Предлагаемая ниже вниманию читателей подборка статей включает тексты, родившиеся в ходе реализации проекта «“Ресурсное проклятие” на циркумполярных территориях: российский и международный опыт анализа и урегулирования конфликтов из-за невозобновляемых ресурсов в местах традиционного проживания аборигенных этнических групп» (РНФ, грант № 15-18-00112)¹ в 2017–2018 гг. Первый из них – своего рода введение в проблему – публикуется на английском языке, поскольку изначально был написан в качестве программы (силлабуса) курса лекций на этом языке и как таковой на английском же и был прочитан магистрантам Института социальной и культурной антропологии и этнографии Венского университета весной 2018 г. Следующие три текста максимально детально показывают то, каким образом феномен «ресурсного проклятия» проявляется на различных территориях Сибири и Севера, и то, какого рода объяснительные модели могут быть задействованы при их анализе с позиций антропологии. Две статьи представляет собой исследовательские кейсы, реализованные аспирантами (или бывшими аспирантами) кафедры этнографии исторического факультета МГУ на якутских и курильских материалах, а завершающая статья, написанная на основе многолетнего мониторинга ситуации в Кемеровской области, стала результатом сотрудничества коллег Московского, Кемеровского и Томского государственных университетов.
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Summary. The proposed course traces key developments in anthropological research on phenomena of the “resource curse” in post-soviet Siberia. After discussing some fundamental terminology used in the course and overviewing official documents drawn on in social impact assessment practices, as well as following a brief discussion of the history of resource extraction in territories inhabited by the indigenous peoples of Siberia and social and cultural consequences of industrial development in the region, the author goes through various case studies of so-called “ethnological impact assessment” (in Russian: etnologicheskaya ekspertiza) conducted in Siberia, taking note of some major problems of interaction between the state, business companies and indigenous peoples, and analysing underlying theoretical approaches in each of the cases.
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A course proposal

A short description of the course, including methods of instruction

The course will trace key developments in anthropological research on phenomena of the “resource curse” in post-soviet Siberia and will be divided into three main parts. First, we will familiarise ourselves with some basic terms used in the course and overview official documents that are normally adhered to all over the world in social impact assessment practices. Second, we will look at the history of resource extraction in territories inhabited by the indigenous peoples of Siberia and discuss social and cultural consequences of industrial development in the region. Finally, we will go through various case studies of so-called “ethnological impact assessment” (in Russian: etnologicheskaya ekspertiza) conducted in Siberia, taking note of some major problems of interaction between the state, business companies and indigenous peoples, and analysing underlying theoretical approaches in each of the cases.

The course of 6 3-hour classes will consist of both lectures and seminars. The first half of the course will primarily include lectures, while the second one will be comprised of seminars. Throughout the course, sufficient time will be reserved for student presentations and discussions.

Learning objectives

On completion of the course, students will be able to:
1) compare main features of internationally recognised SIAs and examples of “etnologicheskaya ekspertiza” in Siberia,
2) demonstrate understanding of differences and similarities in ethnological impact assessment practices depending on the living conditions of IPs and types of extracted resources,
3) see and understand the reasons for the existence of a significantly more fragmented picture of interests than that of just three groups of stakeholders usually singled out in this type of analysis, namely, business, the state, and indigenous population,
4) analyse the phenomenon of “resource curse” not just from the “applied anthropology” or the anthropology of development point of view but in the frame of other (contemporary) theoretical approaches as well.

Assessment
Assessment will include a seminar paper and an exam. In order to pass the course, one needs to receive at least 60 points. A “sehr gut” grade requires at least 90 out of 100 points (a “gut” one at least 80 points, etc.).

An exam will count for 30% of the grade, and a short seminar paper – due by the end of the course – will count for 40%. Short oral presentations will make up 20% of the grade, and the remaining 10% will be determined by course participation.

Course syllabus (lectures)

Lecture 1. Relations between extractive companies, communities, and the state. An introduction
The introductory lecture provides an overview of academic research and current practice relating to dialogue between extractive companies, communities, and the state, both generally and in post-soviet Russia in particular. Applied anthropology, the anthropology of development, and certain aspects of it such as the “resource curse” or “the anthropology of oil” are the spheres of scientific and practical research that have been actively developing in the last 20 years. They cover the problems of existence of different socio-cultural and ethnic groups in situations of conflict over extraction of the resource rent – an income from production and sale of minerals – which characterises today’s economies in many countries of the world.

In Russia, this topic has been studied with regards to the situation that led to the fight for oil in Chechnya and in relation to the peaceful exploration of oil and gas reserves in Siberia for more than 60 years that laid the foundation for the welfare of the Russian state. Nevertheless, the use of the term “conflict” is quite acceptable and justified to describe the situation in Siberia. Throughout the history of northern resources development, intergroup interaction was accompanied by conflicts on various levels, and that has had most
dramatic implications for small Aboriginal groups whose lifestyle and culture have been transformed as a result. These conflicts were not strongly pronounced at the initial stage of development, having been veiled with the rhetoric of solidarity of the Soviet people with the development and enhancement of the common homeland’s economic potential. However, it was during these early stages that the Aboriginal culture underwent revolutionary and – as history has shown – irreversible changes. The conflicts escalated and became explicit in the post-perestroika period when the redistribution of property and spheres of influence in oil production and resource rents were happening against the backdrop of a fall in living standards for ordinary people. That concerned Aboriginal indigenous peoples of the North and the “Russian” old-timers (the latter in fact being of varied ethnic origins and local cultures), as well as endemic descendants of the first settlers and builders in the North who had by that time long lived in these territories. By the beginning of the first decade of the 21st century, these conflicts seemed to have been muffled but they still had the potential of escalating during modern economic and financial crises. In world anthropology, these kinds of conflicts have been recently considered and approached from different angles ranging from traditional research on ethnic, linguistic and cultural conflicts and transformations to research on the “resource curse” as a special form of struggle for dominance which itself is becoming a separate culture whereby the ethnic and social boundaries of different groups are being changed.

The influence that such situations of domination and conflict have on the communities either existing or emerging in Siberia and the Far East of modern Russia is currently one of the most important and urgent social and humanitarian problems of practical importance that requires scientific understanding. One aspect of the problem not to be overlooked is sustainable development which has become one of the top lines of research in Russia and around the world.

Industrial development in areas inhabited by indigenous peoples is a common phenomenon in many territories adjacent to the Arctic. Often, the implementation of oil and gas projects causes conflicts between indigenous peoples and oil workers whose interests in land and resources inevitably overlap and whose views on the problem often do not match. The lecture will give a brief description of some models of interaction between industrial companies and indigenous peoples and discuss the most frequent causes of conflicts (as well as the ways to resolve them) through the example of several communities living on the lands of their ancestors in such countries as Canada, the United States, Norway, and Russia.

Also discussed in the lecture will be some fundamental ideas behind social impact assessment, the main steps in the development of applied anthropology, examples of so-called best practices, and major anthropological ap-
proaches to the analysis and resolution of conflicts over non-renewable resources in areas traditionally inhabited by indigenous ethnic groups.

Lecture 2. “Etnologicheskaya ekspertiza” in post-soviet Russia: history, fundamental features, and international context

The lecture presents the essence of the current interpretation of “etnologicheskaya ekspertiza” in Russia, as well as epistemological and practical problems associated with the interpretation of Russian “etnologicheskaya ekspertiza” projects. It discusses fundamental characteristics of the history of surveys within the framework of ethnography and applied anthropology and provides an overview of definitions, legal regulations, and practices of “etnologicheskaya ekspertiza” in Russia. Three major types of “etnologicheskaya ekspertiza” are differentiated: (1) complex modern research including ethnological impact assessment: legally binding ecological and historical-and-cultural surveys, (2) surveys initiated by citizens against the implementation of state designs, and (3) official investigations regulated by regional laws. All the three ways of conducting ethnological impact assessment will be briefly illustrated with examples from the past decades. We will come to a conclusion that nowadays there is no comprehensively elaborated or at least generally accepted academic concept of ethnological impact assessment in Russia. Methods used vary depending on the competencies of research groups. Modes of approaching and theorising on the topic that have been tested and are widespread in international scholarship are missing from or undefined in the research practice of Russian scholars.

Among these there is the methodology of business anthropology and the anthropology of corporations developed internationally which enables us not only to consider the relationship between extractive companies and indigenous peoples (local communities) in terms of assessing the influence of the former on the latter but to also see the reverse processes: natural (forced or voluntary) changes within corporations, on all levels of their structure.

This combination of traditional expert approach assessing the extractive industry’s impact on local indigenous communities and attempts to synchronously consider adaptive strategies of business corporations is undoubtedly valuable because it brings the researcher to the level of practically important conclusions about the most effective ways of mutual adaptation and further joint development of companies and the local population.

Such a methodology is characteristic of research offering the widest possible coverage of various issues of extractive companies’ social impact on local communities and provides a relevant social impact assessment, unlike the Russian research practice with its attempts to conduct ethnological or ethno-ecological impact assessment instead and its focus mainly on ethnic (ethno-social, ethno-cultural) aspects of interaction – hence “ethnological” impact assessment – as it is shown in the lecture.
Considerable attention is paid here to social anthropology in terms of evaluating the effectiveness of extractive companies’ social responsibility policies and providing them with practical recommendations for general adjustments in such policies as well as for adjustments that would take into account specific circumstances of local communities. The experience of interaction between indigenous peoples and mining companies accumulated worldwide includes a number of cases where business corporations even superseded the state as a regulator of social processes. As a rule, this happens when the state does not demonstrate a high enough degree of centralisation with regard to solving local socio-economic development issues.

It is important not to forget about the practices of anthropology and indigenous research which make it necessary to ensure involvement of indigenous and local communities (place-based experts) in impact assessment, both at the stage of concluding agreements with corporations and when monitoring implementation thereof. The currently known Russian experience in carrying out “etnologicheskaya ekspertiza” basically comes down to the indigenous communities not participating in the research process directly but being just to some extent involved only at the stage of discussing the final results.

Finally, in all of the cases of community impact assessment we shall see the use of developed standards of impact assessment and scientific-and-technical justification for compensation measures and social-and-cultural rehabilitation of aboriginal groups in the event of their involuntary resettlement from the territories of traditional residence that have fallen into the category of intensive industrial development zones.

Following the overview of main features of research projects carried out in Russia, we shall also discuss some possible prospects for the future.

Lecture 3. Legally binding ecological and historical-and-cultural surveys in Siberia

Today, ethnological impact assessment (understood in almost all cases in accordance with the corresponding definition given in the Federal Law “On guarantees of rights...” of 1999) is carried out in one form or another in a number of regions of Russia. The lecture presents and discusses two of its variants.

The first one is ethnological impact assessment conducted within the framework of certain legislative ecological or historical-and-cultural expert works. Here, main examinations are done as state examinations, and the ethnological component serves as a basis for the development of certain recommendations that are or are not legally binding. Such was the examination of the Katun project in Altai in the late 1980s. This kind of impact assessment – with legally non-binding conclusions – is observed in the territory of the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous District (Golovnev et al., 2014). With certain reservations, within this “combined” type of ethnological impact as-
assessment also fall ethnological studies which are periodically conducted in the framework of historical-and-cultural assessment as a complement of, for example, archaeological works. Although, as follows from the published evidence, these ethnological reports are included in the final report as an independent volume, apparently they are not legally binding.

The second variant is public impact assessment. This type is exemplified by a number of examinations that have been done in the territory of the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous District and, in part, in the Kemerovo region.

The lecture presents and discusses these cases in detail.

Lecture 4. “Etnologicheskaya ekspertiza” in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia): bureaucratic procedures and structural violence

Under the law of 2010, state ethnological impact assessment in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) is designed to protect the interests of indigenous peoples of the North (indigenous peoples) in conflict situations when “business entities” (primarily mining companies) claim the right to use the resources located in these peoples’ territories of traditional residence. Moreover, with regards to the procedure of such impact assessment, dialogue and partnership are expected to be established between industrial companies and communities of indigenous peoples. At the same time, “etnologicheskaya ekspertiza” is developed as a bureaucratic procedure, which means that it can be analysed in terms of projecting structural violence. According to David Graeber, in structural situations normative decisions – backed by the threat of anonymous state violence – are made based on limited and inadequate knowledge of the counterparty, in this case – knowledge about the indigenous people. In other words, if the conceptual foundations of D. Graeber’s theory of bureaucracy are correct, state ethnological impact assessment implemented as a bureaucratic procedure must be structurally inconsistent with the conditions needed for developing the dialogue and partnership between the parties. In the lecture we shall see whether these foundations are applicable to the analysis of ethnological impact assessment specifically in the Republic of Sakha but also in other contemporary cases of “etnologicheskaya ekspertiza” in Siberia more generally.

Lecture 5. Oil companies and indigenous peoples. On the rhetoric of development and anthropologists as cultural brokers: the case of Sakhalin

In one of his works the well-known anthropologist Adam Kuper wrote that scientists engaged in social research should reconsider or even abandon the uncritical use of the concept of “primitive society” and the mythology that accompanies this construct in favour of a comprehensive study of reality (Kuper 1998: 243–244). Be that as it may, the idea of the existence of a “primitive society” – which has long existed and is understandable – continues to be popular not only among some national leaders but also among state
power representatives – the fact that is particularly well reflected in the programma of indigenous peoples’ economic development.

The lecture will be based on the analysis of the “Assistance Plan” on the island of Sakhalin as it is a good example of such an approach and generally because it reproduces the ideas laid out in both state and regional programmes, as well as in World Bank directives, and in speeches and publications of representatives of the national intelligentsia, including many experts and scientists. In 2010, preparations for the implementation of the second “Assistance Plan” began. We will see that this plan, being “European” in terms of its form, remains “soviet” in terms of its contents, in fact playing in the life of the indigenous peoples of Sakhalin that same role of the patron that was the prerogative of the state in soviet times. “Sustainable development” began to be understood as another stage of evolution or a social formation that the indigenous peoples have yet to reach.

Contrary to this logic it turns out that at the moment the traditional economy and even the indigenous peoples themselves are developing somehow differently, unsteadily and incorrectly or are not developing at all. Such a view suggests that the “Europeans” either have already achieved this stage or have the knowledge of how to do that. Indigenous peoples, following the “European” example, should first go through the stage of capitalism, and as a result oil company’s experts and authors of state economic development programmes pay so much attention to the integration of indigenous peoples into the system of market relations and their adaptation to modern (European) society. Thus, for them indigenous peoples are “the Other” that is different from their own society and is located on a different level of development. Consequently, the “manipulation of fantasy” as to the existence of the “primitive society” that Kuper wrote about successfully continues to be the case in post-soviet discourse and to influence policy towards indigenous peoples implemented by both state authorities and business.

Lecture 6. Shamanic and mining practices of dealing with the world(s) of spirits: the case of South Siberia

Spiritual / shamanic worlds as perceived by the Turkic-speaking groups in South Siberia consist of up to five worlds with a very detailed picture available of only one of these worlds – the lower one. In ritual texts and people’s explanations this world is shown as the land of the deceased, even though some “practices” are known whereby a living person can enter the underworld / mountain world and eventually bring something valuable back. This “gift” is not particularly valued because his or her contemporaries would normally be dead by the time he / she returns to the middle world. One of the shaman’s tasks was to search for a lost soul (a lost person) in the hope to regulate the temporarily broken social order.
Mining practices in soviet and post-soviet times reveal different approaches to subsurface treasures. Official ideologies and superstitions of mineworkers, among whom there often were representatives of local indigenous groups as well, varied significantly. The pressure of mining industries that has changed practically all social, cultural and ecological landscapes of indigenous societies has brought about a shamanic revival as a last means of resistance.

Drawing on our own field data and contemporary theoretical frames (such as indigenous perspectivism by E. Viveiros de Castro), we will identify major differences and similarities in dealing with the world(s) of spirits in shamanic cosmologies and in perceptions and practices of actors from mining companies thereby showing how different cultural interpretations are used, forgotten or invented in order to either defend the ancestral land or derive at least some benefit (or maybe even super profit) from losing it, and how these strategies interact in the apparently unequal social conditions which the main stakeholders find themselves in today.

Literature for the course

Handbooks/manuals on SIA

General and case specific monographs
Journals’ special issues


Additional papers and reviews
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