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“If the war protracts for a long time, there will be a social revolution the world has never known”, the Pontifex told the German emissary Matthias Erzberger, who visited the Vatican at the end of 1915.

In the position of Cardinal Rampolla’s Secretary, Giacomo della Chiesa carefully studied works by socialist authors and prepared comments to Karl Marx’s works for Leo XIII; he understood the practical aftermath of the ongoing war better than many European governmental and party political leaders.

However in late 1915, Matthias Erzberger ignored the warnings made by Benedict XV and treated his requests with minor concessions. Only due to persistent appeals by the Pontifex, fathers of large families and POWs having spent over eighteen months in prison were to be returned to their mother countries since 1916.

All consumptive Italian soldiers were returned to the country in that same year. Catholic priests responded to the appeal of Benedict XV and often visited the POW camps, delivered their messages and letters to their relatives, prepared detailed reports on the condition of the people held there and urgent measures to assist them. In 1916 the Pontifex strongly supported the initiative of the International Committee of the Red Cross to print photos of the POW camps on postcards, having instructed Catholic prelates to send all available photos they had to Geneva. In his letter to Gustave Ador, President of the International Red Cross, Benedict XV wrote that such action would fill hearts of thousands POW family members with hope.

The news of the February Revolution in Russia disturbed the Pontifex. Nicholas Bock, the Head of the Russian Diplomatic
Mission of the Holy See, based on the oral information provided by Cardinal Pietro Gasparri, wrote that Benedict XV was seriously concerned that a revolution in the midst of a long and exhausting war would inevitably radicalize society. Many books and monographs, mentioning N. Bock’s name, quote his report to St. Petersburg, where he recounted a conversation with the Pontifex and accused the latter of secretiveness! The authors, who are not familiar with the biography of Nicholas Bock, expose Benedict XV as his enemy; however, the Russian diplomat sincerely respected the Pontifex. In 1925, Nicholas Bock, aged 45, became a Catholic priest named Benedict!

In February 1917 the Pontifex sends his envoy, Cardinal Achille Ratti (the future Pope Pius XI), to St. Petersburg to establish contacts with the Provisional Government and to assist the arrested Royal family; however, the papal legate only reached Warsaw.

Count A. Sheptitskiy was released from prison by the Provisional Government in March 1917; however, his work failed once again, and the ideologist of the Catholic and the Orthodox church unification in Ukraine departed to Switzerland.

On May 1, 1917, Benedict XV reorganized (contrary to frequent quotes that he actually established it to harm the Soviet Russia) the Congregation for the Oriental Churches (Congregatio pro Ecclesia Orientale) founded back on January 6, 1862, to an Independent Congregation, for the direction of which the Pontifex formed a college of 20 cardinals. The ongoing war spread over the Balkans, the Middle East and Africa; the Holy See indicated its presence everywhere through missionaries. The Pontifex established the Institute of Oriental Studies for missionary training, having permitted the Orthodox to study there.

On August 1, 1917, Benedict XV called on to conclude universal peace without victors or vanquished, and made an appeal to cease hostilities and initiate peaceful negotiations. The Pontifex proposed a seven clause peaceful settlement, providing a mutual reduction of war damages, a mutual restitution of occupied territories, a settlement of territorial disputes between the central states and the Entente countries, a solution of Armenian national problem, and the problems of the Balkan states and Poland.
Realizing that the exhausting war would inevitably radicalize all strata of society, the Pontifex, in the encyclical *Humani generis*, 1917, tried to protect the clergy from involvement in the politics by regulating church sermons and banning political agitation.

In April 1918 Benedict XV appointed prelate Achille Ratti his representative in Russia, Poland and the Baltic States; however he stayed in Warsaw because of the Civil War in Russia.

In the summer of 1918 Benedict XV appealed to the Soviet government for the release of Emperor Nicholas II and his family. The negotiations on the departure of the Royal family to the Vatican were conducted by Nuncio Eugenio Pacelli (the future Pope Pius XII) and Archbishop of Mogilev Edward von der Ropp; however, they proved fruitless.

In August 1918 the Pontifex was reported that the Italian poet Gabriele d’Annunzio, who was considered to be a romantic and an epicurean, had participated in the first-ever (!) night bomber raid on the city of Vienna. Benedict XV had long refused to believe this, considering the news to be the Austro-Hungarian Ministry of Defence propaganda. The Pontifex neither considered d’Annunzio to be a genius, nor able to do villainy such as the bombing of the civilians of Vienna. But, alas!

The mission of Symon Petliura visited the Vatican in 1919. However, there is a historical mystery here! Symon Petliura, baptized in the Orthodox rite and educated in the Poltava Seminary, was an atheist of leftist-nationalistic views. The Petliurists robbed and killed with extreme cruelty, both the Orthodox and the Catholics; the Polish count S. Tyszkiewicz, who was sent on Petliura’s behalf, did not so much seek blessings or spiritual protection of the Holy See but money to purchase weapons for the gangs. However, S. Petliura on behalf of proclaimed by him Ukrainian People’s Republic signed an alliance with Poland on April 21, 1920, by which Poland promised the Ukrainian People’s Republic military help in exchange for the acceptance of Polish-Ukrainian border on the river Zbruch. That meant that Galicia and Volhynia were given to Poland, and it explained the efforts of Count S. Tyszkiewicz, a Polish emissary. The Vatican was wary of this embassy, therefor it sent its representative to clarify the circumstances in Poland; however, while the representative was on his way, S. Petliura was defeated. When the
Vatican learned of the arrests of the Orthodox priests in Russia, Cardinal Pietro Gasparri on behalf of Benedict XV sent the following telegram to Moscow on March 12, 1919: “a major source reports, that your followers are persecuting the servants of God, especially those who belong to the Orthodox religion. The Holy Father Benedict XV exhorts you to give strict orders that the ministers of all religions are to be respected. Humanity and religion would be grateful to you for this”. On 13 March, 1919, a reply came from Moscow signed by Georgy Chicherin: “Having received your telegram of March 12, I can assure you, that the major source mentioned in it misled you.” On July 27, 1919, Benedict XV in a letter to G. Chicherin, the People’s Commissar for Foreign Affairs, personally protested against the persecution of the Russian Orthodox Church, and offered to buy back church utensils, confiscated by the Soviet regime. Metropolitan Sergius (Stragogrodsky) of Vladimir and Shuya, the future Patriarch, on behalf of the Holy Synod thanked the Pontifex and the Holy See for the intercession. His Holiness Patriarch Tikhon expressed to Benedict XV “sincere gratitude for the Christian action”. Welch, blessed on this by the Roman Pope, and the Catholic missionary organizations helped Patriarch Tikhon until his death.

In the fratricidal fire of the Russian Civil War, People’s Commissar Leon Trotsky had no interest in the opinion of the Pontifex-peacemaker.

In spite of this, Benedict XV did not support the proposal of the Entente on the establishment of a cordon sanitaire and isolation of Soviet Russia, considering that this would complicate the lives of its people during the post-war chaos and civil war.

In April 1920 Fridtjof Nansen, a Norwegian polar explorer and a social activist, worked in the area of the League of Nations on the questions of repatriation of prisoners of war, scattered around different European countries. Benedict XV immediately ordered for the information base (the Opera dei Prigioneri) — the Vatican Bureau of missing persons, POWs and internees, to be available to all Nansen’s employees. In November 1920 Nansen had already reported to the League of Nations Commission on the repatriation of 200,000 people, pointing an effective assistance of the data received from the Holy See in his report. At the same meeting, Nansen predicted an imminent onset
of a severe hunger in Russia which had been ravaged by the World War, the Revolution and Civil War, pointing out that over 2 million citizens of this country were scattered around European countries. Nansen, at the suggestion of Philip Noel-Baker, Britain’s delegate to the League of Nations, became the League of Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on September 1, 1921. At the same time, the League of Nations refused to help the starving in Russia, so Nansen appealed to private organizations and individuals and to Benedict XV.

By August 5, 1920, the Pontifex had appealed to all the civilized nations for donations to the starving in Russia. Benedict XV found words for the people of war-torn Europe to assist with Christian charity and support the people dying in distant Russia.

In December, 1920, Benedict XV gave 1 million lire to Archbishop Edward von der Ropp and Jan Cieplak, a representative of the Vatican in Petrograd, for famine relief. On September 30, 1921, Nansen gave a speech at the League of Nations meeting, asking to convey to governments that for the salvation of people in Russia 5 million pounds sterling were needed to purchase grain in the United States and Canada, which had gathered rich harvests in that year, for the salvation of people in Russia. Benedict XV ordered to print Nansen’s speech in all Catholic editions and announced a new fundraising for famine relief.

On August 22, 1921, Patriarch Tikhon issued a Message with an appeal to believers of all faiths around the world to help the starving in Russia. On December 8, 1921, the Soviet government allowed the Russian Orthodox Church and other religious organizations to raise funds to save people from starvation. On December 21, 1921, the Pontifex gave another 500 000 lire to assist all those in need “without distinction of religion”, and personally to Fridtjof Nansen, who expressed his gratitude to the Pontifex and gave him photos of women and children, made by him on a trip to the starving regions of Russia.

Michael von Faulhaber, Archbishop of Munich and Freising, aged 52, actively raised funds to save the starving in Russia. The participation of American and Canadian cardinals, European clergy and personally Benedict XV in saving the starving was noted in Fridtjof Nansen’s speech at the Nobel Peace Prize 1922 Award ceremony. The Pontifex was one of the first organizers of fundraisings, and the provision of aid to Russia ravaged by the World War I and the Civil War was kept under his control. A monument to Fridtjof Nansen by sculptor Vladimir Tsigal was erected in the Bolshoi Levshinsky lane in front of the Russian International Red Cross building in Moscow in 2004. Benedict XV has the same right to have a monument from Russia, however, his name is almost unknown. Many Russians do not even know that their grandparents were saved from starvation with the help of the Roman Pope in the distant 1921–1922.

For his work to save the starving in Russia Nansen was accused of “Bolshevism” and sympathy to the Soviet government. In 1921 the Pontifex made a speech with an encyclical devoted to the necessity of saving the children in Russia and the children of post-war Europe in a difficult situation. The Roman Pope reminded of no confessional differences, national boundaries and political preferences for Christian charity for those in need! Benedict XV was one of the first who spoke about giving the Nobel Peace Prize award to Nansen for his work as the League of Nations High Commissioner. The consistory of March 07, 1921, was called a “consistory of mercy” or “the consistory of fifty year old cardinals”.

All those, who had been saving war-ravaged Europe and the especially affected Russia from hunger, received scarlet birettas from Benedict XV: F. Ragonesi, Apostolic Nuncio in Spain, D. Dougherty, Archbishop of Philadelphia, Michael von Faulhaber, Archbishop of Munich and Freising, Karl Schulte, Archbishop of Cologne, and two Spanish Archbishops — H. B. Benlioh y Vivo and Francisco de Asís Vidal y Barraquer. Benedict XV’s friends and enemies did justice to his generosity and responsiveness. The Pontifex and his brother Admiral dela Chiesa’s personal savings always formed part of the subscribed money to charities. Shortly after the sudden death of Benedict XV on
February 1, 1922, twelve catholic priests, who had received the blessing of the late Pontifex, departed for Russia to distribute the food.

A short (consisting just of five letters) but nevertheless interesting correspondence between Benedict XV and Fridtjof Nansen, who continued to be engaged in the repatriation of refugees, is left. The Pontifex, receiving information from the Opera dei Prigionieri — the Vatican Bureau of missing persons, POWs and internees, wrote to Nansen that one of the main problems was the lack of documentation which didn’t give people a legal status in the receiving country. The idea of the Nansen Passport — an identity card for stateless refugees, was discussed not for the first time in a letter from Benedict XV to F. Nansen on March 2, 1922. The document began to be issued in 1922 after the Pontifex’s death, and was initially given only the Russians, however afterwards to refugees from other countries as well.

At the same time, Benedict XV was engaged in daily affairs of the church, which required time and attention. In December 1916, he had completed works on the codification of the canon law, which was supervised by Cardinal Pietro Gasparri. The new Code of Canon Law (Codex Iuris Canonici) was published on May 27, 1917, and came into force a year later. The Pontifex dedicated the encyclical to anniversaries of Catholic saints Dominic and Francis of Assisi, Loreto Virgin and St. Joseph.

The encyclical *Spiritus Paraclitus*, 1920, in connection with the 1500th anniversary of the death of Church Father St. Jerome, the Pontifex dedicated to theologians, urging them not to lock in conservatism and to harmonize the Christian tradition and the results of new research papers in the interests of faith. Benedict XV knew classical literature very well, expressing his love in the most interesting encyclical *In Praeclara Summorum* (April 30, 1921) on the occasion of the 600th anniversary of Dante’s death. Subsequently, the experts on Dante’s works compared the encyclical *In praecelara* with a full doctorate, where in addition to in-depth analysis of Dante’s religious poetry the author showed himself as a serious connoisseur of his work, history and Italian language.

In his speech on Dante, Benedict XV associated the past war years with human disregard for Dante’s warnings from the remote past, for the word of the Lord and his calls!
The Pontifex dismissed *Sodalitium Pianum* — a “secret police” of the Roman Curia, created by his predecessor, Pius X, ended the persecution of the modernists and allowed theological discussions.

Missionary organizations in the time of Benedict XV extended their influence in Asia, Africa and the Middle East. After the establishment of diplomatic relations with China in 1918, the Pontifex published the encyclical *Maximum Illud (Many of Those)* issued on November 30, 1919, in which he appealed to the working missionaries to guard the interests of the church and not of their governments, to educate national cadres and respect the laws and customs of the countries in which they work. This encyclical became an effective guide for missionaries for many decades.

Pope Benedict XV’s active peace-making efforts during the World War II gained him international prestige and respect. The world was preparing for a conference, which was supposed to put an end to the war. In the encyclical *Quod Iam Diu* the Pontifex urged public prayers for the success of the peace conference and for a lasting peace based on the principles of Christian morality. However, the person who made the most to end the war was not admitted to the Versailles Peace Conference! It was neither because of Italy nor because of a secret clause of the London Agreement, which ceased to be a mystery after the promulgation of diplomatic documents of Tsarist Russia by Lenin in 1918.

The world was rapidly changing, and in its post-war system, many were striving for occupying the place belonging to the Roman Pope by right. The victors did not remember yesterday’s mistakes, and did not think about tomorrow; they lived in the current triumph of repeating old mistakes. Everyone needed an arbitrator at the beginning of the war, to the name of which you could appeal; however, no one wanted to consider the opinion of Benedict XV when it came to the division of the spoils. The end of the First World War coincided with the Nobel Peace Prize ceremony, which was established in 1901, and Benedict XV, Giacomo Della Chiesa, was recognized to be the most worthy of the prize. The Nobel Prize was not presented in 1914 again, as well as in 1915 and in 1916. The International Committee of the Red Cross was presented with the Nobel Peace Prize “for the work to improve the situation of the prisoners of war” in 1917. No prize was given in 1918.
In 1919 the public opinion, Henri La Fontaine in particular, the President of the International Peace Bureau, and Gustave Ador, the President of Switzerland and the International Committee of the Red Cross, named the Pontifex perhaps the only real contender to receive it. However, in the postwar world the good was easily forgettable, especially when the American president Woodrow Wilson wanted to receive the Nobel Peace Prize. An energetic American politician, who had volunteered to be a mediator between the Vatican and the victorious powers, visited the Pontifex on the issue of the Pontifex’s participation in the Versailles Conference in 1919. At the beginning of 1919 Benedict XV suffered a second heart attack, and as he hadn’t yet recovered from the disease he yielded to the pressure of Woodrow Wilson and abandoned further attempts to participate in the conference. Woodrow Wilson attributed himself the chief merit of conclusion of peace! To be fair it was Woodrow Wilson who proclaimed a policy of neutrality at the beginning of the First World War and initiated the creation of the League of Nations, offering a peace plan on January 22, 1917, with the help of founding this organization. But! The United States entered the war on April 6, 1917, however, the president called “… the entry into the war a preparation of the world for democracy!”.

Even before Woodrow Wilson’s visit to the Vatican a powerful PR-campaign was held in The New York Times of January 2, 1919, with the title “Pope Hopes For Foundation of League of Nations” standing out on the front page.

Much was taken out of context from the New Year Message of Benedict XV, and something was frankly added. Everyone was surprised at an inexplicable delay in the opening of the peace conference; however, all was clear and simple — the world stage for the main characters was being cleared, and there was no place for the Roman Pope who had been speaking about peace during all the years of the war! What did the words spoken or written by Benedict XV in the encyclical mean against 1 million American soldiers in Europe at the end of the First World War? Such argument as the million military contingent had outweighed all the rest! Prior to the meeting in Versailles, as if by magic, articles with old accusations of pro-German sympathies of the Pontifex appeared around
the world in newspapers. At once everyone forgot everything that the peacemaker of the Holy See — the Apostle of the world, had done!

Rudyard Kipling appeared in the British press with a protest against the abuse of the Pontifex. After they had lost the eldest son at the front in 1915, R. Kipling and his wife had worked for the Red Cross for the next three years of the war, so he knew about the extensive social activities of the Roman Pope.

Aggrieved Benedict XV did not recognize the results of the Versailles Conference and the formed League of Nations, which had become a part of the peace treaty. Italy and France prevented the Vatican from joining the League of Nations. Russia was not accepted in the League of Nations, but what is even more curious, the United States did not enter it as well! Whereas it was for the creation of the League of Nations that the 28th President Woodrow Wilson was awarded the 1919 Nobel Peace Prize, which was received by Albert Schmedeman, an American ambassador in Norway. The United States Congress didn’t ratify the Treaty of Versailles as well!

The Nobel Peace Prize to Woodrow Wilson was Entente’s price for England and France concessions at the peace conference; however, it did not convince the United States in the strength of the Versailles system and prospects of the League of Nations as the arbiter of international disputes! Nearly 100 years ago the United States Congress eliminated a possibility of foreign interference in the internal political life of the country.

In the encyclical *Pasem, Dei Munus* of May 20, 1920, dedicated to the end of the First World War, the Pontifex expressed a critical attitude to the established order of the world, the peace instability under the conditions of total humiliation of Germany and Austria, and pointed to the neglect of the Holy See. However, it did not worry the victors, and nobody asked the opinion of the defeated.

Benedict XV was perhaps the first to point out the inevitable problems with Germany, which had lost 10% of its territory with several million inhabitants, and overwhelming reparations imposed on it. There were no occupation troops in Germany at the end of the First World War, and a retained military-industrial potential and a dissemination of
revanchist sentiments were only a matter of time for a dissolution of the Treaty of Versailles by a new armed conflict!

During a public worship on Ash Wednesday (Dies Cinerum), which was the first day of Lent, in 1919, Benedict XV sprinkled ashes over his head, and gave one of his wonderful sermons — on the ash-strewn disaster of Europe. His gesture surprised even the Cardinals who knew him, though, if you think about it there was no eccentricity in it, no pose! The year 1919 was the first year after the end of the war. Europe was recovering as if probing itself and not believing that it had survived! Benedict XV was an intellectual, and he gathered all the cultural news of the postwar continent. Let us consider this news…

… Even in 1917, Cardinal Friedrich Gustav Piffl, Archbishop of Vienna, at the request of a mutilated by war Austrian pianist Paul Wittgenstein, sent a personal inquiry to the Vatican Information Office (the office concerned with tracing prisoners of war) with a request to find his younger brother, philosopher Ludwig Josef Johann Wittgenstein, one of the most brilliant thinkers of the 20th century. When his whereabouts were found, the Pontifex sent a personal request for a release of L. Wittgenstein, and in 1919 the thankful philosopher wrote to the Vatican that he had written “Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus” in captivity, which was about to be issued. Paul Wittgenstein, L. Wittgenstein’s older brother, a pianist with a right hand amputated after an injury, soon resumed giving concerts playing with his left hand and thanked Benedict XV for the help in saving his brother. The Pontifex asked Teodoro Valfrè di Bonzo, Apostolic Nuncio in Vienna, and Cardinal Friedrich Piffl to publish articles about creative successes and concerts of the one-armed pianist stressing that each of his concerts was worth many Masses for the same crippled by war people!

One has to be the Roman Pope to write this to one’s prelate.

In late March 1918, Cardinal Leon-Adolphe Amette, Archbishop of Paris, told Benedict XV of an untimely death of Claude Debussy. The Cardinals knew that the Pontifex was fond of Debussy’s music; his favorite works were a cantata L’enfant prodigue (The Prodigal Son) and a piano piece Clair de Lune. Benedict XV often said that an immersion into such music was akin to a prayer! The disciple of
Leo XIII and Cardinal Rampolla lived not only by a canonical Gregorian chant. After the outbreak of war C. Debussy had not come to the piano for weeks, leaving the piercing *Sin nombre* and *Christmas Carol for homeless Children* until later (*Ode à la France* remained unfinished). Fifty-year old Debussy died under the sounds of gunfire bombarding Paris on March 25, 1918. In the spring of 1919 Cardinal Amett wrote to the Vatican of composer Joseph Guy Marie Ropartz reconstructing the score of the opera *Guercœur* (the healing of the heart), burnt together with its composer Albéric Magnard by the advancing Germans at his house in France. He also wrote that the French were waiting for the opera reconstitution; however, the composer Guy Ropartz refused to compose music and left to teach in Strasbourg. Being a music lover, Cardinal L. Amett gladdened the Pontifex with the news about the composer Maurice Ravel who served as a volunteer truck driver for the infantry in 1914 and then for Aviation Regiment of the French army. M. Ravel was discharged due to illness after undermining his health in 1918 and was improving his health. But! According to his friends, he had not been composing anything during that time. Maurice Ravel was only forty-five years old in 1919!

**The World War I shocked Maurice Ravel, and he did not write anything till 1925.** After eight years of silence his first work was a suite *Le Tombeau de Couperin* dedicated to friends who had died in the war. Impressionism of M. Ravel’s music had exhausted itself and changed to an emotional beginning, which changed the style of the composer’s works. Subsequently, M. Ravel identified this trend in his work as “laconicism carried to the verge of a limit”.

In Eastertide of 1919 among clerical news Cardinal L. Amett reported that the composer Arthur Honegger was finishing his oratorio *King David* on the play by Rene Morax.

**The oratorio *King David* was written in 1921.**

Among other things His Eminence Cardinal Pietro La Fontaine, Patriarch of Venice, wrote to Benedict XV about the composer Ermanno Wolf-Ferrari who was best known for his comic operas before the war which were based on plays by Carlo Goldoni. After surviving the war in
Zurich, Switzerland, the musician was in a deep depression, according to Cardinal La Fontaine.

The World War I was the end of the composer Ermanno Wolf-Ferrari’s creative work; his first work appeared in 1925, and critics pointed out melancholy and somberness in it.

The composer Ferruccio Busoni, who lived in Berlin until 1913, almost repeated E. Wolf-Ferrari’s fate. Ferruccio Busoni went to Zurich at the outbreak of war and refused to give concerts for any of the belligerent countries; he was in need. He returned to Berlin in 1920 and began to write opera Doctor Faustus, which he did not finish. Archbishop Eugenio Pacelli, Apostolic Nuncio in Berlin, appointed in 1920, wrote to his counterpart in Vienna about the composer’s distress.

János Csernoch, Primate of Hungary, proudly wrote to the Vatican of the finalization of Psalmus Hungaricus (Hungarian psalm) by the composer Zoltán Kodály owing to the termination of the war.

The First World War spared Zoltán Kodály and Belo Viktor Janos Bartok; instead of being sent to the front, they were left to work in the press department of the Ministry of War of Austria-Hungary. Psalmus Hungaricus by Zoltán Kodály was completed in 1923, and the first performance was dedicated to the memory of Benedict XV.

Apostolic Nuncio in Vienna reported that people were enthusiastically waiting for a novelty by the notorious composer Alban Berg. Probably if it wasn’t for this cursed war, Cardinal Valfrè di Bonzo would not dare to write to the Pontifex about a prewar premiere of Alban Berg’s Five Songs on Picture Postcard Texts by Peter Altenberg on March 31, 1913, in Vienna, accompanied by civil commotion involving the police. The premiere scandal of A. Berg’s work in 1913 was the same as Stravinsky’s “The Rite of Spring” being “the two outrageous spectacles of pre-war music”. However the war inevitably did its job; what had not been possible in the daily routine of a peaceful life became commonplace. Austria-Hungary collapsed, and 32% out of the total loss of the Imperial Army were in captivity; confusion reigned in the country. The Pontifex and the Cardinal knew that not only God and Berg as well gave people the strength to live on! In 1919 Cardinal Valfrè di Bonzo wrote to Benedict XV that the brawler Alban Berg had finished the first act
of the opera *Wozzeck*, and the audience was looking forward to the completion of the work.

The premier of A. Berg’s opera *Wozzeck* was first performed on December 14, 1925 (it was a mystical year for musicians after the World War I, they were all gradually returning to their scores). However Alban Berg astonished with his work. Personal experiences of the composer, who had lived through the horrors of war, were the basis of the libretto and music. The premiere of the opera *Wozzeck* took place in the USSR in 1927.

Apparently Cardinal T. Valfrè di Bonzo knew well the mood of Benedict XV after the war, since he questioned the Pontifex about his impressions from reading the editions of the Viennese magazine *Torch* (the author and publisher of which was an Austrian writer and satirist Karl Kraus) in addition to the clergy business, reports on the visits of POW camps, hospitals and orphanages. Karl Kraus, Vienna’s favourite and a smart man, knowingly catholicized in 1911, when he was thirty-seven years old; Apostolic Nuncio was proud of the great poignancy and popularity of the Catholic writer. A book by K. Kraus, written during the four years of war on the basis of relevant materials from European newspapers, under an uncheerful title *The Last Days of Mankind*, was published in 1919.

Nowadays, publicist Olga Fedyanina named Karl Kraus a resident of Vienna, who single-handedly tried to prevent the 21st century from coming!

No one has succeeded in preventing the time from going; however, the world lives on simple stories. Some of the aphorisms by Karl Kraus appear in correspondence of Benedict XV. For example: “… The closer the look one takes at a word, the greater the distance from which it looks back”

“A weak man has doubts before a decision; a strong man has them afterwards.”

“… The devil is an optimist if he thinks he can make people worse than they are.”

Benedict XV would not know that the clever Karl Kraus left the Catholic Church in 1923. The wound given by the First World War did not heal, and K. Kraus was looking for the guilty. Maybe the Pontifex would have understood him!
The anti-war drama *The Last Days of Mankind* by Karl Kraus opened the 2014 Salzburg Festival.

Having referred to the liturgy of Ash Wednesday in 1919, I gave a few examples of personal tragedies and dramas of outstanding people of the early 21st century in order to try to explain the state of the Pontifex. The consequences of the First World War were too hard, and they were reflected in all aspects of life of the society. Benedict XV knew better than others that the pre-war social and cultural structure of Europe had been destroyed. Roger Osborne, the author of *Civilization: A New History of the Western World*, wrote about twenty years of peace between the First and Second World Wars: “A sense of loss of the coordinate system was the predominant feeling of the interwar years, expressed in the most important works of culture”. Roger Osborne called the First World War “the internal war of civilized nations”; a terrible realization of this truth was felt during the liturgy of Ash Wednesday of 1919. Benedict XV as an intellectual understood that civilization was equal neither to the destroyed Reims Cathedral nor to the Santa Maria degli Scalzi in Venice, however it was still inseparably connected with them. The Pontifex, reading letters from his nuncios and papal legates from around the world on the state of society, understood the size of the disaster and that the world would never be the same again.

To the credit of signatories of the “Manifesto of the Ninety-Three” of October 4, 1914, two thirds of them publicly renounced their signatures during the war.

Not only poet Paul Valéry’s response to the war but his response to the preaching of the Pontifex was written in *The Crisis of the Spirit* in 1919,— “While not everything submitted to destruction, everything sensed it. An extraordinary tremor ran through the mind of Europe. Through all the corners of its mind it felt that it no longer recognises itself, that it is no longer the same, that the threat of losing its self-identity is real and must be stopped…” (F. Porche *Paul Valéry et la Poesie Pure*, P. 1926, p. 23.)

The Pontifex could not close himself from the world as Guy Ropartz or Ermanno Wolf-Ferrari did; nor could he afford to be silent for a few years. Like M. Ravel, brothers Peter and Ludwig Wittgenstein,
Karl Kraus, Slovenian composer Emerick Beran and millions of others Benedict XV learned to live in the new reality.

The Liturgy of Ash Wednesday in 1919 was more than a Mass and a sermon before Lent!

On November 10, 1919, Benedict XV abolished the *Non Expedit* (1871 and 1874), allowed the Catholics to participate in national elections thereby legalizing progressive Catholic movements in the congregation’s opinion. At the same time, the Pontifex permitted the Catholics to create their own political organization in Italy — People’s Party (Partito Popolare Italiano), which asserted itself as a powerful party at the first parliamentary elections.

Addressing the leaders of Catholic parties, the Pontifex urged them to contribute to the creation of a Christian social order in post-war Italy, while he rigidly excluded the Vatican from the line of its political activity. With his resolution to create the Catholic party, the Roman Pope reached reconciliation and a dialogue with the Parliament of Italy. Since the loss of temporal power by the Popes, Benedict XV was the first of them to recognize the right of other heads of states to pay visits to the King of Italy; he canceled the decree banning the heads of foreign Catholic powers to come to Rome other than with a visit to the Vatican, which had been in force since 1870. With a separate decree the Pontifex legalized official contacts of the “black” Diplomatic Corps, accredited to the Vatican, and the “white”, accredited to the Quirinale.

Benedict XV was also the first of the Roman Popes who tried to settle the “Roman Question” and reconcile the Vatican with the Quirinale since the formation of the Italian State. A preliminary agreement on granting a small area for the Vatican use was reached between the Holy See and the Government of Orlando. However these plans were not realized owing to an imminent resignation of the government.

By his actions Benedict XV actually completely prepared the conclusion of an agreement between the Vatican and the Italian government, which would have soon been made, if it was not for his untimely death in 1922. The Roman Pope, who found a common language with all the world, could not but agree with Italy!
(An agreement between the Vatican and the Italian government, Lateran Treaty was signed on February 11, 1929: by Cardinal Pietro Gasparri on behalf of Pope Pius XI, by B. Mussolini on behalf of King Victor Emmanuel III)

Continuing the cohesion policy with France, Benedict XV canonized Joan of Arc, the French national heroine, in May 1920. Later in 1921, the Pontifex restored diplomatic relations with France, ineptly torn by his predecessor.

The University of the Sacred Heart, a secular institute for Catholics, designed to facilitate a dialogue of the Church with modern society, was opened at the initiative of Benedict XV in Milan in 1920. The devastating effects of the First World War on the European civilization were the subject of numerous speeches and letters by the Pontifex. Benedict XV tried comprehensively to promote the post-war recovery of the Europe’s wounded soul. In 1918 the reconstruction of the Leuven University Library, Belgium, as well as a construction to expand the Egyptian Museum and the new School of Sacred Music in Rome (1915) were began at the initiative of the Pontifex with the help of his significant personal donations. In late 1917 restoration work was carried out on the Vatican territory as well as a construction of a new administrative building (Government Palace) was began.

The tapestry workshop to produce tapestry was recreated on the initiative of Benedict XV in 1915; Astrophotography room was opened at the the Vatican Observatory in 1917 and the construction of quarters for the Swiss Guards was completed. In gratitude for the end of the war, a statue of Saint Mary — the Queen of Peace, was solemnly erected in the Basilica di Santa Maria Maggiore in 1918. Hospitals and shelters for veterans — the veterans of war and orphans, were opened in monasteries at the call of Benedict XV in Italy, France, Belgium, Germany and Austria. Ceremonial burials of the Unknown Warrior took place in London and Paris on November 14, 1920. The idea of creating such a monument arose during the war. David Railton, an Anglican priest, chaplain to the British Navy, often left an inscription “Unknown British Warrior” on the graves of unknown soldiers. A memorial was erected
in Westminster Abbey in London; because of the separation of church and state it was erected under the Arc de Triomphe in Paris.

A month later, on Christmas Day 1920, Benedict XV called the monument to the Unknown Warrior the most pious repentance before the dead soldiers.

A monument to the Unknown Warrior was opened in the memorial Vittoriano complex, Piazza Venezia, in Rome on November 14, 1921.

The Pontifex dearly blessed the monument; however he was worried about the public sentiment. Demobilized youth felt the unemployment and became an easy prey for nationalists and radicals, who would infect them with the “brown” contagion just in a year. Veteran Gabriele D’Annunzio’s star was brightly shining together with the journalist Mussolini. The war, which had ended two years ago, continued in people’s heads! In the year 1921, the year of the 600th anniversary of the death of the great Dante, the famous Franciscan church in Rowan (the poet’s birthplace) was reconstructed on the initiative and with financial support of the Roman Pope.

Benedict XV, Giacomo della Chiesa, chose his apostolic name in honor of Pope Benedict XIV — Prospero Lorenzo Lambertini, whose pontificate fell on 1740–1758. He fully confirmed the continuity! In the 18th century, Pope Benedict XIV was known as the “Pope of Concordats”: he concluded them on favorable terms — more than ten! Pope Benedict XIV reformed the education of priests, studying attentively the works of the Enlightenment period and corresponding with Voltaire and Montesquieu. Benedict XIV was known for his honesty; he condemned usury in his encyclical *Vix Pervenit*. The Pope Lambertini created Academy of Roman Archaeology; helped the opening of Chemistry, Physics and Mathematics Departments in the University of Rome. One hundred and fifty years before Giacomo della Chiesa was an archbishop for seven years in Bologna (before his election as the Pontifex), Benedict XIV established a department, in which women could study, and opened an anatomical museum in Bologna.

Benedict XIV (Lambertini) was honoured with a monument in England (!). The words engraved on the pedestal wonderfully accord with
the apostolate of Benedict XV (della Chiesa) and with the continuing ministry of the retired pope Benedict XVI (Ratzinger): “Loved by the Papists, respected by Protestants, a cleric without vainglory and greed, a prince without favourites, a father without a nepos”.

An amazing succession of Roman priests is passing through the ages!

The contained herein biography of Roman priests is passing through the ages! The standards of the Vatican Benedict XV was “a young Pope” — he was only 60 years old! Everyone prepared for long years of his apostolic reign since Giacomo della Chiesa was remarkable for perfect health. Nevertheless worries and troubles of the First World War undermined his health. Even after several heart attacks, after which the Pontifex was always in haste to go back to work, he had never changed his routine. His working day began at 5 am and ended no earlier than at 11 pm. Benedict XV always read personally his solid mail correspondence, wrote speeches and encyclicals. The Pontifex was not an ideal. But who is ideal among all people?! Benedict XV was blamed for restraint and a certain dispassionateness. The Pontifex was foreign to the Church exaltation, expression of mysticism and church fanaticism. Like Leo XIII, he surrounded himself with bright and talented people: first he appointed Cardinal Domenico Ferrata, Secretary of State, and after his death — Cardinal Pietro Gasparri, an eminent jurist. The future Roman Pontifexs — Akella Ratti and Eugenio Pacelli, were brilliant diplomats. His sudden death was a discouraging shock! Benedict XV caught cold during the Christmas service in 1921. The disease rapidly developed into bronchitis, bronchitis into pneumonia and the heart of the not yet old Pontifex did not survive. Benedict XV died on January 22, 1922.

Many of his undertakings and Christian initiatives continued to be realised after his sudden death. According to the memoirs of Cardinal Pietro Gasparri, the Holy See continued to help the Russian Orthodox Church, which was pursued by Soviet authorities, with attention and compassion by the example of Benedict XV. Monsignor Pizzardo sent a message to G. Chicherin on May 14, 1922, with a request to abandon the trial of Patriarch Tikhon, who was accused of anti-Soviet activity and resistance to the confiscation of church property and was arrested.
in Moscow in May 1922. On June 7, 1922, Cardinal Pietro Gasparri, on behalf of Pius XI made a similar request to Lenin; however, both calls were left unanswered. In September 1922 Cardinal Gasparri requested permission for a representative of the Holy See to attend the trial of Patriarch Tikhon; however there was no trial of the Primate of the Russian Orthodox Church. His Holiness Patriarch Tikhon was under arrest until his death.

Here is another interesting fact. As a politician and diplomat, Benedict XV not only spent his time on peacekeeping exhortations of European monarchs and heads of governments; nevertheless, he closely followed the trial of Gavrilo Princip, and received confidential information from his prelates. Documents and correspondence of the Apostolic Nuncios in Austria-Hungary and Austria were found in the Soviet archives. After the Second World War. Cardinal Raffaele Scapinelli di Leguigno visited G. Princip in Theresienstadt prison. On behalf of the Pontifex, Cardinal Scapinelli di Leguigno followed the investigation of the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo and reported to the Vatican. The investigation did not assert a connection between Mlada Bosna organization, to which G. Princip with an incurable form of tuberculosis belonged to as well as the other five bombers, and official Belgrade! Being under-age, nineteen year old G. Princip was sentenced to 20 years in prison, where he died on April 28, 1918. Citing sources in Hungary Cardinal Scapinelli di Leguigno pointed to the connection of Mlada Bosna organization with the Hungarian prime minister István Tisza. His nephew Archduke Franz Ferdinand, who became heir of Emperor Franz Joseph in 1886, was an educated man who was thoroughly preparing for the future role of a ruler. In particular, the Archduke was well aware of the need for change in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In 1906 together with politician Aurelio Popovich he formed up a plan on reorganization of the empire into a federal state with 12 autonomous regions. The working title for the future country was The name the United States of Greater Austria (a triune: Austro-Hungarian-Slavia) was proposed, where a same autonomous system was provided for each major ethnicity. This was convenient to everyone except Hungary, which in that case would
have lost its privileged position. Count Istvan Tisza was twice the Prime Minister of Hungary from the Liberal Party — in 1903–1905 and in 1913–1917. He was the most ardent supporter of the Habsburg monarchy. Archduke Franz Ferdinand with his plan to transform the Austro-Hungarian Empire was his implacable enemy. Istvan Tisza frankly said: “If the heir to the throne thinks of implementing his plan, I will raise against him Magyar national revolution.” The heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary responded I. Tisza with a direct accusation of the Magyarization policy affecting non Hungarian peoples of the empire, especially the Croats, Romanians, Ruthenians and Slovaks. Political reforms and equal rights for all autonomies in the future federalization of the empire promised by Franz Ferdinand were destroying the dual monarchy and deprived I. Tisza, the chief ideologist of Magyarization, of prospects.

The heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary had clerical difference with calvinist I. Tisza as well. Franz Ferdinand became a trustee of the “Union of Catholic Schools” in 1901; his speech at the ceremony confirmed the obvious sympathies towards the Catholic foundations of society and intolerance of atheism. His speech was subject to violent accusations by I. Tisza.

Interestingly, that Archduke Franz Ferdinand as Chairman of the Prague Academy personally struck out Leo Tolstoy’s name from the list of newly elected honorary members on learning of his excommunication by the Holy Synod of the Russian Empire from the Church in 1902.

The assassination of the Archduke in Sarajevo was the reason for the start of the First World War. The reason (!), and not the cause! However, having studied the issue, Cardinal R. Scapinelli di Leguigno wrote to Benedict XV about the famous article of June 30, 1914, in the Viennese newspaper Die Reichspost. In the article all the blame for the murder of the Archduke was put on Serbia and Russia that had a big impact there. It was written by I. Tisza’s secretary, and the paper itself actually belonged to the Hungarian National Labor Party till 1917. The cardinal pointed out that the Hungarian prime minister I. Tisza and subordinates of Erich von Falkenhayn from special corps of German staff officers
belonged to one Masonic lodge. According to Cardinal R. Scapinelli di Leguigno, Orthodoxy of the Serbs and Puritan Calvinism (rare for Hungary) together with a pathological monarchism, to which I. Tisza was adhere, prevented a possible conspiracy with the Serbian military leaders.

Even the date (St. Vitus Day, June 28) of the assassination of the Archduke in Sarajevo (a day when the Serbs were defeated during the Battle of Kosovo Field), was deliberately chosen by someone from the outside, according to Cardinal R. Scapinelli di Leguigno. Nuncio wrote to Benedict XV, that “… the dying fanatic G. Princip, who does not believe in God, did not know and does not know that St. Vitus day on June 28 falls on a day of the Serbian national tragedy”. In the same letter to the Vatican, the Cardinal sent copies of correspondence between Franz Ferdinand and Alexander Spitzmüller, the Finance Minister of Austria-Hungary, in which the Archduke wrote — “… I will never go to war against Russia. I will make sacrifices in order to avoid this. The war between Austria and Russia would end either with the overthrow of the Romanovs or the Habsburgs, or even both dynasties.” Commenting on these letters, the Cardinal wrote to Benedict XV that, knowing A. Spitzmüller’s talkativeness, the standpoint of the future emperor was not a secret.

In the spring of 1914 eighty-two year old Franz Joseph fell seriously ill. Therefore his opponents began to act in hope to avoid future political reforms by his successor and the expected change of the foreign policy. Also the cardinal emphasized that the interests of I. Tisza, the Hungarian Prime Minister and a supporter of strengthening of a military alliance with Germany, coincided with the interests of German General Staff in spring 1914. I. Tisza sought only for the removal of Franz Ferdinand, and did not even think about the World War; however, he could not change the course of events.

In support of his words, the Nuncio refers to previously sent copies of letters between Austrian General Conrad von Hötzendorf and Helmuth von Moltke (the Younger), the Chief of the German General Staff, to the Vatican in May and June 1914. Judging by the drafts of letters by Cardinal R. Scapinelli di Leguigno, Benedict XV had already written to Emperor Franz Joseph about a few mentally ill fanatics, condemned to death by tuberculosis, who were a mere toy in hands of those who sent
to death hundreds of thousands in Europe, and urged the monarch to change his mind and stop the war. János Csernoch, Hungarian Cardinal, Archbishop of Esztergom and Hungary, and his secretary Jusztinian Gyorgy Seredi, a Benedictine monk, helped Cardinal R. Scapinelli di Leguigno in the investigation of the truth of the Sarajevo tragedy and in gathering information about the involvement of I. Tisza in it. One year of war was enough for Primate of Hungary János Csernoch to realize the size of the disaster. He began to support vigorously the peacemaking efforts of the Pontifex.

In the three letters to Cardinal János Csernoch the Hungarian politicians Endre Hadik-Barkóczy, Speaker of the House of Magnates of Hungary in 1917–1918, and his brother János Count Hadik de Futak, Minister of Food, had no doubt in count I. Tisza’s involvement in the murder in Sarajevo. Copies of their letters from Budapest, Pannonhalma and Zemplén are now in the Moscow archives. In a letter dated September 16, 1916 (the anniversary of the death of Empress Elisabeth (Sissi), Cardinal Teodoro Valfre di Bonzo, Apostolic Nuncio in Austria-Hungary, wrote to the Pontifex that the Emperor of Austria-Hungary was feeling bad, and that he would possibly listen to the call of the Vatican before the last sacrament. After two years of war the quilt of Austro-Hungarian Empire was going to pieces! Europe was bleeding! Cardinal Valfre di Bonzo urged Benedict XV to threaten Francis Joseph with a refusal of the last sacrament or excommunication on his deathbed.

However, Franz Joseph knew what he was doing depriving Cardinal Rampolla of the Papal tiara in 1903! Benedict XV just did not dare. On November 21, 1916, Franz Joseph died; his heir Charles I, the nephew of the late Franz Ferdinand, dutifully followed the wake of the German policy. A year later, a famine started after a bad harvest in Hungary and the Balkans. Austria-Hungary collapsed as a result of the disaster at the front. This happened exactly two years after the death of Franz Joseph. In October 1918 Istvan Tisza, apologist of a militarist policy, forced to resign, was killed on the first day of the bourgeois democratic Aster revolution, the main slogans of which were: “The armistice with Russia on any terms, reforms and supply of population with bread!”.
In July 1937 Maximilian, Duke of Hohenberg, the son of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, blamed the German General Staff and their supporters (naming I. Tisza in the first place) for the death of his parents in Sarajevo in an interview to a Paris newspaper *Paris-Soir Dimanche*.

Referring to M. Hohenberg, it should be noted that the political leadership of Germany had a long-term, pathological hatred for the memory of the murdered in Sarajevo heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary and his descendants. After the Austrian Anschluss on March 12–13, 1938, all Archduke Franz Ferdinand’s children—two sons and a daughter, were arrested and imprisoned in the Dachau concentration camp, where they had spent seven years before the end of the Second World War. The year 1918 buried under its ruins: first, Gavrilo Princip who died of tuberculosis on April 28 in Theresienstadt, then ex-premier I. Tisza killed by rebels in Budapest on October 3, and Austro-Hungary which had split on November 12! The German empire — the main warmonger, was blown up from the inside by the November Revolution in the same 1918!

History loves grimaces. These two people connected mysteriously again in 2014! One hundred years after the First World War, we witnessed the opening of monuments to Istvan Tisza in Budapest on June 9, 2014, and to Gavrilo Princip in Sarajevo, Bosnia, on June 28, 2014. The monument to Istvan Tisza by sculptors György Zala and Antal Orbán in Budapest was already erected in 1934, on I. Tisza’s birthday, April 22. In 1945 this monument was destroyed by an unknown. Characteristically, the Soviet troops have never been accused of the destruction of the monument to I. Tisza in 1945. A monument to Mihály Károlyi, the “leftist” prime minister of the revolution which killed Count Tisza, stood on this pedestal after 1945. However, the monument to M. Károlyi was moved to another city at the start of 2014, and a new monument to I. Tisza by sculptor Istvan Elek was put up on its place.

The two-meter statue of Gavrilo Princip — the work of the Belgrade architect Zoran Kuzmanovic, is cast in bronze. After 100 years, the history intricately linked these two men; one of whom unknowingly, and the other deliberately lit a fire of the First World War.
For what did Benedict XV, through the nuncios of Europe, collect information on the cause of the worldwide conflict?! Maybe he expected to disclose and indicate to the obvious political arguments of the victors and the defeated?! It is unknown. In any case, the Apostolic Nuncios thoroughly gathered information for the Pontifex on the murder in Sarajevo, which led to a military disaster, in Vienna. The Nuncio reported data validation on the fate of POWs and internees received from Bishop of Paderborn Karl Joseph Schulte and Bishop Adolf Bertram of Breslau. The draft of a letter by Cardinal Francesco Marchetti Selvaggiani of November 1, 1921, where he wrote that the search of documents on the case of investigation of the assassination in Sarajevo had given nothing and the volumes brought to Vienna had disappeared, was the final document from the letters by Apostolic Nuncios of Austria-Hungary, afterwards Austria to the Vatican relating to the period of pontificate of Benedict XV.

However, nothing is lost in history; it is only not found immediately!!

Undoubtedly, Benedict XV wanted to know the truth so that the people, who had to pay such a high price, did not repeat the same mistakes.

Benedict XV didn’t have a bright appearance and the charisma of Cardinal Rampolla; he looked like a university professor, with calm delicate features. However, the Pontifex was a brilliant orator and conversationalist! It appeared that no money was left in the church treasury after his death. Camerlengo Pietro Gasparri made a forced loan from the Roman bankers to cover the costs associated with the burial of the Roman Pope and the convening of the conclave. The so-called “funeral fund” intended for the burials of the Roman Pope was set untouchable by the successor of Benedict XV — Pius XI Akella Ratti in order to avoid such incidents. Donating money to the victims of the World War I, Benedict XV spent not only personal and church savings, but all money belonging to his brother Admiral della Chiesa as well. The paralyzed Admiral, who survived his brother the Pontifex by several years, was buried at the expense of the sister Countess Persico.

In recognition of a high moral and political authority of Benedict XV, a mourning around the world was declared over his death. Benedict XV is buried in the Vatican, in St. Peter’s Basilica.
P.S. Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, who was elected by the Pontifex, chose for himself the apostolic name Benedict and became Benedict XVI at the 4th meeting of the conclave on April 19, 2005.

The adoption of the name of the newly elected Roman Pope is never accidental; it shows the continuity of the church policy. Cardinals Achille Ratti and Eugenio Pacelli, companions of Benedict, preferred the succession from Pius X, who was more quiet and conservative, on becoming the Pontifices.

Benedict XV, who often came under attack during his life, has been forgotten after his death. Joseph Ratzinger, the future Pope Benedict XVI, was a teenager at the beginning of the Second World War and became a witness of the horrors. The war was also began because of the fact that the main world powers, the victors in 1919, did not hear the warnings of the Holy See about the fragility of the peace established on the humiliation of Germany and Austria.

In 1951 Cardinal Michael von Faulhaber laid hands on the twenty-two year old Joseph Ratzinger. Cardinal Faulhaber was elevated to the cardinalate by Benedict XV on the Consistory in 1921. Benedict XV passed a deep respect for the Pontifex, the Apostle of peace, to the young Joseph Ratzinger.

The world didn’t listen to the appeals and warnings of Benedict XV and his followers, and the global catastrophe repeated during the World War II.

From a religious and philosophical point of view, Benedict XVI contemplated on the realities of the modern civilization, to which an irreparable damaged was given by the two world wars, in his works — *The Values in the Era of Change, Introduction to Christianity, The Essence and Problems of Theology; Faith, Truth, Tolerance* and *The Dialectics of Secularization: On Reason and Religion*, written in collaboration with a prominent philosopher and sociologist Jürgen Habermas.

It could not but affect all spheres of life, including religion.

*Jesus of Nazareth* and *At the Root of the Church. The Apostles and the First Disciples of Christ* were written by Benedict XVI from an interesting point in accessible language.
Preface to the Russian edition of Introduction to Christianity was written in 2006 by Kirill, the Metropolitan of Smolensk and Kaliningrad, now the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia.

The First World War quickly took all energy from Benedict XV, who named this massacre “the suicide of Europe” from which the continent could never recover.

According to the memoirs of Cardinal Camillo Laurenti, the Secretary of Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, during the last year of the Pontifex’s life, 1921, Benedict XV often lamented that he was not heard by the people!

And to the objection that it was a reason why religiosity in Europe had increased, he bitterly complained that this was only despair and devastation rather than a celebration of faith!

Benedict XV did not survive the loss of ten million lives taken away by the disaster at the beginning of the 20th century. The comprehension of this tragedy incinerated the heart of the Shepherd!

Two decades later, the world which had not yet recovered from the losses and destruction of the World War I, went into the fire of the Second World War.

In his books our contemporary Benedict XVI, Joseph Ratzinger, with a great feeling of a theologian and philosopher called to comprehend what happened and irreversibly changed the future of civilization, and to try to change something.

Nature doesn’t tolerate emptiness!

The emptinesses of irreversibility of human and cultural losses after two world wars are being rapidly filled from outside, changing society beyond recognition. The society which is no longer a heir nor a successor of the destructed civilization.

In his books Benedict XVI tried to explain the danger of ignoring the consequences of the past disasters. However, he wasn’t heard and not understood by the rapidly changing world. The Pontifex-philosopher, the Pontifex-theologian found the inner strength to release the Holy See for the one who would firmly navigate the ship of the Church through everyday life. He now lives quietly in a small monastery in Vatican,
as a keeper of wisdom and knowledge, which he still hopes to impart to people. We are left with his books and his words addressed to us.

And here is an aphorism of Ralph Waldo Emerson, an American poet, philosopher, thinker and pastor: “there is properly no history, only biography…”

INDEX OF NAMES

1. **Matthias Erzberger** (20 September 1875–26 August 1921) — a German writer and politician. Member of the Center Party. Head of the Armistice Commission and the Reich Minister of the Weimar Republic. Shortly before the outbreak of the First World War he was placed in charge of the promotion policy of Germany abroad. As a special envoy unsuccessfully tried to persuade Italy and Romania not to enter the war. Repeatedly met with Benedict XV.

2. **Fridtjof Wedel-Jarlsberg Nansen** (10 October 1861–13 May 1930) — a Norwegian polar explorer, scientist and founder of the new science — physical oceanography, political and social activist, humanitarian, philanthropist, Nobel Peace Prize for 1922. Since April 1920 engaged through the League of Nations to repatriate more than half a million POWs, scattered in different countries. By November 1920 Nansen reported to the Assembly that he had returned home 200 thousands of people. Back in 1920 analyzing the situation in Russia Nansen predicted an onset of severe hunger. At the suggestion of the British delegate Philip Noel-Baker Nansen was appointed High Commissioner for Refugees of the League of Nations on September 1, 1921, and his main aim was to return more than 2 million refugees, former POWs and internees, back to Russia. At the same time, on his own initiative Nansen addressed the problem of hunger in Russia, which affected more than 30 million people in a country struck by civil war. This greatly damaged the reputation of Nansen, who was accused of “Bolshevism” and defending the interests of the Soviet government. The League of Nations refused to take part in famine relief in Russia. Nansen had to attract private organizations to turn to the church. Nansen called on European governments to find 5 million pounds for the purchase of grain in Canada and the United States, to prevent the famine in Russia in his speech on September 30, 1921, at the session of the League of Nations. “Can Europe be still and do nothing to deliver food here, which is necessary for the salvation of people on this side of the ocean? I do not believe this. I believe the people of Europe will force their governments to take the proper decision.”


7. **Symon Petliura** (10 May 1879–25 May 1926) — a Ukrainian politician, Head Director of the Ukrainian People’s Republic in 1919–1920. On April 21, 1920, after the fall of the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic Symon Petliura on behalf of UNR concluded an agreement with Poland to hold the border between Ukraine and Poland on r.Zbruch, thereby giving the Poles Volhynia and Galicia.


10. **Dante Alighieri** (26 March 1265–13 or 14 September 1321) — an Italian poet, one of the founders of the Italian language. Creator of the Comedy, which acquired the name the Divine.


15. **Paul Wittgenstein** (11 May 1887–3 March 1961) — an Austrian pianist, in 1914 was sent to the front, where lost his right arm as a result of wounds.

16. **Ludwig Josef Johann Wittgenstein** (26 April 1889–29 April 1951) — an Austrian philosopher, one of the most brilliant thinkers of the 20th century.


22. **Ermanno Wolf-Ferrari** (12 January 1876–21 January 1948) — an Italian composer best known for his comic operas.

23. **Ferruccio Busoni** (1 April 1866–27 July 1924) — an Italian composer.


25. **Maurice Ravel** (7 March 1875–28 December 1937) — a great French composer.

26. **Karl Kraus** (28 April 1874–12 June 1936) — an Austrian writer, poet and satirist, columnist. The publisher and the sole author of the journal *Törch*. 
28. Camillo Laurenti (20 November 1861–6 September 1938) — an Italian Curial Cardinal, the Secretary of Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith.
30. Erich von Falkenhayn (11 September 1861–8 April 1922) — a German military leader, Minister of War in Germany, the Head of the German General Staff in 1914–1916.
31. Franz Ferdinand Carl Ludwig Joseph Maria von Österreich-Este (18 December 1863–28 June 1914) — an Archduke of Austria, from 1896 heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary. The assassination of Franz Ferdinand was the reason for the outbreak of the First World War.
32. Aurel Popovici (16 October– 9 February 1917) — an Austro-Hungarian politician and lawyer of Romanian origin. Together with the Archduke Franz Ferdinand was the author of the concept of federalization of Austria-Hungary in order to transform it into a triune federation. The project was not implemented because of the assassination of the Archduke.
33. Dukes Gogenberg children of Archduke Franz Ferdinand by a morganatic marriage with a Sophie Maria Josephine Albina Chotek von Chotkow und Wognin (01 March 1868–28 June 1914) who was killed with her husband in Sarajevo. Maximilian Gogenberg (1902–1962); Ernst Gogenberg (1904–1954); Sofia Gogenberg (1901–1990). All three of them after the Austrian Anschluss on March 12–13, 1938, were arrested and imprisoned in Dachau concentration camp. were freed by allied forces on April 29, 1945. Memories of their stay in the camp were left by another prisoner at Dachau — Kurt Alois Josef Johann von Schuschnigg (14 December 1897–18 November 1977), Austrian statesman and politician, Federal Chancellor of Austria in 1934–1938
35. István Tisza (22 April 1861–31 October 1918) — a Hungarian politician, Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Hungary. Monarchist, an adherent of the emperor of Austria-Hungary Franz Joseph, one of the ideologists of the First World War in Austria-Hungary.
36. Franz Conrad von HötzendOrf (11 November 1852–25 August 1925) — an Austro-Hungarian Field Marshal, Chief of General Staff of the Austro-Hungarian Empire before and during the First World War.
41. János Count Hadik de Futak (23 November 1863–10 December 1933) — a Hungarian politician.
47. Jürgen Habermas (born 18 June 1929) — an eminent German philosopher and sociologist. Since 1964 — Director of the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Living Conditions in the Scientific and Technical World
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THE EGYPTIAN REVIVAL STYLE IN EUROPEAN ARCHITECTURE OF XIX\textsuperscript{th} CENTURY

\textit{Summary:} The article is dedicated to the development and formation of Egyptian Revival style in European countries on the examples of various forms of architecture. Several different tendencies are determined, as well as its sources described.
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The Egyptian Revival Style in architecture and decorative arts started to develop after Napoleon’s Campaign to Egypt in 1798–1799 and had numerous definitions in European culture, such as: “Egyptomania”, “Egyptiana”, “Neo-Egyptian style” or “Egyptian Revival”\textsuperscript{1}.

Culture of Ancient Egypt has made an enormous contribution to the development of world art, creating a unique monumental architecture. Particularly impressive was the impact of Egyptian art in the culture and architecture of Western Europe and United States. It strictly followed the established tradition: Sphinxes, winged sun disks, mummies, sarcophagi, stylized drawings, pyramids and pylon-shaped gates — the most characteristic and easily recognizable symbols of Egypt. This became the basis for styling in later periods. Enthusiasm for ancient civilization expressed in the general style of large architectural ensembles and in individual form. Memorial obelisks are commonplace around the world, and eventually almost lost an association created with their culture. Sphinxes fascinated and inspired many sculptors and architects. Lots of motives from history of ancient Egypt are well represented in painting.
and literature. The widespread use of characteristic elements of ancient Egyptian art and architecture presented even in the art of Hellenism and Rome\(^2\). And then, these motifs have proliferated in European Countries through XVI–XVIII centuries.

The particular interest to Egypt showed “Freemasons” — among them there were many both architects and customers. Fascination with ancient cults, such as Isis and Osiris, strongly influenced on the Masonic ritual and had a huge impact on the ideas and plots in the artistic culture. Most of Masonic lodges were designed using these iconographic features\(^3\), what had turned a private mansion in the sacred building and mysterious temple.

During the reign of Napoleon, Egyptian motifs became an integral part of new Empire style. Because Rome has played a vital role in the reflection of Egyptian specificity during Antiquity, Egyptian elements became an organic part of the Empire style in architecture, painting, sculpture, decorative arts and in the interior design. French scientist, Egyptologist and Heritage General Curator Jean-Marcel Humbert emphasizes that during Empire style various Egyptian elements became more popular, which were characteristic of the era of Louis XVI and had remained in fashion after the Revolution\(^4\). The Egyptian campaign of Napoleon failed its political mission, but has made a tremendous contribution to the development of French culture and world science, and gave the familiar images of ancient culture the new charm. The head of scientific expedition was an archeologist and diplomat Baron Dominique Vivant Denon (1747–1825), later appointed as the first Director of the Louvre Museum. A consequence of the expedition was extraordinary attention of Europeans to the art of Egypt and has brought to France many samples of the original Egyptian sculptures, including well-known figures of sphinxes. Expedition deepened and put on a scientific basis for studying ancient civilization and its culture. The publishing of his research: “Travels in Upper and Lower Egypt during the campaigns of General Bonaparte” (published in Paris and London), and the precious “Description of Egypt” (Paris, 1802) with hundreds of engraved illustrations gave an inspiration to many architects in Europe,
1. Fontaine du Fellah in Paris, 1806
United States and Russia. With this scientific study has begun a serious stage in the history of Egyptian Revival.

At the service of Napoleon consisted several famous architects such as Charles Percier and Pierre Fontaine, who, together with the increased attention, started using Egyptian motifs in architectural buildings and projects, furniture and decorative items. Elements of the monumental Egyptian architecture widely penetrated into decorative forms, including applied and bronze decor. Special popularity had Parisian “furniture in the Egyptian style”. Using the “Egyptian-style” in France had an extremely patriotic character — Egyptian motifs were widely used in the construction of facilities for the glory of Bonaparte and his military victories. In May 1806 by the order of Napoleon decreed the establishment of fifteen new fountains in Paris, six of which were to be in the Egyptian style, “Fountaine du Fellah”, “Fountaine du Palmier” at the Chatelet Square, “Fountaine de la Paix”, “Fountaine de l’Institut”, “Fountaine Château d’Eau” with Nubian lions on the Boulevard Montmartre.

“Fountaine du Fellah” or Egyptian Fountain (arch. Francois-Jean Bralle, Pierre-Nicolas Beauvalet), is an interesting example of the French Egyptomania. The figure of Antinous from Hadrian’s Villa with two pitchers in his hands, from which the water flows, is placed in the portico of the Egyptian-pylon, cornice is decorated with a winged sun disk, and an eagle — a symbol of the empire (pic.1).

An interesting example of the Egyptian Revival style in Italy can be considered The Egyptian gate of Villa Borghese in Rome, built in 1825–1828 by Luigi Canina. They were the first in the European art of the XIX century decorated by two obelisks, as expected at the entrance to an ancient Egyptian temple. The Garden of Villa Borghese had reproduced or resembled the atmosphere of Hadrian’s Villa in Tivoli. Which too, was conceived as a projection of the world, in different parts could be seen Greek Arcadia, Egyptian Canopus, the corner of Asia Minor with a copy of Artemis of Ephesus, and brought by Hadrian mosaics and sculptures from Greece and Egypt.

At Villa Torrigiani in Florence the owner Pietro Torrigiani together with the architect Gaetano Baccani decided to set a traditional English
garden for Masonic purposes in 1813–1814. And at the entrance of which was placed a marble bust of Antinous-Osiris, what was at the same time a tribute to the Egyptian fashion and served to the main idea of Masonic ritual. The Antinous is holding in his hands the tablets with inscriptions on how to get into the park. The garden had a numerous places and objects characteristic to the philosophical park, one of the most interesting, preserved up to nowadays, is an Alchemical Tower

2. The bust of Antinous in the Garden of Torrigiani, Florence, 1814
(project of G. Baccani). And in the basement of the tower there was designed a symbolic “Sepolcreto”, burial-ground with the pylon-shaped entrance and couple of sarcophagus inside of it (pic. 2, 3).

The confirmation of the popularity of Egyptian motifs in Rome served a reconstruction of the Obelisk at Piazza del Popolo in the 1816–1820 by Giuseppe Valadier (1762–1839), who added the figures of Sphinxes, which became the part of the neo-classical ensemble of the square.

Interest to the “Egyptian style” in England accounts for the same time period. It spread along with the activation of archaeological research. After the release of Denon’s book in England, many architects and designers began to use his prints for an inspiration. Travelers, scientists, adventurers and collectors, and then the tourists travelled to Egypt. The British Museum has been filled with lots of artifacts, where special attention was made by a mummy, in particular — fascinated by the process of expanding them in front of the public.

3. Sepolcreto at Garden Torrigiani, Florence, 1824
The works of French architects Percier and Fontaine had a huge influence on the English collector and decorator Thomas Hope (1769–1831), who began to make changes to the interior of his house in London in 1799–1804. His book “Household furniture and interior decoration” made a great impact to the development of decorating art, we can say that Thomas Hope was one of the founders of neoclassical style during Regency, bringing in the basic elements of the Ancient Egypt Art to English Empire style.

“Egyptian Hall” on Piccadilly in London was built in 1812 on the grounds of the Temple of Hathor in Dendera (pic. 4). It owes its name only to a facade, decorated in bright colors and with the use of Egyptian elements and the shape of the pylon as a kind of decoration. Originally the museum for collection brought from Asia, Africa, North and South America, as well as an impressive collection of Egyptian artifacts. The
result was a very special project, typical only for England, which later became a source for copying an Egyptian style in English architecture. For example, the design of the facade and reading room of “Egypt Library” of Mathematical School in Devonport, and Egyptian House at Chapel Street in Cornwall, built as a museum store for various artifacts and Antiques in 1830.5

“Egyptomania” during the Empire pushed France to the formation of an Egyptology, as a science of antiquities, with a major landmark at Champollion’s decipherment of Egyptian hieroglyphs in 1822. This event has not only strengthened the position of science, but also has given a “second wave” to “Egyptomania” in discovering the historical context of mysterious civilization. Since then, the strange inscriptions began to be read, and the understanding of ancient Egypt had been constantly deepened.

Thus, in Europe, above all in France, in the first third of the XIX century the widespread use of Egyptian motifs in different kinds of art allows us to speak about “Egyptomania”6. It has been formed on the tradition, maintained with the interest to the exotic, and philosophical ideas of Freemasonry, but most of all on the archaeological finds and serious scientific study.

In a special way Egyptian Revival style then manifested in the architecture of Historicism, an integral component of which it has also been. But the ideological basis for the use of an Egyptian style has changed: it was no more imperial; it got democratized and became a style of thoroughness of the bourgeoisie, reliability and durability.

In 1842, in Leeds (England) The Flax Factory for the John Marshall was built in Egyptian style, carrying the idea of stability, power, and eternity7. As the owner wanted the building to correlate with a manufactured product. The architects found the Temple of Typhonium at Dendera from the prints of Denon as a prototype for the project. Not only the facade and interior decoration, but also some of the factory machines have been designed in this style.

English architecture had an amusing examples for Egyptian Style, one of them was Clifton Suspension Bridge in Bristol over the River Avon, the design for which was created in 1831 by the great British engineer-
architect Isambard Kingdom Brunel (1806–1859), a famous constructor of bridges, ships, railways and docks. The bridge was designed to have “fashionable” by the time the image in Egyptian manner.

Obelisks as monuments also were wide popular across the European countries since Antiquity, but during the second part of XIXth century they got a brand new attraction — originally Egyptian sphinxes, to complete the whole ensemble. So, the erection of the Obelisk now became an independent object with full iconographical features and historical meaning. The Obelisk in London “Cleopatra’s Needle” was erected on the River Thames in 1877. Obelisk of pink Aswan granite 1450 BC, originally set before the Temple of Tuthmosis III at Heliopolis, was given a company of two sphinxes, turned to face him, to create a unified ensemble.

The most significant influence to the European culture made by Egyptians cults of afterlife, which distributed in the funerary architecture
and the memorial art. The architects were looking for simplicity and expressiveness of geometric forms. Lately the tradition of using the forms of the obelisk and the pyramids as tombs has been widespread. Many tombstones for the participants of the Napoleonic campaigns at the French Père Lachaise Cemetery, Montparnasse and Montmartre were built in order to perpetuate the memory of deceased witnesses of historical events. Many of them combined Greek and Egyptian motifs. Père Lachaise cemetery in Paris was a kind of model, many of the projects of tombstones were published and served as a source for inspiration. In London at the Highgate Cemetery was built the Egyptian Alley (1839) by James Banning (1802–1863), the entrance to which was decorated with papyri-shaped columns and pylon-form mausoleums covered with relevant Egyptian decor (Fig. 5). Therefore, the “Egyptian style”, has been mainly used for placing the tombs of freemasons and freethinkers, not only in England but also in all the Catholic countries of Europe — Belgium, France and Spain.

In the second part of the XIX century after numerous scientific and archaeological discoveries, stylization in “Egyptian-style” already gets new, more concrete features. A serious attempt to recreate the original interiors and repeat with sufficient accuracy based on a thorough knowledge of the subject was the final goal. Among these examples is “Egyptian Court” at Crystal Palace of Joseph Paxton opened at the first World Exhibition in London (1854). There were presented different models of bas-reliefs, columns, deities, Carnac lions, models of the Pharaohs, the Rosetta Stone, etc (Fig. 6). This was the result of profound scientific approach and attempt to provide new knowledge to the public.

An outstanding, unusual and yet very profound ideological content has an interesting project of enclosure for elephants in Antwerp Zoo — “Egyptian Temple” 1856 — at one of the oldest animal parks in Europe. Charles Servais (1828–1892) was inspired by the “Egyptian court” of Crystal Palace in London and used some of the features of the Hathor Temple at Dendera and Isis Temple of Philae. Hieroglyphics, covering buildings, had an association with the territory of living of exotic animals (Fig. 7).
A distinctive and most important projects in this style were the buildings of freemasons’ lodges, for example, the house built in Boston (Lincolnshire, England) in 1860–1863, designed on the basis of the portico of the Temple of Dendur, dedicated to Isis and Osiris, taken from the engravings of Denon (Fig. 8). Small building consisted of a hall, kitchen and banquet hall, decorated with Egyptian elements — the winged sun disc, scarabs, lotus, snakes and Masonic attributes.

Masonic ideas are often reflected in the organization of European gardens and parks, especially in the classic English gardens. Among the caves, ruins, artificial lakes could found a small Egyptian temple, for example in the garden of Villa Stibbert. The principle of eclecticism is present in the design of the villa and its park. As originally designed, the house and garden were to be in a modest English style, but the architect Giuseppe Poggio (1811–1901) made his changes and raised on the shores of an artificial lake The Egyptian Temple — the main

6. Egyptian Court at Crystal Palace, London, 1854
attraction of the Garden (1862–1864) which gave the whole villa deep Masonic symbolism. A small temple — a pavilion for citrus trees, with two obelisks and terracotta sculptures reminding the avenue of sphinxes and the Temple of Karnak, complement the style of the whole Masonic Garden and including the hidden symbolism (Fig. 9).

Eclecticism, which framed the formation of “Egyptian style” at the end of the XIX century, was not just a mix of all styles of the past, but one of the richest and most important trends involving an Egyptian stylization. Despite the predominant and widespread influence of Gothic style, this style survived and remained relevant and continued to influence on the architecture of the XXth century.

In the period of Art Nouveau, “Egyptian style” is used in the construction of a variety of diversion include cinemas, colleges, libraries, museums and zoos, factories, prisons and synagogues, Masonic lodges and tenements. In their construction were reflected the main trends of
the time: the use of new building materials (steel, glass), new technical possibilities and the desire to decorate, even utilitarian buildings, rooms and objects. Despite the fact that modern clearly favored curved lines, strict, massive, monumental “Egyptian” forms used in all fields of architecture and interior design. Sometimes interiors fully documented in the “Egyptian-style” or are using only its basic elements, combined with the characteristics of the Empire, or neoclassical, eclectic and Art Deco.

Ancient Egypt at the turn of XIX–XX centuries was perceived as the cradle of Western civilization. This, no doubt, reflected on the discoveries of Archaeology, intensive museum activities and the rapid development of Egyptology. Their discoveries and achievements received considerable attention. Have an understanding of ancient history, culture, religion,
art — has become a must for the educated people of that era. Egypt was seen as a country of justice, ruled by wise rulers. This was obviously one of the causes of frequent use of Egyptian forms and motives for courthouses. The idea of justice and harmonious world order was specific for the design of Masonic lodges. A striking example of the interior of the Belgian lodges can be Masonic Temple in Brussels, designed by a P. Bonduelle (1877–1955). Belgian lodges feature decor was a denial of Christian symbolism in favor of a more ancient motifs. Antiquity and ancient Egyptian culture had a great attraction for the Masons than the Bible. That is why the “Egyptian style” could not be more consistent for the expression of Masonic ideas in the architectural design and interiors,
and made a visual difference from Gothic, Baroque and Romanesque buildings associated with Catholicism⁹.

The elements of the “Egyptian-style” were often used in the designs of house facades across Europe during the period of Art Nouveau. A bright example is a facade of the house in Strasbourg (General Rapp, 10), built by F. Scheider (1905). Known as the “Egyptian house”, unique in its design, it is covered with polychrome panels depicting the pharaoh and his wife during duck hunting, decorated with lotus flowers, papyrus (floral ornament as a special sign of Art Nouveau) and the winged sun disc.

The discovery of the King Tutankhamun (1922) Tomb was the most important event that influenced the further development of the “Egyptian-style” in the twentieth century. “Egyptian style” firmly rooted in Art Deco style, was widely used in furniture, jewelry, clothing, reflected in the art of book illustration and theatrical scenery¹⁰.

Egyptian motifs could be found in all the countries of Western Europe and America, spread throughout the world — from Australia to Ireland. Strict, massive, monumental forms used in all fields of architecture and interior design. “Egyptian style” has been used in the various constructions for different purposes of factories and prisons, theaters, pharmacies, colleges, libraries and museums, Presbyterian and Baptist churches, synagogues and Masonic lodges, in the interiors of the Mediterranean liners. In many European countries the interest to this “style” has had different root causes, but had same incentives and general development. In France, the details of Egyptian architecture served the historical memory, was depicted in the monuments dedicated to Napoleon’s campaign in Egypt. England showed the exotic, unusual brightness, the contradiction of ancient architecture to the English Nature. In Italy it revived the antique taste, associated with the Hadrian’s Villa in Tivoli. But all these directions of style transformations are connected by philosophical interest, the traditions and cults of ancient Egypt, their scientific study and the ideas of freemasonry, common in Europe, which play a significant role in the origin and cultivation of Egyptian themes in art.
NOTES


REFERENCES

The young Picasso was full of wrath and revolt when he was about fifteen to twenty years old. He openly renounced the role that his descent and his place of birth seemingly destined him for. He did not want to be a well-to-do bourgeois offspring, therefore he joined the bohème. Initially he found his place among the unruly fraternity of young artists of Barcelona. This city was an important place on the map of the new arts. Around 1900 the city of Barcelona got the new bold architecture and design by Antoni Gaudi. The younger generation was hardly as inspired as Gaudi was; however, fantasy and non-conformism stood high in esteem between the upcoming artists and authors. They deliberately plunged into experiments just because they wanted to say NO to their fathers’ world. Where did their radicalism come from?

Art students know the circumstances of social and individual life of Pablo Picasso during his early years well enough. However, the most private and existentially important factors of his artistic formation for some reasons usually get lost in art studies. Historians of art were and are minutely researching and analyzing stylistic influences and aesthetic implications in Picasso’s art. Art history has been constructed as a logic order of epochs and styles since long ago. Artists have to be put into a system of artistic evolution and history of taste — before this was an unshakeable principle of professional experts describing art development. Therefore, Picasso’s formative years have been described as the time of personal discoveries of artistic developments of the past.
and of the present. Picasso, in this perspective, got his decisive impulses from meeting the art of European Symbolism, drawings by Steinlen and paintings by El Greco, Degas, Toulouse-Lautrec, Cézanne and van Gogh.¹

The question is why was he able to accept the new movements in art and give them a strong push himself? This is probably a question beyond the matter of style and taste as such. The violent and explosive art of early Picasso must have received the outer influences of experimental visual art just because he was ready to interiorize the most daring and challenging ways of making art. He was ready to be a rebel in his art. This is more a fundamental item than a question of when and how he saw paintings of his contemporaries, or met artworks in museums which were to influence him deeply.

In other words we have to begin with the human dimension. Social, psychological and other anthropological factors made the mind and psyche of the young artist open to strong feelings.

A typical conflict between generations ripened and surfaced in Spain at the end of the 19th century. The outer society and the family of the artist were rather a depressing factor for him. He must have felt a painstaking problem. Looking from the outside one could hardly find something disturbing in his family life. On the contrary, his family house was a normal place to live in, like thousands of alike households all over the country. The youngster belonged to a typically Mediterranean family group with common traits of a Catholic bourgeois community and with a clear stamp of Spanish Hidalgo syndrome. There were no open excesses nor evident violence in this well-bred and normal circle of decent and quite religious people; no signs of tyranny nor repressing of the younger ones by older ones, what would be described later in Federico Garcia Lorca’s theater play “The House of Bernarda Alba” (1936).

Such families, widespread in Spain and Italy, included numerous female persons of all ages. Their mission and function was to keep the house, to observe religious rites and rules in a most scrupulous way, and to care for the male part of the house — boys, young and mature men as well as elders. Care, service and control went, as it were, hand in hand. However, the control of the loving mothers, aunts and sisters
concerned only one side of life and conduct — namely everything that had any relation to the Family, State and Church. Personal conduct of Spanish men has been very liberal indeed since centuries. Don Juan, the symbol of libertinage, disregarding any prohibition and challenging any social norm but a good Catholic, a nobleman with honor principles, belongs to the core repertoire of Spanish theater and literature.

Spanish men of any social stand and age had always had the strict obligation to publicly stress their loyalty to the Crown and the Altar, as well as to pay attention to the sacred norms of their family house. The rest was their own business. Loving and best beloved women of the family adored both young Pablo and his father, Don Jose Ruiz, and easily excused their extravagancies and manly exploits including debauchery and visiting public houses of Barcelona. Thus, Don Juan’s way of life, namely praying to God and serving the Crown but undermining laws of the State and norms stated in the Bible, was the way of life given a priori to the young artist. He was expected to live the life like his father’s, and to create a family like his parents had.

Pablo must have looked at such way of life with a mixed feeling, to say the least. He valued nightlife and specific adventures under red lanterns; however, the double morality made him skeptical and uneasy. The social, religious and political duplicity had infected the Spanish world for centuries. The younger generation of the country entered the stage of disenchantment and protest.

As in many other cases, the artist’s mother was very far from understanding his creative impulses and his longing for a “new honesty”. For the adolescent the art was already a medium for a protesting outcry. The family would have never accepted this idea of “artistry as protest”. Concerning Pablo’s father, who was a painter himself, he seemed to have totally dismissed his son’s turn of mind. Don Jose Ruiz was a kind of a traditional Don Juan — a conformist towards the State and the Church, quite liberal in his stormy but secret sexual life, and, more over, as an artist he was a creator of mediocre “pictures for a dining room”, as his son ironically uttered. Some form of alienation from one’s relatives and one’s close surroundings is the usual story with artists.
It does not always mean a real conflict. In this case, however, a conflict there was, and an acute one.

The family turned to be a serious nuisance for Pablo since he was 14 years old. Misunderstandings and mutual displeasure emerged from the clash of the two ways of life, the two stances towards power, faith, morality, and art. Picasso’s family, like other social units in the Catholic South Europe, imposed a conformist behavior on their members. Being an artist, he faced very insistent demands and expectations concerning his artistic production. Only his parents and relatives wanted and expected him to produce morally pathetic, religious and patriotic homilies brought to canvas. The uncertain adolescent conceded to this pressure once or twice, and, as a compromise, produced a couple of such pictures; the one called “Science and Charity” (1897, Picasso Museum, Barcelona) was among them. It represents a moving scene: two figures, namely a physician who cares for the flesh and a nun helping the soul of the patient, are standing at the side of a young woman devoured by disease. A typical conflict of the Good and the Better results from this theatrical collision. Medical care is the Good, but the religious Caritas, the Christian attitude towards the suffering humanity, is the higher value among people. This was the message imposed on the beginning artist from the outside.

The young painter consented to the compromise with the public (including his own family) when he made his “Science and Charity”; however, he never tried anything like it ever more.

Young Pablo was endowed by a mature intellect and a phenomenal understanding of people and events. Those who observed him from a close distance usually mentioned his piercing look and penetrating mind. Since his early years he must have understood that religious morals and political loyalty were used as instruments of success in his country as well as in his own family. The conservative milieu wanted him to visit church at due dates, marry a good girl and have a normal family, teaching his children to be like the rest of the population, and to paint pictures to be approved by the public opinion and the dominating class. This was the program for him to be fulfilled.
The passionate and sincere young man saw the philosophy of his family and the rest of Spanish society as hypocrisy masked as normality. Picasso’s relatives, like thousands of other good bourgeois citizens, sincerely believed that Socialism, Anarchism and new liberal ideas would bring the soul and career of anyone to ruins. Family documents and correspondence between Picasso’s relatives illustrate this patriarchal state of mind. They were ready to agree with the traditional Don-Juan’s way of life, but never with new social and political ideas. Sexual orgies and drunken nights in the most disreputable dens of iniquity would not bring any ruin to a proud and strong Spanish man. Serving to God, Nation and State, a man has his freedoms in private. An artist has to pay tribute to the higher values by painting nice and morally instructive paintings.

This was his family’s philosophy, an outline of a Don Juan’s life program (obviously copied from his father’s image). Don Juan’s program allows a young man to hang around in pubs and brothels if one likes it. However, as an artist, you should paint pictures to please the public, the State administration and the Church. Young Pablo must have been indignant about this way of thinking he met in well-to-do society and his family house. More than that, he and his friends in Barcelona Academy of Arts probably understood quite well that what went on in their country was a continuation of the life and thinking of their families.

Pablo and his artistic friends in Barcelona could see with an uncomfortable certainty that the State power of their country acted at the world scene just the way the majority of normal families tried to behave in everyday life. Namely they supported the hypocrite morality and took the principle of double truth as a stronghold of power. As a result of social degradation and pervasive lie Spain arrived at a shameful defeat in 1898 when the USA forced the Spanish government to drop the most valuable colonial territory, Cuba — the last pearl of the falling Imperial crown. Spaniards met with the fact that corruption must have been the main cause of the shameful military knockout.

In other words, last strongholds of the old Empire broke down irreparably — and this was the result of the way of life itself. As it has been obvious for many people, the reason of the last big defeat was a
far-going impotence of the State itself which had been deeply corroded by incompetence and venality. A deep crisis of Spain surfaced in the same year 1898. Younger generations of working class, intellectuals and artistic community saw themselves in a harsh confrontation with the ruling ideology, the State power and the Church.

The youth of Spain was becoming tense and red, and burst with anger. The ripe fruit of this wrath came to life later with social and political upheavals of 1920-s and the Civil War in Spain in 1930-s. The first eruption of massive strong emotions happened as early as the first decade of the 20th century. The events in Barcelona, which are called The Tragic Week (La Semana Tragica) since then, were extremely violent and chillingly brutal in July, 1909. Several radical forces, namely working class activists and political associations of Anarchists and Socialists, took part in this chaotic mutiny.

Such leftist protests happened in Europe since the mid-19th century. What was new and unique for a European country was an emerging of the new Spanish “young Barbarians” (jóvenes Bárbaros). By this term Spanish historians describe the radical youth who violently protested in the streets of Barcelona but did not proclaim any political or cultural slogans. Having no positive program nor ideology behind them, the “Barbarians’ demonstratively expressed their hate towards “life as it was”, towards rules and customs dictated by religion and government, dominated by the privileged ones — the new rich class, the old aristocracy, and the military caste. Like Attila’s warriors invading Rome, Barcelona’s “Barbarians” destroyed and annihilated churches, palaces, offices of State and municipal power. Their primary goal was to smash down the old world, and not to plunder its riches, nor construct a new order. Among executed and imprisoned participants of the mutiny of 1909 there were numerous furious young men of this kind.4

In the tragic year 1909 Picasso lived away from Barcelona (after 1900 he stayed in Paris and settled there in 1904 visiting the Catalan metropolis now and again). However, following his emotional and creative development in Paris one is tempted to assume that his state of mind had been formed since 1890-ies by the youthful anger and total revolt of the beginning movement of the “young Barbarians”.
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Family, society, the State and the flow of everyday life roundabout provoked his extreme sarcasm, hatred and disdain. Painting pictures and making drawings was his special way to demonstrate how he understood the old world of hypocrisy and total lie. Destruction and revenge loomed large over him.

In Barcelona, Picasso formed firm links with several artists of his age (his family mostly feared young people of this kind) in 1895–1900. Carlos Casagemas, Jaime Sabartes and Manuel Pallares became his close friends. All of them were “enemies of society” in this or that way and angry young radicals.

The first of this company, Casagemas, was a psychically unstable talented artist who committed suicide in 1901. The second, Sabartes, was a peculiar type who never took the risk of a free artistic career, and saw his task and destination in helping his friend Picasso whom he deeply adored. (Finally Sabartes was to take over the role of Picasso’s secretary.) The third of the small gang, Pallares, happened to be Picasso’s companion when the latter lived for a time in a Catalan countryside and travelled across the mountainous desert at the border of Spain and France. Manuel Pallares belonged, as one might assume, to the Nationalist wing of the Anarchist movement (very characteristic for the Spanish scene). As a kind of Neo-Rousseauist ideologist and an enemy of urbanism, industry and modernization, Pallares trained Picasso to live a natural primordial life in a virginal landscape.

A symbolic gesture marking Picasso’s divorce from the paternal civilization was the choice of maternal family name. From the end of 1898 onward the artist called himself Picasso (his mother’s name) and refused to use his father’s name Ruiz. Later the artist is reported to have said that his artistic name had been chosen by his bohemian friends in Barcelona. Presumably he just said yes to his friend’s proposal. If so, the fact itself of this decision is hardly less important. Finally the artist himself met and accepted friends who gave him his the artistic name bound to the future glory.

A flaring revolt further proceeds with the known episode (mentioned above) of the romantic flight from the obnoxious co-humans. In the company of two friends (one of them must have been an anonymous
young gipsy with who he probably met in a Catalan village; the other one was Manuel Pallares, the semi-Anarchist friend) young Picasso spent several months in remote parts of Catalonian mountain land. Young people walked through mountain ravines, slept in caves around a bonfire like primitive natives, and avoided meeting civilized people.\(^6\)

Later on the artist claimed that his character and psyche got its definitive shape in these months of wandering adventures and almost full isolation from the civilized world. In the magic circle of primordial nature he saw himself as a lonely wolf alien to the life and conduct of human herds. Norms and forms of the inherited high culture turned out hostile towards his mind in the course of this initiation.

For most Europeans, the topic of individual revolt stems from Romantic literature and philosophy. We do not know for sure if Picasso knew names like Goethe and Werther, Schiller and Karl Moor. Literary competence never seems to be his strong side. However, the wanderings of a lonely and odd character through human society and his alienation from its norms and forms belong to the cultural reservoir of Europe since Cervantes described wanderings and exploits of Don Quijote. This was the book second only to the Bible for most Spaniards through centuries.

The important fact is that the artist himself readily corroborated the colorful story of his youthful escapade, which meant that he himself strongly desired not to be seen as an offspring of a cultured bourgeois family. To the contrary, he felt like being a lonely ranger who crossed the wild Pyrenees and came back from his travel as a different person, free from the life style and ideas he would never agree with. And then, reborn through difficult experience, off he went.

His itinerary included, as an interim stop, some time to study at Madrid’s Academia de San Fernando. Unhappily for the honorable Academia, Picasso could see paintings by El Greco, Velázquez and Goya at Prado Museum. As a result of this experience, Academic routine learning must have been no more welcome to him than lessons of his father and other teachers of fine arts in Barcelona. Pablo had no intention to stay in Madrid for a long time. The genuine artistic life seemed to evolve elsewhere. In late 1901, Paris, the capital of free arts and new
movements in painting, saw the arrival of a young man from the South, known almost to nobody in France and hardly speaking any French.

Landing in the cosmopolitan centre of arts our hero joined the artistic life in the most known and suspect dwelling house called Bateu Lavoir. Here, as in several artistic cafes the remarkable newcomer met with a large community of innovative artists, including Gauguin, Toulouse-Lautrec, Bernard, Matisse. Among this group the Spaniard immediately took an extremely hard position. He entered Paris as a “young Barbarian” from Barcelona. He and his close friends practiced very indicative gestures during their lives and artistic activity. They demonstrated their fury and sarcasm towards the presumably eternal values and, among other things, towards the high art.

Earlier in Barcelona Picasso’s group produced, in collective performances, what they called “dibujos fritos” (“roasted drawings”). They made conventional drawings on paper in an Academic manner; after they put them on a big frying-pan and prepared the “dish” on fire adding olive oil. The final product (brownish oily “roasted drawings”) looked like real museum pieces. This technique had a markedly rebellious goal. Sarcastic youngsters frying their Academic drawings in oil openly parodied and symbolically annihilated the good old way of doing art. They rejected the cult of the sacrosanct creativity and greatness of true Classic artistry.

However, painting as such was also on the agenda. Initially, Pablo Picasso had painted his “blue” pictures for several years in Paris — a kind of messages from an after- or underworld dedicated to lost souls forgotten in irradiating spaces. The “blue” period lasted until 1906–1907 (being transformed temporarily to a more complex “pink” stage). One can hardly see anything lyrical and poetically charming in these pictorial products. They rather show a painful departure from the cultural tradition.

The paintings of these half dozen years represented such figures as bohemian artists, beggars, circus clowns and close friends. They belonged to the outskirts of society, to the helpless, depressive and, maybe, dangerous outcasts of society. Victims and losers of history, as Walter Benjamin stressed, are doomed to disappear in depths of time,
and they seem to us morally valid and innocent. (Victors are guilty of violence, not losers.) The artist’s stance towards his heroes, as many observers are convinced, was tainted by a humanistic compassion and ethically valid solidarity with the oppressed. On the level of a visual plot, indeed, we can see something like episodes from a broken and unhappy existence in the “blue” pictures. Melancholic and lonely strangers arouse our compassion. They are so pallid, thin and sickly. We are accustomed to believe that any representation of suffering, oppressed, outcast people has to be morally valid and full of compassion. Hence we almost automatically conclude that paintings by Picasso produced in these years are based on benignity, humanness and sympathy to the losers. Harsh in conduct, he must have been good at heart, and very, very much humanistic. A very problematic supposition and a very widespread prejudice indeed.

Not everyone agrees to this moralistic way of seeing Picasso’s early works. For example Karl Gustav Jung left several penetrating remarks about Picasso’s early paintings. In the “blue” works the German thinker saw a recession into the “collective unconscious” of prehistoric ancestors. Jung described Picasso’s early paintings as reminiscences from a deeply buried kingdom of the dead. This is what our collective psyche was and is preserving deep down: a kind of ignored but eternally present cemetery of past lives, ideas and facts. Deep sorrow, melancholy or fear are much more compatible with the subconscious levels of psychic life than moral values and empathy towards co-humans.

Actually, in his observations on art and artists Jung reproduced the known commonplaces of his neo-Freudian psychoanalysis. The psychoanalytic tradition was the first and foremost willing to recognize an escape from civilization in art and its discontents through immersing into the depths of subconsciousness and prehistoric, even pre-human memories.7

Looking from this viewpoint one would not see in Picasso’s “blue” paintings any ethical content at all, that is no sign of compassion towards slim, almost immaterial figures of melancholic and alienated cranks and dreamers represented in these canvases. Shadows live their shadowy lives bathed in blue fogs. Melancholy and bitterness emanate from their
eyes and gestures. Maybe here one should remember a specific Spanish melancholy called by a special word “angustia”. Like the notorious Russian melancholy which easily grows over to a dare-devil’s behavior, the Spanish version of blue soul is ready to switch over to aggressiveness and (self) -destructiveness. In Flamenco dance and song expression of mad and hopeless love, deep sorrow and tragic alienation end with bursting out of explosions of furious ecstasy. Anyway, paintings under discussion did not presume any kind of moral relation at all. This means that the artist was not involved with any kind of consolation of the suffering human race. There was no compassion nor consolation among the blue shadows. Ethics did not give any help to the artist’s brush. He was not about to bemoan unhappy souls. A condensing of tragedy served to prepare an explosion of strong emotions in future.

To sum up one may say that we have two interpretations of the early Parisian paintings by Picasso. The first one is approved by the majority and supported by students. It states that the artist is a highly compassionate and ethically oriented benefactor of the human race who transmits his regret for human fate and his woe for the souls in purgatory to us. The opposite idea is that the artist was not at all involved with doing good and consoling the unhappy human beings. His aim was to reveal his subconscious strata, and to get out the irrational pre-human depths of one’s self. There were no human morals and no empathy in the “blue” pictures. Pre-human depths have never had any human criteria to display. The large body of the Universe outside us has always been free from morality. Art is not here to serve the cause of good, whatever are the things people describe as good. Art has different purposes and functions. Among other things, art deals with terrible, laughable and mean things.

A third conclusion is also possible. In his “blue and pink” period (ca.1900–1906) Picasso still was not certain about his own choice. On the one hand he was willing to express human pain, and suffering, and solitude in his art. He was about to mourn the human misery, and to be morally right and socially acceptable. On the other hand, something prevented him from being welcome and good to people; being welcome means demonstrating pathetic gestures, populist slogans, and sentimentality. He felt he must embraced the role of a hard Spanish guy.
He had to twist forms, to hit the eye of the viewer by hard contrasts, and to shock minds and souls by challenging contents.

The “Blue” paintings have something hard and passionate in them. The artist harshly deformed figures and bathed them in a cold blue substrate. Telling stories of bitter human fate he never forgot that he must still stay cold and aggressive. Deformations visible in hands and legs and necks of his twisted figures make an utterly uncomfortable impression. Terror, protest and violence were inherent in these apparently lyrical and poetic images.

In 1903 Picasso arrived at his “pink” paintings. The term is somewhat misleading. Pink pigments as such would be hard to find in them. Still, their general tone is more warm and soft than the hard and disturbing metallic atmosphere of the pictures with beggars, guitarists and circus artists painted in blue. In Picasso’s “pink” works viewers and critics usually see a wish to flee from the circle of angry, sarcastic and unhappy feelings he was stuck in. Maybe he tried to embrace a more optimistic world view. Maybe warmth, smile and life urged to come back to the artists’ pictures. This is a widespread opinion. However, it is hardly tenable.

A great paradox of Picasso’s world view and axiological position is obvious in his painting *Acrobat on a Ball*, 1904 (Moscow, Pushkin Museum). It is based on a direct experience of the everyday life of gymnasts, acrobats and other circus artists of a travelling company. A strong man is sitting on the right side; an embodiment of male force, a mountain of muscles. However, he is obviously too heavy and bulky even to get up and walk. This is a force which is hardly able to act in any way, to do something to protect his companion. The latter, though, needs help and protection indeed. The young girl balancing on a big ball is thin and graceful as a leaf of grass. This child, who was put on an unstable basement, a big ball, is vulnerable and needs support. Can the strong man help her? Hardly so.

Probably, here we have a story of a helpless force, on the one side, and ephemeral grace and beauty which is unstable and highly vulnerable, on the other side. This is the reason for a feeling of alarm and uneasiness emanating from the Moscow painting. There is no explicit tragedy
there. However, any viewer may grasp a disturbing message under the surface of this impressive scene. Grace is in danger, force cannot save or protect the doomed child.

In 1906–1907 Picasso’s new series arose, namely his Archaic and Neolithic female figures and portrait works. The Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg keeps a representative set of this pictorial group in the museum collection. The Early Avant-Garde in Western Europe (until ca. 1914) was thoroughly permeated with a new cult of the “new primordiality”.

In Paris this trend was displayed by Matisse and Picasso. In German art centers, namely Munich, Berlin and Dresden we can observe the wave of Expressionists like Ernst Ludwig Kirchner and Franz Marc. A couple of years later Russia witnessed the appearance of Neo-Primitive painters and so-called “Donkey Tail” artistic group with Mikhail Larionov and Nathalia Goncharova. An energetic “wildness’ invited their creative vision. In a sense, they all belonged to the hypothetical category of “young Barbarians”, and displayed more or less independence towards the traditional European culture.

The first to start to this direction was Matisse. At this moment he was moving ahead a bit faster than his future rival Picasso. The last must have jealously observed the evolution of the elder master and was ready to react to the challenge. In 1905 Matisse was 36 years old; Picasso just turned 25. This rivalry of the two representatives of two different artistic generations went through the rest of their lives. The beginning of this battle fell to a definitive point on the timetable: autumn of 1905.

An important event of Paris life — Le Salon d’Autumne of 1905, occurred on this date. Matisse displayed several paintings; The Open Window (National Gallery, Washington) and Portrait of M-me Matisse (Statens Museum for Kunst, Kopenhagen) were among them. Contemporary viewers and journalists have been chocked by the flatness of the painted surface and the “lines thick as a finger”, as one of the exhibition visitors noted with unfriendly perplexity. One can imagine that Picasso felt alert and took, metaphorically speaking, a fighting position following the challenge from Matisse. About 1905 he still painted his melancholic “blue” visions. (Even tried to make them harder and more aggressive.) And here was a surprise! Matisse, this mature
master in full command of professional cunning, master of Academic drawing and Impressionist use of color, made a turn about; he gave up his former way of painting fine color symphonies and started to paint boldly and daringly with explosive color strokes and rough stains as if he were a little child or a far-off native!

Matisse’s creative strategy was defined in 1905; his art fully emerged with its basic features towards 1910, the time when he produced his panneaux Dance and Music (now in Hermitage, St.Petersburg). In fact there was nothing subversive about him. He would not attack the European civilization as other new artists did. He was in fact not a Barbarian to smash down principles and tastes of high culture. He followed a program of a therapeutic art. His program was to extract deep elementary feelings and eye and body perceptions, natural irrational drives. However, not the dangerous or predatory ones. His direct use of paint caused a scandal and protesting articles in French press, which gave him the nickname “Le Fauve” — the Wild Man. But the artistic community was not to be deceived by the apparent “wildness’ of Matisse’s pictures. Picasso, as well, should not have thought the elegant and mondaine French to be his ally. Matisse should be rather considered an adversary.

Calmness, Epicurean sensuality, pure color and relaxing meditativity irradiated from masterpieces by Matisse. The two famous panneaux in the Hermitage (Dance and Music, 1909), commissioned by the Russian businessman Sergey Schchukin, may be considered as psychotherapeutic machines. This might appear as an unwanted joke, for Schchukin has been considered to be too strange and unpredictable to be normal by many contemporaries. Did he purchase some sort of medical help for himself when he ordered Matisse’s big canvases?

At this time point Picasso probably grasped what his friend and rival Matisse aimed at in his art. The latter tried to support and console, to help his co-humans in conditions of insane and destructive modern reality. The stunted and fierce Spaniard lived through his moment of truth at this point. In fact, he got very close to his furious art and earlier behavior in Barcelona. The year of Autumn Salon in Paris was the year of final decision. Namely this was a decision by the contrary. He had to
paint unlike Matisse and contrary to Matisse. Picasso forced his hard line disturbing and shocking his public. Primordial energies (relaxing, meditative and friendly with Matisse) had to be uncomfortable, shocking and dangerous with Picasso.

Both Picasso’s life and art look more and more harsh and challenging for some time. Sarcasm, revolt and uneasiness attack us from them. After 1905 he acted on the art scene as an exploding bomb bringing destruction. Until his Cubist period went to finish after 1912 (and new experiments began) his art was like the epicenter of a Spanish wrath, *furia española*. In a sense, in his paintings of 1905–1912 he realized the arsenal of the young revolt and recalcitrance of which he was full in his early years.9

We can observe meaningful changes in his art after 1914. Picasso grew to be more complicated and multifaceted in his art. He became “softer”. His irony never became really friendly to people and events; however, in his mature years he took a much more relaxed position and renounced demonstratively hard and wild and provocative gestures in art and life. Still, a constant charge of a toxic dislike in relation to the European civilization kept on working in his art. “Classicist” paintings and etchings from 1920–1939 displayed brisk changes from hard sarcasm and shocking grotesque, on the one side, to a sort of distanced humanistic ideal, on the other. Such are p. e. famous illustrations for Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. However, they stay outside our attention here. Now, we have to return to the first stages of the master’s development in Paris.

Friends and combatants of his youth like A. Salmon claimed (in later memoirs) that young Pablo fell in love with African and Oceanian art as early as 1905–1906. Within these years Matisse (the object of special attention of Picasso) publicly declared his program of a serene and meditative Fauvism and, in the mind of the Spaniard, strengthened his will to move his art to another direction, inverting the friendly anthropology of the French master into a martial gesture.

Picasso himself asserted that he did not know anything of non-European art until he finished (or stopped painting) his scandalous and historical picture *Les Demoiselles d’Avignon* in 1907. Could he have been able to see the artworks of non-European people earlier than that?
Historians of art employ a maximally possible scrutiny in dating events in artistic biographies. Here, however, one has to quote the statement by Picasso himself who told much later that he had been excited by the art of Black Africa in June, 1907, visiting the museum of Trocadéro. Exactly during these days and months he worked on his big canvas with wild and idol-like Demoiselles. The question is, though, to what degree can we trust the story about his stormy beginnings told by the artist in his later years?

Maybe he saw the African tribal art with open eyes just because he was ready for this meeting and was willing to make a picture with masks and idol-like figures. Or (another version) African native artists seen in Trocadéro were the first to help him to open his eyes and understand that he had to paint like this. This may be a curious but a very narrow and special problem. Anyway, the general trend of Picasso’s development is clear enough.

The magic expression and animalistic energy of tribal and primordial art forms had to help new art renounce to the senile weakness and spiritual paralysis of Europe. Young artists in France, Germany, Russia and Britain encountered this way of thinking. Dreams of the Primordial appear in the creations of R. M. Rilke, A. Gide, in the Celtic Revival of Glasgow and Edinburgh and elsewhere. In Barcelona Gaudi erected edifices of the Park Güell — a variation on the idea of pagan sanctuaries dedicated to snakes, salamanders and other beings living in real nature or fantasy. A biological substance of life vivified by some mysterious spirit (of the living soul of being) grew to be Gaudi’s central idea or message.

One more factor which influenced Picasso’s development is imitation of styles and manners of other artists. Max Jacob, who was the first friend of the Spanish newcomer in Paris, mentioned in his memoirs edited in 1927 that Picasso was severely reproached by many observers for imitating styles and artistic ways of other past and present artists.

Imitation and citation kept playing a sedative function in European artistic tradition. This is a signal of loyalty. Let us imagine an Academic painter imitating style and manner of Poussin, Ingres or Raphael. He has to be criticized for dull emulation; however, we should remark the fact that imitation comprises a signal of loyalty. A good and honest
follower of good examples in art always seemed to support the part of cultural and moral people who were sitting in academies, reading good books, going to museums and observing rules of ethics and aesthetics. An imitator may be a tedious and flat personality but he is a socially valid personality. He adheres to professorial elite, Parliament deputies and ministerial functionaries, ergo he defends covenants of good fathers of the Nation and the State.

However, there was and still is a delicate moment about it. Imitators have always had a problematic status in European cultural tradition. Modernity demands originality and innovation in art. Thus we have a contradiction here. Following great masters and imitating them is a very positive thing but somehow the follower of a good tradition has to find his own way in art. How to combine imitation, on the one hand, with artistic originality, on the other hand? How to produce a hot snow, or dry water? This was the stumbling block for Academic theory and practice all over the world in Modernity.

The hard and violent genius of young Picasso unmistakably hit the most problematic point of the European culture. To follow traditions and to be original and innovative at the same time — this was a weak point.

From the very beginning of his artistic career Picasso readily imitated styles and manners of ancient and new artists. He practiced imitation with a remarkable enthusiasm. His drawings followed classic examples, and in Paris he emulated El Greco and Daumier, Degas and Toulouse-Lautrec. Traces of many museal reminiscences surfaced here and there in his paintings and drawings. And what is particularly remarkable is his obvious joy of copying. This is a strange effect indeed. Imitators and copy makers more often than not produce their artifacts with hard work and sweat. There is something slavery about imitation. Any imitation but not Picasso’s. He married imitation to inspiration.

A talented and inspired imitation of somebody’s art; can it be possible? In theory, hardly so. However, somehow in real life things happen which do not correspond to logic. Picasso demonstrated that he was able to follow someone’s manner in painting and drawing, and to produce excellent results.
The audacious artist probably had his special reason to be enthusiastic about imitation in art. Emulating historical examples was an instrument for attacking them. At the turning point of his artistic biography he clearly demonstrated his subversive strategy.

About 1907 Picasso was stricken by a bold idea. He thought that he could use a museal Academic composition with nude figures in Classicist postures. But this conservative group, composed on examples of Classic paintings, had to be transposed to a language of non-European art — that is of African masks or Tasmanian idols, artifacts made in New Zealand or Tahiti. The point was that the two ways of seeing (the traditional European one and the primordial “savage” one) had to meet each other in one pictorial space. This meeting would produce a harsh collision. Clash of civilizations concentrated in a single picture!

One way is the European following of Academic tradition. The other way taken by a “native” talent, a primordial maker of idols, bursting natural energy and alien to correct drawing and composition of Poussin or Raphael. It is as if a classical painter, educated on the best rules of European tradition, suddenly began painting faces and bodies in a way a Tribal maker of idols would do.

Something like this metempsychosis one can subsume in Picasso’s paintings like Bathing woman in New York and, of course, Les Demoiselles d’Avignon in the same MOMA. This stage of development had approximately lasted for two years. However, an important key for understanding Picasso rests just in such duplex works from 1907–1908. It would be an unpardonable simplification equal to a mistake to claim that he moved to the side of Tribal art and primitive deformations. The crux of the matter is that our master combines two artistic languages on one canvas. One of them is a classical composition of nude figures balanced in their masses and gestures and put to a system of a mis-en-scene with left and right obligatory coulisses. This structure and principle of classical visual art visibly appears in Demoiselles. However, faces and bodies in this quasi-classical picture are treated as African ritual masks or Iberian stone idols from Pyrenean archeological excavations found around 1900. These Neolithic artifacts aroused vivid interest and affection in many artists including Picasso.12
For this reason we can hardly join the common opinion which ascribes a break with the European tradition to this picture. Breaking with it would mean taking leave and going another way. *Demoiselles* is a matter with another message: an aggregate of subversion from inside. The artist demonstrated that he was in full command of the traditional European painting. He imitated main principles of this tradition. He would not break with the basic concept of classical art. His idea was to reproduce this concept and to add to this representational code another code borrowed from far-off magic figures produced by native carvers and painters in far-off regions of the globe. This alien ferment destroys the classical concept from inside but not to an extent to kill it. A museum masterpiece and a savage ritual artifact stay in a tense embrace not able to annihilate each other. As Ch. Green put it: “*The Demoiselles simultaneously invoked and demolished the canon celebrated in the great museums where Picasso had trained his eye.*”

Evocation and destruction. This was a partisan strategy.

Hence the grade of hatred and fear which was and still is is addressed to this subversive artwork. A clear-cut alternative art would not earn him such a grade of discontent. An aesthetic conflict implies adversity, but a demonstrative destruction of the “good old” tradition from within may cause panic and fear. One of the brilliant masters of the traditional artworld went to undermine the basements of our civilization and it was not because the artist was ignorant or forgetful of them (as one might think of Malevich who was not much trained in the Academic tradition).

Picasso was really dangerous because he deeply knew and cunningly used the classical tradition (in Green’s words, “canon”) though he broke and destroyed it from inside. Not a simple enemy but a virtuoso of secret operations. A sort of cancer agent working in the body.

The next stage of the artist’s development was, in a sense, the true apogee of a hard line within the Early Avant-Garde.

From 1908 a new movement was present on the scene, namely Cubism. A description of the history of its formation would break the modest size of the present essay. We have to tackle only one aspect of a big and complex problem. The trajectory of Cubism in art has been studied by a constellation of old and new historians of art from A. Barr
and J. Golding to Ch. Green and J. Richardson. My task now is to understand the message contained in Cubist works by Picasso. Other individual versions of Cubism, belonging to Braque, Gris, Leger and the rest of the team, stay beyond my attention.

The content and message inherent to this new pictorial language instantly moved to the spot of interest and grew to be the object of theories and hypothetic assumptions. Until now these theories of Cubism have been influential enough to convince the majority of educated public today.

Picasso’s friends and admirers felt obliged to speak and write on his art, to defend and comment it at the moment when, in 1908, he started a new line of unusual paintings. They got an (initially) mocking nickname “Cubism” due to their faceted forms. New works visibly outstripped everything done before by their harsh deformations. Comments came ready in numbers. Apollinaire’s voice and word was the most notable in the choir. The outstanding poet simultaneously was a highly effective art critic. He had charisma which was very important for playing an advantageous role on the art scene. The question is, however, who invented the notorious theory of the “smart art of Cubism” with its supposedly scientific and almost mathematical analysis of form and space?

One ought to stress that the idea of “smart Cubism” was not a proposal by Picasso and Braque themselves. These two played the roles of “parents” of Cubism, but they also had “children”, namely Juan Gris, Albert Gleizes, Jean Metzinger, Fernand Leger and others. Like most followers of strong leaders, they tried to systemize and structure the energetic strike made by Picasso with his pictures of 1908. Some support the construction of a rational and quasi-scientific theory ensued from the term “Cubism” itself. In reality the painters did not represent geometric bodies called cubes, they deformed and dissected visible forms in many ways and transformed them into new configurations. The word “Cubism” had its aura; it informed a European educated mind that a scientific geometry was at work here, and, thus, some rational process dominated the Cubist pictures.

The circle around Picasso produced a whole set of reasonings. Popular press brought several statements, then more serious texts followed suit.
The manifest Du “Cubisme” was issued by Gleizes and Metzinger in 1912; Guillaume Apollinaire’s booklet “Les Peintres Cubistes” appeared in 1913. At this time Cubist painters came to favor with the remarkable art lover, theoretician and gallery owner Daniel-Henri Kahnweiler. The comprehensive treaty written by this German-born cosmopolitan dealer was published in after-war years.\textsuperscript{14} In pre-war years he was an active visitor of artistic ateliers and an interlocutor of leading persons of the scene. His systematic and comprehensive reasonings earned him a serious prestige in this milieu.

His theory was readily accepted by the new school. There was a visible imprint of scientism about it. Thanks to well-educated Kahnweiler, supporters of Cubist art may have thought that this art had a fundamental affinity to the new scientific vision of nature. Space and time ceased to be constant and turned out to be variable and dynamic. The new art supposedly responded to the challenge of the new science. Artistic community must have been happy about such theory — or, at least, not resisting to it.

The strongest impact was produced by Apollinaire’s booklet of 1913. He declared that the goal of Cubism was to realize the space-time connection, and to involve the fourth dimension, namely time, into painting. In other words, a Cubist painting shows simultaneously different sides of one and the same thing of figure.\textsuperscript{15} Similar ideas were also put down by Gleizes and Metzinger in their known manifest of 1912.

Theoretical texts, which emerged in Picasso’s surroundings, tell us that a Cubist painter moves around the object he represents, and then unites partial views collected in this circumferential trajectory into one space. Regarding pictures produced by “children” one may somehow swallow the bulk of scientific theories. For example Gleizes’ painting \textit{Man on the balcony} in Philadelphia Museum, or \textit{Portrait of Picasso} by Juan Gris in Art Institute of Chicago. These pictures demonstrated a fine and resourceful partition into many plans combined into new combinations leading up to a process of a sophisticated intellectual play. One can hardly say that Gris and Gleizes observed formulas of the theory they shared. But at least both painters displayed a rational,
unmistakably intellectual approach, and a very balanced treatment of surfaces, plans and details.

The fact is that paintings by Picasso’s emulators and theories emerging in his entourage basically differ from his own artworks of 1908–1912. It is impossible to imagine that Picasso, after creating his tense “blue” pictures and magic alternative pictures with masks and idols, dismissed his former aggressive state of mind and became a serene rationalist, that is a scientific artist who cultivated a kind of geometry and cared a lot for the fourth dimension — time.

Believing such a miraculous conversion is an impossible thing. Could Picasso, a dangerous guy and a friend of gypsies, a wandering wolf and an enemy of conventions, make such a dramatic turn? Could he forget his own self and become a rationalistic, balanced character and brainiac working with the problem of the fourth dimension in order to construct circumferential spaces on canvas? A young Barbarian, a furious annihilator and underminer of values becoming a learned master of a complicated representational system?

Who can believe it?

Historians of art are well acquainted with the phenomena of theories born and grown in the shadow of great masters and their masterworks. Sometimes artists themselves concocted theories in order to give reasonable arguments to their impulsive artistic gestures. Theories belonging to Poussin, Reynolds, Delacroix and others emerged in such way. Theories are needed first of all for integration and absorption of an artistic creation with social and national life.

Worth noting is the fact that Picasso lived and worked for six decades after his Cubist period had finished. Through the rest of his life he was silent on the theme of theories which surrounded the activity of the group of artists who had followed him in early years. He neither joined the opinion of Apollinaire — Kahnweiler nor denied it. He tolerated their suggestions. In his mature years he was rather patient about reasonable and soft comments on his explosive and subversive pictures given by others. Thus, the picture of New York MOMA, repeatedly mentioned above, was named Whorehouse of Avignon or Prostitutes of Avignon by the artist himself. This name was extremely hard and
shocking, and, given the fact that this work had aroused big indignation for many reasons, Picasso’s friends convinced him to be patient about the compromise title *Les Demoiselles d’Avignon*. It is a mild title as the word “Demoiselles’ is ambivalent and may mean not only female sexual service but also decent gentlewomen. In order not to pull society’s leg Picasso consented to accept the soft title.

Supposedly Picasso saw ideas of his comrades as indulgently as that. Students and journalists could massively reproduce and relay the rational theory of Cubism. Nothing to do with those incurable people, must have thought the shrewd artist meeting the public reaction to his artworks. Harsh lessons never can reach social co-humans. Therefore one has to wrap up cutting edges into soft and safe package.

If one asks about the most important thing, that is what content did Picasso himself put to his paintings, one has to observe pictures themselves and try to see how they were made.

In his early Parisian pictures Picasso evoked the life style and surroundings he lived in. Artists and their girls, people in cafes, street scenes, guitars, bottles, glasses on an old worn-out table. This milieu was definitely located outside the “good society”. This dimension was inhabited by strange youngsters and weird old types, marginal persons and other outsiders — patented criminals and bohemian stars (today some of them are considered to be great painters, poets and musicians) were among them. Intensive production of pictures depicting scenes and elements of this life world began with the “blue” paintings. They contained a confession of a tense soul vibrating with Spanish “angustia”, a strange double of the German Existentialist word “Angst” which means “desperation” and “hopelessness”.

This state of mind would be comprehensible to Vladimir Mayakovsky, the enemy of the good old world of professors and newspapers, mondaine public and the police rules he often broke. Like the young rebel Mayakovsky, the young Picasso was ready to stand up and fight against the good old order of things in hope to find an undiscovered continent of freedom, love and understanding.

In this critical moment his friendly rival Matisse appeared on the avant-scene and launched his tender, mild and therapeutic Avant-
Garde version. Picasso went up like a madman. At first he married the principle of a Classical figure scene with the treatment of an African or Neolithic idol. challenging and frightening pictures appeared this way — bugaboos for bourgeois public. (The New York picture Les Demoiselles d’Avignon is of course the most famous or notorious of them.) This subversion wasn’t enough for the red-hot artist.

The birth of the soft and friendly Avant-Garde in Matisse’s art around 1905 may have been a last drop which set the emotion in motion. Picasso reacted to the outer call. He saw that his colleague and maybe the most talented painter of his generation, Matisse, chose the side of peaceful, serene and humanistic art (using hard means of Avant-Garde). What’s next? Next came the most toxic subversion of Museum canon — Les Demoiselles. He goes further. Furia epañola boiled over. Cubist paintings represent this stage of the unrestrained “furia”.

He set out to press and crumple things and figures and faces. Surfaces crossed each other and came together into lumps. Forms penetrated each other. Cubism is a revolt, aggression, attack. It was invented by a hard Spanish fighter. Not by his rival, a mild and consoling French painter. No joy for our eyes is envisaged. He attacks us like a Desperado — a soldier who does not care for his life nor security.

Now again: What about the theory of the fourth dimension and mathematical analysis of dissected forms? The answer is: study it, think it over but never take it for granted.

Theories of art are not the same as works of art. It’s impossible to imagine that Picasso treated pictorial form and space as a scientist does with his materials and instruments in his laboratory. Picasso as a smart and rational analyst of dimensions and a student of forms-in-time is a fiction never having existed in reality. This fictional personage was invented by his fellows and followers. They wished well to the reputation of the new art. They sincerely cared for the status of Cubism in the cultural society. This is a normal aspiration of social human beings. However, paintings made by Picasso have nothing common with that. Theories describe Cubism as a rational quasi-scientific process. The character, nature and psychic condition of the Spanish artist have nothing to do with that. His Cubist canvases were born in a
dramatic process of attacking the public across the canvas. Cubism is a prolongation and the apogee of Picasso’s hard line in art; theories of Cubism belong to a soft, socially oriented thinking.

Matisse is reported to have said that Picasso was a bandit. Maybe this harsh term was uttered without any scorn but rather smelt of a good-humored joke. Anyway, Matisse was right because he grasped very well the nature of his confrere. *Picasso desperado. Picasso furioso.* Uncontrollable fighter. However, not for ever. Soon the time would come and he would go through considerable changes.

After the Great War in 1914, the senseless wrath would destroy the formerly well-organized world. European plains would be sewn with millions of dead bodies. During these years Picasso would go other ways, and his art would grow more friendly and mild. But this is a different story.

**NOTES**

3. Mass media in Spain helped to support the common opinion that the shameful defeat of 1898 was caused by incompetence, venality and degradation of the upper strata of the government and the military force of the country.
8. The term “new primordiality” applied to the Early Avant-Garde has been coined by Valery Prokofiev (1928–1982) — an outstanding art historian and connoisseur of Goya and Picasso.
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Summary: The problem of studying the second wave of Russian artistic emigration, the formation of which was caused by the events of the Second World War when hundreds of thousands of Soviet citizens were captured and deported to Germany or found themselves on the territories occupied by the troops of the Third Reich, is raised in the article. Afterwards, many of them went through European camps for displaced persons (DP) and managed to avoid forced deportation to the Soviet Union. The problem of the future research is formulated in the following paper: to determine the artists of the second wave of emigration, whose names, with a few exceptions, are unknown in Russia; to examine their lives and ways of their socio-cultural adaptation in their countries of residence; to get an idea about their work, locate, preserve and present their works to the audience.
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Three main waves, the formation and fate of which are closely related to the turning points in the history of our country, are defined in the history of the Russian emigration of the 20th century.
The first wave of emigration was caused by the revolution of 1917 and the Civil War — an event that prompted hundreds of thousands (according to some estimates up to two million) of Russians of different classes, different nationalities and religions, different professions and political convictions to forever leave their homeland and start a new life with a clean slate. The first wave of emigration seamlessly absorbed those Russians who were abroad before the revolution by force of circumstances and were unable to return to their homes for obvious reasons. Russians who found themselves in territories rebelled against the Russian Empire as results of its collapse refer to the same wave. The formation of the first wave of emigration was mostly completed in the second half of the 1920s, when, in accordance with the general policy of the Soviet government, it became practically impossible to leave the Soviet Union.

The second wave of emigration was caused by the events of the Second World War when hundreds of thousands of Soviet citizens were captured and deported to Germany or found themselves on territories occupied by the troops of the Third Reich. Many of them were faced with a dilemma at the final stage of the war: whether to return to the USSR, risking to fall under “the roller” of Stalinist repression, or to try to avoid forced returns due to allied interstate agreements, and to remain in exile\(^2\).

People, who left the USSR in 1970–1980-ies, including those who left in accordance with the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe signed in Helsinki in 1975, which declared freedom of movement of persons across state boundaries, form the third wave of emigration. In a number of cases this wave had a cultural and socio-political (dissident) character, but for the most part it was due to economic considerations, to a desire to overcome the scarcity and monotony of the Soviet everyday life. The third wave of emigration had been growing steadily until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, when the motives, incentives and ways to travel abroad began to acquire a different character, and the concept of “emigration” (except for some isolated cases) largely lost its former ideological meaning.
Culturally, the emigration of the first wave is considered to be the most significant, the history of which is surrounded with the names of Ivan Bunin and Alexander Kuprin, Igor Stravinsky and Sergei Rachmaninoff, Vaslav Nijinsky and Anna Pavlova. Many artists including such well-known artists as Ilya Repin, Vasily Kandinsky, Marc Chagall, Natalia Goncharova, Mikhail Larionov, Alexander Benois, Mstislav Dobuzhinsky, Konstantin Somov, Nicholas Roerich, Boris Grigoriev, Yuri Annexkov, whose names are permanently inscribed in the history of world art, were among the representatives of this wave. Representatives of the younger generation, coeivals of the twentieth century, whose creative formation started to develop abroad and fame came in 1950–1960’s (Sergey Polyakov, Andrei Lanskoi, Nicholas de Stael, Kostia Terechkovitch, Paul Tchelitchew, Feodor Rojankovsky, Dimitri Bouchéne, Nicholas Benois, Boris Chaliapin, Elizabeth Ivanovsky and others), were among the artists-emigrants of the first wave.

Cultural significance of the third wave of emigration is determined by the constellation of prominent personalities, in one way or another involved in the dissident movement and forced voluntarily or involuntarily to leave the Soviet Union for political reasons. Writers and poets were among them: Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Viktor Nekrasov, Alexander Galich, Andrei Sinyavsky and Vladimir Maximov, Joseph Brodsky, Sergei Dovlatov, ballet stars Rudolf Nureyev and Mikhail Baryshnikov, directors Andrei Tarkovsky and Yuri Lyubimov, violoncellist Mstislav Rostropovich and opera prima Galina Vishnevskaya. Erik Bulatov, Ilya Kabakov, Ernst Neizvestny, Oleg Tselkov, Edward Sternberg, Mikhail Shemyakin, Boris Zaborov, Vitaly Komar and Albert Melamid can be named among the artists who left the Soviet Union with the flow of the Third Wave, and they are still holding high positions in the ranking of world art.

The second wave of Russian emigration is not so rich in outstanding names. The creativity of artists belonging to this wave has always been in the shadow of their famous predecessors, as well as in the shadow of the famous people who were among the dissident generation of the late Soviet era. Russian art history, to which the theme of Russian artists abroad is relatively new, still focuses on personalities, who vividly
proved themselves on the international art scene in the interwar period, or on successful artists of modern times.

The study of cultural heritage of the second wave of Russian emigration should be based on a correct estimate of its scale and composition.

And it is equally important to break ideological cliches, imposed upon people for decades in the Soviet Union, whereby persons who had emigrated during the Second World War and did not want to return, were considered to be traitors to the fatherland and accomplices of fascism almost without exception. At the same time, a whole variety of circumstances and motives of emigrants’ actions, including people’s pessimistic and sober view on the prospects of their return to their homeland, was, as a rule, ignored. The fact that a significant number of former Soviet citizens had objective grounds for rejecting the Stalinist regime, and which did not necessarily presuppose faithfulness to the Nazi ideology, was not taken into account either.

Let us refer to history. By the end of World War II, the total number of Soviet citizens living outside the USSR was about five million, more than three million of whom were in the zone of the allies activity (West Germany, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Italy) and about two million in the Soviet army activity zone (East Germany, Austria, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Finland).

At the final stage of the war the USSR leadership obtained consent of the allies to repatriate all Soviet citizens regardless of their wishes. Relevant agreements were signed with the United States and the United Kingdom (February 11, 1945, as part of the Yalta agreements) and France (June 26, 1945).

It can be assumed that most Soviet citizens returned to the USSR voluntarily, in a natural desire to be reunited with their families, not knowing other life opportunities. However, it is well known that a lot of people were repatriated forcibly. According to official figures of the Soviet repatriation authorities and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR the number of citizens who found themselves in exile at the beginning of the 1950s is estimated to range from 450 thousand to 620 thousand people. The majority consisted of the “Westerners”—emigrants from the western territories annexed by the USSR at the
beginning of World War II (Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Karelian Isthmus and western Ladoga, western Ukraine and Belarus, Bessarabia and West Bukovina). The number of the “Easterners”, emigrants from the Soviet Union within the boundaries prior to the Second World War, is estimated at only 100 thousand people.\textsuperscript{4}

Since mid-1946 the former anti-Hitler coalition allies no longer forcibly extradited Soviet citizens to the USSR repatriation authorities; it was related to the beginning of the Cold War, the signal for which was the famous speech by former British Prime Minister Winston Churchill delivered on March 5, 1946, in the US city of Fulton (Missouri). New life’s challenges awaited the defectors in the next couple of years; however, they were not as severe as those that befell on the majority of people who had voluntarily or involuntarily returned to the USSR.

The defectors were held in special DP camps on the provision of the American and British occupation authorities. These camps were originally monitored by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA), established in November 1944, and by the International Relief Organization (IRO) from October 1949. Former prisoners of war were in majority among the defectors; then were the so-called Ostarbeiters massively exported to work on the territory of the Third Reich; further were the people from various military units of the Wehrmacht (in Russia traditionally referred to by the general term “Vlasovite” which, as it is known, is far from the historical reality) and who actively cooperated with the German occupation administration; and, finally, a number of civilian refugees, mainly from among the intelligentsia, who took the opportunity to leave the USSR. The first-wave emigrants fleeing from the Red Army from Eastern Europe, including full citizens of these states, also found shelter in these camps, as well as owners of “Nansen passport” — a document that replaced a national passport for Russian emigrants since 1922, allowing them to legally live and work in other countries.

The largest DP camps were located in Germany: Mönchehof locality near Kassel (about 40,000 displaced persons), Schleissheim, Landsgut and Fussen, near Munich; Fishback, near Hamburg, Ganghofersiedlung, near Regensburg in Bavaria. Such camps were in Austria (Kellenberg),
in Italy near Rome (Chin-Chita), Rimini and Bologna; in the port of Piraeus in Greece and in other places in Europe.

Inhabitants of the DP camps were not considered to be convicted or as persons on remand. They were given normal food and medical care; they were not forced to work and had a relatively high degree of freedom; they were able to leave the camp for a short period in certain cases. Social life was intensively developing in the camps; children and adolescent education was set going; churches were opened, theatrical productions, musical concerts and exhibitions were arranged, manuscripts and prints were produced. Thus, Mönchhof club, a drama theater, ballet troupe and choir functioned in the camp. The scenery for the camp performances was painted by artists Rostislav Sazonov and Alexander Mikhailov, who came to Germany from Belgrade. The journal *Posev*, an organ of the anti-Soviet emigre organization People’s Labor Union (NTS), and the literary journal *Grani*, that exists to this day, began to be published in this same camp in November 1945.

Veronica Gashurova, an artist (b. 1932) now living in the United States, describes one of the smaller camps in Kempten in Bavaria: “We arrived at a small picturesque town. Houses, shops — nothing was touched by the war. Amazing! The camp was in a school. Many Russian people gathered there from all sides, from different countries. There were bunks in classes. Fourteen to sixteen people lived in each class. Kitchen. Food was brought in kiers into the room. Help was needed for those who were on duty in the kitchen. There was a club. There was a grand piano. There was a volleyball ground on the territory before the school.”

The most dramatic memories of the defectors’ stay in the DP camps are associated with the filtration of the inhabitants in order to detect Soviet citizens and extradite them to the Soviet authorities. Gashurova recalls, “A forcible removal was the last blow of the war. We suffered through it, and we endured and withstood. We survived, thank you, Lord! A new life began — the post-war one.” Veronica Gashurova’s family, pretending to be the “old” Russian emigrants, came through several DP camps, until finally, in 1949; they were able to leave to the United States. There Veronica graduated from the Art Department at
Pratt Institute in New York and became a textile designer, decorator and painter.

The stay in the DP camps allowed many thousands of former Soviet citizens to avoid forced repatriation to the Soviet Union, fraught with repressions, and in the future — to have a possibility to live in countries free of Soviet influence. Most DP camps were eliminated by the early 1950s. Their former inhabitants settled in Western Europe, North Africa and the Middle East, many went to Australia; a significant number of people was able to move to the US, Canada and Latin America.

***

The difficulties, faced by the researchers of the second wave of artistic emigration, are mainly determined by the fact that the activities of its members were largely “atomized” and did not give cause for a comprehensive study. In the history of this artistic generation there were no attempts to organize such joint exhibitions with impressive scale as the Great Exhibition of Russian Art, held in Belgrade (1930), the Exhibition of Russian Art in Paris gallery La Renaissance (1932) or the Retrospective Exhibition of Russian Painting in Prague (1935). This generation did not attempt to create a museum similar to the Russian Cultural Historical Museum founded by V. Bulgakov in Prague in 1930. We will not find the names of the representatives of the second wave among the participants of several exhibitions arranged in Paris in 1945–1947 (exhibition In Honor of the Victory organised by the Union of Russian (later Soviet) Patriots) as well as among the participants of the later retrospective exhibitions representing the art of Russian emigration in Europe, e.g. Russian Artists of the School of Paris, Paris (1961); Significant Paintings of Russian Artists in French Collections, Paris (1972); The Russians Again, Paris (1975); Russian View, Heidelberg, Germany (1974).

Representatives of the second wave, recent Soviet citizens, unlike their predecessors and even peers who grew up in exile, did not have “admission” to the high cultural environment of Europe and America for a long time. They did not have the charismatic status of a “Russian emigre” — a bearer of great traditions lost in Russia. Also, they did not have that legal and financial support in the framework of state and
public programs, which Russian emigrants of the first wave had once received in countries of the West. Ordeals in the post-war European camps under the threat of forced repatriation to the Soviet Union, a difficult journey over the ocean, a long way to social, economic and cultural adaptation on a new land — all this was the usual fate of the emigrant, who found themselves outside the USSR in 1940.

The circle of artists-emigrants of the second wave consisted mainly of young people aged 25–35. Most of them received primary or secondary art education in the USSR; however, they were not familiar with current trends in the art of the West and had no experience of self-exhibition and commercial work. With few exceptions, there were not any craftsmen among them who had earlier gained fame in the USSR. One can agree with the painter and writer Serge Hollerbach, who explains the latter circumstance with the fact that a significant number of representatives of the senior cultural layer were evacuated deep into the Soviet Union during the outbreak of war. The evacuation of the artistic intelligentsia, along with a relocation of industrial and agricultural enterprises to the East, were regarded by the Soviet leadership as important socio-political problems of the wartime.

A preliminary review of art criticism literature, Russian and Western art reference books as well as emigre periodicals allowed the authors of this article to reveal the names of about 150 artists, emigrants of the second wave, who had manifested themselves in exhibition practice, book illustration, icon-painting works and scenography. Artists who settled in the United States form the most part of this preliminary glossary.

Association of Russian-American Artists and the Society of Russian Artists, which organized small group exhibitions in the hall of the Barbizon Plaza hotel, functioned in New York at the beginning of the 1950s. According to the memoirs of Serge Hollerbach, “there were no differences in ideology nor in the course of these societies; personal relationships were the connecting-link”. Both societies did not last long, having played a role in the initial support and promotion of its members. Young Russian artists gradually appeared on the American art market and no longer strained after ethnic communities, although group exhibitions of Russian artists (Pandora’s Gallery, Lynn Kottler, ADA Arts and others)
were still organised occasionally in New York commercial galleries during the 1950s. Only a few of the participants of these exhibitions won a place in the American artistic life. But most of them had to deal with commercial artistic crafts or to make a living by another career.

The exhibition of Russian artists, held in Philadelphia in 1983, presented, in our opinion, the most interesting Russian emigre artists of the second wave who had settled in the United States. Yuri Bobritsky (the cousin of Vladimir Bobritskiy, an emigrant of the first wave, a talented artist and musician, known as Bobri), Sergei Bongart, Sergei Hollerbach, Brothers Victor and Michael Lasuchin, Vladimir Odinokov, Vladimir Shatalov and Constantine Cherkas participated in it. The introduction to the catalog was written by art historian Burton Wasserman, a college professor at Glassboro, New Jersey. All eight artists were born in the period between 1908–1927 and received art education in the USSR. During the war they were in Germany (Odinokov as a POW); they were in DP camps and after, being able to avoid forced repatriation, emigrated to the United States in 1949–1950. Apart from the general emigre fate, the artists were influenced in the same way. As was noted in the catalog, the work of artists was nurtured by Russia, Western Europe and America. Six of them remained committed to traditional forms of art, and only the Lazuhin brothers were carried away with abstraction by that time.

Serge Hollerbach, a member of the exhibition, is a remarkable figure of Russian artistic emigration. In Russia, his essays and memoirs largely contributed to the growth of interest in creative works of our compatriots in the United States. A lot has been written about Serge Hollerbach in recent years, who still lives in New York. His exhibitions are held, his books are being published in Russia. Serge Hollerbach, nephew of the famous art historian Erich Fedorovich Hollerbach, was born in 1923 in Tsarskoye Selo. He received his first art lessons in the Art Studio at the Voronezh Pioneers Palace (his family was exiled to Voronezh in 1935). On his return to Leningrad he attended the Art School at the Academy of Arts for some time; however, his studies were interrupted by the war. In 1942, being near Leningrad in the area of the German occupation, Serge Hollerbach with his mother was forced to go to
Germany. They found themselves in the American occupation zone in 1945, thus avoiding the forced repatriation to the Soviet Union. In 1946–1949 Hollerbach studied at the Munich Academy of Fine Arts, after which he was able to obtain a US visa and move to the United States. Having lived for many years in New York, he was familiar with many Russian emigrants, participated in group exhibitions, wrote reviews on his colleagues’ exhibitions and, in recent years, has turned to memories that are extremely valuable for a complex understanding of the current topic.

In 1995, thanks to Hollerbach, an exhibition of five artists-emigrants (apart from Hollerbach’s works, works by the aforementioned brothers Lazuhin, Shatalov and Odinokov were exhibited as well; works of the latter two were exhibited posthumously) was held at the Representative of Russia to the UN in New York. At the opening ceremony, Sergei Lavrov, Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the UN and now Minister of Foreign Affairs, presented certificates to artists on the occasion of the upcoming 50th anniversary of Victory in the Great Patriotic War. These were the first signs of reconsideration of the Russian state official position in relation to the Soviet defectors of the Second World War.

Galina Alexandrova, Ivan Garikov, Anatoly Gorokhovets, Irina Dee, Vyacheslav Ilyahinsky, Sergei Korolkov, Nicholas Papkov and Anatoly Sokoloff can be named among other Russian artists, who notably manifested themselves in the US market in the postwar decades.

A difficult fate of the last of these artists is very typical for the second wave of emigration. Anatoly Sokoloff (1891–1971), son of the hunt Stewart at the Jägermeister Chancellery, was born in Peterhof, graduated from the Nicholas Cadet Corps in St. Petersburg and later studied at the Tver Cavalry School — a military career was their family tradition. After graduation, Sokoloff served in the Finnish Dragoon Regiment in Vyborg and, as an auditor, attended D. Kardovsky and B. Kustodiev’s classes at the Imperial Academy of Arts. At the beginning of the First World War, he was transferred to the Gatchina military aviation school, where he became a pilot instructor in 1915. Being in the acting army, he made sketches, which were published in the journal reports.
After the revolution Anatoly Sokoloff remained in Petrograd, where he continued his studies in painting under the guidance of A. Savinov at the Higher Art and Technical Institute (reformed Academy of Fine Arts). Being a former officer he was arrested in March 1932, sentenced to 5 years and placed in Svirsky labour camp in the Leningrad region. After his release in 1936 (without the right to live in large cities), Sokoloff settled in Simferopol, where he was not only able to continue art classes, but also able to achieve success in the field of his official career: he was elected into the leadership of the Crimea Union of Artists in 1938, and the following year he participated in exhibitions of paintings, drawings and sculptures of the Crimean artists (Homeland Welcomes the Leader, Walkers with Lenin, Elections to The Supreme Council of the Crimean Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, The Battle of Yushuni, Harvest Festival were among his painting); the exhibition was dedicated to the 60th anniversary of the birth of Stalin. All Sokoloff’s paintings were destroyed during the German bombing attack at the beginning of the war. In 1942, when the city was already occupied by German troops, the artist decided to flee the USSR. Using other people’s documents, along with his wife and son he crossed the Romanian border, a few months after they were in neutral Switzerland and later they settled in the Principality of Liechtenstein, which gave temporary shelter to many Russian emigrants after the war.

Sokoloff managed to resume active artistic activity in emigration; he participated in many exhibitions in Switzerland, Austria and Liechtenstein. As he inherited his father’s love of dressage, he specialized in cavalry battles scenes, though he successfully worked in the portrait genre as well (Portrait of Princess of Liechtenstein, 1946). In 1948, Anatoly Sokoloff and his family, fearing forced repatriation, emigrated to Argentina, where a new phase of his work began. In the 1950s, he created a large series of paintings on the history of Argentina and the life of Argentine cowboys — gauchos. The painting The Crossing of the Andes (1950), dedicated to the national hero of Argentina Jose San Martin, who led the struggle of Latinos for independence from Spain, was awarded with the Grand Gold Medal by the Argentinean Ministry of Education and was acquired by the San Martin National Museum.
In 1953, Sokoloff made a monumental portrait *General Jose San Martin, the Liberator* for the main chamber of the National Congress of Argentina.

By the time of his 70th birthday, Anatoly Sokoloff had fame and wealth, but the emigrant’s journey did not stop there. In 1961, Sokoloff received news from his brother from San Francisco, whom he had regarded as missing since the Civil War in Russia. This dramatically changed the artist’s life plans and encouraged him to move with his family to San Francisco. Thus, two waves of Russian emigration crossed and reunited into one family.


Today Anatoly Sokoloff’s paintings are in museums and private collections in Germany, Romania, Austria, Argentina, the United States. In 1987, the artist’s heirs donated the painting *Suvorov Captures the Turkish Fortress Ismail* (1953; it has been in the State Memorial Museum of A. Suvorov in St. Petersburg since 2004) to the State Tretyakov Gallery. In 2001, they have also been presented to the State Historical Museum portrait Conchita Arguello, beloved Russian Commander Nicholas Rezanova (*Waiting*, 1961). In 1990, the sketch of his painting *Russian Merchants Trading with the Indians at Fort Ross* (1962) was presented as a gift Mikhail Gorbachev from California.

The fate of several artists, immigrants second wave turned out to be connected with Canada. Designer Nikolai Soloviev (1910–1976) was born and raised in Moscow, worked in Moscow theaters and studios, participated in making of Sergei Eisenstein’s film *Alexander Nevsky*. 
During the war, Soloviev was captured by the Germans, then survived the DP camp and after emigrated to Canada in 1949. During the first years he had to work on a farm as a worker and a roofer. Soloviev’s experience as a decorative painter started to be in demand only in 1952, when the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation CBC began to expand television in Canada. He became a pioneer of Canadian television, one of the most famous decorators of television productions and movies. Apparently Russian repertoire was his major strength. He designed the decorations for the first television opera *Eugene Onegin*, as well as plays based on the works of Russian classics: *Crime and Punishment* by Dostoyevsky and “First Love” by Turgenev, “The Cherry Orchard” by Anton Chekhov and “The Government Inspector” by Nikolai Gogol. Soloviev published an album with pictures of national costumes and typical rural houses in different countries to help decorators in their work. Nikolai Soloviev died in Toronto, leaving a memory of himself as being one of the “most influential people on the Canadian television”.15

Australia was one of the centers of Russian emigration in the 20th century. Since the late 1940s emigrants of the first wave from China, who fled from the communist regime, had been moving to this country; some Russian defectors from Europe rushed here as well. Among the latter was sculptor George Jezierski, who still continues his work despite his advanced age. He was born in 1920 in Moscow in the family of writer and historian Milia Vikentievich Jezierski, who had lived in the Soviet Union until his death in 1976 and narrowly escaped repression in his time (his two brothers were killed in 1937–1938). George Jezierski studied at Mossovet sculpture studio and at Sculpture production plant; when he was young he created several monumental works for the Russian State Library building (bronze high reliefs *Book* and *Hammer with Anvil* at the entrance to the library, a figure *Girls with Drawings* on the roof and others). During the Great Patriotic War Jezierski went to the front, but was captured and spent 18 months in the camp of Buchenwald. After the war he was in a DP camp, after lived for several years in France and then emigrated to Australia in 1951, taking a new name — George Virine.16 (It is notable that many cultural figures of his generation preferred to act under pseudonyms, fearing to put their relatives remaining in the USSR
at risk.) In 1956, the sculptor held his first solo exhibition, after which he was invited to teach at the Central Technical College in Brisbane, the state capital of Queensland, where he subsequently had worked for 18 years. In 1976 Virine/Jezierski opened his own studio, where many Australian sculptors had studied and later gained prominence (including Rhyl Hinvud and Philip Payprayds). He preferred the portrait genre in his own work creating busts of Leo Tolstoy, Tchaikovsky, Abraham Lincoln, Mahatma Gandhi, Winston Churchill, King of Great Britain George VI (presented to the Government of Australia by the author) and others. He is the author of the five-meter monument with a bust of the famous Australian aviator Bert Hinkler, who was the first to make a solo flight from the UK to Australia; his sculptures decorate a number of public buildings in Brisbane, including the Houses of Parliament of Queensland (bust of the legendary Captain James Cook) and the Conservatory. In 1994, he made a bronze monument of St. Prince Vladimir, established at the University of Queensland.

***

A lot of outstanding, distinctive and talented people were in the second wave of emigration, who, under more favorable external circumstances, could have gained recognition and could have been the glory of the Russian art school. The artistic heritage of these artists is still mainly distributed among foreign private collections and is not much studied. Biographical information about them is extremely scarce and mostly taken from reviews in emigre newspapers.17 Scarcity, inaccuracy and sometimes inconsistency of this information is largely due to complexity of human lives developing on the background of large-scale political conflicts which interposed a gulf between the defectors and their homeland, reluctance not to get involved in political explanations of their actions and, in some cases, a natural tendency to protect their relatives, who had remained in the USSR, from reprisals.

Studies on the second wave of artistic emigration are, so far, few in number. Nowadays, the task to identify artists-emigrants of the second wave whose names with a few exceptions are unknown in Russia, to study their fate and the ways of their socio-cultural adaptation in
the countries where they live, to get an idea about their work, locate, preserve and present the viewer with their works seems to be a necessary and a very important step towards a comprehensive understanding of the cultural heritage of the Russian diaspora of the 20th century.

NOTES

1 This article opens the next stage of our long-term research on the Art and Architecture of the Russians abroad. The result of the first stage was a biographical dictionary *Artists of Russian Abroad. 1917–1939* (authors: O. Leikind, K. Makhrov, D. Severyukhin, St. Petersburg, 1999; 2000) and an encyclopedic website *Art and Architecture of the Russian Diaspora* (www.artrz.ru), created during the development of this book and supported by the Foundation named after Dmitry Likhachev.


5 Of course, this did not concern the camps under Soviet control like, for example, Camp Beauregard near Paris was, which became a folk symbol of tyranny and violence (See: *Sunset of the Russian emigration in France …* pp. 129–131).


7 See above, p.52.

8 Painter Vasily Krichevsky (1872–1952), one of the founders of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts (1917–1922), is among the few exceptions. During the Great Patriotic War, he left the German-occupied Kiev, went to Lviv, from there to Paris and then to Caracas, where he died.


For information on this painter see: Burova, N. 1972, *Creativity of battle painter Anatoly Sokolov*, Russkaya Jizn (San Francisco), May 18 (№ 2895); Igor Sokoloff. Anatoliy A. Sokoloff 1891–1971. 2012. 24 S.

A. Glagolev *Artists of the Crimea — the 60th anniversary of Comrade Stalin*, Krasniy Krim, 1939, Dec 30.


Reviews on Russian art exhibitions, which were regularly published in the 1950–1970-ies in the emigre newspapers *The New Russian Word* (New York), *Russian idea* (Paris) and others, are of particular interest in this respect. The archive of Vyacheslav Zavalishin, one of the most famous Russian artistic and literary reviewers of the postwar period, is preserved in a private collection in the United States.
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THE IMAGE OF THE LEADER IN THE ART OF SOCIALIST REALISM AND ITS TRANSFORMATION IN THE WORKS OF SOTS ART MASTERS

Summary: This article is dedicated to a problem of depiction the image of the leader in the art of socialist realism and to its reconsideration by the masters of Sots Art. The article allows the establishing of direct dependence between political policy of totalitarianism era and contemporary art tendencies which have found the reflection in informal art afterwards.

Keywords: The image of the leader, socialist realism, Sots Art.

In the hierarchy of socialist realism genres the theme of depiction the leader was given the main priority. Alexander Gerasimov, one of the “court artists” of Stalin, insisted on “the creating the images of socialism geniuses Lenin and Stalin and their closest associates was one of the most crucial ideological and creative tasks that had ever stood in front of the art”\(^1\). As history shows, this problem was performed by the most responsible masters of cultural front in the period of totalitarianism. “Among the 17 Stalin Prizes of 1947, 6 were awarded for the works depicting Stalin, and 4 for Lenin. In 1949, Stalin Prizes were awarded at least for 13 works, recreating the image of the great leader and teacher”\(^2\). Among the winners of these awards can be called Vasili Yefanov (“An Unforgettable Meeting,” 1937, “Stalin, Molotov, Voroshilov at the bed sick Maxim Gorky,” 1944; “Molotov in front of the Kremlin wall”, 1947; “Leading people of Moscow in Kremlin”, with joint authors, 1949), soviet sculptor Euvgeny Vuchetic (portrait of General Chernyakhovsky (1945), a monument to General Yefremov in Vyazma (1946), a basrelief,

The theme of the leader in the art of socialist realism was often difficult to separate from the larger one — “historical-revolutionary” theme, where it found the development. These two themes occupy a dominant position in the hierarchy of genres, and attracted the closest attention of censorship. Maybe that’s why by examining the evolution of these themes in art, it could be considered the “evolution” of repressive totalitarian methods in relation to art in its purest form.

The preconditions for the emergence of the cult of the leader in the art of socialist realism were, oddly enough, the plan of monumental propaganda proposed by Lenin. It was assumed that painters and sculptors must pay particular attention to the image of the heroes who died in the name of revolution in their works in stone, bronze and on canvas. Originally there was an intention to perpetuate and mythologize

1. “An Unforgettable Meeting” (1937) by Vasili Yefanov
only the dead, but in 1933 Lunacharsky made an amendment to the plan of Lenin, calling “to bring to life a second, stronger, more mature wave of monumental propaganda”. Lunacharsky had in mind the need to depict not only the pantheon of the dead, but to include alive leaders and heroes.

After Lenin’s death in 1924, his body was placed in a temporary wooden mausoleum. In the approval of the authorities it was done in order to bid farewell to the leader able to those who had not been able to come to Moscow on the day of the funeral. In 1930, the marble mausoleum of Lenin (by an architect Alexey Shchusev) was built at the Red Square, and a year later appeared the decision on the construction of the Palace

2. “Project of the Palace of Soviets” (1933) by Boris Iofan, Vladimir Gelfreich, Vladimir Shchuko
of Soviets, which was
to culminate with a
hundred-meter statue
of Lenin. Originally,
the building was
designed to be
Lenin’s necropolis.
Over time, the idea
was changed, and in
1938 the magazine
“Art,” writes that
“plastic and pictorial
compositions should
capture how Lenin
and Stalin lead
the peoples of the
Union to freedom
and happiness”.
Despite the fact
that this ambitious
project has never
been realized, many
painters, sculptors
and architects have made an extensive preparatory work, which resulted
with a huge number of sketches and cardboard models, which became
independent works of art. The idea of creating Lenin’s necropolis,
obviously, went back to the famous monument of antiquity — the
tomb of King Mausolus at Halicarnassus (IV century BC. E.), whose
name has become a byword for the monumental tombstone buildings —
the Mausoleum. The structure of Mausoleum at Halicarnassus itself is
typical of the spirit of the era. The creations of Greek Architecture were
public buildings before its appearance, the main purpose of which was
to meet the needs of the citizens of the policy. The Mausoleum sharply
shows completely different task — to perpetuate the memory of the
ruler. Similar trends in the architecture were typical to many cultures, in

3. “Lenin on the tribune” (1930) by Alexander
Gerasimov
which special attention was given to the idea of deification of the carrier power. The Palace of Soviets, not built; Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, the Egyptian pyramids, the tomb of Chinese emperor Qin Shi Huang are, in fact, the phenomena of the same order.

The evolution of deification and mythologizing could be easily traced in the “Leniniana” of an outstanding sculptor and painter Nikolai Andreyev. First full-scale images are more than real. “The second version of the monument to Lenin for the hall of People’s Commissars” (1929) has been already idealized, but still realistically convincing. The sculpture “Lenin-leader” (1930) has already had all the features of sacredness inherent to textbook images of the leader in Soviet art.

A consistent iconography, necessary for the image of the leader, has been set during the era of “cult of personality”. The first of these forms has assumed the transpersonal interpretation of the image of the leader, due to the monumental design and execution. For example, the statues of Lenin (1937) and Joseph Stalin (1939) by Sergei Merkulov in the forebay of Moscow-Volga Chanel. A statue of Lenin, if it crowned an unbuilt Palace of the Soviets, was to become an example of the same order.

At the same time, the image of the leader, as an inspirer and organizer of victories, was welcomed among the artists. This position traditionally has been more appropriate for Lenin. Iconography of depicting has been established — Lenin should be presented to the audience aspiring forward with his right hand, pointing the way to a brighter future, or pledged by the lapel of his jacket (“Monument to Lenin at the Finland Station in St. Petersburg”, 1926, Sergey Yevseev, Vladimir Gelfreich, Vladimir Shchuko, “Monument to Lenin in Ulyanovsk”, 1940, Matthew Manizer). A classic example of this type in painting was the picture of Alexander Gerasimov “Lenin on the tribune” (1930). As a prototype of this depiction could be the famous “Statue of Aulus Metellus” (c. 100 BC. E., The Archaeological Museum, Florence), which portrays a politician (Magistrate), dressed in toga, and standing in the classic pose of the Roman orator. Urging his audience to attention, he stretched out his right hand. This gesture would become traditional and will be repeated many times in the Roman statues, in particular, in the statue “Caesar Octavian Augustus of Prima Porta” (the beginning
The image of the leader in the art of socialist realism and its transformation

of the I century BC. E., Vatican Museum, Rome). Centuries later, the pose of “speaker” will become the standard scheme of leader’s speech in the art of socialist realism.

The next version of the interpretation the image of the leader was representing him as a wise teacher — humble and majestic friend of the people. Here, the important components of its image became the insight, mind and humanity. That’s to say, that in this role of the friend of children, foremost, military and athletes usually appeared Joseph Stalin. As a textbook example, could be list the following thematic paintings: “The leader, teacher, friend” (1937) by Gregory Shegal, “Stalin at a Meeting with Commanders of the First Cavalry Army” (1935) by Alexander Gerasimov, “An Unforgettable Meeting” (1937) by Vasili Yefanov.

It should be noticed, that the image of Lenin, initially prevailed in the art of socialist realism, eventually began to give way to the image of Stalin. In some paintings was subtly emphasized a certain priority of Stalin, for example, in the work of Konstantin Yuon “Comrade Stalin at Lenin’s speech in Smolny” (1939), where the accent was made on the fact of Stalin’s presence at Lenin’s speech. There was an interesting tendency of mythologizing the life of Stalin. He, as it is well-known, came to power in a roundabout way, and did not disdain to achieve his political goals by any means, was badly needed this myth-making. In this regard, there are a huge number of Stalin’s images on the background of the most diverse scenery (“The Morning of our Motherland” (1948) by Fyodor Shurpin; “Stalin on the Tsaritsyn Front” (1938–1939) and “Stalin on defensive borders” (1947) by Pavel Sokolov-Skalia, “Stalin and Voroshilov in the trenches in Tsaritsyn” by Metrophan Grekov). It is significant, that in this case no documentary evidence supporting the visit by leader of any parts of the front has survived. The depiction of appearing of the leader in front of the people in the fatal hour was one of the typical methods of mythologizing in art. For example, the painting of Napoleon Empire style by Antoine Jean Gros “Napoleon in the plague hospital in Jaffa” (1803–1804, Louvre, Paris).

This tendency of mythmaking was reflected in the portraits of the closest associates of Stalin too. Partly it has been preserved even after
the death of Stalin in creating the portraits of his successors — Nikita Khrushchev and Leonid Brezhnev. And if the formal portraits of the era of Khrushchev’s “thaw” was characterized by a certain degree of democracy (“Portrait of N. S. Khrushchev,” 1961, by Dmitry Nalbandian), then in the official portrait of Leonid Brezhnev was found the further development of “Stalin’s empire” style heritage. It is noteworthy that Dmitry Nalbandian, received the Stalin Prize in 1946 for his portrait of the General Secretary, retained its position of “court painter” during the reign of Khrushchev, became subsequently the author of several famous paintings devoted to Leonid Brezhnev. Among them were “L. Brezhnev at the Small Land “(1975), “Creativity for Peace. XXVI Congress of the Party “(1981), “Portrait of Leonid Brezhnev “(1980). In the era of the “Brezhnev stagnation”, a new type in the iconography of the leader appeared. On the one hand this type was characterized by the already known mythologizing. For example, the work of Nalbandian “L. Brezhnev at the Small Land” was a kind of illustration of the book, published under the name of Brezhnev, “The Small Land”, positioning the battle of the same name bridgehead during the Second World War — as one of the key factors that determined the outcome of the war in the end. On the other hand, this type of image of the leader was characterized by attention to the status accessories of a model. Individual portrait characteristic had a secondary role in comparison with carefully drawn Ribbon Star and other senior government awards. Similar decision of portraiture was very popular in the era of the Napoleonic Empire. As one of the best examples it should be mentioned the canvas by Jean Auguste Dominique Ingres “Napoleon on his Imperial Throne” (1806 Army Museum. Paris).

The elements of grotesque, characteristic for almost all types of iconographic image of the leader were reflected in the art of Sots Art, which originated in the 1970s, when Vitaly Komar and Alexander Melamid equated trademark abundance of Western society and the overproduction of ideological production in the USSR. This kind of advertising ideology led to the emergence of a new movement in the art of those years — a time when the circle of authors, who share the interests of Komar and Melamid, was formed. Among them: Alexander Kosolapov,
Leonid Sokov, Dmitry Prigov and Boris Orlov.

The image of the leader undertaken multiple replication in socialist realism visual arts and has become one of the main themes of creative experimentation of the best masters of Sots Art. “Sots-Artists” Alexander Melamid and Vitaly Komar, Alexander Kosolapov, Leonid Sokov and Boris Orlov simply refused to take seriously the established canon of the Leader.

The idea of an ironic deification of Soviet ideals, founded in the Sots Art by Komar and Melamid, came to life in the form of pseudoclassical Stalin’s empire style. Photographic quality of Stalin’s images in the performance of Sots Art masters sent out directly to the notorious paintings of Isaak Brodsky — one of the favorite artists of the General Secretary. A required mythologizing in creating a pictorial chronicle of Joseph Stalin life was beaten in the ironic context repeatedly by Komar and Melamid. So, the painting “The Origin of Socialist Realism” (1982–1983) is based on old legend, recorded by Pliny the Elder. According

to it the first bas relief in the history of art arose precisely because of the shadow. The daughter of a potter from Sicyon surveyed the shadow on the wall the profile of her beloved one (along these lines, her father, made basrelief putting clay). This graceful allegorical allusion by Komar and Melamid refers to verbose assertions of official critics of the Stalin era, that social realism was an evolutionary peak in the development of the fine arts and, in fact, a new birth of it. Another famous painting creative duet — “Stalin and the Muses” (1981–1982) — like the famous allegory of the era of the French Classicism⁵, dedicated to the idea of the glorification of Napoleon Bonaparte by Andrea Appiani.

Another well-known master of Sots Art — Alexander Kosolapov — his experiments were based on the concept of American consumption of Andy Warhol. In the works Kosolapov the leaders’ image was organically combined with the symbols of Western consumer culture. Thus, his famous work “Lenin-Coca-Cola” (1980), made in the form of the Soviet poster, combines the image of Lenin with the company logo “The Coca-Cola Company” and the advertising slogan, given as a quote. Perhaps the most famous work by Kosolapov — sculpture Mickey-Lenin (1990) — is a compound of a headless statue of Lenin with the head of Mickey Mouse. These works and others like them by Alexander Kosolapov reflect the “perestroika” condition and the post-Soviet space, in which the fading faith in the leaders and heroes of communism has been replaced by the rushing stream of western ideology of consumer culture. Kosolapov equates political idea and the object of consumption and indicates that material and intangible values can be replicated and sold in equal measure. The devaluation of the political ideas often leads to the fact that the heroes of popular culture (e.g., the famous Mickey Mouse) are taking place of the leader in people’s minds.

No less interesting interpretation of the leader was reflected in the projects by Leonid Sokov. His “visit card” has become one of the most famous works — “The meeting of two sculptures (Lenin and Giacometti)” (1990, State Tretyakov Gallery). The compositional scheme of “meeting” was devoted to the comparison of the two, belonging to different cultures, backgrounds. “Walking Man” (1961) by Alberto Giacometti opposed to a monument of Lenin by sculptor Nikolai
Andreyev. Surreal situation, enacted by the sculptor, demonstrates to the viewer the duality of socio-cultural environment in the context of the existence of “iron curtain” dividing the “East” and “West.”

Element of the game, due to a clash of symbols or signs of different systems, was typical to many works by Leonid Sokov. “Folklore and carnival manifestation in the works of Sokov were not just borrowing some elements and images, but were the basis of artistic method, which applies to the Sokov objects and phenomena of contemporary reality — both Soviet and capitalist, and even to the mythologemes of modernist culture”6. For example, in the process of creating a series of “History of the USSR” sculptor turned to the traditions of folk art. “Khrushchev” (1983) by Leonid Sokov resembles Russian doll “Matryoshka”, and “Stalin and Hitler” (1983) made on the basis of Bogorodskaya Russian wooden toys. Andrei Yerofeev, and after him, and Julia Tulovskaya explained this phenomenon by comparing the creative experiments of Sokov with reflections of Mikhail Bakhtin about the role of laughter and “carnival” in folk culture7.

The theme of interpretation of the image of the leader had a significant place in the works of Boris Orlov — a longtime friend and associate of Leonid Sokov. Grand sculptural portrait, characteristic to the “Brezhnev” era, underlies many busts by Orlov. The tendency of dominance of status accessories combined with the almost complete disappearance of interest to individual portrait characterization was brought to the grotesque by Boris Orlov (“Bust in the spirit of Rastrelli,” 1982 “in the spirit of Rastrelli Bust”, 1996). Face completely disappears, giving way to a multi-tiered splendor of orders and medal bars. The same trend of portrait unification can be observed in a series “Busts” (1992) in early works of Vladimir Dubosarsky. Here the form becomes extremely concise and simplified into a symbol.

Evolution of the image of the leader in the art of socialist realism throughout the twentieth century was a reaction to social and cultural changes in society. Socialist realism, becoming in many respects a new version of “Empire style” art, absorbed at the same time, lots of other styles that are not in conflict with the official Soviet ideology. In parallel with these processes in the underground of the national culture
in the context of Sots Art, was formed a new approach to the image of the “leader” — a cult figure of power over a certain age. This largely meditative process is both a reflection of the artists about the nature of power and a kind of dialogue with the audience, necessary to everyone to realize their personal relationship to the ambiguous figures and events of the tumultuous XXth century.

NOTES

1. Gerasimov, A. *Socialist Realism*, p. 116
3. *Literary newspaper*, January 29, 1933
4. *Art*, 1938. no. 4, p. 181.
5. “Napoleon’s Apotheosis” (1807, Palazzo Reale, Milan); “Napoleon on the throne with allegorical figures of Peace and Victory” (1806, The Pushkin State Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow).
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ON ANATOLY SMOLENKOV’S “MARMARO”

Summary: This article is about an artistic signature in creation of an outstanding Russian sculptor Anatoly Smolenkov.

Keywords: sculptor, Anatoly Smolenkov, marble, classic art, modern art.

When at exhibitions of flashy contemporary sculptures, often violently gesturing and torn to pieces, you unexpectedly see Anatoly Smolenkov’s calm, restful, to be more exact, figures, a bewilderment, even confusion arises for a moment. What is this? A challenge? A nostalgia for the past? An avoidance of the present? A call for a return to the classics? I suppose not. It is rather a desire to see the art of the past from a new angle, to evaluate it from the present point of view.

In fact there is nothing of the traditional understanding of the antiquity in his bust of David (1998). At any rate, the classical antiquity which we understand today. This antiquity is rather frightening. No less frightening is “antique” Judith of 2003, standing and trampling on Olaferna’s severed head which she contemptuously grabbed by the hair.

Hair in particular is one of the main, if not the main, sense-making motives in Smolenkov’s sculptures. Subject-semantic expressiveness of sculptures is plastically embodied not in faces, nor in gestures, but in the hair. Dramatically dynamic, as if rushing to different directions, the hair so obviously contrasts with the still calm face of Salome; and Judith’s hair is so dangerously active; Judith, who is deliberately calm, is indifferent to the atrocious act of murder just committed. This is also the hair bearing the weight of an architectural structure in the sculpture “The Capital”. As well as the quietly and comfortably sleeping hair in the sculpture “The Dream”; and the hair around a head
It seems to me that Anatoly Smolenkov has found his own special unexpected and original subject and visual language — “the language of hair”.

happily waking up, still unmoving at the bottom and already starting to move at the top in “Morning”.

It seems to me that Anatoly Smolenkov has found his own special unexpected and original subject and visual language — “the language of hair”.

And not only in the approach to the classical plot structure. Smolenkov is an artist of our 21st century — the century of broken, restless consciousness; the century not only of a search, but mainly the century of loss. The loss of our ability to fully perceive modernity and the loss of a poignant acuity of our perception of art of the past. And the drama of his art, it seems to me, is in this.

His sculpture “The Hero” especially intrigued me. It intrigued me particularly by the combination of figurative integrity and plastic dividedness. This sculpture seems to me the most impressive and the most tragically eloquent off all his sculptures I have seen. A peculiar sculptural portrait of our time. Alas.

2004
Before proceeding to the stated theme, it is worth noting that Doukhobor sect formed its ideology and principles throughout its long history. Therefore, to understand how they came to the ideas of non-violence and pacifism it is necessary to present the history of the formation of the sect.

The emergence of the Doukhobor movement associated with the consequences of the church split in 1652. The term “dissenters” officially is used as a symbol of all dissidents who split from the Orthodox Church. Accordingly, the so-called group of “dissenters” that is to say sectarians in relation to each other were also heterogeneous. Groups of sectarians were divided on mystical and rational by scholars. Mystical sects are khlysty, skoptsy, pryguny, beguny etc., which sources of rituals were difficult to determine. In turn, rational sects are doukhobors, molocans, Baptists etc. They are often linked to the influence of the Protestant religion¹.

The emergence of Doukhobor sect researches attribute to the turn of XVII–XVIII centuries². According to the legend, which is referred to by many researchers³, in Kharkov province in the Okhochee village in 1717–1718 there was a retired non-commissioned officer, who began to preach his doctrine. Then teaching spread in Tambov, Voronezh and
Ekaterinoslav provinces. In general, Doukhobor religion of 18–19th centuries expressed as follows: they believed that the temple of God is within man himself: “… our God is acquired in a man is here on earth among us, in all of us… God is in the hearts, in the hearts of man”⁴. Therefore Doukhobors denied external and material forms of religious objects and rituals, church attendance, worship of icons, crosses, sigh of the cross, baptism: “our church is built in the hearts and souls of man”⁵. They also denied the Bible because they believed that God’s word can only exists in the soul and heart of the believer⁶. Thus, the doctrine of the Doukhobors offered equality of all people.

The name of the sect was given by Archbishop Ambrose of Ekaterinoslav in 1786. Churchmen believed that sectarians are fighting against the Holy Spirit, so Ambrose gave them the name “Doukhobors”. Members of the sect have adopted this name, but interpreted it differently trying to explain that they fight for the Holy Spirit⁷. According to others for the first time the name “Doukhobors” was used by Archbishop Nikephoros Theotokis⁸. The researchers note that folk culture in the very rare cases can develop yourself names, and often such names were given by the representatives of “official culture”⁹, giving the name negative ideological meaning. In this case, folk culture did not deny the name and interpreted it as a positive.

In 1802 a decree was issues by Alexander I, in which the Doukhobors were allowed to resettle in the poorly treated land from the banks of the Molochnaya river in Taurian province. Subsequently, this settlement became known as Molochnye Vody. This relocation was not a deportation, on the contrary in the official documents this act appears as action carried out under exceptionally favorable view namely the ability to provide security of the Doukhobors¹⁰.

In the 1841–1845 Doukhobors were evicted to the Caucasus. There they tried to live independently. Leader and the spiritual mentor lived in the Sirotskiy house, which was the symbol of the holy place for Doukhobors. In 1886 Lukerya V. Kalmikova, former chairwoman of the spiritual life of the sect, died. Her secretary Peter Verigin became her heir. Most of the Doukhobors decided to support Verigin, but his opponents enlisted the support of local authorities and addressed the
court, whereupon Verigin was sent into exile. While in exile, Peter Verigin carried away by ideas of Leo Tolstoy about nonviolence and vegetarianism and pacifism of Quakers, and began a correspondence with Tolstoyans. Verigin wrote letters with the instructions for the Doukhobors. Taking him for spiritual mentor, they began to develop the principles of nonviolence and peaceful life, considering it the most suitable to their faith, which before had no official doctrine\textsuperscript{11}.

In 1895 an event occurred, after which the Doukhobors began to identify themselves as the peace movement. June 25, 1895 on the initiative of Peter Verigin they demonstratively burned all of their weapons, as a refusal to take the oath of allegiance to the king, and in support of Duokhobors’ deserters\textsuperscript{12}. In the village Goreloye Tiflis province Cossacks and troops beat the Doukhobors and abused women for the purpose of restoring order.

Tolstoyans staged to bring to this event publicity and protect the rights of the believers. It was finally decided on the need of the resettlement the Doukhobors abroad. In 1899 with the help of Leo Tolstoy, Tolstoyans and the Society of Friends (Quakers), about 8,000 Doukhobors moved to Canada.

Nonetheless, there was ideological and individual dispute among members of the sect. Some of the them came out of the community, preferring to build individual farms, others did not want to live under the guidance of a spiritual leader, and others opposed to technical progress, preferring to work with their own hands. Thus the idea of nonviolence and peaceful life remain fundamental to their identity\textsuperscript{13}. As a result emerged three directions in the Doukhobors movement. In 1938 the Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ was organized, which became the main organization of the Doukhobors in Canada. The members of this society have sought to communal lifestyle and practiced the principle “work and peaceful life”. The second direction called itself independent Doukhobors. In 1945 they founded the Union of Doukhobors in Canada\textsuperscript{14}. The main differences with the Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ were the rejection of communal property and the principle of spiritual guidance, but its members were pacifists and actively cooperated with the main organization for pacifism.
The third direction was the Sons of Freedom or the Brotherhood of Reformed Doukhobors. This group is known for its nonconformism and “terrorist” acts against the Doukhobors of other organizations and the Government of Canada.

In Western historiography exists the impression that resettlement of the Doukhobors transformed them from religious organization into social movement. The impetus for change was the demonstrative burning of weapons, marked the beginning of the pacifist “social activism” in the history of the Doukhobors.

Indeed, the burning of weapons June 29, 1895 is a historic symbol of renunciation of militarism; however, Doukhobors did not forget their religious roots. In officials letters appeals in the middle of the 20th century the Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ identifies themselves as a “religious organization based on the principle of pacifism and nonviolence”. The transformation could not have come at once, as this process is complex and multifaceted. Therefore, in the process of comprehension of their religious roots and linking it with demonstrative burning of weapons Doukhobors purchased signs of social movement. There has been a gradual move from the rational Christian sect to the “moral and social movement”.

Official documents of the Doukbors sect were Protocol of the Congress of Doukhobors, 1928 and the Declaration adopted in 1934. Refusal from militarism was based on the commandment “Thou shalt not kill” and on the teachings of Christ in the Sermon of the Mount. The Declaration expressed a negative attitude toward politicians and political parties, nongovernmental supply of votes in the elections. Doukhobors explained that “engaging in politics so-called Christian participates in the wars, while for the Doukhobors and many other people they are incompatible with Christianity in its true meaning”.

In the middle of the XX century Russian Doukhobors (Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ and Union of Doukhobors of Canada) were quite famous pacifist communities in Canada. They closely followed the developments in the world, were concerned about the policy of the Cold War and the imminent danger of nuclear war. On the pages of their weekly newspaper “Iskra” Doukhobors covered all news
related to the pacifists from different countries, the protests against the war, and led discussions about how to act as pacifists.

Doukhobors was an open group and were willing to cooperate with all their supporters, namely with all Christian pacifists. So in 1958 the War Resisters Conference was held at the initiative of the Doukhobors. It is worth noting that the Doukhobors were concerned about their peacemaking acts. They felt the need to participate actively in the struggle for peace. Therefore, they encouraged to participate in the Conference Doukhobors’ youth and not only “We, the present generation should in turn with our like-minded pacifists as Quakers, Mennonites and others who will participate at this Conference to submit a vote for peace and prosperity”\(^\text{19}\).

Initiators of the Conference except Doukhobors were the Society of Friends (Quakers) and the Fellowship of Reconciliation. It should be noted that the Fellowship of Reconciliation was founded in 1915 in the United States of America and still exists today. The organization was founded by Christian pacifists and at that time included many religious groups, the activity of which was the use of nonviolent action in addressing issues such as disarmament, race relations, civil rights and others. The cooperation these three pacifist groups speaks to their significant impact on the territory on North America.

At the organizational meeting it was decided to hold the Conference at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver 27–29 June, 1958\(^\text{20}\). For Doukhobors the Conference played a decisive importance in the search for further action in the struggle for peace “… conference will provide an opportunity to combine the pacifist movement in Canada and harmonize their actions”\(^\text{21}\).

The program of the Conference except pacifist speeches and discussions included a lecture by professor of the University of British Columbia William Dixon on “Nonviolence in action” and Quaker Dr. Ralph Victor on “The challenge that represents the path of nonviolence in our days”\(^\text{22}\). In addition the program included a peaceful walk through the city with posters calling for peace “Down with the war”, “Ban the atomic bomb”\(^\text{23}\). The third day of the Conference coincided with the main Doukhobors’ holiday the Feast of Saints Peter and Paul, which
is directly linked to the action of Doukhobors — burning of weapons in June 29, 1895.

Conferee from the Doukhobors describing his experience in the newspaper concluded “In general, it has been a lot of very valuable ideas, for example, one world language, one world government, the strengthening of the anti-death penalty, and much more”\(^{24}\). In turn, representatives of the Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ I. Rylkov, P.P. Rylkov and I.A. Popov spoke at a Conference with the following words “…At the moment, when the world is in such a critical situation, such a conference, where peace seekers determine the best ways in which they direct all their efforts are urgently needed… In their public enterprises, regardless of the spanned international relations and political differences, we must be careful to ensure that our actions do not ascribe to the political benefits of Western or Eastern block… Our actions must flow only from wholehearted desire to fulfill the teachings of Jesus Christ… In his personal dedication to the service of truth, basically we must put itself, directly or indirectly, that we cannot support the war, when we must also strive to overcome and do not support all forms and conditions of life the create the causes that lead to war”\(^{25}\).

From the above statements can be determined that the Doukhobors aware of the need to solve problems not within their community, and even within the state in which they lived, on the contrary, they thought globally. If to this we take into account the fact that in Russia Doukhobors tried to live independently (in the Molochnie Vody and the Caucasus) and moved to Canada, one of the principle of their life was the rejection of any participation in the political life of the country we can conclude that in they had cosmopolitan ideas. Doukhobors in mild form prefigure those cosmopolitan societies that began to develop at the turn of the XX–XXI centuries such as youth subcultures, environmental organizations and others. It can be concluded, as sociologist Ulrich Beck said that cosmopolitanism connects with the construction of the image of a common future\(^ {26}\), that the Doukhobors were on their way to this state because in their collective memory there was only one event specifically the burning of weapons. By analyzing this event, they were in constant search of new nonviolent methods to fight for peace.
The participants adopted three resolutions according to the results of the Conference. Two of them were addressed primarily to the Government of Canada “We affirm and serve protest against the construction of any military bases of any foreign country on Canadian soil… measures to persuade the government of Canada establish the Royal Commission and to investigate and study the measures, methods and the possibility of introducing pacifism in the foreign policy of Canada, which would replace the present policy based on thermonuclear bombs to save the world leading to self-destruction of humanity must be taken”\(^{27}\). The third resolution was of a general nature “request to governments on the prohibition of atomic bombs, and a call for peace and brotherhood to the systematic disarmament”\(^{28}\).

Thus, in the middle of the XX century orthodox Doukhobors conducted their activities under the absolute pacifism, based on Christian precepts. Watching the active actions of pacifists from around the world such as obstruction of work on military bases, mass strikes, hunger strikes, protest actions against the war, peace marches and so on, Doukhobors also embarked on an active pacifism. This Conference strengthen their faith on the correctness of their actions in the struggle for peace.
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RHYTHM AND RHETORIC

Summary: One of the problematic issues in L. Sterne studies is his graphological style. This paper seeks to illustrate that graphological rhythm plays the crucial role in communicating the implied author’s point of view in Laurence Sterne’s novel “A Sentimental Journey through France and Italy”. The key to the rhetoric of the novel is the rhythm of graphic units of three types: syntagmas + phrases, sentences and paragraphs. These rhythms are built into one another. The rhythm of paragraphs corresponds to the implied author’s level of discourse, the rhythm of sentences — to the travel accounts of the Reverend Mr. Yorick (this level is a mystification), the rhythm of syntagmas and phrases — to the inner speech of the Reverend Mr. Yorick. The level of Yorick’s inner speech makes it possible to turn this speech (and through it the processes taking place in the protagonist’s consciousness and soul) into the main theme of the novel. Interaction of the three rhythms reveals the implied author point of view.

Keywords: Rhetoric of fiction, rhythm, discourse, graphological style, implied author, effective communication, text semantic map, purport of communication, mind style

Problem
L. Sterne is known for his peculiar graphological style. The question arises, if the graphological rhythm of his texts is just a kind of eccentricity, a representation narrator’s associative way of thinking or, perhaps, it has some rhetorical and structural value in terms of communication between the implied author and reader.

Premise
Rhetoric is the art of effective communication. It is about how to form your idea and put it into words in order to reach some external
aim. Classical rhetoric speech generation algorithm contains three steps: invention, disposition and elocution. At the stage of invention by identifying the relevant-for-the-purport-of-communication aspects of the theme we produce the figure of thought. The key aspects are represented by the key words. The system of the key words forms the semantic map (structural metaphor) of the text idea. At the disposition stage the key points are distributed in a certain order reflecting the author’s strategy in communication. The linear sequence of the key words is the semantic rhythm of the text. At the elocution stage the verbal text is created. The choice of words and syntactic structures and the way they are organized in the text constitute the text’s style which is the realization of the author’s communicative purport. The linear sequence of the text elements composes complex rhythm of the text in which units of different levels (semantic, syntactic, phonological, graphological) correlate. This rhythm is the text perception programme.  

Thus rhythm can serve as a key to all levels of the text content. Linearity of written texts is rendered first and foremost in graphological rhythm, so the decoding of a written text message can be represented as follows: graphological level — syntactic level — semantic level.  

Scope of discussion  
The paper presents the analysis of the first small chapter of “A Sentimental Journey…”:

“— (1) They order, said I, this matter better in France—
— (2) You have been in France? said my gentleman, turning quick upon me with the most civil triumph in the world.— (3) Strange! quoth I, debating the matter with myself, That one and twenty miles sailing, for “tis absolutely no further from Dover to Calais, should give a man these rights— (4) I’ll look into them: so giving up the argument— (5) I went straight to my lodgings, put up half a dozen shirts and a black pair of silk breeches— (6) “the coat I have on, said I, looking at the sleeve, will do”— (7) took a place in the Dover stage; and the packet sailing at nine the next morning— (8) by three I had got sat down to my dinner upon a fricassee’d chicken, so incontestably in France, that had I died that night of an indigestion, the whole world could not have
suspended the effects of the Droits d’aubaine — (9) my shirts, and black pair of silk breeches— (10) portmanteau and all must have gone to the King of France— (11) even the little picture which I have so long worn, and so often have told thee, Eliza, I would carry with me into my grave, would have been torn from my neck.— (12) Ungenerous!— (13) to seize upon the wreck of an unwary passenger, whom your subjects had beckon’d to their coast — (14) by heaven! SIRE, it is not well done; and much does it grieve me, “tis the monarch of a people so civilized and courteous, and so renown’d for sentiment and fine feelings, that I have to reason with——

(15) But I have scarce set foot in your dominion——”  

The excerpt is taken from the edition, which renders peculiar graphological properties of the 1968 edition (Laurence Sterne, A Sentimental Journey through France and Italy by Mr. Yorick to which are added The Journal to Eliza and A Political Romance, Edited with Introduction by Ian Jack. London, Oxford University Press) which in its turn reproduces the spelling and punctuation of the first edition of the novel.

Discussion and Results
Firstly a few words about “A Sentimental Journey…”.

The novel is written in the form of travel notes. The narrator is the Reverend Mr. Yorick. He classifies himself as The Sentimental Traveller. The purpose of his journey is to write an essay on human nature. He goes to France for the sake of this, because he believes that “they know this matter better in France”.

Bearing this in mind we can assume that the novel has two levels of discourse: those of the implied author and narrator. But graphology of the text does not allow to do so.

The text of the chapter has three clearly observable graphological rhythms: the rhythm of paragraphs, the rhythm of sentences (segments divided by full stops) and the rhythm of phrases (segments divided by dashes). The study showed that the rhythmical organization of the chapter gives us a clue to understanding the text as a counteraction of the points of view of three levels of discourse: the implied author (the
rhythm of paragraphs), Yorick as a writer of travel notes (the rhythm of sentences) and Yorick’s inner speech (the rhythm of phrases).

There is nothing new in the idea that “A Sentimental Journey…” is virtually a rudimentary form of stream of consciousness. Virginia Woolf wrote in “The “Sentimental Journey”: “He was travelling in France indeed, but the road was often through his own mind, and his chief adventures were not with brigands and precipices but with the emotions of his own heart.”

What is new in this study is that the three levels of discourse are correlated with particular graphological rhythms.

Let us consider each of the levels in the following order: Section 1 — the most outward level of travel accounts, Section 2 — Yorick’s inner speech, Section 3 — the implied author’s level of discourse.

Section 1.
The novel claims to be travel notes, so it is logical to expect that such parts of the text as narrations, dialogues, descriptions would be arranged in separate paragraphs. They are indeed singled out but only as sentences by full stops. The first sentence is a dialogue (phrases 1 and 2), the second one consisting of inner monologue (phrase 3 and 1st syntagma of phrase 4), narration (2nd syntagma of phrase 4 — phrase 10), monologue addressed to Eliza (phrase 11) can be treated as narrator’s words, the third sentence is a narrator’s monologue addressed to the King of France (phrases 12–15). Actually when we read the text we do not mention the full stops. At first the beginnings of the second and third sentences seem to belong to the previous mode of discourse. This can be easily seen. The words “Strange! quoth I…” (phrase 3) would first seem to continue a dialogue, similarly phrases 12 and 13 (“Ungenerous!— to seize upon the wreck of an unwary passenger”) are perceived as the address to Eliza.

Let us look at this in more detail. The first sentence is not direct speech proper: although this part of the text has been meant as direct speech, its graphic presentation (missing inverted commas, but with an interrogation mark) shows that this is free direct speech. They are scraps of Yorick’s and some other gentleman’s conversation intertwined into Yorick’s reminiscences.
There is no address of any kind until phrase 11 and it would be quite right to suppose that Yorick as a narrator addresses his reader. In phrase 11 the address “Eliza” appears. We might state that Eliza is the addressee only of phrase 11. On the other hand however this phrase is not distinguished sintactically, therefore this address may just as well be referred to the whole preceding text beginning with the word “Strange”. The ambiguity in referring words and expressions, which stand on the conjuncture of different types of discourse, to this or that discourse type, is a stylistic device, which the author employs throughout the extract. The words “Strange! quoth I…” (phrase 3) would first seem to continue a dialogue, and only afterwards does the reader finds out that Yorick is discussing the problem with his own self. Phrases 12 and 13 up to the words “Your subjects…” are perceived as the address to Eliza or to the reader, and it is only after the words “your subjects…”, and especially “SIRE” and “monarch” do we understand that Yorick is actually appealing to the King of France. This kind of ambiguity proves that Yorick’s thought has not been structured artificially to meet the expectations of the reader, but has been recorded as a process.

It looks as if Yorick was trying but couldn’t create reader-oriented narrative because of the constant changes of his mood and various associations.

Thus, upon closer examination, it turns out that the form of travel notes is just a mystification. The text of this small chapter is Yorick’s spontaneous inner speech. And it is the protagonist’s inner world, his thoughts and state of mind that is the theme of the novel.

Section 2.

At the level of Yorick’s inner speech two rhythms should be considered: A) semantic and B) phrasal (graphological).

A) Semantically the chapter can be easily divided into two parts (two mind styles): the factographic narrative about concrete events (phrases 5–10) and emotional harangue on ethics (phrases 2 (partially), 3, 11–14). The second mind style, dealing with social and moral aspects of human life, forms a kind of the chapter’s frame, and also it can figuratively be considered as ideological frame of the novel.
The two mind styles mean that the protagonist’s mental outlook boils down to 2 points: everyday life and ethical issues of rationalism and sentimentality. Graphically, the transition from one thematic type of text to another is not pointed out anywhere.


Lexically, this part of the text may be distinguished for its simplicity. The verbs denote concrete actions and are used in the Indefinite — “went, put up, said, took a place” (on the way to France) and Perfect — “had got sat down” (arrival in France) forms. It is only in phrases 8 and 9, with the shift to the second type of style there appear modals “could” and “must” and the subjunctive.


There are five adjectives altogether: “black”, “silk” and “fricassee’d” (participle in the attributive function) point out the objects’ concrete qualities; “next” — shows the time sequence. The few adjectives make the text dynamic and enhances the semantic importance of those used. The adjectives “silk” and “black” are repeated twice: the quality of the breeches is a very significant detail for Yorick. “Fricassee’d chicken” is a French dish which means that the protagonist is in France, a fact to be proud of. “Next” shows that Yorick is satisfied with the swiftness of his actions.

There are two adverbs. “Straight” describes the protagonist’s determination to start off straightaway. “So incontestably” expresses the fact that he is content with having reached his destination — France.

The two numerals — “nine” and “three” — define the time.

Pronouns. Only first-person pronouns “I” and “my” are used, which testifies to the protagonist’s egocentrism.

Stylistically, the majority of the words are neutral, there is one colloquialism “will do” and some bookish vocabulary — “incontestably”, “suspend”, “effect”.
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Only one stylistic device is used: comparison. Yorick’s being in France is as indisputable as the inevitability of the law of Droits d’aubaine. This comparison reiterates Yorick’s attachment to material things, his personal belongings.

Thus, the selected vocabulary describes a character of a practical, pro-active and egocentric person. This effect is supported by the syntactic organisation of the text.

Most of the syntactic units possess the structure “I+v+n”. In phrases 5–8 only two notions perform the role of the subject: “I” and “the whole world”. This apposition speaks for itself. In phrases 9 and 10 the agents are Yorick’s various personal items: “My shirts and black pair of silk breeches — portmanteau and all…” They seem to be personified, become as important as “I”.

The other mind style is the style of ethical discourse (phrases 2,3,11–14). The first that strikes here as compared to the factographic mind style is that Yorick does not do anything, but just reacts emotionally and verbally to somebody’s actions. In phrase 3 it is his reaction to some gentleman’s words; in phrases 11–14 — to the French law of Droits d’aubaine. In this context evaluative expressions are used “Strange!”, “Ungenerous’!, “it is not well done”, modal verbs “should”, “have to”, words related to social and moral spheres — “civilised”, “rights”, “courteous”, “sentiment”, “fine feelings”.

The use of verbs is also emotional. The verbs, the action of which Yorick experiences, notify rapid, almost forcible actions — “would have been torn from my neck”, “to seize upon the wreck of an unwary passenger”. The verbs that denote actions undertaken by Yorick, however, have the connotation of steadiness and formality: “debating”, “grieve”, “reason with”.

The metaphor “wreck of an unwary passenger” and epithet “the most civil triumph in the world” create the effect of Yorick’s “suffering” state.

The syntactic constructions of these parts of the chapter is multifarious, it’s mainly hypotaxis. The phrases have different length — from one-word to 30-word ones. Emotional exclamations “by heaven’!, emphatic ellipse “Strange’!, “Ungenerous!” are used. Phrase 14 is a convergence of syntactic stylistic devices: inversion with emphatis “does” (‘and
much does it grieve me); attribute in post-position the parts of which have parallel structure with repetition of “so” (‘people so civilised and courteous, so renown’d for sentiment and fine feelings’).

Yorick demonstrates his evaluative point of view twice. Firstly, it is his indignation at the fact that somebody dares to triumph over somebody else only because he has been to France. His indignation is expressed by the oxymoron epithet “the most civil triumph in the world”, by evaluative exclamation “Strange!”, attribute “these” (these rights) with derogatory colouring.

Secondly, it is Yorick’s indignation at the Law of Droits d’aubaine which is expressed by the evaluative phrases like “Ungenerous!, it is not well done…”, by the expressive verb “grieve” with intensification and inversion, exclamation “by heaven”, emphatic construction with the infinitive “to seize upon the wreck of an unwary passenger”, as well as by counter-opposition of words with the positive connotation “civilised”, “courteous”, “sentiment”, “fine feelings” to the Law of Droits d’aubaine.

These examples show that the protagonist claims to be a representation of a “moral man” of the Enlightenment.

Yorick’s tone changes depending on the suggested addressee and the subject. The beginning of the chapter where Yorick mimics the gentleman and answers him in his thoughts possesses sarcastic and ironic tone. This effect is created by the epithet “the most civil triumph in the world”, as well as the forgrounding of 4th syntagma of phrase 3 with the help of the capital letter (‘… myself, That one and twenty miles sailing…’).

The tone of the narrative is light — the protagonist is satisfied with his actions. The danger of losing his possessions makes Yorick moan addressing Eliza. While addressing the King of France he is accusatory at first, then he takes a patronising and edifying stand.

Yorick’s tone overall (especially in the style of his ethical speculations) is characterised by affectation and mannerisms typical of a sentimental character.

B) Graphological rhythm of syntagmas and phrases, is strikingly uneven. The number of words in a syntagma, syntagmas in a phrase,
and words in a phrase keeps changing. The combination of these rhythms gives the picture of the rhythm of Yorick’s inner speech.

The first and the second phrases (the “dialogue”) have a similar rhythmical structure: the same number of syntagmas, the last syntagmas are much bigger in size than the previous ones.

The first two syntagmas of these phrases are parallel. The first syntagma of phrase 2 echoes the structure of the third syntagma of phrase 1: the same number of words, the same focus, alliteration in the words better and been placed in the same position. This and the transposition of the affirmative sentence into an interrogative one in the first syntagma of phrase 2 render the irony in the gentleman’s question.

Phrases 1 and 2 form a unity in the rhythmical outline: irregular, but still growing of the tempo manifests the growth of emotional tension. This effect is enhanced by the epithet the “most civil… in the world”.

The abrupt acceleration of the tempo in the last syntagma of phrase 2 is interrupted by not less abrupt halt — the stressed beginning of phrase 3 — the emotional-evaluating exclamation “Strange!” which turns out to be foregrounded due to such a position.

The first three syntagmas of phrase 3 repeat the structure of phrase 2. Phrase 3 structurally continues the “dialogue” and it is only from the words “with myself” that the reader understands that the protagonist is talking to himself.

Syntagmas 4, 5, and 6 of phrase 3 are a subordinate clause from the main one “Strange!”. Syntagma 4 is graphically foregrounded by the capital letter “T”. The capital “T” here does not just distinguish the syntagma, but makes it a proper noun. This syntagma is a periphrasis of the word France. The device of litotes is used here: the contents of the word France has been compressed to the distance of 21 miles by sea.

Syntagma 6 has a strong position because of the change in the rhythm tendency of the whole of phrase 3: the gradual acceleration of the tempo during five syntagmas is succeeded by its slight slowdown. Besides, syntagma 6 is placed at the end of the phrase. All this underlines one of the key words of the style of “ethical speculations” — “rights”, which is placed at the end of syntagma 6 as well as at the end of phrase 3.
Phrase 4 — the abrupt slowing of the tempo expresses Yorick’s deliberation to set off immediately. The first syntagm continues and ends the free direct speech and in this way it is connected with three previous phrases. As for its contents, it is connected with the ensuing narrative until phrase 11 included.

This excerpt of the text (syntagm 2 of phrase 4 — phrase 11) comprises two syntactic phrases (‘sentences’) separated by a semicolon after the first syntagma of phrase 7.

“Sentence” (1) tells of Yorick’s actions until his boarding the packet-boat. The grouping of the homogeneous members into separate phrases and their asyndetic linkage singles out these actions and accelerates the tempo of the narrative thus rendering Yorick’s hasty actions. In the first syntagma of phrase 7 the tempo slows down: Yorick is close to his destination.

The beginning of “sentence” (2) is similar to that of the first one, it is a participle construction. This similarity in the “sentence’s” beginnings only underlines the opposition of their other parts. In phrase 8 the tense form changes from Indefinite to Perfect: Yorick has reached his destination. The tempo grows dramatically: it is the longest phrase in the chapter, its first syntagma is also the longest, and it finishes with the word France: Yorick is exulting and triumphing. He is content for having reached France and allows himself a joke. But the joke turns out a clumsy one and it once again brings out of balance the protagonist’s state of soul. The tempo shifts dramatically bringing to the fore the syntagm “my shirts” naming one of Yorick’s “valuables”.

Phrase 9 and beginning of phrase 10 are parallel. They are built along the model “something should have been confiscated”. However the structure of phrase 11 is complicated by the attributive clause it also has parallelism — chiasmus: “I have so long worn, and so often have told thee…” The abundance of parallel constructions as well as the acceleration of the tempo, the abrupt shift of rhythm (syntagm Eliza) and then again its acceleration, unstressed beginnings and stressed syntagma endings, using of Subjunctive mood, the word “grave”, hyperbole “would have been torn from my neck”, repetitions of the
words “would” and “my” render this part of the text the form and intonation of moaning.

Phrases 12 and 13 are parts of one syntactic sentence: “It is ungenerous to seize…” Here the emotional tension remains strong, which is proved by the division of this sentence into separate phrases, usage of exclamation mark, transformation of phrase 13 into an emphatic construction with an Infinitive, the rhythmical outline (abrupt shift of rhythm by phrase 12, considerable acceleration of the tempo in phrase 13, then again abrupt shift in phrase 14), and by the vocabulary (evaluative words and expressions, expressive verbs “seize” and “beckon”, the metaphor “wreck of an unwary passenger’). But the tone is changed: Yorick accuses the King of France of the absence of mercifulness.

In phrase 14 the tempo gradually grows until the last syntagma. Yorick sermonizes. Two attributive structures in postposition (parallel forms with the repetition of the adverb so, inversion (word order typical of reproach and pity), expressive verbs (“grieve”, “reason with” in combination with the modal “have to’) make Yorick’s tone tragically patronizing.

In phrase 15, the last phrase in the extract, the tension completely disappears. Yorick is back to the reality. The rhythm of the unfinished sentence introduces the whole of the ensuing narrative.

Thus, the protagonist’s speech is characterized by the impossibility of decomposition: it is not subdivided into paragraphs, but is represented as an uninterrupted stream of consciousness: in this stream the graphic, syntactic, semantic and stylistic boudaries do not coincide, hence the impression that it is impossible to disintegrate this speech into logical parts.

Within this uninterrupted stream one can see constant shifts of rhythm: the tendency to establish a certain norm appears and then is dramatically violated.

Yorick’s interior speech reflects his unbalanced nature and associative character of his thought.

The above allows us to make a conclusion that the protagonist is an emotional even passionate figure, he is well educated, is aware of contemporary philosophical and ethical ideas, and moreover, thinks of himself as a “moral person”, the ideal of the Enlightenment. However,
along goes his care for everyday life details, he is not alien to material
attachments and is a rather emotionally unstable and petty person. His
thought always goes with associations and impulses, being at the same
time continuous (uninterrupted). It is well developed: he uses sentences
of various length and types (simple, complex, with subordination and not).

Section3.

The key to the author’s point of view is the rhythm of paragraphs.

It counterpoises the first and the last phrases, which are parallel. The
text begins with a long dash and no indention, in other words, with a
meaningful pause, which continues (not begins) the conversation. The
chapter ends also with a long dash at the end of an unfinished sentence.
Thus, the first phrase turns out to be connected with some conversation
prior to the beginning of the novel, while the last one — with all the
following narrative. The space in between them, i.e. the second paragraph,
is the context for the interpretation of these phrases. It reproduces the
chain of events (Yorick’s actions) which had been caused by the first
phrase and lead to the consequence expressed in the last one.

The denotate of the rheme in both phrases is France. The function
of the frame in this case is to point out the cause and its consequence.

The real cause of Yorick’s journey is not writing an essay on human
nature as he states, but his wounded vanity. This will be explained.

The novel begins with the phrase the meaning of which is not
expressed explicitly (minimal context for the interpretation of this
phrase is the 1st sentence). Yorick does not care to clarify the meaning
of the word “matter”. In this situation it is something else that is
important for him — this phrase has caused his humiliation: some
gentleman dared to point out to Yorick (and did it in public) that he was
speaking of the things he had never seen. Yorick wanted to produce an
impression of a connoisseur, but he suffered humiliation. This is the
reason for the protagonist’s annoyance and indignation, not the snobbery
of the gentleman who asked the question. The gentleman’s words catch
Yorick unawares and this is what exasperates him. He did not expect the
question, which is proved by the adverb “quick” used to describe the
gentleman’s actions. The epithet “the most civil triumph in the world”
reveals Yorick’s annoyance at his interlocutor’s placid confidence.
Thus the real reason for Yorick’s “sentimental journey” is his offended pride rather than some lofty motive befitting a “moral man”.

The first chapter is the actual preface of the novel. It is the preface of the story about Yorick’s inner world. The nominal preface — Chapter 7 (it is called “Preface”) was written after the protagonist recovered from the shock.

The above allows to conclude that the author’s point of view is irony. However, the object of the author’s irony is not just (or not so much) Yorick himself as the embodiment of the Enlightenment’s ideas, but the ideas per se. The protagonist’s mannerist tone seems to be mimicking various kinds of printed matter popular at that time, parodying them. This is on the one hand. On the other, Yorick’s frankness, his real wish to live up to the ideal, make one simply like him as a person. L. Sterne, a clergyman, was above the philosophy of his time. He knew how to love man in his weakness, mocking at it. This trait of the writer was imprinted in the image of the author of the Sentimental Journey. And this is the discoursal point of view in the novel.

NOTES


3 The analysis presented in this paper was made as a part of the comparative study of the style of six Russian translations of “A Sentimental Journey…” but findings as regards the novel’s style turned out to be interesting as well. For more information see: Salieva, L.K. “The method of historical and stylistic analysis of translated texts (based on the Russian translations of the novel L. Sterna)” Sentimental Journey Through France and Italy “)” (thesis, Lomonosov Moscow State University, 1992)

4 Laurence Sterne, “A Sentimental Journey through France and Italy by Mr. Yorick” in From Fact to Fiction (Moscow: Raduga, 1987), 233–312.

5 Ibid., 233
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