

A Discussion on Methodology for Researching Soviet Literary Space

In the closing discussion after the international conference „The Literary Field under the Communist Regime: Structure, Functions, *Illusio*“, held on October 7– 9, 2015 at the Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, prof. Violeta Kelertienė (moderator; University of Washington, USA), prof. Marina Balina (Illinois Wesleyan University, USA, International Youth Library, Munich, Germany), prof. Katerina Clark (Yale University, USA), dr. Violeta Davoliūtė (University MacMillan Center for International and Area Studies, Yale University, USA), prof. Evgeny Dobrenko (University of Sheffield, UK), prof. Wolfgang Emmerich (University of Bremen, Germany), dr. Vilius Ivanauskas (Lithuanian Institute of History, Lithuania), prof. Aušra Jurgutienė (Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, Lithuania), dr. Mindaugas Kvietkauskas (Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, Lithuania), dr. Dalia Satkauskytė (Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, Lithuania) participated.

Violeta Kelertienė: I would like to thank the organisers and the Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore for holding this very interesting and very rich conference, full of possibilities for more work together collectively. In my long life I've attended many conferences of the Association for the Advancement of the Baltic studies, of the Baltic Studies in Europe, and other places, and this conference has been one of the most fruitful ones, possibly because it was all about literature. It gave us a great opportunity to be together and to hear others people's views. To start a discussion I'll just say a few things that interested me, hoping that you will jump in with the things you want to say.

First of all, it struck me that we really need to discuss further the relationship between the center and the periphery, between Moscow and all the ex-republics, and satellite states, etc., and that it is very different for each country. Some of the assumptions that are usually made, that the center enforces the periphery has been mentioned during the course of the conference, and I think so too,

definitely, that a periphery also influenced the center, some things were allowed in the periphery that were not allowed in the center, certainly in the early times.

We've heard a lot of prominent names, from Lithuania and from some other countries, stating that postcolonialism is their favorite approach. I think it presents many possibilities that have not been explored yet. When postcolonialism started (it started with Frantz Fanon in the 1950s), we began to see that its ideas were applicable to the Soviet Union. I especially felt that the Soviet Union was being let off the hook because it was never mentioned as a colonial power for decades. I think that there are aspects that need to be shaped, applied and changed, but there are many, many things that we can use from the theory. And Russia itself has scholars of a postcolonialist frame of mind now like Alexander Etkind and others. Part of Russia is an internally colonised country. It changes the whole map and gives us a lot of room for discussion. Of course, postcolonialism is not the only approach, I know its problems. I was hoping that Evgeny Dobrenko who said he was against that method on the first day of the conference would explain himself, but he hasn't. So let me give an opportunity for him to do that.

Evgeny Dobrenko: As I've said, I do think so. What this conference shows, when we approach such a broad topic of the Soviet past, or Soviet legacy, or whatever, from different aspects – be it national, comparative or political, – we need to think about the methodology. The methodology is an issue, and it is very hard to come up with something coherent when you deal with such a broad, very often undefined set of issues. I would say that methodology is an important thing; I don't think we've addressed this issue during the conference, it wasn't in the focus, it's just something that we need to be aware of. From my point of view, when it comes to postcolonialism, you see what happened. I've discussed this issue with Dalia Satkauskytė yesterday on our way from the Tuskulėnai museum. I've just mentioned that last year we had in the university of Sheffield a public lecture by Terry Eagleton (you know, he is a Marxist, an old fashioned Marxist) – a presentation about literary theories, what happened to them. And the question was what Eagleton thinks about postcolonialism, orientalism, gender studies. According to his quite strict political approach, all these theories were born after the failure of the revolution of the 1960-ies. Why? Because it was an attempt to turn the attention from the real problem. The „real problem“

for him, of course, is a class struggle. So he said, „I would urge you“; he said, „not to invest too much in all this...“

Dalia Satkauskytė: I'm sorry to interrupt you, but I would like to bring up the fact that Eagleton finishes his study *Literary Theory: An Introduction* with the final chapter called „Conclusion: Political Criticism“. He suggests that feminist critics, postcolonial critics are the only ones worth doing.

Aušra Jurgutienė: ...and that the best theory is Marxism.

Evgeny Dobrenko: Yes, the best is Marxism. But why I am saying this? Postcolonialism is not particularly applicable to our area of discussion, I mean the status, the result of the failure of the revolution or not. Why I personally have problems with postcolonialism and all these „big“ theories, is that we don't have a working methodological frame. It is clear, why – because we all work for decades in quite isolated areas of research (methodologically). We don't have our own systemic methodological frame, we did not work out something „workable“. That's why we just try to apply something „ready-made“ and to take and use our material basically as case studies. You work with Lithuanian literature, I work with Georgian – we just apply this theory, and it should work. But it does not always work, this theory is too big – it tries to cover everything from Mumbai to Kinshasa, from Moscow to Vilnius, so here is a problem. The same can be said not only about postcolonialism, but about all *grandeur*, megalomania theories. Structuralism is a different thing, it is instrumental. Theories like postcolonialism, gender studies, postmodernism are ideologically situated grand theories. And because structuralism is instrumental, it is much more practical in our real work and can be accepted by a much wider audience. These grand theories very often don't have methodological apparatus and instruments that can be used specifically for our purposes when it comes to specific material. They are too much politically biased.

For example, I work with multinational Soviet literature. I had a very long conversation at the conference in Berkeley this April with the scholar from the university in Austin. He is originally from India, and his fascinating paper was about India and Great Britain. I asked him precisely these methodological questions about postcolonialism. He said: „When I was in India, I thought these

postcolonial theories are very useful, but when I came to the States, they seemed less and less applicable to my material“. When listening to him I admitted that the situation in the Soviet Union looks very similar to that in India (the introduction of the English language), he said: „Absolutely not, I can't even understand how can you apply all these aspects of postcolonial theory to the Soviet situation which is completely different“. I'm very cautious with postcolonial theory. And one more aspect (just as a remark) – it has very strong political flavour that I don't like. It's too predictable: in the beginning you know the end of the story.

Violeta Kelertienė: There are smaller concepts of the postcolonial theory, for example, hybridity, that have not been much applied. There is so much to be done, and some Lithuanian scholars are doing such research.

Violeta Davoliūtė: Following up on what you have said, the special issue of the *Journal of Baltic Studies* dedicated to postcolonialism in the context of the Baltic states is about to come out. A number of Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian scholars have been collaborating. I would also highly recommend an article by Epp Annus published a couple of years ago in the *Journal of Baltic Studies*. Epp really takes the question of the applicability of postcolonial theory in the Baltic context very seriously.

Katerina Clark: When we look at the postcolonialism, the question of race very quickly comes to mind. We look at Lithuania which is a European country. Russia, some would say, is not a European country. In some ways the better analogy would be the situation in Austria-Hungary which was an empire containing a lot of nations (Czechia, Hungary, Slovakia, and so forth). We have the situation where countries and areas change hands periodically all the time (Vilnius was a part of Poland in the interwar period, and so forth), this is a long history of countries. This is not quite the same thing as one particular race visiting a remote area where people of a different race lived and imposing European civilisation on an area where European civilisation was not a part of the local tradition. For me, the situation seems very different, we have many problems with this postcolonial theory.

Evgeny Dobrenko: When I talk about Russia to my students, I always ask them to comment on the quotation of the famous British historian Geoffrey Hosking.

He wrote lots of histories of Russia. One of them is about an empire and its people (*Russia: People and Empire, 1552–1917*). And it starts with an absolutely amazing aphorism: „Britain had an empire, Russia was an empire“. It's not just a joke. To have an empire and to be an empire is not the same thing. And if we think that it's just the matter of geography (London is here and Mumbai is there), it is quite different from Moscow and Kiev. The problem is that you can not apply the theory that treats the London-Mumbai situation with the Moscow-Kiev situation. The difference is very substantial.

Violeta Kelertienė: You know, some of the Baltic states have been under oppression for seven hundred years. And I still think it's not just a matter of race, you could feel superior without being of a different race. So it's a question of who is civilising whom, for instance, till Lithuanians...

Violeta Davoliūtė: The same is with Hungary and Czechoslovakia. They had to write in German, not in Czech, not in their vernacular language. Hungarians were not a majority in ...

Violeta Kelertienė: So we had to write in the Latin script and in Polish; Estonia, Latvia even did not have their own countries until 1918. Until then, you know, there are occupations by Sweden, by the Poles, the noblemen were colonised – there are very many aspects at work.

Evgeny Dobrenko: Russian intellectuals...

Violeta Kelertienė: This is what I'm trying to get to. Russians thought they were civilising us because they were bringing socialism.

Evgeny Dobrenko: All the Soviet Union knew that the Baltic countries is the West...

Violeta Kelertienė: But there were more republics, not just the Baltics...

Aušra Jurgutienė: I want to ask Evgeny. In your lecture at our Institute some years ago you stated that the Russian people were colonised themselves. Can you please remember your statement more broadly in this discussion about postcolonialism?

Evgeny Dobrenko: I just meant internal colonisation which is described in Et-kind's book. He did it very well and quite cleverly with interesting metaphors, et cetera, but this is not something new. The same you can find in writings of Russian philosophers who were expelled from Soviet Russia that Bolsheviks practically occupied Russia. When I read that, I thought about the famous Herzen's pronouncement that the Russian state stayed in Russia as an occupational army. What do you expect in a country with 90 percent enslaved population? The intellectuals, the only Europeans, the tsar who was the only European in the country, who else would colonise the country? This is what I meant by the internal colonisation. With the colonisation the problem is, and the postcolonial theory pushes us in this direction, we all understand the agenda behind that: against the racism and all the rest. We are fixed on that. We think that the colonialism is something connected with race. In Russia it wasn't the case: you have 90 percent of the colonised population being of the same ethnicity as their landlords.

Violeta Kelertienė: It's a question of power, they had the power, it's not just the race...

Katerina Clark: Considering the history of Russia. How many minority peoples were subsumed by imperial Russia and they don't exist any more? Their languages do not exist and they do not exist as a separate ethnic group. The Polovetsian and so forth... The Russians *per se*, do we know what they are? Historically, they were not the majority's people. All the time these minority people were subsumed and their languages were largely lost, and folklore as well. It diagnoses this huge land with the predominant circle of Russians. If we look at the microhistory of the 20th century, at the colonisations, this is a process of the time of subsuming different ethnic and cultural traditions in this general area. This also raises problems in terms of postcolonial theory.

Evgeny Dobrenko: By the way, there is nothing Russian in it, it happens all over the world.

Katerina Clark: Absolutely. But historically in the case of Russia you have this going on. And so the fact that Lithuania has emerged, and still has its language, its culture, is quite an achievement. It could be subsumed by Poland, as we all know, and language could be lost in that way, etc. etc. History has his own blacks and greys.

Marina Balina: I would like to be the dove of peace. The conversation we've started here is actually about methodology. The entire conference was organised around the deals of methodology: we were talking about the literary field, about Pierre Bourdieu, one of the concepts. It is a very honorable attempt to break the mould of the idea that we, I mean Russia and everything that is related to Russia, are so unique that none of the European theories are going to be applicable to the Russian case. I think that all our problems of how we are going to apply this theoretical apparatus are related to our inability to work with this theoretical apparatus. At the time when this apparatus was developing we are coming, I'm sorry to say, again and again, as the late bloomers. At least the conferences like this are going to do the job in helping people to develop the vocabulary that will empower us to discuss the issues of history, culture, language, literature in terms that are understood by the rest of the European community. The last paper that was presented to us today about Simone de Beauvoir and her case talking about opinions, talking about foreigners, European intellectuals, coming to visit exactly shows that we are on totally different levels of the discourse. And I have to applaud the two of you, Satkauskytė and Mačianskaitė, for organising the conference around the western concept. You started actually the question of the applicability of this western concept to the material that we are discussing. We are on the way to developing the language that will help us to move forward. Am I a dove of peace?

Dalia Satkauskytė: Just a few words to continue your thoughts and to support you. With the background of strict structuralists I will say that the problem is not in the theories, but in what we are trying to do with them. What is the theory or material problem we are dealing with? We are applying a theory as a matrix and not questioning the theoretical concept. If it doesn't work we must think what to do with the theory. We need not put the concept on the material, but go from the material to the theory. You must be in a constant negotiation between the theory and the material (literary text, historical data, etc.) if you want to make a really working theory.

Vilius Ivanauskas: I also think that it is possible to use different methodologies. It depends on what we want to say. Sometimes we need to look for more universal questions, to look how different empires are managing the relations of the dependence or being subaltern, but at the same time we need to know

the limits of the theory, especially, for instance, when we're making the comparative analysis. The comparative approach could also be an answer if we're trying to look at different peripheries. Postcolonialism, probably, can not show their contrast. There are other theories which show this dynamics better. For instance, nationalism studies. The Soviet Union was an ethnofederalist state, and it is important to investigate the role of intellectuals in it. In a fascinating study by David Beecher who recently graduated from Berkeley he writes about Tartu University describing the phenomenon of the periphery's periphery. And here periphery appears as dominated very strongly, but still its multilingual atmosphere was very fruitful for Yuri Lotman, for example. We need to be more precise and always much more dynamic, be aware of what we're investigating – then we can apply the methods.

Wolfgang Emmerich: I'm just commenting what Marina and Dalia said. Having got this invitation I read the title and had a naive expectation that everybody will try to apply Bourdieu. It would have been very interesting if everybody would have tried one theoretical set. I've suggested in the beginning to transform it into different concepts, but starting out with this concept. But, let me say so, this was not the case – only a quarter of papers had some relationship with Bourdieu. In a way, I regret this since my expectations were not fulfilled. But I agree with Evgeny saying that you can't tell whether the method you are working on is useful for everything, you can only try to transform the theory, you can ask which theories are combinable and which are not. I think, this is worth trying. As sitting neighbour to you (Valentyna Kharkhun), I would link with the generation model. Coming from Karl Mannheim's essay from 1928 explaining what it means to belong to a generation. You've mentioned Homi K. Bhabha. Looking at Soviet multilingual literature he is quite helpful. It is better than not using any theoretical approach. My advice would be – try and use one or another approach. For instance, if you look at Germany, what is happening right now (more than 1 million people coming from the Arabic states or from Pakistan and Muslim states), you have to use Homi K. Bhabha's approach of the third space. We all are already living in this third space, and, I think, all Lithuanians lived in the third space, too, and it is interesting and helpful what Homi K. Bhabha and others say about it. My position is not just belief in one set of theoretical terms or so, but to try to invoke new ones again and again, and this is helpful.

Violeta Davoliūtė: I support your point very strongly. In terms of the Baltic context we are still creating the concepts, we are exploring because so much is unexplored, so much underresearched and there is so much rigidity. I can't imagine the process of exploration without, so to say, playing with some ideas and the theories that were created in the 1960s and 1970s in different contexts but can still be informative in the Baltic context as well. I myself use the concept of Angel Rama *lettered cities* and try to apply it looking at the formation of the Lithuanian elites after World War II. I find this comparative approach informative, but I understand that some colleagues of mine will be looking at it and thinking "What the hell is she doing?" But in a way this is precisely the effect I want to have – I think that comparing processes in different contexts helps to start thinking out of the box and developing a more comparative approach which is strongly lacking, at least in the Lithuanian context. It is educational, if nothing else.

Violeta Kelertienė: The Greimas school of semiotics is very prominent in Vilnius. But I believe we should try different keys and methodologies, we will not agree on a single one, of course. For me it was fascinating here to hear not always only Bourdieu...

Evgeny Dobrenko: Methodologies, of course, is a very important issue. But the first word in the topic of this conference is Soviet. And it is also important to discuss a couple of issues that were mentioned during the discussion. For example, yesterday in Valentina Kharkhun's paper the generation approach was mentioned which is quite productive. There are some cases when it was applied to Soviet material and worked perfectly (in Marietta Chudakova's works). The generational aspect is important, but there is something broader than that, – the dialectics between concepts we use and real historical process. We work with historical *longue durée* subjects. And at the same time we use concepts that are part of the material which we analyse. One of them is socialist realism. On the one hand, you have a concept, practically – a canon, more or less as we understand it. And then you have a developing historical process that was discussed in Valentyna's paper. And how do we deal with these two things? One is stable, the other one is still in flux. It is important to look at both sides. There is something very stable about a concept, for example, that of socialist realism, but there is something that is very dynamic in it as well. And maybe

we need to look into the very definition of the term that we use – be it socialist realism or something else. Half of the problem is the definition we use. If we define something in very strict and rigid terms, practically we're moving towards a crash with history. In the case of socialist realism – if you see it as just an incarnation of Stalinism which it was, but it was not only that. If you try to apply the concept to the literature of the 1960s or the architecture of the 1970s or the sculpture of the 1980s, before the end of the Soviet Union, you'll see that there is socialist realism there. But the difference is that in 1949 it occupied practically 99 percent of public space, in 1959 it occupied 70 percent of it, in 1969 it occupied, probably, 50, and by the late 1980s it was somewhere 10 percent. Apparently, you are not dealing with something stable. There is something, but what is this „something“? How to touch it, how to define it? But if you see the concept in its dynamics then you won't have a problem with applying it to a real historical process. I'm sure we all are dealing with concepts that are quite understandable, but at the same time (be it a genre, or children literature or whatever) we need to negotiate the material and the concept we're using.

Violeta Kelertienė: I watched socialist realism from America, the Lithuanian literature that was being produced. For me it was the production of the only official publishing house „Vaga“ other than „samizdat“ which we had very little of (we had a religious „samizdat“). That meant if „Vaga“ released a new book, it must then be socialist realism. But the definition changed over the years and there was pretty much nothing left. Every year wonderful books appeared...

Evgeny Dobrenko: with less and less of the official content...

Dalia Satkauskytė: in manuals of literary theory of the Soviet times all this was still named socialist realism...

Evgeny Dobrenko: they wanted to sell it as socialist realism...

Aušra Jurgutienė: I would like to add some ideas about socialist realism. In the 1970s in Lithuanian criticism there was a large discussion about socialist realism – what is it? I can mention the book „Socialist Realism and Modern Artistic Searches“ (*Socialistinis realizmas ir šiuolaikiniai meniniai ieškojimai*, 1981)

and especially „Problems of Modern Criticism“ (*Šiuolaikinės kritikos problemos*, 1975). Some critics considered that socialist realism was a dogma pushed from the centre in Moscow. But the majority of literary critics thought that socialist realism covers literary works published at that time, and its notion is in flux. The main question in this discussion was if all literature written in the Soviet period should be named socialist realism or only a part of it could be named socialist realism, as modernist literature was something different. This discussion had an ideological character.

Vilius Ivanauskas: I'm a social historian, so for me it is very obvious that in some presentations we see too simplistic and monolithic an approach to what various Soviet policies were. I see the division: there is a Soviet policy, and there are local elites acting and making some particularity somewhere in Lithuania, Ukraine, Kazakhstan or whatever. But it is so important to know the nature of the state, to understand that Soviet policy was not monolithic, but changing in different periods. In the first plenary session chaired by Evgeny these affirmative actions were demonstrated. Also there were some contradictions between Soviet policies, and its elites were fighting (battles of local elites with the center, or battles between peripheral elites). We need to know the context of the big politics.

Katerina Clark: The relations of the local elites and the center is more complex, in no way is it a single policy, it is a kind of voices, even in the center.

Marina Balina: I would go back to the issue that we were talking about, the opposition between the local, national elite and the center. Many years ago, inspired by Evgeny Dobrenko, I was trying to come up with the most difficult methodological definition of socialist realism (concepts of *партийность*, *классовость*, *идейность*) to the volume *Социалистический канон* he and Hans Gunther co-edited. Talking about socialist realism, about social history, we have to remember that all those directors, all those rules and regulations that were created from the center were so loose. You really could read into that what you wanted. And that was the power of Soviet rule.

Violeta Kelertienė: Let's not forget that we had censorship ...

Evgeny Dobrenko: Let me address to this question. This is a very important point because we always wrongly think that socialist realism is some concept, a sort of theory. But in fact socialist realism first of all is an institution. And that is a way Bourdieu is really helpful and important. All these theoretical debates is just a camouflage for hiding the machinery of power which is very wide – from the censorship to the place where we have been yesterday (the massacre place in Tuskulénai where in 1944–1947 the KGB imprisoned, tortured and sentenced to death more than 760 persons). *Партийность, народность* is a curtain, a very important curtain, because this machinery could not work on the open stage, it had to cover its mechanism. And the mechanism was institutional.

Katerina Clark: Individual people had their own values. We are looking not only at the machinery, but at the ideas, at the circulation of the ideology. The machinery was a means of the power.

Wolfgang Emmerich: As an American friend of mine often says, I couldn't agree with you more, but... This is a small „but“ that you already named it – the ideas, the ideology. From the German perspective, you could not talk about socialist realism without naming Lukacs' consistent theory: an optimistic hero, the types, you know that, I should not repeat it. So you have to combine the institution and the power which is behind it and then the power, the ideas and ideology get in themselves.

Katerina Clark: The ideas are not unitary, they are shaped by the community... I agree with you about the machinery's power...

Evgeny Dobrenko: I think the metaphor of theatre is excellent... Have you seen the theatre without stage and curtains?

Wolfgang Emmerich: But there is a machinery behind it...

Evgeny Dobrenko: ..some are moving the decorations, there is a director there, the actors, the viewers...

Violeta Kelertienė: Let's not forget that artists and writers did suffer, people paid with their lives, at least in our country. People were closed up in psychiatric

hospitals to be injected with insulin. There were differences in other countries as to how these things were applied (and this conference showed some of them). I think Lithuania was more strict, especially in some periods, than other places, but we don't know enough about each others experiences.

Katerina Clark: In the 1960s Lithuania had the reputation of being the place for the things which could not happen in Moscow...

Voices: that's for sure...

Katerina Clark: and, I suppose, because of Lithuanian which was a minor language, and the central authorities and intellectuals themselves could not access all material written in Lithuania. Many Russian intellectuals were coming to Lithuania to see its theatre which was more accessible. Lithuania's enormous importance in the 1960s...

Violeta Kelertienė: until 1972 when a young man Romas Kalanta self-immolated protesting the Soviet regime in Lithuania; his death provoked the largest post-war riots in Lithuania, effectively ending the Thaw.

Violeta Davoliūtė: But, Violeta, there was no complete crack-down after that. Antanas Sniečkus managed to convince the center that it was plain hooliganism.

Violeta Kelertienė: But, for example, none of Juozas Aputis' works between 1972 and 1978 were published.

Eogeny Dobrenko: We know lots of the cases when literary works could not be published in Ukraine but they managed to publish in Moscow. Moscow was much more liberal.

Dalia Satkauskytė: We know the myth that Lithuania was the West for the rest of Soviet Union. Recently a lot of memoirs of intellectuals (philosophers, literary researchers, and so on) who studied in Moscow have appeared. They all mention that in Moscow they could find a more open and productive intellectual atmosphere.

Violeta Davoliūtė: But, Dalia, it was not so simple also. I've done a number of interviews with the writers and intellectuals here, and Martinaitis or even Grauskas, actually, stated that Ukrainian, Belarussian writers would come and see what has been written.

Dalia Satkauskytė: You're speaking about artists, and I am speaking about intellectuals in general.

Marina Balina: In the periphery the situation was much more liberal than in the center. In the 1970s you could defend a dissertation about Osip Mandelstam in Perm, and you could not say a word about it in Leningrad.

Vilius Ivanauskas: We don't need to find the most liberal space. In concrete republics the reception of the nomenklatura was different. Certain things were protected more in some peripheries than in other ones. For example, the center often mentioned the bourgeois nationalism of Lithuania, so to counterbalance it the cosmopolitan ideas could get here more easily than in other republics, and more universalism could appear in certain periods. And Vytautas Kubilius, a famous Lithuanian literary critic, when he was condemned by some dominant writers here in Lithuania, got support in Moscow and published his articles there. I mean the general principle was the same, just different parts had got more control in different peripheries because some aspects were conceived to be more dangerous in a certain republic.

Marina Balina: You are talking about a lot of writers who would go to Moscow, publish their work in Moscow and come back. What would happen with them? Is publication in Moscow a validation of their state?

Vilius Ivanauskas: Of course, it is the symbolic capital.

Aušra Jurgutienė: If a Lithuanian writer wanted to have a publication in German or in another European language, first he had to achieve a publication of it in Russian.

Violeta Kelertienė: The same Vytautas Kubilius in order to enter graduate studies had to inform on his professors in Lithuanian literature at the university. He had

to write for the KGB, and four women were removed from the university, there were other troubles later. Let's not forget these kinds of things.

Katerina Clark: There are different historical moments and circumstances, but we are also talking about the facts. I'm arguing about the complexity.

Mindaugas Kvietkauskas: I would like to thank all participants of this conference. During it we spoke about theoretical issues, about confronting different realities and experiences, joining our approaches and constructing a common discourse. These topics are very important because the public debate in our society is still very intense and sometimes very hot. The issue of working over the traumas, of constructing more coherent narratives of our own society is very important. Such conferences, such academic debates are very significant in the broader field, to use Bourdieu's concept, of our contemporary social public life. So thank you very much again for a very good academic provocation.

Marina Balina: Thank you so much for your hospitality.