Georgy Kiesewalter

Information and communication permeability of the *Iron Curtain* in the 1950s-1970s in light of the situation in art and culture in the USSR

To begin with, I would like to thank OSA for the opportunity to work in its archives. The amount of information for my research that I have found in the archives was amazing, the signifying constituent of that information – invaluable.

*****

As is well known, practically in all fields of culture and art in the socialist camp, the situation with free, uncensored creativity was at least far from being perfect, and at most, simply awful. This was especially true if we talk of the Soviet Union. First, free travel to the West was forbidden, so a one-week voyage to Poland – if allowed by the Party committee at work – under a constant KGB man's observation was perceived as an amazing stroke of luck and a superior memory of one's life. Moreover, even the natural exchange of information with colleagues and institutions in the West was stemmed, so most of the cultural processes in the SU were deemed to evolve in complete isolation behind the notorious Iron Curtain.

However, slowly, but inevitably the Curtain began to crack and honeycomb. Unable to completely isolate the economy, education and culture from the West, in the 1970s, the Soviets had to allow exchanges of specialists and professionals with various countries of the world. These specialists and professionals started to carry back and forth all kinds of information that had been unavailable before, and, therefore, contributed to mutual enlightenment and eventual liberation of dogmas and illusions. As Gyorgy Peteri noted in his article *Nylon Curtain – Transnational and Transsystemic Tendencies in the Cultural Life of State-Socialist Russia and East-Central Europe*, "To the extent there was an Iron curtain it was required by the complete failure of communism's attempt at emancipating social progress from capitalism. This failure and the awareness about it, however, had generated alternating periods of increased isolation, regimentation, and terror, and periods of Thaw, increased openness, emulation and the softening of the Iron into Nylon."[1]. It is also worth noting that in the past, the West perceived the Iron Curtain as drawn between the socialist and capitalist blocs; however, in the Soviet Union, we knew not too much of what was going on in the socialist camp either, i.e. we had another *Burlap*

[1] In *Slavonica*, Vol.10, No 2, Nov. 2004

Curtain (which is not so nice and beautiful as Nylon and as a metaphor reflects the situation in the USSR more adequately, I believe) between the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

Anyway, this research has significantly altered my initial concept of the events and processes in Soviet culture of the 1950s and their eventual consequences in the 1960s. The usual picture painted by some Soviet-Russian art historians and those Western ones who just followed suit, looked like this: a small community of *unofficial* artists and poets led by the so-called Lianozovo[2] group, which included such figures as Evgeny Kropivnitsky, Oskar Rabin, Alexander Kharitonov, Vladimir Nemukhin, Lidia Masterkova, a. o., emerged around 1956 in opposition to the official Union of Artists and the ideological oppression of the Soviets. The group heroically paved the way for the new generations of artists and contributed to the revolutionary events in the culture of the mid-seventies, and so on... Although I can practically agree with the last sentence, the newspaper clippings of the time disclose quite a different image of the situation in Soviet culture in the 1950s and 1960s.

Even one of the earliest available articles from the *New York Times* of June 1955 is entitled, "Dispute over art flares in Soviet"[3]. A former artist, motion picture director, and twice a Stalin prize winner, A.Dovzhenko asks extension of ‘artistic boundaries’: “art cannot develop on prescribed standards”. In part, it was a criticism of the latest All-Union Art show, where “the most popular feature of the exhibit was a series of genre paintings or pictures of Soviet life executed in a photographic manner”. Sure, he gets a rebuke from the critic Kemenov of the Academy of Arts in *Pravda*: "no retreat from realism that could lead Soviet artists into impressionism and other isms!" Of interest is that Kemenov agrees that a variety of artistic forms and styles is needed, but insists that the old method of realism is the only possible basis for development.

In October 1956, Radio Free Europe in its background information report called *Deep Freeze in Soviet Painting* says, “The optimists who had hoped that the apparent move towards liberalization in the USSR might extend to the sphere of art have been dealt a body blow by the authoritative voices of criticism in Moscow." A mammoth article by Sokolov-Skalya published in *Izvestia* and later in *Pravda* lashes out at impressionists and their defenders. The article indicates that the authorities have been deeply alarmed by the outstanding success of the recent French Art Exhibition in Moscow. In *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, a critic Solodovnikov assaults the cosmopolitan abstract art of Serbian artists. However, despite these uniform publications, there is plenty of popular support for modern art in the USSR as the show of six Soviet impressionists in May 1956 demonstrated, says the report.

[2] Lianozovo is a small town in the northern suburbs of Moscow.
[3] By C.Daniel, NYT of 28.06.1955

On December 31, 1959, Camilla Gray writes in the *Manchester Guardian*, "abstract painting is revealed as a pressing issue [being debated in the Soviet press], and one which is most vividly illustrates the tension and division of opinion…" The current debates were given impetus by the exhibition in Moscow at the end of 1958 of abstract paintings by two Polish artists, whose work had been included in an orthodox show entitled *Paintings from the People's Democracies*. Thus, the year of 1959 began with a sharp criticism of Polish abstract art by Sokolov-Skalya. During the summer, the display of American abstract painting at the US show also attracted much criticism in the Soviet press, but one of the young poets, Evgeny Evtushenko, announced in *Komsomolskaya Pravda* of 9 August 1959, "I believe in the decorative significance of abstract painting…", which caused a divine wrath of the ideological bosses.

After the Fifth Exhibit of young Moscow artists, *Komsomolskaya Pravda* admitted in its vigorous attack on Soviet double-faced artists that the two most widespread deviations at present were abstractionism and surrealism... Later, some Gorky University students initiated a dispute on abstract art with participation of the Komsomol Committee after they had seen reproductions of formalist paintings in the magazine 'Poland'. The discussion lasted 4.5 hours in an audience of 400 students"[4].

'Komsomolskaya Pravda' singles out such young artists as Mikhail Kuznetsov as a representative of an *abstract school* (while claiming he is just repeating the work of K. Malevich and S. Dali – and where, in the first place, did Russian journalists find information on Malevich and Dali, we should ask), Kupryashin, Alimov, and an Uzbek Bulatov[5].

In a nutshell, the formalist trends appear to be slowly paving the way for themselves. "Quite clearly the young Soviet artist is in revolt against the dogma of socialist realism, but it is a complex reaction, full of illogicality and divergence. Caught between the fact of his comparative isolation and ignorance of developments in the West, and the limitations of his national tradition, he is fighting for the right to create a new language to express the new reality", says Camilla Gray in her article *The Soviet Artist in Revolt*.

In *Russian News* No 1388 of Nov. 1962, M. Mondich reports, "there are many hopes for liberalization expressed in the newspapers." However, already the issue of RN No 1410 of 06.12.1962 asks, *Is it the end of liberalism in Soviet Art?* The article provides an analysis of the situation in Soviet art after Stalin's death and the *revolutionary* artist Ilya Glazunov is recalled to have set up a show where he exhibited "an impressionistic painting of a female nude" among his works in February 1957. "Crowds filled the gallery daily". The artist was chastised later that year

[4] from the *Manchester Guardian* article *The Soviet Artist in Revolt* by Camilla Gray
[5] All these names can hardly ring a bell with anyone nowadays.

by Academic Boris Johanson. In conclusion, the author says, “Things are clearly astir again in the world of Soviet art. Hopefully, this time progress will follow the crooked line instead of repeating the straight circle”.

According to the report, art historians A.Kamensky, D.Sarabyanov, N.Dmitrieva, P.Sysoev support the search of young artists for new ideas, their attempt to rid of dogmatic shackles that leave labels like *formalists*, *stylists*, and *aesthetes* everywhere. An artist from Sverdlovsk is reported to be working in Van Gogh's manner. A big group of abstract artists who as a rule do not belong to the Artists’ Union or take art as a hobby is described (I assume the group of Elii Belyutin's students was meant in this case). The *Observer* of 25.02.1959 also mentions a big group of abstract artists. Both the NYT (12.1.62) and Observer (12.2.62) write about Belyutin’s group show opening on 26 November 1962. From 80 to 100 works were shown there. The reports say there are altogether about 400 abstract artists in Moscow, and many others in Leningrad, Tyumen, Irkutsk, Alma-Ata, Armenia, etc. Finally, *Pravda* of 02.12.62 reports of Khrushchev’s infamous visit to two exhibitions in the Manezh including Belyutin’s group show where Khrushchev condemned liberalism in art and anathematized the formalists.

Already on the basis of these materials we can clearly see that a) the formalist trends appeared in Soviet art long before 1956 – apparently, soon after Stalin's death, – and quickly became a mass craze, although in the visible official milieu, as the New York Times correspondent noted in May 1959, "you can observe sharp disputes among older artists and their younger colleagues, who have exhibited the most controversial by Soviet standards art, while by the standards of New York or Paris you will not see at *Kuznetsky Most* gallery any painting or sculpture that will seem daring or advanced"; b) it was not only the unofficial artists who paved the way, but also young members and non-members of the Artists' Union who felt an urge for a change in arts; c) there were lots of clashes between various clans within the Union of Artists and, at the same time, lots of expectations in the society for liberalization in the culture and arts that did not come true at that time.

Of greatest importance for influencing the change of the public's world-view, as many eyewitnesses note, was the 1959 American National Exhibit in Moscow. If we make a sortie into the US history, according to James Shenton from Columbia University, one of the weapons in the war of the US pioneers with Native Americans was to send them blankets infected with deadly diseases. The American Exhibit had the effect of a "poisoned blanket" that helped to destroy the credibility of communist ideology among the capital's cultural elite, says Vladimir Paperny, a future émigré, designer and architecture historian, who was among the 2.7 million Russians that crammed the 10-acre site in Sokolniki Park to get their first view of what they thought was the real America.

“The idea was to convey the niceties of capitalism to Soviet people", recalls V. Paperny. Capitalism was represented, among various consumer commodities, by "designers George Nelson, Buckminster Fuller and Charles and Ray Eames, producer Walt Disney, photographer Edward Steichen, painters Jackson Pollock, Mark Rothko and Robert Motherwell with their abstract paintings. Somehow, between the 1950s and 1980s, abstract painting became loaded with political significance. As we learned from a book by Frances S. Saunders, Who Paid the Piper: The CIA and the Cultural Cold War (London, 1999), the CIA was spending millions of dollars promoting American Abstract Expressionism as a weapon in the Cold War."

However, it is necessary to note that excitement at abstract art was far from being unanimous. The newspapers report of people spitting on some sculptures and asking the organizers to bring realistic art for the future shows in the USSR; the documentaries of 1959 reflect bewilderment and confusion on the people's faces: the Soviet public was not yet ready to perceive and accept such an art.

What other sources of information and inspiration for Russian artists were available in the 1950s and 1960s? Sure, the information was sporadic, the sources – unique and hardly accessible. However, even based on official Soviet newspapers it turns out that already at the end of the 1950s, certain information like reproductions and articles on earlier forbidden art started to appear in the press and catalogues. As for literature, the period from 1958 to 1969 is often characterized as the ‘Novyi Mir’ (*New World*) epoch. This magazine, probably the only official source of literary opposition of the time, essentially formed the conscience of Soviet intelligentsia in the sixties. Almost everyone tried to get a yearly subscription of Novyi Mir, but it was very difficult due to limitations in circulation. People would just lend the magazine copies to friends and pass them from one to another. The opposition democracy-oriented conscience that was characteristic of Moscow kitchen intellectual talks in the 1970s was also in part a product of the Novyi Mir publications along with Samizdat manuscripts. There were other significant humanitarian and all-science periodicals in the USSR, like *Literaturnaya Gazeta,* or magazines *Znanie – Sila (Knowledge is Power)* and *Nauka i Zhizn’ (Science and Life)* that occasionally published very interesting articles on literature, music, visual arts and other fields of humanities. The first publications of such authors as Mandelstam, Tsvetaeva, N.Zabolotsky and M. Bulgakov (some of his works appeared in 1963 in the magazines *Moskva* and *Novy Mir*; *Master and Margarita* – in December 1966 in ‘Moskva’) appeared in various magazines in the mid-sixties.

Already in the early 1960s, big monographs on Impressionists and Russian Avant-garde were published[6]. In November 1962, RN No 1682 reports, "The *Bubnovy Valet* painters have been rehabilitated in two articles in the magazine *Iskusstvo* (#9, 1962). In April 1962, *Herald Tribune* writes about Kazimir Malevich's paintings shown in Moscow at Mayakovsky Museum. All the works were from private collections".

However, in January 1963, RN No 1430 reports of a counter-offensive of the cultural Stalinists wishing to balance all those victories of the liberals. "Why so much fuss in Moscow these days? Not all people like abstract art in the West, but no one thinks it's a matter of politics." Hadn't Stravinsky conducted an orchestra in Moscow recently? Hadn't there been several shows of western non-figurative art in Moscow before? Hadn't Soviet music lovers met American jazz so enthusiastically? Probably Iljichev[7] and Khrushchev cannot forget that in Budapest curious writers-communists and students, looking for answers, set the anticommunist revolution in motion. The underground magazine *Phoenix*, a copy of which got across the border to the West, has shown that there is a very short way from a spiritual insurgent to an author of an anti-government manifesto. The steam valve can be controlled for a while, but the innovators and rebels will become only more popular and confident. In the end, an ideological shift can occur that may happen to be very serious for the regime."

As the artist, Vladimir Yankilevsky noted in his memoirs, "At that time, what had been banned by one hand of the authorities was unknowingly permitted by the other". It looked like a hopeless game where a small triumph of the liberals was quickly followed by a tough blow from the conservatives. Yorick Blumenfeld's book, *Seesaw. Cultural life in Eastern Europe* had an extremely adequate title: it reflected the sitcom existing in the SU in the 1960s. Periodical timid attempts to call for liberalization, certain publications of modernist paintings in catalogues and shows of once forbidden artists were now and again replaced by Stalinists' dogmas and threatening calls for order and closures of such shows. "The continued efforts of the Russians to impose ideological conformity a full fifty years after the October revolution is looked upon with unfeigned contempt", notes Blumenfeld. "All Polish painters are fully aware, for instance, that nonrepresentational art shows are still being closed in Moscow; that an exhibit of Marc Chagall's works was quickly declared a non-event, and that Soviet expressionist Oskar Rabin's paintings are denounced as "crude jokes", while Rabin himself is declared as being "unpleasantly sick". Naturally, the Moscow Union of Painters added their two pence, "Rabin casts a shadow on

[6] For instance, John Rewald's *History of Impressionism*. 1959, Moscow, Iskusstvo, and *Post-impressionism*, 1962, Leningrad, Iskusstvo.

[7] Leonid Iljichev in 1961-65 was a CPSU Central Committee secretary and Chairman of Committee on Ideology.

Soviet ideology, distorts the true image of our reality in the eyes of the foreign observer and gives grounds for undeniable propaganda against our country."[8]

These words (and the further narration in the book) reflect the point of view where the situation in the Soviet Union was perceived as a whole, without nuances or divisions. "The extent to which the USSR has ceased to be a true cultural influence everywhere, from Prague to Bucharest, is astounding. Moscow is today seen as the center of the great cultural void," says Blumenfeld.[9]

As many young artists of the 1960s noted in their memoirs, they could easily find magazines and catalogues from the West at various institutional libraries that, nevertheless, were not accessible to others. Since it was often too hard to find information on many issues that were of interest to the public, samizdat could not but begin to spread. Sure, samizdat was as much important for the West where it was seen as a sign of unrest in the socialist bloc and a source of information about it, as for the East. The flip side of the coin was tamizdat that played a crucial role in changing the minds of the people in the socialist countries. As F.Kind-Kovacs and Jessie Labov stated, "The parallel phenomena of samizdat and tamizdat, as well as the much broader circulation of cultural products that was instigated and sustained by these practices, in many ways anticipates what we identify as "cultural globalization" in Eastern Europe today."[10]

According to Alfred A. Reisch's *Hot Books in the Cold War*, the book distribution program started around 1956. According to the head of RLC's Special Projects Division, Isaac Patch, "over a period of 14 years, Bedford Publishing Company distributed through various channels over a million books to Soviet readers from the US and Western Europe. /.../ In 1982, 155,000 books and magazines were for the SU; 66,000 books for Poland (the fiscal projection for 1983 was $129,000 and $75,600 correspondingly). George Minden's book distribution program gave priority to the USSR (this trend appeared after the 1975 Helsinki Accords). According to G. Minden's data of 1991, the total number of books and periodicals distributed for ca. 35 years to five East European countries and for ca. 30 years to the Soviet Union amounted to almost 10 million. … The CIA-funded, Minden-managed book mailing and distribution programs played a decisive role, by contributing, together with the radio broadcasts, to the West's ideological victory."[11]

The result of the Information exchange and book distribution program can be ironically rendered with K. Marx's words from the *Manifesto of the Communist party*, "In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction,

[8] Yorick Blumenfeld: Seesaw. Cultural life in Eastern Europe. 1968. Harcourt, Brace & World, NY. (pp. 11-12)
[9] Ibid. p. 10
[10] In 'Samizdat & Tamizdat. Entangled phenomena?' by F.Kind-Kovacs and Jessie Labov
[11] Alfred A. Reisch. Hot Books in the Cold War, 2013, CEU Press

universal inter-dependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures, there arises a world literature."[12]

Of great importance were the publications of the publishing house Ardis. In January 1969, Karl and Ellendea Proffer visited the USSR for the first time. What the Proffers saw in Russia can be described by the following comment, "In the 1970s, Russian writers used to stay in depression and paranoia. We thought this would never end." At the beginning of the seventies and, naturally, earlier, the West knew very little of Russian literature. To help Soviet writers and to express their love for Russian literature in the first place, the Proffers founded a home-based publishing house, Ardis, and started to publish the works of Aksyonov, Bitov, Voinovich, Platonov, Bulgakov, Kuzmin, Vagin, Sokolov, Brodsky… Later, they published photo biographies of Mikhail Bulgakov, Vladimir Nabokov, Marina Tsvetaeva, Anna Akhmatova, Sergei Esenin, a two-volume collection of Bulat Okudzhava's songs and photos, with his essays and stories. They found it exciting to publish those books and send them clandestinely with various carriers to the USSR. As the writers recall, "Ardis helped us hold out by publishing the books that brought little profit or even at a loss, by supporting us in all ways when they came over." (Inna Lisnyanskaya) "We all were united by our hatred to the engaged literature and by our wish to be heard." (Semen Lipkin) "We were involved in a process of useless writing without a single opportunity to get published. That's why I was glad to accept Ardis' proposal" (Evgeny Popov)[13].

Besides Ardis and YMCA Press that became an immense source of support and enlightenment for the intelligentsia in the USSR, at the end of the sixties, a series of books on Russia's literature "Books that matter" was published:

1) *Russia's underground poets* (ed. by Keith Bosley), Frederick A. Praeger, NYC – Washington, 1969, previously published as *Russia's other poets* in Great Britain in 1968 by Longmans, Green and Co, Ltd. Included verses by B. Akhmadulina, I. Brodsky, A. Galich, B. Okudzhava, N. Gorbanevskaya and others.

2) *Russia's other writers (selection from Samizdat literature)* – Praeger, 1971. NYC – Washington (ed. by Michael Scammell). Included 11 short stories by Vl.Maximov, Vl.Bukovsky, Varlam Shalamov, Osip Mandelstam (*The Fourth Prose*) and others. However, a line from the commercial on the book cover is quite eloquent: "The result is a moving and

[12] Chapter 1, Bourgeois and Proletarians.

[13] The quotes were taken from a RTV broadcast on VHS (1992-93).

memorable collection of stories about human beings who happen to be Soviet citizens". 3-4) Later, Praeger also published *Modern Poems from Russia* and *A History of Russian Music* (both in 1977).

In 1971, one of Radio Liberty's hosts, Boris Alexeev, asked himself, "How well is the West informed about art in the USSR?" – "Badly," admitted he after a pause. Many other RL hosts had earlier posed this question to their guests as well. Sure, it is true that very few books on Soviet avant-garde had been published in the West by that time. Very successful was Camilla Gray's book *The Russian Experiment in Art 1863-1922*, published in 1962 by Thames and Hudson Ltd. Extremely important was John Berger's monograph, *Art and Revolution: Ernst Neizvestny and the Role of the Artist in the U.S.S.R* (1969) as the first monograph about a Russian artist born after 1917, written by a Western author. The book *Unofficial Art in the Soviet Union* by Paul Sjeklocha and Igor Mead (1967) gave an unnecessary detailed insight into the Russian avant-garde, but later provided information on Soviet unofficial artists – not incidentally coupled with official artists – along with some images of works by *anonymous* artists (whom I happen to know), which signifies the artists did not always trust the Americans while they were visiting their studios.

The lack of information about the art situation in the USSR, especially before 1974 when the infamous *Bulldozer exhibition* in Moscow broke a window to the West, led to its controversial perception by western critics and art collectors. Michael Scammell, the founder of The *Index on Censorship* magazine (1972), who helped organize the show of unofficial Soviet art in London in 1977, admitted in an interview (*Tretja Volna* #2, p.69), "First time I heard about unofficial art in the USSR in 1967, when I was in Czechoslovakia. I got to know there Russian literature translators who had often visited the USSR and knew a lot about the so called nonconformist artists." According to him, he first time went to Moscow in 1970, met with an unnamed unofficial sculptor and became familiar with the situation in art in general, as professionally he was interested only in Soviet literature. Scammell also added that "the West had not even assumed the existence of unofficial art in the USSR". He certified there had been a mistrust of western public and critics of contemporary Soviet unofficial art. He said, 'the painting of Russian nonconformists did not match the tastes of the ICA board', but they were glad to organize the show at the Institute. There was "a certain shock when they saw images of those paintings. Only now the critics have explained that this art has its own time dimension, obeys other chronological laws". Gallerist Dina Vierny also periodically treated that kind of Russian unofficial art with contempt – although, in my opinion, that could be as well due to her ambitions to be the only Soviet unofficial art dealer in Paris (at least).

In June 1967, the Baltimore Sun noted, "Banned Art from Russia seems bland. New York show makes Americans wonder, “Why the fuss?” “Bland” and “1890” are the first words that come to mind about the works by such “unofficial” artists as Oskar Rabin, Dmitry Plavinsky and Anatoly Zverev." However, the official Soviet art is scolded in the same way: IHT of Oct 10, 1967, asks, “Is Soviet Art all that bad? – Yes!” – The article was about an official art show at the Manege in Moscow.

The tamizdat of the late 1970s and 1980s had already a different mission and significance. The émigré magazines like *Tretja Volna* and especially *A-Ya* helped present Soviet artists to the western art market in a much better, professional way[14]. As Valentina Parisi remarked in her essay *Writing about apparently nonexistent art*, “By reflecting themselves through the tamizdat review’s ‘mirror’, Soviet unofficial art began to rethink its status and emerge progressively from apparent nonexistence.”[15] And the Kontinent magazine was kind to observe, "One of the unquestionable merits of *A-Ya* is the parallel English translation of its articles. This is, so to speak, an attempt to open a window to Europe and tell it in the language it understands about Russia’s innovative artists".

The last, but not least observation would be that throughout these decades, the broadcasts of RL, RFE, Voice of America, BBC added to the impact of the samizdat-tamizdat tandem by persistently bringing information on literature, arts, music, changes in official politics, traces of liberal ideas in official publications, hopes for development in culture, the latest samizdat reviews, social problems and current events to Soviet listeners. For instance, the Voice of America’s radio jazz program, Music in the USA, hosted by Willis Conover, and the BBC's rock music programs hosted by Seva Novgorodtsev were of greatest importance for all music lovers in the USSR. Margo Shohl Rosen argues in her work, *The Independent Turn in Soviet-Era Russian Poetry*[16] that Conover’s interviews with jazz artists conveyed to the Leningrad poets and their generation an attractive and influential narrative of independence and human dignity. The only unfortunate detail about all these broadcasts was that jamming too often prevented the listeners from hearing everything in detail, especially in the early years of the stations' existence.

I cannot present here all the interesting and significant information I have found in the archives, but I hope it can be seen already that the research has turned out quite fruitful and contributing to further work on the topic.

---

[14] Unfortunately, the general impression was often spoiled by the permanent fight and squabbles between various immigrant groups, so typical of ex-Soviet immigration. The main problem of Russian immigration was that various parties were constantly fighting for the monopoly of 1) presentation/owning; 2) interpretation/criticism; 3) promotion/sales of the works of unofficial artists.

[15] *Samizdat, Tamizdat & Beyond. Transnational media during and after socialism.* 2013, Berghahn Books. New York. P.193

[16] Margo Shohl Rosen, *The Independent Turn in Soviet-era Russian Poetry: How Dmitry Bobyshev, Josephy Brodsky, Anatoly Naiman and Evgeny Rein Became the 'Avvakumites' of Leningrad*. Columbia University, 2011

April 2016

Budapest - Moscow