The Recognition of the Dolgans, Science and Soviet Institutions' Toil

Yann Borjon-Privé

The Recognition of the Dolgans, Science and Soviet Institutions' Toil

Chapter · December 2021

CITATIONS
0

READS
28

1 author:

Yann Borjon-Privé
French National Centre for Scientific Research
10 PUBLICATIONS **1** CITATION

SEE PROFILE

ULUSLARARASI YAKUTÇA ARAŞTIRMALARI

Editörler

Emine Yılmaz - Hasan Hayırsever

nobel bilimsel

ULUSLARARASI YAKUTÇA ARAŞTIRMALARI

Editörler: Emine Yılmaz - Hasan Hayırsever

Yayın No.: 855
ISBN: 978-625-433-101-5
E-ISBN: 978-625-433-102-2
Basım Sayısı: 1. Basım, Aralık 2021

Genel Yayın Yönetmeni: Nevzat Argun -nargun@nobelyayin.com-
Genel Yayın Koordinatörü: Gülfem Dursun -gulfem@nobelyayin.com-

Sayfa Tasarım: Dicle Korkmaz -dicle@nobelyayin.com-
Redaksiyon: Sergen Öz -sergen@nobelyayin.com-
Kapak Tasarım: Lale Yalçın -laleeyalcin@gmail.com-
Görsel Tasarım Uzmanı: Mehtap Yürümez -mehtap@nobelyayin.com-
Baskı Sorumlusu: Yavuz Şahin -yavuz@nobelyayin.com-
Baskı ve Cilt: Sarıyıldız Ofset Amb. Kağ. Paz. San. ve Tic. Ltd Sertifika No.: 23593
İvedik Ağaç İşleri San. Sit. 1354. Cad. 1358. Sok. No.: 31 Ostim / ANKARA

Kütüphane Bilgi Kartı

Yılmaz, Emine., Hayırsever, Hasan.
ULUSLARARASI YAKUTÇA ARAŞTIRMALARI / Editörler: Emine Yılmaz - Hasan Hayırsever
1. Basım, VI + 274 s., 16x23,5 cm. Kaynakça var, dizin yok.
ISBN: 978-625-433-101-5
E-ISBN: 978-625-433-102-2
1. Yakutça 2. Sahaca 3. Dolganca

Genel Dağıtım

ATLAS AKADEMİK BASIM YAYIN DAĞITIM TİC. LTD. ŞTİ.
Adres: Bahçekapı Mh. 2465 Sk. Oto Sanayi Sitesi No:7 Bodrum Kat, Şaşmaz/ANKARA
Telefon: +90 312 278 50 77 - **Faks:** 0 312 278 21 65 - **Sipariş:** siparis@nobelyayin.com-
E-Satış: www.nobelkitap.com - esatis@nobelkitap.com / www.atlaskitap.com - info@atlaskitap.com

Dağıtım ve Satış Noktaları: Alfa Basım Dağıtım, Arasta, Arkadaş Kitabevi, D&R Mağazaları, Dost Dağıtım, Ekip Dağıtım, Kida Dağıtım, Kitapsan, Nezih Kitabevleri, Pandora, Prefix, Remzi Kitabevleri

İÇİNDEKİLER

SUNUŞ

Elinizdeki kitap, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Çağdaş Türk Lehçeleri ve Edebiyatları Bölümünün, kuruluşundan beri her yıl düzenlemekte olduğu Türk Dilbiliminde Tanımlama ve Belgeleme üst başlıklı uluslararası toplantıların yedincisi olan ve 17-18 Ekim 2019 tarihinde düzenlenmiş bulunan Uluslararası Yakutça Araştırmaları Çalıştayı'nda sunulmuş bildirilerden oluşmaktadır.

Neden Yakutça!

Bilindiği gibi Yakutça, Çuvaşçadan sonra en eskicil Türk dilidir ve bu nedenle tarihsel/karşılaştırmalı Türk dil bilimi çalışmalarında çok ayrıcalıklı bir yere sahiptir. Ancak Türkiye'de Yakutça çalışmaları henüz başlangıç düzeyindedir. Hacettepe Üniversitesinin bu alanda görece eski bir geleneği olduğu söylenebilir. Prof. Dr. Talat Tekin'in 1972'de Hacettepe Üniversitesinde, doktora düzeyinde başlatmış olduğu Yakutça dersleri kesintisiz olarak bugüne dek sürdürülmüştür. Ayrıca Talat Tekin, elliye yakın akademik yayınında Yakutçaya da geniş yer vermiştir.

Hacettepe'deki bu kırk beş yıllık gelenek, 2012'de Çağdaş Türk Lehçeleri ve Edebiyatları Bölümünün kurulmasıyla biraz daha güçlenmiştir. Bölümün dört araştırma görevlisinden ikisi yüksek lisansını bu alanda yapmıştır ve biri doktora tezini de bu alanda yapmaktadır. Son dört yılda dört kez Yakutistan'da alan araştırması yapmış olan araştırma görevlimiz Hasan Hayırsever, iyi derecede Yakutça bilmektedir.

Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Çağdaş Türk Lehçeleri ve Edebiyatları Bölümü, yılda bir kez düzenlediği bu toplantılarda, doğrudan alan araştırmalarıyla belgelediği Türk dillerine odaklanmaktadır. Alan araştırmalarına dayalı bu toplantı aynı zamanda, Türkiye'de, doğrudan Yakutçaya odaklanmış ilk çalıştaydır. Diğer toplantılarımızda olduğu gibi Yakut çalıştayında da alanın, zaten az sayıda olan tüm uzmanlarına katılım çağrısında bulunduk. Kimi araştırmacılar, farklı programları ya da sağlık sorunları nedeniyle katılamadılar. Bu nedenle toplantı Yakutistan Cumhuriyetinden 5, Dolgan-Nenets Özerk Bölgesi'nden 1, Macaristan'dan 1, Hollanda'dan 1, Fransa'dan 1 ve Türkiye'deki üniversitelerden 7 akademisyenin katılımlarıyla gerçekleşmiştir.

Alana yararlı olması dileklerimizle…

Editörlerden

Ankara 2021

2. The Recognition of the Dolgans, Science and Soviet Institutions' Toil[5]

Yann Borjon-Privé

Introduction

My article is on the recognition of the Dolgans as an official nationality in the USSR. Sometimes, scholars consider that the Dolgan people appear between the second half of the 19th century and the 1960's (Borjon-Privé 2011: 13, 87-88; Krivonogov 2013: 870-871). What does it mean? How can a people appear? Are the Dolgan people a creation of Soviet administration? Or were they a forgotten people?

This idea of a late "apparition" is a misunderstanding caused by lack of knowledge of Dolgan history and the Soviet policy of Nation. I have compared in previous works historical and ethnographical data about the past of the Dolgan people (Borjon-Privé 2011; 2014). I have also shown how Dolgan people depict their identity and ipseity in tales and legends. There are two difficulties with the Dolgan history and identity. Firstly, the use of the word "people" may trouble the historiological and ethnological analyses. Cossacks – soldiers of the Russian army – met with Dolgan groups – *rody* – during the winter 1629-1630 (Armon 1977: 16). Secondly, the Russian and Soviet administrations have brought the

[5] This article tells about a work in progress. I would sincerely like to thank the editors for inviting me to write about the Dolgan people and my own research. I would like also to thank my proof-readers for their help and remarks: Beatrice Zani, Jean-Luc Lambert and Siôn Millichip. This paper is dedicated in memory of Marina Nikolaevna Vysockaja (1957-2020) and her family, the first of my lights in Krasnoyarsk.

Dolgan groups or the Dolgan people with their Tungus neighbours – lately called Evenk – because of their past, or with their other Yakut neighbours because of their language.

My article is focused on the recognition of a Dolgan nationality by the Soviet administration. It is not designed to build new borders between the Evenk, the Yakut and Dolgan peoples. I do not look to define an absolute concept of a people's identity or to justify identity assimilations or distinctions. In addition, it is no reject of linguistic or statistic approaches in anthropology. My only aim is to understand and to contribute in explaining how the Dolgan ethnonym disappeared from official lists of peoples and nations in the USSR and finally reappeared after 1960.

Therefore, I purpose to present the Soviet policies that have reorganised the ethnical map in USSR. These policies have assimilated the Dolgan people with the Yakut people. Next, the conditions and the issues of the ethnical identifying need to be examined carefully. Finally, specialists applied the ethnogenetic conception to historical and ethnographical cases so as to tell the difference between the Dolgans and their Yakut neighbours.

1. Scientific commitments and political project

1.1. Multi-ethnical states

The study of the course of official identifying the Dolgan people leads us to autochthonous, scientific, or politic fields, and to their intricate challenges. In Russia, the imperial and the Soviet administrations both seize scientific data or methods for two reasons. First, it was a way to better understand the local characteristics of populations. Second, it was a way to control the territories as much as possible. Wide geographical dimensions constitute an important complexity in Russia, where more than 200 ethnic groups have been enumerated in the Soviet Census of 1926.

The first All-Empire Census was organised in 1897. One aim was to distinguish and classify the population with categories of peoples, tribes

or genetical groups (Patkanov 1911: 16-26). Since the end of the 1850's, a principle is to identify each people based on its language (Miller 2010: 43). In Taimyr peninsula, two Dolgan groups and two Yakut groups are thus distinguished according to ethnographical and historical data (Patkanov 1911: 58-59; 1912: 388-423, 709-842). But a first confusion appears here since the Dolgan groups are assimilated to the Yakut groups on the account of the similarity of their languages (Patkanov 1912: 48, 393). After the Revolution of 1917, the Soviet administration maintains the linguistic criterion in the treatment of its first Arctic and All-Union census. The use of a strict correlation between a linguistic identity and an ethnic identity is the crux of the problem for the recognition of a Dolgan people.

What are the relevant criteria in identifying an ethnic group: auto-affirmation, ethnonym, glossonym, idiom, past, territory, activity, kinship, religion? Each criterion could be pertinent. It depends on a point of view, on a method of comparison and on a context for two main premises in the Russian context. First, the Russian Empire and the USSR were multi-ethnic states. Secondly, both states used of classification in order to distinguish types of ethnic groups: clans, tribes, foreign nomads, gatherers-wanderers, settled autochthonous, peoples, nations, nationalities… Each administration has then looked for a method and criteria that must be relevant to its approach and ideology of human diversity.

1.2. Communist Revolution and diversity

During the Civil War (1917-1923), the Bolsheviks fought with those they called Nationalists. Lenin feared separatisms and autonomies that would weaken the Revolution, the power, and his leadership (Seton-Watson 1977: 312; Hirsch 2005). Finally, the Bolsheviks achieved victory and launched three main nation policies or strategies: creation of the USSR, Cultural Revolution, and ambiguity about Nationalism (Atnachev 2001: 157-158; Bertrand 2002: 45; Cadiot 1997: 607, 611). The challenge was to create a new type of multi-ethnical state, preserving the whole territory and, henceforth, bringing together political leaders and scientific

specialists (Hirsch 2005: 17; Bertrand 2002: 41-42). With these fixed purposes, the Soviet power enhanced "national intelligentsias", which means elites and local specialists who help the administration. These elites and specialists were the agents of the communication between the political centre and the populations. Passing on the Communist ideology, they corresponded to an additional link between the power and the people.

In order to preserve its leadership during the Civil War, the Soviet power first carried out an anti-nationalist policy and created the USSR in 1922. The Russian Imperial State has already used of a such coercive strategy (Seton-Watson 1977: 86; Kappeler 1994: 221-222; Miller 2010: 48). In 1923, Stalin became the People's Commissar for Nationalities. He renewed the political use of the Nation concept according to Marxist thought in stages and evolution. His project was to create Socialist nations. In 1925, the Soviet leader affirmed that the nationalist contents of nations must be cleared and be replaced with a socialist content (Bertrand 2002: 44; Martin 2001: 219). Stalin thus played with the concept of Nation and the Communist ideology.

1.3. Some involvement of human and social sciences

Therefore, the policy system was built to achieve a Sovietisation of the nations and an "enlightenment" of the masses by schools, propaganda, and cultural bases. In this way, local intelligentsias were involved in that institutions to train members of the new elites. The power supported too scholars working on the elaboration of similar tools for each nation.

A well-known case of their toils is the creation of alphabets. Since the middle of the 19th century, German and Russian linguists worked on the transcription of the Old Turkish – runic – alphabet and on the creation of a Yakut alphabet. Missionaries tried also to create local Siberian alphabets. Adaptations of the Cyrillic and Latin alphabets appeared in several Siberian regions. Uses and new works on these alphabets were locally driven until the Soviet Revolution (Ŝerba 1912: 3-5). In 1922, linguists had anew worked on this new project for four years with some efficiency (Nazirov 1928: 21). In 1926, the Soviet power supported the

Pan-Union Central Committee for the New Turkic Alphabet. This new institution took back the old ecclesial project in order to create official new adapted alphabets for each people (Aliev et alii 1931-a: 227-228). In that way, a United Northern Alphabet was created for linguistic minorities of the North and Siberia, and there was another project of New Turkic Alphabet for Turkic languages in USSR.

More than the project of alphabets, cooperation between the administration and scholars is important because another Soviet policy was to reduce the number of ethnonyms in the official list of nationalities in the USSR in order to simplify the administrative action on the whole Soviet territory. Statisticians, ethnographers, and historians had then been involved in this simplification. For example, some Arctic and Siberian areas' specialists also got together in a new institution called Committee of the North, created in 1924. This institution oversaw the care for minorities living in Siberia and Northern Russia. More generally, a kind of dialog appeared between political leaders, administrators, linguists, and ethnographers. The Soviet power supported or created new institutions that it made responsible for the identifying and educational projects.

2. The Dolgans and the course of identifying

2.1. Ideology, concept and interdisciplinarity

The disappearance of the Dolgan ethnonym begins here, in the context and the Soviet reforms of the 1920's. This disappearance results of the administrative policy of ethnical simplification and depends on scientific analyses. The Dolgan people have been assimilated as Yakut people because of the high similarity and the relatedness of their languages. The links between both languages are known since the linguistical analyses of the Finnish Matthias Alexander Castrén and of the German Otto Nikolaus Böhtlingk published in 1846 and 1848, respectively.

How to understand that relatedness? One hypothesis is that Dolgan groups have borrowed a Yakut idiom. Another is that some Yakut people

have been assimilated by Dolgan people. But these Yakuts would have kept their own idiom. From a historiographic outlook, the Dolgan ethnonym is used during the 17th century in designing a group of Tungus speakers in Central Yakutia (Baḫrušin & Tokarev 1953: 31, 36; Müller 2005: 64, 210-211). Later, these groups migrate East to the Kamchatka peninsula and North to the Taimyr peninsula (Borjon-Privé 2011). Since the 19th century and according to the quoted linguistic analyses, the Dolgan name finally refers in Taimyr to groups of Yakut speakers. Nowadays in the same region, the majority of Dolgans are Russian speakers. The number of bilingual speakers is going down.

Here is the difficulty for non-linguistic specialists in identifying and naming an object. It seems that we underestimate the inertia of a name and the evolutional potential of it sense, according to the objects known under this name and to their description or characterisation. Similarly, the use of ethnonyms may neutralize the ideas of Darwin's principles of evolutional distinction and self-formulation. The use of an ethnonym can hide the historical dimension. In anthropology, this illusion is called "ethnographical present". Thus, a Yakut idiom borrowed by a Dolgan people could be different in Taimyr from a Yakut idiom in Yakutia. And a Yakut idiom borrowed during the 18th century could be different from a contemporary Yakut idiom. So, the common difficulty for linguists, ethnographers and non-specialists is to know the thin nuances or principles that could justify – or not – an assimilation between Dolgan and Yakut peoples.

2.2. How to set (administrative) assimilation?

Soviet specialists sometimes have disdained for such methodological thinness in order to be in harmony with the political ideology. In 1926, the first All-Union Census took place. In 1927, ethnographers and demographers have analysed the gathered data and counted 146 ethnonyms. Since 1917, several Soviet institutions work on an All-Union list of ethnonyms. Between 1925 and 1929, the Committee of the North published two lists of 37 and 38 ethnonyms of Siberian peoples, including the Dolgan ethnonym (Smidovič et alii 1925: 121; Ekunidze &

Kalinin & Kamenev 1926: 86; [Sine nomine] 1929: 117). But in December 1930, the influent linguist and ethnographer Jan Petrovič Al'kor provided a new list of 13 ethnonyms during a meeting with the Central Committee of the New Alphabet (Aliev et alii 1931-b: 221). The simplification policy was applied by specialists and administrators who worked by assimilation to create a new ethno-linguistic map of Siberia and Northern Russia (Dolgiḫ & Gardanov & Ždanko 1961: 12). For example, that map would serve for the creation of new educative, social and communicational tools.

Before Al'kor and among numerous scientists working on the list of official ethnonyms, the Bolshevik activist Karl Janovič Luks published the aims and rules of this project of a new map in USSR. He was already involved in ethnonymic changes in Eastern Siberia. According to his approach, he rejected the used of "injurious nicknames", "geographical deviation[s]", or "artificial, invented names" (Luks 1930-a: 100). He advocated in an article the use of autonyms – selves-designations, which would be distinguished "between the walls of the Institute of the Peoples of the North" and "checked by the Committee of the North" (idem: 101).

This work joined the general project which the main aim was to renew the identification and the typology of the ethno-linguistic diversity in the USSR. In an other article from 1929-1930, Luks conducted a first and obvious simplification. He assimilated "dialects" in new linguistic ensembles. Next, he used of new ethnonyms in order to identify these different ensembles. Luks carefully indicated the former ethnonym in parenthesis after each new ethnonym. But that principle rested on a confusion between ethnonyms and glossonyms. Moreover, the Luks' typology remained imprecise because it was mainly thought according to Extreme-oriental cases (Luks 1930-b: 41-45). For example, Luks only used of the Dolgan name as an ethnonym what appeared in a demographic table. But he did not analyse the linguistic Dolgan case.

Al'kor – first known as Jakov Petrovič Koškin – took over the study of Luks, to which one he succeeded as rector of the Institute of the Peoples of the North in 1931. This former student of the professor-ethnographer Lev Jakovlevič Šternberg was a specialist of the Tungus

people and language. He mixed at the Committee of the North with political leaders such as the People's Commissar for Education Anatolij Vasil'evič Lunacharskij, and with eminent scholars, such as the professor Vladimir Germanovič Bogoraz-Tan. Taking part in the formal group of "Marxist-Historians" who inflected the sciences in the way of a socialist approach, Al'kor was also part of the Commission of Study of Tribal Composition, whose aim was to define an ethnical map of the USSR (Bertrand 2002: 102, 129-130). His position at the intersection of political, administrative, linguistic, and ethnographic circles gave his simplified list of ethnonyms a characteristic dimension.

We could say that Al'kor is one of the architects who justified – facilitated? – the confusion between Dolgan and Yakut peoples drawn in administrative outlooks after Patkanov – on the 1897's Imperial census – and Luks. He signed the publication of the new maps or ethno-linguistical lists and commented them in several articles. Al'kor looked for a continuity between languages, autonyms – or self-designations – and ethnic groups. Between 1930 and 1932, he increased the work of Luks in order to study the validity of each ethnonym of Siberia and Northern Russia.

As a representative of the Association of Scientific Research at the Institute of peoples of the North, Al'kor displayed in 1932 the results about "the questions of creation of national-literary languages of the North and the questions about the alphabet" (Al'kor & Davydov 1932: 4; Al'kor 1932: 56-57). Since 1930, his method of simplification was clear. Al'kor showed a first list of 28 glossonyms, which the Association changed to 25 new glossonyms. "After an attentive elaboration", the Association next reduced the list to 14 entries. This number was closed to the previous Al'kor's work when he published a list a 13 linguistical entries in 1930 (Al'kor 1931). After the members of a conference about those questions had modified the number of glossonyms, these members adopted the corrected list of Al'kor. Whereas Luks did not renew the Dolgan ethnonym, Al'kor followed another method. In the same article, he first published a list of ethnonyms with an entry "Dolgan (Saḫa)". Next he used of a new glossonym: "Saḫa (Dolgan)".

How to understand the change of the Dolgan name? Al'kor cited the name of the Russian professor-linguist Nikolaj Nikolaevič Poppe in order to justify the shift of the Dolgan glossonym to the Saḫa and Yakut glossonyms (Al'kor 1931: 22). We notice that Poppe published in 1926 a manual about the Yakut grammar (Poppe 1926: 9-12). But he did not write into that book about the Dolgan dialect. Al'kor indicated that Poppe was working about Dolgan language. According to the linguistic bibliographies, it is not clear that Poppe wrote about the Dolgan case before 1959 (Poppe 1959: 671; Ubrjatova 1966: 41; Stachowski 1996: 123; Artem'ev & Nazmutdinova & Spiridonova 2013: 7, 12). Did Al'kor refer to an oral communication from Poppe? Beyond that point, the analysis' methodology is clear. The problems of each dialects had already been solved by an assimilation to the main near language (Al'kor 1931: 22).

The straddling case of the Dolgan identity was cleared by a linguistic point of view. Since the Dolgan people used to speak a Yakut idiom – and since there are Yakut people living in Taimyr – , the Dolgan idiom must be renamed after the Yakut autonym, Saḫa. That shift helped the instruction with manuals in Yakut alphabet along. The Dolgan ethnonym's change was then a consequence of the glossonym's change. With such principles of equation in linguistic, Al'kor and the members of the Institute of the Peoples of the North – through its Association of Scientific Research – divided the number of admitted Northern and Siberian ethnonyms, confirmed the renaming of several peoples. Thus, the scientists took part into the theorical – administrative and scientific – assimilations of different groups or peoples.

2.3. How to enhance or ignore a People?

As a consequence of proposals and corrections about the list of ethnonyms and glossonyms, the number of official – admitted – names varied from an institution to another, from a conference to another, from an article to another, from a science to another. Behind the toil of Al'kor and its colleagues from the Institute of Peoples of the North about glossonyms and education-linguistic project of simplification, their

collective work had an impact in distinguishing new ethnonyms and peoples. The scientists used the equation that specialists of the Imperial state already used: one language, one nation.

However the Al'kor's list was not the only one proposal. The members of the Committee of the North published other ethnonymic lists. Still toward the Dolgan case, we said that the Committee purposed in 1925 and 1929 lists of 37 and 38 entries including the Dolgan ethnonym. The Yakut people were not concerned because they were a majority. Their ethnonym did not appear in the list of the Committee of the North. This institution only cared about minorities. In 1929, the Dolgan ethnonym disappeared from the new Committee's ethnonymic list, whereas an ethnographic and demographic article published by the Committee used of their ethnonym at that time (Terleckij 1930: 6, 18, 28). Can we suggest that it was a theorical alignment to the Al'kor's and Institute of the peoples of the North's proposal?

With an anthropological outlook, the assimilation of Dolgan and Yakut peoples under a same Saḫa ethnonym is fundamentally and literally based on a question of identity. The Dolgan identity has been officially and tacitly fixed as a Saḫa identity in 1931, when the Committee for the New Alphabet corrected the Al'kor's first proposal but published its list of 14 Northern and Siberian ethnonyms without the Dolgan name (Aliev 1931: 3). The Institute of the Peoples of the North had to create a Unified Northern Alphabet for those 14 distinguished linguistic minorities, whereas Dolgan and Yakut languages were concerned by the New Turkic Alphabet. The Scientific Council of the All-Union Central Committee for the New Alphabet had to control and approve each final proposal of alphabet. In 1932, this list was officially adopted by the Central Executive Committee (Onenko 1981: 96). But the Presidium of the Council for Nationalities of the Executive Central Committee of USSR reduced it to 13 nationalities in 1936 and the Presidium of the Executive Central Committee of USSR confirmed this correction in 1937 (Ҕackevič 1937: 109). Thus, the Dolgan name disappeared from the lists of Northern and Siberian linguistic minorities.

In Taimyr, official documents and journals followed that official shift. For example, public and official lessons of "Dolgan language" became lessons of "Saḫa language" (Soveckij Tajmyr 1934-6; 1935-56). For that matter, here is another point of the combined policies of education and nationalities. The scholars sought new alphabets for each official nationality since 1929. Educational manuals and teaching books were published with these alphabets. And young members of the Communist Party, trained to these new programs and tools, taught reading and writing to native peoples.

There are few data about the greeting at that time by native peoples in Taimyr of the ethnonym's shift. Two ethnographers, Popov and Dolgiḫ, published scientific articles about the native peoples of the region. They mostly used the Dolgan ethnonym rather than the Saḫa ethnonym, and besides, they described Yakut people in assimilation with Dolgan people in Taimyr. They also gathered tales and legends, in which ethnonyms sometimes appeared. Native peoples displayed the Dolgan ethnonym in different patterns. According to the depiction, the Dolgan people are a native or Tungus group living in Taimyr next to Yakut, Russian and other native peoples.

So, a gap and a contradiction appeared between the ethnographical facts, the demographical data, the administrative theory, and the politic strategy. On the one hand, the Dolgan people distinguished themselves from Yakut people. This was an identity depiction on ipseity. Next, the Dolgan people affirmed connections with Tungus and Yakuts, but no assimilation. This came under identity in otherness. On the other hand, the political project of simplification was only about identity and it did not take account of local points of view. In order to apply this project, Al'kor and other specialists diverted both linguistical and ethnological sciences. This is a recurrent pitfall in implementing of policy on scientific data. However, some specialists did not follow the Stalinist ideology and his Nation strategy: they gave priority to contemporary fieldwork data.

3. Dolgiḫ and a new Dolgan identity after the 1950's?

3.1. Dolgiḫ and the ethnogenesis

I would like to put some emphasis on the role of Boris Osipovič Dolgiḫ, because he was one of the architects who strove to restore the administrative use of the Dolgan ethnonym. He was a historian and an ethnographer of several native peoples living in Siberia. He took part himself in the 1926's Census. He met with the different native peoples of Taimyr and he analysed the data that he has contributed to gathered. Thus, Dolgiḫ developed and reinforced ethnographical, historical, and statistical knowledge of Siberia. In 1944, the director of the Institute of Ethnography in Moscow, Sergej Pavlovič Tolstov, integrated him to his institution. There, Dolgiḫ finished a monumental thesis about the history and the consequences of the Colonisation of Siberia by the Russian people. Later, he worked on economic data from Siberian kolkhoz and sovkhoz. He finally studied the traditions and spiritual life of the native peoples.

Dolgiḫ published many analyses about – Dolgan and others – peoples of Taimyr peninsula, their economy, and their past. Thus, the notion of Ethnogenesis appeared frequently in his works, suitable for his articulation of ethnographical and historical analyses. Ethnogenesis is based on evolution in order to explain the appearance of ethnical groups (Dolgiḫ 1952: 55-56; Vasil'ev 1990: 33; Bertrand 2002: 229-234, 238). The notion was compatible with the Marxist and Stalinist ideologies and became a classical concept in Soviet ethnography, allowing the Soviet administration to map and to classify the ethnic diversity.

Besides, Dolgiḫ paid attention to an ethical application of the scientific concepts and to the idea of ipseity – the characteristics identifying a person herself. His works showed disagreements with the ethno-linguistical simplification made 20 years earlier by the different Committees and Councils in Moscow and Leningrad. Then, after Stalin died in 1953, Dolgiḫ and other scholars from the Institute of Ethnography rebuilt the ethnographical discipline. It was the time of numerous reforms by Khrushchev in USSR (Bertrand 2008: 244-245). Thus, ethnographers

could work more on ethnogenesis as well as on family and spiritual life, material culture and economy. This wide project was authorized by the 21st and 22nd Communist Congresses (1959; 1961), what described it a "serious improvement" in the knowledge of ethnic processes and of a condition of "socialist nations" in their way to a "whole Soviet people" (Ivaŝenko 1960: 2-3; [Sine nomine] 1961: 5-6).

3.2. New analyses between censuses

Throughout the 1950's, the Dolgan ethnonym remained unrecognized in official documents. According to speeches I have gathered between 2009 and 2017, Dolgan speakers in Taimyr passports delivered with the mention of the Saḫa nationality until the 1960's. Socio-economical and political data registered in sovkhoz and kolkhoz archives show a majority of cases with the Saḫa ethnonym until 1962-1963, sometimes 1967 (Municipal'noe kazënnoe učreždenie – Tajmyrskij arḫiv: f. 47, op. 3, d. 6, 56; f. 49, op. 1, d. 1, 13, 23, 25, 28-29, 37). During a set of ethnographical missions with students and colleagues in Taimyr, Dolgiḫ was marked by the fact of gap in ethnonymic uses (Dolgiḫ 1959: 2). Local administrations used of the Saḫa ethnonym, whereas the local people frequently kept a Dolgan self-designation. Other young ethnographers who worked with Dolgiḫ, such as Viktor Aleksandrovič Tugolukov, Jurij Borisovič Simčenko, and Vladimir Ivanovič Vasil'ev, noted it too (Vasil'ev 1959: 2).

Then Dolgiḫ published several works and commentaries about the Dolgan and Yakut identities (1959; 1963; 1964). He exploited historical data to show the migrations of Dolgan, Tungus and Yakut families or groups from Yakutia to the Taimyr since the 17th century. He also published a dexterous and clever lesson about it in the Taimyr official journal, in order to call for an official renewing of the native ethnonyms in Taimyr (1959).

His disagreement was a reaction to the choices of his elders and to the Soviet Nation policy. His position reaffirmed that of Terleckij, an ethnographer and demographer who had published the USSR ethnic map in 1932, according to the 1926's Census. Terleckij already disagreed with

the works of Al'kor, who he met in several committees. Dolgiḫ and Terleckij's position was also agreed with by the director Tolstov, who incorporated Dolgiḫ at the Institute of Ethnography in Moscow.

3.3. Reaction to inconsistencies

In the context of reforms in the USSR after Stalin, a new census was organized in 1959. The last authorized census had been organized in 1939: inconsistencies had been caused by the content of the official list of ethnonyms and by the methods of data gathering and analysis. Then, Sergej Pavlovič Tolstov, Petr Evgen'evič Terleckij and Pavel Ivanovič Kušner, another ethnographer, cooperated with the Central Division of Statistics, the institution in charge of the 1926's, 1939's and 1959's censuses. They promoted a new list of ethnonyms before the 1959's census (Kušner & Terleckij & Tolstov 1958). They reintroduced the Dolgan ethnonym and rejected the use of the Saḫa ethnonym, because, according to Terleckij and Kušner, a language or a specific alphabet cannot justify any assimilation, and it is a source of confusion that ignores millions of peoples (Kušner 1950: 3, 8; 1951: 64). Both scientists tacitly affirmed that an assimilation is a subjective identification what must be confirmed by objective method and data. The trio wrote: "Dolgany […] Autonym – dolgan, dulgan. The term *saḫa* is the Yakut autonym, assigned to the Dolgans, is incorrect and leads only to confusion" (Kušner & Terleckij & Tolstov 1958: 27).

Data gathered by census-takers of the Central Division of Statistics have confirmed most of ethnonyms promoted by Tolstov, Terleckij and Kušner. But in their first reports published between 1959 and 1962, the Division's analysts rejected newly recognised ethnonyms. Moreover, they substituted in Taimyr the Saḫa ethnonym by the Yakut ethnonym but not by the Dolgan ethnonym. In 1963, Dolgiḫ published a study of the Dolgan ethnogenesis in the Institute of Ethnography review as a response to those new lists. He rejected the Saḫa-Yakut ethnonyms anew for Dolgan cases (1963: 105-106). The census data gathered in Taimyr confirmed that a Dolgan ethnonym was still used by local people.

However, according to the Taimyr official economical and administration books I have already mentioned, there was few shifts of ethnonyms before 1962. These books were compiled by secretaries of kolkhoz and sovkhoz, in each village where they worked and lived within the local population. How to explain the differences appearing from one secretary to another, one year to the next or one village to another: did they hesitate between applying official ethnonyms and using of local ethnonyms? Was it the sign of global lag in changing and applying administrative norms?

A last key to the official distinction between Dolgan and Yakut peoples happens in 1964 when Arkadij Aleksandrovič Isupov, a demographer-statistician of the Division of Statistics, confirmed the list of the Institute of Ethnography. Some historians observed that the method and analyses used by Isupov were like the method and analyses used by the leaders of the Institute of Ethnography (Silver 1986: 84; Hirsch 2005: 320-321). Isupov also considered that the official list of nationalities had to be renewed according to the 1926's census and data gathered before changes of ethnonyms and glossonyms in the 1930's. The Dolgan ethnonym appeared in his treatment and commentaries about the census data. Finally, the next census happened in 1970: the Dolgan ethnonym has been discussed (Bruk & Kozlov 1967: 9; Oreḫov et alii 1973: 10). But it was well used and confirmed the change in administrative documentation observed during the 1960's in Taimyr. At that time too, the people living in the Anabar district of Yakutia began to officially affirm themselves as part of the Dolgan people.

4. Conclusion

The aim of this article was to show how people, scholars and political institutions can cooperate and what successes or failures can then occur. This was not critical of interdisciplinary cooperation but rather focussed on the course of the official identifying of the Dolgan identity. It is a historical and anthropological case what shows some relationship to the science and its effect in acknowledging a people. I

could also go into the details of the Soviet conception of people, nation, or nationality. Or I could work about the rationales and challenges of Marxism, of the theory of Ethnos or of the Native policy and the enhancement of native cultures since the 1920's. But it would have been too ambitious in a brief article. My study was only an attempt at investigating the mistakes in some crossovers between linguistic, ethnography and demography, and their consequences on local peoples in some highly-politized Soviet contexts.

Bibliography

[Sine nomine] 1929. Osvoboždenie ot voennoj služby malyḫ narodnostej Severa. (Severnaja Azija, 1) Moskva: Mospoligraf, Obŝestvo izučenija Urala, Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka, Komitet sodejstvija narodnostjam severnyḫ okrain pri VCIK, Glavnoe upravlenie naučnym učreždenijami (Glavnauka). 117.

[Sine nomine] 1961. Navstreču XXII S-ezdu Kommunističeskoj Partii Sovetskoj Sojuza. Sovetskaja ètnografija nakanune XXII S-ezda KPSS. (Sovetskaja ètnografija. Žurnal osnovan v 1926 godu, 4 – Iûl'-Avgust) Moskva: Akademija Nauk SSSR. 3-8.

Al'kor, Jan Petrovič 1931. Pis'mennost' narodov Severa. *Kul'tura i Pis'mennost' Vostoka* 10. Moskva: Izdanie Vsesojuznogo Central'nogo Komiteta Novogo Alfavita. 12-31.

Al'kor, Jan Petrovič & Davydov, I. D. 1932. Ot redakcii. In: *Materialy I Vserossijskoj konferencii po razvitiju jazykov i pis'mennosti narodov Severa*. Moskva/Leningrad: Učpedgiz. 3-7.

Aliev, Umar 1931. Na fronte latinizacii pered V Plenumom VCK-NA. *Kul'tura i Pis'mennost' Vostoka* 9. Moskva: Izdanie Vsesojuznogo Central'nogo Komiteta Novogo Alfavita. 3-10.

Aliev, Umar et alii 1931-a. Rezoljucii Konferencii [mongol'skoj gruppy narodov po voprosam pis'mennosti i jazyka]. *Kul'tura i Pis'mennost' Vostoka* 9. Moskva: Izdanie Vsesojuznogo Central'nogo Komiteta Novogo Alfavita. 69-77.

Aliev, Umar et alii 1931-b. Na fronte Latinizacii pis'mennosti narodov SSSR. V Naučnom Sovete. In : *Kul'tura i Pis'mennost' Vostoka* 7-8. Moskva: Izdanie Vsesojuznogo Central'nogo Komiteta Novogo Alfavita. 219-223.

Armon, Witold 1977. *Polsczy badacze kultury Jakutów*. (Monografie z dziejów nauki i techniki 112) Wrocław: Zakład Narodowych im. Ossolińskich.

Artem'ev, Nikolaj Matveevič & Nazmutdinova, Tat'jana Stanislavovna & Spiridonova, Žanna Prokop'evna 2013. *Dolganskij jazyk. 10-11 Klassy; Čast' 3 - Sintaksis.* Sankt-Peterburg: Almaz-Graf.

Atnachev, Timour 2001. Les nouvelles frontières de la civilisation russe. In: *Raisons politiques* 2001 2(2). 153-173.

Baḫrušin, Sergej Vladimirovič & Tokarev, Sergej Aleksandrovič 1953. *Jakutija v XVII veke. (Očerki)*. Jakutsk: Jakutskoe Knižnoe Izdatel'stvo.

Bertrand, Frédéric 2002. *L'anthropologie soviétique des années 20-30. Configuration d'une rupture*. (collection Études culturelles, 3) Bordeaux: Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux.

Bertrand, Frédéric 2008. Penser et panser la société. Défis et perspectives de l'anthropologie russe postsoviétique (note de recherche). *Anthropologie et Sociétés* 32/1-2, 241-252.

Borjon-Privé, Yann 2011. *Représentations et mise en valeur du passé chez les Dolganes. Du XVII^e siècle aux années 1930*. [MD. dissertation, École pratique des hautes études, Paris].

Böhtlingk, Otto Nikolaus von 1848. *Über die Sprache der Jakuten. 1 - Einleitung. Jakutischer Tekst. Jakutische Grammatik*. (Reise in den äussersten Norden und Osten Sibiriens, 3) Sankt-Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Bruk, Solomon Il'ič & Kozlov, Viktor Ivanovič 1967. Ètnografičeskaja nauka i perepis' naselenija 1970 goda. *Sovetskaja ètnografija* 5, 3-20.

Cadiot, Juliette 1997. Les relations entre le centre et les régions en URSS à travers les débats sur les nationalités dans le recensement de 1926. *Cahiers du monde russe: Russie, Empire russe, Union soviétique, États indépendants,* 38(4), 601-616.

Cadiot, Juliette 2007. Le laboratoire impérial. Russie-URSS, 1870-1940. *Cahiers du monde russe: Russie, Empire russe, Union soviétique, États indépendants,* 49(4), 810-812.

Castrén, Matthias Alexander 1856. *Reiseberichte und Briefe aus den Jahren 1845-1849*. Sankt-Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Dolgiḫ, Boris Osipovič 1952. O nekotoryḫ ètnogenetičeskiḫ processaḫ (pereselenijaḫ narodov i raspostranenii jazykov) v severnoj Sibiri. *Sovetskaja ètnografija* 1952(1), 51-59.

Dolgiḫ, Boris Osipovič 1959. Korennoe naselenie tajmyrskogo nacional'nogo okruga i ego nazvanija. *Sovetskij Tajmyr* 83(3827), 2.

Dolgiḫ, Boris Osipovič 1963. Proisḫoždenie dolgan. In: *Sibirskij ètnografičeskij sbornik* V. Moskva. 92-141.

Dolgiҕ, Boris Osipovič 1964. Problemy ètnografii i antropologii Arktiki. *Sovetskaja ètnografija* 1964(4), 76-90.

Dolgiҕ, Boris Osipovič & Gardanov, Valentin Konstantinovič & Ždanko, Tatiana Aleksandrovna 1961. Osnovnye napravlenija ètničeskiҕ processov u narodov SSSR. Sovetskaja ètnografija 1961(4). Moskva: 9-29.

Ekunidze, Avel Safronovič & Kalinin, Miҕail Ivanovič & Kamenev, Lev Borisovič 1926. O nalogovyҕ l'gotaҕ plemenaҕ, naseljajuŝim severnye okrainy SSSR (Postanovlenie CIK i SNK SSSR). *Severnaja Azija* 2. Moskva: 86.

Hirsch, Francine 2005. *Empire of Nations. Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union*. (Culture & Society after Socialism, 5). Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.

Ҕackevič, Aleksandr Isakovič 1937. Postanovlenie Prezidiuma CIK Sojuza SSR. Ot 7 Marta 1937 goda. *Sovetskaja Arktika* 1937(6), 109-110.

Isupov, Arkadij Aleksandrovič 1964. *Nacional'nyj sostav naselenija SSSR. Po itogam perepisi 1959 g*. Moskva: Statistika.

Ivaŝenko, O. 1960. Puti pod-ema ҕozjajstva i kul'tury narodnostej Severa. *Sovetskij Tajmyr* 22(3918), 2-3.

Kappeler, Andreas 1994. *La Russie. Empire multiethnique*. Trad. Guy Imart. Paris: Institut d'études slaves.

Krivonogov, Viktor Pavlovič 2013. The Dolgans' Ethnic Identity and Language Processes. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences* 6 (2013, 6), 870-881.

Kušner, Pavel Ivanovič 1950. O metodaҕ opredelenija ètničeskogo sostava naselenija v polose ètničeskiҕ granic (Predvaritel'noe soobŝenie). *KSIÈ AN SSSR* 11, 3-9.

Kušner, Pavel Ivanovič 1951. *Ètničeskie territorii i ètničeskie granicy*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Kušner, Pavel Ivanovič & Terleckij, Petr Evgen'evič (reds.) & Tolstov, Sergej Pavlovič (dirs.) 1958. *Narody SSSR. Kratkij spravočnik*. Moskva/Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Luks, Karl Janovič 1930-a. O nazvanijaҕ tuzemnyҕ narodnostej Severa. *Sovetskij sever* 2, 99-101.

Luks, Karl Janovič 1930-b. Problema pis'mennosti u tuzemnyҕ narodostej Severa. *Sovetskij sever* 1, 38-47.

Martin, Terry Dean 2001. An Affirmative Action Empire: The Soviet Union as the Highest Form of Imperialism. In: Martin, Terry Dean & Suny, Ronald

Grigor (dirs.) *A State of Nations. Empire and Nation-Making in the Age of Lenin and Stalin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 67-90.

Miller, Aleksej Il'ič 2010. Identité et allégeance dans la politique linguistique de l'Empire russe dans les territoires périphériques occidentaux au cours de la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle. In: Cadiot, Juliette & Arel, Dominique & Zakharova, Larissa (dirs.) *Cacophonies d'empire. Le gouvernement des langues dans l'Empire russe et l'Union soviétique*. Paris: CNRS Editions. 37-59.

Müller, Gerhard Friedrich 2005. *Istorija Sibiri 3*. Moskva: Vostočnaja Literatura.

Nazirov, Ju. 1928. Provedenie Novogo Tjurkskogo Alfavita v SSSR i bližajšie perspektivy. *Kul'tura i Pis'mennost' Vostoka* 1. Moskva: Centrizdat Narodov SSSR. 11-33.

Onenko, Sulungu Nikolaevič 1981. Sozdanie i razvitie nanajskoj pis'mennosti. In: *Pis'mennost' narodov Sibiri. Istorija i perspektivy* (*Sbornik naučnyḫ trudov*). Novossibirsk. 96-101.

Oreḫov, K. A. et alii 1973. *Itogi Vsesojuznoj Perepisi naselenija 1970 goda 4, Nacional'nyj sostav naselenija SSSR, Sojuznyḫ i Avtonomnyḫ Respublik, Kraev, Oblastej i Nacional'nyḫ Okrugov*. Moskva: Statistika.

Patkanov, Serafim Keropovič 1911. *O priroste inorodčeskago naselenija Sibiri. Statističeskie materialy dlja osveŝenija voprosa o vymiranii pervobytnyḫ plemen. Predstavleno v zasidanie Istoriko-Filologičeskago Otdelenija 10 marta 1910 g*. Sankt-Peterburg: Imperatorskaja Akademija Nauk.

Patkanov, Serafim Keropovič 1912. *Statističeskija dannyja, pokazyvajuŝija plemennoj sostav naselenija Sibiri, jazyk i rody inorodcev. Na osnovanii dannyḫ special'noj razrabotki materiala perepisi 1897 g.* (Zapiski 1-3). Sankt-Peterburg: Imperatorskoe Russkoe Geografičeskoe Obŝestvo.

Poppe, Nikolaj Nikolaevič 1926. *Učebnaja grammatika jakutskogo jazyka*. Moskva: Centrizdat.

Poppe, Nikolaus 1959. Das Jakutische. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis: Steiner. 671-684.

Seton-Watson, Hugh 1977. *Nations and States. An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism*. London: Methuen.

Silver, Brian D. 1986. The Ethnic and Language Dimensions in Russian and Soviet Censuses. In: Clem, Ralph Scott (ed.) 1986. *Research Guide to the Russian and Soviet Censuses*. (Studies in Soviet History and Society, 2.) Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press. 70-97.

Smidovič, Pëtr Germanovič et alii 1925. V Komitete Severa pri Prezidiume VCIK. (Severnaja Azija, 3) Moskva: Mospoligraf, Obŝestvo izučenija Urala, Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka, Komitet sodejstvija narodnostjam severnyḫ okrain pri VCIK. 104-122.

Soveckij Tajmyr 1934-6: (Dudinka, Organ Tajmyrskogo okružnogo i Dudinskogo gorodskogo komitetov KPSS, okružnogo i gorodskogo Sovetov deputatov trudjaŝiḫsja).

Soveckij Tajmyr 1935-56 (Dudinka, Organ Tajmyrskogo okružnogo i Dudinskogo gorodskogo komitetov KPSS, okružnogo i gorodskogo Sovetov deputatov trudjaŝiḫsja).

Stachowski, Marek 1996. Über das Alter des dolganischen Sprache. *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 6, 123-130.

Ŝerba, Lev Vladimirovič 1912. K voprosu o transkripcii. (Doklad'', čitannyj v'' zasedanii lingvističeskoj sekcii Spb. Neofilologičeskago Obŝestva 11. Maja 1911 g.). Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiya Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk.

Ubrjatova, Elizaveta Ivanovna 1966. O jazyke Dolgan. In: Avrorin, Valentin Aleksandrovič (ed.) 1966. *Jazyki i fol'klor narodov sibirskogo Severa*. Moskva/Leningrad: Nauka, Akademija Nauk SSSR. 41-68.

Vasil'ev, Vladimir Ivanovič 1959. Ètnografičeskie raboty na Tajmyre. *Sovetskij Tajmyr* 118(3862), 2.

Vasil'ev, Vladimir Ivanovič 1990. Teoretičeskie i istočnikovedčeskie problemy izučenija ètničeskoj istorii. Na materialaḫ narodov Severa SSSR. Sovetskaja ètnografija 1990(6), 33-41.