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Preface

Yves Corpataux

1 Moving is generally an occasion to rediscover chapters of our personal history and that of our family. Rediscovering letters, photographs, press clippings and official documents of our ancestors and of our youth often gives us a new perspective on our origins and on our era. The move of the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies and of its library to the Maison de la Paix in 2013 offered us the opportunity to restore life to the Boris Souvarine Collection, bequeathed by him to the Institute with part of his library, catalogued in the 1980s.

2 The book and catalogue edited and curated by Professor Andre Liebich and Madame Svetlana Yakimovich, From Communism to Anti-Communism: Photographs from the Boris Souvarine Collection at the Graduate Institute give us a new and original perspective on the period that runs from the Russian Revolution to the 1950s and allow us to reflect upon the present era. The documents on which this book and catalogue are based come from the Boris Souvarine Collection consisting of his working notes, press clippings, and documentation concerning East-West relations collected by Souvarine.

3 As head of the Institute Library it gives me utmost satisfaction to publish a book based on the archival materials preserved and processed at this Institute. On this occasion I should like to thank Madame Marie Caillot, archivist and paleographer, who worked on the inventory of the Boris Souvarine Collection and who attracted the attention of Professor Andre Liebich to these extraordinary materials. My heartfelt thanks as well to Madame Svetlana Yakimovich, Institute librarian, whose mastery of the Russian language and of the history of her country allowed us to continue the work initiated by Madame Marie Caillot. Finally, I extend my gratitude to Professor Andre Liebich whose erudition, academic rigor and sense of humor have enriched my years at the Institute.
Boris Souvarine (1895–1984): A Biographical Portrait

Andre Liebich

Boris Souvarine (1895–1984)

Boris Souvarine moved from communism in the first years of the Soviet régime, to anticommunism, by the 1930s and throughout the rest of his long life. Such a trajectory is not unusual in the annals of the 20th century but Souvarine’s itinerary is, in many ways, paradigmatic.
Boris Souvarine was born in Kiev in 1895 as Boris Lifschitz, to a Karaite Jewish family. His father, an artisan jeweler of modest though comfortable condition, moved the family to Paris in 1897. Souvarine was naturalized French in 1906 and he attended French public schools until the age of fourteen when he left to work in an airplane factory. He never received any formal schooling after that date. As of 1910, Souvarine considered himself a socialist. The family language having changed from Russian to French shortly after their move to Paris, Souvarine learned or re-learned Russian on his own while doing his obligatory military service on the eve of the First World War. In 1916 he was allowed to leave the army, after his only brother had been killed in action. It was in the same year that he chose the pseudonym, Souvarine, after an anarchist who appears in Emile Zola's novel *Germinal*. The Russian ring to the name, undoubtedly, attracted Boris. By that time, however, he was thoroughly French, molded by the secular republican ideology of the French school system and keenly conscious of the saga of the French Revolution of 1789. Under the influence of his brother's death, he moved ever closer to pacifist circles, though still attempting to advocate both national defence and an end to the war. It was not until the October Revolution in Russia that he came to espouse Bolshevik views and rekindled his Russian roots.

Souvarine greeted the creation in 1919 of the Third International, the Comintern, enthusiastically. He initially militated in its favor through the Committee for the Resumption of International Relations (Comité pour la reprise des relations internationales) and then through the Committee of the Third International. He was among the moving spirits of the new organization and he wrote passionately on its behalf, stating the alternative as one between bourgeois dictatorship and proletarian dictatorship. The First Congress of the International, held in Moscow in March 1919, was sparsely attended, largely because of practical difficulties of reaching Russia. The true inaugural meeting was the Second Congress, held triumphantly in Petrograd and Moscow in July 1920, at a time when hopes of world revolution were high and Soviet power was more firmly established than it had been the previous year. Souvarine himself missed this Congress as he was in French prison at the time. This may explain the numerous photos from that occasion in his collection, some of which are presented in the first chapter of this exhibition. They were feeble compensation for Souvarine's absence from the Congress but they were a comfort nonetheless. In spite of his imprisonment, Souvarine played a key role in the scission of the French Socialist Party at the Congress of Tours in December 1920. Elected one of the "honorary presidents" of the meeting it was the "Souvarine Resolution," adopted by an overwhelming majority of the delegates, that led to the creation of the French section of the Communist International that eventually took the name of the French Communist Party.

Soon after his release from prison, Souvarine left for Russia where he attended the Third Congress of the International as one of the French delegates. As secretary of the French Committee for the Third International he was destined for high office in the Comintern. Elected to its Executive Committee and then to its Presidium Bureau, he also became a member of the International's Secretariat. At a very young age, Souvarine was thus the most prominent Frenchman in Moscow, aided, no doubt, by his affinity with Russia, his knowledge of the Russian language, and his enthusiasm for the new régime. Throughout 1922 Souvarine, like many other Comintern officials, lived in Moscow's Hotel Luxe and delighted in the cultural and other privileges reserved for deserving high functionaries. He also enjoyed close relations with several Soviet leaders, notably with the notoriously
gregarious Nikolai Bukharin. Although “Bukharchik” and “Souvarchik” or “Souvarinionok,” as they called each other got along famously, Souvarine’s relations with his home party were strained and soon he found himself entangled in intra-party politics in Russia as well.

Souvarine was re-elected to the Presidium Bureau of the International in June 1923. Not long thereafter, however, he found himself the target of attacks, not only at home but in Moscow too. His preface to the French edition of Leon Trotsky’s *New Course* in early 1924 provoked an uproar. Not only did he identify with one of the contestants for power after Lenin’s death but he also criticized the direction in which the Russian revolution was going. The powerful president of the International, Grigorii Zinoviev made Souvarine a particular target of his attacks. Even Souvarine’s friend, Bukharin, defended him only flaccidly, simply inviting delegates to the 13th Congress of the Russian Communist Party in May 1924, where Souvarine had used his prestige within the International to make a speech (in French, translated into Russian), not to take account of it stating that one does not attack someone who is already down. Leon Trotsky, whom only Souvarine had openly defended at the congress, avoided public references to his supporter. In the wake of Souvarine’s intervention, the French delegation demanded his removal from the leading bodies of the International. The request was parried by Karl Radek who insisted that it was not a national delegation but only a congress of the International which could take such steps. Thereafter, Souvarine attempted to mend matters with his French comrades, in part by bringing about a meeting between them and Leon Trotsky; it proved counter-productive as it ended in a fiasco. In July 1924, in the wake of the Fifth Congress of the International, Souvarine was duly excluded from the French Communist Party. Even though the exclusion was supposed to be “temporary,” the bill of charges against him was overwhelming. Even as the French party acknowledged his brilliance as a journalist and his ability as a polemicist, it accused him of being an authoritarian autocrat, infatuated with himself. The French party’s decision was accepted by the Executive of the International (according to some sources it was the International that first authorized Souvarine’s exclusion), resulting in Souvarine’s dismissal from his Comintern posts.

Perhaps surprisingly, Souvarine decided to stay on in Russia. He may well have expected political winds to turn and to be able to recover his position. In any case, he enjoyed life in Russia and was keen to perfect his Russian. Only months later, in early 1925, did he return to France. There he militated to change the course that the French Communist Party was taking, contributing, anonymously, to an opposition publication, *La Révolution prolétarienne*, and animating a “Cercle communiste Marx et Lénine”, that brought together oppositionist communists and those who had left the party or been excluded, like himself. Reflecting his continued faith in communism, in December 1925, Souvarine made a formal request, that was denied, to be readmitted into the Executive Committee of the Comintern. At the time, Souvarine was more opposed to Stalin’s erstwhile allies, Lev Kamenev and Zinoviev, than to Stalin himself and he continued to put out, often at his own expense, the *Bulletin communiste*, a theoretical publication that he had directed previously and that now came out as a voice of the communist opposition. His concerns about the future of the revolution also differed from those of many other communists, particularly those in Russia. Whereas they feared the threat to Soviet achievements posed by the New Economic Policy (NEP), pursued since 1921, which seemed to be steering the Soviet Union in a capitalist direction, Souvarine warned of the dangers of bureaucratization and authoritarian rule. It was only after celebrations of the tenth
anniversary of the revolution, in an article published in March 1928, that Souvarine’s argument concerning the degeneration of bolshevism gave way to an assertion that the interests of the party no longer matched those of the proletariat and that the party was turning its back on communism. Even thereafter, he briefly pinned his hopes on Trotsky after the latter’s expulsion from the Soviet Union in 1929. Trotsky proved unresponsive to Souvarine’s position, which implied criticism of Trotsky himself although Souvarine had defended him years earlier, and he rebuffed Souvarine’s overtures. For years, however, both before and after this altercation, Souvarine was loosely identified as a “Trotskist.”

At the beginning of the 1930s, Souvarine still expressed hope in the future of communism, free of the corrupting influences of post-Leninist neo-bolshevism. He transformed the “Cercle communiste Marx et Lénine” into the “Cercle communiste démocratique” and began to publish La Critique sociale which drew a number of prominent, non-communist contributors. It was then too that he agreed to write much of a book published under the name of Panait Istrati, a writer who had originally sympathized with the Soviet experience but had recently returned from the Soviet Union completely disenchanted. Souvarine claimed that he agreed to contribute to the book, and to do anonymously, for material reasons but, clearly, he was then reluctant to publish openly the devastating critique of the Soviet experience that appeared in Istrati’s book as La Russie nue. The contribution was republished as L’URSS en 1930 under Souvarine’s name in 1997. Souvarine’s continued interest in the Soviet Union and his lingering hopes for radical change there are manifest in the photograph collection of Soviet life in 1931 that are part of his archives. Executed by a photographic studio in Berlin and probably intended as propaganda in the years of industrialization and collectivization, the photos reveal, sometimes in spite of themselves, an unvarnished view of the Soviet Union in these fateful years where the hopes and joys they seek to portray reveal a stark background of misery and backwardness.

In the early 1930s, Souvarine worked on what was to be his opus magnum, Staline, aperçu historique du bolchevisme. The book came out in mid-June 1935. It enjoyed a second edition in 1940 with an additional chapter bringing it up to date. This second edition was re-published in 1977 with a new preface by the author. An English-language edition soon appeared, though without its bibliographic apparatus, and a Dutch translation came out in 1940. The book has now been translated into eight languages. Souvarine’s Staline deserves a bibliographic and historiographic study of its own but, suffice it to say here, that its impact extended well beyond the several thousand copies initially sold, although this was already an impressive demonstration of the interest it aroused. Interestingly, the book’s first admirers were ultra-leftist opponents abroad of the Soviet regime. Obviously, it was belittled by orthodox communists as well as by those who still put their faith in the Soviet experiment even as it was touted by anti-communist forces then and later.

Souvarine’s qualifications to write Staline were those he had acquired during his years of intimacy with the communist movement. He could not claim to be on terms of familiarity with Stalin himself as they had only met, for the first time, in August 1923 in the Caucasian spa town, Kislovodsk, where the two were vacationing. Then and later, he denounced the “pseudo-revelations” of those, such as Boris Bazhanov and Grigorii Bessedovsky, who claimed special insight into Stalin’s mind by virtue of a putative closeness to the dictator. Most significant from our point of view, however, was the impact that this book had on the author himself. It turned out to be a cathartic experience as it purged Souvarine of his own past. As Souvarine himself wrote, though
many years later, “I was still a communist, though in my own way (à ma façon) at the beginning of the 1930s ... I was ever less so as I advanced chapter-by-chapter.’ Whereas Souvarine was already being denounced earlier by the Communist Party as a renegade, with this book he could accept such a designation with relative serenity. Whatever remained of Souvarine’s attachment to Marxism too was buried under a flood of denunciations so that the anti-Marxist label which was henceforth pinned on him could not readily be shaken off.

Even earlier, Souvarine had begun what was to be a long scholarly career. In leaving Russia in 1925 he had been asked by David Riazanov, the erudite head of the Marx-Engels Institute, to help gather archival materials in Western Europe. He did so with growing enthusiasm participating in 1935 in the creation of the Paris office of Amsterdam’s International Institute of Social History, itself founded to preserve the Marx-Engels Archive that had been spirited out of Germany to forestall Nazi depredation. This was the origin of the Institut d’histoire sociale, despoiled after the French defeat in 1940 and refounded by Souvarine in 1949. Souvarine’s name is inextricably linked to the history of this institution, where he served at its permanent secretary until retirement as he passed the age of eighty and to its publications, the most important of which was the journal, *Le Contrat social*, that came out between 1957 and 1969.

During World War II, Souvarine, like many European intellectuals of anti-Nazi persuasion, was forced to flee to the United States. He hated New York feeling himself isolated among the eight million other people who didn’t know why they were there, as he put it. Initially, he hesitated to return to France after the liberation fearing the strength of the French Communist Party and the prevailing pro-Soviet tendencies. After his eventual return, Souvarine threw himself into the struggle against the ambitions of the communists and against popular illusions about the Soviet Union. The posters selected from Souvarine’s archives for the final chapter of this photographic exhibition come from this period. They were produced and plastered throughout France in hundreds of thousands of copies by the anti-communist movement “Paix et Liberté” created in 1951 as a reaction against the success of the communist-inspired Stockholm Peace Congress and against communist utilization of the famous Picasso image of the dove of peace.

Even Souvarine’s opponents acknowledged his qualities as an ardent and acerbic debater. Until the end of his life, he loved to argue, as his later controversy with Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn demonstrates, however, with time he became evermore bitter and acidic. Judging from his correspondence, the transformation began in the mid-1930s, a period of political reconfiguration but also of personal anguish connected with the illness and death of his companion, the writer Colette Peignot, who had also financed *La Critique sociale* until, according to Souvarine, the publisher had stolen her capital. Souvarine’s increasingly rancorous temperament was evident in his relations with the exiled Mensheviks who had moved to Paris from Berlin after Hitler’s takeover. Souvarine was welcomed within the group of exiles which met at the Petit Saint Benôït on Paris’ left bank and that included not only Russians but, after Munich, Czechs such as Hubert Ripka and Ivo Duchacek. The exiled Mensheviks showered Souvarine with both help and sympathy. Boris Nicolaevsky, the famous Menshevik historian, was Souvarine’s partner at the Paris office of the Amsterdam Institute of Social History. It was Mensheviks in America who managed to obtain a visa for Souvarine to escape France during the Second World War. After the war, it was a Menshevik, Alexander Shifrin known as Max Werner, who helped Souvarine recover his library and archives that had been taken by the
Germans. In New York, they were Souvarine’s natural allies and much of his argument that the industrialization of Russia had advanced significantly under the tsars rather than under the Bolsheviks has often been dubbed “Menshevik history.” Nevertheless, Souvarine denounced his allies as inhabiting a madhouse. Indeed, “madness” became something of a catchall phrase, if not an obsession, for Souvarine. He considered Stalin to be mad in the latter’s last years and he was resentful that only one Menshevik, Nikolai Valentinov-Volsky, shared this view. Nevertheless, in the clippings on the death of Stalin, presented in the third chapter of this exhibition, Souvarine confined himself to collecting accounts of the dictator’s death from contrasting French, American and Soviet sources, with an eye to the power struggle that, he was sure, would ensue upon Stalin’s demise. He did not allow his own views to impinge upon his sources, making no comment, for instance, upon the contrast in the legend under the same picture of Stalin’s wake in the New York Times and in Pravda.

Until the end of his life, Souvarine refused to be branded simply as an anti-communist, a designation conferred upon by his friends as well as his enemies. He insisted that his underscoring of the essential incompatibilities between Marxism and Leninism and between Leninism and Stalinism exempted him from this label. Few were convinced by this plea. Souvarine did write harshly of America too although, in the final analysis, his criticism amounted to chiding the United States for not standing up sufficiently strongly to the Soviet Union. For example, he condemned the celebrated Paris daily, Le Monde, for being more anti-American than anti-Soviet, a stance which made it, he believed, into an auxiliary of communism. Some of my older colleagues remembered a colloquium in Geneva, probably the one held in anticipation of the fiftieth anniversary of the October Revolution, where “big Boris” (Nicolaevsky) and “little Boris” (Souvarine) walked up and down the lakeshore arguing fiercely. They were both exiles, sometime Marxists who declined to acknowledge that they had renounced completely that heritage, nostalgic of Russia and ferociously anti-Soviet. In spite of these many commonalities, Souvarine refused to embrace the views of his interlocutor, a refusal to agree with others which had characterized him throughout his life. Whatever his political position, he always defended it passionately.
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The Boris Souvarine Archive and Library at the Graduate Institute

Svetlana Yakimovich

1 The Boris Souvarine Library is a true reflection of his intellectual itinerary during the long years of his active life. The wide range of the books and periodicals shows the development of his political views, but the main subject of the library was determined by the area of his particular interest and the name of the Institute he directed – the collection is focused on social and historical studies of contemporary politics.

2 Having founded the Institute of Social History in Paris in 1935 as a French branch of the International Institute for Social History of Amsterdam, Boris Souvarine carefully developed the library, often at his own expense, preserving as the core of his collection the documents and correspondence concerning the Comintern and rare published materials, such as first Soviet editions and press clippings. After his return from American refuge in 1948 Boris Souvarine recreated the Paris Institute and ran it single-handedly till his retirement in 1976, continuing the publication of the journal Le Contrat social until 1969 and willingly sharing his experience, knowledge and the library with hundreds of people who were seeking advice in the field.

3 In the end of the 1950s his failing health and ever increasing financial burden brought about a critical situation and as a result the Library had to be either dispersed or sold to the highest bidders. At that time the Collection was considered to be the fourth most important library in the field in Europe, after the Moscow Institute of Marxism-Leninism, the one at the Amsterdam Institute (Boris Nicolaevsky, as a Director of the Paris Branch, and Boris Souvarine, as Secretary General of the institution were both responsible for the creation of its library) and the Giangiacomo Feltrinelli Library in Milan. Boris Souvarine considered several ways of saving his collection from dispersal or falling into communist hands and finally proposed it to the Library of the Graduate Institute of International Studies in Geneva, which seemed to be an ideal solution. He explained his choice in a letter of 1 February 1960 to the Director of the Geneva Institute at that time, Professor Jacques Freymond, in the following words: “Geneva is a center of international meetings and has long been an academic center for students and professors of all nationalities ...
Also Geneva is a haven of peace, neutrality, stability. Geneva precisely combines the advantages of being a Swiss city and a global crossroads”, and later, in a letter of 30 March 1971 to the Geneva Institute, he wrote “in spite of the most tempting propositions that were coming from America I have always wanted all my collection to stay in Europe, and Geneva seemed to be the most suitable place for different reasons, as well as being the most available”.

In the first stage of the negotiations Michael Josselson, the head of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, an anti-communist advocacy group founded in 1950, petitioned in favor of Boris Souvarine’s Library to the Director of the Geneva Institute and to its Foundation Board, convincing them of the advantages of this acquisition. According to Souvarine’s Memorandum of 4 December 1959, The Paris Institute consisted of a Library of approximately 12,000 volumes on the history of socialism and communism among which there were valuable collections of newspapers and magazines related to revolutions, economic doctrines and social movements. In addition to this, there were several thousand pamphlets of great importance in these fields. There were also a number of documentary files such as the documents which Boris Souvarine kept at the time when he was Secretary of the Comintern; documents, covering the negotiations between France and the Soviet Union about the settlement of tsarist regime debts; as well as some personal files of Sergey Prokopovich.

From the very beginning Jacques Freymond showed enthusiasm for the idea, as at the time the Institute already had a library of about 30,000 volumes but it did not possess a section on the history of socialism and communism. The project of enlarging the building of the Institute and providing the capacity for the library to house approximately 90,000 volumes was to be finished in spring 1960. Besides, the inclusion of Souvarine’s Library in that of the Geneva Institute would have given Jacques Freymond the possibility to expand his program, to include the study of the history of communism and developments in Eastern Europe. Moreover, Jacques Freymond himself was doing scholarly research on the history of the First International and Souvarine’s Library was particularly well equipped with material on the history of the Internationals. Another important factor was the short distance between Paris and Geneva, which would have made it possible for Boris Souvarine to spend a certain amount of his time in Geneva continuing his work based on the collections and acting as an adviser in the field of the organization of his fund.

Long and tiring negotiations started in early 1960 between Jacques Freymond and Souvarine on the conditions of the purchase and the organization of the transfer of the library and the scientific work of the latter for the Geneva Institute. Boris Souvarine eventually accepted Geneva’s offer in early 1961, and started preparing the books for the transfer and simultaneously continuing research for his French publication, *Le Contrat social* and the promised scientific work for the Graduate Institute based on the history of the Third International. He also took upon himself the obligation to have the brochures and fragile rare books bound at the expense of the Institute and to assure the return of the books that had been borrowed from his collection. The Geneva Institute never specified the exact number of volumes bought, the proposition to purchase dated 16 February 1961 mentions “all the works, brochures, publications, editions, periodicals concerning the field of social history, political and economic movements and doctrines, in which the activities of our Institute specialize, together with the fund of manuscripts and documentation, such as press clippings, and also your personal archives, especially on the Comintern”. Between spring 1961 and until Boris Souvarine’s death almost a quarter
century later, books arrived in a series of boxes. The ageing man tried hard to arrange the books in the best manner, to write his comments where necessary, and at the same time to keep apart those publications useful for his own research. Most of the books and all the brochures in Russian contain an insert, a sheet of paper with an author’s surname transliterated and a translation of the book title into French, handwritten by Boris Souvarine. The Institute librarians decided to systematize and catalogue the books delivered from Paris upon their arrival, starting with the most precious editions and collections of surveys. Some of Souvarine’s letters of this period describe the content of the boxes sent to Geneva in simple handwritten lists. The last packages of Boris Souvarine’s personal archives and the rest of the books, carefully prepared and sent by his widow, Madame Souvarine, arrived in Geneva in September 1985 after his death.

The meaning of this important “operation Souvarine”, as Mr Yves Collart, the Secretary General of the Graduate Institute, called it in his letter of 22 February 1961 about the outcome of the negotiations to Mr Alfred Borel, Geneva State Counselor, head of the Department of Public Instruction and head of the Institute Foundation Board, is best expressed in his words: “A project, which not only enriches our library by collections of great value but opens new opportunities of great interest for our future research”.

The Boris Souvarine Archive at IHEID comprises several sections: fourteen folders of his personal documents, vast correspondence, press clippings and historical photographs, dating from 1917-1960, from before the time of his Comintern activity to the period of Khrushchev’s leadership; twelve folders of the archive of Anatole de Monzie, a French political figure and scholar; various donors’ folders, such as that of “George Kagan”, a Comintern delegate from Poland, known as “Constant” and later a French communist; “Andre Marty”, a leading figure in the PCF, Secretary of the Comintern; “Baranès”, a controversial Frenchman, involved in communist and anti-communist activities in the Cold War; “Arthur Raffalovich”, a Russian state financial agent in London; a folder entitled “NKVD”; also one under the name of “Ernest Vaughan”, an early French journalist and publicist; Paix and Liberté leaflets. A significant part of the collection is represented by numerous folders of the family of Sergey Prokopovich, Russian economist, sociologist, liberal politician, Minister in the Provisional (Kerensky) Government (1917), and his wife, Yekaterina Kuskova, a politician, advocate of social reformism, economist and journalist writing on economics, history and political matters, founder of the “Public Committee for Famine Relief” in 1921 and, a year later expelled with her husband from Soviet Russia for their anti-Bolshevik activity. The family lived in Geneva from 1939 up to their deaths, leaving their forty-eight folders of archive material, containing rare original correspondence, manuscripts and press clippings dated 1900-1954, to Boris Souvarine.

The collection was highly valued by its holder himself: “As fragmentary, as insufficient as my collection may be, it still represents a real interest in various fields. It denies well established legends concerning the life of the Comintern, its terms of deliberation and action, its relations with national sections, the “money question”, Soviet espionage, etc. It illuminates in general the Executive Committee’s relations with the PCF [French Communist Party], but some aspects of these relationships also apply to the other sections of the Comintern. It contains texts and papers concerning different Communist Parties, various poorly known episodes of international communism. It preserves the letters of Zinoviev, Boukharine, Trotsky, Kuusinen, Lozovsky, Manouilsky, Rosmer, Sadoul, Bordiga, Roland-Holst, Rutgers and the others, which contribute to the comprehension of the people and of the facts. It provides all necessary materials on the
PCF for a future true history of this party “in the making”, of its crisis, of its transformation into the instrument of the Soviet state. Due to these diverse titles the collection is irreplaceable and it is worth a publication…” (from B. Souvarine’s letter to J. Freymond of 30 March 1971).
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3 folders of documents, concerning the collaboration between B. Souvarine and the Graduate Institute dated from 1959 till 1984.
From the Revolution to the Comintern
Demonstration of a Factory Delegation, Petrograd, April 1917

Alexander Rabinowitch

The banners in the centre of the photograph read in Russian: "Да здравствует немедленное перемирие на всех фронтах! РСДРП"; "Вся власть Советам Рабочих, Солдатских и Крестьянских депутатов" – ["Long live the immediate armistice on all fronts! RSDLP"; "All power to the Soviets of workers’, Soldiers’ and Peasants’ Deputies‘]. Black and white photograph; 24 x 18 cm.

Following the overthrow of tsar Nicholas II in February 1917, a Western-oriented, liberal government, the “Provisional Government,” took power in Russia pending convocation of a nationwide Constituent Assembly. Simultaneously, the Petrograd Soviet, representing
revolutionary workers and soldiers, was also established. Led by moderate socialists, it pledged to support the Provisional Government. Unfortunately for the stability of this temporary new order, the Provisional Government was unable to ease the fundamental political, economic, and social problems that had led to the fall of the tsarist regime. Rather, these problems quickly worsened. So it was that in the spring and early summer of 1917 Petrograd (then the Russian capital) was the scene of three major, mass anti-government protest demonstrations.

The first, so-called April demonstrations, 20–21 April, were disorganized eruptions of popular opposition to the expansionist war aims secretly pursued by Pavel Miliukov, the fledgling Provisional Government’s Foreign Minister. These demonstrations forced Miliukov’s resignation, after which the Provisional Government was reformed as a liberal-moderate socialist coalition. Among its members now were several prominent moderate socialist leaders from the Petrograd Soviet. However, this new government was fundamentally divided, ineffective, and inherently unstable. Moreover, it was fiercely opposed from the start by Lenin’s left-wing Bolsheviks, whose radical program was captured succinctly in the increasingly popular slogans “All-Power to the Soviets!” and “Peace, Land, and Bread!”
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Demonstration of the War Veterans, Petrograd, April 1917

Andre Liebich


The photograph shows a demonstration that has been described by Leon Trotsky in the following terms:
“On 17 April [1917] there took place in Petrograd the patriotic nightmare of the war invalids. An enormous number of wounded from the hospitals of the capital, legless, armless, bandaged, advanced upon the Tauride Palace. Those who could not walk were carried in automobile trucks. The banners read: ‘War to the end’. That was a demonstration of despair from the human stumps of the imperialist war (...)”.

The demonstration took place in a context of increasing war-weariness and impatience with the Provisional Government’s failure to put an end to the war. Russian military losses were lower than those of some other countries and civilians had not yet felt all the privations that they were to encounter later. However, in Petrograd and other cities, material conditions were worsening by the day, as bread rations were being cut and inflation soared. Nothing could bring home as vividly the horrors of war as this demonstration by its living victims. Presumably, the slogan cited by Trotsky – “War to the end” – was intended to be ironic.

The demonstration followed the dramatic ceremonial burial several weeks earlier of the casualties of the February Revolution whose red coffins were carried to the Field of Mars by workers and soldiers amid a crowd estimated by Trotsky to number at least 800,000. The demonstration also took place on the eve of celebrations of May Day (18 April in the Julian calendar still in force in Russia), a feast day that, this year, brought together the most diverse social forces, formerly (and later) opposed to each other. It was also on 18 April that Foreign Minister Pavel Miliukov sent a Note to Russia’s Entente allies, primarily France and Great Britain, reassuring them of Russia’s intention to continue the war against the Central Powers. The Note provoked indignation in Russia, skillfully manipulated by revolutionary forces, within days obliging Miliukov to resign and thus ending the first, liberal-bourgeois, phase of the Revolution.

The Tauride Palace which is given as the destination of the march was still the seat of the Provisional Government as well as of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies. The two bodies coexisted uneasily under the same roof until the Provisional Government moved out to a corner of the Winter Palace.
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Demonstration, Petrograd, 18 June 1917

Alexander Rabinowitch

The photo represents the second of three major anti-government demonstrations held between February and July 1917. On 18 June, the Bolsheviks successfully turned a 400,000-strong mass march on the Field of Mars conceived by moderate soviet leaders as a show of socialist unity and a demonstration of support for their moderate policies into a strong expression of the expanding popularity of the radical Bolshevik program.
In early June the Bolsheviks – partly in response to pressure from militant elements among Petrograd factory workers and soldiers of the city’s war inflated garrison threatened with transfer to the front – began preparations for a mass political protest demonstration on 10 June. The Bolshevik leadership was forced to abort this event at the last minute, after it was banned by the moderate socialist-controlled First All-Russian Congress of Soviets, then meeting in Petrograd. However, the Bolsheviks eventually got the better of this clash with the 18 June demonstration depicted here.

Sunday, 18 June, was a clear, windy day – ideal parade weather. It was already warm in the early morning, when crowds of sailors and workers began assembling at designated points throughout the city, and promptly at 9:00, to the strains of the Marseillaise, the first elements in the parade began moving down Nevsky Prospekt. The Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet and the Presidium of the Congress marched at the head of the parade. At the tomb of the heroes of the February Revolution on the Field of Mars long columns of soldiers and workers, several abreast, filed silently by, lowering their fluttering banner in tribute to the fallen heroes, only to raise again as they marched proudly away.

The huge demonstration (it lasted until late in the afternoon) was turned into a clear indication of the attractiveness of the Bolshevik program and the effectiveness of Bolshevik techniques. Regiments marched unarmed under predominantly Bolshevik slogans. Occasionally, one saw specifically Socialist Revolutionary and official Soviet slogans but they were the exception. Pavel Miliukov, the liberal Kadet (Constitutional Democrat) minister who had, by then, resigned as Foreign Minister, conceded that the 18 June Demonstration revealed that in Petrograd the Bolsheviks had the upper hand, as had been shown even in a demonstration intended to be friendly to the Provisional Government.
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Demonstration in Moscow [1918 or 1919?]

Joseph C. Bradley

The middle banner reads “Proletarians of all countries” and refers to an “All-Russian Union” though its shortened form renders it difficult to make out. The banner which is mostly hidden could be that of a union of firefighters, “domovykh pozharnykh”. The back of the document reads (in English): “Moscow”. Black and white photograph; 18 x 24 cm.

The photo depicts a demonstration in Red Square with the Kremlin wall and towers on the left. The History Museum, now the State Historical Museum and, before the Revolution, the Alexander III Historical Museum, is visible in the back, St Basil’s Cathedral.
would be behind and to the right of the photographer. GUM, the Glavnyi universal’nyi magazin or Main Universal Store, a major shopping mall, known at the time of the photo and through the 1920s as the Upper Trading Rows or Verkhnye torgovye riady, would be across the square to the right. The tower on the left, the Nikol'skaya bashnya was damaged during the Revolution and was under reconstruction when the photo was taken. There would appear to be a star atop it.

2 The photo is undated but evidence suggests a demonstration in autumn 1918 or 1919, commemoration of the first or second anniversary of the October Revolution. Evidence for this is given by the fact that the banners already have the new orthography introduced by the Bolsheviks in 1918, although the orthographic reform had been initiated in tsarist times. The demonstrators are comfortably dressed in winter clothes which would eliminate a Mayday celebration.

3 Moscow and Saint Petersburg had long been, and still remain, to a certain extent, rival capitals. Peter the Great moved the capital to Saint Petersburg, his window on the West, in 1712. Lenin moved the capital back to Moscow in March 1918, at a time when Petrograd (as it had been renamed during the First World War) was exposed to enemy armies. Though Lenin’s move may have been dictated by strategic consideration, it was seen as symbolic as well. Moscow represented an old and authentic Russia, that of the unwesternized masses who had reacted eagerly to the Bolshevik Decree on Land, adopted by the All-Union Soviet of Workers, Soldiers’ and Peasants’ Deputies in the immediate aftermath of the Revolution, ordering the confiscation of landed estates and their distribution among the peasants. Although St. Petersburg or Petrograd was the nerve center of the October Revolution and was closer in heart and spirit to Lenin himself, it was perceived by many as an alien outpost, more “European” than “Russian.”
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Lenin with Comrades, May Day Rally, Moscow, 1919

Lars Lih

The banners on the Kremlin wall read in Russian: “1 Интернационал”; “Да здравствует пролетариат Англии, Франции, Германии”; “Пролетарии всех стран, соединяйтесь” – “[1st International]; “Long live the proletariat of England, France, Germany”; “Workers of all countries, unite”. Black and white photograph mounted on card; 16.5 x 22.5 cm.

Over a year before the opening of the Second Congress of the Comintern, the true founding congress of the new organization of revolutionary socialist parties, a grandiose monument shows the millennial hopes placed on the new International. The first congress held in March 1919 had been a hastily arranged affair with only a few, rather
unrepresentative delegations. Still, as the decorations here show, the Bolsheviks had not
given up their hopes. These would only be fulfilled with the arrival of representatives of
thirty-seven countries, including those of the large and important parties of France and
Germany in summer 1920. The new Soviet Russia had been waiting to welcome them for
more than a year.

2 The mural at the center shows a St. George figure defeating a dragon, a curious image, as
the icon is Christian in origin that had been much favored in tsarist Russia. On the left of
the picture, Karl Marx is emblematic of the First International; the words “the future” can
be made out in the lettering in this section. On the right of the picture, the Third
International claims continuity with the worker organization of Marx’s time.

3 The Second International is pointedly left out of the revolutionary filiation. This had been
an impressive organization that united national Social Democratic parties, both large and
small, since 1889. Yet, the Bolsheviks vociferously condemned the Second International
because most member parties had supported their own government during the war and
had not attempted to use the war as an occasion for revolution, as they had pledged to do
at the Basel Congress of the Socialist International in 1912. Outraged by what they saw as
a betrayal of revolutionary principle, the Bolsheviks and others called for a new
International that would eliminate “opportunism,” the doctrinal disease they blamed for
the debacle in 1914. The Third International or Comintern (kommunisticheskii
international) was the outcome of that call.

4 At the same time, probably more than they were aware, the leaders of the new
International took over from their shunned predecessor an ideal image of a militant and
global revolutionary organization. By purging the member parties of “opportunists” and
other defects, the new Communist International would embody the ideal that the old
Social Democratic International had failed to live up to.

5 The lettering on this side of the picture contains the words “under the banner.” Many
countries of the world are named, giving the monument a global resonance. For example,
Turkey, Egypt, India and China are mentioned at the top right in the futuristic font
favored at this time. At the lower right, we find Ukraine and Belorussia, still thought of as
independent countries. Banners, floral tributes, and military salutes all add to the
solemnity of the occasion. Lenin is standing on the lower steps at the left.
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Arrival of Delegates, Comintern Congress, Petrograd, 1920

Lars Lih

The working sessions of the Second Congress of the Comintern were held in Moscow and began on 23 July. The ceremonial opening session took place a few days earlier in Petrograd (St. Petersburg was given a less German-sounding name at the outbreak of war in 1914, and only changed from “Peter’s city” to “Lenin’s city” after Lenin’s death in 1924). All the available delegates gathered in Moscow took an overnight train and arrived in Petrograd on the morning of 19 July. They then embarked on a day of visiting revolutionary landmarks, listening to Lenin’s opening remarks, honoring revolutionary
martyrs, participating in rallies along with Petrograd workers, and finally watching a remarkable open-air theatrical production.

2 Here an official greets Marcel Cachin and Louis-Oscar Frossard on their arrival in Petrograd. These delegates from France were not yet quite committed to urging the French socialist party to join the new revolutionary organization. On their way to Russia they stopped in Warsaw and held talks with Polish socialists who approved of Pilsudski’s war against Soviet Russia. According to Victor Serge, standing here in a dark suit on the extreme left of the group, on learning of this, Trotsky demanded and obtained their immediate expulsion, although Rosmer contests this. On their return to France, however, they lobbied strongly to urge French socialists to apply for membership in the Comintern, and they became leaders in the new French Communist Party. How Boris Souvarine, who had already militated ferociously on behalf of the new party, would have loved to be there instead of lingering in a French jail!

3 Cachin and Frossard are flanked by Karl Radek on the left and Grigorii Zinoviev on the left. Radek is somewhat hard to recognize, because he evidently shaved his straggly beard for the occasion, and his hat (also hard to miss in later photos) hides his scraggly hair. Zinoviev was the Chairman of the Comintern from its inception to the mid-twenties.
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Group of Delegates, Comintern Congress, Pavlovsk Palace, Petrograd, July 1920

Lars Lih
Practically every device used by the Bolsheviks in Petrograd in 1920 had a direct predecessor in prewar practice: sightseeing in host cities, commemoration of martyrs, honoring current leaders, visiting sacred places of revolutionary history, affirming solidarity by speeches and resolutions, affirmation of leadership within the International (Germany and France before the war, Russia afterwards), demonstrations alongside local workers, and impressive theatrical spectacles. During the conferences of the Second International, delegates were often treated to the famous sights of the various cities which hosted socialist conferences.

Here we see delegates to the Second Congress of the Comintern posing (at least according to the caption on the photo) at the Pavlovsk Palace in Petrograd: an aristocratic residence built by Catherine the Great and turned into a museum after the revolution, and thus a symbol of the new narodnaia vlast, people’s power. Karl Radek is recognizable not only by his hat but by the iconic pipe. The woman in the center is identified as Zinaida (according to some sources, Zlata) Lilina, Grigorii Zinoviev’s wife and an important Bolshevik of long standing in her own right. Involved in children care and education, she was People’s Commissar for Social Planning to the Northern Commune (organ of the Petrograd Soviet). Victor Serge described her as “a small crop-haired, grey-eyed woman, sprightly and tough”. To her right is the German delegate Willi Münzenberg, the man in the back with his hand on his chin is Manabendra Nath Roy, who for complicated reasons represented the Mexican party at the Congress. Roy gave an important speech on the tasks of the International in the colonies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


Front Door of Smolny, Comintern Congress, Petrograd, 19 July 1920

Lars Lih

Although the Bolsheviks used prewar practices from earlier socialist conferences, such as sightseeing in host cities, they were doing so in a public space they themselves controlled.

From the station, most delegates went to the Smolny building, seat of the first Soviet government before the move to Moscow in early 1918. The delegates took a streetcar from the station, and at the controls was Mikhail Kalinin, formerly a leader of the...
streetcar workers’ union but now the official Soviet head of state (a largely ceremonial office).

This photograph shows the revolutionary decorations of the approach to the building. Over the archway is a sign “Long live the III Communist International.” The lettering on the arch itself spells out “Proletarians of all countries, unite!” In smaller letters on each side, the slogan is found in German and French. France, and especially Germany, dominated the Second International and served as model parties to other members. Thus the archway asserts that a new model party was now dominant. The decorative motifs – sun and flowers – recall the actual season as well as symbolic hopes for the Comintern.

---
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Front View of Smolny, Comintern Congress, Petrograd, 19 July 1920

Lars Lih

We are now in the Smolny grounds.

The Smolny building was another imperial landmark (a pioneer in women’s education, even if only for ladies of the nobility) turned into a revolutionary shrine, since it was the
meeting place of the Second Congress of Soviets that established the new Soviet government in October 1917.

On each side of the gate, we see “Fraternal Greetings to the II Congress of the III Communist International” in German and Russian. A statue of Karl Marx stands in the central garden (although the imperial double eagle does not seem to have been removed from the top of the building!).

Mikhail Kalinin, the former leader of the streetcar workers’ union but now the official Soviet head of state who had driven the delegates here in a streetcar informed them of the sacred significance of Smolny: “Comrade delegates, since you come from distant lands, this hall is perhaps not as familiar, not as dear to your hearts as it is to us Russian workers and peasants, and especially to the members of the Communist Party of Russia ... It was in this building, in this hall, that the course of action of the Russian Soviet government was determined and confirmed. All that this government is accomplishing now is but the realization of the tasks, the guidelines, set in this hall ... For the entire world, for all Communists, this hall will represent the eternal shrine where the oppressed and toiling masses took power for the first time.”
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Entering Smolny, Comintern Congress, Petrograd, 19 July 1920

Lars Lih

The delegates approach the entrance to the Smolny building hastening up its steps with a crowd of onlookers to their left. This moment is akin to the religious service, toute proportion gardée, that preceded important meetings in the bourgeois world. Smolny, a school for young ladies of the nobility in tsarist times, was a revolutionary shrine as it had been the meeting place of the Second Congress of Soviets that established the new Soviet government in October 1917. The delegates must have been aware of the historic
significance of the building and they would have entered it reverentially. Lenin himself was in place inside to greet the delegates before they proceeded to the formal opening of the Congress in the Tauride Palace.

2 The delegates are variously attired, including sailor suits, peasant and military garb. For the most part, however, they are dressed in sober business suits. One assumes that these are the delegates from the bourgeois countries. They are greeted by what seems to be a children’s choir, conducted by the man in the white suit with his back to us. At the top of the steps to meet the delegates is a group, mainly of women presumably charged with greeting them and ushering them to their assigned places.

3 Right above the entrance is a poster that announces its fraternal greetings to the Second Congress. Above this poster we see the iconic sickle, although the hammer and sickle had not yet become the central symbol of Soviet Russia. On top, the sickle is coupled with grain stalks: a remarkably agricultural symbol for the proletarian congress. At the left is a poster with “S R” arranged in two vertical columns: Soviet Russia (the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, or cccp in Cyrillic, was not proclaimed until the end of 1922).
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Group of Delegates, Comintern Congress. Smolny, Petrograd, 19 July 1920

Lars Lih
A group of delegates is now leaving Smolny for the formal opening session at the Tauride Palace. As much as they were eager to enter Smolny, a revolutionary shrine, they now seem relieved to have done with the formality of the Smolny ceremony.

On each side of the departing group of delegates stands a group something in between spectators and an honor guard. It consists of sailors and, above all, of children, female children in white summer hats together on the right. A striking black-and-white effect is created by the sailors, the women in their white suits, the children onlookers in white, and the white shirts of some of the male delegates against the dark background.

Hardly conspicuous but central to the scene is Vladimir Illich Lenin himself, white shirt and tie but wearing his iconic worker’s cap. He is not at the head of the procession but in the middle, apparently savoring this moment with undisguised pleasure. Alfred Rosmer writes the following in his memoir of this event: “When Lenin advanced in the great hall where we met, the English and American delegates, reinforced by some others since they were so few, surrounded Lenin forming a chain and sang 'For he’s a jolly good fellow!' the traditional English expression of affection and admiration.”

The line in front of Lenin, consisting of young men with watchful eyes, may well have been his bodyguards. An attack on Lenin almost exactly two years previously by the Social Revolutionary Fanny “Dora” Kaplan had taken place in analogous circumstances, as Lenin was leaving a factory meeting. Lenin’s early death a few years later has been attributed to the sequels of this attack.
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Leaving Smolny, Comintern Congress, Petrograd, 19 July 1920

Lars Lih

The stream of delegates walks away from the Smolny grounds, accompanied by a brass band. Many people are now sporting what seems to be delegate identification on the lapels. One sees a much reduced honor guard consisting of sailors but the numerous spectators, mainly children, who looked on as the delegates were leaving the Smolny building, are no longer there.
On either side of the Red Army soldier in the front of the procession is German delegate Paul Levi, to the left, and Russian delegate Nikolai Bukharin, to the right. Paul Levi was to leave the presidency of the German Communist Party (KPD) within months of this photograph in disagreement with the Comintern line on a revolution in Germany. He was excluded from the Party and the International and eventually returned to the Social Democratic Party leading a left-wing current within it. He was still a Reichstag Deputy when he committed suicide in 1930. At that time, Bukharin was a member of the Politburo of the Russian Communist Party and editor-in-chief of its main daily newspaper, Pravda. Several years later he was to head the Comintern but, eventually, he fell victim to Stalin’s purges.

The Second Congress was extensively photographed. The photographs of the later working sessions in Moscow only show us the surface of events and not the complex debates and negotiations that defined the work of the new organization. The opening session in Petrograd portrayed here, in contrast, was essentially a day of affirming solidarity and honoring the sacred symbols of the movement. Each delegate received a collection of photographs at the end of the proceedings. Presumably, one of the delegates gave Souvarine his or her collection, as compensation for having missed this historic event.
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Exiting the Tauride Palace, Comintern Congress, Petrograd, 19 July 1920

Lars Lih

After leaving Smolny, the delegates went to the Tauride Palace, a building with a long tradition of representative assemblies. There is no documentary evidence for the caption which calls this the Uritsky Palace, although the assembly hall within the building was renamed the “Uritsky Theater.” Moisei Uritsky was a Bolshevik hero who had died of an
assassin’s bullet. The opening session of the Second Congress of the Comintern was held in this room.

2 The tsarist Duma had held its sessions in the Tauride Palace beginning with the first Duma of 1906 which was dissolved *manu militari* by order of the tsar in 1908. It was there too that the Provisional Government was declared immediately after the fall of the empire in February 1917. For a time the building was the seat of the Provisional Government as well as of the Petrograd Soviet. The government moved out to a corner of the Winter Palace, and the Tauride Palace became identified with the Soviet. The Constituent Assembly held its sole meeting in January 1918 in the Tauride Palace before being dispersed by the Bolsheviks. In years to come, the building became the Communist Party School and since the 1990s it has been the meeting place of the Interparliamentary Assembly of the Community of Independent States.

3 In his brief opening remarks, Grigorii Zinoviev connected the Second Congress with two great revolutionary events of the past: “In a few months fifty years will have passed since the first great, historic insurrection of the European workers, which showed the way both for you and for us. I speak of the Paris Commune ... Present here are representatives of the working men and women of Petrograd, who were the first to begin the insurrection of October 1917 ... Remember this day. Know that this day is the reward for all your sacrifices and for your courageous, steadfast struggle. Tell you children about this day and explain to them its meaning. Inscribe this solemn hour in your hearts.”

4 Lenin gave an extensive speech analyzing the world situation, and then several appeals were made for help in ongoing revolutionary struggles, particularly in Hungary and Poland. The adoption of these sorts of appeals also took place at international congresses during the Second International – only in those days, such appeals most often called for support of the revolutionary struggle in Russia.
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Procession, Field of Mars, Comintern Congress, Petrograd, 19 July 1920

Lars Lih


After the adjournment of the short opening session at the Tauride Palace (as the official record tells us), “the delegates set out for the Field of Mars, accompanied by a huge crowd of workers, soldiers, and sailors in an endless procession. At the grave of fighters for the
revolution, they lay a wreath bearing the inscription ‘The Second Congress of the Communist International of proletarians of all countries – to brothers fallen in the struggle for communism’.

2 An overview of the procession can be seen here with delegates pulling a giant wreath. The delegate in the front of the procession in the center of the picture is the romantic American radical John Reed whose Ten Days That Shook the World is a classic account of the Russian Revolution. Reed is the only American to be buried in the walls of the Kremlin.

3 The Field of Mars is a large park in the center of Petrograd that became a memorial location for victims of the revolution immediately after the February Revolution in 1917 (that is, when the Bolsheviks were still a small minority). The procession there in March 1917 honoring those who fell in the February Revolution had been, no doubt, the largest mass procession seen in Russia up to that time. The solemn re-enactment of that procession among the ceremonies held at the beginning of the Second Congress of the Comintern was designed both to memorialize and reiterate that earlier episode. It was now carefully choreographed with its impressive framing of the marching delegates by an honor guard, apparently of sailors, in gleaming white shirts, including a second line of white-shirted guards, further separating the marchers from the spectators. In this event too the Bolsheviks were drawing on the choreography worked out at earlier socialist meetings. Their control of public space allowed for some genuinely impressive spectacles such as this solemn procession but the genuine drama of actual contestation with independent forces was absent.
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Commemoration, Square of the Victims of the Revolution (Field of Mars, Comintern Congress, Petrograd, 19 July 1920)

Lars Lih
Here we see close up the giant wreath commemorating the victims of the Revolution that was carried in the procession from the Tauride Palace where the formal opening of the Second Congress of the Comintern had taken place to the Field of Mars. The white-shirted honor guard which seemed earlier to have been constituted of sailors is now a more varied group. Some members in white shirts and kerchiefs are wearing what would become later on the uniform of young Soviet Pioneers. The delegates at the head of the procession are unidentified. They are dressed in bourgeois business suits and, like some other delegates, are holding briefcases under their arm but, conspicuously, they are not pulling the cart that is carrying the giant wreath.

The Field of Mars is a large park in the center of Petrograd that became a memorial location for victims of the revolution immediately after the February Revolution in 1917 (that is, when the Bolsheviks were still a small minority). The procession there in March 1917 honoring those who fell in the February Revolution was, no doubt, the largest mass procession seen in Russia up to that time. The present procession, among the ceremonies marking the opening of the Second Congress of the Comintern was clearly an attempt to reenact that earlier event. As before the war, the ability to organize such huge gatherings, to maintain order and decorum, and to manifest constructive solidarity was a proud statement by worker parties and other worker organizations of their legitimacy as a political actor and as future leader of society.
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Banners, Comintern Congress, Field of Mars, Petrograd, 19 July 1920

Lars Lih

1 The procession of delegates to the Second Congress of the Comintern appears to have now reached the Field of Mars, a large park in the center of Petrograd that became a memorial location for victims of the revolution immediately after the February Revolution in 1917 (that is, when the Bolsheviks were still a small minority). The procession there in March 1917 honoring those who fell in the February Revolution was,
no doubt. the largest mass procession seen in Russia up to that time. The present procession sought to reenact and memorialize that earlier event.

2 This photo focuses on the banners containing slogans such as “Proletarians of all countries, unite!” Words such as “communist,” “international,” and “world” (adjective) can be made out. Banners had long been an essential part of socialist demonstrations that asserted the new worldview in a pithy and proud way. A member of the brass band is seen at the bottom of the photo, and to his left is Nikolai Bukharin.

3 Like prewar socialist celebrations this procession was a commemoration of martyrs and a visit to a sacred place of revolutionary history, although on a scale unimaginable earlier. As in previous celebrations, this procession included current leaders as well as local workers who demonstrated together. It was a truly impressive spectacle made possible by the fact that the state had eliminated all competition and mobilized resources by fiat. The state discovered that in this way it could put on campaigns of remembrance or of solidarity on an inconceivably greater scale than had previously been possible.
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After the Procession, Comintern Congress, Petrograd, July 1920

Lars Lih

The back of the document reads in Russian and French: “Олимпиада в честь 2-го Конгресса” — “Olympiada” — “The Olympic Games in honor of the 2nd Congress”. Black and white photograph; 17.5 x 13 cm.

1 By the time of this photo, the formal part of the events marking the opening of the Second Congress of the Comintern was over.

2 The ceremonies had led delegates and participants from the Smolny Institute, a building that held the status of a revolutionary shrine, to the speeches in the Tauride Palace where
the Congress formally began, to the procession toward the Field of Mars where delegates had deposited a giant wreath commemorating the martyrs of the Revolution. After these formalities, many of the white shirts that had been so prominent earlier on during the ceremonies, in a formal and quasi-military capacity, were now milling around in the warmth of a summer day. All the people here appear to be relaxing while waiting for the next episode in the well-choreographed festivities. There was to be a midnight show across the Neva on Vasilyevsky Island.

The caption indicates that this photo represents a sports event, loosely described as “Olympic Games.” In fact, the Spartakiade, the Soviet alternative to the Olympic Games, was not created until 1928 and the Soviet Union first participated in the Olympic Games in 1952. There may well have been sports activities on the occasion of the Second Congress but, if so, this photo depicts spectators rather than athletes. The crowd may also have been waiting for a distribution of food and drink, as was common on such festive occasions, and a practice that was particularly appreciated at times of hardship, such as these.

---
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Demonstration on the Nevsky Prospekt, Petrograd [1920?]

Lars Lih

This photo is undated but it is likely to have been taken on 19 July 1920 during the festivities in honor of the opening of the Second Congress of the Comintern. A parade up Nevsky Prospect made sense as a way to get from the Field of Mars where a
commemoration had taken place to the former Winter Palace, now part of the Hermitage Museum.

The aim of the ceremonies of 19 July 1920, the formal opening of the Second Congress of the International, was to give the beleaguered Petrograd population a sense of being supported by a world-wide movement, and to give the delegates a sense of mass popular support for the struggling Soviet regime. Thus, devastated and crumbling Petrograd – a city that suffered immensely during the Civil War – could for one day be turned into a fairy kingdom.

This photo shows a fairly unscripted crowd wandering down one of Petrograd’s main arteries on a pleasant summer day. Most other processions or even other moments in this procession on that day are more tightly choreographed, some in almost military fashion. Looking back, we can see in the events of 19 July 1920 a foretaste of the mass rallies and propagandistic productions that were such a striking feature of all communist regimes.
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Tribune on Uritsky Square, Comintern Congress, Petrograd, 19 July 1920

Lars Lih

Some of the more notable delegates to the Second Congress appeared on the speakers stand erected at what had once been the Winter Palace and that was then, as it has been since, part of the Hermitage Museum. It stood in front of the huge expanse once called Palace Square and, from 1918 to 1944, Uritsky Square.
The square was renamed in honor of a martyr of the Revolution, Moisei Uritsky, the head of the Petrograd Cheka or political police who had been assassinated at this location on 30 August 1918. Coupled with the attempt on Lenin’s life the same day, the assassination led to the Red Terror of autumn 1918 in which thousands of people lost their lives. Ironically, Uritsky had been opposed to excessive Cheka repression. Uritsky himself was buried in the Field of Mars. Palace Square or Uritsky Square had been the center of revolutionary events in 1917. It was in a corner of the Winter Palace, located behind the speakers’ podium, that ministers of the Provisional Government took refuge before being driven out by Bolshevik insurgents backed by the cruiser Aurora.

Either here or at another rally on the same day, the cornerstone of a monument to Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht was laid. In his remarks, Paul Levi connected the martyrdom of the German communist leaders to the present occasion: “You are erecting a monument of stone to Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, but you should know you are building an even better monument: the world revolution that you have initiated. I know, Petrograd workers, that you will raise that monument to completion.”
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Uritsky Square, Petrograd [1920?]

Lars Lih

It may be assumed that the occasion which brings this huge crowd together filling Uritsky square is the ceremonial opening of the Second Congress of the Comintern on 19 July 1920.

Starting at midnight, just across the Neva River, was performed 'The Spectacle of Two Worlds', a piece of mass theater with some three thousand costumed performers. Unfortunately, we have no photographs of this climactic stage production, which portrayed the ups and downs of the revolutionary movement from the Paris Commune in...
1871 to the downfall of the Provisional Government in October 1917 and the declaration of soviet power.

3 The German delegate Willi Münzenberg described the effect of such a dramatic spectacle: all this took place “at night, at two o’clock, while the red flags on the Winter Palace give their salute, and the brightly illuminated warships on the Neva display the Soviet star, and hundreds of thousands of workers watch, filling up all the streets. It was like a dream. As the sailors’ armored car drove up [as part of the final episode], we delegates stood, shouting, waving our arms, so enthusiastic we were quite overcome.”

4 The next morning the delegates returned to Moscow, where the working sessions of the Congress started a few days later.

---
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Workers’ Meeting, Putilov Factory, Petrograd, 1920

Lars Lih

The back of the document reads in Russian and French: “Перевыборы в Петросовет на Путил. Заводе после доклада тов. Глебова. Путиловского. Июль 1920” – “Nouvelles élections au Petrosoviert à l’usine Poutilov” – [“New elections to the Petrosoviet at the Putilov Plant”]. The banners read in Russian: “Да здравствуетъ праздникъ Всемирной Армии Труда”; “Починить один паровоз значит приблизить конец голода и нищеты, этим добить окончательно капитализьм” – [“Long live the holiday of the Global Army of Labor”; “To repair one locomotive is to bring closer the end of hunger and poverty, and by this means finish off capitalism for good”]. Black and white photograph; 11 x 15 cm.

This photo shows us some of the political and social dynamics of Petrograd itself around the time of the Second Comintern Congress in July 1920 or slightly earlier.
Looking at us are the workers of the Putilov factory: mainly men with their worker caps, but also a number of women with their head scarves. They are conducting elections to the Petrograd Soviet, the local government body whose chairman was Grigorii Zinoviev. For the most part, elections in Soviet Russia were by this time single-party affairs, although the other socialist parties had not yet been definitively declared illegal. Nevertheless, the election process was still an important means of communication between the ruling party and its worker base. The annotation tells us that “Com. Glebov” has given a report; this may be the prominent Bolshevik Nikolai Glebov-Avilov who was a trade-union leader in Petrograd and who, until recently, had been People’s Commissar for Posts and Telegraphs. He is distinguished from the workers by his tie and suit jacket, but his suit is hardly elegant and he seems at ease in this environment.

On the left, the poster reads “Long live the holiday of the Global Army of Labor!” A worker is shown ringing a holiday bell. This poster may have been put up during May Day celebrations or it may be referring to the Comintern Congress. On the right is a slogan which brings out the grim economic realities of 1920: “To repair one locomotive is to bring closer the end of hunger and poverty, and by this means finish off capitalism for good.” The immediate goal is to stave off complete economic collapse by alleviating the transport breakdown. Yet even this struggle with immediate “hunger and poverty” takes on meaning because of the long-term perspective of finishing off capitalism.
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Commemoration of October Revolution, City Council Building, Petrograd, [1919]

Jean-François Fayet

1 Situated at number 33 Nevsky Prospekt, at the angle of Dumskaya Street, this neoclassical building erected under Catherine the Great was modified several times in the course of the 19th and 20th centuries.
This building, which had housed the municipal council before the October Revolution, was eventually put to use for congresses, exhibitions, theatre performances and concerts. As part of the plan for transformation of the Nevsky Prospekt, itself renamed the Avenue of October 25, into a site of monumental propaganda, 6 October 1918 saw the unveiling in the entrance of the building of a gypsum bust of Ferdinand Lassalle. In honoring the German socialist, founder of the first workers’ party (Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverband) the Bolsheviks sought to identify themselves with the traditions of the international workers’ movement.

The budget of the celebration of the October Revolution having been reduced to one-fifth that of the previous year, festive decorations were, in general, very limited compared to those of the first anniversary: no novelties, few multicolored canvasses or plywood constructions; nothing on the façades of the buildings or on the lampposts of the avenue, a traditional parade site. Nor were there any posters (notwithstanding the boom in poster production at the time) garlands, or flags. Soviet iconography did not yet dominate public space where the urban style of tsarism still prevailed. The restrictions on material and human resources imposed by War Communism are obvious.

The photograph shows the relatively spontaneous, chaotic and austere atmosphere of early celebrations. A meeting is being held in front of the building, under the two staircases which converge in front of the bust of Lassalle. Nearby, a column of demonstrators, in orderly file behind a banner in rectangular form borne by a staff topped by a pickaxe, seems to be awaiting its departure. Small groups listen to a propagandist charged with crowd coordination. One also sees several giants mounted on stilts. The different groups seem totally independent of each other. But this scene probably occurs early in the morning before the official beginning of the parade. As it happens, some Bolsheviks criticized the practice of “demonstrations” which they likened to religious processions.

Although 7 November is the most important holiday in the Soviet calendar the processions and other commemorative celebrations do not yet monopolize urban space nor upset daily life. Apart from the demonstrators there are passers-by, onlookers, and many children. All hope to be treated to some food in this period of food crisis. Municipal cafeteria serve children, whether abandoned or not, distribute tea, sugar and coffee to adults; factories offer manufactured goods to the demonstrators. As is the case at every anniversary during the Civil War, rations for the families of soldiers of the Red Army have been increased. The free distribution of food products is a fundamental component of the celebration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


Commemoration of October Revolution, Petrograd, Hermitage, 1919

Jean-François Fayet

1 The meeting was held in front of the New Hermitage, at 35 Millionnaya Street which leads to Palace Square, renamed Uritsky Square after Moisei Solomonovich Uritsky, an early Soviet martyr. The former Winter Palace, now, and already in 1919, the Hermitage Museum stands at the northern tip of Nevsky Prospekt. This building commissioned by
Catherine the Great to serve as a museum was inaugurated in 1851. On the first anniversary of the Revolution, Millionnaya Street, lined on both sides by aristocratic palaces, was renamed Khalturin Street in memory of Stepan Khalturin, a member of the Narodnaya Volya (People’s Will) organization, who carried out a bomb attack on the Winter Palace in 1880 and was later hung for another assassination attempt.

The relatively orderly crowd stands behind two Red Army soldiers wearing sashes across their coats. One is holding a red flag with an unreadable inscription sown on; this is certainly the initials of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic (RSFSR). The fact that a soldier is the flag holder is typical of the commemorations of the period of War Communism, both symbolically (the future of the Revolution is being decided at the front, fewer than fifty kilometers from Petrograd) and materially (only the army has flags). Among the participants one sees women (of a very conventional, even “bourgeois” sort, as attested by their hairdos and their fur coats), children and elderly people. The men, several soldiers or Red Guards with caps or Cossack fur hats (ushanka), sometimes decorated with a pentagonal red star, are rarer, due to mobilization for obligatory military service or economic mobilization into the requisition brigades. One also sees in the crowd some wind instruments, notably tubas, which play the International, the Marseillaise or the Dubinushka of Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov at every stop of the procession in between speeches and other solemnities.

The photo reveals the poverty of commemoration rites at the time of the Civil War often limited to a procession drawn up behind a red flag. This is a far cry from the allegory of “the people marching towards the revolution,” dear to the theoreticians of revolutionary festivities such as Anatolii Lunacharsky, People’s Commissar for Education (Narkompros). In contrast to the previous year, all such events have been entrusted to amateurs since professional actors and artists, members of the theatre and graphic divisions (TEO and IZO) of the Narkompros and of Proletkult have been exercising their talents with the troops. This is the period of propaganda trains on all fronts.

In the evening festivities continued in workers’ clubs with memorial evenings during which participants in the revolutionary events told their story or modest performances were organized by proletarian art groups. All newspapers in reporting on these events emphasized the restrained nature of the commemorative events of 1919, marked by austerity and extreme uncertainty as to the future of the régime.
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Demonstration, Petrograd
[Celebration of October Revolution 1919?]

Andre Liebich

The overwhelming and overpowering presence of the imperial past in the former tsarist capital was manifested particularly in its architecture and monuments. Among the
solutions adopted by the Bolsheviks and even the previous Provisional Government to temper the overpowering evocations of the past was to change names; for example, Dvortsovaya Ploshchad’ (Court or Palace Square) became Ploshchad’ Uritskogo, after Moisei Solomonovich Uritsky, an early Soviet martyr. Another solution was to cover or envelope tsarist monuments for particular holidays or in more permanent fashion.

2 This appears to be the solution adopted in this photo for the equestrian monument to Alexander III. The monument, under cover in this photo, had been erected in 1909 and celebrated the creator of the Trans-Siberian railway. It stood in what had been known as Znamenskaya Ploshchad’, named after the Church of the Sign located there, and renamed under the Bolsheviks as Ploshchad’ Vosstaniya or Insurrection Square.

3 Judging by the winter clothes of the demonstrators in the photograph, it is doubtful that the date of 1 May is accurate. It is more likely that this was a celebration of the October Revolution; if so, it would have been in 1919, as contemporary documents reveal a different scene at this place the previous year. It may also have been a demonstration connected with the launching of the “Red Terror” in autumn 1918 or to protest against the assassinations of German revolutionaries, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. This is what the banner which reads “[by] murder of the leaders of the bourgeoisie” completed by the statement “will not be able to stop the march of our revolution” would seem to suggest. It is not clear when the covering of the monument to Alexander III took the form represented in this photo. The reference to the “Bibliothèque populaire” or “People’s Library” is also puzzling as it does not seem to correspond to any known institution at the time, and certainly not at this location. The Winter Palace on Palace Square or Uritsky Square was renamed the “People’s House” and later the “Palace of Arts” housing the Museum of the Revolution. It may be that a “People’s Library” was planned for Insurrection Square but not carried out or it may simply be a confusion on the part of Souvarine who was witnessing these events from afar.

4 Note the large number, indeed, the overwhelming presence of children in this photo. Mobilization of youth was an important Bolshevik objective and, in this case, it appears to have been successful though the bewildered expressions of many of these children suggest that they had not (yet?) integrated the Bolshevik narrative and were unsure of themselves and perhaps curious as well as somewhat fearful of the photographer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Review of Military Academy Students, [Petrograd, Field of Mars?]

Mark Von Hagen

The “élèves” were a new class of officer cadets but never called that, out of protest at the old régime. It was not until the 1930s that old ranks were restored and that, eventually,
the Red Army became the Soviet Army. The person on horseback is, most likely, Nikolai Illich Podvoisky (1880-1948).

2 Podvoisky was a member of the Social Democratic Party since 1901. In 1917 he was a deputy to the Petrograd Soviet and head of the military organization of the Petrograd Party Committee. During the October Revolution he was chairman of the Revolutionary Military Committee and one of the leaders in the storming of the Winter Place. Podvoisky served as People’s Commissar for Military Affairs of the RSFSR from November 1917 to March 1918. From December 1919 to 1923 he acted as head of universal military training, Vsevobuch or Vseobshchee voennoe obuchenie, destined for urbanites who did not belong to exploiting classes. Presumably the students in the photograph are proletarians enrolled in the recently created schools for Red commanders. The women are, possibly, spouses or relatives of the new graduates or Party agitators and enthusiasts. The relatively healthy and well-dressed appearance of the cadets suggests that the photograph dates from a time when things were looking up for the Reds, possibly 1919 or 1920.

3 That the young Soviet republic should be celebrating students of a military academy, was not how the Russian Revolution was supposed to turn out. The Bolsheviks, like all the revolutionary socialist and even anarchist parties throughout the Russian empire, had opposed not only the imperialist war of the old regime, but its standing army and a professional officer corps as bastions of despotism and defenders of the hated autocracy. Instead, the socialists advocated a citizens’ militia of volunteers who would rise up in defense of the Revolution from its enemies. They also called for a just and democratic peace with no annexations or reparations without popular referenda.

4 Lenin’s government quickly realized that the makeshift military forces that had fled in the face of the Germans were not sufficient to defend the revolutionary state. It introduced conscription and, shortly thereafter, command ranks and the employment of former imperial officers as “military specialists”—both to avoid using the hated term “officer” which smacked of elitism and to distinguish the “bourgeois” former officers from the new “proletarian” commanders who would eventually take their places. The Red commanders were to be recruited among the workers and peasants. Other important political “insurance” measures that were adopted early in the Red Army’s history was the commissar, a political appointee, ideally, a tested member of the Bolshevik party, whose signature was required on all commanders’ orders in a system known as “dual command;” and the other important rival for power, the Cheka, which had “special sections” in the Red Army to watch over the commanders, commissars, and Red Army men. The word “soldiers” was also banned from the revolutionary lexicon for its association with the imperial army.
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Polish-Soviet Prisoners of War, 1919-1920

Francesca Piana

In the aftermath of World War I, Boris Souvarine was detained in a French prison when this picture portraying prisoners of war on the Polish-Soviet front was shot around 1919-1920. There is no information about the authorship, the setting, the technology, or the precise context in which the picture was taken.
The picture portrays a group of nearly fifty men, a few women, and several children in the background standing and sitting on two wooden boats. It is not clear why young boys or women who are not combatants would be included. Among the subjects portrayed, some have a serious expression, others a tired look, while still others have more curious eyes. It is possible that the camera itself provoked curiosity in the people portrayed. A few men wear eye patches, with white bandages around their faces, necks, and arms. These elements, in conjunction with the caption, situate the picture in a wartime setting.

The photo does not reveal whether these are Polish prisoners in Soviet captivity or Red Army soldiers held by the Poles. The white-bordered ‘czapka’, a cap identified with Polish cavalry, worn by one of the prisoners would suggest that these are Poles. However, the ‘czapka’ could just as well have been taken by a Soviet soldier from a Pole, dead or alive. Other headgear, notably that of the bandaged soldier, would seem to bear a red star, as would another cap. The precise date is not indicated but the winter gear of the prisoners speaks for an autumnal or springtime date, before or after the river has frozen over in winter and not during the hot summer.

The Soviet-Polish war was one of the regional wars that broke out after World War I. The latter had caused huge destruction to the European continent at large – something that Souvarine experienced directly, being on the French front himself and losing his brother on the battlefield. The aftermath of World War I was no less violent: peace in Europe was still fragile and far from being achieved. Fought between 1919 and 1921, the Soviet-Polish War has to be understood against the territorial arrangements that were agreed or contested at the end of World War I. After initial success the Poles were pushed back to the shores of the Vistula, inspiring hopes among the Bolsheviks and their allies, notably at the Second Congress of the Comintern in July 1920, that they were soon going to reach Berlin, thus kindling the flames of world revolution. Soviet defeat at the decisive battle of Warsaw in August 1920 put an end to such expectations.
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May Day Celebration, Petrograd, Field of Mars, 1917

Andrea Panaccione

On 9 May 1917, according to the Julian calendar then in use in Russia, the Petrograd Soviet announced its decision to make the date for the celebration of May Day coincide with that of 1 May in the West. Until then, Russian workers had celebrated the proletarian feast of May Day according to the old style calendar. Only in the western territories of the empire and in Poland did workers take to the streets on the same day as
their foreign comrades, that is on what was in Russia, 18 April. The tsarist government and the Orthodox clergy had preserved the Julian calendar seeing in it the symbol of Russia's detachment from Europe and European thinking. Thanks to the overthrow of the tsarist regime, for Russia 1 May 1917 also meant the first free and open celebration of that day, the end of the heroic but clandestine maevki (May assemblies) held beyond urban borders, in the woods or in suburban parks, an end to the hesitant and contentious marches toward city centers, often at the price of harsh repressions.

2 The coincidence between the celebrations in Russia and in Europe highlighted May Day's international character. On 1 May 1917, the rallying cries echoing in many manifestations all around the world concerned Russia, with the masses worn out by three years of war expressing hopes raised by the Appeal to the Peoples of the World for a peace without annexations and indemnities based on popular self-determination. Despite their divisions, European socialists looked towards revolutionary Russia. Some were in Petrograd, notably Albert Thomas, an experienced reformist and Minister of Armaments and Weapon Production in the French union sacrée government, who had come to support continuation of the war but who still experienced some subversive thrills on this day. In later Soviet tradition, and in historiography as well, this 1 May 1917, the one closest to the spirit of that day, would be, if not removed, then downsized to that of a transitional moment towards the proletariat’s conquest of power, systematically underlining its popular – rather than class- character and the lack of clear answers to the country’s dramatic situation, given the still minority role of the Bolsheviks compared to other socialist trends.
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May Day Celebration, Petrograd, 1918

Andrea Panaccione

The sign at the bottom of the photograph reads in Russian: "Первый пролетарский праздник 1 мая 1918 г. в Петрограде" – "The first proletarian holiday of May 1, 1918 in Petrograd". Black and white postcard; 9 x 14 cm.

In Soviet Russia, 1 May 1918, stood for celebration of the new power arisen from the October Revolution. It became an official holiday when the Soviet State adapted the Russian (Julian) calendar to the European (Gregorian) one and at the same time substituted new revolutionary holidays for the old tsarist ones (the so-called “red calendar”). On 12 April 1918 the Decree on the Monuments of the Republic created a specific committee in Moscow – where the government’s headquarters had been transferred in March 1918 – to quickly arrange the city’s decorations for May Day and to
replace signs, emblems, street names etc. with new inscriptions reflecting the ideas and
the feelings of revolutionary Russia. Similar committees were created in Petrograd and in
other main centers. On 27 April Izvestiia published an appeal by the Soviet Central
Executive Committee with the text of the main slogans that were to characterize May Day
celebrations in all Russia and, at the same time, Pravda published the appeal and slogans
of what had become in March 1918 the Russian Communist Party.

2 This first May Day celebration could not have taken place in a more difficult situation.
The BrestLitovsk Peace Treaty of March 1918, which had taken from the Russian state
territories of vital importance, was followed by the beginning of the Civil War. Precisely
in these days the first units of the Red Army – for whom this 1 May would become the
first official parade – were being created.

3 Despite the singularity of the situation, it is possible to discern in the celebrations of this
day some features and issues that would regularly recur in the history of May Day in the
USSR: the mobilization of state and party organs in setting up the celebration of May Day;
the political mobilization of the masses on behalf of the objectives that, time after time,
were the order of the day; the participation of wide sectors of artists and intellectuals in
the decoration and scenography of the cities and in the organization of exhibitions, and
their difficult relationship with the tastes of both the masses and the political authorities,
even at a time when a party aesthetic theory had not yet been formulated; the
contradiction between the proclaimed attribution of a main role to the masses and the
prevalence of controls that rapidly eliminated any expression of spontaneity; the
unacceptability of the participation of opposition forces (or those in any way critical of
the existing power); the intimidating and demonstrative meaning assumed by the
presence of the military; the elaboration of a specific language for managing the masses,
with terms like ‘massovodstvo’ (the direction of the masses), ‘massovik’ (parades and
mass plays organizer), massovii organizator, rukovoditel’, administrator, ‘aktivizator’
(organizer, supervisor, administrator, “activizer” of the masses).

4 All this, along which Lunacharsky’s lyrical invocation that “the whole people will
demonstrate to itself its own soul” paved the way for what would later be replaced by
other, more concrete objectives.

---
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May Day Celebration, Petrograd, [Nevsky prospekt?], 1920

Andrea Panaccione


The man in the Astrakhan hat in the middle is Grigori Zinoviev, President of Executive Committee of the Comintern since 1919 but here appearing in his role as the Bolshevik in charge of Petrograd. The winter clothes worn by Zinoviev and those in the forefront of the demonstration suggest that it was a cold May Day in the northern capital that year but the absence of snow on the ground practically excludes an October anniversary celebration and thus May Day, as indicated on the photo, is not improbable.
In 1920, Soviet Russia was undergoing the final phase of the Civil War and the problems related to the economic reconstruction of the country began to become a priority. May reflected this new climate emphasizing the theme of work and the characterization of the day as ‘vserossiiskii subbotnik’, the voluntary Saturday work that had been extended to all Russia after some earlier avant garde experiences. In 1920, the regulation of voluntary work in the subbotniki, for which a committee (Glavnyi Komitet po vseobshchei povinnosti) had been appointed, contradicted the exaltation of voluntary work; moreover, the generalization of the commitment to work incorporated in the very name of this institution completely denied its voluntary character.

The “spectacularization” of communist work inaugurated in 1920, i.e., the notion that work should be admired and that the masses should be incited to work, would remain one of the constant features of Soviet celebrations of 1 May and would contribute to make this day the greatest occasion for tourism and political pilgrimage and for spreading the image of the socialist society in the world. One of the first among the countless well-disposed visitors to Moscow would summarize, in 1920, the nature of the substantial difference between celebrations in Russia and in capitalist countries: “The meaning of this May Day is different from that of the capitalist countries,” he wrote, “under capitalism, the proletariat demonstrates its socialist will by interrupting its work, while in socialist Russia it does so by intensifying its work”.

These were only the first signals of a theatrical and ritualistic exaltation of labor, while, in reality, the celebration was organized in such a way of as to control and subdue labor, to impose this new understanding of labor upon common sense as expressed by an old Russian proverb: “work is not a wolf, for it does not run away into the woods”.
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Urutsky Square, Petrograd [1919]

Jean-François Fayet

The back of the document reads (in Russian and French): “Площадь Уритского” – “Place Ouritzky”.
Black and white photograph; 10.5 x 15.5 cm.

1 The photo may refer to a meeting held during the Second Congress of the Comintern on 19 July 1920. We are assuming it more likely depicts a rally on 1 May International Workers’ Day, 1919.

2 The rally is held on Uritsky Square, formerly Palace Square. The square was renamed in honor of Moise Uritsky, People’s Commissar for Internal Affairs of the Petrograd region assassinated by a Socialist Revolutionary and it kept this name until 1944 when it reverted to its previous name. The photo is taken from one of the stoops of the Hermitage, already a museum since 1852 and today housing the largest collection of
paintings in the world. In the background, on the right, one sees the Eastern façade of the Admiralty building, the historic heart of the city built by Peter I. Above the trees of the Alexander Garden one can make out the dome of the cathedral of St. Isaac the Dalmatian, named after Peter the Great’s patron saint, which rises above the trees. In this garden or park, renamed Workers’ Garden, a number of strollers were killed during the First Russian Revolution, on Red Sunday in January 1905. The crowd is turning its back to the Alexander Column, designed (like St. Isaac’s cathedral) by the French architect, Auguste de Montferrand, and erected by him and the Swiss architect, Antonio Adamini, in 1834.

Traditionally, Palace Square was used for military parades in tsarist times. It was no less used for the ceremonies of the new régime. All demonstrations and commemorative parades passed through Uritsky Square which also provided a decor for the mass displays or mass actions organized in connection with the commemorations of October. These included the famous “Taking of the Winter Palace” of Nikolai Evreinov and Yuri Annenkov which involved the participation of several thousand people.

The crowd in a visibly festive mood listened to the speakers. Whether before or after having circled the square, the crowd proceeded via Khalturin Street, to the Field of Mars housing the tombs and the monument to the victims of the Revolution.

The cult of the dead was characteristic of Soviet commemorative practices in the era of the Civil War. The Mayday celebration characteristically ended with a popular ball and other festivities in the evening.
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Zinoviev’s Speech, May Day, Petrograd, 1918

Andre Liebich

The sign reads in Russian: “1 мая 1918 г. Речь Предс. Сов. Комиссаров Петроград. Труд. Коммуны Г. Зиновьева на Марсовом поле” - “[1 May 1918. The speech of the Chairman of the Commissars’ Council of the Petrograd Labour Commune G.Zinoviev on the Field of Mars]”. Black and white photograph, 8 x 11.5 cm.

Grigorii Zinoviev had been one of Lenin’s closest associates from a very early date. They fell out over the question of an armed insurrection in 1917, advocated by Lenin but opposed by Zinoviev (and Lev Kamenev). However, Zinoviev soon regained his prominent position in the Party. He was re-elected to the Central Committee at the Seventh Party Congress in March 1918 and was soon Party Chief in Petrograd. It is in this capacity that
he is addressing the masses on the first May Day after the October Revolution, if the caption inscribed directly on the photo is to be believed.

2 Zinoviev is described by Victor Serge, at one time an ardent revolutionary but eventually a stern critic of Bolshevism, as endowed with “an unruly shock of hair, a somewhat flabby, clean shaven face, a careless appearance, a low voice which can become strident when he wants to be sure of being heard.” In fact, here, as well as in the other photo of Souvarine’s collection where Zinoviev is depicted at the Nikolaevskii Station, his appearance appears quite dapper.

3 The date of 1 May is plausible as Zinoviev himself is standing without hat or gloves whereas the woman and child next to him are bundled up in winter clothes, suggesting that it is a cold spring day. One is surprised by the presence of the woman and child but no explanation is given. Zinoviev appears to be speaking from a motor vehicle, which suggests that this is just one stop in his circuit of that day. The Field of Mars where this speech is taking place had been a military parade ground in tsarist days. It became the burial place of victims of the February Revolution and, later, of those who fell in the wake of the Bolshevik seizure of power or who died in the course of the Civil War, yet to unleash its strength after the event that this photo identifies.
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Subbotnik, Saturday volunteer work, [Moscow or Petrograd?], June 1920

Joseph C. Bradley

In April 1919, workers in the freight yards of the Moscow-Kazan Railway Line launched what was later to become a mass movement of unpaid labor known as the subbotnik, a word derived from the Russian word for Saturday (in turn derived from the Russian word for 'Saturday', 'subbotnyi').
for Sabbath). They are not to be confused with the religious sect of Subbotniki, a heretical movement in Russian orthodoxy which, in its absorption in the Old Testament, gravitated towards Judaism.

Initially, the communist subbotniki, such as that depicted in this picture, were sporadic local efforts, largely loading and unloading freight and repairing railway lines. In fact, the emblem on the workers’ caps worn by most of the men in this photograph would seem to be that of Russian railroad workers. Judging by the pile of logs on the upper level of the photograph they appear to have hauled wood to fuel their locomotives. The people in the picture are a very diverse crowd. In addition to the railroad workers, the crowd includes men and women of all ages, perhaps even of diverse social classes, as well as children. Although the people here appear to be resting the communist subbotniki reflected the revolutionary enthusiasm that could sometimes be found in the early days of Soviet power and the desire to save the revolution from the threats of Admiral Aleksandr Kolchak’s and General Anton Denikin’s White Armies. The subbotniki also took place in the context of efforts to mobilize labor and strengthen labor discipline.

Lenin enthusiastically gave the imprimatur of the state in an article entitled “A Great Beginning: On the Heroism of Workers Behind the Front Lines. Concerning Communist Subbotniki” (“Velikii pochin: O geroizme rabochikh v tylu. Po povodu kommunisticheskikh subbotnikov”) published in Pravda on 28 June 1919. In Lenin’s eyes, the subbotniki were the “cell of a new, socialist society” of “communist consciousness” and the work performed was not simply overtime but exemplary “revolutionary-style” work.

---
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Subbotnik, the Kremlin, Moscow, May Day [1920?]

Joseph C. Bradley

The back of the document reads in Russian: “4204. Первомайский субботник в Кремле” — [“4204. 1 May subbotnik in the Kremlin”]. Black and white photograph; 9 x 12 cm.

1 By spring 1920, the movement of unpaid labor known as the ‘subbotnik’ had become an organized mass phenomenon. Initially, the ‘subbotniks’ had been sporadic local efforts, largely loading and unloading freight and repairing railway lines. These initiatives then reflected revolutionary enthusiasm and the desire to save the revolution from the many threats hanging over it.
The Moscow Party Committee formed a Department of Subbotniks and by a decree of the Central Executive Committee of the Russian Republic, May Day 1920 was decreed a subbotnik. Subbotniks also accompanied labor mobilization schemes such as Cleanliness Week, Transport Week, and Labor Front Week. Party members were expected to participate; likewise Red Army soldiers garrisoned in Moscow were ordered to work. Non-Party civilians were incentivized to participate by rewards of extra rations of food and fuel. As the movement expanded, so too did the work sites, as participants not only repaired the railways and factory machinery but also engaged in a “spring cleaning” of streets, parks, and buildings.

Work in Palace Square, renamed Uritsky Square in honor of a martyr of the Revolution, Moisei Uritsky, the head of the Petrograd Cheka or political police who had been assassinated, and work in the Moscow Kremlin pictured here received great fanfare as symbols of the creation of a new socialist society. Lenin himself helped remove timber from the Kremlin, a moment portrayed in a painting by Vladimir Krikhatsky, Lenin at the First Subbotnik. The poet Velmir Khlebnikov wrote a verse with the rather oxymoronic title “Labor Holiday,” and propaganda claimed that, “the trash you are picking up was left by capitalism!” The movement was taken over by the Party (“partified”) and combined elements of voluntarism, mobilization, and coercion. Spontaneity was replaced by ritual and “work performance.” However, the subbotniks became an annual day of spring cleaning of public spaces throughout the Soviet period and are still a festive occasion after the last snow has melted in the Russian Federation.
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Zinoviev at Nikolaevskii Train Station, Petrograd [1921-1924?]

Andre Liebich

Grigorii Zinoviev was the first Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Comintern, from its inception in 1919 until he was driven from power at the end of 1926, although he continued to participate in Comintern activities at least until 1928. He was also Boris Souvarine’s nemesis, to whom Souvarine attributed responsibility for his exclusion from the Comintern secretariat.
In those early days Zinoviev controlled the Comintern. According to Victor Serge, the Executive Committee of the Comintern existed in name only, “Zinoviev attended to everything,” sometimes consulting Lenin, more often Nikolai Bukharin and Karl Radek. One can understand Souvarine’s complaint that the dictatorship of the proletariat had been replaced by the dictatorship of the secretariat. Souvarine’s quip applied equally well to Zinoviev’s control over the Comintern as to Stalin’s takeover of the Bolshevik Party after Lenin’s death in 1924. Even in Victor Serge’s account written from the anti-communist perspective that was to be Souvarine’s, the latter is described as “biting, imperious, unruly, perpetually asking embarrassing questions.” No wonder, Zinoviev was keen to get rid of him.

Here Zinoviev is portrayed in this photo, at an unknown date, at the Nikolaevskii Station in Petrograd. He is surrounded by tough looking military men, soldiers and a sailor, one of whom is looking suspiciously into the camera. These men probably constituted Zinoviev’s bodyguard, essential companions at a time when memory was still fresh of the assassination of other Bolsheviks in Petrograd, such as Moisei Uritsky and the attempt on Lenin’s life at the same time. It was also a time of hunger when someone could be mugged in the street for a loaf of bread. The portly Zinoviev had every reason to be cautious and surround himself with a protective guard.

The Nikolaevskii station had been built in 1844 as the terminal for the Moscow-Petersburg railway line. It was renamed Oktiabrskaya Station in 1924 and Leningradskaya Station in 1935. It is now known as the Moscow Railway Terminal. The freight station where goods were transferred from ships to railway travel inland lies behind the passenger terminal and is not visible here.
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Ploshchad' Vosstaniya [May Day 1920?]

Andre Liebich

This photo depicts a group, mostly of men, many in military or quasi-military attire, but also a few children and one woman in the background on the Ploshchad' Vosstaniya or Uprising Square. They appear to be relaxing after having participated in a procession or demonstration; a man with a balalaika, a popular Russian variant of the lute, is standing amidst the group. Their spring clothing would suggest that this was a 1 May celebration, as evidenced also by the flags and decorative festooning around the square, although...
another photograph (May Day Celebration, Petrograd, [Nevsky prospekt?]), allegedly representing the same event, has demonstrators wearing winter coats and, even in the case of Grigorii Zinoviev, a fur hat.

2 Insurrection Square was named after the bloody confrontation that had taken place there early in 1917. Previously, it had been named Znamenskaya Ploshchad' after the church of the Sign which stood from the turn of the 19th century until 1940. The Square was a sacred lieu de mémoire for the young Soviet régime, though the Square was encumbered by the equestrian statue of Alexander III which stood there and which was covered on this and other occasions – one of the solutions, along with topographical renaming, adopted by the new authorities to deal with Petrograd’s imperial past.

3 The statue of recent Soviet vintage shows two women, one holding a hammer, in triumphant pose. At their feet lies a victim, presumably one of the victims of the 1917 insurrection after whom the Square has been named. It is possible, though unlikely, that the man at their feet is a member of the defeated oppressors’ class. Not only does his skeletal body differ from the obesity characteristic in Soviet iconography of the oppressors but such a representation would be too reminiscent of the St. George-slaying-the-dragon motif much favored in tsarist times. It is not clear what the second woman is pouring onto the victim. The sculptor also appears to be unknown.

4 A photo of a May Day 1921 demonstration involving a huge crowd at the same spot shows the same statue but even more elaborate decoration. This would suggest that the 1920 date for this photo is probably accurate.
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Soviet Life in 1931
At the end of the 1920s, after Stalin had defeated both the Left and the Right Opposition, the Soviet Union embarked upon what would be known as the Velikii Perelom or the “Great Upheaval.” This involved a radical and ruthless campaign of collectivization of agriculture and a forced, intensive process of industrialization. These great collective efforts changed the face of the Soviet Union and affected every one of its citizens.
The series of photographs preserved in the Souvarine collection under the heading “Soviet Life in 1931”, reflect their times in ways that are revealing in many different aspects. They may have been intended as propaganda but they portray more than they intend. In this photograph we may note the freshness of the face of the “Russian” boy (though perhaps Ukrainian?), a collective farm peasant in the North Caucasus, his unassuming gaze, his confidence with his horses. At the same time the bareness of the landscape and the poor clothing give a sense of the hardships endured by Soviet peasants.

This picture, as well as the others in the series, have a directness and simplicity about them but without the glorification and heroism of Socialist Realist depictions in films and paintings. This is realism that exposes a “socialist” revolution that was about hard work and the delayed possibility of a better life. One can only guess at the later fate of this young boy, whether he was one of the millions soon destined to starve along with other peasants, whether he would be killed in action during the Second World War or perish in a German prison camp, or whether he would be among the more fortunate ones who would survive hunger and war and return to a devastated land.

One of the reasons advanced, both by political actors and historians, for the decision to undertake “The Great Upheaval” was the need to prepare the country for the war that was bound to come. At the time this picture was taken, in 1931, Stalin warned that the Soviet Union had ten years to prepare itself for a fateful confrontation. The disarming assurance of the boy in the picture suggests that he does not foresee any of the tragedies that the country would encounter. If he thought of the future it was in the terms that Stalin proclaimed, “Life will be more joyous, comrades,” he promised. Here though the toughness of making it through the day is much more evident than the joy.
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Medical Consultation, Forest Exploitation, Orletsk

Lewis H. Siegelbaum

One thing the Soviet Union had in abundance was forests and felling timber proved an essential part of the Soviet economy. This was especially the case during the 1930s when...
exports of wood and wood products provided the USSR with otherwise scarce foreign currency.

2 As settlement authorities promoted migration to ever-more remote and sparsely populated regions, such as the Amur River basin bordering on China, virgin forests became targets of exploitation. There does not seem to be information available about the Orletsk Forest Exploitation identified here though it may have taken its name from a nearby Orthodox monastery that had been functioning since the 15th century. The Kholmogorsky District in which the Orletsk Forest Exploitation is located is part of Archangelsk Oblast (region) in the far North of Russia. Though remote, it boasts Mikhail Lomonosov, father of Russian science, as one of its sons. Today, Moscow University is named after Lomonosov as is the village in the Kholmogorsky District where he was born. Timber cutting has long been and is still the principal industry in that part of the country.

3 Timber cutting was a dangerous activity and that, as well as the harsh climate of the area, made this particular polyclinic a busy place. Loss of fingers from accidents and frostbite were the most common maladies. At least in the 1930s and 1940s lumberjacks overwhelmingly were collective farmers working seasonally (primarily in winter) to supplement their all too meager incomes. So crucial was their labor to the production of timber that in November 1933 the Soviet government required each collective farm in certain designated areas to include logging and rafting in their production plans, and assume full responsibility for their fulfillment. In later years, the labor reserve system sent collective farmers to forests, but increased mechanization and professionalization encouraged a more permanent labor force.

4 Perhaps intentionally, the photographer has portrayed a group of patients where timber workers appear to be absent. At the center of attention is a young boy sitting in a wheel chair with a bandaged left hand and a bandaged, perhaps amputated, right leg. His winter garb and that of his neighbors suggests that this is a winter scene and the cause of the boy’s misfortune is therefore probably frost bite. In sharp contrast to the appearance of the patients is the figure in white, with his back turned and barely visible at the right of the photo. This would probably be the doctor who seems to be speaking to – scolding? – the boy. This sort of public or collective consultation would not have been the rule. Another consultation area is visible behind the waiting room but, in this case, the white-coated specialist may be trying to give a lesson to all those around him.
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Youth Active in the Harvest

Hiroaki Kuromiya

An all-female Youth Brigade at harvest time ready and, supposedly, eager to undertake its task: Agricultural labor was intense and seasonal. Sowing and harvest had to be completed within a limited range of time and therefore required concentrated labor. In the Soviet Union, most agricultural activity was collectivized in the early 1930s, meaning that collective farms (kolkhozes) or state farms (sovkhozes) replaced individual farming on
small plots. More than 60% of peasant families were in collective farms by late summer 1931, a plateau not surpassed for three years. The assumption was that agricultural work, like industrial work, was to be mechanized, and large-scale collective farming was expected to become far more productive than old, individual farming.

2 This proved to be a fantasy. By all estimates, Soviet agriculture stagnated and continued to lag far behind European standards for various reasons, both political and technical. Mechanization proved difficult to implement in the absence of machinery and of mechanical skills. Mismanagement compounded these problems. As a result, human labor still played the predominant role in Soviet agriculture, then and later. Many people, especially young people, such as students, were mobilized as “volunteers” to help collective farms at sowing and harvest times.

3 The present photograph shows young, purportedly Ukrainian, girls, all in decorative attire, with impeccable white socks, sent to a village for harvesting. The fact that the girls are dressed alike in festive costumes and aligned in quasi military fashion wielding their hoes like rifles suggests that this photo was a propaganda exercise designed to emphasize the theme of mass mobilization. The photographer does not seem to have noticed the church in the background, hardly a positive element in Bolshevik iconography. Millions were to die of famine in Ukraine in the following years but the harvest in 1930 to which this photo refers was a bumper crop. This photograph thus shows a picture of well-fed girls gazing into the camera with a sense of purpose and dedication. There is no sign of the disaster that was soon to overtake the Ukrainian countryside at that time.
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Sovkhoz Medical Consultation

Lewis H. Siegelbaum

State farms (sovchozy) distinguished themselves from collective farms in a number of respects. First, as state-owned entities, they hired and paid workers a wage, much as industrial enterprises did. This meant that, like other kinds of workers but unlike collective farmers, state farm workers belonged to trade unions. Second, state farms
tended to specialize. Some concentrated on livestock and dairy production; others cultivated particular fruits and vegetables; while still others raised exotic species such as sable and mink. Third, state farms contained scientifically trained staff devoted to experimentation, for example, in cross-breeding.

2 Although the earliest state farms date back to 1918, the period of their greatest growth, like that of collective farms, occurred during the late 1920s and early 1930s. In August 1928, the Soviet government decreed the formation of “grain factories” (zernozavody) to expand wheat and other grain cultivation on the steppe. The first of these, aptly named “Giant” (“Gigant”), was located in Rostov Oblast (region). It contained 240,000 hectares, covering over 70 kilometers from north to south. Much celebrated at the time of its inauguration, the farm eventually became notorious for over-extension, that is, the sin of “giganticism”. Meanwhile, the number of state farms rose from some 4,000 in 1940 to well over 7,000 by 1960.

3 State farms provided not only employment but also medical services. In 1918, Soviet Russia became the first country to promise universal “cradle-to-grave” healthcare coverage through the complete socialization of medicine. The "right to health" thus became a “constitutional right” of Soviet citizens. It was developed under the Commissar for Public Health throughout the 1920s, Nikolai Aleksandrovich Semashko and reached remote areas.

4 As this photograph illustrates, women comprised the majority of medical personnel. Indeed, along with teaching, medicine was one of the few professions that Soviet gender norms encouraged women to enter. Salaries remained correspondingly low. Nevertheless, the expansion of medical services in rural areas may have been the most beneficial social consequence of the institution of state farms.

5 The young woman doctor, with a sensible short modern haircut and properly attired in a white coat, with medical equipment on her desk is clearly a novice. She seems to be as intimidated as her patient, a long-bearded peasant of venerable age. In all likelihood she was seconded to this makeshift clinic, with the rough plank door one sees behind her, soon after graduation. She may have been the first doctor to tend to the villagers’ needs and most probably the first female doctor which may explain her patient’s embarrassment.
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Festivity in North Caucasus
Collective Farm

Lewis H. Siegelbaum

In 1931 collective farms (kolkhozy) were still new institutions to which peasants were adjusting. Only two years earlier in 1929 such farms had enrolled a mere 57,000 homesteads comprising less than four percent of the total and only about five percent of
all sown area. Even in 1930 after Soviet authorities had launched full-scale collectivization, more than three-quarters of all peasant households remained outside of collective farms as did two-thirds of sown area. But 1931 proved a breakthrough year, for by year’s end, more than half of all peasant households resided in collective farms, cultivating some two-thirds of all sown territory.

2 We know that most peasants experienced collectivization as a catastrophe. Loss of decision-making over the allocation of whatever resources they had possessed, the crushing burden of the unequal exchange with procurement authorities, and the imposition of a new system of accounting (“labor days”) created bitter antipathy to the institution, leading to much artful dodging and other weapons of the weak. Yet, although historians have paid much less attention to it, evidence of making do, of eking out moments of entertainment and enjoyment, and, in the long term, making lives within collective farm society abounds.

3 This photograph seeks to testify to the fact that peasants continued to celebrate much as they had before collectivization. Participants of both sexes and all ages, wrapped in winter clothing - it is 5 February, after all, as the banner on the right proclaims - appear to be waiting for the festivity to begin, perhaps with handouts of food and drink. The numerous banners would suggest that they had just concluded the formal part of the ceremony that would have included speeches and perhaps a march. Soon, the fun would begin. Women were to dance with men and with each other to music provided by the accordion. In this manner, the sense of community that had survived the deportation of kulaks (peasants identified as exploitative and therefore ineligible for membership in collective farms) was reinforced. And though succeeding decades saw considerable rural depopulation, the institution remained dominant in the countryside until the end of the Soviet Union in 1991.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


Fishermen in Collective Farm, Novorossiisk

Hiroaki Kuromiya


1 Communism emphasized collectivism. As in agriculture, in fishery and other economic activities too, collective efforts were regarded as inherently superior and productive. Fishing collectives were thus created en masse from the late 1920s onward. This collective is one such entity in Novorossiisk, situated in the north-eastern shore of the Black Sea.
Novorossiisk, established in what was known as Novorossiya and is now in the province of Krasnodar, was an important and strategic port in the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union. Located in an inlet of the Black Sea it was one of the country’s very few ports that did not regularly freeze over in the winter time. The name (New Russian Town) long ruled by Ottoman Turks who fortified the city, fell into Russian hands only in the first half of the nineteenth century. The coastline was ceded to Russia after one of the numerous Russo-Turkish wars that marked the second half of the 18th century and continued throughout the 19th century and into the First World War.

As was true of many other parts of the Soviet Union, especially Ukraine, the Northern Caucasus (where Novorossiisk is situated), the Volga regions, and Kazakhstan, Novorossiisk was severely affected by food shortages and famine in the first half of the 1930s. Under such conditions, fishing provided an essential resource to alleviate famine in Novorossiisk as elsewhere in the Soviet Union at that time. The famine may not have been as perceptible at the time the photo was taken as it was to be within a few years when it was to ravage the entire region.

The seven fishermen in the photo are perfectly anonymous, as befits Soviet ideological precepts. Unlike several of the other pictures in this series, however, they are all male and appear to be of mature age. Unwittingly, the photo also suggests that they are not very familiar with their task. One man is looking to his neighbor in obvious bewilderment as to how to proceed. Nor do the others seem to be sure-handed with their nets. The legend on the photo specifies that they are only preparing to work which would conveniently explain away why there are no fish in their nets. The heavy clothes they are wearing may be due to the season but, in any case, are suitable for the early morning exercise in which they are engaged. The impression of early twilight is heightened by the colors of the photo, obviously gray even on a black and white background. One would expect a boat to be waiting to take the fishermen out to sea but there is none in sight. Perhaps the fishermen are expected to wade into the waters in the tall boots they are wearing.
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Listening to the Radio, Volga Region

Hiroaki Kuromiya

1 Radio communication was invented at the end of the 19th century. Although the Italian physicist Guglielmo Marconi is usually credited with its invention, for which he was awarded a Nobel prize in physics in 1909, Russia, whether Soviet or non-Soviet, claims that one of its physicists Aleksandr Stepanovich Popov was the real inventor preceding Marconi. He has received Western recognition of sorts in seeing that the main auditorium
of the International Telecommunications Union headquarters in Geneva has recently been named after him.

Whenever the inventor of the radio, in a vast country like Russia and the Soviet Union where communication was always very difficult, a wireless transmission of sound promised to improve communication greatly. The Bolshevik government did not fail to take note of its political utility as a propaganda tool. It had military significance as well. In fact, Popov is said to have been prohibited from publishing his invention by imperial Russia’s military authorities. In a country where literacy was still very limited (in 1917 more than half of the adult population in the Russian Empire were illiterate), visual and aural communication was indispensable: films, posters, radio proved to be the most useful. While films and posters needed some time to be produced, radio communication was simpler and quicker.

The transmission of human voices over the air waves first took place in Bolshevik Russia in 1919, two years after the October Revolution. Although music was also an important part of radio programs, political information and agitation became the core of Soviet broadcasts. From the early 1920s “radio points” began to be created in the country where radio programs were broadcast over loud-speakers, even in far-away hamlets, and people gathered and listened to them.

This photograph shows such a point in a village in the Lower Volga region of Russia in 1931. Entitled “Radio is the best guide of culture in the village” the photo shows a broad cross-section of listeners, from a mother with an infant to an older man in a typical peasant shirt and an adolescent. It is likely that the smiles on the faces of the young boy and a woman are not due to the content of the broadcast but rather to the thrill of being photographed as those whose face is turned away from the camera appear to be listening intently. The scene illustrates neatly how educational and propaganda themes blended seamlessly. The culture that was diffused by radio was, obviously, Soviet culture where raising the level of political and cultural consciousness was part and parcel of the Bolshevik experiment.
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Factory Entrance

Lewis H. Siegelbaum

The Stalinist frenzy to industrialize the entire Soviet Union as quickly as possible is nicely captured in the slogan above the entrance to the factory shown in the photograph: “We will fulfill the Five-Year Plan in four years!” Assuming the obligation to overfulfill the...
plan – what came to be known as “counter-planning” – pervaded Soviet industry at this
time. The chief means for accomplishing this goal was socialist competition, a set
of recursive challenges issued by groups (aka brigades) of workers to other brigades, among
different sections of the same factory, or even between entire factories to best their
performance. So long as they overfulfilled their targets, participants in socialist
competition bore the exalted title of “shock brigades.” Members of shock brigades
enjoyed certain privileges such as higher quality or greater quantities of food in factory
canteens.

2 In the photograph, the wire shop of the factory had fulfilled its plan for the first ten days
of December by 101 percent, whereas the rolling shop lagged far behind at 71 percent,
earning it the shameful prize of the crab. Each section’s daily output is displayed for all to
see as they arrive at work. These efforts to inculcate a new, more responsible and more
modern work culture faced many obstacles. Older, more skilled workers resented such
intrusions from agitators and the enthusiasm of youthful upstarts. Younger workers,
overwhelmingly from the countryside, looked on much of their new environment with
stupefaction. Even with the best of intentions, workers often lacked necessary equipment
and supplies, to say nothing of safety training and devices. Accident rates were
appallingly high; breakdowns frequent; and shamming or “phony shock work” endemic.

3 In 1927, Nikolai Bukharin, the “gentle Bolshevik,” opposed Stalin’s over-ambitious plans
by pointing out that, “you can’t build today’s factories with tomorrow’s bricks.” True
enough, but for better or for worse – and for quite a while now, the verdict among
historians has been that the Communist Party under Stalin operated according to a
different ethos. As Stalin put it toward the end of the speech cited above, “There are no
fortresses the Bolsheviks cannot storm.”
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Stephen Kotkin, Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilization, Berkeley: University of California

Kenneth Straus, Factory and Community in Stalin’s Russia: the Making of an Industrial Working Class,
Pioneers of Uzbekistan as Guests of Moscow Pioneers

Sergey Abashin

This photo underscores the remarkable cultural and regional diversity of the Soviet experience. The USSR inherited from the Russian Empire a multiplicity of different languages, religions, ethnic and tribal identities. Central Asia was one of the largest regions, which found itself in the sphere of Russian influence in the second half of the 19th century. This faraway region, inhabited by Muslims, known for the cities of Bukhara...
and Samarkand and for the Pamir Mountains, was seen as a territory with a military and colonial administration without strong government intervention in the local lifestyle. After the collapse of the Russian Empire in 1917 there was a powerful political movement for independence, known as Basmachestvo, in Central Asia. Only by 1922–1923 did Soviet authorities manage through violence and concessions, to draw some political groups to their side and to suppress others, thus regaining control and integrating the region into the USSR.

Like their imperial predecessors, Soviet politicians treated Central Asia with trepidation, lack of understanding and caution. However, their goals were more ambitious and their actions more resolute. During the 1920s the intervention of Soviet ideology and its institutions increased. The Republics of Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan were created as a result of the national administrative delimitation, carried out in the region in 1924–1925, followed by the creation of an autonomous Tajik Republic in 1929. The statuses of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan were raised to that of a union republic in 1937. By 1927–1928 all Islamic schools and courts had been prohibited. The mass campaign of “liberation of women” started in 1929, comprising removal of facial clothing and the more active involvement of women in public life. In 1930–1931 social and economic reforms, collectivization and dekulakization encompassed the whole Central Asian population. In the same years, the first repressions occurred among the cultural and political elite that had adopted the Soviet system, but looked insufficiently loyal.

One of the main trends in Soviet policy was the formation of a new cultural and political stratum in Central Asia which would have nothing in common with pre-Soviet experience. To achieve this here, as well as in other regions of the Soviet Union, a network of Soviet secondary schools and civil society organizations, including children and youth groups, Pioneers and Komsomols, was established. They were designed to create a new Soviet person, whose cultural experience could be national in form, but necessarily socialist in content.
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The Death of Stalin
“Staline Mourant”, *France Soir*, 5 March 1953

Alexey Antoshin

---

The headings read in French: “Staline mourant”; “Hémorragie cérébrale”; “Le maréchal, qui a perdu connaissance dans la nuit du 1er au 2 mars, est paralysé de la jambe et du bras droits. Il a perdu l’usage de la parole. Son état s’est considérablement aggravé au cours de la nuit dernière”; “Le communiqué du gouvernement”; “Un homme – Molotov ou Malenkov – ou bien un triumvirat succédera à Staline” – (“Stalin dying”; “Cerebral Bleeding”; “The marshal, who lost consciousness on the night of March 1 to 2, is...”

---
paralyzed in the right leg and the right arm. He has lost the use of speech. His condition has worsened considerably during last night”; “The government statement”; “A man – Molotov or Malenkov – or a triumvirate will succeed Stalin”].

2 Stalin’s death was unexpected even for his entourage. One of Stalin’s perennial associates, the head of the construction of the Moscow Metro Lazar Kaganovich later recalled: “Though some of us rarely visited him at home in the last period of his life, nevertheless at conferences or official meetings we were pleased to see that despite war weariness Stalin looked good. He was active, cheerful and still led the discussion in a lively and informative manner.”

3 On 2 March 1953 Stalin suffered a stroke at his residence near Moscow; he was paralyzed and speechless. The agony of the Soviet leader lasted two days as doctors fought for his life. Members of the Politburo – the highest organ of the party in the USSR – were summoned for a tour of duty around the clock organized at Stalin’s bedside.

4 Only on 4 March at 6:30 AM was the first official report on the state of Stalin’s health transmitted by Moscow radio. USSR citizens learned that the leader was gravely ill. Authorities announced that Stalin’s illness would entail “a more or less long period of his non-participation in managing governmental activities.”

5 On 5 March at 8.00 PM a joint meeting, chaired by Nikita Khrushchev began of the USSR’s senior party and government bodies. Present at that meeting the well-known Soviet writer and poet Konstantin Simonov later recalled the impression of relief in the expressions of the party and government leaders: “It was shown involuntarily on their faces” – he recollected – “perhaps with the exception of Molotov’s countenance – motionless, as if petrified.” Georgii Malenkov and Lavrenti Beria appeared to be people “freed from something pressing upon them, binding them.”

6 The news about Stalin’s demise broke an hour after the end of the meeting.
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“Staline est mort”, *L’Humanité*, 6 March 1953

Alexey Antoshin

On 6 March at 6:00 AM the Soviet people learned about Stalin’s death from the radiobroadcast official appeal of higher party and government bodies. The news was relayed by the Central Organ of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party, *L’Humanité*, with a stark headline and an oversized portrait of Stalin that corresponded to the image he had created in his last years. It is not clear whether the text that
accompanies the headline and the photograph on the first page, a reproduction of the
communiqué issued in Moscow, is due to the disarray within the editorial offices of
L’Humanité caused by this news or by the wish not to depart from the line set by the new
Soviet leadership in this communiqué.

2 A Commission on the Organization of Stalin’s Funeral was hastily created in Moscow.
According to the memoirs of Lazar Kaganovich, Nikita Khrushchev asked him while
members of the Commission were traveling in a car accompanying the body of Stalin:
“Lazarus, how shall we live and work without Stalin? It will be hard for us.” In response,
Kaganovich reassured him: “If we hold firmly to Lenin’s path on which Stalin led us, we
shall survive and move forward successfully.”

3 Khrushchev’s anxiety about the upcoming course of events was not limited to the Soviet
leadership. A sense of deep confusion, fear of the future, was widespread throughout the
Soviet Union in the wake of Stalin’s death: “What will happen to us?”; “How shall we live
from now on and what will happen?” people asked themselves and others. Stalin’s
personality had played a decisive role in the Soviet political system, and people could not
imagine how the Soviet Union would evolve without its leader.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Yuri Aksiutin, “Khrushchevskaya ‘ottepel’ i obschestvennye nastroeniya v SSSR v 1953-1964, Moskva:
Rossiiskaya politicheskaya entsyklopediya, 2010, (anonymous quotation p.43)

Lazar’ Kaganovich, Pamyatnye Zapiski rabochego, kommunista-bol’shevika, profsoiuznogo, partiinogo i
sovetsko-gosudarstvennogo rabotnika, Moscow: Vagrius, 1996 (Khrushchev-Kaganovich quotation
p. 500).


Alexey Antoshin

The headlines read in English: "Vishinsky leaving. Foreign Minister Called to Moscow to Report – Will Sail Today"; "Condolences sent. President Orders Terse Formal Note on Stalin Dispatched to Soviet"; "Tribute is omitted. Eisenhower Still Ready to Confer on Peace With the Kremlin"; "Premier Ill 4 days. Announcement of Death Made by Top Soviet and Party Chiefs"; "Stroke proves fatal. Leaders Issue an Appeal to People for Unity and Vigilance"; "Soviet fear of an Eruption Discerned in Call for Unity".

1 The New York Times’ headline announcing Stalin’s death suggests that Stalin’s opponents were just as clueless regarding the Soviet future as were his partisans. The note of
condolences sent by the White House demonstratively omitted a tribute. The headline invoking President Eisenhower’s readiness to enter into peace talks with the new masters of the Kremlin, presumably over the Korean stalemate, could be seen as a pro forma declaration or as an expression of hope for an adjustment of Soviet foreign policy.

2 The brief notice of Andrei Vyshinsky’s departure for Moscow deserves attention. Vyshinsky, a former Attorney General of the USSR had been the head of Soviet diplomacy since March 1949. His name was associated with Stalin’s repressions, as it was he who was a public prosecutor in the so-called “Great Moscow Trials” of 1936–1938. Since 1939, Vyshinsky had been in the diplomatic service; he was in charge of Soviet relations with the United States and the United Kingdom; he also took part in the Yalta Conference (February 1945) and the ceremony of signing of the capitulation of Nazi Germany (May 1945). As Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Vyshinsky was known for sharp, unparliamentary remarks against Western diplomacy. Nevertheless at times he appeared very charming, witty and resourceful, and some Western politicians and journalists (in particular, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Edgar Snow) fell under his charm.

3 According to some Russian historians Vyshinsky was a “minister of Stalin”, “minister of the beginning of the Cold War.” He was not the person suitable for a “warming” in foreign policy, and even less so for the “thaw”. Therefore, on the day of Stalin’s death, Vyshinsky lost his membership in the Presidium of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Minister of Foreign Affairs. On 7 March 1953, the day after The New York Times had reported that he was sailing for Russia, he was appointed Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs and Soviet representative to the United Nations.
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“От Центрального комитета”, Pravda, 6 March 1953

Alexey Antoshin
The communiqué of the senior party and government bodies - the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Council of Ministers and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR – entitled "To all members of the Party, to all workers of the Soviet Union" was transmitted on 6 March 1953 at 6 AM by Moscow radio; on the same day it was printed in the newspaper Pravda. The communiqué read in part:

"The heart of Lenin’s comrade-in-arms and the inspired continuer of Lenin’s cause, the wise leader and teacher of the Communist Party and the Soviet people—Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin—has stopped beating...

Together with Lenin, Comrade Stalin was the inspirer and leader of the great October socialist revolution, founder of the world’s first socialist state. Continuing Lenin’s immortal cause, Comrade Stalin led the Soviet people to the world-historic triumph of socialism in our land. Comrade Stalin led our country to victory over fascism in the Second World War ...
The news of Comrade Stalin’s death will bring profound pain... Our task is to guard the unity of the Party as the apple of our eye, to educate Communists as active political fighters for carrying out the policy and decisions of the Party...

The immortal name of Stalin will live forever in the hearts of the Soviet people and all progressive mankind.

Long live the great and all-conquering teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin!

Long live our mighty socialist motherland!

Long live our heroic Soviet people!

Long live the great Communist Party of Soviet Union!

The communiqué contained an official report on Stalin’s death and the statement of the "collective leadership" regarding its intention to continue the "Leninist-Stalinist" course. However, the document comprised new points as well. In particular, there was no mention of the need to develop heavy industry, an invariable reference under Stalin. Special attention was paid to the necessity of improving the material well-being of the Soviet people. The communiqué did not refer to the fight against the "imperialism", NATO and the United States. No document of the Stalin era could have been issued without such a phrase.
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By the time of Stalin’s death Georgii Malenkov had largely taken control of the state and party apparatus. As the head of the Soviet government, he supervised the work of the governments of the Union republics. He influenced the formation of the agenda, gave the party apparatus, led by Nikita Khrushchev, orders to engage in certain matters, guided the discussion of these issues and formulated the final decrees.

Along with Lavrenti Beria (although questions remain about Beria’s recent proximity to Stalin) Malenkov managed to become one of the people closest to Stalin in the last years of the leader’s life. He was on good terms with the majority of Stalin’s associates. Anastas Mikoyan, Stalin’s and Khrushchev’s comrade, later characterized Malenkov as "an educated electrical engineer, cultured (kul’turnyi), savvy, able to deal with people." According to Mikoyan, Malenkov was never rude, behaved modestly and was "very afraid of Stalin and was ready to do the impossible to strictly comply with any of his instructions."

Russian historians have noted the lack of independence of Malenkov as a political figure. According to the famous historian and dissident Roy Medvedev, Malenkov was a man "without a biography", "who had neither his own face nor his own style;" he was "an instrument of Stalin." He had been on the sidelines for too long to act on his own and he
did not possess Stalin’s will and determination. Ordinary Soviet citizens used to say that Malenkov gave the impression of an educated person but was, at the same time, close to the people. However, most persons did not delve into the reasons for his promotion to a senior position, considering "They, up there, will get it sorted out by themselves".

It was obvious for the nation that none of the leaders was capable of fully replacing Stalin.
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“V Kolonnom zale Doma soiuzov”,
Pravda, 9 March 1953

Alexey Antoshin
"V Kolonnom zale Doma soiuzov", Pravda, 9 March 1953. The headlines read in Russian: "Сегодня советский народ, все прогрессивное человечество провожают в последний путь своего великого вождя и учителя Иосифа Виссарионовича Сталина"; "Бессмертное имя Сталина будет жить вечно!"; "Великое прощание"; "Прибытие в Москву иностранных правительственных делегаций для присутствия на похоронах Председателя Совета Министров Союза ССР Иосифа Виссарионовича Сталина"; ["Today the Soviet people and all progressive mankind see off to the last journey their great leader and teacher Joseph Stalin"; "The immortal name of Stalin will live forever!"; "A great farewell"; "Arrival in Moscow of foreign government delegations to attend the funeral of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Joseph Stalin"]. The sign under the photograph reads in Russian: "В Колонном зале Дома союзов 9 марта 1953 г. На снимке (слева направо) товарищи В.М.Молотов, К.Е.Ворошилов, Л.П.Берия, Г.М.Маленков, И.А.Булганин, Н.С.Хрущев, Л.М.Каганович, А.И.Микоян у гроба товарища И.В.Сталина" – ["In the Hall of Columns on 9 March 1953. In the photo (left to right) comrades Molotov, Voroshilov, Beria, Malenkov, Bulganin, Khrushchev, Kaganovich, Mikoyan at the coffin of Comrade Stalin."

1. The struggle for power and consultations on the new structure of the political system started on 2-5 March at the bedside of the dying Stalin.

2. Of course, already on 3 March Viacheslav Molotov was included into the leadership structure troika [three] that had existed during the last years of Stalin's life, along with Georgii Malenkov and Lavrenti Beria. Soon the "troika" was extended to the "pyaterka" [five] that also included Nikolai Bulganin and a long-term Stalin associate, Lazar Kaganovich. This structure was supposed to symbolize the continuity of the new government with the Stalinist era. Gradually, through the inclusion into the pyaterka of some other leaders in particular, Nikita Khrushchev, the phenomenon of "collective leadership" arose. Its members were neither united by common goals nor like-minded. This structure allowed the creation of a balance of contradictions due to the diverse interests of Stalin's successors. All of them, however, lacked Stalin's charisma.
The various members of the "collective leadership" had varying potentials of personal power. Molotov had been Stalin's long-term ally, the only implacable rival of Beria at that time, and quite popular throughout the country; he had often been heard on the radio during the war; it was he who addressed the nation about the German attack on the Soviet Union on 22 June 1941. Many considered Molotov to be the second person after Stalin among the country's leaders in terms of political influence. However, he was largely discredited in the eyes of the party apparatus by Stalin himself, who had removed him from the circle of his closest advisers in recent years. Khrushchev initially did not reveal his own ambition of attaining sole power.

Malenkov and Beria exerted decisive influence on the formation of the new power structure. Generally it was they who made decisions that were approved later by the other representatives of the political elite. Malenkov was promoted to Head of Government, and Beria became his First Deputy. At the same time, Beria gained control of the combined Ministry of the Interior, which consisted of a variety of special services, in particular, the Ministry of State Security. This was a cause for concern among Stalin's other successors, who feared Beria's attainment of sole power. According to Khrushchev, he said to Bulganin still at the bedside of a dying Stalin: "If Beria receives the State Security Services, it will be the beginning of our end. He will take the position in order to destroy us all." At the initiative of Beria, Marshal Kliment Voroshilov, a general famous from the Civil War period, became the head of the Soviet "Parliament" - the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. According to Khrushchev, with the help of this maneuver Beria wanted to have a man "who will issue decrees formatting what Beria will do when his 'meat grinder' begins to work."
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Before Stalin was buried on 9 March 1953 his body lay in state and masses of Soviet citizens stood in line to pay him their respects.

The vast majority of the Soviet people saw the death of Stalin as a great tragedy. The Soviet government received numerous letters from citizens, party organizations’ and labor groups’ resolutions with suggestions on the best ways to perpetuate the memory of
the deceased leader. Later, people recalled their feelings: "Stalin had been a god for us, and when he died, we seemed to have lost a part of ourselves"; "He was believed to be tsar and god"; "People were crying as if something had been torn out of their heart", "Stalin had been loved and life without him was unimaginable". However, there were other points of view. Mostly it was those citizens of the USSR, who had not suffered from repressions who mourned Stalin’s death. But others, whose relatives had been repressed, had different feelings. "Finally he croaked!" - some people thought. Part of the population nurtured secret hopes for a change in the situation of the country.

3 Millions of people wished to say farewell to Stalin personally. Not only residents of Moscow and the Moscow region, but also those of more remote areas, rushed to the House of Unions in the center of Moscow, where a coffin with the body of the leader had been installed. To avoid overcrowding, the authorities banned the sale of tickets for all passenger trains en route to Moscow, and canceled all the suburban trains. However, people used any means to participate in Stalin’s funeral. A line of trucks queued for many kilometers at the entrance to Moscow. From early morning in the center of Moscow on Pushkin Street and neighboring boulevards many thousands of people gathered. At 8 am there was already a long queue of mourners at the Column Hall of the House of Unions. By the time of the Hall opening at 2 PM the queue had spilled over into the streets adjoining the House.

4 Hundreds and even thousands of casualties crushed in the crowd were reported later. On Trubnaya Square people crushed by the crowd fell into manholes. But historians have no exact data on the victims of the tragedy. According to the testimony of one state security employee, the casualty toll was about 400 people.
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“Au Grand Staline”, L’Humanité, 9 March 1953

Alexey Antoshin

"Au Grand Staline", L’Humanité, 9 March 1953. The headings read in French: “Suprême adieu de l’Union Soviétique et des peuples du monde au grand Staline. En présence d’une foule immense, à 12 heures précises, le corps du guide immortel de l’humanité a été déposé auprès de celui de Lenine tandis que tonnaient les salves d’honneur. Malenkov, Beria et Molotov ont prononcé l’éloge funèbre” – [“Last farewell of the Soviet Union and the peoples of the world to the great Stalin. In the presence of a huge crowd at the stroke of midday, the body of the immortal guide of humanity has been placed beside that of Lenin under a gun salute. Malenkov, Beria and Molotov delivered the eulogy”].
French Communists and their daily press organ *L’Humanité*, identified as the organ of the Central Committee of the Party, represented one of the most powerful Communist parties of Western Europe. In 1946, the number of PCF members reached its absolute maximum of more than 800,000 members. It was an especially noticeable force in the areas where the French Resistance groups of snipers and partisans operated during the war. The French Communists could also boast prominent figures of science and culture among their members: Paul Langevin, Louis Aragon, Frederic Joliot-Curie and Pablo Picasso.

In October 1945 the French Communist Party and its allies received more than 26% of the votes in the elections to the Constituent Assembly of the French Fourth Republic. However, its influence on French government policy gradually weakened. In May 1947 the Communists were removed from the government. In May 1952 Jacques Duclos, the head of the parliamentary group of the French Communist Party, was briefly arrested. However, the Communists continued to be an important element of social protest movements in France and the Communist Party maintained its hold upon a certain part of the French population, especially upon workers.

The French Communist Party at the time, like most other Communist parties, was an unconditional supporter of the Soviet Union, having bought into the rhetoric of the Cold War with its “for us or against us” positions promoted on both sides. Although *L’Humanité* had to pay due attention to the everyday concerns of its readers in France, it never stinted in its praise of the Soviet Union. Naturally, it shared in the drama of Stalin’s death. It was left to the “bourgeois” press to announce that Stalin was dying. *L’Humanité* reported his death on 6 March with a stark headline and a reproduction of the communiqué issued in Moscow. The title page of the 9 March issue shown here commemorates in grandiose form Stalin’s lying-in and his funeral. It mentions, though somewhat timidly, his possible successors – Malenkov, Beria and Molotov – though the implication is that no one can truly succeed Stalin.
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“Honor Guard”, *The New York Times*, 10 March 1953

Alexey Antoshin
Georgii Malenkov, Lavrenti Beria and Viatcheslav Molotov spoke at Stalin’s funeral on 9 March 1953. They tried to seize the opportunity of expressing their vision for the further development of the USSR.

Due to his rank as President of the Council of Ministers, Malenkov was the first to deliver a speech, which took the form of a vow: "Stalin commanded - and we preserve and enhance". He stated that "the gains of socialism" were not only valuable as such, but also as a prerequisite for the further progress of the country. The goal of the new leadership was announced as: "continuously aiming at further improvement of material well-being." However, Stalin and his associates had made such statements earlier. Malenkov's idea of the possibility of long-term coexistence and peaceful competition between the two systems - capitalism and socialism - became a new feature of Soviet foreign policy. According to Malenkov, the main task of the USSR was supposed to be "peace with all countries."

After Malenkov it was the turn of Beria, newly-appointed vice president of the Council of Ministers and reappointed Minister of the Interior upon Stalin’s demise. Although Beria was very close to Stalin, it was reported that he had been in partial disgrace during Stalin’s last years and rumors continued to fly that he had been responsible for Stalin's death. Beria paid attention mainly to the solution of internal problems, speaking about the significance of the national factor and friendship between the peoples of the USSR, emphasizing that the policy of the Soviet leadership should focus on the growth of economic and military power of the country, on the maximum fulfillment of the growing material and cultural needs of Soviet society. Beria urged "to steadily improve and sharpen the vigilance of the party and the people against the intrigues and machinations of the enemies of the Soviet state" without mentioning "peaceful coexistence" but referring to the fact that the armed forces of the USSR were equipped with "all kinds of modern weapons."

Stalin's old comrade-in-arms Molotov was the last to speak at the funeral. He also stated the necessity to strengthen the armed forces of the USSR in the event of an "attack of the aggressor and to maintain "vigilance and firmness in the fight against all kinds of snares of the enemy". As Foreign Minister, he declared that he would liaise only with those countries that aspire to cooperate with the Soviet Union. Molotov also paid attention to "the growth of the national liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries." Thus, Molotov's speech was the most conservative in spirit while those of Malenkov and Beria contained some hints as to the possibility of adjusting Stalinist policy.

The very next day after Stalin’s funeral Malenkov summoned a group of employees of the Central Committee of the CPSU and announced: "In the past we used to have major abnormalities, various things tended towards a cult of personality. Now we must immediately correct the trend that goes in this direction ... We consider it necessary to stop the policy of the cult of personality!"

Starting from 20 March 20 1953, Stalin was no longer mentioned in the headlines of newspaper articles, his words were almost never quoted in the Soviet press.
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“Moskva: Krasnaya Ploshchad’", 
*Pravda*, 11 March 1953
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Despite all official statements, the new Soviet government initiated a review of Stalin's policies in the very first days after the leader's death. The scriptwriter Alexey Kapler, who had been arrested during World War II for his relationship with Stalin's daughter Svetlana Alliluyeva, was released from prison on 6 March 1953. On 9 March 1953 (the day of Stalin's funeral, which coincided with Molotov's birthday) Molotov's wife Polina Zhemchuzhina, who had been accused of involvement in the so-called "Zionist conspiracy" during Stalin's lifetime, was released. Already in March 1953 the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR declared an amnesty, on the basis of which hundreds of thousands of convicts, mostly criminals and those who committed small (so-called "household") crime were liberated from prisons and camps. The decree was signed by Marshal Kliment Voroshilov, who was to be appointed, four days after the issue of Pravda portrayed here, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, i.e., Soviet head of state. A very small (less than 1%) number of political prisoners came under this amnesty.

The impressive display of flowers, a universal form of tribute to the departed, shown here at the Kremlin Wall prolongs the homages to Stalin that marked the period between the announcement of his death and his funeral. One can detect the anxiety that reigned throughout the Soviet Union, both at the popular and at the leadership level, regarding a world without Stalin. There is a “whistling-in-the-dark” quality to the editorials on this page of Pravda. “Closing ranks” rather than “new victories” would seem to correspond to the prevailing mood. One can assume that the many onlookers behind the flower display at the Kremlin Wall were themselves wondering what the future held in store for them.
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1 As its masthead indicates, Avant-garde was the “combat organ” of young workers. It had been founded as a monthly in 1920, at the time of the creation of the French Communist Party by young socialists who were following their elders into what was to become the French Communist Party. After the Second World War it became the weekly of the
Republican Youth of France, also mentioned on the masthead, an outgrowth of the Resistance-based efforts to unite all leftist forces. In the immediate post-war period it was the most widely read youth weekly publishing more than two hundred thousand copies.

The popularity of leftist ideas in the country in the late 1940s and early 1950s was associated with a complex socio-economic situation and the difficulties of post-war reconstruction of the French economy. More than four thousand strikes broke out in the country in 1951-1952 alone involving around three million people. The General Confederation of Labor, France’s main trade union under Communist sway, comprised more than five million people, was very active at that time. Inflation, retail and wholesale prices were growing in France. Significant budget expenditures were related to the conduct of the war in Indochina (1946-1954). All this strengthened the position of the Left. Under the pressure of social protest movements in December 1952 the right-wing government of Antoine Pinay eventually resigned.

It was in this context that *Avant-Garde* published the commemorative title page and editorial dedicated to Stalin portrayed here. The youthful workers of both sexes, though not all equally youthful, are looking up in the direction to which an oversized Stalin is pointing. Their faces portray anxiety rather than hope and confidence but the defiant legend assures them that Stalin’s ideas will triumph throughout the world. No doubt, some of the members of the crowd are thinking of the war in Vietnam being waged by France notwithstanding the fierce opposition of the Communist movement in which they are playing an active role. In the background, one sees Soviet skyscrapers, the pride of Stalinist architecture, that include the buildings of Moscow State University where some of the young progressive intelligentsia of France dream of studying.

---
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Anti-communism in the Cold War
Hej Kolenda

Andre Liebich

Full-color poster [s.d.]; 30 x 37 cm. The picture also exists in the form of a leaflet (8.5 x 11 cm). In red letters “Hej, kolenda, kolenda, - [‘Hey, (Christmas) carol, carol’], below it, “Ostrożnie z dziadkiem mrozem i reżymową gwiazdką,” – [‘Careful with Grandfather Frost and the regime Christmas’]. On bottom right, “Pokój i wolność, sekcja polska” – [‘Peace and freedom Polish section’]. On upper left hand corner, one reads “szkoła” [school]. The newspaper headline in the knapsack reads: “ekspulsie,” – [‘expulsions’], and the dog collar around the little devil’s neck identifies him as Bierut.

The poster portrays Stalin disguised as Santa Claus, dragging along on a leash the Secretary of the Polish United Workers’ Party from 1948 to 1956, Bolesław Bierut.
poster warns against falling for the communist organized Christmas (gwiazdka) celebrations meant to replace the traditional Christmas.

2 The task of anti-religious struggle was particularly difficult in Poland where the Catholic Church enjoyed huge prestige, thanks to its role in fostering Polish nationalism during the 19th century partitions of the country and, more recently, by its role in resisting Nazi occupation policies. The Polish primate, Cardinal Wyszynski, was put under house arrest in 1953 and only freed during the 1956 events which ushered in de-Stalinization. It is a statement on the relative mildness of Stalinism in Poland, however, that he did not suffer harsher punishment.

3 Christmas festivities were a particularly difficult target for the Communist campaign against religion as Poles, almost universally, observe religiously-inspired traditions on Christmas Eve. Communist efforts to transform this traditional holiday, as depicted in this poster, are presented as clumsy. Communist Party Secretary Bierut, portrayed here as a little devil, represents the “Black Peter” tradition according to which undeserving children receive only coal as a present. In fact, coal would have been much appreciated in the cold Polish winter at a time when penury reigned. Note the diminutive size of Beirut as compared to Stalin. Note too the war-like “gifts” that Stalin is carrying in his knapsack.

4 “Expulsions” may refer to measures taken against recalcitrant peasants unwilling to enter the newly-founded collective farms (largely dissolved after the 1956 events). As Stalin and Bierut are entering a school it may also refer to pupils and teachers unwilling to accept the Communist version of Christmas which downplayed its Christian elements.

5 The “Polish section” of Paix et Liberté which claims authorship of the poster is, most likely, the invention of the Paris office. It probably recruited a number of anti-communist émigrés in France but it is unlikely that it could claim a branch office, even an underground one, in Poland. To be sure, anti-communist armed resistance persisted for several years in Poland after the onset of communist power but by 1950 it had been stamped out. It is also unknown whether and, if so, how many of the posters depicted here could be smuggled into Poland.

6 Not surprisingly, the campaign to transform observance of such traditional holidays as Christmas failed.
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La vie exemplaire du petit Jacques Duclos

Joël Kotek

[The exemplary life of the little Jacques Duclos]. The line under the photograph reads in French: “Plus vite! Maman, plus vite!” – ["Faster, Mummy, faster!"] Full-color poster, signed J. Sennep, printed by Paix et Liberté [s.d.], 30 x 40 cm.

This caricature emphasizes the subordination of the French Communist Party with regard to Communist dictates. In September 1947, the French Communist Party was obliged to take up the cudgel of the Cold War against its former allies in government in the wake of the Szklarska Poręba Conference, in Polish Silesia, which saw the creation of the
Cominform, a successor the defunct Third International that had been founded in 1919 and dissolved in 1943. The secretary general of the Party, Maurice Thorez, reluctant to be ordered about, had delegated Jacques Duclos to attend the meeting. Not coincidentally, the French Communist Party was the target of numerous accusations there. It was reproached with having entered into a pact with reactionary forces. The French Communist Party was urged to break with the (previously Stalinist) tactic of the Popular Front. The task from now on was to struggle against American imperialism incarnated in the Marshall Plan as well as against its valets, especially the Socialist SFIO, a social democratic party that had formerly been the Communists’ ally.

Humiliated by these critiques, the suave Jacques Duclos had no choice upon his return to Paris but to offer a French version of the militant Zhdanov report read out at Szklarska Poręba. On 29 November 1947, he greeted the Prime Minister, Robert Schuman, in the National Assembly with the cry “Voilà le Boche!” using a derogatory French term for German. He went on to denounce the Socialists for “being under the command of the potentates of the dollar” and, for good measure, called the Gaullists “neofascists.” That day Duclos outdid himself. Ranting against the government he cried out, “lying dogs, bastards, liars, this is the way that Hitler acted, this is a Boche law.” Assassins, liars, cowards, fascists, executioners were among the most mild epithets in the Communist repertory. Later, Maurice Thorez would say to François Mitterrand, then Minister of Veterans’ Affairs and later first socialist President of the Fifth French Republic: “Provocateurs, you are talking like Goering [a leading Nazi and commander of the Luftwaffe].” This parliamentary session lasted four days and four nights. The Communist deputies had the numbers, the endurance, and the enthusiasm to stay at the tribune as long as they wished preventing ministers and rapporteurs from speaking. The government withstood this assault and the image of Jacques Duclos, previously considered debonair and urbane, changed completely.
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À vous de juger

Joël Kotek

The top of the first page reads in French: “À vous de juger. Le Parti Communiste a commandé à Pablo PICASSO le portrait de Staline, conforme aux données du réalisme socialiste. Ayant eu de la chance de nous procurer quelques études qui paraissent pouvoir être attribuées au Maître, nous les soumettons au public pour qu’il se rende compte des tâtonnements de l’Artiste et de ses efforts jusqu’à l’Art Suprême.” – “[Your turn to judge. The Communist Party commissioned Pablo Picasso a portrait of Stalin, consistent with the rules of socialist realism. Having had the chance to get a few sketches that seem to be linked to the Master, we subject them to the public so that they can realize the Artist’s gropings and his efforts to the Supreme Art ”]. The bottom line of the page reads in French: “Version initiale” – “[The initial version]”. The bottom line of the second page reads in French: “Deuxième version” – “[The second version]”. The bottom line of the third page reads in French: “Troisième version” – “[The third version]”. The top of the forth page reads in French: “…Et voici ce que serait la version définitive dans le cadre voulu.” – “[And here is what would be the final version in the desired setting]”. The lines under the portrait read in French: “Gloire Immortelle au Génial STALINE Coryphée de tous les Arts” – “[Immortal glory to great STALIN, coryphee of all Arts]” 2-page full-color leaflet (recto-verso), printed by Paix et Liberté [s.d.]; 17.5 x 22 cm.

1 This cartoon is a satire on the portrait of Stalin painted by Pablo Picasso. Stalin died on 5 March 1953 after a cerebral hemorrhage in his dacha at Kountsevo not far from Moscow. He was 74 years old and had wielded monolithic power in the Communist world. His funeral in Moscow on 9 March gave rise to scenes of collective hysteria which brought about the death of hundreds of onlookers, trampled to death or suffocated.

2 The shock of Stalin’s death reverberated throughout the Communist world and France joined in the general hysteria. The Parisian headquarters of the French Communist Party were entirely draped in black. On 12 March, at the request of its editor, Louis Aragon, Les Lettres françaises, the Communist cultural weekly published a tribute by Picasso to the
great Stalin. The departed autocrat was portrayed in youthsome tones, fresh and rosy. Initially, Aragon was relieved. Picasso could have, but did not, portray Stalin as a hero, and as the heroic mode requires, as a nude on a cloud. Nevertheless, Picasso’s tribute was considered a scandal. Protests poured in, immediately and spontaneously. “a horrible drawing,” “an indecent caricature,” “appalling,” “ridiculous,” disrespectful,” “outrageous,” a hideous portrait,” were some of the reactions. Picasso and Aragon had committed a sacrilege by representing him other than as a reassuring elderly man, eternal father of his peoples, in short, in a way which did not correspond to the canons of socialist realism.

3 The indignation of the Party was unanimous. The Party secretariat categorically condemned the publication of this unrealistic and unsympathetic drawing:

4 “Without putting into question the sentiments of the great artist Picasso, known to all for his affection for the working class, the Secretariat of the French Communist Party regrets that comrade Aragon, a member of the Central Committee and editor of the Lettres françaises who, let it be noted, fights courageously for the development of realistic art, allowed this publication.”

5 To repair the damage the Lettres françaises were summoned to publish the letters of disapproval. As for Aragon, he was obliged to offer excuses.

6 “[O]ne can invent flowers, goats, bulls and even men or women, but our Stalin cannot be invented because in the case of Stalin, an invention – be it of Picasso himself – is necessarily inferior to reality, incomplete and therefore false.”
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La colombe qui fait BOUM

Joël Kotek

La colombe qui fait BOUM, ["The dove that goes BOOM"]. Plate of full-color, fake stamp, printed by Paix et Liberté [s.d.]; 3.5 x 5 cm (size of each stamp).

1 The Soviet Union presented itself as a fundamentally pacifist power. Reality was quite different as shown by this excellent caricature of "Paix et Liberté," that plays upon one of the best known symbols of its time.

2 To counter the European wish to provide themselves with a common defense mechanism (NATO), the Soviet Union prompted the creation of a vast network of pacifist NGOs, all dependent upon it. Among these was the World Peace Council, an organization still in existence today, that was entrusted to the 1935 Nobel Prize for Chemistry co-winner (with his wife Irène Joliot Curie) and later member of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party, Frédéric Joliot-Curie. He was also the initiator of the 1950 Stockholm Appeal, signed by millions, calling for the absolute prohibition of nuclear arms.
Among Joliot-Curie’s associates was the already famous painter and Communist Party member, Pablo Picasso, who, at the First World Congress of Peace in Prague and Paris in 1949, created his famous dove of peace which quickly became the symbol of the struggle for peace. The iconography was not new as the dove had been a biblical symbol of peace but its dissemination on a world-wide level, exacerbated by the horrors of war, was such that this symbol of Communist propaganda succeeded in imposing itself upon the Western imagination. Thanks to Picasso’s dove progressive Christians and others succumbed to the Communist propaganda campaign of the struggle for peace. Needless to say, Soviet pacifism raised serious and legitimate doubts in the circles to which Souvarine belonged. They denounced early on the Soviet pacifist campaign as a pure propaganda concept in the service of a heavily armed state possessing, as of August 1949, a nuclear weapon. This is the well-aimed message of the peace dove that “goes boum,” underlining the aggressive meaning behind a widely-known and admired symbol.
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This caricature underlines the profound contradictions of the Soviet state. The Soviet Union might well present itself as the pacifist country par excellence. It was, nevertheless, one of the most war-like and militarist states. The themes of peace, then that of disarmament, was always a key and recurrent subject of Soviet propaganda from the Decree on Peace in 1917 to Mikhail Gorbachev’s "Zero" option in 1987. Here, the contrast between Soviet vocabulary and reality is vividly emphasized: a tractor is, in fact, a tank; sports training is military drill; and a honeymoon consists of planes dropping bombs. The graphic aspect of the caricature appears to have been inspired by Hergé’s (pseudonym of Georges Remi) *Tintin au Pays des Soviets*, his 1930 comic strip lampoon emphasizing the illusory quality of Soviet progress.

The theme of peace was at the heart of Stalinist propaganda. Immediately after the end of the Second World War, Soviet power made pacifism the very foundation of its ideology. Under the halo of its victory over Nazism, the Soviet Union presented itself as the champion and standard bearer of the struggle against militarism, obviously tied to capitalism. In 1947, the Zhdanov Doctrine, named after Stalin’s close companion, Andrei Zhdanov, discerned two camps: the war camp led by the United States and the peace camp led by the Soviet Union. Pacifist propaganda would organize itself around the
exploitation of nuclear war to denounce American imperialist warmongers. Throughout the Cold War Communists would conduct vast agitation and propaganda campaigns on behalf of pacifism intended to show the intrinsically pacific nature of the camp led by the USSR. Obviously, in reality things looked different. Stalin, whose armies occupied Central and Eastern Europe, continued to reinforce the Red Army and to encourage local conflicts, such as the war in Korea, even as he promoted vigorously atomic research for military ends. It is this which the caricature here satirizes.
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The second volume of the “Illustrated Soviet Dictionary” hammers away, as did the first volume against the illusionary character of the Soviet state. The first image in this cartoon strip emphasizes the fact that the Soviet Union is not only built on lies but that it is incapable of respecting any and every agreement. The name of former Soviet Foreign Minister, Viatcheslav Molotov, signatory of the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact on Non-Aggression in 1939, on the toilet paper recalls that infamous agreement between Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia. The Kremlin toilet is stuffed with other, disregarded pacts. The second image, portraying a grotesque, primping Stalin, mocks the world-wide cult of Stalin among Communists. The third image, under a banner proclaiming a “fifth column” shows individuals in thespian masks. One can easily detect at the extreme left the rotund bespectacled figure of Jacques Duclos, acting secretary-general of the French Communist Party in the absence, for health reasons, of the historic leader of the Party, Maurice Thorez. The other figure are Marcel Cachin, considered the founder of the
French Communist Party, possibly André Marty, a revolutionary hero who was to be expelled from the Party by the end of 1952, and Thorez himself.

2 Even as he claimed to be the champion of antifascism and of non-intervention, Stalin had not hesitated to enter into an agreement with the Nazis and then to prevent free elections in the countries of Central Europe which he controlled after the Second World War, in spite of commitments made at Yalta. Stalin required complete subordination of fraternal communist parties turning them into a “fifth column,” as evidenced by declarations of the leadership of the French Communist Party. Indeed, the isolation of the Communist Party was heightened by the fact that it espoused positions that could appear, in many ways, to be antinational.

3 The French Communist Party might well oppose the Marshall Plan and European construction in the name of French national independence but its platform repelled numerous French people. It could hardly be otherwise after Maurice Thorez had declared on 30 September 1948, even as negotiations were ongoing concerning the North Atlantic defense alliance, that “the French people would never make war against the Soviet Union.” This declaration was reprinted on the first page of *L’Humanité*, the French Communist Party’s daily newspaper. In his response, on 24 February 1949, to the question “What would you do if the Red Army occupied Paris?” Thorez confirmed his explosive remarks: “Could French workers behave any differently towards the Soviet Army than those of Poland, Romania or Yugoslavia?” The French National Assembly easily noted that “for the French Communist Party, in the event of conflict between France and a foreign power, the USSR, the French people should oppose no resistance and even collaborate with it”.

4 One may conclude that Maurice Thorez was giving assurances to Stalin that “although he was French, he had the soul of a Soviet citizen.”

---

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

This comic strip, like several others in the series, underscores the profound contradictions of the Soviet state. The USSR presented itself in the best colors possible. It claimed to be pacifist even as it was warmongering; it declared that it was the fatherland of the workers even as it muzzled trade unions; it asserted that it stood for the right of self-determination even as it repressed the least manifestations of independence within its border as within its empire; it stated that it was democratic but rejected the very idea of free elections. The list goes on.

The vignettes here refer most probably to the obstructive attitude of Andrei Gromyko, a diplomat who in the post-war years occupied the Soviet seat on the Security Council as his country’s permanent representative to the United Nations, was later longtime Soviet foreign minister (1957-1985) and, in his last years, the ceremonial head of state of the Soviet Union. Known as “Mr. Nyet,” because of the Soviet propensity to use its vetoes against Security Council proposals, Gromyko was, in fact, a skillful negotiator and proved that he had the talent to defend the worst aspects of Soviet foreign policy, notably North Korea’s mendacious affirmations.
The cartoon mocks Soviet dismissal of American arguments at the UN as “nonsense” and portrays Gromyko’s own interventions as “propaganda.” Gromyko would appear to be picking his nose or making a rude gesture during the American speech. The French representative seated between the Soviet and the American representatives is equally subdued during both speeches suggesting that France does not have the courage to take sides, although it did participate in the UN Expeditionary Force in Korea. The last vignette depicts a hefty and triumphant Stalin in full military regalia, whip in hand, riding roughshod over a suffering peasant, whether of a Soviet or Central and East European nationality, with the bitterly ironic title “sovereign people.”
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Pluie de bactéries américaines

Joël Kotek

Pluie de bactéries américaines ["Rain of American bacteria"]. The words in the picture read in French: "Ce n'est pas la pluie, ce sont les bactéries américaines qui font leurs petits besoins!" – ["This is not rain, these are american bacteria doing their thing [urinating]"]. Black and white leaflet, printed by Paix et Liberté [s.d.]; 5 x 19.5 cm.

1 The Korean War gave rise to an unprecedented barrage of propaganda. Although North Korea bore all the responsibility, it persisted in accusing the South Koreans of having unleashed it. This was an enormous lie.

2 It was indeed Pyongyang that, on 25 June 1950, sent 138 00 soldiers to the 38th Parallel which brought about the capture of South Korea's capital on 28 June, within a few days of the outbreak of the war. Nevertheless, North Korea's mendacious propaganda was promptly picked up throughout the world and, not least, in the Communist press. “The North was obliged to hit back against a grave provocation by Washington's puppets,” wrote L'Humanité, the daily paper of the French Communist Party. This affirmation was immediately picked up by the leading French public intellectual, Jean-Paul Sartre. More seriously, the Communist press even invented a story about American usage of bacteriological arms.

3 On 22 February 1952 the North Korean Minister of Foreign Affairs, Pak Hon-Yong officially accused the Americans of having used “insects as vectors spreading the plague, cholera and other illnesses.” The accusation was clearly absurd. How could insects be controlled?
Soviet documents published in 1998 reveal a sinister conspiracy orchestrated by the North Koreans and their Soviet advisors. Nevertheless, the false information was picked up immediately by the French communist press and by communist peace movements who denounced the massive – and imaginary – use of bacteriological weapons by the UN coalition led by the United States. It was in this context that a massive demonstration took place in Paris in May 1952 against the American general, Matthew Ridgway who was being appointed head of allied forces in Europe. The former commander of UN forces in Korea, was immediately dubbed “Ridgway the Plague” or the “microbial general”.

The demonstration degenerated rapidly, leading to the death of at least two demonstrators and some 372 police officers wounded, 27 of whom suffered serious wounds. The man speaking is Jacques Duclos, easily recognizable on the caricature by his round glasses and rotund figure, to which the cartoonist has added a hammer and sickle armband and an umbrella with Soviet stars, acting secretary-general of the French Communist Party during the illness of Maurice Thorez.
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La femme qui avait vu Staline

Andre Liebich

La femme qui avait vu Staline ["The woman who saw Stalin"]. The first picture reads in French: "La vie Parisienne. Film soviétique. Prix Staline" – ["Paris life. Soviet film. Stalin prize"]. The second picture reads: "Arrivée à Orly de Nina, la femme la plus heureuse du monde : elle a vu Staline" – ["Arrival at Orly of Nina, the happiest woman in the world – she saw Stalin"]. The third picture reads: "L'enthousiasme des Parisiens qui acclament la femme qui a vu Staline" – ["The enthusiasm of Parisians cheering the woman who saw Stalin"]. The fourth picture reads: "En vertu du plan Marshall, on emprisonne tous les Français qui ont vu la femme qui a vu Staline" – ["Under the Marshall Plan, we imprison all the French who saw the woman who saw Stalin"]. Black and white leaflet, printed by Paix et Liberté [s.d.], 5 x 19.5 cm.

1 In the 1920s and 1930s there was a popular song entitled, “I knew a girl who knew a girl who danced with the Prince of Wales.” That is the spirit underlying this cartoon strip. Whereas there was a considerable literature in the Soviet Union recounting meetings with Stalin in early revolutionary days, the cult of Stalin’s person came into its own only in the post-World War II years. It may have been enhanced by Stalin’s reclusiveness in these last years of his reign. Although the cult of Stalin drew the line, reluctantly, at the thaumaturgic powers once attributed to kings, he was regularly compared to the sun and poems about Stalin reached new heights of lyrical obsequiousness.

2 This cartoon strip thus pokes fun at the inordinate cult of Stalin, widespread in the Soviet bloc and among Western Communists and Soviet sympathizers. It is ordinary “Parisians” not just French Communists who react deliriously to the arrival of “the woman who saw Stalin.” As for “Nina,” “the woman who saw Stalin,” she is a typically Soviet woman of peasant or worker extraction, with an old fashioned kerchief on her head. The unlikelihood of such a person travelling – by plane! – to France at a time when the Soviet
Union was practically hermetically sealed so that no ordinary Soviet citizen could possibly dream of crossing its borders, seems self-evident. The glint in Nina’s eyes suggests madness rather than eroticism and betrays the anti-Communist thrust of the cartoon strip.

The first cartoon holds the key to the sequence that follows. What we are witnessing here is ‘Paix et Liberté’’s portrayal of a Soviet film which purports to present “Parisian Life” and does so in full accordance with Stalinist norms. This is confirmed by mention of the “Stalin Prize” that the film has won. Instituted in 1941 and renamed, after 1954, the State Prize of the Soviet Union, the Prize was awarded in a number of categories, from engineering to cinematography. Among the recipients are individuals as diverse as Andrei Sakharov, father of the Soviet Hydrogen bomb (and later human rights activist), Lev Theremin, one of the creators of electronic music, the cinematographer Sergei Eisenstein, Mikhail Kalashnikov, the inventor of the eponymous machine gun.

That the cartoon strip is a satirical look at Soviet representations of reality is confirmed by the emaciated look of the Parisians shouting frantically against a background of a still devastated capital city and the last strip portraying them behind bars linking, improbably, the Marshal Plan with their enthusiasm about “the woman who saw Stalin.” The absurdity of the last cartoon should have been obvious to any French reader.
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Historians continue to dispute the role of Stalin in the outbreak and conduct of the Korean War that began on 25 June 1950 and only ended with an armistice on 27 July 1953, after the death of Stalin. Many historians claim that Stalin actively discouraged Kim Il Sung from launching an attack on his southern neighbor but eventually acceded to the North Korean leader’s insistence. The role of the Soviet Union in prompting Chinese intervention in Korea is also debated as is its decision to boycott the United Nations Security Council, a decision that allowed the United States to muster UN support for its resistance to North Korean and Chinese advance.

The authors of this image have no doubts about Soviet meddling in the Korean War. For ‘Paix et Liberté’ the Communist movement was a monolithic bloc (notwithstanding the recent Yugoslav defection) and it was inconceivable that any action would be taken within the Soviet bloc that was not only authorized but initiated by the Kremlin. Although it remained officially neutral throughout the Korean War, the Soviet Union did provide material support to its North Korean and Chinese allies. It is this role that the cartoon lays bare, showing Stalin passing a tank under the table to his North Korean ally or vassal. That Stalin appears worried and reticent, with the famous dove of peace on his shoulder, while his North Korean counterpart is bursting with righteous fury corresponds
to later accounts of the relationship between the two men. Here, however, Stalin’s sphinx-like countenance suggests the total hypocrisy alluded to in the comment by the anonymous onlooker who has raised the tablecloth: “benevolent neutrality” was a contradiction in terms in an era that lived according to Andrei Zhdanov’s theory of “two camps” and the impossibility of remaining truly neutral.
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Halte aux menteurs

Andre Liebich


Well before Vaclav Havel had proclaimed “living in truth” as the essence of opposition to Communism, “Paix et Liberté” had waged an uncompromising and lengthy campaign against Communist “lies.” One of its persistent themes was the discrepancy between the facts, as they could be ascertained by an objective individual, and the falsehoods
propagated by the French Communist Party as the mouthpiece of Kremlin Cold-War propaganda. Here 'Paix et Liberté' uses the widely-diffused myth of bacteriological weapons employed by a newly-founded NATO against its adversaries in Korea to denounce Communist rumor-mongering. The figures represented in this image are French Communists and, at least one fellow-traveler (Pierre Cot, founder of the Union progressiste), portrayed as themselves poisonous bacilla spreading hatred throughout all corners of the French hexagon with their mendacious claims.

2 It is an angry Stalin who diffuses these bacilla with a megaphone. Almost next to him but at an appropriately deferential level stands Maurice Thorez, Secretary-General of the French Communist Party. He is connected with a string to his wife, Jeanette Vermeersch, figure III and the only woman in the group, herself a prominent Communist activist and, for many years, a deputy to the French National Assembly. Among the other “bacilla” are Frédéric Joliot-Curie, one of the prominent intellectuals in the French Communist Party who, with his wife, Irène Joliot-Curie, won the Nobel Prize for Chemistry in 1935. One sees also Charles Tillon, figure VII, founder and commandant of the FTPF (Francs tireurs et partisans français) one of the most important pillars of the French Resistance during the Second World War. In 1952, Tillon as well as André Marty, figure II, and in 1954, Auguste Lecoeur, figure XI, were to be read out of the Communist Party. There is no sign of their upcoming disgrace in their portrayal here. Indeed, the uniform depiction of each figure here suggests they are all diffusing the same message blared to them by Stalin although the graphic representation of each figure would have made them immediately recognizable to French readers, even without the glossary attached.
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Les deux pigeons

Joël Kotek

Les deux pigeons ["The two pigeons"]. The lines on top read: "Mon frère a-t-il tout ce qu'il veut: Bon souper, bon gîte, et le reste ? La Fontaine" - ["Has my brother got everything that he wants: good supper, good accommodation and the rest? La Fontaine"] Full-color leaflet, printed by Paix et Liberté [s.d.], 10 x 14.5 cm.

1 Under the auspices of the "Peace Movement" a demonstration was organized on 28 May 1952 on the occasion of the arrival in Paris of General Matthew Ridgway. Ridgway had succeeded Douglas MacArthur as commander of UN forces in Korea and had been accused of using bacteriological weapons there against North Korean and Chinese troops. He was
on the point of replacing Dwight Eisenhower, soon to be American President, as NATO
commander in chief.

2 That evening, Jacques Duclos, acting secretary-general of the French Communist Party,
was arrested in Paris itself. To justify this arrest, police invoked the fact that, in addition
to a caliber 7.65 millimeter pistol and a nightstick or truncheon, they had found two
pigeons in his car. Above all, they had found the Communist leader’s notebook with notes
of a meeting of the secretariat of the Politburo of the French Communist Party where he
had written “We work for the certain defeat [of the French army] in Vietnam, in Korea, in
Tunisia.” To further justify this arrest, the policemen pointed to the pigeons in Duclos’
car as: “pigeons clearly intended to transmit messages.” According to the Minister of the
Interior, Charles Brune, the birds were evidently carrier pigeons, proof of Duclos’
treachery vis-à-vis the Republic. It is true that the French Communist Party was accused
of undercutting the morale of the army. In fact, however, the two pigeons were dead. It
was thus more probable that they were intended for the cooking pot of Mr and Mrs
Duclos. After having been arrested Jacques Duclos was charged with having undermined
the security of the state. This was the notorious “pigeon conspiracy.” Incarcerated in the
Santé Prison, the man who led the French Communist Party in the absence of Maurice
Thorez was quickly liberated. The incident was nonetheless comical.
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29 Gorbachev M. (1931- ...) last President of the Soviet Union
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34 Joliot-Curie F. (1900-1958) joint Nobel Chemistry Prize winner, prominent French communist
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37 Kagan G. (1906-1944) Comintern delegate, Polish then French communist
38 Kaganovich L. (1893-1991) head of the construction of the Moscow Metro
39 Kalashnikov M. (1919-2013) the inventor of the eponymous machine gun
40 Kalinin M. (1875-1946) head of state of RSFSR and then Soviet Union (1919-1946)
41 Kamenev L. (1883-1936) prominent Bolshevik and Soviet politician
42 Kaplan F. (1890-1918) Socialist Revolutionary, assassination attempt on Lenin
43 Kapler A. (1903-1979) Soviet scriptwriter, arrested for relationship with S Alliluyeva
44 Kerensky A. (1881-1970) Second Prime Minister of Russian Provisional Government
45 Khalturin S. (1857-1882) Russian revolutionary, attempted to assassinate tsar
46 Khlebnikov V. (1885-1922) Russian futurist poet and playwright
47 Khrushchev N. (1894-1971) Soviet leader after Stalin’s death to 1964
48 Kim il Sung (1912-1994) North Korean communist leader for 46 years
49 Kolchak A. (1874-1920) White Russian leader in Civil War
50 Krikhatsky V. (1877-1942) Russian painter
51 Kuusinen O. (1881-1964) Finnish and Soviet communist leader
52 Kuskova Y. (1883-1930) German Communist and Social Democratic leader
53 Liebknecht K. (1871-1919) co-founder of Communist Party of Germany
54 Lilina Z. (1882-1929) Bolshevik activist, wife of G. Zinoviev
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57 Luxemburg R. (1871-1919) co-founder of Communist Party of Germany
58 MacArthur D. (1880-1964) commander of UN forces in Korea
Marconi G. (1874-1937) Italian inventor of radio
Marty A. (1866-1956) leading French Communist, expelled from Party in 1952
Mikoyan A. (1895-1978) Old Bolshevik and Soviet politician for many years
Miliukov P. (1859-1943) Russian liberal politician, foreign minister in 1917
Mitterand F. (1916-1996) Minister in 4th French Republic and, later, President
Molotov V. (1890-1986) Old Bolshevik, occupied many prominent posts under Stalin
Münzenberg W. (1889-1940) German Communist political leader
Nicolaeovsky B. (1887-1966) Menshevik activist and historian
Peignot C. (1903-1938) French writer and Boris Souvarine’s partner
Peter the Great (reigned 1682-1725) Russian tsar
Picasso P. (1881-1973) important artist, joined PCF
Pinay A. (1891-1994) French conservative Prime Minister in 1952
Podvoisky N.J. (1880-1948) Russian revolutionary and military leader
Popov A.S. (1859–1905) Russian physicist, acclaimed in Russia as inventor of radio
Prokopovich S. (1871-1955) Russian liberal politician and economist, exiled after 1922
Quarenghi G. (1744-1817) Italian architect, active in Russia
Radek K. (1885-1939) Internationalist Communist, in Soviet Union after 1917
Raffalovich A. (1853-1921) Russian state financial agent in London
Reed J. (1887-1920) American sympathizer of Russian revolution
Riazanov D. (1876-1938) Marxist theoretician, founder of Marx-Engels Institute
Ridgway M. (1895-1993) American general, head of allied forces in Europe
Rimsky-Korsakov N. (1844–1908) Russian composer
Ripka H. (1895-1958) Czechoslovak politician, twice exiled
Roosevelt F.D. (1882-1945) President of the United States (1933-1945)
Rosmer A. (1877-1964) French revolutionary, later opposed to Stalin
Roy M.N. (1887-1954) Indian Comunist, founder of Indian and Mexican CPs
Sakharov A. (1921-1989) Soviet physicist, later, human rights activist
Sartre J.-P. (1905-1980) leading French public intellectual
Schuman R. (1886-1963) French Prime Minister and a “father” of Europe
Semashko N.A. (1874-1949) Soviet Commissar for Public Health in 1920s
Serge V. (1890-1947) Russian revolutionary and writer, later, critic of Stalin
Shifrin A. (1901-1951) left Menshevik journalist
Simonov K. (1915-1979) well-known Soviet writer and poet
Snow E. (1905-1972) American journalist, wrote on Chinese Revolution
Stalin, J. (1878-1953) pseudonym of J. Dzhugashvili, Soviet leader for 29 years
Theremin L. (1896-1983) one of the creators of electronic music
Thomas A. (1878-1932) French reformist socialist and minister
Thorez M. (1900-1964) secretary general of the French Communist Party
Tillon C. (1897-1993) French Communist leader, prominent résistant
Trotsky L. (1879-1940) Soviet leader, opposed to Stalin
Uritysky M. (1873-1918) Bolshevik leader, assassinated in August 1918
Valentinov-Volsky N. (1878-1964) Menshevik, sometime Lenin’s companion
Vermeersch J. (1910-2001) prominent French Communist, wife of M. Thorez
Voroshilov K. (1881-1969) Soviet Marshal, Head of Supreme Soviet Presidium
Vyshinsky A. (1883-1954), Soviet prosecutor, later, Minister of Foreign Affairs
Wyszyński Stefan (1901-1981) Polish cardinal, Primate of Poland
Zhdanov A. (1896-1948) Soviet politician, responsible for cultural policy after 1946
Zhemchuzhina P. (1897-1970) Soviet politician, V. Molotov’s wife, imprisoned under Stalin
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