

The main holders of the collective memory of the “Second Baptism of Russia” under the Nazis remained those Orthodox priests who returned to service during the war or came to the church as young parishioners. They, as well as the population of the previously occupied territories, carried this memory until the beginning of the 1990s and then began to revive it in the wider consciousness of the Russian citizens. A kind of rehabilitation of the very phenomenon of religious rebirth under the Nazis and of those who participated in it took place with a large support from Patriarch Alexy II. With his death in 2008, a reverse process began: a new amnesia of memory, a step back towards the construction of a new myth – about the “Orthodox” Red Army and its marshals and generals. In this context, there is definitely no place in the modern Russian collective memory for remembering the religious revival under the Nazis.

---

## **Native language as the basis of national identity: the case of Russian indigenous peoples of the North**

**Evelina Peshina**

*Dr. oec., Institute of Philosophy and Law of Ural Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences, Ekaterinburg, Russia*

As of 2020, the key document regulating the issues of Russian Indigenous Peoples of the North is the Common List adopted in 2000 and including 47 peoples. In 2006, 40 minor indigenous peoples of the North (MIPN) were identified. Based on the current List of MIPN and on six official censuses conducted from 1959 to 2010, the identification of MIPN was analyzed according to the two parameters agreed upon by the academic community:

1. population growth rate;
2. good command of native language.

During 1959–2010, the population of MIPN increased by 60% with a variety of trends for 40 MIPN, which is attributed not only to the birth rate, but also to the special rights introduced for them in 1999.

In general, the population of those MIPN who claimed to speak their national language as native (in the total number of population) was in a decline: 73% in 1959; 66% in 1970; 61% in 1979; 53% in 1989; in 2002 there was no question about the native language in the census; and 34% in 2010. In the course of 50 years, the decline was 39% in relative terms. For the period of 1959–2010, critical negative dynamics of the population numbers was observed in Veps (– 63%), Chuvans (– 28%), and Orochs (– 23%); and the numbers of people speaking their national language as their native language in negative dynamics was: Orochs – 99.6%, Chuvans – 80%, and Veps – 78%. According to the 2010 census, nearly 50% of MIPN viewed Russian as their native language.

We analyze the main reasons behind the ethnic re-identification of MIPN, as well as recommendations on the nine criteria of UNESCO “Language Vitality and Endangerment”, which makes it urgent for the Russian government to ratify the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages.

---

## **Discursive form of identity of the Russian-speaking youth in Latvia**

**Vladislav Volkov**

*Dr. sc. soc., Institute of Philosophy and Sociology,  
University of Latvia, Rīga, Latvia*

Discursivity is the most important way of existence of the ethnic identity. The need for discursivity is rooted in the desire of the individual to emphasize the need to recognize their identity, their Self, in interaction with other social actors, and to emphasize the issues of identity as more significant than immediate problems. At the same time, discursivity becomes a space for a stable self-categorization of the personality with the characteristics of the ethnic group. The methodological basis of this paper is a combination of elements from the theory of discourse (Foucault, Mouffe, Laclau), the theory of categorization and self-categorization (Tajfel, Turner), and the theory of actualization of the collective identity