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This thesis is dedicated to studying the current processes of the Kaliningrad Region’s identity transformation by examining debates over restoration of Kaliningrad’s historical name, Königsberg in regional media. The aim of the study is to find out how does the regional media contribute to the renaming debate, and how is the regional identity transformed within the discussion in the media. The material for the analysis is a collection of 24 articles from 5 regional media sources published in January-April 2013. Articles are examined using Fairclough’s three-dimensional concept of analysis of media texts.

This work provides an introduction into the socio-cultural background of the topic. It thoroughly investigates how text producers use genre of “letters to the editor” to influence their audiences in a certain way. It discovers the political dimension of the renaming debate by looking at standpoints of various political actors and their representations in the media texts. It defines central topics within the renaming discussion and examines argumentation of renaming supporters and their opponents. It identifies discourses influencing the process of transformation of the Kaliningrad Region’s identity.

The study has shown that some of regional media outlets prefer to keep the status quo, while others are interested in the further development of the renaming debate. The latter are trying to introduce new topics and fresh opinions to their audience. The analysis of argumentation has shown that some arguments have already lost their persuasive power since the beginning of the discussion in 1991, while new arguments are entering the scene. The most influential discourse is the discourse of Europeanness, which central idea is to become as close to the EU as it is possible, without being separated from Russia. It shows how the Kaliningrad Region attempts to utilize its position in-between the EU and Russia. Conducted study has demonstrated significance of borderlands as political actors in international relations and importance of analyzing political dynamics related to margins along with state-state dynamics.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

This research focuses on the debates over the name of Kaliningrad, the capital city of the Russian enclave within the borders of the EU. Its point of departure is the idea that as a “space in-between” (Browning & Joenniemi 2004) the political dynamics of the Kaliningrad Region can reveal interesting insights not only about European-Russian relations but additionally about international relations in general. Russia’s Kaliningrad Region attracted the attention of the academic world community due to its unique geopolitical location after the end of the Cold War. After the collapse of the Soviet Union the region became separated from the mainland Russia, and thus became an exclave. In addition to that, since its neighboring countries, Lithuania and Poland, joined the European Union in 2004, the Kaliningrad Region turned into an enclave within the EU (Vinokurov 2005: 57). Scholars have studied various aspects of the Kaliningrad Region related to its position in-between Russia and the EU, such as military-strategic aspects, issues of its socio-economic development, ensuring political stability in the region and preventing marginalization. Some scholars view the Kaliningrad Region as a region of confrontation, meaning that it may become a source of insecurity in the Baltic Sea region. Others believe that it is a region of cooperation, as it gives Russia a chance to be integrated into the process of Western European development on a regional level (Sergunin 2007: 56-57). Most scholars who research the Kaliningrad Region agree that it is an import matter for EU-Russian relations (Joenniemi and Makarychev 2004: 3).

One particular topic, which is actively discussed in academic community, is formation of the Kaliningrad’s identity. First of all, it is interesting due to the migrant character of the region’s socium. (Berendeev 2007: 1; Klemeshov 2009: 110). As the indigenous German population of the territory was replaced by new inhabitants that came from various regions of the USSR, the process of regional identity formation had to begin anew (Wellman 2007: 1). Whilst the official discourse aimed at preserving a strong Soviet identity amongst migrants, the historical heritage of the region also had a certain influence on construction of regional identity. Secondly, after the dissolution of the Soviet Union the region’s sociocultural links to Russia started weakening (Klemeshov 2009: 110). According to research conducted by the Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University in 2008, the

1 In this thesis instead of using oblast, the official Russian term, I use the English term ‘region’.
national identity of the citizens of the Kaliningrad Region is predominantly based upon expectations of economic and political support from Russia. However, Kaliningraders feel that the federal government ignores the specific problems and needs of the region, which strengthens the exclave syndrome\(^2\) (Alimpieva 2009: 2). At the same time the Kaliningrad Region is subject to many non-Russian influences, as it is constantly involved in cultural exchange with its neighbors, who are non-Russian orthodox believers and non-Cyrillic writers with non-Russian habits, lifestyle and culture (Wellman 2007: 2). Furthermore, Kaliningraders tend to feel closer to Europe than to Russia not only geographically, but also in a cultural and economic sense (Alimpieva 2009: 4). Although identification with Russia prevails in the region, many Kaliningraders identify themselves as ‘European Russians’ or ‘Baltic Russians’ (Berendeev 2007: 9). At the same time during periods of crisis in relations between Russia and the EU or NATO, many Kaliningraders tend to develop a ‘protest identity’ and identify themselves as Russians to greater extent than during periods of amity (Berendeev 2007: 7).

Whilst separatist moods do exist in the region many academics (for example, Alimpieva 2009, Klemeshov 2009, Berendeev 2007) emphasize that the implementation of separatist scenarios is highly unlikely. According to research conducted in 2008, 20% of Kaliningraders want the Kaliningrad Region to become independent from the Russian Federation (Alimpieva 2009: 3). Another symptom of the weakening of Kaliningraders’ national identity is their migratory moods. 80% of Kaliningraders do not want to move to mainland Russia, while 30% of them would like to move elsewhere abroad (Alimpieva 2009: 3). The geographical remoteness of the Kaliningrad Region from its mainland state is demonstrated by the fact that about 70% of Kaliningraders under age of 30 have never other Russian regions, but travel to Poland and Lithuania frequently (Karabeshkin and Wellmann 2004: 39).

This thesis studies the current processes of the identity transformation of the Kaliningrad Region by examining the discussion of the possibility to restore the historical name of the city of Kaliningrad the Königsberg. Thus, in order to frame the re-naming issue better, I will provide an introduction into the socio-cultural background of the topic.

---

\(^2\) Exclave syndrome is a term used to describe a feeling of growing concern about remoteness from the mainland state among inhabitants of a particular exclave territory.
1.2 The context of the renaming debate

1.2.1. De-Germanization and de-historization after 1945

The history of the city of Kaliningrad and the Kaliningrad Region began in earnest after the end of the Second World War, when the northern part of East Prussia became affiliated to the Soviet Union. The Soviet government made the decision to turn Königsberg, a city devastated by bombing raids into a model Soviet city. The new city was meant to become a home for thousands of Soviet citizens recruited from different regions of the Union (Browning and Joenniemi 2004: 711). Shortly after death of Mikhail Kalinin, Head of the Soviet State in 1946 the city was renamed to Kaliningrad. Following that everything that invoked any memory of the region’s German past was renamed: towns, villages, streets and even geographical features, such as rivers (Browning and Joenniemi 2004: 711). The remaining German population of the city (about 140,000 people) was expelled by the end of the 1940s (Browning and Joenniemi 2004: 711) and by January 1950 more than 400,000 Soviet citizens had settled in Kaliningrad (Berger 2010: 348). Many of them were members of Red Army and their families.

The Soviet government started the process of de-Germanization of its new territory. Newly published literature about the Kaliningrad Region provided detailed geographical information, while the history of this land started with the account of storming Königsberg at the end of the Second World War (Sezneva 2002: 51). In official statements Königsberg was described as a bulwark of German militarism and fascism (Berger 2010: 348) and an antagonist to the ‘Soviet way of life’ due to its ‘capitalist character’ (Sezneva 2002: 53). Kaliningrad became a place, where history was limited to the post-war period (Browning and Joenniemi 2004: 711). The process of de-Germanization and de-historization of the territory included the complete change of the cityscape. The decision was made to rebuild the city in a way that would not bear any resemblance to its German past: streets and avenues were straightened, cobblestone roads were covered with asphalt, old bridges across the River Pregola were destroyed, and Soviet-type residential areas were built (Sezneva 2002: 54). Additionally, the city was turned into a symbol of the Soviet victory over fascist Germany with monuments to the Red Army dotted around the city’s landscape (Berger 2010: 348).

However, the rebuilding of the city did not progress as fast as it was promised, which led to frustration among new Kaliningraders (Berger 2010: 349). After the Soviet Baltic Fleet was headquartered in Kaliningrad in the 1950s, with its main base in Baltiysk, the Kaliningrad Region
gained the image of the westernmost outpost and the military bastion of the Soviet Union (Oldberg 2000: 271; Berger 2010: 348). Militarization increased citizens’ dissatisfaction as it brought with it restrictions to freedom of movement (Berger 2010: 349). The Kaliningrad Region was “closed” not only to foreigners, but also to most Soviet citizens (Diener and Hagen 2011: 574).

In the 1960s Kaliningraders, partly due to growing frustration, began to rethink the past of their city and re-evaluate its cultural heritage, which included German memorials and buildings. Throughout these years there was a major discussion in the city on the future of remains of the Königsberg Castle (Sezneva 2002: 53-54; Berger 2010: 349). A number of architects and intellectuals mobilized public opinion to support the restoration of the thirteenth century castle, which was an architectural landmark of Königsberg. However, despite Kaliningrad citizens’ protests the castle remains were completely destroyed by the end of the 1960s in order to remove the reminder of the ‘Prussian militarism’.

In 1970 the construction of a new administration building, the House of Soviets started to the east from the place, where the Königsberg Castle used to be. What was to become the tallest building in Kaliningrad at the highest point of the city, was meant to overshadow all the other buildings and signify the triumph of socialism (Oldebrg 2000: 272). However, construction work stopped in the 1980s and the House of Soviets has never been completed. This unfinished building became a landmark of the city and gained the nickname ‘Monster’ (Sezneva 2002: 57) or ‘Buried Robot’ among Kaliningraders (Figure 1). The Königsberg Cathedral, which was located on Kneiphof

**Figure 1. Königsberg Castle and the House of Soviets.**

![Königsberg Castle in 1910.](image1a.png)


![The House of Soviets was painted light blue in preparation for Putin’s visit in 2005. However, the interior of the building remains empty.](image1b.png)

*Source: www.smartnews.ru*
Island (now Kant Island) and was mostly destroyed during the bombing raid, was saved by the fact that the tombstone of eighteenth-century philosopher Immanuel Kant is located at the northeastern corner of the Cathedral outside the building. In terms of Marxism-Leninism, Kant was considered ‘progressive’, therefore his tomb was preserved and remains of the Cathedral were not destroyed (Oldebrg 2000: 273).

Despite the dominance of the communist ideology, many Kaliningraders felt increasingly connected to the heritage and the history of their new home, which led to a sense of distinctiveness from other Soviet citizens. However, it was only in the years of Gorbachev’s Perestroika, when the idea of Kaliningraders as ‘European Russians’ became publicly pronounced (Browning and Joenniemi 2004: 712). Cultural societies started researching German heritage, opening small museums and producing publications on the pre-war history of the Kaliningrad Region (Oldeberg 2000: 273). At first these were mainly intellectuals who tried to escape the Soviet present by discovering the German past and started to identify with ‘König’, as they called their city (Berger 2010: 350). Many Kaliningraders who worked in the military or the fishing sector did not have much interest in the foreign past of their land (Oldberg 2000: 273-274).

1.2.2. Reconstruction of pre-war history after 1991

A large-scale reconstruction of history began with the collapse of the Soviet Union (Sezneva 2002: 60). The re-evaluation of the German period of the region expressed itself in various movements, which developed ideas of historical continuity (Sezneva 2002: 55). The restoration of old buildings and the imitation of old Königsberg architecture in new buildings became increasingly commonplace. In 1992, the reconstruction of the Königsberg Cathedral received support from Germany and the regional administration (Oldberg 2000: 276). By 1998 the Cathedral had been successfully restored. Currently, the building hosts a Lutheran and an Orthodox chapel, a museum of the history of the Cathedral, and a Museum of Immanuel Kant (Figure 2). The Königsberg Cathedral, together with the tomb of Emmanuel Kant, became the most popular tourist sight amongst both Russian and foreign tourists.
References to German history and German heritage gained popularity in the Kaliningrad Region. The name ‘Königsberg’ became ubiquitous in all kinds of commercial activities and developed into a mark of quality (Horst 2010). For example, an international bus transportation company, which was established in 1993 and connected Kaliningrad to cities in Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Germany and Belarus, was named ‘König Auto’. A cognac produced in the Kaliningrad Region received the name ‘Old Königsberg’ and became a well-known brand in Russia. In addition to that Kaliningraders rediscovered German brewing traditions. For instance, the beer brand ‘Ostmark’ has been produced in Kaliningrad since 1994 and has German history, as the original beer of the same name was brewed in Königsberg from 1910 to 1945. The current manufacturers of ‘Ostmark’ claim that they use the original German recipe. ‘Ostmark’ is also the name of the brewery located in the same place, where the original ‘Königsberg Brauerei in Devau’ was situated. Another interesting beer brand from Kaliningrad is ‘Ponarth’. The original Bavarian-style brewery located in the district of Königsberg named Ponarth was one of the largest breweries in northern Germany. Currently, a small brewery located in the city district of Dmitrovo (formerly Ponarth) produces beer using the original German recipe.

The official celebrations of the 750-year anniversary of the city in 2005 finally legitimized the memory of Königsberg, and put an end to the long-standing taboo regarding its pre-war history (Berger 2010: 351). Celebrations were funded by the Russian federal government, and a substantial sum of money went towards the restoration of pre-war buildings (Sezneva 2013: 775). Among them was the King’s Gate, which also became a symbol of the anniversary celebrations along with the Königsberg Cathedral (Berger 2010: 351). Moreover, the federal government actively participated in preparations of anniversary celebrations, as a consequence the main emphasis of the anniversary
was that the city was a part of the Russian Federation. For instance, the official logo of celebrations had an image of the King’s Gate with a Russian flag in the background and the inscription ‘750 – Kaliningrad’. Additionally, the anniversary ceremony was opened by an actor portraying Russian Tsar Peter the Great. According to Berger (2010: 351), these numerous references to Russia and Königsberg’s place in Russian history were meant to reduce possible separatist tendencies in the region.

Another project closely associated with the anniversary celebrations is the Fischerdorf or the Fish Village (Berger 2010: 351). It is a city quarter that consists of several buildings representing various architectural styles typical to pre-war Königsberg and contains restaurants, cafes, hotels and shops (Sezneva 2013: 779). Fischerdorf was built next to Kant Island on the bank of the River Pregola and is mainly aimed at tourists. On the whole, references to the German past became widely used in Kaliningrad’s tourism industry. On tourist maps, the Russian names are often duplicated with German ones. In addition to traditional amber items, souvenir shops sell all kinds of Königsberg themed gifts, such as postcards and photo books with views of the old city. Furthermore, tourists from mainland Russia are fond of antique stores selling pre-war items. German words are used in the names of hotels and restaurants. For instance, a quick Internet search of hotels in Kaliningrad gives such names as ‘Heliopark Kaiserhof’, ‘Guest House Ratshof’, ‘Hotel Oberteich Lux’, ‘Prussia’, ‘Albertina Hotel’, ‘Friedrichshof Hotel’ and so on. Although local cuisine is mainly Russian with Lithuanian and Polish influences, restaurants aimed at tourists started including traditional Eastern Prussian dishes in their menus. Such names as ‘Königsberger Klopse’ (a special kind of meatballs), ‘Königsberger Fleck’ (a tripe soup) or ‘Königsberger Marzipan’ (a type of desert) attract the interest of both Russian and foreign tourists.

1.2.3 Politics of the Kaliningrad Region since 1991

After the dissolution of the USSR, many federal subjects of the Russian Federation including the Kaliningrad Region took advantage of decentralization. The weakness of the central government allowed them to enjoy significant independence and make political and economic decisions on their own. However, after Vladimir Putin was first elected president in 2000, the policy of re-centralizing power has brought changes to the federal regions of Russia (Rogoza et al. 2012: 9).

Certain reforms influenced the political life of the Kaliningrad Region. First of all, in 2001 a new administrative division of the Russian Federation was introduced. The country was divided into federal districts led by presidential envoys with broad competences. During the course of the reform
the Kaliningrad Region became a part of the North-Western Federal District with its administrative center in Saint Petersburg. Secondly, between 2005 and 2012 the regional heads were appointed by the president instead of being elected in general elections. This new procedure allowed Kremlin to replace governors with people more loyal to Moscow. However, in 2012 elections were restored. In September 2015 the people of the Kaliningrad Region will choose their governor for the first time since 2000. Thirdly, the new Russian law on political parties from 2001 affected regional groupings that existed in the Kaliningrad Region. According to this law, political parties are required to have regional branches at least in half of federal districts of the Russian Federation and at least 10,000 members. Furthermore, only officially registered political parties are allowed to take part in elections. Due to these new requirements the Baltic Republican Party, which aimed to establish an autonomous Baltic Republic within the Russian Federation, lost its official status in 2003. The party was the most significant regionalist movement in the Kaliningrad Region and was often perceived as having ‘separatist’ goals (Holton 2003: 174).

Along with other local parliaments in Russia the Kaliningrad Regional Duma is dominated by the United Russia party. However, the region is characterized by greater political variety, as the position of smaller parties is stronger and thus the results achieved by United Russia are poorer (Rogoza et al. 2012: 14). In terms of public activity, the Kaliningrad Region is Russia’s leader. According to statistics from the region’s Ministry of Justice, there are almost 3500 non-governmental organizations operating there, which is a significant number for a region with less than a million inhabitants (Rogoza et al. 2012: 29). Kaliningrad bloggers are also remarkable in their public activity. For example, in 2009 they established the Amberkant club, which developed into a notable forum for public discussion. Since its establishment Amberkant has organized more than 100 meetings with social activists and politicians, including journalist and public figure Oleg Kašin, regional governor Nikolaj Cukanov, and the mayor of Kaliningrad Aleksandr Jarošuk (Amberkant 2015).

The Kaliningraders’ high level of social activity expressed itself in public protests at the end of 2009 – beginning of 2010. During these protests, people stated their dissatisfaction with the economic situation and the region’s isolation from the EU (Rogoza et al. 2012: 31). The organizers of the protests were: Konstantin Dorošok (then leader of ‘Justice’ movement, now member of the Civil Platform party and deputy of the regional parliament); Mixail Česalin (member of the Patriots

---

3 Hereinafter, scientific transliteration of Cyrillic is used.
of Russia party and deputy of the regional parliament); and Solomon Ginzburg (deputy of the regional parliament, now also member of the Civil Platform party), who is known for his appeals to broaden the region’s autonomy and for open critique of United Russia and Putin’s regional policy. Protestors were calling for the dismissal of Georgij Boos, regional governor, who was nominated by the President. The Federal Government responded in an atypical fashion. In August 2010 Boos was replaced with another member of United Russia, Nikolaj Cukanov (Rogoza et al. 2012: 32). Unlike Boos, he was born in the Kaliningrad Region. He worked as a mayor and as the head of administration of Gusev, where he earned the reputation of being one of the most efficient officials in the region (Rogoza et al. 2012: 13). Although a more suitable person was appointed governor of the region, the protests failed to influence Russia’s regional policy.

As seen from the discussion above, the regionalist agenda plays an important role in the political life of Kaliningrad Region. The most significant regionalist movement was the Baltic Republican Party established by Sergej Pas'ko in 1993, which used to have several hundred members. Since the party was banned in 2005 its members operate as the public movement ‘Respublika’, which actively participates in the political life of the region. Pas'ko’s associate Rustam Vasil'ev became the most prominent member of the movement mobilizing other activists to take part in various campaigns, such as “Kaliningrad - the prisoner of Europe” campaign aimed at simplifying the visa regime with the Schengen area. As a part of this campaign, activists picketed the consulates of Schengen member states in Kaliningrad and Brussels in October 2010 (Rogoza et al. 2012: 30). Rustam Vasil'ev found supporters amongst Russian nationalist organizations in the region, such as “The Baltic Vanguard of Russian Resistance” and “Russians of Kaliningrad-Königsberg”. These organizations have de-sovietization as one of their priorities and therefore support Vasil'ev’s idea of renaming Kaliningrad back to Königsberg. Regionalists take part in Russian Parades organized by regional nationalist organizations. Russian Parades are held by nationalists all over the country on red-letter days, but in Kaliningrad they have their own distinctive feature, as the parades in Kaliningrad are held under the banners of Königsberg and often referred to as “P-russian Parades”.

1.2.4 Renaming discussion in the Kaliningrad Region

Since Kaliningraders’ attitude to both German heritage and the Soviet period started to change during Perestroika, discussion surrounding the restoration of historical names in the Kaliningrad Region became commonplace (Oldberg 2000: 276). These talks concerned not only the capital of the region - Kaliningrad, but also other localities, such as Sovetsk (former Tilsit) and Pravdinsk
The renaming debate was inspired by a general trend among other Russian cities to revert back to their pre-Soviet names: Leningrad to St. Petersburg; Sverdlovsk to Yekaterinburg; Kuybyshev to Samara; etc. This trend was especially common for cities renamed after Soviet politicians. It is important to note the renaming of two other cities named after Mikhail Kalinin; Tver renamed to Kalinin in 1931 regained its historical name in 1990, and Kaliningrad in Moscow Region was renamed to Korolyov in 1996. Therefore, Kaliningrad in the Kaliningrad Region is the only city named after Mikhail Kalinin left.

The renaming discussion of Kaliningrad to Königsberg frequently flares up and abates since the early 1990s. Apart from returning the historical name there were also proposals to name the city ‘Kantograd’ in honor of Immanuel Kant (Oldberg 2000: 276) or ‘Korolevec’ (a name used to refer to Königsberg in Russian sources since the 13th century) to escape connotations with the personality of Mikhail Kalinin. Usually, the renaming discussion is accompanied with a large number of publications in media. For example, in September 2011 during the session of the EU-Russia Parliamentary Cooperation Committee in Warsaw, Werner Schulz, a member of the European Parliament from Germany, asked Nikolaj Cukanov, governor of the Kaliningrad Region, why the westernmost city of Russia still has a name ‘associated with crimes of Stalinism’. Cukanov answered that the decision to rename the city could be taken as a result of referendum. The Polish media interpreted his answer as supporting of the idea of bringing back the historical name ‘Königsberg’ (Gazeta.Ru, 21 Sep 2011), which was immediately republished by numerous Russian news sources. The publications in the Russian media produced an active debate over renaming and in various Internet communities and blogs under such headlines as “Will [we] give Kaliningrad to Germans?” or “The revision of the results of the Great Patriotic War has started from Kaliningrad”. In his later interviews Cukanov had to explain to indignant citizens that the main point of his answer was irrelevance of renaming to the current situation in the Kaliningrad Region. He also claimed being against the renaming of Kaliningrad to Königsberg (Kaliningrad.Ru, 21 Sep 2011).

The latest wave of discussion appeared in the beginning of 2013. It started in October 2012, when Rustam Vasil’ev, leader of the Kaliningrad regionalists, wrote a letter to the International Federation of Association Football (FIFA), asking them to require the Russian government to restore the historical name of the city. In his letter, Vasil’ev stated that holding the 2018 World Cup events in the city named after the criminal Mikhail Kalinin goes against the moral and ethical principles of FIFA (Baltijskaja Respublikanskaja Partija, 3 Oct 2012). On the 30th of November an initiative group led by Rustam Vasil’ev started gathering signatures for returning the city to its historical
name. In their activities the initiative group referred to Art. 7 of the Federal Law on naming geographical objects (№ 152-ФЗ), which permits restoration of names widely known in the past and present (Baltijskaja Respublikanskaja Partija, 4 Dec 2012).

At the same time, on the 13th of November in the Kaliningrad Regional Duma a working group on the “identification of public opinion on renaming geographical objects” was created. According to Art. 9 of the Federal Law on naming geographical objects (№ 152-ФЗ) renaming initiative coming from the federal subjects of the Russian Federation should be approved by a competent authority of the Federal Government. Therefore, the Kaliningrad government cannot decide itself on renaming a certain locality. However, it can identify opinion on renaming and then, if people approve the renaming, it can put forward the renaming initiative to the Federal Government. The task of the working group was to work out a new regional law, which would regulate how people’s opinion should be identified. Oleg Šlyk, the co-chairmen of the working group claimed that the decision to create the new regional law was not related to the initiative of renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg and was based on people’s proposals to rename much smaller localities of the region, such as villages Sadovo and Novostroevka.

On the 14th of November the initiative group organized a rally under the historical banners of Königsberg next to the monument of Mother-Russia in Kaliningrad inviting everyone to sign their petition ‘for Königsberg’ to the Regional Duma. On the 24th of December the petition signed by 400 citizens (including non-citizens of the Kaliningrad Region) was officially handed to the Regional Duma (Baltijskaja Respublikanskaja Partija, 25 Dec 2012). After that two members of the initiative group, Rustam Vasil'ev and Dmitrij Karpović were invited to take part in activities of the working group, which started in January 2013.

The working group held three meetings in 2013: on the 25th of January; on the 19th of February; and a final meeting on the 27th of March. In January and February 2013 the activities of the working group became a popular topic in regional media. However, in their articles the media preferred to emphasize debates on renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg, which were generated by the renaming initiators participating in the sessions. This can be clearly seen from the following headlines of articles covering the activities of the working group: “Sadovo to Sadovoe”: First deputies’ debates on renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg”; “Supporters of renaming Kaliningrad refused to hold a referendum”; “400 signatures are gathered for renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg”; and “How people from Novosibirsk and Barnaul are related to renaming Kaliningrad?”: a discussion in the Regional Duma”. Moreover, various media outlets developed the renaming discussion by
conducting interviews with officials and public figures asking for their view on renaming, and encouraging readers to take part in polls and to express their opinions on topic. Therefore, it can be clearly seen that the regional media has actively participated in the public discussion of renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg.

### 1.3 Aims of the research

The hypothesis of my research resides in an assumption that the regional media influences the construction of regional identity via their contribution to discussion of renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg. Here I consider regional identity as subject to constant change under the influence of political, cultural and economic interests of various groups. I hypothesize that people, who read about the renaming initiative from the news, consciously or subconsciously make their choice and opt for one side over another in this debate. Furthermore, by choosing one of two names people accept a whole set of meanings articulated with this name, which in its turn influences the formation of their identity. Media publications stimulate the audience’s interest into the renaming debate, which might have been considered irrelevant and long forgotten. Moreover, the media can develop the renaming discussion by supplementing it with new topics.

Thus, my research questions are: *How does the regional media contribute to the discussion on renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg?* and *How is the identity of the Kaliningrad Region transformed within the renaming discussion in the regional media?*

In order to achieve the primary research aim, I have identified several objectives, which will be fulfilled in the course of the study:

- To study what kind of techniques are used by the media in the production of texts on renaming;
- To discover the standpoints of various political actors within the Kaliningrad Region;
- To investigate what kind of topics dominate the renaming discussion;
- To find out what kind of arguments the renaming supporters and their opponents use;
- To identify what kind of meanings, symbols, and historical events are articulated with the name ‘Kaliningrad’ and the name ‘Königsberg’;
- To detect certain discourses within the renaming discussion;
- To reflect upon how the identity of the Kaliningrad Region may be transformed through these discourses;
• To disclose what the dynamics of regional identity can tell us about the dynamics of transformation in European-Russian relations and international relations on the whole.

The thesis will be structured as follows. In Chapter 2 I will outline the theoretical framework of my thesis, paying special attention to concepts of region, regional identity, place name, and place brand, and establish links between these concepts. In Chapter 3 I will proceed with outlining the methodological orientations for the analysis of collected material by introducing the three-dimensional concept of analysis of media texts. Additionally, I will review various tools, which will be used in my investigation. Chapter 4 will be dedicated to the analysis of media texts. In the first subchapter I will investigate how text producers use readers’ opinions. In the second subchapter I will study the political dimension of the renaming debate and argumentation of the discussion’s participants. The last subchapter will be devoted to the discourses within the renaming discussion and their possible influence on the transformation of the Kaliningrad Region identity. Finally, in the Chapter 5 I will present the general findings and implications of my study.
2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Construction of regions and regional identity

In my study of the Kaliningrad/Königsberg renaming discussion I draw upon Anssi Paasi’s theory of institutionalization of regions. The point here is to situate the renaming discussion within a theoretical debate, which highlights the constructedness of political space underpinning international relations. My research predominately concerns the topic of identity of the city of Kaliningrad. However, I believe it is useful to take the wider territorial entity, the Kaliningrad Region, into consideration. In my opinion, the city of Kaliningrad cannot be separated from the Kaliningrad Region when talking about identity, as the two are closely linked together by the circumstances of their establishment. It is noteworthy that in Paasi’s theory of institutionalization of regions the term ‘region’ mainly refers to territorial entities of sub-state level (Paasi 2009: 122). However, within the sub-state category ‘region’ may refer to any kind of administrative or cultural units including cities. Therefore, there is no contradiction in applying the theory of institutionalization of regions to both the city of Kaliningrad and the Kaliningrad Region. The theory of institutionalization of regions represents Paasi’s view of the construction of territories, and of regional identity, which is achieved through the institutionalization process (Paasi 1986). This approach will be complemented with a look at the role of place identity in place branding. I have decided to include the consideration of place branding, as it helps to understand the tendency of using references to German heritage for marketing purposes and its possible influence on local identity.

2.1.1 Theory of institutionalization of regions

According to Anssi Paasi (1996: 3) the territorial system consisting of various entities, such as states, nations, administrative and cultural regions, as well as boundaries separating them from each other has been continuously transformed over the course of history. Paasi (1996: 3) argues that this transformation results from various economic, political, military and administrative actions and decisions. Therefore, it can be said that territorial entities are products of history both in their physical characteristics and socio-cultural meanings. It is noteworthy that these territorial entities are not constant or fixed. Paasi (1986: 120) comprehends them as processes, which once established are continually reproduced and gradually transformed through social practices. In other words, they are constantly ‘becoming’ instead of just ‘being’ (Paasi 2009: 133).
Regarding the establishment of territorial entities or regions, Paasi (1996: 27) states that in order to establish something and to provide it with certain identity you must, first of all, determine its boundaries. Furthermore, he also emphasizes the discursive nature of the social construction of space. He argues that the construction of territoriality happens through differentiation between ‘we’ and ‘other’ in language, i.e. through homogenization of a social group within territorial entity and distinguishing it from social groups outside territorial entity (Paasi 1996: 15). These discourses of ‘we’ and ‘other’ establish boundaries between insiders and outsiders. They are produced and exploited by various power-holding social groups within the territorial entity. Therefore, territories can be seen as contested results of power relations (Paasi 2009: 133).

In addition to the discussion above, Paasi (1996: 28) explains that the process of production of territories happens in the context of history and space. Therefore, the study of territories, boundaries and territorial identities should be located in the broader socio-spatial context, which goes beyond the actual bounded area. When discussing territorial entities of the sub-state level it is important to consider also the state, as state power is always present within the borders of the particular region.

To conceptualise the region-building process Anssi Paasi (2009: 134) developed the theory of the institutionalization of regions. Paasi (1996: 32) defines institutionalization of regions as a process of emergence and establishment of territorial units as parts of the territorial system and socio-spatial consciousness. Through this process, territorial units gain their boundaries and symbols, which distinguish them from others. Paasi (1986: 121-131, 1996: 33-35, and 2009: 134-136) differentiates four stages of institutionalization of regions. Firstly, it is constitution of territorial shape. According to him the existence of some sort of boundaries is crucial for the emergence of a regional consciousness amongst the inhabitants of the region. Through this stage, the region becomes identified as a distinct unit. The second stage is the development of symbolic shape, this refers to creation of symbols, which strengthen the idea of the existence of the region, such as maps, flags, typical landmarks, notable personalities, or traditions. The most significant symbol of a territorial unit is name, which may become an important element of the collective identity of the region’s inhabitants, as it links their personal histories with the collective heritage of the region. The next stage is the development of institutions. Both informal and formal institutions are crucial for maintaining the image of the region and the development of regional consciousness among inhabitants as they produce and reproduce territorial symbols. The last stage is the establishment of a region, which means that the region is accepted as a part of the territorial system and into the territorial consciousness of the society. Throughout the process of institutionalization, and after the
establishment of the region, it is continuously produced and reproduced in individual and institutional discourses and social practices. Paasi (1986, 1996 and 2009) remarks that the four stages of institutionalization of a region may be ordered in a different way than presented above or could potentially happen simultaneously.

The Kaliningrad Region perfectly illustrates Paasi’s theory of institutionalization of regions. The territorial shaping of the region occurred in 1945 according to the Potsdam Agreement, when the northern part of East Prussia was affiliated to the USSR. Moreover, this new territory became a part of the Russian SFSR, which determined its future after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. The symbolic shaping of the new territory was of great importance for the Soviet government. The total reconstruction of the administrative center of the region in typical Soviet style is one example. As was the mass renaming of all geographical objects in the region, which will be thoroughly examined later. In case of the Kaliningrad Region, institutional shaping refers to the establishment of all typical Soviet institutions in the region. One such example are schools, which taught young Kaliningraders a very limited history of their homeland. Thus, it can be said that educational institution of schools produced discourses on the Kaliningrad Region, which contributed to formation of regional identity. The concept of regional identity in considered in the following part of the theory chapter.

2.1.2 Conceptualization of regional identity

Through the process of institutionalization, the region achieves its specific regional identity. Within the concept of regional identity Paasi (1986, 1996 and 2009) makes a distinction between two dimensions: a) regional consciousness, which refers to a feeling of togetherness and a perception of the region’s distinctiveness amongst its inhabitants, i.e. identification of people with the region; and b) identity of the region, which refers to those elements of nature, culture and people that are used in discourses and classifications of science, politics, cultural activism, regional marketing, tourism, governance and political or religious regionalization. The identity of the region is expressed in structures of expectations, which may be understood as ‘time-space specific, region-bounded, institutionally embedded schemes of perception, conception and action’ (Paasi 1986: 122-124 and 1996: 35). The structures of expectations provide an understanding of where the region comes from and where it is going, thereby creating continuity.
As seen in Figure 3, Paasi (1986: 133) divides regional consciousness and identity of the region in several parts. Within the regional identity of the inhabitants he distinguishes two parts: a) identification with the regional community; and b) the role of region in the hierarchy of regional consciousness, i.e. individual’s identification with a particular territorial entity. As human beings tend to live simultaneously within several territorial entities, these identities are structured in hierarchical order; and each territorial level (local, regional, national or global) has its own specific structures of expectations. The identification with the community is divided into two levels. The ideal community indicates a narrated collective identity of the territory. It refers to the discourse filled with economic, cultural, and political interests used to shape spatial consciousness. The factual community refers to communities based on the idea of the region, where individuals actually participate.

The identity of the region is divided into ‘subjective’ and ‘objective’ parts (Paasi 1986: 136). The ‘objective’ part indicates the features of the region that are constructed within various scientific disciplines, such as physical nature or cultural characteristics. The ‘subjective’ part refers to the internal and external images of a region, which are essential components of its identity. The external image, which is the region’s ‘poster’ in social consciousness, can be manipulated by various institutions according to their interests and needs. For example, tourist organizations may
emphasize some features contained in the region’s structures of expectations over others, to make it appear more attractive. The internal image of the region comprises the idea of the region’s distinctiveness from others, as well as distinctiveness of its inhabitants from outsiders. The reality portrayed by the internal image is commonly beyond one’s day-to-day life. Hence, it is evident that both external and internal images of the region may be controlled and manipulated.

To summarize, the concept of regional identity presented by Paasi (1986: 131-138) links objective features of the region (nature, culture, economics, etc.) with subjective perceptions of the region (individual and collective representations). It is useful to apply Paasi’s concept of regional identity to the Kaliningrad Region, as it brings together various factors, which are significant for this particular case. For instance, the hierarchy of regional consciousness is a very interesting aspect. The Kaliningrad Region is a place, where such territorial entities as Russia, the Kaliningrad Region, Central Europe, and the Baltic Sea Region overlap. The order of these territorial entities in minds of Kaliningraders is a part of their regional consciousness, and thus a part of regional identity. Another remarkable aspect is inclusion of outsiders’ image of a region as a part of regional identity. It is important for my research as I am additionally examining the marketing of the region, i.e. creation of a specific image of the region for outsiders. Furthermore, I will consider role of place identity in a practice of place marketing.

2.1.3 Role of place identity in place branding

Paasi (2009: 145) notes that regional identities became important components of regional development. Besides from being widely used as policy instruments, regional identities also gained a significant role in economic life and in regional marketing. Indeed, numerous authors in the field of place marketing emphasize the importance of considering place identity whilst developing a place marketing strategy (Kavaratzis and Hatch, 2013; Warnaby & Medway, 2013).

Before looking at the role of place identity in place branding, it is necessary to develop an understanding of what place marketing and place branding are. Kavaratzs and Ashworth (2010: 1) state that place marketing, which gained significant popularity in past decade, is not a completely new thing. They state that places have always competed with each other. According to Kavaratzs and Ashworth (2010: 2) place marketing responds to the existence of competition among places by discovering or creating uniqueness in order to improve the competitive position of marketed place. There is no clear distinction between place marketing and place branding in academic literature (Kavaratzis and Hatch 2013: 70), furthermore the interrelations between the two are not clearly
described. Kavaratzis and Ashworth (2010: 4) give the following view on how branding and brand are understood in marketing theory. Generally speaking, branding is a process aimed at influencing the consumers’ interpretation of what the brand means. A brand represents a distinctive product or service, and embodies a set of physical and socio-psychological attributes and beliefs associated with it. Therefore, branding is the process of selecting and associating attributes with the product or service, because these attributes are able to add value to it. Kavaratzis and Hatch (2013: 70) suggest the following definition of place brand provided by Zenker and Braun (2010: 3) as the most comprehensive: “A network of associations in the consumers’ mind based on the visual, verbal, and behavioral expression of a place, which is embodied through the aims, communication, values, and the general culture of the place’s stake-holders and the overall place design”. According to Kavaratzis and Hatch (2013: 70) this definition highlights several important issues: a) a brand is formed in people’s minds; b) a brand is a variety of associations, which are not necessarily aligned, but may be in conflict with each other; c) a brand’s stakeholders are important for place branding.

Thus place brand should reflect the place’s uniqueness and distinctiveness. However, many authors note the lack of distinctiveness in place marketing campaigns (Warnaby and Medway 2013: 347). Hospers (2006: 1018) gives an example of places copying the ‘best practice’ of Silicon Valley: Silicon Saxony (Sachsen in eastern Germany), Silicon Kashba (Istanbul), Dommel Valley (Eindhoven), and Bavaria Valley (Bavaria). All of them choose to follow the ‘hi-tech area’ trend instead of emphasizing their own unique identity, and thus they potentially undermine their competitiveness (Hospers 2004: 274). Within the place branding literature there are various understandings of the term ‘place identity’ (Kavaratzis and Hatch 2013: 73). Govers and Go (2009: 17) state that ‘place identities are constructed through historical, political, religious, and cultural discourses; through local knowledge, and influenced by power struggles’. This understanding corresponds to Paasi’s view of regional identity. Govers and Go (2009: 18) also note that place identities are subject to change and emphasize that place brand should be built on the ‘true identity of a place’, which they understand as ‘a full set of unique characteristics or set of meanings that exist in a place and its culture at a given point in time’. According to Kavaratzis and Hatch (2013) place brand and place identity are two interdependent concepts. While place brand is reflective of place identity it also influences its formation, as place identities are processes rather than stable notions. Kavaratzis and Hatch (2013: 75) also note that if the brand is not based on identity, branding may lead to brand alienation among its internal audience. Indeed, there is a need to find a balance between ‘external marketing’ and ‘internal marketing’. Therkelsen, Halkier, and Jensen (2010: 128) observe that place branding theory commonly concentrates on selling the place to
foreign investors, employees and tourists. Conversely, they suggest taking into account the potential of place branding in building a sense of community among internal stakeholders. Therkelsen, Halkier, and Jensen (2010: 139) emphasize that external and internal audiences are mutually supporting target groups. Therefore place branding initiatives can provide locals with a sense of belonging and local pride, which can be further strengthened by external demand for their place. On the other hand, satisfied local citizens being a part of a place product can function as ambassadors of the place to external target groups.

The issues presented in the discussion above are applicable to the case of the Kaliningrad Region. First of all, there is a problem of a ‘true identity’ of a place. Does marketing the region through its German past actually reflect reality in the Kaliningrad Region? Secondly, there is correlation between place’s identity and its image for outsiders. Can emphasizing the pre-war historical heritage of the region for outsiders actually change internal identity to less Russian and more German/Prussian/Baltic? Finally, there is importance of internal community of the region. Do people feel happy with being presented through foreign history and culture? All these questions have their place in discussion of renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg.

2.2 Theorizing place names and naming

In my study I examine place identity by looking at place names, thus in this section I will consider the phenomenon of geographical naming. I will start with an attempt to establish the connection between place name and place identity. Furthermore, I will consider the political dimension of naming via look at critical study of naming places. In the conclusion of the theoretical chapter I will investigate the role of place names as brand names explored by Medway and Warnaby (2014).

2.2.1 Linking place name and place identity

Anssi Paasi (1996: 35) indicates that territorial naming is a part of the conceptual shaping of a region. He sees the name as the most important symbol of a region crucial for formation of its identity. According to Paasi (1986: 125), the name connects an image of a region with the regional consciousness of its inhabitants. He argues that naming often brings together cultural, historical, and political interests (Paasi 2009: 135). For purposes of my research it is necessary to establish a link between toponym and territorial identity. An investigation of the role of cultural landscape in the formation of territorial identity is also helpful for further study.
Peter Jordan (2012) in his article “Place names as ingredients of space-related identity” discovers the role of geographical names within culture-space relations. Before approaching relations between toponyms and culture, he defines three links between the culture of a social group and geographical space the culture belongs to (Jordan 2012: 117-125). First of all, culture makes use of natural resources offered by certain territory. That means, for example, that wooden buildings would be typical for places rich with forest, while stone buildings would be typical for rocky places. Secondly, culture reflects itself in landscape. Such cultural elements as religion, language or history would be visible in landscape in a form of churches and monasteries, road signs and shop names, museums and monuments. Thirdly, an identity of a cultural group is shaped by the cultural landscape. An individual, who was born in, or was socialized to, a certain cultural landscape, becomes familiar with a specific type of climate, scenery, land use, architecture, vegetation and so on. Day by day it reminds him/her of his/her cultural identity.

Further in his article Peter Jordan (2012: 125-129) explains the role place names play within the three relations defined above. First of all, geographical names are reflections of spatial characteristics, such as nature, settlement history, land use, historical events etc. Therefore, geographical names are determined by culture. However, names tend to lose their original meanings over the course of time, and current users of a name may not recognize its origins anymore. Jordan (2012: 125) states that names may belong to older layers of language or even have origins in other languages, which may not let the users recognize its original meaning. Secondly, place names contribute to shaping the cultural landscape. According to Jordan (2012: 127) place names label spatial concepts, i.e. space-related images and ideas. Thus place names are take part in structuring the geographical space, as the name and spatial concept are closely connected to each other. Furthermore, the name attributed to the specific concept cannot be changed without simultaneous changes in the concept (Jordan 2012: 125), therefore if a place name is changed, the concept will not stay same either.

Spatial concepts may coincide with functional features (administrative unites, like communes, provinces or states) or natural features (like land/sea divide), but there are also spatial concepts, which are ‘pure projections of ideas onto a certain geographical space’ as Jordan (2012: 126) states. He gives an example of two cultural regions: Croatian Dalmatia and Austrian Salzkammergut. Both regions previously functioned as administrative units, while currently both of them have neither administrative, nor natural boundaries. However, the names ‘Dalmatia’ and ‘Salzkammergut’ are carriers of specific spatial concepts and regional identities. They are widely used by local
populations, as well as in literature, media, and especially in tourism, as brands. These names have a certain appeal for tourists and therefore hotels, restaurants, and dishes are named after them. All of these factors make the existence of Dalmatia and Salzkammergut unquestionable. In these two cases in particular and in general place names are important for clarifying mental maps, which people carry in their minds.

The third relation Jordan (2012: 127) defines concerns functions of place names in space-related identity building. Firstly, it has a label function or symbolic function, which means that place names represent a space-related concept filled with specific contents. The name communicates these contents both to the local population and to outsiders, as is the case with place marketing. Place names here have a similar function to other territorial symbols such as, for example, flag. In the case of strong space-related identities place names, as much as other regional symbols, are used widely in the names of newspapers, restaurants, ships, dishes, hotels, and so on. In addition to that, naming is perceived of having the power to define the identity of a place, as in the case of the restriction for linguistic minorities to officially use their names. The second function of place names is to support emotional ties with a certain place (Jordan 2012: 129). It affects people, who were born in the place, were socialized to it and left it later, or people, who found an emotional relation to a certain place later in their life. This idea corresponds with Paasi’s view of place names, who stated that name as a territorial symbol gathers together elements of collective heritage and links them to personal histories of people (Paasi 1996: 35).

I will use Jordan’s notion of spatial concepts and names as their labels. Using this notion I will indicate images and ideas labeled by names ‘Kaliningrad’ and ‘Königsberg’. It will show what kind of contents are communicated to outsiders by each of these names, and which one of these names is more suitable for place marketing.

2.2.2 Political dimension of naming places

Berg and Kearns (1996: 105) state that the geographical naming plays a key role in the social construction of spaces and in contested processes of attaching meaning to them, which corresponds with Paasi’s view of naming as an important part of the process of symbolic shaping within the institutionalization of a region (Paasi 1996: 35). Passi also states that the construction of a region is a contested process, as it involves various power-holding social groups with various interests (Paasi 2009: 133). This part of the theoretical chapter focuses on the employment of geographical naming by dominant groups and their contestants, i.e. on the political dimension of naming places.
The nature of geographical naming is elaborated by Pekka Korhonen (1999) in his article “Naming spaces”. He presents the nominalist view of a name, meaning that names are the results of an activity called naming, which is done by someone specific in a particular situation. In other words, the name of some object does not come from the object itself; on the contrary, it has to be designed and accepted by others. Further examining the nature of naming, Korhonen (1999: 124) refers to Kari Palonen (1997: 239), who emphasized the political dimension of names. Korhonen states that ‘naming is a political act, a claim about the structure of the world, and as such it sets itself in opposition against other claims’ (1999: 124). The acceptance of a particular name by others depends on a certain political situation. Any change in the political situation is accompanied by the entry of new actors and thus new names.

Berg and Vuolteenaho (2009) in their work “Towards Critical Toponymies” also elaborate the role of power relations in naming and renaming places. Their understanding of place and the making of place is similar to Paasi’s concept of a region and the institutionalization of a region (Paasi 1986: 119-131, 1996: 31-38). Berg and Vuolteenaho (2009: 9-10) see places as specific constructions of social relations, and names as a social fact embedded into them. They state that naming plays an important role in the construction of places and attaching meaning to them. Furthermore, that place naming is one of many strategies of the production of space, where naming is used together with other procedures, such as boundary making, cartographic representations, discourses on place etc. (Berg and Vuolteenaho 2009: 11). In addition to that they emphasize role of naming in governing of social spaces, in a sense that official toponyms can contribute to the functioning of the society by creating politically appropriate meanings (Berg and Vuolteenaho 2009: 10). In societies characterized by cultural consonance and/or stable power relations, hegemonic toponymies are taken for granted. Contrariwise, in societies characterized by socio-cultural tension toponymic conflicts may appear in various forms, such as renaming initiatives or usage of alternative names (Berg and Vuolteenaho 2009: 11).

In their article “Geographies of toponymic inscription: new directions in critical place-name studies” Rose-Redwood, Alderman and Azaryahu (2010: 458-460) recognize political semiotics as one of several new directions in the critical study of toponyms. Furthermore, they examine the commemorative dimension of place names and state that it may be used to fill them with ideological meaning and political significance (Rose-Redwood et al. 2010: 459). Rose-Redwood et al. note that the semiotic connection between place naming and political power can be traced back throughout history. For instance, naming places after their founders is an ancient tradition, which is
still alive. Along with the utilitarian function of determining a place as a part of general spatial system, such commemorative names may conform to ideologies characterizing ruling political order. For example, with the communist ideology and Stalin’s cult of personality, expressed itself in naming cities after the Soviet leader in each of 16 Soviet Republics (Rose-Redwood et al. 2010: 458).

Thus, when commemorative names become closely associated with their geographical locations, history becomes geography (Rose-Redwood et al. 2010: 459). Although historical references may become less obvious to users of commemorative toponyms over the course of time, it does not weaken their power to make certain versions of history familiar and self-evident. As Alderman (2008: 208) states, toponyms direct people to what is historically important. Rose-Redwood et al. (2010: 459) emphasize that commemorative names transform an official history into common cultural experience built into everyday practice. At the same time, the fact that commemorative names are bound with specific social, cultural and political systems makes them vulnerable to changes in political ideologies and discourses of history. That is why the renaming of existing landmarks happens in periods of regime change and revolutionary transformation together with, for instance, pulling down monuments (Rose-Redwood et al. 2010: 460).

To give a clear example, the Russian city Saint Petersburg, has changed its name several times due to political circumstances. The original name was given to the city by its founder Tsar Peter the Great and had German origin. In Russian history, Peter the Great is associated with the cultural revolution of modernizing Russia. He was known for his reforms and European views. The city was founded as a seaport and a base for Russian navy. It was often referred to as ‘a window to Europe’. The name ‘Saint Petersburg’ was changed to ‘Petrograd’ in 1914 by Tsar Nicholas II. The decision to replace the German name with a Russian one, was because of World War I, where the Russian Empire was fighting against the German Empire. In 1917, Petrograd became the main scene for the October Revolution led by Vladimir Lenin, which marked the rise of the Communist party. The city became a symbol of political change and gained the descriptive name of ‘the city of three revolutions’. In 1924, five days after Lenin’s death, the city’s name was changed to ‘Leningrad’ in his memory. Only in 1991, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the city regained its historical name ‘Saint Petersburg’ via a referendum of its citizens. The referendum was arranged together with the first mayoral elections. Therefore, the renaming of the city along with other democratic initiatives may be seen as an attempt to cut links to the Communist past.
In addition to political semiotics Rose-Redwood, Alderman and Azaryahu (2010: 462-466) recognize place naming as a cultural arena as one of contemporary directions in critical study of place names. The term ‘cultural arena’ here means that place names become sites of contest, debate, and negotiations between various social groups for the right to name places and so to attach meanings to them.

Bergs and Kearns (1996: 118-119) explain that due to the normative power of naming it may be used by dominant groups to impose certain meanings onto the landscape and thus to control the attachment of certain identities to both people and places. Rose-Redwood et al. note, that according to theories of hegemony, the dominance of one group is never complete and is always challenged by other groups with their counter-hegemonic ideologies. The dominant groups control the production of cultural space, whilst other groups are involved with symbolic resistance. Place naming may become one of ways of challenging hegemonic ideologies via the creation of alternative cultural meanings and narrations of identity (Rose-Redwood et al. 2010: 463).

One such example of toponymic resistance suggested by authors is Irish nationalists in Northern Ireland spray-painting through the word ‘London’ on road signs to Londonderry. However, the use of place naming as resistance is often done in a less vocal way; for instance, through usage of alternative names instead of official. Furthermore, the choice to use other place-naming system than the official one is a practice of self-determination (Rose-Redwood et al. 2010: 463). Although they suggest that research on place naming as ‘cultural arena’ should be used in the study of minorities and social justice, it is also applicable to the issue of the reconstruction of the landscape in a way, which reflects formerly suppressed history.

The case of the Kaliningrad Region fits well into the discussion of the political implications of geographical naming. As previously mentioned, the name ‘Kaliningrad’ commemorates the historical figure of Mikhail Kalinin, who was the Head of the Soviet State. However, naming the city ‘Kaliningrad’ was meant not only to commemorate Kalinin, but also to get remove the name ‘Königsberg’, which was a reminder of the city’s German past. Many other new names that were introduced in the Kaliningrad Region in 1946 also carried ideological and commemorative functions. Geographical objects were called after heroes of the Great Patriotic War and Soviet military commanders (Guryevsk, Chernyakhovsk, Gusev). Many new names were related to war (Gvardeysk, Soldatovo, Partizanskoe) or to concepts and symbols of Soviet times (Sovetsk, Komsomolsk, Krasnoznamensk, Dobrovolsk). The overall renaming of localities and geographical
objects in the Kaliningrad Region was meant to reinforce and maintain the Soviet identity among its citizens, and therefore was of special importance for the process of institutionalization of the region.

With the change of political regime in 1991 Kaliningraders and other inhabitants of the region re-evaluated the Soviet period. They started to feel dissatisfied with names that carry ideological significance. Even before the dissolution of the USSR people started using an alternative name for Kaliningrad. The name ‘König’, which comes form the pre-war name ‘Königsberg’, is still popular among Kaliningraders of various ages, professions and political views. The continuous discussion of a possibility of renaming in society indicates the link between a place name and a place identity. Many Kaliningraders do not like the name that carries a trace of Soviet ideology, but at the same time they cannot accept the pre-war name, because it would undermine their Russian identity. However, there are factors speaking in favor of the name ‘Königsberg’. One of them is the potential of the historical name for marketing the city and the whole region for outsiders. The usage of toponyms for marketing purposes is considered in the following part of the chapter.

2.2.3 Place names as place brands

Rose-Redwood, Alderman and Azaryahu (2010: 466) suggest broadening the critical study of place naming by discovering other unexplored questions of the field. One such question is the commodification of place names. While Rose-Redwood et al. focus on the issue of rights to name places being sold to corporate sponsors, I concentrate on the idea of using toponyms as brand names within place marketing. This idea is explored by Medway and Warnaby (2014) in their article “What’s in a name? Place branding and toponymic commodification”, they remark that places have recently become regarded as ‘brands’, where a toponym often plays a role of a brand name. However, the topic of brand naming in relations to place brands has not received much discussion yet.

To study the notion of toponyms as place brand names Medway and Warnaby (2014: 155-159) attempt to use a conventional branding perspective, they state that according to mainstream marketing literature a ‘good’ brand name should meet several requirements. First of all, it should be simple, meaning that it can be spelled, pronounced and recalled easily. In case of toponyms, which are sometimes quite complicated, shortened versions or acronyms may be used as a brand name. Also it should be distinctive and memorable. Place names do not necessarily meet this requirement, as they usually emerge naturally arising from some geographical features. Here Medway and Warnaby (2014: 156-157) elaborate upon the distinction between semantic memory, which is based
on individual’s general knowledge about the world, and autobiographical memory, which is based on individual’s personal experiences. While corporate brand names usually try to appeal to consumer’s semantic memory, place names are often related to autobiographical memory, as they are built out of meanings people once have attributed to the place. However, through the repetition of a place name over time the link between name and memories attached to it may be lost.

Another requirement for a ‘good’ brand is meaningfulness. A ‘meaningful’ brand name is reflective of the product’s benefits. As discussed above, usually place names have a basic meaning attached, which might be forgotten through the years, or not. Moreover, it might be difficult to use a name as a brand name, if it has a negative meaning (Medway and Warnaby 2014: 157). According to marketing literature, the brand name should also be evocative meaning that it should generate positive feelings. As toponyms are linked to autobiographical memory, they might produce different images in peoples mind, based on their individual life experience, knowledge of history, or representation in movies. These images could be both positive and negative. Moreover, different users (for example, residents and visitors) may produce different images of the place based on their autobiographical memory. However, for products’ brand names that produce multiple images are considered damaging, therefore in terms of evocativeness using a toponym as a brand name might be problematic (Medway and Warnaby 2014: 158). Another requirement for the brand name is to be protectable. While conventional brands are protected by trademark, protecting toponyms is more complicated, as many places can have the same name. The last requirement for a brand name is to be transferable. In the case of toponyms transferability becomes an issue, when autobiographical memory is considered. The most obvious example of place names being transferrable is colonial exploration of new territories.

An attempt to apply conventional branding perspective to place names brought Medway and Warnaby (2014) to the conclusion that toponyms cannot be treated in the same way as conventional brand names. Furthermore, in their article they develop the concept of place name commodification and explain the key issues that appear problematic. First of all, Medway and Warnaby (2014: 159) state that finding a proper message, which has to be associated with the toponym and to serve the chosen marketing strategy is critical for the process of commodification. However, toponymic commodification may become problematic, if the image created by marketing experts for the particular place contradicts with external or/and internal perceptions of the place. Another key issue identified by Medway and Warnaby (2014: 160) is the possibility of changing the place name to fit better into marketing strategy. Such a move may be considered as a form of rebranding aimed at
improving the image of the place or attracting more visitors. However, an attempt to change the toponym may be contested, as a place name is often strongly linked to the autobiographical memory of its users. It is important to understand that any change of a place name, whether it is made with good intentions or not, will meet resistance of some level.

To illustrate ways of using toponyms as brand names Medway and Warnaby (2014) in their article often refer to Russian city of Volgograd. The original name of the city first recorded in the 16\(^{th}\) century was Tsaritsyn. This name comes from Turkic words sary-cin or ‘yellow island’ and reflects a geographical feature of the area on Volga River. In 1925 it was renamed Stalingrad after the Soviet leader Joseph Stalin. The major battle of the World War II, Battle for Stalingrad that took place in the city, made Stalingrad perceived as a symbol of resistance. In 1961 during Nikita Khrushchev’s administration the name of the city was changed to Volgograd, i.e. the city on Volga River, as a part of the de-Stalinization program following Stalin’s death. However, even after more than 50 years there are still many people, who want to revise this decision and rename the city Stalingrad. Medway and Warnaby (2014: 160) remark that renaming initiatives are related to the fact that the name Stalingrad is fixed in the autobiographical memory of Russian people more than other names as it is associated with the most famous military victory of Russia in the 20\(^{th}\) century. In addition, the name Stalingrad is considered more attractive from the tourist point of view, as battlefield tourism organizations offer tours to Stalingrad, not to Volgograd (Medway and Warnaby 2014: 161). Although the Stalingrad brand is stronger than the Volgograd brand, there is a certain level of resistance in Russian society in general and among Volgograd citizens in particular towards bringing back Stalingrad due to the negative connotations with the figure of Stalin, which is again a matter of autobiographical memory. This toponymic contestation prevents full renaming, although Stalingrad is now officially used as the name of the city on 6 red-letter days per year.

The issue of renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg is in many ways close to the issue of renaming Volgograd to Stalingrad. As references to the pre-war past are successfully applied in the tourism industry of the Kaliningrad Region, it seems that restoration of the pre-war name is a solution for improving the region’s economy. It could help to draw the attention of Russian and foreign visitors, as well as attract investments from Russia and from abroad. However, many Kaliningraders resist the idea of renaming, as the name ‘Königsberg’ has negative connotations grounded in their autobiographical memory. These matters will be further considered in the analysis chapter.
3. METHODOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS

3.1 Data collection

According to Paasi (2009: 142), the media is a powerful institution in terms of the production and reproduction of discourses on spatial identity. Media texts are a valuable material for the study of formation of regions and regional identities; therefore I chose to use media sources for my research. I started collecting articles from printed media, which could be analyzed in terms of discursive construction of Kaliningrad Region identity. During summer 2012, I carried out a research visit to Kaliningrad, where I examined archives of local and regional newspapers. As a result of this work, I became familiar with the variety of printed media in the region and gathered articles covering various topics from cross-border cooperation with neighboring countries, to discussions of the possibility of independence for the Kaliningrad Region from the Russian Federation. I continued following the regional media and examining material back in Tampere. At the beginning of 2013, a working group within the Kaliningrad Regional Duma started a discussion of the new law concerning public opinion on renaming geographic objects in the Region. The activities of the working group were widely covered by both the regional and federal media, which started a new wave of debates concerning the possibility of renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg. That is when I decided to use articles from regional news sources dedicated to the renaming initiative and activities of the working group for my research.

I chose to use online news sources as material for analysis. Whilst an Internet search is a straightforward and effective tool for collecting data, there are some specifics that should be taken into account. Mautner (2005) studied the advantages and disadvantages of using web-based data, and some of her findings may be applied in my case. First of all, the size of the Internet may be considered as both an advantage and a disadvantage. On the one hand, it allows the gathering of a large amount of data in a relatively short period of time. On the other hand, the arbitrary nature of the search results can be a potential time waster for the researcher. Therefore, the relevance of sources for a specific research question should be identified carefully. Thus there is a need to develop certain search criteria specific to the goals of the project in order to increase the accuracy of the Internet search results (Mautner 2005: 815). Secondly, the multiplicity of voices on the Internet should be taken into account, as the Internet enables many individuals and groups of people to voice their opinions and they may not be representative of the larger sample. While it is possible to concentrate on news articles containing information about the particular event, the information
about same event may be presented in personal blogs or in communities on social media networks. The most likely results of an Internet search will include all manner of sources, accordingly, the researcher should pay attention to the type of source (e.g. individual vs. institutional) the data comes from (Mautner 2005: 816). Finally, the dynamism of the Internet may raise certain problems, as web-based material is potentially ephemeral. There is always a possibility that some of it will be changed, moved or even deleted by the time the research is completed. Thus, when working with internet-based data its replicability is always under question, one way to address this issue is to save the data in paper-based or permanent electronic forms. i.e. by taking a screenshot or saving the html-pages (Mautner 2005: 818).

I conducted an internet search for source material taking into account the recommendations regarding collecting web-based data, provided by Mautner (2005). The data was collected via the Google and Yandex search engines using various combinations of keywords 'rename', 'Kalinigrad' and 'Königsberg'. The main search criterion was the date of publication. I concentrated on the period between January-May 2013, when the renaming discussion was especially active. The results of the initial search contained links to federal and regional online news sources, links to online surveys in social media, personal blogs, forum discussions, as well as webpages not related to the topic. According to my research aims I concentrated on regional news sources. The regional sources that were shown in the search results included both online news websites and online versions of printed media that were both suitable for analysis. As many news sources use ready material produced by news agencies (Fairclough 1995: 48), I looked for unique articles instead of copies from these news agencies. I also took into consideration the size of the audience, the amount of website’s visitors and the printed version’s readers, for example. For these purposes, I used the Kaliningrad Sociological Service (Kaliningradskaja Sociologičeskaja Služba 2012) evaluation of the popularity of the regional online portals. From this, five online news sources have been selected.

Kaliningrad.Ru is a highly recognizable and frequently visited regional news portal. According to its overview (Kaliningrad.Ru 2014a), the portal aims to provide readers with full and comprehensive information regarding the most interesting and significant events in the city of Kaliningrad and the Kaliningrad Region. According to the Kaliningrad Sociological Service’s report (Kaliningradskaja Sociologičeskaja Služba 2012: 31) it is the second most popular regional online news source.

Kaliningrad.KP.ru is an online version of the newspaper Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade, which is a regional division of Komsomol'skaja Pravda, a leading daily newspaper in Russia with
editorial offices in many regions of the country and several offices outside Russia. The newspaper covers a broad array of issues, such as politics, economy, and entertainment. *Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade* is a part of the Zapadnaja Pressa Media Group. According to Media Group’s overview (Klops.Ru 2014a) the daily circulation of the newspaper varies from 12,000 to 16,000 copies. Whereas the circulation of the weekly issues varies from 52,000 to 60,000 copies. The articles from the printed issue of *Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade* are also published online.

**Klops.Ru** is Kaliningrad’s online news portal, which claims to have the biggest constant audience among regional websites and 40,000 visitors per day (Klops.Ru 2014b). Its main aim, is to provide its readers with news from Kaliningrad and the Kaliningrad Region. According to Kaliningrad Sociological Service’s report (Kaliningradskaia Sociologičeskaja Služba 2012: 31) it is the third most popular regional online news source. **Klops.Ru** is a part of the Zapadnaja Pressa Media Group. As the newspaper *Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade* belongs to the same Media Group similar articles appear on both news sites.

**Kaliningradka.Ru** is an online version of the regional daily newspaper *Kaliningradskaia Pravda*. According the newspaper, it has the highest subscription rate among the all printed media outlets in the region (Kaliningradka.Ru 2014). Circulation of everyday issues varies from 11,100 to 11,300 copies, while the circulation of weekly issues is approximately 14,500 copies. The *Kaliningradskaia Pravda* is presented as an independent newspaper writing about social and political issues in the Kaliningrad Region. The online version of the newspaper does not provide any unique material comparing to the printed newspaper issue, and the articles from the newspaper are published online daily.

**NewsBalt.ru** is an international online project containing information in Russian regarding cross-border cooperation within the Baltic Region, with an emphasis on Russia (NewsBalt 2014). *NewsBalt* provides various types of information: news, reports, reviews, analytics, commentary, and surveys. The project mainly concerns itself with the politics of the Baltic Sea countries. According *NewsBalt*, it is open to discussion and welcoming diverse opinions. The editorial office is located in the city of Kaliningrad.

However, the Internet search does not fully represent the amount and variety of publications on the topic in regional media, because a) not all printed media publish their articles online; b) some Internet media sources may be unreachable with the search; c) some material may have been missed
by the researcher. Therefore, I decided to conduct a search through the Integrum Database and see if my text collection is sufficient, and if additional publications can be located. For the Integrum search I used same keywords and same time period as for the Internet search. As a result, I located 22 articles from 8 regional printed media sources and 10 articles from 4 regional Internet media sources. The search results are presented in the Appendix. These results proved that the sources and articles chosen for the analysis were sufficiently representative of the amount and variety of publications on topic. First of all, three out of five sources chosen for the analysis appeared in the Integrum search results: newspapers Kaliningradskaja Pravda and Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade, and the online portal Kaliningrad.Ru (the other two online news sources are not included in the Integrum database). Secondly, these three sources contained the largest amount of unique articles on topic. I have added the missing articles from Kaliningradskaja Pravda and Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade to the collection. However, I decided not to include two newly found publications from the Kaliningrad.Ru, as they were just short quotes on the topic from social media. In total, my collection of articles for the analysis contained 24 articles from 5 sources.

3.2 Three-dimensional concept of CDA

Vaara and Tienari (2010: 245) define Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a theoretical and methodological framework that allows one to investigate the constitutive role of discourses in contemporary society. Fairclough (2004: 215), one of the most prominent scholars, states that CDA is based on an assumption that the linguistic elements of social events (e.g. talks or texts) contribute to change in social elements. The approach is used to study the effects of discourse in constituting, reproducing, and changing ideologies. Fairclough’s CDA is an interdisciplinary approach specifically engaged with social theory and research. According to Fairclough (2004: 216) it aims to enhance the capacity of research on the social transformations of the contemporary world by focusing on how language participates in the process of social transformation. CDA is widely used throughout various disciplines of social sciences, e.g. geography and urban studies, media studies, sociology, etc. I believe CDA is appropriate methodological framework for my research, as I will study how media texts take part in the transformation of the regional identity of the Kaliningrad Region.

For the article analysis, I utilize Fairclough’s three-dimensional concept of the analysis of communicative events (i.e. texts). According to this concept, the analysis of a particular communicative event is an analysis of relations between its three important aspects, which are: a)
text; b) discursive practice; and c) sociocultural practice (Fairclough 1995: 57). The following is a presentation of the frameworks for analysis of each aspect.

Fairclough (1995: 58) states that any text is simultaneously constitutive of social identities, social relations and systems of knowledge and beliefs. His views draw on Halliday’s (1978) Systemic Functional Linguistics and an idea of the three functions of language: ‘ideational’, ‘interpersonal’ and ‘textual’ (Fairclough 1995: 17). The ideational function of language lies in creating representations of the world; the interpersonal function resides in constitution of relations and identities; and the textual function is related to the constitution of text out of sentences. The analysis of the textual aspect of a communicative event focuses on its linguistic features, which appear as a result of linguistic choices made by text writer. The core idea here is that these linguistic choices contribute to the construction of social identities, social relations, knowledge, and beliefs.

The discourse practice aspect of a communicative event concerns its production and consumption. Discourse practice is a mediator between a text and a sociocultural practice. Sociocultural practice shapes texts by shaping discursive practices, i.e. ways in which text is produced and consumed. Fairclough (1995: 59) distinguishes between institutional processes and discourse processes of discourse practice. Institutional processes relate to institutional routines, e.g. process of collection, selection and editing of material in a media organization. Discourse processes, however, refer to the transformation a text undergoes during its production and consumption. The analysis of this aspect of a communicative event focuses on mixes of genres and discourses appearing in the text. Fairclough (1995: 60) defines genre as a use of language articulated to the particular social practices, such as interview or advertising, while discourse is the language used in representing a given social practice from a particular point of view.

The sociocultural practice aspect concerns the wider social conditions that a communicative event happens within. Fairclough (1995: 62) states that the context of a communicative event should be analyzed together with its other aspects, as it shapes discourse practices and is shaped by them itself, especially in the case of mass media communication. Obviously, the media is shaped by society, but they also take part in spreading social and cultural changes. The sociocultural practice aspect of a communicative event may be analyzed at various levels of abstraction: immediate situational context; wider context of institutional practice; or even wider frame of the society and the culture.
Fairclough (1995: 62) specifies that according to the research aims, the researcher may concentrate on one of three aspects. However, the other aspects should be taken into account. For each part of the analysis of a communicative event I identified a list of general questions, which correlates with my research objectives. Figure 4 displays the questions that are to be investigated at each stage of the analysis:

Figure 4. Analysis scheme and questions (concept from Mullins, 2012: 60).

Analysis of text:
- How are social actors represented?
- What side do the social actors support?
- What arguments do they use to support their standpoint?
- How are the spatial concepts of Kaliningrad and Königsberg represented?

Analysis of discourse practice:
- What kind of genres and discourses do the texts draw upon?
- How are specific genres used by text producers?

Analysis of sociocultural practice:
- What is the sociocultural context of texts?
- What are the social effects produced by texts?

As all parts of the analysis are interconnected, any stage may be chosen as the starting point of the study. I have already provided a description of the sociocultural context of the research in the introduction chapter of this thesis. Therefore, in the next chapter I will concentrate on analysis of discourse practice and textual analysis of collected articles. The analysis chapter will be concluded by a summary, where the main discourses influencing the institutionalization of the Kaliningrad Region will be identified.
3.3 Instruments of analysis of communicative events

This part deals with instruments, which will be applied in the analysis of media texts, provided by practical guides to doing CDA: “How To Do Critical Discourse Analysis: A Multidimensional Introduction” by David Machin and Andrea Mayr (2012) and “Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis” by John E. Richardson (2007).

3.3.1 Tools for analyzing readers’ letters to editor

Among the articles selected for this research there is a group, which represents the opinions of the readers on the renaming topic. In most cases, the readers contacted the editors of the news source themselves to express their opinion. This specific genre of journalism is commonly referred to as “letters to the editor”. John E. Richardson (2007) provides useful tools for consideration of this genre.

Richardson (2007: 151) states that letters published in newspapers can reveal much about the newspaper itself and its readers. Firstly, the letters are based upon the reader’s ideas, observations and arguments, which vary across different newspapers. Secondly, the letters are usually written in response to news published in the newspaper, which shows the value of the news. Thirdly, the selection of particular letters by the newspaper indicates news value and representation of readers’ opinions. Fourthly, all readers’ letters are edited according to the newspaper’s discourse. And finally, the placement of letters with different standpoints may reveal the editorial line of a newspaper. Richardson (2007: 152) explains that readers’ letters published in a newspaper are not representative of public opinion, as letter writers are not representative of the general population. According to Richardson, they tend to be older and politically more conservative.

Richardson (2007: 152) presents four rules of letter selection indicated by Wahl-Jorgenson (2002) as a useful tool for the analysis of readers’ letters. These rules are relevant for most newspapers, despite the difference in terms of the amount of correspondence received and the amount of space allocated for publishing letters (Wahl-Jorgensen 2002: 70). The first rule is the rule of relevance; the decision to choose one letter for publication over another is determined by the dominant news story. Editors prefer to publish letters written in response to the newspaper item that was already on the agenda and which is considered newsworthy by the newspaper (Wahl-Jorgensen 2002: 73). The second rule is the rule of entertainment, which draws upon the editors desire to choose more entertaining material to attract readers. Wahl-Jorgensen (2002: 75) explains that this tendency for
entertaining material deprioritizes rational discussion. At the same time, letters, which can emotionally fire up audience, may help to engage more readers in discussion. The third rule is the rule of brevity, this rule works in conjunction with the rule of entertainment, and requires readers’ letters to be short as the editors prefer to publish as many responses as possible, which makes the space allocated for one reader very limited. This means that the diversity of names tagged to opinions is often more important than the opinions themselves. This tendency limits the possibility for minority opinions to be heard, as majority opinions will always take more space. The final rule described by Wahl-Jorgensen (2002: 76) is the rule of authority, although the editors generally deny editorial bias towards particular opinions or individuals, there are certain preferences in selecting letters. Thus the editors tend to prefer contributors with experience in the topic and textual competence, meaning that he/she is able to express his/her opinion in a well-written text.

The analysis of articles related to the genre of “letters to the editor” using the rules of letter selection presented above, help to discover the newspaper’s general vision of the topic and ways of influencing its audience through discourse practice.

3.3.2 Tools for analyzing representation of social actors

Some of the articles selected for analysis are dedicated to the activities of the working group within the Kaliningrad Regional Duma. These articles are characterized by the report genre, where the writers present the discussion of the participants of the working group sessions. For the purposes of this research, it is necessary to examine the different ways used by text writers to represent people and investigate how the various ways of representation may influence readers.

Machin and Mayr (2012: 77) state that there is no neutral way to represent a person in any language as the communicator makes certain choices on how to represent groups or individuals, who in CDA are usually referred to as ‘participants’ or ‘social actors’. These semiotic choices are called ‘representational strategies’. Based on the particular way of representation, the text consumers (i.e. readers) make an evaluation of participants. Therefore, by choosing one way of representation, the communicator may draw readers’ attention to certain aspects of the participants’ identity. Furthermore, these representational choices may produce an effect of linking certain sets of ideas, values and sequences of activity, that are not overtly articulated in the text (Machin and Mayr, 2012: 77)
Machin and Mayr (2012: 79-85) refer to works Theo van Leeuwen (1996), who identified a wide variety of classifications of social actors commonly used in media texts. One way of referring to a participant is through *impersonalization*. Social actors can be impersonalized in text by referring to them with abstract nouns or concrete nouns, which the meaning does not include human beings (van Leeuwen 1996: 59). Impersonalization is often used to give an impersonal authority to a particular activity. Van Leeuwen (1996: 60) gives a following example: “Australia was bringing in about 70,000 migrants a year”. In this case impersonalization is used to conceal who is responsible for bringing in migrants. In addition to that, impersonalization may be used to indicate identity or role of a social actor, or to add positive or negative connotations to an activity or utterance of a social actor.

Machin and Mayr (2012: 80) state that it is also useful to consider how participants are described as individuals or as a part of a collectivity. For example, “Two soldiers, privates John Smith, and Jim Jones, both fathers of two daughters, were killed today by a car bomb”. *Individualization* here happens through naming soldiers and providing additional information about them. This example makes readers feel empathy with the social actors. Collectivization, on the other hand, does not produce such an effect: “Militants were killed today by a car bomb”. Moreover, individualization is not used to classify, for example, terror suspects, because it would humanize them. Therefore, it is important to identify which participants are personalized and which are collectivized in a text.

Another widely used way of classification of participants is by *nomination* or *functionalisation*. Nomination means representation of social actors in terms of their unique identity (van Leeuwen 1996: 52), while functionalisation means representation of actors in terms of their activities (van Leeuwen 1996: 54), e.g. their occupation or role. According to Machin and Mayr (2012: 81) the use of functionalisation may sound more official, while nomination may sound more personal. At the same time functionalisation may dehumanize participants by reducing them to their roles. Machin and Mayr (2012: 81) also state that functionalisation may be used to connote legitimacy. For example, use of occupation such as ‘an office worker’ may serve to positively evaluate a participant as a proper member of the society, while not so legitimate participant may be represented in generic terms such as ‘one local’.

Another source for the evaluation of social actors on the basis of a text, is the way they are represented as speaking. As Machin and Mayr (2012: 57) explain, word choices used to describe how the participant spoke, can have a considerable impact on the perceptions of the event by text consumers. The classification of verbs by Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard (1994: 306) can provide
a toolkit to analyze the choice of quoting verbs and their connotations. The first group of verbs are *neutral and structuring verbs*, which introduce speech without explicit evaluation. Such verbs are: *to say, to tell, to ask, to reply, to answer*, etc. This type of verbs does not give the reader any guidance on how to perceive a situation or a speaker. In this case reader should find the intended meaning from the saying itself. However, if the speaker is represented using only neutral verbs, he/she might appear disengaged or impersonalized for the text consumer. The writer of the text can use such a strategy to bring readers further from the thoughts and feelings of a particular social actor (Machin and Mayr 2012: 59).

The following groups include verbs, which convey the presence of text maker and are interpretive. Two groups are *metapropositional verbs* and *metalinguistic verbs* (Caldas-Coulthard 1994: 306). These groups refer to verbs, which label and categorize a speaker’s contribution. A metalinguistic group includes verbs specifying a kind of language used by speaker, such as *to quote, to narrate* or *to recount*. Verbs from the metapropositional group denote the writer’s interpretation of a speaker. This group can be into three sub-groups: a) assertive propositions marked by such verbs as *to remark, to explain, to agree or to correct*; b) directive propositions marked by such verbs as *to urge, to instruct or to order*; and c) expressive propositions marked by such verbs as *to accuse, to grumble, to complain, to swear or to claim*. The next group is *descriptive verbs*, which categorize the interaction. Such verbs as *to cry, to yell, to whisper, to giggle or to sigh* belong to descriptive group. They mark the manner and attitude of a speaker in relation to what is said. The final group is *transcript verbs*, which are not speech reporting, instead these verbs mark the development of the discourse (e.g. *to pause, to continue, to go on*) or relate quotation to other parts of the discourse (e.g. *to repeat, to echo, to add, to amend*).

Machin and Mayr (2012: 60) denote that different verbs can be used to influence a reader’s perception of a certain participant. Some of them can make a social actor look more authoritative or subservient, legitimate or non-legitimate. They may help the reader to define the role of a certain participant in event without explicitly stating it. They may also lead the text consumer to consider some social actors as having a negative attitude and some as being friendly.

### 3.3.3 Tools for analyzing argumentative discourse

Due to specificity of the research, most of the selected articles contain the authors’ arguments either for or against renaming of Kaliningrad to Königsberg. Therefore, for further research it is necessary to consider tools used in CDA to analyze argumentative discourse.
Richardson (2007: 156) outlines the following characteristics of argumentation: “argumentation is aimed at resolving a difference of opinion, occurs in a particular material context, and is realized through the participants offering arguments which they believe support their standpoint and which are aimed at exerting an influence of opinions, attitudes and even behavior of others” (Richardson 2007: 156). He uses Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* to describe a set of rules of successful argumentation. Aristotle distinguishes three types of rhetorical discourse: *forensic*, *epideictic* and *deliberative*. Each of three types has its own goals and means of fulfilling those goals. Thus, as Richardson (2007: 157-159) argues, identifying the types used in rhetorical discourse should be the first stage of analysis of argumentation. *Forensic* argumentation deals with past actions. Its means are accusation or defense. *Epideictic* argumentation focuses on the present. It is concerned with proving something or someone worthy of admiration or disapproval. *Deliberative* rhetoric concerns itself with the future. It is used to prove the desirability or otherwise of a decision. Although the reasoned opinion may combine two or more types of rhetoric, it is usually possible to identify the most important one.

For the next step of analysis, Richardson (2007: 159-165) suggests the identification of the arguer’s strategy or mode of persuasion. According to Aristotle’s rhetorical theory there are three types of persuasion strategies: *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos*. In *ethotic argument*, the character of the arguer plays a central role. The idea here is that someone of ‘good character’, someone having expertise or firsthand experience has more influence on reader and may convince him/her easier. Thus, the arguer should be presented in a certain way, which would make his argumentation seem convincing for reader. *Pathos* or emotion is used to sway the reader to a certain frame of mind, which would make him/her more receptive to the arguments presented by the arguer. Among emotions, which might be used for argumentation, are fear, anger, love, pity and others. *Logos* means the logic of the argument, which is used to convince an audience. The idea is that the reader is more likely to be convinced by arguments supported with evidence and reasoning. *Logetic argumentation* may be divided by forms: deductive or inductive. A deductive argument is organized in a way that a number of statements are followed by a valid conclusion, whereas an inductive argument uses specific cases to support general conclusion. Inductive argumentation may take three different forms: *symptomatic*, *comparison* and *causation*. In a symptomatic argument, a certain example is taken to illustrate the whole pattern. This type of inductive argumentation can be identified in texts by following phrases: ‘...is a characteristic of...’; ‘...is typical of...’; ‘...illustrates...’; ‘...is evidence of...’ and so on. Comparison or analogy can be indicated by phrases: ‘...equally...’; ‘...similarly...’; ‘...so too...’; ‘...any more than...’. Richardson (2007: 163) states that this type of inductive argument may be especially powerful if used properly. Analogy may have a great effect is
audience is familiar with something issue is compared to, and has very strong positive or negative feelings about it. Causal argument may be identified in text by phrases referring to outcomes or consequences: ‘...creates...’; ‘...makes...’; ‘...gives rise to...’; and many others.

Richardson (2007: 167-170) argues that Aristotle’s modes of proof may be used incorrectly and presents fallacies common for each of three persuasion strategies. Although Aristotle’s ethos is recognized as the most convincing mode, there is the possibility of the fallacy of the abuse of authority. This may happen if the arguer claims having expertise and authority, but does not have it in reality. The pathos argumentation fallacy may lay in the manipulation of emotion; a common pathotic fallacy is the usage of fear tactics involving exaggeration and hyperbole. Another pathotic fallacy is claiming the argument should be accepted because so many people agree with it. Furthermore, there are many ways to misuse logos argumentation as Richardson (2007: 169) gives the example of the case of symptomatic argument, when overgeneralization may occur, if the generalization is based on an example that is unrepresentative or insufficient, the analogy may fail if its components are not sufficiently comparable. As a conclusion, Richardson (2007: 177) states that during the analysis of argumentative discourse, the analyst should ask himself/herself if rhetorical strategies successfully and reasonably support the standpoint.

Using the rules of Aristotle’s Rhetoric to consider articles containing argumentation helps to analyze which arguments may be more convincing for readers and thus which standpoint readers are likely to take in the renaming discussion.
4. ANALYSIS OF MEDIA TEXTS

4.1 Discourse practice analysis

4.1.1 Using ‘voice of people’ in media texts

As previously mentioned, I selected 24 articles on the topic of renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg from five different sources. These selected articles draw on various journalistic genres. Although many articles can be characterized by a mix of genres, there is a distinguishable from others group of articles based on the opinions of the audience, which I labeled the *vox populi* group. The genre of *vox populi* or ‘voice of the people’ is quite distinctive from the other genres in terms of text production, which makes it important to thoroughly consider this group in this part of my research.

In the *vox populi* group, I included four articles from the *Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade* (#4.1, #4.4, #4.5 and #4.6)\(^4\). Article #4.1 is a collection of readers’ comments to the news from Article #3.1. The readers expressed their opinion in the comment section on the webpage of the newspaper. The other three articles contained the opinions of the printed version’s readers, who contacted the editorial office of the newspaper. In Article #4.5, some opinions were presented in the form of a dialogue between the reader and a worker of the newspaper. Also in this article every opinion goes under a headline, which summaries its main point: “[We] don’t remember history”; “There are many Königsbergs, but only one in Russia”; “Immortalize the Empress!”; “It sounds venal”; “[Germans] will come and ask [us] to move out”; and “It’s better not to stir this question”. Where as the other three articles do not have such headlines. Additionally, in articles #4.5 and #4.6, the writers added personal information such as profession, status (retiree or war veteran), hobbies, and age. Additionally, the editors specify if a reader moved to Kaliningrad or was born in Kaliningrad. In addition to the articles from *Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade*, the *vox populi* group contains five articles from the newspaper *Kaliningradskaja Pravda*. All five were published in the newspaper’s regular column called “Glas naroda” (*vox populi* or ‘voice of the people’). One of them (#5.6) contains the opinions of six readers, while the other four articles present full letters written by readers (#5.3, #5.4, #5.5 and #5.7). Interestingly, two of them are written by the same person.

---

\(^4\) Hereinafter, I refer to articles by their number. The full list of articles can be found from the Primary Sources section.
The *vox populi* genre is commonly used by print newspapers, but not by online news sources. Print newspapers traditionally use the *vox populi* genre as a way of communicating with their readers. The letters to the editor section also serves as a forum for public discussion (Richardson 2007: 149). For the same purpose, online news usually has a comment section, where readers can freely express their opinion on the topic presented in that particular article. However, the difference between the comment section and the letters section is significant, as in the case of latter, the readers’ letters are selected for publication by the editorial office. Thus, it is necessary to look at the letter selection process.

As mentioned, letters to the editor are not representative of public opinion, and the writers tend to be older and politically more conservative. This can be clearly seen from the selected *vox populi* articles, in article #4.5 the *Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade* published the opinions of six readers and with three of them provided extra information, rather than just their names. All three were senior citizens. Additionally, in the article #4.6 one of readers is described as a ‘military retiree’. In the case of *Kalingradskaja Pravda*, out of three readers, whose full letters were published in the newspaper, two were senior citizens and one did not provide any information about his age. In article #5.6 two readers were senior citizens, one was 25 years old and the others did not provide the information.

Furthermore, I will analyze the group of *vox populi* articles using the rules of letter selection identified by Wahl-Jorgensen (2002), which were presented in the methodology chapter. First of all, according to the rule of relevance, the desire of the *Kalingradskaja Pravda* editors to publish five articles, containing their readers’ opinion on renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg, clearly shows that this topic is considered relevant and newsworthy. In case of the *Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade*, the editors invited their readers to express their opinion and to take part in the poll on their website with four options: a) keep the name Kaliningrad; b) return to the Königsberg; c) choose another name; or d) undecided. The readers’ opinions were collected in four articles and the poll results were considered during the round table discussion (#3.3), which also indicates the editors’ interest in the topic.

The second rule presented by Wahl-Jorgensen (2002) is the rule of entertainment, which indicates the editors’ desire to entertain their audience with interesting and amusing material. *Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade* obeys this rule by publishing uncommon and sometimes bizarre opinions and statements. For example, one of the readers makes the assumption that the Russian police ‘militia’ was renamed to ‘policija’ after the German ‘polizei’, whom he
characterizes as ‘monsters’ and ‘fascist henchmen’ (#4.5). In the article #4.1, one reader suggests naming Kaliningrad after the original name of the Prussian settlement, ‘Twangste’. Another reader from the article #4.4 states that renaming is necessary, so people abroad remember Königsberg and how they have lost it to the USSR. Richardson (2007: 152) notes that conceptions of what is entertaining vary from one newspaper to another. While Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade published some unusual and peculiar opinions to entertain their readers, Kaliningradskaja Pravda in article #5.6 used several highly emotional letters to engage the audience, seen from various expressive rhetorical questions used in letters: “Will the thousands of heroes, who died here for the Victory forgive the initiators?” or “Doesn’t this man [any soldier of the Great Patriotic War with surname Kalinin] deserve the former Königsberg to be called Kaliningrad?”.

The third rule is the rule of brevity, which requires letters to the editor to be short (or shortened), so that more opinions can be presented. Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade presented many short statements in articles #4.1, #4.4 and #4.6, and some longer opinions in the article #4.5. The total amount of opinions published is 21, which shows that the newspaper relies on the rule of brevity. Contrary to that, Kaliningradskaja Pravda published four full letters, including two from the same author, and only one mixed article containing six opinions.

The fourth and final rule identified by Wahl-Jorgensen (2002) is the rule of authority, which states that editors prefer contributors with the insider’s experience and textual competence. The opinions presented in the Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade cannot be analyzed from the textual competence point of view, as articles are mainly based on readers’ phone calls to the editorial office, not on their letters. In article #4.1, which is based on readers’ written comments, opinions are too short to identify the level of authors’ textual competence. At the same time, four full letters published in the Kaliningradskaja Pravda meet the requirements of the rule of authority. Articles #5.3 and #5.5 present letters from a veteran of the Great Patriotic War, who came to Kaliningrad in 1946. He had been a witness to the whole Russian history of the city, which gives him certain degree of expertise on the topic. Also in the article #5.5 he tells a story from his childhood about Mikhail Kalinin, which shows the historical figure as kind and helpful person. In article #5.4 the author, to support his rather unconventional opinion, provides an interesting introduction into the history of Königsberg he uses various historical facts that might be unknown for most of the audience, which makes it interesting to read. The author of article #5.7 is a city planner, who worked on rebuilding Kaliningrad after the war. Although his opinion is quite common and he does
not use any outstanding facts to support his standpoint, he provides insider information on decisions about the demolition or reconstruction of several historical building in Kaliningrad.

4.1.2 Local newspapers contributing to renaming discussion

It is evident from the discussion above, that two newspapers: Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade and Kaliningradskaja Pravda, use readers’ opinions differently. Although both newspapers emphasize the newsworthiness of the renaming topic, the selection of the letters and the space allocated for readers’ opinions make the difference in the editorial line visible. Kaliningradskaja Pravda as a less modern and more conservative newspaper prefers to support opponents of renaming, because among their audience there are many senior citizens, who generally oppose bringing back the German name. From the nine opinions presented in the vox populi column of the Kaliningradskaja Pravda five are strongly against the name Königsberg, three are against changing name of the city in general and only one supports changing the name of the city from Kaliningrad to Petrograd, but not Königsberg. In these terms it is useful to examine two other articles on the topic published in the same newspaper.

Several readers in their letters referred to the article #5.1 written by journalist Kirill Sin'kovskij and titled “Everything is possible...”. In response to this, Article #5.6 is titled: “Not possible!”. However, the conflict between the two headlines does not mean that Kirill Sin'kovskij expressed a positive attitude towards the renaming idea; rather he was neutral in his reflections. At the beginning of the article, he presented various common arguments of the renaming supporters and from their opponents, and after that reported on the renaming initiative and the creation of the working group. Yet Sin'kovskij expressed his surprise in the fact that the ‘letter of 400’ presented by the renaming initiators had not been ignored by the Regional Duma due to insignificant amount of petitioners. He also cast doubt upon the proclaimed independence of the creation of the working group from the renaming initiative. Sin'kovskij made a supposition that the deputies of the Regional Duma showed from their actions that they accept the possibility of renaming. The second article (#5.2) was written by journalist Vlad Rževskij. The name of the article “Sami my ne mestnye...” (We are not local…) is a stereotypical phrase used by beggars. In Russian it is commonly used in a jocular manner before asking for something. Rževskij uses this phrase in the headline in reference to non-Kaliningrad citizens, who signed the renaming petition. The article is written in very informal style and he openly takes the side of the renaming opponents and satirizes the renaming initiators. He also states that according to response of the Regional Duma deputies the renaming
initiative does not have any prospects, which contradicts the report of Sin'kovskij. Moreover, Rževskij does not say anything about the creation of the working group and the participation of members of the initiative group.

Compared with the vox populi column of the Kaliningradskaja Pravda, Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade provides a wider range of opinions. For instance, out of seven readers, whose opinions were presented in the article #4.5, two are against Kaliningrad and want to return to ‘Königsberg’; one is against both names and suggests naming the city after the Empress Elizaveta Petrovna; one is against Königsberg and wants to keep the name ‘Kaliningrad’; and two are against Königsberg, but accept changing the name to something else. The other three articles are mainly supportive of renaming. Komsomol'skaja Pravda, which is more modern and liberal than the previous newspaper, is more tolerant to the idea of renaming. To study further standpoint of the Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade it is useful to look at other articles on topic of renaming published in this newspaper.

Articles #4.2 and #4.3 represent opinions given by public figures in their interviews with the newspaper. In many ways these articles are close to the vox populi genre. The main difference though is that the public figures have not contacted the editorial office themselves to express their opinion. Rather they were chosen and interviewed by journalists. Article #4.3 consists of two out of seven opinions presented in the article #4.2. It is noteworthy that the renaming initiative and the working group are not mentioned in this article, rather it refers to the decision of the Volgograd Regional Duma to rename Volgograd to Stalingrad for six days of the year, which are red-letter days related to the Great Patriotic War and the Battle of Stalingrad. The decision was made in January 2013 and was used by media in connection with the renaming discussion in Kaliningrad at both the regional and federal levels. Furthermore, the journalists explain that they asked for the opinions of public figures and fellow-citizens on the restoration of the historical name of the city.

The article is titled “Pilot-cosmonaut Aleksej Leonov: The name “Königsberg” has nothing in common with Nazism”. Aleksej Leonov, who lived in the city in his youth, is an Honorary Citizen of Kaliningrad and a highly respected person. Leonov spoke out for the restoration of the name ‘Königsberg’. Reno Komarovskij who is another respected person, an air force pilot, a veteran of the storming of Königsberg, and citizen of Kaliningrad also supported the idea of renaming. Both Leonov and Komarovskij emphasized that the name ‘Königsberg’ is not related to Nazism, and Mikhail Kalinin does not deserve the honor of having the city named after him. Konstantin Egorov,
a senior citizen and one of the Children of Stalingrad⁵, holds the same opinion. Nikolaj Černyšev, another veteran of the storming of Königsberg, said that he never liked the name ‘Kaliningrad’, and would prefer the name ‘Baltijsk’. Another locally well known person, Igor' Odincov, the director of the public cultural institution “Kaferdal'nyj Sobor” (the Königsberg Cathedral), stated that he personally respects history and the name ‘Königsberg’, but decision should be made only by citizens of Kaliningrad via a referendum. The Soviet and Russian actor Sergej Nikonenko also supports Königsberg. His opinion was taken from the interview he gave in 2009. Only one of the interviewed people, another veteran of the storming of Königsberg, Nikolaj Grišin was against the German name. The opinions of Odincov and Komarovskij were republished in the article #4.3, again with a reference to the renaming of Volgograd.

As it can be clearly seen, the interviews published in Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade were mainly supportive of the name of Königsberg. It is also worthy of note that in articles #4.2 and #4.3 the writers mainly used the opinions of veterans of the Great Patriotic War, who typically oppose the renaming due to their commitment to the Soviet past of the city (Berger 2010). The displeasure of veterans is one of the main arguments against renaming. The main idea of articles #4.2 and #4.3 was to show that this general trend is false. As seen from the headline of article #4.3: “A Veteran of the storming of Königsberg spoke in favor of renaming Kaliningrad”. Furthermore, the veterans’ displeasure with the potential renaming was also contested by Oleg Kašin in article #3.2. I will thoroughly consider this topic in the next part of the research, but here I would like to discuss in more detail the participation of Oleg Kašin in the renaming discussion. Kašin is a controversial political journalist in Russia. He gained widespread popularity as a political activist critical of the Russian ruling party after he was attacked in November 2010 as a consequence of his professional activity. He was born in Kaliningrad and started his career in the Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade. Therefore, it is hardly surprising to see his opinion on the renaming debate in this newspaper. However, his support for Königsberg is not surprising either for those, who are aware of his reputation. I think, Komsomol'skaja Pravda published his article on this topic to attract opposition-minded readers, who would be swayed by the popularity of this public figure.

I will conclude the examination of Komsomol'skaja Pravda’s standpoint with exploration of article #3.3, which was meant to conclude the renaming discussion on the pages of this newspaper. This

---

⁵ Deti Stalingrada (the Children of Stalingrad) is often used in Russian to refer to people who as kids survived the Battle of Stalingrad.
article draws on the genre of roundtable discussion, where a journalist has a conversation with several people at the same time. According to Lazutina and Raspopova (2011) this genre is used to contribute to the formation of public opinion on particular topic through the representation of individual opinions. The genre of roundtable discussion usually implies a sophisticated analysis of the problem (Lukina 2003). Therefore, participants of the discussion are usually experts, whose opinion on certain social problems is valuable. During the roundtable discussion the journalist acts as a moderator. Three guests and two representatives of the Komsomol'skaja Pravda took part in the roundtable discussion at the editorial office of the newspaper. Two of them were businessmen from Kaliningrad: Andrej Levčenko and Vladimir Kacman. The third guest was the head of the Kaliningrad Sociological Centre Sergej Cyplenkov. Aleksej Denisenkov, the editor of the Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade presented the results of the poll from the webpage of the newspaper and an overview of phone calls from readers. The moderator of the conversation was Ljubov' Antonova, who was a chief editor of the Zapadnaja Pressa Media Group. Among the participants of the discussion, two businessmen and the chief editor were supporters of renaming, and only Cyplenkov did not support this idea. During the discussion the participants agreed on fact that the majority of Kaliningrad citizens do not support the restoration of the historical name ‘Königsberg’. However, the participants also came to the conclusion that ‘Königsberg’ is a stronger brand than ‘Kaliningrad’, and the attractiveness of Kaliningrad for tourists is based on the Königsberg heritage.

It is clear from the analysis presented above that two local newspapers - the Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade and the Kaliningradskaia Pravda - have opposing views on the renaming of Kaliningrad and contribute to the renaming discussion in two different ways. Kaliningradskaia Pravda strongly opposes the renaming initiative and generally relies on argumentation presented by senior citizens, which has been commonly used in the renaming discussion since the 1990s. Contrariwise, the Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade is more tolerant of the renaming initiative and tries to present new arguments and new views on renaming. The detailed analysis of the argumentation of renaming supporters and their opponents is presented in the next part of the research.
4.2 Textual analysis

The first subchapter of the textual analysis is concerned with the representation of political actors involved in the renaming discussion. For this part of analysis, I use articles covering the activities of the working group. The idea is to see how representations of political actors may influence the opinions of audience. Three other subchapters focus on various topics touched upon in the renaming debate. Here I analyze articles, which draw on argumentative discourse, i.e. present opinions of various social actors and their arguments. I identified that the argumentation of the renaming supporters and their opponents mainly falls into three categorizations: a) national identity and the memory of the Great Patriotic War; b) the historical justification of renaming; and c) the image of Kaliningrad and the Kaliningrad Region for outsiders. The idea is to explain how these three topics are constructed in the argumentation of the participants of the discussion, and which arguments may be more convincing for the audience.

4.2.1 Political dimension of renaming discussion

In this part of analysis, I concentrate on the bloc of articles, which relate to the activities of the working group on the identification of public opinion on renaming geographical objects. Here I show how writers represent social actors in selected articles, and how these representations may influence readers’ opinion.

The actual composition of the working group is not specified in any of articles. However, there are several names, which appear more often than others. First of all, it is deputy Oleg Šlyk. In addition to numerous references in the reports from the working group sessions, two of the selected articles are based on Šlyk’s speeches presented outside the activities of the working group. These are article #2.2 which is based on the interview Šlyk has given to the radio station Business FM Kaliningrad and article #6.2 that is based on the deputy’s speech at the meeting of the bloggers’ discussion club “Blog-post”. The second name is Solomon Ginzburg. Article #1.1 on the Kaliningrad.Ru regional news portal is based on his video blog entry, it is worth mentioning that Ginzburg’s video blog (Kaliningrad.Ru 2014b) is located on the same news portal. From the video catalogue it is clear that no other politician enjoys the same opportunity to deliver his/her opinion to the audience of the portal. The third name, which appears frequently in selected articles, is Rustam Vasil'ev, one of renaming initiators, who often speaks for the initiative group during the working group sessions. The fourth person is Dmitrij Karpovič, another member of the initiative group, whose short interview, given right after the first meeting of the working group to the NewsBalt correspondent is
presented in the end of the article #6.1. The other members of the working group, which are mentioned in selected articles are Mixail Česalin, Igor’ Revin, and Sergej ŠČepetil’nikov, who appears only once. Additional information about the members of the Regional Duma taking part in sessions of the working group is provided in Figure 5.

Figure 5. List of members of the Kaliningrad Regional Duma taking part in activities of the working group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position in the Kaliningrad Regional Duma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oleg Šlyk</td>
<td>United Russia</td>
<td>chairman of the legislation committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Ginzburg</td>
<td>Civic Platform</td>
<td>member of the legislation committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixail Česalin</td>
<td>Patriots of Russia</td>
<td>vice-chairman of the legislation committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igor’ Revin</td>
<td>Communist Party</td>
<td>member of the economic policy committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergej ŠČepetil’nikov</td>
<td>United Russia</td>
<td>member of the committee on international relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the selected articles a clear separation between the Regional Duma members and the members of the initiative group within the working group can be seen. Duma members are mainly referred to using functionalisation: deputat (deputy), parlamentarij (parliamentarian), predsedatel’ (chairman), and lider partii (political party leader). Additionally, in some of the articles the party affiliation is accentuated. For example, in the article #6.1 from the NewsBalt, where they were mentioned, each deputy name is accompanied with the name of the party. Moreover, while all the deputies are presented as members of a certain political party, members of the United Russia party are described with the word edinoross. The word edinoross comes from the Russian name of the party Edinaja Rossija, which is a neologism widely used to address members of United Russia in the mass media. According to Jacee Cho (2008: 138) the word edinoross is not simply a shortened version, because the word came to the media from spoken language, it also has an expressive function. Indeed, Litvin (2011: 62) states that the word edinoross has gained negative connotations due to its frequent usage in a negative context related to the activities of United Russia. Although, it is used in mass media both in negative and neutral ways, for the reader, who has some prejudice towards United Russia, the word edinoross may envoke a strong negative reaction. Thus, in the article #6.1 writer makes a representational choice by giving preference to edinoross instead of a neutral phrase ‘member of the United Russia party’. The term edinoross also appears in the article #3.1 in the context of the dialogue, which happened between members of the working group during the session:
“[Rustam Vasil’ev speaks] «Immoral questions must not be submitted for people’s discussion. [...] After all you do not allow the homeless and alcoholics to make decisions regarding important issues». “We do!” – Mixail Česalin interjects. – “We create voting stations especially for them”. “We even know who wins at those stations”, - deputy Solomon Ginzburg stung edinoross present in the hall” (Article #3.1).

According to the journalist’s remark Ginzburg highlights dubious activities used by United Russia to win elections, this reference to the party’s foul play during elections portrays the party members in a bad light. Moreover, Mixail Česalin, who is a member of the Patriots of Russia, which is in opposition to the ruling party in the Kaliningrad Region, gets involved on the side of United Russia. On the contrary, this representation of Ginzburg allows readers to assume that he is an honest politician. Furthermore, deputy Solomon Ginzburg appears as the most calm and reasonable participant of the ‘nervous discussion’ (#5.1) in selected articles. The writers use interpretation, when introducing Ginzburg’s speech. In the article #6.3 he ‘takes the heat off’ at the end of the working group session. In the article #1.2 Ginzburg is presented as a ‘referee’, who reconciles opponents and the supporters of referendum.

Indeed, deputy Ginzburg is the only supporter of the renaming initiative among the deputies, while e.g. Oleg Šlyk ‘swears off’ being an initiator of renaming (#6.1). Ginzburg’s three-step plan of renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg is presented in the article #1.1, which is based on his video blog entry. In article #6.1, during the first session of the working group Ginzburg speaks on behalf of his party: “We, Civic Platform party, will insist on holding a referendum in Kaliningrad on the renaming of our city in 2020, the 75th anniversary of the Great Victory”. In the article #6.2 during the second session he speaks of 2020 as the year, when “Russia stops being corrupted and gets rid off a gang of thieves”. Who are those thieves? Might be it is a reference to the well-known term ‘the party of crooks and thieves’, which was introduced by Russian activist Alexey Navalny accusing United Russia of corruption. By citing words of Ginzburg, the writer again sets him in opposition to the members of the ruling party.

While the representation of Ginzburg’s behavior gives an impression of him as of calm and reasonable person, some other deputies often appear too judgmental and unbalanced. Oleg Šlyk labels the renaming initiative as ‘cheap populism’ (#2.2 and #3.1) and ‘expresses his contempt’ for the renaming initiators (#6.2). Igor’ Revin thinks that the appearance of the renaming idea is due to people’s idleness and a low level of intelligence (#6.1). Oleg Šlyk and Mixail Česalin get into an argument with the renaming initiators (#6.3). Statements from Šlyk, Revin and Česalin are often
ended with an exclamation mark, which illustrates the heated tone of the discussion. How does the reader’s evaluation of deputies’ performance in the discussions influence their opinion on renaming topic? I hypothesize that the readers would rather take into account the opinions of those politicians, whom they consider as honest and reasonable, than those, who seem untrustworthy and act provocatively.

Throughout the bloc of news articles, the authors of the renaming initiative, Rustam Vasil’ev and Dmitrij Karpovič are mainly addressed with fairly neutral words. First of all, in the background part of the news articles #1.1 and #1.2 the writer applies collectivization by using the generic phrase gruppa kaliningradcev (group of Kaliningrad citizens), which does not give the reader any information on who those people are or how many of them there are. Secondly, in articles related to the activities of the working group, the authors of the renaming initiative are presented with two types of functionalisation: specifying their role in the process: iniciativnaja gruppa (initiative group), iniciatory Pereimenovanija (initiators of renaming); and specifying their line of activity: obščestvennyj dejatel’ (public figure), aktivist (activist), gruppa kaliningradskich aktivistov (group of Kaliningrad activists).

Only two of the selected articles present some background information about the members of the initiative group. In the article #3.1 the writer limits it to mentioning that Dmitrij Karpovič kak govorjat (as the story goes) is close to Russian nationalists and expresses surprise in the fact that a Russian nationalist may initiate the return of German name to the city. The anonymisation of the source here denotes uncertainty in the truth of Karpovič’s involvement in a nationalist movement. In the article #6.1 the writer is far more categorical in his/her representation of four obščestvenniks (public figures, social activists) engaged in the renaming initiative. NewsBalt gives a short record about each of them:

“There are noteworthy personalities among initiators. First of all, it is several times convicted Mixail Kostjaev, who was the initiator of the referendum against the Baltic Nuclear Power Plant. Then there are Rustam Vasil’ev, an activist of the former Baltic Republican Party, and two local nationalists Dmitrij Karpovič and Vladimir Xodaev, organizers of the so-called P-russian Parade” (Article #6.1).

This resume is clearly not positive and contravenes with the neutral functionalisations used in other articles. Later in the same article the writer uses collectivization by referring to Karpovič with the word ‘nationalist’. The author also personalizes the initiator of renaming by adding a detail of his
behavior during the interview: “<…> Karpovič, smoking his fifth cigarette, said <…>”, which also carries a negative impression of the participant.

Another distinctive case of representation of the renaming initiators is in article #5.2 from the newspaper Kaliningradskaja Pravda. The author of this article, Vlad Rževskij, discusses the renaming initiative in a very satirical manner. He openly satirizes the renaming initiators. However, he does not mention any concrete names using the following functionalisation: neutral členy iniciativnoj gruppy (members of the initiative group) and mestnye aktivisty (local activists), and ironic sobiravšie podpisi èntuziasty (enthusiasts collecting signatures). Rževskij emphasizes that the renaming initiators could not think of any new arguments than the ‘same old story’ of the immorality of Mikhail Kalinin. He also mentions the absurdity of involving non-citizens of Kaliningrad to support the renaming petition. The amount of signatures collected by the renaming initiators is also ridiculed by author. At the end of the article, Rževskij makes a clearly negative statement: “Apparently, the members of the initiative group want to be Germans more than Germans themselves”.

These representational choices used to introduce renaming initiators were determined by the ways, in which the writers want to introduce the renaming initiative itself. If the renaming initiators were represented through neutral functionalization, the readers may not gain a positive or a negative impression of them. This allows readers to form their opinion regarding renaming, which would not be based on their feelings towards the initiators. This representational strategy is used by the newspaper Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade and news portals Klops.Ru and Kaliningrad.Ru. The newspaper Kaliningradskaja Pravda and the news portal NewsBalt use a kind of representation that uncovers the initiators’ unpleasant nature, linking them to a nationalist movement or satirizing them, perhaps with the goal of leading the reader to reject of the idea of renaming.

To summarize, in the selected articles on the activities of the working group, the renaming supporters are represented by two renaming initiators and one deputy of the Kaliningrad Regional Duma. The supporters of renaming the city are Rustam Vasil'ev, the leader of the regionalist movement in the Kaliningrad Region and head of the former Baltic Republican Party, and Dmitrij Karpovič, a member of Russian nationalist movement in the Region and the head of the organization “Russians of Kaliningrad-Königsberg”. Their view on renaming is mainly based on the idea of de-sovietization. The renaming initiators argue that there should not be a renaming referendum, as they believe people have been affected by Soviet propaganda for too long and are not able to make the right decision. While deputy Solomon Ginzburg, the representative of a new
liberal party Civic Platform (created in June 2012) supports renaming, he does not have any close
relations to initiators. Being a historian himself, he sees the restoration of the historical name as an
act of historical justice and an attempt to revive the cultural traditions of the Kaliningrad Region.
He suggests holding a campaign to promote Königsberg’s history, and then conduct the renaming
referendum in 2020. On the other side, the renaming opponents are represented by Oleg Šlyk, a
member of United Russia; Mixail Česalin, a member of Patriots of Russia; and Igor’ Revin, a
member of the Communist Party. They state that renaming is costly and does not promise any
positive changes or economic benefits in the future. Moreover, the deputies assume that the
restoration of the name ‘Königsberg’ is disrespectful to the veterans of the Great Patriotic War. It is
noteworthy that the two major political parties in Russia, the Communist Party and United Russia,
often draw on historical discourse and build their ideology around particular historical events, such
as the Great Patriotic War (Bondarenko et al. 2011). Both parties support the sanctification of the
war, which is protected from any debates. Potentially because both parties strongly rely on the
support of elderly people and war veterans, who are especially sensitive regarding this topic.
Therefore, these parties cannot allow the displeasure of war veterans. The political dimension of the
renaming discussion showed that the conflict lies between more center-oriented political actors (the
Communist Party, United Russia) and those political actors, who see the perspective for the
region’s development with greater autonomy (Civic Platform, regionalist movements).

4.2.2 Conflicting identities in the Kaliningrad Region

Giving commemorative names to new territories is a common political practice, which can be
traced back through history. As argued in the theoretical chapter, commemorative names are often
filled with ideological meanings and political significance. The name ‘Kaliningrad’ certainly
performs a commemorative function, however the commemorative character of this name is not
related solely to the figure of Mikhail Kalinin. As even to a greater extent it commemorates the
Great Patriotic War, the victory of Red Army, and an entry of the Soviet Union into the territory of
German East Prussia. It represents the act of bravery performed by all Red Army soldiers, who
made this victory possible. As previously mentioned, commemorative names direct people to what
is historically important. In this sense, the name ‘Kaliningrad’, together with other names related to
the Great Patriotic War in the Kaliningrad Region and supplemented with numerous memorials,
make the victory over fascism the most important historical event in the understanding of local
people.
The central argument presented by the opponents of renaming is rooted in the commemorative character of the name ‘Kaliningrad’. It is based on a firm conviction of the renaming opponents that bringing back the name ‘Königsberg’ is offensive to the veterans of the Great Patriotic War, and especially to those who took part in the storming of Königsberg. One of readers of Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade explains: “The question about renaming should not be stirred like that, because if we rename the city right now, it will insult veterans of the Great Patriotic War” (#4.5). Kaliningradskaja Pravda presents a letter written by Viktor Muxortov, who himself is a veteran. He also thinks that renaming is offensive to the veterans who stormed Königsberg and also for those who came to the city after the war to raise it from ruins and to turn it into ‘their own blossoming Kaliningrad’ (#5.3).

The opponents of renaming extensively use a patriotic mode of persuasion, by trying to appeal to the audience’s emotions. They also accuse the supporters of renaming of disrespecting the memory of the Great Patriotic War and, by extension all of its veterans. For example, the rhetorical question “Will thousands of heroes who died here in the name of the Victory forgive [renaming] initiators?” (#5.6) shames the initiators of renaming in front of Russian soldiers, who performed the immortal heroic deed. The phrase “This ground is drenched with blood of Soviet/Russian soldiers” (#5.3, #5.6 and #6.2) is repeated like a mantra throughout the articles. This verbal cliché is a product of the Soviet era, where the memory of the Great Patriotic War was a foundation of Soviet identity. In modern times, this tradition is followed by the Russian Communist Party and United Russia.

Nevertheless, patriotic argumentation used by renaming opponents obscures the inconsistency of their argument, as no one clearly explains, why restoration of the name ‘Königsberg’ is insulting to veterans. Andrej Levčenko highlights this fact during the roundtable discussion organized by the Komsomol'skaja Pravda:

“The war is long over. We won it, because of the victory we live here and it is wonderful. We could live somewhere in Siberia, God forbid. But I still cannot understand, why is it offensive to people, who gained medals “For the Capture of Königsberg”? Why is it offensive to veterans? After all, we are proud of those cities we have captured” (Article #3.3).

Oleg Kašin shares Levčenko’s opinion and remarks, that veterans gained medals “For the Capture of Königsberg”, not “For the Capture of Kaliningrad” (#3.2). The same view is expressed by one reader in article #4.4: “There is a medal “For the Capture of Königsberg”, but where is the city?”.
Indeed, publications in *Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade* and the *Kaliningradskaja Pravda* show that veterans’ opinions on renaming vary and there is no such thing as common veteran standpoint towards the renaming. Kašin goes further in his counter-argumentation making an assumption that the myth of veterans’ displeasure with renaming is created by the members of veterans’ organizations, who misuse their position for their pseudo-patriotic purposes:

“When we say ‘veteran’, we think of a 90-year-old man, who on the red-letter day comes to the Memorial of 1200 Guardsmen holding a plate with his regiment number written on it and doesn’t meet anyone there. The old man may have come there, but he is not the ‘veteran’. Rather, ‘veterans’ are burly men a bit over the age of 60, members of veterans’ organizations, who have been representing themselves on the old man’s behalf for decades, who have their own interests at heart, and making some outlandish suggestions like renaming a brand of bread «Kaiser»” (Article #3.2).

In their counter-argumentation, the renaming supporters try to show that they are respectful of veterans and they do not want to offend the memory of the Great Patriotic War or those, who had given their lives for Victory. Ginzburg, suggests that referendums are held, not only in Kaliningrad, but also in other municipalities of the Kaliningrad Region, and he stresses that geographical objects named after Heroes of the Great Patriotic War should not be renamed (#1.2). He suggests renaming only those geographical objects, whose names relate to bygone Soviet realities. Furthermore, one reader thinks that renaming will contribute to sustaining the memory of the Victory: “Let them abroad remember that here is Königsberg and they've lost” (#4.4).

As mentioned, the name ‘Kaliningrad’ marks the entry of the Soviet Union into German East Prussia as a result of the Great Patriotic War. It shows that Soviet Union became the owner of this territory and gained its right to name this city and this land in its own manner. It can be said, that names ‘Kaliningrad’ and ‘Kaliningradskaja Oblast’ (the Kaliningrad Region) illustrate the war trophy character of the Region. Indeed, many renaming opponents believe that a city captured by Russians should receive a new Russian name. This argument draws on the *logetic* mode of persuasion: the city is now part of Russia, thus its name should be Russian. In article #4.5 one of readers observes that nations who capture foreign cities never leave alien names in their territory, and always rename them in their own manner. One veteran of the storming of Königsberg says in his interview for *Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade*: “So we gained this city, <...> And it should have Russian name” (#4.2). He also adds that he is Russian and he would not be pleased if the city was called Königsberg. Some opponents openly say that there is no problem in renaming
Volgograd to Stalingrad as both names are Russian, but restoration of a German name is not right (#2.2 and #4.5). The similar view is expressed by Sergei Cyplenkov, who states that if the city is renamed to Königsberg, then the Kaliningrad Region should be renamed to Prussia, and if it is Prussia, it cannot be situated in Russia (#3.3).

This argumentation is based on the perceptions of ‘we’ and ‘other’. It was mentioned in the theoretical chapter that drawing a line between insiders and outsiders is essential for the establishment of territorial entities. During the institutionalization period of the Kaliningrad Region, the Soviet government emphasized the difference between the former German population and the new Soviet inhabitants (mainly Russians, Ukrainians, and Belarusians) of this territory. This new ‘Soviet way of life’ was situated in opposition to Nazism and Prussian militarism. This creation of a clear boundary between ‘we’ and ‘other’ was completed by the banishment of German citizens in the late 1940s. Therefore, in the understanding of the opponents of renaming the city, Königsberg is a fascist German city, while Kaliningrad is Russian. One reader, who took part in rebuilding the city after the war, writes to the Kaliningradskaja Pravda: “We came here to raise this city from the ruins, not as a fascist city, but ours, a Russian city” (#5.6).

However, renaming supporters respond to this argumentation with the examples of Saint Petersburg and Yekaterinburg (#3.3, #4.1 and #4.2). Both names have German origins and are not very common for Russia. For instance, one reader says: “So Yekaterinburg in Ural Mountains is normal, and Königsberg in the center of Europe is not?” (#4.1). However, the analogy between Saint Petersburg and Yekaterinburg, and Königsberg is not accurate, as these two cities were founded and named by Russians, while Königsberg is originally foreign. The second counterargument of renaming supporters is more convincing. They explain that Königsberg was a part of the Russian Empire during the Seven Year War under its original name “…and it hasn’t killed anyone. Neither in Königsberg, nor in Russia” as Kirill Sin'kovskij says in his article (#5.1). He also adds that Königsberg could have stayed Russian “…if Peter III would not have, for some reason, given it back to Frederick II”. There are several readers, who oppose the restoration of the name ‘Königsberg’, but recognize that the territory of the Kaliningrad Region had once been a part of Russia. They suggest giving Kaliningrad a new name, which emphasizes the Russian presence in its history. One reader proposes the name Petrograd after the Tsar Peter the Great, who visited Königsberg several times (#5.4). Another reader suggests renaming the city after the Empress Elizaveta Petrovna, who ruled the Russian Empire during the Seven Year War.
Indeed, the Russian episodes of Königsberg’s history could serve as a source for the formation of a new regional identity of Kaliningraders after the collapse of the Soviet Union. However, the identity discourses produced by Soviet government still prevail in Kaliningraders’ minds, especially among older citizens. For many people Königsberg is still associated only with fascism. Moreover, some citizens equate fascists with Germans:

“What connotations does our generation have with Königsberg? One German city. Of course, now there is amity between Germany and our country, but as the saying goes, a word dropped from a song makes it all wrong. The fascists treacherously attacked the USSR; they started the war, where many millions of our compatriots perished...” (Article #5.6).

Many opponents of renaming see the renaming initiative as the aspiration of its supporters to become like Germans and like Europeans; and such an aspiration is highly criticized and considered unpatriotic. For example, an analyst of the NewsBalt Vladislav Gulevič labels the renaming idea a ‘pro-Western verbal liberation’ coming from people with a ‘(sub)conscious internal dissatisfaction of Russian culture’ (#6.4). The opponents believe that this ‘dream of mental integration into Europe’ (#6.4) goes against national identity, Gulevič puts it this way:

“...What kind of people are among us, who are in such a hurry to part with their national identity that they are ready to live, not in Russian Kaliningrad, but in German Königsberg voluntarily, without any struggle and regret?” (Article #6.4).

Some opponents believe that the restoration of the historical name is an act of fawning upon the West. One reader states that renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg is aimed at pleasing Germany, and thereby it is ridiculous (#5.6). Oleg Šlyk in his interview points out that renaming is not going to change the life of ordinary citizens and remarks that supporters of renaming should not expect any privileges from the European Union for their support of the restoration of ‘Königsberg’ (#2.2 and #6.2). For the most part, Gulevič states that the renaming initiatives in Kaliningrad can be explained by isolation from mainland Russia, which effects the political life of the region, and by general crisis of culture in Russia (#6.4).

While renaming opponents comprehend an idea of integration into Europe as a betrayal of Russian national identity, the renaming supporters do not deny their willingness to identify themselves with Europeans and do not see anything wrong with it. Andrej Levčenko says that renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg is needed to fit into the concept of European cities and into European history (#3.3).
One reader of the *Komsomol'skaja Pravda* says: “We are charmed by Königsberg’s 757-years-old charisma, and we are trying hard to make German history ours” (¶4.5). He also believes that the restoration of the historical name will improve relations of Kaliningrad with its European neighbors.

It is clear from the discussion above that there is a conflict between the old identity discourse, which emphasized national identity and strong ties to Moscow, and the new identity discourse, which focuses on a unique location in Europe and the rich history of the territory. Although this history is foreign to the Russian inhabitants of the land, people have already developed strong bonds with the cultural landscape of its German heritage.

### 4.2.3 Renaming as an attempt to restore historical continuity

In the introduction chapter it was mentioned that the pre-war history of the Kaliningrad Region was suppressed by Soviet government. The new Soviet inhabitants were restricted from any information pertaining to the history of their new home. However, the old German architecture of Königsberg has always attracted the attention of Russian inhabitants and contributed to the development of their interest in the land’s history. Finally, the collapse of the Soviet Union gave a rise to the reconstruction of the history of the Kaliningrad Region. The restoration of the historical name of the city can be understood as an attempt to reconstruct the historical landscape. Thereby, supporters of renaming see it as an act of historical justice. They believe that renaming will serve as the revival of cultural and historical traditions of this territory (¶6.1).

The renaming supporters construct their argumentation around one particular statement, which is related to forensic rhetoric. They claim that renaming Königsberg to Kaliningrad was wrong in first place. To support this argument Oleg Kašin in the article #3.2 quotes Ivan Bunin, the first Russian writer to win the Nobel Prize for Literature, who in one of his autobiographical notes talks about the renaming taking place in the Soviet Union:

“All of Russia renamed for the USSR is one of the most brazen and idiotic insults to Russian history: the city of Peter the Great was given to Lenin; ancient Nizhny Novgorod became the city of Gorky; the ancient capital of an independent principality Tver became Kalinin, city of some little typesetter Kalinin, and Königsberg, city of Kant, became Kaliningrad” (Article #3.2).
Kašin’s argument draws on the *ethotic* mode of persuasion, using the authority of the famous writer. The supporters of renaming state that their claim is proved by the numerous cases of the restoration of historical names across Russia after the collapse of the Soviet Union, which put an end to the era of the deification of Soviet leaders (#4.1 and #5.4). They use the *logetic* mode of proof, explaining that other cities named after Kalinin have already been renamed. However, the main argument supporting the initial statement of renaming supporters draws on *epideictic* rhetoric highlighting the unpleasant personality of Mikhail Kalinin. Kalinin was Bolshevik revolutionary, the nominal head of state and held office during the Great Purge in the USSR. The renaming supporters state that Kalinin does not deserve the city to be named after him, as he was ‘odious’ (#4.5) and ‘immoral’ (#3.1) person, ‘Stalin’s stooge’ (#5.1) and ‘criminal of Stalinism’ (#1.1, #1.2), who ‘was signing hit lists’ (#2.1). This argument draws on the *logetic* mode of persuasion claiming Kalinin is bad, because he took part in the Great Purge. This argument is sufficiently convincing, as the fact of Stalin’s political repression being cruel and inhuman is widely accepted in Russian society. The argument also draws on the *pathotic* mode of proof as it is supported with words ‘odious’, ‘immoral’, ‘stooge’ and ‘criminal’, which are meant to reveal the unpleasant personality of Kalinin to the audience.

It is noteworthy that most of renaming opponents generally agree with the statement that Kalinin is a controversial historical personality. However, they do not see it as a sufficient reason to change the name of the city. The renaming opponents state that many citizens do not identify the name ‘Kaliningrad’ with Kalinin anymore. One reader says that no one even remembers Kalinin (#4.5). She remarks that the Russian surname ‘Kalinin’ comes from the word *kalina*, which means ‘guelder rose’, and assumes that if guelder rose gardens were to be planted in the city, in ten years the connotations become purely natural. This argument draws on a statement about toponym’s tendency to lose its original meaning through repetition over the course of time. Another reader notes that surname Kalinin is very common in Russia, and any Russian soldier of the Great Patriotic War called Kalinin deserves the city Königsberg to be called Kaliningrad (#5.6). This statement resonates with the commemorative character of the name ‘Kaliningrad’. An expert of the NewsBalt Vladislav Gulevič thinks that people, who feel offended with the name ‘Kaliningrad’, are being too sensitive (#6.4). He is surprised that these people accept the fact that the capital city of the USA is named after George Washington, who took part in the extermination of Native Americans. However, the two elements of this analogy, Washington and Kaliningrad, are not sufficiently comparable in this case. People living in the Kaliningrad Region do not care about city names in the USA and they barely have any relation to extermination of Native Americans. At the same time, the
name of their own city and the history of their country are much closer to them. In addition to that, the personalities of Kalinin and Washington are hardly comparable.

To conclude, during the 1990s two out of three Russian cities named after Mikhail Kalinin took advantage of de-communization and got renamed. For many years in Kaliningrad, Kalinin’s personality was also one of main arguments in the renaming discussion. However, this argument has lost its significance, because people are not so eager to remove everything that relates to the Soviet past as they were in the 1990s. In addition to that there is a new generation of Kaliningraders, who was raised out of Soviet ideology and knows little of Mikhail Kalinin.

Returning to the initial statement, many opponents of renaming are not fond of the idea of historical justice. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, residents of the Kaliningrad Region are worried about losing their homes. They are scared to share the same fate of the Germans expelled from the Kaliningrad Region in the late 1940s, if Germany claims its territories back. Therefore, renaming opponents believe that the renaming initiatives question the right of Russians to live on this territory. “Are they not satisfied with results of the war? What kind of historical justice do they appeal to?” – asks one reader (#5.6). “There are many families that are deeply rooted in the Amber Region. So provocations about ‘the right’ should be cut already” – tells another reader (#5.7). Many opponents suppose that the restoration of historical names in the Kaliningrad Region will lead to the annexation of the territory by Germany. One reader explains for Komsomol'skaja Pravda:

“And then we will start renaming rivers, lakes and mountains... And after that they [Germans] will come and tell us to leave, because it is not our land when everything is named differently here” (Article #4.5).

Indeed, some renaming opponents believe in existence of revanchist sentiments in modern Germany. One reader, whose letter was published in the Kaliningradskaja Pravda, suppose that financial support, which German organizations are eager to provide for the restoration of the Königsberg Castle, is a display of such sentiments (#5.7). In response to that, the renaming supporters underline that they are not interested in giving up their land or becoming a part of Germany. Some of them also suggest naming the city ‘Russian Königsberg’, which would highlight that it belongs to Russia (#4.5).

In addition to that, renaming opponents claim that the creation of historical continuity is impossible, as there is nothing left from old Königsberg in the city. One reader tells Komsomol'skaja Pravda:
“It is impossible to return the past. Even if we rebuild demolished monuments of architecture, they won’t be authentic. We should take into account the mistakes of Soviet urban planning and create new future for Kaliningrad” (Article #4.4).

The renaming opponents state that modern Kaliningrad is completely different from what Königsberg once was; and thereby restoring the historical name does not make sense. Another reader says: “This city is ours, built by our fathers and grandfathers. There was nothing left of Königsberg here after the 1944 English bombing” (#4.5). Moreover, some opponents claim that the restoration of the historical name is disrespectful of the Russian history of the city. Journalist Vlad Rževskij in his article says that Königsberg remained in the foreign past (#5.2). He adds that restoring the German name would mean ‘erasing our own past’ and ‘declaring that everything was wrong and useless”.

In fact, many renaming supporters, and some opponents as well, are not content with the transformation of the city during the Soviet period. One reader tells Komsomol'skaja Pravda that ‘featureless Kaliningrad symbolizes an obvious failure of the state’ (#4.5). Another reader believes that by bringing back the name ‘Königsberg’, Kaliningraders will be able to ask for forgiveness from the city for destroying it:

“We’ll apologize for the exploitative attitude towards the city, when construction companies disfigure it with shopping malls and street stalls. We’ll apologize for the boorish attitude towards its past and history, when we lay asphalt atop of the century old cobblestone roads and cover brick facades with floor paint” (Article #4.6).

In his article, Oleg Kašin states that starting from a scratch and building a proper Soviet city Kaliningrad in place of Königsberg was an audacious experiment, which failed (#3.2). “The experiment failed, Soviet asphalt cracked and from under it Königsberg’s cobblestone road treacherously appeared” – adds Kašin meaning that memory of Königsberg came back immediately with the collapse of the Soviet Union. In a similar vein, Andrej Levčenko explains:

“Everywhere today, on the streets, in offices and in apartments, there are photos of Königsberg. Why are there photos of Königsberg in the City Hall? Get rid of them and let’s forget about this city! No, nevertheless we are still coming back to this city, the city which does not exist”. (Article #3.3)
Both Kašin and Levčenko use the *pathetic* mode of persuasion trying to appeal to the audience’s emotions. They call their audience on to reflect on their own feelings towards the city and to answer one question: Why do they keep remembering Königsberg? Indeed, most of Kaliningraders are curious, if not nostalgic, about the German past of their city, which is reflected in the studies on the history of Königsberg and discussion surrounding the restoration of buildings related to the German heritage of the city. At the same time, it does not mean that they despise its Russian history. For example, many Kaliningraders do not want the House of Soviets to be demolished, as they believe it is one of the most famous sights of the city and a symbol of Soviet era. Therefore, the German heritage as well as Soviet heritage is a part of cultural landscape, which shapes the identity of people living in it.

### 4.2.4 Using German heritage as brand identity

It was briefly mentioned in the chapter dedicated to the social context of the renaming discussion, that the rise of the new wave of renaming debates was highlighted in Rustam Vasil'ev’s letter to FIFA and the following actions of the initiative group. In his letter, Vasil'ev states that holding the 2018 World Cup events in the city named after the criminal Mikhail Kalinin goes against the moral and ethical principles of the organization. On this basis, Vasil'ev assumes that FIFA should either cancel events scheduled to take place in Kaliningrad or require the restoration of the historical name from the Russian government. Evidently, Vasil'ev’s statements made Kaliningraders think if the connotations with Mikhail Kalinin were indeed harmful for the image of the city. The attractiveness of Kaliningrad to outsiders and place branding issues became a new topic in the renaming discussion, which was traditionally dominated by more inside-oriented topics.

Branding Kaliningrad to outsiders with the German heritage of the city and through the name ‘Königsberg’, is mentioned during the roundtable discussion at the editorial office of the *Komsomol'skaja Pravda* (#3.3). There are two supporters of renaming among guests of the newspaper – two businessmen from Kaliningrad, Vladimir Kacman and Andrej Levčenko. The former clearly states that he supports renaming because it is economically beneficial. Kacman believes that ‘being Königsberg’ is a stronger brand than ‘being Kaliningrad’. Furthermore, Andrej Levčenko adds that ‘Kaliningrad’ conjures up the image of ‘an ordinary Russian city’, rather than being something attractive for tourists. He claims that the only way to attract Russian tourists, at least, is to promote the city using the Königsberg heritage. Even Sergej Cyplenkov, who generally does not support the renaming initiative, agrees with Levčenko and Kacman on this issue. He uses a
symptomatic argument to support his standpoint by giving an example of his friends from other parts of Russia visiting Kaliningrad. Cyplenkov notes that his guests are usually interested in Königsberg architecture, whether its old German buildings or new buildings styled as old German ones. Cyplenkov adds that his friends regard maintaining the German style of architecture as ‘Western’ and thereby ‘advanced’. Levčenko says that he dreams of three things in regard to his city: first of all, the restoration of the Königsberg castle; secondly, transforming the city to have a European look and feel; and finally, renaming Kaliningrad back to Königsberg, which, in his opinion, is the most realistic of three. He believes that for the renaming of Kaliningrad may become an impulse for further development. Levčenko refers not only to development of the city as a tourist destination, but also to the general development of the city, ensuring it is a comfortable place for living, working and conducting business, which would be comparable to other European cities.

Conversely, the opponents of renaming believe that restoring ‘Königsberg’ would not have any impact on the amount of visitors. Deputy Sergej ŠČepetil’nikov states that renaming is not economically beneficial, as tourists are attracted by special places and good infrastructure, not by names (#6.1). One reader writes in her letter to the Kaliningradskaia Pravda: “Do they [renaming supporters] think that tourists will get ‘hooked’ by the German name and there will be no getting rid of them? It is delusional!” (#5.6). She believes that the city should be improved to attract tourists and adds that Kaliningrad’s neighbors - Lithuanian Klaipeda (or Memel in German) and Polish Gdansk (or Danzig in German) – have developed their tourist industry without restoring their German names. The statement that well developed infrastructure is essential for the successful growth of the tourist industry is undeniable, however, the argumentation of renaming supporters has certain fallacies. First of all, the analogy between Kaliningrad and its neighbors Klaipeda and Gdansk isn’t accurate. In the case of Kaliningrad, restoring the historical name would promote the city through an explicit reference to almost 700 years of its history. From this point of view, Klaipeda and Gdansk do not need to be renamed, as both names may be considered historical, because they existed before Germans came to these cities. Secondly, the opponents of renaming completely deny the role of brand name in the promotion of Kaliningrad as a tourist destination, while marketing literature emphasizes the importance of brand names as labels of brand identity.

As it was mentioned in the theoretical chapter, place branding is concerned with creating an attractive image of a place through the process of selecting and attaching specific attributes and beliefs to this place. Toponyms play an important role in place branding as they usually serve as brand names, which are meant to evoke feelings and memories in minds of consumers and thus
communicate the brand identity to them. It was emphasized that toponyms work as labels for spatial concepts, which include space-related images and meanings. Next, I will examine the representations of spatial concepts labeled by names ‘Kaliningrad’ and ‘Königsberg’ in selected articles.

I will start with the spatial concept of ‘Kaliningrad’. First of all, for some insiders and outsiders aware of the Soviet Union’s history this name may have negative connotations associated with Stalinism. Secondly, some participants of the renaming discussion see Kaliningrad as a symbol of the failure of the Soviet Union (#4.5) and its failed experiment (#3.2), which also creates a negative image. Additionally, some people think that the typical Soviet name makes the city featureless (#4.5) and similar to dozens of other Russian cities (#3.3). Therefore, it is not reflective of the city’s benefits, and thus damaging for the brand. However, the name ‘Kaliningrad’ also evokes positive feelings. To begin with, Kaliningrad is seen as a symbol of the resistance of Soviet people and as a symbol of the victory over fascism. For many Russians, such an image is strongly positive. It brings the city in line with Leningrad, Stalingrad, or the Brest Fortress. Moreover, such an image might be attractive for foreign visitors interested in World War II battlefields. Besides that, many Kaliningraders believe that their city is worthy of pride. One reader of the Kaliningradskaja Pravda writes in his letter: “Kaliningrad has its own unblemished history. A big group of cosmonauts grew up here including the first man to make a spacewalk” (#5.7). Yet those reasons to be proud of are mostly known for residents of the city, and thereby have no impact on the city’s attractiveness for outsiders.

I will proceed with the spatial concept of ‘Königsberg’ starting with its positive meanings. Aleksej Leonov, cosmonaut and twice Hero of the Soviet Union, gives the following representation of Königsberg:

“It is a city of science, students, and peace. The King’s hill! A man of worth, Albert [Duke Albert of Prussia] founded a university in Königsberg. One of the oldest universities in Europe. This is what we should think of; this is history we have to respect” (Article #2.1).

Therefore, the image of Königsberg is related to European history and European traditions. In addition to that for many people the name ‘Königsberg’ is associated with the German philosopher Immanuel Kant. All together these connotations generate a positive image of a European center of science with a rich history and long traditions. Many discussion participants explain that the name ‘Königsberg’ is known worldwide, for instance, Ljubov’ Antonova, chief editor of Zapadnaja
Pressa says: “Königsberg sounds special not only in the Russian context, but also in a global context” (#3.3). At the same time, however the name ‘Königsberg’ may carry negative connotations, as some participants of the renaming debate associate Königsberg with fascism. One reader writes in his letter: “What is actually Königsberg so ‘famous’ for? Except for the fact that several famous people were born here… But the last years of its history are disgraced by fascism” (#5.7). The fascist link is a negative feature harmful for the brand of the city. However, such connotations are typical mainly for the older residents of the city, who are a product of their Soviet education. Furthermore, those Russians, who were not raised in the Kaliningrad Region during Soviet times and have no relation to the storming of Königsberg, have not established a link between the name ‘Königsberg’ and fascism. As Sergej Cyplenkov notes, most of Russians from outside the Kaliningrad Region perceive Kaliningrad as formerly Königsberg, which means for them that it is situated in the West and ‘Western’ in this case is perceived as ‘advanced’ (#3.3), which is clearly positive.

On the whole, both spatial concepts described above have positive and negative connotations. It is clear that meanings evoked by names ‘Kaliningrad’ and ‘Königsberg’ in minds of people differ depending upon their background. This problem is rooted in the strong link between place names and autobiographical memory (Medway and Warnaby 2014). This link is problematic for place branding as people attribute meanings to places on the basis of their personal experience, which makes them almost impossible to change. Another interesting observation from the discussion above, concerns the fact that the spatial concept of ‘Kaliningrad’ has not developed any new connotations since the collapse of the Soviet Union. It might be due to the active reconstruction of the pre-war history since the early 1990s. As previously mentioned, the references to German history and the emphasis on German heritage became ubiquitous in the Kaliningrad Region after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Therefore, it is clear that a specific spatial concept marked by the name ‘Königsberg’ with its specific place identity does exist, although the city was renamed, repopulated, and rebuilt almost 70 years ago. The wide usage of the Königsberg heritage in commercial activities in general and in the tourism industry in particular, shows that there is certain potential in branding the city and the region through historical links. Indeed, renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg could become an impulse for further development and serve as a tourist attraction and a positive sign for investors. However, the commodification of a place name can potentially result in the resistance of population. For instance, one reader tells the Komsomol'skaja Pravda that renaming the city because of tourists is disgraceful and shameful (#4.5). In addition to that, place brands are required to be reflective of the true identity of the place. Indeed, many Kaliningraders
note that the appearance of their city is completely Russian and there is not much left of historical Königsberg. In this case, branding the city as Königsberg may lead to alienation among insiders, which is also harmful for the brand.

### 4.3 Discourses within the renaming discussion

Based on the analysis of the argumentation of social actors, which was presented in three previous parts, I identified the following discourses within the renaming discussion: a) discourse of memory of the Great Patriotic War; b) discourse of historical justice; c) discourse of patriotism; and d) discourse of Europeanness. To indicate discourses in selected articles I used the recommendations provided by Norman Fairclough (2003: 129-133), who states that a discourse may be thought of as representing some aspect of reality, and representing it from a particular point of view. Therefore, to indicate various discourses within the text means to locate the main themes and to identify the perspective from which these main themes are represented. The existence of a discourse comes from texts, and more specifically from repetition in texts. That means that discourse exists if a specific aspect of reality is represented in a similar way throughout several texts. It should be also noted, that there is a plurality of discourses, meaning that a particular aspect of reality may be represented in completely different ways in different discourses.

I will start with the consideration of the discourse of memory of the Great Patriotic War. Throughout the selected articles, various social actors touch upon the topic of the War. As seen from articles, this discourse includes such ideas as the memory of war victims; honoring the deeds of the Red Army; respect for war veterans in general, and veterans of the storming of Königsberg in particular. The discourse of the memory of the Great Patriotic War originally created by the Soviet government also included the concept of a common enemy. It can be seen that some social actors still maintain this idea that Germans are Nazis and therefore enemies. In the selected articles those social actors mainly belong to the older generation of Kaliningraders, who witnessed the Second World War. It should be taken into account, that their perception of Germans is determined by their traumatizing war experience. However, this idea may be used by other social actors to create an image of modern Germany as of a foe.

It is noteworthy, that the discourse of the memory of the Great Patriotic War is common for both supporters and opponents of renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg. With a rare exception, both sides accept and share same set of ideas related to the war. Such persistence and the ubiquity of the discourse of Great Patriotic War’s memory in the Kaliningrad Region has its reasons. The
circumstances of the establishment of the region are indissolubly related to the outcome of the Second World War. Also the first citizens of the Kaliningrad Region were predominantly members of the Red Army and their families. In addition to that, Soviet government constructed the identity of the region around the memory of the war and the triumph over fascism. For instance, many localities in the Kaliningrad Region received new names that carrying with them a commemorative function and numerous war monuments were also meant to commemorate the events of the Second World War.

At the same time the discourse of memory of the Great Patriotic War is constitutive of the national identity of Russians all over the country. It is commonly used to create and maintain unity among citizens of Russia. For instance, such names as ‘the conqueror of fascism’ or ‘an emancipator-nation’ can be heard frequently, especially on the Second World War red-letter days, such as the Victory Day, the Battle of Stalingrad, or the Siege of Leningrad. The two major political parties in Russia in general and in the Kaliningrad Region in particular, the Communist Party and United Russia, draw on this discourse in their ideological orientations. Therefore, in the case of the Kaliningrad Region’s this discourse is constitutive of both regional and national identity. The ideas included into the discourse of memory of the Great Patriotic War are fundamental to the institutionalization of the Kaliningrad Region as they constitute the basis of regional identity and at the same time link the region to mainland Russia.

The next discourse within the renaming discussion is the discourse of historical justice. It is actively used by renaming supporters, who claim that naming the city after Mikhail Kalinin was wrong in first place. The central idea of this discourse is the admission of mistakes made by their predecessors and to correct these mistakes where possible. For instance, many social actors in the selected articles think that destroying the remains of Königsberg Castle was wrong and that the Castle should be restored. It was mentioned in the introduction chapter that local intellectuals and architects mobilized public opinion trying to save the Königsberg Castle in the 1960s. Therefore, it may be inferred that the discourse of historical justice was first produced by the intelligentsia of the region.

Another important notion within the historical justice discourse is respect for history, whether it is the history of your own country or of a foreign country. In the Kaliningrad Region, this notion is mainly related to the preservation of historical heritage and the reconstruction of historical objects. However, some social actors also believe in the necessity of the restoration of the region’s historical traditions. It should be noted, that some social actors misuse the discourse of historical justice by
favoring the pre-war history of the region over its postwar history. For example, the perception of Kaliningrad as a failed Soviet experiment (#3.2) is clearly disrespectful of postwar history of the city.

An interesting moment within the historical justice discourse is the perception of the respect of history as belonging specifically to civilized (i.e. developed) societies. For instance, deputy Solomon Ginzburg in article #1.1 says that Kaliningrad should be renamed to Königsberg “on the day, when the whole civilized world will be celebrating the 300th anniversary of the birth of the philosopher Emmanuel Kant”. This discourse distinguishes the ‘civilized world’, where historical traditions are respected and valued, from the ‘barbaric world’, where history may be easily erased and forgotten. Here the Soviet Union falls into the second category, as the suppression of history was common in Soviet times, and the history of East Prussia is one example. Thus, within the discourse of historical justice there is a call for the Kaliningrad Region to enter the ‘civilized world’ or the Western world.

All in all, the discourse of historical justice, which appeared in the Kaliningrad Region in the 1960s and gained more popularity, or at least has become more vocal, since that time, has certainly affected the construction of regional identity. This sensitivity to history of their land became a distinctive feature of Kaliningraders and as such, the debates over the fate of the historical objects in the region continue unabated for many years, as well as the discussion on the extant towards a person may feel connected to foreign history.

The third discourse, which may be recognized within the renaming discussion, is the discourse of patriotism. This discourse is widely used by renaming opponents, who state that restoring ‘Königsberg’ is unpatriotic. The central concept within this discourse is an appreciation of Russian culture. Being a patriot here is explained as valuing Russian culture and feeling satisfied with belonging to it. On the other hand, the willingness to belong to non-Russian culture is considered as a betrayal and goes against the notion of patriotism. For instance, in some of the selected articles a desire to reconstruct and renovate pre-war buildings, restore pre-war names, and rediscover pre-war history is seen as a desire to replace Russian culture with German culture in the Kaliningrad Region.

The discourse of patriotism makes a clear division between Russians and non-Russians (i.e. Germans and Europeans). Vladislav Gulevič, an expert of NewsBalt states that: “Only someone, who doesn’t feel proud with his own culture, wants to replace everything native with non-native”
(#6.4). Therefore, in terms of institutionalization, this discourse emphasizes Kaliningrad’s belonging to Russian culture and it illustrates unity with the mainland state. In addition to that, it creates boundaries between the Russian region and its non-Russian surroundings.

While the general idea of admiring ones own culture is certainly positive, there are some controversial moments within the discourse of patriotism. First of all, the strengthening of psychological boundaries between the Kaliningrad Region and its neighbors may be harmful, as it facilitates alienation and isolation from the outer world. For a small territory left isolated from its mainland state amity and exchange with its neighbors is necessary. In addition to that, the border between patriotism and nationalism is not that clear, and some social actors are very close to crossing it. For instance, talking about having pride in the fact that they belong to Russian culture can be followed with accusations of the others being subservient to the West, these are dangerously close to slipping into a nationalist discourse.

The last discourse I have identified is the discourse of Europeanness, which is actively used by the renaming supporters. This discourse is built around the notion that the Kaliningrad Region belongs to Europe both geographically and culturally. Within the discourse of Europeanness, various social actors emphasize the need for further integration of the Kaliningrad Region into the European world and for the acceptance of European lifestyle. Peaceful coexistence and cooperation with neighboring countries and the creation of a positive image of the Kaliningrad Region for outsiders are considered essential for its development. In selected articles, this discourse is mainly presented by the younger generation of businessmen, who consider the European model of development as progressive and suitable for the Kaliningrad Region. It should be noted, that discourse of Europeanness has economic implications.

It can be noticed that there is a certain degree of conflict between the discourse of Europeanness and the discourse of patriotism, as the latter disclaims any feelings of attachment to non-Russian cultures. Compared with the discourse of patriotism, which stresses the Kaliningrad Region’s resemblance to Russia, the discourse of Europeanness shows the difference from it. It emphasizes that the region’s European character is grounded in its geographical location and its unique history. However, it does not disassociate the Kaliningrad Region from the mainland state. The region is still considered as Russian territory, but with its own distinctive features. The concept of patriotism itself, as cultural attachment and devotion to own country, does not contradict with other ideas within the discourse of Europeanness. Another point, where two discourses come into conflict with
each other, are the economic implications of the Europeanness discourse, as social actors within the discourse of patriotism clearly state that patriotism comes before any economic benefits.

I believe the discourse of Europeanness, which was introduced after the end of the Cold War and became even more significant after the EU enlargement in 2004, had a great impact on the process of the transformation of Kaliningrad Region’s identity. One of problematic issues within this process is fitting the new discourse of Europeanness together with the discourse of patriotism, which has always been strong in the region. On the one hand, the majority of region’s population belongs to Russian culture and is loyal to the state. On the other hand, the region is now surrounded by the European Union, and its population wants to live according to European standards. Thus, the central idea within the discourse of Europeanness is to benefit from the region’s location and to become as close to the European Union as it is possible, without being separated from Russia.

Based on the above discussion, it can be inferred that the Kaliningrad Region attempts to utilize its position in-between the European Union and Russia and turn into a rightful actor within European-Russian relations. In negotiations with Moscow, the regional authorities emphasize Kaliningrad’s difference from other regions and try to draw attention to the region’s specific problems. Despite the general centralizing trends in Russia, many Kaliningrad politicians appeal to the federal government to broaden the autonomy of the region. At the same time the Kaliningrad Region develops close relations with the European Union through various regional projects. Sometimes these relations go beyond simple cross-border cooperation, as in case of the “Kaliningrad - the prisoner of Europe” campaign. This case has shown that the Kaliningrad Region perceives the EU as its second core entity along with Moscow. Kaliningraders who participated in the campaign made it clear that they expect help from both Russia and the EU. While the Kaliningrad Region accentuates its difference with Russia, with the EU it places the emphasis on kinship, i.e. on common cultural and historical background with other European countries and restoration of the name ‘Königsberg’ is one way of showing its belonging to Europe.

The example of the Kaliningrad Region demonstrates how borderlands are able to utilize their position in-between instead of being silent and dependent peripheries with no voice of their own. They may appeal to their core entity and try to benefit from their location and by bringing their cores to negotiating table borderlands may influence regional and international politics. Border territories may become important actors in international relations, and thus they should not be ignored. As Browning and Joenniemi (2004: 726) note, in international relations center-periphery dynamics should be analyzed along with state-state dynamics.
5. CONCLUSION

This thesis was devoted to researching the current process of the transformation of the Kaliningrad Region’s identity through the study of the discussion on the possibility of the restoration of the historical name ‘Königsberg’ in regional media. I decided to focus on the Kaliningrad Region, as it is an overlapping space in-between Russia and the European Union. This allows me, as an IR scholar, to pay attention to political dynamics, which is often missed due to focusing exclusively on state-state dynamics. The renaming discussion in Kaliningrad often raises various sensitive issues for Kaliningraders, such as the respect for foreign history and the re-evaluation of own history, or staying loyal to Russia, while interacting with neighboring countries. This makes it a rich field for research on identity issues in international relations.

The aim of my thesis was to explore how the regional media contribute to the renaming discussion and how the identity of the Kaliningrad Region is transformed through this discussion. For my analysis I selected 24 articles from 5 regional printed and Internet media sources published at the peak of the newest wave of the renaming discussion in January-April 2013. As the main theoretical framework for my study I used Anssi Paasi’s theory of institutionalization of regions, which states that regional identity is formed through discourses on a particular region produced by various social groupings. To identify discourses within selected media texts and explore their possible social implications, I used Fairclough’s three-dimensional concept of analysis.

First of all, in the course of my study I have found out that different media outlets have different attitudes towards the renaming topic. The editorial lines of newspapers can be revealed by their representational choices in portraying the various participants of the discussion or in the way that they use the readers opinions in publications. Two apt examples are the major regional newspapers: Kaliningradskaja Pravda and Komsomol'skaja Pravda. The conservative newspaper Kaliningradskaja Pravda has published five articles containing the opinions of nine readers. None of these opinions were supportive of the name ‘Königsberg’. Most of the authors were senior citizens, who drew upon the argumentation related to the Great Patriotic War. In addition to that, the newspaper published an article, which openly satirized the renaming initiators. On the other hand, Komsomol'skaja Pravda organized an online poll thus inviting readers to express their opinion on the topic, and it presented a wide range of views from their readers and public personalities. Eventually, the newspaper has organized a roundtable discussion, where its participants summarized the poll results and discussed the implications of renaming for the
development of the region. In this way, *Komsomol'skaja Pravda* organized its own research on public opinion and contributed to the renaming discussion by introducing new topics. Therefore, it is apparent that one newspaper prefers to keep the status quo, while the other one is interested in the further development of the discussion.

Secondly, various political actors within the renaming discussion have different standpoints, which they attempt to convey to the audience via media. For instance, two deputies of the Kaliningrad Regional Duma: Oleg Šlyk and Solomon Ginzburg. The former opposes the renaming initiative; this can be seen by his frequent appearances in the media and his many interviews. In interviews he often talks about the renaming initiative in a very emotional manner and explains the reasons, why renaming Kaliningrad is not possible. On the contrary, Solomon Ginzburg supports the idea of renaming; he made a videoblog entry, where he describes his detailed three-step renaming plan. Additionally, both political actors are very active during sessions of the working group, which makes them appear in publications related to its activities. Therefore, it can be stated that the regional political actors are actively involved in the discussion and can influence the audience through media.

My third finding is related to the argumentation of renaming supporters and their opponents. The analysis of arguments presented by both sides in selected publications has shown that neither side may be considered a winner in this conflict. Both sides have several strong arguments and counterarguments as well as certain fallacies in their argumentation. In addition to that, there are no universal arguments, which are equally persuasive for all the readers. For instance, the argument related to unpleasant character of Mikhail Kalinin is not convincing for the younger generation of Kaliningraders, as they do not know this historical figure and do not associate the name ‘Kaliningrad’ with him. However, for the older generation it is still one of main arguments in favor of renaming. Based on this example it can be seen that some arguments have already lost their persuasive power since the beginning of the discussion in 1991. At the same time, new arguments are entering the scene, such as the recent arguments related to marketing of the region for outsiders and economic implications of renaming.

Finally, I have identified four discourses within the renaming discussion, which contribute to the process of transformation of the Kaliningrad Region’s identity. First of all, the discourse of the memory of the Great Patriotic War is a cornerstone of identity of the region. It serves as a basis of national identity and binds the region to the mainland Russia. Secondly, the discourse of historical justice with its emphasis on respect of history is a distinctive feature of the Kaliningrad Region,
which always had great influence on its identity. Within this discourse Kaliningraders are perceived as inheritors of their land’s pre-war history and culture. The third discourse is the discourse of patriotism. It places the emphasis on belonging to Russian culture and thus binds the Kaliningrad Region to the state and it clearly demarcates Kaliningraders from their non-Russians neighbors. Lastly, there is discourse of Europeanness. This discourse stresses the region’s European belonging and calls for following the European model of development.

As a general conclusion to my thesis, I emphasized importance of the analysis of borderlands as influential political actors in international relations. The Kaliningrad Region, which found a voice for itself within the European-Russian relations, perfectly illustrates how border territories may utilize their location and influence international politics. The current international system allows these borderlands to become more than a silent periphery highly dependent on the decisions made by the center. This makes the analysis of political dynamics related to borderlands as important as the analysis of state-state dynamics.

In closing, there are certain limitations to the conducted research, which are grounded in the character of analyzed material. Within the topic of the renaming discussion of the beginning of 2013, the material collected for this study may be considered comprehensive. However, the renaming debate itself is just a single case from a wide variety of topics, which may be used to study the process of the transformation of the Kaliningrad Region’s identity. I am sure that researching other topics will prove the relevance of discourses identified in my study. However, there might be other discourses that are not present in my topic, but which also have strong influence on the construction of the Kaliningrad Region’s identity and the formation of its stance in the international arena. Therefore, for further research one might look for other popular themes in regional media, which might yield interesting insights into identity issues.

Another approach would be to research the discourses on the Kaliningrad Region produced outside the region. As was stated in the theory chapter, the study of regional identities should be located in a broader socio-spatial context, which goes beyond the bounded area, as regions are established in the context of history and space. For instance, in case of the Kaliningrad Region discourses produced by the state would have great impact on the institutionalization process. Besides that, it would be interesting to research discourses on the region produced in the EU, especially in Poland, Lithuania and Germany. These discourses on the region produced in Russia and the EU may also reveal if the region’s attempt to balance the two cores is successful or not.
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## APPENDIX: Integrum Search Results

### Regional Printed Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper (City)</th>
<th>Date (Issue)</th>
<th>Title of article (in Russian and English)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaliningradskaia Pravda</td>
<td>29.01.2013 (014)</td>
<td>Vsë možet byt’… / Everything is possible…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04.02.2013 (018)</td>
<td>Sami my ne mestnye… / We are not local…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.02.2013 (027)</td>
<td>Ne nužen nam gorod nemeckij… / We don’t need a German city…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.03.2013 (043)</td>
<td>Ne Kaliningrad i ne Kënigsberg / Neither Kaliningrad, nor Königsberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.03.2013 (053)</td>
<td>Obidno za Kalinina… / I feel sorry for Kalinin…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04.04.2013 (058)</td>
<td>Ne možet byt’! / Not possible!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.04.2013 (068)</td>
<td>Kaliningrad – na vse vremena / Kaliningrad – once and for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komsomol'skaja Pravda v Kaliningrade</td>
<td>26.01.2013 (011)</td>
<td>Za Kënigsberg sobrali 400 podpisej po vsej Rossii / 400 signatures are collected for renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg in whole Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.01.2013 (013)</td>
<td>Kak korabl' nazoveš' - tak on i poplyvët / How you name a boat, is how it will sail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01.02.2013 (014)</td>
<td>Lëtčik-kosmonavt Aleksej Leonov: &quot;Navzanie &quot;Kënigsberg&quot; nikogo otnošnija k nacizmu ne imeet&quot;! / Pilot-cosmonaut Aleksej Leonov: Name “Königsberg” has nothing in common with Nazism!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09.02.2013 (019)</td>
<td>Kënigsberg. I obligazat'no čerez &quot;ë&quot; / Königsberg. And obligatorily with ‘ë’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.02.2013 (026-d)</td>
<td>&quot;Pust' pomnjat za bugrom, čto est' Kënigsberg, kotoryj oni poterjali&quot; / «Let them abroad remember that there is Königsberg they've lost»</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.02.2013 (027)</td>
<td>Kënigsberg v Rossii - ěto zvučит po-russki / Königsberg in Russia – it sounds Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.03.2013 (030)</td>
<td>Krasotu ne xranim, davajte ostatim zotja by imja /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date of publication</td>
<td>Title of article (in Russian and English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaliningrad.Ru</td>
<td>04.02.2013</td>
<td>Obzor socsetej ot Kaliningrad.Ru. Fraza nedeli: V dele peremenovaniya Kaliningrada v Këningsberg nado idi po puti naibol’shego idiotizma. / Social media review. Quote of the week: in case of renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg the most idiotic way should be chosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.02.2013</td>
<td>Ginzburg predložil pereimenovat' Kaliningrad 22 aprelja 2024 goda / Ginzburg suggests renaming Kaliningrad on the 22nd of April 2024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.02.2013</td>
<td>Storonniki pereimenovaniya Kaliningrada otkazalis’ provodit’ referendum / Supporters of renaming Kaliningrad refused to hold a referendum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baltijskij Portal</td>
<td>Za pereimenovanie Kaliningrada v Kénigsberg sobrali 400 podpisej po vsej Rossii / 400 signatures are collected for renaming Kaliningrad to Königsberg in whole Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.02.2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Letčik-kosmonavt Aleksej Leonov vyskazalsja za Kénigsberg / Pilot-cosmonaut Aleksej Leonov spoke for Königsberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.02.2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>V Kaliningrade snova zagovorili o Kénigsberge / Talks about Königsberg started again in Kaliningrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.02.2013</td>
<td>Kaliningrad Live</td>
<td>V Kaliningrade pytajutsja obuzdat’ zuž pereimenovanij / Renaming itch is being contested in Kaliningrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.02.2013</td>
<td>Kaliningradskoe Nezavisimoe Informacionnoe Agentstvo (KNIA)</td>
<td>V Kaliningrade &quot;generirujut idei&quot; o tom, kak bezboleznenny Pereimenovat' gorod v Kénigsberg / Ideas on how to painlessly rename the city to Königsberg are generated in Kaliningrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.02.2013</td>
<td>Kaliningradcy vnov' zagovorili o pereimenovanii goroda v Kénigsberg / Kaliningraders again started talking about renaming to Königsberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>