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Abstract
Doubled Sense of Resistance:
The Makortoff Family Collection of Photographs of Doukhobor Daily Life 1920 – 1950
Natalia Lebedinskaia

The Makortoff Family Collection consists of 153 photographs taken in the Doukhobor communities in the British Columbia Kootenay Mountains from the 1920s, through the 1950s. The Collection was compiled in 2002 by Teryll Plotnikoff, who selected the images from her family’s pictures to be added to the Doukhobor Historic Collection at Simon Fraser University. By engaging with these family snapshots and the accompanying guide, this thesis brings to the fore the role of personal agency in negotiating between assimilation and resistance within the Doukhobor communities in British Columbia. This reading contributes to the history of the Doukhobors, a Russian Christian group that originally relocated to Canada in the 1890s, and its role in the development of Canadian multiculturalism. The family snapshots in the Makortoff Family Collection represent a state of transition from the traditional Doukhobor way of life, narrating aspects of modernity adopted by the community; they are thus speaking to a doubled sense of resistance, simultaneously to the Canadian mainstream and to the Doukhobor traditions brought from Russia. By insisting that their subjects continue to maintain agency, I choose to view these snapshots not only as historical documentation, but also as active participants in the acts of reading and writing of their own histories.
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Introduction

The Makortoff Family Collection consists of 153 photographs taken in the Doukhobor communities in the British Columbia Kootenay Mountains from the 1920s, through to the 1950s. The Collection was compiled in 2002 by Teryll Plotnikoff, who selected the images from her family’s pictures to be added to the Doukhobor Historic Collection at Simon Fraser University. The photographs originally belonged to her grandparents who were members of the community, John and Nellie Makortoff, and were given to Teryll Plotnikoff by her mother, Nell Plotnikoff. The Makortoff Family Collection is a mixture of snapshots of daily life, postcards, and studio photographs. Before making the donation, Plotnikoff catalogued the photographs according to their contents and divided them into categories listed in a guide.

Many of the prints are worn, narrating their circulation through albums and peoples’ walls. Various members of the Makortoff and Plotnikoff families or their friends made inscriptions on the backs of the photograph in both English and Russian. The Russian that is used in the inscriptions is quite different from that spoken in contemporary Russia; a combination drawn from various local dialects adopted by the Doukhobors during their years in exile, both in Southern Russia and Caucasus. In addition to these influences, the new dialect developed independently because of its isolation, being further affected by English and Ukrainian in Canada. Doukhobor Russian carries with it the traces of the community’s movement, incorporating the shift from Russian to English.
The inscriptions narrate the photographs’ movements outside of official circuits of representation, incorporating private family memory and its lapses. Forgetting was the main reason that the Makortoff Family Collection was donated to the University, as neither Plotnikoff nor her mother could remember the subjects of most of the photographs. The images’ captions and descriptions suggest their functional histories in both private and public life. The ordinariness of many of the photographs, combined with signs of use, makes them seem out of place between the sheets of acid-free paper in an archival box. The oscillation between personal and collective remembering can be interpreted through the concept of postmemory, developed by Marianne Hirsch to describe the experience of temporal and spatial inaccessibility of the traumatic histories that may have shaped the diasporic identity of the generation that did not experience the trauma directly, but only through the accounts of elders who did.

As the compiler of the Makortoff Family Collection, Plotnikoff is intimately tied to the photographed subjects who are her aunts, uncles, and family friends. Even when she does not remember their names, they are no less part of the family’s history. Her forgetfulness does not mean their erasure from the Doukhobor past; in fact, they are playing an important role by entering the public archive. In addition, as Plotnikoff represents the Doukhobors’ complex relationship with the Canadian authorities, her contribution to the community’s archive through this donation needs to be seen as a part of that history. By incorporating her own subjectivity in the decisions that went into compiling, classifying, and labeling the Makortoff Family Collection, Plotnikoff foregrounds her own voice in its formation and interpretation.
The contrast between these images and their new context subtly shifts the view of the other photographs in the Doukhobor Collection, which are more typical, not to say stereotypical, images of the Doukhobors. Most photographs of the community held in public collections project an image of the Doukhobors as rooted in their history as a peasant society, continuously striving to maintain their traditions brought from Russia after immigration to Canada in the late 1800s. Such traditional photographs depict the community’s leaders, or were taken as portraits for special occasions or by non-Doukhobor photographers, and distributed for sale within the community as well as to outsiders.\(^7\) Their ubiquity in public collections leads to their frequent reproduction in texts about Doukhobors as illustrations of traditional ways of life, or the history of their leaders. However, because of their commemorative functions, they rarely depict the daily life of the community, especially as it was undergoing drastic changes in the 1930s and 1940s: when the communal way of life was being replaced by individual land ownership, private homes, and radical shifts in interpretation of tradition.\(^8\) The Makortoff Family Collection points to these omissions.

The Makortoff Family Collection and its guide can be examined as an expression of the Doukhobor view of memorialisation. The photographs’ complex relationship to both personal and collective remembering is especially potent considering the role of memory in the Doukhobor faith. Doukhoborism stresses that the mundane and everyday actions exist in an inseparable relationship with universal divinity of all people, and thus are therefore unclassifiable and unregulatable by institutional or legal systems.\(^9\) Doukhoborism, therefore, is not seen as exclusive to those who follow it, but understood by the Doukhobors as a universal truth that should be passed on to all humankind.\(^10\)
In their introduction to *Locating Memory: Photographic Acts*, Annette Kuhn and Kirsten McAllister suggest that photography carries a potential for “acknowledging ways of seeing and that, in turn, question the basis for our own subject positions and social order.” In this light, I am led to consider my desire to understand the Makortoff Family Collection, being aware of my own subjectivity in engaging with these images as a first-generation Russian immigrant. The Doukhobor experience is inaccessible to me, yet its visual vocabulary evokes my own memories of rural Russia. This disjuncture creates what Svetlana Boym terms “diasporic intimacy:” fleeting moments of connection in search for doubles of one's experience of dislocation, as projected onto others' stories of migration. My initial attraction to the Makortoff Family Collection constituted such an encounter. Therefore, I have to put myself on notice to not confuse the history of the Doukhobors with my own, or with those of my Russian family. The signs of “Russianness” in the photographs connect the community to their cherished myth of return to their homeland, creating visual tropes that echo the images of the idyllic pastoral landscapes in my own family photographs of villages outside of Moscow. However, my study of the Makortoff Family Collection’s guide, inscriptions, and context situates them within the history of Doukhobors living in British Columbia, and the specificity of Teryll Plotnikoff’s family.

When Doukhobor concepts of memory enter the archive, the photographs and their accompanying guide not only present new ways of understanding Doukhobor history, but also perform alternative ways of seeing and their relationship to both personal and collective memory in photography. Looking at the photographs and their guide as a series of objects that are engaged in the negotiation and preservation of the Doukhobor
faith allows the Makortoff Family Collection to exceed its basic value as visual
documentation. In part, this is because the Collection steps out of the assumption that
history must be exhaustive and based on consistent written facts, and that the historian’s
role is to translate past knowledge as preserved and unchanged into the present for neutral
examination. Engaging the viewer in complex relationships between images, inscribed
captions, and the guide, the Makortoff Family Collection allows for an interpretation that
challenges the linearity of time, showing it to be unstable and exceeding attempts at its
institutionalization.

The images in the Makortoff Family Collection are classified by Plotnikoff into
seven categories that resemble ethnographic classifications: “Elders”, “Group Gathering”,
“Family Portraits”, “At Work”, “Group shots – traditional dress”, “Youth”, and
“Miscellaneous”. The Makortoff Family Collection’s order is established from the
beginning as a loose chronology, from “Elders” to “Youth”, while incorporating both the
Plotnikoff family and many unknown subjects. The progression of the images, as
organized by the categories, implies a movement away from Doukhobor traditions
through assimilation, even though signs of modernity continue to exist within the
community. This narrative (Elders to Youth) would seem to be established through the
divisions between categories and the distribution in the number of photographs; on closer
examination, it transpires that this movement is not simply linear, but also an oscillation
within each division.

The first five categories in the Makortoff Family Collection contain forty-seven
photographs that primarily depict tradition. The “Youth” and “Miscellaneous” groups,
totaling eighty-nine photographs, are mixed and contain the largest number of the casual
snapshots of the Makortoff family. The titles of the first five groups imply the importance of establishing these aspects of the Doukhobor community, which are simultaneously reinforced and subverted by the two last categories.

The first grouping, “Elders”, contains only two images. They depict traditionally dressed older women, from very different time periods: the first is from the 1940s and the second is a copy of a photographic image from the beginning of the century, now printed on postcard stock. The first photograph is a snapshot of two women, one of whom is Plotnikoff’s grandfather’s aunt, while the second belongs to the history of the community. The following category, “Group Gathering”, narrates a traditional family funeral through six snapshots from different angles. “Family Portraits”, holds nine photographs that include family groups posed together, their formal dress and settings reinforcing the importance of tradition within the Doukhobor community. They also include members of the Plotnikoff and Makortoff families whose identification introduces their role within the context of the Collection.

The category “At Work”, numbering ten photographs, is positioned between “Family Portraits” and “Group shots – traditional dress.” It marks work as traditionally important, while demonstrating the variety of jobs that existed in the community at the time: logging, farming, working at the mill, and tending to private gardens. This reading is reinforced through the following category, “Group shots – traditional dress,” which holds another twenty photographs of groups posed in traditional clothing. They suggest a preamble to the last two sections by establishing their subjects as Doukhobors who continue to preserve tradition despite changes within the community.
The last two sections constitute the majority of the Makortoff Family Collection. There are forty-one photographs of young people and children classified under “Youth”. They include the fullest narratives within the Collection, containing the most obvious signs of change through incorporation of Canadian lifestyles. As will be shown, this group complicates the emphasis on tradition that was set up through the previous categories.

The final group of the Makortoff Family Collection, “Miscellaneous,” is, rather interestingly, the largest. It is a mixture of forty-eight family snapshots, postcards, and other photographs that appear not to have fit into the previous categories. While Plotnikoff intended the Makortoff Family Collection to be classified into traditional categories, the majority of the photographs remain outside of them as “Miscellaneous.” The combination of time periods, subjects, and contexts presents a heterogeneous view of the Doukhobor identity that has been established (and challenged) by the previous sections. “Miscellaneous” both fills and suggests gaps presented by the rest of the Makortoff Family Collection, while solidifying its connection to the Plotnikoff family by including many informal family snapshots. The Collection ends with a group photograph of family and friends, identified by Plotnikoff in the guide as her favourite.

While many of the groupings contain traditional commemorative images, those images classified under “Youth” and “Miscellaneous” represent drastic changes that were happening concurrently with the community’s struggles with the Canadian government. The photographs narrate the movement away from tradition through inclusion of modern Western clothing and technology, symbols of private property, and adoption of Canadian ways of life. The simultaneity of collective remembering and personal histories, set up
through the Makortoff Family Collection and Plotnikoff’s guide, erases the binary between tradition and assimilation, and situates the photographs within complex negotiations of preserving the Doukhobor identity as tied to Russia, while shifting it towards the community’s then-current place in Canada.

Doukhobor history is still largely absent from discussions of immigration history in Canada, relegated either to the success and the idyll of the communal system established in the Kootenays until 1937, or the extremist Sons of Freedom faction that became notorious for nude protests and arson until the 1960s. Photography played an important role in both of these trends, as well as in the attempts to establish a view that breaks out of such stereotypes.

Simma Holt’s *Terror in the Name of God* is perhaps the most widely publicized and the least accurate account of the community, presenting a sensationalist and generalizing history of the Sons of Freedom movement. Holt sets the derogatory tone of her book with sixteen pages of photographs of nude Doukhobors, taken by journalists and Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) during the arrests, trials, and incarcerations of the protestors. Their air of objectivity is enhanced by Holt’s accompanying text, which states that photographers from all over Canada and around the world arrived in British Columbia to document these events. The sensationalism of her account of these photographs is naturalized through Holt’s position as a journalist for the *Vancouver Sun* and the assumed neutrality of the vantage point of the RCMP. This sensationalism is has marked all sectors of the community, deeply shaping the image of the Doukhobors for outsiders, as well as creating deep internal suspicion of journalistic representations.
By contrast, other projects have focused primarily on representing the traditional Doukhobor way of life in the community, consisting of visual tropes established through presumably sympathetic, although often superficial, histories. One such account was written by Elizabeth Hayward in 1918, documenting the Doukhobor communes in British Columbia at the height of their prosperity. It was published as *Romantic Canada* in 1922, accompanied by images taken by an American Pictorialist photographer, Edith Watson. Watson’s photographs mostly depict women and their work, setting up a visual narrative that relies heavily on the picturesque quality of the images. She omits men from most of her images, as they would have countered the way that she wanted to present the community. At the time she was photographing, Doukhobors dressed as modern Canadians and worked in a variety of jobs, including business ventures that financially benefited the community. The photographs and the text, however, position the Doukhobors as a timeless society that preserves its Russian ways through religious faith and agrarian lifestyle, free of inner contradictions and outside of modernity. Hayward sets her subject up as an opportunity for a rare glimpse: "through [the Doukhobors] it may be said that Canada is perhaps the only country in the world outside Russia having a very intimate living, human-interest acquaintance with the Slav on the land, the only country presenting an opportunity to study him in his daily life." Thus the experience of the Doukhobors is typified into a romanticized view of all Slavic peasants, curiously situated in remote valleys of British Columbia. A similar view is supported through numerous Russian, Canadian, and foreign scholars, activists, and journalists who have visited the community throughout its history in Canada, and who frequently wrote in
frustration about its inner contradictions and failures to uphold the utopian idealism and
naïveté they had expected to find.  

Two projects, one by Robert Minden (1980) and the second by Marjorie Malloff and Peter Ogloff (1977) have attempted to counter the dichotomy of these views of the community. Robert Minden’s project was shaped by his aim of using photography not as a means of documentary, but as a stage that created encounters between himself and the Doukhobors: a series of conversations, not a history. He visited the community over the course of seven years with a large-format camera, which he set up as an invitation for a meeting. The resulting photographs and the texts that stemmed from the conversations about the images, constituted the 1980 exhibition and the accompanying catalogue, Separate from the World: Meetings with Doukhobor-Canadians in British Columbia. The format of the encounters that took place between Minden and the Doukhobors emphasized the mediated nature of his images, and gave a space for his subjects to present themselves as they wished to be photographed.

Around the same time, in 1977, the journal Sound Heritage published Toil and Peaceful Life: Portraits of Doukhobors, compiled and translated by Marjorie Malloff and Peter Ogloff, with a preface by Frances Mark Mealing and an introduction by Peter Legebokoff. The project consisted of photographs by Ogloff of elders in their homes, and transcriptions of interviews, conducted and translated by Malloff. It also included photographs from the Koozma Tarasoff Collection of the British Columbia Archives. Ogloff’s photographs and accompanying illustrations from the Tarasoff Collection are contextualized by the author’s introduction and the interviews.
Both Minden’s *Separate from the World* and Ogloff and Malloff’s *Toil and Peaceful Life* focus on the generation that has seen the hardships of exile, the communal life in British Columbia, and its dissolution. Both works point to the existence of another history that followed, although they omit it: “a whole generation of people, young married couples who are trying to lead respectable middle class lives.” However, as Lebebokoff says in his introduction to the text, “The elders trust that … one moves and lives, a movement that may be mapped across time, space, and ideology. Not least of their gifts is their news: one’s adaptation need not be at the expense one’s integrity.”

Stories told by the elders narrate signs of adopting Canadian ways, and the photographs support this: there are portraits of their leaders on the walls, combined with modern interiors, and marks of tradition. These interweaving narratives document the lives in a community as individual stories that counter the view propagated by both Holt and Hayward, allowing contradictions to be part of Doukhobor history.

Larry Ewashen, the former curator of the Doukhobor Museum in Castlegar, British Columbia, shared the story of his mother’s adoption of Canadian dress in the 1920s. His great-grandfather Vasilii was the older brother of the Doukhobor leader, Peter “Lordly” Verigin, and even though they lived in a commune in Alberta, there was little resemblance to traditional Doukhobor dress in their clothes, except when they were photographed with his grandparents or elders. Their relatives in Mission, British Columbia, did not wear Doukhobor dress either. His mother, before her marriage to Verigin, was frequently photographed in traditional dress that she wore in her daily life, and was an excellent seamstress known to the community. After marriage, she continued to make dresses, suits, and shirts for the entire family, but always in the modern style.
The maintenance of tradition as a seamstress, a skill that she likely learned from the previous generation of Doukhobor women, here blends with an unexplained and sudden adoption of 1920s dress.

Similar movements appear throughout the Makortoff Family Collection in depictions of suits made by Doukhobor women in Canada to mimic Western clothing styles.30 Most formal photographs echo studio portraits in their composition or devices, such as putting children up on chairs, or including props such as furniture, flowers, kerchiefs, or carpets in the compositions. While they emulate traditionally Western styles of photographic portraiture, they nevertheless render them distinctly Doukhobor through reference to tradition, as well as the contexts in which they were taken and distributed.

By engaging with such tensions within the photographs in the Makortoff Family Collection and Plotnikoff’s guide, my aim is to understand better the negotiations between tradition and adaptation, carried on privately within the Doukhobor community. These negotiations provide a more nuanced view of Doukhobor history, bringing forward the broader potential of photography in writing histories of Canadian diasporic communities by inserting personal lives into public discourses on multiculturalism. My hopes for this study are shared by at least some members of the Doukhobor community. In my discussion with Koozma Tarasoff, he suggested that seeing the adoption of Canadian ways of life by the Doukhobor community presents a view of integration that also creates social value in cultural understanding of other immigrant experiences, adding the nuances of personal histories to the established views of assimilation.31

**Doukhobor History and Its Traces in Public Archives**
A history of the Doukhobors is beyond the scope of this thesis and is not the primary intention of my study. However, a broad introduction to the community’s past is necessary in order to establish the context in which the photographs of the Makortoff Family Collection were taken.

Doukhobors are a Christian peasant group that emigrated from Russia to Canada in 1899 to escape persecution by the Russian Government for their pacifist Christian beliefs, and refusal of Church and government authority. The Doukhobor faith, which can be traced to sixteenth-century rural Russia, focuses on nonviolence and the sanctity of hardworking communal life. Grounded in the rejection of both secular government and the Russian Orthodox Church, Doukhobor beliefs center on the concept of universal Christian divinity within each individual being, which is manifest in all actions.

Beginning in the seventeenth century with a schism within the Russian Orthodox Church, Doukhobor history has been shaped by tensions between their non-conformist beliefs and external demands for assimilation. These tensions resulted in violent confrontations with Russian and Canadian authorities, leading to divisions within the group, first in Russia and then again, dramatically, in Canada.

After forceful attempts to dissolve the sect through a series of relocations within the Russian Empire, imprisonment in Siberia, and systematic torture, the Imperial Russian government allowed the Doukhobors to leave for Canada in 1899 – a move encouraged by campaigns to populate the Canadian interior along the Canadian Pacific Railroad, subsidized by profits from Leo Tolstoy’s novel Resurrection (1899), the Society of Friends (Quakers), and a series of fundraising campaigns in Europe.
A group of 7,500 settled in the North-West Territories (now Saskatchewan and Manitoba) living peaceably until a change in policy in 1906 regarding the oath of allegiance and private registration of homesteads renewed their struggle. Both requirements were in opposition to the central Doukhobor beliefs in individual divinity and the communal way of life, which stressed refusal of government authority and land ownership. The Canadian government threatened confiscation of the original lands, which by then were cultivated by the Doukhobors who had built villages and established farms. Disagreement about compliance with the government split the group into three factions: the Community, or Orthodox, Doukhobors; the Independent Doukhobors; and the Sons of Freedom. The Independent Doukhobors chose to obey the government demands to privately register their homesteads, and therefore stayed on their land. They continue to constitute the majority of the Doukhobors living in Saskatchewan. The Community Doukhobors moved to British Columbia in 1908 to new land purchased by the commune under the name of their leader, Peter Lordly Verigin, who later transferred ownership of the new lands to the Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood (CCUB), an organization that he established to create economic autonomy for the community. This group, under Verigin’s leadership, constituted the majority and lived as an isolated and financially prosperous commune until the CCUB’s dissolution in 1937, during the Great Depression.

The Sons of Freedom was a radical splinter group that rejected assimilation and followed Verigin to British Columbia, while vigorously protesting the Community Doukhobors’ interpretation of Verigin’s teachings. Their extreme tactics, such as bombings and public nudity, were followed by sensationalist press and the authorities
into the 1960s. A penal colony on Piers Island, BC was established in 1932 to imprison the protestors. In 1953, children of the Sons of Freedom were forcibly removed from their parents and sent to a residential school in Denver, British Columbia to force their assimilation. These events radicalized that generation and led to a growth in Doukhobor literature by writers inside and outside the community.

Until the 1950s, Doukhobors had avoided producing written records of their history. Their preference for oral psalms and songs reflected their concern for the written word’s potential to become dogmatic, coupled with a deeply rooted distrust in official representation. They also rarely took, or posed for, photographs. The Makortoff Family Collection is therefore a remarkable addition to outsiders’ knowledge of Doukhobor visual culture, especially as it constitutes a large part of the Doukhobor Collection at the Simon Fraser University, complementing and complicating the better-known Keenlyside Collection.

The Keenlyside Collection contains the second largest number of British Columbia Doukhobor photographs in public collections in Canada, and the largest number of original prints and postcards from the community. The Keenlyside Collection was amassed over four years by John Keenlyside, an investment counselor and then chair of the Friends of the Library Board, as a gift to the University in 2000. As an avid collector of nineteenth-century documents relating to British Colombia’s colonial past, and having made a number of large donations to the University in the past, Keenlyside wanted to collect this material “while it was still fresh,” realizing that it was becoming increasingly rare to find original documents. It was collected through his network of document and rare book dealers, and consists of photographs, as well as documents,
books, and periodicals. Keenlyside’s goal was to “collect in different mediums … having photos, documents, letters, and books all dealing with the same subjects … That way we can look at each event and see how it is perceived in different ways.”

Photographs in the Keenlyside Collection occupy two archival boxes on the same shelf as the Makortoff Family Collection and new photographic acquisitions. The photographs are from a variety of now unknown sources, and contain many repeated images that were distributed as postcards or were popular in Doukhobor homes. There are also a number of images of nude protests that circulated in the press, reporting the Sons of Freedom movement. These images belong to a type held in larger quantities by the City of Vancouver Archives. There is no order to the photographs, and no separate guide. According to the finding aid, “The collection is artificial, having no original order or provenance.”

The repetition of certain photographic subjects within the Keenlyside Collection creates a sense of continuity of the Doukhobor traditions in terms of subjects but also, somewhat ironically, through the absence of details about their context. They present an idea of Doukhoborism that follows types instead of individuals, even when families or casual scenes are depicted. One example, dated 1924, represents a group near a train station (Fig 1). Like so many photographs in the Keenlyside Collection, this one is printed on postcard stock likely intended to be sold to Doukhobors and visitors. Cards such as this one appear with both English and Russian handwriting on the back, often with postage stamps and stories of tourist trips to the Kootenay Mountains, or notes to Doukhobor relatives. The card has the price written on the back in Russian: 15 cents for one postcard, 25 cents for two. A large group of people, dressed in formal clothing, is
gathered around a table with salt, bread, and water: a traditional greeting and a symbol of
Doukhobor faith that stands for the simplicity of all that is necessary for survival.51 The
group is arranged in a curve to allow everyone to fit into the frame; the white kerchiefs of
the women offset the dark suits of the men in the middle, while the children crowd
around them. The railroad points to the gathering’s purpose: to welcome in the traditional
Doukhobor way, as it had been done for centuries in Russia. The community is
represented as a harmonious whole, not separated into individual families. The continuity
of tradition, combined with the symbols of hospitality towards visitors, as well as the
postcard’s status as a circulated and preserved image, all point to the vision of
Doukhoborism as timeless and inextricably connected to Russia.

Many of the images in the Keenlyside Collection appear in the Tarasoff Collection
at the British Columbia Archives, which numbers 800 images.52 Tarasoff borrowed
photographs from numerous public and private sources to compile his Collection of
copies that were then printed and fit into binders. The Tarasoff Collection was started for
the Doukhobor Centennial Celebration (1958) and continues to grow with new additions.
Housed in the photo reference room in the British Columbia Archives, the Collection
occupies seven binders that are numbered and accompanied by interpretive texts by
Tarasoff in three additional binders.

There is no specific information provided about the provenance of individual
photographs, either in Tarasoff’s texts, or in the accompanying documentation about the
Collection. Therefore, we do not have access to information about their original sizes,
locations, and most of their subjects.53 There is also no trace of how they circulated
before becoming part of the Collection: whether the originals exhibited traces of being
hung on walls, compiled in albums, or shoved in a drawer. However, the project of making them available to the public through the British Columbia Archives and through use in his various publications indicates that Tarasoff views them as important primary documents of Doukhobor history. In my discussion with him about the Makortoff Family Collection, he suggested that his collection constitutes a series of similar narratives, distinct through the different additions. It presents an important trace of discovering and accumulating these visual documents of the community. Tarasoff discussed finding private and public collections of hundreds of images, which he then sorted and described in his guide.

His personal family photographs also constitute a part of the Tarasoff Collection and he does not see them as distinct from its whole. They were used in his exhibition *Spirit Wrestlers* for the Museum of Civilization in 1996. Tarasoff’s daughter, Tamara Tarasoff, suggested to him that the exhibition must contain emotion in order to successfully portray Doukhobor history. To accomplish this, she chose to include their own family snapshots in the exhibition, and asked her father to go into the displays after they had been designed to indicate those relatives he could remember. These relationships, however, are not indicated in the descriptions of the photographs in the Royal British Columbia Archives. The originals are still held by Tarasoff, along with many others that he has collected over the years. He sees this as an ongoing project, with the aim of eventually organizing them for digitization.

In “Reading an Archive: Photography Between Labour and Capital,” Allan Sekula discusses how archives displace the sentimental value of photographs to make room for their status as historic documents, as transparent pictorial evidence. The archive, in its
claim of completeness and organization, strives to do this through attempts at achieving a
“universal inventory of appearance.”59 Pictures are both isolated and homogenized, as an
order must be established within the images in order to make them accessible. He gives a
poignant example of trying to sort through a box of family photographs, a process that
brings to the fore the “folly” of such attempts at organization: “one is torn between
narration and categorization, between chronology and inventory.”60 The Makortoff
Family Collection and its guide exemplify such a process. However, it could also be
applied to any of the other mixed collections that attempt to reconstruct, retroactively,
histories of individual lives that refuse to fit easily into existing taxonomies.

The Makortoff Family Collection demonstrates this transformation from private to
public documents. The family snapshots in the Collection present a view of the
community that challenges established ideas of its depiction. Nevertheless, many of the
photographs still follow the conventions of traditional Doukhoborism, and as similar to
the ones found in most photographs of the community and its members. Plotnikoff uses
traditional photographs to establish the pace of the Collection from the beginning.

The Makortoff Family Collection begins with a photograph of two women sitting
side by side in a garden, wearing festive Doukhobor clothing (Fig 2). The photograph,
classified under “Elders” is labeled as follows in the guide: A pair of middle-aged or
older women, seated, outdoors, in traditional Doukhobor clothing. The embroidered
kerchiefs, such as ones worn by the women in the photograph, are frequently cited as one
of the most important aspects of Doukhobor traditional dress.61 Their pose echoes studio
portraits. The women look slightly somber, although the woman on our right smiles
lightly. In most photographs of traditional occasions, the subjects are depicted as serious,
looking at the camera, rarely smiling or displaying other facial expressions. In my interview with Tarasoff, he suggested that this could be explained by the Doukhobor stance of “ne hvalis” or “don’t show yourself as better than others.” In his interpretation, smiling could be seen as a sign of pride or superiority, and seriousness as a sign of modesty and simplicity, which was advocated by Verigin. Larry Ewashen supports this view by suggesting that Verigin’s instructions for women to cut their hair could also be explained in the context of vanity. According to Ewashen, Verigin also suggested removing portraits and mirrors from the walls. The somber photographs, then, could stand for a negotiation of the desire to commemorate tradition without the danger of appearing boastful or vain.

Aside from the details of the dress, the image could depict any point in Doukhobor history. Its timelessness, however, is betrayed by two captions that both ground it and allow for it to slip: first in Russian, in pencil, and then again in English in red pen: "And so we've arrived, two aunts," followed by "Dad's auntie Savinkoff" (Fig 3). The red captions are by Nell Plotnikoff, Teryll Plotnikoff’s mother, and they were written for the Collection, identifying those figures she could remember. The photograph was taken in the late 1920s, judging from the women’s age in comparison with the other photographs of Nell’s parents.

A single red cross on the front of the image points out which of the two women she is referring to. The pencil caption in Russian is either by Auntie Savinkoff or her unknown friend, who is perhaps her sister. Auntie (tetka or tetia in Russian) could refer to any adult woman in the commune, and there is no indication about the subject’s relation to Auntie Savinkoff in the other photographs or the guide. It is because
information about the subject is missing that this picture is now in the Makortoff Family Collection. A collection that enshrines collective memory was built around non-remembering, bringing not only personal memory, but also personal forgetting, into the informational neutrality of the archive. The paradox is a partial fulfillment of Jacques Derrida’s wish: “One could dream of another archive: an archive of misunderstandings, of contempt and of misapprehensions.”

Auntie Savinkoff is mentioned again in a later photograph under “Miscellaneous,” where she is identified by her first name, Laura (Fig 4). In that photograph, she stands next to her nephew, Plotnikoff’s grandfather. They are both well dressed, although not traditionally, indicating that the first photograph of the aunts was taken on a special community occasion. The separation of the two images in the Collection allows for this reading to emerge gradually, shaped by the flow of the photographs and Plotnikoff’s descriptions.

Many of the photographs in the Makortoff Family Collection, even though they often portray the same individuals, contrast the traditional depictions by including groups of young people going on trips, taking pictures of each other at train stations and in front of their homes, or playing musical instruments. These images, in their ordinariness of daily life and the seeming absence of visible cues of Doukhoborism, create a simultaneous pull and push, even in the most traditional images. They suggest that the timelessness of the other photographs is also connected to the daily life within the Canadian present (the present represented in the photograph). The traditional images and their modern context within the Doukhobor community do not counter each other, but continuously shape each others' formation through this reading of the photographs.
The variety of sizes, traces of wear on the prints, glue from albums, different supports, and occasional nail holes all point to different ways in which the images circulated. They present the historian with a task that is described by Geoffrey Batchen in *Forget Me Not* as marking a shift from recovering lost stories to seeing these objects in our own time. This shift blurs boundaries between photography’s conceptual and physical identities, and between tactility and visibility. This approach relocates the study of historic photographs into the present to explore how they function as parts of personal and collective memory, thereby questioning how photography is involved in knowing the world. The meaning of vernacular photographs is constructed through their physicality in their size, inscriptions, frames, or albums; it presents its viewer with the “thingness of the visual and the visuality of the tactile,” insisting on the arbitrary nature of distinctions between “materiality” and “immateriality,” between the “social” and the “non-social” contexts. It disrupts the seamlessness of photography’s representational claims to fidelity and realism, as suggested by its use in archives and history books as an empirical and scientific window onto the past. By confronting the viewer with their “thingness,” vernacular photographies present a break with the linear study of history to allow distinctions between interpretation and truth to be challenged. This approach is no longer searching for singular authorship, aesthetic purity, or avant-garde notions of modernity, concerns that have structured previous studies of photography. Instead, Batchen situates vernacular photography as inviting a different way of looking that would allow for its complexity to bridge the distance between the viewer and the object.

In conversation about the Makortoff Family Collection, Tarasoff suggested that Plotnikoff, by placing the Collection into the archive, makes us partners in writing this
history. Tarasoff stressed that the only reason the Makortoff Family Collection is extraordinary, and the only way it carries Plotnikoff’s voice, is in her ordering and the guide. Its construction as an object – the photographs and the guide together – allows it to be studied. According to Tarasoff, the individual images do not have as much power: they are too ordinary, too singular.

Tarasoff’s comments reinforce Batchen’s directions. The tactility of the individual images, combined with their treatment by Plotnikoff within the guide through inscriptions and ordering, invites what Batchen has described “speculation and an empathetic, phenomenological style of historical writing that seeks to bridge the temporal and emotional gap between them and us.”

Examining Plotnikoff’s category “Group shots – traditional dress,” Tarasoff stresses that he has seen many such images in public and private collections, and they are typical depictions of groups on their way to and from Doukhobor gatherings, usually wearing their “Sunday best.” The second photograph in this group is titled: Group of 9 adults, 2 boys standing in front of buildings (Fig 5). As with the photograph of the two aunts, there is a red cross in front of one of the figures, corresponding to an inscription on the back: “Nell’s grandpa Mike Makortoff.” The rest of the group is anonymous. The reading flows between the generality of the category, the specificity of the caption, and the descriptive neutrality of the guide.

These movements trace the process of these personal histories as they become public through the archive. The inscription on the back by Nell Plotnikoff, as well as the marks on the front of the prints, emphasize the documentary nature of the photograph. The marking of the photograph is a gesture that assumes the reader of the caption would not know the individuals in the image. However, the cross invites me to turn the
photograph over to read the caption, to handle it the way it was handled, once, as an object in Plotnikoff’s home. Meanwhile, the brightness of the red pen marks emphasizes that the photograph is now in the archive. The gesture appears too bold to mark a treasured snapshot in a family collection.

My reading of the Makortoff Family Collection is informed by Batchen, as well as Elizabeth Edwards and Janice Hart in their edited collection, *Photographs, Objects, Histories*. Edwards and Hart emphasize the importance of locating the study of photography in the present, tracing the photograph’s circulation, tangible uses, transformations, and movements. The agency of the photographs is viewed as connected to the agency of their subjects, as they continue to construct meaning, while the photographs are seen as active participants in their social spheres. By drawing attention to the ways they are displayed, used, circulated, stored, and classified, connections between memory and history are drawn into the fabric of everyday lives. The meaning of the image is entangled within its circulation between private collections, archives, and museums. Engagement with photographs as physical objects, along with their role as historic documents, creates a connection between collective memory and personal remembering. While Edwards and Hart’s critical reading does not strive to completely divorce the objects from being seen as images (the paradigmatic way of looking at them within historical collections), it connects the photographs’ contents to their physical presence, demonstrating that the two are involved in a complex flow of signification.

The image of the two aunts that opened the Makortoff Family Collection is followed by the second photograph that Plotnikoff classifies as “Elders” (Fig 6). It
depicts two women standing in a garden, facing the camera. They have extremely short haircuts and straight fringes, and there is a chair between them. Plotnikoff describes the scene: A pair of women standing on either side of a chair that has two vases of flowers on the seat and a kerchief draped over the top. As already noted, the photograph is a copy of an older image, re-presented on postcard stock. Its corners appear worn from having been handled frequently, and there is a pencil mark on the back, a rough number two, corresponding to its place in the Makortoff Family Collection. Some of the other photographs are numbered as well, an accidental trace of Plotnikoff’s organizational work. The chair and the kerchief draped over it, as well as their traditional dress, all appear to demonstrate and preserve tradition. The chair was likely made in the community as a copy of a typical Windsor style. Mark Mealing suggests that Doukhobor woodworkers employed woodcarving skills that were passed down and improved through generations, to create copies of higher quality than the originals. The pose suggests a studio portrait, although it is taken outside in a garden.

Photographs such as this one appear frequently in other photographic collections, such as the Keenlyside Collection, as non-specific signifiers of Doukhoborism. However, the card’s placement after the photograph of the two aunts in the Makortoff Family Collection, under the general category “Elders”, draws the subjects into the same family as those identified as its members: they are all the compiler’s elders. The identified photographs make other images seem familial, instead of illustrative, “sentimental” as well as “ informational” in Sekula’s classifications. It opens the possibility that the postcard was added to the family’s collection as a gesture of remembering Doukhobor traditions, thus unifying it with other family photographs. The card points to the
circulation of this image, as it was copied from an older photograph. There are other rephotographed postcard images in the Makortoff Family Collection. This practice emphasizes that the other postcards, such as those included in the Keenlyside Collection, also circulated in the Doukhobor community and beyond it also represented individual families with their own histories.

Borrowing Tim Ingold’s proposition in his article “Materials Against Materiality,” I view the power of agency in the photographs within the Makortoff Family Collection as nestled within their physicality as material objects, moving through a series of contexts. According to Ingold, the temporal dimension of the movement of materials, their flux and mutation, constitute overlapping regions of activity that can be studied in relation to the connections between them. People and objects are part of the same material flux, so there is no separate “social” context; it is part of the layered and overlapping “mesh” that remains in constant movement. The subjects of the Makortoff Family Collection, viewed as a part of the complex fabric of relations that have constituted Doukhobor history, exist within the same flow. The complexity of their interrelations can be understood by paying close attention to their trajectories.

In “Mixed Box,” Edwards and Hart describe a very ordinary “box with things in it in the reserve collection,” much like the Makortoff Family Collection at the Simon Fraser Archives. While the object itself is “synthetic,” Edwards and Hart propose that its different parts produce meaning through interactions between objects and their context, which shifts and changes over time. A synthetic object is one that has acquired its order through the history of its institutional contexts. As such, Edwards and Hart argue that museums and archives are arch-synthetic objects that participate in building the
individual objects’ histories and meanings.\textsuperscript{90} They look at the photographs in the mixed box as both carriers of visual information and as evidence of curatorial thinking, two different systems carrying layers of different ways of classification and labeling, and relationships between the institution and larger discourses that lead to different meanings.\textsuperscript{91}

Applying these ideas to the Makortoff Family Collection brings out its complexity within the context of the Simon Fraser University and its Doukhobor Collection, to which the Makortoff box both belongs and from which it is set apart through its “pre-synthetic” nature. The Makortoff Family Collection was assembled by the Plotnikoff family, classified by them, and donated as a complete, albeit constructed, object. The production of meaning within the Makortoff Family Collection occurs not only within the box itself, but also within the Doukhobor Collection, as both a contrast and a supplement to it. Its meaning shifts further, as it has largely been digitized for \textit{Multicultural Canada}, a database in which its images exist alongside other public collections of Doukhobor photographs.\textsuperscript{92} In this context, one needs to search deliberately for the Makortoff name to reconstitute the Makortoff Family Collection and see it as a whole.\textsuperscript{93} However, its images of families and youth appear in searches for keywords that also bring up the other Doukhobor collections, thus weaving its narrative into these larger contexts. Yet, by separating the images from their place in the Makortoff Family Collection, the \textit{Multicultural Canada} database further contributes to marking the subjects as types, as opposed to specific individuals with particular family memories.

\textbf{Teryll Plotnikoff’s Guide}
The guide to the Makortoff Family Collection, compiled by Plotnikoff for the donation, consists of five pages of typed text, placed with the photographs in their archival box. The descriptions from the guide also exist on the Multicultural Canada website accompanying the images. The titles were constructed by Plotnikoff for the Collection, and maintained by the Simon Fraser Archives for inclusion in its database. While most of the captions in the guide also incorporate information from the inscribed notes on the photographs, some of these inscriptions are not mentioned in the guide, although they appear translated on the online database. The titles in the guide are frequently literally descriptive, such as a *Family of five, father seating with baby on one knee, mother and two children standing on either side of him. Taken in front of a bare tree, so either in spring or fall*, under “Family Portraits.” Others are much shorter, *Family of four*, also in “Family Portraits,” or *Young couple, standing in a field*, under “Group shots – traditional dress”. Others are directly related to the Plotnikoff family, such as in the “Family Portraits” category: *Two photographs with almost the same combination of people in them. My grandmother, Nellie Makortoff, is one of them. The baby boy is my uncle John Makortoff, standing beside him is my Auntie Ann Deakoff. The man in the photos is Mike Poznikoff with his wife, Fanny, on his right. They lived in Winlaw.*

Plotnikoff points to aspects of material culture in the photographs through the guide, such in *Three women in fancy Doukhobor suits with a little girl, also dressed up. Kerchiefs are quite fancy as well, satiny. Must have been for a special occasion. Car wheel at edge of photograph*. This photograph, under “Group shots – traditional dress”, also has an inscription in the back in Russian, almost illegible and washed out, which is not mentioned by Plotnikoff in the guide: “This is us taking a picture on Peter’s day and
the card came out somehow special, somehow powerful. Wind and sun and [illegible]. This card is for mom.” The story about being photographed on St. Peter’s Day, June 29, records the group’s observance of the Burning of the Arms, an event that took place on 29 June 1895, and marked a shift in the Doukhobor philosophy towards radical pacifism, vegetarianism, and categorical refusal of military service. The Burning of the Arms occurred on an existent holiday that traditionally honoured the Apostles Peter and Paul, and also coincided with Verigin’s birthday. Therefore, its celebration combined a series of crucial events in the community’s history, while maintaining their connection to divinity through its original significance.

Plotnikoff designates the occasion as special by pointing to the satin kerchiefs worn by the women. She also indicates the car wheel, a detail that would have gone unnoticed if the photograph were only studied for its evidence of traditional dress. However, it is the inscription on the back, including the impressions of the day and the power of the image, that connects it to the observance of tradition and the presence of the divine: a suggestion that something from the mystical qualities of the day was carried over into the snapshot (which is now a gift to somebody’s mother). Meanwhile, the double use of the word “somehow” suggests a hesitation in these mysteries, or the means of their transmission. The time that separates the two inscriptions, the caption and Plotnikoff’s guide, enforced by the difference in the language and the photographs’ intention, situating it as part of transitions within the community.

The language of Plotnikoff’s guide to the Makortoff Family Collection, as well as the inscriptions on many of the photographs, emphasizes the parallels that exist between photography and the traditional Doukhobor ways of remembering, informed by the
orality at the core of the community’s worldview. As Doukhobors have always privileged oral history, their relationship to photography can be seen in connection to oral traditions as demonstrated by the accounts of families retelling the stories of migration through pictures of their families and leaders on the walls. These histories are grounded in the tradition of recalling past suffering and hardships of exile, as well as with passing on Doukhobor beliefs that are seen as existing in the present, held in the psalm and songs passed orally through *The Living Book*. According to Lena Sherstobitoff and Mark Mealing, Doukhobor history is not only what is written, but also, what is remembered and believed. Therefore, any written (or photographic) account must be seen as a perspective in the continuum of building this history through its recollection. The *Living Book* of psalms and songs is also seen as a historical narrative, as it describes the community’s suffering in exile in Russia and the formation of its belief system through these experiences.

Because of the complexity of the Doukhobor society, with its inner tensions and contradictory beliefs, the task of writing a singular history has always proven difficult. George Woodcock addresses this issue in his book, *Doukhobors*, when he refers to a lack of concrete information about crucial events in community, such as the founding of the movement, leaders’ births and deaths, and its tenets of faith. Tarasoff believes nevertheless that his responsibility as a Doukhobor historian is to write down histories of the community. The goal of such writing is not only to remember what happened, but also to avoid perpetuating mistakes and confusions, to promote understanding and agreement. However, he also sees this written history not as a fixed and unchangeable entity, but as a constantly shifting project. His use of the Internet through the website
*Spirit Wrestlers* emphasizes this fluidity. He believes that the current generation, even when it remembers psalms either through hearing them or as singers, cannot connect them to their origins: “they are nice songs, but the message is lost.” The written history, therefore, must be studied in order to build an understanding of the context that is then performed through the psalms, songs, and traditions of the community.\(^{102}\)

The English version of the psalms, published in 1978, is a translation of the original compilation of Doukhobor oral materials by the Bolshevik ethnographer Vladimir Bonch-Bruyevich who assisted the Doukhobors’ emigration in 1899, and spent a year with the community after their arrival in Canada. He recorded most of the Doukhobor psalms, songs, and sayings, previously transmitted only orally, and published his work in 1909 in St Petersburg. It was republished again in Winnipeg in 1954, and then translated in 1974 to respond to the needs of a younger generation of Doukhobors, no longer fluent in Russian. The recorded version of the psalms is understood only as a reference, while the real *Living Book* is the orally transmitted material and the experience of its singing; the *Living Book* is continuously constructed as it is spoken and sung.

Bonch-Bruyevich’s recording the *Book of Life* was seen by him as part of a larger project to record the history of peasant resistance in Russia and its role in the country’s history. The *Book of Life* was published as a historical and a philosophical text in Russia and aimed at Russian readers, not at the Doukhobor community in Canada, whose members were still mostly illiterate at that time. As an outsider, Bonch-Bruyevich encountered considerable skepticism, though he eventually gained strong support from the community’s elders. They saw the project as a means to reveal their life philosophy
for the first time to those outside the community who might benefit from it; as the threat of persecution had diminished, the psalms could be shared.

The text contains a series of psalms that explain the basic tenets of the Doukhobor faith, focusing on the power of each individual person as a site of divinity. These psalms are structured as a dialogue between the members of the Tsarist regime or the Orthodox Church, and the persecuted Doukhobors. They are written in the first-person, and believed to be based on real interrogations during the Doukhobors’ years in Russia. These dialogues are not confrontational, but propose alternative interpretations that resist and refute the regime’s and church’s structures using the oppressors’ own vocabulary.

The formation of the community’s belief system, on which all aspects of daily life are based, is a result of this dialogue with the forces of opposition. The Living Book’s emphasis on continual growth, and on the continual shifting of Doukhoborism according to the community’s migrations, can be interpreted not as disappearance of identity into the mainstream Canada, but as another model of integration. In the Makortoff Family Collection, photographs in the “Youth” category of the guide illustrate this oscillation.

The photograph that opens the “Youth” category has a caption penciled on the back: “To Uncle Jim Poznoff” (Figs 7 and 8). It is described in the guide as: *Three poses recorded on one photograph. Two young brothers.* The combination of the description in the guide and the caption on the back identifies the two young boys in the photograph as brothers, Jim Poznoff’s nephews. The photograph is a gift to their uncle, signed by them.

In writing about the practice of famous thinkers gifting signed photographs of themselves, Derrida suggests that the signature is a double-exposure to the portrait, a sign that it has been given by the subject as a gift. It bears trace of the photographed
subject’s hand through writing, making it a self-portrait while “authenticating” the receiver, as well as the gesture of giving. The intersections between Plotnikoff’s guide to the images and the captions that appear on many of the snapshots can be interpreted within this framework, drawing attention to ways that writing on and about the photographs participates in the process of their gifting, exchange, or “authentication,” by bearing a trace of their movements.

Jim Poznoff’s nephews, and possibly their mother, were photographed in four poses. The photograph is arranged in three stages: one large pose takes up most of the print, and two smaller ones are on the side. For the larger pose, the two nephews are seated with a woman, perhaps their mother. Their faces are arranged in a pyramid, with the older boy at the top. They are smiling lightly, almost unnoticeably. For the two images on the side, their expressions are less neutral. With their arms around each other, they are very serious in the top photograph, and are smiling openly in the bottom one.

The occasion may have been a trip to a photographer’s studio, as everyone is well dressed, and the combination of the poses suggests a professional photographer’s involvement. They are not dressed traditionally, and only their family name and their place in the Makortoff Family Collection identify them as belonging to the community. As neither the names Jim nor Poznoff appear on any of the other captions on the photographs, the relationship between the two families is unknown. However, the inscription traces the portrait’s circulation: the writing on the back, in pencil and in English, points to the intended movement of the photograph from the two nephews to their uncle.
This photograph is found at the beginning of the “Youth” category, which contains the largest number of images that describe the community’s adoption of Canadian lifestyles. The photograph of Poznoff’s nephews depicts the family as accepting of modernity, while keeping family ties. It represents the family as wearing formal non-Doukhobor dress, and marks the moment as important by including a professional photographer’s involvement. Its place in Plotnikoff’s “Youth” category frames it as part of Doukhobor history in renewal and transition. The rest of the photographs in the “Youth” category represent young people from different times in Doukhobor history, sometimes wearing traditional clothing or being photographed in formal settings. Plotnikoff’s defining of “Youth” does not explicitly equate to the loss of Doukhobor traditions. However, by setting up the category with the photograph of Jim Poznoff’s two nephews, the Makortoff Family Collection frames these other settings and other depictions of youth as also belonging simultaneously to modernity and tradition. My perception of the “Youth” photographs is shaped by the ones that preceded it in the categories such as “Elders,” while challenging some of the guide’s previous cohesiveness by associatively including the other young people from its groupings into the narrative.

By contrast, other public photographic collections, such as the Keenlyside or Tarasoff Collections, follow the process of labeling the images as types, alluding to the individuals in the photographs representing their communities. One of the images in the Tarasoff Collection is labeled: Two typical Doukhobors in the Caucasus, dated circa 1899, classified by Royal British Columbia Archives as “Group Photos” (Fig 9). The image depicts two young Doukhobors, smiling at the camera in their traditional festive dress worn in Caucasus. A number of similarly captioned photographs appear in Unlike
the Lilies: Doukhobor Textile Tradition in Canada by Dorothy K. Burnham in the chapter on clothing. She describes the vests worn by the men:

A fancy type of embroidered vest appears in a number of photographs taken after arrival on the prairies. These vests were apparently worn during the summer with a long-sleeved shirt and without a coat for semiformal occasions, such as having a photograph taken … The photographs reveal that the fashion was for wearing them fastened only at the top.105

Earlier in the text, Burnham notes that the sophistication of the surviving waistcoats from Russia, made from fine commercial materials, indicates that they were tailored with considerable skill. She adds that “judging by the photographs, it might seem that tailored garments were the usual attire, but people have a habit of donning their best clothes for posed photographs.”106 She goes on to say that, while some of men’s work clothes were made in the community, most men dressed in a way that would make them indistinguishable from Canadians at work. Returning to the waistcoats, she refers to an image in the Saskatchewan Archives that depicts a family seated in front of a home in traditional dress. The caption reads: “A Doukhobor family in Saskatchewan in the early 20th century. The men are wearing slimly cut dark waistcoats fastened only by the top buttons.”107

Burnham’s discussion of preservation of tradition through these photographs and their inscriptions situates their subjects as belonging to a hermetically sealed past. The well-tailored vests, through Tarasoff’s and Burnham’s framing, become signs of traditional Doukhoborism, although they were contemporaneous to the community’s life in the Caucasus. When removed from their value as timeless signs of Doukhoborism, their trajectory from the Caucasus to Canada, and their eventual replacement with handmade formal suits, presents the vests in a different light.
Most suits worn by Doukhobor men in Canada were made by hand in the
community to emulate Western clothing styles. They allowed the men to appear more
modern and less foreign in contrast to the mainstream Canadian dress of the time.\textsuperscript{108}
These are the suits that appear in Plotnikoff’s photographs in the grouping of “Group
shots – traditional dress”. While Western in their tailoring, the process of their creation
from hand-spun wool and their production within the community makes them
“Doukhobor,” in the same way as the 1920s dresses worn by Ewashen’s mother. They
function within the power relations between the community and the Canadian
mainstream as active in negotiations of assimilation, while creating tradition and
producing new visual cues of Doukhoborism. The photographs in the “Traditional Dress”
category, therefore, can no longer be perceived as belonging purely to tradition. The same
visual strategies of dress and poses that have made them appear timeless and belonging
exclusively to Doukhoborism, can also be read as Canadian.

One of the photographs in the group depicts Fred and Vera Rebin in formal attire,
standing in front of trees (Fig 10). Fred is wearing a three-piece suit, likely handmade as
the cut and the fit are very similar to suits described by Burnham. He is reaching into his
pocket, and only the top button on his jacket is closed. The small gesture of leaving the
rest unbuttoned creates an association with the photograph of the two young boys in the
Caucasus, and the early photographs of Doukhobors on the Prairies before three-piece
suits were adopted. According to Tarasoff, the photograph, which looks very old, was
most likely taken at a photographer’s studio in the Doukhobors’ first years in Canada.
Fred Rebin might have buttoned his jacket in this way out of habit, having recently worn
formal vests in the Caucasus.\textsuperscript{109}
The buttoning of the jacket suggests multiple readings of belonging: to the tradition of vests made by local tailors in Caucasus, and to the Doukhobor women who spun wool as fine as commercial worsted by hand, and piece-dyed it black or dark blue to emulate Canadian suiting. The couple is posed for a special occasion, and the image is printed on postcard stock, suggesting that multiples might also be circulating. The names on the card, likely written for the Makortoff Family Collection, indicate that the subjects are still remembered, although the donation of their portrait to the archive hints at a distance between the Rebins and Plotnikoff. This possibility is a poignant force in many of the images. It must be considered that alienation, as well as forgetting, has allowed the photographs to be made accessible to the public.

In contrast to the “Group shots – traditional dress”, the category “At Work” includes images of traditional farming and gardening, as well as young people working at the mill, and a family driving a garbage truck. Harry Hawthorn, in his report for the Doukhobor Research Committee, argues that shifts away from traditional farming led to the assimilation of male community members into the Canadian mainstream. He suggests that work brought many Doukhobors in contact with Canadians and the promise of individual wealth, thus eroding the communal values. This reading complements Tarasoff’s, who adds that the grouping demonstrates that Doukhobors were “jacks of all trades.”

Plotnikoff places the “At Work” photographs in the fourth section of the guide, having established Doukhobor reverence for elders, and the importance of group remembering. The importance given to “Work” perpetuates the Doukhobor slogan of “Toil and Peaceful Life.” The photographs of the mill workers represent the
industriousness of the community, while a photograph of a young girl smiling coyly at the camera as she washes her feet in a bucket in a well-tended garden reinforces what Woodcock and Avakumovic describe as one of the only vestiges of the community’s agrarian past still lingering in the 1930s: “only the meticulous and productive Doukhobor gardens, largely cultivated by women and children, remained as concrete survivals of the peasant past that still occupied so large a place in Doukhobor tradition.”113

Photographs of the mill, even though they are taken during different times of the year and possibly at different mills, are structured as a narrative: men working at the mill, the building, the logjam, even posing on break: Group of men, probably on a break or after work, at the mill (Fig 11). Some of the men are posing as a band, with various found objects as musical instruments; others are smoking.

The “orchestra” with found materials from the mill foreshadows others photographs later in the Makortoff Family Collection under “Youth,” of a group of men posing while playing instruments, and later of couples dancing at a train station. There are signs of rupture: dancing and instruments were discouraged by the older Doukhobor generations.114 Posing playfully with work instruments as a band, therefore, was an act of resistance to that tradition and a novelty, a make-belief scenario that was entertaining because of its improbability. It is very unlikely that there would have been drums, or an upright bass, available in the community. There is playfulness in the pose that comes up again in the “Youth” photographs of the group at the train station, however it is made in the context of the Doukhobor approach to dedicated work as the centre of its faith. Reinforcing this reading, “Group shots – traditional dress” follows it with further images of tradition.
The photographs in the “Youth” and “Miscellaneous” groups carry on with the previous photographs’ oscillations between tradition and assimilation; which positions the images within Doukhobor culture. The largest sub-group of photographs in the Makortoff Family Collection pictures young people having fun in the Doukhobor areas of Shoreacres and around Castlegar. Without the previous groupings, it would be impossible to identify the subjects as Doukhobors, and the photographs could easily pass as tourist shots in the Kootenays. In this series, a dozen young men and women narrate their trip to the Shoreacres train station, taking pictures around the railway: together and in smaller groups, very likely on the same day. The poses are playful: girls standing in a row, pretending to be a train, wearing non-Doukhobor clothing, posing with cars, demonstrating their friendship (Figs 12, 13, and 14).

Two photographs symbolize the powerful oscillation between assimilation and tradition in the community. They are listed in the guide as Two photos of two young men shaking hands in a field (Figs 15 and 16). The poses are identical, and the men are smartly dressed. We deduce that they are not going to a traditional community gathering because the other photographs, in which the same men are depicted having fun, appear to have been taken on the same day. Asked about these photographs, two Doukhobor historians responded in opposing ways. Tarasoff suggested that they were demonstrating Charleston-era dancing, a style of swing that his father learned on a trip to Chicago and brought back to his Saskatchewan community of Independent Doukhobors.\textsuperscript{115} Ewashen, on another hand, suggested that this was a handshake, as Plotnikoff indicates in her guide. As a handshake, it stands for the traditional Doukhobor greeting: an acknowledgement of peaceful intentions, nonviolence, and divinity in each individual.\textsuperscript{116}
As there is another photograph of the young girls dancing on the same trip, the disagreement between the context and Plotnikoff’s guide allows the image to function on both levels, not allowing for a single interpretation.

The girls on the trip to Shoreacres are fashionably dressed and have matching haircuts, something that could perhaps appear as a sign of modernity – following Canadian trends. They are also wearing, as Tarasoff noted, Charleston-era hats. These hats and dresses support his interpretation of the handshake photograph as also fitting into that era. According to Woodcock’s discussion on Doukhobor dress, Verigin wrote in one of his instructional letters that shorter hair and shorter skirts are more practical for farming, long before they became fashionable in the 1920s. Therefore, the identical stylish haircuts that appear in many of the “Youth” photographs shift from being a sign of Canadian influence, into a sign of continuing Doukhobor traditions and following leadership advice on the smallest details of everyday life, even as they are modified and their origins in ideals of humility are forgotten. But within the Makortoff Family Collection, they recall the straight bangs of the unknown women in the second photograph under “Elders,” creating continuity.

“Vechanaya Pamit,” Postmemory, and the Living Book

“Group Gathering” is the section that directly follows “Elders” in Plotnkioff’s guide, and it presents a potential model for understanding the Doukhobor view of memorialisation through a narrative of a funeral ritual of a group meal (Figs 17, 18, 19). The Doukhobor expression that is used to describe the memory of somebody in afterlife is “vechnaya pamit,” which means both eternal consciousness and eternal memory.
There is no boundary between the process of memorialisation and the spiritual
continuation of one’s life. The act of remembering is not separated from its subject;
instead it is permanently connected to individual divinity and to Doukhoborism.

As Tarasoff explains this concept, this concept is an answer to the Christian belief
in heaven or hell, which is not held by Doukhobors. Instead, the continuation of one’s life
happens through remembrance of their actions and the passing of their lives into the
present in different ways. He connects these ideas to contemporary New Age theories
about passing of atoms into different planes.\textsuperscript{119} However, on a more historical basis,
Doukhobors in Saskatchewan sometimes refused to mark their cemeteries, instead
choosing that the earth be ploughed and used for farming. According to Frances Swyripa,
they believed that the body passing into the earth became part of it, which she interprets
as contributing to the complex relationship between the community and their stay in
Canada.\textsuperscript{120}

In Plotnikoff’s guide description of the “Group Gathering” photographs, she states:

\textit{Five photographs of a group gathering outdoors for a meal, standing to say prayers
first, and then seated while the meal is served. I know that this meal was after the
funeral of a loved one of the group because I previously had the photograph of the
open casket that was in the same setting. That photo, sadly, has been misplaced.}

This description suggests a single meal, while in the photographs, the two
gatherings appear separate. There are different groups of people, different tablecloths,
even a different house: one has white window frames and the other does not. One of the
photographs is captioned in the back with a blue color pencil, \textit{J Makortoff}, suggesting
Plotnikoff’s grandfather John who appears in other photographs in the Makortoff Family
Collection.
Figures 17, 18, and 19 were photographed from different angles in an effort to capture the whole group in its act of remembering. Photographs were frequently taken at funerals, and there are many in the Keenlyside Collection; portraits from the deceased’s life were also displayed next to the casket, as part of the tradition of reading their biography.\textsuperscript{121}

Combined with Plotnikoff’s mention of the missing photograph of the casket, this series is an example of how the authority of the archive shapes the Makortoff Family Collection, prompting Plotnikoff to provide a coherent reading as a guide to photographs that somehow refuse to conform. The description shifts abruptly into the present moment of attempted reconstruction and recognition of the Makortoff Family Collection’s limitations. The incomplete funeral is no longer a historical event, nor a personal memory of Plotnikoff’s. Neither is it a demonstration of “traditional Doukhobor funerals,” as it is not fully documented: there is no casket, aside from its mention in the guide. It is a story of how funerals might happen, as well as a story of a specific family funeral, and Plotnikoff’s memory of the other photograph. It provides evidence that these photographs were seen, handled, misplaced, and are continuing to circulate. That missing photograph must still be somewhere.

The question of diasporic identity, as applied to the Doukhobor community, is explored in depth by Lena Sherstobitoff in her MA thesis “Flowers and Weeds.” She follows Julie Rak’s lead in identifying the Doukhobors as a diasporic group, and establishes the relationship to the Russian homeland through interviews within her own community, as well as her personal recollection of questioning the origins of her identity as a member of the Sons of Freedom.\textsuperscript{122} Sherstobitoff’s account focuses on the
relationship between the Doukhobors and the myth of returning to Russia as a group: something that she sees as a central formative force in Doukhobor identity. The Doukhobors’ faith that they would eventually return to Russia meant that they saw their stay in Canada as only temporary. A number of projects were attempted to arrange a return of the Doukhobors to Russia; none succeeded.¹²³ There is still a small community of Doukhobors in Russia, connected to the Canadian community, but it is now distinct and has its own negotiation of traditions.

Sherstobitoff draws from a number of interviews that she conducted about the possibility of leaving for Russia. She asked questions about their shared ties to place, and whether they still saw Russia as their homeland.¹²⁴ When she discusses the relationship of her interviewees with British Columbia, they recall being told not to become too attached to it, while they also remember feeling ambivalence about the possibility of leaving. Beautiful British Columbia was but a temporary home.¹²⁵

The Makortoff Family Collection, especially the “Miscellaneous” category, contains many snapshots of families in front of picturesque areas around Castlegar and Shoreacres. The stories that Sherstobitoff retells allow these photographs to be read doubly as tourist snapshots, as well as expressions of pride in the cultivated land (Fig 20, 21). Based on the timeframe of the photographs, Tarasoff suggested that their subjects might either have moved, be moving to new locations, or starting new lives. These images might be a combination of “life as we lived it” and documentation of the changes in the community.¹²⁶ As tourist views, they perform the possibility that, at the time the photograph was taken, there was a strong sense that the community would leave. These depictions of Canada are shaped by the shared past in Russia, foregrounding the
importance of memory in the Doukhobor understanding of the present. As Rak discusses in her definition of the Doukhobors as a diaspora, the connection to Russia was strengthened through the prophecy by the revered leader Lukerya Vasilyevna Kalmykova that the community would return after centuries of migration and suffering. These ties are maintained through memories and recollections of personal stories, as well as through singing of psalms and hymns that "correlated cultural identity with the migratory experience… Imagined consequences of displacement have a greater affect on the Doukhobor community than does the physical reality of living “here.”

In the “Miscellaneous” category of the Makortoff Family Collection, this reading enters into a complex relationship with photographs that assert their location in Canada, in front of individual houses and the beautiful scenery that surrounds them (Figs 20 and 21). Their framing emphasizes that they are not only about their human subjects, but about the landscape as well: the mountains, orchards, and gardens. They depict Plotnikoff’s family in stylish Canadian clothes, occasionally with cars, but the larger parts of the composition in many of these photographs are devoted to their surroundings.

A potential key to interpreting these photographs lies in the difference in the ideological and theological interpretation of land ownership between the Doukhobors and the Canadian authorities. John McLaren describes this relationship in Religious Conscience, the State, and the Law as a clash of belief systems at the core of violent schisms within the community since its emigration from Russia. The Doukhobor article of faith that only God possesses the land conflicted with the dominant Western ideology that it is a commodity that can be bought, sold, and exploited. Responsible stewardship and respect for the land’s productive capacity was part of the Doukhobor
social structure that did not differentiate between the economic, social and religious being. In this context, the relationship between these aspects of life was seen as stemming from the divine, and thus irreducible to land’s legal status. These complex relations have to be taken into account in viewing the photographs in the Makortoff Family Collection. Images that might be read through Western ideology as performing pride land ownership, might also, as Tarasoff suggested, have just been emulations of photographs seen in magazines circulating in the community of the 1950s, depicting ‘modern’ suburban households.

While the Doukhobor families posing in this way did not necessarily subscribe to the mainstream ideologies of the 1950s Canada, they took similar pictures and were engaged in parallel negotiations of modernity. These trends are exhibited in publications of the day. As Valerie Korinek argues in *Roughing It in the Suburbs: Reading Chatelaine Magazine in the Fifties and Sixties*, Chatelaine magazine was widely read and distributed across post-war rural Canada. Through its readership and editorial content, Chatelaine was a powerful force in Canadian women’s interpretation and adoption of ‘modern’ suburban lifestyles, despite economic disparities between Canadian and American families, and especially in rural areas where the ideal of the ‘modern’ family was unattainable for both financial and logistical reasons. Coinciding with the time of extreme transition in the Doukhobor way of life, the magazine addressed the adoption of ‘modernity’ in the rest of rural Canada. While these changes cannot be confused with the radical shift from the communal to individual land ownership for the Doukhobors, visual references to the emerging ideal of nuclear families enjoying suburban lifestyles
situate the Makortoff Family Collection within the broader negotiations of modernity in Canada, and the role of print culture in this context.

As snapshots of the Kootenays, with its majestic mountains and the well-tended farms, the photographs can be seen as expressions of pride in the cultivation of the communal lands and the economic prosperity, indistinct from the community’s spiritual strength. They hold moments that were both signifiers of the group’s cohesiveness, as well as its fate of living in exile, waiting for the inevitable return to Russia. The spiritual strength and pride in the community’s wealth is entangled within memorialisation of what the community was in its heyday.

The photographs also foreshadow their movement into the public archives; while the photographers could not have been predicted this outcome, they nevertheless succeeded in fulfilling the images’ memorial function. Changes in the community during the period narrated by the Makortoff Family Collection could be compared in terms of monumentality with the migration from Russia. While depicting “life as we lived it,” in Tarasoff’s words, the casual snapshots’ ephemeral quality suggests the fleeting moment, while their framing also opens the possibility assumptions of permanence and a new life. The families depicted could be read as simply assimilated, having left the Doukhobor tradition behind. Their place within the Makortoff Family Collection, however, as well as Plotnikoff's identification of individual family members' as belonging to the community, does not allow for this superficial reading.

The theme of movement, carried through the photographs within the Makortoff Family Collection, also extends to images in the Keenlyside Collection. The train station appears as a common thread in both Collections, representing key moments in
Doukhobor history. The group of youth playing and taking photographs around the train station at Shoreacres; men and women staging a welcome with the bread, salt, in the Keenlyside Collection; two long panorama photographs of the Doukhobors welcoming their new leader Peter P. Verigin, after the death of Peter “Lordly” Verigin in a train explosion. These images are further connected through the historic role of the Doukhobor workmen in building the Canadian Northern Railway, which was expanding westward out of Manitoba.\textsuperscript{137} While this work provided the funds to build the first Doukhobor communities in Canada, and ultimately to establish the commune in British Columbia,\textsuperscript{138} it also brought the Doukhobor workers in contact with the Canadians, thus expanding the possibilities for Western influence. According to Woodcock and Avakumovic, the successful completion of the railroad contributed to the influx of new settlers to the prairies, increasing pressures for the community to assimilate into the Anglo-Saxon mainstream, and ultimately leading to the conflict over registration of individual homesteads.\textsuperscript{139} Going even further back into the Doukhobor past in Russia, the meeting between Verigin and Tolstoy that inspired Tolstoy to fund the community’s move to Canada, also took place on a train at a station, while Verigin was on his way into political exile in Siberia, which he spent preparing the plans for the community’s structure in Canada.\textsuperscript{140} The theme of the railroad echoes transience and movement, connecting these images of major moments in the community’s history to its presumed fate of exile and migration.

The photographs in the Makortoff Family Collection convey the complexity of the Doukhobor diasporic identity as both and neither Russian nor Canadian. To viewers from outside the community, the migration from Russia, the first communes in
Saskatchewan, the building and the eventual end of the communal way of life in British Columbia go unnoticed in some of the images. Even Tarasoff suggested that some of the photographs might have been taken in Russia, and then recognized upon closer examination that the settings and the subjects’ dress are Canadian.141

The sense that the narrative of the images still remains out of reach shifts the position of power and allows for the photograph to maintain their agency as separate from the archive's overarching claim to documentation.142 As Hirsch begins her discussion of family photographs in *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative, and Postmemory*, “They reveal even as they conceal. They are opaque as they are transparent.”143 Because the photographs in the Makortoff Family Collection are intricately tied with personal experiences of exile and resistance, they must also be viewed within the context and the continuum of individual remembering.

Hirsch’s conceptions of the familial gaze and the familial look in photography and postmemory can be used as a framework through which the Doukhobor conceptions of remembering could be interpreted in these images. Hirsch develops the concept of postmemory in relation to memories of children of Holocaust survivors, whose connections to its powerful trauma and inability to grasp this experience as their own, combine to construct their diasporic identity. While Hirsch uses the Holocaust as her own autobiographical point of departure for building on this concept, she views it as applicable to other groups whose members’ experience has been shaped by the memories of suffering that they cannot themselves directly access.144

Recollections of the past through the psalms of the *Living Book*, as well as through personal stories of suffering and exile, are at the core of the Doukhobor diasporic
imaginary as described by Julie Rak in *Negotiated Memory: Doukhobor Autobiographical Discourse*, and narrated autobiographically by Sherstobitoff. These experiences were not felt first-hand by the majority of those living in the community, or directly depicted in the Makortoff Family Collection. The ambivalence within the signifiers of tradition and assimilation in many of the photographs, especially as they depict youth and modernity, traces the disconnection in the continuation of tradition, its origins, and the experience of personal exile that informs it. Photographs, because of their indexical connection to the depicted moment, tie memory with postmemory in an attempt to bridge this distance, while testifying to their own inability to replace experience.

Doukhobor oral history practices are also such active vehicles of postmemory through the *Living Book*, as the psalms are sung, remembered, forgotten, or translated into English to preserve traditions despite the fading knowledge of Russian in the community.

Hirsch’s distinctions between the familial gaze and familial look are useful in exploring the tension between tradition and assimilation in the photographs, situating their negotiation as acts of postmemory and double-resistance. The imaginary cohesion of the ideal family, shaped by the familial gaze and represented through the typologies of family albums is a force through which families reproduce an ideology that is impossible to either uphold or abandon. The familial looks, on another hand, happen between the subjects of the photograph, the photographer, and the viewer. They work to build the conventions in which personal and public identities intercept, allowing for the agency of the subjects and the viewers to come to the fore. To engage with family photographs through the dynamics of the familial look allows for a multiplicity of individual stories to
constitute act of resistance to the power of the familial gaze, while acknowledging moments of intimacy and connection that the photographs create.\textsuperscript{148}

The photographs in the Makortoff Family Collection draw out cultural differences in ways of looking, shaped by the familial gaze. The photographs are open to projection of dominant Western ideologies about property, individuality, place, belonging, and family relations, because of their format and their familiarity, especially in the compositions that suggest assimilated families and their private homes. Likewise, the expectation of seeing the Doukhobors as an idyllic rural commune, perpetuated through projects such as Hayward and Watson’s \textit{Romantic Canada}, are mapped onto the traditional images and render them as vestiges of an irretrievable past, skimming past the markers of shifting traditions, such as the gradual adoption of Canadian or Southern Russian clothing styles. This is the formative force for the “then and after” discourse that dominates the discussion of assimilation within the community, which situates it as a final parting from tradition. However, engaging with Plotnikoff's text in the guide has shown that this partition is not solid.

The familial gaze can be contested, Hirsch argues, through meta-photographic texts that destabilize its power.\textsuperscript{149} They place the images into narratives that can resist its power in shaping the family ideology, allowing for possibilities of alternative interpretation. For Hirsch, “Photographs have a special capacity to locate themselves precisely in the space of contradiction between the myth of the ideal family and the lived reality of family life.”\textsuperscript{150} Located at this border, they have the capacity to be engaged through meta-photographic texts, making them into what W.J.T Mitchell calls “imagetexts” that bring their representational conventions to the forefront to explore the
fissures within.\textsuperscript{151} The Makortoff Family Collection, through its combination of the textual guide, the captions, and the photographs can be read as such an imagetext. Through this contextuality, the photographs simultaneously challenge the ideology of the traditional Doukhobor worldview, as well as its presumed threat under assimilation. Postmemory plays a large role in how the guide is structured and how the photographs interact with it, thus existing in the space between their complexity as stories and their opacity as images.

This is the space of postmemory when it makes exile visible, while conveying the impossibility of fully sharing in its experience. Plotnikoff’s guide to the Makortoff Family Collection is a trace of her affiliative looks at the photographs and their subjects. Through inclusion of her own family, as well as photographs of those people she does not remember, she presents the passage of time within the community as tied to the agency of those who have experienced its movement. Through inclusion of both casual and traditional images, Plotnikoff challenges the lived realities behind the familial gaze both within the Doukhobor tradition and its movement towards the Canadian mainstream. By organizing and donating the Makortoff Family Collection to the public, she renders individual remembering and forgetting into collective actions, while acknowledging personal emotional connections.\textsuperscript{152} The affiliative look that has shaped her relationship with the images of her family enters the archive, affecting the dominance of the familial gaze in the rest of the Makortoff Family Collection; she refers to the same subjects as elders, aunts, “aunties,” as well as by their first or last names, thus shaping affiliative looking at these images (Figs 2, 3, 4).
The separation between the origins of the Doukhobor identity, and their quest to hold onto the stories of exile and past suffering in migration, creates what Hirsch calls the “aesthetic of postmemory.” The sense of displacement of identity experienced by children of exile is not that of absence, but of a dizzying number of stories and affects that continue to haunt and call for both a desire to mourn and to rebuild that which has been lost.

The aesthetics of postmemory, as a repository of exile, equates personal with collective remembering, and writes the history of the Doukhobors. As traces of personal remembering, Plotnikoff’s photographs are narratives of postmemory. Incorporating both general types and the specificities builds an image of the Doukhobor identity as heterogeneous and marked by postmemory, reconciling the moments that Plotnikoff cannot access with those that constitute her own remembering. The individual photographs of family members that Plotnikoff remembers, such as those of her mother as a young girl (Fig 22), also position the images that she cannot access, such as Jim Poznoff’s anonymous nephews (Fig 7), within the affiliative look of postmemory.

The Doukhobor beliefs emphasize the everyday and mundane lived experience as a site of divinity within the community. The everydayness, seen in the conventionality of family photographs, creates an aesthetic of displacement that allows for identification and erasure of spatial and temporal differences. The images, in following visual conventions of family photography, while remaining situated in the knowledge of their contexts, allow for other peoples' memories to be transformed into the viewing subject's postmemories and to function within the framework of familial looking.
photographs in the Makortoff Family Collection, therefore, resist the notion of the archive as a source to be used purely for historic narratives. Instead, they make its function memorial, open to strangers’ projections onto the images, and allowing for others’ experience of postmemory to be mapped onto them.

The Makortoff Family Collection narrates the experience of displacement and belonging as it performs individual ways of negotiating change within the community. It presents memory that is individual, while upholding Doukhobor conceptions of identity as shaped by the memory of the community as a whole. However, the contrast between the traditional and modern images in the Makortoff Family Collection also enacts the separation between individual experiences of their subjects’ history of displacement, with affirmation that this history is rooted in a shared past. The communal experience of exile informs individual negotiation of assimilation.

Conclusion

Plotnikoff closes the “Miscellaneous” category with a photograph that is dear to her (Fig 22). In the guide, she describes it: *My favourite photograph of the bunch. A large group of adults, including my grandparents, and children, including my mom on the left.* We see people who have appeared throughout the Makortoff Family Collection, mostly in the “Miscellaneous” category. They are relatives and family friends who have been identified previously in the guide and captions, making the last photograph into a moment of recollection. We do not need to be informed where Plotnikoff’s grandparents are, because we identify them right away. The setting is also familiar, as the same mountain has appeared in numerous other images. Plotnikoff’s description assumes that strangers
have become familiar with the other photographs, thus reaffirming a cohesive reading of the Makortoff Family Collection.

This photograph, marked by Plotnikoff as her favourite, invites closer engagement. The gazes and postures in the image suggest an intimate group of friends. Their sense of belonging to the community has been narrated in the preceding images through the inclusion of subjects wearing traditional clothing, or posing on their farms and orchards. In this shot, however, there is nothing that distinguishes them from other Canadians of the time.

The group is arranged by height to fit everybody into the frame: children are in the foreground, the women stand behind them, and the men are in the back. The nuclear families are grouped together. Plotnikoff’s mother as a child, Nell, always appears next to her mother, Nellie Makortoff, a lady in a fashionable 1930s dress. The dress that she is wearing appears on some of the other images as well, sometimes belted or with a brooch. Nell’s father, John Makortoff, is in the far row. He is a tall man, and usually has to kneel or sit in group photographs to fit into the frame. Throughout the Makortoff Family Collection, they establish an image of a happy couple; John’s arm is always around Nellie and they almost always appear together (Fig 23). Here, because the group is arranged by height, he is hidden in the back, but recognizable by his height.

The photograph is depicting a special occasion that merited rather formal outfits, and nobody is wearing the traditional Doukhobor dress associated with a spiritual gathering; their arrangement is playful and relaxed, people are smiling. The two women in the front row, Nellie and her friend from the other snapshots, are standing arm in arm. The photographer framed the composition just a little bit off centre, leaving a sliver of
empty space on the right and cutting off a figure on the left, leaving only the person’s arm around the shoulders of another man who stands behind Nellie. Her head blocks most of the man’s face.

This man is holding a white sphere, which appears to be an egg or a small white ball, right above Nellie’s friend’s head. What we see of his face is mischievous, although that could be coloured by his gesture, to which Nellie’s friend is oblivious. Another man in the back row notices that the prank is blocking his face. He stretches up and smiles, exaggerating the movement of trying to be seen. Nellie’s daughter, Nell, stands in front of the adults in a white outfit and a bonnet, more formally dressed than the rest of the children. She is a little to the side, away from the other children and close to her mother. She looks out to the left of the frame, where the figure has been cut off.

The gestures and composition of the photograph all evoke the passage of time and the irretrievability of the moment that the photograph attempts to capture. Nell’s curious look to the left, and the missing man, both suggest that the framing is constructed, leaving things out deliberately and accidentally. One of the men in the back is standing off to the side of the huddled together group, revealing his three-piece suit. He is wearing a hat and appears to be smoking. The hat obscures his face almost completely, leaving only his well-dressed tall figure and the gesture of taking a drag of his cigarette. His modern and sleek look is concurrent with his smoking, which traditionally has been forbidden by the Doukhobors. He is stylish, and his pose suggests more confidence in modernity than was visible in the forbidden fun of dancing in the “Youth” photographs.

Holding the egg, or ball, above the woman’s head in the centre hints that it will be dropped on her after the photograph is taken – a practical joke in process. The gesture
conspires with the shutter, marking the passage of time between the shot and its aftermath tangible: as soon as the photograph is taken, the object might drop and startle the woman. Even if the ball or the egg is never dropped, the gesture points to the duration between the moments when the photograph is taken and when it is developed and seen. It relies on the delay between these two moments, and the inaccessibility to viewer of the instant that directly follows the click of the shutter.

The joke is provoked by the construction of the photograph, disrupting its clean organization and challenging its order. As Derrida speaks of photography, it is “grasping [this instant], certainly, but in grasping it to let it be lost.”162 The photograph, as “a signature of the loss” is also the keeper of what remains.163
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