

---

## SUMMARY, No. 11–12 (86–87), 2009

---

2009 last issue three main thematic points are (1) discussion over the origins of the modern Belarusian identity and basic foundations of the Belarusian nation-building (2) the new challenges in Belarusian social and humanities sciences; (3) the highlighting of the hidden or forgotten pages of the Belarusian past.

The (1) thematic section presents a discussion, sparked by a recently published book of the Mahiloŭ based historian **Ihar Marzaluk** 'The Myths of the Belarusian Nativist Historiography'. It opens with its review by the historian **Aleh Lickievič** 'On the «Ruthenization» of Baltic Population of Grand Duchy of Lithuania in XIV — early XV centuries'. A philosopher from Mahiloŭ **Alaksiej Baciukoŭ** continues discussion in his essay entitled 'Who Is Afraid of Ihar Marzaluk'. The section contains an exchange of opinions between the initiator of the whole discussion **Ihar Marzaluk** and his fierce critic **Siarhiej Astankovič**, respectively 'Another Liberation' by the latter, the response 'A Clarification for All Interested' and the final remark by **Siarhiej Astankovič** '5 Questions for Ihar Marzaluk'. The section ends with critical essays by **Vital Jeŭmiańkoŭ** 'Deliverance from the Lie?' and **Vital Aŭramienka** 'The Belarusian Historiography: the War of 'Myths' or the War of 'Ambitions'?'

There are other three pieces close to this thematic agenda. They form a discussion caused by the preface by Stockholm based historian **Andrej Katlarčuk** to ARCHE # 9 2009 ('Lithuanian') issue. **Hanna Vasilevič**, a PhD candidate from Prague Metropolitan University, Czech Republic, and her co-author **Kirył Kaścian**, a PhD candidate from Bremen University, Germany, criticize it, in their 'The Legacy of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the Eyes of Belarusian and Lithuanian historians: a Field for Equal Opportunities?', for incoherency with current Belarusian 'nativist' historiography concepts. In his response 'History Is Very Complicated Science' **Andrej Katlarčuk** stresses the need of complex renewal of the Belarusian historical science, which continues to be intellectually isolated for political reasons after Soviet Empire collapse. **Vasilevič** and **Kaścian** try to justify their nativist beliefs in a final piece 'History Is not Just Complicated, but Interdisciplinary Science'.

The (2) thematic section contains an analyses by **Siarhiej Zaprudzki**, a professor of History of the Belarusian Language department of Belarusian State Univerisity. His comprehensive account 'Some Remarks on 'Trasyanka' Study, or Challenges for the Belarusian Humanities and Social Sciences' 'is dedicated to trasyanka, or trasyanka, a Belarusian–Russian patois. Over decades trasyanka' existed without any academic attention. Although Soviet utopia of the Belarusian language flourishing in a communist state collapsed long ago, Belarusian academics remain incapable to disclose adequately its sophisticated nature.

Another linguist **Žmicier Saŭka** in his 'Dictionary-Fumbler' reviews an orthography dictionary of Belarusian, edited by director of the academic Institute of Belarusian language A. Łukašanec. Saŭka concludes that the academic attempts to normalize the Belarusian orthography prove to be chaotic and inconsequent. The section finishes with a review by **Volf Rubinčyk** 'Chess Trash in Mahilou Style' on a quasi academic book, written by a former head on Sub-commission on scientific affairs by the lower chamber of Lukashenka's parliament Ruslan Ihnaciščaŭ.

---

## SUMMARY, No. 11–12 (86–87), 2009

---

The (3) thematic section includes a review by **Aleś Biely** named ‘False Faces of the Past’ on the Białystok based Belarusian historians **Aleh Latyŝonak** and **Jaŭhien Miranovič**’s synthesis ‘The History of Belarus Since the Second Half of the XVIII Century Till the Beginning of the XXIth’. Historian **Aleś Jurkaviec** in his ‘A Narrow Chink in a Dark Room’ reacted to the publication in an official periodic “Biełaruskaja Dumka” on the Belarusian national partisan movement in early 1950s. Despite its tendentious character, it provides some worth information, because it is based on KGB sources, unavailable to independent researches. **Alaksandar Pilecki** in his ‘The Populist Freak of the Imagination’ reflects on the Adam Eberhardt book ‘Gra pozorów. Stosunki rosyjsko-białoruskie 1991—2008’ (Polski Instytut Spraw Międzynarodowych, Warszawa 2008.) **Anatol Sidarevič** in ‘Another Source’ criticizes a book by Sviatlana Bielaja on the Belarusian emigrants in the USA who lived in Vilnia during interwar time.

**Uładzimir Lachoŭski** in his ‘Minsk Stay of an Eternal Voyager’ unveils new pages of a famous Belarusian artist Jazep Drazdovič’s life and artistic creation. **Krzysztof Pogorzelski** and **Krzysztof Sychowicz**, the historians from the Białystok branch of the Polish Institute of the National Remembrance, in their ‘Secret Agent Kastuś, Security Service and Belarusian Milieu at the Białystok Region’ reconstruct secret activity between 1958 and 1970 performed by top Belarusian writer Sakrat Janovič. They describe also the circumstances under which he broke up with Polish communist secret service.

A lecturer from Warsaw University, **Jury Hryboŭski**, in his ‘The International Contacts of the Belarusian Emigration in the West (1945—1956)’ shows the attempts of some Belarusian activists to break the wall of their alienation in free word. His counterpart from the department of the Philosophy and Methodology of the Belarusian State University **Andrej Šuman** in his ‘Hebrews-Ashkenazy As a Native People of Belarus’ traces the historical trajectory of the ethnic community in the country. **Aleś Biely** in his ‘Catholic Community in Belarus: an Attempt of Reflections’ offers some ideas how to provide the reproduction of the community, namely its customs, traditions, etc.

Sankt-Petersburg researcher and publisher of Belarusian writer Jan Barščeŭski’s (1894—1851) works **Dmitriy Vinokhodov** ‘The Peculiarities of the Literature Ophthalmology’ carries on a controversy to an article of **Mikoła Chaŭstovič**, published in ARCHE # 4 2009. Mikoła Chaŭstovič answers to him in his ‘An Answer to an Oculist, Free from Ideological Biases’.

The issue presents, as well, a never published correspondence of a prominent Belarusian writer of 1920s **Uładzimir Duboŭka**, written between 1928 and 1935. He was arrested in 1930, after a falsified accusation to be a member of a fictitious ‘Belarus Liberation Union’. Thus a number of the letters was written from exile.

Poet **Uładzimir Arloŭ** contributes to the Literature rubrics with his latest lyrics. Analyst **Andrej Dyńko** evaluates the sustainability of the domestic economic model during the global financial crisis.

The issue closes with a letter by a political scientist **Jury Čavusaŭ** on plagiarism in the national intellectual discourse.