agents of KGB who were included in every group and on the use of these trips as an economic resource by Soviet citizens who purchased consumer goods unavailable in the Soviet market.

Gelinada Grinchenko

PRESENTING “VOICES”: “THE TELLER” VERSUS “THE RESEARCHER”

The report will address the problem of publishing oral histories according to two main aspects: the question of correlation regarding the “voices” of the teller and researcher, and the question of compliance between sound and text, namely audio (video) protocol of the interview and its printed version.

The first part concerning the question of the presentation of “voices” is concentrated on the tellers and their interviews, and is connected to the decision of the compiler of oral history book: who will speak in the book, how many voices will be included and how they will be broken down and put together. The books based on an interview

with a single individual demonstrate the most “easy” way of publishing an oral history and could present the narrator’s voice in two ways: around a “question-and-answer” framework, or as an autobiographical narrative. When a historian decides to publish a couple of interviews, he faces the question of differing strategies when attempting to combine these oral histories into one book: to combine these sources into a unified story by using the abstracts of interviews, to collocate them as a series of monologues, or intertwine them into a montage or collage — thematic, logical or chronological. In turn, the last case looks at the question of oral histories that are to be collected into a collage of typically contrasting or similar perspectives.

The second part of the question of the presentation of “voices” concerns the relationships of the voice(s) of the teller(s) with the voice of historian, in other words — the communication between “story” and “argument.” In other words, as A. Portelli says, what is, in each case, the balance between *oral* and *history*, the mode of transmission and factual reconstruction. The main question here is the goal (or more — the hierarchy of goals) of publishing an oral history: providing readers with information, giving them the argumentative (scientific) point of view, or the presentation general human-interest stories. Here the place and “power” of the voice of the historian are realized in the editing of oral texts, and in the presence of contextual information to be provided for the readers as the background to interviewers’ accounts (end- or footnotes, prologues and epilogues, framing each chapter of the book with the historian’s explanations etc.). Namely, this contextual information determines the balance of the voices within the book and (sic!) — whether readers perceive the narrators or the researcher as the book’s author.

Finally, the third part of the question of the presentation of “voices” raises the problem of the audience with this type a book and the following decision has to be made by the researcher: to whom his book should speak. In general, there could be three types of audience: the public at large, the broad academic community, and the specialized scholarly audience.

The question of compliance between sound and text, namely the audio (video) protocol of the interview and its printed version, will focus on how to correlate the passive negotiation between reader and narrator, and previous interactive cooperation between speaker and listener.

Oksana Kis

UKRAINIAN ORAL HISTORY AS A GENDERED RESEARCH FIELD: TOWARDS THE ISSUE OF FEMINIZATION

Oral History is a relatively new and rapidly growing — though not yet institutionalized — research field in Ukraine nowadays. Its methodology proved to be a reliable and

effective tool for studying formerly overlooked, suppressed or controversial aspects of the totalitarian Soviet past. The history of everyday life and the social history of socialism are amongst the most rewarding research areas in terms of using the oral history approach, as other historical sources are often unavailable, irrelevant, insufficient or unreliable.

At the same time, female interviewees prevail among the respondents, no matter what is a research topic. Indeed, the higher average life expectancy of women (as compared to men) and their relative better health conditions often determine the predominance of female narrators in virtually any study which implies oral history methods. Therefore, all kinds of women’s historical experiences are brought to the fore, broadening and reshaping our knowledge of the past. A variety of oral history research projects recently conducted in Ukraine have proven the category of gender to be essential for fieldwork, analysis and interpretations.

Women’s lives in a patriarchal society are gendered and therefore their experiences, by definition, differ from those of men. The personal recollections of male and female survivors in a range of specific historical events (mass collectivization, the Great Famine of 1932-33, forced labor in Nazi Germany, etc.) show remarkable gender differences in their respective experiences and narratives.

In the totalitarian Soviet society, many facts and events have been silenced in the official historical discourse. The officially inhibited memories, however, continued to exist and circulate at the level of everyday communication — in the narrow circles of trusted friends, family members and neighbors. The informal “kitchen talks” constituted a specific milieu, where counter-narratives and oppositional discourses persisted and thrived during the Soviet era. Women appear to be the key agents of maintaining those informal communicative networks, not to mention, that the kitchen was the woman’s domain. Moreover, the repertoire of women’s habitual conversations includes a fair amount of personal stories reflecting the variety of events, situations, special cases and experiences of others (which are subsequently represented in their oral recollections). The studies of such “communicative memory” (as defined by Halbwachs, Assman, Czaplicka) requires special attention to women as its most competent bearers.

Women constitute the majority of the oral historians in Ukraine today, as the membership in the Ukrainian Oral History Association shows. Studies in feminist economy suggest that rapid feminization of any profession could serve as an indicator of the decline of its general social prestige. Nevertheless, this situation might be understood from another angle: oral history appears as a (promising) research field where women can make their carrier not *in spite of*, but *owing* to their gendered socialization. Noteworthy, that

the methodological principles and basic techniques of oral history interviewing implies rather 'feminine' modes of the interviewer's behavior (including attentiveness, listening, tact, empathy, supportiveness, openness to the other's experiences and opinions, holding oneself back, etc.), irrespective of her/his gender. Obviously women are more inclined to this specific activity, not because of their "inborn" predisposition to such behavioral patterns, but rather due to their gendered socialization which trained women to express mentioned attitudes towards others.

The progress of women's oral history proper (as a specific sub-field) is also appreciable, as several research projects carried out recently have testified to. The use of feminist methodology in oral history challenges traditional conservative historiography in many ways. The spontaneous 'feminization' of oral history in Ukraine (as both scholars and their respondents are predominantly women, and the research method assumes certain 'female' patterns of interaction) and the further infusion of feminist scholarship into oral history research could ultimately result in a creation of a substantial counterpoise for highly androcentric traditional historiography in Ukraine. This might have tremendous impact on the way in which recent history is constructed, understood and represented.

Natalia Khanenko-Friesen

IN SEARCH OF SUBJECT: ORAL HISTORY, SOCIETY, IDEOLOGY

Over the last two decades Eastern European scholarship have been witnessing slow but steady expansion of oral history into various disciplines within the domain of social sciences. Why is that, that with the collapse of the socialist system in Europe we have seen such an increase in oral historical research in every country of the former socialist bloc? Is this only because Eastern Europeans had gained a better access to Western scholarship, where oral history has already been established and its methods have been actively applied? Why is that, that oral history method in post-socialist societies, especially initially, have been in the foreground of the extensive reconstructivist historic research, revisiting and revising some aspects of the (socialist) past such as the history of Gulag, Leningrad blockade in the WW2, 1930s collectivization of the Ukrainian villagers, famine of 1932-33 in Ukraine, the fate of the UPA members in Western Ukraine after the WW2, the fate of Greek Catholic church under the Soviet rule to name just a few and leaving the other aspects of the past? Is it only because these histories have been forbidden under the previous political regime, have never been written, and now, rightfully so, need to be reconstructed?

To address the above questions, one needs to move beyond the specificity of each individual project, and even beyond the specificity of a particular historic period, such as post-socialist transition in which these projects take place. To better understand the choices and the directions of current oral history projects taking place in Ukraine, and for that matter elsewhere, one needs to look further -- into the intricate relationship between oral history, ideology and society. As it is at this important juncture important (re)interpretations of history are being actively formulated, and it is at the intersection of all three domains that oral historians help their societies to construct legitimate subjects and agents of their national histories.

Thus, oral historians find themselves in a unique position within the network of other scholars, from which they can successfully challenge established principles of representation of the past, history, and society. After addressing the above questions on the unique role of oral history in reconstructing historical metanarratives, in the second part of my presentation, I turn to one of the projects I have conducted recently in Ukraine in collaboration with my many esteemed Ukrainian colleagues. Launched in 2007, the project Oral History of Decollectivization of Ukraine in the 1990s encompassed ten regions of Ukraine where local interviewers conducted interviews with former members of collective farms. The goal of the project was to record people's perspectives on de-collectivization and to document a particular collective stance which, I assumed, would emerge through multiplicity of the recorded testimonies.. My task today is to evaluate the project's claims and methods in relationship to its attempt to locate, explore, understand and perhaps redeem yet another subject of the Ukrainian history, Ukrainian villager, decollectivized .

Yana Komar

THE PROBLEM OF CREDIBILITY OF ORAL HISTORY INFORMATION WHEN WORKING WITH SPECIFIC RESPONDENTS' CATEGORIES: THE BULGARIAN DIASPORA OF EAST UKRAINE AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The history of the formation of the Bulgarian Diaspora in East Ukraine (Donbass) and the Russian Federation is insufficiently known. The current number of Bulgarians in East Ukraine and the Russian Federation grows out of many political and social processes of the Soviet period. Bulgarians are mainly inhabitants of the cities, correlated with the degree of development of industry. In the industrial regions of the Soviet Union, the Bulgarian Diaspora was formed as a result of the state policy on industrial

restoration. Hence, the process of maintenance for restored and developing regions by labour contingent became one of the main reasons for the migratory streams of Bulgarians to East Ukraine and the Russian Federation. To assess the character of migration, whether it was voluntary or compulsory, is impossible. The distinctive features required for studying the migratory stream is not only housed in archival documents, but also in oral history sources.

One of the main features of studying the Bulgarian Diaspora in industrial regions is the reception of not only ethnographic information, but also gathering historical material. One of the main problems in working with groups of Bulgarian respondents of the given migratory wave is the following question: is it possible to consider the information received from oral sources as authentic, alternative or information that should be disregarded.

The attention of regional authorities was concentrated on the selection of technical officers and the completion of the states of workers after 1943. The main organizations which completed the states of workers were executive committees and military registration and enlistment offices.

The executive committees carried out the selection of labourers from collective farms and other areas for the industry of the Donbass. For example, from August until December 1947, Stalin only trusted one area, Izmailsky, from which 230 labourers arrived. Those who worked in the industry noted awful sanitary conditions and heavy physical work, therefore some left.

The information received from this group of Bulgarians by means of the oral history method is documentary, confirmed and is in keeping with the conventional historical version of regarding the actions for restoration of the industrial enterprise.

Mobilisation in the area of military registration and enlistment offices was spent among free citizens of the Soviet Union, and also repatriates and those belonging to a special contingent. In the period from October 1945 until January 1946, in the Voroshilovgrad area, 60 554 repatriates had arrived. Among the repatriates of the Voroshilovgrad area, a considerable amount of people were of other nationalities, including Udmurts, Georgians, Poles and others. There were 49 nationalities present in total, not including Ukrainians and Russians, among them 20 Bulgarians and 13 Crimean Bulgarians.

Work with people who belonged to a special contingent category was most difficult: first, because of the small number of the given group (tiresome work, high death rate); secondly, because of the unwillingness of the workers to recognise themselves as a part of a special contingent.

There are blanks in time, in-authenticity, an unwillingness to co-operate, suspicion in stories among violently mobilised people.

Research regarding the Bulgarian Diaspora of East Ukraine and the Russian Federation uses not only archival and documentary materials, but also the method of oral history. The problem in using the given methods consists in the level of reliability of the received information from different categories of respondents. The same reality regarding the mobilisation of the industry was perceived by different categories of respondents differently. Versions which are not similar to the official interpretation of a historical reality should not be rejected, but the researcher has to use them as an alternative vision of history. Thus, in the example of the Bulgarian Diaspora of East Ukraine and the Russian Federation, oral history is merely one of methods in the research of historical realities.

Konstantin Kozlov

THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF ORAL HISTORY IN RUSSIAN HISTORICAL SCIENCE OF THE XX CENTURY

Intensive research in the field of oral history in modern Russia has predetermined the need for understanding the historical experience which formed the chosen research direction in social-humanitarian thought. Nowadays, Russian science, as a priority, recognizes the European and American tradition in the sphere of oral history. The scale of the problems solved by foreign researchers inspires respect. However, oral history is not a purely academic science for research, in many respects it is a part of public processes and reflects socio-cultural peculiarities of each country and, even separately, a given region. For this reason, the institutionalization of oral history and its existence in the Russian humanities are of interest for modern researchers.

The formation of a practice whereby phonographic record were collected in Russia is connected with S. I. Bernstein's activity in the otophonetic laboratory of the *Institute of the Living Word* (1920–1924), and later in the *Institute of the History of Arts* (1924–1930), where he recorded the performances of Russian poets. The creation of the *State Archive of Sound Recordings* is connected with his initiative in 1932.

The attempt to create a corpus of memoirs of crucial historical events from participants (1920–1930) represents special interest. Namely, projects of the Commission focused on the history of the Russian Communist Party (b); the All-Union

Society of Political Convicts and Exiled; on collecting and publication of memoirs of the participants of the *Narodnik* movement; the October revolution; and the political prisoners of the pre-revolutionary prisons. In the 1930s, under M. Gorkiy's initiative, large-scale work on collecting memoirs was started within the framework of two research projects — the creation of the "History of Civil War" and the "History of Factories and Plants."

The most interesting oral history project is the activity of the Commission on history of Great Patriotic War at the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Since 1941, a research group of professional historians documented, in shorthand, their conversations with military men, state and party officials, the workers of defense enterprises, and the inhabitants of the territories released from German occupation. In this work, the principles of selecting the interviewees and providing "representativeness" among the received information have been determined. Thus, for example, the research group under A.L.Sidorov's supervision in 1943 recorded the memoirs of 77 Kharkiv inhabitants who survived occupation. The structure of those interviewed included representatives of not only professional, but also social categories, and even people working in German occupational establishments. After the war, the experts working in the Commission returned to their research, and collected materials were placed in the archive of the Institute of USSR History.

The first Russian scientist specifically dealing with the collection and recording of oral memoirs on audiocassettes was V. D. Duvakin, a historian of literature, who created an audio collection of memoirs from outstanding figures of Russian science and culture in the XX century, on the basis of which the Department of Oral History in the Scientific Library at Moscow State University was created in 1991.

The experiences documented in oral history became a consideration in the creativity of Russian writers and journalists, who seemingly found such information to be interesting and prospective. The appearance and development of a new genre — namely, interviews with the participants of Great Patriotic War, and the creation of historical and public works on this basis is connected with the activities of K.M.Simonov, S.S.Smirnov, D. A. Granin, A. M. Adamovich, L. P. Ovchinnikova, S. Aleksievich's.

The intensive development of oral history in Russia has been connected with the democratization of social life in 1980. Plenty of research projects have raised oral history to a new level of development, including studies at the society "Memorial," the Centers of Oral History of the Russian State University for the Humanities and the European University in St.Petersburg, the Center of the Study of Peasantry and Rural Reforms, and those belonging to a great number of individual researchers.

As a whole, taking into consideration above-listed examples, it is possible to draw a conclusion that oral history, as a method of getting information about the past in our country, was developing almost synchronously with that of the USA and Western Europe. Censorial restrictions have concluded the illustrative, factual, though not problematic character of Russian researchers in the field of oral history, which did not have sufficient methodological and conceptual information. A significant amount of collected material has not been processed, nor has it been put into scientific usage yet. For modern researchers, such findings of their predecessors could result in the demand of further study and publication of these special interests in the future.

Wiktorja Kudela-Swątek

**AT HOME AMONG STRANGERS:
MATERIALS FROM THE PROJECT «Z ZIEMI KAZACHSKIEJ DO POLSKI»
DEVOTED TO COLLECTIVE MEMORY OF THE REPATRIATES
FROM KAZAKHSTAN TO POLAND**

The subject of my research is a group of repatriates, arriving from Kazakhstan to Poland since 1998, now residing in Kraków. The collective memory of this group is the phenomenon, based on the specific historical experience of the examined people and their position in modern Polish society.

Crucial to understanding the whole issue is the fact that the Polish Diaspora in Kazakhstan consists mainly of descendants of the victims of mass-deportations from the border-line districts of Soviet Ukraine and Soviet Belarus, conducted by Stalin in 1930s.

In the mid-1990s, the Polish Government passed an act about the repatriation of citizens of Polish origin from the countries of the former USSR.

The arrival of a few thousand families, taking advantage of this possibility, aroused interest among Polish anthropologists, sociologists and historians specializing in oral history. From 2006 to 2008, a group of students from the Jagiellonian University in Kraków realized, with my participation, a project entitled «*Z ziemi kazachskiej do Polski*» («*From the land of Kazakhstan to Poland*»), devoted to the first generation of victims of Stalin's repressions against national minorities.

The peculiar popularity of this group among the researchers applying oral history methods, resulted in the process of the standardization of personal memories. The recurrent expectations of historians forced narrators "to construct" their memories

in such manner, that they concentrated on proving their affiliation to the impermeable Polish society. Thus, they wanted to defend their rights to arrive in Poland, change their citizenship, change their residence and adopt the set of privileges provided to them by the Polish Government.

The specific character of the source consists of the emotional importance of the memories for our narrators, including the original language of the repatriates (a mixture of Ukrainian-Russian-Polish) and the traumatic character of their experience.

All these factors compelled me to consider the method of archiving and the transcription of collected materials. After the first attempt of editing the interviews, I had to acknowledge the impossibility of expressing, in printed word, all aspects of their emotions, and all the information communicated by my narrators in their interviews. Currently, efforts are being made to create an internet-museum, which in my opinion, much more effectively will present results of our research.

Tetiana Pastushenko

THE “LIFE HISTORY” AND THE “LIFE STORY” IN A BIOGRAPHICAL INTERVIEW WITH A “RESIDENT OF KYIV”: THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE MEANING OF LIFE EXPERIENCE

In my presentation, I would like to reconstruct the biographical meaning of an interview with Ivan Klymenko. The interview was conducted in January and February of 2006 in Kyiv, within the framework of **International Slave and Forced Labourers Documentation Project**. I want to shed light on the meaning that the Interviewee puts into his experience of being a forced labourer in Nazi Germany.

My analysis was done based on the transcription of his interview. I used the Rozenal method of hermeneutic reconstruction. I also used photographs from the Interviewee’s family archive.

Ivan Klymenko is a typical first generation inhabitant of Kyiv. He is a member of the Ukrainian Union of Nazi Victims. He was born in 1923 in the village Germanivska Slobidka (Obukhiv, Kyiv region) into a wealthy peasant family. When the collective farms were formed, his family was persecuted: all property and half of their house were taken away. In 1937 his father was arrested and perished in the Arkhangelsk region. Ivan Klymenko finished his school in 1940, and then took teacher courses in Kyiv. However, he did not finish them because of the War.

He worked on the construction of fortifications in Kyiv, then in the Dnipropetrovsk and Donetsk regions (in the summer of 1941). When these regions were occupied by

the Nazi army, he came back home. On April 23, 1943 he was deported to the Reich as a forced laborer. He worked on the farm of Frau Nyusse in the village of Lyauenburg (in Lower Saxony).

His classmate Olha was deported with him. In 1944, their daughter Halyna was born. In 1945, Ivan came back home. He tried to legalize his position and attempted to obtain a passport for over 2 years. In 1948, he became an accountant in a military unit. He also received higher education in Economics. Afterwards, he worked in the Ministry of Finance of the Ukrainian SSR and taught students until his retirement. Since 1959 he has been living in Kyiv. Until 2002, Ivan Klymenko had been working for numerous companies. He has 2 children, 3 grandchildren and 3 great-grandchildren.

The interview with Ivan Klymenko was based on the method of **biographical interviewing**. The recording was done over two meetings; its total duration exceeds 6 hours. The Interviewee turned out to be a talented storyteller, who had no troubles answering from the first open question. An analysis of the theme blocks during the open part of the interview showed that the Interviewee paid most attention to the experience of his residence in the German village (8 pages, 387 lines), whereas the block devoted to his pre-war experience consisted only of 29 lines (less than a page).

From the beginning of the interview, we find out that Klymenko’s family had lived well before the collectivization; that after being labeled a “kulak family,” their life became much worse; also, that his grandfather’s family was deported to Siberia. The Interviewee pays much attention to the details of his life in Lyauenberg: the farmsteads of the German landlords, agricultural implements, keeping house, and the German peasants’ way of life.

His story about his labour in Germany starts with something like a “life coda,” it actually starts in the end — with a story about his grandson visiting his former German landlords. He also showed some photographs and letters. This idyllic story does not quite coincide with the typical image of Nazi victims suffering. We can assume that his labour in the German family really was an extremely important experience, impacting Ivan Klymenko’s entire life. On the other hand, we suspect that the Interviewee was encouraged to tell such a detailed story by Interviewer and by the aim of the Project — which consisted of documenting the story of “forced labour.”

The second part of the interview confirmed our last supposition. In response to my questions — “What family do you parents come from?,” “Were they from the same village?,” “Do you remember the Famine?,” “How did your family survive?” — I heard a long (7 pages, 547 lines), horrifying story about the fate of his family during collectivization and during the Famine in the 1930s. The topic of the Famine was resumed

during our second meeting. I heard five more stories about the deaths of people in his village, and some miraculous stories about survival.

In contrast to the *“life history”* told by Klymenko, his *“life story”* shows that Famine stands out as a episode of terror for the Interviewee. A microanalysis of separate parts of the interview has confirmed a similar suspicion. Thereby the story about forced labour, and more specifically about his life in the German village, comes out as a comparative contrast to his family’s “normal life” before collectivization, when they had a big house, much soil and cattle.

What is the meaning of Ivan Klymenko’s life experience? Ivan’s father and family home are at the center of his story about the Famine and collectivization. The Interviewee always refers to these images during the interview. They are also present visually. The “family home” appears in the photograph of a village pasture, where we can see his uncle’s big house — similar to the one Klymenko lived in. This is proof of a “good life” before collectivization

In 1937, Kyryl Klymenko was arrested; in 1941 he was executed. His son found this out just recently, near the end of the 1990s. Their “kulak” house also suffered: it was torn down completely. The twin-house of Ivan Klymenko was torn down partly. The part of the house that survived destruction is also in the photograph (from the 1960s), which the Interviewee is **currently restoring. We suppose that the meaning of the Interviewee’s whole life is the renewal of his ruined homeland. A successful career, an apartment in Kyiv, general prosperity — these are not his aims. These are only means for restoring his father’s house. We can see a confirmation of this sentiment in a recent photograph, where Ivan Klymenko is sitting with his great-granddaughter, with a huge cottage in the background, a cottage built on his father’s farmstead.**

Alexander von Plato

POLITICAL CHANGES AND PERSONAL ORIENTATIONS: THE DEVELOPMENTS OF ORAL HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHICAL RESEARCH AFTER 1945 IN GERMANY EAST AND WEST

My lecture is dealing with three “big questions”:

First: how the political disruptions affect personal attitudes and orientations, biographies and life story narratives of elites and different groups within the population. Germany after 1945 and 1989 is in the centre of this question and perhaps an example for other countries with changes of the political system.

The second question concerns the role of Oral History and biographical research in these explorations and analyses.

In a third part I will try to compare the different “National Remembrance Cultures in Europe East and West” concerning World War II. This third part bases on the international life story project on forced labor in 27 countries and the International Mauthausen Documentation project in over 20 countries.

Olexandr Priharin

BETWEEN ETHNOLOGY AND ORAL HISTORY THE EXPERIENCE OF USING THE BIOGRAPHICAL METHOD IN THE PRACTICE OF FIELD RESEARCH: ODESSA, EARLY XXI CENT

Along with reviving the traditions of ethnography in Southern Ukraine in 1990s at the Chair of Archaeology and Ethnology of Ukraine (I. I. Mechnikov Odessa State University), special attention was paid to field expeditions. In this field research, initially stories “about life, about me” were estimated as being inevitable, accompanying the dialogue between researcher and respondent. But gradually, biographic interviews became the most important research method, because the creation of such a mass of sources appeared to be a heuristically adequate way of studying ethno-cultural processes. On the basis of a set of concrete life trajectories, the existence of traditions and the formation of innovative experiences in the complexes of folk culture were studied. At the same time, similar transformations happened in the examination of family photo albums – from searching for illustrations to a new variant of biographic interview. And the structure of the album became the matrix for the respondent’s storytelling (a method equal to the traditional questionnaire).

As a result, since 2000 “oral history” as a special method of collecting the data was included in studies at the Odessa Center of Ethnology. Step by step, oral history as a method has transformed into a special visionary approach to research.

The stimulus for this process was the fact that projects were mostly oriented to communities without “official” or “written” history (the Greeks of Crimea, the Old Believers of Southern Ukraine, the Bulgarians of Bessarabia and Tavria, the Turkish population of Odessa etc.). In such circumstances, despite the immediate individual plots of land and memorials, researchers succeeded to write down the stable folk narrative about the past of the whole group. These “ethnological” plots (beliefs about the origins of the people, or of its parts) may be considered as the self-reflection of “the Others” about their own place

in the common history, and as an additional documentary resource. For example, we would hardly have a historical source about the details of Greek migrations from the “conflict regions” of the USSR into Crimea. And the study of their own history in school hardly will replace the recollections of the old people “about the past,” where the ways and methods of the Old Believers’ migrations (since the time of Peter I) are represented.

The culmination of experiences in oral history has led us (frankly speaking, not always consciously) to new approaches in generating research tasks and creating strategies. The principle “follow the field,” well-known for all field researchers, gave us the possibility to correct the actuality and methodological projections of many traditional sources, from articles to dissertations. Concentrating our attention on the local data, we unnoticeably went to the trans-disciplinary perspective: rather, the periphery dictates how to build up models in accordance with certain directions, not the centre. However, these models are built together with the borrowers of certain traditions. “Correlation by the field” appeared to be in accordance with the general changes in the humanities associated with postmodernism or with postcolonial writing. According to these traditions, the very phenomenon explored is seen from the point of view of effective methods of cognition, regardless of their disciplinary affiliation.

That is why the attempts to separate the field strategies of ethnology, folklore studies, sociology, and linguistics etc. into different fields seem to be paradoxical. At the moment, the logic of this separation is based upon a formalized positivistic scheme. It does not give opportunity for the emancipation of the very “field” as a separate activity. Specificity can be highlighted only on the stage of the interpretation of the data, influencing the general point of view. That is why a generally cooperative toolkit has to be universal, in terms of the questions that arise when gathering the data, so that the collected results will be used in a variety of ways. The accents can be also placed on the stages of preparation, creating the special aspect of research. Nonetheless, in interviewing, in accordance with the well-known rules, it is impossible to speak on behalf of somebody or instead of someone, as the interviewer has to give complete freedom to the speaker. It is obvious that our engagement with the cooperative experience influences the course of the dialogue. This influence has to be minimal, and the conversation has to be the universal value in both the general human sense and in the narrow scientific sense.

Going back to the activity of our regional community of researchers, I’d like to state that we are in a situation of interdisciplinary transformation. “Human biography” changes the bibliography of the Chair of Archaeology and Ethnology of Ukraine, I.I.Mechnikov at Odessa State University. Obviously, this appeal to the individual lives of the re-

spondents as a source of information has given our center the possibility to change the orientation of its mandate into a mass of “life-writings” as the methodological value. Furthermore, abstract considerations have been replaced by an empirical polyphony of sources, as well as the texts themselves. In other words, “Oral History is the set of facts and factors in the contemporary historiographical landscape of Odessa...”

Natalia Pushkareva

ORAL HISTORY: THE GENDER ASPECT

Oral History and Gender History are two new directions of historical studies, which are spoken about in relation to both method (method of work with the source, a way of reconstructing the past) and the result of the application of this method. Their meaning is underlined in the incompleteness and partiality of any point of view, and they emphasize the necessity of the polyphony of representations.

In the discussions about the role and place of “qualitative methods” in Russian humanities (1990s), gender researchers were united into one theoretical approach together with ethno-methodologists and Marxists of the new generation (L. Althusser). This was because, from the gender point of view, social science lays the foundation for the reproduction of the established power relations in the creation and distribution of knowledge (access to cognitive resources is represented as structured and organized, in order to preserve male dominance in the sciences). Gender methodology challenges the objective character of the male interpretation of the past and present.

The wish to empathize with the subject studied is common for feminist theorists and for those who use the ethnographic method of “participant observation,” the biographical method, and the method of “human sociology.” Usually, a researcher of the individual phenomena has a chance to observe the scene of the social theatre from a historically-safe vantage point. On the contrary, a researcher with a feminist point of view has the ability to empathize, and first “historicizes” him/herself.

Stories told by the informants correlate with their personal biography. Female researchers following feminist approaches of “Verstehende” and “human” social anthropology constantly take the researcher’s own role (in the process of their informants’ life-storytelling) into account.

As everyone has his/her own bodily memory (filled with the muteness of memories), the memory of a body is marked, burdened with history having already taken place, leaving a representation that provides *joy in the re-discovery of reality*

(something stored deeply in the memory, unexpectedly revived by coincidences and revealed on the surface, gives joy to the researcher). This additional information has often been avoided for years by historians researching other themes that they consider to be thrilling.

As the final goal of any social research is exploration of the social networks, *gender studies reveal the specificity of conventional forms of human interactions through their embedded subjective meaning*. Researching women's "ego-documents," a woman's life scenarios are aimed at revealing the social structures hidden in the events that seemed to be accidental, in the individual life trajectories, in decisions that seemed to be undetermined. In general, women are more dependent on these social structures than men are.

Narrative analysis on the basis of empathy is not a panacea, but merely one possible approach and useful addition to classic scientific knowledge. Due to this method, we can revise the established macro-theories. One who practices oral history, being well-informed in gender theory, is much less dependent on the established judgments and thus is able to produce much more accurate scientific knowledge.

Irina Rebrova

**THE ORGANIZATION AND ACTIVITY OF THE
STUDENTS' SCIENTIFIC GROUP ON ORAL HISTORY
AT KUBAN STATE TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY**

The term "oral history" is considered to be one of the most used in the humanities, nowadays. A wide range of interpretations of this term exist thanks to the veracity of disciplines, schools and directions of oral history. Oral history, as a method of learning the past, forms new approaches in the explanation of the past. Thanks to oral sources, we can study problems of the social, collective and individual memory.

There are several Oral History centers that exist in Russia. In my paper, I'll try to analyze the work of one of such center.

In 2006, the Students' Scientific Group on Oral History was formed at the Department of History and Social Communications, Kuban State Technological University (Krasnodar). The specifics of the non-humanitarian institution profile influenced the methods of working in this group. The main aim of the group is educational work, first and foremost. It was necessary to arouse the students' attention to various historical problems.

This group consists of 8–10 permanent members and up to 20 students, who may work from time to time. For example, they can help with finding out the list of informants, or make the interview transcription or update the website of the group.

At least twice a month, the permanent members of the group gather together

to study the theoretical and practical questions of oral history. The central topic of the group research is similar to my own personal scientific interests, because I am the person who organized this group. The members of the group usually become members of my projects. The knowledge of oral history theory helps students in their own work as members of the projects.

The main interest is based on creating and analyzing the complex of ego-documents about World War II.

In 2007, we worked on one of the oral history project together with our colleagues from Stavropol. The project was supported by the Russian Humanitarian Scientific Fund. The aim of the project was to create a website on oral history which is called "The Everyday Life behind the Front-line." This site is available on the web page of our university in the section "Students' Scientific Activities" (<http://oralhistory.kubstu.ru>). We noticed that Oral History centers in Europe and in the USA have web links. Their websites consist of theoretical and practical sources. So we tried to publish the practical sources first of all, because our experience of collecting oral stories can be shared with historians who study the same problems. Besides this fact, our archives cannot deal with the oral sources due to their institutional organization. Therefore, web archives or websites of oral history institutions can become the only place for saving them. We published collected oral stories about World War II on our web page. Members of our group helped a lot during the project. They helped conduct interviews, made transcriptions and helped design the web page. Besides, we usually present the results of the students' work at different scientific student's conferences.

The activities of the group members work towards the important task of the connection between science, morality and the patriotic education of the youth.

Iryna Rebrova

**THE 'INDIVIDUAL' AND THE 'TYPICAL':
THE EXPERIENCE OF INTERVIEWING
AND PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION AT THE KHARKIV COUNCIL
OF ANTI-FASCIST RESISTANCE PARTICIPANTS**

My presentation is devoted to the part of my broader dissertation research project on the Soviet collective memory of the Nazi occupation in Ukraine. Here I'd like to present my experience of interviewing and participant observation at the Kharkiv Council of Anti-fascist Resistance Participants (*Oblastnoj sovet bortsov antifashystskogo soprotivlenia*). Founded in 1963 in Kharkiv, this society was one of the very few organizations uniting former Nazi concentration camps prisoners living in USSR. Specific conditions for the formation of the Soviet narrative of Nazi concentration camps influenced

the specific features of group memory, and its highly institutionalized and ritualized character. The stable distribution of power positions open up a possibility to categorize this way of remembering as a certain kind of “institutional memory.” In this short summary, I’d like to outline my way of studying the mastering of memory within this group, focusing on the important role of notions such as ‘single’ and ‘mass,’ ‘individual’ and ‘typical’ in creating their common vision of the past.

Initially, my encounters with this society had taken place in 2004 when I, as a student, volunteered to take part in interviewing and the collection of written testimonies of Council members for a book of memoirs to be published in 2005. Further, I had interviews with some activists and developed in personal connections with a number of people, which have lasted until the present day. In 2006, I even became a member of the Society and obtained an even broader possibility to observe the situation from within, taking part in regular gatherings of the Council and of its administrative branch (“Buro”). Gradually, my position as an observer became more self-conscious, and the uncritical engagement gave way to much more systematic observations with more strict research purposes. My idea was to compare the original versions of memoirs about Nazi KZs presented to student volunteers by the members of the Council during interviews or in written form, with the final versions published in the book after negotiations and corrections initiated by the leaders of the Council. For this analysis of differences between two versions of personal memoirs, my participant observations, as well as interviews and personal talks with the Society’s members, were of crucial importance. There were discovered some important differences in the description of the same events for the purposes of the book, and in personal talks and interviews, and my point is that these differences have not only an ideological character, but they are rooted, in part, in a specific understanding of interrelations between the notions of ‘individual’ and ‘typical’ in memoirs of the past.

The most important common narratives of memory and ways of organizing the power relations inside the group, as well as the order of organizing the meetings and rituals, were formed during the Soviet times and were greatly influenced by the Soviet official politics of memory and by the Soviet public culture. That is why the most important narratives are narratives of the cruelty of ‘Germans’ (presuming the position of the victim-prisoners) and the narrative about the glorious Resistance (presuming an active position), in this way both active and passive positions are incorporated. The core of these narratives is the sharp and undoubted opposition between ‘Germans’ (KZ authorities) and ‘us.’ Unsurprisingly, observations and personal conversations reveal obvious feelings of hostility to and tendency to dissociate themselves from such groups as Ostarbeiters (because their narratives often challenge the sharp opposition between ‘Germans’ and ‘us’) and, on the other hand, from Holocaust victims (who

are supposed to be the non-resistant passive victims). However different and variable the Council’s members’ personal experiences and narratives are, all of them feel themselves as obliged to follow these general narratives, in order to achieve their important mission as ‘fighters against contemporary fascism’ and patriotic educators of the youth. This primacy of the general narrative over personal experience, as well as specific Soviet public culture, is the cause for ‘delegating’ the right to speak about KZ past to the leader of the organization, who was supposed to be the holder of the real ‘truth,’ however so different from the personal experiences of many. Moreover, often real factuality can be considered as “non-existent” or “less important” than the ‘typical truth.’ However, this presumes both restrictions in speech and the possibility for people who were not Resistance participants, and even who never were in a concentration camp, to join the Council. The very fact that other young volunteers and myself joined the organization means that the recognition of and the following of generalizing narratives is a guarantee for a “borrowed experience” and a sufficient reason for membership. Moreover, personal conversations revealed were that there are some members of the organization whose KZ past is doubtful but they present themselves as former KZ prisoners and even Resistance participants, without any protests of other members and the leader. The most important thing is that these members are able to confirm the generalizing narrative and perform the functions of their community, as well. Needless to say, that despite the name of the organization related to the Resistance, mostly its members concur that only a few of them were participants of the Resistance, and not all of them were informed about its existence.

However, this commitment to ‘typical’ and ‘general’ also has its roots in the personal narrative experience. Usually members of the Council gained their first and most important experience of telling about their KZ past during the ceremonial procedure of the joining of the organization. To join the Council, since the Soviet times, one had to prove his own direct experience in the KZ during WWII. Because of the absence of any documents (which was often the case), one had to publicly tell his whole personal story, starting from deportation to Germany until the liberation from KZ, and other members of the organization had to evaluate the truthfulness and reliability of this account. One of the most important pieces of evidence of a real account of the concentration camp is the ability of this supposed former prisoner to pronounce his KZ number in German (as it was always repeated several times a day at the roll-calls at the camps). In this number, we can see the symbolic unity of the “personal” (the unique combination of numerals) and the “mass” (thousands of people had numbers). Surely, this public speech had to represent not something unique and personal (because of impossibility to verify it), but rather something ‘typical,’ (the general data about the certain camp, well-known for other camp inmates) in order to be recognized as faithful. There is no

need to say that this tendency to prefer some 'typical' and 'mass' facts coincides with the traditional view of historical science as a discipline interested in the most widespread, general tendencies, involving masses of people, but not the individual lives themselves.

Nevertheless, the primacy of certain general narratives does not exclude individual experience, but rather transforms it in a certain way. Everyone who gave interviews or wrote memoirs had to negotiate his/her individual memoirs with general 'knowledge,' and differences in representations of the same events in different contexts show us how is it possible to be successful in creating different stories on the basis of the same events, through the shifting from 'typical' to 'individual' and back.

Irina Romanova, Irina Makhovskaya

**“MIR: A HISTORY OF A BOROUGH NARRATED BY ITS INHABITANTS”
(A STUDY OF LOCAL HISTORY THROUGH ORAL HISTORY)**

Mir is a small borough in the Grodno region of Belarus. From 1921 to 1939 the territory it is situated on belonged to Poland, but in 1939 it was annexed by the USSR and became part of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. Its uniqueness as an object of research is due to several factors. First, Mir is included in all major tourist guides, mainly thanks to its 16th century castle, which has been designated by UNESCO as a world heritage site. Life in the vicinity of the castle, close to the Dukes (until 1939), gave the local people a sense of uniqueness in terms of their “home place” and had a great impact on their self-identification.

The huge significance of the castle and its inhabitants is, for the plain folk, evident from the fact that photos of the Duke's family are affectionately kept in the photo albums of the villagers until now.

The second reason for Mir's worldwide renown is the local Yeshivah — one of the most prominent ones during the first half of the 20th century. The Yeshivah was a major educational establishment for students from all parts of the world. In 1939, the Yeshivah was disbanded in Minsk, and in 1947, it was divided. Today, there are two Yeshivahs that have “Mir” in their name — one in Jerusalem and the other in New York.

Currently, oral narratives are the primary source of data in studying and reconstructing the castle inhabitants' everyday life, since no family archives or relevant documents or photos (with few exceptions) have survived to this day. The interior of the castle has been plundered as well. This is precisely the reason why the memories of the people who grew up and spent their young adulthood in the immediate surroundings of the castle are of such great value to researchers.

In the study of provincial life, oral history plays a special role, among other reasons, because the number of educated population here is generally limited. Hence, the relevant autobiographical sources, such as memoirs, are virtually absent. Besides, it is a known fact that the reconstruction of past events is only possible by supplementing the “total history” with the “history from below.”

Our team of interviewers visited practically all of the houses of the borough of Mir, taking down all the stories that the elderly people (born between 1910–1930) wished to tell. This amounted to a total of 85 interviews.

For the purposes of this research, we designed a questionnaire. It was structured based on the generally-accepted tradition of dividing the interview into two parts — a biographical narrative (“life story”) and “Q&A” (questions and answers). For example, the interview began with the request: “Would you please tell me what you remember about...?”, followed by a number of specific questions. Special attention in developing the questionnaire was given primarily to the questions concerning everyday life.

The questionnaire itself, in the process of the work, was repeatedly revised and re-worked. For example, there was no point in asking 85 people the same question about the whereabouts of the “gmina” or some monument; on the other hand the informants themselves frequently brought up new topics that were subsequently included in the questionnaire. The team also adjusted its efforts to the different ages, social positions and nationalities of the interviewees. The key guideline that we followed in our work and to which all the students working in this project were instructed to adhere, was not to limit the informants to the questionnaire, but rather, to let them speak freely. In other words — “spare neither tape nor time”. Another reason was that, at first, there was not enough knowledge available for the questionnaire to cover all aspects of Mir's life.

To simply document each respondent's life story seemed too simplistic to us, more so because they all differ in length, richness of detail etc. At the same time, they serve to effectively complement each other.

Autobiographical narratives are complicated material to interpret, because the means of expressing historic experience, in this case, is the life of one person. However, when brought together and viewed from a different perspective (“horizontally”), they produce a unified and multi-dimensional picture. This prompted us to create a model of research in which virtually all of the folk “gather together” in one location to talk, listen and add to each other's stories. That is, the interviews after being transferred into the text format were split into thematic pieces and then the segments from different interviews on the same topic were put together. Certain facts were verified by means of comparing the statements by different informants, which in their turn, were correlated with the information received from other sources.

In this way, we conducted the thematic assembly of the fragments, supplementing them by biographical pieces as needed. What resulted was a collective life-story of the folk, or in other words, a reconstruction of their everyday life (see. “Mir: a History of a Borough Narrated by its Inhabitants”, Iryna Ramanava, Iryna Makhouskaya, Vilnya, 2009, 248 p.).

The history of the 20th century as seen by the people of Western Belarus is divided into the following periods: “under the Tsar,” “under Polish rule,” “the first Soviets” (September 1939—June 1941), “the war” (or “under the Germans”), and “the second Soviets” (the post-war period). During this time, Mir was repeatedly subjected to powerful social and economic transformations. Life under these conditions of constant change is best summarized in the words of our interviewees: “*We used to live under Poland, then the Russians came, after that — the Germans, then the Russians again. Surviving all of that was not fun.*” “*We had a hard time adjusting to things: any power that came here was not here for long.*”

We did not subject our findings to any political or ideological censorship. On a number of topics, our informants expressed differing, sometimes diametrically opposite ideas. We included them all with a hope of demonstrating a whole range of attitudes and opinions on a wide scope of issues.

As a result, the following major sets of data were singled out: “everyday life of the borough of Mir and the castle under Polish rule (1920–1930),” “the first Soviets,” “everyday life during the German occupation,” and “the post-war Mir.”

Mir used to be a multi-ethnic place, so the question of inter-ethnic relations was a pressing issue. Gathering information on ethnic stereotypes is no easy task. Based on the subconscious drive to represent themselves in the “right” way, the interviewees try to show off their tolerance. **Furthermore, the further “disruption of the narrative” is already a matter of the level of trust between the interviewee and the interviewer, as well as the latter’s professional skills and ability to find the right approach to every respondent.** Every now and then, the frequent declarations of supposedly “good relationships between the Byelorussians and the Jews” were backed by self-defeating statements, such as “*they were all kind of brawny, like boxers, we called them ‘malamonts’ ... when the locals threw stones at them trying to pick a fight, they just didn’t react, didn’t do anything... those were good relationships.*”

On another occasion the informant, speaking about the common gossip circulating among ignorant village folk, that the Jews abducted Christian children to make matza out of them, assured the interviewer with surprising confidence: “*That is not true!*” but then added, “*By the way, my wife used to live in Yeremichy, there were Jews there too, so once as it happened they nearly kidnapped her,*” and then recounted the story of her rescue.

Each epoch has its own specific set of mandatory topics that people address in their memories. For example, the “mandatory topics” in reminiscences about the inter-war period were the shops that “had everything in stock,” the Yeshivah, the Jews, the Duke and the castle. Recollecting the war, the people invariably speak about the humiliation of the Jews, about the partisans, the policemen recruited by the Nazis from the locals in occupied territories, and so on. Even if these mandatory topics did not play a noteworthy role in the personal life of particular narrators, they are still referred to. These subjects are preserved in the collective memory of the people and are actualized through their biographical history.

Aleksey Rostovtsev

**THE CREATION OF A COMPLEX OF MEMOIRS FROM
THE PIONEERS OF PHYSICAL TRAINING PEDAGOGY
AT THE BELGOROD STATE UNIVERSITY,
AND ITS USE IN HISTORICAL RESEARCH**

This research begins with a study of the background of the oral history project and its official start on June 17th, 1967, at the *Belgorod State Teacher Training Institute*, with a focus on the *M.S. Olminsky Physical Training Faculty* (hereafter PTF — BSTII). By the beginning of the 1970s, a considerable volume of archival materials had already been studied.

Oral history, in many instances, can help to fill in the missing gaps of human history. In an attempt to do so, the decision was made to form a complex of oral history sources based on the memoirs of the pioneers of the pedagogical work undertaken at PTF — BSTII, in terms of their professional experiences. What resulted were questions covering the entire spectrum of the teachers’ beginnings through to the present day of project collection.

Among the veterans of the sports faculty at BSTII was one of the “fathers” of the elite sports program there, Vasily Aleksandrovich Kolosov, the first chair of physical education. It was thanks to the work of Kolosov that the foundation was laid for key faculty members to follow in his footsteps, including: Alexander Grigorevich Nametchenko (faculty chair, 1964–1979) and Vyacheslav Vyacheslavovich Olendsky (one of the first teachers at PTF-BSTII, 1970-present). The interview with Nametchenko was a vivid description which truly highlighted how vital an oral history can be in detailing the past. The interviews with Kolosov and Olendsky showed how integral a solid methodology is when striving for clear, independent responses from the interviewees.

One of the techniques used in the interviews was the use of respondent information in the formation of interview questions which were used in subsequent interviews. For example, during the interview with V.A. Kolosov, information was used from A.G. Nametchenko's answers on the very same topics.

Another methodological issue was raised during the interview with V.V. Olendsky. Olendsky had asked to see the questionnaire for the interview so that he may become acquainted with the information that he was to speak about. However, he was refused and it was explained to him that one of the methodological rules of the project was that only the interviewer would have access to the interview questions.

Elena Rozhdestvenskaya

THE STATUS OF EVENTS AND THE STATUS OF THE SUBJECT: OSTARBEITER FIGURE IN THE BACKGROUND

The focus of the report — “not connected and not completed” as a biographical work on the return of sense (for example, the life histories of the Ostarbeiter). Accordingly, research interests held by a pair of “historic event — the subject/social actor” contextually can change their status. Clarification of the circumstances of these changes may be from a sociological point of view, pursuing not only the influence of institutional pressures on the biography, but also the efforts of the biographant to overcome the biographical gaps caused socio-historical trauma.

Relying in part on the cultural-anthropological approach of Jurn Ruzen, in studying the crisis of historical memory, which occurs in the collision of historical consciousness with the experience that goes beyond notions of socio-historical norm, we consider the collected biographies of the Ostarbeiter as a space of traumatized social identity. Catastrophic experience in terms of the subjects cannot be endowed with meaning and disposed of 1) by silence or 2) the fragmentation of the story, or 3) by flight in the form of collective narrative.

History or a fragment of the main story of the traumatic experience of the Ostarbeiter should be placed in the semantic framework of the social and temporal context. These are the characteristics of the society, organized as forcibly mobilized masses, the standard of living is comparable (at least after the war) and is comparable with the control and the degree of exploitation, hunger, forced labor camp. Poverty and the practice of survival did not differ greatly, bringing together the pre-war, wartime and post-war periods. Against this background, the devaluation of the human person acquires no sudden or sustainable nature.

For survivors of concentration camps, some authors (Primo Levi, D. Agamben, etc.) postulated a definite connection between the desire to survive and the willingness to wit-

ness. They see a special function of a witness narrative, a story about what happened — on values, meaning. The survivor aims to remember, he cannot forget. Solving this problem, a former prisoner, reduced to an object of violence, partly reclaims subjectivity. However, we note, even against the background of discussions with ‘negationists’ and “Holocaust revisionists”, they still take place in the legal field of the laws of the Holocaust, when there are established legal notions of responsibility and estimates. What does the function of the story of the Ostarbeiter tell us about the past? Its reconstruction is complicated primarily by the fact that the Soviet and then Russia's historical and humanitarian official discourse was no place for symbolic recognition of this category. Their de-subjectification could not be restored through discursive means of the Soviet era. Failure to fit in the post-war grand narrative (as we have forged a victory, as we toiled in the rear for the victory) was the consequence of silence, a biographical gap, non-appropriation of past life as a resource for identification. Most of the storytellers first talked about it only in the 90 years of the campaign of compensation, but this says nothing about including a husband, wives, children. During the interview, the storytelling could acquire a reversible character — trying to talk only about the war and the camp, not including his childhood, and postwar life — as the inability to link a normal life before the traumatic event with normalization thereafter. Narrative identity of our storytellers have an important common characteristic — problematisation connectivity / coherence, understood as the creation of a coherent, meaningful way on the basis of autobiographical memories and biographical perspectives on their own past.

Prolonged silence or partial understatement of the past storytellers, dechronologization until the elimination of entire sections of life as a narrative solution reports an injured biography. Nonetheless, this contains a set of social actions, which at the level of designing life path reflects the strategy of normalization, coping with a break in the biographies or biographical restoration integrity:

- normalization (women's biography as the history of marriage, change of name, burdened by the work in Germany, and the birth of children, plus employment, men's biography in the light of a supplementation military biography, plus labor employment)

- compensation (search for cultural niches of employment that allow for an ongoing dialogue, not always directly about his experiences and positioning experts working in archives, the organization of their community — for example, the society of prisoners, young prisoners, literary and historical works, etc.)

- hyper-compensation (a form of recycling of the past was a role reversal and identification with the conservative character)

- anonymisation (classical for Stalinist Russia, for necessary maintenance to prevent reprisals are, and examples from our sample confirm this, labor migration, manipulation with documents — their loss, substitution, concealment of facts, silence, mating strategies),

If we go on the reverse, by adapting to the object of study in Rusen's set of strategies of detraumatization, we put the traumatic events in a meaningful context, thus quickly and easily determining what they lack — no anonymization, subject of violence, moralizing, aesthetization, teleologizatsii, historical reflection. Part of the strategy is the categorization (unique trauma section into the category of "deprivation") and the normalization of (the traumatic event, see paragraph 2) are imposed on the social context of habitualised trauma.

The narrative strategy of our storytellers has been evolved from silence, partial silence, pronunciation, and speaks of a partial or partially-reconstructed identity. Forming a collective narrative of the Ostarbeiter is current within the community during the commemorative practices, resting on the ceiling of a lack of interest of society and public debate.

Olena Stiazhkina

ORAL HISTORY: THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF DIRECTION IN THE RESEARCH PRACTICES OF HISTORIANS IN THE DONBASS

Oral history is always a unique, individual project, focused on the mental characteristics and self-identification mechanisms of a carrier of information, as well as those of an interviewer. Today, "the myth of Donbass" defines the peculiarities of the regional mentality and regional collective memory. "The myth of Donbass" invokes a rigid mechanism of self-censorship during "self-telling."

And the oral tradition of elders and middle-age people continues to be focused on the Soviet meta-narrative.

Regional specifics of the institutionalization of oral history in the Donbass are dictated by the necessity to overcome the fear of memory not only among the academics, but also among the carriers of those memories.

Practices of institutionalization. Ours and «theirs». Oral histories beyond the methodology and theory. Consume, deconstruct or consider not viable?

Oral history in the region is institutionalized in two directions. The first trend relates to the interest in the memory of the certain social and age groups, manifested at the level of state and public structures. Oral materials are collected as an initiative of the state administration, veterans' organizations, within school educational projects, but without the participation of professional historians. The results of these projects are large-scale publications of eyewitness accounts of political repressions, Holodomor, the Second World War, the Afghan war, etc. The published materials suggest that both field studies and their presentation are held outside of the methodologies and techniques which have been accumulated within «oral history.»

The second trend relates to the fact that many in the university environment have grown to understand the necessity of teaching a special course on «oral history» for the Masters of History post-graduate degree. The outcome of the work associated with the proposed course would be the creation of oral sources, which can either be used as the topic of dissertation, or obtained by interviewing the most senior member of the family. Oral sources today are regarded as equal and equivalent, and their introduction to the academic discourse has led to the emergence of separate columns in special historical journals and the publication of individual papers.

Meanwhile, the parallel existence and mutual exclusivity of the two trends creates a problem. Can an intense accumulation of data, made in the first direction, be considered the accumulation of «oral sources?» If yes, what is the most effective way to work with this data? How feasible and appropriate would be the process of «refining» and including in accrued base of already published «cleaned-up» interviews? And is such a process of refining and «appropriation» possible at all?

Property of all: Can the state/does it want to be the guarantor of safety and translation of the "oral histories" bank

The problem of institutionalization of oral history in the region lies in the methods of storage and the inability to re-use, including the re-transcribing of the previously received sources. The state archiving system, burdened by bureaucratic procedures, was not ready to create audio and visual assets or to store handwritten (printed) "oral sources." Archival institutions do not accept working papers, created as part of "state contract," let alone those prepared by Masters' students as part of course studies.

The accumulated data becomes the property of the authors and private collectors, but not the property of all. The level of legitimacy of the source increases only by the publication of the collections of documents. However, this does not solve the problem of re-use/re-interpretation/ evidence hearing. The need to create a special establishment — the National Archives — becomes paramount.

The generation gap as the loss of precedent texts. Relativity and adequacy of the translation possibilities

"The witness of the era" and a historian, who creates an oral source, are increasingly distancing themselves from each other in time. A normal generation gap is aggravated by a change in the language picture of the world. Soviet meta-narrative, clichés and precedent texts of the Soviet era are "not audible" for the modern researcher. Folklore, vernacular, family precedent texts are hard to distinguish for the "modern ear." The training of oral history specialists requires not only eventual, but also the textual study of the era. A transcribed source, containing references to the precedent texts, details the interpretation of these references.

Place of interview as a place of memory? Necessity / possibility of an additional protocol

The problem of place/space/choice of space is important for the oral source. The place of an interview as a place of memory should and can become an act of interpretation. Something that is self-evident in the culture today, may tomorrow be permanently incomprehensible. Description of the space of conversation can / should be fixed in a separate protocol in no less detail than other descriptive components of the source. We still do not know how to interpret the material world of everyday life in all its symbolic meanings, but a chair, table, lighting, a thing which a respondent's hand touches — these are important symbolic components of the process of recalling and storytelling. Additional protocol that secures the visual-material components of the interview, a few decades from now may prolong and / or change the meaningful dominant of the source being created today.

Yulia Stukanova

IN SEARCH OF A SOURCE IN THE PROBLEM OF THE DONBASS ELITE IN 1953–1964: MATERIALS OF PERSONAL ORIGIN

Sources of personal origin pertaining to the problem of the Donbass cultural elite in the period of the “thaw” are completely full of the official documents, which are traditionally disregarded. Present materials are divided into memoirs (namely, the literary critic of I. Dzuba, the writer G. Volodin, the theatre director A. Bondarenko), correspondence (writers, artists and theatre figures), and interview materials collected by the author.

It should be pointed out; personal origin materials on the above-mentioned theme brightly illustrate the literary processes of creative life. The reasons can be observed in the imperial discourse accepted by the provincial elite (from a position of dichotomy — the centre\province as synonymous senses of high\low and developed\remained behind) and their adaptation as their own. They did not see their creativity as significant within the scope of the state, which increasingly limited the creative property of personal origin.

Special attention should be paid to the genre of memoirs, the very materials enable cultural processes in the Donbass region to be revealed from a social-anthropological approach. Among the most interesting and detailed, the following reminiscences of I. Dzuba and G. Volodin should be mentioned. Memoirs of the latter were published in the “Vechernii Donetsk” newspaper (1988-1989) as a part of a book entitled “Past years.” Also, memoir drafts have been kept in the personal fond of G. Volodin at the *State Archive of the Donetsk Oblast* and they contain some interesting extracts that

have been omitted in the published version. The value of his memoirs lies in the fact that his descriptions include aspects such as the attitude of writers towards ideological demands, the painful process of over-thinking caused by de-Stalinization, relationships between representatives and the centre, conflicts between inner creative impulses and social realization motives. Also, the memoirs of I. Dzuba published as a separate book (*Memoirs and thoughts on the homestretch*) are sufficient for understanding of social liberalization scales in the Donbass region. Besides, they sufficiently add some features of directors of the SPU regional office — Pavel Baidebura and Andriy Klochi — concentrating on the national aspect.

All above-mentioned reasons put the researcher forward, towards interview creation as a personal source. Its advantages lie in the historian's ability to model the source direction concerning problems aimed to be researched. The author has conducted interviews with former actors from the regional Luhansk and Donetsk dramatic theatres — T. Kakob'yan, V. Timoshenko (2004), I. Moloshnikova (2006), O. Cimal, the daughter of the theatre director K. Cimal (2005) and also from E. Stukanov, a former participant of the Amateur Union of Composers of the Donetsk Region (2006) — first of all, from the perspective of a resident of the region, and secondly, regarding the issues of his responsibilities and the creation of Donetsk artists.

The following common features of these interviews can be regarded as fact: all interviews are conducted with people who are intelligentsia in the humanities, in their education, and in their professional activity, as well as being individuals that have had adequate practice in delivering speeches before the audiences for a long period of time. This resulted in an adequate objectivity towards a definite source saturation of self-descriptiveness and detailed elaboration.

During the interview conducted with O. K. Cimal about Konstantin Cimal's directing activities, it was described that he worked in the Artemovsk Opera Theatre in the 1950s and in the Stalinskyi Opera Theatre in the 1960s. The following data proved that directors in the Donetsk region had the opportunity to carry out all creative ideas and individualize the concrete performances by the end of the 1950s. While conducting an interview with Igor Moloshnikov, an actor of the Donetsk Regional Ukrainian Drama Theatre, the essential goal was to find out material-financial and everyday work conditions and life of theatre figures. Besides, his interview informs us about possible career opportunities, the amount of material ensured to a theatre worker, and also gives interesting details about strategies for everyday survival in the theatre industry.

The interview with E. Stukanov, as a member of the Amateur Union of Composers of the Donbass Region, gave an alternative description from the one the authors

of the press articles tried to create. The information that appeared in the articles did not idealize the activities of the amateur group. The information collected in the interview also involves interesting thoughts about the role of initiative “from below” (not only the pressure from “above”) in the current creation of musical works. The aim of another discussion was to address the attitudes towards the creativity of the Donbass cultural elite. This interview, as a personal experience, allowed readers to presume the following conclusion: social space gave the intelligentsia the opportunity for accidental meetings, though the formal acquaintances with creative elite did not mean that all shared the same ideas towards creativity itself. From the other side, the interview results raise the problem of the absence of the literary works from the Donbass within the common-Soviet cultural narration, these non-actualized epistles identifying the problem of the region as unnoticeable and voice-deprived.

Work methodology concerning materials of oral history assist one to imagine the “dialogue” in culture while working with documents, using deeper analyses, a critical approach and comparison with other kinds of sources. We tried to follow the main established rules for interviewing and interview interpretation.

Thus, personal origin materials are an essential part of the source based on the problem of the Donbass elite in 1953-1964. They are able to reveal aspects that official documents cannot. The creation of oral history sources opens the opportunities to pose and solve new problems according to the research theme.

Serhiy Taboranskyi

**THE PROBLEMS AND METHODS OF ORAL HISTORY DURING
THE XV INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF HISTORICAL SCIENCES
IN BUCHAREST (1980)**

As of the present day, Oral History is still in the process of its establishment, its institutionalization, its theoretical basis and its conceptualization of methodological boundaries is still in progress. In this context, discussion of its issues during XV International Congress of Historical Sciences in Bucharest (1980) is very interesting. Addressing the mentioned issues is important, due to the fact that this page within the process of “establishing” Oral History has not been explored yet, and opinions expressed during the session of the Congress are extremely realistic, even now.

In our investigation, we consider the problems of Oral History during the Congress on the basis of studying the presentations of the reporters of the methodological section and drawing on additional materials after their discussion. The main source of the subject treatment, we mentioned, is the published material of the Bucharest

Congress reports — *XV^e Congres international de sciences historiques. 15-e. Bucarest. 1980. Rapports. v.1. Grand themes et metodologie, as well as the discussion materials — Actes. Bucuresti. 1982.*

A Spanish scientist, Jose Adan, presented results of his oral history project for the Civil War in Spain (1936–1939) during the Congress. He became convinced that a human — witness of the epoch being studied is the most important document for the present-day historian. A historian cannot understand the essence of a human, his thoughts, his motivations, if he does not ask himself about it. An Indian Historian, A.R.Kulkarni, had the floor with a similar approach. He stated that the Oral History objective is the intention to preserve the present-day witnessing of the events and participants, to be used by the would-be generations of historians.

The report of English historian, T.Barker, contains interesting methodological reflections of the author regarding the practical issues of oral-witnessing collection techniques. He dwelled briefly upon the importance of equipment choice and the creation of high quality audio-recordings; he also touched upon the problem of informant selection. An important point during the interview, on the opinion of T.Barker, is focusing on what the respondent wishes to tell. A checklist is useful to encourage the respondent towards the most important topics only.

Swedish historian, J.Weibull, proposed four sections of the “correct” interview, developed jointly with his colleague H. Poulsen: the narrative period, the questioning period, the comparison period, and the comments period. He specially stressed the last point, which adds specific “sensing” to the value of the initial material, already recorded.

Problems of the source in oral-witnessing were touched upon by the report of a Hungarian scientist, Glatz Ferenc. He sees Oral History as a changeable process of creating a source that is connected with the natural variability of oral information itself, which occurs under the influence of different public events. To understand oral-witnessing, G. Ferenc thinks it is necessary to study social and cultural peculiarities of the investigated historical epoch in order to understand the mechanism of memory functioning itself. He also pointed out specific features of Oral History and presented a traditional classification of sources according to their form, suggesting the date of source creation as the main criteria.

The report by M. Vilanova (Spain) and D. Willems (Belgium) was dedicated to the specific features of Oral History. The issues of creation and the control by a historian of an oral source, to their opinion, transform history from an interpretive science into an experimental science. They emphasized the role of a language in Oral History, the necessity to analyze a “question/answer” mechanism, which controls the respondent’s questioning, investigation of internal and comparative text analysis peculiarities, and the connection between language and mental structures, as well as language and reality.

Discussing problems and methods of Oral History during the XV International Congress of Historical Sciences in Bucharest testified to its recognition as an independent approach of historical research, and became an important event within the process of its further establishment.

Oksana Tovarianska

**THE UKRAINIAN-GERMAN RELATIONSHIP
DURING MILITARY TRAINING IN THE MEMORIES
OF THE FORMER SOLDIERS OF THE “GALICIA” DIVISION**

This paper examines the relationship between Ukrainian and German personnel of the Waffen SS “Galicia” Division during military training in the period of July 1943 – June 1944. The main sources used for this research are memoirs and oral histories of the former soldiers of the Division, who are living now in Western Ukraine after returning from the GULAG. The question of the Ukrainian–German relationship is usually neither illustrated by historiography, nor mentioned by the former soldiers in their memories. The remembering of any event is possible when it is very exceptional for the person, due to its importance in regards to future life. From this point of view, joining the Division is recollected as “public euphoria” and as the most pleasant episode of their past, whereas the period of military training is recalled only in general terms and context. In order to collect their personal reminiscences about these times, additional questions were asked. Frequently, the following answer was received: “Hm,... I have never thought about this.”

For the most part, respondents are representatives of the first wave of recruitment to the Division, who left Galicia during July-October of 1943. The Division was commanded by German officers and by Ukrainians on the lower ranks. After examining the sources, it could be preliminarily stated that the character of the Ukrainian–German relationships depended on the amount of Ukrainians among the Germans commanders. Their presence and direct communication with common soldiers formed the vision of a true “Ukrainian Division” in their eyes. The following thought expresses their controversial perception very clearly: “it was a little bit not ours, but it was ours”.

The Germans’ attitude towards Ukrainians could be illustrated in terms of positive, negative, and neutral positions. Usually, it is remembered that Ukrainian–German relationships were built under the principle of subordination and not under national/patriotic beliefs. Usually, common former soldiers have positive memories about those German commanders who helped Ukrainians and had interest in Ukrainians, who knew military schooling perfectly, and who appreciated that Ukrainians fought together with

the German nation. But in the eyes of the Ukrainian officers, their relationship with the Germans was harsh, as they were obliged to communicate with the Germans on a daily basis, in order to protect the Ukrainian soldiers.

Machteld Venken

**TO THOSE WHO DID NOT FIND THE WORDS
TO ARTICULATE THEIR WAR EXPERIENCES**

Ostarbeiterinnen were Soviet young women of Ukrainian, Russian or Belarusian decent, who, after the German invasion of the Soviet Union on 22 June 1941, were deported to Nazi Germany for forced labour. While at work, the young women met Western European deported workers, volunteers and prisoners of war. Although off duty, any contact between them was prohibited, numerous love affairs flourished and after the liberation, about 4,000 of them chose to migrate further to Belgium, were wed, and settled in their husbands’ home towns or villages. Because of the difficulty of their war experiences, many of them in their post-war life kept silent. However, these experiences came to the surface by means of gestures and slips of the tongue.

This contribution shows how I gathered and analysed narratives on war memory of former Ostarbeiterinnen in Belgium for my PhD dissertation.¹ Its aim is to portray whether the method I followed can contribute to other research on Ostarbeiterinnen. I used an ethnographical fieldwork approach. Inductive fieldwork, among others, allows one to do interviews as well as to do participant observation during gatherings. The combination of both approaches enables the researcher to highlight which war experiences are more easily verbally or non-verbally presented in group, and which ones are more easily, verbally or non-verbally, touched upon during individual interviews. One of the results I will present, for instance, goes into a shared but silenced war experience which, nevertheless, stood central during group gatherings of former Ostarbeiterinnen in Belgium.

This research question is interesting for many reasons. First, research on Ostarbeiterinnen until now has concentrated on the former Soviet Union, not on Ostarbeiterinnen who migrated to third countries, such as to Belgium. Second, former research has focused on interviews with individuals, as the former Ostarbeiterinnen in the Soviet Union were not allowed to gather. In Belgium, however, formal immigrant organisations of Ostarbeiterinnen existed. Third, the analysis of former researchers has mainly focused on what people said, not on what they did not say.

¹ A summary can be found on: <http://hdl.handle.net/1979/2028>. All my publications can be found on: <https://lirias.kuleuven.be>, browse by author: Venken, Machteld.

CONTENTS

ПРОГРАМА / PROGRAM	3
--------------------------	---

ABSTRACTS

Liisa Avelin. MISSION IMPOSSIBLE? THE ORAL HISTORIAN AND THE BLOG.....	9
Liudmila Afanasieva, Liudmila Glinskaia. THE STUDY OF SOCIAL AND CULTURAL PROCESSES IN ZAPORIZHZHIA-AZOV AT THE LABORATORY OF SOCIAL RESEARCH, BOHDAN KHMEL'NYTS'KYI STATE PEDAGOGICAL UNIVERSITY OF MELITOPOL	10
Olexandra Britsyna. THE ORAL HISTORY OF UKRAINIANS IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY (FOLKLORE AND HISTORY)	12
Rosalia Cherepanova. "SMALL PERSON" AND "BIG HISTORY": AN EXPERIENCE OF INTERPRETATION OF ORAL BIOGRAPHIC S TORIES	13
Alexey Golubev. THE ORAL HISTORY PROJECT OF SOVIET-FINNISH TOURISMIN THE 1960S—1980S.....	14
Gelinada Grinchenko. PRESENTING "VOICES": "THE TELLER" VERSUS "THE RESEARCHER"	15
Oksana Kis. UKRAINIAN ORAL HISTORY AS A GENDERED RESEARCH FIELD: TOWARDS THE ISSUE OF FEMINIZATION	16
Natalia Khanenko-Friesen. IN SEARCH OF SUBJECT: ORAL HISTORY, SOCIETY, IDEOLOGY	18
Yana Komar. THE PROBLEM OF CREDIBILITY OF ORAL HISTORY INFORMATION WHEN WORKING WITH SPECIFIC RESPONDENTS' CATEGORIES: THE BULGARIAN DIASPORA OF EAST UKRAINE AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION	19
Konstantin Kozlov. THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF ORAL HISTORYIN RUSSIAN HISTORICAL SCIENCE OF THE XX CENTURY	21
Wiktorija Kudela-Swątek. AT HOME AMONG STRANGERS: MATERIALS FROM THE PROJECT «Z ZIEMI KAZACHSKIEJ DO POLSKI» DEVOTED TO COLLECTIVE MEMORY OF THE REPATRIATES FROM KAZAKHSTAN TO POLAND.....	23
Tetiana Pastushenko. THE "LIFE HISTORY" AND THE "LIFE STORY" IN A BIOGRAPHICAL INTERVIEW WITH A "RESIDENT OF KYIV": THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE MEANING OF LIFE EXPERIENCE.....	24

Alexander von Plato. POLITICAL CHANGES AND PERSONAL ORIENTATIONS: THE DEVELOPMENTS OF ORAL HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHICAL RESEARCH AFTER 1945 IN GERMANY EAST AND WEST.....	26
Olexandr Priharin. BETWEEN ETHNOLOGY AND ORAL HISTORYTHE EXPERIENCE OF USING THE BIOGRAPHICAL METHOD IN THE PRACTICE OF FIELD RESEARCH: ODESSA, EARLY XXI CENT	27
Natalia Pushkareva. ORAL HISTORY: THE GENDER ASPECT.....	29
Irina Rebrova. THE ORGANIZATION AND ACTIVITY OF THE STUDENTS' SCIENTIFIC GROUP ON ORAL HISTORY AT KUBAN STATE TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY.....	30
Iryna Rebrova. THE 'INDIVIDUAL' AND THE 'TYPICAL': THE EXPERIENCE OF INTERVIEWINGAND PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION AT THE KHARKIV COUNCIL OF ANTI-FASCIST RESISTANCE PARTICIPANTS.....	31
Irina Romanova, Irina Makhovskaya. "MIR: A HISTORY OF A BOROUGH NARRATED BY ITS INHABITANTS" (A STUDY OF LOCAL HISTORY THROUGH ORAL HISTORY)	34
Aleksey Rostovtsev. THE CREATION OF A COMPLEX OF MEMOIRS FROM THE PIONEERS OF PHYSICAL TRAINING PEDAGOGY AT THE BELGOROD STATE UNIVERSITY, AND ITS USE IN HISTORICAL RESEARCH	37
Elena Rozhdestvenskaya. THE STATUS OF EVENTS AND THE STATUS OF THE SUBJECT: OSTARBEITER FIGURE IN THE BACKGROUND.....	38
Olena Stiazhkina. ORAL HISTORY: THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF DIRECTION IN THE RESEARCH PRACTICES OF HISTORIANS IN THE DONBASS.....	40
Yulia Stukanova. IN SEARCH OF A SOURCE IN THE PROBLEM OF THE DONBASS ELITE IN 1953—1964: MATERIALS OF PERSONAL ORIGIN.....	42
Serhiy Taboranskyi. THE PROBLEMS AND METHODS OF ORAL HISTORY DURING THE XV INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF HISTORICAL SCIENCES IN BUCHAREST (1980)	44
Oksana Tovarianska. THE UKRAINIAN—GERMAN RELATIONSHIP DURING MILITARY TRAINING IN THE MEMORIES OF THE FORMER SOLDIERS OF THE "GALICIA" DIVISION	46
Machteld Venken. TO THOSE WHO DID NOT FIND THE WORDS TO ARTICULATE THEIR WAR EXPERIENCES	47

Наукове видання

Міжнародна наукова конференція
**«У пошуках власного голосу:
усна історія як теорія, метод та джерело»**

Харків, 11–12 грудня 2009

Матеріали конференції

Редактор *Г. Г. Грінченко*
Коректор *Дорошенко Н. С.*
Комп'ютерна верстка *Ю. І. Цитковська*

Підписано до друку 07.12.2009.
Формат 60×84/16. Папір офсетний. Друк офсетний.
Гарнітура SchoolBook. Умов. друк. арк. 1,36.
Облік.-вид. арк. 2,35. Наклад 50 прим.

Площа Свободи, 4, Харків, 61077
Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна

The Organizing Committee would like to thank the following organizations and individuals for their support and contribution to the conference organization:

Prairie Centre for the Study of the Ukrainian Heritage, Saskatoon, Canada
St. Thomas More College, Saskatoon, Canada
Kharkiv V. N. Karazin National University, Ukraine
The Kowalsky Eastern Ukrainian Institute
Ukrainian Oral History Association

Natalia Aksjonova, Senior Lecturer, Department of Ukrainian Studies,
Kharkiv V. N. Karazin National University

Volodymyr Al'kov, postgraduate student, Department of Ukrainian Studies,
Kharkiv V. N. Karazin National University

Taras Chuhuy, Research Associate, D. I. Bahalij Research Center
for Ukrainian Studies, Kharkiv V. N. Karazin National University

Andrij Domanovsky, Associate Professor, Department of Ukrainian Studies,
Kharkiv V. N. Karazin National University

Nadya Foty, Research Assistant, Prairie Centre for the Study of Ukrainian Heritage
and Graduate Student, Ukrainian Folklore, University of Alberta

Roman Kazankov, postgraduate student, Department of Ukrainian Studies,
Kharkiv V. N. Karazin National University

Tetiana Pastushenko, Research Associate, Institute of History,
Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences

Iryna Rebrova, postgraduate student, Department of Ukrainian Studies,
Kharkiv V. N. Karazin National University

Julia Tsitkovskaya, Managing Director, Kharkiv Historical & Archaeological Society

Conference Organizing Committee:

Gelinada Grinchenko, Kharkiv, Ukraine

Ivan Karpenko, Kharkiv, Ukraine

Natalia Khanenko-Friesen, Saskatoon, Canada

Volodymyr Kravchenko, Kharkiv, Ukraine