

Non-Russian Language Space and Border in Russian Karelian Literature

By Tuulikki Kurki

Abstract

This article examines Finnish language literature in Russian Karelia on the Russian–Finnish national borderland from the 1940s until the 1970s. It focuses on the concepts of the non-Russian language space and border that are constructed and studied in the context of three novels: *Iira* (1947), *Tiny White Bird* (1961), and *We Karelians* (1971). The article claims that the non-Russian language space and the national border started to be understood differently from the official degrees dictated by Moscow, as found in literature already from the late 1950s and early 1960s. From the 1950s onwards, the historical, linguistic, and cultural roots across the national border and the Finnish population were allowed to be recognized in literature. Furthermore, this article claims that in the 1970s, literature was able to represent such regional history, and also the closeness and permeability of the national border that influenced the lives of the Soviet Karelian non-Russian speaking population and their identity formation. This led to different ideas of the national border, in which the border and its functions and meanings became gradually more multi-voiced, ambivalent and controversial, in comparison to the conceptualization of the border as presenting a strict, impermeable boundary.

Keywords: Finnish language literature, Soviet Karelia, Russian Karelia, border, space

Introduction

This article examines Finnish language literature in Russian Karelia (former Soviet Karelia) at the Russian Finnish national borderland (see map 1), and focuses on the concepts of non-Russian language space and border that are constructed in the studied literature.

Finnish language literature is one of the non-Russian language literatures established in the Soviet Union in the 1920s. At this time, the Finnish language, in addition to Russian, was made the language of local administration, education and culture for the non-Russian speaking¹ population in Soviet Karelia (Kangaspuro 2000: 100–101). Although during the Soviet era, the Finnish language linguistically and socially dominated the other Finno-Ugric languages (such as Karelian and Vepsian), its position as an official language of Soviet Karelia was not stable and varied according to changes in the political atmosphere (Kangaspuro 2000: 11–12; Kangaspuro 2002: 31; Kruhse & Uitto 2008: 54–55). There were two reasons contributing to the dominant position of the Finnish language. First, the political immigrants who had moved from Finland to the Soviet Union held the important positions in the local administration in the Soviet Karelia from the 1920s until the mid-1930s. Second, the Bolshevik nationality policy favoured the use of local languages in local administration and education in the 1920s (Slezkine 1994: 419–420). The dominating position of the Finnish language among the non-Russian speaking population was maintained throughout the Soviet era, with the exception of the last few years of the 1930s when the use of the Finnish language was banned for political reasons. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, writing and publishing in Finnish have continued in post-Soviet Karelia, although in modest quantities.

The presence of the national border has influenced the development of Finnish language literature in Russian Karelia in many ways. Firstly, linguistic, cultural, and historical connections across the Finnish-Russian national border have existed



Map 1: Russian Karelia at the Finnish Russian national borderland. © Tuulikki Kurki.

for centuries, and the border has permitted Finnish political emigrants to join the Finnish language literature field in Soviet Karelia (Kokkonen 2002; Palmgren 1984; Ylikangas 2004). On the other hand, during the oppressive years of Soviet totalitarianism, the border functioned as an impermeable boundary which aimed at protecting the Soviet Union and its communist ideology from the slightest influences of bourgeois culture. The political leadership in the Soviet Union regarded the borderland population as unable to choose their own ideological side correctly, and therefore they had to be protected against foreign influence (Chandler 1998: 4–5). This background raises two questions which this article focuses on. First of all, how is the so-called non-Russian language space constructed in the Finnish language literature of the Finnish-Soviet Union national borderland? Second, how have the literary representations of the Finnish-Soviet Union national border as an element of the non-Russian language space changed in literature? In this article, the term “non-Russian” is preferred instead of “Finnish”, because in Soviet Karelia, several ethnic-national groups such as Finns, Karelians, and Veps used the Finnish language, and furthermore, Finnish language literature also applied elements of the Karelian language.

The article focuses on the time period from the late 1940s until the 1970s. During this period, the representations of the Finnish-Soviet national border changed from being an impermeable separating boundary between East and West, to becoming a more ambiguous and multivalent border which already reflected the changes that took place during Perestroika and the immediate post-Soviet years. Consequently, during this time, the non-Russian language space was constructed in close connection with Moscow. This article claims that the non-Russian language space and the national border started to be understood differently from the official degrees dictated by Moscow, as found in literature already from the late 1950s and early 1960s. From the 1950s onwards, the historical, linguistic, and cultural roots across the national border and the Finnish population were allowed to be recognized in literature. In spite of this however, the ideological and societal differences on each side of the border were still strongly contrasted and opposed to each other. This article further claims that in the 1970s, literature was able to represent such regional history, and also the closeness and permeability of the national border that influenced the lives of the Soviet Karelian non-Russian speaking population and their identity formation. This was followed by different ideas of the national border, in which the border, its functions and meanings became gradually more multi-voiced, ambivalent and controversial. During the post-Soviet era, the national border has become one of the central factors that influences the development of the non-Russian language space and identity in post-Soviet Karelia. Although the construction of the non-Russian language space and identity are closely linked with each other, the concept of identity construction is not discussed in this article.

The conceptual framework of this article is based on cultural anthropology and new spatial history research on place, space, and borders (Gupta & Ferguson 1992; Bassin et al. 2010; Lefebvre 2012). In cultural anthropology, “space” is often defined as “a place” which is made meaningful and significant for a group of people (Gupta & Ferguson 1992: 11). In new spatial history research, space is defined both as an arena for historical events and as a construct of historical events. In other words, in addition to its geographical dimension, space has a mentally and socially constructed dimension that is both subjective and debatable (Bassin et al. 2010: 6–8; Lefebvre 2012: 13–16). Therefore, space is understood as a more abstract entity than a place. Often such terms as “a literary space” or “linguistic space” are used (Hernández 2009: 4, 8), while the term “place” is often “involved with embodiment: it is occupied and experienced” (Bassin et al. 2010: 11).

The question about who can turn a place to a meaningful space includes a question of power, that in turn is established through verbal struggle. Words can be seen as the means of battle of representations of the space and of material control over the space (Hernández 2009: 8). When the Soviet Union was formed, the central political leadership constructed the Soviet space, its territorial unity, and established and enforced the official views of shared history and values among the hundreds of different linguistic, cultural, and ethnic groups in the Soviet Union (Hirsch 2005: 5–9). The ideas of territorial unity, shared history and common values were enforced through political iconography, grand narratives, and metaphors which were ritualistically repeated in literature, art, film, and mass media since the 1920s (Bonnell 1997; Brooks 2001; Dobrenko 2008). Although, the largest ethnic-national groups were recognized and acknowledged in the Soviet Union, they were merged into the Soviet space, and expected to join communism and the “universal” Soviet culture (Slezkine 1994: 419–420). In this context, the representations of the non-Russian language groups were guided and directed from above by the Communist Party and therefore became very unanimous (Dobrenko 2008; Baločkaitė 2013).

In this article, the non-Russian language space means a discursively constructed regional, temporal and social unity (such as the ideas of shared region, history and values) of a non-Russian language group in Soviet Karelia at the Finnish-Soviet national borderland. On one hand, this non-Russian language space was merged into the Soviet space. On the other hand, it included elements that transgressed the borders of the Soviet space. These transgressions become evident when examining the position of Soviet Karelia at the national borderland. Throughout its history, Soviet Karelia as a borderland has had many cultural, linguistic and administrative ties with its neighbouring country, Finland. The proximity of the national border has been influential either directly or through negation, for example in the development of the Finnish language literature and its representations of the borderland area in Soviet Karelia (Ylikangas 2004).² Re-

gionally at the micro-level, the border and border crossings were actively present in the lives of the borderland population. Therefore, it is justified to define the non-Russian language space at the Soviet borderland as being debatable and multi-voiced. It is a space where the varied and conflicting cultural, political and economic interests of the place confront each other, and the space is under constant re-negotiation.

The research material of this article includes one short story and two novels which address the questions of national border, border-crossing, and the non-Russian population (Karelian or Finnish) in Soviet Karelia. The selected works represent some of the most recognized Finnish language works of their own time. They also follow the canon of Socialist Realism, and therefore reflect the dominating literature trends and political opinions surrounding the national border, border crossing, and the non-Russian population. Furthermore, according to publication catalogues, the annual number of published prose fiction was rather low during the latter half of the 20th century: the average number of published prose was 1–2 novels per year (translations not included). Therefore, relatively few novels are available to adequately reflect the characteristics of the published literary works during each studied time period. In addition, the authors of the studied works, Karelian born Soviet writers Nikolai Jaakkola (1905–1967) and Antti Timonen (1915–1990) were two leading names in the Finnish language prose literature in Soviet Karelia during the latter half of the 20th century, and they offer a good representation of the Finnish language literature field in Soviet Karelia at this time. The first examined work is Nikolai Jaakkola's short story *Iira* (Iira, 1947), which introduces a Karelian woman Iira, a Soviet patriot who becomes imprisoned in a Finnish prison camp during the Second World War. The second novel is Antti Timonen's novel *Tiny White Bird* (Pieni valkosiipi, 1961). It is the story of a Karelian girl Mirja who is taken to Finland during the Second World War, but, returns to Soviet Karelia as a young adult. The third novel is Antti Timonen's *We Karelians* (Me karjalaiset 1971). The main protagonist is a Karelian man named Vasselei who is unsure of his identity and therefore does not have a sense of belonging. In the novel, Vasselei probes his position in relation to Bolshevism, socialism, capitalism, and moves across the border between the Soviet Union and Finland in the early 1920s. In these studied literary works, the non-Russian language space is constructed in relation to the national border, various symbolic borders, and also border-crossings.

In the analysis section, methods of narrative and metaphor analysis are applied. The narrative is understood here as a narrative structure, where events follow each other and form a story (Rimmon-Kenan 1983: 3). Additionally, the concept narrative is "restricted, referring to brief, topically specific stories organized around characters, setting, and plot" (Riessman 2003: 1). In narrative analysis, the non-Russian language space and ideas of the border are studied through the main protagonist's development narrative: how he or she positions him/herself in relation

to the non-Russian language space, Soviet space, national border, border crossings and “the other” on the other side of the border, and also how these positions change in the narrative. Second, the analysis focuses on the central spatial and border related metaphors in each novel, and how they construct ideas of the non-Russian language space and border. Each novel is studied in the context formed by the dominating ideological and political discourses about Soviet space, Soviet identities, national border, Finland and the political West. Therefore the analysis of each novel begins with an introduction to the political and historical context applicable to where the novel was published.

Extreme Border and a Non-Existent Non-Russian Language Space

The Finnish and foreign ideological influences were removed from the Finnish language literature of Soviet Karelia during the ideologically restricted periods of the late 1930s, late 1940s and early 1950s. One politically tight period was the immediate post-war years of the late 1940s when concerted post-war reconstruction work started, and the need to strengthen the country’s ideological unity intensified. The first post-war five-year-plan, launched in 1946, became the most important guideline for reconstruction in all areas of life (Clark 2000: 189). In addition, in external politics the world fell into the so-called Cold War era and was divided into the political East and West, and the subsequent ideological juxtapositions between them became strong (Chandler 1998: 81–82; Gaddis 2007). During the post-war years, Russification tendencies and centralism strengthened (Clark 2000: 150; Clark & Dobrenko 2007: 401). This meant that the expressions of regional nationalism were suffocated and eliminated, and the public sphere in which writers could discuss topical and political concerns in literature became non-existent (d’Encausse 1992: 91–93; Loewenstein 2001; Taubman 2007). Instead, the five-year-plan which stressed Soviet patriotism, the victories of the Red Army during the Second World War, and the ideological divide between the political East and West, became the guide post of literary and cultural life (Ermolaev 1997: 99–102).

Nikolai Jaakkola’s short-story *Iira* (1947) was published within a strictly controlled and politically charged post-war atmosphere. It narrates the story of a young Karelian woman Iira during the Second World War, and the events of the short story are located in the villages and woods of Soviet Karelia. The enemy, Finland, had crossed the national border and had occupied areas in Soviet Karelia. Furthermore, they had established a prison camp. The short story reflects the typical themes of literature in the post-war years determined by the elements of the five-year-plan which have been previously described. The short-story *Iira* constructs Soviet Karelia as an integral part of the spatial, temporal, and social Soviet space. The connection between the main protagonist and the power centre (Mos-

cow) is strong, even though Iira is imprisoned in the enemy's space. Therefore the novel creates interesting dynamics between the Soviet space and the non-Russian language space, and serves to show how this relationship was controlled in literature for political reasons.

The novel *Iira* has five parts: 1) Iira's childhood and the pre-war years; 2) participation in the Second World War at the Karelian front; 3) imprisonment in a Finnish prison camp; 4) her return home; and 5) the beginning of a new life. Each part of the novel defines Iira's position in relation to her homeland and home region, to the ideals and values of the Soviet ideology, to the border, and to the ideological enemy on the other side of the border. This article focuses on parts 3, 4, and 5 of the novel which construct the spatial, temporal, and social dimensions of the non-Russian language space. These dimensions can be identified in Iira's personal development narrative and in the most important spatial metaphor in the novel – the birch tree.

The first turning point in Iira's development narrative is the beginning of the so-called Continuation War³ between the Soviet Union and Finland in 1941. When Iira reads a newspaper article which encourages Soviet citizens to gather their strength and destroy the enemy, she becomes convinced of her Soviet identity and the coming requirements of the war. She transforms from a Karelian girl into a conscious, self-confident and patriotic Soviet hero, who is extremely determined to serve and defend her home country. Iira pushes her emotions and fears aside, and replaces them with efficient rationality in order to find the best strategies by which to defeat the enemy. Her determination is visible in her war declaration:

Not an inch of the homeland, not a single grain, not a fragment, not even the smallest piece of our people's common wellbeing, not even one piece of the results of our people's co-operation will be given to the enemy.⁴ (Jaakkola 1947 part 1: 93–94.)

In Iira's words, there is only one homeland and that is the Soviet Union. Her loyalty belongs to the Soviet Union and its peoples that form one Soviet nation. Homeland is the result of the shared history through which the Soviet Union was built by its people, and no-one is willing to give the slightest piece of it to the enemy. The novel represents Iira as a patriotic Soviet woman who is willing to sacrifice her life and youth for her home country. The Soviet patriotism is linked to the communist ideology and the power centre of Moscow, and is further strengthened when Iira leaves for the front in Soviet Karelia. Physically she recedes from Moscow, but ideologically her connection with it intensifies. This is shown when at the front, Iira sings a patriotic song with her women comrades:

The morning sun lights
the walls of the Kremlin and makes it beautiful
so vibrant
so great
there is no-one who could beat you
the country so wide

my Moscow
there is nothing like you, nothing more valuable than you.⁵

(Jaakkola 1947, part 1: 100–101.)

When the women are singing the song, the sun emerges from behind a cloud and shines on them. The song refers to the pervasive light and life giving power of the sun which was one of the most commonly used elements of the iconography built around Stalin. Stalin's centrality and pervasive effect is represented in the nature metaphors relating to him, of which the most popular were the sun and light (Plamber 2003: 25–27). Furthermore, during Stalin's era, the construction of the Soviet space included an idea that Stalin was the centre around which the Soviet space was organized. Centripetally, the ideologically most important areas were positioned at the center or as close to it as possible, and ideological importance of these areas lessened as the distance from the center grew (Plamber 2003: 20–21). The song also aims to show that there is no ideological distance between the power center and the periphery of the Soviet Union. Thus, the singing and the sun's appearance express a symbolical unity between the Soviet periphery and the ideological power center, Moscow, and its ruler Stalin.

However, Iira's unwavering identity as a Soviet patriot and her closely felt connection with the ideological power center is problematized in the third part of the short story. Finnish soldiers arrest her and take her to a Finnish prison camp – to the enemy's space. Her identity as an ideal Soviet woman and patriot is questioned when the Finnish soldiers interrogate her. The soldiers ask her whether she is a Russian, Karelian, Finn, or whether she represents so-called kindred people to Finns, because Iira can speak Finnish.⁶ The idea of kindred people was strongly opposed in the Soviet Union. In the example below, Iira rejects the attempts to define her as a representative of the kindred people to Finns, but the Finnish soldier continues to pressurize her to cross to the “other side”; in other words to become an enemy to the Soviet Union:

Karelian? Yes, I am Karelian, but not your kindred people – she said with a calm and confident voice, stressing the word “your”.
[...] “You do not understand what is best for you. Come to your senses. Join us, our groups... we have a common language, common origin, common enemy...”⁷ (Jaakkola 1947 part 2: 46.)

Iira's doubts are caused not because she feels that a common cultural heritage with Finland makes her a Finn, but rather she doubts her ability to fulfil the requirements of the ideal Soviet woman and patriot. Because the Finnish soldiers have arrested her, for a moment, Iira questions her identity, her sense of belonging in the Soviet space, her loyalty towards her home country, and her own strength. She even considers suicide as a solution to her misery and problematic position in the prison camp:

Fatherland! If you only knew how passionately I love you. Forgive me, if I have somehow, unintentionally offended you... The Red Army soldier never surrenders or

becomes a prisoner. Did I surrender or was I forced to?[...] Nevertheless, it is so painful to be absent from one's army ranks when everyone should keep fighting.⁸
(Jaakkola 1947, part 2: 44.)

Iira's faith and connection to the power center of Moscow is re-established when she hears another prisoner singing in the Russian language. When listening to the song, Iira finds the defiant and patriotic pride in her again which helps restore her willingness to survive. Finally, when peace arrives, a Red-Army officer with shiny gold Soviet stars on his uniform arrives at the prison camp to release the prisoners, and with his arrival, the connection to her home land, its values and ideals are re-established in Iira's consciousness.

In *Iira*, the war-time non-Russian language space is constructed spatially on the disputed national borderland, where ties with Finland and enemy become visible. However, at the end of the short story, the non-Russian language space re-establishes a strong link with the Soviet Union and returns to the Soviet space. Consequently, the ties across the border are cut off and become meaningless. The link between the power center and the Soviet Karelian periphery is reflected in Iira's character, as well as in her home village to which she returns and subsequently is returned to the Soviet space. After the war, Iira and the villagers are representatives of one non-Russian speaking population of the Soviet fatherland, who together with all Soviet citizens look towards a promising future. The change from wartime hopelessness to post-war hopefulness is expressed in the way in which Iira voices the words "home village" when she arrives home. Iira first sighs "Home village" when she sees her village which has been mostly burned down and destroyed by the enemy. However, when Iira hears sounds of work, of constructing new houses and cutting wood, then the home village creates the sense of belonging and of hope for a better future. Then Iira cries "Home village!" cheerfully and runs towards the new constructions (Jaakkola 1947 part 2: 64). Iira's self-confidence about the ability of the Soviet Union's periphery to defeat all obstacles to gain a glorious future returns.

Metaphorically, the non-Russian language space and Soviet space as a future-oriented homeland are represented through the birch tree metaphor which both begins and ends the short story. At the beginning of the story, the birch is described as being older than any of the villagers and had witnessed all of the events in the village's history. During the Second World War, the birch had been badly damaged and had almost died. The short story ends with a description of a new birch twig that grows from the side of the badly destroyed stump and reaches towards the sun. The birch metaphor, as well as those of trees and roots are fairly popular for regionalizing national and cultural identities (Malkki 1992: 31). In *Iira*, the birch stands for the homeland, life, and hope for a better future. In addition, the birch and the new twig serve as a metaphor for the non-Russian language space within the Soviet space. The destroyed birch and the new twig stand for the idea that the non-Russian language space cannot be destroyed. The stump and the

twig can be also be interpreted as metaphors for the older diminishing generation and the new rising generation, and for the time when new life returns to Soviet Karelia. The new generation looks towards the future and is guided by the sun's light. Thus at the end of the novel, Jaakkola evokes the dominant rhetoric and political image of the unquestioned faith in Soviet ideology under Stalin's guidance.

In *Iira*, the non-Russian language space is neither on its own, nor clearly distinguished from the Soviet space. It is visible only vaguely, and mostly by searching in-between the lines. On one hand, the birch metaphor can be interpreted as representing the development of the Karelian woman, Iira, and on the other hand, it can be seen as a metaphor for the regional history of Soviet Karelia and the collective memory of the non-Russian speaking population; both of which also return to life from the verge of destruction.

The literary critic Raisa Miroljubova (1950) strongly criticized *Iira*. She criticized the idea that Jaakkola had questioned Iira's identity as a patriotic Soviet woman. In addition, she criticized the birch metaphor which she regarded as a completely failed metaphor for a future-oriented Soviet society. According to Miroljubova, Iira and some other characters in the novel follow their biological instincts and emotions, and are therefore not fit to represent the ideal of a rational, alert Soviet patriot. An example of this irrational and uncharacteristic behaviour is Iira's prayer "in God's name" that no-one suffers in a prison camp in the future. Another character in *Iira* prayed to water spirits to save her life, and Miroljubova claimed that these characters were irrational and thus "lowered the moral characteristics" of the Soviet man, which was therefore unacceptable.

Miroljubova's criticism may have been an attempt to reject the expressions of regional nationalism that were politically explosive topics in the late 1940s. The purpose of her criticism may also have been to prevent a regional collective memory emerging from the short story. Strong criticism against prayer supported the idea that the religious ideas of traditional folk (especially if they were expressed in a non-Russian language) did not have any room in the Soviet space, and therefore were unable to be translated into the Soviet nationalist discourse. In addition, allowing positive representations of folk religious elements and collective memories of the non-Russian language people could strengthen the history and regional awareness of the non-Russian language population, which would have violated the ideological principles of the time. Miroljubova's criticism supports the idea that a non-Russian language group could not separate itself from the Soviet space in its literary representations. Similarly, it was barely possible to create literary heroes who would differ from Soviet ideals or who would emphasise a non-Russian ethnic national background.

The Border Emerges in the Non-Russian Language Space

The political and cultural atmosphere changed radically after Stalin's death and Khrushchev's ascendance to power in 1954. First, the nationality policies in the Soviet Union returned to the utopia of one unified Soviet nation. Khrushchev's aim was to solve the nationality questions by "new communism" and the creation of one unified Soviet people. The unity of the Soviet nation would be based on the Russian language spoken by all of its citizens, as the ethnic-national groups in the Soviet states would receive their education in Russian. Furthermore, the nationality policies program redistributed the work force in the Soviet Union, the aim of which was to fuse the different ethnic-national groups together. In this way, Khrushchev's new communism would also erase the questions of inequality between the Soviet nationalities. (d'Encausse 1992: 97–98.)

However, the expressions of regional awareness were allowed more room in public discourse than previously during Stalin's era. Right after Khrushchev's ascendance to power, the new political trends allowed the non-Russian language groups in the Soviet states to express economic and cultural interests that were in conflict with the interests of other Soviet states and centralism (Simon 1991: 8). In addition, the ethnic-national groups were able to strengthen and advance their own national languages, values and life-style that also strengthened the ethnic-national consciousness. This in turn positively influenced the development of non-Russian language literatures (Simon 1991: 239–246). Another sign of the growing versatility of values in literature was the appearance of the so-called village prose which saw the depiction of regional, traditional village life as valuable (Parthé 1992: 107). Still, during the post-Stalin era, the literary criticism was ambivalent towards the representations of non-Russian language and ethnic-national features in literature: on one hand they were required, but on the other hand, they were seen as factors that threatened the unity of the Soviet identity (Miroľjubova 1950: 112–122; Bassin & Kelly 2012: 1–6). However, the permissive atmosphere quickly tightened in the late 1950s, as expressions of regional nationalism had negative consequences to Khrushchev and his ideas of centralism. Therefore, the expressions of regional nationalism and patriotism again became criticized for demonstrating nationalistic chauvinism. Thus, to avoid further problems, the idea of fusing the Soviet peoples became once again voiced more loudly (Simon 1991: 239–246; d'Encausse 1992: 96–97).

The fluctuating and controversial political atmosphere in Khrushchev's era also reflected in the Finnish language literature produced in Soviet Karelia. Soviet Karelia was represented as a quickly modernizing and urbanizing Soviet periphery (Kurki 2010), and trends that stressed regional, non-Russian language folklore as the source of artistic inspiration emerged. Furthermore, subtle contacts across the national border with Finland started to influence the themes of Finnish language literature. Contacts between the Soviet Union and the political West became sub-

tly evident in the late 1950s (Chandler 1998: 83), and at first the contacts with Finland were created through official literature and cultural organizations, exchange programs, and for example through the Finland-Soviet Union friendship association (Timonen 1963).

Since the late 1950s, the Finnish–Soviet Union national border and contacts across the border became a visible theme in the Finnish language literature of Soviet Karelia. This had also an influence on the construction of the non-Russian language space in literature. The first novels that noted the national border as a more multifaceted entity than just a strict separating division line and as a manifestation of the Cold War was Nikolai Jaakkola’s historical novel *On the Shores of Lake Pirttijärvi and Elsewhere* (Pirttijärven rantamilla ja muualla) in 1957. Some years later, Antti Timonen published his novel *Tiny White Bird* (1961) which is structured even more strongly around the border crossing theme. In the novel, a Karelian girl Mirja is taken from Soviet Karelia to Finland during the Second World War. In Finland, adoptive parents take care of her and she grows up under the influence of both capitalism and Finnish socialism, represented by the political Workers Movement. As a young woman she comes to support socialism and the peace movement, and feels suspicion towards the capitalist ideals that dominated Finnish society in the 1950s. At the end of the novel, Mirja finds her biological mother in Soviet Karelia and moves back to the Soviet Union where she once again feels at home.

The novel *Tiny White Bird* introduces two different ideas of the border: one which connects and one which separates. The novel shows the connections between the Finnish speaking populations across the Finnish-Soviet national border. At the same time, it stresses the ideological divide between the communist Soviet Union and capitalist Finland. Therefore, the non-Russian language space constructed in the novel is ambiguous. The novel begins and ends with a description of a tiny white bird which crosses the national border. The bird functions as a metaphor for Mirja who crosses the national border at both the beginning and end of the novel. From the bird’s viewpoint, the border is easy to cross, as it simply does not exist. Furthermore, the bird does not recognize “the line which had been axed under her nest in the woods and which is drawn with red ink on all the world maps” (Timonen 1961: 314). In a sense, the political definitions of the border, and the juxtapositions created by the border, border guards or regulations do not belong to the natural world but are more human constructs. Humans however have to follow strict regulations when crossing the guarded border:

Two border poles stood on each side of the border, next to the railway. One had the Soviet emblem, the other the Finnish emblem. The border guards from two different countries stood by the poles. Aino Andrejevna was amused when she looked at the tiny bird which jumped on the gritty soil next to the railway embankment. It found something on the ground and flew to Finland, and settled on a juniper tree, then it pecked something and flew back to the Soviet side of the border, and settled on a pine tree.⁹ (Timonen 1980: 130.)

The bird's movement across the national border and its careless attitude towards it is comparable to Mirja who, at least at the beginning of the novel, is unaware of the human tragedies caused by its establishment. Furthermore, the white bird (and therefore Mirja) are associated with the well-known peace symbol, the white dove. This is also echoed by Mirja's Finnish adoptive parents who see Mirja as "a tiny bird of peace" whom they return to the Soviet Union at the end of the novel (Timonen 1961: 311). The peace metaphor reflects changed attitudes towards the national border, the political West, and Finnish society and its people in comparison to the earlier post-War literature of Soviet Karelia. Since the 1950s, the peace movement which sought a peaceful co-existence between socialism and capitalism strengthened in the Soviet Union, and the symbol of the white dove spread widely despite the continuing Cold War and the tense relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States (Gaddis 2007: 68–72). The theme of peaceful coexistence also reflected in literature which stressed universal humanist values and peace ideology. However, according to historian Geoffrey Roberts (1999: 38), from a political point of view, the goal of the peace movement was also to hinder "the development of the western cold war bloc".

The novel also represents the border as a brutal and violent dividing line when viewed from the human perspective. The border separates two different worlds from each other, and its establishment always causes blood shedding and tears. Timonen uses a metaphor of the Kemijoki-river when describing the consequences of establishing the Finnish-Soviet Union national border. The Kemijoki-river has one starting point in north but then divides into two branches which are separated from each other by the Finnish-Soviet Union national border: Whilst one branch flows to the east, the other flows to the west. The river is a metaphor for the Karelians and Finns who live in Finland and the Soviet Union as being a divided people. Even though they have a common origin and shared history, they are separated from each other by the national border and thence develop in opposite directions:

Through the wilderness, rocks, peat lands and lakes runs a line that is not always visible but it is marked with a wide red line on the world maps. It is the national border. There are numerous national borders on the world map. The borders go along seas, steppes and snow covered mountain peaks, they cut railways and are invisible barriers to gigantic ocean liners and airplanes. History knows numerous cases when those borders have been moved in one direction or the other, but all these occasions have been preceded by blood and tears, shed by nations. [- -] These borders separate two different worlds, two different life orders and ways of life, two different pasts and futures in the lives of individuals and nations. The divide between the two Kemijoki-rivers is a national border exactly like that.¹⁰ (Timonen 1980: 24–25.)

Despite that the novel recognizes the historical contacts, language and oral poetry as connecting factors across the Finnish-Soviet Union national border, the border appears ideologically as a strict dividing line. At the same time, the border renders the realities on each side as inverted pictures of each other – it contrasts and jux-

taposes. The border divides the world into good and evil, communist and capitalist, right and wrong. In Timonen's novel, both the connecting and dividing functions of the national border became the elements which also created the non-Russian language space of the national borderland.

The national border and the historical connections between the Karelians and Finns became a topical and problematic theme for Soviet Karelian writers in the early 1960s. Then, for example, Antti Timonen discussed the theme and the politically heated subject of the kindred people with a Finnish writer Antti Seppä through correspondence. The ideas that Timonen wrote in his letters about this sensitive theme explicate further the ideas presented in his *Tiny White Bird* novel. In the letter below, Timonen stresses the differences between Karelians and Finns, despite existing historical connections. In between the lines, it is apparent that the Finnish writer Antti Seppä has previously stressed the idea of a kindred bond between the Karelians and Finns in their correspondence. Antti Timonen rejects the kindred people ideology in his letter:

The question of the kindred people. That is a long and complicated issue to discuss in a letter. We indeed have a lot in common— language, Kalevala [national epic], fairy tales, songs, riddles. We have a similar nature, equally rough and beautiful on both sides of the border. However, we differ from each other in many respects. We have a different societal system, a different understanding of the profound questions of the human condition, different ideas of history, and different goals regarding the future. By the way, for me as a Karelian, that question is very close. I think that the idea of a kindred people has been spoiled by the West. Already long ago, the Western leading names of “kindred people ideology” approached the Karelians with a whip in one hand, and sweets in the other. Dogs and circus animals are tamed in that way, but not a people.¹¹ (Letter Antti Timonen to Antti Seppä, October 28, 1960.)

Timonen's opinion clearly states that the ideology of the kindred people is “low”, meaning that the ideology itself had strong imperialistic, militarist connotations, and was used for nationalistic rather than humane goals. Furthermore, Timonen emphasizes that Karelians are not a small isolated group, but they are part of the Soviet nation which includes millions of people. In this way, he emphasizes that the non-Russian language space in Soviet Karelia is in close connection to the center of the ideological space, Moscow. Furthermore, he does not regard the connections across the national border as important or meaningful. Timonen sees the Karelians and the non-Russian language space as socially and temporarily belonging to the Soviet space:

[...] however, I cannot tolerate the claim that we would be a small, isolated group. The Karelians I mean. Our group is not that small – we are over two hundred million, including Karelians, Russians, Bashkirians, Ukrainians. If I remember correctly, about seventy languages are used in the Soviet Union. See – also in this case we think differently. Language and ethnic-national differences do not mean national isolation. [...] If we Karelians would be isolated, we would live on the level that we lived on before 1917: As far as I know, before we were the most backward people in the world, if we are excluding the savages. Now, we have gradually achieved the same technical and cultural level as all of the other Soviet peoples.¹² (Letter Antti Timonen to Antti Seppä January 15, 1960.)

The turn of the 1960s was a period when the traumatic history of the Karelians and their division across the Finnish–Soviet Union national border could emerge in public discussion, albeit to a slight degree. In addition to literature, the newspaper *Soviet Karelia* (Neuvosto-Karjala) published some articles about families that had been split by the border (Räikkönen 1968). Nevertheless, the dominating literature strongly emphasized the construction of a unified Soviet people, Soviet space, history and future. It also emphasized the national border as a strong dividing boundary. The difference in comparison to the Stalinist era was that now the national border could be crossed peacefully. There were also some connecting factors across the national border, and so comrades could also be found among the “ideological enemy”.

Towards the Ambiguous Borderland Space

The Soviet peoples started to become more and more aware of their ethnic-national backgrounds and express their ethnic-national identities in the 1970s (Simon 1991: 7). One reason for this can be found in the Soviet nationality policies. During previous decades, the policies of nationality aimed at merging the different nationalities with each other, for example, by promoting internal migration within the Soviet Union. Because of this, the 1970s was the era when people became increasingly interested in their ethnic-national backgrounds which had previously been tried to be erased. In literature, the expressions of ethnic-national identities and the history of the non-Russian language groups gradually began to emerge. Thus, the non-Russian language groups were able to express their alternative history narratives, for example through the literary genre of magic realism that had arrived in the Soviet Union. Examples of the best known writers following this trend were Chingiz Aitmatov and Fazil Iskander (Haber 2003).

In the 1970s, the Soviet Karelian literature also expressed the idea that the previous historiography had not shed enough light on the history of the Soviet Karelian people (Summanen 1973: 118–119). Then, several historical novels such as Antti Timonen’s *We Karelians* (1971) and Nikolai Jaakkola’s four piece novel *On the Shores of Lake Pirttijärvi* (1977) were published, so as to improve the situation. These novels exposed the internal conflicts and confrontations existing among the Karelian population during the formational years of the Soviet Union however these conflicts which had previously been kept silent. These novels brought up the painful and tragic history of the Karelian people who on one hand were divided by the national border, but on the other had to move across this border for political reasons.

Antti Timonen’s novel *We Karelians* focuses on the violent Civil War years in Soviet Karelia, when the Soviet Union was established. In Soviet Karelia, the Civil War (1920–1922) was fought between those who supported Bolshevism and the establishment of Soviet power (Reds), and those who opposed it (Whites). The

third party in the war were those Karelians who formed a temporary Karelian Government, and who wanted to keep Karelia separated from both the Soviet Union and Finland. Somewhere between the Reds and Whites was also a group of people who did not want to choose sides, but were nevertheless drawn into the fighting. In the Civil War, some opponents of Bolshevism joined troops of the Finnish Army which had its own interests in Soviet Karelia. In 1918–1920, the Finnish Army troops (also called the Liberation Army in Soviet Karelia) tried to invade the western parts of Soviet Karelia where the Finnish speaking population lived. In this way, Finland would have been able to expand its territory. The Finnish troops based its military headquarters, the so-called Uhtua Government, in the administrative region of Uhtua (contemp. Kalevala). However, the Tartu Peace Treaty of 1920 ended the action of Finnish troops in Soviet Karelia. During the same year, the Workers' Commune of Karelia was also established. Despite these events however, conflicts continued in Soviet Karelia. Several hundred Finns participated in the fighting which aimed at annexing the Karelians to Finland. After the Soviet regime was established in 1923 and border guards were positioned on both sides of the Finland-Soviet Union border, movement across the border stopped (Baron 2007: 26–27). The Civil War years were tragic. People had to choose their ideological side and try to survive through the hostilities. In addition, in the borderland area, the establishment of the national border with Finland had radical consequences for the everyday life and identities of the borderland population. These themes were studied profoundly in the novel *We Karelians*.

The novel *We Karelians* begins with a murder. A murderer (Mikitän Miitrei) disguises himself as a Bolshevik, and shoots a Karelian man Oleksei. Oleksei's brother Vasselei starts to look for an opportunity to exact revenge on the murderer. During the violent Civil War years in Soviet Karelia, Vasselei's search for revenge and his own identity form the basic narrative of the novel. Whilst looking for the opportunity for revenge, Vasselei continuously moves across the Finnish–Soviet Union national border. Each time he crosses the border, he has to evaluate his motives and loyalties towards the different ideologies and value systems, lifestyles and people on either side. When crossing the border, Vasselei continuously changes his position: first he is a Bolshevik, then a White, then he allies with the Finnish White troops. Finally he recognizes that he cannot and will not ally with anyone. This revelation symbolizes the idea that some Karelians prefer to live separately from Finland and the Soviet Union and their associated political interests. The revelation comes too late however. Vasselei had destroyed his relationship with both the Whites and the Reds, and finds himself in an ideological vacuum. In the end, Vasselei is wandering in the borderland area and wishes that the Bolsheviks could find him so that he could surrender to them. However, his brother's murderer (Mikitän Miitrei) who has become a Second Lieutenant on the White Army (the Liberation Army), finds him first and shoots him dead.

Skies scratched on the road. Now they are coming. Vasselei did not want to hide. He lit a cigarette so that he would be seen easily.

- Hello, who sits there?

What? That voice belongs to Mikitän Miitrei!... Vasselei was ready for anything else but not being shot by Mikitän Miitrei, even though he would be a Red.

Vasselei stood up and asked:

- Who is it?

- Second Lieutenant of the Liberation Army. Come here. Do you want to be captured by the Reds? What.. is it Vasselei?

- Damn! Vasselei became furious. Second Lieutenant of the Liberation Army? Too much anger and hatred filled Vasselei's mind and blurred his thoughts. He grabbed a knife and ran in the deep snow towards the lieutenant, growling furiously. The lieutenant had raised his revolver. Three shots rang out in the gloomy forest, Miitrei shot his victim three times at least. Vasselei stood still, as if hesitated what to do: to die right here and now, and by the bullets shot by that man. He started to fall slowly, as if he looked for a place to die.

- Will you take me, Karelian land?

Dry snow puffed and hid Vasselei. The indifferent moon lit the snowy forest.¹³

(Timonen 1971: 442–443.)

Vasselei's death symbolizes his position simultaneously as a Karelian man and a homeless man, both territorially and ideologically. The traumatic experiences of his homelessness and his inevitable death are created by the definition of the national border and by disputes between men, but nature remains indifferent to the war and violence that takes place.

Vasselei's movement across the national border, and life and death in the borderland also become a symbol of Soviet Karelia and its position as a borderland. In the novel, the non-Russian language space in Soviet Karelia is constructed separately from Finland's Finnish language space and the Soviet Union's Russian language space. Furthermore, the novel creates an impression that sharing the same ideology can connect people on the different sides of the national border, but different ideologies can separate people on the same side. Thus, the borders and their meanings appear ambivalent at the micro-level and in the encounters between individuals. This becomes evident especially in Vasselei's life-story which is full of contraction and ambiguity. In addition, the ambiguity of Vasselei's ideological identity and his feeling of homelessness suggest that among the borderland population, making ideological and political choices and formulating ideas of belonging are not black-and-white. Therefore, Vasselei's life-story at the national borderland can be interpreted as a symbol of the development of the non-Russian language space in Soviet Karelia. This space has belonged variably in the sphere of different ideologies and nations: Reds, Whites, the Soviet Union, and Finland. Vasselei was unsure of his own ideological belonging, and it is this which destroys him in the end. The only thing he was sure about was that he wants to live

in peace and see Karelia separated from the Soviet Union and Finland. This idea is simultaneously raised and killed in the novel: Vasselei is shot as an ideological traitor.

Finland on the other side of the border is experienced as a threatening place where restlessness and violence come from. At one point in the novel, Vasselei has two options regarding his future: Finland or Siberia. However, they both mean death to him, because in his mind, Finland is equated to the grave and Siberia to Hell (Timonen 1971: 68). This idea follows one of the common metaphors of the border as a death zone, and the idea that crossing the border means inevitable death (see Ristolainen 2014 in this journal). Furthermore, the dangerous, threatening Finnish space by way of the Uhtua Government, invades the Soviet Karelian space, and the Uhtua Government is seen as a threat as it attacks the Karelians (Timonen 1971: 102–103, 115).

In addition to metaphors of death and threat, the “otherness” of the Finnish space is defined by observed differences. For example, when Vasselei visits the headquarters of the Uhtua Government formed by the Finnish White army troops, he observes the similarities and differences between Karelians and Finns, e.g. their customs, clothes, and furniture (Timonen 1971: 51–53). In the example below, Vasselei describes the strangeness of the Finnish space. On the wall, he notes a map of the local area, but a local Karelian home would not need to have one due to the familiarity and local knowledge of the place. In addition, he notices that the house of the Uhtua Government has furniture brought from Finland, and they appear strange against the context of the Karelian building. Otherness is also observable in the eyes of the Finnish man which are blue, and regarded especially as a Finnish facial feature.

Vasselei sat down on the chair and looked around. A topographic map of the region was placed on bleached wall papers. A cupboard, desk, and chairs, all brought from Finland stood on unpainted, wide floor beams. [...] The host's words were friendly but his voice was dry and lifeless, just like his wide, blue and expressionless eyes. Something similar exuded from the entire surroundings.¹⁴ (Timonen 1971: 51–53.)

The creation of the non-Russian language space continues in the novel through observations of similarities and differences. Vasselei observes that the Finns who tried to invade areas in Soviet Karelia attempted to speak the Karelian language among the Karelians, but they could not speak it correctly which both amused and irritated the Soviet Karelians (Timonen 1971: 86–88). Here again, some similarities are recognized between the Soviet Karelian non-Russian speaking population and Finns, but the differences are stressed to a greater degree.

In the novel, the non-Russian language space in Soviet Karelia also aimed at separating itself from the Soviet space. Some Karelians passively oppose the Soviet power and they form a “hidden” non-Russian language space within the Soviet space. The Karelians for example participate in required meetings organized by the Soviet authorities and accept those decisions that are profitable to them, but

they stall the enforcement of such decisions as long as possible (Timonen 1971: 113). Thus the non-Russian language space exists in social action, even though it is not otherwise observable.

At the end of the novel, the significance of the topographic border between Finland and the Soviet Union changes. The national border between Finland and the Soviet Union is established, and that changes the attitudes towards the border. However, the local borderland people are not aware of the establishment of the border and continue to move across it to meet their relatives and friends. According to Andrea Chandler (1998: 59), this was rather typical at the borderlands of the Soviet Union immediately after the national border was formally established. However, after establishing the border, the meaning of border crossing subsequently changed: it became forbidden and illegal. This was also a signal that the control maintained by the center had now been extended to the peripheries, and at the same time, the non-Russian language space had been placed more firmly in the Soviet space (Chandler 1998: 55–59). According to Chandler (ibid.), the center-periphery relationship that was created during the establishment of the Soviet Union, aimed at controlling the movements of the borderland population across the national border, and preventing the enemies ideology and criminal elements from entering the country. Furthermore, extending control and so-called micro-level politics¹⁵ to the borderland and the borderland population was very important, because the borderland population often represented ethnic-national groups other than Russians. Their connections with similar ethnic-national groups across the national border thus formed an internal security thread. The Karelian and Finnish populations were considered such a threat in the Soviet Union, because their connections enabled counter-Bolshevik groups to join forces.

The idea of the Soviet border as a protective boundary against enemy ideology is also repeated in the *We Karelians* novel, because Vasselei is shot in the national borderland. Vasselei did not fit into the black-and-white ideological world view, which divided people as either supporters or opponents of Bolshevism, and therefore he had to die. On the other hand, Timonen creates an idea that nature and the “innocent folk people” do not recognize political and brutal borders, similar to the allusions in his earlier novel *Tiny White Bird*. In the example below, an elderly woman who has lived at the borderland for her entire life, crosses the national border to meet her sister who lives on the Soviet side. However, she does not know that the national border has been established, and that she should not cross it:

It was past midnight when the guards from the watchtower called that noise had been heard coming from the northern ski patrol route. Soon, four figures, instead of the expected three, appeared from the snowfall. The fourth was a tall, elderly woman with a sack on her back.

- Comrade Chief, we captured a defector, the oldest in the group announced. She was coming from Finland. [...]

The elderly woman started to nag in the Karelian language:

- For the whole of my life I have visited my sister, and she has visited me. I have not asked where the border is and why it is. Oh, the times we live in!

[...]

- Don't you know that the border has been closed? Lipkin asked. It has been notified in meetings.

- I don't have time to sit in your meetings.

Lipkin wrote woman's name down, gave her sack back and warned:

- Remember, this was the last time! If we ever catch you again, the worst will happen. And now, go home.¹⁶

(Timonen 1971: 452–453.)

As a whole, the novel strengthens the idea that the Finnish and Karelian languages are just superficial connecting factors across the national border. The separating and most dividing borders between Finland and Soviet Union are ideological, cultural and social, however, the border appears more ambiguous than previously depicted in Soviet Karelian literature.

Timonen's novel was well received. He received the Soviet Karelian state price for the novel (Neuvosto-Karjala June 9, 1971). This indicates that novels which problematized the significance of the national border from an individual point of view and discussed the historical and linguistic connections across the national border were accepted in the literary circles, as early as the beginning of the 1970s.

The literary and cultural life in the 1970s anticipated the changes that were to later emerge in the 1980s during Perestroika. The period from the 1980s onwards has been termed as a type of Cultural Revolution in the history of Russia. The political changes started in the 1980s ignited revolutionary changes also in literature and cultural life: the commanding presence of the Communist Party and the methods of Socialist Realism started to lose their dominance, and official censorship was abolished in 1986. By the turn of the 1990s, it was fashionable to talk about "the death of Soviet literature" (Brown 1993: 7; Marsh 1995: 3). In the late 1980s, questions regarding nationality also started to increase. The strengthening of regional national movements is not regarded as a reason for the disintegration of the Soviet Union, however due to this disintegration, national movements were able to ignite (Hirsch 2000: 225–226).

Conclusions

In literature published from the 1940s to the 1970s, the non-Russian language space at the Finnish-Russian national borderland develops from a non-existent space, to a unanimous Soviet periphery space, and finally to an ambiguous, border-crossing space. The development of this non-Russian language space reflects the general atmosphere and opinion towards the national border, as well as to-

wards the many ideological and political borders that exist between the political East and West, and the Soviet Union and Finland.

In the late 1940s, at the beginning of the Cold War era, the national border between Finland and the Soviet Union was a sharp, exclusive, and almost impenetrable Iron Curtain. In addition, it was a border which protected against “the enemy” from entering either country. In literature, through metaphors and linguistic allusions, Finns and Finland were represented as a source of evil. The non-Russian language space in Soviet Karelia could emerge only as an integral part of the Russian language Soviet space. In addition, the national border marked the external border of this non-Russian language space, even though historical, linguistic and cultural connections existed across the national border with Finland.

Since the late 1950s and early 1960s, the non-Russian language space as a border crossing entity, and the linguistic, cultural and historical connections across the border have received slightly more room in Soviet Karelian literature. At the same time, connections between the Soviet Union and Finland started to revive through cultural and scientific exchange programs, and an increase in tourism. In literature, the connections across the national border often emerged as peaceful, but the ideological border between “us” and “them” was still emphasised. Worlds that were separated from each other by the national border appeared as counter-images of each other.

Since the 1960s and the 1970s, the non-Russian language space in literature has become more multivoiced because the individual life-stories of the national borderland population have received public attention. During the formation of the Soviet Union and the Second World War, many people had to cross the national border because of the threat of violence and hostilities. In addition, during the chaotic war time years, the border divided many families. Therefore, the border also became a noted source of trauma, and this topic was able to achieve some public space in literature since the 1960s. In the studied novels, the tragic and traumatic life-stories of the borderland population are still strongly intertwined with the ideological discourse of the border. In addition, since the 1960s, the non-Russian language social and cultural space changed in literature representations. For example, Antti Timonen’s novel introduced individuals who were not sure about their ideological, cultural, or societal identities, and this was a significant change compared to the unanimous literature of the 1940s and 1950s.

The changed representations of the national border, border crossings, and their significance to individuals’ lives that took place in the Finnish language literature of the 1960s and 1970s anticipated the trends that became more visible in the post-Soviet literature of Russian Karelia. The importance of the border and border crossings have now become central elements in writing the non-Russian language space and identity at the Finnish-Russian national borderland in the post-Soviet era. For example, the novels introduce protagonists whose identities are strongly connected with the border and border crossings: they live on the Finnish-Russian

national borderland, on the symbolic borderlands of the Soviet and post-Soviet eras, and on the borderlands of different languages and cultures. They also cross these borders, and these crossings permanently influence the protagonists' regional, temporal, and social space (Kurki 2013; Kurki 2015 forthcoming).

In this article, during the studied time period the role of the border has changed from being relatively insignificant, to becoming a rather prominent means of constructing the non-Russian language space in literature. This is in accordance where developing interaction and the historical connections between Finland and Russia have become increasingly visible factors in defining borderland identities on the both sides of the national border (Alasuutari P. & Alasuutari M. 2009; Hämynen 2012). This development follows the more general tendency where the identity formation of border crossing population has become a central element in borderland literatures and art, and can be seen at the edges of the post-Soviet space, globally in emigrant literature, and especially in the locale of the U.S.A.–Mexico national borderland (Sadowski-Smith 2008; Aldama et al. 2012.)

Tuulikki Kurki is a Senior Researcher in Cultural Studies at the Karelian Institute of the University of Eastern Finland and a Docent in Folklore research. Her research interests include Finnish language literature in Russian Karelia, writing cultures in borderlands, and amateur writers in Finland. E-mail: tuulikki.kurki@uef.fi

Acknowledgements

This article is written as part of the research project Writing Cultures and Traditions at Borders (SA131578) funded by the Academy of Finland.

Notes

- ¹ The non-Russian speaking population as termed here means the Karelians, Finns, Veps and Ingrian Finns that had to use the Finnish language in matters of education, administration and culture in Soviet Karelia due to the Soviet language policies of the time.
- ² Finnish political emigrants participated in the formation of the Finnish language literature in Soviet Karelia in the 1920s. Interaction across the Finnish-Russian national border was active in literary life from the 1920s until the mid-1930s (Palmgren 1984; Ylikangas 2004).
- ³ The Continuation War between the Soviet Union and Finland took place in 1941–1944. Finns defined the war as a continuation to the Winter War between Finland and the Soviet Union in 1939–1940. The Soviet Union defined the war as a part of the Second World War which they termed the Great Patriotic War against Germany.
- ⁴ “Ei vaaksan vertaakaan isänmaasta, ei jyvääkään, ei sirustakaan, ei pienintäkään palasta kansan yhteisestä hyvästä, kansan yhteistyön hedelmistä vihollisen käsiin, ei yhtään mitään!” (Jaakkola 1947 part 1: 93–94.)

- 5 “Aamuaurinko valollansa / Kremlin seinät kaunistaa / niin eloisa / niin mahtava / ei löydy sinun voittajaa / maa valtava / mun Moskova / ei vertaistasi kalliimpaa” (Jaakkola 1947, part 1: 100–101.)
- 6 The idea of kindred people can be dated back in the 19th century. During the 20th century, it became a politically explosive subject in Finland and the Soviet Union. According to the idea, Finns, Karelians, Estonians, and Hungarians form kindred peoples with each other because they have linguistic and cultural ties (Puolakka 2013). In the 1920s, the White Finns used the kindred people ideology as an argument for their penetration into Soviet Karelia and their attempt to annex borderland areas of Soviet Karelia to Finland (Niinistö 2001).
- 7 “Karjalainen? Niin, minä olen karjalainen, mutta en... teidän heimokansalaisenne. – sanoi hän varmalla, rauhallisella äänellä korostaen erikoisesti sanaa ”teidän”.
- Mitä, mitä te sanoitte? [...] Te ette käsitä omaa parastanne. Tulkaa järkiinne. Siirtykää meidän puolellemme... Meillä on yhteinen kieli, yhteinen alkujuuri, yhteinen vihollinen...” (Jaakkola 1947 part 2: 46.)
- 8 “Isänmaa! Jospa sinä tietäisit, kuinka kiihkeästi minä rakastan sinua. Anna anteeksi, jos olen jollakin tavalla tahtomattani loukannut sinua... Puna-armeijalainen ei saa antautua vangiksi. Antauduinko minä vaiko jouduin?” (Jaakkola 1947, part 2: 44.)
- 9 “Rautatien varressa eri puolilla raja seisoj kaks pylvästä. Toisessa oli Neuvostoliiton ja toisessa Suomen vaakuna. Kumman pylvään luona seisoj eri maiden rajavartiosotilas. Aino Andrejevnaa huvitti katsoa pikku lintua, joka hyppelehti hietikolla ratapenkereen vieressä. Jotain siitä löydettyään se pyrähti Suomeen katajan oksalle, noukkasi jotakin ja lensi Neuvostoliiton puoleiseen mäntyyn.” (Timonen 1980: 130.)
- 10 “Korpien ja kallioiden, soiden ja salolampien halki kulkee linja, jota ei siellä ehkä aina huomakaan, mutta joka merkitään maailman kartoille leveällä punaisella viivalla. Se on valtakunnan raja. Maailman kartalla on paljon valtakunnan rajoja. Ne kulkevat meriä, aroja ja lumipeitteisiä vuorten harjanteita, katkovat rautateitä ja ovat näkymättöminä esteinä niin suurille valtamerilaivoille kuin lentokoneillekin. Historia tuntee lukemattomia tapauksia, jolloin noita linjoja on siirretty puoleen tai toiseen, mutta jokaisen tällaisen tapauksen edellä ovat kansat vuodattaneet verta ja kyyneleitä. Satojen valtakunnan rajojen joukossa on sellaisia, jotka eivät maailman kartalla eroa muista, mutta kansojen elämässä ja koko ihmiskunnan historiassa ne merkitsevät hyvin paljon. Nämä rajat erottavat toisistaan kaksi eri maailmaa, kaksi erilaista elämänjärjestystä, elämäntapaa, erilaista menneisyyttä ja tulevaisuutta yksilön ja koko kansojen elämässä. Kahden Kemijoen välisellä vedenjakajalla kulkee juuri tuollainen valtakunnan raja.” (Timonen 1980: 24–25.)
- 11 “Heimokysymys. Se on pitkä ja monimutkainen juttu näin kirjeessä väiteltäväksi. Meillä on todellakin paljon yhteistä - kieli, Kalevala, sadut, laulut, arvoitukset. Meillä on samanlainen luonto, yhtä karua ja kaunista rajaa kummallakin puolella. Mutta me eroamme monessa muussa suhteessa. Meillä on toisenlainen yhteiskuntajärjestelmä, erilainen ajattelutapa elämän tärkeimmistä kysymyksistä, erilaiset käsitteet historiasta ja erilaiset tavoitteet tulevaisuuteen nähden. Muuten, karjalaisena minulle tuo kysymys on hyvin läheinen. Minusta tuntuu, että tuota heimoajattelua on tavattoman paljon pilattu sieltä lännestä käsin. Sikäläiset ”heimoaatteen” päämiehet ovat kautta aikojen, jo paljon ennen Lokakuun vallankumousta ja monastisen jälkeen lähennelleet meitä, karjalaisia, toisessa kädessä makeisia ja toisessa ruoska. Sillä tavalla kesytetään koiria ja sirkuseläimiä, mutta ei kansaa. (Letter from Antti Timonen to Antti Seppä October, 28, 1960.)
- 12 “[...] mutta en jaksa sulattaa sitä, että joukkomme on pieni ja eristetty. Karjalaiset nimittäin. Ei meidän joukkomme niin pieni ole – onhan meitä yli kaksi sataa miljoonaa, siinä luvussa karjalaiset, venäläiset, balshkirit, ukrainalaiset. Muistaakseni meillä puhutaan ja kirjoitetaan noin 70 kielellä. Katsos, tuossakin asiassa ajattelemme eri tavalla. Kieli ja kansalliset eroavai-

suudet meillä eivät merkitse kansallista eristyneisyyttä. [...] Jos me karjalaiset olisimme eristettyinä, niin eläisimme sillä tasolla, millä elimme vuoteen 1917 saakka: Tietääkseni me olimme maailman takapajuisinta kansaa, jos ei nyt verrata aivan villikansoihin. Nyt kun alamme olla sillä teknillisellä ja kulttuurisella tasolla kuin kaikki muutkin Neuvostoliiton kansat.” (Letter Antti Timonen to Antti Seppä January 15, 1960)

- ¹³ “Tieltä kuului suksien suhinaa. Nyt ne tulevat. Vasselei ei halunnut piileskellä. Hän syytti tupakan että hänet huomattaisiin helpommin. – Hei, kuka siellä istuu? Mitä perkelettä?! Tuo ääni oli Mikitän Miitrein!.. Kaikkeen muuhun Vasselei oli valmis, mutta ei Mikitän Miitrein ammuttavaksi, vaikka olisi kuinka punainen. Vasselei nousi ja kysyi kuitenkin: - Kuka se on? – Vapautusarmeijan vänrikki. Tulkaapas tänne. Aiotteko jäädä punikkien vangiksi? Mitä! Onko se... Vasselei?... –Emäs!—Vasselein valtasi silmitön raivo. Valkoisen armeijan vänrikki?! Sekunnin murto-osassa risteili liian paljon vihaa ja raivoa. Ne sumensivat järjen. Käsi sieppasi puukon ja hän syöksyi syvässä lumessa raivosta muristen vänrikkiä kohti. Tällä oli revolveri ojolla. Synkässä metsässä kajahti kolme laukausta, Miitrei ampui uhriaan ainakin kolmesti. Vasselei pysähtyi. Seisoi paikallaan aivan kuin taaskin epäröiden, mitä nyt tehdä, kuollako juuri tähän ja juuri tuonko miehen kuulista. Hän alkoi hitaasti kaatua kuin olisi etsinyt sopivaa paikkaa, mihin kuolla. – Oatko miut, Karjalan mua? Kuiva lumi pöllähti ja kätki Vasselein poveensa. Kuu valaisi välinpitämättömänä lumista metsää.” (Timonen 1971: 442–443.)
- ¹⁴ “Vasselei istahti tuolille ja katseli ympärilleen. Haalistuneiden seinäpapereiden päälle oli kiinnitetty paikkakunnan topografinen kartta. Maalaamattomilla leveillä lattiapalkeilla seisoi Suomesta tuotu kaappi, kirjoituspöytä ja tuoleja. [...] Isännän sanat olivat ystävällisiä, mutta ääni kuiva ja eloton, samanlainen kuin hänen suuret siniset ja ilmeettömät silmänsä. Jotain samantapaista huokui koko ympäristöstä.” (Timonen 1971: 51–53.)
- ¹⁵ According to Chandler (1998: 57–58), micro-level politics meant that the population at the national borderland was harnessed to co-operate with border guards. Their task was to observe movement at the borderland, report illegal border crossings and smuggling attempts. Micro-level politics also included the ideological education of the borderland population.
- ¹⁶ “Oli jo yli puolen yön kun tähystysasemalta soitettiin, että pohjoiselta partioladulta päin kuului ääniä. Pian lumipyrystä sukelsikin esille neljä lumen peittämää ihmistä odotetun kolmen asemesta. Neljäs oli pitkänpuoleinen vanha nainen kontti selässä.
- Toveri päällikkö, olemme saaneet kiinni rajaloikkarin, ryhmän vanhin ilmoitti. – Suomesta oli tulossa. [...]
Mummo alkoi paapattaa Lipkinille karjalaksi:
-Ilmasen ikäni olen käynyt sisareni luona ja hän miun luona. Emmä ole kysellyn, missä on raja ta mitä varoin. Ohhoi, aikoihin olemma elän! [...]
- Etkö sie tiijä, jotta raja on pantu umpehe? Lipkin kysyi, - Siitä on sanottu kokouksissa.
- Jouvan mie tän kokouksissa istumah.
Lipkin kirjoitti nimen muistiin, työnsi mummolle kontin eväineen takaisin ja varoitti:
- Tämä oli viimeinen kerta, muista! Jos vielä suamma kiinni, paha etehes tulou. A nyt mäne kotihis.” (Timonen 1971: 452–453.)

References

Archive material

National Archive of Republic of Karelia.

Letter Antti Timonen to Antti Seppä, 15/1/1960, Fond 1075, opis 1, delo 1/28.

Letter Antti Timonen to Antti Seppä, 28/10/1960, Fond 1075, opis 1, delo 1/28.

Literature

- Aldama, Arturo J., Chela Sandoval & Peter J. Carcía (eds) (2012): *Performing the US Latina and Latino Borderlands*, Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Alasuutari, Pertti & Maarit Alasuutari (2009): "Narration and Ritual Formation of Diasporic Identity: The Case of Second Generation Karelian Evacuees", *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 16:3, 321–341.
- Alvarez, Robert R. Jr. (1995): "The Mexican-US Border: The Making of an Anthropology of Borderlands", *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 2, 447–470.
- Baločkaitė, Rasa (2013): "On Ideology, Language, and Identity: Language Politics in the Soviet and Post-Soviet Lithuania", *Springer Science + Business Media Dordrecht*.
- Baron, Nick (2007): *Soviet Karelia: Politics, Planning and Terror in Stalin's Russia, 1920–1939*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Bassin, Mark & Katharina Kelly (2012): *Soviet and Post-Soviet Identities*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bassin, Mark, Christopher Ely & Melissa K. Stockdale (eds) (2010): *Space, Place, and Power in Modern Russia: Essays in the New Spatial History*, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Bonnell, Victoria E. (2007): *Iconography of Power: Soviet Political Posters under Lenin and Stalin*, Berkley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Brooks, Jeffrey (2001): *Thank you, Comrade Stalin! Soviet Public Culture from Revolution to Cold War*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Brown, Deming (1993): *The Last Years of Soviet Russian Literature: Prose-fiction 1975–1991*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chandler, Andrea (1998): *Institutions of Isolation: Border Controls in the Soviet Union and its Successor States 1917–1993*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Clark, Katerina (2000): *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual*, 3rd edition, Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Clark, Katerina & Evgeni Dobrenko (2007): *Soviet Culture and Power: A History in Document, 1917–1953*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- D'Encausse, Hélène Carrere (1992): "When the "Prison of Peoples" Was Opened", Rachel Denber (ed.), *The Soviet Nationality Reader: The Disintegration in Context*, Boulder, San Francisco, Oxford: Westview Press, 87–101.
- Dobrenko, Evgeni (2008): *Stalinist Cinema and the Production of History: Museum of the revolution*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Dobrenko, Evgeni & Eric Naiman (eds) (2003): *The Landscape of Stalinism: The Art and Ideology of Soviet Space*, Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Ermolaev, Herman (1997): *Censorship in Soviet Literature 1917–1991*, Lanham, Boulder, New York, London: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Gaddis, John Lewis (2007): *The Cold War: A New History*, New York: Penguin Books.
- Gleason, Gregory (1992): "The "National factor" and the Logic of Sovietology", Alexander J. Motyl (ed.), *The Post-Soviet Nations: Perspectives on the Demise of the USSR*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1–29.
- Gupta, Akhil & James Ferguson (1992): "Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference", *Cultural Anthropology*, 7:1, 6–23.
- Haber, Erika (2003): *The Myth of the Non-Russian: Iskander and Aitmatov's Magical Universe*, Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Hernández, Bernadine H. (2009): "Rewriting Space in Ruiz de Burton's *Who Would Have Thought it?*", *Comparative Literature and Culture*, 11:2: <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol11/iss2/10> (accessed 26 June 2012).

- Hirsch, Francine (2000): "Towards the Empire of Nations: Border Making and the Formation of Soviet National Identities", *The Russian Review* 59 (April 2000), 201–226.
- Hirsch, Francine (2005): *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union*, Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press.
- Hämynen, Tapio (2012): "Changes in the Linguistic Identity of the Borderland Karelians in Finland up to the Year 2009", Tapio Hämynen and Aleksander Paskov (eds): *Nation Split by the Border: Changes in the Ethnic Identity, Religion and Language of the Karelians from 1809 to 2009*, Joensuu: University Press of Eastern Finland, 246–271.
- Jaakkola, Nikolai (1947): "Iira", *Punalippu* 4/1947, 60–115 & 5/1947, 21–75.
- (1957): *Pirttijärven rantamilla ja muualla*, Petroskoi: Karjala-kustantamo.
- (1977): *Pirttijärven rantamilla*, Petroskoi: Karjala-kustantamo.
- Kangaspuro, Markku (2000): *Neuvosto-Karjalan taistelu itsehallinnosta*, Helsinki: SKS.
- (2002): "Russian Patriots and Red Fennomans", Antti Laine & Mikko Ylikangas (eds), *The Rise and Fall of Soviet Karelia*, Helsinki: Kikimora Publications, 24–48.
- Kokkonen, Jukka (2002): *Rajaseutu liikkeessä*, SKS: Helsinki.
- Kruhse, Pauli & Antero Uitto (2008): *Suomea rajana takana 1918–1944. Suomenkielisen neuvostokirjallisuuden historia ja bibliografia*, Helsinki: Kansalliskirjasto & BTJ Finland Oy.
- Kurki, Tuulikki (2010): "The New Soviet Man Looks Back: Images and Narratives of Soviet Karelia", Pekka Suutari & Yuri Chikalov (eds): *Karelia Written and Sung: Representations of Locality in Soviet and Russian Contexts*, Helsinki: Kikimora Publications, 86–108.
- Kurki, Tuulikki (2013): "From Soviet Locality to Multivoiced Borderland: Literature and Identity in the Finnish-Russian National Borderlands", *Region: Regional Studies of Russia, Eastern Europe, and Central Asia*, 2:1, 95–112.
- Kurki, Tuulikki (2015 forthcoming): "Personal Trauma vs. Cold War Rhetoric at the Finnish Russian National Borderland", A. Kannike (ed.) *Approaches to Culture Theory Vol. 5*, University of Tartu Press, Tartu.
- Lefebvre, Henry (2012): *The Production of Space*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Loewenstein, Karl Edward (2001): *The Thaw: Writers and the Public Sphere in The Soviet Union, 1951–1957*, Michigan: UMI Dissertation Services.
- Malkki, Liisa (1992): "National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity Among Scholars and Refugees", *Cultural Anthropology*, 7:1, 24–44.
- Marsh, Rosalind (1995): *History and Literature in Contemporary Russia*, Oxford: Macmillan & St. Antony's College.
- Miroļjubova, Raisa (1950): "Vastoin elämän totuutta (N. Jaakkolan "Iira" kertoelman johdosta)", *Punalippu*, 12, 112–122.
- Neuvosto-Karjala* 9 June 1971. "Karjalan ASNT:n valtionpalkinto kirjallisuuden ja taiteen alalla vuodelta 1971 on myönnetty".
- Niinistö, Jussi (2001): *Bobi Sivén: Karjalan puolesta*, Helsinki: SKS.
- Palmgren, Raoul (1984): *Kapinalliset kynät*, Helsinki: WSOY.
- Parthé, Kathleen (1992): *Russian Village Prose: The Radiant Past*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Plamber, Jan (2003): "The Spatial Poetics of the Personality Cult", Evgeny Dobrenko & Eric Naiman (eds): *The Landscape of Stalinism: The Art and Ideology of Soviet Space*, Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 19–50.
- Puolakka, Jenni (2013): *Kieli ja kulttuuri heimoveljeyden perustana. Kielitieteilijä Lauri Kettusen heimoaateen synty ja ilmenemismuodot vuoteen 1924*. Aate- ja oppihistorian pro gradu -tutkielma, Oulun yliopisto. (Unpublished MA thesis)

- Riessman, Catherine Kohler (2003): "Narrative Analysis", Michael S. Lewis-Beck, Alan Bryman & Tim Futing Liao (eds): *The Sage Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*, 3. London: Sage Publications:
<http://cmsu2.ucmo.edu/public/classes/Baker%20COMM%205820/narrative%20analysis.riessman.pdf> (accessed 14 February 2014).
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith (1983): *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*, London and New York: Methuen.
- Roberts, Geoffrey (1999): *The Soviet Union in World Politics: Coexistence, Revolution and Cold War, 1945–1991*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Räikkönen, Jukka (1968): "Mitä minulta kysyttiin Suomessa", *Neuvosto-Karjala*, 17 December 1968.
- Sadowski-Smith, Claudia (2008): *Border Fictions: Globalization, Empire, and Writing at the Boundaries of the United States*, Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press.
- Simon, Gerhard (1991): *Nationalism and Policy toward the Nationalities in the Soviet Union: From Totalitarian Dictatorship to Post-Stalinist Society*, Boulder, San Francisco, Oxford: Westview Press.
- Slezkine, Yuri (1994): "The USSR as a Communal Apartment, or How a Socialist State Promoted Ethnic Particularism", *Slavic Review*, 53:2, 414–452.
- Summanen, Taisto (1973): "Ristiaallokosta selville vesille", *Punalippu*, 5, 114–121.
- Taubman, William (2007): *Hruštšov – mies ja hänen aikakautensa*, Helsinki: Art House Oy.
- Timonen, Antti (1963): "Koko kansan tukema seura", *Neuvosto-Karjala*, 1 March 1963.
- (1961/1980): *Pieni valkosiipi*, Petroskoi: Karjala-kustantamo.
- (1971): *Me karjalaiset*, Petroskoi: Karjala-kustantamo.
- Ylikangas, Mikko (2004): *Rivit suoriksi! Kaunokirjallisuuden poliittinen valvonta Neuvosto-Karjalassa 1917–1940*, Helsinki: Kikumora Publications.