

Soviet reflections: Music, nostalgia and personhood among (post-)Soviet immigrants in America¹

AMY GAREY

ABSTRACT

Drawing on data from Soviet-era folk song festivals in the midwestern United States, this article argues that Soviet nostalgia is a practice directed towards constructions of history as well as personally experienced pasts. The objects of nostalgia at these events are not songs, material goods or even, necessarily, the past. Instead, nostalgia gets expressed for representations of Soviet time and space. At these festivals, people are neither here (America) nor there (the Soviet Union) and are neither Americans nor Soviets. The bounds of an intermediate identity space, “Russian,” get hammered out in the way (post-)Soviet immigrants discuss Americans, Russians and Soviets. Discourse analysis of conversation at and about these festivals illustrates the semiotic mechanisms of nostalgia, speaking to relationships between history and memory, society and the individual, and tradition and change.

Introduction

People were singing Soviet-era songs around campfires, flying the hammer and sickle, and wearing jackets lettered with *СССР*. But we were not in Cold War Russia; this happened in Wisconsin, in 2006, at a gathering of over three hundred Russian speakers. Some people drove hundreds of miles to attend this festival in the forest, stuffing their cars with tents, guitars, dogs and children. Groups in America, Australia, Canada, Israel, France and many post-Soviet states hold campouts like these. Such

organizations, called KSP (*Klub samodeiatel'noi pesni*, or Club of Amateur Song), began in the Soviet Union as a way to perform music not sanctioned by the state. Now, of course, immigrants do not need to escape to the wilds of Wisconsin to sing no-longer-subversive songs. What draws people to these events? Further, why would a largely Jewish pool of immigrants invoke the symbols of a regime many made great sacrifices to flee?

Perhaps they are nostalgic for KSP festivals of their youth. But while some participants were active in the *samodeiatel'naia pesnia* movement in the USSR, others learned songs sung at campouts only after immigrating to the United States. At first glance, it seems that people miss something they never experienced. Most definitions of nostalgia require that it involve memories of a past that is irretrievably gone (Davis, 1979). How can immigrants feel nostalgia, though, without the accompanying memories? KSP thus presents twin paradoxes: why would Eastern Europeans long either for an event that has lost its political resonance or for songs never before sung?

KSP becomes less mysterious if one delinks memory and nostalgia. As the ubiquity of campy 1950s movie posters in twenty-first century dorm rooms proves, nostalgia is as often for an imagined history as for personal experience (Wilson, 2005).² In fact, Svetlana Boym defines nostalgia as "...a longing for a home that no longer exists *or has never existed*" (2001:xiii; emphasis added). The objects of nostalgia at KSP are not songs, material goods or even, necessarily, the past (cf. Stewart, 1988). Instead, participants levy nostalgia at representations of Soviet time and space—"chronotopes" in Bakhtin's (2004:84) sense of a time-space-person amalgam. Anyone can voice nostalgia for a chronotopic representation, even if they never lived in the Soviet Union. While personal memories are nearly always part of nostalgic reflections, I wish to interrogate how nostalgic discourses reproduce tradition in ways that are not bound by actual recollection (which is often mis-remembered, anyway). Nostalgia as an emotion, as a practice and as a semiotic construct functions to keep a Soviet cosmology alive for immigrants and their children alike, on the periphery of the Soviet imagined community (Anderson, 2006).

KSP campouts in America provide a unique contrast to Soviet nostalgia in other sites, as they establish that even nostalgia mediated by the "same" objects—the hammer and sickle, Soviet-era songs, Soviet military paraphernalia—varies depending on the context in which it is expressed. Soviet-bloc emigres in the United States live in very different structural conditions than do those undergoing political and economic transition in post-Soviet nation states, and, thus, are generally excluded from analyses of socialist nostalgia. Maria Todorova argues that socialist nostalgia expresses one of two sentiments: (1) a critique of the post-socialist present or (2) "disappointment, social exhaustion, economic recategorization, generational fatigue, and quest for dignity..." (2010:7). The diaspora, though, does not have to manage the disappointments of

revolution, and all of the immigrants I spoke with were better off, materially, than they had been in the USSR. Interestingly, however, nostalgic discourses were still used to critique present circumstances. In the midwestern US, KSP participants mobilized an idealized socialist past to criticize American consumerism.

To illustrate how “Russians” in America engage with socialist nostalgia, I sketch the history of the KSP movement, describe how chronotopes were discursively constructed by immigrants at campouts in the midwestern US, and show how both ironic voicing and wistful framing of the past deployed the language of the Soviet state in order to disassociate from it.³ Finally, I demonstrate how casting the Soviet nostalgia of immigrants in terms of chronotopes resolves overlapping categories of nostalgia. Discourse analysis of conversation at and about these festivals illustrates the semiotic mechanisms of nostalgia, speaking to relationships between history and memory, society and the individual, and tradition and change.

Unbreakable union

“I can walk by myself,” slurred a man to three other campers, leaning against a tree even as he pleaded sobriety. One of the men looped his arm through that of his inebriated friend to help him stand, then the other two linked up as well. As the four men marched arm-in-arm and out-of-step down a road leading to a campsite, they began singing the unmistakable strains of the Hymn of the Soviet Union (*Gimn Sovetskogo Soiuza*) “*Soiuz nerushimi...*” (“Unbreakable union...”). All four wore headlamps, and the beams of light bobbing among the trees made them look like displaced miners. It was a surreal scene in a state park more commonly overrun with Boy Scouts.

Though the lyrics evoked Soviet propaganda, the interactional meaning of the song was more satire than serious that night in Wisconsin. The men distanced themselves from the hymn’s lyrics via irony, which is one of the ways symbols once considered “political” have changed in their American instantiations. As Konstantin Tarasov asked about the future of amateur song after Communism, “What makes up the framework of a genre that has stopped being an alternative?” (2001:10). The rest of this essay addresses that question.

KSP Midwest and Bard-Klub Midwest are organizations of Russian-speaking immigrants who hold concerts and campouts in Illinois and Wisconsin. Bard-Klub Midwest was founded in 2003, and KSP Midwest began holding campouts in 2005. Each organization runs two campouts per year, one in the spring and one in the fall, for a total of four annual festivals for the Illinois and Wisconsin regions. My data include recorded interviews with KSP participants and field notes from campouts in September 2006, April 2007 and September 2007. I attended the events with

acquaintances and secured interviews both among these people and others that I met at the campouts.⁴ Most of the people that I spoke with were Jewish, in their thirties or forties, and had immigrated to the United States with their parents after the US Congress passed the Jackson-Vanik amendment in 1974.

The number of attendees at midwest campouts ranges from 200 to 600. Events last three days, with most people arriving on Friday evening and leaving on Sunday. I arrived at my first event on the Friday evening before my birthday, on September 15, 2006. Knowing that it was my birthday weekend and that I was studying Russian culture, a friend invited me to tag along with him and his girlfriend. I had not known what to expect, exactly, so the sight of hundreds of Russian speakers singing, eating and partying in a Wisconsin campground took me by surprise. Children laughed and played. Men grilled shashlik. During the day people hiked, played cards and snacked. Nights, though, were reserved for music. The key event of the weekend was a concert on Saturday night, but jam sessions around the campfire lasted until dawn on Friday and Saturday. Anyone who signed up could sing in the concerts, and while informants ruefully wished for one, there was no audition process. During the concert, which lasted around three hours, people sat in lawn chairs or crouched on fallen logs.

At a campout I attended later, in 2007, the smells of pine, beer and roasted meat wafted through the campgrounds. The air went from crisp to biting as the evening wore on, and people jockeyed for spots near fires. Men who had earlier in the evening worn blue-and-white striped Soviet Navy t-shirts (*tel'niashki*) put on sweatshirts and black leather jackets. After the concert people hung out around campfires, either sticking with groups of friends or following particular artists from the concert. The singing lasted until dawn. Drinking didn't even stop at sunrise.

Most attendees were young professionals, most married, many with children nearby. That said, the vodka flowed freely, singing got loud, and at one campout police were called (by "Americans," clearly). My position as an American in a sea of Slavs was odd and conspicuous. At my first *slet* (KSP campout),⁵ I told people that I'd come with Vasilii and Liuba, and everyone seemed fine with that. At two subsequent events, after I had decided to write about the campouts, I said I was studying KSP. I spoke Russian with everyone but one person, Ivan (quoted later in this article), who insisted on speaking English with me.

All of the people I interviewed from the *sleti* had professional identities outside of the immigrant community. Ivan was an engineer; Vika an accountant; Vasily a real estate agent; Iakob a computer programmer. Two University of Chicago undergraduates who regularly attended East Coast *sleti* also talked to me about their experiences. In this study, my aim was neither to survey the overall lifestyles of Russian-speaking immigrants in Chicago nor to pin down stable immigrant selves.

My focus was, instead, to examine the ways in which KSP campouts functioned as a Soviet chronotope, attending to the actions and utterances participants used to proactively construct this Soviet-marked time-space in the US.

In order to understand what is interactionally referenced when immigrants gather at KSP campouts, we must consider the origins of these events in the former Soviet Union. Since the Soviet music industry was tightly regulated, musicians who wrote, sang and distributed their music independently did so outside of official channels. Even though not all, or even most, *samodeiatel'naia pesni* were politically sensitive, they were suspect because they were not state-regulated (Frumkin, 1989:287).

In the Soviet era, *samodeiatel'naia pesnia* songwriters voiced opinions that could not be expressed in state media channels. Bulat Okudzhava, considered one of the founders of *avtorskaia pesnia* (Smith, 1984:111), impressed Morris Sinelnikov, an immigrant songwriter from the Ukraine, because his songs were “about us, about how we feel, about how we live” (interview with author, July 12, 2007).⁶ These songs hit on truths obscured by Soviet propaganda, truths such as the impact of the Gulag on individuals (Vysotsky’s “My friend left for Magadan”), the practice of labeling dissidents insane (Vysotsky’s “No mistake”), or simply the inanity of bureaucracy (Galich’s “The Red Triangle”). Sinelnikov stated that the most important criterion for performing a song at KSP campouts in the USSR was that it was not an official, state-sponsored song. Even American, British and French songs were preferable to Soviet ones. He also cited youthful rebellion as a reason to favor any music that was prohibited, if only because they were told they could not listen to it. “Young people are always like that,” he said. Part of *samodeiatel'naia pesnia*’s appeal was its emphasis on sincerity and honesty—qualities Soviet mass song was perceived to lack (Platonov, 2005:22–23).

The relationship between KSP and state regulation was complicated. While the genre of *samodeiatel'naia pesnia* was a-Soviet (if not always anti-Soviet), the state youth organization, the Komsomol, became heavily involved in KSP administration in the 1960s (Garey, 2011:8–9; Platonov, 2005:42). Though the Komsomol directed most public concerts, unlicensed events such as the All-Russia Bard Concert in Akademgorodok in 1968 still occurred (Mesiak, 1998:609–610). In fact, this event was so controversial that the Komsomol did not license Moscow-region *samodeiatel'naia pesnia* concerts again until 1975 (Daughtry, 2006:283). Groups of people still traveled to forests to play, sing and socialize without state permission, though (Tarasov, 2001:9). To dodge censors, information about KSP was often distributed via word of mouth. Tonya Hovonova remembers Moscow area KSP events as conducted “in secret, [you were told] what train you should take and where you should go. Then you walk on for a long while, and then you come to a place and they sing songs, things like that” (Dornhelm and Jarrell, 2003).

It should not be forgotten, though, that people ultimately listen to music because

they enjoy it. Some KSP attendees may have interpreted their actions through a political lens. Others simply went to have a good time. KSP in the Soviet Union, as in Wisconsin, was above all fun. The fact that some concerts were state-sponsored may have mattered little to those who went primarily to hear music.⁷ Defining practices as state or non-state, Soviet or a-Soviet, draws artificial distinctions; there was state intervention in all aspects of what could be considered “private” life in the USSR. Elements of both force and farce characterized the Soviet bureaucratic machine, and the relationship between the state and KSP participants entailed grudging acceptance on both sides. Immigrant relationships to the Soviet past are equally ambivalent.

“We’re all Russians here”: Shifters and ethnic categories

Liuba, Vasilii and I drove into a recreation area near Baraboo, Wisconsin, at dusk on a Friday evening. As we wound our way through the park looking for our campsite, Vasilii noted of passersby, “There are some Russians” (*Vot russkie*). He punctuated the drive with more observations, gesturing with his chin: Russian (*russkii*). Ours (*nashi*). Russians (*russkie*). After one of the sightings, I asked Vasilii how he could tell. He replied, “He walks like a Russian.” Other give-aways included facial structure and clothing.

Neither Liuba nor Vasilii are ethnic Russians, though. Liuba is Ukrainian and Vasilii is from Belarus. Both are Jewish, and the term for ethnic Russians, *russkii*, would not have been applied to them in the USSR or in modern-day Russia. Ukrainians, Estonians and Belarusians would also not be called “*russkii*.” Nonetheless, people at KSP referred to each other as *russkii* regardless of ethnicity or nationality. Among most US immigrants the term “Russian” has shifted to mean “Soviet” or “post-Soviet.” This is, in part, accommodation to Americans’ predilection to label everyone from the USSR “Russian” (Andrews, 1999:2; Boym, 2001:332), and it’s partly due to the pan-Soviet frame of KSP. The fact that many KSP participants emigrated when Russia was the economically, politically and culturally hegemonic republic in the USSR also influences how people imagine what Russia represents. When I asked Ivan, a 35-year-old Jewish immigrant from Belarus why he called himself *russkii*, he responded, “You’re thinking Russia as in *the Russia*. But you gotta be thinking Russia as in the Soviet Union.” “Russian” takes on special meaning, then, when used in the United States. It becomes conflated with “Russian-speaking immigrant.” This process of lumping Jewish, Ukrainian and Belarusian Russian speakers into one category is similar to what Laitin observed among “beached diasporas” of ethnic Russians in former Soviet republics (1998:91–92). But unlike the cases Laitin studied, these speakers have beached themselves.

One of the attractions of American campouts is that they are opportunities to

interact with other immigrants, whom they dub “ours” (*nashi*). KSP in America is appealing because people, as Vasilii remarked, “are all Russians here [at KSP].” Max, a twenty-one-year-old college student and amateur musician, noted that he considered a Russian-speaking Croatian *ruskii* because he had knowledge of “[Russian] rock songs, some bard songs” and spoke Russian. He claimed that “a Croatian fits under the Russian category *at KSP*” (emphasis added). In other contexts, he implied, he would not be called *ruskii* (interview with author, October 17, 2007). The word *ruskii* comes to mean virtually everyone who attends KSP, in contrast to the wider American community.

Even within Chicago, though, how *ruskii* got used varied. Vasilii identified Liuba as a Ukrainian when we were introduced (*ona ukrainka*), but referred to her as *ruskaia* in most other situations. Shockingly, sometimes people will even say “he is a *Russian* Russian” (*on ruskii ruskii*) to indicate a *non-Jewish* Russian. Since such a large percentage of Russian immigrants in America are Jewish, it has become the norm in some communities to assume that all Russian speakers are as well. The residual, ethnic-Russian-only meaning of *ruskii* is thus preserved, and sometimes used to differentiate (aberrant) *Russian* Russians from (normative) Jewish Russians.

Words can change meaning depending on how they are used (*ruskii*), as can songs (*Gimn sovetskogo souiza*) and even entire events (campouts), with each of these larger-scale extrapolations relying on smaller semiotic building blocks. And each song, symbol and utterance implies an orientation towards the Soviet past. The festival itself as a cultural text gets transposed into different contexts, changing both the meaning of the original event and the social situations in which it is embedded. In all cases, people interpret symbols via a synthesis of shared and individual knowledge, and change results from the tensions between the two.

Why 600 immigrants met to camp and sing probably had little to do with love of the outdoors or of Russian bard music—or not that alone. At KSP, people interacted with others who shared specific cultural knowledge, knew the songs they knew and got their jokes. This knowledge influenced people’s modes of relating to each other, or the participation framework of KSP (Goffman, 1974:21). “Being ordinary” is not a no-effort default setting in social setting. Rather, norms are situationally defined (Sacks, 1984). KSP campouts are opportunities for immigrants to be ordinary “Russians,” something rare in American society.

While the Soviet state no longer exists, the cultural forms that constituted the nation do. Common understandings of Soviet-era references link immigrants. Mexican, Indian and Greek émigrés can imagine diasporic community with reference to contemporaneous nation-states. Similarly, Benedict Anderson observes that settlers in the New World imagined life as synchronous with their European counterparts

(2006:188). But because the system that united Soviet successor states is gone, Soviet immigrants can only reference common knowledge about Soviet-era society, or a Soviet “social imaginary” (Ricoeur, 1991).

Soviet sociality at campouts was performed literally through song, but also enacted in the way people drew upon a common knowledge base. A joke Vasilii spontaneously made at the September 2006 campout illustrates the interactional function of presupposed pop cultural knowledge. The joke was based on lines from a popular 1966 movie, *Kavkazskaia plennitsa, ili Novye prikliucheniia Shurika* (*Girl Prisoner of the Caucasus, or the New Adventures of Shurik*), in which a student is kidnapped from a camping trip. In the film, a folklorist goes to the Caucasus to research traditional toasts. But the toasts all include drinking and the social scientist cannot handle his liquor. Predictable hilarity results. One of the movie’s scenes revolves around the (drunken) folklorist’s misunderstanding of a toast’s moral:

Toaster: A small bird said, “I’m going to fly by myself straight to the sun.” And he flew higher and higher. And soon he fell...Let’s drink to the fact that none of us will fly so high. That none of us will ever thus break away from the collective. What’s the matter with you?

Folklorist: [crying] Poor bird! (Gaidai, 1967).

At the September 2006 campout, Liuba was standing slightly outside a circle of people. Vasilii asked her, “Why have you broken away from the collective?” (*Pochemu ty otorvalas’ ot kollektiva*). This phrase immediately referenced the joke in the movie, but it was also a pun on the campout experience depicted in the film. That’s why it was such a good joke: a double pun. And part of its pleasure was that it relied on knowledge that the general American population would not have. This joke could only be made in an immigrant context.

The participation frameworks of the *sleti* influenced how Russians negotiated both space and social relations. As Vasilii’s observations of a “Russian walk” indicate, some of these habits are automatic. Others, such as not shaking hands across a threshold, taking your shoes off in the house (or tent), and sitting quietly before leaving for a trip are consciously acknowledged guidelines. When walking with a group of people at the September campout, one woman even scooted into me rather than let a pole separate us; it is considered bad luck in Russia.

In contrast, a couple with whom I had attended the April 2007 campout held a barbecue at their house and invited three other frequent KSP attendees. The crowd was comprised exclusively of immigrants, a fire burned in the backyard and someone had even brought a guitar. According to Vasilii, the man played well, but he only played “American songs.” So Vasilii went inside. “You know, when I am with Russians, I want to hear *Vagonchiki*⁸ or something fun like that,” he told me. “If they want to

hear that other stuff, they can go to Carnegie Hall or something.” Thus, the setting—the shared understanding of the campout space as “Soviet”—helps determine how people socialize and what songs they expect to be played. The moment-by-moment constitution of a Soviet participation framework relies on presuppositions about the proper way to behave, which language people should speak and what kinds of songs should be sung. Taking cultural knowledge for granted, in turn, reinscribes its normative nature.

Homo sovieticus: Person, time and chronotope

Chronotopic representations are not accomplished in a neat, bounded, uniform way, as they would be in a newspaper article or film. Rather, what people talk about, what jokes they tell and what songs they sing conjure an image of the USSR. Much as children will “key” a play frame that organizes a speech event (e.g., “I’m Luke and you’re Vader”) (Goffman, 1974:43-44), KSP campers approach the experience with a certain understanding of how to behave. And just as an image of the Death Star will emerge through the children’s dialogue even if they never explicitly describe it, Soviet chronotopes materialize in interaction.

Deanna Davidson, for example, illustrates how spatial and temporal adverbs undergird East German chronotopes. Words such as “here” and “there” and “now” and “then” index affiliation with the *Ossi* past (2007:219). In a similarly indirect way, at KSP chronotopes were conjured in strips of interaction like the joke referenced above, through performances, and through the habitus generated via accommodation to a Soviet-marked participation framework. A Soviet worldview was selectively referenced largely because people operated within a Soviet frame, or as Vasili put it, a “Russian bubble.” The idea of KSP as a bubble maps neatly onto the idea of cultural chronotope (Agha, 2007). As Asif Agha explains, “A chronotopic depiction formulates a sketch of personhood in time and place; and, the sketch is enacted within a participation framework” (2007:321). Both performatively and narratively, KSP participants “create, populate, and forge relations between spatio-temporal realms” (Lempert and Perrino, 2007:206). Joint reference builds chronotopes.

The foundation of any participation framework is shared presupposition. Everyone has to (1) know what frame they are supposed to be operating in and (2) agree to do so. Frames compete, though, in nearly every interaction. For example, the September 2007 Bard-Klub Midwest campout included a “disco” after the main Saturday night performance. This was an opportunity for performers to play contemporary Russian rock and for people to dance to more upbeat music than the slower, longer *samodeiatel’naia pesnia* repertoire. Though Soviet-era references constituted much of the shared knowledge base among the immigrants, most people also listened to

Russian radio, watched Russian satellite TV and frequented Russian restaurants—all places where the latest Russian hits are played. Even the disco, however, which featured post-Soviet songs, was marked by someone shouting from the crowd, “Everybody dance!” (*Tantsuiut vse!*), which is a well-known line from the Brezhnev-era film *Ivan Vasilevich Changes Profession* (*Ivan Vasilevich meniaet professiiu*) (Gaidai, 1973).

Chronotopes abut, eclipse and overlap each other (Bakhtin, 2004:252). I don’t attempt to classify characteristics of “the” Soviet chronotope, but rather outline how representations of Soviet space-time signal evaluative stances towards the past. And those evaluations do vary. While the Soviet regime ran millions of people through the same educational, institutional and ideological structures, they did not turn into a monolithic mass: *Homo sovieticus* robots. Those who grew up in the USSR share a common symbolic vocabulary, though, even if Soviet immigrants and present-day residents of Russia incorporate historical images into different narratives of identity.

At the *sleti*, essentialized categories of “Russian” and “American” served as foils against which conceptions of immigrant personhood were constructed. Max and Vasilii repeatedly stressed the superiority of KSP experience over any similar American activities. They insisted that Russians *really* camp, while Americans use trailers. Russians *really* play the guitar; Americans just sing dull songs. Russians *really* go out into the woods; Americans pay someone for a commercialized substitute (even though these campouts took place in fee-based state parks). Max and Vasilii collapsed “Russian” and “Soviet” categories in opposition to “American.” Additionally, Vasilii maintained that KSP has “Russian roots, just like under Brezhnev,” arguing that Americans “can always do barbecuing in the park or whatever. This is different. This goes back to Russian tradition, like in pioneer camps.” Vasilii tied essential differences between American and Russian camping to his understanding of state-sponsored Young Pioneer camping trips (which he never attended), linking the authenticity of KSP experience to an imagined Soviet time and place. His use of “here,” when he said “people go camping here,” indexed the United States. “Here” was contrasted to “there,” or the Soviet Union. He also maintained that people go to KSP in search of something “that may not exist there anymore, and certainly doesn’t exist here” (interview with author, September 16, 2007). In other words, people go to KSP, at least in part, in search of a Soviet phantom.

Vasilii drew discursive boundaries between these two idealized groups, mapping essential qualities about types of people onto discourses about the authenticity of given songs. America is thus associated with the commercial in land use and music. By extension, then, both Soviet camping and music are portrayed as being more authentic. Though he expressed nostalgia for state-run Pioneer camps, Vasilii took pains to disassociate himself from “Communists.” When I asked him whether songs that had been sung at KSP were Soviet, he quickly corrected me: “Soviet-era. But

they're not necessarily *Communist* songs." In the segment below, Ivan also describes an ideal of Soviet personhood linked to Soviet *times* but explicitly detached from the Soviet *state*.⁹

- 1 In spite my living in this country
- 2 I think of myself as a Homo sovieticus
- 3 [Uh so]
- 4 AG: [Okay]
- 5 Ivan: So
- 6 AG: Yeah
- 7 Ivan: So—
- 8 You know
- 9 and it's kind of hard
- 10 it's a little difficult to explain
- 11 It's um—
- 12 By Soviet I don't mean the Communists
- 13 I mean the time when we grew up
- 14 AG: Uh huh
- 15 Ivan: Um
- 16 It was during, you know
- 17 It was kind of you get used to certain
- 18 Certain things
- 19 Um going camping
- 20 You know getting away I guess
- 21 Maybe [unintelligible]
- 22 It's psychological
- 23 You know getting away from being under a watchful eye
- 24 Going to a forest
- 25 Singing some songs
- 26 Just
- 27 Having
- 28 Letting your soul run free I guess (interview with author,
April 29, 2007).¹⁰

Ivan used *Homo sovieticus* here to signal that he supported Soviet ideals, but stripped the phrase of its political implications. Sociologist and émigré Aleksandr Zinoviev (1985) deployed the term *Homo sovieticus* to highlight stereotypical, generally negative characteristics of Soviets, but his apparent criticism of Soviet shiftlessness was tempered by the superior position he placed Soviets vis-à-vis Westerners. Ivan's use of the term here was not intended to be ironic, but rather

to affiliate with a highly propagandized vision of the New Soviet Man. Then, though, he distanced Sovietness from “Communists” and the “watchful eye” of the state (lines 12 and 23). He thus opposed a political order to the chronotope of Soviet-style sociality enacted at the campouts. Though Ivan’s narrative referenced Soviet personhood, he reproduced “post-Soviet immigrant” personhood. No one can have Soviet personhood any longer. People can only use Soviet norms to inform present behavior.

But it wasn’t just *what* Ivan said that set “Soviets” apart from “Communists.” It was *how* he said it. He achieved these contrasts through parallel stress and pitch contours (lines 12-13).¹¹ The rhythm and interactional implication of, “By *Soviet* I don’t mean the *Communists*. I mean the *time*...,” is different from “By Soviet I don’t mean the Communists, I *mean* the time...” In the first statement, Soviet, Communists and time are clearly linked. In the second they are not. People draw on prosody—pitch, loudness and timing—in order to make interactional points as much as they use vocabulary. Words are like the brushstrokes of a conversational painting: essential, but meaningless without depth, color and texture. Poetic strategies such as repetition, contrast and pitch-matching add rhetorical force and cue how the text should be interpreted. And prosody can even trump denotation. For example, the interactional implication of “Yeah, *that’s* a good idea,” when voiced sarcastically, is the opposite of its denotational meaning. A transcript tells only a fraction of the story. Presenting interlocutors’ comments in intonation units visually displays the mechanics of stance-taking, illustrating how concepts point to each other and how such assemblages contribute to meaning-making (cf. Shoaps, 1999, 2009).¹²

Jakobson termed such structural aspects of discourse “poetic functions,” as opposed to strictly literal interpretations (1960:358–359). In the example below, Max relies on the *pattern* of his utterances to compare *samodeiatel’naia pesnia* to American folk music, which he portrayed as commercialized and insincere:

- 1 Yeah and Bob Dylan you
- 2 You know
- 3 As soon as you say
- 4 For me at least
- 5 I don’t know
- 6 I-it’s
- 7 It’s definitely going to be wrong for the—
- 8 Totally different type
- 9 For me Bob,
- 10 Bob Dylan means America

- 11 Means capitalism
- 12 Means
- 13 <VOX> Oh wait a sec
- 14 You know that's—<VOX>
- 15 You got everything already in there (interview with author, March 21, 2007).

Max equates Bob Dylan with America, and both with capitalism, by repeating analogically associated concepts after the word “means” (lines 10–11). “Everything already in there” (line 15) refers to aspects of American music which Max considers contrary to the spirit of *samodeiatel'naia pesnia*. Marked intonation in lines 13–14, signaled by a dip in pitch and slower pace, indicates that he spoke, sarcastically, as someone else. Max voices an imagined third party in order to make the point that American folk music comes less from the heart than *samodeiatel'naia pesnia*.¹³ Such idealization of Soviet authenticity is reminiscent of sentiments expressed elsewhere. Maria Todorova observed that, across the Soviet bloc, “There is also the feeling of loss for a very specific form of sociability, and of vulgarization of the cultural life” (2010:7). For Max, the vulgarization of music resulted from a profit motive. *Samodeiatel'naia pesnia* stands outside that. In the US., KSP is *a*-corporate in the same way that it was *a*-state in the USSR. Explaining the appeal of *sleti*, Morris Sinelnikov claimed that official Soviet songs did not “lay on the soul” (*lezhat na dushu*) like *samodeiatel'naia pesnia* did (interview with author, July 12, 2007). As another mass-produced, pre-vetted product, Max makes a similar argument about American folk music.

Ivan connected concepts with pitch and stress; Max did it rhythmically. These prosodic accents helped shape distinct, sometimes intersecting, axes of differentiation: here/there; now/then; private/public; commercial/authentic; Russian/Communist. An overall Russian/American dichotomy regiments these concepts, though, illustrating Susan Gal's observation that a central semiotic opposition can “anchor” concurrent axes of differentiation (2005). “Russian” becomes associated with “public” and “authentic,” while “private” and “commercial” characteristics are attributed to “Americans.” Ideals of post-Soviet personhood were forged in the interstices of these oppositions. At KSP, people are neither *here* (America) nor *there* (the Soviet Union) and are neither *Americans* nor *Soviets*. The space of “Russianness” is not created solely through a Russian/American binary, but is instead part of a three-term contrast set: Americans, Russians and Communists. Campouts are thus liminal spaces, their space-time defined almost more by what they are not than what they are. Soviet chronotopes are constructed, though often without longing. America is represented, but from the point of view of outsiders. KSP stands suspended between these two cultural

worlds.

Some performers capitalized on this liminality to poke fun at Soviets and Americans at the same time. Profiting from such multi-layered punning, one singer performed an English translation of the Russian folk song “Kalinka,” a tune many may recognize as in the same genre as the theme song to the video game “Tetris.”¹⁴ It is a joke that drew on Soviet references, but the parody’s success depended on having a bilingual audience who could immediately back-translate the lyrics into Russian, remember the original song and laugh at the disconnect between the two versions. The performance was especially humorous to an immigrant audience because the singer exaggerated his Russian accent. The joke’s butt was not “Russians,” though, especially since the audience probably hears heavier accents all the time. It was not funny because of pronunciation, but because it spoofed the Boris-and-Natasha-style essentializations *amerikantsii* make.

The same singer also performed a version of the hit 1953 song “So Many Golden Lights” (“*Ognei tak mnogo zolotykh*”), which tells the story of a woman in love with a married man (in Gillespie, 2003:482):

There are so many golden lights	<i>Ognei tak mnogo zolotykh</i>
On the streets of Saratov	<i>Na ulitsakh Saratova</i>
There are so many bachelor boys,	<i>Parnei tak mnogo kholostikh</i>
But I love a boy who’s married.	<i>A ia liubliu zhenatogo.</i>

The performer parodied the lyrics by translating them into English and substituting the character of the woman with a homosexual man:

There’s so many nice homosexual boys
 But I love a hetero
 There’s so many *niice* homosexual boys here
 But I’m in love with a hetero.

Additional comedic effect came from the fact that this song played on the (presumed) contrast between heterosexual men in the audience and homosexuals in the lyrics. The singer’s improvisational use of the deictic “here” (“There’s so many nice homosexual boys *here*”), which is not in the original Russian version, draws the audience into the performative space. Just translating the lyrics into English, in this case, may not have been enough to render the song funny. The “original,” almost sacred, lyrics of these songs in the popular Soviet canon were turned on their heads by transposing them into an unexpected context.

The double- or triple-voicing of parody results in a comedic Venn diagram; punch lines occur at the intersection of indexical valences. And they draw on

several different symbolic universes—each itself a chronotope—in order to execute the joke. Ironic voicing demonstrates how political systems can be critiqued via their own propagandistic codes. It simultaneously lampoons Soviet ideology and reinforces the importance of Soviet-era references in this community of imaginers.

“It’s not just the words”: Affect and index

At home my father and mother wait for me
My “Phantom” was blown up quickly
In the clear blue sky
I won’t see them anymore (“Phantom,” Soviet-era folk song; author unknown).¹⁵

After the guitarist finished singing the above stanza, a grey-haired, teary-eyed man stood up and thanked him. He explained that he had listened to that song with army friends in Siberia, then told a tale of swimming to shore in freezing water, barely surviving, with those same comrades when the motor on their boat broke. The crowd listened, captivated. We were enthralled less by the drama of the man’s stories, which rambled, than by his display of emotion. But the most palpable feeling emerging from that interaction was the sense that we, a group of about thirty people huddled around a campfire, were linked to each other through his stories. Gazes, nods and sighs communicated that we were sharing a reaction; understanding bound us. Events often create emotional responses, but semiotic triggers for such feelings vary. A song such as “Phantom” both indexes its historical genesis and comments on the context in which it is invoked. As Abu-Lughod and Lutz observe, emotion is “about social life rather than internal states” (1990:1–2). While feelings are personal, discourses of emotion are also ways of managing interpersonal relations and, through these interactions, of defining concepts of the community. Nostalgia is, thus, a response to cultural signifiers situated within a field of ever-changing conditions.

Just as people watch sentimental films to be moved, visit haunted houses to feel fear or race cars for the adrenaline, many enjoy KSP because they have a rare opportunity to revel in group nostalgia. Max describes the pursuit of emotional experience through song as one of the main reasons to attend campouts. He claims that there is something unique to the group experience not captured by either playing CDs or attending concerts, even if the song lyrics have personal significance for him:

1 I mean

2 and in bard music
3 there's one thing that where you listen to a CD,
3 there's one thing where you go to a concert,
4 and then there's where you sit around at a campfire
5 or in the living room in this kind of
6 group of people where
7 you read everyone's emotions.
8 You know,
9 you can see everybody's eyes.
10 You can,
11 you know,
12 hear them sing or hum or,
13 you know,
14 sing in their heads or something.
15 This whole kind of,
16 you know,
17 group environment.
18 In this group experience.
19 And it's the music,
20 it's the words,
21 it's—
22 for people who,
23 you know,
24 it's the lyrics.
25 It's,
26 and it's also just this kind of—
27 I mean
28 I guess that sounds a little bit crazy and metaphysical
29 But this whole emotional experience where people feel each other.
30 It's not just the words (interview with author, March 21, 2007).

Participants often represented nostalgic experience at KSP as something uniquely available to immigrants. Max claimed that American music was incapable of triggering intense, affective, nostalgic responses around campfires because of the commercial motive underlying its circulation. Likewise, Ivan held that the type of nostalgic experiences people have at KSP cannot be replicated in an American context because Americans don't understand suffering: "This kind of bard music comes from some sort of pain. Some sort of oppression—which in the United States literally does not exist" (interview with author, April 29, 2007).

In his analysis of *Ostalgie*, or nostalgia for East Germany, Martin Blum observed nostalgic discourses serving comparable exclusionary purposes. His research shows that knowledge of East German products is used to mark boundaries between (former) East and West Germans (Blum, 2000). Similarly, Soviet-era pop cultural competence cordons off a space for the articulation of “Russianness.”

In order to understand how a sense of group identity is constructed at and through KSP campouts, we must consider two levels of triggering events and, consequently, two types of affective response. First, many people have personal associations with the songs. “Phantom,” mentioned above, summoned highly specific, emotion-laden memories for the Soviet army veteran. Though everyone’s associations are different, people often narrate their connection to each other in terms of mutual emotion. Nodding, smiling and singing in unison then become paralinguistic signals through which people renew their ties to each other. The recognition that people share similar experiences and presuppositions about the meanings of lyrics leads to a second level of affective experience, or what Max calls “feeling each other.” Understanding that everyone is having the first level of emotional engagement with the songs produces a sense of group belonging.

These two types of emotional states correlate to orders of indexical association (Hill, 2005). First-order indexicality denotes social categories. For example, Jane Hill states that some Americans’ use of “mock” Spanish—such as “hasta la banana” or “el truck-o”—relies on negative stereotypes of Spanish speakers. But using these forms in conversation to appear laid back, funny or hip also indicates something about the relationship between speakers in that interaction; this is second-order indexicality (Hill, 2005; Silverstein, 2003). At KSP campouts, the first indexical order invokes a Soviet symbolic universe, and the second references interactions between participants in the speech event. Nonverbal communication, such as singing and eye gaze, signal that people understand the first level of reference: it is meta-commentary on the first, purely figurative one. Showing that you know the words to songs demonstrates that you share knowledge with the group, and the sense of belonging becomes itself emotionally charged.

As Max observed, it’s not just the words. Lyrics get infused with the emotional power of nostalgic reflection, spurring effervescence at campouts that, when represented afterwards, contributes to the reproduction of community in diaspora. Emotion fosters a feeling of group solidarity at campouts themselves, but is equally important in the stories people tell themselves and each other. Whether moments of transcendental group solidarity actually materialize for all participants is impossible to assess. But it is at least clear that it is important to some informants to talk about the event in these terms.

People gather at KSP campouts to be moved, each in their own way. There

is enough overlap in people's biographies and understandings, though, to build solidarity. This feeling of "groupness" at KSP then becomes incorporated into narratives about what it meant to be Soviet—and what it means to be a Soviet immigrant—leading to a conception of community identity that transcends the campout.

"Something different, something of their own":

Genre, generation, conflict

One Soviet-era song sung several times over the course of the September 2006 festival was "My Dear One" ("*Milaia Moia*"), a romantic ballad first performed by Yuri Vizbor at a 1973 *slet* in Samara. The lyrics are about lovers who meet at a campout and are unsure when they will see each other again. Some people may have sung this as students in the USSR and were simply reminiscing as they sang along. Many age groups were represented at KSP, though, so this explanation is lacking. One participant, Liuba, was only thirty years old, had never gone to KSP in Russia, and yet knew all the words to "My Dear One." Vasilii was 39 and had not been to a *slet* in the Soviet Union, either, but he also sang along. He said he learned the words by going to KSP events in the US. Thus, when people sing Soviet songs, they often cite a familiar time and place even if they didn't sing those particular songs in their youth.

Interpretations of cultural references vary, even among people of the same generation. So creating cohesion at an event where the performers are between 20 and 80 years old, where émigrés left their home countries anywhere from weeks to decades ago, and where some are too young to have had any direct experience with the Soviet Union is, to say the least, a challenge. There are conflicts of representation within the diasporic community because people have different understandings of what the Soviet Union signified and different relationships to that past. While it is illustrative, we should not attribute variations in knowledge about Soviet popular culture to "young" and "old" generations, but to diverse experiences. People who are the same age may have immigrated at different times and have varying levels of familiarity with Soviet life, symbols and references. And even those who left the USSR as adults may not have encountered KSP until coming to the United States. Ideas about appropriate repertoire are linked to the presumed participation framework of the campouts. But since people hold different assumptions about how KSP should be conducted, there is active negotiation of appropriate behavior within the participation framework of KSP.

For example, one man's attempt to play Metallica's "Enter Sandman" was halted by people sitting around him—twice. Playing a contemporary Western song violated the sense of cohesion fostered by references to collectively held knowledge (since

few people knew the words). Similarly, when a man in his twenties delivered an impassioned performance of the 1989 song, “Everything is Going According to Plan” (“*Vse idet po planu*”) by the punk group *Grazhdanskaia Oborona*—a song which details leaders’ failures from the Soviet era through Gorbachev—the concert organizers cut his microphone. “Only our grandfather Lenin was a good leader. All the other ones are such shit,”¹⁶ the singer had belted out. Around fifteen twentysomethings all but moshed along to the music. Their parents glowered.

It seems little has changed. Morris Sinelnikov framed part of his motivation for participating in the *samodeiatel’naia pesnia* movement in terms of youthful rebellion:

- 1 *Glavnoe chto ne byli sovetskie pesni.*
It was most important that they were not Soviet songs.
- 2 *Ofitsialnie takie.*
Official-type.
- 3 *Znaiete molodie liudi*
You know, young people
- 4 *oni vseгда hotiat*
they always want
- 5 *chto nibut’ drugoe*
something different
- 6 *chto nibut’ novoe*
something new
- 7 *chto nibut’ svoei*
something of their own
- 8 *chto nibut’ ne obychnoe.*
something out of the ordinary (interview with author, July 12, 2007).

Max reported that the Solnyshko campout in Pennsylvania in August 2007 also featured generational disconnect (interview with author, October 17, 2007). The event’s website boasted, “Where can you expect to see Pioneer inductions? In America!”¹⁷ The narrator for a video produced about the event says,

For us, former Pioneers of the Soviet Union, the red necktie always goes with memories of the smell of baked potatoes.... And even though I have an account with an American bank and a townhouse mortgage, it doesn’t hurt to sometimes look in the mirror, smile and give the past a Pioneer’s salute.¹⁸

Though the video claims that Solnyshko was put on by “people who still remembered,”

Max, who attended, said that at least half of the attendees were college students in their twenties who had never been Pioneers themselves and may have had very limited memories of life in the former Soviet Union at all. In the video, these young adults marched in a parade, waved red Pioneer flags and sang the *Hymn of the Pioneers of the Soviet Union*¹⁹:

Soaring campfires light up dark nights
Vzveites' kostrami, sinie noch

We are Pioneers, children of the working class
My Pioniry—deti rabochikh!

The era of brighter years is approaching
Blizitsia era svetlykh godov

The motto of the pioneers is always be ready!
Klich pionerov—vsegda byd'gotov!

While the college students had never been Young Pioneers, they fashioned new meaning for Soviet practices. Even if KSP participants sit around the campfire singing the same songs, Max said,

People have to understand that young people are doing something different....
Not like let's remember the good old times; more like let's hear some good music.
Let's sing some songs that we all know. And let's sing some songs that we've just
heard, too (interview with author, October 17, 2007).

Youth are creating something of their own, rendering KSP relevant to life in the United States. This relevance, in turn, safeguards the festival's survival.

Conclusions: Semiotics of nostalgia

If one's personal memories are not necessary for nostalgia, the category explodes to include Renaissance festivals and nostalgia for the future (Boym, 2001). Memory offers a great conceptual brightline. Then affection for the Middle Ages or youthful fascination with the 1950s can be termed "antiquarian feeling" or "displaced nostalgia" (Davis, 1979:8; Wilson, 2005:32). We have no way, though, of knowing what people remember. The problem is not that too many types of activities are considered nostalgia, but rather that the term "nostalgia" simultaneously refers to individual emotion, sociological data and the theoretical framework used to interpret those data. If we took Renato Rosaldo's (1989) analysis of rage as an example, this would be like calling a grieving husband's fury, collective headhunting practice and the anthropological concepts used to describe those activities "anger." "Nostalgia" is overtaxed. Nostalgia, like anger, is an emotion. It *circulates*, though, in representations.

The data about such emotions that social scientists have access to are observable social practices.

Because of these limitations, scholars have moved to locate the objects of nostalgia not in the past itself, but in public depictions of it (Bissell, 2005; Boym, 2001; Ivy, 1995; Nadkarni and Shevchenko, 2004; Oushakine, 2007; Wilson, 2005). Anyone can voice nostalgia for chronotopes, even for pasts never experienced or futures not yet realized. It is also essential, though, to differentiate between mental and material symbolic phenomena. This is the advantage of a semiotic view: it allows us to separate out not only signified from signifier, but both signifier and signified from the cognitive processes used to interpret them (cf. Garey, 2012). Peirce's three-pronged sign, lucidly defined by Richard Parmentier, provides the conceptual hooks on which to hang analysis of nostalgic practice:

Fundamental to a Peircean view of signs, linguistic or otherwise, is the notion that three elements need to be kept in sight at all times: (1) the quality of the expressive semiotic vehicle (what he calls the Sign), (2) some aspect of physical, social or psychological reality brought into play by these means (what he calls the Object), and (3) the semiotically-determined state of affairs that results from and objectifies the interplay of Signs and Objects (what he calls the Interpretant) (2007: 273).

For example, a semiotic vehicle would be the material shape of the hammer and sickle; the object would be what that image represents; and the interpretant would be what it "means" or how it affects the viewer. Most of the studies listed above classify nostalgia according to differences in the interpretant. Semiotic vehicles, such as the red neckties of Young Pioneers, are constant whether they are donned as camp humor or contemplative reminiscence. The represented objects, too, are largely the same. What is variable is how people *relate to* those symbols (the interpretant). Differences in attitude, not practice, are what separate restorative and reflective nostalgia, Davis' orders of nostalgia, and modern versus postmodern nostalgia (Boym, 2001; Davis, 1979; Nadkarni, 2007). There is utility to classifying types of nostalgia, just as psychologists distinguish between anger, hostility and aggression (Belgum, 1987). Hewing to a semiotic approach, however, acknowledges private aspects of nostalgic experience without relying on them for social scientific explication.

While KSP is a festival of reminiscing, participants are not just aping Soviet canonical songs. Each person's voicing of a Soviet chronotope is a slightly different representation. (Post-)Soviet immigrants use the symbolic resources of a Soviet social imaginary to construct ideals of personhood, but the significance of these references must be interpreted in the context of their American contextualizations. Nostalgia is not just a looking back, and more even than a way of interpreting the present: it is a

mechanism for reproducing tradition. KSP participants voice narratives of continuity, not irrevocable loss. The sometimes awkward and often conflicting alignments described here represent nostalgia in-the-making—a nostalgia dependent on sociality as much as memory.

KSP campouts in the midwest are festivals of contradictions: of non-Russian Russians; of ex-Soviets brandishing Soviet symbols; of young people nostalgic for their parents' pasts. At KSP, people enact, animate and (re)create Soviet sociality. These festivals point to the context-specific ways in which a symbolic order is read, as well as to how the meanings of social signifiers are negotiated interactionally. Is KSP tradition? Is it nostalgia? Is it kitsch? Like reflections in a warped mirror, the answer shifts with where you stand.

NOTES

- 1 This essay would not have been possible without the generosity of people in the Chicago Russian-speaking community who shared their homes, tents, songs and stories with me. These interlocutors commented on—and quarreled with—my interpretations, and had a hand in not only providing “material” for the paper, but in informing analysis of it. I also owe deep intellectual debts to professors, colleagues and friends at the University of Chicago and the University of Texas. Thanks, particularly, to Robert Bird for his considered and thorough feedback and to Robert Blunt, Kevin Caffrey, Brian Horne, Dionisios Kavadias and members of the University of Chicago Anthropology of Europe workshop for suggestions on earlier drafts.
- 2 See also Svetlana Boym's (2001:xii) discussion of nostalgia directed at mass-mediated images, such as for dinosaurs in *Jurassic Park*.
- 3 This analysis supports Serguei Oushakine's (2007) argument that not all representations of Soviet signifiers endorse a socialist political order. But while Oushakine intentionally excludes performative aspects of re-signification to draw attention to pictorial examples, I take them up explicitly.
- 4 Most interviews were conducted in English. I translated quotations from those that were in Russian. Conversations at KSP were almost exclusively in Russian. Unless otherwise indicated, translations of textual Russian material are mine as well.
- 5 *Slet* is a term which comes from the verb *sletat'sia*, to gather or congregate, often used to refer to flocks of birds (Morris Sinelnikov, interview with author, July 12, 2007).
- 6 Mr. Sinelnikov stated that he would prefer to be cited by name rather than with a

- pseudonym. All other interlocutors' names have been changed.
- 7 A recent American example supports the idea that event participants do not necessarily affiliate with the political goals of institutional organizers. Live Earth concerts were staged worldwide in July 2007 to raise awareness of global warming. But one media description of the concerts noted that the activist goals of the concert were "very grand and high-minded, but yesterday afternoon, outside Giants Stadium, it was all about tailgating and beer pong" (Weekend Edition Sunday, 2007).
 - 8 Song from the popular film, *Ironiia sud'by, ili 's legkym parom!* (Riazanov and Petrov, 1975).
 - 9 Each line in the transcript represents an intonation unit, which is a psychologically salient chunk of discourse (Chafe, 1994:57–59). Breaks between intonation units usually occur when a breath is taken or speech is slowed down, often at the end of a phrase (Du Bois, 1992).
 - 10 Transcription conventions:

En dash (-)	Truncated word
Em dash (—)	Truncated intonation unit
Italics	Emphasis
Brackets []	Overlapping speech
<VOX>	Marked prosody
 - 11 There are high pitch accents on the words "Soviet," "Communists" and "time." See Wennerstrom (2001), Chapter 2, for further explanation of how pitch accents can set up contrasts between words or concepts.
 - 12 In this article, I only transcribe natural speech in intonation units. Quotes from songs and movies are presented as block quotations.
 - 13 Some musicians would disagree with Max. The lead singer of the Russian rock band Akvarium, Boris Grebenshchikov, maintains that Bob Dylan, Woody Guthrie and Leadbelly were the leaders of an American *avtorskaia pesnia* tradition. "KSP USA, June 2006," <http://www.aquarium.ru/misc/aerostat/aerostat59.html>, accessed November 1, 2007.
 - 14 Donna Buchanan (2010) describes how the tune to "Kalinka" was redeployed in satiric Bulgarian performances.
 - 15 The song tells the story of an American F-4 Phantom fighter pilot who is shot down by a Soviet during the Vietnam War.
 - 16 "Odin lish' dedushka Lenin horoshii byl vozhd' / A vse drugie ostal' nie takoe govno." "Grazhdanskaia Oborona," <http://www.gr-oborona.ru/texts/1056899068.html>, accessed September 18, 2007.

- 17 The website of the Solnyshko event is <http://www.festival-x.org/>, accessed January 18, 2007.
- 18 *No u nas, bivsheikh pioneerov sovetskogo souyza, krasnie galstuki vseгда ostanutsia v pamiati vmeste s zapakhom pichenoi kartoshki.... I dazhe chet v amerikanskom banke i kredit na taunhaus, ne meshaet inogda posmotret v zerkalo, ulibnutsia i otdat' proshlomu pioneerskii saliut.*
- 19 Video report available at http://www.tusovo.com/article.php3?id_article=1746, accessed October 30, 2007.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Lughod, Lila, and Lutz, Catherine. (1990). "Introduction: Emotion, discourse, and the politics of everyday life." In Lila Abu-Lughod and Catherine Lutz (eds.), *Language and the Politics of Emotion* (pp. 1–14). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Agha, Asif. (2007). "Recombinant selves in mass-mediated spacetime." *Language and Communication* 27,3:320–335.
- Anderson, Benedict. (2006 c1983). *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Andrews, David R. (1999). *Sociocultural Perspectives on Language Change in Diaspora: Soviet Immigrants in the United States*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. (2004 c1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*. Translated by Carlyl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Belgum, David. (1987). "Re-exploring anger: Its dynamics and treatment." *Journal of Religion and Health* 26,4:277–285.
- Bissell, William. (2005). "Engaging colonial nostalgia." *Cultural Anthropology* 20,2:215–248.
- Blum, Martin. (2000). "Remaking the East German past: Ostalgie, identity and material culture." *Journal of Popular Culture* 34,3:229–253.
- Boym, Svetlana. (2001). *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York: Basic Books.
- Buchanan, Donna. (2010). "Sonic nostalgia: Music, memory and mythography in Bulgaria, 1990–2005." In Maria Todorova and Zsuzsa Gille (eds.), *Post-communist Nostalgia* (pp. 129–154). New York: Berghahn Books.
- Chafe, Wallace. (1994). *Discourse, Consciousness and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Daughtry, James. (2006). "The intonation of intimacy: Ethics, emotion, metaphor and dialogue among contemporary Russian bards." PhD dissertation, Department of Ethnomusicology, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Davidson, Deanna. (2007). "East spaces in west times: Deictic reference and political self positioning in a post-socialist East German chronotope." *Language and Communication* 27,3:212–226.
- Davis, Fred. (1979). *Yearning for Yesterday: A Sociology of Nostalgia*. New York: Free Press.
- Dornhelm, Rachel, and Jarrell, Todd. (2003). "Russian song and poetry event in the Catskills." Transcript, Savvy Traveller, Minnesota Public Radio, November 1.
- Du Bois, John. (1992). *Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics, Volume 4: Discourse Transcription*. Santa Barbara: University of Santa Barbara.
- Frumkin, Vladimir. (1989). "Liberating the tone of Russian free speech: Reflections on Soviet magnitizdat." In Alexander Shtromas and Morton A. Kaplan (eds.), *The Soviet Union and the Challenge of the Future. Volume 3: Ideology, Culture and Nationality* (pp. 277–298). New York: Paragon House.
- Gaidai, Leonid, dir. (1967). *Kavkazskaia plennitsa, ili novye prikliucheniia Shurika* [Girl Prisoner of the Caucasus, or the New Adventures of Shurik]. 77 min. Mosfilm. Moscow.
- . (1973). *Ivan Vasilevich meniaet professiiu* [Ivan Vasilevich Changes Profession]. 93 min. Mosfilm. Moscow.
- Gal, Susan. (2005). "Language ideologies compared: Metaphors of public/private." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15,1:23–37.
- Garey, Amy. (2011). "Aleksandr Galich: Performance and the politics of the everyday." *Limina* 17:1–13.
- . (2012). "'How it was': Semiotic approaches to Soviet references." *Laboratorium* 4,2:27–50.
- Gillespie, David. (2003). "The sounds of music: Soundtrack and song in Soviet film." *The Russian Review* 62,3:473–490.
- Goffman, Erving. (1974). *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harper Colophon.
- Hill, Jane. (2005). "Intertextuality as source and evidence for indirect indexical meanings." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15,1:113–124.
- Ivy, Marilyn. (1995). *Discourses of the Vanishing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jakobson, Roman. (1960). "Closing statements: Linguistics and poetics." In Thomas Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language* (pp. 350–377). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Laitin, David. (1998). *Identity in Formation: The Russian-speaking Populations in the Near Abroad*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Lempert, Michael, and Perrino, Sabina. (2007). "Entextualization and the ends of temporality." *Language and Communication* 27,3:205–211.
- Meisak, Nikolai. (1998 c1968). "Pesni: Ego oruzhie" ["Songs: His weapons"]. *Vechernyi Novosibirsk*, April 18. Reprinted in Iu. Poliak (ed.), *Aleksandr Galich* (pp. 604–610). Ekaterinburg: U-Factoria.
- Nadkarni, Maya. (2007). "The master's voice: Authenticity, nostalgia and the refusal of irony in postsocialist Hungary." *Social Identities* 13,5:611–626.
- Nadkarni, Maya, and Shevchenko, Olga. (2004). "The politics of nostalgia: A case for comparative analysis of postsocialist practices." *Ab Imperio* 2:487–519.
- Oushakine, Serguei Alex. (2007). "'We're nostalgic, but we're not crazy': Retrofitting the past in Russia." *The Russian Review* 66,3:451–482.
- Parmentier, Richard. (2007). "It's about time: On the semiotics of temporality." *Language and Communication* 27,3:272–277.
- Platonov, Rachel Slayman. (2003). "Marginal notes: *Avtorskaia pesnia* on the boundaries of culture and genre." Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Harvard University.
- Ricoeur, Paul. (1991). "Imagination in discourse and action." In Kathleen Blamey and John B. Thompson (trans.), *From Text to Action: Essays in Hermeneutics, II* (pp. 164–183). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Riazanov, Eldar, and Petrov, Igor. (1975). *Ironiia sud'by, ili 's legkym parom!* [*Irony of Fate, or With a Light Steam!*] Mosfilm. Moscow.
- Rosaldo, Renato. (1989). *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Sacks, Harvey. (1984). "On doing 'being ordinary'." In J. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 413–429). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silverstein, Michael. (2003). "Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life." *Language and Communication* 23:193–229.
- Shoaps, Robin. (1999). "The many voices of Rush Limbaugh: The use of transposition in constructing a rhetoric of common sense." *Text* 19,3:339–437.
- . (2009). "Moral irony and moral personhood in Sakapultek discourse and culture." In Alexandra Jaffe (ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 92–118). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Gerald Stanton. (1984). *Songs to Seven Strings: Russian Guitar Poetry and Soviet*

- "*Mass Song*." Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Stewart, Kathleen. (1988). "Nostalgia: A polemic." *Cultural Anthropology* 3,3:227–241.
- Tarasov, Konstantin. (2001). *Grushenski festival'naia letopis 1968–2000* [*Grushenskii Festival Annals: 1968–2000*]. St. Petersburg: Gitara Vremeni.
- Todorova, Maria. (2010). "Introduction: From utopia to propaganda and back." In Maria Todorova and Zsuzsa Gille (eds.), *Post-Communist Nostalgia* (pp. 2–13). New York: Berghahn Books.
- Weekend Edition Sunday. (2007). "Live Earth: The music and the message." Transcript, National Public Radio, July 8.
- Wennerstrom, Ann. (2001). *The Music of Everyday Speech: Prosody and Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, Janelle L. (2005). *Nostalgia: Sanctuary of Meaning*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.
- Zinoviev, Alexander. (1985). *Homo Sovieticus*. Boston: The Atlantic Monthly Press.